RHIC DetectorWorkshop BNL Nov. 13-14, 2001 W.J. Llope Rice University Recent Progress on MGRPCs for Large-Area Time-Of-Flight for STAR k

005

# A Brief History of Time (of Flight for STAR)

- 1991 STAR is formed by a merger of two RHIC proposals
- 1992RICE leading STAR TOF efforts
- 1993 In-beam test results for scintillator TOF published A. Ahmad *et al.*, Nucl. Inst. and Methods A330, 416 (1993)
- 1994 RICE proposes large-area scintillator TOF for STAR
- 1995 NSAC Review of Additional Experimental Equipment C.K. Gelbke, chair

"A small-area TOF array ... will be sufficient to measure inclusive particle ratios and correlate them to other observables measured event-by-event in STAR. Such a smaller array would already significantly enhance the physics capabilities of this experiment. ... STAR should aim at a coverage which is sufficient for event-by-event Kaon (and possibly proton) identification, which in other observables is the prominent feature and strength of STAR. If fiscal constraints are such that this cannot be realized, a small area TOF array would still be very valuable, and further R&D should be encouraged to search for a viable solution for large area coverage."

1996	Successful Final Design Review of large-area scint. TOF (~15M\$)
1996	RICE/MELZ/ELECTRON begin development of low cost Russian PMTs
	Prototype Russian PMTs released, testing begins at RICE
1997	Russian PMT tests published A. Ahmad <i>et al.</i> , Nucl. Inst. and Methods A400, 149 (1997)
1998	RICE/BNL/Burle CRADA to develop Russian PMTs for STAR
1999	CRADA Approved.
1998	Llope proposes single-tray of scint. TOF, called " <b>TOFp</b> " (0.12M\$)
2000	Successful Final Design Review of TOFp. Construction at RICE.
2001	Installed, collecting data in present RHIC running.
1998	RICE participating in CMS RPC R&D, and later, MGRPC R&D
1999	First successful test beams of our MGRPC detectors
2000	LOI for large-area TOF Proposal, optimization of MGRPC design
2001	Proposal for single-tray of MGRPC TOF, called "TOFr" (~0.2M\$)
	Successsful Review. Construction underway.
2002	Test beam studies of TOFr, Then Installation in STAR.
	Proposal for large-area MGRPC TOF, called "TOFR" (~5M\$)
2004	TOFR Installed.

# Small-Area TOF:

existing STAR TOFp  $\rightarrow$  singles spectra of  $\pi$ , K, p, d, t, ...  $0 < \eta < 1$  and  $\Delta \phi \sim 1/60$  of  $\pi$ 

# Large-Area TOF:

singles spectra w/ direct PID at vastly higher rate, azimuthal observables, ...

potentially interesting events for more detailed analyses form E-by-E observables based on direct PID, and use these to classify  $\rightarrow$  E-by-E is practically STAR's reason for being....

No. Kaons or protons E-by-E K/π, K+/K-, and p/pbar ratios E-by-E K or p <Mt> E-by-E *et al.....* 

- High efficiency PID on both daughters from interesting particle decays
- $\rightarrow$  substantially suppressed backgrounds  $\rightarrow$  cleaner spectra..
- $\rightarrow$  greater efficiency over wider range of Pt spectrum  $\rightarrow$  more precise integrals...

 $\Lambda \rightarrow p \pi$  $K_S \rightarrow \pi + \pi - \phi \rightarrow K + K - \psi$  $\Lambda(1520) \rightarrow p K$  $K^* \rightarrow K$ ้ส

STAR Long Range Planning Committee (Summer 2000), R. Bellwied et al.

(paraphrased) "...after completion of calorimetry, large-area TOF is considered highest priority near-term upgrade to STAR."

# **Resistive Plate Chambers**

(in avalanche mode)



Figure 2. Schematic representation of a monogap RPC (top); a double gap RPC (middle) and a multigap RPC (bottom).



narrow single gaps don't work well in avalanche mode

#### wider single gaps?

- enhanced streamer-free range of operating voltage but time resolution suffers...
- primary ionziation is a stochastic process!
   → timing jitter from location of ionization in RPC
- avalanches from single primary clusters tend to merge
  - $\rightarrow$  fluctuations in avalanche development dominate

#### many narrow gaps!

- characteristic distance for primary ionization decreased → decreased timing jitter from primary ionization step
- N-independent avalanches, hence an averaging
  - $\rightarrow$  decreased timing jitter from avalanche fluctuations



With many small gaps,

- the resistive plates are transparent to the fast signals generated by the avalanches in each gas gap. The induced signal is the *sum over all gaps*.

- the internal resistive plates are electrically floating, so the stable state is *equal gain in all gaps*.

...perhaps the MultiGap Resistive Plate Chamber (MGRPC)?

(also referred to as Micro-Gap RPC)

Cheaper per detector channel than Hamamatsu mesh dynode PMTs

**But** do they work for fast timing?!?!?

i.e. can they provide timing stops w/ <100ps resolution at high efficiency, at up to the maximum expected particle rates/channel, with cell sizes small enough to handle highest occupancies but large enough to afford, with sufficiently low detector noise rates, with sufficiently low detector and FEE dead-time, and be stable, or correctably so, over short and long terms

Answering these questions, and hence deciding if MGRPCs are appropriate for TOF in several experiments, has been the focus of very recent R&D.

Italy and CERN (C. Williams et al. & INFN-Bologna), towards ALICE TOF and since mid-1997 by a Bonner Lab group, potentially for STAR. Jose "Pepe" Lamas-Valverde (full-time at CERN) Geary Eppley (leading our R&D efforts) Ted Nussbaum, Nick Adams (electronics engineers) Jay Roberts, Ed Platner, Billy Bonner, Bill Llope

Important differences between ALICE and STAR environments!

particle rates:	$<300 \text{ Hz/cm}^2 \text{ vs.} <10 \text{ Hz/cm}^2$
beam rep rate:	25ns vs. ~100ns
due date:	in some years vs. now

On the other hand, many functional requirements are similar.

So, Bonner Lab and ALICE groups have been collaborating very closely over the years...



Not such a crazy idea.

(ALICE prototype, figures from M. Spegel, NIM A 453, 308 (2000).

10000

"The simulation of resistive plate chambers in avalanche mode: charge spectra and efficiency", M. Abbrescia *et al.*, NIM A **431**, 413 (1999)



Fig. 6. Tests performed with other detectors featuring different widths of the gas gap suggest that the main contribution to the time jitter is associated to the amplification process in the gas. The timing resolution seems to depend almost linearly on the gap width, with a slope of approximately 40 ps/0.1 mm.

#### History of MGRPC R&D at Rice

Lamas-Valverde, Eppley, Nussbaum, Roberts, Adams, Platner, Bonner, Llope

Summer 1997 Rice begins thinking about this for STAR

initiate close collaboration with Alice groups, still going strong initial prototyping of detectors and specific electronics

••••

Apr.-Jul. 2000 CERN T10 beam tests of Rice version 4 & 5 MGRPCs several single channel versions built four 2x8ch detectors built, 3x3cm pads

sandblasted or acid washed outer glass different thickness outer glass, different thickness inner glass  $\rightarrow$  these variants resulted in factor 2-3 worse timing resolution

various internal support schemes

proved different choice of preamplifier would work better russian preamp changed to Maxim 3760

typical performance: 95-97% efficient, stop resolution ~80 ps some channel by channel variations

construction techniques not suitable for mass production

Oct.-Nov. 2000 CERN T10 beam tests of Rice versions 6, 7, & 8 all 6 gap chambers with same glass, pads differ Rice 6: 2 x 6 array of 3 x 3.1 cm pads, 3mm space between pads. Rice 7: 1 x 6 array of 3 x 6.5 cm pads read out from one end. Rice 8: 1 x 6 array of 3 x 6.5 cm pads read out from both ends.

numerous studies of performance with larger pad sizes, different shapes results on following slides...

first RPC-related Rice-China direct collaboration.... significant shift-taking, first chinese chamber...

## Rice Version 7 MGRPC





Tray inner dimensions: 213mmx2413mmx85mm outer glass: 84mm x 204mm (10mm extra width for HV / gnd. connect. included) graphite layer: 70mm x 200mm inner glass: 65mm x 195mm pad size: 31mm x 30mm, distance between pads = 3mm





#### Rice version 6.x

12 "square" 3×3.1cm pads, read out separately or w/ adjacent pads into same preamp

60 sq.m / 9.3 sq.cm = 71,000 chs

Rice version 7.x 6 rectangular 3×6.5cm pads read out on one side

Rice version 8.x

6 rectangular 3×6.5cm pads read out on both sides

60 sq.m / 19.5 sq.cm = 34,000 chs or 216ch/tray \* 120 trays = 26,000 chs

#### Rice MGRPC version 6 pad layout





Internal dimensions of the aluminium trays 213mm x 2413mm x85mm

(Dwgs by Jose Lamas-Valverde)

# Readout Pads for TOFr and TOFR

н

region of pads above thin glass indicated by dashed box hole to pass HV through to graphite layer pins for signal output 0 0-0-0 00 00 0-0-0 0-0-0 0-0-0 30 0-0-0-0

# Photos from May-July, 2000 CERN Test Beam Run



# Fall 2000 Test Beam

an example set of detector performance histograms from one run...

#### the usual cuts and corrections apply for this technology too: good beams selection, slewing correction, start resolution correction....





Fig. 2. The efficiency and corrected time resolution ( $\sigma$ ) versus voltage for the prototype with 2x6 pads and pad area of 3x3 cm<sup>2</sup>.



Fig. 1. The histogram on the top shows the raw time, and the histogram on the bottom shows the Time-to-Amplitude corrected time. The distributions are fitted with Gaussians, and the variance,  $\sigma$ , is reported in the boxes in each frame in units of TDC bins, which are 50 ps wide. Comparing the two frames, one observes the overall timing resolution improves from 94 ps to 57 ps following the offline correction for slewing [3] and, by subtracting the mean jitter introduced by scintillators counters, we obtain 90 ps and 50 ps respectively.

### Channel-by-Channel Variations





Beam Spot Location

## Position Dependence w.r.t. Pads



## Rate Dependence





Testing

beams are best by far... cosmics useful for pulse area studies... chamber-to-chamber comparisons... chamber HV settings... FEE ADC gain.... spotting gas problems...



# TOFr FEE

typical MIP hit in a MGRPC equivalent to  $\sim 25$  fC (not a typo)

need to amplify first

rise time of detector practically limited only by bandwidth of this preamp

major breakthrough for ALICE and STAR FEE development came w/ adoption of MAXIM 3760 then discriminate using standard components



Maxim 3760 Preamplifier Analog Devices 96687 Comparator

# Digitization...

# ADC

"easier" existing example at Rice, 8 bits (M. Wright and H. Themann)

evaluation board for AD9058 (8 bit, 40 MSPS) in hand  $\rightarrow$  would work for us... when available, will evaluate 10 bit, 80 MSPS version from MAXIM



# TDC

"harder" presently investigating candidates....

• CERN group....

http://mota.home.cern.ch/mota/ http://pcvlsi5.cern.ch:80/MicDig/hrtdc.htm

- http://pcvlsi5.cern.ch:80/MicDig/hptdc.htm
- Finnish group... IEEE Journal of Solid-State Circuits, **35**, 1507 (October 2000)
- German company.... http://www.acam.de/Content/gp1\_e.HTM

standing request for prototypes from CERN R&D.... contacting Finnish group also...

# Summary/Outlook:

The detectors are dirt cheap and appear to outperform the conventional technology...

The basic long-range plan....

Single tray of MGRPC for STAR, "TOFr," now under construction → *realistic* proof of principle... Long cables & digitization by existing STAR TOFp System...
Proposal for large-area system, "TOFR," in Spring 2002...
Installation of TOFR in the 2004 shutdown...

# **Recent Major Successes**

- Fishing line is a great choice for the 220 µm spacer...
- Maxim 3760 preamp...
- Collaboration of US and CN institutions developed. CN groups making solid progress....
- Detector module design (Rice v.11) is now final... <60ps stop-resolution is typical... Chamber construction for TOFr now underway at CERN and CN...
- 40 FEE boards for TOFr constructed and look very good on the bench....

# Hurdles Still Ahead of Us

- Solving the problems uncovered during the TOFr project...
- ADC & TDC Digitization for the large-area system must be "on-board"... TDC chip w/ required specs does not exist, although CERN efforts look promising... We have standing request for these when they become available...
- Marriage of preamp+comparator w/ the digitization on one board... Facing the age-old nightmare of analog and digital electronics on the same board... ~6 EE-year engineering effort...
- Locating funding for these electronics  $R\&D...(\sim 500+k\$?)$  spinoff applications exist...
- Locating funding for the large-area system itself.... ( $\sim 5M$  ? = 4M DOE + 1M CN-contributed)