AC-LGAD for the Roman Pots Detectors at the EIC

Alex Jentsch (BNL) TIC Meeting July 17th, 2023







The Far-Forward Detectors



Digression: particle beams

Angular divergence

- Angular "spread" of the beam away from the central trajectory.
- Gives some small initial transverse momentum to the beam particles.
- Crab cavity rotation
 - Can perform rotations of the beam bunches in 2D.
 - Used to account for the luminosity drop due to the crossing angle – allows for head-on collisions to still take place.



These effects introduce smearing in our momentum reconstruction.

Momentum Resolution – Timing

For exclusive reactions measured with the Roman Pots we need good timing to resolve the position of the interaction within the proton bunch. But what should the timing be?



- Because of the rotation, the Roman Pots see the bunch crossing smeared in x.
- Vertex smearing = 12.5mrad (half the crossing angle) * 10cm = 1.25 mm
- If the effective vertex smearing was for a 1cm bunch, we would have .125mm vertex smearing.
- The simulations were done with these two extrema and the results compared.

From these comparisons, reducing the effective vertex smearing to that of the 1cm bunch length reduces the momentum smearing to negligible from this contribution.
This can be achieved with timing of ~ 35ps (1cm/speed of light).

Momentum Resolution – Comparison

eRD24 Studies - 2020

• The various contributions add in quadrature (this was checked empirically, measuring each effect independently).



Beam angular divergence

- Beam property, can't correct for it sets the lower bound of smearing.
- Subject to change (i.e. get better) beam parameters not yet set in stone
- Vertex smearing from crab rotation
 - Correctable with good timing (~35ps)
- Finite pixel size on sensor
 - 500um seems like the best compromise between potential cost and smearing

eRD24 Studies - 2020

Digression: Machine Optics

275 GeV DVCS Proton Acceptance







<u>High Divergence</u>: smaller β^* at IP, but bigger $\beta(z = 30m) \rightarrow$ higher lumi., larger beam at RP



eRD24 Studies - 2020

Digression: Machine Optics

275 GeV DVCS Proton Acceptance







<u>High Divergence</u>: smaller β^* at IP, but bigger $\beta(z = 30m) \rightarrow$ higher lumi., larger beam at RP

<u>High Acceptance:</u> larger β^* at IP, smaller $\beta(z = 30m) \rightarrow$ lower lumi., smaller beam at RP

Digression: Machine Optics 275 GeV DVCS Proton Acceptance



Detailed Momentum Resolution - 18x275 GeV



- Each case includes all beam effects.
- Updated transfer matrix reconstruction compared to eRD24.
- Material thickness has not been evaluated in detail, but of course additional material will degrade resolution.



- Goal is to extract slope of t-distribution.
- Ratio indicates expected capability.

Detailed Momentum Resolution - 10x100 GeV

g





- Yellow shaded area is the acceptance gap between the detectors.
- No acceptance correction is applied here.

Detailed Momentum Resolution - 10x100 GeV





- Zoom-in to relevant RP range.
- Since angular divergence is smaller in the 100 GeV beam, the spatial resolution has a larger impact.

Detector Resolution Summary

- Modern studies support basic idea of eRD24 studies.
 - 500um pixels can do the job.
 - Expecting x2 improvement (super-conservative minimum) in (pixel size)/Sqrt(12) reduces slope distortion in t-distribution.
 - Physics groups have not produced any further input on required performance so we should ensure the detector choices do not hinder a possible measurement.
- Strips increase the number of needed planes x2, which increases cooling, needed space, engineering constraints, etc.
 - Strips can make background rejection much more challenging (experience of PPS @ CMS).
 - Long strips potential for RF pickup noise.
 - We have no real estimates on these things from the engineering design, so it makes it challenging to know what to include in the simulations.
 - The active area of the detectors is very large, and the whole system is directly in vacuum. Adding more planes means more services, impedance, etc.

What about the B0 tracker?

- Originally planned to use ITS3 (3 layers) + AC-LGAD (1 layer) to get 5-10um spatial resolution, combined with precise timing of AC-LGADs.
- Long integration window for ITS3 sensors a major problem for the high occupancy environment of the B0 tracker.
 - https://wiki.bnl.gov/EPIC/index.php?title=Background
- Looking at AC-LGADs as an option for the full subsystem → will the worsening of the spatial resolution be tolerable?
 - Beam tests demonstrate AC-LGADs achieving ~ 20um spatial resolution with charge sharing: <u>https://indico.bnl.gov/event/19471/</u>

B0 tracking: new technology + material assumptions



- 27cm spacing with fully AC-LGAD system and 5% radiation length may be the most-realistic option.
 - Needs to be looked at with proper field map and layout.
 - Is this resolution going to be a problem?
- <u>Note</u>: p resolution is ~ 2-4%, depending on configuration.

B0 tracking: Impact on pT spectra

100 GeV protons - 27cm spacing - 1%X0 - High Divergence



100 GeV protons - 27cm spacing - 5%X0 - ALL ACLGAD - High Divergence

- Full study: <u>https://indico.bnl.gov/event/19620/</u>
- Information passed to PWG in early June.



Roman Pots

• Updated layout with current design for AC-LGAD sensor + ASIC.



• Current R&D aimed at customizing ASIC readout chip (ALTIROC) for use with AC-LGADs.

ASIC size	ASIC Pixel pitch	# Ch. per ASIC	# ASICs per module	Sensor area	# Mod. per layer	Total # ASICs	Total # Ch.	Total Si Area
1.6x1.8 cm ²	500 μm	32x32	4	3.2x3.2 cm ²	32	512	524,288	1,311 cm ²