Multi-Calorimetry in Light-based Neutrino Detector

Yang HAN

Sun Yat-sen University Oct. 26. 2023 Neutrino Telescopes @ Venice



In a light-based neutrino detector



Advances in photonics interface contribute greatly to neutrino physics!

Liquid scintillator detector (LSD)

One of the most widely used technology.



Ideal calorimeter in MeV scale.

(Reactor neutrino, solar neutrino, geo-neutrino, $0\nu\beta\beta$...) (LSD energy range: tens of keV to GeV)

LSD:

- More light w.r.t. only Cherenkov light: $O(10^2) \sim O(10^3)$ photon detected per MeV
- Higher energy resolution: up to % level @ 1MeV
- Lower energy threshold: down to ~tens of keV

Discussion based on calorimetry

(energy measurement)

in LSD in this talk.

(Other detectors, e.g. water Cherenkov, may benefit.)

Calorimetry in LSD

Calorimetry response:

Systematics from 3 types of effects

Non-Linearity (NL)

- Light non-linearity i.e. NL(l): Quenching and Cherenkov.
- Charge non-linearity i.e. NL(q): Photo-sensors, readout electronics, reconstruction and their interfaces. In-situ measurement is important.

Non-Uniformity (NU)

 Detector geometry and optical effects.
Position-dependent. Changes in time w.r.t. temperature, detector medium evolution, and readout configuration.

Non-Stability (NS)

Overall: $R = R_o \cdot \alpha_{NU} \cdot \alpha_{NS} \cdot \alpha_{NL}$ $R : response \alpha_i : normalized NU,$ $k = R_o \cdot \alpha_{NU} \cdot \alpha_{NS} \cdot \alpha_{NL}$ $R : response \alpha_i : normalized NU,$ $k = R_o \cdot \alpha_{NU} \cdot \alpha_{NL} \cdot \alpha_{NL}$ $R : response \alpha_i : normalized NU,$ $k = R_o \cdot \alpha_{NL} \cdot \alpha_{NL} \cdot \alpha_{NL}$ $R : response \alpha_i : normalized NU,$ $k = R_o \cdot \alpha_{NL} \cdot \alpha_{NL} \cdot \alpha_{NL}$ $R : response \alpha_i : normalized NU,$ $k = R_o \cdot \alpha_{NL} \cdot \alpha_{NL} \cdot \alpha_{NL}$ $R : response \alpha_i : normalized NU,$ $k = R_o \cdot \alpha_{NL} \cdot \alpha_{NL}$ $R : response \alpha_i : normalized NU,$ $k = R_o \cdot \alpha_{NL} \cdot \alpha_{NL}$ $R : response \alpha_i : normalized NU,$ $k = R_o \cdot \alpha_{NL} \cdot \alpha_{NL}$ $R : response \alpha_i : normalized NU,$ $k = R_o \cdot \alpha_{NL} \cdot \alpha_{NL}$ $R : response \alpha_i : normalized NU,$ $k = R_o \cdot \alpha_{NL} \cdot \alpha_{NL}$ $R : response \alpha_i : normalized NU,$ $k = R_o \cdot \alpha_{NL} \cdot \alpha_{NL}$ $R : response \alpha_i : normalized NU,$ $k = R_o \cdot \alpha_{NL}$ $R : response \alpha_i : normalized NU,$ $k = R_o \cdot \alpha_{NL}$ $R : response \alpha_i : normalized NU,$ $k = R_o \cdot \alpha_{NL}$ $R : response \alpha_i : normalized NU,$ $k = R_o \cdot \alpha_{NL}$ $R : response \alpha_i : normalized NU,$ $k = R_o \cdot \alpha_{NL}$ $R : response \alpha_i : normalized NU,$ $k = R_o \cdot \alpha_{NL}$ $R : response \alpha_i : normalized NU,$ $k = R_o \cdot \alpha_{NL}$ $R : response \alpha_i : normalized NU,$ $k = R_o \cdot \alpha_{NL}$ $R : response \alpha_i : normalized NU,$ $k = R_o \cdot \alpha_{NL}$ $R : response \alpha_i : normalized NU,$ $k = R_o \cdot \alpha_{NL}$ $R : response \alpha_i : normalized NU,$ $k = R_o \cdot \alpha_{NL}$ $R : response \alpha_i : normalized NU,$ $k = R_o \cdot \alpha_{NL}$

Ideally: $\alpha_{NU} \otimes \alpha_{NS} \otimes \alpha_{NL} = 0$ ("orthogonality") \rightarrow Independent precise control of each term.

Realistic complex scenarios with Response Entanglement can lead to:

 $\alpha_{NU} \otimes \alpha_{NS} \otimes \alpha_{NL} \neq 0 \rightarrow$ Challenge of systematics control !

Calorimetry regimes

Energy measurement \rightarrow Detection of photons \rightarrow Direct observable: charge signal



Channel-wise light level

Average detected photons in single photo-sensor (SPS) (Driven by energy of interest, detector geometry and SPS dimension.)

Hypothetical LSDs:



Single Calorimetry LSD

Most LSD experiments so far !

$$R=R_o\cdot lpha_{NU}\cdot lpha_{NS}\cdot [lpha_{Nl(l)}\otimes lpha_{NL(q)}]$$
 Delicate & Challenging

Take LSD-XL as an example (MC):



*upon corrections based on Poisson statistic feature.

Entanglement in PIR; Orthogonality in PCR



Consequently deteriorating PIR calorimetry precision! (Beyond traditional calibration due to large $\alpha_{NU} \otimes \alpha_{NS} \otimes \alpha_{NL}$ phase space to be covered!) Y.H.@Neutel23

While PCR is not reachable, (e.g. sometimes not cost-effective for large detector) PIR is the design.

Stringent systematics (e.g. permille) control over large(st) photon dynamic range in PIR.

How to improve the calorimetry design for more precise energy measurement?

Multi-Calorimetry!

Multi-Calorimetry

For a common detection medium *Holding PIR photonics interface as main calorimetry (*R^m*). #Adding PCR photonics interface as auxiliary calorimetry (*R^a*).

One PIR and one PCR in a single LSD \rightarrow Dual calorimetry



Exploiting synergy between PIR and PCR in single detector to achieve high precision calorimetry.

*For e.g. cost-effectiveness. #No need high coverage.

Synergy in Multi-Calorimetry LSD

- PIR and PCR connected by viewing same events
 - \rightarrow correlated NU, NS and NL(1) and uncorrelated & different NL(q)
- Robust NL(q) control in PCR ($\alpha_{NL(q)} \rightarrow 1$),

auxiliary PCR: $R^a = R_o^a \cdot \alpha_{NU}^a \cdot \alpha_{NS}^a \cdot \alpha_{Nl(l)}^a$; $\alpha_{NU}^a \otimes \alpha_{NS}^a \otimes \alpha_{NL}^a = 0$, orthogonal reference while main PIR: $R^m = R_o^m \cdot \alpha_{NU}^m \cdot \alpha_{NS}^m \cdot [\alpha_{Nl(l)}^m \otimes \alpha_{NL(q)}^m]$

• PIR and PCR comparison:

$$\frac{R^{m}}{R^{a}} = \frac{R_{o}^{m} \cdot \alpha_{NU}^{m} \cdot \alpha_{NS}^{m} \cdot [\alpha_{Nl(l)}^{m} \otimes \alpha_{NL(q)}^{m}]}{R_{o}^{a} \cdot \alpha_{NU}^{a} \cdot \alpha_{NS}^{a} \cdot \alpha_{Nl(l)}^{a}}$$
$$\rightarrow \frac{R^{m}}{R^{a}} = \frac{R_{o}^{m}}{R_{o}^{a}} \cdot \alpha_{NL(q)}^{m}$$

Cancellation upon optimal strategy with calibration. (with sources like laser/ led, radioactive sources, and even physics signal.)

- Enable powerful in-situ channel-wise $\alpha_{NL(q)}^m$ control. (via reconstruction and calibration).
- Spot unknown readout systematics.

MC demonstration

Direct NL(q) control with multi-calorimetry



MC demonstration: NL Disentangling



MC demonstration: NU Disentangling

- $\frac{1}{2}$ - $R^{m(\phi=20)}$ with $\alpha_{NL(q)}$ - $\frac{1}{2}$ - $R^{m(\phi=20)}$ with corrected $\alpha_{NL(q)}$

 $-\frac{1}{2} - R^{m(\phi=8)}$ with $\alpha_{NL(q)} - \frac{1}{2} - R^{m(\phi=8)}$ with corrected $\alpha_{NL(q)}$

Entanglement: channel-wise $\alpha_{NL(q)}$ engendering fake energy non-uniformity



MC demonstration: Resolution



15

Summary

Towards future light-based neutrino detectors:

High precision (stringent systematics control and/or permille level)

Large detector size (large dynamic range)

+ cost-effectiveness

Multiple photonics interface calorimetry is a design to excel in above conditions. (Considering the calorimetry systematics control at the detector design level.)

Minimal modification w.r.t single PIR calorimetry (most experiment so far). Maximum calorimetry systematics control capability ! Thanks to response synergy and systematics complementarity/redundancy.