ICHEP2018 SECUL XXXIX INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON MANY PHYSICS

JULY 4 - 11, 2018 COEX, SEOUL

The Mu2e Tracker



Gianantonio Pezzullo Yale University

on behalf of the Mu2e tracker group



The Mu2e collaboration





Argonne National Laboratory, Boston University, Brookhaven National Laboratory University of California, Berkeley, University of California, Irvine, California Institute of Technology, City University of New York, Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, Duke University, Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati, Helmholtz-Zentrum Dresden-Rossendorf, University of Houston, University of Illinois, INFN Genova, Kansas State University, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, INFN Lecce and Università del Salento, Lewis University, University of Louisville, Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati and Università Marconi Roma, University of Minnesota, Muons Inc., Northern Illinois University, Northwestern University, Novosibirsk State University/Budker Institute of Nuclear Physics, Institute for Nuclear Research, Moscow, INFN Pisa, Purdue University, Rice University, University of South Alabama, Sun Yat Sen University, University of Virginia, University of Washington, Yale University



What is $\mu \rightarrow e$ conversion



ICHEP - July 7 2018

• μ converts to an electron in the presence of a nucleus $\mu^- N
ightarrow e^- N$

$$E_e = m_{\mu} c^2 - B_{\mu}(Z) - C(A) = 104.973 MeV$$

- for Aluminum: $\begin{cases} B_{\mu}(Z) \text{ is the muon binding energy (0.48 MeV)} \\ C(A) \text{ is the nuclear recoil energy (0.21 MeV)} \end{cases}$
- μ conversion in the SM is induced by neutrino masses and mixing at a negligible level ~ 10⁻⁵²
- Many **SM extensions enhance the rate** through mixing in the high energy sector of the theory (other particles in the loop...)



G. Pezzullo (Yale University)



History of $\mu \rightarrow e$ search



History of $\mu \to e\gamma$, $\mu N \to eN$, and $\mu \to 3e$



G. Pezzullo (Yale University)

ICHEP - July 7 2018



Experimental setup



(I) Production Solenoid:

Proton beam strikes target, producing mostly pions

Graded magnetic field contains backwards pions/muons and reflects slow forward pions/muons

(3) Detector Solenoid:

- ➡ Capture muons on Al target
- ➡ Graded field "focuses" e- in tracker fiducial
- Measure momentum in tracker and energy in calorimeter



Select low momentum, negative muons



Backgrounds & design



	Source	Scale with	Solution	
Intrinsic	decay-in-orbit	# of stopped-µ	Tracker resolution	
Beam	radiative π capture	closeness to beam pulse	pulsed beam	
Running time	Cosmic ray	live time	veto system & PID	

μ decay-in-orbit (DIO)







G. Pezzullo (Yale University)



Tracker design



- 36 double-layer planes equally spaced with straws transverse to the beam
- Inner 38 cm un-instrumented:
 ✓ blind to beam flash
 ✓ blind to >99% of the DIO spectrum

panels

• Expected resolution:

301.88 R .

Cover

panel - zoom

- 6.25 -

05.00

✓ ~ 200 keV/c @ 105 MeV



x6

plane

x36



Straw technology



- ~ 20k straws employed in the tracker
- Multiple scattering is the major contributor to dp
 ✓ straw material budget is comparable to the gas
- Straw specs:
 - ✓ 5 mm diameter, 2x6.25 µm Mylar walls Au and Al coated
 - \checkmark 25 μm Au-plated W sense wire
 - \checkmark 80/20 Ar/CO₂ with HV ~ 1500 V
- Straw length varies from 44 to 114 cm

straw tube



Mylar roll





Vacuum requirements



- There are ~ 20k straws that collectively must leak less than 6 cm³/min
 √ total surface > 3e6 cm² with ~ I atm differential pressure Ar:CO₂
 √ straw are delicate and we need to test all of them!
- CO2 permeates Mylar at least x10 faster than Argon
- We measure the CO₂ leak rate for each straw with custom chambers





chamber @ UMN



Vacuum requirements



Vacuum test on each panel to check
 ✓ gas manifold leak + outgassing



panel vacuum test @ Fermilab





Electronics



- Outer part of the panel houses the FEE and Digitizer Readout & Assembler Controller (DRAC)
- High hit rate sustainability: 15 kHz/cm²





Radiation Environment



- Detailed Monte Carlo simulations with MARS and GEANT4
- peak dose ~ 9 krad/year in the first plane
- Neutron flux up to 2ell n_{1MeVeq}/cm²/year



Non Ionizing Energy Loss (NIEL)





Electronics vs radiation



- PolarFire FPGA from Microsemi (tested up to 500 krad)
- rad hard Optical transceiver VTRx from CERN (tested up to 1 Mrad)
- tests campaign to qualify other major components:
 ✓ TID tests @ local radiotherapy clinic up to 200 krad
 ✓ NIEL tests @ UC Davis McClellan reactor up tp 2e14 n_{1MeVeq}/cm²







Prototype



- Small panel prototype with 8 straws used to test performance @ LBL
- Test for cross talk using LBL 88" cyclotron
- Test with Cosmic rays and radioactive sources to measure performance





Prototype - Results



Single hit efficiency and resolution meet requirements



Position measurement vs source location

Drift resolution vs gas gain



G. Pezzullo (Yale University)



Prototypes



- straw resolution measured for each of the 8 straws using cosmic rays
- Simulation implements detailed model of physical and electronics reposes to G4 energy deposition
 - \checkmark Clusters \rightarrow Drift \rightarrow Current pulse \rightarrow Voltage waveform \rightarrow Digitization
 - \checkmark Tuned to literature and prototype







Panel production



- Panel assembly @ Univ of Minnesota (with Fermilab and U. Houston)
- Full plane assembled at Fermilab
- QA of panel components @ CUNY, Duke and LBL/UC Berkeley





Summary



- Mu2e will improve the sensitivity by four orders of magnitude
- The Mu2e tracker has been designed to:
 - ✓ provide accurate reconstruction of e⁻ momentum
 - \checkmark operate in a very harsh environment (high γ and neutron dose)
- First 3 panels built and already under test:
 - ✓ good agreement of data with our Monte Carlo simulation
- QA process and plane assembly started

backup slides





Straw leak chamber







Muonic atom life times





G. Pezzullo (Yale University)

ICHEP - July 7 2018









G. Pezzullo (Yale University)

ICHEP - July 7 2018



Mu2e sensitivity



	AC	RVV2	AKM	δ LL	FBMSSM	LHT	RS
$D^0 - \bar{D}^0$	***	*	*	*	*	***	?
ϵ_K	*	***	***	*	*	**	***
$S_{\psi\phi}$	***	***	***	*	*	***	***
$S_{\phi K_S}$	***	**	*	***	***	*	?
$A_{\rm CP}\left(B o X_s \gamma\right)$	*	*	*	***	***	*	?
$A_{7,8}(B ightarrow K^*\mu^+\mu^-)$	*	*	*	***	***	**	?
$A_9(B o K^\star \mu^+ \mu^-)$	*	*	*	*	*	*	?
$B \to K^{(\star)} \nu \bar{\nu}$	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
$B_s \to \mu^+ \mu^-$	***	***	***	***	***	*	*
$K^+ \to \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$	*	*	*	*	*	***	***
$K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu}$	*	*	*	*	*	***	***
$\mu \rightarrow e \gamma$	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
$\tau \rightarrow \mu \gamma$	***	***	*	***	***	***	***
$\mu + N \rightarrow e + N$	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
d_n	***	***	***	**	***	*	***
d_e	***	***	**	*	***	*	***
$(g-2)_{\mu}$	***	***	**	***	***	*	?

W. Altmannshofer, A.J.Buras, S.Gori, P.Paradisi, D.M.Straub

Table 8: "DNA" of flavour physics effects for the most interesting observables in a selection of SUSY and non-SUSY models $\bigstar \bigstar \bigstar$ signals large effects, $\bigstar \bigstar$ visible but small effects and \bigstar implies that the given model does not predict sizable effects in that observable.

Listovery Sensitivity





CLFV limits I



Process	Upper limit				
$\mu^+ \to e^+ \gamma$	$< 5.7 \times 10^{-13}$				
$\mu^+ \to e^+ e^- e^+$	$< 1.0 \times 10^{-12}$				
$\mu^{-}\mathrm{Ti} \to e^{-}\mathrm{Ti}$	$< 1.7 \times 10^{-12}$				
$\mu^{-}\mathrm{Au} \rightarrow e^{-}\mathrm{Au}$	$< 7 \times 10^{-13}$				
$\mu^+ e^- \to \mu^- e^+$	$< 3.0 \times 10^{-13}$				
$\tau \to e\gamma$	$< 3.3 \times 10^{-8}$				
$\tau^- \to \mu \gamma$	$< 4.4 \times 10^{-8}$				
$\tau^- \to e^- e^+ e^-$	$< 2.7 \times 10^{-8}$				
$\tau^- \to \mu^- \mu^+ \mu^-$	$< 2.1 \times 10^{-8}$				
$\tau^- \to e^- \mu^+ \mu^-$	$< 2.7 \times 10^{-8}$				
$\tau^- \to \mu^- e^+ e^-$	$< 1.8 \times 10^{-8}$				
$\tau^- \to e^+ \mu^- \mu^-$	$< 1.7 \times 10^{-8}$				
$\tau^- \to \mu^+ e^- e^-$	$< 1.5 \times 10^{-8}$				

G. Pezzullo (Yale University)

ICHEP - July 7 2018



CLFV limits 2



Process	Upper limit				
$\pi^0 \to \mu e$	$< 8.6 \times 10^{-9}$				
$\mathrm{K}^{0}_{\mathrm{L}} \to \mu e$	$< 4.7 \times 10^{-12}$				
$[\mathbf{K}^+ \to \pi^+ \mu^+ e^-]$	$< 2.1 \times 10^{-10}$				
$\mathrm{K}^{0}_{\mathrm{L}} \to \pi^{0} \mu^{+} e^{-}$	$< 4.4 \times 10^{-10}$				
$Z^0 \to \mu e$	$< 1.7 \times 10^{-6}$				
$Z^0 \to \tau e$	$< 9.8 \times 10^{-6}$				
$Z^0 \to \tau \mu$	$< 1.2 \times 10^{-6}$				



Mu2e signal?



- A next-generation Mu2e experiment makes sense in all scenarios:
 - \checkmark Push sensitivity or
 - ✓ Study underlying new physics
 - ✓ Will need more protons upgrade accelerator
 - ✓ Snowmass white paper, arXiv:1802.02599





Mu2e detector hall



put solenoid pictures here!!!



ICHEP - July 7 2018

DS bay

G. Pezzullo (Yale University)