Performance of SVT HPS Collaboration Meeting Nov 15, 2021

Alic Spellman Cameron Bravo







Outline

- 2021 slim sensor module production
- Recovering the SVT after ~ 2 year hibernation at JLab
- Minor issues during run
- Qualitative look at loss of L1/L2 charge collection efficiency over 2021 Run
- Preliminary tracking performance, emphasis on hit efficiencies in L1+L2



New 2021 Sensor/Module Production



2021 Slim Edge Sensors

- 2019 slim sensors, if manufactured correctly, should be useable for much longer
 - However, **2019 sensors riddled with "pinholes"** (later slide), and had **issues with high surface currents and low breakdown voltages**
- New slim edge sensors manufactured to replace 2019 sensors
- 2021 Wafers had trench etched into silicon to help cleave at 250 um
 - Slim edges very consistent at 250 um (improvement over 2019)
- Trench aluminized before cleaving left aluminum deposit on slim edge...possible factor in overall lower breakdown voltages for 2021 slim sensors
- IV plots of wafers used in 2021 show initially (CNM + initial) very low breakdown voltages
- Baking sensors at 168-172 C for 24-40 hrs (in two separate baking cycles) increases breakdown voltage
- UV radiation exposure, and other types of induced radiation (not shown) were tested on other wafers...studies incomplete



2021 Slim Edge Sensor IV Curves

- Wafer IV curves of 2021 sensors
- Initial testing at UCSC showed very low breakdown
- Post baking, IV data shows significant improvement (from 30-40V to 80-90V)





UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

2021 Slim Edge Sensor Halfmodule IV Curves

- Halfmodules built from selected sensors attached to hybrids, wire-bonded to APVs...
- Figure shows HV IV curves for 2021 slim sensor half-modules
- L0M06 wafer had very slim edge (178 um) compared to others (250 um), was placed closest to beam





SVT Main Bias HV IV Curve November 5, 2021

- Near end of 2021 Run (11/05/21), IV run taken by scanning through SVT HV bias values
 - Data obtained from Mya
- Will need new slim sensors for future run
 - In contact with CNM already



7

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

2021 vs 2019 Slim Edge Sensor Pinholes



Low noise spikes on physical channel indicate "pinhole" aka bad channel

- 2019 slim sensors had many initial pinholes, and grew more during run due to fabrication issues
 - 2021 sensors have significant improvement in fewer pinholes!

SVT Initial State Summer 2021

- After returning to Jlab July 2021 (late due to covid delay) to inspect state of SVT post 2019 storage...
- Found some APVs failed, leaving sections of sensor strips dead (shown in red)
 - Damage shown NOT present at end of 2019 Run...occurs during hibernation
- Degraded halfmodules needed to be replaced
- All 2019 slim sensors needed replacement due to fabrication issues previously mentioned



SVT Initial State Summer 2021





SVT Recovered State 2021 Run

- All L1/L2 sensors replaced with 2021 sensors
- L5B axial replaced with flipped L6B axial
- L5B stereo replaced with spare "Beta"
 - Beta electron side failed after install
- L6T axial swapped with L7T axial
- L6B axial replaced with L7B stereo
- L7T stereo flipped
- L7B axial replaced with spare "Gamma"
- L7B stereo replaced with L5B stereo

- Lacked supply of useable spares for back layers
- Had to re-organize existing damaged areas to maximize SVT performance with what we have
- Will work on improving supply of spares for future runs

Minor Operations Issues

- Losing clock during "Download"
 - Can only be solved with TI changes
 - Increased average time to reset DAQ
 - Should discuss how to improve for next run
- Monitoring ADC's died from radiation damage in first few layers
 - Intermittent loss of Hybrids before issue understood
- Possible loss of efficiency due to rad damage in slim sensors
 - Started raising voltage slowly during run to recover efficiency
 - Later slides will illustrate extent of issue
- Higher than expected V125 currents in back layers (not caught in time due to covid delays)



Hybrid V125 Currents During Run

- V125 currents for some hybrids discovered to be higher than expected
- **Discovery occurred too late** (due to covid) to fully address issue
- Currents look flat over course of run
- Looking into replacing these hybrids and increasing spare stock



INIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

L1/L2 Charge Collection Efficiency Loss



<u>Cluster-on-Track Charge Collection Efficiency</u>

- With radiation exposure, **sensor bias may need to be increased to maintain charge collection efficiency**, especially on high occupancy strips
- 2021 slim sensors have low breakdown voltages and high leakage currents, so increasing bias can be risky
- 31 days after start of production running, L1/L2 bias voltage had not been increased
 - Possible that sensors lost hit efficiency at this voltage (30V)
- Day 35, and again on Day 46, L1/L2 bias voltage was increased in caution of decreased efficiency
- Will show qualitatively that there was some loss in track hit efficiency...further investigation coming soon

L1/L2 sensor bias over time

- **Run 14191:** Day 0 (9/10/21)
 - Slim sensor bias = 30V
- **Run 14552:** Day 31 (10/11/21)
 - Slim sensor bias = 30V
- **Run 14596:** Day 35 (10/16/21)
 - Slim sensor bias = 45V
- **Run 14691:** Day 46 (10/27/21)
 - Slim sensor bias = 60V

Offline Baseline Fitting

- Before going into charge efficiencies...brief aside on offline baseline fits
- APV25 channel pedestals change with occupancy, and can shift significantly especially in strips with high occupancy
- Online baseline runs done with no beam
- Offline baseline fitting extracts pedestals using production conditions
- Plot shows first of 6 RawSvtHit time samples, which represents readout before passage of charged particle
- Online baselines can deviate as much as
 1*Sigma of true pedestal value when running production



Histogram of Production Data RawSvtHits Time Sample 0



Cluster-on-Track Charge Collection Efficiency

- Back to charge collection efficiency...
- Take reconstructed tracks, break into hit clusters, and check charge collected on clusters of hits
- Strip hits have Landau charge distribution, with most probable value (MPV) roughly brightest bin (Right plots)
- If strip bias too low, less charge collected from hit on strip (MPV decreases)
- Since pedestals change with occupancy, charge of fitted hits also shifts...to show changes in charge collection independent of occupancy shifts, **used offline baseline fits in reconstruction**
- Right plots show clusters-on-track charge collected for strips on first bottom layer ("L0 convention used here")
 - Orange line just visual guide for change
- After 31 days at 30V bias, see clear reduction in charge collected from hit clusters on reco tracks



Cluster-on-Track Charge Collection Efficiency

- Important Note for Charge Plots!
- (TOP) Standard reconstruction sets cluster amplitude
 threshold = 3*noise from offline baselines
 - Threshold too large in high occupancy strips due to increased noise
 - Lose information on actual charge collection
- (BOTTOM) Reconstruction with cluster amplitude threshold hardcoded to 100 ADC
 - Better picture of charge collection independent of hit cluster thresholds

All charge collection efficiency plots in this presentation use this 100 ADC threshold!



"L0" Charge Collection Over Time

- Plots show charge collection on left side of L0B axial over 46 days, with 3 different bias voltages
- Day 31 shows large decrease in peak charge collected on high occupancy strips
- After bias raised to 45V, charge collected per strip increases
- At 60V bias, see charge collected per strip return close to nominal at Day 0



1.100 million on chieffor her (1.100) million

Entries

Mean x

Mean v

Std Dev x

Std Dev v

Bias:

30V

Day 31

80

Bias:

60V

Day 46

80

60

Strip Position

Entries

Mean x

Mean v

Std Dev x

Std Dev y

Strip Position

LDR axial chance vs. shinPos has \$14891 thQuat2

19702

13.73

1059

9.745

457.4

- 50

40

30

20

15993

15.61

893

9.774

399.5

40

30

"L0" Charge Collection Over Time

- Find similar pattern of loss in charge collected for high occupancy strips on right side of L0B axial
- Less of a recovery at 60V



"L1" Charge Collection Over Time

- L1 (second layer) slim sensor charge collection
- Find similar decrease in charge collected on high occupancy strips after 31 days at 30V
- Pattern continues for all slim sensors (plots in backup)
- We see qualitatively, did lose charge collection efficiency during 2021 run in first layers
- Efficiency changes with time and SVT HV bias
- Track efficiency may be highly run dependent due to this
- Will work to quantify issue and try to recover hits





Brief Preliminary Tracking (Slim Sensors)

Standard Reconstruction Tracks PRELIMINARY



Track Reconstruction Comparison Runs Day 0 and Day 31

- The following is a *very* preliminary look at tracking with raw data
- Run 14522 shows loss in charge collection efficiency in high occupancy regions compared to earlier run 14191, both at same 30V HV bias
- Ran standard 2021 reconstruction using Pass1Top Alignment on run 14191 and 14552
- Tracks with > 9 hits broken up into 16 hit categories
 - All combinations of **if hit on track exists in first 4 sensors**
 - "1111" means Track has hit in all 4 first sensors
 - "1110" means Track missing hit in first sensor, has hit in next three sensors, etc...
- Compare track parameters for different hit categories, separated into Ele/Pos, Top/Bottom
- The following plots do not yet have a clear interpretation...they are result of complicated interplay of efficiencies, alignment, geometric acceptance, etc
- Style of plot may be useful as a standard check on alignment improvements



Electron Track TanLambda

- Plots show stacked histograms of TanLambda for reco tracks with different hit combinations in L1+L2
- <u>Run 14191</u>
 - Good charge collection efficiency at 30V
 - More Ele tracks in Top than Bottom at low TanLam
 - Larger fraction of Top Ele tracks have no L1 hits (1st and 2nd sensors) at low TanLambda than Bot
 - Note: One of many possible explanations for raw data, is angular acceptance of L2 is greater than L1, so tracks at edge of L2 can easily miss L1. "Missing" hits in L1 not necessarily due to infefficiency (not necessarily "missing" at all)
- <u>Run 14552</u>
 - Saw previously that charge collection efficiency decreased in high occupancy strips
 - Increased fraction of Top Ele Tracks have no L1 hits, especially at low TanLambda
 - Bottom Ele Tracks also has less hits in L1
- Roles of alignment, acceptance, and hit efficiency in these results is not yet understood! Emphasis on preliminary!







hc0 0000

hc1_0001

hc2_0010

hc3_0011

hc5 0101

hc9_1001

hc4_0100 hc6_0110

hc8_1000 hc7_0111

hc10_1010 hc11_1011 hc13_1101

hc12_1100 hc14_1110

hc15 1111

0.1 TanLambda

Ele TanLambda run 14191 hit combinations

Positron Track TanLambda

- Plots show stacked histograms of **TanLambda** for **reco tracks** with different hit combinations in L1+L2
- Both runs show many more Pos Tracks in Bottom than Top at low TanLambda
- <u>Run 14191</u>
 - Again Top shows larger fraction of Low TanLambda Tracks without hit(s) in L1
- <u>Run 14552</u>
 - Increase in fraction of Low TanLambda Tracks that without L1 hit(s) for both Top and Bottom
 - For unknown reasons, Top tracks more often have no hit in very first sensor ... (green is now larger than blue)
- Again, plots are difficult to interpret due to complication of misalignment+acceptance+efficiency, and other factors
- But increase in fraction of Tracks without a hit (or both hits) in L1 between runs 14191 to 14552 does motivate taking a closer look at hit efficiency changes in L1 over the 2021 Run





Pos TanLambda run 14191 hit combinations

Positron Track d0

- Stacked histograms Pos d0 (Top/Bottom)
- *Maybe* interesting to see how Top Pos d0 mean shifts based on hits on Track
- Run 14191 orange mean roughly 0, but on Run 14552, orange mean shifted left
- These plots, in addition to z0, and Phi (see backup) may find themselves useful for checking alignment in future...

Electron Track Momentum

- Stacked histograms Ele Momentum (Top/Bottom)
- Obviously **Bottom detector** not yet **FEE** aligned

Positron Track Momentum

• Stacked histograms Pos Momentum (Top/Bottom)

SANTA CRUZ

Conclusion

- Covid delays led to some late SVT hardware issue discoveries, but we still managed to get a solid detector ready for the 2021 Run!
- Need more slim sensor layers, and more back layer spares for future runs
 - Slim sensor fabrication still has issues that need to be addressed by CNM to improve quality
- Appears we **did lose some charge collection efficiency** in high occupancy regions of slim sensors over time, to varying degrees based on bias voltage
 - Severity of this loss not yet quantified
 - Likely that Track efficiency is more run dependent than we prefer
- Extremely preliminary tracking plots show fraction of Tracks without hit(s) in L1 increases between Run 14191 and Run 14552 (31 days later)
 - Not clear how much of this is due to changing hit inefficiencies, misalignment, or simply complicated acceptance and other subtle details of tracking
- Need to dig into hit reconstruction and get a better understanding of the impacts of inefficiencies on tracking

<u>Next Steps</u>

- Estimate loss of hit efficiency by fitting strips with landau distribution
- Review hit clustering algorithm
 - Look into using hit time errors for clustering
 - Try using hit fit error to set cluster thresholds
 - Uses all 6 RawSvtHit time samples, instead of just time sample 0
- Review pulse pileup fitting procedure
 - Can we improve the logic of when to fit a hit with a pile-up pulse
- Calibrate APV-Xtalk filter
- Iterate 2021 alignment forward
- Suggestions from collaborators?

Backup

Offline Baseline Fitting

- Extract pedestal with gaussian fit in window
- xmax₀ (fit window max ADC) set by reading thresholds file used to set apv readout thresholds
- $xmin_0$ initialized as first bin above 0.2^* maxbinvalue
- Channel RawSvtHit Sample 0 distribution initial fit with gaussian inside fit window
- Iteratively fit, updating xmin and xmax to be (FitMean + N*Sigma) | (FitMean - N*Sigma)
 - restrict $\operatorname{xmax} < \operatorname{xmax}_0 | \operatorname{xmin} > \operatorname{xmin}_0$
- Second itertive fit, walking xmax backwards and checking for fit chi2/ndf to improve
 - If FitMean > xmax, break the iterative fit at previous value
 - This recovers fits such as shown Right

L0 Charge vs Run For 12 Hit Tracks

left_L0B_axial_charge_vs_stripPos_hps_014191_trkClus12hits

left_L0B_axial_charge_vs_stripPos_hps_014552_trkClus12hits

right_L0B_axial_charge_vs_stripPos_hps_014691_trkClus12hits

left_L0B_stereo_charge_vs_stripPos_hps_014691_trkClus12hits













left_L0T_axial_charge_vs_stripPos_hps_014691_trkClus12hits









left_L0T_stereo_charge_vs_stripPos_hps_014691_trkClus12hits













L0 Charge vs Run For All Tracks





left_L0B_axial_charge_vs_stripPos_hps_014691_trkClus





left_L0B_axial_charge_vs_stripPos_hps_014596_trkClus





right L0B axial charge vs stripPos hps 014596 trkClus





right_L0B_axial_charge_vs_stripPos_hps_014691_trkClus



right_L0B_axial_charge_vs_stripPos_hps_014552_trkClus

charge



left_L0B_stereo_charge_vs_stripPos_hps_014691_trkClus







left_L0B_stereo_charge_vs_stripPos_hps_014596_trkClus





right_L0B_stereo_charge_vs_stripPos_hps_014596_trkClus



right_L0B_stereo_charge_vs_stripPos_hps_014552_trkClus



right_L0B_stereo_charge_vs_stripPos_hps_014691_trkClus







left_L0T_axial_charge_vs_stripPos_hps_014596_trkClus





right_L0T_axial_charge_vs_stripPos_hps_014596_trkClus





right_L0T_axial_charge_vs_stripPos_hps_014691_trkClus



right L0T axial charge vs stripPos hps 014191 trkClus





left LOT stereo charge vs stripPos hps 014691 trkClus





right_L0T_stereo_charge_vs_stripPos_hps_014596_trkClus



right_L0T_stereo_charge_vs_stripPos_hps_014552_trkClus



right_L0T_stereo_charge_vs_stripPos_hps_014691_trkClus



L1 Charge vs Run For 12 Hit Tracks





left L1B axial charge vs stripPos hps 014596 trkClus12hits





left L1B axial charge vs stripPos hps 014691 trkClus12hits



left L1B axial charge vs stripPos hps 014552 trkClus12hits

charge



right L1B axial charge vs stripPos hps 014596 trkClus12hits





right_L1B_axial_charge_vs_stripPos_hps_014691_trkClus12hits



right L1B axial charge vs stripPos hps 014552 trkClus12hits



R L1B stereo sharpe vs stripPos hps 014596 trkClus12 2500 charge 21416 D Entries 25.86 Mean x 1130 Mean y 17.45 Std Dev x 2000 Std Dev y 382.8 1500 60 1000 40 500 20 0 80 100 0 20 40 60 Strip Position

left_L1B_stereo_charge_vs_stripPos_hps_014552_trkClus12hits



left_L1B_stereo_charge_vs_stripPos_hps_014691_trkClus12hits









right L1B stereo charge vs stripPos hps 014691 trkClus12hits





left_L1T_axial_charge_vs_stripPos_hps_014596_trkClus12hits





left_L1T_axial_charge_vs_stripPos_hps_014691_trkClus12hits



left L1T axial charge vs stripPos hps 014552 trkClus12hits



aht L1T axial charge vs stripPos hps 014596 trikClus12h 2500 charge 24541 Entries Mean x 483.7 Mean y 1038 17.65 Std Dev x 2000 Std Dev y 367.5 60 1500 50 40 1000 30 20 500 10 0<u>∐</u> 400 420 440 460 500 Strip Position 480



right_L1T_axial_charge_vs_stripPos_hps_014691_trkClus12hits











left_L1T_stereo_charge_vs_stripPos_hps_014691_trkClus12hits





right_L1T_stereo_charge_vs_stripPos_hps_014596_trkClus12hits





0<u>⊔</u>

Strip Position

right_L1T_stereo_charge_vs_stripPos_hps_014552_trkClus12hits

L1 Charge vs Run For All Tracks





left L1B axial charge vs stripPos hps 014596 trkClus



left_L1B_axial_charge_vs_stripPos_hps_014552_trkClus



left_L1B_axial_charge_vs_stripPos_hps_014691_trkClus





right_L1B_axial_charge_vs_stripPos_hps_014596_trkClus





right_L1B_axial_charge_vs_stripPos_hps_014691_trkClus



right L1B axial charge vs stripPos hps 014552 trkClus



left_L1B_stereo_charge_vs_stripPos_hps_014691_trkClus





left_L1B_stereo_charge_vs_stripPos_hps_014596_trkClus





right_L1B_stereo_charge_vs_stripPos_hps_014596_trkClus



right_L1B_stereo_charge_vs_stripPos_hps_014552_trkClus



right_L1B_stereo_charge_vs_stripPos_hps_014691_trkClus





left L1T axial charge vs stripPos hps 014596 trkClus



left_L1T_axial_charge_vs_stripPos_hps_014552_trkClus



left_L1T_axial_charge_vs_stripPos_hps_014691_trkClus





right L1T axial charge vs stripPos hps 014596 trkClus





right_L1T_axial_charge_vs_stripPos_hps_014691_trkClus



right L1T axial charge vs stripPos hps 014552 trkClus







right_L1T_stereo_charge_vs_stripPos_hps_014596_trkClus





right_L1T_stereo_charge_vs_stripPos_hps_014691_trkClus



right_L1T_stereo_charge_vs_stripPos_hps_014552_trkClus



SHN H







botPos_p_h_run_14191_hit_combinations



topEle_p_h_run_14191_hit_combinations



topPos_p_h_run_14191_hit_combinations




botPos p h run 14552 hit combinations



topEle p h run 14552 hit combinations



topPos p h run 14552 hit combinations





botPos_Phi_run_14191_hit_combinations





topPos_Phi_run_14191_hit_combinations





botPos Phi run 14552 hit combinations





topPos_Phi_run_14552_hit_combinations





Z0

Z0





d0

d0

topEle d0 run 14191 hit combinations



d0

Draft Slides



<u>Cluster-on-Track Charge Collection Efficiency</u>

- Reconstruct tracks on production data using **offline fitted baselines**
 - Important that baselines are correct. Any unaccounted shift in baselines will also shift charge(ADC) of clusters on track
- Loop over 3d hits on track and fill histograms with rawhit amplitude vs strip number
- Split L1 and L2 sensors into "left" and "right" halves for better scaling in histograms
- Compare Strip Position vs Charge for the same sensor across different runs (14191, 14552, 14596, 14691 will be in plot title)
- Some plots have different requirements for the Tracks being looped over...
 - **Tracks can require 12 hits, 10 hits, and all hits** (will say in plot title... "TrkClus12hits" for example)
- If a sensor strip number appears to have little/no charge efficiency, could be due to geometric acceptance for Tracks...check "all hits" plots to confirm that there is still charge collection efficiency in those strips
- If strip appears to have low/no charge efficiency, may be due to geometric acceptance...check "all hits" to minimize this acceptance effect



- 2019 slim-edge sensors received damaging radiation
 - Example: 2019 L2 Top Stereo
- 2021 sensor production drastically improved number of pinholes compared to 2019
- All L1/L2 halfmodules replaced with 2021 production halfmodules



UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA





2019 Detector Diagram







damaged and required replacement/reorientation



				MEASURED CURRENTS						
Layer	FEB		Hybrid	Туре	Side	ON/OFF	DVDD	RVDD	V125	Temp (C)
L4b		Off on		Stereo	Electron	Off On	0,294	0,142	0,001	0,000
			1	Stereo	Positron	Off On	0,281	0,408	0,315	20,206
			2	Axial	Electron	Off On	0,283	0,377	0,301	21,096
			3	Axial	Positron	Off On	0,286	0,371	0,301	20,801
L5t		OFF On		Axial	Electron	Off On	0,282	0,370	1,063	22,506
			1	Axial	Positron	Off On	0,279	0,364	0,284	18,104
			2	Stereo	Electron	Off On	0,278	0,373	0,703	21,962
			3	Stereo	Positron	Off On	0,281	9,374	0,299	21,619
L56		OFF on		Stereo	Electron	Off On	0,281	0,366	0,291	20,666
			1	Stereo	Positron	Off On	0,281	0,363	0,282	21,477
			2	Axial	Electron	Off On	0,277	0,365	0,285	21,249
			3	Axial	Positron	Off On	0,279	0,377	0,956	20,274
L6t	8	OFF on		Axial	Electron	OFF On	0,281	0,400	0,775	21,943
				Axial	Positron	OFF On	0,280	0,368	0,841	21,897
			2	Stereo	Electron	Off On	0,279	0,370	0,300	21,261
			3	Stereo	Positron	OFF On	0,282	0,518	0,492	21,880
LGb		Off on		Stereo	Electron	Off On	0.279	0,375	0,823	20,977
				Stereo	Positron	Off On	0,281	0,374	0,780	21,012
			2	Axial	Electron	Off On	0,281	0,364	0,295	22,691
			3	Axial	Positron	Off On	0,288	0,374	0,294	19,771



MEASURED CURRENTS AVDD V125

Layer FEB

L0-1t 0

L0-1b 1

L2-3t 2

L2-30 3 OFF On

L4t 4 OFF On

OFF On

Off On

Off On

3

3 Stereo Positron

Hubrid Type

0 Axial

Side

Electron

0N/0FF

Off On

DVDD

.316

Temp (C)

