Jets-HF PWG requirements for backward hadronic calorimeter construction

Leszek Kosarzewski

Ohio State University

Jets-HF PWG group meeting, 15.11.2023

Jet-HF measurements with backward HCal

Purpose:

- The point of this presentation is to get feedback from Jet-HF PWG about:
  - Which Jet measurements could benefit from backward HCal(nHCal)
  - Start coordinating with the Jet-HF PWG on the performance checks
    - Extended acceptance, charged/neutral hadron identification and measurement
  - What parameters are most relevant?
    - Efficiency, acceptance, granularity/position resolution
  - How can we translate the acceptance into coverage in x, Q^2 plane

Physics processes of interest:

- Vector Meson production and measurement via dimuon channel
  - μ/π distinction, track-cluster matching
- Jets coming from low-x partons
  - Low energy neutrons $< E >= 2.38\mathrm{GeV}$
- Low-x physics in general, but more suggestions welcome!

Simulations of physics processes including backward HCal:

- Track-cluster association should work (not tested for nHCal)
- Basic reco clusters available - further tests needed
- Truth clusters can also be used

Requirements: https://eic.jlab.org/Requirements/

A future backward HCal shall provide functionality of a tail catcher for the high resolution e/m calorimeter in electron identification, as well as for jet kinematics measurement at small Bjorken x





- Design considerations:
  - High efficiency for low energy neutron detection
  - Good spatial resolution to distinguish neutral/charged hadrons
- Follow similar solutions as Forward HCal instead of STAR EEMC megatiles
  - Due to required quick dissassembly of STAR - the EEMC megatiles are no longer an option
  - Can make adjustments to Forward HCal (LFHCAL) design, but no need to reinvent the wheel

- Sampling calorimeter with 10 alternating layers, $2.4\lambda^0$ (red), similar to Belle-II KLM:
  - stainless steel 4 cm
  - plastic scintillator 4 mm - follow forward HCal
- Light collection by SiPM:
  - Candidate (to verify): S14160-1315PS `https://www.hamamatsu.com/eu/en/product/optical-sensors/mppc/mppc_mppc-array/S14160-1315PS.html`
- Electronics to follow solutions of other calorimetry systems (HGCROCv3 or EICROC)



- nHCal decoupled from the magnetic steel ⇒ more flexibility



- A simplified version with STAR EEMC tiles already present in the main ePIC branch and included in the simulation campaigns
  - Good enough for basic checks
- Need a quick update with forward HCal-type geometry

Overlap of calorimeters

Acceptance



- Acceptance $-3.5 < \eta < -1.27$ - can still be extended to match the stainless steel absorber volume
- Overlaps with backward and barrel EMcals
- Scattering may be important in these overlap regions

Scattering may be a problem for jet energy reconstruction





- 50% of neutrons scatter in backward EMCal
- Scattered neutron may fall out of a jet reconstruction cone
- We need to study this in coordination with Jet-HF PWG



- Important for high y or low-p_T vector mesons - depends on type
- Increases acceptance
- Need projected MIP tracks and MIP signals in backward HCal and EMCal
  - μ/π distinction important, position resolution...

Radiation length - brycecanyon geometry



- $\sim 24 X_0$ for backward HCal
- Scintillator tiles do not cover the same volume as steel absorber yet



- $\sim 2.4\lambda_0$ for backward HCal
- Scintillator tiles do not cover the same volume as steel absorber yet

Conclusions

- Presented basic concept for backward HCal for ePIC
- Simplified geometry already in simulation campaign for STAR EEMC geometry+extensions
- Need guidance from physics on the coverage in η
- Starting point for a discussion/coordination between PWG(effects on physics) and detector design

BACKUP







- Pythia simulation by Brian Page







- Pythia simulation by Brian Page

Primary particle distributions - eta and energy









- Primary (generated) MC particles hitting nHCal
- Mean energy of neutrons $< E >= 2.38\ \mathrm{GeV}$
- Large number of high E e^- - from beam? (but these should have generator status=4)



- Primary (generated) MC particles hitting nHCal
- Mean energy of neutrons $< E >_{-2<\eta<-1} = 1.65\ \mathrm{GeV}$ and $< E >_{-3<\eta<-2} = 2.52\ \mathrm{GeV}$





- Primary (generated) MC particles hitting nHCal
- Mean energy of neutrons $< E >_{-4<\eta<-3} = 3.84\ \mathrm{GeV}$





- Primary (generated) MC particles hitting nHCal
- Mean momentum of neutrons $< p >= 2.12\,\mathrm{GeV/c}$

Primary particle distributions - Momentum vs. eta



- Primary (generated) MC particles hitting nHCal
- Mean momentum of neutrons $< p >_{-2<\eta<-1} = 1.32\ \mathrm{GeV/c}$ and $< p >_{-3<\eta<-2} = 2.29\ \mathrm{GeV/c}$





- Primary (generated) MC particles hitting nHCal
- Mean momentum of neutrons $< p >_{-4<\eta<-3} = 3.68\ \mathrm{GeV/c}$

LFHCal design



Stacking design




15.2 mm absorber
0.1 mm kapton + 0.05 mm glue
0.2 mm reflective foil
0.25mm air ga
4 mm Scintillator
SiPM
0.1 mm reflective foil
0.1 mm kapton + 0.05 mm glue
flex pcb 0.2mm
0.25mm air ga
15.2 mm absorber
4

LFHCal PCBs


wraped scintillator tile
flex PCB for mounting and signal transfer of 4 SiPM
PCB for signal transfer
from single layer


8M tile assembly
19.6 cm
9.8 cm


16mm tungsten plates
16mm steel plates
4 mm scintillator tiles
transfer PCB
HGCROC read-out board
hadrons
10 cm
120 cm
8M tower module - 20 cm x 10 cm x 140 cm
- 8 5 cm x 5 cm LFHCal towers