

Pioneer test of the DIRC-like TOF prototype at SLAC CRT for SuperB project


Laboratoire de l'Accélérateur Linéaire (CNRS/IN2P3), Université Paris-Sud 11
N. Arnaud, D. Breton, L. Burmistrov, J. Maalmi, V. Puill, A. Stocchi

SLAC National Accelerator Laboratory
J. Va'vra, D. Aston

SuperB general meeting
December 15, 2010




Prototype of the DIRC-like TOF detector




- Two quartz bars connected to one Photonis MCP-PMT (8x8 channels, stepped face, 10 micron holes).
- Tube operate at -2.7kV (gain $\sim 7.0 \times 10^5$)
- 16 channels connected to the USBWC electronics developed by LAL electronics team
- Amplifiers (40dB)
- Filters (600MHz bandwidth)
- Another quartz counter used as trigger


Schematic drawing of the fTOF



J. Va'vra



Geometry of the experiment





→ Looking for cosmic muons

→ Quartz Start counter was used as a trigger


→ We do not have precise start time

→ Time difference between different channels should be studied


Coordinate system. Time differences which we are going to use



Geant4 Simulation of the fTOF prototype



QE + electron collection efficiency






- ▶ 16 channels 6 x 18mm each
- ▶ TTS = 35 ps
- ▶ Electronics = 10 ps / channel
- ▶ Bialkali photocathode
- ▶ electron collection efficiency 70.0%
- ▶ Time of first p.e. arriving is taken as a time measurement for given channel.
- ▶ Simple muon generator was developed

Muon generator

- $dN/d\theta \sim \cos(\theta)^{1.85}$
- ϕ , x , y of the muon have flat distribution
- Position and sizes of detectors were taken into account
- Momentum 1.5 GeV/c

- fTOF only
- Trigger1, Trigger2, Quartz srt.
- Quartz srt. , fTOF
- Trigger1, Trigger2, Quartz srt. , fTOF




15.12.2010


Theta and x distribution of the muons entering fTOF prototype

What we learn from Geant4 Simulation of the fTOF prototype

Total number of p.e. per channel



Time distribution of p.e.






5 p.e. per channel

- ➔ Majority of the late p.e. arrive within rise time of the signal from first p.e. (~1ns). This will spoil rise time and amplitude of the signal, **Constant Fraction (CF) algorithm will not work properly any more.**
- ➔ Total number of p.e. ~80, we run at $7.0 \cdot 10^5$ gain, this can make the phototube behave badly. We should probably run at a smaller gain.

Time difference between top and bottom channels (simulation)

Time distribution of p.e.



Momentum = 1.5GeV

$x = 0.0$

$y = 0.0$

$\theta = 175^\circ$

$\phi = 20^\circ$

	σ, ps	fraction, %
wide	221.5	45.5
narrow	59.5	50.5

Time difference between two neighbor channels

Momentum = 1.5GeV


$x = 0.0$

$y = 0.0$

$\theta = 175^\circ$

$\phi = 20^\circ$

	σ, ps	fraction, %
wide	210.9	50.5
narrow	55.9	49.5






Results of simulations

Wide

Narrow

Type of time difference	x, cm	y, cm	θ°	ϕ°	σ ,ps	fraction, %	σ ,ps	fraction, %
ch2 - ch3	0	0	175	20	210.9	50.5	55.9	49.5
ch1 - ch9	0	0	175	20	221.5	45.5	59.5	50.5
ch2 - ch3	0	-1.5	175	180	1644	88.7	80	11.3
ch2 - ch3	14	0	170	0	--	--	45	100
ch2 - ch3	14	0	170	180	--	--	492	65
ch2 - ch3	14	0	170	90	--	--	52	100
ch2 - ch3	8	0	180	0	200	34	68	66
ch2 - ch3	8	1.5	180	0	300	28	79	72
ch2 - ch3	8	0	175	-10	165	36	55	64




Time difference between two neighbor channels, with big ϕ



Momentum = 1.5GeV
 $x = 0.0$
 $y = 1.5$
 $\theta = 175^\circ$
 $\phi = 180^\circ$

	σ, ps	fraction, %
Wide	1644	88.7
Narrow	80	11.3

Time difference between two neighbor channels, with big ϕ




Momentum = 1.5 GeV
 $x = 14.0$
 $y = 0$
 $\theta = 170^\circ$
 $\phi = 180^\circ$



	σ, ps	fraction, %
Wide	---	---
Narrow	492	65 12

Example of a track for which most of the direct photons exit the quartz bar

In order to keep "direct" photons, tracks with phi above 90 degrees should have their theta between 175 and 180 degrees



Percentage of the events with wide time distribution



Events with not good time resolutions are this:
Theta <175° && ((90 <Phi< 180) || (-90 >Phi> -180))


16%

By tilting the detector we can remove this kind of events

fTOF prototype current geometry



fTOF prototype new geometry





Results of simulations, integrating all muons

Coincidence with Quartz Start counter and fTOF

	σ , ps	fraction, %
wide	254.5	42
narrow	67.3	58

	σ , ps	fraction, %
wide	265.2	40
narrow	73.0	60




What we learnt from simulation

- 5 p.e. per channel
- Majority of the late p.e. arrive within rise time of the signal from first p.e. ($\sim 1\text{ns}$). This will spoil rise time and amplitude of the signal, CFD algorithm will not work properly any more.
- Total number of p.e. ~ 80 , we run at $7.0 \cdot 10^5$ gain, this can make the phototubes behave badly. Probably we will have to run at smaller gain.
- Top to bottom and neighbor time difference show approximately same RMS

- Depending on position, theta and phi of the track time resolution per channel can be $60/\text{Sqrt}(2) \sim 42\text{ps}$
- If we do not fix position and direction of the track (integrate all muons) time resolution per channel can be $70/\text{Sqrt}(2) \sim 50\text{ps}$

Measurement with cosmic muons




→ More than 50% of the signals don't look good for precise timing measurements



Main reasons:

- More then 1 p.e. per channel
- Crosstalk
- Base line oscillation?



→ We classify the waveforms into 3 main types


- 1) Good signal
- 2) Crosstalk
- 3) Double peak

→ For all analysis described below we use just good signals



Laser run VS cosmic run

As expected rise time and charge are different


Laser (single p.e.)




Cosmic



charge ch3




Laser run VS cosmic run




↑
Muons

Laser →



15.12.2010



Merging CRT and USBWC data



	Fraction of the events
CRT	100%
USBWC	~ 80%
Merged	~ 10%


Merging data is one order of magnitude less than data from CRT

PC which take data from USBWC have to be changed from more powerful





Problem in USBWC data taking. Consequences.

- We discover some strange behavior of the waveforms on the 16 channel USBWC array at LAL (06.12.2010) .
- Events from different boards can be shifted, i.e. events written to file from USBWC can contain waveforms from physically different events.
- Thus, merged CRT-USBWC data cannot be used
- We can avoid this problem by constructing time differences using times from one board.



time_ch2 - time_ch3 OK

time_ch3 - time_ch4 NOT OK



Different strategies for data analysis

No merging with CRT	Merging with CRT	
Simple	Complicated	Very complicated 3D analysis
<p>Time differences between channels from one board.</p> <p>Cuts on charge, amplitude, rise time and shape of the signal</p> <p>No cuts on tracking</p>	<p>Top to bottom time differences between channels</p> <p>Cuts on charge, amplitude, rise time and shape of the signal</p> <p>Cuts on theta, phi and position of the track</p>	<p>Time differences between given channels</p> <p>Cuts on charge, amplitude, rise time and shape of the signal</p> <p>Using information about the track construct expected time difference.</p>
<p><u>DONE</u></p>	<p><u>NOT DONE</u></p> <p><u>For the moment we can not perform this analysis, we plan to do it in future</u></p>	



Comparison between Simulations and Measurements

	σ , ps	fraction, %
wide	254.5	42
Narrow	67.3	58

**Time resolution/channel:
67.3/Sqrt(2) ~ 50ps**

	σ , ps	fraction, %
wide	470.5	54
Narrow	129.0	46

**Time resolution/channel:
129.3/Sqrt(2) ~ 90ps**



Discrepancies between measurements and simulation coming from existing of multiple p.e./channel and crosstalk


Estimation and simulation of these contributions are under studying

Measurements. Fit with three Gaussians

	σ ,ps	fraction, %
wide	532	47
Narrow	76	13
Third	174	39


**Time resolution/channel:
76/Sqrt(2) ~ 54ps**

- We fit with three Gaussians, in order to reproduce better measurements
- We are able to extract narrow component 54ps



Discussion of the results. Conclusions

dtimeL ch1



- Time resolution from simulation
50ps / channel
- Time resolution from measurement
90ps / channel
- Narrow component of the time
resolution from measurement
54ps / channel (three Gaussian fit)

- Total number of p.e. ~50
(3p.e./channel), we run at $7.0 \cdot 10^5$
gain, this can make the phototube
behave badly.
- Effect coming from multiple p.e.
and crosstalk have to be estimated

Future plans

- Within simulation we did not take into account effects coming from multiple p.e. and crosstalk. In order to estimate effect coming from multiple p.e. and crosstalk. We are going to simulate response of the MCP-PMT

Update setup

- Reduce amount of p.e. :-). Put absorber in front of MCP-PMT.

Update setup would be with MCP-PMT SL10

- Rise time 500ps
- TTS ~ 35ps
- 4 and 16 channels

Backup slides