Response on the critical comments of the TAC Report addressed to

the KLF proposal C12-19-001 for PAC48

**Noticed typos in the 2020 proposal**: **Table 4**: K°/K°-bar ratio is expected to be 2:1 at the Be target, rather than at the cryogenic target. At the cryogenic target it is expected to be close to 1:1.

**Fig.22 caption, and page 32**: Radiator thickness: instead of 0.005% should be 0.05%.

Thanks.

The appropriate line of Table 4 on pg. 28 has reading as ``*K°/K°-bar ratio at Be-target is 2:1.”*, where on Be-target reads as just before the tungsten plug*.* On a cryogenic target we have pure beam, hence “expected ratio expected to be close to 1:1.”

The appropriate line in Fig 22 caption on pg. 31 has reading as *``Left: Nominal Hall D configuration with an amorphous radiator of 0.05% R.L.*”

Then 2nd paragraph on pg 32 has reading *``Additionally, we show in Fig. 22 a comparison of radiation dose rates in the Tagger Hall at 5 mA beam current between a radiator of 0.05% R.L. in the standard GlueX beamline configuration and an early configuration of the CPS. Similar levels are seen for both configurations, showing more evidence that the CPS will deliver a level of radiation not higher than what could potentially be seen in standard GlueX configuration operating at the maximum beam current of 5 mA.”*

**Major modifications:**

**1. Accelerator**: The bunch spacing of 64 ns (16 MHz repetition rate) will require new injector equipment, estimated at about $130k, as well as an R&D and installation labor performed by the injector group… This may cause interference with the beams for other halls and needs an R&D effort.

Following to the director of CASA, Todd Satogata, there is a low probability that this regime can cause a problem. More details in the Sec. 5.1 of the proposal.

2. **Compact Photon Source** (CPS) **(**updated since 2019 due to the completion of the Hall A/C design)

There is no final design of the CPS for Halls A/C, while there is a conceptual design of CPS which was published in NIM. More details in Sec. 5.3 of the proposal.

***Electron beamline:*** *(new development in 2020) CPS* operations may require a 15mm beam spot on the radiator (see the previous item in the list). … According to Jay Benesch the cost of such a scenario may be about $1.5M.

Unfortunately, TAC report did not inform us what is the source of Jay’s $1.5M to discuss this issue. While, the CPS Collaboration is still optimizing a design.

6. **Kaon Flux Monitor:** will be a new device consisting of a superconducting solenoid and a detector system, all installed on the platform downstream of the Pair Spectrometer (PS) magnet. The plan is to keep the PS magnet off in order to extend the effective decay volume. A conceptual design has been presented. Achieving a few percent precision appears challenging. The detector should be able to separate well the 3 decays modes. The spectrum of the detected kaons will be different from the spectrum of the kaons reaching the target. On the technical side, the installation and operation of another superconducting magnet will require considerable efforts.

***There are two statements from the reviewer regarding Flux monitor which are not fully correct and require clarification:*** *“The detector should be able to separate well the 3 decays modes.” and “The spectrum of the detected kaons will be different from the spectrum of the kaons reaching the target”.* The flux monitor does not! need to separate various decay modes to reconstruct the flux. The branching ratios between major decay channels are known extremely well, so as their decay kinematics, hence the shape of decays can be reproduced by MC; its scaling would give the flux. Particle identification and decay separation within the FM is designed to ensure the absence of any unexpected background rather than for flux determination.

Regarding spectrum of kaons: Kaons are decaying in flight, so kaon flux in any point of space, even within the target, is different. In this situation the task of the Flux monitor is to measure larger Kaon beam phase space (both in coordinate and momentum space) than seen by the target. Current design of Flux monitor at its proposed location fulfill this criterion with large margins.

**Summary:**

**Feasibility:** The project appears to be technically feasible…. The beamline modifications described by T. Satogata may add $1.5M.

Thank you for your positive conclusion. We agreed that more advance study is in order.