Occupancy and Bandwidth requirements for highly granular calorimeters at FCCee

V. Boudry*, K. Hassouna^a

Institut Polytechnique de Paris ^a IPP PSEI and U. of Manoa (USA), now PhD at Khalifa U. (UAE)

IR





Rationale for HG calorimeters: ILD as an example

ILD high granularity calorimeters

- Designed for ILC
 - Power pulsing, low occupancy
- Marginally adapted for CLIC and CLD
 - Physics : number of layers
- Adapted for CEPC
 - Lower granularity, ...
- Needs strong adaptation for EW physics and continuous operation
 - Rates, Heat, Electronics

ECAL: 30 layers

- SiW-ECAL": Si cells 0.5×0.5 cm²
- ScECAL: Scint strips 0.5×5.0 cm²

10–100M channels

HCAL

Endcap1

HCAL: 48 layers

- AHCAL: scint. cells $3 \times 3 \text{ cm}^2$

Barrel

Endcap2

ECAL

- SDHCAL: RPC cells $1 \times 1 \text{ cm}^2$

10–70M channels

Vincent.Boudry@in2p3.fr

Revisiting the HG calorimeters for circular colliders

Large panel of running conditions

- $90 \text{GeV} \times 10^7 \text{ fb} \times 5.10^{36} \text{ cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1} (\text{qq} \times 20,000 \text{ ILC} @ 250)$
- 150 GeV (WW) + 250 GeV (ZH) + 280 GeV (tt) ~10⁴ fb × 5·10³⁵ cm⁻² s⁻¹ (qq × 5–10 ILC @ 250)



Are the current hypothesis viable ?

- Occupancy, DAQ, Cooling
- 1 detector fit-all ?



- What are the limits :
 - Power vs Granularity \rightarrow Active Cooling ?
- New electronics (DRD6):
 - TSMC 130 nm vs AMS 130 nm (or 65nm)
 - Down to 1mW / ch ? Timing ?
 - Running mode (continuous, trigger-less)
 - Trigger for other detectors ?

Need rough numbers $O(\pm 50\%)$ for Occupancy, Data, Power, Dynamic Range (E, t) for all calorimeter's regions

Calorimeter Fluxes from Full Simulations

Quantities useful for Self-Triggering & Low Occupacy Front-End electronics & Design

- Number of hits/s per ASICs
 - → Power (Energy per conversion)
 - → Memory size
- Distribution of Energy & Time
 - → Dynamic ranges
 - → Power per conversion (Wilkinson ADCs)
 - \rightarrow Double hits
- Data output
 - → Data Flux per readout partition (DAQ)
 - \rightarrow DAQ scheme (Calo trigger to other parts ?)

Other quantities

- Deposited energies
 - → Radiation



CaloFlux Software package

Python code

Production of Primary histograms :

- LcioReader from pyLCIO
- Mapping & Selection
 - Cell_id decoding
 - Highly configurable
- ROOT histograms
 - System and histogram type hierarchy
 - Auto-rescalable (high E, high Nhits)

Secondary histograms :

Scaling : e.g. power, data size = f(#hits, Energy)

2D histograms

 Fix one component and get its 1D histograms as bins of a single 2D histogram.

Described in a Technical Report accepted by JINST. JINST_006T_0324

system_limits = {"ECALBarrel" : (8, 5, 5, 30) , "EndCaps" : (4, "0-6", 5, 30)}

#selection format "S:M:T:L" conditions => "*:*:2:0-4,5-10" means no selection on M, S, 1 histo per 2 tower , 1 for layer 0 to 5, and one for #The keys of the dictionary are the system names. Each key has a value composed of 4 lists. The first list has the collections' names. The second one has the selections we impose on the histograms made in the order given above. The third list has 4 lists each with 2 arguments. Each list has the bin number (the first argument) and the maximum of the range of the his The fourth list has the energy threshold that we use in the Nhits histogram. dictionary_of_system = { Towers "SiECalEndcap": (["ECalEndcapSiHitsEven", "ECalEndcapSiHitsOdd"], [["*"],["*"], ["0","1:2","3:5","6:8"], ["0:9 "SiECALBarrel": (["ECalBarrelSiHitsEven", "ECalBarrelSiHitsOdd"], [["*"],["1","2","3","4","5"], ["*"], ["0:9 "SiECalRing": (["EcalEndcapRingCollection"], [["*"],["*"], ["*"]; ["0:9 [["*"],["*"], "ScECalEndcap": (["ECalEndcapScHitsEven", "ECalEndcapScHitsOdd"], ["0","1:2","3:5","6:8"], ["0:9 "ScECALBarrel": (["ECalBarrelScHitsEven", "ECalBarrelScHitsOdd"], [["*"],["1","2","3","4","5"], ["*"], ["0:9 ["0:3","4:7","8:11","12:15"], ["0:1 "RPCHCalEndcap": (["HCalEndcapRPCHits"], [["*"],["*"], [["*"],["*"], "RPCHCalBarrel": (["HCalBarrelRPCHits"], ["*"], ["0:1 ["*"] [["*"],["*"], ["*"], "RPCHCalECRing": (["EcalEndcapRingCollection"], [["*"],["*"], ["0:3","4:7","8:11","12:15"], "ScHCalEndcap": (["HcalEndcapsCollection"], ["0:1 "ScHcalBarrel": (["HcalBarrelRegCollection"], [["*"],["*"], ["*"], ["0:1 ["*"] "ScHCalECRing": (["EcalEndcapRingCollection"], [["*"],["*"], ["*"],

highE bin/max #hits bin/max EThr Split Func:ranges
100, 0.03], [100, 35]], [[0.0001]], {}),
100, 0.03], [100, 35]], [[0.0001]], {}),
100, 0.03], [100, 35]], [[0.0001]], {}),
100, 0.03], [100, 35]], [[0.0003]], {}),
100, 0.03], [100, 35]], [[0.0002]], {}),
100, 3e-5], [100, 35]], [[3e-7]], {}),
100, 3e-5], [100, 35]], [[3e-7]], {complex_sad:["0:79", "80:159", "160:234"]
100, 0.03], [100, 35]], [[0.0001]], {}),
100, 0.03], [100, 35]], [[0.0001]], {}),
100, 0.03], [100, 35]], [[0.0003]], {complex_happy:["0:29", "30:59", "60:76"
100, 0.03], [100, 35]], [[0.0001]], {})

Vincent.Boudry@in2p3.fr

Histograms Types (1,000,000 muon events)



Vincent.Boudry@in2p3.fr

System Low Energy & #hit responses raw energies (no digitization yet)



Vincent.Boudry@in2p3.fr

Geometries & Services





Geometries : logical numbering





Vincent.Boudry@in2p3.fr

SiW-ECAL R&D | FCC-France, Strasbourg | 23/11/2023

Segmentation by "Logical Geometry" C:M:S:T:L:I:J



Geometric Selections (Explicit)

- All the staves are symmetric (φ , azimuthal symmetry-8)
- Radial behaviour can be obtained from different layers (central image).
- Polar behaviour (cos θ): from Modules in Barrel, from Towers in EndCaps.



Selections in Barrel : 5 Modules × 3 block of 10 layers

Logical Geometry : Towers & Staves in Endcaps

x:y:T {C==30 && log10(E)<-6}

y:x:S {M==0 && C==29}



Logical Geometry (HCAL BARRELs, in Prism geometry)



Geometric Selections (1D histograms : 1M muons events) Time of SubHits × E_{SubHit}



Geometric Selections (2D histograms)









Vincent.Boudry@in2p3.fr

Processes to Fluxes



Selected modes



Processes: n	nin. bias	
--------------	-----------	--

- All

- ee → qq
- $ee \rightarrow \mu\mu, \tau\tau$ • $ee \rightarrow ee$ (\supset Bhabha)
- $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow VV$
- Machine background (ee pairs)
- E_{CM}≥ 160 GeV
- ee → WW
- (E_{CM}≥ 240 GeV)
- ee → HZ
- (E_{CM}≥ 360 GeV)

•	ee	\rightarrow	tt	
•	ee	\rightarrow	tt	

Config	#IP	E_{Beam}	#BX	£ [10 ³⁴ /cm²/s]	ΔT [µs]	Freq[Hz]	√s [GeV]
FCC-Z2	2	45,6	12000	180,0	0,025		91,2
FCC-Z4	4	45,6	15880	140,0	0,019		91,2
FCC-W	4	81,3	688	21,4	0,442		162,5
FCC-ZH	4	120,0	260	6,9	1,169		240,0
FCC-tt	4	182,5	40	1,2	7,600		365,0
ILC250 [1]	1	125,0	1312	1,4	0,554	5,0	250,0
ILC500	1	250,0	1312	1,8	0,554	5,0	500,0
ILC1000	1	500,0	2450	4,9	0,366	5,0	1000,0
CLIC380	1	160,0				10,0	380,0
ILC-GZ	1	45,6				5,0	91,2
ILC250-HL	1	125,0	2625	2,7	0,366	5,0	250,0
CEPC							

ILC from: P. Bambade et al., The International Linear Collider: A Global Project, arXiv:1903.01629 [Hep-Ex, Physics:Hep-Ph, Physics:Physics]. (2019). FCC from: <u>Tor Raubenheimer, FCC Week June 2023</u>

C³

:

Generated data: ILD_l5_v02 (+ cross-angle 30mrad, B=3.5T), bgd files → ILD_l5_v11gamma

Table 1: 91.2 GeV ($N = 10000, L_{ins} = 1.4 \times 10^{-3} f b^{-1} s^{-1}$)

Channels	$\sigma (10^5 fb)$	$\frac{\left(\frac{\sigma \times L_{int}}{N}\right)}{\left(s^{-1}\right)}$
$ee \rightarrow qq$	344	4.82
$ee \rightarrow ll$	34.6	0.484
$ee \rightarrow ee$		
$(M_{ee} < 30 GeV)$	1.01	0.0141
$ee \rightarrow ee$		
$(M_{ee} > 30 GeV)$	57.8	0.809

Table 3: 240 GeV ($N = 10000, L_{ins} = 6.9 \times 10^{-5} \, \text{fb}^{-1} \, \text{s}^{-1}$)

Channels	σ	$\left(\frac{\sigma \times L_{\text{int}}}{N}\right)$
	$(10^5 {\rm fb})$	(s^{-1})
$ee \rightarrow qq$	0.550	$3.80 imes 10^{-4}$
$ee \rightarrow ll$	0.100	$6.88 imes 10^{-5}$
$ee \rightarrow WW$	0.167	1.15×10^{-4}
$ee \rightarrow ZH$	0.00204	1.41×10^{-6}
$ee \rightarrow ee$		
$(M_{ee} < 30 GeV)$	0.120	8.29×10^{-5}
$ee \rightarrow ee$		
$(M_{ee} > 30 GeV)$	5.92	4.09×10^{-3}

Table 2: $162.5 \, GeV$

 $(N = 10000, L_{ins} = 2.14 \times 10^{-4} f b^{-1} s^{-1})$

Channels	σ $(10^5 fb)$	$\frac{\left(\frac{\sigma \times L_{int}}{N}\right)}{\left(s^{-1}\right)}$
$ee \rightarrow qq$	1.55	3.32×10^{-3}
$ee \rightarrow ll$	0.241	$5.16 imes 10^{-4}$
$ee \rightarrow WW$	0.0504	1.08×10^{-4}
$ee \rightarrow ee$ ($M_{ee} < 30 GeV$)	0.240	5.14×10^{-4}
$ee \to ee$ ($M_{ee} > 30 GeV$)	12.9	2.76×10^{-2}

Table 4: $365 \, GeV$ (N = 10000, $L_{ins} = 1.2 \times 10^{-5} f b^{-1} s^{-1}$)

Channels	σ	$\left(\frac{\sigma \times L_{int}}{N}\right)$
	$(10^{5} fb)$	(s^{-1})
$ee \rightarrow qq$	0.228	2.74×10^{-5}
$ee \rightarrow ll$	0.0430	5.16×10^{-6}
$ee \rightarrow WW$	0.111	$1.33 imes 10^{-5}$
$ee \rightarrow ZH$	0.00123	1.47×10^{-7}
$ee \rightarrow tt$	0.00372	4.46×10^{-7}
$ee \rightarrow ee$		
$(M_{ee} < 30 GeV)$	0.0499	5.99×10^{-2}
$ee \rightarrow ee$		
$(M_{ee} > 30 GeV)$	2.57	3.08×10^{-4}

Machine background sources :

Source	#particles per bunch	< E > (GeV)	
Disrupted primary beam	2×10^{10}	244	
Bremstrahlung photons	2.5×10^{10}	244	
e ⁺ e ⁻ pairs from beam-beam inter- actions	75k	2.5	
Radiative Bhabhas	320k	195	
$\gamma \gamma \rightarrow hadrons/muons$	0.5 events/1.3 events	-	

T. Behnke, et al.

The International Linear Collider Technical Design Report - Volume 4: Detectors, arXiv:1306.6329 [Physics]. (2013)

Incoherent pair production : 100 BX at FCC-ee 91.2 GeV and 240 GeV

Produced by Andrea Ciarma,

Simulated (special setup) in ILD's by <u>D. Jeans</u>

Vincent.Boudry@in2p3.fr

Results : Rates in Silicon ECAL Barrel, Central Module vs depth



0.3 %

0.05 %

Distributions of the number of hits crossing (MIP/4) energy threshold of all the physics processes and machine background at 91.2 GeV (FCC-Z4) The z scale is the number of event/s

From the $\langle f_{\text{Nhits}} \rangle$ in one region one can extract :

- The data rate, knowing the number of bytes per hits (here 7 as a landmark)
- The occupancy, knowing the number of cell in the region.
- The power dissipated on elec. power (here for SKIROC2 like chip)

 Most of the hits are in the first third of the calorimeter. Highest average rates L0:9 Highest max rates in L10:19

Note 1 : (still) preliminary Note 2: Rates & Power for all M3 modules \rightarrow 8 per module, 10 per layer for 1 slab \rightarrow ~ 50 W/slab

Vincent.Boudry@in2p3.fr

1,5 %

% conv.

Calorimeter Fluxes | FCC Physics week, 30/01/24

5.5

7

Results : Silicon ECAL Barrel, per module, first 10 layers

Mean: 1.44e+01 #hitsMean: 1.18e+01 #hitsMean: 6.54e+00 #hitsMean: 9.53e+00 #hitsMean: 1.08e+01 #hitsStd Dev: 5.09e+00 #hitsStd Dev: 4.65e+00 #hitsStd Dev: 3.74e+00 #hitsStd Dev: 4.83e+00 #hitsStd Dev: 4.47e+00 #hitsevents/second: 5.27e+07events/second: 5.27e+07events/second: 5.27e+07events/second: 5.27e+07events/second: 5.27e+07

Distributions of the number of hits crossing (>MIP/4) energy threshold of all the physics processes and machine background at 91.2 GeV (FCC-Z4) with the colour bar representing the rate of events

- •Rates M1/M3 ~ 2
- Double counting of physics events in Module 3 due back-to-back events
- Machine backgrounds dominate the distribution.

Vincent.Boudry@in2p3.fr

Results: Rates in SiECAL EndCaps, Tower 0 vs depth

2000

22/35

Vincent.Boudry@in2p3.fr

Results: Contributions to rates in SiECAL EndCaps, Tower 0 vs depth

2000

1000

Results: Dynamic Range in SiECAL EndCaps, Tower 0 vs depth

SiECalEndcap high_#Nhits Towers 0

Upper Scale Energy distributions of tower 0 of ECAL end cap at 91.2 GeV of all physics and background

Max Energy = ~2000 MIPs
Tower 0 is the closest to the beam-pipe
Almost the same for both energies.
Rates 240 GeV / 91.2 GeV down by 60

Upper Scale Energy distributions of tower 0 of ECAL end cap at 240 GeV of all physics and background

Physics week, 30/01/24

Vin

-

Results: Scintillator AHCAL Endcap

Note 1 : Very preliminary

Note 2 : Rates for all tower 4:7 modules \rightarrow /4 per module, /16 per layer

Distributions of the number of hits crossing (MIP/4) energy threshold of all the physics processes and machine background at **91.2 GeV** (FCC-Z4) with the color bar representing the rate of events

Calorimeter Fluxes | FCC Physics week, 30/01/24

calorimeter, but in average more in the back (!)

The central towers have most of the hits due to

Significant angular dependence.

the closeness to the beam pipe.

Machine backgrounds for ILC/FCC tracking configurations

LC@250GeV/ILI	65319 BX					
ILC@250GeV/ILI	65319 BX					
FCCee@240GeV	100 BX					
FCCee@90GeV/I	100 BX					
0						
		(Nhit)	>/BX			
Config		⟨Nhit Barrel M3 L0:9	:>/BX EndCap T0 L0:9			
Config ILC @ 250 GeV	ILD_I5_v05	(Nhit Barrel M3 L0:9 0,0170	:>/BX EndCap T0 L0:9 0,0500			
Config ILC @ 250 GeV ILC @ 250 GeV	ILD_I5_v05 ILD_I5_v11γ	⟨Nhit Barrel M3 L0:9 0,0170 3,33	:>/BX EndCap T0 L0:9 0,0500 6,40			
Config ILC @ 250 GeV ILC @ 250 GeV FCCee @ 240 GeV	ILD_I5_v05 ILD_I5_v11γ ILD_I5_v11γ	(Nhit Barrel M3 L0:9 0,0170 3,33 15,9	:>/BX EndCap T0 L0:9 0,0500 6,40 36,0			

<**Nhits**>, per BX

- Barrel and Endcaps
 same behaviour
- Much higher numbers in
 - 240 GeV (FCC config)~ 4 × 90 GeV
 - 250 v11 ~ 100× 250 v5

Distribution of hit energy

- No difference SiECALBarrel_M3_L0:9

Vincent.Boudry@in2p3.fr

Key4hep: All Calorimeter hit collection:

Vincent.Boudry@in2p3.fr

What, where | When

Asymmetry in central calorimeters

ECAL barrel

HCAL endcaps

- A slight asymmetry can be observed
 - Significant ?

MCparticle EndPoints

r-z (in detector) × log10(E) (Initial)

Same for calor only – E from 1MeV – 1 GeV

Vincent.Boudry@in2p3.fr

Particle momentum in calo

Low energy photons <10 MeV

Most particles (>10 MeV) in-calo are low energy neutrons

Vincent.Boudry@in2p3.fr

What, where | When

Conclusion

Done

Flux determinations

- Simulated detector-level data for main physics processes and machine background at 91.2 GeV and 240 GeV.
 - Simulated detector-level data for all physics processes but not machine background at 162.5 GeV and 365 GeV.
- Generated primary, secondary 1D and 2D histograms in 11 systems of ECAL and HCAL of the ILD calorimeters
- Merged different processes and background and got collective histograms.
- Early conclusion on the ECAL

Conclusions or the ECAL:

- The power is ≥90% driven by the continuous component even in the endcaps sections for SKIROC2 ASICs in CC
- Machine background / BX much higher in the FCC-ee config.

To be done

Simulation:

- Resimulate with new model (and 2T B field).
- Simulate in the IRIS Geometry
- Machine background
 - at 162.5 GeV and 365 GeV
 - More statistics at 91.2 GeV and 240 GeV
 - Check for $\gamma \gamma \rightarrow VV$ contributions

Results:

- Automate the occupancy and power for all calorimeters
- Include digitization (on going with key4HEP) in timing studies
- Determine the exact precision on timing \rightarrow ASIC
 - Power ~ $1/\sigma_t$. 1mW/ch for 1ns \rightarrow 30 mW for 30 ps ?

Vincent.Boudry@in2p3.fr

Extras

ee Higgs factories: configs & backgrounds

Running mode		Z	W	ZH	$t\bar{t}$
Number of IPs	2	4	4	4	4
Beam energy (GeV)	45	5.6	80	120	182.5
Bunches/beam	12000	15880	688	260	40
Beam current [mA]	1270	1270	134	26.7	4.94
Luminosity/IP $[10^{34} \text{ cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}]$	180	140	21.4	6.9	1.2
Energy loss / turn [GeV]	0.039	0.039	0.37	1.89	10.1
Synchr. Rad. Power [MW]			100		
RF Voltage 400/800 MHz [GV]	0.08/0	0.08/0	1.0/0	2.1/0	2.1/9.4
Rms bunch length (SR) [mm]	5.60	5.60	3.55	2.50	1.67
Rms bunch length $(+BS)$ [mm]	13.1	12.7	7.02	4.45	2.54
Rms hor. emittance $\varepsilon_{x,y}$ [nm]	0.71	0.71	2.16	0.67	1.55
Rms vert. emittance $\varepsilon_{x,y}$ [pm]	1.42	1.42	4.32	1.34	3.10
Longit. damping time [turns]	1158	1158	215	64	18
Horizontal IP beta β_x^* [mm]	110	110	200	300	1000
Vertical IP beta β_u^* [mm]	0.7	0.7	1.0	1.0	1.6
Beam lifetime (q+BS+lattice) [min.]	50	250		$<\!28$	<70
Beam lifetime (lum.) [min.]	35	22	16	10	13

P. Bambade et al., The International Linear Collider: A Global Project, arXiv:1903.01629 [Hep-Ex, Physics:Hep-Ph, Physics:Physics]. (2019).

Quantity	Symbol	Unit	Initial	\mathcal{L} Upgrade	TDR	Upgr	ades
Centre of mass energy	\sqrt{s}	GeV	250	250	250	500	1000
Luminosity	$\mathcal{L} = 10^{34}$	$\mathrm{cm}^{-2}\mathrm{s}^{-1}$	1.35	2.7	0.82	1.8/3.6	4.9
Polarisation for $e^{-}(e^{+})$	$P_{-}(P_{+})$		80%(30%)	80%(30%)	80%(30%)	80%(30%)	80%(20%)
Repetition frequency	$f_{ m rep}$	Hz	5	5	5	5	4
Bunches per pulse	$n_{ m bunch}$	1	1312	2625	1312	1312/2625	2450
Bunch population	$N_{ m e}$	10^{10}	2	2	2	2	1.74
Linac bunch interval	$\Delta t_{ m b}$	ns	554	366	554	554/366	366
Beam current in pulse	$I_{\rm pulse}$	$\mathbf{m}\mathbf{A}$	5.8	5.8	8.8	5.8	7.6
Beam pulse duration	$t_{\rm pulse}$	$\mu { m s}$	727	961	727	727/961	897
Average beam power	$P_{\rm ave}$	MW	5.3	10.5	10.5	10.5/21	27.2
Norm. hor. emitt. at IP	$\gamma \epsilon_{\mathbf{x}}$	$\mu{ m m}$	5	5	10	10	10
Norm. vert. emitt. at IP	$\gamma \epsilon_{ m y}$	nm	35	35	35	35	30
RMS hor. beam size at IP	$\sigma^*_{ m x}$	nm	516	516	729	474	335
RMS vert. beam size at IP	$\sigma_{ m y}^*$	nm	7.7	7.7	7.7	5.9	2.7
Luminosity in top 1%	$\mathcal{L}_{0.01}/\mathcal{L}$		73%	73%	87.1%	58.3%	44.5%
Energy loss from beamstrahlung	$\delta_{ m BS}$		2.6%	2.6%	0.97%	4.5%	10.5%
Site AC power	$P_{\rm site}$	MW	129		122	163	300
Site length	$L_{\rm site}$	$\rm km$	20.5	20.5	31	31	40

Tor Raubenheimer, FCC Week June 2023

TABLE I: Summary table of the ILC accelerator parameters in the initial 250 GeV staged configuration (with TDR parameters at 250 GeV given for comparison) and possible upgrades. A 500 GeV machine could also be operated at 250 GeV with 10 Hz repetition rate, bringing the maximum luminosity to $5.4 \cdot 10^{34} \text{ cm}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ [10]

Summary of Backgrounds

The background sources have been investigated in various studies. For example, the beam-beam interaction and pair generation, radiative Bhabhas, disrupted beams and beamstrahlung photons for the 500 GeV ILC were studied with GUINEAPIG [333]. Also, the $\gamma\gamma$ hadronic cross section was approximated in the Peskin-Barklow scheme [2]. Based on these studies densities of particles which will reach the different sun-detectors have been estimated. Table I-1.3 summarises these estimates.

Table I-1.3 Background sources

the nominal 500 Ge beam parameters.

Source	#particles per bunch	< E > (GeV)	The International Action 1306 6
Disrupted primary beam	2×10^{10}	244	di/(iv. 1500.0
Bremstrahlung photons	2.5×10^{10}	244	
e ⁺ e ⁻ pairs from beam-beam inter- actions	75k	2.5	
Radiative Bhabhas	320k	195	
$\gamma \gamma \rightarrow hadrons/muons$	0.5 events/1.3 events	-	

T. Behnke, et al.

The International Linear Collider Technical Design Report - Volume 4: Detectors, arXiv:1306.6329 [Physics]. (2013)

Vincent.Boudry@in2p3.fr

Machine backgrounds

Files produced by Andrea Ciarma at Z-peak and Top threshold

Incoherent Pairs Creation (IPC) output files from GuineaPig++ for FCC-ee 4IP lattice nominal beam energy: 45.6GeV @Z - 182.5GeV @Top

Each file corresponds to pairs created during 1BX each line corresponds to a particle

The format of the line is:

m_input >> PHEP4 // energy [GeV]
>> PHEP1 >> PHEP2 >> PHEP3 // momentum component [rad]
>> VHEP1 >> VHEP2 >> VHEP3 // vertex coordinates [nm]
>> process >> trash >> id_ee; // process type; internal flag; id of the single particle - all useless for tracking in the detector

Charge and PID should be manually set, according to the sign of the energy

PHEP4>0 -> IDHEP = 11; CHARGE =-1; PHEP4<0 -> IDHEP =-11; CHARGE = 1;

A Lorentz boost should be applied along X to account for the fact that GP produces particles in the rest frame of the two beams, which due to the crossing angle (15 mrad) moves w.r.t. the detector.

Mean calculations from histograms

Low #hits & Zoom

High #hits

All #hits & Zoom

35/35

Histograms of qq161: Nhits M3 L0:9 and M5 L20-29

\triangle Beware of automatic rescaling \triangle

Vincent.Boudry@in2p3.fr