ECCE TOF requirements and design

Wei Li Rice University



EIC Detector 1 TOF-PID WG April 25, 2022



Office of Science



https://www.ecce-eic.org/ecce-internal-notes

<u>General principles:</u>

- a 4π TOP-PID coverage for $(e/\pi/K/p)$ for low-to-intermediate *p* range that sufficiently overlaps with RICH-based PID systems to cover the full phase space for PID
- Provide a high spatial resolution point for tracking



- Explore novel technology (AC-LGADs, benefit the tracking) and leverage established designs (DC-LGADs for CMS/ATLAS) to minimize the cost and retain a fallback solution.
- Material budget does not impact the performance of other subsystems.
- Reasonable size and cost (e.g., comparable to CMS/ATLAS TOF system).

Key specifications:

- $\sigma_{\rm t}$ = 25 ps per hit
- 0.5x3 mm² pixel: $\sigma_x = 30 \mu m$ per hit
- Material: ~ 6% total
- Total area: ~ 15 m² (comparable to CMS ETL)
- Number of readout channels: 8-9 millions (comparable to CMS ETL)



The design is largely a copy of CMS ETL module, electronics, service design (minimize the risk!) but adopts lighter support/cooling to minimize material budget



Schematics of dimensions and locations



ECCE TOF (tracking) Performance



Possible Fallback options



Use DC-LGADs instead of AC-LGADs and insert an additional layer of μ Rwell

- Mature design is available from CMS ETL
- Lose 10-15% acceptance because of intra-pad dead zone (unless using TI)
- More space needed (LGADs + μ RWell), (slightly) increased cost

Final words ...

We invite all of you to join and contribute to build the TOF at EIC Detector 1 (it is taking >15 groups to build CMS ETL)

We encourage everyone to review the ECCE design, raise your concerns so that we can have well-defined tasks to investigate, optimize the design and make changes that are necessary, based on the physics performance requirements.



ECCE TOF (tracking) Performance

Impact on forward tracking by LGADs layers

