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## Overview

- Mu2e is going to probe $\mu$-e conversion in an muonic atom at an unprecedented sensitivity



## The number of stopped muons

- Mu2e is going to probe $\mu$-e conversion in an muonic atom at an unprecedented sensitivity

$$
\text { S.E.S. }\left(\mu^{-}+\mathrm{Al} \rightarrow e^{-}+\mathrm{Al}\right)=3.0 \times 10^{-17} \sim \frac{1}{N_{\mu}}
$$

- Number of stopped muons $N_{\mu}$
- designed value $N_{\mu}=6.8 \times 10^{17}$
- need to measure in the real experiment to $10 \%$ precision


## Pulsed proton beam

- $6 \times 10^{20}$ protons delivered in 3 years
- Proton pulses are 1695 ns apart
- $3.1 \times 10^{7}$ protons per pulse
- Conversion electron search window: 700-1600 ns

$\pi, \mu$ arrives at the muon stopping target


## Conceptual design

- Measuring observable(s) directly associated with a stopped muon
- characteristic muonic X-rays
- prompt gamma rays
- decay-in-orbit electrons
- Obvious issues due to Mu2e beam characteristics:
- very high rate
- radiation damage


## Xrays and gammas

## Xrays and gammas

| Transition | $E(k e V)$ | $\mathbf{I}(\%)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2 p \rightarrow \mathbf{1 s}$ | 346.83 | 79.8 |
| $3 d \rightarrow \mathbf{2 p}$ | 66.11 | 67.6 |
| $3 p \rightarrow \mathbf{1 s}$ | 412.87 | 7.6 |
| $4 p \rightarrow \mathbf{1 s}$ | 435.96 | 4.9 |

Muonic X-ray from AI prompt with atomic capture
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## Xrays and gammas

| Transition | E(keV) | $I(\%)$ |
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Main gamma of interest, prompt with nuclear capture

| Energy | 1808.7 keV |
| :---: | :---: |
| Lifetime | 476 fs |
| Intensity | $51 \%$ |

Muonic X-ray from AI prompt with atomic capture

## Conceptual design

- Collimators to define the view of the stopping target
- Minimize that rate



## Detector candidates



- High-purity Ge (HPGe):
- excellent energy resolution (<2 keV)
- slow
- susceptible to radiation damage
- LaBr3:
- worse energy resolution
- very fast
- radiation hard


## Simulation

- Mu2e's Geant4-based software with full geometry
- $8 \times 10^{11}$ protons on target simulated in total
- Observed particles at several virtual detector planes downstream of the muon stopping target



## Measurement window

- Timing of hits just upstream of the detectors



## Particle types



## Hit rate estimation

- 160 kHz instantaneous rate on the HPGe/LaBr3 detectors
- nominal $3.1 \times 10^{7}$ protons per pulse
- 1.7 нs interval between pulses
- Commercial HPGe's performance falls off around 10 kHz
- Purdue group achieved 2 keV resolution, $3.2 \%$ event loss at 150 kHz
- Also have experience with annealing
- An absorber is still needed upstream of these detectors


## Performance test of Ge detectors

- A beamtest at ELBE
(Dresden) is scheduled in early August
- High flux pulsed gamma beam
- driven by a continuouswave electron beam
- mimic the expected rate ~ 160 kHz
- Detector performance
 after a flash


## Summary

- Counting number of stopped muons is important for Mu2e
- Baseline design: use a HPGe detector to measure prompt X-rays and gammas.
- need to solve problem of high rate and radiation damage
- Simulation work and beam test are ongoing to finalize the design.
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4. Deadtime and Event Loss Issue at Continuous Mode

Event Loss Fraction $=1-\frac{\text { Registered Events }}{\text { Pileup Events }+ \text { Detected Events (-Cosmic Events) }}$


For rates $\sim 100 \mathrm{kHz}$, the DMA algorithm is able to keep:
(1) Dynamic range overflow event loss $<5.8 \times 10^{-3}$
(2) Pile-up event loses to $<2.6 \times 10^{-2}$
in both $\sim 100 \%$ n-type and p-type HPGe detectors.

HPGe high gain energy spectra, all Al runs


$$
347 \mathrm{keV}(\sigma=0.884 \mathrm{keV}) \quad 844 \mathrm{keV}(\sigma=0.76 \mathrm{keV}) \quad 1809 \mathrm{keV}(\sigma=1.8 \mathrm{keV})
$$

Incident on the det.:

| S/B | $112.9 / 289.2=0.39$ | $6.7 / 113.7=0.06$ | $56.9 / 118.7=0.48$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| S/B (prompt) | $100.1 / 10.0=10.1$ | $5.9 / 3.9=1.5$ | $50.5 / 4.1=12.3$ |
| S/B (semi-prompt) | $12.3 / 1.0=11.9$ | $0.73 / 0.41=1.79$ | $6.2 / 0.43=14.5$ |

