Silicon-tungsten Electromagnetic Calorimeter of ILD

Daniel Jeans, Department of Physics, The University of Tokyo

CHEF 2013, Paris, April 2013



On behalf of the ILD SiW ECAL groups

IN2P3/CNRS LLR (École polytechnique) LAL (Paris Sud) LPSC (Grenoble) LPNHE (Paris Diderot, UPMC) LPC (Clermont Ferrand)

Kyushu University

The University of Tokyo



Outline

Role of ECAL in International Large Detector (ILD)

Design requirements

Silicon-tungsten ECAL

Optimisation studies

Next talk (T. Frisson) will address status of detector prototypes

More details in ILC Detector Baseline Design (DBD)

Role of ECAL and photon reconstruction in Particle Flow

Hadronic jets on average consist of ~65% charged particles ~25% photons ~10% neutral hadrons Large fluctuations in these fractions

Particle Flow (PF): accurate jet energy measurement

PF relies on (ideally) topologically distinguishing Individual particle calorimeter deposits in hadronic jets Allows use of tracker measurements to estimate charged energy Main limitation: confusion between charged and neutral energy deposits Double counting of energy: charged CALO energy mis-identified as neutral Undercounting: neutral CALO energy mis-identified as charged > "confusion term"

Main role of ECAL:

Cleanly identify photon energy deposits Measure this photon energy reasonably well Identify energy deposits due to charged and neutral hadrons (with HCAL) At lower jet energies (<~100 GeV), particles in jet generally well separated JER dominated by single particle energy resolution of photons and neutral hadrons

At higher energies (>~100 GeV) particles in jet no longer well separated JER dominated by confusion term Single particle energy resolution has rather small contribution



M. Thomson, NIMA611 (2009)

ECAL for particle flow

Large distance IP -> ECAL: Allow jet to spread, increasing distance between jet particles easier to distinguish particles B-field also helps

Small Molière radius Smaller single particle showers Easier to distinguish nearby showers Fine segmentation of readout in 3-d for accurate topological clustering

 $\sim 24X_{n}$ to contain EM showers

Compact depth: small X0 Constrain size of detector yoke and solenoid

Relatively large hadronic interaction length Longitudinal separation between EM and hadronic showers

Choose multi-layer sampling calorimeter Tungsten is a good choice for absorber material In this talk, focus on silicon PIN diodes as actve material scintillator (later talk by Sudo-san), hybrid (Ueno-san in simulation session)

Non-projective geometry avoid pointing cracks

Hermiticity ECAL ECAL ring Forward: LumiCal, BeamCal down to 5 mrad

For default 30-layer design: ~2400 m² of sensors ~10⁸ readout channels Rather small material budget before ECAL

Interactions (particularly hadronic) before ECAL can have severe consequances for PF (~impossible to tag neutrals as not prompt)





Particles typically measured by many detector cells

Water-based cooling

HV, LV, signal cables



DAQ interface cards

Endcap: similar design somewhat longer modules

Carbon-fibre / tungsten mechanical modules

Digitization, data concentration performed inside detector

Services run in 3cm gap between ECAL and HCAL

Exit detector between barrel and endcap





Carbon-fibre/tungsten mechanical strcuture

Active Sensor Unit (1024 readout channels) 18X18 cm² PCB 16 readout ASICs 4 silicon sensors (each with 256 5x5mm² pads)

Dynamic range: single MIP to EM shower core @ 100s GeV

Details of technical realisation in next talk





9

Power and cooling

To reduce power consumption,

take advantage of ILC beam structure: 1ms bunch train every 200 ms switch off front end electronics in inter-train interval

Then ~25 microW per channel -> ~2.5kW in total within structure Additional power consumption in ECAL-HCAL gap (mostly DAQ)

Designed water-based cooling system Sub atmospheric pressure -> "leak-less" Remove heat at edge of every detector slab

Construction industrialisation

Highly modular design, large numbers of identical pieces industrialised manufacture Simpler testing and quality control

Optimisation studies

to justify or reduce cost

ECAL cost driven by

- large sensitive area
- number of readout channels



(ILD Detector Baseline Document)

Optimisation of ECAL

Overall dimensions

Readout granularity

Number of sampling layers

PCB thickness

Silicon sensor guard ring width

Robustness against failures

Optimisation metric: single photon energy resolution, PF jet energy resolution (RMS₉₀) in 2-light quark events at various energies Attempt to reduce cost, technical "aggressiveness"

ECAL inner radius, readout granularity





Large radius clearly improves performance however also has large influence on cost of HCAL, solenoid and yoke

Cell sizes below 1cm useful for higher energy (>100 GeV) jets (higher particle density in higher energy jets)



PCB of Active Sensor Unit (ASU)

18x18 cm², multilayer Si sensors glued on one side Host the front end readout ASIC DAQ, power lines

Minimise thickness -> reduce Molière radius, total thickness ...but preserve flatness

Technologically challenging Current prototypes ~1.2 mm: difficult Optimistic hope ~ 0.8mm: not yet demonstrated

Assess effect of increasing thickness: JER for different PCB thicknesses

No strong effect on performance Can relax beyond 1.2 mm However: has effect on overall ECAL thickness and size of HCAL, coil, yoke...



C Kozakai, Tokyo

Dead area at edge of silicon sensor due to guard ring, mechanical tolerances

Simulation study to understand effects of this region How carefully do we need to minimize?

These dead zones are projective only at theta = 90 degrees



Silicon sensor quality/defects

How robust are the ECAL design and PFA reconstruction against sensor imperfections?
Every particle is measured by 10s -> 1000s of detector cells
Are "perfect" sensors required? Can we accept sensors with a small number of "randomly" distributed defective cells?

Improve industrial yield, reduce cost



Global correction factor applied more sophistical approaches possible

Negligible effect on Jet measurement, even up to $\sim 15\%$



What if an entire readout ASIC fails ? (e.g. bonding failure during assembly) Lose block of 64 readout cells Do we reject entire ASU?

(1 ASU = 16 ASICS, 1 ASIC = 64 channels)



Loss of large areas of pixels has more serious effect than random pixels A few % is still acceptable Expect these to be identified before final assembly can be installed in less critical regions of detector (e.g. later layers)

¹⁸ S. Chen, Tokyo

Summary

Si-W ECAL for ILD optimised for Particle Flow reconstruction

3-d readout granularity is central

Compact design based on tungsten absorber and silicon sensors

Effects of "downgraded" designs to ease manufacture, reduce cost Number of layers, PCB thickness, Si sensor dead area

Jet Energy Resolution seems robust against up to several % pixel and readout ASIC failures







Dead ECAL pixels for single photon resolution

Constant term, stochastic term



Affects mostly constant term of resolution Less important for low energy photons

S. Chen, Tokyo

Dead ASIC: single photon



S. Chen, Tokyo

Dead ASIC: 2-q events



S. Chen, Tokyo

Effect on Z->ee reconstruction of guard ring width

Reconstruction of Z mass in Z->e+e- important for higgs-strahlung measurement

Could be sensitive to effects of large GR



No significant degradation in realistic GR size range (0->2 mm)

S. Amjad (LAL)

Calibration

How can you hope to calibrate 10⁸ detector cells?

PIN diode response expected to be very stable seen in test beams over ~5 year period

Electrical characterisation of PIN diodes width of depletion layer

Calibrate all ASUs before final assembly Sensor + front end ASIC Muon beam and/or cosmics Relative channel-to-channel calibration

Absolute energy scale Completed module(s) in test beam

In-situ monitoring MIP-like tracks in jets (hadrons, muons) Bhabha, Z->e+e-, E/p