Evolving the ILD Detector Design

(a personal take on what we should be doing from a detector optimization perspective)

> Graham W. Wilson Univ. of Kansas

Overarching Goal

- Do outstanding science with a high energy e⁺e⁻ collider as soon as reasonably achievable (ASARA)
 - This has many facets, not least of which is securing timely approval for the linear collider project
 - In ILD, we now have at hand the tools to continue evaluating the detector performance at a rather realistic level
 - Study technological options, detector layout and improve the design
 - We have the opportunity and a responsibility to try to do things right
 - We should welcome feasible design evolutions with potential for significant positive impact, and actively encourage such studies
 - Establish a fair review based on scientific merit and welcome new collaborators.
 - Best detector for the science (not necessarily the one that supports in-house R&D)
 - Understand eventual detector performance
 - Extend and enhance the physics case with credible and improved detector and reconstruction tools
 - In the current climate: more necessary than ever.
 - The goal of the DBR timeline is not to twiddle our thumbs en attendant (encore, depuis 2000) LHC

Detector Performance Optimization

- During the LoI phase, a first optimization of global detector parameters was done – based largely on p-flow performance.
- It is important to revisit this in more detail now that we can address integrated detector issues, and with growing insight into p-flow inner workings
 - ECAL compactness, longitudinal segmentation
 - TPC Endplate thickness
 - Octagonal TPC or 12-fold ECAL.
 - Electron reconstruction (material).
 - Tracking, vertexing, calorimetry in the presence of background.
- We should avoid linking our work plan too closely to the timelines imposed by full simulation of SM physics background events
 - The "physics-benchmarking" exercise so far has been of little value in evolving the detector design per se.
 - It is good for putting the physics case on a firmer footing but channels need to be chosen appropriately. What exactly are we trying to learn?
- We should put the emphasis on detector performance optimization using single particle and di-jet events under realistic conditions.
 - This should have priority for computing resources

Reconstruction Tool Development

• Feasibility

Lot's to do !

- Bunch crossing ID
- Backgrounds
 - TPC Patrec
 - VTX track finding
 - BeamCAL
- Calibration & Alignment

Physics Scope

- Electron ID in jets
- Muon ID in jets
- Vertex Charge, Tau Vertexing
- Beam-spot determination

• ILD Specificity

- dE/dx
- V0's
- Scintillator timing

Acceptance

- Low pT tracks, forward tracks
- Low E photons
- Forward MIPs

• Particle Flow

- Kinematic Fitting
- Jet Specific Energy Errors
- Software Compensation
- Leakage/Coil/Muon System
- Full Event Reconstruction ?
- Jet Energy Scale
 - Bottom-up or empirical ?
 - p-scale, EM-scale, NH-scale
- Physics-based Beam Diagnostics
 - ECM (Z γ), dL/dE (MABB)

ILD Detector Design Weaknesses

- Material Budget
- TPC Endplate thickness (ETD pourquoi ?)
- ECAL barrel/endcap overlap
- LCAL design appears over-optimized for Lumi & not optimized enough for hermeticity.

• All are interesting areas for dedicated studies and improved design.

Critical Path Planning

- In the spirit of science ASARA, we should develop an understanding of which detector items may be close to the critical path to first physics.
 - Eg solenoid
 - A light Higgs discovery could lead to an early start ! (2012 ??)
- While R&D may be on-going, we do need to develop a fair and appropriate way to make the best current decision on appropriate timescales.
 - At least one feasible solution
 - We need to make sure that there are no show-stoppers and make it abundantly clear that ILD is ready

Conclusions

• We have an opportunity to advance significantly the ILD detector concept, and the linear collider physics case too – let's take advantage of it.