

Core-to-Core Program



# MEG II実験における、背景事象削減に向けた ガンマ線再構成手法の開発

Development of gamma-ray reconstruction algorithm towards the reduction of background events in MEG II experiment

> 小川真治、他MEG IIコラボレーション @日本物理学会 2018年秋季大会 2018.09.16

# **Table of Contents**

- 1. Introduction
- 2. Multiple  $\gamma$  event in MEG II
- 3. Reconstruction algorithm
- 4. Performance of the analysis

# **MEG II experiment**

#### **Upgrade of MEG experiment**

- $\Box \quad \text{Searches for } \mu \to e\gamma.$
- Dominant BG : accidental BG

#### More statistics

- x2.3 muon beam rate
- x2 positron efficiency

#### Better separation of signal event from BG

- x2 for all detector resolutions
- New detector for background tagging will be introduced



#### Expected sensitivity: $6 \times 10^{-14}$

One order of magnitude better than MEG

#### **Engineering run from 2019**

Followed by physics data taking.

Reference : "The design of the MEG II experiment", Eur. Phys. J. C (2018) 78:38

# LXe detector upgrade

MEG II

We have upgraded LXe detector for MEG II to significantly improve the performance.



#### We have replaced 216 2-inch PMTs on the γ-entrance face with 4092 12 × 12 mm<sup>2</sup> MPPCs.

- Better granularity
  - Better position resolution
- Better uniformity of scintillation readout
  - Better energy resolution
- Less material of the γ-entrance face
  - Better detection efficiency



# Multiple y identification

- Granularity of γ incident face has been largely improved.
  - 1 PMT replaced with 4 x 4 MPPC. (i.e. factor 16 improvement)
  - Main purpose: Improvement of position/ energy resolution.
- Can we utilize higher granularity for other purpose?
   → Identification of multiple y event.





### Gamma-ray background in MEG II

- Main BG in MEG II : accidental BG of e &  $\gamma$  . E $\gamma$  ~ E $\gamma$  of Signal (= 52.8MeV).
- Three types of background γ near signal energy.



# Gamma-ray background in MEG II

- Energy spectrum of BG γ generated by MC (muon decay on target).
- AIF 2γ is dominant (60%) in "signal region".



#### Signal region

- Defined as 52.4 54 MeV in this study.
- Likelihood fit by PDF will be performed in MEG analysis.

# Gamma-ray background in MEG II

- Energy spectrum of BG γ generated by MC (muon decay on target).
- AIF 2γ is dominant (60%) in "signal region".
- Roughly half of them can be identified by MEG II readout granularity.
- New in this study.





# Pileup gamma

- Many pileup events due to higher beam rate in MEG II
  - 2.3 times higher beam rate than MEG.
  - Rate of pileup  $\gamma$ : 1MHz  $\rightarrow$  Half of events have some pileup hit.
- Energy deposit of pileup γ has to be subtracted.
- Effect on BG spectrum in MEG II has not yet estimated.



# Multiple y reconstruction algorithm

- Reconstruction for multiple γ has been implemented.
- 1. Multiple hit identification
  - 1. Waveform Analysis:
    - Extract peak amplitude and timing.
  - 2. Clustering:
    - Cluster adjacent channel which has similar timing.
    - New cluster is generated from local peak of amplitude.
  - 3. Quality cut of found clusters.
- 2. Waveform unfolding

Peak timing distribution



each color corresponds to each cluster

# Multiple y reconstruction algorithm

- Reconstruction for multiple γ has been implemented.
- 1. Multiple hit identification
- 2. Waveform unfolding
  - Make sum waveform for each found cluster.
  - 2. Fit each waveform to unfold it.







# Multiple y reconstruction algorithm

- Reconstruction for multiple γ has been implemented.
- 1. Multiple hit identification
- 2. Waveform unfolding



Pulses from each  $\gamma$  are correctly unfolded.

# Performance - AIF 2y identification -

 To estimate analysis performance, reconstructed Eγ spectrum has been checked.



#### 58% reduction of AIF 2γ BG

(being identified as multiple-γ event)

34% of reduction of BG in "signal region".

# Performance - Pileup elimination (Signal γ)-

14

• Performance for pileup elimination is also checked.



- Tail in reconstructed Eγ caused by misidentified pileup.
  - **6% reconstruction inefficiency to signal event** (out of 3σ from true Eγ).
  - Especially, small energy at same timing pileup.
     → Needs dedicated algorithm (as is in MEG I).

# Performance - Pileup elimination (BG γ) -

15

- Pileup identification and unfolding work well for 97% of events.
- Other 3% of pileup event are left in signal energy.
   → Non-negligible number of pileup events.
  - +24% of BG event in "signal region".
    - +7% for 52 54 MeV. + 37% for 52.8 54 MeV.



- LXe detector in MEG II has been upgraded, and readout granularity has been improved by a factor of 16.
- Reconstruction algorithm of pileup identification and unfolding has been developed, and its performance has been tested by MC.
  - Number of BG event in "signal region" (52.4<  $E\gamma$  <54 MeV) is discussed.
- By utilizing MEG II granularity, 58% of AIF 2γ event is identified, and this leads to 34% reduction of BG.
- Due to the misidentified pileup, 24% increase of BG, and 6% of signal inefficiency.

#### **Prospect**

- Improvement of identification performance.
- For the precise estimation of those effect, physics sensitivity estimation by likelihood fit by PDF is needed.

# BACKUP

# **Expected performance**

• Significant improvement of all resolutions and efficiency are expected.

#### Detector performance for signal γ-ray

	MEG (measured)	MEG II (simulated)
Position	~5 mm	~2.5 mm
Energy	~2%	0.7 - 1.5%
Timing	62 ps	40 - 70 ps
Efficiency	65%	70%







# Multiple $\gamma$ from single muon decay

- I classified high Ey BG event into three types.
  - 1. Single y event from RMD decay. ( = "RMD  $1\gamma$ ")
  - 2. Single y event from Michel decay. ( = "AIF  $1\gamma$ ")
  - 3. Multiple  $\gamma$  event from single muon decay. ( = "AIF  $2\gamma$ " + unusual events)
- High Ey BG event in signal region is dominated by multipley events.



eV (i.e 1 que energy deposit			
60%	# of event	52.4 < Eγ (MeV) <	
	Multiplay	10/	

RMD single  $\gamma$ 

# of event	52.4 < Eγ (MeV) < 54
Multiple γ	104
AIF single γ	37

9

# Multiple y events

2 MeV v

#### 20 3 example events.

- If we can identify multiple  $\gamma$  events, we can reduce BG event.  $\rightarrow$  How multiple y events look like?
- Most of them  $2\gamma$  from AIF.
- Whether we can identify them as  $2 \gamma$ , depends on
  - Energy
  - Hit depth (deep events is hard to be found)
  - distance on Inner face
- By my eye, 60-80 % of them can be identified as 2y event.
  - $\rightarrow$  Those can be identified by pileup anal



# Multiple y events

- Another type of multiple γ even combination of RMD and AIF.
- In this event
  - $15 \text{MeV } \gamma + 40 \text{MeV } e \text{ from RMD.}$
  - Positron cause pair creation.
     Both 14 & 26 MeV γ goes to XEC.
- Many of those events can also be identified as multiple γ event by my eye.





# Pileup found, not unfolded.

- Sometimes we can find the existence of pileup, but cannot be unfolded.
- Typical example : Pileup at the same timing.
  - Assignment of PMT Charge for each cluster is not correct.
     (No local peak of pileup γ on PMT faces.)
- → For now, those event (large energy pileup at same timing on inner face) is flagged to reject them in the physics analysis.
  - In MEG I, EneTotalSumRectask performed template fit of light distribution for those events.



# Performance -signal γ + pileup -

- Performance for Signal γ + pileup.
   Half of events has pileup γ.
- Two source of inefficiency for signal.
  - 1. Event selection in pileup analysis.
  - 2. Tail events in reconstructed energy
- In total, 6% inefficiency.



	Signalγonly	Signal γ + pileup	total
Generated in MC	100%	100%	100%
After event selection in pileup analysis	99.5%	96.0%	97.8%
Tail event cut (3σ)	97.5%	90.6%	94.1%

# Performance -signal γ + pileup -

24

•  $E(reco) - E(MC) > 3\sigma$ 





# # event in signal region

# of BG event <i>in 52 &lt; Ey &lt; 54</i>	expected from MC (w/o pileup)	reconstructed (w/o pileup)	reconstructed (w/ pileup)	52% of BG is AIF 2γ 60% reduction of AIF 2γ
Multiple $\gamma$ (+pileup)	200.6	81	81 (80)	$\rightarrow$ 32% reduction of BG
AIF single γ (+pileup)	106.5	110	201 (163)	
RMD single γ (+pileup)	78.6	72		+7% of BG by pileup
Total	385.6	263	282 (243)	-14% by DS RDC
# of BG event <i>in 52.4 &lt; Ey &lt; 54</i>	expected from MC (w/o pileup)	reconstructed (w/o pileup)	reconstructed (w/ pileup)	60% of BG is AIF 2γ 58% reduction of AIF 2γ
Multiple γ (+pileup)	115.0	48	54 (54)	$\rightarrow$ 34% reduction of BG
AIF single $\gamma$ (+pileup)	50.2	53	105 (87)	
RMD single $\gamma$ (+pileup)	27.2	27		+24% of BG by pileup
Total	192.4	128	159 (141)	-11% by DS RDC
# of BG event <i>in 52.8 &lt; Ey &lt; 54</i>	expected from MC (w/o pileup)	reconstructed (w/o pileup)	reconstructed (w/ pileup)	70% of BG is AIF 2γ 56% reduction of AIF 2ν
Multiple γ (+pileup)	54.7	24	27 (27)	$\rightarrow$ 38% reduction of BG
AIF single γ (+pileup)	17.6	20	40 (32)	
RMD single $\gamma$ (+pileup)	6.6	5		+37% of BG by pileup
Total	78.7	49	67 (59)	-12% by DS RDC

() : no hit on DS RDC

# Performance - BG γ from single muon decay-

- Performance for **single muon decay on target**. (i.e. no pileup event)
- 60% of multiple BG event is identified as multiple γ event and get out of signal Eγ region.
  - Expectation from MC : based on true total energy deposit convoluted by



# of BG event in 52.4 < Εγ < 54	expected from MC	reconstructed
Multiple <b>y</b>	115.0	48
AIF single $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$	50.2	53
RMD single γ	27.2	27
Total	192.4	128

# Performance - BG γ from single muon decay-<sup>27</sup>

- 40% of multiple BG event is not identified.
  - Deep hit
  - small energy deposition
  - Too close to find
- It seems not easy to find them.



# <sup>100</sup> <sup>1</sup>

Three example events

# Performance - BG γ + pileup -

- Performance for **BG γ + pileup**.
- Pileup identification and eliminati works well for most events, but there are several events left in the signal region.
- + 24% of BG from pileup.



black: before pileup subtraction
red : after pileup subtraction

# of BG event in 52.4 < Εγ < 54	expected from MC (w/o pileup)	reconstructed (w/o pileup)	reconstructed (w/ pileup)
Multipleγ (+pileup)	115.0	48	54
AIF single γ (+pileup)	50.2	53	105
RMD single γ (+pileup)	27.2	27	
Total	192.4	128	159

# Performance -signal γ + pileup -

- Performance for Signal γ + pileup.
   Half of events has pileup γ.
- Two source of inefficiency for signal.
  - 1. Event selection in pileup analysis.
  - 2. Tail events in reconstructed energy
- In total, 6% inefficiency.



	Signal y only	Signalγ+pileup	total
Generated in MC	100%	100%	100%
After event selection in pileup analysis	99.5%	96.0%	97.8%
Tail event cut (3σ)	97.5%	90.6%	94.1%

# Room for improvement of pileup

- There are still room for improvement.
  - Combination with result of other algorithm is promising.



**Outlier search in XECTimeFit** should be useful for this

We can see the sign of pileup in PMT sum WF.

#### Signal inefficiency by LD my slide 3. @collab. Mar/2017

- For some of the signal event, LD method find multiple peak even for the signal event /o pileup γ.
  - This is due to the energy deposition just in front of the MPPC caused by the gamma ray escaped from shower.
  - This can lead to the inefficiency to the signal, if we eliminate the effect of the pileup based on this kind of false information.





31