

# Study of the performance of the SPL-Fréjus Super Beam using a graphite target



A. Longhin  
(DSM-IRFU CEA Saclay)  
EURONU Working Package 2



NEu2012

**Abstract.** An optimization of the CERN SPL neutrino beam line has been performed guided by the idea of employing a graphite target. The interactions of protons of kinetic energies of 2.2-3.5-4.5 and 8 GeV/c<sup>2</sup> on a cylindrical 1.5 cm diameter carbon target have been simulated with FLUKA2008. Energy deposition and particle yields with mercury and carbon have been compared. Power deposition and neutron fluxes are suppressed to a large extent with carbon. The transportation and decay of secondary mesons was done with GEANT3 in order to calculate the neutrino fluxes. Sensitivities were calculated with GLOBES assuming a beam power of 4 MW (HP-SPL) and a 440 tons water Cherenkov detector (MEMPHYS) located at 130 km from the target in a new foreseen Fréjus laboratory. The obtained sensitivities with the carbon target are comparable to the ones achieved with the mercury target. The full simulation has been recently rewritten using GEANT4 which allows a higher degree of flexibility for arranging the horn geometries. A detailed comparison of the algorithms has been done and a good agreement is found for the final neutrino fluxes. A preliminary comparison of the sensitivities to  $\sin^2 2\theta_{13}$  as a function of  $\delta$  with an optimized horn shape will also be presented.

## The SPL-Fréjus Super Beam

Being studied in EUROnu WP2 (beam), LAGUNA (far site) and MEMPHYS

- SPL p driver @ 4MW (H- linac  $E_k \sim 5$  GeV)
- L = 130 Km
- Far Detector: 0.44 Mton Water Cherenkov
- 1<sup>st</sup> oscillation maximum  $E_\nu \sim 260$  MeV

**low E**

- very few  $\nu_\mu$  from K
- compact horn and tunnel
- good reconstruction in W.Ch.
- all elastic
- $\sigma_{\nu_e}$ : 43 MeV : [0.2-0.3] GeV
- easy  $\pi^0$  rejection

**small L**

- High flux
- No matter effects

"Narrow band" beam

- $\sin^2 2\theta_{13}$  sensitivity limit @  $\sim 10^{-3}$
- good sensitivity to  $\delta$  (down to  $\sin^2 2\theta_{13} \sim 10^{-2}$ )

**MEMPHYS** multi purpose p decay, atm- $\nu$ , SN- $\nu$ , ...

## Focusing system

Due to the low energy proton beam pions are mildly forward boosted ( $\langle \theta_p \rangle \sim 55^\circ$ )

- Target inside the horn to recover collection efficiency

Surface design principle

Reflector (600 kA)  
Horn (300 kA)

Proton beam  
Hg target  
Max angle  $\sim 25^\circ$

The outer conductor is placed where the slope becomes // to the beam ( $d(r)/dz = 0$ )

all x of a certain p from a point-like source focused

- $i(h/r) = 300/600$  kA
- pulsed @ 50 Hz
- Toroidal  $|B| \sim i/r$
- $B_{MAX} = 1.5$  T,  $B_{MIN} = 0.6$  T
- 3 mm thick Al

Horn prototype at CERN (detailed geometry implemented in the Geant simulation)

## Decay tunnel

Cylindrical filled with low pressure air.

- Tested geometries:  $L=10-20-40-60$  m /  $r=1-1.5-2$  m
- $L = 40$  m,  $r = 2$  m chosen as central value
- Based on sensitivities.  $L > 40$  m gives  $\nu_\mu$  contaminations from  $\mu$  decay which spoil gain given by increase of  $\nu_\mu$  statistics

Cylindrical ( $\sim 2 \lambda_1$  long)

- $r = 0.75$  cm
- Liq. mercury (Hg):  $L = 30$  cm
- Carbon (C):  $L = 78$  cm

**Simulation tools**

Power dissipation / mesons yield /  $\pi$  collection /  $\nu$  fluxes / sensitivities

FLUKA 2008.3 + GEANT4 | FLUKA 2008.3\* | GEANT3 | GEANT3 | GEANT3 | GLOBES 3.0.14

$\nu$  fluxes: probabilistic approach. Each decay is weighted with the probability of the  $\nu$  to reach the far detector. Event duplication + weighting for  $\mu$  and K decays.

\*FLUKA 2002.4 and MARS in previous study

Decay lengths (m) @ 600 MeV	
$\pi$	33.7
$K^+$	37.66
$K^0_S$	4.5
$K^0_L$	3.2
$K^0_{S^*}$	18.5

## C vs Hg: energy deposition in the target

Mean energy deposition vs  $E_k(p)$

Energy release vs incoming p beam energy

Power release: 4 MW \*  $\langle E_{dep} \rangle / E_k(p)$

Released power (MW) vs  $E_p$  (4 MW input)

Hg:  $\sim 1 - 0.6$  MW  
C:  $\sim 0.8 - 0.1$  MW

Mean energy deposition vs  $E_k(p)$

FLUKA08 (thick markers)  $r=1$ cm  
GEANT4\* (thin markers)  $r=0.75$ cm

Graphite: 78 cm  
Mercury: 30 cm

considerably lower for C!  $\sim 200$  kW @ 5GeV

\*with hadronic "QGSP physics list"

- G4 larger than FLUKA.  $\sim +10\%$  for Hg
- General trend is confirmed

## C vs Hg: meson production (FLUKA2008)

vs proton kinetic energy [2-10] GeV

4MW

- $1.13 \times 10^{10}$  pots at 2.2 GeV
- $0.71 \times 10^{10}$  pots at 3.5 GeV
- $0.55 \times 10^{10}$  pots at 4.5 GeV
- $0.31 \times 10^{10}$  pots at 8.0 GeV

Particle multiplicities

Particle yields

Same vert. scale

Pion yields comparable, neutron flux reduced by  $\sim 15$  with C !!

## C vs Hg: $\nu$ fluxes

Minimal change approach

- Standard Horn
- Geant3 simulation
- 30 cm Hg  $>$  78 cm C (FLUKA)

pion yield trends are reflected in fluxes despite non optimized focusing for long C target

- Fluxes from C and Hg are comparable
- higher high energy tail for C due to not optimized focusing

Mercury

Graphite

Same vertical scale

4MW

- $1.13 \times 10^{10}$  pots at 2.2 GeV
- $0.71 \times 10^{10}$  pots at 3.5 GeV
- $0.55 \times 10^{10}$  pots at 4.5 GeV
- $0.31 \times 10^{10}$  pots at 8.0 GeV

## C vs Hg: $3\sigma$ sensitivity on $\theta_{13}$ vs $\delta$

Carbon (---) Mercury (—)

Color codes: proton energies

SPL sensitivity

MEMPHYS 0.44 Mton

8y (anti  $\nu$ ) + 2y ( $\nu$ )

GLOBES 3.0.14 Apr 2009

AEDL file SPL.glb in GLOBES (with M=0.44Mton)  
J. Phys. G29 (2003),1781-1784

Horn optimization for a long target

graphite limit worse in the low  $\delta$  region (driven by anti- $\nu$  running)

related to rising  $\nu_\mu$  contamination in the anti- $\nu$  beam from not defocused  $\pi^+$   $\rightarrow \mu^+$ . Effect important in anti- $\nu$  running due to  $\pi^+ > \pi^-$  &  $\sigma(\nu) > \sigma(\text{anti-}\nu)$

$\rightarrow$  let's minimize wrong charge pions!

$\pi^+ \rightarrow \mu^+ \nu_\mu$   
 $\nu_\mu \rightarrow e^+ \nu_e \nu_\mu$

$\pi^- \rightarrow \mu^- \nu_\mu$   
 $\nu_\mu \rightarrow e^- \nu_e \nu_\mu$

## New simulation with Geant4

The full simulation has been recently migrated from Geant3 to Geant4

2 geometry implementations:

- 1) the standard horn reproducing the existing CERN prototype
- 2) a new parametric model implemented (MINIBOONE inspired)

Better wrong charge pion rejection (more "forward closed") and higher mean neutrino energy

Flexible enough to reproduce also standard conical geometry

"Heuristic" approach to find favorable geometries based on the generation of random configurations using the horn parametric model

The resulting fluxes are selected according to quality parameters ( $\nu_\mu$  normalization,  $\nu_\mu$  contamination, mean energy, energy spread)

Randomly generated Accepted after cuts on spectra

9 parameters fully accessible from external macro file

Inner radius

## GEANT3-4 comparison with standard horn

GEANT4 (—) GEANT3 (---)

z of decays in flight

Parameters of pions at tunnel entrance

$\nu$  fluxes

Good agreement between the two simulation programs

## A new test horn

Only mildly "tuned".

- "found" by "random search" with limited samplings and preliminary selection criteria on  $\nu$ -fluxes.
- Thicker reflector (+10cm)
- Forward "end-cap" to "sweep away" wrong charged forward going pions
- Usual currents (300+600 kA)

Hit maps (r,z) plane

NEW TEST GEOMETRY  
CLASSICAL GEOMETRY

GEANT4

DAWN visualization

## The 4-horns scenario

Reduced stress on target via

- lower frequency (12.5 Hz) or
- lower p-flux (1 MW) depending on injection strategy

Profits of horn compactness ( $r \sim 0.5$  m)

Baseline configuration with horns as "central" as possible

Worst case

Small flux loss even up to big lateral displacements.

tunnel:  $R = 2$  m,  $L = 40$  m

## Fluxes: new VS old horn

Carbon target new horns / old horn

- gain  $\nu_\mu$  at higher energies
- Effectively suppressed contributions from wrong charge pions (more than a factor 2 less anti- $\nu_\mu$ , lower anti- $\nu_e$  + c.c.)

GEANT4

@ 4.5 GeV positive focusing

	OLD (%)	NEW (%)
+ FOCUSING		
$\nu_\mu$	88.9	95.55
$\nu_e$	10.5	3.9
anti- $\nu_\mu$	0.6	0.56
anti- $\nu_e$	0.052	0.025
- FOCUSING		
$\nu_\mu$	26.1	11.2
$\nu_e$	73.4	88.4
anti- $\nu_\mu$	0.17	0.09
anti- $\nu_e$	0.34	0.35

## $3\sigma$ sensitivity on $\theta_{13}$ with the new horn

Color codes: proton energies

SPL sensitivity

MEMPHYS 0.44 Mton

8y (anti  $\nu$ ) + 2y ( $\nu$ )

GLOBES 3.0.14

AEDL file SPL.glb in GLOBES (with M=0.44Mton)  
J. Phys. G29 (2003),1781-1784

Carbon target

old horn (---)

new horn (—)

Significant improvement achieved by the new horn design.

GEANT4

## Conclusions

Activity on the SPL-Fréjus project revived within EUROnu. Simulation tools working and being updated (GEANT4-FLUKA2008.3-GLOBES 3.0.14).

Solid target: simulation indicates much reduced energy deposition and neutron fluxes ( $\times 15$ ), comparable neutrino fluxes and competitive/better performances at the level of  $\theta_{13}$  sensitivity.

Simulation rewritten in Geant4. Good agreement with previous Geant3 simulation

New optimized horn design suited for a long target worked out.

4 horn concept viable under the point of view of fluxes (only mildly reduced)

Solid target option in association with multiple horns looks very appealing for the SPL-Fréjus Super Beam

Outlook

Verify FLUKA description of carbon target with HARP "thick target" data (synergy with EUROnu-WP3) and other models

## References

- M. Mezzetto Physics potential of the SPL SuperBeam J. Phys. G29 (2003),1781-1784, hep-ex/0302005.
- J.E. Campagne, A. Cazes. The  $\theta_{13}$  and CP sensitivities of the SPL-Fréjus project revisited
- Eur. Phys. J. C45 (2006), LAL 04-102 October 2004. hep-ex/0411062v1
- J.E. Campagne, M. Maltoni, M. Mezzetto, T.Schwetz, Physics potential of the CERN-MEMPHYS neutrino oscillation project (2006), hep-ph/0603172
- NUFACT09 talk: http://nufact09.iit.edu/wg3/wg3\_longhin-euronuuperbeam.pdf
- EUROnu WP2 Indico page: http://indico.in2p3.fr/categoryDisplay.py?categid=203
- Study of the performance of the SPL-Fréjus Super Beam using a graphite target A. Longhin. www.euronu.org WP2-note

Acknowledgments

A. Cazes, M.Zito, J.E. Campagne, M. Mezzetto,