

CEPC Muon Detector

Xiaolong Wang (for the Muon Detector Group) Fudan University

Aug. 7th, 2024, CEPC Detector Ref-TDR Review



- Introduction
- Requirements
- Technology survey and our choices
- Technical challenges
- R&D efforts and results
- Detailed design
- Readout electronics
- Performance from simulation
- RPC related and testing
- Research team and working plan
- Summary

Introduction

Muon detector, the outermost detector with the largest volume.

- Production of Higgs: $e^+e^- \rightarrow ZH$, Higgs could be determined in the recoil of $Z \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$.
 - Special determination of muon with $p \approx 40 \text{ GeV}/c$.
- Muons provide in many theoretical models a characteristic signature for new physics.
- Muon detector is designed for muon identification, but not limited to this.
 - Could be used to detect the leakage of HCAL.
 - Can be used for trigger, like in ATLAS.
 - Could be useful for T0 determination. $\sigma(T0) = \sigma(T_{hit}) / \sqrt{n_{hits}}$
 - Can be used to search for Long-lived particles, with its large volume, and relatively clean environment outside HCAL.
- Furthermore, it must be robust and low cost.



We seek excellent performance from the muon detector!

Requirement



Technology survey and our choices

- Extruded plastic scintillator (PS) technology
 - Belle II, JUNO-TAO, MATHUSLA, LHAASO, sPHENIX, etc.
- **RPC technology:**
 - Belle, BESIII, Dayabay, ATLAS, CMS
- μ -RWELL (MGPD) technology
 - IDEA
- **Experiments** @ LHC
 - ATLAS: Thin Gap Chamber, RPC, Monitored Drift Tube, Small-Strip Thin-Gap Chamber, and Micromegas
 - LHCb: MWPC, RPC
 - CMS: Drift tube, Cathode Strip Chamber, RPC

Summary of performance and technical requirements for different gaseous μ detectors

	MDT/DT	CSC	TGC	MRPC	RPC
Spatial resolution [µm]	150	100	$5 \mathrm{mm}$	$15 \mathrm{mm}$	$15 \mathrm{mm}$
Time resolution [ns]	40	7	4.3	0.075	2
Averaged efficiency [%]	98	98	99	95	95
Hit rate $[Hz/cm^2]$	200	500	1000	500	100
Eletronic dependence	Α	Α	в	Α	\mathbf{C}
Software dependence	В	Α	в	\mathbf{C}	\mathbf{C}
Technology requirement	Α	Α	в	в	\mathbf{C}
Cost per channel	Н	Н	Μ	Μ	\mathbf{L}

A-C are in descending order of the requirements, H-High, M-Middling, L-low.





Drift cathode PCB

kapton (50 L

U-RWELL F

Copper top layer (5 µm)

Rigid PCB readout

electrode

Well nitch: 140 um Well diameter: 70-50 um

Comparisons

	Advantages	Disadvantage
PS(+SiPM)	Solid detector, structure simple, high rate capability, low operation voltage, use SiPM similar to HCAL, time resolution	DCR of SiPM
RPC	Cost, mature tech., time resolution	Fill gas, HV system
μ -RWELL	Spatial resolution, high rate capability	Structure, number of readout channels, time resolution, cost.

Table 5.3.Characteristic parameters of some organic scintillators [87, 93, 94,102, 103]

EPS and RPC have similar cost.

Consideration of rate capability:

- Decay time: ns level
- SiPM+FE: $< 100 \text{ } ns \rightarrow 10 \text{ MHz}$
- Typical area of a bar: $1600 \ cm^2$
- Pulse shape: width ~ 10-20 ns
- Rate capability: $5 \sim 10 \text{kHz}/cm^2$





Our choice: PS as the baseline option, RPC for comparison in R&D.

20MHz tested for SiPM+FEE with laser.

Main Technical Challenges

- Long detector module: could be ~5m
- How to achieve the efficiency and the time resolution required from a long PS bar?
 - 2.8 m bar has been used at Belle II;
 - 1.5 m bar has been tested in lab;
 - It's possible since Kuraray fiber has an attenuation length of 6.8 m.

R&D efforts and results

- Simulation and software
- Performance of PS bars
- Front-end electronics
- Prototype and CR testing

Published papers:

- 1. Design and performance of a high-speed and low-noise preamplifier for SiPM, Nucl. Sci. Tech. 34, 169(2023)
- 2. Design and test for the CEPC muon subdetector based on extruded scintillator and SiPM, JINST 19 P06020(2024)

Simulation and software

Simulation based on Geant4

- Standalone
- Implemented in CEPCSW
- Simulation for single channel
 - Light collection and compared to lab test
 - Fiber embedding: Groove \rightarrow hole, $N_{pe} \times 1.4$
 - Diameter: $1.2mm \rightarrow 2.0mm$, $N_{pe} \times (2 2.8)$

Simulation shows potential to increase the light yield by a factor of (2.8 - 3.9), which is helpful for building long detector module.



Geometry of endcaps is being modified.







Performance of PS bars

PS bars made by GNKD company

- Increase the light yield;
- Develop/improve the reflection layer with Teflon;
- Strip production.
- The quality of 1.5m bars has achieved the required performance, which will be described later.



All samples with U groove



R&D for front-end electronics

Many different kinds of preamps for SiPM have been designed and tested, such as:

- Design high-speed and low-noise preamp for SiPM.
 - Baseline noise of 0.6 mV, bandwidth of 426 MHz, and time resolution of 20 ps.
 - Test with laser input at 20MHz.
 - Clear *N*_{pe} spectrum.
- Design FEE to test with 16 ch ADC
 - Develop the FPGA for ADC.
 - Works well, but time resolution is several ns due to the DCR.





SiPM_Mini Power

Study on mini power to be integrated into the FEE.



SiPM POWER	BIAS-2-14/70 @NDL	C14156 @Hamamatsu	MAX5026 @Fudan
Voltage (V) Output Range	14~70	0~80	0~71
Current (mA) Output Range	0.5mA	2mA	2mA
Number of SiPMs driven	100	400	400
Power consumption (mW)	250	100	200
Ripple noise(mV)	5.2 mVp-p	0.1 mVp-p	2mVp-p
Price (¥)	~2000	500	30
		O OND VCC SCL SDA	A B







Prototype and CR test



Detailed design

- Geometry: barrel and endcaps
- Detector channel elements and module
- Consideration on readout electronics (preliminary)

Detailed design - geometry

Geometry:

- Barrel: Helix dodecagon sectors.
- Rectangle modules inserted in the gaps ____ between iron plates.
- Cable: towards the gaps between barrel and endcaps.







Detailed design - geometry



Detailed design – channel and module

Detector channel

- PS bar: $4cm \times 1cm$ cross section
- WLS fiber: $\phi = 2.0mm$
- SiPM: 3*mm* × 3*mm*

Detector module

- Superlayer with perpendicular channels
- Carriers for preamps held at the frame
- Space between PS bars and aluminum layer is allowed for long cables.
- Mechanics
- R&D on the new Aluminum frame, PS bars production is ongoing To BEE with ribbon cables Space covered by large area aluminum layer. Carrier for the FEE, inside the module ୍ର ତ୍ରା ତ୍ରା ତ୍ର 0 2 2 2 2 000000 superlayer 17

Detailed design - overall

Number of channels: (288 modules) 51,744

- Barrel: 192 modules, 32,544 ch
- Inner endcaps: 48 modules, 6,912 ch
- Outer endcaps: 48 modules, 12,288 ch
- Sensitive length: 148,416*m*
 - Length for PS bar and WLS fibre
 - Sensitive area: $5936m^2$





Detection dead area: $\sim 1.5\%$ No dead zone in the barrel, 0.07% from the cross in endcaps, and 1.4% due to the beampipe

Readout electronics: Time-over-threshold (TOT) scheme

Front-end electronics

- High time resolution preamp: $\sigma_T \approx 20 \ ps$
- High-speed discriminator shows $\sigma_T \approx 0.2 \ ns$
- Implementation of TOT: operational amplifier + high-speed discriminator + TDC.
- **FEE** integrated DAC to adjust threshold and SiPM bias voltage.
- It's possible to get N_{pe} according to TOT.
- Investigating the possibility of integrating the BEE into the detector module: only power cable and signal fiber.





300 350

Input(m

400

Geant4 simulation for performance

- Geometry and Geant4 simulation is implemented in CEPCSW, reconstruction and performance studies are onging.
- Still have a lot of work to do:
 - Study of the Molière radius of muons originating at the interaction point and traversing the ECL and HCAL.
 - Algorithm for muon ID based on multiple hits in the detector, using PFA, Kalman filter, etc.
 - Tracking reconstruction.
 - Fake rate of $\pi \rightarrow \mu$.
 - Simulation of final states including muon track(s). \rightarrow Physics performance.
 - Background and hit rate!



Preliminary simulation on hits of muon track with 40 GeV/c momentum

1 GeV/c vs. 40 GeV/c



RPC technology – BESIII MUC

- Homemade Oil-free Bakelite RPC;
- Gas mixture: Ar:R134a:ISO-B=50:42:8
- First time successful mass production in China, bare chamber pass rate > 90%;
- Good performance and keep running even now (>15years)!

Bare RPCs	$1,272 m^2$
Box	136
Readout strip & insulation materials	636 m ²
Electronics	9,152ch

Parameters		Dosign Targot	Real Performance				
		Design Target	Cosmic Ray	Double μ	$\pi\pi J/\psi(\mu\mu)$	Total	
Average Efficien	ncy	95	94.7	95.11	95.17	93.6	
Counting Rate		$< 0.1 Hz/cm^2$		0.04 (F	Random Trigger)		
Spatial	$\sigma_{R\Phi}$	< 20mm	19	18	19	17.6	
Resolution	σ_Z	< 30mm	23	21	22	22.5	
$P(\pi \rightarrow \mu)@10$	FeV/c	< 5%		5.5%	(MC)		

Table 2-4 BESIII Detector Performance





21

RPC technology – Dayabay

Super module:

- Two layers of 2-D readout
- 4-layer RPCs
- Module size: $2.17m \times 2.20m \times 0.08m$
- Module number: 194
- Bare RPC sizes: $1.0m \times 2.10m$, $1.1m \times 2.1m$
- Bakelite plate size limitation: $2.4m \times 1.2m!$

A
SF
3
AT S
2
12
19-



X" Direction

Y" Direction



We have the tech. based on bakelite ready.

Bare RPCs	$3,200 m^2$
Box	195
Readout strip & insulation materials	3,200 <i>m</i> ²
Electronics	6,000 ch

Ongoing test at SJTU

- A prototype from ATLAS (upgrade).
- Use R134a gas.

which is available in China.

Efficiency curve of large RPC determined.



	Event 3	
(Var) leads		
8		
(A)		
Ngnu		
ŝ		
Ngnul in		
Ngnal intV	www.assaluman.	
Ngnal (mV)		
Signal (mV)		
Ngnal (mV)		
	Signal window	
(Jul)		
z		
	-40 =	

Research Team

Institutions and faculties/staff: 11

- Fudan University (FDU): Xiaolong Wang, Wanbing He, Weihu Ma
- Shanghai Jiaotong University (SJTU): Jun Guo, Liang Li
- IHEP: Zhi Wu, Yuguang Xie
- South China Normal University (SCNU): Hengne Li
- Nankai University: Minggang Zhao, Junhao Yin
- USST: Qibin Zheng
- Task board:
 - Overall: X.L. Wang
 - Software and simulation: H.N. Li, L. Li, J.H. Yin, M.G. Zhao
 - R&D on PS scheme: X.L. Wang, Z. Wu, W.B. He, W.H. Ma
 - R&D on PRC scheme: J. Guo, Y.G. Xie
 - Production and testing: Z. Wu, Y.G. Xie
 - Electronics: X.L. Wang, Q.B. Zheng
- Graduate students: ~15
- We are inviting BINP (Russia) to join.

Working plan

Improvement and optimization of PS bars

- Increase the light yield to reduce the weight of a long module

Electronic readout

- Study on the TOT scheme
- Implementation of the CEPC electronics frame
- An open question: how about integrating the BEE into the module, and try wireless like 5G/6G to avoid the troubles from long cables?
- Build a prototype module and testing
 - The performance of a module with a length of 5m: efficiency, time resolution
- Optimization of structure design
- Software and simulation
 - Algorithm for muon ID
 - More physics performance study

Summary

- Muon detector will be designed for muon ID, but not limited to this.
- Many R&D efforts have been performed: FEE, prototype, simulation, etc.
 - Performance of a 1.5*m* prototype: $\epsilon > 98\%$, $\sigma_T < 1.5 ns$

Detailed design:

- Barrel: 8 layers, 2 long modules per layer, helix dodecagon
- Endcaps: 6 layers, 4 sectors per layer, two modules (inner and outer) per sector
- Large area modules with long PS bars.
- 51,744 channels, 5,936 m^2 area, and 148,416 m long fibre, in total.
- Work plan will focus on electronics, software and simulation for performance, prototype modules with long bars.



Thank you for your attention!



中國科學院為能物品加完所 Institute of High Energy Physics Chinese Academy of Sciences

Aug. 7th, 2024, CEPC Detector Ref-TDR Review

Reference for endcaps

Structure of a module





Installation



Cables

Estimation of dead zone



Cost estimation – PS scheme

Unit: CNY

SiPM+FEE:

Number of detector channels: 51,744

– Endcaps:

- Inner modules: $72 \times 2 \times 4 \times 6 \times 2 = 6,912$
- Outer modules: $128 \times 2 \times 4 \times 6 \times 2 = 12,288$
- Barrel: $1356 \times 2 \times 12 = 32,544$

• Cost: 51,744 $ch \times 80/ch = 4.14 M$

SiPM: ¥ 50/ch Preamp: ¥ 30/ch (could be ¥ 10) PS + fiber

- Sensitive length: 148,416 m
 - Endcaps: $(154.83 + 343.73) \times 2 \times 4 \times 6 \times 2 = 47861.76 m$
 - Barrel: $4189.76 \times 2 \times 12 = 100,554.24 m$
- Sensitive area: 5936.64 m^2
- Scintillator volume: 59.3664 m^3

Cost for fiber: $148,416m \times 45/m = 6.68 M$ Cost for scintillator: $59.3664m^3 \times 200/L = 11.87 M$

Total cost: 4.14 + 6.68 + 11.87 = 22.69 M

Consider 20% is for additional costs, like the module structure, wastage, etc.

 $22.69 \times 1.2 = 27.228 M$

CEPC RPC Muon cost

A previous estimation

Bare RPCs (Bakelite)	5080 m^2	2200/m^2	11.18 +0.6 = 11.78M	From GNKD
Bare RPCs(glass)	5080 m^2	1000/m^2	5.08+0.6=5.68M	Estimated
Box	280	3500/module	0.98 M	Estimated
Readout strip & insulation materials	5080 m^2	1000/m^2	5.08 M	Ref to DYB
Subtotal			17.84(Bakelite)/11.74(glass)	
Electronics (discrete)	31100 ch	~200/ch	6.22 M	From USTC
Electronics (ASIC)	31100 ch	~146.5/ch	4.55M	From USTC
HV system			1.5M	Estimated
Gas system			1.0M	Estimated
Total	Bakelite RPC: 2	6.56M(discrete)/2.48	9(ASIC); Glass RPC: 20.46M(discre	te)/18.79(ASIC)

RPC mass production condition

Vendor: GaoNengKeDi co.ltd only, currently; glass RPC no problem. A new clean room is needed. Raw materials are not an issue. (Bakelite, graphite, glass, glue, strips of insulation film, etc.)

Bakelite or glass?

Major factors for choosing glass:

- Module size is too big, Bakelite bare chamber size limited in 2.3*1.1m (Bakelite plate 2.4*1.2m). Glass can be larger, 2.44*2.0m (2mm glass plate 2.44*2.0m) . Two workers can handle.
- Much cheaper, float glass plate -2mm, 10.6/m², 21.2(double layer)/m² for glass RPC. So bare chamber cost should be much lower than the Bakelite one. (e.g, half or 1/3).
- 3. Strength and performance improved for glass, not fragile, bulk resistivity could be controlled to $0.1^{1*10^{12}} \Omega m^* cm$

Parameters		Bakelite	Glass
Pulk resistivity [0, cm]	Normal	$10^{10} \sim 10^{12}$	$> 10^{12}$
Burk resistivity [32. cm]	Developing	10^{8} $^{\circ}$	10 ⁹
Max unit size (2 mm thick) [m]		1.2×2.4	1.0×1.2
Surface flatness [nm]		< 500	< 100
Density [g/cm ³]		1.36	2.4~2.8
Min board thickness [mm]		1.0	0.2
Mechanical performance		Tough	Fragile
Pata canability [Uz/am ²]	Streamer	100@92%	
	Avalanche	10K	100@95%
Noise rate [Hz/cm ²]	Streamer	< 0.8	0.05

 Table 7.2: Comparison of the main parameters of Bakelite and glass RPCs. Both technologies would satisfy the CEPC detector requirements.

Old data

For CEPC RPC, glass should be a better choice according to current survey in China. But glass RPC option needs some R&Ds, rate capability and aging are the main issues.

Geant4 simulation for performance

2mm blue

ntries

BMS

1000

37.78

10.72

28.61

10.85

- Reflection layer: $90\% \rightarrow 98\%$
- Scintillator for fiber: groove \rightarrow hole
- WLS fiber diameter: $1.2mm \rightarrow 2.0 mm$
- **PS bar length:** 1.5*m* vs. 4.0*m*

Comparison of 2mm & 1.2mm fiber (hole) (40 GeV/c) (1.5m)





Comparison of groove & hole (40 GeV mu-) (1.5m)



The sub-group for software and simulation was founded less than one year ago.

We still have a lot of work to do for the performance based on simulation.

Hits of muon tracks with different momentum.

Muon ID efficiency

SiPM – ASIC MPT2321



MPT2321, made in China 32CH ADC (12bit) + TDC(50ps)

