## <span id="page-0-0"></span>Simulation studies for the main tracker

A. Nürnberg, M. Münker

CLICdp collaboration meeting, CERN, 03. 06. 2015



#### **Outline**

► Occupancy due to beam induced background

- $\triangleright$  Detector simulation in mokka
- Analysis of hit density from incoherent pairs and  $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow$ hadron events
- $\rightarrow$  limits on strip/pixel size in the main tracker

#### $\blacktriangleright$  Detector response

- $\triangleright$  T-CAD finite element simulation
- $\blacktriangleright$  Charge sharing and cluster size
- $\blacktriangleright$  Spacial resolution
- $\rightarrow$  do we benefit from analog readout?

# Beam induced background, occupancy



#### Beam induced background, detector model

- $\triangleright$  Detector simulation using mokka
- $\triangleright$  CLIC ILD CDR detector model as starting point (4 T field)
- $\triangleright$  Removal of TPC and silicon tracking layers
- $\blacktriangleright$  Insert all-silicon tracker, tracker support tube and modified beampipe
- Incoherent pairs and  $\gamma\gamma\to$  hadron background samples at 3 TeV
- $\triangleright$  Study hit rates in the silicon tracker
- $\triangleright$  New analysis code, validated against results published in CDR







### Tracker geometry

- $\blacktriangleright$  Current tracker layout and beampipe geometry
- $\triangleright$  CF support tube implemented (5 mm wall)
- $\blacktriangleright$  Endcap discs split in inner and outer part
- ▶ CLIC ILD CDR vertex detector (3 double layers)
- ▶ CLIC ILD CDR forward region





#### Hitrate in main tracker

- $\blacktriangleright$  Hitrate from incoherent pairs and  $\gamma\gamma\rightarrow$  hadrons in the main tracker
- ▶ No digitization, no clustering, no safety factors





#### Occupancy in the main tracker

- $\triangleright$  Calculate occupancy, assuming 100 mm  $\times$  50 µm strips, avg. cluster size 2.6, apply safety factors 5 (pairs) and 2 (gghad)
- ► Large cell size leads to high occupancy, up to  $\geq 100\,\%$





#### Max. strip length in the main tracker

► Maximal strip length to keep occupancy per bunch train at 3 %, assuming 50 µm strip pitch, avg. cluster size 2.6, safety factors 5 (pairs) and 2 (gghad)





### Sensor simulation



### **Motivation**

- $\blacktriangleright$  For overall detector performance, 7 µm single point resolution in main tracker required. How to achieve?
- $\blacktriangleright$  Spatial resolution can be improved over the binary limit of  $\frac{p}{\sqrt{12}}$ , if charge is shared among two cells. Can we benefit from that?



From: Analysis of Timepix test beam data, Sophie Redford, CLIC workshop, Jan. 2015

- $\blacktriangleright$  Aims of this study:
	- 1. Understand the variation of the cluster size with thickness
	- 2. Evaluate possible ways to modify the sensor design in order to increase spatial resolution, especially in thin sensors
	- 3. Support decision on possible readout scheme (digital or binary) for tracker frontend



#### Sensor

- $\triangleright$  T-CAD finite element simulation of silicon sensor
- $\triangleright$  As starting point: AC-coupled p-in-n silicon strip sensor, best guess of process details, 2 dimensional cut, no B-field (yet)
- $\triangleright$  Simulate particle hit at several positions in the strip unit cell, fixed incidence angle
- **•** Readout of current signal  $\rightarrow$  integration over time  $\rightarrow$  charge signal per strip







#### T-CAD results - Cluster size

- $\triangleright$  Compare signals to threshold level
- $\blacktriangleright$  Estimate fraction of multi-hit clusters

 $\triangleright$  Good agreement to testbeam results



Particle hit position / pitch

Sensor thickness / µm

















### Toy monte carlo - Efficiency



- Efficiency as function of applied threshold
- $\blacktriangleright$  Efficiency fall-off defines upper threshold limit, lower limit is set by noise occupancy
- $\blacktriangleright$  Efficiency as function of track hit position relative to strip (perpendicular incident)
- $\blacktriangleright$  Due to charge sharing, inefficiency most pronounced for tracks hitting directly between the two strips



#### Toy monte carlo - Resolution



- $\triangleright$  Reconstruct particle hit position
- $\blacktriangleright$  Center of gravity or  $\eta$ -method
- $\triangleright$  Residual by comparison to MC-truth particle hit position
- $\triangleright$  Resolution as function of applied threshold
- $\blacktriangleright$  No significant benefit from analog readout compared to binary readout

$$
\blacktriangleright \sigma \approx 7 \,\mu\text{m} \approx \frac{\rho}{\sqrt{12}}
$$



#### Toy monte carlo - Inclined incident



- $\triangleright$  No significant benefit from analog readout over binary readout for small incident angle
- At large angle (low- $p_T$ tracks), analog readout benefits from increased charge sharing



#### Toy monte carlo - Inclined incident



- $\blacktriangleright$  No significant benefit from analog readout over binary readout for small incident angle
- At large angle (low- $p_T$ tracks), analog readout benefits from increased charge sharing
- $\blacktriangleright$  However, for low- $p_T$  tracks, the overall detector performance is dominated by multiple scattering and not by the single point resolution



#### Summary

- $\triangleright$  Occupancy due to beam induced background restricts the maximal possible strip length in the main tracker
	- $\blacktriangleright$  Few millimeters in the inner layers
	- $\blacktriangleright$  Few centimeters in the outer layers
- $\triangleright$  Simulation study on charge sharing
	- $\triangleright$  T-CAD simulation reproduces the trend of increased charge sharing in thick sensors as seen in timepix testbeam
	- $\triangleright$  Simple toy model allows estimation of efficieny and resolution as function of operation parameters (threshold, noise, frontend adc resolution,...)
	- $\triangleright$  No real benefit in resolution from charge sharing and analog readout in thin planar sensors  $\Rightarrow$  binary readout,  $\sigma = \frac{\rho}{\sqrt{12}}$
	- $\blacktriangleright$  However, planar sensor might (most certainly) not be the final answer for the main tracker
	- $\triangleright \Rightarrow$  Possibility to look at other technologies by replacing T-CAD simulation part only



### Backup



### Hitrate in VXD

Incoherent pairs and  $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow$  hadrons in the vertex detector



 $\triangleright$  No z-dependence, steep fall-off in r

### Occupancy in VXD

Incoherent pairs and  $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow$  hadrons in the vertex detector (assuming  $25 \mu m \times 25 \mu m$  pixels, cluster size 5, safety 5 and 2)



 $\triangleright$  With this parameters, occupancy  $\leq 3\%$ 



#### Delta electrons in T-CAD

- $\triangleright$  No direct way to include delta electons in T-CAD
- $\triangleright$  Simple geant simulation to record energy deposit after particle incident with fine granularity,  $O(nm)$
- $\blacktriangleright$  Average over many events
	- $\blacktriangleright$  Sharp core
	- $\triangleright$  Significant tails (delta electrons, scattering) over several 100 µm
- $\triangleright$  Take recorded energy deposits from geant4 as averaged input for charge carrier generation to T-CAD





#### Noise rate - Rice formula

Noise hit rate:  $f_t = \frac{f_0}{2} \exp\left(-\frac{v_{th}^2}{2\sigma^2}\right)$  with  $f_0 = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}$  $rac{1}{2\sqrt{3}\tau}$ 

- Frequency at which a given threshold level  $v_{tb}$  is passed
- $\blacktriangleright$  Shaping time  $\tau$  limits bandwidth
- $\triangleright$  Take CLIC active cycle of 156 ns into account
- $\triangleright$  With 100 ns shaping time,  $V_{th}/\sigma = 3$  results in a noise occupancy of 2.5  $\times$   $10^{-3}$  per bunch train





 $\text{Re}(\text{CERN})$   $\text{Andreas Nürnberg:}$  $\frac{d}{d}$  different construction studies for the main tracker 03. 06. 2015 21