The Mu2e Experiment at Fermilab

Doug Glenzinski Fermilab July 21, 2009





Introduction

- We expect that colliders might soon yield direct observation of New Physics particles/interactions
 - Tevatron is probing mass scales of ~1 TeV
 - LHC will probe mass scales of a few TeV
- To get a full understanding of the New Physics will require measurements the colliders can't do
 - Determining the parameters of the PMNS matrix
 - Determining whether or not mixing occurs in the charged lepton sector (Charged Lepton Flavor Violation - CLFV)
 - Proton decay, CKM matrix, DM Searches, etc.

Introduction

- Mu2e experiment is a search for Charged Lepton Flavor Violation (CLFV)
 - Coherent conversion μ⁻N --> e⁻N
- Strictly speaking, forbidden in Standard Model
 - But since $m_v > 0$ we now know it's allowed
 - Rate proportional to $(\Delta m_v^2 / M_W^2)^2$ so practically still absent from SM e.g. BR(μ -->e γ)~10⁻⁵⁴
 - Observation thus offers unambiguous evidence for New Physics

 In wide array of New Physics models CLFV processes occur at rates we can observe with next generation experiments

sensitive to effective mass scales well beyond collider energies

Some CLFV Processes

Process	Current Limit	Next Generation exp
τ> μη	BR < 6.5 E-8	
τ> μγ	BR < 6.8 E-8	10 ⁻⁹ - 10 ⁻¹⁰ (SuperB)
τ> μμμ	BR < 3.2 E-8	
τ> eee	BR < 3.6 E-8	
К _L > еµ	BR < 4.7 E-12	
K+> π+e ⁻ μ+	BR < 1.3 E-11	
B ⁰ > eμ	BR < 7.8 E-8	
B+> Κ+eμ	BR < 9.1 E-8	
μ+> e+γ	BR < 1.2 E-11	10 ⁻¹³ - 10 ⁻¹⁴ (MEG)
μ ⁺ > e ⁺ e ⁺ e ⁻	BR < 1.0 E-12	
μN> eN	R _{μe} < 4.3 E-12	10 ⁻¹⁶ (Mu2e, COMET)

(current limits from the PDG)

- Relative sensitivities model dependent
- Measure several to pin-down <u>NP details</u>

D.Glenzinski

New Physics Contributions to Mu2e



 The μN-->eN process is sensitive to wide array of New Physics processes

D.Glenzinski

🛟 Fermilab

Mu2e Experiment

- Anticipate a phased program at Fermilab
 - Phase I: use Booster cycles left unused by Nova
 - Phase II: use spare protons from Project-X
- Presently optimizing (Phase-I) experiment and beam line
 - At present, largely based on MECO proposal
 - Account for differences between BNL/FNAL accelerator complex
 - Take advantage of technological advances
- Strongly endorsed by Fermilab PAC and P5

Mu2e Sensitivity

- Single Event Sensitivity = 2×10^{-17}
 - For 10¹⁸ stopped muons
 - If $R_{ue} = 10^{-15}$ will observe ~50 events
 - If $R_{\mu e} = 10^{-16}$ will observe ~ 5 events
- Expected background < 0.5 event
 - Assuming 2 x 10⁷ seconds of run time
- Expected limit < 6 x 10⁻¹⁷ @ 90% CL
- >5σ sensitivity for all rates > few E-16 (my estimate)
 LHC accessible SuSy gives rates as large as 10⁻¹⁵

Mu2e Sensitivty



Target Mu2e Sensitivity best in all scenarios

D.Glenzinski

‡ Fermilab

Mu2e Sensitivity



A specific example in the context of SuSy

D.Glenzinski

🛟 Fermilab

Mu2e Sensitivity



Some more specific examples

D.Glenzinski

🛟 Fermilab

Mu2e Concept

- Generate a beam of low momentum muons (μ⁻)
- Stop the muons in a target
 - Mu2e plans to use aluminum
 - Sensitivity goal requires ~10¹⁸ stopped muons
- The stopped muons are trapped in orbit around the nucleus
 - In orbit around aluminum: $\tau_{u}^{AI} = 864$ ns
 - Large τ_{μ}^{N} important for discriminating background
- Look for events consistent with $\mu N \rightarrow eN$
 - Use a delayed timing window to suppress bgd

Mu2e Signal

Proceeds from the 1S state

 Use x-rays as muons transition to 1S from atomic excited states to monitor rate of stopped-µ in situ

- The process is a coherent decay
 - The nucleus is kept intact
- Experimental signature is an electron and nothing else
 - Energy of electron: $E_e = m_{\mu} E_{recoil} E_{1S-B.E.}$
 - For aluminum: E_e=104.96 MeV
 - Important for discriminating background
 - Signal window: 103.6-105.1 MeV accepts 62% signal

Mu2e Background

Category	Source	Events
	μ Decay in Orbit	0.225
Intrinsic	Radiative μ Capture	<0.002
	Radiative π Capture	0.072
	Beam electrons	0.036
	μ Decay in Flight	<0.063
Late Arriving	π Decay in Flight	<0.001
	Long Transit	0.006
	Cosmic Ray	0.016
Miscellaneous	Pat. Recognition Errors	<0.002
Total Background	0.42	

(assuming 1E18 stopped muons in 2E7 s of run time)

Designed to be nearly background free

D.Glenzinski

Mu2e Intrinsic Backgrounds

Once trapped in orbit, muons will:

- 1) Decay in orbit (DIO): $\mu^- N \rightarrow e^- v_{\mu} v_e N$
 - For AI. DIO fraction is 39%
 - Electron spectrum has tail out to 105 MeV
 - Accounts for ~55% of total background



Electron energy in MeV

Mu2e Intrinsic Backgrounds

Once trapped in orbit, muons will:

- 2) Capture on the nucleus:
 - For AI. capture fraction is 61%
 - Ordinary μ Capture
 - $\mu^- N_Z \nu N_{Z-1}$
 - Used for normalization
 - Radiative μ capture
 - μ⁻N_Z --> νN_{Z-1} + γ
 - (# Radiative / # Ordinary) ~ 1 / 100,000
 - E_y kinematic end-point ~102 MeV
 - Asymmetric γ -->e⁺e⁻ pair production can yield a background electron

Mu2e Late Arriving Backgrounds

- Backgrounds arising from all the other interactions which occur at the production target
 - Overwhelmingly produce a prompt background when compared to τ_{μ}^{AI} = 864 ns
 - Eliminated by defining a signal timing window starting
 700 ns after the initial proton pulse
 - Must eliminate out-of-time ("late") protons, which would otherwise generate these backgrounds in time with the signal window

out-of-time protons / in-time protons < 10⁻⁹

Mu2e Late Arriving Backgrounds

- Contributions from
 - Radiative π Capture
 - $\pi^-N_Z N_{Z-1}^* + \gamma$
 - For Al. $R\pi C$ fraction: 2%
 - E_{v} extends out to $\sim m_{\pi}$
 - Asymmetric $\gamma --> e^+e^-$ pair production can yield background electron
 - Beam electrons
 - Originating from upstream π^- and π^0 decays
 - Electrons scatter in stopping target to get into detector acceptance
 - Muon and pion Decay-in-Flight
- Taken together these backgrounds account for ~45% of the total background and scale *linearly* with the number of out-of-time protons

Mu2e Miscellaneous Backgrounds

 Several additional miscellaneous sources can contribute background - most importantly

Anti-protons

- Proton beam is just above pbar production threshold
- These low momentum pbars wander until they annihilate
- 150 μm mylar window in decay volume absorbs them all
- Annihilations produce lots of stuff e.g. π⁻ can undergo RπC to yield a background electron

Cosmic rays

- Suppressed by passive and active shielding
- μ DIF or interactions in the detector material can give an e⁻ or γ that yield a background electron
- Background listed assumes veto efficiency of 99.99%

Mu2e Experimental Requirements

Beamline

- Narrow pulses (<100ns full width) of ~10⁸ protons each, delivered every ~2* τ_u^{Al} ~ 1700 ns
- Stringent out-of-time requirements for POT
- High duty cycle preferred
- Detector
 - Excellent spectrometer resolution (< 1MeV FWHM)
 - High efficiency (99.99%) cosmic veto shield
 - In situ monitoring of stopped-µ rate
 - Capable of handling high rates

Mu2e Beamline



- Use 8 GeV protons from Booster to produce π⁻, which decay π⁻ --> μ⁻ν
- Use a system of solenoids and collimators to momentum and signselect μ⁻
- No impact on Nova
- Aiming for high duty cycle

Mu2e Beamline

 Fermilab complex well matched to beam timing requirements for Mu2e



D.Glenzinski

🛟 Fermilab

Mu2e Production Target

- Gold or Tungsten target, water cooled
- Capture (mostly) backwards going pions
 - Eliminates backgrounds from the primary beam
 - Expect something like (1 stopped-µ / 400 POT)



Mu2e Transport Solenoid

- Designed to sign select the muon beam
 - Collimator blocks positives after first bend
 - Negatives brought back on axis by the second bend
 - No line of sight between primary target and detector



D.Glenzinski

Mu₂e Detector

1.0T

Electromagnetic

Calorimeter

- 1.2k PbWO₄ crystals
- $\sigma_{\rm E}$ / E = 5% at 100 MeV
- confirmation of track
- can provide a trigger

Tracker

1.0 T Solenoidal Field

- 2.8k 3m long straws
- 17k cathode pads
- intrinsic resolution at 105 MeV/c: 190 keV/c

Target

Stopping

• 17 Al. foils each 200 μ m thick

Graded Field for

Magnetic Mirror Effect

- spaced 5 cm apart
- radius tapers 10.0 to 6.5 cm
- < <4% radiation length

Designed to detect 105 MeV signal and suppress DIO •

D.Glenzinski

辈 Fermilab

u beam

2.0T

Mu2e Status and Schedule

- Have Stage-1 approval from Fermilab PAC
- Expect DOE CD-0 approval this summer and aim for CD-1 in 2010
- Cost estimated at \$ 200M (fully loaded, escalated, and including contingencies)



Mu2e R&D

- Broad R&D campaign identified
 - Design and Specifications of Solenoids
 - Optimization of the production and transport regions
 - Demonstrating resolution and rate capabilities of various tracker options
 - Rethinking calorimeter and trigger requirements
 - Demonstrating cosmic ray veto efficiency and characterizing response to neutrons
 - Developing robust monitoring of out-of-time protons
 - Developing thorough and accurate simulation
 - Measuring proton, neutron rates from stopped muons
- New collaborators welcome!

Conclusions

- Understanding charged lepton flavor physics necessary to fully illuminate New Physics
- μN --> eN among most sensitive probes of Charged Lepton Flavor Violating processes
- Fermilab complex well suited to delivering the necessary beam for a phase-I experiment
- Mu2e experiment with a single-event-sensitivity of 2E-17 being enthusiastically pursued
 - Improves current world's best by 10⁴
 - Probes mass scales well beyond LHC's capabilities
 - Two year run starting as early as 2016
 - Clear upgrade path using Project-X

Mu2e Collaboration

http://www-mu2e.fnal.gov

Boston University J.Miller, R.Carey, K.Lynch, B. L.Roberts

Brookhaven National Laboratory P.Yamin, W.Marciano, Y.Semertzidis

University of California, Berkeley Y.Kolomensky

University of Calivornia, Irvine W.Molzon

City University of New York J.Popp

Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory

C.Ankenbrandt, R.Bernstein, D.Bogert, S.Brice, D.Broemmelsiek, R.Coleman, D.DeJongh, S.Geer, D.Glenzinski, D.Johnson, R.Kutschke, M.Lamm, P.Limon, M.Martens, S.Nagaitsev, D.Neuffer, M.Popovic, E.Prebys, R.Ray, V.Rusu, P.Shanahan, M.Syphers, H.White, B.Tschirhart, K.Yonehara, C.Yoshikawa

> Idaho State University K.Keeter, E.Tatar

University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign P.Kammel, G.Gollin, P.Debevec, D.Hertzog

Institute for Nuclear Research, Moscow, Russia V.Lobashev

University of Massachusetts, Amherst K.Kumar, D.Kawall

Muons, Inc. T.Roberts, R.Abrams, M.Cummings R.Johnson, S.Kahn, S.Korenev, R.Sah

> Northwestern University A.De Gouvea

Instituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare Pisa, Universita Di Pisa, Pisa, Italy L.Ristori, R.Carosi, F.Cervelli, T.Lomtadze, M.Incagli, F.Scuri, C.Vannini

> Rice University M.Corcoran

Syracuse University P.Souder, R.Holmes

University of Virginia E.C.Dukes, M.Bychkov, E.Frlez, R.Hirosky, A.Norman, K.Paschke, D.Pocanic

College of William and Mary J.Kane

~70 Members 17 Institutions

b

2

Backup Slides

D.Glenzinski

🛟 Fermilab

Mu2e Signal vs Background

DIO vs Signal E spectrum



Mu2e Phase-II Possibilities

- If Phase-1 Observes a signal:
 - Change target to probe coupling (vector, scalar, etc)
 - Need to go to high Z
 - Hard because τ small for large Z (τ_{μ}^{Au} =72ns)
 - But DIO backgrounds are suppressed and signal rate increases
- This is a unique feature of the μN-->eN measurements

