## SUMMARY OF SESSIONS 1A & 2A

#### L. Pandola

INFN – Laboratori Nazionali del Sud on behalf of the EM working groups

### Session 1A: New EM physics models

- D. Bernard, New 5D gamma conversion model
- A. Alkin, New model of 3-gamma annihilation
- S. Dosatsu, Model for simulation of gold nanoparticles
  - Talking given by I. Kyriakou
- S. Guatelli, New PIXE cross sections and validation of Auger electrons

# G4BetheHeitler5DModel: a new 5D gamma conversion model Slide fro

Slide from D. Bernard

- First physics model that samples the exact (5D) Bethe-Heitler differential cross section
  - Exact target-recoil-momentum distribution
  - Exact (linear) polarisation asymmetry
  - Strict energy-momentum conservation
- G4EmLowEPPhysics (E < 80 GeV)
  - Inherits total cross section from G4BetheHeitlerModel
  - We provide SampleSecondaries()
- Generator parameters
  - Isolated charged target (no screening) / target in atom (e<sup>-</sup> field screening)
  - Polarised (photon polarisation vector zero) or non-polarized (not zero) conversion
  - Pure nuclear / pure triplet / natural (Z / 1) mixture conversion.
- Nucl. Instrum. Meth., A 899 (2018) 85

#### Geant4 simulation of positron annihilation into 2 and 3 gamma Slide from A. Alkin

- Andrei Alkin, CERN summer school student, Lomonosov Moscow State University
- Supervisor: V.N. Ivanchenko, Tomsk State University & CERN
- 3γ-annihilation process at high energy affects high energy shower shape in EM and hadronic calorimeters
- 3y-annihilation process at rest affects simulation for positron tomography
- This process may provide background for search of light dark matter particles



#### **Current status**

5

- The smaller the  $\Delta E$ -threshold the greater the proportion of events with  $3\gamma$
- Total cross-section remains const



A method of introducing the  $3\gamma$ annihilation of electron-positron pair as a next to leading order correction to  $2\gamma$ -annihilation is proposed.

The 1<sup>st</sup> version of the model class and unit test to study cross section and final state generation are available.

We plan to deliver new model for Geant4 10.5.

#### **2018** Electron physics models for Gold



#### Slide from S. Dousatsu

6

#### Total cross sections of **Di-**Electric Theory is shown in **dashed** line.

	Physics	Model	
Energy Range of the di-electric models 10 eV < E < 10 keV	Elastic	PWA (ELSEPA)	10 eV – 1GeV
	Ionization	<b>Di-Electric</b> Relativistic BEB-V	10 eV – 10 keV 10 keV <i>–</i> 1 GeV
	Excitation	<b>Di-Electric</b> Exp. +Dirac B-spline RM	10 eV – 10 keV 10 keV – 1 GeV
	Plasmon Excitation	<b>Di-Electric</b> Quinn	10 eV – 10 keV 10 keV <i>–</i> 1 GeV
	Bremsstrahlung	Seltzer and Berger Model	10 eV – 1GeV

#### Summary

(1) New alternative Geant4-DNA physics models based on Di-Electric theory have been implemented.

- (2) Electron Physics models for GNP have been improved on **stopping power**.
- (3) The new DE physics models **demonstrate high dose enhancement** around Au-nanoparticles below 10 um from GNP center.
- (4) GS MSC model shows high back-scattering in macroscopic volume, but not in microscopic volume.



### PIXE Ionisation Cross Sections

#### ANSTO ECPSSR theory

- Plane wave Born Approx, with corrections for energy loss, Coulomb deflection of the projectile, perturbed stationary states of the target atoms, relativistic nature of the inner electrons
- Tabulated in Cohen & Harrigan, At. Data Nucl. Data Tables 33 (1985) 255.
- Agreement with experimental data
  - Few % for K-shell, 5-15% for L-shell, 10-50% for M- shell
- Implemented in Geant4 PIXE module for protons and alpha particles



#### Next step:

- Include ANSTO cross section for carbon ions The use of the ANSTO ECPSSR for ions heavier than  $\alpha$ particles is more accurate than using  $\sigma_{ion}$  (E)=Q<sup>2</sup>· $\sigma_{p}$  (E·M<sub>p</sub>/M<sub>ion</sub>)
- Validate against experimental measurements at ANSTO

#### Next stage: Implement recommended approach for X-ray emission

Recommended in Cohen DD, Crawford J, Siegele R. K, L, and M shell datasets for PIXE spectrum fitting and analysis. NIM B. 2015, 363, pp. 7-18.

**W**<sub>k</sub>: Krause(1979), based on experimental measurements

**W**<sub>L</sub>: Campbell (2003) and (2009)

 $W_M$ : Dirac Fock theoretical data

K and L shell emission rates: Salem (1974)

**M shell emission rate**: Dirac Fock theoretical data set. Compilation of Chauhan and Puri – At. Data nucl. Data Tables 94(2008) 38-49

**C-K transitions:** Chauhan and Puri – At. Data nucl. Data Tables 94(2008) 38-49

Still to understand which approach to adopt

$${}^{1}\sigma_{\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{p}}}^{\mathrm{X}} = \sigma_{1}^{\mathrm{I}}\omega_{1}\frac{\Gamma_{\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{p}}}}{\Gamma_{\mathrm{L}_{1}}}$$

$$^{2}\sigma_{L_{p}}^{X}=\big(\sigma_{1}^{I}f_{12}+\sigma_{2}^{I}\big)\omega_{2}\frac{\Gamma_{L_{p}}}{\Gamma_{L_{2}}}$$

$${}^{3}\sigma_{L_{p}}^{X} = (\sigma_{1}^{I}(f_{12}f_{23} + f_{13} + f_{13}') + \sigma_{2}^{I}f_{23} + \sigma_{3}^{I})\omega_{3}\frac{\Gamma_{L_{p}}}{\Gamma_{L_{3}}}$$

## Validation of Auger e- emission w.r.t. exp. results and theoretical data

Authors: S. Bakr and S. Guatelli, CMRP, University of Wollongong T. Kibedi, ANU, Canberra, Australia

~0.15 keV shift observed for EADL/Geant4

Initiated discussion with Vladimir and Marilena



#### Session 2A: New EM validation results

- I. Kyriakou, Geant4 low-energy models for electron transport in liquid water X
- M. Omer, New low energy elastic model for gammas
- M.C. Bordage, CPA100 models for Geant4-DNA
- S. Guatelli, Validation of the Geant4 EM physics for modelling high energy synchrotron beamlines

#### Geant4 low-energy models for electron transport in liquid water Slide from I. Kyriakou

Ioanna Kyriakou, Univ. of Ioannina, Greece and co-workers

Systematic comparison of the available EM physics models of Geant4 (Standard Opt4, Livermore, Penelope, Geant4-DNA Opt4) for the simulation of low-energy electron tracks in liquid water

Simulations of penetration and dose-point-kernel (DPK) for electrons with initial energy from 100 eV to 10 keV

Investigation of the effect of tracking (and production) cut and the step-size limit in the condensed-history models

## Summary of main results

- For sub-keV electrons differences between the condensedhistory models (Standard Opt4, Livermore, Penelope) and the DNA (Opt4) model are significant (up to ~100% or more); differences become negligible above 5-10 keV
- Livermore has the best agreement with DNA (Opt4) and it is the most stable to step-size variations
- Increasing the tracking (and production) cut from 10 eV to 100 eV for speeding up the simulation can be safely used for electrons above 1 keV
- Main suggestion: It is worth using Livermore ionization for electrons below 1 MeV in Standard Opt4 EM physics instead of Penelope.

Slide from I. Kyriakou

## JAEA Elastic Scattering Model

Slide from M. Omer

- A new alternative model for G4RayleighScattering improving accuracy of gamma-ray elastic scattering up to 3 MeV.
- Main Improvements:
  - Including the QED nonlinear effect (Delbrück scattering) for the first time.
  - Use the scattering matrix cross section for Rayleigh scattering, much more accurate than the form factor approximation based on evaluated photon data library (EPDL).
  - Handle the interference among all scattering mechanisms.
  - Fix the inconsistency of angular distribution at large scattering angles and high Z elements.
  - Much better agreement with experimental data.

Nucl. Instrum. Meth. B 405 (2017) 43.

## **JAEA Elastic Scattering Model**

Slide from M. Omer

- Rayleigh scattering cannot account for the elastic scattering measured experimentally
- Total cross section is changed by adding Delbrück scattering.
  - The change is up to 20% at 3 MeV.
- Reasonable computational performance with much better accuracy





#### CPA100 models for Geant4-DNA

Slide from M. C. Bordage

- Impact of physics models (option2, option4, option6 (=CPA100 models) in H<sub>2</sub>O on the calculations of
  - basic quantities (11 eV 250 keV)
    - $\circ$  Number of interactions: big differences in the number of excitations
    - ranges: smallest with option6
  - dosimetric quantities (and comparisons with Penelope code in track-structure version).
    - DPK: option6 gives less diffusion
      - Low energy: good agreement between option6 and Penelope
      - High energy: close results between all options and Penelope



#### CPA100 models for Geant4-DNA

Slide from M. C. Bordage

 Impact of physics models (option2, option4, option6 (=CPA100 models) in H<sub>2</sub>O on the calculations of

- dosimetric quantities (and comparisons with Penelope code in track-structure version).

- S-value (comparison also with MIRD reference data)
  - Monoenergetic electrons
  - Auger emitters
- Differences are function, not only of the incident energy but mainly of the configuration source-target.
- ✓ Important differences are observed with MIRD data.



• Electron interaction physics models in the 4 DNA bases (preliminary results) for elastic scattering and ionization

08/2018

17

## Validation of the G4 EM physics for modelling high energy synchrotron beamlines



Livermore Polarised Physics, Geant4 9.6.patch4

#### Absolute comparison

Slide from S. Guatelli

- Geant4.10.2.p02, G4EMLivermorePolarisedPhysics
- Wiggler model: G4SinusoidalMagField in laboratory vacuum

