

## **MIP Energy and Time Calibration**

Sabrina Salamino - on behalf of the calorimeter group Mu2e CM - Calorimeter Workshop June 9th, 2025





- → Energy and time calibration studies with cosmic rays data taken in May 2025:
  - → Procedure to extract the MPV of the energy deposition distribution for every crystal of the calorimeter
  - → T0-alignment procedure test

#### May 2025 cosmics runs

- → Data on both disks, acquired half disk at a time
- → ~15 hours of data taking
- → ~400k events for each half, enough to have more than 500 selected events for each channel
- → Two HV configurations:
  - 1. Vop
  - 2. Vrescaled



#### Visualization of number of selected events for each disk

#### **Event selection**

- $\rightarrow$  Nhits > 4
- → Vmax > 250 ADC counts
- → Straight tracks (3 types):
  - 1. Vertical:  $\Delta X < 34$  mm
  - 2. Diagonal: CRs hitting 1 crystal per layer
  - 3. General:  $\chi^2/NDF < 2.5$
- → Path length correction for diagonal and general tracks



# Langauss fits

→ For each channel, the charge distribution is fitted to a Langauss in order to extract the MPV





## Langauss fits





Sabrina Salamino Mu2e CM - Calorimeter Workshop 09/06/2025







#### **MPV distribution @ Vop**

#### **Rescaled HV**

- → In order to be able to match the 6MIP dynamic range, data with rescaled HV were acquired
- → The HV were rescaled using the MPV values extracted with Langauss fits from March 2025 data at Vop
- → Data for half of each disk (Phi = 1)
- → The same energy calibration procedure was applied



#### **Rescaled HV**





#### **Energy calibration results**

- → To test the energy calibration procedure, the data sample for Disk 1 Phi 1 at Vop was split in half
- → One half used to extract the MPV for each channel
- → The other half was rescaled in MeV using the extracted MPVs





→ E [MeV] = Q / MPV \* 20 MeV

- → Test of the T0-alignment procedure for both disks using May data
- → Fit Template is the old one used for Module-0
- → Procedure organized in two steps. First step with laser not performed:
  - → Starting time offsets up to 12 ns for Disk-0 and up to 150 ns for Disk-1
  - → DT jumps from board to board vary for different runs



- → For each event and for each crystal, the time difference between SiPM left and right is evaluated
- → The distribution of DT for each channel is then fitted to a Gaussian distribution
- $\rightarrow$  The same is done for the mean time, evaluated as:

$$T_{mea} = \frac{T_L + T_R}{2} - \Delta T - T_{mean}^0$$

- →  $T^0_{mean}$  is the average time for each event in order that all channels are corrected from the Tmarker.
- → T<sub>mea</sub> are used as T0 correction in the second step of the time calibration procedure, and times are corrected for the DT



- → The second step is an iterative procedure consisting of the following sequence:
  - 1. The angle between the CR track and the X coordinate is evaluated with a 2D linear fit;
  - 2. For each event, a common energy-weighted of the event is determined;
  - 3. For each event and each hit, the time residuals are evaluated as:

 $T_{\rm res} = T + Y_{\rm cel} / (c \cdot \cos \theta) - T_0^{evt}$ 

- 4. For each channel, the distribution of residuals is fitted to a Gaussian distribution to extract T<sub>cor</sub>
- 5. The obtained T<sub>cor</sub> is subtracted from the measured time in the following iteration.







09/06/2025

T\_1

Entries

Mean

Std Dev

 $\chi^2$  / ndf

Mean

Sigma

Constant

0.008038

257/119

 $27.04 \pm 1.57$ 

-0.02672±0.00823

0.2301± 0.0115

0.302



Run# = 107529, 107550

#### Disk 0

The T0-alignment procedure is finally converging. The spread of the T0s improves from a starting 500 ps to around 60 ps after 9 iterations.

Entries

Mean

Std Dev

 $\chi^2$  / ndf

Mean

Sigma

Entries

Mean

Std Dev

y2 / ndf

Mean

Sigma

Entries

Mean

Std Dev

 $\gamma^2$  / ndf

Constant

T-Tcor ins

Mean

Constant

Constant





#### Disk 1

The final spread obtained with the T0 alignment procedure on Disk-1 is worse than on Disk-0 due to the much larger initial spread on the boards. It improves from 682 ps to 95 ps.

#### **Conclusions**

- → MIP energy calibration successfully tested on both disk-0 and disk-1.
- → The channel-by-channel spread is better than 10% in the Vop configuration and gets reduced to a 3.8% spread setting a better working point a 380 ADC counts.
- → The average response of Disk-0 is 10% larger than Disk-1 as expected.
- → Reproducibility between calibration in different runs is better than 0.25 sigma.
- → A first successful test of the T0 alignment procedure done for Disk-0 and Disk-1.
- $\rightarrow$  Disk-0 calibration provided a final spread for the residuals below 60 ps.
- → Disk1 calibration provided a large spread (98 ps) due to the worst starting conditions.
- → Improvement expected looking at the data with the new Firmware releases.

#### **Backup slides**

#### **Path length correction**

- → The track is defined by:  $y = m \cdot x + q$
- → The intersection with the edges of the crystal in the X-Y plane are evaluated:

$$x_{ ext{up}} = rac{(y+17)-q}{m}, \hspace{1em} x_{ ext{low}} = rac{(y-17)-q}{m} \hspace{1em} y_{ ext{left}} = m \cdot (x-17) + q, \hspace{1em} y_{ ext{right}} = m \cdot (x+17) + q$$

- → Tracks crossing top-bottom:  $path = 34 \cdot \sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{m^2}}$
- → Tracks crossing left-right:  $path = 34 \cdot \sqrt{1 + m^2}$
- → In general: path =  $\sqrt{(x_2 x_1)^2 + (y_2 y_1)^2}$

#### **Tres vs iDAQ**



Sabrina Salamino | Mu2e CM - Calorimeter Workshop | 09/06/2025