

# Analysis of PCB Exposure Tests



Roman Pöschl LAL Orsay

- Motivation
- Experimental Setup
- Data Samples
- Analysis and Results
- Summary, Conclusion and Outlook

Calice Collaboration Meeting Lyon Feb. 2009

## Introduction

Calorimeter Electronics to be interleaved with layer structure



Do high energetic showers create signals directly in electronics ? If yes, Rate of faked signals ?

Special PCB in Ecal Prototype during CERN 07 testbeam – Experimental Setup I



## **Usual Slab**

**Prepared Slab** 

- capton and paper

for electrical shielding

- W dummy

Special PCB in Ecal Prototype during CERN 07 testbeam – Experimental Setup II

- PCB positioned at place of layer 12 in Ecal  $\sim$  shower maximum x,y position identical to layer 2
- Schematic view of test PCB 'Expect' signals from 72 pads, 4x18 = 2 Wafer



- 2.6 10<sup>6</sup> Events with 90 GeV Electrons (- 5.8 10<sup>5</sup> with 70 GeV Electrons) At least 70 K at each scanning point (Details see later) Runs 331462 – 331518 Today: Full Statistics
- First Step: Runs were subject to the same data processing chain as 'usual' runs Calice Collaboration Meeting Sep. 2009



#### 90 GeV run (331495)

- Clear Energy Peak
- Special Board place at
  - ~ shower maximum

### Hit Maps

- Layer 2
  - Same xy-Position as Special Board
- Layer 14 First instrumented Layer after Special board

Chip(s) well within lateral shower extension

So far all runs have been reconstruction using usual reco software Now Disabling of zero suppression in reco output

# - Three Scenarios:

- 1) No pedestal correction
- 2) Full pedestal Corrections
- 3) Pedestal Corrections restricted to signals from Chips Remember that there are still 216 entries for the layer in the data files

# - General Methodology:

Subdivision of Runs into BeamTrigger and Pedestal Trigger Events (Oscillator Trigger) interleaved with beam events Corrections are applied (or not) to pedestal as well as to signal events Note: The reconstruction s/w had to be tweaked a bit for that

Three 'Standard Candles'

- 1) Development of MIP Peak in Energy Spectrum
- 2) Correlation between Chip Signals
- 3) 'Noise History' within run

#### **Statistics of Analysis**



On Run Selection and Observations

- Run Selected according to entries in the logbook No comments on bad quality by Shift Crew
- Switch of energy between Run 331473 and Run 331478
  - Change in Pedestal Rate
    20% of all events -> 5% of all events
    Still at least 3500 of (valuable) pedestal events

#### - at least 70k Events at each point

- mostly 90 kEvents for off center runs
- > 200k at (nomincal) Chip Center

Pedestal Correction Disabled



## **MIP Peak vanishes entirely**



## **Noise History**

- 'Grey' Band "Other signals"
- Colored Lines
  Signals from Chips
  Large Fluctuations
  [-30,30] ADC Counts

Pedestal Correction Fully Enabled



#### **MIP Peak restored**

Correlation between Signals slightly reduced O(25%)

## Noise History

- 'Grey' Band "Other signals"
- Colored Lines
  Signals from Chips
  Fluctuations largely tamed
  [-6,6] ADC Counts
  with occasional correlated spikes

Pedestal Correction Restricted to four Chips



MIP Peak slightly washed out

- Reason: Pedestal Correction calculated for Chips applied to all 216 signals less important for this study

Correlation between Signals strongly reduced O(5%) on average More details -> see later

**Noise History** 

- 'Grey' Band "Other signals"
- Colored Lines Signals from Chips Fluctuations tamed [-4,4] ADC Counts no spikes

Average Correlation within Chips



Slightly positive correlation within a Chip O(4%)

#### Average Correlation among different Chips



Scenario for extraction of results I

- No zero suppression
- Pedestal Correction applied to Chips only Major Change w.r.t. to results shown at Daegu Not a sensation but now well investgated
- Only 'electron' events/entries Low energetic entries may bias the results



Calice Collaboration Meeting Sep. 2009

## Scenario for extraction of results II

## **Discarding of Signals**



 Closer Look reveals strong correlation between first signals of each chip These signals arrive together in the multiplex series of the data acquistion (Remember all 216 cells of a board are transmitted in 12x18 chunks to the CRC boards) Reason is unknown but it rings a bell ...

## => First signal of each chip discarded in analysis

Noise Spectra Scan 4

Scan ID

#### Signal Events Pedestal Events



**Discussion of Noise Spectra** 

Did show only a selection of spectra

- Full set of scan plots in Annex to talk
- First Order: No difference between signal and pedestal events visible
- No obvious dependency on scan position
- No Hits above MIP threshold

Assume 45 ADC counts for a MIP Quantitative results -> Next Slides

Average Mean and RMS for Scan 1



Average Mean and RMS for Scan 2



Average Mean and RMS for Scan 3



Average Mean and RMS for Scan 4



Probability of fake hits - Estimation

## **Binomial Distribution**

$$\begin{split} P=N_{_{sig}}/N_{_{tot}} \ , \ N_{_{tot}} = Nevents \ x \ 17 \ (17 \ independent \ signals/Chip) \\ N_{_{sig}} = \#Signals > |n| \ ADC \ Counts \\ \sigma_{_{P}} = [P(1-P)/N_{_{tot}}]^{1/2} \end{split}$$

N=45, 38:  $N_{sig} = 0$  for all runs and all chips !!!! First signals seen for n=30 <=> 2/3 MIP

Probability for #Hits > |2/3| MIP



#### **Probability** < 10<sup>-5</sup>

No evidence for beam induced signals Same level of 'outliers' in Signal and Pedestal Events Chip 1 looks like being a bit noisier than the others Largest 'Hit Probability' when beam was targeted on other Chips Given number is **upper limit** 

#### Influence of other Chips

#### Probability of finding a Signal > 2/3 MIP if

a) There was a signal > 15 ADC Counts in another Chip ("Hits")

b) There was no signal > 15 ADC Counts in another Chip ("No Hits")



Tendency that Signal in one Chip induce Signals in the other Chips

- Consistent with residual Correlation (see above)

- Allows for conclusion that 'real' probability is yet smaller than given here!

Summary, Conclusion and Outlook

- Analysis of PCB exposure test with full statistics Study is finished
- Pedestal Correction necessary for analysis
- No signals above 1 MIP observed
- Probability to find signals with > |2/3| MIPS < 10<sup>-5</sup>
  'Real' probability looks like being much smaller
- No evidence that shower particles create fake hits in detector or even influence noise distribution at smaller level
- All observed 'effects' seem to be independent of scan position
- Presented results summarised in note for CALICE (waiting for approval by referees)
- Can be "immediately" sent to NIM

# Annex: Noise Spectra in other scans

#### Scan 1



27

#### Scan 2



28

Scan 3



29