UPGRADE OF THE CMS TRACKER WITH TRACKING TRIGGER

R&D and ideas for implementation
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The Tracker Upgrades

- **Pixel upgrade**
  - Foreseen for the middle of this decade
    - 4-layers / 3 disks
    - Optimized design, substantially reduced mass
    - CO$_2$ cooling, DC-DC converters for powering
    - Electronics more robust @ high rate

- **Full Tracker upgrade**
  - Foreseen for the beginning of the next decade
  - Large project, vast R&D program covering all detector aspects
    - Includes requirement of tracking in Level-1 trigger
  - Will also involve one further upgrade of the pixel detector
    - Focus has been mostly on the outer tracker, for the time being
The full Tracker Upgrade: basic requirements

- **Granularity**
  - Resolve up to 200÷250 collisions per bunch crossing
    - Nominal figure of $5 \times 10^{34}$ cm$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ @ 40 MHz corresponds to $\geq 100$ collisions
  - Maintain occupancy at the few % level

- **Radiation hardness**
  - Ultimate integrated luminosity considered $\sim 3000$ fb$^{-1}$
    - To be compared with original $\sim 500$ fb$^{-1}$
An “old” requirement

- Improve Tracking performance
- Current Tracker has a lot of material
  - Modules, power cables, cooling, support structures
  - Particularly between barrel and end-caps
A “new” requirement

- µ, e and jet rates would exceed 100 kHz at high luminosity
- Increasing thresholds would affect physics performance
  - Performance of algorithms degrades with pile-up
    - Muons: increased background rates from accidental coincidences
    - Electrons/photons: reduced QCD rejection at fixed efficiency from isolation
- Planned “phase-1” trigger upgrades are not sufficient
  - 4th CSC muon station in the forward
  - More granularity/segmentation from calorimeters and muons

Tracker input to Level-1 trigger

Goals:
- Maintain overall L1 rate within 100 KHz
- Keep latency within ~ 6 µs (ECAL pipeline 256 samples = 6.4 µs)
  - The current limit is the Tracker
Example: single muon trigger

- Phase-1 trigger upgrade should provide $\geq \times 2$ improvement in rejection power
- However, rate remains $\sim$ flat at high $p_T$
  - Mis-measured tracks would $\sim$ saturate the available rate eventually
  -Muon system alone cannot cope with $5 \times 10^{34}$ and above
- Matching Tracker coordinates can potentially improve the resolution by one order of magnitude

- Similar issue for single electron trigger
  - Isolation cuts using tracks may need some discrimination on primary vertex $z$ position, to avoid rejecting good electrons
Trigger architectures

- **(a) “push” path**
  - L1 tracking trigger data combined with calorimeter & muon trigger data
    - With finer granularity than presently employed
  - Physics objects made from tracking, calorimeter & muon trigger data transmitted to Global Trigger

- **(b) “pull” path**
  - Use present L1 calorimeter & muon triggers to produce a “Level-0” to request tracking information from specific regions
    - Same latency as today’s Level-1 (~3 µs)
    - Expected rate ~ 1 MHz
  - Tracker sends out information from regions of interest (within a few clock cycles), to form a new combined L1 trigger
    - Within the remaining ~3 µs

- Mostly focusing on option (a) so far
  - Maintains present architecture
  - Requires local data reduction (i.e. rejection of low-p_T tracks)
    - Possible implementation exploits the strong CMS magnetic field
Modules with $p_T$ discrimination

- Select locally hits from particle above a $p_T$ threshold ("$p_T$ module")
  - Threshold 1 to a few GeV → data reduction of one order of magnitude or more

- Correlate signals in two closely-spaced sensors
  - Exploits the strong magnetic field of CMS

- Several options considered:
  - With strip sensors only
  - With pixellated sensors
  - With vertical interconnection through an interposer
  - With interconnection at the sensors edge
$p_T$ modules in barrel and end-cap

- Sensitivity to $p_T$ from measurement of $\Delta(R\phi)$ over a given $\Delta R$
- For a given $p_T$, $\Delta(R\phi)$ increases with $R$
  - A same geometrical cut, corresponds to harder $p_T$ cuts at large radii
  - At low radii, rejection power limited by pitch

- In the barrel, $\Delta R$ is given directly by the sensors spacing
- In the end-cap, it depends on the location of the detector
  - End-cap configuration typically requires wider spacing
Simplest option: “2S Module”

- 2x Strip sensors
- Light and “simple”
- No z information
- Suitable for outer part
2S Modules: possible features

- ≈ 5 cm long strips, ≈ 90 µm pitch
- Wirebonds from the sensors to the hybrid on the two sides
  - 2048 channels on each hybrid
- Chips bump-bonded onto the hybrid
- Neat and lightweight design
- Should use 1 link / module
  - Ideally to be integrated in the module itself, to avoid cumbersome connectivity
    ★ Option under study
“PS” module

- Pixel + strip sensor with horizontal connectivity

≤ 50 mm

≤ 100 mm
PS modules: some features

- **Sensors:**
  - Top sensor: strips
    - 2×25 mm, 100 µm pitch
  - Bottom sensor: long pixels
    - 100 µm × 1500 µm

- **Readout:**
  - Top: wirebonds to “hybrid”
  - Bottom: pixel chips wirebonded to hybrid
  - Correlation in the pixel chips?

- **No interposer, sensors spacing tunable**

- **Power estimates**
  - Pixels ~2.62 W
  - Strips ~0.51 W
  - Logic ~ 0.24 W
  - Low-power GBT ~ 0.5 W
  - Power converter ~0.4 W
  - Total ~ 4.5 W
  - Pixel chip is the driver
Vertical interconnections: “VPS module”

- Meant to improve upon limitations of “horizontal” PS modules
- Possible advantages
  - Module size independent of granularity
    - In principle $10 \times 10 \mathrm{cm}^2$ module feasible
    - Can help for integration in hermetic surfaces, services etc…
    - Strip length tunable, not constrained to $\frac{1}{2}$ module length
    - Mitigate geometrical inefficiency for stub finding at the edges and in the center
- Several difficult issues involved
  - Interconnection technologies
  - Size of the assembly may be eventually limited anyway, by difficulty/yield
  - Need interposer covering the whole surface of the module
    - May significantly affect the module mass
  - Sensor spacing determined by thickness of interposer (not tunable)
    - Not well adapted to end-cap configuration
- Possible advantages in terms of system aspects are to be proven, and depend on module details
One development based on 3d electronics

- A single chip connected to top and bottom sensors
- Analogue paths through interposer from top sensor, segmented in ~ cm long strips
- Bottom sensor provides $z$ precision (~ mm long pixels)
- Electronics and connectivity (interposer) are technological challenges (yield, robustness, mass, large–size module)
Development in steps

- Demonstrator $5 \times 5 \rightarrow$ module $100 \times 100$?

- A long way to go for large surface, and volume production
- Lightweight interposer is a key for the module quality
Evaluation of different options: layout modelling

- Dedicated standalone software package©
  © N. De Maio, S. Mersi
  Based also on work from V. Karimaki and G. Hall

- Allows to place in space active and passive volumes
  ⊢ Starting from a small sets of simple parameters
Simple (semi-automatic) modelling of services

Material on active elements + Material for services automatically routed
- Implements estimates of tracking performance

- Use measurement errors to estimate the errors in track fit parameters

- **Multiple scattering** treated as (correlated) a measurement error

\[ y_n = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} (x_n - x_i) \theta_i \]

**Deviation due to scattering:**

\[ \sigma_{n,m} = \langle y_n y_m \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} (x_m - x_i) (x_n - x_i) \langle \theta_i^2 \rangle \]

\[ \sigma_n^2 = \frac{p^2}{12} \]

- As well as fraction of interacting particles

- Can be used in the same way to evaluate trigger performance potential
- Validated by modelling the present tracker

- Spectacular accuracy out of the box!
➢ Summarize results in three rapidity regions

Δη = 0.8
Roughly same number of tracks expected
Layout studies: some results

- Compare options with different levels of trigger functionality
  - Evaluate trigger performance potential and impact on tracking performance
  - Compare with present tracker
Momentum resolution

Resolution @ 100 GeV [%] vs. Resolution @ 10 GeV [%]

- **A**: CMS Tracker
- **B**: Tracking only
- **2S**: pT outer only
- **PS**: 2S+PS all trigger

Legend:
- **C**: 0 → 0.8
- **I**: 0.8 → 1.6
The impact of trigger modules is well visible, but not too disruptive.
Overall comparison

- Penalty due to extra material is visible
- Substantial gain in trigger performance potential
  - Better tracking precision in the forward
  - Better $z_0$ resolution everywhere
    - In principle this should allow isolation cuts for electrons/photons!
- N.B. trigger performance estimate assumes efficient stub finding, sufficient data rate reduction etc…
Towards implementation

- Layout modelling software also used to estimate efficiency of individual $p_T$ modules
  - E.g. to choose starting value for sensor spacing
  - Can play at the same time with sensors spacing and width of the window
First optimization exercise
preliminary

- Keep as ideal targets:
  - 0% efficiency @ $p_T = 1\text{GeV}$
  - 100% efficiency @ $p_T = 2\text{ GeV}$
- Limit choice of spacing to “a few” different values
Optimize width of the window at the same time…
Expected \( n \) of coordinates @ L1

- Almost full efficiency @ \( p_T = 2 \) GeV up to \( \eta \approx 2 \)
Low $p_T$ rejection looks OK!
From stubs to tracks

- Full-scope goal: reconstruct all tracks above ~2 GeV
  - Inspired from isolation cuts presently used in High-Level Trigger
    - N.B. Association of stubs directly to muon/calorimeter primitives does not seem viable

- Two approaches considered so far to process “stubs” at the back end
  - Still in the speculative stage…
Hierarchical stub/tracklet/track processing in FPGAs

- Pairs of layers closely spaced to moderate combinatorial problem
  - “Double-stack” geometry
  - Pairs of stubs are combined into a “tracklet”, that has sufficient precision to extrapolate to the next double stack
  - Find track if at least one tracklet is found (plus two stubs)

- Geometry tuned to have well-defined sectors in the $r\phi$ view
- Concept studied only in the barrel geometry (...so far...)
- Would lead to a detector layout entirely determined by trigger architecture
  - Penalty in tracking performance non-negligible

Concept studied in some details
- Feasibility of FPGA processing still to be proven
Parallel processing in Associative Memories

- AMs used in CDF and now considered in ATLAS
- In principle powerful approach for this kind of problems
- Should be applicable to different detector geometries
  - However size of the application unprecedented
  - A first exercise done so far, using only three outermost layers, and 2S modules

... to be followed up!
... and beyond tracks?

- Study of possible use of Level-1 tracks in combined triggers not yet really started
- Trigger group busy with “Phase-1” upgrade
- Current thinking mostly inspired by use of tracking info in HLT

- For one of the next TWEPPs...
Conclusions

- Good progress in identifying options for the implementation of the tracking trigger
- Providing information that offers potential for sufficiently precise tracking @ Level-1 appears plausible
  - With acceptable impact on tracking performance
- We are still exploring the phase-space of possible options
  - Non trivial, no obvious privileged corner…
- A lot of demanding developments involved
- How to process the L1 Tracking information is an open problem
- Excellent software tools to qualify options have been developed
  - Will help all along the design of the detector!