Luminosity measurement by ZEUS @ HERA-II

W. Schmidke
MPI, Munich

EIC meeting
Stony Brook 12.01.10

Outline
- The process: $ep \rightarrow ep\gamma$ & measurement requirements
- ZEUS LUMI system components & layout
- Photon calorimeter: 'classic' direct γ measurement
- LUMI pair spectrometer: novel features
- Results
- Lessons

Process: BH $ep \to ep\gamma$

<u>*ep* bremsstrahlung</u> (Bethe, Heitler 1934)

- High rate, σ_{BH} known to <0.5%
- Steeply falling w/ E_γ (IR divergent)
- Drops to zero @ endpoint $E_\gamma = E_e$
- Sharply forward-peaked
  @ HERA θ_γ dominated by
  e-beam p_T spread



<u>Photon measurement requirements</u>

- E_γ in range few GeV → ~25 GeV
- @ high L_{inst}, low E_γ >1 γ per HERA bunch
- Measure θ_γ, correct for aperture loss

aperture as measured by
foil exposed to sync. rad.



ZEUS LUMI system: 2 γ detectors

~100 m from I.P.



<u>*e* tagger @ 6m from I.P.</u>
- Measure scattered *e*
- W-scint. spaghetti calor.
- Check photon accept. (work in progress...)
- Also for physics: tag high W photoprod.
- Not discussed more here...

<u>Pair spectrometer</u>
- Measure pairs from $\gamma \rightarrow e^+e^-$ in exit window

<u>Photon calor. (PCAL)</u>
- Direct measure γ

PCAL: direct γ measurement



C filters
- ~3-4 X_0
- w/ Aerogel Ckv. det. (not used for LUMI, used for physics)

PCAL
- Pb-scint. sandwich
- Scint. hodoscope for position recon.

- PCAL sits in direct γ beam, also primary syc. rad. fan
- PCAL *must* be shielded: C/graphite filters
- Serious resolution degradation; must be MC modeled
- Does provide soft cutoff E_γ<few hundred MeV, protect against IR divergence in B-H spectrum

PCAL

<u>Calibration: endpoint B-H spectrum</u>

- Colliding *ep* bunch endpoint smeared
- Use unpaired *e*-only HERA bunches
  - *e*-gas rate ~10^{-2} ep rate
  - *e*-gas spectrum ~B-H undistorted
  - MC fit to endpoint





<u>LUMI measurement</u>

- Scalers count γs E_γ > threshold
- Spectrum distorted by

  multiple γ's / bunch $\times$ing (pileup)
- Use several thresholds, compare to MC for various n_γ

  e.g.: E_γ >0.1GeV, n_γ=0,0.5,1,1.9
- Several % correction: requires precise PCAL MC model



PCAL

Beam-size effect

- Impact parameter limited by transverse beam size: low E_γ suppressed
- Observed e.g. VEPP e^+e^-, HERA-I *ep*
- HERA-II smaller beam size, stronger efffect >2%



Other effects, corrections:

- Electronics pileup (pulse overlaps)
- Pedestal shift from sync. rad.

PCAL summary:

- Concept & detector simple
- Complications: shielding, high rates, low E_γ
- Large (several %) corrections require accurate MC modeling

Pair Spectrometer



- In exit window ~9% $\gamma \rightarrow e^+e^-$ conversions **$\Rightarrow$ >10 rate reduction**
- Pair separated vertically by dipole $\int$Bdl $\approx$ 0.3 T-m $\approx$ 0.1 GeV p_T
- e^+,e^- detected in W-scint. sandwich calorimeters

  horiz., vert. segmented for position **recon.** **$\Rightarrow$ out of primary sync. rad. fan**

<u>Calibration:</u>

- Insert 'moving collimator', defines narrow vert. pair position
- Now a 'true spectrometer':

  From $\int$Bdl, distance to calorimeters,

  vertical position in calorimeter determines energies e^+,e^-

Spectrometer: calibration

- Check endpoint of B-H spectrum (special run w/ higher dipole field):
- E-scale agrees ~1%



However:

- Calorimeters were not well shielded from secondary synchrotron radiation
- Gains varied considerably; here worst channel last ~3 years HERA operation:
- Gain dropped in HERA operation; recovered HERA shutdowns (it was wavelength shifters)
- A calorimetry based E_γ LUMI measurement problematic
- Solution in a few slides...



Spectrometer: LUMI measurement

- Count up, down calor. <u>coincidences</u> for ~16 sec. (ZEUS int. time)
- Accumulate E_γ, X_γ, Y_γ, histograms
- Account for ellipse tilt:
- Fit MC for photon beam (X0, Y0)
  and gaussian spread major-/minor axes

  $\Rightarrow$ accept. corr. for aperture, spec. geom.
- Fits made to X_γ, Y_γ distributions, good:







Spectrometer: LUMI measurement

- Fit not made to E_γ spectrum, but resulting MC prediction agrees well:



- Can also reconstruct $\int$Bdl each event
- Compare difference from nominal $\int$Bdl to MC prediction:



- Tail @ low $\Delta\int$Bdl due to $\gamma\rightarrow e^+e^-$ in *air inside dipole gap*
- Good agreement data↔MC

<u>MC verified by independent checks, accurate acceptance</u>

Spectrometer: E_γ range

- Consider pair midway between calorimeters, with equal shared energy e^+,e^-
- There is a minimum E_γ which will produce a coincidence; lower E_γ either e^+or e^- will miss outside calorimeters:



- Similarly there is a maximum E_γ which will produce a coincidence; higher E_γ either e^+or e^- will miss inside calorimeters:



Spectrometer: E_γ range

- Define the energy sharing $z=Ee^+/E_\gamma$, $0 \le z \le 1$
- Then can plot SPEC acceptance in the (E_γ,z) plane, inside kite-shaped region:
- Insets show the pair configurations at edges, corners of acceptance



- Pair spectrometer geometry defines an inherent region of acceptance in the (E_γ,z)

Spectrometer: E_γ range

- The energy sharing distribution symmetric, slightly peaked @ z=0,1:



- Integrate over acceptance region to get acceptance vs. E_γ
- Simple calculation describes features of full MC simulation including beam spread, resolutions, ...



Pair spectrometer geometry defines an inherent E_γ range:

- Low E_γ cutoff, protect against IR divergence of B-H spectrum, low E_γ beam-size effects
- Fiducial regions of detectors weakly dependent on calibration, protect against gain variations

Spectrometer: pileup

- Can have >1 γ conversion in 1 HERA bunch $\times$ing
- 2 pairs that would not each make a coincidence could make one:



- Such single hits can come from lower E_γ than possible for true coincidences $\Rightarrow$ potentially high rate
- This leads to *overcounting* of coincidences at high L_{inst}

Spectrometer: pileup

- The spectrometer DAQ did baseline (pedestal) subtraction by subtracting channel energies from previous HERA bunch
- A single from a previous bunch conversion (- - - -) could overlap a valid coincidence, stealing its energy and failing threshold cuts



- Such single hits can come from lower E_γ than possible for true coincidences $\Rightarrow$ potentially high rate
- This leads to *undercounting* of coincidences at high L_{inst}

Spectrometer: pileup

- Model in MC: overlap conversions, add/subtract channel energies:
- As expected 2 effects opposite sign, **and nearly cancel**
- Total pileup correction <0.5% @ highest HERA L_{inst}



Spectrometer: summary

- Concept & detector more complex than PCAL, <u>but:</u>
- Straightforward calibration, E-scale ~1%
- Natural E_γ range: no low E_γ complications, weak dependence on calorimeter calibration
- Negligible pileup correction

Results

PCAL & SPEC comparison:

- PCAL & SPEC operated and analyzed by two independent groups
- They agree within 1%
- Plotted here L weighted ratio per physics run:



Systematic uncertainties:

- Both PCAL & SPEC have sys. uncert. **±2.5%**
- PCAL uncert. comes equally from the several corrections, probably irreducible
- SPEC uncert. dominated by window conversion prob.: **±2%** already improvement found; window being remeasured...
- Hope to improve further with *e*-tagger studies...

Lessons

PCAL & SPEC both useful for future installation:

- Complement each other well:
  - PCAL simple concept, detector; tricky LUMI analysis
  - SPEC complex idea hardware; novel features aid LUMI meas.
- Also: backup, redundancy, cross checks...
  - SPEC (recycled hardware, HV) failed several periods
- PCAL also useful for initial state radiation tagging
- SPEC has several parameters that can be tuned:
  - window thickness (conversion probability)
  - dipole field
  - detector geometry, fiducial volume

Not discussed in detail here, but
electron tagging very useful:

- Measure LUMI acceptances, other checks...
- Low angle *e* tagging already EIC priority

EXTRAS

HERA tilt scans

- HERA made extreme tilts of *e* beam to probe aperture edges:



(E_γ,z) plane acceptance

- Acceptance region in (E_γ,z) plane varies with γ vertical position
- Shown here for 0,1,2 cm above SPEC midpoint