

BDX tests

Marzio De Napoli INFN-CT

- Cosmogenic background
- Results from MC simulations
- Measurements @ LNS-CT

What next LNF: Perspectives of fundamental physics at the Frascati Laboratory

10-11 November 2014 INFN - Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati Europe/Rome timezone

The cosmogenic background issue



Experimental requirements:

- Sensitivity to ~ MeV nucleon recoil (low detection thresholds)
- Low energy backgrounds rejection capability

The cosmogenic background issue

Backgrounds matter !



Beam-related background see R. De Vita talk

Cosmogenic background is the main limiting factor

Beating down the cosmogenic background is crucial for BDX

Reducing cosmogenic background

Time correlation

High intensity

e⁻ beam

RF or BM

Shielding

Beam dump .

Beam-uncorrelated background can be rejected by requiring a time coincidence between the RF signal and the event recorded by the detector.

Continuous beam - time resolution is critical

Reduction factor

$$\stackrel{\text{ment.}}{R} \simeq \frac{\delta T}{3\sigma} \Leftarrow \simeq 100$$



Tight time coincidence

Shielding

χ scattered

Beam sti

χ beam Detector

Pulsed beam - allows to take full advantage of this technique

$$R = \frac{1}{f \cdot \delta} = 2 \cdot 10^5 @ 50 \, Hz, 100 \, ns$$

significant reduction but not enough



Reducing cosmogenic background

Passive shielding + Active Veto

Passive shielding and active veto are crucial for reducing the cosmogenic background



is BDX a feasible experiment?

MC simulations to estimate cosmogenic background rates for different possible contributions (neutrinos, neutrons and muons)

Neutrinos

Neutrinos can interact with protons in the detector mainly by inverse beta decay (v⁻p → e+ n), producing a positron that could mimic a **x** interaction.

Considering flux, interaction crosssections and thresholds the contribution is **negligible**





Neutrons

1 m iron shielding + 1 MeV detection threshold introduce an energy cut-off on the primary spectrum ~ 50 MeV

High-energy neutrons can penetrate the shielding and interact inside the detector, mimicking a \varkappa -N interaction

Contribution **sizeable**



Muons

1 m iron shielding + 5 cm thick lead suppress muons with momentum <1.45 GeV/c

Different contributions:

Crossing muons Muons decaying inside the detector Muons decaying inside the lead shielding



Some of them are missed by the veto due to detection inefficiencies

Contribution **sizeable**

Cosmogenic Background rates

Estimated background rates								
http://arxiv.org/abs/1406.3028								
	Rate $_{Thr=1MeV}$ (Hz)	Rate $_{Thr=10MeV}$ (Hz)						
B-unrel ν	$2.0 \ 10^{-6}$	$2.0 \ 10^{-7}$						
B-unrel neutron	$2.7 \ 10^{-3}$	$0.6 \ 10^{-3}$						
Crossing muons	$3.3 \ 10^{-3}$	$3.5 \ 10^{-3}$						
Captured μ^+	$1.4 \ 10^{-3}$	$2.4 \ 10^{-3}$						
Decaying μ^- (CORM)	$2.9 \ 10^{-3}$	$4.8 \ 10^{-3}$						
Stopped μ in lead	$7.0 \ 10^{-3}$	$4.3 \ 10^{-3}$						
μ^- rare decay	$2.0 \ 10^{-5}$	$8.0 \ 10^{-6}$						
Total Beam-unrelated bg	$1.7 \ 10^{-2}$	$1.5 \ 10^{-2}$						

with some assumed quantities:

- detection efficiencies
- detector thresholds
- veto inefficiencies

 $\mathbf{x}_{i} \in [\mathbf{x}_{i}] \times [\mathbf{x}_{i}]$



The estimated background rates suggest for BDX orders of magnitude better sensitivity to light dark matter than any previous experiment

these numbers are a key ingredient to predict the final BDX sensitivity: they need to be <u>experimentally proved</u>

Measurements at LNS



We are preparing a campaign of cosmogenic background measurements at LNS-CT

- Validate MC results
- Background vs energy threshold
- Test different veto solutions and measure detection efficiencies
- Optimize shielding
- Test the performances of plastic scintillators and different crystals (we are working on both options for the full detector design)



Plastic scintillator vs crystals



Heavy crystals has a density 5-8x wrt plastic (compact detector)

Easy EM shower detection (X-e- scattering channel)

Similar LY and Timing as for plastic

Physics: is the X scattering on a free N equivalent to a quasi-free on heavy nuclei ? Detection: light quenching ? Minimum proton momentum detectable ?

Considering LY, Timing, Cost, Availability Candidates for the LNS tests

	РЬЖО	BGO Bi4Ge3O122	BSO Bi4Si3O12	LuAG:Ce	BaF2	Csl:T10.1%	Plastic	
density (g/cm³)	8.3	7.1	6.8	6.7	4.9	4.5	I	
LY (N _Y /MeV)	120 (0.3 %Nal)	6 10³ (15%Nal)	100/200/1.4 10 ³ (0.25/0.5/3.4 %Nal)	8 10³ (20 %Nal)	1.4 10³/15 10³ (3.4/36 %Nal)	75 10 ³ (105/60 %Nal)		
Decay time (ns)	10	300	2.4/26/99	70	0.9/630	680/3340	1.8	
Radiation length (cm)	0.9	1.12	1.15	1.4	2.03	1.85	42.5	
Emission peak (nm)	420	480	480	530	220/300	565	410	
Light Quenching (T _P =10MeV)		0.5	0.5			0.5	0.5	
cost (\$) 30x30x40cm ²	750k 450x (2x2x20)	crystals from L3	600k 600x (2x2x15)		540k 120x (10x10x20)	crystals from BaBar	9k 36x (5x5x30)	
cost (\$) 30x30x1000eq	2.25M L=1.2m	0.3M L=1.5m	2.4M L=1.5m		2.75M L=2m	0.3M L=2.25m *	0.3M L=10m	
Full cost (cal+veto+shield)	2.5M	0.5M	2.6M		2.85M	0.5M	2.0M	
Reuse of 810 CsI(TI) crystals from BaBar the instrumented volume would be 60x45x225 cm3								

Experimental setup: inner detector



Different solutions for the inner detector will be tested

Plastic scintillator (NE110) bars read at both ends by PMTs



Mechanical support for plastic scintillators + crystals + VETOs + lead bricks



V. Vigo, F. Parodi

CsI (TI) from BaBar

Crystals





BSO-BGO







Experimental setup: inner veto



Active veto between the inner detector and the lead shielding extruded plastic scintillator paddles + WLS fibers + single sipm readout





Experimental setup: passive shielding INFN Passive shielding 5cm-thick lead bricks

Experimental setup: external veto



BDX-prototype alcove at LNS





Conclusions

Statistical uncertainties of cosmogenic background are the main limiting factor for the BDX reaches in the X-N scattering channel

The ability of rejecting cosmogenic backgrounds was studied with MC simulations

The estimated background rates suggest orders of magnitude better sensitivity to light dark matter than any previous experiment

In preparation to the BDX experiment, a campaign of cosmic background measurements at LNS will start at the beginning of the next year

Validate MC simulations + veto system + shielding + test of different detector solutions

Optimize the BDX final design at the end of these measurements

Cosmic neutrinos negligible

The only sizeable flux we need to consider is for solar neutrinos with energy below 10 MeV

Low energy neutrinos (E_V <10 MeV) interact with protons in the detector mainly by inverse beta decay (v⁻p → e⁺ n), producing a positron that carries almost all the neutrino energy and could mimic a χ interaction.

The background rate, considering the volume of CORMORINO and assuming a detection efficiency of $\varepsilon_{e^+detection} = 50\%$ with 1 MeV thresholds (and 5% for 10 MeV threshold), is given by:

 $R_{Bg}^{\nu} = R_{E_{\nu} < 10MeV}^{Cosmic\nu} \sigma_{\bar{\nu}p} \ 1/AN_{Avogadro} \ \rho_{plastic} \ L_{CORMORINO} \ \epsilon_{e^+detection} = 10^{-6} \text{Hz} \ (10^{-7} \text{Hz})$

the cosmic neutrino background is negligible with respect to the other sources.



Cosmic neutrons sizeable

A cosmic neutron interacting with CORMORINO can produce a signal over the trigger threshold identical to a χ hit. Considering the typical interaction length of neutrons in plastic, the 2 cm thick active veto has a small chance to detect the incoming neutrons.

1 m iron shield + detector energy threshold introduce a neutron energy cutoff (detection efficiency = 0) for $E_n < 50$ (100) MeV

Thus, the overall visible rate for a detection threshold of 1 MeV (10 MeV) is :

 $R_{Bq}^n = 2.7 \ 10^{-3} \text{Hz} \ (0.6 \ 10^{-3} \text{Hz})$



Cosmic muons sizeable

The effect of 1 m iron shielding and 5 cm thick lead is to suppress muons with momentum <1.45 GeV/c

Crossing muon sizeable

usually provides 2 hits on the veto detector and ≥ 1 hits in CORMORINO. To misidentify a crossing μ as a χ it is necessary that both hits in the veto counter are missed and only one CORMORINO bar records the hit.

Assuming the veto counter inefficiency to be 5% $(1 - \epsilon_{veto})$

 $\alpha^{Crossing \ \mu}_{Single \ hit} = 32\%$ 1 MeV threshold (36% 10 MeV threshold)



Muons decaying inside CORMORINO sizeable

Muons stopping inside the detector cross one side of the veto. Negative muons, not detected in the Veto and providing a single hit in CORMORINO, contribute to the background.

 $\alpha_{Single\ hit}^{\mu\ inside\ capture}$ =24% 1 MeV threshold (39% 10 MeV threshold)

$$R_{Bg}^{\mu^+ \ inside \ capture} = R^{\mu^- \ inside \ capture} \ \alpha_{Single \ hit}^{\mu \ inside \ capture} \ (1 - \epsilon_{veto}) = 1.4 \ 10^{-3} \text{Hz} \ (2.4 \ 10^{-3} \text{Hz})$$

Positive muons stopping and decaying (at rest) generating a single hit in CORMORINO

$$R_{Bg}^{\mu+inside\ decay} = 2\ R^{\mu+inside\ dec}\ \alpha_{Single\ hit}^{\mu\ inside\ dec}\ (1-\epsilon_{veto}) = 2.9\ 10^{-3} \text{Hz}\ (4.8\ 10^{-3} \text{Hz})$$



Muons decaying inside lead shielding sizeable

 $\alpha^{\mu \ lead}_{Single \ hit} \sim 0.46$ 1 MeV threshold (0.43 10 MeV threshold)

$$R_{Bg}^{\mu^{-} \ lead} = R^{\mu \ lead} \ \alpha_{Single \ hit}^{\mu \ lead} \ (1 - \epsilon_{veto}) = 7.0 \ 10^{-3} \text{Hz} \ (4.3 \ 10^{-3} \text{Hz})$$

Muons decaying between iron shielding and veto negligible

For the usual decay, the few e⁺ escaping the iron have a good chance to be detected by the veto and fully absorbed by the lead shielding between the veto and CORMORINO and therefore their contribution to the background is negligible.

The rare $\mu^- \rightarrow e^- v_{\mu}^- v_e \gamma$ decay (BR~ 1.5%) produces a 20-50 MeV gamma that can enter in CORMORINO bypassing the veto. The leads shielding between the detector and the veto produces an overall attenuation of ~ 4 10⁻³.

 $\alpha^{\mu \ between \ dec}_{Single \ hit} \sim 0.5$ 1 MeV threshold (0.210 MeV threshold)

 $R_{Bg}^{\mu;\;rare\;dec} = R^{\mu\;between\;dec}\;BR\;Att\;\alpha_{Single\;hit}^{\mu\;between\;dec} = 2\;10^{-5}\mathrm{Hz}\;\;(0.8\;10^{-5}\mathrm{Hz})$