Calorimeter Beam Test Plans

David Kapukchyan

UC EIC consortium meeting

January 17, 2020

Recap of Run 19

- Successful test of preshower, Ecal, and Hcal for STAR forward upgrade
- Data analysis still underway
 - Hannah
 - Xilin
- What we need to test
 - Ability to control voltages using DEP
 - Change shaping of pulse to improve on trigger and timing
 - What type of SiPMs should be used for final preshower design
 - Gains of Ecal towers for analyzing Run 19 data

Voltage control using DEP

- Voltage control was done through TUFF box and Tonko's slow control software
- In some setups simply a power supply box was used
- Need a more robust way to control voltages
- DEP boards allow us to set and read back voltages from FEE cards
- Need adapter on power cable to interface with DEP
 - Tim Camarada has designed and produced one such cable
 - It will be installed
- Need to new control software to interface with DEP
 - Paul Nord

1/17/20



Changes to shaping of pulse

- DEP allows readout of the data in timebins so we can see signal in real time
- If the signal is too wide there would be overlap between each RHIC crossing
- Narrower pulse shape should help with this problem
- Also narrower pulse shape makes it easier to find peak which is important in the trigger algorithm
- Gerard is designing and testing new FEEs for this



As can be seen currently about 10 timebins Want to reduce by maybe factor 2 so only 5 timebins

Type of SiPMs to use in preshower

- The STAR forward upgrade will re-use the postshower detector as its preshower detector (fPRE)
- The Run 19 data shows that the preshower was working fine but noisy due to radiation damage
- This means all the SiPMs will have to be replaced on the old postshower
- The question becomes are the SiPMs we plan to order for the calorimeters have sufficient performance to use for the preshower or is a separate model SiPMs need to be ordered
 - One is a SiPM with 15um pixel pitch used for the calorimeters
 - The other has a 50um pixel pitch and is similar to what we had but newer

Determining SiPMs

- To determine which SiPMs to use we have set up a cosmic test stand in the lab
- DAQ setup same as Fermilab Test from Oleg
- We characterized the existing SiPMs
- We installed both models of SiPMs alongside the old ones
- Repeat same tests

Kem

fPRE prototype (Postshower layer 1)



Characterizing SiPMs

Channel 4 Take cosmic data at various voltages
Fit MIP peak and pedestal
Compute the difference between
Compute the peak position and MIP ChannelHist4 Entries 3568 Mean 1399 120 Δ Std Dev 72.31 100 pedestal peak position and MIP 80 peak position (Δ) 4. Signal to Noise (S/N) defined as 60 σ Δ/σ , where σ is the width of the 40 pedestal 20 1300 1350 1550 1600 1650 1700

ADC, [-]

Plot from Veronika

Results from new ones

• Plots below for old SiPMs showing Δ , σ , and Δ/σ as a function of voltage



Gains on Ecal

- Use DEP boards to take cosmic data with 2x2 tower of Ecal
 - Use same settings and voltages as Run 19
- This will help us determine the gain for the Run 19 data
- Need the gains to accurately compute energy in the towers
- Also useful in testing DEP control of FEE cards
- Test peak finding software

Results from Ecal Cosmics



Conclusions and Run20 outlook

- Finish taking data from cosmics
 - Clear method developed using old ones
 - Will apply same principles to new ones
- fPRE prototype installed with new SiPMs
 - Testing underway
- Prepare Ecal with new FEEs
 - Towers installed but no electronics connected
- Install fPRE prototype at STAR
 - DEP control and readout
- Test systems and take data!

Backup



Slide taken from Veronika