

F-CAL LUXE

Ben David Talmor

Instructor: Prof. Halina Abramowicz, Prof. Yan Benhammou

Tel Aviv University, School of High Energy and Particle Physics

2025

Contents

1 Introduction

Particle physics has been studied for a long time and many of the known models today describe the behaviors of systems under no external fields, or weak fields which can be modeled by using perturbation theory and linear approximation. In LUXE, we study Quantum Electrodynamics (QED) under strong external fields, where the behavior becomes non-perturbative. In this regime we investigate some special phenomena.

One main goal of the LUXE experiment is to study the **nonlinear Compton (NLC) process** where an electron or positron absorbs n optical photons, γ_L , from laser background and converts them into a single, high-energy gamma photon.

$$e^\pm + n\gamma_L \longrightarrow e^\pm + \gamma \quad (1)$$

Another target of the LUXE experiment is the **nonlinear Breit-Wheeler process** where high energy photons produce an electron-positron pair.

$$\gamma + n\gamma_L \longrightarrow e^+ + e^- \quad (2)$$

To study this realm, we will experiment with high energy electron beam and high voltage lasers, the experiment system is built in collaboration with DESY where the electron accelerator is based.

2 Experiment System

A key operation for the experiment will be to capture the positrons created in the Breit-Wheeler process and determine their energies. To obtain this, we will use a sensor composed of layers of silicon semi conductors and Tungsten (W_{74}). The silicon is divided to channels connected to external voltage. When high energy charged particles interact with the silicon it causes an ionization and an electrical charge transmittance. By converting this charge into digital signal, we can learn the trajectory of a particle in the sensor by seeing which channels were creating the signal. The Tungsten, being a heavier material, is used in order to reduce the particles energy, as particles interact with it, they undergo an electromagnetic shower, in which they break down into more particles with lower momentum. The width of each tungsten layer is 3.3 mm which results with the highest probability of the particle to create only two more particles. In our sensor we will have multiple such structures of silicon and Tungsten layers, which are referred to as **Towers**. The towers will be placed next to each other in order to cover the surface area needed to capture the positrons.

3 Gap Between Towers

Between every two towers is a distance of

Ben: check dist between towers

where we have a "blind spot" in the sensor. The goal of this section is to present how this blind spots affect the accuracy of the sensor.

3.1 Run 1101 (Off the Gap)

Ben: Check why there are readings on the first row of the left tower

The reason for the peaks in fig(??) can be explained by the Minimum Ionizing particle (MIP), where particles of high energy will cause a minimum amount of energy loss when passing through the silicon. The amount of lost energy in such case will be translated to a digital signal with amplitude of around 15 ADC. Since the electrons also undergo a shower in tungsten before reaching the first plane, the most probable outcomes are of either 1 particle leaving 1 MIP - around 15 amp or after




Figure 2: Run 1101. Number of hits for each channel in planes 0 (first) and 7 (last). Here we see the area where the electron beam was pointed to on the sensor, as well as the deviation from it. the difference between (a) and (b) shows the growth of particle number over the planes and also the growth of the surface area of the hits. both can be explained by the electro magnetic shower of the high energy electron in the tungsten




Figure 3: Run 1101. Average amplitude in each channel, planes 0 (first) and 7 (last). the average was taken by the total amplitude of each channel, divided by the total amount of hits in the channel, for the specific plane. One can notice that for the channels at the area of the electron beam, the amplitudes at plane 7 are bigger than in plane 0, while on the channels located further, there is no significant change in the reading. It is important to state that there is a tungsten layer before the first silicone layer (plane 0) and this is may cause the scattering of electrons to reach the channels further from the electron beam area. however, most of the electron that reached this far lose more energy, and in average will stamp a lower amplitude than the ones in the beam area.

multiplying in the shower we will have 2 leaving 2 MIP - 30 amp or 3 particles leaving 3 MIP - 45 amp. which explains the peaks at 17, 28 and 42.




Figure 4: Run 1101. Average amp in each plane. The blue plot describe the average amplitude over the total amount of events in the run (absolute average amp), showing how much energy did each plane read over the entire run. The orange plot shows the average amplitude over the amount of events read in the plane (relative average amp), this shows the average energy of each plane solely without comparing it to the other planes. We can on the right the amount of hits in each plane, as expected, it grows bigger as the particle goes deeper in the sensor, However, in plane 4 there was probably some malfunction in the sensor as we see a major drop in comparison to the other planes. As for the energies, we see that the average amp per plane grows bigger until plane 5 and then starts to descend. The absolute average amp behave similarly, except for plane 4 which have significantly less hits and therefore lower amplitude.




Figure 5: Run 1101. the percentage of events where the stated planes were the first ones to read data.




Figure 6: Run 1101. The average shower energy of an event starting in a specific column of the sensor (X position)




Figure 7: Run 1101. Histograms of Shower energies for events starting in different columns




Figure 8: Run 1101. average energy in each plane for event starting in different columns

3.2 Run 1063 - On the Gap




Figure 9: run 1063. Number of hits for each channel in planes 0 (first) and 7 (last). Here we see the area where the electron beam was pointed to on the sensor, as well as the deviation from it. the difference between (a) and (b) shows the growth of particle number over the planes and also the growth of the surface area of the hits, both can be explained by the electro magnetic shower of the high energy electron in the tungsten

The reason for the peaks in fig. ?? can be explained by the Minimum Ionizing particle (MIP), where particles of high energy will cause a minimum amount of energy loss when passing through the silicone. The amount of lost energy in such case will be translated to a digital signal with amplitude of around 15 ADC. Since the electrons also undergo a shower in tungsten before reaching the first plane, the most probable outcomes are of either 1 particle leaving 1 MIP - around 15 amp or after multiplying in the shower we will have 2 leaving 2 MIP - 30 amp or 3 particles leaving 3 MIP - 45 amp. which explains the peaks at 17, 28 and 42.




Figure 10: run 1063. Histogram of the amplitudes written in the first plane. the lines shows the peaks of the histogram




Figure 11: run 1063. Average amp in each plane. The blue plot describe the average amplitude over the total amount of events in the run (absolute average amp), showing how much energy did each plane read over the entire run. The orange plot shows the average amplitude over the amount of events read in the plane(relative average amp), this shows the average energy of each plane solely without comparing it to the other planes. We can on the right the amount of hits in each plane, as expected, it grows bigger as the particle goes deeper in the sensor, However, in plane 4 there was probably some malfunction in the sensor as we see a major drop in comparison to the other planes. As for the energies, we see that the average amp per plane grows bigger until plane 5 and then starts to descend. The absolute average amp behave similarly, except for plane 4 which have significantly less hits and therefore lower amplitude.




Figure 12: run 1063. the percentage of events stating the shower on different planes.




Figure 13: run 1063. The average shower energy of an event starting in a specific column of the sensor (X position)

In figure (??) we see the average energy of an event given the column of the first pad that was activated. This run occurs close to the Gap (between columns 11 and 12) and we see indeed how the energy is decreased for the events starting in these columns.

In figure (??) we have the histograms of energies of all showers which activated only a single pad in the first plane, for different columns of initiation. we see a difference in the center of the peak, as for the columns closer to the gap the energies are lower. we remind that in run 1101 (fig. ??) all energies are around 4220.




Figure 14: run 1063. Histograms of Shower energies for events starting in different columns




Figure 15: run 1063. Average energy in each plane for event starting in different columns

In figure (??) we have the average energy in a plane, for events starting in different columns, we see from fig. (??) that plane 4 was problematic and many false pads were activated in it, and indeed get some random results in fig.?? as well. We also see a drop in plane 2 for some of the columns. There is also a drop in plane 5, this might occur because this is at a depth of the sensor where the shower is close to its peak, meaning that we also have a large amount of leakage to the Gap.