#### Test of a LYSO+APD matrix prototype for the KLOE-2 upgrade



M.Cordelli<sup>(1)</sup>, F.Happacher<sup>(1)</sup>, G.Xu<sup>(2)</sup>, M.Martini<sup>(1)</sup>, S.Miscetti<sup>(1)</sup>, I.Sarra<sup>(1)</sup>, M.Schioppa<sup>(3)</sup>, S.Stucci<sup>(3)</sup>

Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati of INFN, Frascati, Italy Institute of High Energy Physics of Academia Sinica Bejing, China INFN and Dept. of Physics, University of Calabria, Cosenza, Italy

Frontier Detectors for Frontier Physics 2009 La Biodola (Elba's island) 26/5/2009



#### KLOE-2 upgrade: a Crystal Calorimeter with Timing

- Physics Motivations
- Basic layout of the upgrade
- Test of single crystals+amplifiers
- Assembly of the Crystal Matrix
- Test with e-beam from 100 to 500 MeV
  - energy resolution and response
  - light yield
  - timing resolution
  - position resolution
- Conclusions and prospects

#### Physics Motivations

W/O UPGRADE

UPGRADE



• EMC of KLOE covers up to  $\theta \ge 21-22^{\circ}$  Needs extention at low angles (8°) both as veto detector or as acceptance extension for rare decay channels golden channels:

- (1) working as a veto  $K_s \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$
- (2) acceptance ext:  $K_s \rightarrow 3\pi^0$





#### First design of the CCALT



- New machine layout of DAFNE --> the first quadrupoles @ 30cm from IP
- Spherical Beam pipe shape close to IP needed for Ks F.V.

 Only 20 cm of space in length available with the idea of keeping the detector also inside the constraint of quadrupole coverage in acceptance (18 degrees) to not interfere with main EMC reconstruction (and IT).

 Solution: two small barrels of 24 crystals/each with length from 10-13 cm & transversal area 1.5x1.5 to 2x2 cm<sup>2</sup>



#### Requirements for a CCALT calorimeter



- Dense, small Xo, Rm
- Extremely Fast 300-500 ps @ 20 MeV
  - (timing needed to reject accidental/machine bkg)
  - A CCALT == Crystal Calorimeter with Timing
- □ Highly efficient ---> High Light Yield
- Small number of channels w photo-sensors working in B-Field (0.52 kGauss)
- □ Energy resolution will be poor: no transversal coverage.
- □ Reasonable position resolution (2-3 mm at 15 cm from IP) to improve energy resolution with kinematic fitting (Ks->3pO search)

#### LYSO crystals look as a perfect match for this work:

- 27000 photons/MeV
- emission time of 40-42 ns
- $X_0$  = 1.1 cm, Rm = 2 cm, refraction index = 1.8
- not hygroscopic
- nice optical coupling with APD

### Test of single crystals with CR





- Large signals with CR (40 mV) with APD@410V
- □ HV from CAEN (CMS-like)
- □ Noise few mV
- Readout by Lecroy ADC 400ns wide gate
- $\Box$   $\sigma$ (ped) = 1.5 counts
- □ MIP(peak) = 50 Counts
- □ (MeV) = 0.6 MeV



#### Crystal Matrix Composition



Due to the high LYSO cost we have realized a matrix with:

- an inner core done either by 10 LYSO+APD(CCALT) or 10 PbWO/LSO +SIPM (LET) crystals
- an outer leakage recovery section done by PbWO+PM

#### PbWO from SICCAS

- LYSO/LFS from 3 producers:
- -S.Gobain
- Scionix
- Zecotek (LFS)
- •3 Lyso-SG +1 scionix 3x(15x15x150)+15x15x130 mm3 •1 Lyso-SG +2 Lyso-Scionix 20x20x150 + 2x(20x20x130) mm3 • 3 LFS 20x20x130 mm3



#### Crystal Matrix overview



- Each APD inserted in a PVC mask and soldered to his amplifier.
- APD+amplifier inserted in a small box sustained by a PVC matrix
- Optical contact by means of Bicron optical grease

- External aluminum holder for the crystals
- Crystals wrapped in 100 µm of Tyvek apart from front and end faces. Front face kept free to insert LED for testing.
   PMs from outer matrix taken into

position by external holder



# From CAD to realization (in pictures)



-First Assembly of overall matrix (march 2009), waiting for arrival of APD-amplifier boards - test of Outer Matrix





#### From CAD to realization (inner matrix)







a lot of days to understand data! In the second week we turned off the outer matrix and got two days of good "e" data with KLOE daq.

#### Inner Matrix MIP calibration @ BTF





CH10 Q(counts)

CH9 Q(counts)

S.Miscetti @Frontier Detectors for Frontier Physics 09

CH8 Q(counts)





 $\Box$  Qcol =  $\sum$ (Qi/Mi) < M>, where < M> = 120 counts



S.Miscetti @Frontier Detectors for Frontier Physics 09



### Fit to the spectra



27/5/2009





- Constant term dominated by leakage .. Fixed by MC
- Noise term between 0.8-1.1 %/E(GeV)
- Stocastic term between 1--2.4%/√(E/GeV) few data taking points .. Instable fit.

## MC simulation



# 100 MeV 500 MeV

- Detailed MC simulation in progress with Geant-4
- All dimensions respected (crystals, wrapping, APD's)
- Beam spot simulated with different dimensions (5×5 mm<sup>2</sup>, 10×10mm<sup>2</sup>)
- Simulation of time emission spectra OK
- Optical transportation of photons underway (... study as a function of photons-yield needed .. CPU time)

## Leakage term and MC simulation



E <sub>beam</sub> (MeV)	Epeak	σ	σ/E
100	0,9373	0,04594	4,9%
200	0,9206	0,04212	4,6%
300	0,9112	0,03856	4,2%
400	0,9065	0,03728	4,1%
495	0,9019	0,03502	3,9%

### Consideration on noise term



Q<sub>tot</sub> w.o. e beam shows σ(total noise) from 4.3 to 4.9 MeV.
 Single channels with beam σ (ped) = 1.1-1.2 MeV --> 3.6-3.8 MeV
 Noise twice larger than what measured in electronic lab

 --> coupling with KLOE EMC chain? Still under study

## Position resolution measurement

- Special runs @ 500 MeV taken reading out also the BPM of BTF .. based on X-Y hodoscope of scintillating fibers (3 mm -pitch)
- Plots shown correspond to events with only 1 "electron" selected offline





#### Position resolution @ 500 MeV



 Position reconstruction in prototype by means of energy weighted mean of the fired crystals

Xpos =  $\sum(XiQi)/Qtot$ Ypos =  $\sum(YiQi)/Qtot$ 

Resolution 2.8 mm vs > 4.3 mm due to the pitch in agreement with expectations



#### Timing measurement at BTF

Each spill arriving from LINAC consists of many bunches separated of 200-300 ps for a total of 10 ns.

When using as TDC start the Gate from Linac we get a 10 ns wide distribution. To eliminate this we offline correct For the arrival time provided by the Two finger scintillators limiting the Beam spot.

Jitter of the start:  $\sigma(\Delta T)/\sqrt{2}$ 

KLOE TDC -- 53 ps/Count

Otrig = 245 ps @ 500 MeV = 265 ps @ 100 MeV









- σ(Tclu) = 250 (49) ps at 500 MeV, 291 (120) ps at 100 MeV
   without (with) correction for trigger jitter
- □ Consistency with cr/single crystal measurements in progress

## Conclusions



We are designing a Crystal Calorimeter with timing for KLOE-2 upgrade (2011-2012)
First prototype has been built and tested with CR and e-beam
High Light Yield observed
Energy resolution dominated by leakage at higher energy
<ul> <li>k/E component too high w.r.t. lab measurement of noise</li> </ul>
- stocastic term between 1-2%/√(E/GeV)
Position resolution 2.8 mm @ 500 MeV as expected
Timing resolution 250-300 ps from 100 to 500 MeV
without correcting for trigger jitter.
<ul> <li>Already satisfies detector requirement.</li> </ul>
D Next Plans (fall 2009)
- identify /correct noise term
- make a test with outer matrix functioning
Iongen data taking for single crystale certification
neduce time litter of the triacer
- reduce time jirrer of the trigger



Additional material





27/5/2009

S.Miscetti @Frontier Detectors for Frontier Physics 09



Response to MIP vs time



Example of MIP fitting @ test lab





#### S.Miscetti @Frontier Detectors for Frontier Physics 09

29





27/5/2009

# Need of timing @ KLOE-2



The main constraint comes from accidental background:

- simulation of new optics suggest a x 5 increase of Touschek background rate: from 5 MhZ in EMC to 15 MhZ with screens around inner quads
- to play conservative we want to be able to keep up a rate of 0.5 MhZ/channel.
- A prompt time window of 2 ns -->

makes Pacci = 1ns \* 0.5 Mhz = 1% ---> negligible

- WE NEED A CALORIMETER with 300-500 ps time resolution @ 20 MeV
- CCALT



27/5/2009





![](_page_34_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_34_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### S.Miscetti @Frontier Detectors for Frontier Physics 09

34

![](_page_35_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_35_Picture_1.jpeg)

	LYSO	LFS
Density	7.1	7.2 - 7.3
Attenuation length (cm)	1.2	1.12
Decay constant (ns)	41	35 - 36
Max emission (nm)	420	435 - 438
Light yield (relative NaI)	75	80 - 85
Energy resolution	8	9 - 12
Hygroscopic	NO	NO
Refractive index	1.81	1.78