

Beam-beam effects in luminosity measurement at CLIC

S. Lukić, HEP Group Vinča, Belgrade, Serbia FCAL workshop, Zeuthen, May 2012



Outline



- Luminosity measurement and the beam-beam effects
- Beam-beam effects: CLIC vs. ILC
 - Specific issues for CLIC
- Correction of the BS+ISR angular losses for CLIC
- Deconvolution of the ISR energy loss for CLIC
- Correction of the counting bias due to the finite energy resolution of the LumiCal for CLIC
- Summary and conclusions



Bhabha scattering



• Luminosity measurement by counting the Bhabha pairs in coincidence



Systematic effects

 e^+

LumiCal

4



e

lumi

- Deviation from ideally symmetric kinematics
 - Emission of beamstrahlung and ISR along the beam axis before the scattering
 - Electromagnetic deflection after the scattering

Systematic effects

- Angular losses
 - BS+ISR
 - EMD
- *E_{CM}* spectrum distortion
 - ISR



Counting bias







 CM energies of colliding e⁻e⁺ pairs in Guinea-PIG before ISR







 CM energies of colliding e⁻e⁺ pairs in Guinea-PIG after ISR







Angular loss



10 4

 Distortion of polar angles due to BS+ISR emission along the beam axis 200



CLIC



- Very intense beam-beam effects
- Most e⁻e⁺ collisions occur at energies significantly lower than 3 TeV
 - The luminosity in the peak is an important parameter
 - Reconstruction of the form of the spectrum is important
- Energy reconstruction by polar angles has difficulties due to the frequent emission of photons in both directions



Angular loss by E_{CM} at CLIC



• Angular loss affects the low-*E* tail more, but there is a loss of several % in the peak as well





Correction of the BS+ISR angular losses



Beamstrahlung and the ISR miss the calorimeter \rightarrow

Detected showers reveal kinematical information on the colliding system after emission of the BS and the ISR (*s*, β_{coll} , θ , ...), in the collision frame



Deformation of the polar angles of Bhabha pairs



- Among events with a given β_{coll} (dashed line), the angular counting loss can be analytically calculated

- Correct by the appropriate weighting factor $\theta_{max} d \sigma$

$$w(\beta_{coll}) = \frac{\int\limits_{\theta_{min}} \frac{d \sigma}{d \theta} d \theta}{\int\limits_{\theta_{max}}^{\theta_{max}} \frac{d \sigma}{d \theta} d \theta}$$



Assumptions



• Necessary

•
$$\vec{\beta}_{coll} = \beta_{coll} \vec{e}_z$$

- All ISR is lost, all FSR is added up in the calorimeter
- Convenient $d\sigma$ 1





Results of the angularloss correction



- Reconstructed CM energies (after emission of ISR,
 - without correction of the *s*-dependence of the Bhabha xs,



• LumiCal energy response included,

 collinear outgoing photons added)



count

Results of the angularloss correction



- Deviation in the integral count in the top 5% of energy with respect to the control histogram:
 - Before correction: $(\Delta N/N)_{top5\%} = 3.7 \%$
 - After correction: (ΔN/N)_{top5%} = (-0.4 ± 0.8) x 10⁻³
 i.e. with the present statistic, no significant deviation in the corrected peak
 - Lost fraction: $(n_{lost}/N)_{top5\%} = (0.016 \pm 0.012) \times 10^{-3}$ (negligible)
- In the region of 80-90% of CM energy:
 - Before correction: $(\Delta N/M)_{80-90\%} = 42 \%$
 - After correction: $(\Delta N/N)_{80-90\%} = (-6.2 \pm 4.4) \times 10^{-3}$
 - Lost fraction: $(n_{lost}/N)_{80-90\%} = (1.2 \pm 0.1) \times 10^{-3}$



- Relevant CM energy is **before** the ISR
- ISR energy loss deforms the spectrum
- Deconvolution necessary





ISR energy loss



$$h(E_{CM,rec}) = \int_{0}^{\infty} f(E_{CM})g\left(\frac{E_{CM,rec}}{E_{CM}}\right)\frac{1}{E_{CM}}dE_{CM}$$

- Known distribution g(x) of remaining fractions x of CM energy after emission of ISR
 - Parametrize g(x) and fit to the generator results (BHLUMI, BHWIDE)
 - Discretize the equation for $h(E_{CM})$ and solve for f



ISR energy loss deconvoluted



- Residual deviation in the top 5%: (-3.4 \pm 3.4) x 10⁻³
- Residual deviation in 80-90%: (42.8 ± 7.1) x 10⁻³





• The count in the peak is affected by the smearing due to the finite energy resolution





- Peak count deviation due to three effects
 - Cut of the low-energy tail of the Gaussian bell
 - Asymmetric redistribution of counts from each side of the sharp energy cut, due to the slope
 - Weighting error (*s'/s*)
- These effects can be expressed in terms of the parameters of the energy spread and the underlying functional form of the spectrum
- Correction based on the fitted parameters of the spectrum function and of the energy response





• Safe when sufficiently far from the peak (energy cut at min. 3.5% below 2*E*_{beam})





 Residual deviation for peak regions of 3.5% and more



CLIC - Summary



Step	Residual relative deviation Δ <i>N/N</i> (10 ⁻³) in the top 5%
BS+ISR correction	0.4 ± 0.8
Deconvolution	3.4 ± 3.4
Energy resolution	0.08 ± 0.26
EMD (uncorrected)	0.54 ± 0.08
Events with high $oldsymbol{eta}_{coll}$	0.016 ± 0.012



Conclusions



- The lumi spectrum at CLIC extends down to almost zero CM energy
- Bhabha events at lower energies mostly invisible to the LumiCal
 → Use LumiCal to precisely measure the absolute luminosity in and
 near the peak
- Above 2200 GeV, the luminosity spectrum can be measured with good precision, the residual uncertainty in the peak is several permille,
- The deconvolution error in the tail is several percent
- Energy reconstruction capability of the LumiCal is crucial for the \sqrt{s} reconstruction at CLIC
- Complementary measurement of the form of the spectrum needed
 - At angles wider than LumiCal acceptance
 - Using the reconstructed 4-momenta of the outgoing particles
 - Normalize by the LumiCal measurement above 2.2 TeV



Thank you!



Additional slides





Fermion – BS photon angles







General analysis steps



- Reconstruct the CM energy after ISR
- Correct for the ISR+BS angular counting loss
- Deconvolute the ISR energy loss
- Correct for the effects of the finite energy resolution
- Correct for the EMD angular counting loss



Test of the angular-loss correction





