

# Improvement of calibration of the timing detectors of the Precision Proton Spectrometer of CMS

T. Ostafin<sup>1</sup> on behalf of the CMS Collaboration

<sup>1</sup>AGH University of Krakow

January 14, 2025

Research partially funded by the Ministry of Science and Higher Education grant 2022/WK/14

#### **Precision Proton Spectrometer (PPS)**



- PPS is a sub-detector of CMS which extends the physics program to Central Exclusive Production (CEP) processes where both protons remain intact after the interaction at IP 5 [1]
- PPS can measure the proton kinematics, which in combination with the information from the central CMS detector allows to reconstruct the full event
- Consists of tracking and timing detectors located symmetrically on both sides of IP 5 and hosted in movable devices called Roman Pots (RP) which allow to bring the detectors very close to the beam (~1.5 mm for PPS) [2]



### **PPS Timing Detector**

- The PPS tracking detector has no way of disentangling pileup in the CMS detector because of its placement far away from IP 5
- The timing detector is used for measuring the time of flight of the protons, which helps to reduce the pileup effect coming from other collisions
- Started collecting data in Run 2 with 1 station in each sector, with 3 planes in them and a mix of single and double diamond readout channels
- In 2024 the full setup consisted of:
  - 2 sectors (45 and 56)
  - 2 stations (cylindrical and box) per sector
  - 4 planes per station
  - 10-12 double diamond readout channels per plane

Knowing the difference between the time of flights of the protons ( $\Delta t$ ), we can compute the *z* vertex position

 $z_{pp} = \frac{c}{2} \Delta t$ 

We can correlate the *z* vertex with one of the vertices reconstructed by CMS and observe if the two protons came from the same vertex or not

### **PPS Timing Detector Digitization**



### **PPS Timing Calibration**

- A two-step timing calibration procedure has already been established in Run 2 [3]
  - 1) Timing correction and alignment
  - 2) Timing resolution
- In Run 3 new problems have been spotted [4]
  - 1) Non-converging t vs ToT (time over threshold) fits for many readout channels
  - 2) Bad quality of the fits (wrong shape, high  $\chi^2$  / ndf etc.)
  - 3) Leading edge *double peak*

- Used for correcting the time walk effect
- Based on a fit function
- Result: 4 fit parameters
  - $p_0$ : difference between the upper and lower asymptotes

**Timing Correction and Alignment** 

- $p_1$ : center of the distribution
- $p_2$ : slope
- $p_3$ : lower asymptote
- Ideally, an S-shaped curve describing well the most populated ToT regions



### **Timing Resolution**

- Uses reconstructed and corrected data based on the previously computed fit parameters
- Additionally, tracks reconstructed with the PPS tracking detector are used to reduce the background
- Performed in *n* iterations
  - Throughout Run 2 and in the beginning of Run 3 the value of n was arbitrary, usually n = 4
  - In each iteration the resolution from the previous step is used as a weight in the current one
- Ideally, converging to a certain value after *n* iterations



### **Bad Quality Fits**

- As opposed to Run 2, in Run 3 many channels have data which doesn't align into an S shape
- The fit doesn't describe the most populated ToT regions very well for both low and high ToT values
- As a result, high  $\chi^2$  / ndf
- Often results in non-converging fits



### **Fit Improvements**

- Changing the fit parameters limits
  - Previously, only two of them were bounded
  - Old limits weren't good enough in Run 3
- Increasing the max function call limit of the minimizer
- Introducing iterative thresholds
  - In Run 2 the fit had constant bounds
  - In the beginning of Run 3 the bounds were based on an arbitrary constant ToT fraction of its max bin
  - Now, that fraction is iterative and the bounds are set to the ones which give the best  $\chi^2$  / ndf

#### **Constant Threshold**







---- c<sub>max</sub> \* tfm

2. Compute the threshold by multiplying  $c_{max}$  with a constant threshold fraction of max (*tfm*) value



3. Find the bins with the min count which are still above the threshold to determine the fit bounds

#### **Iterative Thresholds**



1. Find the bin with the max count  $(C_{max})$ 



Time over threshold (ns)

---- c<sub>max</sub> \* tfm1

cmax \* tfm2

3. Compute the thresholds by multiplying  $c_{\text{max}}$  with  $tfm_1$  and  $tfm_2$ 



4. Find the bins with the min count which are still above the thresholds to determine the fit bounds

5. Check  $\chi^2$  / ndf, save if the best and go to 2.

### **Fit Improvements Results**

- The most populated ToT regions well described
- Low  $\chi^2$  / ndf
- Small chance of non-converging fits
- Even though the data doesn't always align into an S-shape, it can still be fit properly most of the time



### Leading Edge Double Peak

#### Channel distribution

- Detectors are tuned to have the signal leading edges concentrated around a certain value (~5 ns)
- This ensures that also the trailing edge of the signal (~13 ns after the leading) is registered in the 25 ns acquisition window
- Sometimes, during a data acquisition run a shift happens to either higher or lower values
- Reasons aren't exactly known; probably a phase shift of the precision clock used for the timing measurement, possibly due to a single event upset in the clock distribution circuitry



#### **Double Peak Correction**



Plane distribution

Plane distribution

#### **After Double Peak Correction**



Channel distribution





#### t vs ToT Fit

 $\chi^2$  / ndf = 645.2 / 21



Bad shape, the most populated regions aren't described very well, big  $\chi^2$  / ndf

#### $\chi^2$ / ndf = 40.34 / 14



#### **Automation Workflow**

- A step-by-step automatic computation per Run based on user-defined datasets (e.g. ZeroBias, AlCaPPSPrompt).
- A workflow consists of a set of **tasks** which are logically grouped:
  - Workers (one worker per dataset file)
  - Harvesters (grouping workers' results)
  - Others (e.g. validation, iteration)
- A task execution is represented by a **job**. One task can have many jobs (e.g. one job per input file).
- Tasks run in a pipeline, i.e. are executed one-by-one and depend on each other (e.g. a harvester task can only begin when all worker jobs have finished processing).
- Often the injection of Runs to be processed happens automatically (**prompt mode**) through periodic synchronization (e.g. with CMS Online Monitoring System (OMS)).

#### **PPS Automation Framework**

#### Software for running automation workflows for PPS:

#### tracking efficiency and timing calibrations [5]

- Originally developed by ECAL
  - Relies on their automation control library which is a steering wheel for the framework
  - We made contributions to this library as well
- Includes different modes: dev (manual Run injection and testing), prompt (automatic Run sync with OMS) and repro (allows reprocessing campaigns)
- Comes with full doumentation which is being constantly developed alongside new features
- Previously manual calibration performed by a person took ~1-2 months; now reduced to ~36 h done fully automatically
  - Easier testing of improved workflows due to much lower turn-around time
  - Made this analysis a lot faster!

#### **Iteration Stop Condition**

- Previously stopping the timing resolution workflow after meeting a certain number of iterations
  - Not ideal since Runs differ from each other and in some channels converge much faster than in others
  - We ended up doing either too few (bad resolution) or too many (wasting resources) iterations for some Runs
  - Required monitoring to change the iteration number if necessary
- Instead, a new multi-step condition was implemented:
  - 1) Perform at least iteration 4
  - 2) If at least 95% of the channels have a difference between the resolution from the previous step and the current one below 10 ps, stop iteration
  - 3) Otherwise, continue unless iteration 10 has been reached

[TIMING-RESOLUTION-ITERATION]: Channels below delta: 164. Working channels: 174.

[TIMING-RESOLUTION-ITERATION]: Iteration 8 for Run 383418 requested. Tasks to iterate marked for reprocessing: ['timing-resolution-worker', 'timing-resolution-harvester']

[TIMING-RESOLUTION-ITERATION]: Max iterations reached for Run 383487.

[TIMING-RESOLUTION-ITERATION]: Iteration stop condition for Run 383487 reached after iteration 10 for tasks: ['timing-resolution-worker', 'timing-resolution-harvester'].

[TIMING-RESOLUTION-ITERATION]: Channels below delta: 167. Working channels: 174.

[TIMING-RESOLUTION-ITERATION]: Iteration stop condition for Run 385127 reached after iteration 9 for tasks: ['timing-resolution-worker', 'timing-resolution-harvester'].

#### **Validation Task Handler**

- Some Runs require reprocessing the workflow based on the produced results (e.g. double peak correction)
- For some Runs a workflow can also produce results which seem valid from the CMSSW point of view but are useless
  - For instance, for the timing correction and alignment workflow this results in all channels having parameters equal to zero
  - It could cause the timing resolution workflow to fail since all channels are broken
- A handler has been implemented in our framework to validate results after each processing.
  - If validation detects a need for reprocessing, it marks the specified tasks as *reprocess*.
  - If validation fails, the whole task is marked as *failed* and its dependencies as *skipped*, which will cause the global status to be *failed* as well.

Timing calibration overview 🛈 🖒							
Run ↑ 🖓 Fil	⊽ Global status ⊽	timing-time-walk-worker 🖓	timing-time-walk-harvester 🖓	timing-time-walk-validation 💎	timing-resolution-worker 🖓	timing-resolution-harvester 🖓	timing-resolution-iteration $\overline{\bigtriangledown}$
<u>383767</u> 99	43 failed	done	done	failed	skipped	skipped	skipped
<u>384273</u> <u>99</u>	88 failed		done	failed	skipped	skipped	skipped
<u>384593</u> <u>10</u>	113 failed	done	done	failed	skipped	skipped	skipped



[1]CMS and TOTEM Collaborations, CMS-TOTEM Precision Proton Spectrometer, CERN-LHCC-2014-021 ; TOTEM-TDR-003 ; CMS-TDR-013

- [2] E. Bossini, Status and perspective of the CMS Precision Proton Spectrometer timing system, FAST 2023
- [3] CMS Collaboration, *Time resolution of the diamond sensors used in the Precision Proton* Spectrometer, CMS-DP-2019-034
- [4] CMS Collaboration, Improvement of the timing calibration in the CMS-PPS timing detectors, CMS-DP-2025-001
- [5] A. Bellora, T. Ostafin, An automation framework for the calibration of the CMS Precision Proton Spectrometer, CHEP 2024

## **Backup Slides**

T. Ostafin | PPS Timing Calibration Improvement

#### **Framework Input**



### **Automation Technologies**

- InfluxDB
  - A time series database used for storing information about workflows, tasks and jobs
  - Access through the automation library
- HTCondor
  - A high performance framework for parallel job processing
  - Executed through CLI (*condor\_\**); in our case, through Python scripts in the framework
- Grafana
  - A monitoring tool for the framework
  - Integrated with the InfluxDB instance
  - Allows easy filtering, provides charts etc
- Jenkins
  - A DevOps tool for executing tasks in a pipeline

#### **Automation Prompt Mode**

#### Both timing and tracking efficiency workflows are working now in prompt

- This means Runs are periodically synced with OMS every 1 h and processed once their datasets are available (usually up to 48 h)
- Every Run from 2024 was processed if it passed a two-step filtering:
  - 1) Based on the OMS *runs* resource:
    - a) sequence = GLOBAL-RUN
    - b) last\_lumisection\_number >= 100
    - c) stable\_beam = true
  - 2) Our own Run filter (based for now on the *lumisections* resource):
    - a) rp\_sect\_45\_ready >= 100
    - *b*) *rp\_sect\_56\_ready* >= 100
    - *c) rp\_time\_ready* >= *100* (only for the timing workflows)