

#### **Topics**

#### Introduction

**Tracker layout** 

Straw tube drift cells

**Detector modules** 

Performance

**Stations** 

**Electronics** 

HV, gas, alignment

**Project organization** 

**Summary** 







# Boundary IT - OT: cell occupancy $\leftarrow$ track density $\otimes$ granularity



# TRACKER LAYOUT



Detection elements 5 mm diameter straw tubes packed in double-layered modules



# Station = 4 planes of modules arranged as X U V X views

		active	e area	
station	$z_{max}$	$x_{max}$	$y_{max}$	channels
	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	
2	2275	704	581	4.3 k
3	3635	1125	929	6.8 k
4	6035	1867	1541	11.4 k
5	7035	2176	1796	13.1 k
6	8038	2486	2052	15.1 k
7	8497	2628	2170	16.0 k
8	8956	2770	2287	16.8 k
9	9415	2912	2404	17.5 k
				101.0 k

Stereo angle  $\pm 5^{\circ}$  optimised for

 $\varepsilon_{seeding}\otimes \varepsilon_{following}\otimes \mathsf{RICH}$  slopes



Economised since Techn. Proposal:

- No station behind RICH 2
- No Y planes at RICHes
- One magnet station less



 $\pi$ -K separation for true pions

#### **STRAW TUBES**

Cell size limited by: occupancy signal collection time clean electrostatics (tube) fast drift gas

 $T_{max}$  < 25 ns ideal  $T_{max} < 50$  ns realistic

consequence: time overlap with hits from neighbouring BX



Use Ar /  $CF_4$  /  $CO_2$  for fast drift Large electron capture c.s. of  $CF_4$  at few eV:

- degrades drift resolution
  insignificant
- breakup to free fluorine radicals

Cathode surface of noble metal or carbon loaded polymer (ATLAS, HERA-B, COMPASS)

Technical Proposal: "drift cells of straw tube geometry built with honeycomb chamber technique"

HC proto's of C-doped polycarbonate foil (Pokalon) Switched to real straw tubes of C-doped Kapton because:

- 1. Pokalon-C very expensive
- 2. doubts about Pokalon-C 'aging' in Ar / CF $_4$  / X
- 3. slow drift in HC cell corners
- 4. better precision of cell shape

Channel density increase: 5 + 1 mm HC cell pitch 5.25 mm tube pitch

Less planes  $\implies$  stayed at 100 k channels



#### Outer layer = 25 $\mu$ m Al $\Leftarrow$ X-talk suppression



Tested 1. Kapton XC

- 2. aluminium
- 3. pure Kapton
- 4. aluminised Mylar
- 1 & 2 cathode to HV GND via outer layer

X talk by amplitude: 0.5 % aluminium 1.8 % Kapton XC stays worse with shielding foils Pair of Al-XC tubes acts as  $1/4\lambda$  resonator if only

sees GND at preamp  $\mathcal{L} = O (2 \text{ m}) \Longrightarrow \nu = O (40 \text{ MHz})$ , inside preamp bandwidth

Remedy: tube grounding at short intervals



64 cells wide

sandwich plates of HC core + 100  $\mu \rm m$  carbon facings + 20  $\mu \rm m$  Al foil



no module overlap  $\implies$  loose 1/2 cell at border





#### gas distribution into tubes



Electrical split near y = 0 to limit cell occupancy and signal propagation time

Wire centering supports every 80 cm



### midway splitter boost far-end amplitude: no terminating impedance





#### signal round trip $\leq$ 20 ns $\simeq$ shaping time



# 10 mm long wire support $\implies$ 12 mm insensitive region





#### assembly of end piece and front end boards

#### **MATERIAL BUDGET**

#### Module elements: 0.67 % X<sub>0</sub>

2 tube layers	0.276	%
4 x 0.1 mm facing	0.14	%
2 x 10 mm HC core	0.11	%
2 x 20 $\mu$ m Al foil	0.045	%
gluings (est.)	0.1	%

Break down for tube layers:

aluminium0.165 %glue0.02 %Kapton XC0.091 %

Add localised materials  $\implies$  0.75 % per module 4 x 0.75 % = 3.0 % X<sub>0</sub> per station Sum for Outer Tracker: 24 % X<sub>0</sub> 10 %  $\lambda_I$ 

# **TEST BEAM RESULTS**











### PERFORMANCE STUDIES

OT configuration optimization

Track reconstruction on simulated  $b\overline{b}$  events + min. bias bkg events

pp interactions at  $\sqrt{s} = 14$  TeV Pythiaparticle decaysQQ packagefollow through LHCbGEANT based SICBOuter Tracker responseGAUDItuned to test data, incl.dead time etc.track reconstructionTRAIL package

Background mixed into  $b\bar{b}$  events :

**PILE UP:** min. bias in same BX (average 0.53) **SPILL OVER:** hits due to different BX

- 1. overlap of 50 ns OT time windows per BX
- 2. long-lived curling tracks





#### OCCUPANCY

Def: fraction of channels hit within the 50 ns event window

importance:

 pattern recognition efficiency & ghost rate requires mean occupancy

seeding  $\leq 10$  %

other  $\leq 15 \%$ 

• f.e. dead time  $\simeq$  35 ns / hit occupancy  $\Longrightarrow$  inefficiency



seeding eff. vs number of hits in T6 – T9

#### Tuning of IT - OT boundary







# Track reconstruction $OT \oplus IT$

Upstream tracking

- find track seeds in T6 T9
- assume origin in vertex  $\Rightarrow \delta p/p$  to O(2 %) from  $p_t$  kick
- follow into the gently rising B field

Fast variant for L2 trigger

• match track seed with VELO track, p from kink  $\delta p/p$  = 1.3 % matching eff. = 92 % for p > 5 GeV/c

Downstream tracking

• follow VELO track into the magnet (T4)  $\delta p/p \simeq 0.6 \%$  $\varepsilon = 80 \% - 90 \%$  depending on p



m.s. term (constant) and resolution term ( $\propto p$ ) are equal at 100 GeV/c

 $<\delta p/p>$  = 0.39 % for p> 1 GeV/c

Upstream tracking efficiencies







track following  $\leq 5^{o}$ 

track seeding  $\leq 10^o$ 

RICH slopes not too small, 5° still OK  $(\Rightarrow 0.09 \text{ mrad on track})$ vs 0.58 mrad per photon)



seeding eff. vs stereo angle



following eff. and ghost rate vs stereo angle

Physics performance illustration

**Tracking efficiency** 

 $B_d \to \pi \pi$ 94 % ( $\Leftarrow$  97 % per track) $B_s \to D_s(KK\pi)K$ 80 % ( $\Leftarrow$  95 % per track)

Mass resolution



#### comment to mass resolution

- Tracker  $\implies$  track momenta
- VELO  $\implies$  track angles

### $\delta M/M \propto \delta p/p \ {\rm and} \propto \delta lpha/lpha$

- $B \rightarrow \pi \pi$  hard tracks, large opening angle momentum error dominates
- $D_s \rightarrow KK\pi$  soft tracks, small opening angle errors on momenta and angles contribute equally

cp. Techn. Proposal: assumed  $\delta p/p = 0.3 \%$  $\delta M(B_s \rightarrow D_s K)$ : unchanged  $\delta M(B_d \rightarrow \pi \pi)$ : 17 MeV/c<sup>2</sup> × (0.39 % / 0.3 %) = 22 MeV/c<sup>2</sup>







# 10 cm between pole faces and $\pm$ 250 mrad acceptance limit





T3 – T5 mounted on rails fixed to magnet yoke L/R halves separate when moving out

# ELECTRONICS

#### 104000 channels



#### Front end:

- Hit rates locally up to 4 MHz at  $\mathcal{L} = 5 \times 10^{32} cm^{-2} s^{-1}$
- radiation dose O(10 krad/yr) ⇒ rad. tolerant / hard

Preamp: 8-channel ASDBLR chip

 $\begin{array}{lll} \text{DMILL} \rightarrow \text{radiation hard} \\ \text{peaking time} & 8 \text{ ns} \\ \text{shaping time} & 20 \text{ ns} \end{array}$ 

Custom designed TDC OTIS chip, ASIC lab Heidelberg

- rad hard 0.25  $\mu$ m CMOS
- clock driven (via TTC system from LHC clock)
- DLL adds 5 bits fine time
- 32 channels / chip
- each channel has its own clock-synchronous L0 buffer
- on L0 accept two buckets to derandomizer

OTIS development steps

submits of TDC core and memory tested July 2001first submit of full chipApril 2002final evaluationMay 2003

fall-back solution: already existing HPTDC chip

- 32 channels share 1 L0 buffer ⇒ in hot regions use only 16 channels/chip
- limited radiation tolerance ⇒ not on f.e. boards (racks near detector)
- FPGAs convert data to OTIS format ⇒ same L1 electronics

Can do the job at added cost of crates and cabling

#### **HV DISTRIBUTION**



#### $2\times 64$ ch per HV branch







### **PROJECT ORGANISATION**

Milestone	Date
Mechanics	
Engineering design of modules completed	12/2001
Engineering design of frames completed	6/2002
Start of module production	6/2002
Start of frame production	3/2003
All frame parts at IP8; start of station assembly	6/2004
Last modules to IP8	4/2005
Last station installed	6/2005
Electronics	
TDC choice	5/2003
Start of electronics production	6/2003
All electronics produced and tested	3/2005
Project	
Commissioning completed	3/2006



/59

Task	Institutes	
Mechanics		
T2 – T5	Heidelberg, Krakow	
Т6 – Т9	Beijing, NIKHEF, Warsaw	
Electronics		
Before TDC	NIKHEF	
From TDC to DAQ		
Baseline design	Dresden, Heidelberg, NIKHEF	
Fall-back design	Krakow, NIKHEF	
Production & testing	Beijing, Dresden,	
	Heidelberg, NIKHEF	
Services		
Drift gas	CERN, Krakow	
High voltage	CERN, NIKHEF	
Alignment	Warsaw	
Controls	NIKHEF	

#### Comments

620 modules includes 10 % spares

assembly of large stations at CERN

tracking software and performance studies: common for OT + IT by Tracking Task Force

#### **PROJECT COST**

detector modules	2720 kCHF	
electronics	5570	
frames and installation	560	
services	450	

TOTAL

9300 kCHF

### SUMMARY

- Module design: ready and proven
- Known how to assemble into stations
- Electronics is designed; TDC still under development, fall-back is on the shelf
- Tracker layout simplified: two stations less than in Technical Proposal
- Track reconstruction efficiency through entire spectrometer  $\geq$  90 %
- Momentum resolution 0.39 % (T.P. assumed 0.3 %)
- Outer Tracker represents 0.24 X<sub>0</sub>
  (T.P. idealized design 0.18 X<sub>0</sub>)
- Resources of people, time and money match the present project size

Further LHCb optimization: trend to 'less is even better'

May drop another station, but no effect on technical design