

16<sup>th</sup> Pisa meeting on advanced detectors – May 26 - June 1, 2024

**Design and optimization of a MPGD-based** 

HCAL for a future experiment at Muon Collider

# <u>A. Pellecchia<sup>1</sup>, M. Buonsante<sup>1,2</sup>, M. Borysova<sup>3</sup>, A. Colaleo<sup>1,2</sup>, M. T. Camerlingo<sup>1</sup>, L. Longo<sup>1</sup>, M. Iodice<sup>5</sup>, M. Maggi<sup>1</sup>, L. Moleri<sup>3</sup>,</u> R. Radogna<sup>1,2</sup>, G. Sekhniaidze<sup>4</sup>, F. M. Simone<sup>1,2</sup>, A. Stamerra<sup>1,2</sup>, R. Venditti<sup>1,2</sup>, P. Verwilligen<sup>1</sup>, D. Zavazieva<sup>3</sup>, A. Zaza<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> INFN Bari <sup>2</sup> Università degli studi di Bari <sup>3</sup> Weizmann Institute of Science <sup>4</sup> INFN Napoli <sup>5</sup> INFN Roma 3

(2023

### **Calorimeter slice simulation**

Digital calorimeter	Primary energy is proportional to total number of hits	
Semi-digital calorimeter	Hits are weighted based on three thresholds $E_{\pi} = \alpha N_1 + \beta N_2 + \gamma N_3$ $N_x = \text{number of hits overcoming x-th threshold}$	

#### Standalone Geant4 simulation for shower

#### **MPGD-HCAL** for a Muon Collider experiment



**Muon Collider:** powerful probe to investigate the Standard Model with unprecedented precision after HL-LHC

> **Beam-induced background (due to in-flight muon decay)** in hadron calorimeter:

- Mostly photons (96%) and neutrons (4%)
- Large **asynchronous** component

- containment calculation
- Geometry: 2 cm iron, 5 mm gas (Ar/CO<sub>2</sub>)
- Cross section 1×1 m<sup>2</sup>
- Readout pad granularity 1×1 cm<sup>2</sup>



Longitudinal **containment** in 10  $\lambda$ , transversal in 3  $\lambda$ 

Semi-digital energy resolution: down to 8% for a 80 GeV pion **Digital** calorimeter **saturates** at 14%





#### **Development of an HCAL cell prototype**

12 sampling layer prototypes produced and tested in **RD51 common project**:

7  $\mu$ -RWELL, 4 MicroMegas, 1 RPWELL  $\leftarrow$  Common readout for all three technologies

- Active area **20×20 cm<sup>2</sup>**, pad size **1×1 cm<sup>2</sup>**
- Drift gap 6 mm





### **MPGD** performance at CERN SPS



**Test beam at SPS** (July 2023)

## Goal: validating the readout detectors

Test beam setup at SPS

- **Efficiency** higher than 95% throughout all active area
- Space resolution smaller than pad size



MicroMegas (256 µm-strip) Tracking

Under test	12 MPGD prototypes	Detector	Uniformity (%)
Gas	<b>Ar:CO<sub>2</sub>:C<sub>4</sub>H<sub>10</sub></b> 93:5:2 (MicroMegas, RPWELL) <b>Ar:CO<sub>2</sub>:CF<sub>4</sub></b> 45:15:40 (μ-RWELL)	MM-RM3	$(12.3 \pm 0.8)\%$
		MM-Na	$(11.6 \pm 0.8)\%$
		MM-Ba	$(8.0 \pm 0.5)\%$
Particle	80 GeV/c muons	RPWELL	$(22.6 \pm 4.7)\%$

#### calorimeter?

for a hadronic

Why MPGDs

Micro-pattern gaseous detectors as readout layers for a sampling HCAL

Cost effectiveness

SRS for the test

beam setup

- Several C/cm<sup>2</sup> radiation hardness
- Discharge rate not impeding operations
- O (MHz/cm<sup>2</sup>) rate capability
- O (100 µm) space resolution
- Few ns timing with MIPs



-MC

0.06

0.05

0.04

0.02 F



Comparable laboratory performance for all three technologies



#### HCAL cell performance at CERN PS



Test beam data to simulation comparison for 6 GeV pion

6 GeV π

 $< N_{hits} >_{data} = (87.00 \pm 0.48)$  hits

 $< N_{hits} >_{MC} = (82.39 \pm 1.24)$  hits

= (23.48 ± 0.97) hits

 $\sigma_{data} = (22.52 \pm 0.34)$  hits



with MIPs and comparing the three MPGD technologies



Good uniformity for MicroMegas; regions of non-uniformity observed on some  $\mu$ -RWELLs  $\rightarrow$ under investigation in lab

antonello.pellecchia@cern.ch



**Test beam at PS** with calorimeter prototype (August-September 2023):

- Goal: **measuring** the energy resolution of a 1  $\lambda$ calorimeter prototype with 1-10 GeV pions beam
- Compared with **G4 simulation** for the **small** prototype, including problematic electronics effects

Very good data/MC agreement