# **CERN**

# Precision Timing Capabilities of Silicon Pad Sensors in the CMS HGCAL



# Florian Pitters

On Behalf of the CMS Collaboration

CERN, Geneva 23, CH-1211, Switzerland

# **Introduction & Summary**

Excellent time resolution will be an essential tool for pileup mitigation and vertex identification at the HL-LHC.

The CMS experiment is currently building highly granular calorimeter endcaps (CMS HGCAL) with silicon pad sensors as active material in the high radiation region [1].

The results presented here show that these sensors have intrinsic timing capabilities down to 10 ps and that the capabilities are uniform across the sensor. It is further shown that the time resolution can be well modelled by **2** parameters, accounting for jitter and constant contributions. Both are dominated by the front-end electronics.

# **Analysis**

Waveforms are analysed offline

- Timestamp via constant fraction @ 45%
- Time differences between adjacent pads and relative to the MCP as well as single pad and cluster timestamps are analysed

# **Experimental Setup**

A 6" HGCAL prototype sensor samples EM showers after 5.7 X<sub>0</sub> W and 10  $X_0$  W+Pb.

The sensor is wire-bonded to a custom readout board and the waveform is sampled with 5 GS/s.

Some more details on the setup:

- MCP gives reference timestamp
- Delay wirechambers determine the impact position
- Large trigger counter allows illumination of multiple cells

# **More Details**

Some details on the sensor

- HGC 300 µm thick silicon pad sensor
- DC coupled n-type planar FZ
- Hexagonal cells with 1.1 cm<sup>2</sup> (40 pF)



Experimental Setup: A silicon pad sensor with custom read-out optimised for timing tasks samples EM showers. Time differences between pads and relative to the MCP are analysed.

# **Results Relative to MCP**

#### Resolution of MCP with ~20 ps larger than silicon

- Constant term C similar to O(50 ps) TDC
- Jitter term A similar to 1.4 ns/fC
- Final front-end ASIC should do better!

To compare different pads, offset in time between pads & timewalk has to be corrected.





**Example silicon waveform:** Timestamp extracted at 45% of peak height.

Silicon pad sensor: Only red cells are used for the presented data.

#### Some details on the electronics

- DRS4 ASIC with 8 channels at 5 GS/s and  $f_u = 500 \text{ MHz}$
- 1:2 transformer to lower rise time
- Rise time of t<sub>r</sub><sup>si</sup> ~1.8 ns, t<sub>r</sub><sup>mcp</sup> ~0.7 ns

Some details on the analysis

- Effective S/N is the relevant quantity
- · Cluster timestamp via weighting of effective S/N with inverse variance

$$(S/N)_{\rm eff} = \frac{(S/N)_{\rm ref}(S/N)_{\rm dut}}{\sqrt{(S/N)_{\rm ref}^2 + \alpha^2 \cdot (S/N)_{\rm dut}^2}} \quad \alpha \approx \frac{t_{\rm rise, ref}}{t_{\rm rise, dut}}$$

Previous measurements have shown that the dependence of time resolution on S/N is not affected by irradiation up to 10<sup>16</sup> neq/cm<sup>2</sup> [2].



Uncertainty vs S/N and beam energy after 5.7 X<sub>0</sub> W: Results are limited by electronic noise and MCP resolution.

# **Results Between Adjacent Pads**

Results on intrinsic timing

- S/N for MIP is ~ 6.5, noise is 3500 e-
- Data well represented by 2 parameter fit
- Jitter term A fits well with electronics expectations
- Constant term C around 10 ps can be partly explained by DRS4 synchronisation uncertainty of 5-7 ps [3] and the offset uncertainty of 2-3 ps

Results on cluster timing

- Cluster timestamp removes dependency on impact position
- **Excellent uniformity** across illuminated area
- Performance increase with larger cluster size depends on exact values of A and C

0.15  $(t_{cell,max}-t_{cell})$  [ns] 32 GeV data 50 GeV data 100 GeV: A = 2.12 +/- 0.06 ns C = 9.5 +/- 0.7 ps 00 GeV data 150 GeV data 200 GeV data 250 GeV data 100 GeV fit 150 GeV fit 150 GeV A = 2.13 +/- 0.05 ns C = 9.7 + -0.4 ps10 MIPs 0.1 200 GeV fit 250 GeV fit In 300 um Si 200 GeV: @ 3500 e- noise A = 2.11 +/- 0.04 ns C = 10.2 +/- 0.3 ps SWB 0.05 250 GeV A = 2.11 +/- 0.05 ns = 10.4 +/- 0.3 ps  $\oplus C$ 0 100 200 300 0 effective signal-to-noise

#### Uncertainty vs. S/N after 5.7 X<sub>0</sub> W:

Uncertainty is well modelled by a two parameter function, accounting for jitter (A) and constant (C) contributions.



Uncertainty vs. impact at 200 GeV, 10 X<sub>0</sub> W+Pb: Results are uniform across the illuminated sensor area. The red hexagon indicates the approximate position of the central pad.

## **References**

[1] CMS-TDR-019 [2] CMS-DN-2017-011 [3] Nucl. Instr. Meth. A 759 (2014) 65–73

## Acronyms

MCP ... Micro Channel Plate CFD ... Constant Fraction Discriminator FZ ... Float Zone DUT ... Device Under Test

## Contact florian.pitters@cern.ch