ILD Vertex Detector for the Lol

Marc Winter (IPHC/Strasbourg)



• Reminder on (conflicting) requirements :

 \Rightarrow Physics goals \Rightarrow Running conditions

- Vertex Detector geometries for the LoI :
 - \Rightarrow 5 layer geometry \Rightarrow 3 layer-pairs geometry
- Questions addressed by Lol studies

⇔ Detector geometry

 ⇒ Sensor performances

• Summary

ILD-VD

Aim for several very ambitious (realistic ?) goals :

♦ excellent impact parameter resolution
♦ distinguish impacts from close tracks (inside jets)

 \diamond reconstruct soft tracks \diamond minimal m.s. \mapsto pattern confusions, $\Delta p/p$, part. flow, jet flavour content (e⁻ vs ν_e), ...

Constraints mainly driven by σ_{\pm} – a \oplus b/n sin ^{3/2} θ	Accelerator	a (μm)	b ($\mu m \cdot GeV$)
small $a \mapsto bigh granularity (pixels) and small R_{in}$	LEP	25	70
small $b \mapsto small R_{in}$ ($b \sim R_{in}$)	SLD	8	33
reduced mat, budget (b $\sim (X/X_0)^{1/2}$) \mapsto low Pdice	LHC	12	70
	RHIC-II	13	19
		< 5	< 10

Accommodate running conditions (e.g. event pile-up, background from e_{BS}^{\pm} , photon gas ?, etc.)

 \diamond occupancy \mapsto high r.o. speed (or extreme granularity) \mapsto power dissipation

 \diamond irradiation \mapsto radiation tolerant detectors

Accommodate requirements from other sub-detectors :

 \diamond ex : relatively low B for PFA optimisation \Rightarrow occupancy in VXD \nearrow

Accommodate optimise VXD design consistently with neighbouring tracking sub-detectors (SIT, low angle)

_

Aim: ultra-light, very granular, poly-layer, swift, low power and rad. tol. Vertex Detector installed very close to the interaction point

 \hookrightarrow Aim of the studies driven by the LoI : find an optimal balance between

Granularity,

Material budget,

Radiation tolerance,

Speed

and Power dissipation

(cost not expected to be a major issue)

Complications:

→ Several different detection technologies under development,

→ Several read-out architectures under development

 \mapsto Final performances achievable with each variant not yet assessed

 \Rightarrow Trade-off is technology dependent \mapsto convergence within a few years (EDR) is a challenge

14 mrad crossing angle \rightarrow **background simulation with Guinea-Pig** from K.Buesser (22.01.2008)

BG hit density in each layer being updated :

- \Rightarrow moderate z dependence : maximal in inner layer (15–20 %)
- \Rightarrow substantial ϕ dependence suspected (factor > 2)

↔ varying B by \pm 0.5 T changes hit rate by \sim 20–30 % \longrightarrow \longrightarrow much less than uncertainty on hit rate itself

Concern for polar angle coverage :

← cloud of defocussed e_{BS}^{\pm} may hit ladder ends
 ← corner position in *z* vs B and R reevaluated \longrightarrow

 \Rightarrow confirms \pm previous estimates : $z_C \simeq 8.3 \cdot R^2 \cdot B \cdot \sigma_z \cdot 10^{10} / N$

- ▷ ▷ ▷ For $R \ge 15 \text{ mm}$: ladder half-length $\lesssim 8$ –9 cm free from defocussed cloud, even for B = 3 T
- Direct & backscattered photons not yet (well) studied





Maintain 2 alternative long-barrel approaches :





Two read-out modes considered :

⇔ continuous read-out

⇒ read-out delayed after bunch-train

→ 3 double layers expected to help

 \Rightarrow mini-vectors

5 Layer Geometry : VXD03

- 5 layers intercepting angles down to $\|\cos \theta\| \simeq$ 0.97 :
- Layer radii : 15, 26, 37, 48, 60 mm
- Nb of ladders per layer : 10 (in) / 11 / 12 / 16 / 20 (out)
- Ladder lengths : 125 mm (inner), 250 mm (outer)
- Ladder support structure : carbon fiber (100 μm thick)
- Ladder sensitive part width on each layer :
 - inner : 11 mm second : 15 mm outer : 22 mm
 - 50 μm thick silicon
- Electronics at ladder end :
 - 10 mm long
 - 100 μm thick silicon
- Insensitive ladder edge :
 - 1.5 mm wide
 - 50 μm thick silicon
 - can be activated



- **3** pairs of layers intercepting angles down to $\|\cos \theta\| \simeq$ 0.97 :
- Double-layer radii (inner/outer) : 16/18, 37/39, 58/60 mm
- Nb of ladders per layer : 10 (in) / 12 / 20 (out)
- Ladder lengths : 125 mm (inner), 250 mm (outer)
- Ladder support structure : carbon fiber (100 μm thick)
- Ladder sensitive part width on each layer :
 - inner : 11 mm outer : 22 mm
 - 50 μm thick silicon
- Electronics at ladder end :
 - 10 mm long
 - 100 μm thick silicon
- Insensitive ladder edge :
 - 0.5 mm wide
 - 50 μm thick silicon
 - can be activated



Ladder geometry \rightarrow accommodate simultaneously different sensor technologies :

• Steering and r.o. electronics foreseen along the edges and at the ladder ends



Will be studied extensively by VD groups working on diff. sensor technologies

Ladder Support

"Realistic" ladder fixture on "gasket" \rightarrow **combine with beam pipe geometry study**



Gasket" : 0.74 % X₀ in barrel

- Mechanical support (Be) :
 - $R = 75 \, mm$
 - thickness \simeq 500 μm : 0.14 % X $_0$
- Cryostat :
 - R = 90/100 mm
 - styropor (10 mm) : 0.05 % X₀
 - Al skin (0.5 mm) : 0.55 % X₀

Neighbouring trackers :

- Barrel :
 - 2 layers of Si strips (R = 160 & 270 mm
- End-caps (provisionnal) :
 - 3 disks of hybrid pixels
 - 4 disks of Si strips



Objectives of the Study : Optimal Detector Geometry

Studies based on central massive production of signal and background events with baseline geometry \rightarrow outcome will be used by VD groups for refined studies

Vary basic parameters :

- innermost layer radius : 14 mm $\lesssim~$ R $_{in}~$ \lesssim 20 mm
- ladder material budget : 0.1 % X $_0 \lesssim t \lesssim$ 0.2 % X $_0$
- magnetic field strength : $3 T \le B \le 4 T$

Specific questions :

- optimal pixel pitch and read-out time for each layer
- mini-vector efficiency for BG rejection (layer-pair geometry)
- optimal number of ladders per layer, etc.
- *influence of electronics on ladder edge and ends (mat. budget)*
- influence of SIT : track matching \rightarrow time stamping , low P reconstruction, ...
- track matching (& time stamping) with fw/bw trackers \rightarrow how long should the barrel be ?
- for which fw/bw material budget does a geometry based on short barrel + end-cap disks start to be more attractive than long barrel ?

SUMMARY

- ILD baseline geometry :
 - ightarrow vertex detector made of long cylinders (down to $\|\cos \theta\| \simeq$ 0.97)
 - \Rightarrow B = 3.5 T (intermediate between GLD and LDC fields)

Two alternative geometries studied (inheritated from GLD & LDC) :

- \simeq VXD-04 : 3 double layers (R = 16 60 mm)
 - \Rightarrow continuous and delayed read-out

Emphasis on low material budget :

- ightarrow all layers $\simeq 0.48 0.54 \% X_0$
- \simeq Be mecha. support, surrounded by cryostat (styropor) & field cage (AI) $\rightarrow \Sigma$ = 0.74 % X₀
- ▷▷ Alternative geometry to study : short barrel with end-cap disks

Difficulty: VXD optimisation needs to be organised in \geq 2 parallel ways

- ← combined VXD optimisation accounting for (evolving) neighbouring sub-detector parameters

Effect of 14 mrad crossing angle on hit uniformity (B = 3.5 T - R = 15 mm)

head-on collisions

14 mrad Xing angle



Distributions in ϕ and $z \Rightarrow no$ significant change between head-on & 14 mrad Xing angle distributions

Concern for polar angle coverage : *cloud of defocussed* e_{BS}^{\pm} *may hit ladder ends*

Spatial distribution of defocussed e_{BS}^{\pm} studied with GuineaPig (vertical scales are arbitrary)



 \Rightarrow Use the corner between direct and defocussed e_{BS}^{\pm} to determine ladder lengths \rightarrow angular coverage

Beamstrahlung Background Characteristics

Corner position in *z* vs B and R :

Continuous lines : $z_C \simeq 8.3 \cdot R^2 \cdot B \cdot \sigma_z \cdot 10^{10} / N$

M.Battaglia, V.Telnov, Proc. 2nd Workshop on backgrounds at MDI, World Sci., 1998

Dots : GuineaPig simulation



 $\triangleright \triangleright \triangleright$ GuineaPig simulation confirm empirical expression of z_C

▷ ▷ ▷ For R ≥ 15 mm : ladder half-length \lesssim 8 cm free from defocussed cloud even for B = 3 T

Required radiation tolerance because of beamstrahlung electrons :

$$5 e^{\pm}_{BS}$$
 /cm² /BX \rightarrowtail 6·10¹¹ e^{\pm}_{BS} /cm² /yr \rightarrowtail safety factor (\gtrsim 3) : 2·10¹² e^{\pm}_{BS} /cm² /yr

lonising radiation :

⇒ 6.10¹¹ e[±]_{BS} /cm² /yr → ~ 20 kRad/yr → ~ 50 kRad/yr (inclined e[±]_{BS} trajectories)
⇒ safety factor (~ 3) → ~ 150 kRad/yr
⇒ in 3 yrs : 150–500 kRad

Non-lonising radiation :

 $\Rightarrow e_{BS}^{\pm} (10 \text{ MeV}) : \text{NIEL factor} \sim 1/30$ $\Rightarrow 6 \cdot 10^{11} e_{BS}^{\pm} / \text{cm}^2 / \text{yr} \simeq 2 \cdot 10^{10} n_{eq} / \text{cm}^2 / \text{yr} \rightarrow \text{safety factor} (\sim 3) \simeq 6 \cdot 10^{10} n_{eq} / \text{cm}^2 / \text{yr}$ $\Rightarrow \text{in 3 yrs} : 2 \cdot 10^{11} n_{eq} / \text{cm}^2 \text{ (much more than neutron gas ...)}$

Still to be studied : Photons

Read-out architecture : continuous vs delayed r.o.

Continuous read-out :

- Several draw-backs : data throughput, power dissipation, EMI risk, etc.
- 5 hits /cm² /BX \Rightarrow 0.3 % hit occupancy in 50 μs (20 μm pitch)
 - $\Rightarrow \leq$ 1 % pixel occupancy (3 seed pixels /hit due to inclined tracks)
- in case of 15 hits /cm² /BX \Rightarrow several % pixel occupancy

 \Rightarrow read-out may be too long \Rightarrow risk alleviated with fast read-out in 2nd layer

Delayed read-out :

• how small should the pixel be ?

pitch	(3 ; 3)	(3 ; 6)	(15 ; 3)	(15 ; 6)
20 μm	0.48 %	1.80 %	9.25 %	27.4 %
18 μm	0.32 %	1.21 %	6.46 %	19.9 %
16 μm	0.20 %	0.77 %	4.26 %	13.9 %
14 μm	0.12 %	0.46 %	2.63 %	8.94 %
12 μm	0.07 %	0.25 %	1.48 %	5.25 %
10 μm	0.03 %	0.12 %	0.74 %	2.72 %
8 μm	-	0.05 %	0.31 %	1.18 %
6 μm	-	0.02 %	0.10 %	0.39 %
4 μm	-	-	0.03 %	0.08 %

Prob (\geq 2 hits/pixel) for 3/15 hits/cm²/BX & 3/6 pixels/hit

Upper limit M on double hit /pixel \rightarrow pixel pitch

limit M	(3; 3)	(3; 6)	(15; 3)	(15; 6)
0.3 %	17.7 μm	12.5 μm	7.9 μm	5.6µm
0.1 %	13.5 μm	9.5 μm	6.0µm	4.2 μm
0.03 %	10.0µm	7.0µm	4.5 μm	3 .1µm

< 10 μm pitch mandatory ! \Rightarrow