

## Dual-readout Calorimetry

N. Akchurin<sup>1</sup>, F. Bedeschi<sup>2</sup>, A. Cardini<sup>3</sup>, M. Cascella<sup>4</sup>, F. Ceci<sup>5</sup>, D. De Pedis<sup>6</sup>,  
S. Fracchia<sup>7</sup>, S. Franchino<sup>8</sup>, M. Fraternali<sup>7</sup>, G. Gaudio<sup>7</sup>, P. Genova<sup>9</sup>, J. Hauptman<sup>10</sup>,  
L. La Rotonda<sup>11</sup>, S. Lee<sup>1</sup>, M. Livan<sup>7</sup>, E. Meoni<sup>12</sup>, A. Moggi<sup>2</sup>, D. Pinci<sup>6</sup>,  
A. Policicchio<sup>11</sup>, J.G. Saraiva<sup>13</sup>, A. Sill<sup>1</sup>, T. Venturelli<sup>11</sup>, R. Wigmans<sup>1\*</sup>

1 - *Texas Tech University, Lubbock (TX), USA*

2 - *INFN Sezione di Pisa, Italy*

3 - *INFN Sezione di Cagliari, Monserrato (CA), Italy*

4 - *Dipartimento di Fisica, Universit'a di Salento, and INFN Sezione di Lecce, Italy*

5 - *Dipartimento di Fisica, Universit'a di Pisa, and INFN Sezione di Pisa Italy*

6 - *INFN Sezione di Roma, Italy*

7 - *INFN Sezione di Pavia, Italy*

8 - *CERN, Gen'ev, Switzerland*

9 - *INFN Sezione di Pavia and Dipartimento di Fisica, Universit'a di Pavia, Italy*

10 - *Iowa State University, Ames (IA), USA*

11 - *Dipartimento di Fisica, Universit'a della Calabria, and INFN Cosenza, Italy*

12 - *Tufts University, Medford (MA)*

13 - *LIP, Lisbon, Portugal*

### Abstract

The RD52 Project at CERN is a pure instrumentation experiment whose goal is to understand the fundamental limitations to hadronic energy resolution, and other aspects of energy measurement, in high energy calorimeters. We have found that dual-readout calorimetry provides heretofore unprecedented information event-by-event for energy resolution, linearity of response, ease and robustness of calibration, fidelity of data, and particle identification, including energy lost to binding energy in nuclear break-up. We believe that hadronic energy resolutions of  $\sigma/E \approx 1 - 2\%$  are within reach for dual-readout calorimeters, enabling for the first time comparable measurement precisions on electrons, photons, muons, and quarks (jets). We briefly describe our current progress and near-term future plans. Complete information on all aspects of our work is available at the RD52 website <http://highenergy.phys.ttu.edu/dream/>.

---

\*This work is supported by the US Department of Energy and by INFN, Italy.

## 1 Introduction

The DREAM collaboration is an official CERN project, RD52, taking beam test data in the North Area. Our emphasis is in dual-readout calorimetry in which each hadronic shower is measured in two nearly independent ways. In our fiber calorimeters, the absorber is impregnated with two independent particle measuring media, scintillating fibers for all charged particles of the shower, and clear or Čerenkov fibers for the relativistic particles which are predominately the electrons and positrons from the  $\gamma$ -initiated showers from  $\pi^0$  decay.

In our crystal calorimeters, both scintillation light and Čerenkov light are generated in the same optical volume, and the necessary separation of the two kinds of light is accomplished by using those features that distinguish Čerenkov light from scintillation light, *viz.*, time structure, direction, wavelength spectrum, and polarization. We have succeeded in crystal dual-readout in all crystals we have tested: pure  $PbWO_4$ , Molybdenum-doped  $PbWO_4:Mo$ , Praseodymium-doped  $PbWO_4:Pr$ , bismuth germanate  $BGO$ , and bismuth silicate  $BSO$ . These crystals display a wide range in scintillation intensity and lifetime, spectral characteristics, cost, and transparency. It is clear to us that dual-readout is easily achievable in almost any crystal.

In all calorimeters, the energy calibration of each calorimeter volume, tower, or crystal, is simple: for an electron beam energy of  $E_0$ , the mean response in scintillation light,  $S_{ADC}$ , and the mean response in Čerenkov light,  $C_{ADC}$ , both in units of ADC counts above pedestal, are calibrated as  $E_0/S_{ADC}$  and  $E_0/C_{ADC}$ , both constants in units of GeV/ADC.

The simplest formulation of dual-readout response considers hadronic showers to be composed of an electromagnetic ( $e$ ) part and a non-electromagnetic ( $h$ ) part. The  $e$  part is calibrated to unit response, and the resulting average response of the  $h$  part is denoted by  $(h/e)$ , which is less than unity for almost all reasonable calorimeters. If  $f_{EM}$  is the “electromagnetic fraction” and  $E$  is the hadronic energy (either single hadron or jet), and since the scintillation signal sums all charged particles of the shower, and the Čerenkov signal sums predominantly only the  $e$  part, the responses expected in the two signals are

$$S = E [f_{EM} + (1 - f_{EM}) (h/e)_S]$$

$$C = E [f_{EM} + (1 - f_{EM}) (h/e)_C]$$

For the original DREAM module,  $(h/e)_S \approx 0.7$  and  $(h/e)_C \approx 0.2$ [5], and the electromagnetic fraction,  $f_{EM}$  event-by-event, is approximately given by  $f_{EM} \approx C/E$ .

## 2 Fiber dual-readout calorimeters

The conceptual beginning of dual-readout was a talk at the Tucson calorimeter conference in 1997 [1], and the first dual-readout calorimeter was tested at CERN [2] and intended for the International Space Station before the Challenger accident. The first high energy physics proof-of-principle test module was the DREAM module [3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 12, 16].

The distribution of  $S$  vs.  $C$  for 100 GeV  $\pi^-$  is shown in Fig. 1 in which  $S$  is always greater than  $C$ . The distribution of  $S$  for 200 GeV  $\pi^-$  is shown in Fig. 1(a), displaying the expected energy resolution for a sampling scintillation calorimeter. Note that (1) the mean energy is wrong; (2) the distribution is asymmetric with a high-side tail; and, (3) the distribution is non-Gaussian. When the above equations are solved for  $f_{EM}$  and  $E$ , the distribution of  $E$  is shown in Fig. 1(b) to have the correct energy, to be symmetric, and

to be Gaussian. These are the essential attributes of dual-readout calorimetry that make it so powerful and useful for physics. When the beam energy is substituted for the shower energy and the electromagnetic fraction re-estimated,  $f_{EM} \sim C/E \rightarrow f_{EM} \sim C/E_{beam}$ , the resulting distribution of  $E$  is shown in Fig. 1(c). This figure is important. Its width corresponds to a hadronic energy resolution of

$$\sigma/E \approx \frac{20\%}{\sqrt{E}}, \quad (\text{experimentally expected resolution of a dream-like calorimeter})$$

and this finite width is determined by the measured fluctuations in  $S$  and  $C$ . Therefore, a conclusion can be made that a DREAM-like module (Cu absorber with scintillating and clear fibers) is capable, in the extreme case of zero leakage, of achieving the spectacular energy resolution of  $20\%/\sqrt{E}$ . This resolution is close to that expected from the imperfect correlation between the unmeasurable binding energy losses in broken-up nuclei and the corresponding neutrons that are released into the calorimeter volume [29],

$$\sigma/E \approx \frac{15\%}{\sqrt{E}}, \quad (\text{theoretically expected lower limit})$$




Figure 1: The characteristic “banana” shape of the S and C signals at 100 GeV  $\pi^-$ ; (a) the distribution of the S signal; (b) the distribution of the shower energy  $E$  as the solution to the two equations above; and, (c) the solution for  $E$  when the leakage is artificially suppressed by replacing  $f_{EM} \sim C/E$  by  $f_{EM} \sim C/E_{beam}$  for the estimate of the electromagnetic fraction.

Getting the correct hadronic energy is a big deal. Most big detector collaborations have “jet energy scale” groups working continuously to establish not only the correct energies of




Figure 3: Measured response of the dual readout calorimeters of RD52 for hadrons from 5 to 150 GeV. Each module was calibrated only with 60 GeV electrons. The 2% drop at low beam energy is due to material in the beam chambers upstream.

jets, but also to estimate the systematic uncertainty on this scale. In many physics problems at the Tevatron, for example, the uncertainty in the jet energy scale would dominate all other uncertainties in a physics measurement. In a dual-readout calorimeter, one calibration is done with electrons of any energy into each tower and the calibration constant is known, and the hadronic energy scale is determined and correct. In practice in the beam at CERN, we calibrate once at the beginning and once at the end of a week of data taking.

The linearity of the original DREAM module from 20 to 300 GeV is published [5], and the recently measured linearity of the new RD52 modules, both Pb-absorber and Cu-absorber, is shown in Fig. 3. It deserves to be emphasized that the mean values in these plots are from fits to Gaussians in each case.

## 2.1 EM and hadronic responses

The electromagnetic response of the new RD52 modules is shown in Fig. 2. This response is also Gaussian. When the full complement of Pb and Cu modules is complete, amounting to about 5 tons of absorber with an expected mean lateral leakage of 1%, we will test this calorimeter module for hadronic energy resolution.




Figure 2: DREAM electromagnetic energy resolution.[25]



Figure 5: The 100-crystal BGO array placed in front of the DREAM module and exposed to electron and pion beams incident from the lower left in this photo.

### 3 Crystal dual-readout calorimeters

Extensive work on several different crystals is published in *Nucl. Instru. Meths.* [10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24]. A typical separation of Čerenkov light from scintillation light in a BGO crystal is shown in Fig. 4. These BGO crystals were arranged in an 10-by-10 crystal array and placed in front of the DREAM module, as shown in Fig. 5 This configuration is similar to separate electromagnetic and hadronic dual-readout calorimeters in a collider experiment [30] and constitutes a particularly challenging combination of two very different dual-readout calorimeters. Nevertheless, when exposed to 200 GeV  $\pi^+$  beam, the hadronic energy resolution was found to be about 4%, consistent with




Figure 4: The PMT pulse from a BGO crystal exposed to an electron beam. The prompt light at  $t = 0$  is Čerenkov light and the longer tail is the scintillation light with its expected 300ns lifetime. Two gates on this single PMT suffice to give good measurements of the the Čerenkov and scintillation light populations.

the expected lateral leakage from this combined BGO-crystal plus fiber calorimeter, shown in Fig. 5. The energy distribution is shown in Fig. 6(a), a nearly perfect Gaussian at the correct energy.




Figure 6: (a) Energy resolution of 200 GeV  $\pi^+$  in the detector configuration of Fig. 5; (b) simulation by DREAM data of  $W \rightarrow \text{jet} + \text{jet}$ , and  $Z \rightarrow \text{jet} + \text{jet}$ . [31]

The hadronic decays of the  $W$  and  $Z$  are of paramount importance in all future experiments at any collider, lepton or hadron, and measurements of the decays  $W \rightarrow q\bar{q}$  and  $Z \rightarrow q\bar{q}$  to high precision are essential. We have used DREAM data to simulate these decays by randomly selecting events for the beam data files and setting the angle between the two DREAM modules to properly sample the  $W$  or  $Z$  Breit-Wigner, and find that a dual-readout module can achieve better than a Rayleigh criterion on  $W$ - $Z$  separation by direct di-jet mass measurement, Fig. 6(b).

## 4 Particle Identification

Cogent physics in a collider experiment derives from precision measurements combined with high-probability particle identifi-




Figure 7: A multi-variate discriminant, MLP, of  $e^\pm$  from  $\pi^\pm$  using the fraction of Fig. 8, an S/C measurement, and a time-depth measurement.  $\pi^\pm$  rejections of 99.9% for  $e^\pm$  efficiencies of 99.9% are achievable.

cation. In dual-readout calorimeters, we have achieved both of these in the same instrument.

A description of particle identification in all the detectors in a collider detector is given in Ref. [32]. Here we describe only a couple of those which depend exclusively on the dual-readout calorimeter [33], specifically  $e^\pm$  separation from  $\pi^\pm$  and jets, and single  $\mu^\pm$  separation from single  $\pi^\pm$ . Although these are based on beam data with, necessarily, one particle at a time, these same methods and measurements are extendable to the interiors of jets with the fine lateral segmentation that is possible in a fiber dual-readout calorimeter.

The physics selected by nearly pure  $e^\pm$  and  $\mu^\pm$  samples includes  $W^\pm \rightarrow l\nu$ ,  $Z^0 \rightarrow l\bar{l}$ ,  $\tau^\pm \rightarrow l\nu\bar{\nu}$ , and  $H^0 \rightarrow W^+W^-$ ,  $H^0 \rightarrow e^+e^-$ ,  $H^0 \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$ ,  $H^0 \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-$  decays, and others with tertiary decays to leptons. Of course, lepton identification is also a window to unknown physics.

#### 4.1 $e^\pm$ separation from $\pi^\pm$ and jets (*j*)

Electron showers are very narrow and one criterion is the fraction of a particle's energy that is contained in the calorimeter tower this is hit. These distributions are shown in Fig. 8 for electrons and pions at two energies, 20 GeV and 60 GeV. By eye, the separation is close to 100-to-1. Combining this measurement with the timing, similar to that achieved in SPACAL [34], and also with an  $S/C$  measurement, the combined separation is shown in Fig. 7 after a multi-variate analysis [33]. The rejection here is about 1000-to-1 while retained an exceedingly high electron acceptance of 99.9%. These numbers are so favorable that, in a real  $4\pi$  experiment with backgrounds of many sorts, the final rejection-efficiency relation may not be so favorable, but this is a good starting point. A further independent measure was made by SPACAL [34] and shown in Fig. 9 for 80 GeV  $e^-$  and  $\pi^-$ . Simply put, all electron showers look the same in time and space, whereas pion initiated showers contain large fluctuations in electromagnetic fraction, neutron content, and spallation proton energy deposits. These appear as a large variations in the time it takes for the last of these particles to come to rest. This time is represented as the "full width at one-fifth maximum (FWFM)" on the  $t$ -axis. Evidently, the separation is about 100-to-1. This time measurement is similar to one of the three measurements that were included in




Figure 8: (a) The fraction of energy deposited in the hit tower for 20 GeV  $\pi^-$ 's and  $e^-$ 's; (b) same for 60 GeV  $\pi^-$ 's and  $e^-$ 's.

the MLP discriminator [33].

Clearly, this same discriminant can be implemented in a dual-readout calorimeter using only the scintillating fibers and, more importantly, we expect to read out all channels at 5 GHz to have complete control over the optimization of this discriminator. Also, it is the long-time tail of this scintillation signal that yields the neutron signal in the DREAM and RD52 calorimeters.

#### 4.2 $\mu^\pm$ separation from $\pi^\pm$

$\mu^\pm$  that traverse the small 1-ton DREAM module approximately aligned with the fibers allow a unique  $\mu^\pm$  identification: the Čerenkov angle is larger than the capture angle of the clear fibers and, therefore, the Čerenkov photoelectron signal is zero. The scintillation signal is, as expected, about 1.1 GeV for the 2-meter module. In the event of a hard bremsstrahlung or pair production by the muon within the body of the DREAM MODULE, that energy is purely electromagnetic for which the scintillation and Čerenkov responses are equal. Therefore, for a muon,  $S - C \approx 1.1$  GeV, but it is different for a  $\pi^\pm$ . Distributions of  $(S - C)$  vs.  $(S + C)/2$  for  $\mu^-$  in the DREAM module [3] are shown in Fig. 10 for 20 GeV  $\mu^-$  and  $\pi^-$  and 200 GeV  $\mu^-$  and  $\pi^-$ . Clearly, the discrimination is excellent at higher energies, but it is still as good as 1000-to-1 at 20 GeV. We have not been able to test to lower beam energies in the H2 beam at CERN, but will resume this work in the H8 beam at LHC start-up.

Of course, the calorimeter absorber itself provides for muon-pion discrimination and, in the 4th detector [30] the second magnetic field region in the annulus between the dual-solenoids, even further muon-pion discrimination is possible with an energy balance criterion using the main tracker, the calorimeter, and the second muon momentum measurement. Rejections as large as  $10^5$ -to-1 were calculated, but clearly confusion and other effects will limit this particle identification long before  $10^5$  is reached. Nevertheless, this is a good starting point for  $\mu^\pm$  identification.

Dual-readout is rich in unique and powerful particle identification measurements from which we have only discussed a few. In fact, it was argued in [30] that all patrons of the standard model are identifiable with a sufficiently well designed calorimeter inside a good detector.

## 5 Summary




Figure 9: The full-width at one-fifth maximum of the scintillation signal in SPACAL.



We understand the fiber and crystal dual-readout modules that we have built, and the performance of these modules is limited mainly by lateral leakage. To solve this, we are building a large module that is expected to have a mean energy leakage of about 1%, and this large calorimeter consists of separate smaller Pb-absorber and Cu-absorber modules.

Our near-term work in the next two years consists of (i) the building of a one-ton Cu dual-readout module by rolling the Cu, (ii) the building of a small W-absorber module, (iii) the completion of a 5-ton module that will function both as a Pb-module and a Cu-module, and (iv) the direct comparison of the fundamental limitations to hadronic calorimetry in Pb, Cu, and W. In parallel, we will (v) devise and test new optical readout schemes other than PMTs, (vi) formulate a GEANT4-based simulation of RD52 measurements, (vii) design and test a gaseous dual-readout module, and (viii) design fiber wedges for a  $4\pi$  calorimeter.

The two reports to the SPS Council [27, 28] are a more complete and more technical description of the present and future expectations of RD52.

## References

- [1] “Quartz Fibers & the Prospects for Hadronic Calorimetry at the 1% Resolution Level,” R. Wigmans, *VII International Conference on Calorimetry in High Energy Physics*, Tucson, AZ, 11 Nov. 1997.
- [2] Vladimir Nagaslaev, Alan Sill, Richard Wigmans, “Beam tests of a thin dual-readout calorimeter for detecting cosmic rays outside the Earth’s atmosphere,” *Nucl. Instr. and Meth. A* **462** (2001) 411.
- [3] N. Akchurin, *et al.*, “Muon detection with a dual-readout calorimeter,” *Nucl. Instr. and Meth. A* **533** (2005) 305.
- [4] N. Akchurin, *et al.*, “Electron detection with a dual-readout calorimeter,” *Nucl. Instr. and Meth. A* **536** (2005) 29.
- [5] N. Akchurin, *et al.*, “Hadron and jet detection with a dual-readout calorimeter,” *Nucl. Instr. and Meth. A* **537** (2005) 537.
- [6] N. Akchurin, *et al.*, “Comparison of High-Energy Electromagnetic Shower Profiles Measured with Scintillation and Cherenkov Light,” *Nucl. Instr. and Meth. A* **548** (2005) 336.
- [7] N. Akchurin, *et al.*, “Separation of Scintillation and Cherenkov Light in an Optical Calorimeter,” *Nucl. Instr. and Meth. A* **550** (2005) 185.
- [8] R. Wigmans, “The DREAM project—Results and plans,” *Nucl. Instr. and Meth. A* **572** (2007) 215.
- [9] N. Akchurin, *et al.*, “Measurement of the Contribution of Neutrons to Hadron Calorimeter Signals,” *Nucl. Instr. and Meth. A* **581** (2007) 643.
- [10] N. Akchurin, *et al.*, “Contributions of Cherenkov light to the signals from lead tungstate crystals,” *Nucl. Instr. and Meth. A* **582** (2007) 474.




Figure 10: Dual-readout separation of  $\mu - \pi^\pm$ .

- [11] N. Akchurin, *et al.*, “Dual-Readout Calorimetry with Lead Tungstate Crystals,” *Nucl. Instr. and Meth. A* **584** (2008) 273.
- [12] N. Akchurin, *et al.*, “Comparison of High-Energy Hadronic Shower Profiles Measured with Scintillation and Cherenkov Light,” *Nucl. Instr. and Meth. A* **584** (2008) 304.
- [13] N. Akchurin, *et al.*, “Effects of the temperature dependence of the signals from lead tungstate crystals,” *Nucl. Instr. and Meth. A* **593** (2008) 530.
- [14] N. Akchurin, *et al.*, “Separation of crystal signals into scintillation and Cherenkov components,” *Nucl. Instr. and Meth. A* **595** (2008) 359.
- [15] M. Nikl, *et al.*, “Luminescence and scintillation characteristics of heavily  $Pr^{3+}$ -doped  $PbWO_4$  single crystals,” *Journal of Applied Physics* 104, (2008) 093514.
- [16] N. Akchurin, *et al.*, “Neutron Signals for Dual-Readout Calorimetry,” *Nucl. Instr. and Meth. A* **598** (2009) 422.
- [17] N. Akchurin, *et al.*, “Dual-Readout Calorimetry with Crystal Calorimeters,” *Nucl. Instr. and Meth. A* **598** (2009) 710.
- [18] N. Akchurin, *et al.*, “New crystals for dual-readout calorimetry,” *Nucl. Instr. and Meth. A* **604** (2009) 512.
- [19] N. Akchurin, *et al.*, “Dual-readout calorimetry with a full-size BGO electromagnetic section,” *Nucl. Instr. and Meth. A* **610** (2009) 488.
- [20] R. Wigmans, “The DREAM project - Towards the ultimate in calorimetry,” *Nucl. Instr. and Meth. A* **617** (2010) 129.
- [21] N. Akchurin, *et al.*, “Optimization of crystals for applications in dual-readout calorimetry,” *Nucl. Instr. and Meth. A* **621** (2010) 212.
- [22] N. Akchurin, *et al.*, “Polarization as a tool for dual-readout calorimetry,” *Nucl. Instr. and Meth. A* **638** (2011) 47.
- [23] N. Akchurin, *et al.*, “A comparison of BGO and BSO crystals used in the dual-readout mode,” *Nucl. Instr. and Meth. A* **640** (2011) 91.
- [24] N. Akchurin, *et al.*, “Detection of electron showers in Dual-Readout crystal calorimeters,” *Nucl. Instr. and Meth. in Phys. Res. A* **686** (2012) 125. (paper, figures)
- [25] N. Akchurin, *et al.*, “The electromagnetic performance of the RD52 fiber calorimeter,” submitted to *NIM*
- [26] N. Akchurin, *et al.*, “Particle identification in the longitudinally unsegmented RD52 calorimeter,” submitted to *NIM*.
- [27] Progress Report to the SPS Committee, G. Gaudio and R. Wigmans, “Dual-readout Calorimetry for High-quality Energy Measurements,” 3 April 2012.
- [28] Progress Report to the SPS Committee, “Dual-readout Calorimetry for High-quality Energy Measurements,” 9 April 2013, G. Gaudio and R. Wigmans,
- [29] *Calorimetry - Energy Measurement in Particle Physics*, Richard Wigmans, Oxford University Press, 2000.
- [30] “Letter of Intent from the Fourth Detector (4thÓ) Collaboration at the International Linear Collider,” available at [www.4thconcept.org/4LoI.pdf](http://www.4thconcept.org/4LoI.pdf), 31 March 2009.
- [31] 4th Concept Detector Outline Document is available at the WWS-OC website <http://physics.uoregon.edu/~lc/wwstudy/concepts/>.
- [32] “Dual-readout, particle identification, and 4th,” *Nucl. Instr. Meths. A* **623** (2010) 237; *et alius*, John Hauptman, *et alia*, Fedor Ignatov.
- [33] “Particle identification in the longitudinally unsegmented RD52 fiber calorimeter,” submitted to *NIM*.
- [34] SPACAL calorimeter: Acosta, D., *et al.*, *NIM*, **A302** (1991) 36.