



# **FASER2** Updates

### FPF7 Workshop 29/02/2024

#### **Olivier SALIN** on behalf of the FASER2 collaboration

# **FASER2:** Physics motivation

- Program for BSM physics
  - Search for long-lived particles

#### Dark Photon





#### ALP coupling to photon





- Program for SM physics
  - Main spectrometer to neutrino experiments for the FPF (FLArE, FASERnu2)

### FASER2 Baseline detector



GDML/ Geant4 simulation of the detector created with pyg4ometry

### FASER2 Baseline detector: Details



#### Tracker:

- Based on LHCb's SciFitracker
- SiPM and scintillating fiber design
- Detector resolution: ~ 100 μm

#### Magnet:

- Large aperture
- 3m wide X 1m gap
- Superconducting technology
- Magnetic Field : 2-4 Tm
- Based on the SAMURAI magnet

#### Calorimeter:

- Based on dual-readout calorimetery
- Spatial resolution: 1-10 mm

# FASER2 Baseline detector: General consideration



- Detector requirement and performance:
  - From well motivated physics benchmark
  - > Aim to maintain high performance for model-independent physics
- Motivation for detector with less granularity and magnetic field at edge:
  - Near LOS: Particles highly boosted (O(1 TeV))
  - > <u>At 1m from LOS</u>: Significant reduction in boost
- Motivation for detector squared shape detector :
  - Muon background increases with distance from LOS in the horizontal plane
  - More square-shaped detector (e.g., 1.7m x 1.7m) preferred over rectangular shapes (e.g., 3m x 1m)
  - Ongoing studies on optimizing detector shape for improved efficiency

### FASER2 Baseline detector: Costing



• Previous costing estimation in the region of 20 MCHF

Cost mainly driven by magnet quotation (10 MCHF)

- Overall cost could be significantly lower than original estimate
  - Updated quotes for magnet is closer to 5 MCHF (<u>Hidetoshi</u>, <u>KEK expert</u>)
  - > Investigation for reduced complexity for tracker and calorimeter

# FASER2 Magnet: SAMURAI style magnet

- Presentation on FASER2 magnet by <u>Hidetoshi Otono</u> : <u>link</u>
  - Tomorrow at 11:30 (CERN time)
- SAMURAI Dipole Magnet as a reference
  - o Aperture: 88cm X 340cm
  - Field integral 7 Tm
- FASER2 magnet based on SAMURAI:
  - **Dimension**: 3m wide X 1m gap X 4m along LOS
  - o Integrated field: 4 Tm
  - Stored energy: 7 MJ
  - **Power consumption:** 36.2 kW
  - **Superconducting:** Cryogenic infrastructure needed
- On going study to optimise magnet design:
  - Reduce field strength: 2 Tm
  - Enlarging pole gap to 2 m with reduced width
- Discussion and study with KEK experts (Naoyuki SUMI)
  - Conceptual design, Field map, Current density, return yoke

#### Made by Toshiba for RIKEN





### FASER2 Tracker: SciFi technology

- Based on SciFi detector installed in LHCb in LS2
  - SiPM + Scintillating fiber design
  - > Resolution ~ 80  $\mu$ m (fibers diameter 250  $\mu$ m)
  - Each module consists mat of 4 fibers with > 99% efficiency
  - Power comsumption: 10 kW
- FASER2 tracking station layout
  - Active area of 3m X 1m
  - Composed of vertical and horizontal fiber layers
  - Stations relatively rotated e.g angle of 1°
- Cost could be reduced by re-using tooling from LHCb if relevant institudes involved

# contal fiber layers



 Possibility to directly use LHCb's SciFi modules (removed in LS4) for "free" (depend on schedule)

#### Expert: Sune Jakobsen



# FASER2 Calorimeter: Dual-readout technology

- Design based on dual readout calorimeter prototype
  - $\circ~\mbox{Prototypes}$  for Higgs factory detector
  - EM prototype and HiDRa prototype INFN: <u>test beam</u>
- FASER2 calorimeter design:
  - o Fiber diameter 1 mm, 2 mm brass collar
  - $\circ$  Spatial resolution: ~ 5 mm
  - EM energy resolution:  $\frac{\sigma}{E} = \frac{14.5\%}{\sqrt{E}} + 0.1\%$
  - Power consumption: ~ 3 kW (EM), ~ 1.3 kW (Hadronic)
  - $\circ~$  Less granular for outer regions of the detector
    - Reduce number of chanels

- Calorimeter performances Geant4 simulation
  - Simulation π0 -> yy





#### Expert: <u>Iacopo Vivarelli</u>

# FASER2 Software: A Common Tracking Software (ACTS)

- ACTS: Modern tracking toolkit for detectors based on LHC tracking experience
- Implemented in experiments such as FASER, LDMX, ALICE
- Common algorithms for simulation and track reconstruction



- Could be used as main tracking software for the FPF (need adaptation forward region)
- Active and helpful communities of developpers

# FASER2 Software: A Common Tracking Software (ACTS)

#### • Hypothesis for ACTS implementation:

- Tracker with homogeous material and accurate X0
- Tracker resolution digitized as 100 µm
- Constant magnetic field within the magnet volume
- No background
- Truth track finding algorithm
- Rotation of axis to avoid high eta region



• Study of tracking performances for different metrics

#### Momentum resolution



#### **Mass resolution**



#### **Vertex resolution**



11

### FASER2 Software: Performances

**Tracker resolution** 

• ACTS performance plots for different FASER2 detector configurations/parameters

#### Field strength



- Momentum resolution remains good while reducing magnetic field to 2 Tm
- Effect of tracker resolution on the momentum resolution
- Good performances with 6 tracking layers configuration

Number of tracking station

# FASER2 Software: Alignment

- ACTS performance plots for detector toy misalignment of FASER2
- Study identifies the tracker alignment is a key performance driver



- Misalignment of tracking station > 250 µm starts to have significant impact on momentum resolution
- Expected mechanical precision should have alignment precision of 250  $\mu m$ 
  - > Achieving 250µm alignment precision across large detectors (~10m appart) is challenging
- On-going studies to use the muon background for track alignment (Luke Kennedy)

# FASER2 Alternative design: Crystal puller magnet

Toshiba

Possibility to use off-the-shelf crystall puller magnets from Toshiba (Japan) or TESLA electronics (UK)

 Site visit to both Toshiba (<u>Milind Diwan</u>) and TESLA (<u>Alan Barr</u>) by FPF team

TESLA





- Both of those Industrial Crystall puller magnet:
  - Central field of 0.4 0.5 T
  - Can be chained together to have incresead integrated magnetic field
  - Apperture diameter of 1.6 m (up to 2 m)
  - Advantages: Off the shelf, no R&D needed, cryo system integrated into design
- More information on FASER2 magnet talk by Hidetoshi Otono : link

### FASER2 Alternative design: Crystal puller magnet



• Sensitivity plots for Dark Photons and Dark Higgs comparison for FASER2 designs options



• Crytal puller magnet have similar sensitivity for LLP as SAMURAI style magnet aperture

# FASER2 Alternative design: Crystal puller magnet



- Track reconstruction resolution for FASER2 design options
  - Number of Crystal Puller magnets from 2 4 modules
  - Field strength: from 1.25 Tm to 2.5 Tm





- Crystal puller magnets keeps good performance on momentum resolution
- Performance for design with 3 or 4 Crystal puller magnets modules close to SAMURAI magnet

# FASER2 muon acceptance from FLArE

- Study made by <u>Matteo Vicienzi</u> (BNL) and <u>Wenjie Wu</u> from (UCI) from FLArE collaboration: <u>more details</u>
- Muon from neutrino interaction in FLArE simulated in detailled Geant4 simulation

#### FPF options to bring FASER2 and FLArE closer



#### Muon acceptance for FASER2 configurations

	SAMURAI 1 m gap x 3 m	SAMURAI 1.5 m gap x 2 m	Crystal puller 1.6 m diameter
37 m	40 %	51%	50%
30 m	45%	56%	58%
17 m	60%	71%	72%

- To maximise the muon acceptance from FLArE (and FASERnu2) into FASER2
  - Minimising distance between FASER2 and FLArE
  - > Increasing the pole gap of the SAMURAI magnet option is prefered
  - Crystal puller magnet alternative offer good muon acceptance

### FASER2 performance documentation

#### Contents

1	Introduction	4			
	2 Physics motivation and honohmarks				
2	Physics motivation and benchmarks	4			
	2.1 Long-lived particle search	6			
	2.2 FASEA-2 spectrometer for neutrino physics	5			
	2.5 Goal and requirement for the detector	"			
3	FASER-2 detector concept	7			
	3.1 Baseline design: Samurai-like magnet	8			
	3.2 Alternative design: Industrial magnet	8			
	3.3 FASER-2 designs scenarios	9			
	·				
4	Simulation tools	9			
	4.1 FORESEE	9			
	4.2 Geant4 simulation	9			
	4.3 ACTS simulation	9			
	4.3.1 ACTS: A Common Tracking Software	9			
	4.3.2 FASER-2 implementation of ACTS	10			
	TTD 111				
5	LLP sensitivity	10			
	5.1 Decay volume	10			
	5.2 LLP decay product separation	11			
6	Neutrino acceptance	14			
6	Neutrino acceptance 1 6.1 Muon acceptance into FASER-2: Analytical extrapolation	14 14			
6	Neutrino acceptance         1           6.1         Muon acceptance into FASER-2: Analytical extrapolation         1           6.2         Muon acceptance from FLAFE into FASER-2: Ceant4         1	14 14 16			
6	Neutrino acceptance       1         6.1 Muon acceptance into FASER-2: Analytical extrapolation       1         6.2 Muon acceptance from FLArE into FASER-2: Geant4       1         6.2.1 EPE ontions       1	14 14 16			
6	Neutrino acceptance       1         6.1       Muon acceptance into FASER-2: Analytical extrapolation         6.2       Muon acceptance from FLArE into FASER-2: Geant4         6.2.1       FPF options         6.2       Muon acceptance	14 14 16 16 17			
6	Neutrino acceptance       1         6.1       Muon acceptance into FASER-2: Analytical extrapolation         6.2       Muon acceptance from FLArE into FASER-2: Geant4         6.2.1       FPF options         6.2.2       Muon acceptance	14 14 16 16 17			
6 7	Neutrino acceptance       1         6.1       Muon acceptance into FASER-2: Analytical extrapolation       6.2         6.2       Muon acceptance from FLArE into FASER-2: Geant4       6.2.1         6.2.1       FPF options       6.2.2         Tracking performance       1	14 14 16 16 17 18			
6 7	Neutrino acceptance       1         6.1       Muon acceptance into FASER-2: Analytical extrapolation       1         6.2       Muon acceptance from FLArE into FASER-2: Geant4       6.2.1         6.2.1       FPF options       6.2.2         Muon acceptance       1         Tracking performance       1         7.1       Trackers design       1	14 14 16 16 17 18			
6 7	Neutrino acceptance       1         6.1       Muon acceptance into FASER-2: Analytical extrapolation       6         6.2       Muon acceptance from FLArE into FASER-2: Geant4       6         6.2.1       FPF options       6         6.2.2       Muon acceptance       1         7.1       Trackers design       7         7.1.1       Tracker resolution       1	14 14 16 16 17 18 18 18			
6 7	Neutrino acceptance       1         6.1       Muon acceptance into FASER-2: Analytical extrapolation       6         6.2       Muon acceptance from FLArE into FASER-2: Geant4       6         6.2.1       FPF options       6         6.2.2       Muon acceptance       1         7.1       Trackers design       7         7.1.1       Tracker resolution       7         7.1.2       Tracker material budget       1	14 14 16 16 17 18 18 18 18			
6 7	Neutrino acceptance       1         6.1       Muon acceptance into FASER-2: Analytical extrapolation       1         6.2       Muon acceptance from FLArE into FASER-2: Geant4       6.2.1         6.2.1       FPF options       6.2.2         6.2.2       Muon acceptance       1         7.1       Trackers design       1         7.1.1       Tracker resolution       7.1.2         7.2       Magnet design comparison       1	14 14 16 16 17 18 18 18 18 18 18			
6	Neutrino acceptance       1         6.1 Muon acceptance into FASER-2: Analytical extrapolation       6         6.2 Muon acceptance from FLArE into FASER-2: Geant4       6         6.2.1 FPF options       6         6.2.2 Muon acceptance       6         7.1 Trackers design       7         7.1.1 Tracker resolution       7         7.2 Magnet design comparison       7         7.2.1 Samurai style magnet       6	<ol> <li>14</li> <li>14</li> <li>16</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>18</li> <li>18</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>19</li> </ol>			
6	Neutrino acceptance       1         6.1 Muon acceptance into FASER-2: Analytical extrapolation       6         6.2 Muon acceptance from FLArE into FASER-2: Geant4       6         6.2.1 FPF options       6         6.2.2 Muon acceptance       6         7.1 Trackers design       7         7.1.1 Tracker resolution       7         7.2 Magnet design comparison       7         7.2.1 Samurai style magnet       7         7.2.2 Industrial Silicon Crystal pulling magnets       1	<ol> <li>14</li> <li>14</li> <li>16</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>18</li> <li>18</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>19</li> <li>19</li> <li>19</li> </ol>			
6	Neutrino acceptance       1         6.1 Muon acceptance into FASER-2: Analytical extrapolation       6         6.2 Muon acceptance from FLArE into FASER-2: Geant4       6         6.2.1 FPF options       6         6.2.2 Muon acceptance       1         7.1 Trackers design       7         7.1.1 Tracker resolution       7         7.2 Magnet design comparison       7         7.2.1 Samurai style magnet       7         7.3 Vertex resolution       7	14 14 16 16 17 18 18 18 18 18 19 19 19 20			
6	Neutrino acceptance       1         6.1 Muon acceptance into FASER-2: Analytical extrapolation       6         6.2 Muon acceptance from FLArE into FASER-2: Geant4       6         6.2.1 FPF options       6         6.2.2 Muon acceptance       1         7.1 Trackers design       1         7.1.1 Tracker resolution       7         7.2 Magnet design comparison       7         7.2.1 Samurai style magnet       7         7.3 Vertex resolution       1         7.4 LLP models and masses       1	14 14 16 16 17 18 18 18 18 18 19 19 19 20 20			
6	Neutrino acceptance       1         6.1 Muon acceptance into FASER-2: Analytical extrapolation       6.2         6.2 Muon acceptance from FLArE into FASER-2: Geant4       6.2.1         6.2.1 FPF options       6.2.2         G.2.2 Muon acceptance       1         7.1 Trackers design       7.1.1         7.1.2 Tracker resolution       7.2.1         7.2 Magnet design comparison       7.2.1         7.2 Industrial Silicon Crystal pulling magnets       7.3         7.4 LLP models and masses       1	14 14 16 16 17 18 18 18 18 18 19 19 20 20			
6 7 8	Neutrino acceptance       1         6.1 Muon acceptance into FASER-2: Analytical extrapolation       6         6.2 Muon acceptance from FLArE into FASER-2: Geant4       6         6.2.1 FPF options       6         6.2.2 Muon acceptance       6         Tracking performance       1         7.1 Tracker design       7         7.1.1 Tracker resolution       7         7.2 Magnet design comparison       7         7.2.1 Samurai style magnet       7         7.3 Vertex resolution       7         7.4 LLP models and masses       2	<ol> <li>14</li> <li>14</li> <li>16</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>18</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>19</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>20</li> <li>20</li> <li>20</li> <li>20</li> <li>20</li> </ol>			
6 7 8	Neutrino acceptance       1         6.1 Muon acceptance into FASER-2: Analytical extrapolation       6         6.2 Muon acceptance from FLArE into FASER-2: Geant4       6         6.2.1 FPF options       6         6.2.2 Muon acceptance       1         7.1 Trackers design       7         7.1.1 Tracker resolution       7         7.2 Magnet design comparison       7         7.2.1 Samurai style magnet       7         7.3 Vertex resolution       7         7.4 LLP models and masses       2         Alignment studies       2	14         14         16         16         17         18         18         18         19         19         20			
6 7 8 9	Neutrino acceptance       1         6.1 Muon acceptance into FASER-2: Analytical extrapolation       6         6.2 Muon acceptance from FLArE into FASER-2: Geant4       6         6.2.1 FPF options       6         6.2.2 Muon acceptance       1         7.1 FPF options       6         7.1 Trackers design       1         7.1.1 Tracker resolution       7         7.2 Tracker material budget       7         7.2 Magnet design comparison       7         7.2.1 Samurai style magnet       7         7.2 Industrial Silicon Crystal pulling magnets       1         7.3 Vertex resolution       1         7.4 LLP models and masses       2         Alignment studies       2         Benchmark detectors       2	<ol> <li>14</li> <li>14</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>18</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>20</li> <li>20</li> <li>20</li> <li>20</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> </ol>			
6 7 8 9	Neutrino acceptance       1         6.1 Muon acceptance into FASER-2: Analytical extrapolation       6         6.2 Muon acceptance from FLArE into FASER-2: Geant4       6         6.2.1 FPF options       6         6.2.2 Muon acceptance       1         7.1 FPF options       6         7.1 Trackers design       7         7.1.1 Tracker resolution       7         7.2 Tracker material budget       7         7.2 Magnet design comparison       7         7.2.1 Samurai style magnet       7         7.2 Industrial Silicon Crystal pulling magnets       7         7.3 Vertex resolution       7         7.4 LLP models and masses       2         Alignment studies       2         8.1 Benchmark detectors       2         9.1 Benchmark A       0         0.2 Descharger LP       0	<ol> <li>14</li> <li>14</li> <li>16</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>18</li> <li>18</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>21</li> </ol>			
6 7 8 9	Neutrino acceptance       1         6.1       Muon acceptance into FASER-2: Analytical extrapolation       6         6.2       Muon acceptance from FLArE into FASER-2: Geant4       6         6.2.1       FPF options       6         6.2.2       Muon acceptance       1         7.1       Trackers design       7         7.1.1       Tracker resolution       7         7.2       Tracker material budget       7         7.2       Magnet design comparison       7         7.2.1       Samurai style magnet       7         7.2       Industrial Silicon Crystal pulling magnets       7         7.3       Vertex resolution       7         7.4       LLP models and masses       2         Alignment studies       2       9.1         8.       9.2       Benchmark A       9.2	<ol> <li>14</li> <li>14</li> <li>16</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>18</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>21</li> </ol>			

#### Josh McFayden, Alan Barr Jamie Boyd, Olivier Salin

- FASER2 physics studies and detector performance documentation in preparation
  - o Requirement for the detector
  - Summarise performance studies
  - Sensitivity plots, Track reconstruction, neutrino acceptance
  - o Benchmark detectors performances comparison
- Basis of our input for PBC document (summer 2024) and FPF Lol

# FASER2 Alternative design: Tracker proposals

#### **Proposition: Pixel Mighty tracker (LHCb Run 5 upgrade)**

- Mighty pixels modules in central region of tracking layers:
  - $\blacktriangleright$  Achieve better resolution on layer before magnets ~ 50  $\mu$ m
  - Better separation for close-by tracks in central region
  - Interest of UK institutes (Liverpool, Manchester, RAL)

#### <u>Monica D'Onofrio, Carl Gwilliam</u> <u>Eva Vilella-Figueraz</u>



#### **Proposition: Gaseous trackers**

- MPDG tracker option for FASER2:
  - ➢ ATLAS Micro Megas, CMS GEM, µ-RWELL
  - Less than 1 MCHF for 10 layers
  - Less than 1 MCHF for the electronics
  - For MGTD option discussion within RD51 collaboration
  - Studies needed for reconstruction of closely separated tracks

#### Hidetoshi OTONO, Atsuhiko Ochi



# FASER2 Alternative design: LHCb preshower

- Possibility to reuse old LHCb Preshower and Scintillating Pad Detector for part of the FASER2 calorimeter (outer region of the calorimeter)
- Considerable possible cost saving
- Simulation studies in progress to investigate feasibility and performance







# FASER2 community

- We are working to build and consolidate the community and possible funding routes for FASER2
- UK interest and involvement <u>FPF UK meeting</u> (11/10/23):
  - o Oxford, Sussex, Liverpool, Manchester, RAL, Sheffield
  - Dual Readout/ Tracking/ Support structures/ Simulation and data analysis
  - Preparing statement of interest with STFC
- **Geneva:** Investigating options within Switzerland
- Japan: FASER2 & FASERnu2 in process of being included in one of Grand Vision summarised by Science Council of Japan
- US: FASER groups to look at applying for NSF funds for FASER2 work
   OCI, Washington, Oregon
- Serbia: Activities on FASER2 studies
  - o Belgrade group: Marija Vranješ Milosavljević, Nenad Vranješ, Darko Brunet
- Expected increased involvement from existing FASER collaboration

### **Future studies**

- Expected trigger rate
  - Effect on DAQ system design for acceptable physics deadtime
- Expected background from neutrino interaction:
  - Possible mitigation of this effect
- Study on detector material effect on electron and photon reconstruction performance
- Study on ALPs reconstruction and performance of the detector

# Summary

- Studies on detector and magnet technology made significant progress:
  - Magnet FASER2 magnet talk by <u>Hidetoshi Otono: link</u>:
    - Extended discussion with KEK experts on SAMURAI style magnet conceptual design
    - Contact and visit for industrial crystal puller magnet (Toshiba, TESLA)
    - Good performance expected for both options

#### Tracker:

- > Design and costing advanced building on experience from LHCb SciFi
- Advanced simulation and track reconstructions studies
- > Alternative tracker: Gaseous tracker, hybrid SciFi and Mighty tracker

#### Calorimeter

- Design and costing from existing prototype
- Performance from Geant4 simulation
- Work toward the PBC document (summer 2024)
  - > Physics studies with benchmark models to asses detector performances
  - > Detector options with more or less cost/complexity
- Several avenues for funding being pursued in UK/US/Japan