



Implications of particle mass for tracker timing cuts

we're not tracking photons

N. Bartosik

INFN Torino

Timing cuts: not so simple



 $0.55\% \rightarrow 31ps \text{ at } R=1.7 \text{ m a substantial}$ delay compared to the time resolution we are considering: $\sigma_t = 60ps$

Real tracks are curved \rightarrow longer path

 \rightarrow real delays are even bigger



Nazar Bartosik

Time of flight: barrel region



Nazar Bartosik

Time of flight: endcap region



Nazar Bartosik

Implications: InnerTracker

We should take the particle's TOF into account when setting the timing cuts

→ decide on the lowest momentum of the heaviest particle we want measure

Expand the asymmetric time windows to include the hits from slower particles



No dramatic increase in the number of hits in the InnerTracker

Nazar Bartosik

Implications: OuterTracker

Quite a dramatic increase in the Outer Barrel if we want to keep slow particles → to be taken into account in the tracker readout design, data rate, etc.

At $\sigma_t = 60ps$ we can use it as a TOF detector \rightarrow use time in track reconstruction



We use Inner and Outer tracker only for extending track from the Vertex Detector \rightarrow no big problem for the track reconstruction (track p_T estimate is used) Would be a problem if we decide to use the inverted track search

Nazar Bartosik

Conclusions

We have to consider the time of flight of particles that we plan to reconstruct with the Inner and Outer Trackers

We need to define specific benchmark particles and their kinematics to use for tracking efficiency estimations

We likely need to use asymmetric readout time windows to keep hits from slow particles

Track reconstruction should not be strongly affected by the increase in occupancy