

CONSTRUCTION AND COMMISSIONING OF GAS ELECTRON  
MULTIPLIER (GEM) DETECTORS IN ADVANCED ASSEMBLY  
DESIGN FOR LOW-ENERGY APPLICATIONS AT HIGH RATES  
AND ANALYSIS OF GEM DATA FROM THE MUSE EXPERIMENT  
AT PSI

A Dissertation

by

SAHARA JESMIN MOHAMMED PREM NAZEER

Submitted to the Graduate College of Hampton University in  
partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

August 2023

This dissertation submitted by Sahara Jesmin Mohammed Prem Nazeer in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at Hampton University, Hampton, Virginia is hereby approved by the committee under whom the work has been completed.

---

Michael Kohl, Ph.D.  
Committee Chair

---

José L. Goity, Ph.D.

---

Paul Guèye, Ph.D.

---

Al Amin Kabir, Ph.D.

---

Jerald Dumas, Ph.D.  
Dean, The Graduate College

---

Date

PREVIEW

Copyright by

SAHARA JESMIN MOHAMMED PREM NAZEER

2023

# ABSTRACT

Construction and commissioning of Gas Electron Multiplier detectors in advanced assembly design and analysis of scattering data from the MUSE experiment at PSI

(August 2023)

Sahara Jesmin Mohammed Prem Nazeer, B.Sc., University of Peradeniya;

Ph.D. Hampton University

Chair of Advisory Committee: Dr. Michael Kohl

The search beyond the Standard Model explores dark matter and a potential fifth force. DarkLight@ARIEL investigates the dark photon as a mediator between ordinary and dark matter. The experiment aims to measure the process  $e^-Ta \rightarrow e^-TaX \rightarrow e^-Ta(e^-e^+)$ , by detecting a charged lepton pair in the final state. The spectrometers will be instrumented with Gas Electron Multiplier (GEM) detectors with minimal material budget for tracking.

A novel GEM construction technique is employed for fabricating 25 cm x 40 cm GEM detectors, where all layers are mechanically stretched and assembled within a double frame. The dissertation outlines physics motivation, methods, experimental setup, and the role of GEM detectors in DarkLight. A comprehensive discussion on GEM detectors, focusing on the "NS2" technique, including design, parts, assembly, testing, and performance evaluation will be discussed.

The proton has garnered attention due to discrepancies in measuring its charge radius using muonic hydrogen and electron-based methods. The 2010 muonic hydrogen measurement of the proton charge radius  $R_p = 0.84184(67)$  fm, showed a significant  $7\sigma$  discrepancy compared to the previously known value of  $R_p = 0.8775(51)$  fm, giving rise to the proton radius puzzle. Through simultaneous measurements of  $e - p$  and  $\mu - p$  elastic scattering, MUSE facilitates a precise and direct comparison of the

proton radius. The physics background of the proton radius puzzle, measurement techniques, the approach adopted by the MUSE experiment, its significance and the experimental setup will be discussed. Furthermore, the role of GEM detectors, along with an in-depth analysis of their data and efficiency will be discussed and evaluated.

PREVIEW

Dedicated to my beloved parents, husband and children.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to all those who have supported me throughout my journey of completing this thesis.

First and foremost, I am deeply grateful to my advisor, Dr. Michael Kohl. Not only did he provide guidance and support throughout my research, but he went above and beyond by assisting me in securing two fellowships that greatly contributed to the success of my thesis. His dedication to my academic growth and career development has been truly invaluable. I am particularly thankful to Dr. Kohl for his unwavering support during a challenging periods in my life. His compassion and belief in my abilities played a crucial role in my determination to complete this thesis.

I would also like to extend my gratitude to the members of my thesis committee, Dr. José Goity, Dr. Paul Guèye and Dr. Al Amin Kabir, for their time, support, and constructive feedback. Their contributions have helped me to improve the quality of my research.

I would like to thank the department chair Dr. Jaetae Seo, lecturers at Hampton University Dr. Michael Kohl, Dr. Liguang Tang, Dr. Alberto Accardi, Dr. José Goity, Dr. Eric Christy and Dr. Paul Guèye. Their expertise and dedication in delivering coursework and guiding my learning have been instrumental in shaping my knowledge. I am thankful for their commitment to providing a comprehensive education and fostering an environment of intellectual growth. Also I'd like to thank Department assistants Ms. Edna Hogan-Hilton and Ms. Monique Howard for their support in handling the administrative paperwork.

I am thankful to my colleagues and friends, including Dr. Anusha Liyanage, Dr. Aruni Nadeeshani, Dr. Tongtong Cao, Tanvi Patel, Dr. Bishoy Dongwi, Dr. Ishara Fernando, and all the other friends who have provided me with the motivation and encouragement I needed to complete this project. Their unwavering support has been

invaluable throughout this process, and I deeply appreciate their contributions to my success.

I would also like to extend my thanks to the International Office, specifically Ms. Ebony Majeed, for their support and assistance. Their guidance in navigating the international student requirements and providing resources has been invaluable. Additionally, I would like to express my gratitude to the Graduate College, especially Ms. Kristy Cansler and Ms. Karen Rankin for their assistance with administrative processes and ensuring the smooth operation of the graduate program.

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Hampton University and Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility for their support and provision of resources and facilities that have been crucial to the successful completion of my research. Additionally, I am grateful to the Department of Energy and the National Science Foundation for their funding and support, which made this research possible.

I would also like to extend my appreciation to the MUSE collaboration and Dark-Light Collaboration for their valuable insights and contributions to my research. The collective efforts and expertise of the collaboration members have enriched my work and expanded its scope.

Finally, I would also like to acknowledge the support and understanding of my family, especially my mom, dad and husband. Their love and encouragement have been a source of strength for me, and I could not have completed this thesis without their support. Despite the demands of this project, they were always there to provide me with the motivation and encouragement I needed to keep going. My beloved sons, Shevin, Shevon, and Shaheen; Your presence in my life has given me the resilience to push through the challenging moments and the strength to finish what I started.

This thesis is a reflection of the collective effort and support of all of these individuals, and I am deeply grateful for their contributions.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
<b>ABSTRACT</b> . . . . .	<b>iv</b>
<b>DEDICATION</b> . . . . .	<b>vi</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b> . . . . .	<b>vii</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b> . . . . .	<b>ix</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b> . . . . .	<b>xiv</b>
<b>LIST OF FIGURES</b> . . . . .	<b>xv</b>
<b>1 INTRODUCTION</b> . . . . .	<b>1</b>
1.1 GEM Detector Construction for DarkLight@ARIEL Experiment . . .	1
1.2 GEM Data Analysis for MUSE Experiment at PSI . . . . .	3
<b>2 GEM DETECTOR: PRINCIPLES AND FUNCTIONALITY</b> . .	<b>5</b>
2.1 Introduction . . . . .	5
2.2 Structure of a GEM Detector . . . . .	6
2.2.1 GEM Foils . . . . .	7
2.2.2 Readout Plane . . . . .	10
2.3 Operational Principles . . . . .	11
2.3.1 Drift, Transfer and Induction Regions . . . . .	11
2.3.2 Gas Mixture . . . . .	12
2.3.3 Detector Gain . . . . .	13
2.4 Electronics and Data Acquisition System . . . . .	13

Chapter	Page
<b>3 DARKLIGHT@ARIEL EXPERIMENT . . . . .</b>	<b>15</b>
3.1 Motivation . . . . .	15
3.2 Physics Background . . . . .	19
3.3 Projected Scope of DarkLight@ARIEL . . . . .	20
3.4 Overview of the DarkLight Experiment . . . . .	22
3.5 Experimental Setup . . . . .	22
3.5.1 The Electron Accelerator . . . . .	23
3.5.2 Target . . . . .	25
3.5.3 Spectrometers . . . . .	26
3.5.4 GEM Detectors . . . . .	27
3.5.5 Trigger Hodoscopes . . . . .	28
3.5.6 DAQ, Trigger Electronics and Slow Control . . . . .	29
<b>4 CONSTRUCTION AND COMMISSIONING OF GEM DETECTORS . . . . .</b>	<b>31</b>
4.1 Introduction . . . . .	31
4.2 Foil Stretching Techniques . . . . .	31
4.2.1 Mechanical Stretching Technique . . . . .	32
4.2.2 Thermal Stretching Technique . . . . .	33
4.2.3 Drawbacks . . . . .	34
4.2.4 Self-Stretching Technique . . . . .	34
4.3 Design . . . . .	35
4.3.1 GEM Foil . . . . .	36
4.3.2 Gas Flow . . . . .	36
4.3.3 High Voltage Supply . . . . .	37
4.4 Construction . . . . .	40

Chapter	Page
4.4.1 3D CAD Modeling . . . . .	40
4.4.2 Preparation . . . . .	44
4.4.3 Assembly . . . . .	49
4.4.3.1 Assembly of Inner Stack . . . . .	50
4.4.3.2 Foil Stretching . . . . .	64
4.4.3.3 Closing of the Chamber . . . . .	67
4.5 Electronics, DAQ System and COOKER Framework . . . . .	71
4.5.1 APV25 . . . . .	72
4.5.2 MPD . . . . .	73
4.6 Testing and commissioning . . . . .	75
4.6.1 Gas Leak Testing . . . . .	75
4.7 Results . . . . .	77
<b>5 MUSE EXPERIMENT . . . . .</b>	<b>80</b>
5.1 Motivation . . . . .	80
5.2 Proton Charge Radius Measurements . . . . .	83
5.2.1 Elastic Electron-Proton Scattering . . . . .	83
5.2.2 Upcoming Experiments . . . . .	85
5.3 Overview of the MUSE Experiment . . . . .	86
5.4 Experimental Setup . . . . .	87
5.4.1 PiM1 Beam Line . . . . .	88
5.4.2 Beamline Detectors . . . . .	93
5.4.2.1 Beam Hodoscope . . . . .	93
5.4.2.2 GEM Detector . . . . .	94
5.4.2.3 Veto Scintillator . . . . .	97
5.4.2.4 Beam Monitor . . . . .	98

Chapter	Page
5.4.3 Target . . . . .	99
5.4.4 Scattered Particle Spectrometer . . . . .	101
5.4.4.1 Straw Tube Trackers . . . . .	101
5.4.4.2 Scattered Particle Scintillators . . . . .	103
<b>6 GEM DATA ANALYSIS FOR MUSE EXPERIMENT . . . . .</b>	<b>105</b>
6.1 Introduction . . . . .	105
6.2 Analysis . . . . .	106
6.3 GEM data pre-processing techniques . . . . .	107
6.3.1 Common-mode Subtraction . . . . .	108
6.3.2 Pedestal Subtraction . . . . .	110
6.3.3 Background Corrected Data . . . . .	112
6.4 Channel masking . . . . .	114
6.5 Cross-talk Suppression . . . . .	116
6.5.1 Identification . . . . .	117
6.5.2 Suppression . . . . .	119
6.6 Cluster Finder Algorithms . . . . .	120
6.7 Detector Alignment Studies . . . . .	123
6.8 Study of GEM Efficiencies . . . . .	130
6.8.1 Three GEM vs. Four GEM Configuration . . . . .	130
6.8.2 Three GEM vs. Four GEM Configuration in the Presence of BH Hits . . . . .	135
6.9 Results . . . . .	141
<b>7 CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION . . . . .</b>	<b>144</b>
7.1 GEM Detector Construction for DarkLight@ARIEL Experiment . . . . .	144
7.2 GEM Data Analysis for MUSE Experiment at PSI . . . . .	146

Chapter	Page
<b>REFERENCES</b> . . . . .	<b>150</b>
<b>VITA</b> . . . . .	<b>158</b>

PREVIEW

## LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
3.1	Specifications of the Dipole Spectrometers . . . . .	26
4.1	Table of Technical Data of High Voltage Spring Loaded Pins. . . . .	38
5.1	MUSE Kinematics . . . . .	87
5.2	Detector Requirements for MUSE [1] . . . . .	104
6.1	Efficiency Values for Low and High Rate Runs for Each Case . . . . .	141

PREVIEW

# LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
2.1 Cross-section of a triple-GEM layer detector [2]. . . . .	6
2.2 Left: Holes in the GEM foil under optical microscope. Right: Cross section of a GEM hole under electron microscope [2]. . . . .	7
2.3 Schematic of a GEM layer showing hole diameters and pitch. . . . .	8
2.4 GEM foil production - Left: Double masking technique. Right: Single masking technique [3]. . . . .	9
2.5 GEM holes achieved from single mask technique. The first and third pictures show how holes are visible from top and bottom and the second picture shows the cross-section of a hole [4]. . . . .	9
2.6 Electric field lines through GEM holes when a voltage is applied across the copper layers [2]. . . . .	10
2.7 X-Y pattern readout system with strips and pads. . . . .	11
2.8 Electron avalanche through the electric field of triple-GEM detector [5]. . . . .	12
2.9 Diagram of GEM readout system. . . . .	14
3.1 Standard Model of particle physics. . . . .	15
3.2 Composition of the universe - Image courtesy: NASA/CXC/K.Divona. . . . .	16
3.3 The s-channel boson may serve as a mediator for the dark sector. . . . .	17
3.4 (a): Anomaly in ${}^8\text{Be}$ [6]. (b): Anomaly in ${}^4\text{He}$ [7]. . . . .	20
3.5 The projected reaches on a linear plot for three separate data taking runs: 13@31 (dark blue) - a 1000h run at 31 MeV optimized for $m_{A'}$ = 13 MeV; 17@31 (light blue) a 1000h run at 31 MeV optimized for $m_{A'}$ = 17 MeV; 17@45 (light red) a 1000h run at 45 MeV optimized for $m_{A'}$ = 17 MeV; 17@55 (dark red) a 1000h run at 55 MeV optimized for $m_{A'}$ = 17 MeV [8]. . . . .	21

Figure	Page
3.6 3D CAD rendering of the experimental setup relative to average person for scale [8]. . . . .	23
3.7 CAD representation of the proposed experimental layout with top and side views, featuring the scattering chamber, a pair of magnetic spectrometers, and GEM detectors. . . . .	24
3.8 Floor plan of the ARIEL e-Linac. Phase one (31 MeV) will be conducted in position A, while phase two (50 MeV) will take place in position B. . . . .	24
3.9 Floor plan of the ARIEL e-Linac for the final phase of the DarkLight experiment, with a cryo-module to increase the energy from 31 MeV to 50 MeV, and a septum magnet and RF deflector for concurrent beam delivery to ARIEL and DarkLight. . . . .	25
3.10 The figure displays a schematic overview of the spectrometer optics with GEM detectors and trigger hodoscopes. The central momentum, $p_0$ , is depicted in red, while the colors blue and green correspond to $p_0-20\%$ and $p_0+20\%$ , respectively. . . . .	27
3.11 The picture shows two fully-equipped GEM elements, including APV frontend electronics, back-planes, adapter boards, and low-voltage regulator board. . . . .	28
3.12 Scintillator paddles attached to SiPMs - Image courtesy: Kate Pachal.	29
4.1 Mechanical stretching of 50 x 60 cm <sup>2</sup> GEM foils made for a SBS by UVA - Left: Stretched GEM foil using a mechanical system on four sides. Right: Top figure shows the close-up of the mechanical system and bottom figure shows the GEM foil after gluing on to the spacer frame.	32
4.2 Thermal stretching of 30 cm × 30 cm GEM foils made for a muon tomography station by Florida Tech - Left: IR array setup for thermal stretching on an optical bench. Right: GEM foil tensioned at ~ 40°C [9].	33
4.3 Schematic of self-stretch technique used to build the GEM detector for DarkLight@ARIEL experiment. . . . .	35
4.4 Top view of segmented GEM foil with 25 cm × 40 cm active area - credit: Bertrand Mehl, CERN. . . . .	36

Figure	Page
4.5 Two main inlets and outlets are shown (green) on corners of the main frame and 6 inlets and 6 outlets are shown (red) on shorter sides of inner frames - credit: Bertrand Mehl, CERN. . . . .	37
4.6 High voltage divider system - credit: Bertrand Mehl, CERN. . . . .	39
4.7 Ordering of the pins from (1) to (26) from left to right on drift foil attached on inner frame A. . . . .	39
4.8 GEM foil top layer (left) and bottom layer (right) - credit: Bertrand Mehl, CERN. . . . .	39
4.9 From left to right - Tanvi Patel, Jesmin Nazeer, Rui De Oliveira, Michael Kohl at CERN after assembly of the first detector. . . . .	40
4.10 Schematic of triple layer GEM assembly for DarkLight@ARIEL - Credit: Bertrand Mehl, CERN. . . . .	41
4.11 Drift foil, 3 GEM foils and readout board sandwiched between the inner frames from A to F. . . . .	42
4.12 Outer frame providing mechanical tension with screws through embedded nuts inside the inner frames for GEM foil stretching. . . . .	43
4.13 Final GEM chamber closed with top and bottom gas window covers. . . . .	43
4.14 Pre-stretched GEM foils being cleaned to remove dust particles from the surface using a tacky roller. . . . .	45
4.15 The performance of pre-stretched GEM foils at high voltages is being tested using the Megger MIT430/2 insulation tester. . . . .	45
4.16 Top side of top cover with holes for inlay nuts (Left) and inlay nuts were hammered into the top gas window foil (Right). . . . .	46
4.17 Top side of top cover with fixed inlay nuts (Left) and bottom side of top cover with embedded o-ring (Right). . . . .	47
4.18 Prepared adhesive side of inner frame A with embedded nuts for vertical screws (Left) and Inner frames B-E (Right). . . . .	48
4.19 Hammering of inlay nuts into the inner frame A (Left) and non-adhesive side of prepared frame A (Right). . . . .	48

Figure	Page
4.20 Soldering of wires to the HV connections on RO board (Left) Pre-stretched, prepared and cleaned RO board (Right). . . . .	49
4.21 Cleaning the Plexiglas base with a piece of anti-static tacky cloth.	50
4.22 Placing dowel pins for alignment and setting up inner frame A. . .	51
4.23 Extra holes on one side of inner frame A bar and on the drift foil for HV connections. . . . .	51
4.24 Test fitting drift layer on inner frame A bars and removing adhesive sticker from the inner frame A. . . . .	52
4.25 Tacky roller (left) and cleaning of the drift foil using tacky roller.	53
4.26 Placing the drift foil onto the frames while on green canvas and adjusting and pre-stretching the drift foil using green tape . . . . .	54
4.27 Pressing down the drift foil onto the adhesive strips using the tacky cloth and cleaning the drift foil using tacky roller after final pre-stretching.	55
4.28 Fixing the spring loaded pins for HV connections and carefully soldering them to the drift foil. . . . .	56
4.29 Drift foil with all the spring loaded pins attached. . . . .	56
4.30 Placing inner frame B on the drift foil. . . . .	57
4.31 Testing the G1 foil and stretching it on the inner frames B. . . . .	58
4.32 Keep the foil connections for hv connections for G1T and G1B layers and cut-off other marked holes. . . . .	58
4.33 Testing connection between hv spring loaded pins is conducted after each layer of foil is stacked. . . . .	59
4.34 Placing the inner frames C on G1 foil and pre-stretching G2 GEM foil. . . . .	60
4.35 Keep the foil connections for hv connections for G2T and G2B layers and cut-off other marked holes. . . . .	60
4.36 Inserting T-nuts through inner frames C and B. . . . .	61
4.37 Placing inner frames D and pre-stretching of G3 GEM foil. . . . .	61

Figure	Page
4.38 Cleaning the active side of Readout board and placing it on the inner frames E. . . . .	62
4.39 Placing inner frames F and pre-stretching the readout board. . . . .	63
4.40 Tightening the screws through inner frames E - A and fixing the whole stack. . . . .	63
4.41 Flip the whole stack and test all the layers for electrical connections. . . . .	64
4.42 The GEM foil stack after cutting off excess foil. . . . .	65
4.43 The GEM foil stack after cutting off excess foil and after placing the outer frame. . . . .	65
4.44 Stretching of the foils by tightening the horizontal screws . . . . .	66
4.45 The GEM foil stack before stretching. . . . .	66
4.46 The GEM foil stack after stretching. . . . .	67
4.47 The gas inlets/outlets through short bars of inner frames (Left), O-ring pieces are placed to ensure gas flows through active area (Right). . . . .	68
4.48 Cleaning the top cover and drift foil using tacky roller and placing the cover on GEM stack. . . . .	68
4.49 Cleaning the bottom cover and readout layer using tacky roller and placing the cover on RO layer. . . . .	69
4.50 Closing the chamber by inserting screws through bottom cover. . . . .	70
4.51 Placement of M6 screws through openings where horizontal screws sit (Left). . . . .	70
4.52 Fully closed GEM detector. . . . .	71
4.53 Readout system of GEM detector. . . . .	72
4.54 APV Frontend (INFN Geneva - Rev 4.11 Oct 2014) front and back. . . . .	73
4.55 APV Frontend card on GEM 4 slot backplane (Rev3). . . . .	73
4.56 MPD Rev3.0 (Left); MPD Rev4.0 (Right). . . . .	74
4.57 Block diagram for MPD Rev 4.0. . . . .	75

Figure	Page
4.58 The potential gas leak openings were sealed using epoxy. . . . .	77
4.59 The positioning of the GEM detectors at ULQ2@ELPH experiment during 2019 beam time. . . . .	78
4.60 The cluster distribution of GEM detectors for focused beam and de-focused beam. . . . .	79
5.1 Proton radius measurements over the years of 2010-2020 using electron scattering and spectroscopic measurements shown with CODATA compilations [10–17] - Image courtesy: Jan C. Bernauer. . . . .	83
5.2 MUSE Apparatus implemented by MUSE Geant4 simulation - Image courtesy: Steffen Strauch. . . . .	88
5.3 Main components of PiM1 beamline [1]. . . . .	89
5.4 Measured RF time spectrum for negative charge beams with momenta of 117.5 MeV/c, 160 MeV/c, and 210 MeV/c, at a distance of $\approx 23.5$ m from the production target [1]. . . . .	91
5.5 Measured RF time spectrum for positive (top) and negative (bottom) charge beams with momenta of 115.29 MeV/c. . . . .	92
5.6 Beam hodospoe - Plance C. . . . .	93
5.7 10 cm x 10 cm triple-layer GEM detectors built by Hampton University. . . . .	95
5.8 GEM hit maps of the beam [18]. . . . .	97
5.9 Schematic of beam veto detector (Left) and installed veto detector at PSI looking upstream (Right). . . . .	98
5.10 Beam monitor at PSI in production data configuration setup. . . . .	99
5.11 Schematic of scattering chamber (Left) and target ladder (Right). . . . .	101
5.12 CAD drawing of the four STT chambers mounted on a table. The straws are depicted in light gray color, while the HV/readout cards are in dark gray (Left) and installed STT chamber at PSI (Right) [1]. . . . .	102
5.13 Scattered Particle Scintillator. . . . .	104

Figure	Page
6.1 ADC spectrum of US GEM plane before implementing noise subtraction routine for x-axis (left) and y-axis (right). . . . .	108
6.2 ADC spectrum of US GEM plane after subtracting common mode for x-axis (left) and y-axis (right). . . . .	109
6.3 ADC spectrum of US GEM plane after pedestal subtraction for x-axis (left) and y-axis (right). . . . .	112
6.4 ADC spectrum of US GEM plane after subtracting common-mode noise and pedestal for x-axis (left) and y-axis (right). . . . .	113
6.5 Distribution of hit counts for each strip along the X-axis of the US GEM detector. . . . .	115
6.6 Common-mode and pedestal subtracted ADC distribution of X-axis of US GEM (left) Vs. flagged hot channels in the same ADC distribution (right). . . . .	116
6.7 Example plot of correlation coefficient values of $r_{xy}$ for 3rd APV card of MS GEM element. The values filled indicate the strength of correlation between $ch_i$ and $ch_j$ within the same APV card. . . . .	119
6.8 Histogram of cluster distribution map for US GEM element - using CENsus method (left) and K-Means clustering method (right). . . . .	123
6.9 The horizontal and vertical cross-hairs on a GEM plane is visually emphasized with a purple circular outline. . . . .	125
6.10 A visual representation illustrating the measurements conducted to obtain x, y, and z positions. The figure showcases the survey employed to calculate the precise coordinates of observed points in 3D space. . . . .	126
6.11 A picture illustrating the use of a handheld device for obtaining spatial coordinates of multiple points on a Kapton layer. . . . .	126
6.12 A figure illustrating a sequence of frames from left to right: local frame, telescope frame, and MUSE frame. . . . .	127
6.13 Geant4 illustration of the local frame and telescope frame in relation to the MUSE target. The illustration depicts the coordinate orientation, where the z-axis aligns with the beam direction, the y-axis points upwards, and the x-axis extends out of the plane. . . . .	128

6.14	The histograms displaying track residuals of a 3 GEM setup before (blue) and after (red) alignment procedures along the X and Y axes for the US, 4TH, and MS GEMs highlighting the improved alignment accuracy achieved through the alignment procedures, validating the successful transformation of coordinates across the different frames of reference . . . . .	129
6.15	Schematic representation of a hit passing through gem detector setup consisting of three planes and a track formed by two detectors projected onto the third plane. Residuals between the measured positions of the track and the expected positions are examined for precise track reconstruction. . . . .	131
6.16	Efficiency of US, 4TH and MS planes for 2 of 3 GEMs; Low rate run 100 kHz, 100k events. . . . .	132
6.17	Schematic representation of a hit passing through gem detector setup consisting of four planes and a track formed by three detectors projected onto the fourth plane. Residuals between the measured positions of the track and the expected positions are examined for precise track reconstruction. . . . .	134
6.18	Efficiency of US, 4TH, MS and DS planes for 3 of 4 GEMs; Low rate run 100 kHz, 100k events. . . . .	135
6.19	Schematic illustrating a hit passing through 3 GEM detector planes with the condition that the particle had passed through BH planes when in-time hits = 1. . . . .	136
6.20	Efficiency of US, 4TH and MS planes for 2 of 3 GEMs with BH; Low rate run 100 kHz, 100k events . . . . .	136
6.21	Schematic illustrating a hit passing through 4 GEM detector planes with the condition that the particle had passed through BH planes when in-time hits = 1. . . . .	137
6.22	Efficiency of US, 4TH, MS and DS planes for 3-of-4 GEMs with BH; Low rate run 100 kHz, 100k events . . . . .	137
6.23	Correlation between actual hit position and projected hit position of Beam Hodoscope plane 2; Low rate run 100 kHz, 100k events . . . . .	138
6.24	Correlation between actual hit position and projected hit position of Beam Hodoscope plane 3; Low rate run 100 kHz, 100k events . . . . .	138

Figure	Page
6.25 Efficiency of US, 4TH, MS and DS planes for 2 of 3 GEMs; High rate run 2.2 MHz, 100k events. . . . .	139
6.26 Efficiency of US, 4TH and MS planes for 2 of 3 GEMs with BH; High rate run 2.2 MHz, 100k events. . . . .	139
6.27 Efficiency of US, 4TH, MS and DS planes for 3 of 4 GEMs; High rate run 2.2 MHz, 100k events. . . . .	140
6.28 Efficiency of US, 4TH, MS and DS planes for 3 of 4 GEMs with BH; High rate run 2.2 MHz, 100k events. . . . .	140

PREVIEW

# CHAPTER 1

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 GEM Detector Construction for DarkLight@ARIEL Experiment

The Standard Model explains subatomic particles and interactions, but not all mysteries. Dark matter constitutes 27% of the universe, yet remains invisible. A mediator, the dark photon or  $A'$ , could interact with ordinary and dark matter. DarkLight@ARIEL experiment investigates a hypothetical particle using an electron beam at ARIEL facility, TRIUMF, Canada to understand the fifth force and dark matter.

The X17 particle, a hypothetical mediator of the fifth force, has gained significant attention due to various unexplained phenomena observed in recent experiments. Anomalous results in the decay of excited  $^8\text{Be}$  and  $^4\text{He}$  atoms have hinted at the presence of a new particle with a mass of around  $17 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ . These experimental findings, coupled with the deviation in the muon's magnetic moment ( $g_\mu - 2$ ) from the predicted value, have piqued the interest of physicists in the existence of a new force carrier. The DarkLight experiment aims to explore this possibility further by utilizing the ARIEL e-linac's high-energy electron beam to investigate the interaction between the proposed protophobic boson and ordinary matter. By colliding the electron beam with a tantalum target, DarkLight seeks to shed light on the nature of dark matter and potentially discover evidence of the fifth force.

The projected scope of DarkLight@ARIEL encompasses a comprehensive investigation of the proposed fifth force parameter space. The experiment's sensitivity is