





# ILD dimensional constraints

Henri Videau  
LLR – École polytechnique

A more or less organised set of questions  
as a contribution to the MDI/integration ,  
an introduction.



On the ILD boat



As seen in ILD00

Constraints from:

Hall, push-pull and opening,

Shielding

Accelerator,  $L^*$ 

End cap coils

QD0

background

Coil, field quality and (anti-)DID

## Playing with dimensions, construction constraints

About length

TPC end plate thickness

TPC end plate to ECAL (ETD) distance

End cap to barrel distance (overlap)

Using the tail catcher in the EC?

What does optimisation say about TPC length?

About radius

Coil thickness (DID)

HCAL thickness, sampling?  $W$ ? (in memoriam)


ECAL thickness and shape

TPC field cage thickness and shape

radius/SET

Reduce material inside


A plausible hall with the two detectors in push-pull





## Hall, push-pull and opening

ILD, as of today, makes more than 7m x7m and 14000 tons = 2x Eiffel tower (without restaurants)



To install in a hall,  
 To push and pull  
 To open (in garage position)  
 To fit between two quads  
 which “define” the luminosity

The deep yoke controls well radioactivity  
 But is designed to control the stray field

Then can we reduce its thickness by using  
 end cap coils (H Gerwig)? Or outside coil?  
 What are the terms of the bargain?

The current  $L^*$  for ILD is today 4.5m  
 Do we loose by not being shorter?


The  $L^*$  is the distance between IP and the front of QD0

The luminosity grows by reducing  $L^*$   
 forces QD0 in the detector  
 QD0 has to be stable to  $20\mu\text{m}$  or so  
 forces QD0 to be supported by the tunnel  
 then outside of the detector

The extra coils may help solve the problem

What is really in between  
 QD0 and Lumical?  
 Pump size?  
 Valves?

Do we need more space?  
 Can we reduce  $L^*$ ?





The background hurts Vdet but may hamper measuring the luminosity

### The DID dilemma

The TPC may require or not a rather homogeneous magnetic field  
( $\omega\tau \sim 15$ )

To achieve it requires, in the current yoke design, a peculiar coil  
and the DID destroys anyway this homogeneity.

What is the mechanical impact of DID on the coil structure?

Choice:

Drop the DID and make a nice but difficult field homogeneity


Changing the pole design?

Impact on background?

Drop the field homogeneity and relax

When to do this choice?

Yesterday





## About the length of the detector

End-cap yoke already discussed


The end-cap HCAL, sampling  $2 \rightarrow 3$  cm ( $1 \rightarrow 1.5 X_0$ ) gains 10cm, loses what?  
reduce the  $\lambda_1$  length using the tail catcher?

The end-cap ECAL, thickness may increase (+2cm in EUDET)  
But sampling may be coarser (20 layers -3cm)

TPC to ECAL play: 10cm  $\rightarrow$  6 ? ETD layers, TPC cables and services?

TPC end-plate thickness 10cm  $\rightarrow$  6? what does that contain?

Overlap between End-cap and barrel, services 2.5cm, + play  
Reduce it between Ecal parts to 5cm, for shower inefficiencies.  
May not be possible for Hcal.



But what says the optimisation about length?

What's important:

TPC length,  
Ecal distance,  
Lcal distance?

Could'nt we save 20 cm without changing the TPC length?



Would it be possible to have an acceptable ECAL reducing its cost by a good deal?

Going from the actual 30 layers to 20, still with two different thicknesses saves 25% of the overall Ecal cost.


Impacts the energy resolution by 22%,  
may impact the low energy efficiency

Improve the resolution by increasing the Si thickness to 800 $\mu$ m, more suitable for fabrication

Improve the low energy efficiency by using all the information, like counting and ...

Ongoing development

Changing the Si thickness from 150 $\mu$  to 1200.





What does contribute to the radius of the detector?

Yoke already discussed but for its shape

Impact of the DID on the coil thickness

Is there any impact of the compensation coils?

HCAL In the barrel the muon system does not really act as a tail catcher:  
Keep the interaction thickness, but the sampling? Gain 10cm?  
We could consider W but the overcost would be more than the ECAL!  
In memoriam

The ECAL thickness already discussed  
but reduce the 65mm dead zone between ECAL and HCAL to ?

## Impact of the ECAL shape

Keeping in mind that the outer limit of HCAL is close to circular

## Finding our way between eightfold and dodecagonal

Makes 9cm difference for the outer radius  
Impact on the Hcal, on the end-caps...

## TPC shape, what is going on in the corner? SET?

TPC outer field cage thickness 65mm → ?  
connection between TPC, SET, ECAL

With a precise SET how much can we play with the TPC radius?  
What is the stronger constraint, TPC radius or ECAL radius?


TPC inner field cage 65mm?

Interplay with the inner detectors structure  
Reduce the material budget

Largely a piecemeal adjustment



longueur externe 56.5 cm interne 125.7 cm



12 pans 5.6 cm

Some parameters need optimisation before a "baseline" model is defined.

Some principles need to be stated like "get your heat out".

This involves some thinking on physics and background  
some basic studies, reduced ECAL  
before a mechanics re-examination, cables, handling  
and the definition of a new simulation model.

We need to identify who is really able and willing to take things in hands  
(for example the beam tube design).

Just a question of **Who and When**

Have a list of the items , people in charge, milestones  
to reach our goal in time

January 2010 Couvent des Cordeliers Paris

# ILD Workshop 2010



IN2P3  
Les deux infinis




irfu

cea

saclay

**LPNHE**  
Laboratoire de physique nucléaire et des hautes énergies



Accepter for particle flow analysis  
Accepter for particle flow analysis  
Accepter for particle flow analysis