

SiPM photosensors for RICH

Roberto Preghenella 21 December 2021, Giornata nazionale EIC_NET 2021

SiPM option for RICH optical readout





pros

- cheap
- high photon efficiency
- excellent time resolution
- insensitive to magnetic field



cons

large dark count rates

not radiation tolerant





Neutron fluxes and SiPM radiation damage







Most of the key physics topics discussed in the EIC White Paper [2] are achievable with an integrated luminosity of 10 fb $^{-1}$ corresponding to 30 weeks of operations. One notable exception is studying the spatial distributions of quarks and gluons in the proton with polarized beams. These measurements require an integrated luminosity of up to 100 fb⁻¹ and would therefore benefit from an increased luminosity of 10^{34} cm⁻² sec⁻¹.

possible location of dRICH photosensors

neutron fluence for 1 fb⁻¹ \rightarrow 1-5 10⁷ n/cm² (> 100 keV ~ 1 MeV n_m)

- radiation level is moderate
- magnetic field is high(ish)

R&D on SiPM as potential photodetector for dRICH, main goal study SiPM usability for Cherenkov up to 10¹¹ 1-MeV n_{en}/cm²

notice that $10^{11} n_{eq}^{2}$ /cm² would correspond to 2000-10000 fb⁻¹ integrated \mathcal{L} quite a long time of EIC running before we reach there, if ever it would be between 6-30 years of continuous running at $\mathcal{L} = 10^{34} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2}$

 \rightarrow better do study in smaller steps of radiation load $10^{9} \text{ 1-MeV } n_{eq}^{2}/cm^{2}$ $10^{10} \text{ 1-MeV } n_{eq}^{2}/cm^{2}$ $10^{11} \text{ 1-MeV } n_{eq}^{2}/cm^{2}$

most of the key physics topics should cover most demanding measurements possibly never reached

SiPM radiation damage and mitigation strategies

Radiation damages increase currents, affects V_{bd} and increase DCR With very high radiation loads can bring to baseline loss, but... does not seem to be a problem up to $10^{11} n_{ed}/cm^2$ (if cooled, T = -30 C)

If the baseline is healthy, single-photon signals can be be detected one can work on reducing the DCR with following mitigation strategies:

- Reduce operating temperatures (cooling)
- Use timing
- High-temperature annealing cycles
- Key point for R&D on RICH optical readout with SiPM:
 - demonstrate capacity to measure Single Photon
- keep DCR under control (ring imaging background) despite radiation damages

timing

10¹¹











Calvi, NIM A 922 (2019) 243



SiPM radiation damage and mitigation strategies

SiPM R&D program



• born within the forward RICH proposal for EIC

- proof of feasibility of SiPM for Cherenkov application at colliders, this requires
 - single-photon counting capabilities (SiPM can do it)
 - reasonable dark-count rates (low-temperature operation, time resolution)
 - radiation tolerance (small SPAD cells, high-temperature annealing)
- SiPM readout with dedicated readout electronics
 - ALCOR front-end ASIC (Torino)
 - streaming (aka continuous) readout DAQ

• two main phases in 2021

- characterisation of the sensors before and after irradiation
- use of the sensors (with/without irradiation) in dRICH prototype at test beam

• can have direct applications in multiple cases, i.e.

- other EIC detectors looking for B-tolerant photon counters
- the Aerogel-RICH proposal for ALICE3

this R&D is 100% synergic with ALICE3

Electronics equipment



acquisition of commercial and prototype (FBK) SiPM sensors design and production of dedicated electronics boards

• SiPM carrier boards (BO)

- host SiPM matrix: designed with irradiation, annealing and testbeam in mind
- one form factor, different layout for different SiPM family

• SiPM adapter boards (FE)

- couples the SiPM carrier board with readout system (oscilloscope, ALCOR)
 - IV-base adapter (for SiPM IV and DCR characterisation)
 - mini-adapter (for ALCOR-TEST board)
 - adapter-CA (for ALCOR-FE board)

• ALCOR FrontEnd board (TO)

• hosts ALCOR frontend ASIC

• FireFly breakout board (ARCADIA)

- links ALCOR I/O to FPGA
 - ALCOR configuration and readout

the list does not stop here, these are the main equipment boards

Commercial SiPM sensors



	board	sensor	uCell (µm)	V _{bd} (V)	PDE (%)	DCR (kHz/mm²)	window	notes	
	HAMA1	S13360 3050VS	50	53	40	55	silicone	legacy model Calvi et. al	PHOT
		S13360 3025VS	25	53	25	44	silicone	legacy model smaller SPAD	O SI NO
-	HAMA2	S14160 3050HS	50	38	50		silicone	newer model Iower V _{bd}	
		S14160 3015PS	15	38	32	78	silicone	smaller SPADs radiation hardness	
	SENSL	MICROFJ 30035	35	24.5	38	50	glass	different producer and lower V _{bd}	ON.
		MICROFJ 30020	20	24.5	30	50	glass	the smaller SPAD version	ON Semiconductor
	всом	AFBR S4N33C013	30	27	43	111	glass	commercially available FBK-NUVHD	BROADCOM

and FBK prototype sensors wire bonded on custom mini-tiles

FBK has developed for us custom mini-tiles hosting 2x4 prototypes each





Schede SiPM carrier

• SENSL

- 2 schede FULL
- 3 schede LIGHT

• BCOM

- 4 schede FULL
- 2 schede LIGHT

• HAMA1

- 2 schede FULL
- 3 schede LIGHT

• HAMA2

- 2 schede FULL
- 3 schede LIGHT

• FBK

• 4 schede FULL









BCOM



SiPM characterisation @ BO





I-V curves and DCR at different temperatures

+20 C -10 C -30 C

- Memmert climatic chamber
- Keithley source meter
- Keysight power supply
- Cividec amplifier
- Lecroy oscilloscope





SiPM characterisation @ FE



 10^{8}

10º

1010

⊥l×10⁻⁶ 10

Time



1st irradiation round in May



3x3 mm² SiPM sensors 4x8 "matrix" (carrier board) multiple types of SiPM: Hamamatsu commercial (13360 and 14160) **FBK** prototypes (rad.hard and timing optimised)

148 MeV protons \rightarrow scattering system \rightarrow collimation system \rightarrow carrier board



Post-irradiation characterisation

measured also right after irradiation in TIFPA bunker and ~10 days later when TIFPA released the SiPM







FBK #3 (T = -30 C) NUV-HD-CHK (row A)





also Hamamatsu sensors seem to be doing ok up to 10¹⁰ neq



FBK characterisation after 1 week of annealing at T = 125 C



 \rightarrow reworked boards back from company a few days ago

Hamamatsu annealing up to T = 150 C completed





ALCOR – A Low Power Chip for Optical sensor Readout



SiPM tested with beams at CERN

dRICH prototype @ CERN-SPS

gas volume

inner mirror

first test-beams in September (SPS) and October 2021 (PS, in synergy with ALICE) at CERN

aerogel

perhaps too optimistic / ambitious for the program of 2021 some troubles with electronics, not really a successful beam test for the SiPM readout **but we have anyway learned something, stay positive for 2022!** ALICE and EIC at CERN PS T10 October 2021



EIC SiPM with ALCOR readout

ALICE 3 aerogel Chiba sample



SiPM tested with beams at CERN



ALICE and EIC at CERN PS T10 October 2021

some troubles with electronics, not really a successful beam test for the SiPM readout **but we have anyway learned something, stay positive for 2022!**

SiPM+ALCOR setup in Bologna



permanent EIC SiPM setup in the INFN Bologna Silicon Labs characterisation of performance of SiPM with full (ALCOR) readout system measure many SiPM in one go!



plan to add laser diode (or LED) soon illuminate SiPM inside chamber measure correlation on top of DCR

FPGA

10 · 10 · 10 · 10

the following results have been obtained with this setup

a look into the operation of a complete SiPM readout



Vbias (V) 48 50 52 54 56

PRELIMINARY







Vbias (V) 48 50 52 54 56







Vbias (V) 48 50 52 54 56



Hamamatsu (HAMA1 #1) Vbias scans





very uniform performance (besides one outlier) when signal above threshold

PRELIMINARY

Hamamatsu (HAMA1 #1) Vbias scans





very uniform performance (besides one outlier) when signal above threshold

PRELIMINARY

Hamamatsu (HAMA1 #1) Vbias scans



PRELIMINARY



average of the various SiPM sensors, band indicates ± RMS









Vbias (V) 48 50 52 54 56





Vbias (V) 48 50 52 54 56

let's look into the irradiated board

Hamamatsu (HAMA1 #2) Vbias scans



Littute Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare

very uniform performance (besides one outlier) when signal above threshold



Hamamatsu (HAMA1 #2) Vbias scans



Littuto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare

average of the various SiPM sensors, band indicates ± RMS



Hamamatsu (HAMA1) grand comparison



PRELIMINARY

Hamamatsu (HAMA1) grand comparison

measured ~ 750 kHz DCR after 10^{11} neq dose and T = 150 C annealing in line with Calvi

could reduce by another 3x factor with T = 175 C annealing if we believe in Calvi (we do)

could reduce by a further 2x factor

operating at T = -40 C we know DCR decreases by 2x every 10 C







how often do we need to do annealing?



FBK #3 (T = -30 C) NUV-HD-RH (row B)

Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare

assumptions

- NIEL = 10^{11} neq/cm² \Rightarrow DCR = 10 MHz
- DCR increases proportionally to NIEL
- annealing always cures same fraction of damage caused by NIEL
 - constant fraction of new damage, regardless total damage

- delivered $10^{10} \Rightarrow DCR = 1 \text{ MHz}$
- annealing, cures 90% of damage \Rightarrow DCR = 0.1 MHz
- delivered another $10^{10} \Rightarrow DCR = 1.1 \text{ MHz}$
- annealing, cures 90% of new damage ⇒ DCR = 0.2 MHz





assumptions

- NIEL = 10^{11} neq/cm² \Rightarrow DCR = 10 MHz
- DCR increases proportionally to NIEL
- annealing always cures same fraction of damage caused by NIEL
 - constant fraction of new damage, regardless total damage



- delivered $10^{10} \Rightarrow DCR = 1 \text{ MHz}$
- annealing, cures 90% of damage \Rightarrow DCR = 0.1 MHz
- delivered another $10^{10} \Rightarrow DCR = 1.1 \text{ MHz}$
- annealing, cures 90% of new damage ⇒ DCR = 0.2 MHz





assumptions

- NIEL = 10^{11} neq/cm² \Rightarrow DCR = 10 MHz
- DCR increases proportionally to NIEL
- annealing always cures same fraction of damage caused by NIEL
 - constant fraction of new damage, regardless total damage

- delivered $10^{10} \Rightarrow DCR = 1 \text{ MHz}$
- annealing, cures 90% of damage \Rightarrow DCR = 0.1 MHz
- delivered another $10^{10} \Rightarrow DCR = 1.1 \text{ MHz}$
- annealing, cures 90% of new damage ⇒ DCR = 0.2 MHz





assumptions

- NIEL = 10^{11} neq/cm² \Rightarrow DCR = 10 MHz
- DCR increases proportionally to NIEL
- annealing always cures same fraction of damage caused by NIEL
 - constant fraction of new damage, regardless total damage

- delivered $10^{10} \Rightarrow DCR = 1 \text{ MHz}$
- annealing, cures 90% of damage \Rightarrow DCR = 0.1 MHz
- delivered another $10^{10} \Rightarrow DCR = 1.1 \text{ MHz}$
- annealing, cures 90% of new damage \Rightarrow DCR = 0.2 MHz





Summary



• SiPM as photosensors for RICH applications

- many pros
- a few cons

R&D program has just started

- well linked with ASIC development
- from first irradiation results, <u>SiPM look a very promising option</u>
 - soon correlation/efficiency studies with with laser/LED on irradiated SiPM
 - can we distinguish the signal from the DCR ?
- test beam was unfortunately not brilliant
 - signals could be seen, experience gained
- \circ $\hfill stay tuned for the next irradiation campaign$
 - 2022 might be decisive on choice of photosensors

• engineering needs for SiPM operation in experiment

- bring cooling, down to -30 C (or perhaps even -50 C)
- think about how to do annealing on-site
 - warm SiPM with forward bias (Joule effect)
 - design cooling plant to be a warming plant as well
- cable routing, cooling, piping, connections while keeping ~ 100% active area

thanks to all people involved

Breakdown Voltage estimation (HAM1-A & -B)



The curve seems consistent with what is reported on the Datasheet.

Current comparison @243K for FBK3-(C)(R)



Current comparison











Breakdown Voltage Estimation



Breakdown Voltage estimation

6. A second order polynomial, fitted to $I(V_{bias})$ above V_{bd} after surface-current subtraction, crosses the V_{bias} axis.



Breakdown Voltage estimation

Procedure:

- 1. We Fit the two functions in the range: $[V_{BD}-4;V_{BD}-1]$ and $[V_{BD}+1;V_{BD}+4]$ respectively, where V_{BD} is an initial guess.
- 2. The two function crossing is found and taken as the new $V_{\rm BD}^{}$ guess
- 3. We Fit the two functions in the range: $[V_{BD}-4;V_{BD}]$ and $[V_{BD};V_{BD}+4]$ respectively
- 4. Steps 2 and 3 are repeated until the difference between the new guess and the previous guess is less than 1.e-5



Measurement	MC0	MC1	MC2	MC3	MC4	MC5	MC6
Annealing step	Before irradiation	After irradiation	1 st ann. @125°C	2 nd ann. @125°C	3 rd ann. @125°C	1 st ann. @150°C	2 nd ann. @150°C
Duration (tot)	N/A	N/A	12h @50°C 24h @100°C 72h @125°C	62h @125°C (134h)	60ħ @125°C (190h)	73h @150°C (73h)	63h @150°C (136h)

VI characteristic - ratio with respect to MC0





- VI characteristic ratio with respect to MC0
- 2 major gaps corresponding to increasing temperature
- The effect of the second and (probably) third annealing steps is significantly lower than the first.

Current ratio to the recommended operating voltage



Current ratio vs radiation level

- Current ratio with respect to MC0 measured to the recommended operating voltage
- The plots shows the curves for the measurements before annealing and after the first annealing step at 125°C and 150°C.

Filter effect



The plot shows the effect of filter.

It allows to distinguish easily the three peaks (in this example)

S.Vallarino

$$V_i^{filtered} = V_i - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N V_{i-j} \cdot exp\left(-\frac{t_i - t_{i-j}}{\tau}\right)$$

Filter effect



Signal and filtered signal - Zoom

The plot shows the effect of filter.

It allows to distinguish easily the three peaks (in this example)

$$V_i^{filtered} = V_i - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N V_{i-j} \cdot exp\left(-\frac{t_i - t_{i-j}}{\tau}\right)$$

The time-over-threshold criteria to reject the noise appears still valid after filtering.

Dark Count Rate vs Measurement – Preliminary results



Hama2 C2 - DCR vs Measurement step

The plot shows the DCR vs the measurement for a 50µm-cell SiPM wich has received a low dose (10⁹), with or without filtering. The DCR is quiet low, this

allows to obtain it even without the filter.

The vertical green lines marks the different annealing temperature steps:

- 125°C, between MC1 and MC₂
- 150°C, between MC4 and • MC5

As expected, the DCR decreases while the annealing proceeds

Dark Count Rate vs Measurement – Preliminary results



Hama2 C4 - DCR vs Measurement step

The plot shows the DCR vs the measurement for a 50µm-cell SiPM wich has received a high dose (10¹¹), with or without filtering.

When the DCR increases, the analisys without filter fails to identify nearby peaks.



in azienda durante produzione schede SiPM

segnali dai SiPM !

SiPM carrier LIGHT SiPM adapter Base-IV

SiPM characterisation





Collimator setup: intensity calibration



