# Update on Simulation of Time Structure - Progress for T3B and FastRPC -

Frank Simon, Philipp Goecke MPP Munich



**CALICE Collaboration Meeting** 

September 2016 UT Arlington, USA

 $\Delta p \cdot \Delta q \geq \frac{1}{2} t$ 

Max-Planck-Institut für Physik (Werner-Heisenberg-Institut)

## Reminder: T3B & FastRPC

 Dedicated detectors for time structure measurements operated behind CALICE prototypes at CERN SPS (T3B 2011 WAHCAL & SDHCAL, FastRPC 2012 WDHCAL)





Simulation Study of Shower Timing CALICE Collaboration Meeting, UTA, September 2016

2

#### What the Data tells us

• From the T3B and FastRPC measurements:



The interpretation:

Prompt component relativistic hadrons, em subshowers

Intermediate component substantial contributions by MeV - scale neutrons

Late component dominated by neutron capture





#### What the Data tells us

• From the T3B and FastRPC measurements:





4



## **The Simulation Study**

• Study performed by Philipp Goecke

Main goal: Identify sub-processes responsible for late components, and for the difference seen between scintillator and gas - done by adding sophisticated process-tracking to T3B G4 simulations (see backup)





## **The Simulation Study**

• Study performed by Philipp Goecke

Main goal: Identify sub-processes responsible for late components, and for the difference seen between scintillator and gas - done by adding sophisticated process-tracking to T3B G4 simulations (see backup)

#### **Processes of particular interest:**



#### Neutron elastic scattering

most efficient when scattering on protons - particularly relevant for hydrogenous materials: plastic scintillator Assumed to be behind the difference in the few 10 ns region - scattering of MeV - scale neutrons results in *O* 1 MIP signals





## **The Simulation Study**

• Study performed by Philipp Goecke

Main goal: Identify sub-processes responsible for late components, and for the difference seen between scintillator and gas - done by adding sophisticated process-tracking to T3B G4 simulations (see backup)

#### **Processes of particular interest:**



#### Neutron elastic scattering

most efficient when scattering on protons - particularly relevant for hydrogenous materials: plastic scintillator Assumed to be behind the difference in the few 10 ns region - scattering of MeV - scale neutrons results in *O* 1 MIP signals

#### Neutron capture

capture of eV - scale neutrons on heavy nuclei, results in emission of few MeV photons Capture takes place in absorber, photons convert to e<sup>+</sup>e<sup>-</sup> pairs (or e<sup>-</sup> via Compton scattering), resulting in signal in sensitive volume - only "second-order" dependence on exact active material



Simulation Study of Shower Timing CALICE Collaboration Meeting, UTA, September 2016



## The Simulation Study - News Since Kyushu

- Based on GEANT4 10.01.p02
- Two different geometries
  - W-DHCAL geometry for the simulation of FastRPC (fixed W composition) also used for scintillator by replacing the gas + glass volumes are replaced by plastic scintillator - about 3 mm of scintillator per layer
    - used for FastRPC MC, comparison of physics lists for both gas and scintillator
  - Full implementation of T3B geometry (as in T3B analysis paper)
    - used for T3B MC with G4 10.01, QGSP\_BERT\_HP only
- For scintillator data full T3B digitization is now again available
  - Accounting for photon statistics, SiPM afterpulsing etc, time distribution of muon response used to build reference digitisation
  - No sophisticated digitisation in RPC case time smearing taken from muon reference to account for time resolution of system and trigger jitter





## **Comparison of GEANT4 Versions**

 In the T3B paper, we saw good agreement of the data with QBBC-based simulations (GEANT 9.4p03)



- We can now reproduce the old simulation results with re-implemented digitization
- GEANT 10.01p02 shows substantially lower activity in medium time frame: less MeV scale neutrons?





### **Comparison of GEANT4 Versions**

• QGSP\_BERT\_HP in 9.4p03 and 10.01.p02



• Differences seen in the same region - G4 10 has less activity from 20 to 40 ns



8

## What is different in GEANT4.10?

- Still at the beginning ongoing investigation
- The observation: mean time of first hit as a function of radius consistent







## What is different in GEANT4.10?

- Still at the beginning ongoing investigation
- The observation: mean time of first hit as a function of radius consistent



- But: less "first hits" at larger radius results in less late hits in total
- Consistent with MeV scale neutron interpretation less pronounced "neutron cloud" in 4.10 -> would result in fewer hits at high r, since neutrons spread out most





## **Different Physics Lists**

- Simulations in W-DHCAL configuration for scintillator gas + gas replaced by plastic
  - no digitization, no smearing



- QGSP\_BERT and FTFP\_BERT identical only HP shows differences
- Similar trends in gas and plastic: HP low at late times
  - in plastic also smaller differences observed in the 10 30 ns time frame (HP higher)





### Where the differences are



 The dominant source of the differences: Neutron capture - points at less slow neutrons in the HP physics lists



e m

Simulation Study of Shower Timing CALICE Collaboration Meeting, UTA, September 2016

Frank Simon (fsimon@mpp.mpg.de)



### Where the differences are



m

- In the 10 30 ns time frame n-p elastic scattering important source of differences in scintillator dominates over n capture
- At late times slightly higher rate in HP (but overall small contribution)



Simulation Study of Shower Timing CALICE Collaboration Meeting, UTA, September 2016



## Conclusions

- Extended GEANT4 10.01 based simulations to different physics lists: See some differences between HP and non-HP lists in both scintillator and gas
- Have successfully re-established full T3B simulation & digitization, now also on **GEANT4 10** 
  - We observe differences in the time structure of G4 9.4 and G4 10.1: Apparently less MeV - scale neutrons in newer G4 versions, below the T3B data
- Started looking at different physics lists see consistent differences in plastic and gas
  - HP has less late hits: less neutron capture for times > 50 ns







# Backup





## **The Simulation Study - Process Accounting**

- It is not sufficient to look at the particle that deposits the energy in the active medium: typically these are electrons, pions, protons (almost) never neutrons
  - also the direct parent is not enough: for neutron capture the energy is often deposited by electrons, which have a photon as parent
- Our solution: Each particle in our G4 simulation gets a process variable that stores information about all processes that have happened to that particle. When new particles are produced, they inherit the state of their parents.
  - Technically: A 64 bit integer allows to encode 64 different processes



one bit for each process implemented in the physics list In addition: Identification of neutron-proton elastic scattering (in G4 a sub-set of hadron elastic) specifically in active medium







### **T3B MC: Impact of Digitization**







## **Old Results - Comparing Gas and Scintillator**





17

## **Old Results: Neutron Contributions - Scintillator**



- Dominant contribution of neutron elastic scattering between ~ 5 ns and 30 ns
- Neutron Capture Taking over at ~ 50 ns







## **Old Results: Neutron Contributions - Gas**



- Neutron elastic scattering not relevant
- Neutron Capture Taking over at ~75 ns somewhat later than in scintillator





### **Old Results: Relative Contributions - EM**



• Electromagnetic contributions important throughout the shower development





## **Old Results - Relative Contributions: Neutron Elastic**



 In scintillator: Almost all energy deposits from 5 ns - 30 ns are connected to neutron elastic scattering in the scintillator







## **Old Results - Relative Contributions: Neutron Capture**



 In the late shower phase ( > 50 ns) almost all activity has a neutron capture in its history



