# DAQ for Oxygen operation

H. Menjo LHCf Collaboration meeting 16-17 Oct 2023, Nagoya





### **Discussion points**

Self trigger mode (Op2022) / Fast clear mode (Op2015) ? Depending the noise 

DAQ Speed-up

FC modification as Arm1 new FC



### **Event Rate Estimation**

- Operation Condition

  - □ Beam condition : 1 bunch per train, the number of trains is 50 ?  $\Box$  Collision per bunch crossing  $\mu$  = 0.01 (2015 operation), 0.03 (2022 operation)  $\Box$  Acceptance (particle in LHCf per collisions) : ~ 0.2
- Event rate R,
  - $\Box$  Assuming  $\mu = 0.01$  and Nb = 50,  $R = 0.01 \times 50 \times 0.2 \times 11.3 \text{ kHz} = 1.13 \text{ kHz}$
  - $\Box$  Assuming  $\mu = 0.03$  and Nb = 50  $R = 0.03 \times 50 \times 0.2 \times 11.3 \text{ kHz} = 3.4 \text{ kHz}$



## Self trigger mode or Fast clear mode ?

- If bunch spacing is more than 2 usec, we can use fast clear method like Op2015.
  - ADC gate opens every bunch-crossing, if no trigger, ADCs are fast-cleared
- The choice affects whether we need a signal delay or not.
  - $\Box$  clearly the signal delay increase the noise (pedestal fluctuation).
  - delay chip might be a source of 10% gain difference between Op2015 and 2022.
- Trigger logic for fast clear method is more complex than that for the self-trigger method.



## DAQ performance at 2022 operation

- Readout of modules via VME and Silicon via TCP/IP was performed by a single process (frontend) in a computer.
- Maximum DAQ rate
  - $\Box$  Arm1 : 1.9 kHz (for pedestal trigger)  $\rightarrow$  Readout time per event: 520 µs
  - $\Box$  Arm2 : 1.6 kHz (for pedestal trigger)  $\rightarrow$  Readout time per event: 630 µs
- Readout time



Arm2 VME readout was slower than than of Arm1. The reason could not be understood yet. Maybe compatibility between the computer and the VME controller.

- **VME; FPGA, ADC, TDC readout** VME; GSO bar readout (100 usec) TCP/IP; Silicon Readout (250 usec)





## Three proposals of DAQ for pO

- Method used in Op2022
  - Maximum DAQ rate : 1.6 kHz  $\rightarrow$  Operational rate 0.8 kHz
  - Robust.
- New method A) using parallel readout of two VME crate Use the Arm1 VME crate and computer for parallel VME readout (two frontend) Expected maximum DAQ rate :  $3 \text{ kHz} \rightarrow \text{Operational rate } 1.5 \text{ kHz}$

- New method B) using event buffer in each module
  - Data store in the event buffer of each module and readout some events togethers
  - The dead time (only conversion time) per event can be reduced dramatically.
    - ADC module : conversion time, 10  $\mu$ s  $\leftrightarrow$  readout time 100  $\mu$ s
    - How about silicon?

  - Big technical challenge
    - Event ID in each module, readout control, busy control, etc.

Expected maximum DAQ rate :  $3 \text{ kHz} \rightarrow \text{Operational rate } 3 \text{ kHz}$  (assuming two VME readouts)



### New Method A)

- (two frontend)
- Expected DAQ rate
  - maximum DAQ rate :  $3 \text{ kHz} \rightarrow \text{Operational rate } 1.5 \text{ kHz}$
- Feasibility
  - No big technical difficulty
  - Concern
    - Event matching between data from the two frontends (performed offline)

### Use the Arm1 VME crate and computer for parallel VME readout



## New Method B)

- togethers
- The dead time (only conversion time) per event can be reduced dramatically.
  - ADC module : conversion time, 10  $\mu$ s  $\leftrightarrow$  readout time 100  $\mu$ s
  - How about silicon ?
- Expected DAQ rate
- Feasibility
  - Big technical challenge
  - Event ID in each "module", readout control, busy control, etc

### Data store in the event buffer of each module and readout some events

Maximum DAQ rate :  $3 \text{ kHz} \rightarrow \text{Operational rate } 3 \text{ kHz}$  (assuming two VME readouts)





## New FC for joint operation with ZDC

- New FC was introduced in the last operation. It was for better identification of additional particle incidents in ZDC but no hit in LHCf.  $\rightarrow$  Important for event reconstruction using LHCf + ZDC
- Tag such addition hit in ZDC using scintillator covering only outer regions of Arm1 calorimeters.
- Install a new Arm2 FC or not
  - Disadvantage: loose own beam monitor
  - $\Box$  Advantage: ~ 30% identification of additional photons in ZDC
  - Concern: impact on the multi-hit identification on silicon

Side view Photons without hit in LHCf High energy LHCf ATLAS-ZDC neutron





## New Front Counter for Arm1

### Motivation

- Differences in shape between LHCf detectors and ATLAS-ZDC detectors.
- Some particle without hit in LHCf can make an interaction in ZDC module.
- It is difficult to remove effects of these particles. A MC-driven correction can not be accepted by ATLAS without validation using experimental data.

### Concept

- Tagging parts of photons without hit in LHCf but with hit in ZDC.
  - Prepare new front counter with 7mm (2 $X_0$ ) tungsten plate and scintillator.
  - In left plot, orange area is covered by 7mm tungsten + scintillator and black area is covered by plastic plate (NO tungsten)
  - By tungsten plate, parts of high energy photons make an EM shower, and more than 20 MIPs signal is expected.
  - Target of tagging efficiency for photons : ~60% in active area.



### Requirements

- Cost : ~ 800 k yen (5 k EUROs), not so much expensive
- Time : ~ 6 months Take time to produce the W plates

11