Impact of Larger Uninstrumented Region in BeamCal with 20mrad X-angle

New addition to an earlier study

"Experimental Implications for a Linear Collider of the SUSY Dark Matter Scenario"

> by P. Bambade, M. Berggren, F. Richard, Z. Zhang

> [hep-ph/0406010] & contribution to LCWS'04

Reminder of That Earlier Study

Addresses detection issues for stau mainly for benchmark point D both in head-on collisions and collisions with a 10 mrad half X-angle

Battaglia-De Roeck-Ellis-Gianatti-Olive-Pape, hep-ph/0306219



Main Challenges for the Stau Analyses

$$e^+e^- \rightarrow stau^+ stau^- \rightarrow \chi^0 \tau^+ \chi^0 \tau^-$$

Cross sections: 10fb @ 500GeV, 4.6fb @ 442GeV

- SM backgrounds are many orders of magnitude larger
 Need very efficient veto at low angles
- Additional complication if crossing-angle collisions

Vetoing Against Energetic e^+/e^- from $\gamma\gamma$ out of Huge Number Soft Beamstrahlung Background

- e⁺/e⁻ from ee→eeff: At most 2e/event but energetic
- Beamstrahlung background: Huge number e,γ/event but soft e.g. the energy density/event in LCAL @ z=3.7m simulated by K. Buesser



Low Angle Veto in Head-on Collisions



Angular distribution of the spectator e from $ee \rightarrow ee\tau\tau$

Total $\sigma \sim 0.43 \times 10^6$ fb of which 3/4 with both e's staying in the beampipe corresponding to the peak at zero in the inset

Analysis cuts reject most of the background

An ideal veto with $P_{T,min}$ >0.8GeV is sufficient to suppress all remaining $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \tau\tau$ background events except those with energetic μ/π at low angles

Zhiqing Zhang (LAL, Orsay)

Snowmass, Aug.14-27, 2005

Remaining Background in Cross-Angle Mode



10mrad half crossing angle

For an incoming beam hole of r=1.2cm the probability for a spectator e+/e- to enter the hole is 10^{-3} .

Remaining background events correspond (mainly) to those with e+/e- goes into the incoming beam hole.

Additional cuts remove essentially all these events.

A price to pay however: 25% efficiency reduction e.g. for benchmark point D @ Ecm=442GeV from ~5.7% to ~4.3%

New Analysis with Larger Inefficient Region

- 1) If beam hole radius increases from 1.2cm to 1.5cm
- 2) If additional blind region



Question:

What's the consequence for the stau analysis?

Answer:

The additional cuts need to be modified introducing larger inefficiency from 25% to 30% w.r.t. the head-on analysis

Zhiqing Zhang (LAL, Orsay)

Summary

It seems that the horizontal blind regions in between the two beam holes has only a small effect on the stau analysis

Further improvements still to come:
 a) replace the ideal veto (P_T>0.8GeV) with more realistic efficiency tables
 b) use large SM background samples