ATLAS EXPERIMENT
Candidate Event:
pp→H(→bb) + W(→μν)
Run: 338712 Event: 335908183
2017-10-19 23:31:18 CEST

CMS Experiment at the LHC, CERN
Data recorded: 2011-May-25 08:00:19.229673 GMT(10:00:19 CEST)
Run / Event: 165633 / 394010457

Particle Detectors

Summer Student Lectures 2024

Werner Riegler, CERN, werner.riegler@cern.ch

History of Instrumentation ↔ History of Particle Physics

The 'Real' World of Particles

Interaction of Particles with Matter

Tracking Detectors, Calorimeters, Particle Identification

Detector Systems

Detectors based on Ionization

Gas detectors:

- Wire Chambers

- Drift Chambers

- Time Projection Chambers

- Transport of Electrons and Ions in Gases

→ Solid State Detectors

- Transport of Electrons and Holes in Solids

- Si- Detectors

- Diamond Detectors

Solid State Detectors

Gas Detectors

In gaseous detectors, a charged particle is liberating electrons from the atoms, which are freely bouncing between the gas atoms.

An applied electric field makes the electrons and ions move, which induces signals on the metal readout electrodes.

For individual gas atoms, the electron energy levels are discrete.

Solid State Detectors

In solids (crystals), the electron energy levels are in 'bands'.

Inner shell electrons, in the lower energy bands, are closely bound to the individual atoms and always stay with 'their' atoms.

In a crystal there are however energy bands that are still bound states of the crystal, but they belong to the entire crystal. Electrons in these bands and the holes in the lower band can freely move around the crystal, if an electric field is applied.

Solid State Detectors

Free Electron Energy

Unfilled Bands

Conduction Band

Band Gap

Valance Band

Conductor, Insulator, Semiconductor

In case the conduction band is filled the crystal is a conductor.

In case the conduction band is empty and 'far away' from
the valence band, the crystal is an insulator.

In case the conduction band is empty but the distance to the valence band is small, the crystal is a semiconductor.

Solid State Detectors

Band Gap, e-h pair Energy

The energy gap between the last filled band – the valence band – and the conduction band is called band gap E_g.

The band gap of Diamond/Silicon/Germanium is 5.5, 1.12, 0.66 eV.

The average energy to produce an electron/hole pair for Diamond/Silicon/Germanium is 13, 3.6, 2.9eV.

Band Gap

Temperature, Charged Particle Detection

In case an electron in the valence band gains energy by some process, it can be excited into the conduction band and a hole in the valence band is left behind.

Such a process can be the passage of a charged particle, but also thermal excitation → probability is proportional $Exp(-E_g/kT)$.

The number of electrons in the conduction band is therefore increasing with temperature i.e. the conductivity of a semiconductor increases with temperature.

# Solid State Detectors

Electron, Hole Movement:

It is possible to treat electrons in the conduction band and holes in the valence band similar to free particles, but with an effective mass different from elementary electrons not embedded in the lattice.

This mass is furthermore dependent on other parameters such as the direction of movement with respect to the crystal axis. All this follows from the QM treatment of the crystal (solid state physics).

Cooling:

If we want to use a semiconductor as a detector for charged particles, the number of charge carriers in the conduction band due to thermal excitation must be smaller than the number of charge carriers in the conduction band produced by the passage of a charged particle.

Diamond (E_g=5.5eV) can be used for particle detection at room temperature, Silicon (E_g=1.12 eV) and Germanium (E_g=0.66eV) must be cooled, or the free charge carriers must be eliminated by other tricks → doping → see later.

Solid State Detectors

Primary 'ionization':

The average energy to produce an electron/hole pair is: Diamond (13eV), Silicon (3.6eV), Germanium (2.9eV)

Comparing to gas detectors, the density of a solid is about a factor 1000 larger than that of a gas and the energy to produce and electron/hole pair e.g. for Si is a factor 7 smaller than the energy to produce an electron-ion pair in Argon.

Solid State vs. Gas Detector:

The number of primary charges in a Si detector is therefore about 10^4 times larger than the one in gas → while gas detectors need internal charge amplification, solid state detectors don't need internal amplification.

While in gaseous detectors, the velocity of electrons and ions differs by a factor 1000, the velocity of electrons and holes in many semiconductor detectors is quite similar → very short signals.

Diamond → A solid state ionization chamber

Diamond Detector

Typical thickness – a few 100µm.
<1000 charge carriers/cm^3 at room temperature due to large band gap.

Velocity:
μ_e=1800 cm^2/Vs, μ_h=1600 cm^2/Vs
Velocity = μE, 10kV/cm → v=180 µm/ns → Very fast signals of only a few ns length !

A single e/h par produced in the center

T=2-3ns

Diamond Detector

However, charges are trapped along the track, only about 50% of *produced* primary charge is *induced* →

I_2

E

$-q, v_e$ q, v_h

Z=D

Z=0

I_1

$I_1(t)$

T=2-3ns

$I_1(t)$

T=2-3ns

Silicon Detector

Velocity:

μ_e=1450 cm^2/Vs, μ_h=505 cm^2/Vs, 3.63eV per e-h pair.

~33000 e/h pairs in 300µm of silicon.

However: Free charge carriers in Si:

T=300 K: e,h = 1.45 x 10^{10} / cm^3 but only 33000 e/h pairs in 300μm produced by a high energy particle.

Why can we use Si as a solid state detector ???

Doping of Silicon

doping

n-type with donor (arsenic)


p-type with acceptor (boron)

In a silicon crystal at a given temperature the number of electrons in the conduction band is equal to the number of holes in the valence band.

Doping Silicon with Arsen (+5) it becomes and n-type conductor (more electrons than holes).

Doping Silicon with Boron (+3) it becomes a p-type conductor (more holes than electrons).

Bringing p and n in contact makes a diode.

Si-Diode used as a Particle Detector !

At the p-n junction the charges are depleted and a zone free of charge carriers is established.

By applying a voltage, the depletion zone can be extended to the entire diode → highly insulating layer.

An ionizing particle produces free charge carriers in the diode, which drift in the electric field and induce an electrical signal on the metal electrodes.

As silicon is the most commonly used material in the electronics industry, it has one big advantage with respect to other materials, namely highly developed technology.


Depletion Region

p   n

• Electron
⊕ Positive ion from removal of electron in n-type impurity
⊖ Negative ion from filling in p-type vacancy
• Hole

# Under-Depleted Silicon Detector

Zone without free charge carriers positively charged. Sensitive Detector Volume.

Zone with free electrons. Conductive. Insensitive to particles.

Electric Field

Fully-Depleted Silicon Detector

p

n

Zone without free charge carriers
positively charged.
Sensitive Detector Volume.

Electric Field

Over-Depleted Silicon Detector

p

n

Zone without free charge carriers positively charged. Sensitive Detector Volume.

Electric Field

In contrast to the (un-doped) diamond detector where the bulk is neutral and the electric field is therefore constant, the sensitive volume of a doped silicon detector is charged (space charge region) and the field is therefore changing along the detector.

→ Velocity of electrons and holes is not constant along the detector.

Silicon Detector

ca. 50-150 μm

Fully depleted zone

SiO₂ Al

SiO_2 passivation

p^+ silicon

n type silicon

n^+ silicon

$V > 0$

h^+

e^-

300μm

N (e-h) = 11 000/100μm

Position Resolution down to ~ 5μm !

Silicon Detector

Every electrode is connected to an amplifier →
Highly integrated readout electronics.

Two dimensional readout is possible.


CMS Outer Barrel Module

Large Silicon Systems

5.6 m

2.4 m

CMS tracker (~2007)

12000 modules

~ 445 m^2 silicon area

~ 24,328 silicon wafers

~ 60 M readout channels

CDF SVX IIa (2001-)

~ 11m^2 silicon area

~ 750 000 readout channels

CMS Tracker

Pixel-Detectors

Problem:
2-dimensional readout of strip detectors results in 'Ghost Tracks' at high particle multiplicities i.e. many particles at the same time.

Solution:
Si detectors with 2 dimensional 'chessboard' readout. Typical size 50 x 200 μm.

Problem:
Coupling of readout electronics to the detector

Solution:
Bump bonding for correcting a sensor to the readout electronics chip

Monolithic silicon sensors that incorporate the sensor and the electronics inside one substrate

Pixel-Detectors

ATLAS: 10^8 pixels

ALICE: 10^{10} pixels

Bump bonding of pixels to readout electronics.
'Hybrid Pixel Detectors'

Sensitive element and electronics on the same silicon wafer produced with 'standard' electronics fabrication process. 'Monolithic Pixel Detectors'

Radiation Effects 'Aging'

Increase in leakage current

Increase in depletion voltage

Decrease in charge collection efficiency due to under-depletion and charge trapping.

Summary on Solid State Detectors

Solid state detectors provide very high precision tracking in particle physics experiments (down to 5um) for vertex measurement but also for momentum spectroscopy over large areas (CMS, ATLAS+CMS Phase-II).

Technology is improving rapidly due to rapid Silicon development for electronics industry.

Typical numbers where detectors start to strongly degrade are 10^{15}-10^{16} hadron/cm^2.

'Clearly, monolithic solid state detectors are an ultimate goal.

Calorimetry

Bremsstrahlung + Pair Production → EM Shower

Electro-Magnetic Shower of High Energy Electrons and Photons

$$N(n) = 2^n \quad \text{..... Number of particles } (e^{\pm}, \gamma) \text{ after } n \, X_0$$

$$E(n) = \frac{E_0}{2^n} \quad \text{.... Average Energy of particles after } n \, X_0$$

Shower stops if $E(n) = E_{critical}$

$$\to n_{max} = \frac{1}{\ln 2} \ln \frac{E_0}{E_c} \quad \to \text{Shower length rises with } \ln E_0$$

Number of $e^{\pm}$ track segments (of length X_0) after $n \, X_0$:

$$N_{tr}(n) = 2^n$$

Total $e^{\pm}$ track length (after $n_{max} \, X_0$)

$$L = \sum_{n=0}^{n_{max}} 2^n X_0 = \left(2 \frac{E_0}{E_c} - 1\right) X_0 \sim 2 \frac{E_0}{E_c} X_0 = c_1 \cdot E_0$$

Total (charge) track length is proportional to the Energy of the Particle.

$\to$ Calorimeter Principle

Calorimetry: Energy Measurement by total Absorption of Particles


Material   77

μ, E_0 Ionization, Excitation **L**   Stop

$e^{\pm}, E_0$ $\leftarrow \sum$ charged Tracks $= L$

γ, E_0 $\leftarrow \sum$ charged Tracks $= L$

The $e^{\pm}$ in the Calorimeter ionize and excite the Material

Ionization: e^-, I^+ pairs in the Material

Excitation: Photons in the Material

Measuring the total Number of e^-, I^+ pairs or the total Number of Photons gives the particle Energy.

If N is the total Number of e^+, I^+ pairs or photons, on $N = c_1 E_0$:

$\Delta N = \sqrt{N}$ (Poisson Statistics)

$$\frac{\Delta E}{E} = \frac{\Delta N}{N} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} = \frac{a}{\sqrt{E}} \rightarrow \text{Resolution}$$

Only Electrons and High Energy Photons show EM cascades at current GeV-TeV level Energies.

Strongly interacting particles like Pions, Kaons, produce hadonic showers in a similar fashion to the EM cascade
→Hadronic calorimetry

Momentum Spectrometer: $\Delta p/p \; \alpha \; p$

Calorimeter: $\Delta E/E \; \alpha \; 1/\sqrt{E}$

Energy measurement improves with higher particle energies – LHC !

Calorimetry: Energy Measurement by total Absorption of Particles

The Measurement is destructive. The particle can not be subject to further study.

Energy Measurement by

Collecting the produced Charge

Liquid Nobel Gases (Nobel Liquids)

Measuring the Photons produced by the collision of the $e^{\pm}$ with Atom Electrons of the Material.

Scintillating Crystals, Plastic Scintillators

Total Amount of e^-, I^+ pairs or Photons is proportional to the total track length is proportional to the particle Energy.

Calorimetry

Calorimeters can be classified into:

Electromagnetic Calorimeters,
to measure electrons and photons through their EM interactions.

Hadron Calorimeters,
Used to measure hadrons through their strong and EM interactions.

The construction can be classified into:

Homogeneous Calorimeters,
that are built of only one type of material that performs both tasks, energy degradation and signal generation.

Sampling Calorimeters,
that consist of alternating layers of an absorber, a dense material used to degrade the energy of the incident particle, and an active medium that provides the detectable signal.

C.W. Fabjan and F. Gianotti, Rev. Mod. Phys., Vol. 75, N0. 4, October 2003

Calorimetry

Calorimeters are attractive in our field for various reasons:

In contrast with magnet spectrometers, in which the momentum resolution deteriorates linearly with the particle momentum, on most cases the calorimeter energy resolution improves as $1/\sqrt{E}$, where E is the energy of the incident particle. Therefore calorimeters are very well suited for high-energy physics experiments.

In contrast to magnet spectrometers, calorimeters are sensitive to all types of particles, charged and neutral. They can even provide indirect detection of neutrinos and their energy through a measurement of the event missing energy.

Calorimeters are commonly used for trigger purposes since they can provide fast signals that are easy to process and interpret.

They are space and therefore cost effective. Because the shower length increases only logarithmically with energy, the detector thickness needs to increase only logarithmically with the energy of the particles. In contrast for a fixed momentum resolution, the bending power BL^2 of a magnetic spectrometer must increase linearly with the particle momentum.

C.W. Fabjan and F. Gianotti, Rev. Mod. Phys., Vol. 75, N0. 4, October 2003

EM Calorimetry

Approximate longitudinal shower development

$N(n) = 2^n$ ..... Number of particles $(e^{\pm}, \gamma)$ after $n \, X_0$

$E(n) = \frac{E_0}{2^n}$ .... Average Energy of particles after $n \, X_0$

Shower stops if $E(n) = E_{critical}$

$\Rightarrow n_{max} = \frac{1}{\ln 2} \ln \frac{E_0}{E_c}$ $\rightarrow$ Shower length rises with $\ln E_0$

Radiation Length X_0 and Moliere Radius are two key parameters for choice of calorimeter materials

Approximate transverse shower development

The transverse Shower Dimension is mainly related to the Multiple scattering of the low Energy Electrons.

$\theta_0 \sim \frac{21 \, [MeV]}{\beta \, p \, [\frac{MeV}{c}]} \, z_1 \cdot \sqrt{\frac{x}{X_0}}$

Electrons E_c , $E \sim p \cdot c$

$\theta_0 \sim \frac{21 \, [MeV]}{\beta \, E_c \, [MeV]} \cdot z_1 \cdot \sqrt{\frac{x}{X_0}}$ $\qquad z_1 = 1, \beta \sim 1$

$E_c \sim \frac{610}{Z + 1.24} \, MeV \sim \frac{610}{Z} \, MeV$

$\theta_0 = 0.0344 \cdot Z \cdot \sqrt{\frac{x}{X_0}}$

Moliere Radius ρ_m = Lateral Shower Radius after $1 \, X_0$:

$$\rho_m \approx 0.0344 \cdot Z \cdot X_0$$

95% of Energy are in a Cylinder of $2 \rho_m$ Radius.

Crystals for Homogeneous EM Calorimetry

In crystals the light emission is related to the crystal structure of the material. Incident charged particles create electron-hole pairs and photons are emitted when electrons return to the valence band.

The incident electron or photon is completely absorbed and the produced amount of light, which is reflected through the transparent crystal, is measured by photomultipliers or solid state photon detectors.

Measuring the Photons produced by the collision of the $e^\pm$ with Atom Electrons of the Material.

Crystals for Homogeneous EM Calorimetry

	NaI(Tl)	CsI(Tl)	CsI	BGO	PbWO$_4$
Density (g/cm^3)	3.67	4.53	4.53	7.13	8.28
X_0 (cm)	2.59	1.85	1.85	1.12	0.89
R_M (cm)	4.5	3.8	3.8	2.4	2.2
Decay time (ns)	250	1000	10	300	5
slow component			36		15
Emission peak (nm)	410	565	305	410	440
slow component			480		
Light yield γ/MeV	4×10^4	5×10^4	4×10^4	8×10^3	1.5×10^2
Photoelectron yield (relative to NaI)	1	0.4	0.1	0.15	0.01
Rad. hardness (Gy)	1	10	10^3	1	10^5

	Barbar@PEPII, 10ms interaction rate, good light yield, good S/N	KTeV@Tevatron, High rate, Good resolution	L3@LEP, 25us bunch crossing, Low radiation dose	CMS@LHC, 25ns bunch crossing, high radiation dose

# Crystals for Homogeneous EM Calorimetry

Fig. 2. Longitudinal drawing of module 2, showing the structure and the front-end electronics layout.

Noble Liquids for Homogeneous EM Calorimetry

	Ar	Kr	Xe
Z	18	36	58
A	40	84	131
X_0 (cm)	14	4.7	2.8
R_M (cm)	7.2	4.7	4.2
Density (g/cm^3)	1.4	2.5	3.0
Ionization energy (eV/pair)	23.3	20.5	15.6
Critical energy ϵ (MeV)	41.7	21.5	14.5
Drift velocity at saturation (mm/μs)	10	5	3

When a charge particle traverses these materials, about half the lost energy is converted into ionization and half into scintillation.

The best energy resolution would obviously be obtained by collecting both the charge and light signal. This is however rarely done because of the technical difficulties to extract light and charge in the same instrument.

Krypton is preferred in homogeneous detectors due to small radiation length and therefore compact detectors. Liquid Argon is frequently used due to low cost and high purity in sampling calorimeters.

# Noble Liquids for Homogeneous EM Calorimetry

E.g. Liquid Argon, 5mm/ μs at 1kV/cm, 5mm gap → 1 μs for all electrons to reach the electrode.

The ion velocity is 10^3 to 10^5 times smaller → doesn't contribute to the signal for electronics of μs integration time.

Homogeneous EM Calorimeters, Examples

NA48/62 Liquid Krypton
2cmx2cm cells
$X_0 = 4.7$cm
125cm length ($27X_0$)
$\rho = 5.5$cm

KTeV CsI
5cmx5cm and
$X_0 = 1.85$cm
2.5cmx2.5cm crystals
50cm length ($27X_0$)
$\rho = 3.5$cm

Fig. 1. Schematic of the KTeV CsI Calorimeter showing the cluster energy profiles due to four photons.

NA48 Experiment at CERN and KTeV Experiment at Fermilab, both built for measurement of direct CP violation. Homogenous calorimeters with Liquid Krypton (NA48) and CsI (KTeV). Excellent and very similar resolution.

Sampling Calorimeters

Alternation of "passive" absorber plates and "active" readout sections

Advantage:
- optimum choice of Absorber Material
- optimum choice of Signal Readout
- Compact and cheap Construction

"passive": Pb, Fe ....

"active": Scintillator (Signal → Photons)
Noble Liquid, e.g. Ar (Signal → e^-, I^+)
Wire Chambers (Signal → e^-, I^+)

Energy resolution of sampling calorimeters is in general worse than that of homogeneous calorimeters, owing to the sampling fluctuations – the fluctuation of ratio of energy deposited in the active and passive material.

The resolution is typically in the range 5-20%/Sqrt[E(GeV)] for EM calorimeters. On the other hand they are relatively easy to segment longitudinally and laterally and therefore they usually offer better space resolution and particle identification than homogeneous calorimeters.

The active medium can be scintillators (organic), solid state detectors, gas detectors or liquids.

Sampling Fraction = Energy deposited in Active/Energy deposited in passive material.

EM Calorimetry → Hadron Calorimetry

Similar process for Hadrons.

The equivalent to EM Bremsstrahlung is Pion radiation.

The equivalent to the radiation length is the nuclear interaction length.

Hadronic Calorimetry

Hadron

$p^{\pm}, n, \pi^{\pm}, k^{\pm}, k^0$

Strong Interaction

Approximate Energy Distribution

$\sim 50\%$

π^+, π^- π^0

$\downarrow \downarrow$ $\gamma\gamma$

π^+, π^- π^+, π^-, π^0

/\/\ /\/\ $\gamma\gamma$

Hadron Kaskade

$\pi^0 \to \gamma\gamma \to$ Electromagnetic Component

$\sim 20\%$

Nuclear Excitation

5 - 30 MeV

p, n, γ

$\sim 30\%$

Slow Nucleons

In Hadronic Cascades the longitudinal Shower is given by the Absorption Length λ_a $I \sim e^{-\frac{x}{\lambda_a}}$

In typical Detector Materials λ_a is much longer than X_0

$$\lambda \sim \frac{1}{\varrho} \cdot 35 \, A^{\frac{1}{3}}$$

	ϱ	X_0	λ
Fe	7.87	1.76 cm	~ 17 cm
Pb	11.35	0.56 cm	~ 17 cm

Energy Resolution:

- A large Fraction of the Energy 'disappears' into
  - Binding Energy of emitted Nucleons
  - $\pi \to \mu + \nu$ which are not absorbed

- π^0's Decaying into $\gamma\gamma$ start an EM Cascade $(\gamma \sim 10^{-44} s)$

— Energy Resolution is worse than for EM Calorimeters

Hadron Calorimeters are Large because λ is large

Fig. 1 - The ALEPH Detector

Legend:
- Vertex Detector
- Inner Track Chamber
- Time Projection Chamber
- Electromagnetic Calorimeter
- Superconducting Magnet Coil
- Hadron Calorimeter
- Muon Detection Chambers
- Luminosity Monitors

Hadron Calorimeters are large and heavy because the hadronic interaction length λ, the 'strong interaction equivalent' to the EM radiation length X_0, is large (5-10 times larger than X_0)


Because part of the energy is 'invisible' (nuclear excitation, slow nucleons), the resolution of hadron calorimeters is typically worse than in EM calorimeters 20-100%/$\sqrt{E(GeV)}$.

A few Reasons why you want to become an Experimental Particle Physicist

The Standard Model of Particles Physics, a theory that was established in the early 1970ies, is in excellent agreement with experiments. Experiments at LEP/Tevatron/LHC/KEK etc. verified the theory to impressive precision.

The Higgs Particle, a necessary element of the standard model, was found at the LHC.

Although the standard model is perfectly fitting the experiments, we know/think that it cannot be the final answer:

CP violation and the other CKM matrix elements are put into the model explicitly and they are not derived from a theory.

The Matter- Antimatter asymmetry in the Universe cannot be explained by the level of standard model CP violation.

The masses of the particles are unexplained.

We do not know what dark matter is.

The cosmological constant predicted by the standard model differs by many orders of magnitude from the observed one.

The Higgs mass renormalization requires fine tuning etc. etc.

A few Reasons why you want to become an Experimental Particle Physicist

Substantial theory efforts did not really advance on these questions and did not touch base with experiment.

It is very difficult to find out what is wrong with the theory if all experimental results are in agreement with the theory.

The next step in advancing our knowledge will most likely come from experiment. Maybe LHC or some telescope, or some astrophysics experiment or some other future accelerator …

We have to invent new technologies for future accelerators and experiments !

x 10^{13} → LHC

+
1.5
V
–

e⁻

You

have to develop the tricks and technologies to advance on the most fundamental questions in Physics !

Detector Systems

CMS Detector

Key:
— Muon
— Electron
— Charged Hadron (e.g. Pion)
-- - Neutral Hadron (e.g. Neutron)
···· Photon

4T

2T

Silicon Tracker

Electromagnetic Calorimeter

Hadron Calorimeter

Superconducting Solenoid

Iron return yoke interspersed with Muon chambers

Transverse slice through CMS

D. Barney, CERN, February 2004

ALICE

ALICE Particle ID

Alice uses ~ all known techniques!

TPC + ITS
(dE/dx)

π/K

K/p

e /π

TOF

e /π π/K

K/p

HMPID
(RICH)

π/K

K/p

0   1   2   3   4   5   p (GeV/c)

TPC (rel. rise) π /K/p π/K

K/p

TRD   e /π

PHOS γ /π^0

1   10   100   p (GeV/c)

MiniBooNE detector, Neutrinos

MiniBooNE Detector

800 tons of mineral oil
1280 photomultipliers

| Interaction | track | Cherenkov | Candidate |

Muon
ν_μCCQE
$\nu_\mu + n \rightarrow p + \mu^-$

Electron
ν_eCCQE
$\nu_e + n \rightarrow p + e^-$

Neutral pion
NCπ^0
$\nu + N \rightarrow \nu + N + \pi^0$

Super-Kamiokande, Neutrinos

Hyper-Kamiokande

Notre-Dame de Paris

78 m

69 m

~ 260.000 m³   ~ 180.000 m³

Daya Bay, Neutrinos

20 tons of liquid scintillator

NEXT experiment, double β decay

Time Projection Chamber:
100 kg active region, 130 cm drift length

Pressure vessel:
stainless steel, 15 bar max pressure

Energy plane:
60 PMTs,
30% coverage

Tracking plane:
7,000 SiPMs,
1 cm pitch

Outer shield:
lead, 20 cm thick

Inner shield:
copper, 12 cm thick

[Double beta decay]

Double beta decay
which emits anti-neutrinos

Neutrinoless
double beta decay

$\nu_e = \bar{\nu}_e$

ββ0ν

ββ2ν

$(T_1 + T_2)/Q_{\beta\beta}$

CERN Neutrino Gran Sasso

(CNGS)

CNGS

If neutrinos have mass:

$$\nu_e$$

$$\nu_\mu \qquad \nu_\tau$$

**Muon neutrinos produced at CERN.
See if tau neutrinos arrive in Italy.**

CERN

$\nu_\mu \qquad \nu_\tau \qquad \nu_\mu \qquad \nu_\tau$

neutrino trajectory

CNGS Project

CNGS (CERN Neutrino Gran Sasso)

- A long base-line neutrino beam facility (732km)

- send ν_μ beam produced at CERN

- detect ν_τ appearance in OPERA experiment at Gran Sasso

➔ direct proof of ν_μ - ν_τ oscillation (appearance experiment)

CNGS

CNGS

CNGS

Radial Distribution of the ν_μ-Beam at GS

Flat top: 500m
FWHM: 2800m

typical size of a detector at Gran Sasso

5 years CNGS operation, 1800 tons target:
- **30000 neutrino interactions**
- **~150 ν_τ interactions**
- **~15 ν_τ identified**
- **< 1 event of background**

Neutrinos at CNGS: Some Numbers

For 1 year of CNGS operation, we expect:

|	
protons on target	2×10^{19}
pions / kaons at entrance to decay tunnel	3×10^{19}
ν_μ **in direction of Gran Sasso**	10^{19}
ν_μ **in 100 m^2 at Gran Sasso**	3×10^{14}
ν_μ **events per day in OPERA**	≈ 2500
ν_τ **events (from oscillation)**	≈ 2

Opera Experiment at Gran Sasso

Basic unit: brick

56 Pb sheets + 56 photographic films (emulsion sheets)

Lead plates: massive target
**Emulsions: micrometric precision**

Brick

1 mm

τ

ν

Pb

Couche de gélatine
photographique 40 μm

brick

8.3kg

10.2 x 12.7 x 7.5 cm^3

Opera Experiment at Gran Sasso

31 target planes / supermodule

In total: 206336 bricks, 1766 tons

SM1

SM2

Targets

Magnetic Spectrometers

First observation of CNGS beam neutrinos : August 18th, 2006

Opera Experiment at Gran Sasso

Second Super-module

Details of the first spectrometer

Scintillator planes 5900 m^2
8064 7m long drift tubes

3050 m^2 Resistive Plate Counters
2000 tons of iron for the two magnets

Opera Experiment at Gran Sasso

The Brick Manipulator System (BMS) prototype:
a lot of fun for children and adults !

The robotised "Ferrari" for insertion/extraction of bricks with vacuum grip by Venturi valve

Tests with the prototype wall

"Carousel" brick dispensing and storage system

First Tau Candidate !

AMS

Alpha **M**agnetic **S**pectrometer

**Try to find Antimatter in the primary cosmic rays.
Study cosmic ray composition etc. etc.**

AMS

Installed on the space station.

AMS

AMS