



Universiteit Gent
Faculteit Wetenschappen
Vakgroep Fysica en Sterrenkunde

² No title yet

³ No sub-title neither, obviously...

⁴ Alexis Fagot

5



Thesis to obtain the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Physics
Academic years 2012-2017






Universiteit Gent
Faculteit Wetenschappen
Vakgroep Fysica en Sterrenkunde


Promotoren: Dr. Michael Tytgat
Prof. Dr. Dirk Ryckbosch

Universiteit Gent
Faculteit Wetenschappen
Vakgroep Fysica en Sterrenkunde
Proeftuinstraat 86, B-9000 Gent, België
Tel.: +32 9 264.65.28
Fax.: +32 9 264.66.97

17



Thesis to obtain the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Physics
Academic years 2012-2017



Acknowledgements

¹⁹ Ici on remerciera tous les gens que j'ai pu croiser durant cette aventure et qui m'ont permis de passer
²⁰ un bon moment

²¹ *Gent, ici la super date de la mort qui tue de la fin d'écriture*
²² *Alexis Fagot*

Table of Contents

24	Acknowledgements	i
25	Nederlandse samenvatting	vii
26	English summary	ix
27	1 Introduction	1-1
28	1.1 A story of High Energy Physics	1-1
29	1.2 Organisation of this study	1-1
30	2 Investigating the TeV scale	2-1
31	2.1 The Standard Model of Particle Physics	2-2
32	2.1.1 A history of particle physics	2-2
33	2.1.2 Construction and test of the model	2-11
34	2.1.3 Investigating the TeV scale	2-12
35	2.2 The Large Hadron Collider & the Compact Muon Solenoid	2-13
36	2.2.1 LHC, the most powerful particle accelerator	2-14
37	2.2.1.1 Particle acceleration	2-15
38	2.2.1.2 LHC discoveries and LHC physics program	2-18
39	2.2.1.3 High Luminosity LHC	2-19
40	2.2.2 CMS, a multipurpose experiment	2-19
41	2.3 Muon Phase-II Upgrade	2-19
42	3 Physics of Resistive plate chambers	3-1
43	3.1 Principle	3-1
44	3.1.1 Electron drift velocity	3-4
45	3.2 Rate capability and time resolution of Resistive Plate Chambers	3-4
46	3.2.1 Operation modes	3-4
47	3.2.2 Detector designs and performance	3-6
48	3.2.2.1 Double-gap RPC	3-7
49	3.2.2.2 Multigap RPC (MRPC)	3-8
50	3.2.2.3 Charge distribution and performance limitations	3-9
51	3.3 Signal formation	3-12
52	3.4 Gas transport parameters	3-12
53	4 Longevity studies and Consolidation of the present CMS RPC subsystem	4-1
54	4.1 Resistive Plate Chambers at CMS	4-1
55	4.1.1 Overview	4-1
56	4.1.2 The present RPC system	4-2
57	4.1.3 Pulse processing of CMS RPCs	4-3
58	4.2 Testing detectors under extreme conditions	4-4

59	4.2.1	The Gamma Irradiation Facilities	4-7
60	4.2.1.1	GIF	4-7
61	4.2.1.2	GIF++	4-9
62	4.3	Preliminary tests at GIF	4-11
63	4.3.1	Resistive Plate Chamber test setup	4-11
64	4.3.2	Data Acquisition	4-13
65	4.3.3	Geometrical acceptance of the setup layout to cosmic muons	4-13
66	4.3.3.1	Description of the simulation layout	4-14
67	4.3.3.2	Simulation procedure	4-16
68	4.3.3.3	Results	4-17
69	4.3.4	Photon flux at GIF	4-17
70	4.3.4.1	Expectations from simulations	4-17
71	4.3.4.2	Dose measurements	4-22
72	4.3.5	Results and discussions	4-23
73	4.4	Longevity tests at GIF++	4-24
74	4.4.1	Description of the Data Acquisition	4-27
75	4.4.2	RPC current, environmental and operation parameter monitoring	4-28
76	4.4.3	Measurement procedure	4-29
77	4.4.4	Longevity studies results	4-29
78	5	Investigation on high rate RPCs	5-1
79	5.1	Rate limitations and ageing of RPCs	5-1
80	5.1.1	Low resistivity electrodes	5-1
81	5.1.2	Low noise front-end electronics	5-1
82	5.2	Construction of prototypes	5-1
83	5.3	Results and discussions	5-1
84	6	Conclusions and outlooks	6-1
85	6.1	Conclusions	6-1
86	6.2	Outlooks	6-1
87	A	A data acquisition software for CAEN VME TDCs	A-1
88	A.1	GIF++ DAQ file tree	A-1
89	A.2	Usage of the DAQ	A-2
90	A.3	Description of the readout setup	A-3
91	A.4	Data read-out	A-3
92	A.4.1	V1190A TDCs	A-4
93	A.4.2	DataReader	A-6
94	A.4.3	Data quality flag	A-10
95	A.5	Communications	A-12
96	A.5.1	V1718 USB Bridge	A-13
97	A.5.2	Configuration file	A-13
98	A.5.3	WebDCS/DAQ intercommunication	A-17
99	A.5.4	Example of inter-process communication cycle	A-18
100	A.6	Software export	A-18

101	B Details on the offline analysis package	B-1
102	B.1 GIF++ Offline Analysis file tree	B-1
103	B.2 Usage of the Offline Analysis	B-2
104	B.2.1 Output of the offline tool	B-3
105	B.2.1.1 ROOT file	B-3
106	B.2.1.2 CSV files	B-5
107	B.3 Analysis inputs and information handling	B-6
108	B.3.1 Dimensions file and IniFile parser	B-6
109	B.3.2 TDC to RPC link file and Mapping	B-7
110	B.4 Description of GIF++ setup within the Offline Analysis tool	B-9
111	B.4.1 RPC objects	B-9
112	B.4.2 Trolley objects	B-10
113	B.4.3 Infrastructure object	B-11
114	B.5 Handeling of data	B-12
115	B.5.1 RPC hits	B-13
116	B.5.2 Clusters of hits	B-14
117	B.6 DAQ data Analysis	B-15
118	B.6.1 Determination of the run type	B-16
119	B.6.2 Beam time window calculation for efficiency runs	B-17
120	B.6.3 Data loop and histogram filling	B-18
121	B.6.4 Results calculation	B-19
122	B.6.4.1 Rate normalisation	B-19
123	B.6.4.2 Rate and activity	B-21
124	B.6.4.3 Strip masking tool	B-23
125	B.6.4.4 Output CSV files filling	B-25
126	B.7 Current data Analysis	B-29

¹²⁷

Nederlandse samenvatting –Summary in Dutch–

¹²⁹ Le resume en Neerlandais (j'aurais peut-être pu apprendre la langue juste pour ça...).

¹²⁸

English summary

¹³¹ Le meme résume mais en Anglais (on commencera par la hein!).

List of Figures

132

133	2.1	Through the gold foil experiment Rutherford could show that most of the mass of atoms was contained in a positively charged nucleus and could then propose a more accurate atomic model than that of Thomson.	2-3
134			
135			
136	2.2	Figure 2.2a: Meson octet. Figure 2.2b: Baryon octet. Figure 2.2c: Baryon decuplet. .	2-8
137			
138			
139	2.3	The elementary particles of the Standard Model are showed along with their names and properties. Their interactions with the strong, weak and electromagnetic forces have been explicated using color squares. In the left column, the scalar higgs boson is depicted, while the central is focused on the matter particles, the fermions, and the right on the force carriers, the gauge bosons. The role of the Higgs boson in electroweak symmetry breaking is highlighted, and the corresponding way properties of the various particles differ in the (high-energy) symmetric phase (top) and the (low-energy) broken-symmetry phase (bottom) are showed.	2-11
140			
141			
142			
143			
144			
145	2.4	CERN accelerator complex.	2-15
146			
147	2.5	Pictures of the different accelerators. From top to bottom: first the LINAC 2 and the <i>Pb</i> source of LINAC 3. Then the Booster and the LEIR. Finally, the PS, the SPS and the LHC.	2-17
148			
149	2.6	Figure 2.6a: schematics of the LHC cryodipoles. 1: Superconducting Coils, 2: Beam pipe, 3: Heat exchanger Pipe, 4: Helium-II Vessel, 5: Superconducting Bus-bar, 6: Iron Yoke, 7: Non-Magnetic Collars, 8: Vacuum Vessel, 9: Radiation Screen, 10: Thermal Shield, 11: Auxiliary Bus-bar Tube, 12: Instrumentation Feed Throughs, 13: Protection Diode, 14: Quadrupole Bus-bars, 15: Spool Piece Bus-bars. Figure 2.6b: magnetic field and resulting motion force applied on the beam particles. .	2-18
150			
151			
152			
153			
154			
155	2.7	Figure 2.7a: picture of the LHC quadrupoles. Figure 2.7b: magnetic fields and resulting focussing force applied on the beam by 2 consecutive quadrupoles.	2-18
156			
157	2.8	Absorbed dose in the CMS cavern after an integrated luminosity of 3000 fb. R is the transverse distance from the beamline and Z is the distance along the beamline from the Interaction Point at Z=0.	2-19
158			
159			
160	2.9	A quadrant of the muon system, showing DTs (yellow), RPCs (light blue), and CSCs (green). The locations of new forward muon detectors for Phase-II are contained within the dashed box and indicated in red for GEM stations (ME0, GE1/1, and GE2/1) and dark blue for improved RPC (iRPC) stations (RE3/1 and RE4/1).	2-20
161			
162			
163			
164	2.10	RMS of the multiple scattering displacement as a function of muon p_T for the proposed forward muon stations. All of the electromagnetic processes such as bremsstrahlung and magnetic field effect are included in the simulation.	2-21
165			
166			

167	3.1	Different phases of the avalanche development in the RPC gas volume subjected to a constant electric field E_0 . a) An avalanche is initiated by the primary ionisation caused by the passage of a charged particle through the gas volume. b) Due to its growing size, the avalanche starts to locally influence the electric field. c) The electrons, lighter than the cations reach the anode first. d) The ions reach the cathode. While the charges have not recombined, the electric field in the small region around the avalanche stays affected and locally blind the detector.	3-2
174	3.2	Effeciency (circles and stars with 30 mV and 100 mV thresholds respectively) and streamer probability (opened circles) as function of the operating voltatge of a 2 mm single gap HPL RPC flushed with a gas mixture containing (a) 5%, (b) 2%, (c) 1% and (d) no SF_6 [33].	3-3
178	3.3	Movement of the charge carriers in an RPC. Figure 3.3a: Voltage across an RPC whose electrode have a relative permittivity of 5 at the moment the tension s applied. Figure 3.3b: After the charge carriers moved, the electrodes are charged and there is no voltage drop over the electrodes anymore. The full potential is applied on the gas gap only. Figure 3.3c: The streamer discharge initiated by a charged particle transports electrons and cations towards the anode and cathode respectively.	3-5
184	3.4	Typical oscilloscope pulses in streamer mode (Figure 3.4a) and avalanche mode(Figure 3.4b). In the case of streamer mode, the very small avalanche signal is visible.	3-5
186	3.5	Rate capability comparison for the streamer and avalanche mode of operation. An order of magnitude in rate capability for a maximal efficiency drop of 10% is gained by using the avalanche mode over the streamer mode.	3-6
189	3.6	Possible double-gap RPC layouts: a) "standard" 1D double-gap RPC, as used in CMS experiment, where the anodes are facing each other and a 1D read-out plane is sandwiched in between them, b) double read-out double-gap RPC as used in AT-LAS experiment, where the cathodes are facing each other and 2 read-out planes are used on the outer surfaces. This last layout can offer the possibility to use a 2D reconstruction by using orthogonal read-out planes.	3-7
195	3.7	Comparison of performance of CMS double and single gap RPCs using cosmic muons [44]. Figure 3.7a: Comparison of efficiency sigmoids. Figure 3.7b: Voltage distribution at 95% of maximum efficiency. Figure 3.7c: $\Delta_{10\%}^{90\%}$ distribution.	3-7
198	3.8	Presentation of ALICE MRPC using 250 μm gas gaps, 620 μm outer glass electrodes and 550 μm inner floating electrodes. More details on the labels are given in [45].	3-8
200	3.9	Particle identification applied to electrons in the STAR experiment. The identifica- tion is performed combining ToF and dE/dx measurements [50].	3-9
202	3.10	Comparison of the detector performance of ALICE ToF MRPC [51] at fixed applied voltage (in blue) and at fixed effective voltage (in red). The effective voltage is kept fixed by increasing the applied voltage accordingly to the current drawn by the detector.	3-9
205	3.11	Ratio between total induced and drifting charge have been simulated for single gap, double-gap and multigap layouts [52]. The total induced charge for a double-gap RPC is a factor 2 higher than for a multigap.	3-10
208	3.12	Charge spectra have been simulated for single gap, double-gap and multigap lay- outs [52]. It appears that when single gap shows a decreasing spectrum, double and multigap layouts exhibit a spectrum whose peak is detached from the origin. The detachment gets stronger as the number of gaps increases.	3-11
212	3.13	The maximal theoretical efficiency is simulated for single gap, double-gap and multi- gap layouts [52] at a constant gap thickness of 2 mm and using an effective Townsend coefficient of 9 mm^{-1}	3-11

215	4.1	Signals from the RPC strips are shaped by the FEE described on Figure 4.1a. Output LVDS signals are then read-out by a TDC module connected to a computer or converted into NIM and sent to scalers. Figure 4.1b describes how these converted signals are put in coincidence with the trigger.	4-3
219	4.2	Description of the principle of a CFD. A comparison of threshold triggering (left) and constant fraction triggering (right) is shown in Figure 4.2a. Constant fraction triggering is obtained thanks to zero-crossing technique as explained in Figure 4.2b. The signal arriving at the input of the CFD is split into three components. A first one is delayed and connected to the inverting input of a first comparator. A second component is connected to the noninverting input of this first comparator. A third component is connected to the noninverting input of another comparator along with a threshold value connected to the inverting input. Finally, the output of both comparators is fed through an AND gate.	4-4
228	4.3	(4.3a) Extrapolation from 2016 data of single hit rate per unit area in the barrel region. (4.3b) Extrapolation from 2016 data of single hit rate per unit area in the endcap region.	4-6
231	4.4	Background Fluka simulation compared to 2016 Data at $L = 10^{34} \text{ cm}^{-2} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$ in the fourth endcap disk region. A mismatch in between simulation and data can be observed. [To be understood.]	4-7
234	4.5	Layout of the test beam zone called X5c GIF at CERN. Photons from the radioactive source produce a sustained high rate of random hits over the whole area. The zone is surrounded by 8 m high and 80 cm thick concrete walls. Access is possible through three entry points. Two access doors for personnel and one large gate for material. A crane allows installation of heavy equipment in the area.	4-8
239	4.6	^{137}Cs decays by β^- emission to the ground state of ^{137}Ba (BR = 5.64%) and via the 662 keV isomeric level of ^{137}Ba (BR = 94.36%) whose half-life is 2.55 min.	4-9
241	4.7	Floor plan of the GIF++ facility. When the facility downstream of the GIF++ takes electron beam, a beam pipe is installed along the beam line (z-axis). The irradiator can be displaced laterally (its center moves from $x = 0.65$ m to 2.15 m), to increase the distance to the beam pipe.	4-9
245	4.8	Simulated unattenuated current of photons in the xz plane (Figure 4.8a) and yz plane (Figure 4.8b) through the source at $x = 0.65$ m and $y = 0$ m. With angular correction filters, the current of 662 keV photons is made uniform in xy planes.	4-10
248	4.9	Description of the RPC setup. Dimensions are given in mm. A tent containing RPCs is placed at 1720 mm from the source container. The source is situated in the center of the container. RE-4-2-BARC-161 chamber is 160 mm inside the tent. This way, the distance between the source and the chambers plan is 2060 mm. Figure 4.9a provides a side view of the setup in the xz plane while Figure 4.9b shows a top view in the yz plane.	4-11
254	4.10	RE-4-2-BARC-161 chamber is inside the tent as described in Figure 4.9. In the top right, the two scintillators used as trigger can be seen. This trigger system has an inclination of 10° relative to horizontal and is placed above half-partition B2 of the RPCs. PMT electronics are shielded thanks to lead blocks placed in order to protect them without stopping photons from going through the scintillators and the chamber.	4-12

259	4.11 Hit distributions over all 3 partitions of RE-4-2-BARC-161 chamber is showed on 260 these plots. Top, middle and bottom figures respectively correspond to partitions A, 261 B, and C. These plots show that some events still occur in other half-partitions than 262 B2, which corresponds to strips 49 to 64, in front of which the trigger is placed, con- 263 tributing to the inefficiency of detection of cosmic muons. In the case of partitions 264 A and C, the very low amount of data can be interpreted as noise. On the other hand, 265 it is clear that a little portion of muons reach the half-partition B1, corresponding to 266 strips 33 to 48.	4-13
267	4.12 Results are derived from data taken on half-partition B2 only. On the 18 th of June 268 2014, data has been taken on chamber RE-2-BARC-161 at building 904 (Prevessin 269 Site) with cosmic muons providing us a reference efficiency plateau of $(97.54 \pm$ 270 $0.15)\%$ represented by a black curve. A similar measurement has been done at GIF 271 on the 21 st of July with the same chamber giving a plateau of $(78.52 \pm 0.94)\%$ 272 represented by a red curve.	4-14
273	4.13 Representation of the layout used for the simulations of the test setup. The RPC is 274 represented as a yellow trapezoid while the two scintillators as blue cuboids looking 275 at the sky. A green plane corresponds to the muon generation plane within the sim- 276 ulation. Figure 4.9a shows a global view of the simulated setup. Figure 4.9b shows 277 a zommed view that allows to see the 2 scintillators as well as the full RPC plane.	4-15
278	4.14 γ flux $F(D)$ is plot using values from table 4.1. As expected, the plot shows similar 279 attenuation behaviours with increasing distance for each absorption factors.	4-18
280	4.15 Figure 4.15a shows the linear approximation fit done via formulae 4.7 on data from 281 table 4.2. Figure 4.15b shows a comparison of this model with the simulated flux 282 using a and b given in figure 4.15a in formulae 4.4 and the reference value $D_0 =$ 283 50cm and the associated flux for each absorption factor F_0^{ABS} from table 4.1	4-20
284	4.16 Dose measurements has been done in a plane corresponding to the tents front side. 285 This plan is 1900 mm away from the source. As explained in the first chapter, a 286 lens-shaped lead filter provides a uniform photon flux in the vertical plan orthogonal 287 to the beam direction. If the second line of measured fluxes is not taken into account 288 because of lower values due to experimental equipments in the way between the 289 source and the tent, the uniformity of the flux is well showed by the results.	4-22
290	4.17	4-23
291	4.18 Evolution of the maximum efficiency for RE2 (4.18a) and RE4 (4.18b) chambers 292 with increasing extrapolated γ rate per unit area at working point. Both irradiated 293 (blue) and non irradiated (red) chambers are shown.	4-25
294	4.19 Evolution of the working point for RE2 (4.19a) and RE4 (4.19b) with increasing 295 extrapolated γ rate per unit area at working point. Both irradiated (blue) and non 296 irradiated (red) chambers are shown.	4-25
297	4.20 Evolution of the maximum efficiency at HL-LHC conditions, i.e. a background hit 298 rate per unit area of $300\text{Hz}/\text{cm}^2$, with increasing integrated charge for RE2 (4.20a) 299 and RE4 (4.20b) detectors. Both irradiated (blue) and non irradiated (red) chambers 300 are shown. The integrated charge for non irradiated detectors is recorded during test 301 beam periods and stays small with respect to the charge accumulated in irradiated 302 chambers.	4-26
303	4.21 Comparison of the efficiency sigmoid before (triangles) and after (circles) irradiation 304 for RE2 (4.21a) and RE4 (4.21b) detectors. Both irradiated (blue) and non irradiated 305 (red) chambers are shown.	4-26
306	4.22 Evolution of the Bakelite resistivity for RE2 (4.22a) and RE4 (4.22b) detectors. Both 307 irradiated (blue) and non irradiated (red) chambers are shown.	4-27

308	4.23 Evolution of the noise rate per unit area for the irradiated chamber RE2-2-BARC-9 only.	4-27
310	A.1 (A.1a) View of the front panel of a V1190A TDC module [58]. (A.1b) View of the 311 front panel of a V1718 Bridge module [59]. (A.1c) View of the front panel of a 6U 312 6021 VME crate [60].	A-3
313	A.2 Module V1190A <i>Trigger Matching Mode</i> timing diagram [58].	A-4
314	A.3 Structure of the ROOT output file generated by the DAQ. The 5 branches (<code>EventNumber</code> , 315 <code>number_of_hits</code> , <code>Quality_flag</code> , <code>TDC_channel</code> and <code>TDC_TimeStamp</code>) are visible on 316 the left panel of the ROOT browser. On the right panel is visible the histogram cor- 317 responding to the variable <code>nHits</code> . In this specific example, there were approximately 318 50k events recorded to measure the gamma irradiation rate on the detectors. Each 319 event is stored as a single entry in the <code>TTree</code>	A-10
320	A.4 The effect of the quality flag is explained by presenting the content of <code>TBranch</code> 321 <code>number_of_hits</code> of a data file without <code>Quality_flag</code> in Figure A.4a and the con- 322 tent of the same <code>TBranch</code> for data corresponding to a <code>Quality_flag</code> where all TDCs 323 were labelled as <code>GOOD</code> in Figure A.4b taken with similar conditions. It can be noted 324 that the number of entries in Figure A.4b is slightly lower then in Figure A.4a due 325 to the excluded events.	A-12
326	A.5 Using the same data as previously showed in Figure A.4, the effect of the quality 327 flag is explained by presenting the reconstructed hit multiplicity of a data file with- 328 out <code>Quality_flag</code> in Figure A.5a and the reconstructed content of the same RPC 329 partition for data corresponding to a <code>Quality_flag</code> where all TDCs were labelled as 330 <code>GOOD</code> in Figure A.5b taken with similar conditions. The artificial high content of bin 331 0 is completely suppressed.	A-12
332	A.6 WebDCS DAQ scan page. On this page, shifters need to choose the type of scan 333 (Rate, Efficiency or Noise Reference scan), the gamma source configuration at the 334 moment of data taking, the beam configuration, and the trigger mode. These in- 335 formation will be stored in the DAQ ROOT output. Are also given the minimal 336 measurement time and waiting time after ramping up of the detectors is over before 337 starting the data acquisition. Then, the list of HV points to scan and the number of 338 triggers for each run of the scan are given in the table underneath.	A-14
339	B.1 Example of expected hit time distributions in the cases of efficiency (Figure B.1a) 340 and noise/gamma rate per unit area (Figure B.1b) measurements as extracted from 341 the raw ROOT files. The unit along the x-axis corresponds to ns. The fact that 342 "the" muon peak is not well defined in Figure B.1a is due to the contribution of all 343 the RPCs being tested at the same time that don't necessarily have the same signal 344 arrival time. Each individual peak can have an offset with the ones of other detectors. 345 The inconsistancy in the first 100 ns of both time distributions is an artefact of the 346 TDCs and are systematically rejected during the analysis.	B-16
347	B.2 The effect of the quality flag is explained by presenting the reconstructed hit multi- 348 plicity of a data file without <code>Quality_flag</code> . The artificial high content of bin 0 is the 349 effect of corrupted data.	B-19

- 350 B.3 Display of the masking tool page on the webDCS. The window on the left allows the
351 shifter to edit `ChannelsMapping.csv`. To mask a channel, it only is needed to set the
352 3rd field corresponding to the strip to mask to 0. It is not necessary for older mapping
353 file formats to add a 1 for each strip that is not masked as the code is versatile and
354 the default behaviour is to consider missing mask fields as active strips. The effect
355 of the mask is directly visible for noisy channels as the corresponding bin turns red.
356 The global effect of masking strips will be an update of the rate value showed on the
357 histogram that will take into consideration the rejected channels. B-24

List of Tables

358

359	3.1 Properties of the most used electrode materials for RPCs.	3-4
360	4.1 Total photon flux ($E\gamma \leq 662$ keV) with statistical error predicted considering a	
361	^{137}Cs activity of 740 GBq at different values of the distance D to the source along	
362	the x-axis of irradiation field [55].	4-17
363	4.2 Correction factor c is computed thanks to formulae 4.5 taking as reference $D_0 =$	
364	50 cm and the associated flux F_0^{ABS} for each absorption factor available in table 4.1. .	4-19
365	4.3 The data at D_0 in 1997 is taken from [55]. In a second step, using Equations 4.8	
366	and 4.9, the flux at D can be estimated in 1997. Then, taking into account the	
367	attenuation of the source activity, the flux at D can be estimated at the time of the	
368	tests in GIF in 2014. Finally, assuming a sensitivity of the RPC to γ $s = 2 \cdot 10^{-3}$,	
369	an estimation of the hit rate per unit area is obtained.	4-21
370	A.1 Inter-process communication cycles in between the webDCS and the DAQ through	
371	file string signals.	A-19

409	FEE	Front-End Electronics
410	FEB	Front-End Board
411		
412		
413	G	
414		
415	GE-/-	Find a good description
416	GE1/1	Find a good description
417	GE2/1	Find a good description
418	GEANT	GEometry ANd Tracking - a series of software toolkit platforms developed by CERN
419		
420	GEM	Gas Electron Multiplier
421	GIF	Gamma Irradiation Facility
422	GIF++	new Gamma Irradiation Facility
423		
424		
425	H	
426		
427	HL-LHC	High Luminosity LHC
428	HPL	High-pressure laminate
429	HV	High Voltage
430		
431		
432	I	
433		
434	iRPC	improved RPC
435	IRQ	Interrupt Request
436	ISR	Intersecting Storage Rings
437		
438		
439	L	
440		
441	LEIR	Low Energy Ion Ring
442	LEP	Large Electron-Positron
443	LHC	Large Hadron Collider
444	LS1	First Long Shutdown
445	LS3	Third Long Shutdown
446	LV	Low Voltage
447	LVDS	Low-Voltage Differential Signaling
448		
449		
450	M	
451		
452	MC	Monte Carlo

453	MCNP	Monte Carlo N-Particle
454	ME-/	Find good description
455	ME0	Find good description
456	MRPC	Multigap RPC
457		
458		
459	N	
460		
461	NIM	Nuclear Instrumentation Module logic signals
462		
463		
464	P	
465		
466	PS	Proton Synchrotron
467	PMT	PhotoMultiplier Tube
468		
469		
470	Q	
471		
472	QCD	Quantum Chromodynamics
473	QED	Quantum Electrodynamics
474		
475		
476	R	
477		
478	RE-/	Find a good description
479	RE2/2	Find a good description
480	RE3/1	Find a good description
481	RE3/2	Find a good description
482	RE4/1	Find a good description
483	RE4/2	Find a good description
484	RE4/3	Find a good description
485	RMS	Root Mean Square
486	ROOT	a framework for data processing born at CERN
487	RPC	Resistive Plate Chamber
488		
489		
490	S	
491		
492	SC	Synchrocyclotron
493	SLAC	Stanford Linear Accelerator Center
494	SM	Standard Model
495	SPS	Super Proton Synchrotron

496

497

498

T

499

500

501

TDC

Time-to-Digital Converter

ToF

Time-of-flight

502

503

504

W

505

506

webDCS

Web Detector Control System

1

Introduction

507

508

⁵⁰⁹ **1.1 A story of High Energy Physics**

⁵¹⁰ **1.2 Organisation of this study**

2

511

512

Investigating the TeV scale

513 „We may regard the present state of the universe as the effect of the
514 past and the cause of the future. An intellect which at any given mo-
515 ment knew all of the forces that animate nature and the mutual posi-
516 tions of the beings that compose it, if this intellect were vast enough
517 to submit the data to analysis, could condense into a single formula
518 the movement of the greatest bodies of the universe and that of the
519 lightest atom; for such an intellect nothing could be uncertain and
520 the future just like the past would be present before its eyes.”

521

522 - Pierre Simon de Laplace, *A Philosophical Essay on Probabilities*, 1814

523 Throughout history, physics experiment became more and more powerful in order to investigate
524 finer details of nature and helped understanding the elementary blocks of matter and the fundamental
525 interactions that bond them in the microscopic world. Nowadays, the Standard Model (SM) of
526 particle physics is the most accurate theory designed to explain the behaviour of particles and was
527 able to make very precise predictions that are constantly verified, although some hints of new physics
528 are visible as bricks are still missing to have a global comprehension of the Universe.

529 To highlight the limits of the SM and test the different alternative theories, ever more powerful
530 machines are needed. This is in this context that the Large Hadron Collider (LHC) has been thought
531 and built to accelerate and collide particles at energies exceeding anything that had been done before.
532 Higher collision energies and high pile-up imply the use of enormous detectors to measure the
533 properties of the interaction products. The Compact Muon Solenoid (CMS) is a multipurpose ex-
534 periment that have been designed to study the proton-proton collisions of the LHC and give answers
535 on various high energy physics scenari. Nevertheless, the luminosity delivered by the collider will
536 in the future be increased to levels beyond the original plans to improve its discovery potential giv-
537 ing no choice to experiments such as CMS to upgrade their technologies to cope with the increased
538 radiation levels and detection rates.

539 **2.1 The Standard Model of Particle Physics**

540 In this early 21st century it is now widely accepted that matter is made of elementary blocks referred
541 to as *elementary particles*. The physics theory that classifies and describes the best the behaviour
542 and interaction of such elementary particles is the so called Standard Model that formalizes 3 of
543 the 4 fundamental interactions (electromagnetic, weak and strong interactions). It's development
544 took place during the 20th century thanks to a strong collaboration in between the theoretical and
545 experimental physicists.

546 **2.1.1 A history of particle physics**

547 The idea that nature is composed of elementary bricks, called *atomism*, is not contemporary as it
548 was already discussed by Indian or Greek philosophers during antiquity. In Greece, atomism has
549 been rejected by Aristotelianism as the existance of *atoms* would imply the existance of a void that
550 would violate the physical principles of Aristotle philosophy. Aristotelianism has been considered
551 as a reference in the european area until the 15th century and the italian *Rinascimento* where antic
552 text and history started to be more deeply studied. The re-discovery of Platon's philosophy would
553 allow to open the door to alternative theories and give a new approach to natural sciences where
554 experimentation would become central. A new era of knowledge was starting. By the begining of
555 the 17th century, atomism was re-discovered by philosophers and the very first attempt to estimate
556 an *atom* size would be provided by Magnetus in 1646. Although his *atoms* correspond to what would
557 nowadays be called *molecules*, Magnetus achieved feats by calculating that the number of molecules
558 in a grain of incense would be of the order of 10^{18} simply by considering the time necessary to smell
559 it everywhere in a large church after the stick was lit on. It is now known that this number only falls
560 short by 1 order of magnitude.

561 An alternative philosophy to atomism popularized by Descartes was corpuscularianism. Built on
562 ever divisible corpuscles, contrary to atoms, it's principles would be mainly used by alchemists like
563 Newton who would later develop a corpuscular theory of light. Boyle would combine together ideas
564 of both atomism or corpuscularianism leading to mechanical philosophy. The 18th century have

seen the development of engineering providing philosophical thought experiments with repeatable demonstration and a new point of view to explain the composition of matter and Lavoisier would greatly contribute to chemistry and atomism by publishing in 1789 a list of 33 chemical elements corresponding to what is now called *atoms*. In the early 19th century Dalton would summarize the knowledge on composition of matter and Fraunhofer would invent the spectrometer and discover the spectral lines. The rise of atomic physics, chemistry and mathematical formalism would unravel the different atomic elements and ultimately, the 20th century would see the very first sub-atomic particles.

Discovery of the inner structure of the atom




Figure 2.1: Through the gold foil experiment Rutherford could show that most of the mass of atoms was contained in a positively charged nucleus and could then propose a more accurate atomic model than that of Thomson.

The negative *electron* would be the first to be discovered in 1897 by Thomson after 3 decades of research on cathode rays by proving that the electrification observed in an electroscope, as reported by Perrin, was due to the rays themselves and that they had to be composed of electrically charged particles. In 1900, Becquerel would show the *beta rays* emitted by radium had the same charge over mass ratio than what measured by Thomson for cathode rays, pointing to electrons as a constituent of atoms. In 1907, Rutherford and Royds showed that *alpha* particles, once captured in a tube and subjected to an electric spark causing an electron avalanche, where helium ions as they could combine with 2 electrons to form a ${}^4\text{He}$. This discovery was directly followed by the constraint of the atom structure in 1909 through the gold foil experiment in which the deflection angle of alpha particles fired at a very thin gold foil was measured and highlighted atoms where mainly empty with

584 nearly all its mass contained into a tiny positively charged *nucleus*. With these two observations,
 585 he could formulate the Rutherford model of the atom in 1911, shown together with the Thomson
 586 plum pudding model in Figure 2.1. The link in between atomic number and number of positive and
 587 negative charges contained into the atoms would fast be understood and the different kind of element
 588 transmutation appeared to be purely nuclear processes making clear that the electromagnetic nature
 589 of chemical transformation could not possibly change nuclei. Thus a new branch in physics appeared
 590 to study nuclei exclusively: the nuclear physics.

591 Moreover, in 1913 quantum physics would be introduced into the atomic model by Bohr based
 592 on the assumptions of Plank to explain spectral lines, and other observed quantum effects. The same
 593 year, Moseley would confirm Bohr's model and Debye would extend it by introducing elliptical
 594 orbits.

595 By studying alpha emission and the product of their interaction with nitrogen gas, Rutherford
 596 reported in 1919 the very first nuclear reaction leading to the discovery that the hydrogen nucleus was
 597 composed of a single positively charged particle that was later baptised *proton*. This idea came from
 598 1815 Prout's hypothesis proposing that all atoms are composed of "*protyles*" (i.e. hydrogen atoms).
 599 By using scintillation detectors, Rutherford could highlight typical hydrogen nuclei signature and
 600 understand that the impact of alpha particles with nitrogen would knock out an hydrogen nucleus
 601 and produce an oxygen 17, as explicated in Formula 2.1 and would then postulate that protons are
 602 building bricks of all elements.



603 With this assumption and the discovery of isotopes together with Aston, elements with identical
 604 atomic number but different masses, Rutherford would propose that all elements' nuclei but hydrogen's are composed of both charged particles, protons, and of chargeless particles, which he called
 605 *neutrons*, and that these neutral particles would help maintaining nuclei as one, as charged protons
 606 were likely to electrostatically repulse each other, and introduced the idea of a new force, a *nuclear*
 607 force. Though the first idea concerning neutrons was a bond state of protons and electrons as it was
 608 known that the beta decay, emitting electrons, was taking place in the nucleus, it was then showed
 609 that such a model would hardly be possible due to Heisenberg's uncertainty principle and by the
 610 recently measured *spin* of both protons and electrons. The spin, discovered through the study of
 611 the emission spectrum of alkali metals, would be understood as a "two-valued quantum degree of
 612 freedom" and formalized by Pauli and extended by Dirac, to take the relativist case into account.
 613 Measured to be $\frac{1}{2}\hbar$ for both, it was impossible to arrange an odd number of half integer spins and
 614 obtain a global nucleus spin that would be integer. Finally, in 1932, following the discovery of a new
 615 neutral radiation, Chadwick could discover the neutron as an uncharged particle with a mass similar
 616 to that of the proton whose half integer spin would reveal to be the solution to explain the nuclear
 617 spin.

619 Development of the Quantum Electrodynamics

620 Historically, the development of the quantum theory revolved around the question of emission and
 621 absorption of discrete amount of energy through light. Einstein used the initial intuition of Plank
 622 about the black-body radiation to develop in 1905 a model to explain the photoelectric effect in
 623 which light was described by discrete quanta now called *photons*. For this model, Einstein introduced
 624 the concept of wave-particle duality as classical theory was not able to describe the phenomenon.
 625 With the new understanding of atoms and of their structure, classical theories also proved unable

626 to explain atoms stability. Indeed, using classical mechanics, electrons orbiting around a nucleus
 627 should radiate an energy proportional to their angular momentum and thus lose energy through
 628 time and the spectrum of energy emission should then be continuous, but it was known since the
 629 19th century and the discovery of spectral lines that the emission spectrum of material was discrete.

630 This was Bohr who first suggested that a quantum description of the atom was necessary in 1913.
 631 Using the correspondence principle stating that at large enough numbers the quantum calculations
 632 should give the same results than the classical theory, he proposed the very first quantum model
 633 of the hydrogen atom explaining the line spectrum by introducing the principal quantum number
 634 n describing the electron shell. This model would then be improved by Sommerfeld that would
 635 quantize the z-component of the angular momentum, leading to the second and third quantum
 636 numbers, or azimuthal and magnetic quantum number, l and m defining for the second the orbital
 637 angular momentum of the electrons on their shells and thus, the shape of the orbital, and for the third
 638 the available orbital on the subshell for each electron. Nevertheless, although the model was not only
 639 limited to spherical orbitals anymore, making the atom more realistic, the Zeeman effect couldn't be
 640 completely explained by just using n , l and m . A solution would be brought after the discovery of
 641 Pauli in 1924, as Uhlenbeck, Goudsmit, and Kramers proposed in 1925 the idea of intrinsic rotation
 642 of the electron, introducing a new angular momentum vector associated to the particle itself, and
 643 not to the orbital, and associated to a new quantic number s , the *spin* projection quantum number
 644 explaining the lift of degeneracy to an even number of energy levels.

645 The introduction of the *spin* happened 1 year after another attempt of improvement of the theory
 646 was made by De Broglie in his PhD thesis. The original formulation of the quantum theory only
 647 considered photons as energy quanta behaving as both waves and particles. De Broglie proposed
 648 that all matter are described by waves and that their momentum is proportional to the oscillation of
 649 quantized electromagnetic field oscillators. This interpretation was able to reproduce the previous
 650 version of the quantum energy levels by showing that the quantum condition involves an integer
 651 multiple of 2π , as shown by Formula 2.2.

$$p = \hbar k \Leftrightarrow \int pdx = \hbar \int kdx = 2\pi\hbar n \quad (2.2)$$

652 Although the intuition of De Broglie about the wave-particle duality of all matter, his interpretation
 653 was semiclassical and it's in 1926 that the first fully quantum mechanical wave-equation would
 654 be introduced by Schrödinger to describe electron-like particles, reproducing the previous semiclassical
 655 formulation without inconsistencies. This complexe equation describes the evolution of the
 656 wave function Ψ of the quantum system, defined by its position vector \mathbf{r} and time t as an energy
 657 conservation law, in which the hamiltonian of the system \hat{H} is explicit, by solving the Equation 2.3.

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial t} |\Psi(\mathbf{r}, t)\rangle = \hat{H} |\Psi(\mathbf{r}, t)\rangle \quad (2.3)$$

658 In 1927, Dirac would go further in his paper about emission and absorption of radiation by
 659 proposing a second quantization not only of the physical process at play but also of the electromagnetic
 660 field, providing the ingredients to the first formulation of *Quantum Electrodynamics (QED)*
 661 and the description of photon emission by electrons dropping into a lower energy state in which the
 662 final number of particles is different than the initial one. To complete this model to the many-body
 663 wave functions of identical particles, Jordan included creation and annihilation operators for fields
 664 obeying Fermi-Dirac statistics leading to a model describing particles that would be referred to as
 665 *fermions*. Nevertheless, in order to properly treat electromagnetism, the incorporation of the relativ-

666 ity theory developed by Einstein. Including gravity into quantum physics still is a challenge nowa-
 667 days, but in 1928 Pauli and Jordan would show that special relativity's coordinate transformations
 668 could be applied to quantum fields as the field commutators were Lorentz invariant. Finally derived
 669 the same year, the Dirac equation, shown as Equation 2.4, similarly to Schrödinger's equation, is a
 670 single-particle equation but it incorporates special relativity in addition to quantum mechanics rules.
 671 It features the 4×4 gamma matrices γ^μ built using 2×2 Pauli matrices and unitary matrix, the
 672 4-gradient ∂_μ , the rest mass m of any half integer spin massive particle described by the wave func-
 673 tion $\psi(x, t)$, also called a Dirac spinor, and the speed of light c . In addition to perfectly reproduce
 674 the results obtained with quantum mechanics so far, it also provided with *negative-energy solutions*
 675 that would later be interpreted as a new form of matter, *antimatter* and give a theoretical justifica-
 676 tion to the Pauli equation that was phenomenologically constructed to account for the spin as in the
 677 non-relativistic limit, the Dirac equation is similar.

$$i\hbar\gamma^\mu\partial_\mu\psi - mc\psi = 0 \quad (2.4)$$

678 The successes of the QED was soon followed with theoretical problems as computations of any
 679 physical process involving photons and charged particles were showed to be only reliable at the first
 680 order of perturbation theory. At higher order of the theory, divergent contributions were appearing
 681 giving nonsensical results. Only two effects were contributing to these infinities.

- 682 • The self-energy of the electron (or positron), the energy that the particle has due its own
 683 interaction with its environment.
- 684 • The vacuum polarization, virtual electron–positron pairs produced by a background electro-
 685 magnetic field in the vacuum which is not an "empty" space. These virtual pairs affect the
 686 charge and current distributions generated by the original electromagnetic field.

687 Solving this apparent problem was done by carefully defining the concepts of each observables,
 688 for example mass or charge, as these quantities are understood within the context of a non-interacting
 689 field equation, and that from the experiment point of view, they are abstractions as what is measured
 690 are "renormalized observables" shifted from there "bare" value by the interaction taking place in
 691 the measuring process. The infinities needed to be connected to corrections of mass and charge
 692 as those are fixed to finite values by experiment. This was the intuition of Bethe in 1947 who
 693 successfully computed the effect of such *renormalization* in the non-relativist case. Fully covariant
 694 formulations of QED including renormalization was achieved by 1949 by Tomonaga, Schwinger,
 695 Feynman and Dyson and Feynman is now famous for his association of diagrams to the term of
 696 the scattering matrix, greatly simplifying the representation and computation of interactions as the
 697 diagrams directly corresponded the measurable physical processes and would then be used in every
 698 quantum field theories. With the resolution of infinities, QED had mostly reached its final form,
 699 being still today the most accurate physical theory and would serve as a model to build all other
 700 quantum field theories.

701 Development of the quark model and Quantum Chromodynamics

702 To explain the nuclear force that holds *nucleons* (protons and neutrons) together, Yukawa theoreti-
 703 cally proposed in 1934 the existence of a force carrier called *meson* due to it's predicted mass in
 704 the range in between the electron and nucleon masses. Discovered in 1936 by Anderson and Ned-
 705 dermeyer, and confirmed using bubble chambers in 1937 by Street and Stevenson, a first meson

706 candidate was observed in the decay products of cosmic rays. Assuming it had the same electric
 707 charge than electrons and protons, this particle was observed to have a curvature due to magnetic
 708 field that was sharper than protons but smoother than electrons resulting in a mass in between that
 709 of electrons and protons. But its properties were not compatible with Yukawa's theory, which was
 710 emphasized by the discovery of a new candidate in 1947, again in cosmic ray products using photo-
 711 graphic emulsions.

712 This new candidate, although it had a similar mass than the already believed *meson*, would rather
 713 decay into it. For distinction, the first candidate would then be renamed "*mu meson*" when the second
 714 would be the "*pi meson*". The *mu meson* was behaving like a heavy electron and didn't participate
 715 in the strong interaction whereas the pion was believed to be the carrier of the nuclear interaction.
 716 This lead to classify the *mu* in a new category of particles called *leptons* together with the electron
 717 that shared similar properties and *the neutrino*, and be renamed *muon*. The *pi meson* was finally
 718 found to be a triplet of particles: a positively charged, a negatively charged, and a neutral particle.
 719 The neutral *pi meson* has been more difficult to identify as it wouldn't leave tracks on emulsions nor
 720 on bubble chambers and needed to be studied via it's decay products. It was ultimately identified in
 721 University of California's cyclotron in 1950 through the observation of its decay into 2 photons.

722 Also discovered in 1947 but in cloud chamber photographs, the *K meson* as also been an im-
 723 portant step towards the establishment of the Standard Model. A triplet of particle, 2 charged and a
 724 neutral, with a mass roughly half that of a proton, were reported. These particles were baptised *K*
 725 *meson* in contrast to the "light" *pi* and *mu* "L-mesons". The particularity of the *K* were there very
 726 slow decays with a typical lifetime of the order of 10^{-10} s much greater than the 10^{-23} s of *pi*-proton
 727 reactions. The concept of *strangeness*, a new quantum number was then introduced by Pais as an
 728 attempt to explain this phenomenon as *strange* particles appeared as a pair production of a strange
 729 and anti-strange particle.

730 With the development of synchrotrons, the particle *zoo* would grow to several dozens during the
 731 1950s as higher energies were reachable through acceleration. In 1961, a first classification system,
 732 called Eightfold Way, was proposed by Gell-Mann and finding its roots in the Gell-Mann–Nishijima
 733 formula, which relates the electric charge Q , the third component of the isospin I_3 , the *baryon*
 734 number B and the strangeness S , as explicitated in Formula 2.5. The isospin was a quantum number
 735 introduced in 1932 to explain symmetries of the newly discovered neutron using representation
 736 theory of SU(2). The baryon number, was introduced by Nishijima as a quantum number for baryons,
 737 i.e. particles of the same family as nucleons. The mesons were classified in an octet and baryons of
 738 spin $\pm \frac{1}{2}$ and $\pm \frac{3}{2}$ were respectively classified into an octet and a decuplet, as shown in Figure 2.2. To
 739 complete the baryon decuplet, Gell-Mann predicted the existance of baryon Ω^- which would later
 740 be discovered in 1964.

$$Q = I_3 + \frac{1}{2}(B + S) \quad (2.5)$$




Figure 2.2: Figure 2.2a: Meson octet. Figure 2.2b: Baryon octet. Figure 2.2c: Baryon decuplet.

Strong of this classification using an SU(3) flavor symmetry, Gell-Mann, and independently Zweig, would propose a full theoretical model in which *hadrons* (strongly interacting particles, i.e. mesons and baryons) were not elementary particles anymore. They would rather be composed with 3 flavors of particles called *quarks* and there anti-particles. The 3 flavors were called *up*, *down* and *strange*. *Up* and *down* would be used to explain the nucleons and non-strange mesons, while *strange* would come into the composition of hadrons showing strangeness. *Up* and *down* flavors would be discovered in 1968 thanks to the deep inelastic scattering experiments conducted at the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center (SLAC), and *strange* could only be indirectly validated even though it provided a robust explanation to *kaon* (K) and *pion* (π). However, in the decade following the Gell-Mann-Zweig quark model proposition, several improvement to the model were brought, first by Glashow and Bjorken the same year that predicted the existence of a fourth quark flavor, the *charm*, that would equalize the then known number of quarks and leptons and finally in 1973 by Kobayashi and Maskawa that would increase the number of quarks to 6 to explain the experimental observation of CP violation. These two quarks would be referred to as *top* and *bottom* for the first time in 1975. It's only after these additions to the quark model that finally the *charm* would be discovered in 1974 at both SLAC and Brookhaven National Laboratory (BNL). A meson where the *charm* was bound with an *anti-charm*, called J/ψ , would help convince the physics community of the validity of the model. The *top* would be discovered soon after in 1977 in Fermilab and indicate the existence of the *bottom* that would resist to discovery until Fermilab's experiments CDF and D \emptyset in 1995 due to its very large mass and the energy needed to produce it.

As remarked by Struminsky, the original quark model proposal composed of 3 quarks should possess an additional quantum number due to mesons such as Ω^- or Δ^{++} . Indeed, these mesons are composed of 3 identical quarks, respectively 3 *strange* and *up* quark, with parallel spins, which

should be forbidden by the exclusion principle. Independentle, Greenberg and Han-Nambu proposed an additional SU(3) degree of freedom possessed by the quarks, that would later be refered to as *color charge gauge*, that could interact through *gluons*, the gauge boson octet corresponding to this degree of freedom. Nevertheless, as observing free quarks proved to be impossible, two visions of the quarks were argued mainly due to the failures to observe these particles free to prove their existence. On one side, Gell-Mann proposed to see quarks as mathematical construct instead of real particles, as they are always confined, implying that quantum field theory would not describe entirely the strong interaction. Opposed to this vision, Feynman on the contrary argued that quarks were real particles, that he would call *partons*, that should be described as all other particles by a distribution of position and momentum. The implications of quarks as point-like particles would be verified at SLAC and the concept of *color* would be added to the quark model in 1973 by Fritzsch and Leutwyler together with Gell-Mann to propose a description of the strong interaction through the theory of Quantum Chromodynamics (QCD). The discovery the same year of asymptotic freedom within the QCD by Groos, Politzer and Wilczek, allowed for very precise predictions thanks to the perturbation theory. Nowadays, the confinement of quarks is studied in experiments such as ALICE, through exploration of the quark-gluon plasma.

The Weak interaction, spontaneous symmetry breaking, the Higgs mechanism and the Electroweak unification

The weak interaction is the process that causes radioactive decays. Thanks to the neutron discovery, Fermi could explain in 1934 the beta radiations through the beta decay process in which the neutron decays into a proton by emitting an electron. Though the missing energy observed during this process triggered a huge debate about the apparent non conservation of energy, momentum and spin of the process, Fermi, as Pauli before him, proposed that the missing energy was due to a neutral not yet discovered particle that would then be baptised *neutrino*. The impossibility to detect such a particle would leave some members of the scientific community sceptical, but hints of energy conservation and of the existence of the neutrino were provided by measuring the energy spectrum of electrons emitted through beta decay, as there was a strict limit on their energy. It's only 30 years later in 1953 that it would be discovered by the team of Cowan and Reines using the principle of inverse beta decay described through Formula 2.6. The experiment consisted in placing water tanks sandwiched in between liquid scintillators near a nuclear reactor with an estimated neutrino flux of $5 \times 10^{13} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2}$. However, in order to explain the absence of some reactions in the experiment of Cowan and Reines, and constraint the beta decay theory of Fermi and extend it to the case of the muon, Konopinski and Mahmoud proposed in 1953 that the muon decay would eject a particle similar to the neutrino and thus predicted the existence of a muon neutrino that would be different than the one involved in the beta decay, related to the electron. With this, the idea of lepton number would arise. The muon neutrino would successfully be detected in 1962 by Lederman, Schwartz and Steinberger.

$$\bar{\nu} + p \rightarrow n + e^+ \quad (2.6)$$

The theory could not be valid though as the probability of interaction, called cross-section, would have been increasing without bond with the square of the energy. Fermi assumed in a two vector current coupling but Lee and Yang noted that an axial current could appear and would violate parity. The experiment of Wu in 1956 would confirm the parity violation and Gamow and Teller would try to account for it by describing Fermi's interaction through allowed (parity-violating) and superallowed

806 (parity-conserving) decays. But the success of QED as a quantum field theory would spark the
807 development of such a theory to describe the weak interaction.

808 As previously discussed, the great success of QED was built on an underlying symmetry, interpreted
809 as a gauge invariance so that the effect of the force is the same in all space-time coordinates,
810 and of the possibility to renormalize it in order to absorb the infinities. Independently in 1958,
811 Glashow, and Salam and Ward used 1957 Schwinger ideas about vector intermediary for the decay
812 processes, could find a way to unite both the electromagnetic and weak interaction into a gauge
813 theory involving 4 gauge bosons, 3 of which were massive and carried out the weak interaction and
814 a massless boson carrying the electromagnetic interaction. Among the 3 massive bosons, 2 were
815 charged and 1 was neutral, similarly to the previously theorized *pi meson* vector of the Yukawa
816 model and all have a mass much greater than nucleons and thus a very short life time implying a
817 finite very short range contrary to the contact interaction originally proposed by Fermi.

818 Breakthrough in other fields of physics contributed in giving theoretical support and interpretation
819 to the unified electroweak theory. The stepping stone would be the use of spontaneous symmetry
820 breaking that was inspired to Nambu at the end of the 1950s following the development of the BCS
821 superconductivity mechanism in 1957. Cooper had shown that BCS pairs, pairs of electrons bound
822 together at low temperature, could have lower energy than the Fermi energy and where responsible
823 for superconductivity. This lead to the discovery of Goldstone-Nambu bosons as a result of the
824 spontaneous breaking of the chiral symmetry in a theory describing nucleons and mesons developed
825 by Nambu and Jona-Lasinio in 1961, and now understood as a low-energy approximation of
826 QCD. Similarly to mechanism of energy gap appearance in superconductivity, the nucleon mass
827 is suggested to the result of a self-energy of a fermion field and is studied through a four-fermion
828 interaction in which, as a consequence of the symmetry, bound states of nucleon-antinucleon pairs
829 appear and can be regarded as virtual pions. Though the symmetry is maintained in the equations,
830 the ground state is not preserved. Goldstone would later the same year show that the bound states
831 corresponds to spinless bosons with zero mass.

832 Although the model in itself didn't revolutionize particle physics, spontaneous symmetry breaking
833 would be generalized to quantum field theories. As all fundamental interactions are described
834 using gauge theories based on underlying symmetries, processes such as the chiral symmetry breaking
835 would be introduced soon after the publication of Nambu and Jona-Lasinio. In 1962, Anderson,
836 following an idea of Schwinger who suggested that zero-mass vector bosons were not necessarily
837 required to describe the conservation of baryons contrary to the bosons emerging from chiral symmetry
838 breaking, discussed the implications of spontaneous symmetry breaking in particles physics.
839 A model was finally independently built in 1964 by Brout and Englert, Higgs, and Guralnik, Hagen,
840 and Kibble, who discovered that combining an additional field into a gauge theory in order to break
841 the symmetry, the resulting gauge bosons acquire a nonzero mass. Moreover, Higgs stated that this
842 implied the existence of at least one new massive, i.e. self-interacting, scalar boson, that are now
843 known as *Higgs bosons* corresponding to this additional field. The Higgs mechanism today specifically
844 refers to the process through which the gauge bosons of the weak interaction acquire mass. In
845 1968, Weinberg could point to the Higgs mechanism to integrate a Higgs field into a new version
846 of the electroweak theory in which the spontaneous symmetry breaking mechanism of the Higgs
847 field would explicitly explain the masses of the weak interaction gauge bosons and the zero-mass
848 of photons.

2.1.2 Construction and test of the model

The Standard Model of particle physics was built in the middle of the 1970s after the experimental confirmation of the existence of quarks. It is based on the assembly of the models previously introduced and describing the fundamental interactions, except for gravitation, and their gauge bosons as well as the way elementary "matter" particles interact with the fields associated with these force carriers. In this sense, the development of QED and the unification of the electroweak interaction, of the Yukawa interaction and of QCD, and of the Higgs mechanism made it possible to explain most of contemporary physics.




Figure 2.3: The elementary particles of the Standard Model are showed along with their names and properties. Their interactions with the strong, weak and electromagnetic forces have been explicited using color squares. In the left column, the scalar higgs boson is depicted, while the central is focused on the matter particles, the fermions, and the right on the force carriers, the gauge bosons. The role of the Higgs boson in electroweak symmetry breaking is highlighted, and the corresponding way properties of the various particles differ in the (high-energy) symmetric phase (top) and the (low-energy) broken-symmetry phase (bottom) are showed.

In the SM, "matter" particles, are described by 12 fermion fields of spin $\frac{1}{2}$ obeying the Fermi-Dirac statistics, i.e. subjected to the Pauli exclusion principle. To each fermion is associated its corresponding antiparticle. The fermions are classified according to the way they interact and, thus, according to the charges they carry. 6 of them are classified as quarks (u, d, c, s, t , and b) and are subjected to all interactions and the 6 others as leptons ($e^-, \mu^-, \tau^-, \nu_e, \nu_\mu$, and ν_τ). Leptons

862 are not subjected to the strong interaction and among them, the 3 neutrinos only interact weakly as
 863 they are neutral particles, which explains why they are so difficult to detect. The gauge boson fields
 864 are the gluons g for the strong interaction, the photon γ for the electromagnetic interaction and the
 865 weak bosons W^+ , W^- , and Z^0 for the weak interaction. Finally, the Higgs field H^0 is responsible,
 866 through the spontaneous symmetry breaking, of the mixing of the massless electroweak boson fields
 867 W_1 , W_2 , W_3 , and B leading to the observable states γ , W^+ , W^- , and Z^0 that can gain mass while
 868 interacting with the Higgs field. This picture of the SM is summarized through Figure 2.3 where the
 869 antifermions are not showed.

870 When the model was first finalized, the existence of the weak gauge bosons, of the charm, of the
 871 third quark generation composed of top and bottom quarks to explain the observed CP violation was
 872 not proven but the predictions were measured with good precision in the years following. First, the
 873 charm quark would be discovered in 1974, followed by the bottom quark in 1977. The weak bosons
 874 would be discovered during the next decade in 1983. The top quark would resist until 1995 due to
 875 its very large mass but would offer the last piece of the elementary QCD particles. The very last
 876 predicted elementary particle of the model that was not observed yet would prove to be very difficult
 877 to observe. the Higgs boson needed the start of the LHC to finally be observed in 2012. A few years
 878 more of tests were necessary to measure its properties to confirm the observation of a scalar boson
 879 compatible with the predicted Higgs boson H^0 . Even though only quark-antiquark (mesons) and 3
 880 quark states (baryons) were observed, exotic hadrons were not forbidden by QCD and no limit of
 881 quark is imposed by the theory. Moreover, gluons could form bond states by themselves and with
 882 quarks. These two types of states are called *glueballs* and *hybrid hadrons*. For decades, experi-
 883 ments have been conducted without confirmation of such possible states existing. Nevertheless, in
 884 2014, tetraquarks were observed by LHCb, one of LHC's main experiments, and in 2015, the same
 885 experiment reported the discovery of pentaquarks making the SM one of the best tested theories of
 886 physics.

887 2.1.3 Investigating the TeV scale

888 Even though the SM is a well tested theory, several hints of physics going beyond its scope have
 889 been observed. First of all, gravity is not explained through this model and huge difficulties are en-
 890 countered when trying to include gravitation. The strength of gravitational interaction is expected to
 891 be negligible at the scale of elementary particles, nevertheless, adding gravitation in the perspective
 892 of developing a "theory of everything" leads to divergent integrals that could not be fixed through
 893 renormalization.

894 Moreover, the SM considers neutrinos to be massless but it was shown in the late 1960s by the
 895 Homestake experiment that the flux of solar neutrinos (i.e. ν_e) measured didn't match the predicted
 896 values due to neutrino oscillations, confirmed in the early 2000s by the Sudbury Neutrino Obser-
 897 vatory. This oscillation implies that neutrinos that can be observed are a superposition of massive
 898 neutrino states. The research on neutrino oscillation is already quite advanced with experiments
 899 looking at atmospheric, reactor or beam neutrinos in order to determine the elements of the mixing
 900 matrix similar to the CKM matrix describing the mixing of quarks. Nevertheless, no answer to the
 901 origin of neutrino mass is provided.

902 Another intriguing fact is that the universe is dominated by matter. However, the SM predicted
 903 that matter and antimatter should have been created in equal amounts and no mechanism is able to
 904 explain this matter-antimatter asymmetry. Although this asymmetry is seen from the visible uni-
 905 verse, it may be possible that other unknown regions of the Universe are dominated by antimatter.

906 Another possibility to explain the apparent asymmetry would be the existence of a electric dipole
907 in any fundamental particle that would permit matter and antimatter particles to decay at different
908 rates.

909 The discrepancy of velocity dispersion of stars in galaxies with respect to the visible mass they
910 contain is known since the end of the 19th century where Kelvin proposed that this problem could
911 be solved if a "great majority of [the stars] would be dark bodies". Throughout the 20th century,
912 physicists like Kapteyn, Zwicky, showed the first hints of a "dark matter" by studying star velocities
913 and galactic clusters, followed by robust measurements of galaxy rotation curves by Babcock
914 which suggested that the mass-to-luminosity ratio was different from what would be expected from
915 watching the visible light. Later in the 1970s, Rubin and Ford from direct light observations and
916 Rogstad and Shostak from radio measurements showed that the radial velocity of visible objects in
917 galaxies was increasing with increasing distance to the center of the galaxy. Finally observation of
918 lensing effect by galaxy clusters, temperature distribution of hot gas in galaxies and clusters, and
919 the anisotropies in the Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB) kept on pointing to a "dark matter".
920 From all the data accumulated, the visible matter would only account to no more than 5% of the total
921 content on the visible universe. Alternative theories have tried to investigate modified versions of
922 the General Relativity as this theory is only well tested at the scale of the solar system but is not suf-
923 ficiently tested on wider ranges or even theories in which gravitation is not a fundamental force but
924 rather an emergent one, but so far, such theories have difficulties to reproduce all the experimental
925 observations as easily as through dark matter.

926 A possible theory to offer dark matter candidates would be supersymmetry which proposes a
927 relationship in between bosons and fermions. In this model, each elementary particle, through a
928 spontaneous spacetime symmetry breaking mechanism would have a *super partner* from the other
929 family of particles. On top of providing heavy dark matter candidates, supersymmetry could also
930 help solving the *Hierarchy problem*, the very large scale difference in between the weak interaction
931 and gravity, although, as mentioned before, in the case gravity is found not to be a fundamental
932 force, this problem would automatically fade.

933

934 All these different aspects of physics beyond the Standard Model of particle physics and the
935 Standard model itself can be tested through the use of very energetic and intense hadron colliders.
936 The LHC at CERN is a perfect tool to seek answers to these open questions except maybe for the
937 gravity as gravity is extremely weak at particles level. For example, one of LHCb experiment's
938 goal is to investigate CP-violation and thus baryonic asymmetry. In 2017, the collaboration has
939 announced to have so far a 3.3σ statistical significance over a CP-violation through the study of the
940 decays of Λ_b^0 and $\bar{\Lambda}_b^0$ into a proton (or antiproton) and 3 pions. Many analysis teams are also working
941 hard on supersymmetry both in ATLAS and CMS collaborations, the two multipurpose experiments
942 of LHC, even though no evidence of a supersymmetrical theory was seen, the few hint having the
943 tendency to confirm the standard model. These experiments also have the possibility to investigate
944 ways to explain Majorana neutrino mass through Yukawa interactions of scalar particles.

945 2.2 The Large Hadron Collider & the Compact Muon Solenoid

946 Throughout its history, CERN has played a leading role in high energy particle physics. Large re-
947 gional facilities such as CERN were thought after the second world war in an attempt to increase
948 international scientific collaboration and allows scientists to share the forever increasing costs of

949 experiment facilities required due to the need for increasing the energy in the center of mass to
950 deeper probe matter. The construction of the first accelerators at the end of the 50s, the Synchro-
951 cyclotron (SC) and the Proton Synchrotron (PS), was directly followed by the first observation of
952 antinuclei in 1965 [1]. Strong from the experience of the Intersecting Storage Rings (ISR), the very
953 first proton-proton collider that showed hints that protons are not elementary particles, the Super
954 Proton Synchrotron (SPS) was built in the 70s to investigate the structure of protons, the preference
955 for matter over antimatter, the state of matter in the early universe or exotic particles, and lead to
956 the discovery in 1983 of the W and Z bosons [2–5]. These newly discovered particles and the elec-
957 troweak interaction would then be studied in details by the Large Electron-Positron (LEP) collider
958 that will help to prove in 1989 that there only are three generations of elementary particles [6]. The
959 LEP would then be dismantled in 2000 to allow for the LHC to be constructed in the existing tunnel.

960 **2.2.1 LHC, the most powerful particle accelerator**

961 The LHC has always been considered as an option to the future of CERN. At the moment of the
962 construction of the LEP beneath the border between France and Switzerland, the tunnel was built in
963 order to accomodate what would be a Large Hadron Collider with a dipole field of 10 T and a beam
964 energy in between 8 and 9 TeV [7] directly followed in 1985 with the creation of a 'Working Group
965 on the Scientific and Technological Future of CERN' to investigate such a collider [8]. The decision
966 was finally taken almost 10 years later, in 1994, to construct the LHC in the LEP tunnel [9] and the
967 approval of the 4 main experiments that would take place at the 4 interaction points would come in
968 1997 [10] and 1998 [11]:

- 969 • ALICE [12] has been designed in the purpose of studying quark-gluon plasma that is believed
970 to have been a state of matter that existed in the very first moment of the universe.

- 971 • ATLAS [13] and CMS [14] are general purpose experiments that have been designed with
972 the goal of continuing the exploration of the Standard Model and investigate new physics.

- 973 • LHCb [15] has been designed to investigate the preference of matter over antimatter in the
974 universe through the CP violation.

975 These large scale experiments, as well as the full CERN accelerator complex, are displayed on
976 Figure 2.4.

CERN's Accelerator Complex




Figure 2.4: CERN accelerator complex.

977 The LHC is a 27 km long hadron collider and the most powerful accelerator used for particle
 978 physics since 2008 [16]. The LHC was originally designed to collide protons at a center-of-mass
 979 energy of 14 TeV and luminosity of $10^{34} \text{ cm}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1}$, as well as Pb ions at a center-of-mass energy
 980 of 2.8 TeV/A with a peak luminosity of $10^{27} \text{ cm}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1}$. Run 1 of LHC, when the center-of-mass
 981 energy only was half of the nominal LHC energy, was enough for both CMS and ATLAS to dis-
 982 cover the Higgs boson [17] and for LHCb to discover pentaquarks [18] and confirm the existance of
 983 tetraquarks [19]. Nevertheless, after the Third Long Shutdown (LS3) (2024-2026), the accelerator
 984 will be in the so called High Luminosity LHC (HL-LHC) configuration [20], increasing its instan-
 985 taneous luminosity to $10^{35} \text{ cm}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1}$ for pp collisions and to $4.5 \times 10^{27} \text{ cm}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1}$, boosting the
 986 discovery potential of the LHC.

987 2.2.1.1 Particle acceleration

988 The LHC is the last of a long series of accelerating devices. Before being accelerated by the LHC,
 989 the particles need to pass through different acceleration stages. All these acceleration stages are

990 visible on Figure 2.4 and pictures of the accelerators are showed in Figure 2.5.

991

992 The story of accelerated protons at CERN starts with a bottle of hydrogen gas injected into the
993 source chamber of the linear particle accelerator *LINAC 2* in which a strong electric field strips the
994 electron off the hygroden molecules only to keep their nuclei, the protons. The cylindrical conductors,
995 alternatively positively or negatively charged by radiofrequency cavities, accelerate protons by
996 pushing them from behing and pulling them from the front and ultimately give them an energy of
997 50 MeV, increasing their mass by 5% in the process.

998

999 When exiting the LINAC 2, the protons are divided into 4 bunches and injected into the 4 su-
1000 perimposed synchrotron rings of the *Booster* where they are then accelerated to reach an energy of
1001 1.4 GeV before being injected into the *PS*. Before the Booster was operational in 1972, the protons
1002 were directly injected into the PS from the LINAC 2 but the low injection energy limited the amount
1003 of protons that could be accelerated at once by the PS. With the Booster, the PS accepts approxi-
1004 mately 100 times more particles.

1005

1006 The 4 proton bunches are thus sent as one to the PS where their energy eventually reaches
1007 26 GeV. Since the 70s, the main goal of this 628 m circumference synchrotron has been to sup-
1008 ply other machines with accelerated particles. Nowadays, not only the PS accelerates protons, it also
1009 accelerates heavy ions from the *Low Energy Ion Ring (LEIR)*. Indeed, the LHC experiments are not
1010 only designed to study *pp*-collisions but also *Pb*-collisions. Lead is first injected into the dedicated
1011 linear collider *LINAC 3*, that accelerate the ions using the same principle than LINAC 2. Electrons
1012 are striped off the lead ions all along the acceleration process and eventually, only bare nuclei are
1013 injected in the LEIR whose goal is to transform the long ion pulses received into short dense bunches
1014 for LHC. Ions injected and stored in the PS were aceelerated by the LEIR from 4.2 MeV to 72 MeV.

1015

1016 Directly following the PS, is finally the last acceleration stage before the LHC, the 7 km long
1017 *SPS*. The SPS accelerates the protons to 450 GeV and inject proton in both LHC accelerator rings
1018 that will increase their energy up to 7 TeV. When the LHC runs with heavy lead ions for ALICE
1019 and LHCb, ions are injected and accelerated to reach the energy of 2.8 TeV/A.




Figure 2.5: Pictures of the different accelerators. From top to bottom: first the LINAC 2 and the Pb source of LINAC 3. Then the Booster and the LEIR. Finally, the PS, the SPS and the LHC.

1020 The LHC beams are not continuous and are rather organised in bunches of particles. When in pp -
 1021 collision mode, the beams are composed of 2808 bunches of 1.15×10^{11} protons separated by 25 ns.
 1022 When in Pb collision mode, the 592 Pb bunches are on the contrary composed of 2.2×10^8 ions
 1023 separated by 100 ns. The two parallel proton beams of the LHC are contained in a single twin-

bore magnet due to the space restriction in the LEP tunnel. Indeed, building 2 completely separate accelerator rings next to each other was impossible. The dipoles of the 1232 twin-bore magnets are showed in Figure 2.6 alongside the magnetic field generated along the dipole section to accelerate the particles. The dipoles generate a nominal field of 8.33 T, needed to give protons and lead nucleons their nominal energy. Some 392 quadrupoles, presented in Figure 2.7, are also used to focus the beams, as well as other multipoles to correct smaller imperfections.




Figure 2.6: Figure 2.6a: schematics of the LHC cryodipoles. 1: Superconducting Coils, 2: Beam pipe, 3: Heat exchanger Pipe, 4: Helium-II Vessel, 5: Superconducting Bus-bar, 6: Iron Yoke, 7: Non-Magnetic Collars, 8: Vacuum Vessel, 9: Radiation Screen, 10: Thermal Shield, 11: Auxiliary Bus-bar Tube, 12: Instrumentation Feed Throughs, 13: Protection Diode, 14: Quadrupole Bus-bars, 15: Spool Piece Bus-bars. Figure 2.6b: magnetic field and resulting motion force applied on the beam particles.




Figure 2.7: Figure 2.7a: picture of the LHC quadrupoles. Figure 2.7b: magnetic fields and resulting focussing force applied on the beam by 2 consecutive quadrupoles.

1030 2.2.1.2 LHC discoveries and LHC physics program

1031 The very first proton beam successfully circulated in the LHC in September 2008 directly followed
 1032 by an incident leading to mechanical damage that would delay the LHC program for a year until
 1033 November 2009.

1034 **2.2.1.3 High Luminosity LHC**

1035 **2.2.2 CMS, a multipurpose experiment**

1036 **2.3 Muon Phase-II Upgrade**

1037 After the more than two years lasting First Long Shutdown (LS1), the Large Hadron Collider (LHC)
 1038 delivered its very first Run-II proton-proton collisions early 2015. LS1 gave the opportunity to the
 1039 LHC and to the its experiments to undergo upgrades. The accelerator is now providing collisions
 1040 at center-of-mass energy of 13 TeV and bunch crossing rate of 40 MHz, with a peak luminosity
 1041 exceeding its design value. During the first and upcoming second LHC Long Shutdown, the Compact
 1042 Muon Solenoid (CMS) detector is also undergoing a number of upgrades to maintain a high system
 1043 performance [21].

1044 From the LHC Phase-2 or High Luminosity LHC (HL-LHC) period onwards, i.e. past the Third
 1045 Long Shutdown (LS3), the performance degradation due to integrated radiation as well as the average
 1046 number of inelastic collisions per bunch crossing, or pileup, will rise substantially and become a
 1047 major challenge for the LHC experiments, like CMS that are forced to address an upgrade program
 1048 for Phase-II [22]. Simulations of the expected distribution of absorbed dose in the CMS detector
 1049 under HL-LHC conditions, show in figure 4.16 that detectors placed close to the beamline will have
 1050 to withstand high irradiation, the radiation dose being of the order of a few tens of Gy.




Figure 2.8: Absorbed dose in the CMS cavern after an integrated luminosity of 3000 fb. R is the transverse distance from the beamline and Z is the distance along the beamline from the Interaction Point at Z=0.

1051 The measurement of small production cross-section and/or decay branching ratio processes, such
 1052 as the Higgs boson coupling to charge leptons or the $B_s \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ decay, is of major interest and
 1053 specific upgrades in the forward regions of the detector will be required to maximize the physics
 1054 acceptance on the largest possible solid angle. To ensure proper trigger performance within the
 1055 present coverage, the muon system will be completed with new chambers. In figure 2.9 one can
 1056 see that the existing Cathode Strip Chambers (CSCs) will be completed by Gas Electron Multipliers
 1057 (GEMs) and Resistive Plate Chambers (RPCs) in the pseudo-rapidity region $1.6 < |\eta| < 2.4$ to
 1058 complete its redundancy as originally scheduled in the CMS Technical Proposal [23].




Figure 2.9: A quadrant of the muon system, showing DTs (yellow), RPCs (light blue), and CSCs (green). The locations of new forward muon detectors for Phase-II are contained within the dashed box and indicated in red for GEM stations (ME0, GE1/1, and GE2/1) and dark blue for improved RPC (iRPC) stations (RE3/1 and RE4/1).

1059 RPCs are used by the CMS first level trigger for their good timing performances. Indeed, a very
 1060 good bunch crossing identification can be obtained with the present CMS RPC system, given their
 1061 fast response of the order of 1 ns. In order to contribute to the precision of muon momentum mea-
 1062 surements, muon chambers should have a spatial resolution less or comparable to the contribution
 1063 of multiple scattering [21]. Most of the plausible physics is covered only considering muons with
 1064 $p_T < 100$ GeV thus, in order to match CMS requirements, a spatial resolution of $\mathcal{O}(\text{few mm})$ the
 1065 proposed new RPC stations, as shown by the simulation in figure 2.10. According to preliminary
 1066 designs, RE3/1 and RE4/1 readout pitch will be comprised between 3 and 6 mm and 5 η -partitions
 1067 could be considered.




Figure 2.10: RMS of the multiple scattering displacement as a function of muon p_T for the proposed forward muon stations. All of the electromagnetic processes such as bremsstrahlung and magnetic field effect are included in the simulation.

3

1068

1069

Physics of Resistive plate chambers

1070 A Resistive Plate Chamber (RPC) is a gaseous detector using the same physical processes described
1071 in Chapter 3. It has been developed in 1981 by Santonico and Cardarelli [24], under the name of
1072 *Resistive Plate Counter*, as an alternative to the local-discharge spark counters proposed in 1978
1073 by Pestov and Fedotovich [25, 26]. Working with spark chambers implied using high-pressure gas
1074 and high mechanical precision which the RPC simplified by formerly using a gas mixture of argon
1075 and butane flowed at atmospheric pressure and a constant and uniform electric field propagated
1076 in between two parallel electrode plates. Moreover, a significant increase in rate capability was
1077 introduced by the use of electrode plate material with high bulk resistivity, preventing the discharge
1078 from growing throughout the whole gas gap. Indeed, the effect of using resistive electrodes is that
1079 the constant electric field is locally canceled out by the development of the discharge, limiting its
1080 growth.

1081 Through its development history, different operating modes [27–29] and new detector designs [30–
1082 32] have been discovered, leading to further improvement of the rate capability of such a detector.
1083 Moreover, the addition of SF_6 into the gas mix improved the stability of operation of the RPC [33,
1084 34].

1085 The low developing costs and easily achievable large detection areas offered by RPCs, as well as
1086 the wide range of possible designs, made them a natural choice to as muon chambers and/or trigger
1087 detectors in multipurpose experiments such as CMS [21] or ATLAS [35], time-of-flight detectors in
1088 ALICE [36], calorimeter with CALICE [37] or even detectors for volcanic muography with ToMu-
1089 Vol [38].

1090 3.1 Principle

1091 RPCs are ionisation detectors composed of two parallel resistive plate electrodes in between which
1092 a constant electric field is set. The space in between the electrodes, referred as *gap*, is filled with a
1093 dense gas that is used to generate primary ionization into the gas volume. The free charge carriers
1094 (electrons and cations) created by the ionization of the gas molecules are then accelerated towards

1095 the electrodes by the electric field, as shown in Figure 3.1 [39].




Figure 3.1: Different phases of the avalanche development in the RPC gas volume subjected to a constant electric field E_0 . a) An avalanche is initiated by the primary ionisation caused by the passage of a charged particle through the gas volume. b) Due to its growing size, the avalanche starts to locally influence the electric field. c) The electrons, lighter than the cations reach the anode first. d) The ions reach the cathode. While the charges have not recombined, the electric field in the small region around the avalanche stays affected and locally blind the detector.

1096 RPCs being passive detectors, a current on pick-up copper read-out placed outside of the gas
 1097 volume is induced by the charge accumulation during the growth of the avalanche. As a result,
 1098 the time resolution of the detector is substantially increased as the output signal is generated while
 1099 the electrons are still in movement. The advantage of a constant electric field, over multi-wire
 1100 proportional chambers, is that the electrons are being fully accelerated from the moment charge
 1101 carriers are freed and feel the full strength of the electric field that doesn't depend on the distance to
 1102 the readout and that the output signal doesn't need for the electrons to be physically collected.

1103 The typical gas mixture RPCs are operated with is generally composed of 3 gas compounds.

- 1104 • Tetrafluoroethane ($C_2F_4H_2$), also referred to as *Freon*, is the principal compound of the RPC
 1105 gas mixtures, with a typical fraction above 90%. It is used for it's high effective Townsend
 1106 coefficient and the great average fast charge that allows to operate the detector with a high
 1107 threshold with respect to argon, for example, that has similar effective Townsend coefficient
 1108 but suffers from a lower fast charge. To operate with similar conditions, argon would require a
 1109 higher electric field leading to a higher fraction of streamers, thus limiting the rate capability
 1110 of the detector [40].
- 1111 • Isobutane (i- C_4H_{10}), only present in a few percent in the gas mixtures, is used for its UV
 1112 quenching properties [41] helping to prevent streamers due to UV photon emission during the
 1113 avalanche growth.
- 1114 • Sulfur hexafluoride, (SF_6), referred to simply as *SF6*, is used in very little quantities for its
 1115 high electronegativity. Excess of electrons are being absorbed by the compound and streamers

are suppressed [34]. Nevertheless, a fraction of SF_6 higher than 1% will not bring any extra benefit in terms of streamer cancelation power but will lead to higher operating voltage [33], as can be understood through Figure 3.2.




Figure 3.2: Effeciency (circles and stars with 30 mV and 100 mV thresholds respectively) and streamer probability (opened circles) as function of the operating voltatge of a 2 mm single gap HPL RPC flushed with a gas mixture containing (a) 5%, (b) 2%, (c) 1% and (d) no SF_6 [33].

After an avalanche developed in the gas, a time long compared to the development of a discharge is needed to recombine the charge carriers in the electrode material due to their resistivity. This property has the advantage of affecting the local electric field and avoiding sparks in the detector but, on the other hand, the rate capability is intrinsically limited by the time constant τ_{RPC} of the detector. Using a quasi-static approximation of Maxwell's equations for weakly conducting media, it can be shown that the time constant τ_{RPC} necessary to the charge recombination at the interface in between the electrode and the gas volume is given by the Formula 3.1 [42].

$$\tau_{RPC} = \frac{\epsilon_{electrode} + \epsilon_{gas}}{\sigma_{electrode} + \sigma_{gas}} \quad (3.1)$$

A gas can be assimilated to vacuum, leading to $\epsilon_{gas} = \epsilon_0$ and $\sigma_{gas} = 0$, and the electrodes permittivity and conductivity can be written as $\epsilon_{electrode} = \epsilon_r \epsilon_0$ and $\sigma_{electrode} = 1/\rho_{electrode}$, showing the strong dependence of the time constant to the electrodes resistivity in Formula 3.2.

$$\tau_{RPC} = (\epsilon_r + 1)\epsilon_0 \times \rho_{electrode} \quad (3.2)$$

Very few materials with a low enough resistivity exist in nature. The resistivity targeted to build RPCs ranges from 10^9 to $10^{12} \Omega \cdot \text{cm}$. The most common RPC electrode materials are displayed in Table 3.1. When the doped glass and ceramics can offer short time constants of the order of 1 ms,

1132 the developing cost of such materials is quite high due to the very low demand. Thus, High-pressure
 1133 laminate (HPL) is often the choice for high rate experiments using very large RPC detection areas.
 1134 Other experiments working at cosmic muon fluxes can safely operate with ordinary float glass.

Material	$\rho_{electrode}$ ($\Omega \cdot \text{cm}$)	ϵ_r	τ_{RPC} (ms)
Float glass	10^{12}	~ 7	~ 700
High-pressure laminate	10^{10} to 10^{12}	~ 6	~ 6 to 600
Doped glass (LR S)	10^9 to 10^{11}	~ 10	~ 1 to 100
Doped ceramics (SiN/SiC)	10^9	~ 8.5	~ 1
Doped ceramics (Ferrite)	10^8 to 10^{12}	~ 20	~ 0.2 to 2000

Table 3.1: Properties of the most used electrode materials for RPCs.

1135 3.1.1 Electron drift velocity

1136 Talk about the electron drift velocity and mention the time resolution of RPCs.

1137 3.2 Rate capability and time resolution of Resistive Plate Cham- 1138 bers

1139 As already previously discussed, the electrode material plays a key role in the max intrinsic rate
 1140 capability of RPCs. R&D is being done to develop at always cheaper costs material with lower
 1141 resistivity. Nevertheless, the amount of charge released, i.e. the size of the discharge, if reduced
 1142 leads to a smaller blind area in the detector, increasing the rate capability of the detector.

1143 3.2.1 Operation modes

1144 RPCs where developed early 1980s. At that time it was using an operating mode now referred to
 1145 as *streamer mode*. Streamers are large discharges that develop in between the 2 electrodes enough
 1146 to locally discharge the electrodes. If the electric field inside of the gas volume is strong enough,
 1147 with electrons being fast compared to ions, a large and dense cloud of positive ions will develop
 1148 nearby the anode and extend toward the cathode while the electrons are being collected, eventually
 1149 leading to a streamer discharge due to the increase of field seen at the cathode. the field is then strong
 1150 enough so that electrons are pulled out of the cathode. Electrodes, though they are a unique volume
 1151 of resistive material, can be assimilated to capacitors. At the moment an electric field is applied in
 1152 between their outer surfaces, the charge carriers inside of the volume will start moving leading to
 1153 a situation where there is no voltage across the electrodes and a higher density of negative charges,
 1154 i.e. electrons, on the inner surface of the cathode. Finally, when a streamer discharge occurs, these
 1155 electrons are partially released in the gas volume contributing to increase the discharge strength until
 1156 the formation of a conductive plasma, the streamer. This can be understood through Figure 3.3 [27].
 1157 Streamer signals are very convenient in terms of read-out as no amplification is required with output
 1158 pulses amplitudes of the order of a few tens to few hundreds of mV as can be seen on Figure 3.4.




Figure 3.3: Movement of the charge carriers in an RPC. Figure 3.3a: Voltage across an RPC whose electrode have a relative permittivity of 5 at the moment the tension is applied. Figure 3.3b: After the charge carriers moved, the electrodes are charged and there is no voltage drop over the electrodes anymore. The full potential is applied on the gas gap only. Figure 3.3c: The streamer discharge initiated by a charged particle transports electrons and cations towards the anode and cathode respectively.

When the electric field is reduced though, the electronic gain is small until the electrons get close enough to the anode and the positive ion cloud is much smaller. The electric field cannot rise to the point a field emission of electrons on the cathode is possible. The resulting signal is weak, of the order of a few mv as shown on Figure 3.4, and requires amplification. This is the *avalanche mode* of RPC operation.




Figure 3.4: Typical oscilloscope pulses in streamer mode (Figure 3.4a) and avalanche mode (Figure 3.4b). In the case of streamer mode, the very small avalanche signal is visible.




Figure 3.5: Rate capability comparison for the streamer and avalanche mode of operation. An order of magnitude in rate capability for a maximal efficiency drop of 10% is gained by using the avalanche mode over the streamer mode.

This mode offers a higher rate capability by providing smaller discharges that don't affect the electrodes charge and are more locally contained in the gas volume as was demonstrated by Crotty with Figure 3.5 [27]. The detector only stays locally blind the time the charge carriers are recombined and there is no need for electrode recharge which is a long process affecting a large portion of the detector. Another advantage of avalanche signals over streamer is the great time consistency. Figure 3.4 shows very clearly that avalanche signals have a very small time jitter. This is a natural choice for high rate experiments.

3.2.2 Detector designs and performance

Different RPC design have been used and each of them present its own advantages. Historically, the first type of RPC to have been developed is what is referred now to *narrow gap* RPC [24, 43]. After the avalanche mode has been discovered [27], it has been proven that increasing the width of the gas gap lead to higher rate capability, due to lower charge deposition per avalanche, and lower power dissipation [43]. Nevertheless, by increasing the gas gap width, the time resolution of the detector decreases. This is a natural result if the increase of active gas volume in the detector is taken into account. Indeed, for a given threshold, only the small fraction of gas closest to the cathode will provide enough gain to have a detectable signal. In the case of a wider gas volume, the active region is then larger and a larger time jitter is introduced with the variation of starting position of the avalanche, as discussed in [30]. To solve improve both the time resolution and the rate capability, different methods were used trying to get advantages of both narrow and wide gap RPCs.

1183 **3.2.2.1 Double-gap RPC**

1184 Double-gap RPCs are made out of 2 narrow RPC detectors. The 2 RPC gaps are stacked on top of
 1185 each other as shown in Figure 3.6. This detector layout, popularized by the two multipurpose experiments
 1186 CMS [21] and ATLAS [35] at LHC, can be used as an OR system in which each individual
 1187 chamber participates in the output signal. The gain of such a detector is greatly reduced with respect
 1188 to single-gap RPCs with an efficiency plateau reached at lower voltage, as visible on Figure 3.7.




Figure 3.6: Possible double-gap RPC layouts: a) "standard" 1D double-gap RPC, as used in CMS experiment, where the anodes are facing each other and a 1D read-out plane is sandwiched in between them, b) double read-out double-gap RPC as used in ATLAS experiment, where the cathodes are facing each other and 2 read-out planes are used on the outer surfaces. This last layout can offer the possibility to use a 2D reconstruction by using orthogonal read-out planes.




Figure 3.7: Comparison of performance of CMS double and single gap RPCs using cosmic muons [44]. Figure 3.7a: Comparison of efficiency sigmoids. Figure 3.7b: Voltage distribution at 95% of maximum efficiency. Figure 3.7c: $\Delta_{10\%}^{90\%}$ distribution.

3.2.2.2 Multigap RPC (MRPC)

MRPCs are layouts in which floating sub electrode plates are placed into a wide gap RPC to divide the gas volume and create a sum of narrow gaps [30, 31]. The time resolution of such a detector can reach of few tens of ps, with gas gaps of the order of a few hundred μm as shown in Figure 3.8 representing ALICE Time-of-flight (ToF) MRPCs.




Figure 3.8: Presentation of ALICE MRPC using $250 \mu\text{m}$ gas gaps, $620 \mu\text{m}$ outer glass electrodes and $550 \mu\text{m}$ inner floating electrodes. More details on the labels are given in [45].

Sometimes used as a double multigap RPC, taking advantage of the OR of double gap RPCs, the MRPC is mainly used as ToF detector [45–49] due to its excellent timing properties that allow to perform particle identification as explained by Williams in [50]. The principle of particle identification using ToF is simply the measurement of the velocity of a particle. Indeed, particles are defined by their mass (for the parameter of interest here, their electric charge being measured using the bending angle of the particles traveling through a magnetic field) and this mass can be calculated by measuring the velocity β and momentum of the particle:

$$\beta = \frac{p}{\sqrt{p^2 + m^2}} \quad (3.3)$$

Intuitively, it is trivial to understand that 2 different particles having the same momentum will have a different velocity due to the mass difference and thus a different flight time T_1 and T_2 through the detector and this is used to separate and identify particles. The better the time resolution of the ToF system used, the stronger will the separation be:

$$T = \frac{L}{v} = \frac{L}{c \cdot \beta}, \quad \Delta T = T_1 - T_2 = \frac{L}{c} \left(\sqrt{1 + m_1^2/p^2} - \sqrt{1 + m_2^2/p^2} \right) \cong (m_1^2 - m_2^2) \frac{L}{2cp^2} \quad (3.4)$$

1205 An example of particle identification is given for the case of STAR experiment in Figure 3.9.




Figure 3.9: Particle identification applied to electrons in the STAR experiment. The identification is performed combining ToF and dE/dx measurements [50].

1206 Another benefice of using such small gas gaps is the strong reduction of the average avalanche
1207 volume and thus of the blind spot on MRPCs leading to an improved rate capability. Multigaps can
1208 sustain backgrounds of several kHz/cm² as demonstrated in Figure 3.10.




Figure 3.10: Comparison of the detector performance of ALICE ToF MRPC [51] at fixed applied voltage (in blue) and at fixed effective voltage (in red). The effective voltage is kept fixed by increasing the applied voltage accordingly to the current drawn by the detector.

1209 3.2.2.3 Charge distribution and performance limitations

1210 The direct consequence of the different RPC layouts is a variation of intrinsic time resolution of the
1211 RPC as the gap size decreases. An advantage is given to multigaps whose design use sub-millimeter
1212 gas volumes providing very consistent signals.

1213 On the charge spectrum point of view, each layout has its own advantages. When the double-gap
 1214 has the highest induced over drifting charge ratio, as seen in Figure 3.11, the multigap has a charge
 1215 spectrum strongly detached from the origin, as visible in Figure 3.12. A high induced over drifting
 1216 charge ratio means that the double gap can be safely operated at high threshold or that at similar
 1217 threshold it can be operated with a twice smaller drifting charge, meaning a higher rate capability.
 1218 On the other hand, the strong detachment of the charge spectrum from the origin in the MRPC case
 1219 allows to reach a higher efficiency with increasing threshold as most of the induced charge is not low
 1220 due to the convolution of several single gap spectra. The range of stable efficiency increases with
 1221 the number of gap, as presented in Figure 3.13.




Figure 3.11: Ratio between total induced and drifting charge have been simulated for single gap, double-gap and multigap layouts [52]. The total induced charge for a double-gap RPC is a factor 2 higher than for a multigap.




Figure 3.12: Charge spectra have been simulated for single gap, double-gap and multigap layouts [52]. It appears that when single gap shows a decreasing spectrum, double and multigap layouts exhibit a spectrum whose peak is detached from the origin. The detachment gets stronger as the number of gaps increases.




Figure 3.13: The maximal theoretical efficiency is simulated for single gap, double-gap and multigap layouts [52] at a constant gap thickness of 2 mm and using an effective Townsend coefficient of 9 mm^{-1} .

₁₂₂₂ **3.3 Signal formation**

₁₂₂₃ **3.4 Gas transport parameters**

4

1224

1225

1226

Longevity studies and Consolidation of the present CMS RPC subsystem

1227

4.1 Resistive Plate Chambers at CMS

1228

4.1.1 Overview

1229

The Resistive Plate Chambers (RPC) system, located in both barrel and endcap regions, provides a fast, independent muon trigger with a looser p_T threshold over a large portion of the pseudorapidity range ($|\eta| < 1.6$) [add reconstruction].

1230

During High-Luminosity LHC (HL-LHC) operations the expected conditions in terms of background and pile-up will make the identification and correct P_T assignment a challenge for the Muon system. The goal of RPC upgrade is to provide additional hits to the Muon system with precise timing. All these informations will be elaborated by the trigger system in a global way enhancing the performance of the trigger in terms of efficiency and rate control. The RPC Upgrade is based on two projects: an improved Link Board System and the extension of the RPC coverage up to $|\eta| = 2.4$. [FIXME 2.4 or 2.5?]

1231

The Link Board system, that will be described in section xxx, is responsible to process, synchronize and zero-suppress the signals coming from the RPC front end boards. The Link Board components have been produced between 2006 and 2007 and will be subjected to aging and failure in the long term. The upgraded Link Board system will overcome the aging problems described in section xxx and will allow for a more precise timing information to the RPC hits from 25 to 1 ns [ref section xxx].

1232

The extension of the RPC system up to $|\eta| = 2.1$ was already planned in the CMS TDR [ref cmstdr] and staged because of budget limitations and expected background rates higher than the rate capability of the present CMS RPCs in that region. An extensive R&D program has been done in order to develop an improved RPC that fulfills the CMS requirements. Two new RPC layers in the innermost ring of stations 3 and 4 will be added with benefits to the neutron-induced background

1233

1234

1235

1236

1237

1238

1239

1240

1241

1242

1243

1244

1245

1246

1247

1248

1249

1250

1251 reduction and efficiency improvement for both trigger and offline reconstruction.

1252 4.1.2 The present RPC system

1253 The RPC system is organized in 4 stations called RB1 to RB4 in the barrel region, and RE1 to RE4
 1254 in the endcap region. The innermost barrel stations, RB1 and RB2, are instrumented with 2 layers
 1255 of RPCs facing the innermost (RB1in and RB2in) and outermost (RB1out and RB2out) sides of the
 1256 DT chambers. Every chamber is then divided from the read-out point of view into 2 or 3 η partitions
 1257 called “rolls”. The RPC system consist of 480 barrel chambers and 576 endcap chambers. Details
 1258 on the geometry are discussed in the paper [ref to geo paper].

1259 The CMS RPC chamber is a double-gap, operated in avalanche mode to ensure reliable operation
 1260 at high rates. Each RPC gap consists of two 2-mm-thick resistive High-Pressure Laminate (HPL)
 1261 plates separated by a 2-mm-thick gas gap. The outer surface of the HPL plates is coated with a thin
 1262 conductive graphite layer, and a voltage is applied. The RPCs are operated with a 3-component,
 1263 non-flammable gas mixture consisting of 95.2% freon ($C_2H_2F_4$, known as R134a), 4.5% isobutane
 1264 ($i-C_4H_{10}$), and 0.3% sulphur hexafluoride (SF_6) with a relative humidity of 40% - 50%. Readout
 1265 strips are aligned in η between the 2 gas gaps. [\[Add a sentence on FEBs.\]](#)

1266 The discriminated signals coming from the Front End boards feed via twisted cables (10 to 20 m
 1267 long) the Link Board System located in UXC on the balconies around the detector. The Link System
 1268 consist of the 1376 Link Boards (LBs) and the 216 Control Boards (CBs), placed in 108 Link Boxes.
 1269 The Link Box is a custom crate (6U high) with 20 slots (for two CBs and eighteen LBs). The Link
 1270 Box contains custom backplane to which the cables from the chambers are connected, as well as the
 1271 cables providing the LBs and CBs power supply and the cables for the RPC FEBs control with use
 1272 of the I2C protocol (trough the CB). The backplane itself contains only connectors (and no any other
 1273 electronic devices).

1274 The Link Board has 96 input channels (one channel corresponds to one RPC strip). The input
 1275 signals are the ~ 100 ns binary pulses which are synchronous to the RPC hits, but not to the LHC
 1276 clock (which drives the entire CMS electronics). Thus the first step of the FEB signals processing
 1277 is synchronization, i.e. assignment of the signals to the BXes (25 ns periods). Then the data are
 1278 compressed with a simple zero-suppressing algorithm (the input channels are grouped into 8 bit
 1279 partitions, only the partitions with at least one nonzero bit are selected for each BX). Next, the non-
 1280 empty partitions are time-multiplexed i.e. if there are more than one such partition in a given BX,
 1281 they are sent one-by-one in consecutive BXes. The data from 3 neighbouring LBs are concentrated
 1282 by the middle LB which contains the optical transmitter for sending them to the USC over a fiber at
 1283 1.6 Gbps.

1284 The Control Boards provide the communication of the control software with the LBs via the
 1285 FEC/CCU system. The CBs are connected into token rings, each ring consists of 12 CBs of one
 1286 detector tower and a FEC mezzanine board placed on the CCS board located in the VME crate in
 1287 the USC. In total, there are 18 rings in the entire Link System. The CBs also perform automatic
 1288 reloading of the LB's firmware which is needed in order to avoid accumulation of the radiation
 1289 induced SEUs in the LBs firmware.

1290 Both LBs and CB are based on the Xilinx Spartan III FPGAs, the CB additionally contains
 1291 radiation-tolerant (FLASH based) FPGA Actel ProAsicPlus.

1292 The High Voltage power system is located in USC, not exposed to radiation and easily accessible
 1293 for any reparation. A single HV channel powers 2 RPC chambers both in the barrel and endcap
 1294 regions. The Low Voltage boards are located in UXC on the balconies and provide the voltage to the

1295 front end electronics.

1296 4.1.3 Pulse processing of CMS RPCs

1297 Signals induced by cosmic particle in the RPC strips are shaped by standard CMS RPC Front-End
1298 Electronics (FEE) following the scheme of Figure 4.1. On a first stage, analogic signals are amplified
1299 and then sent to the Constant Fraction Discriminator (CFD) described in Figure 4.2. At the end of
1300 the chain, 100 ns long pulses are sent in the LVDS output. These output signal are sent on one side to
1301 a V1190A Time-to-Digital Converter (TDC) module from CAEN and on the other to an OR module
1302 to count the number of detected signals. Trigger and hit coïncidences are monitored using scalers.
1303 The TDC is used to store the data into ROOT files. These files are thus analysed to understand the
1304 detectors performance.




Figure 4.1: Signals from the RPC strips are shaped by the FEE described on Figure 4.1a. Output LVDS signals are then read-out by a TDC module connected to a computer or converted into NIM and sent to scalers. Figure 4.1b describes how these converted signals are put in coincidence with the trigger.




Figure 4.2: Description of the principle of a CFD. A comparison of threshold triggering (left) and constant fraction triggering (right) is shown in Figure 4.2a. Constant fraction triggering is obtained thanks to zero-crossing technique as explained in Figure 4.2b. The signal arriving at the input of the CFD is split into three components. A first one is delayed and connected to the inverting input of a first comparator. A second component is connected to the noninverting input of this first comparator. A third component is connected to the noninverting input of another comparator along with a threshold value connected to the inverting input. Finally, the output of both comparators is fed through an AND gate.


1305 4.2 Testing detectors under extreme conditions

1306 The upgrade from LHC to HL-LHC will increase the peak luminosity from $10^{34} \text{ cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ to reach
 1307 $5 \times 10^{34} \text{ cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$, increasing in the same way the total expected background to which the RPC
 1308 system will be subjected to. Composed of low energy gammas and neutrons from $p\text{-}p$ collisions, low
 1309 momentum primary and secondary muons, puch-through hadrons from calorimeters, and particles
 1310 produced in the interaction of the beams with collimators, the background will mostly affect the
 1311 regions of CMS that are the closest to the beam line, i.e. the RPC detectors located in the endcaps.
 1312 [To update.]


1313

1314 The 2016 data allowed to study the values of the background rate in all RPC system. In Fig-
1315 ure 4.3, the distribution of the chamber background hit rate per unit area is shown at a luminosity
1316 of $5 \times 10^{34} cm^{-2}.s^{-1}$ linearly extrapolating from data collected in 2016 [ref mentioning the linear
1317 dependency of rate vs lumi]. The maximum rate per unit area at HL-LHC conditions is expected to
1318 be of the order of $600 Hz/cm^2$ (including a safety factor 3). Nevertheless, Fluka simulations have
1319 conducted in order to understand the background at HL-LHC conditions. The comparison to the
1320 data has shown, in Figure 4.4, a discrepancy of a factor 2 even though the order of magnitude is
1321 consistent. [Understand mismatch.]

1322



(a)



(b)

Figure 4.3: (4.3a) Extrapolation from 2016 data of single hit rate per unit area in the barrel region. (4.3b) Extrapolation from 2016 data of single hit rate per unit area in the endcap region.




Figure 4.4: Background Fluka simulation compared to 2016 Data at $L = 10^{34} \text{ cm}^{-2} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$ in the fourth endcap disk region. A mismatch in between simulation and data can be observed. [\[To be understood.\]](#)

In the past, extensive long-term tests were carried out at several gamma and neutron facilities certifying the detector performance. Both full size and small prototype RPCs have been irradiated with photons up to an integrated charge of $\sim 0.05 \text{ C}/\text{cm}^2$ and $\sim 0.4 \text{ C}/\text{cm}^2$, respectively [53, 54]. During Run-I, the RPC system provided stable operation and excellent performance and did not show any aging effects for integrated charge of the order of $0.01 \text{ C}/\text{cm}^2$. Projections on currents from 2016 Data, has allowed to determine that the total integrated charge, by the end of HL-LHC, would be of the order of $1 \text{ C}/\text{cm}^2$ (including a safety factor 3). [\[Corresponding figure needed.\]](#)

1330

1331 4.2.1 The Gamma Irradiation Facilities

1332 4.2.1.1 GIF

1333 Located in the SPS West Area at the downstream end of the X5 test beam, the Gamma Irradiation
 1334 Facility (GIF) was a test area in which particle detectors were exposed to a particle beam in presence
 1335 of an adjustable gamma background [55]. Its goal was to reproduce background conditions these
 1336 detectors would suffer in their operating environment at LHC. GIF layout is shown in Figure 4.5.
 1337 Gamma photons are produced by a strong ^{137}Cs source installed in the upstream part of the zone
 1338 inside a lead container. The source container includes a collimator, designed to irradiate a $6 \times 6 \text{ m}^2$
 1339 area at 5 m maximum to the source. A thin lens-shaped lead filter helps providing with a uniform
 1340 outgoing flux in a vertical plane, orthogonal to the beam direction. The principal collimator hole
 1341 provides a pyramidal aperture of $74^\circ \times 74^\circ$ solid angle and provides a photon flux in a pyramidal vol-

ume along the beam axis. The photon rate is controled by further lead filters allowing the maximum rate to be limited and to vary within a range of four orders of magnitude. Particle detectors under test are then placed within the pyramidal volume in front of the source, perpendicularly to the beam line in order to profit from the homogeneous photon flux. Adjusting the background flux of photons can then be done by using the filters and choosing the position of the detectors with respect to the source.

1347




Figure 4.5: Layout of the test beam zone called X5c GIF at CERN. Photons from the radioactive source produce a sustained high rate of random hits over the whole area. The zone is surrounded by 8 m high and 80 cm thick concrete walls. Access is possible through three entry points. Two access doors for personnel and one large gate for material. A crane allows installation of heavy equipment in the area.

As described on Figure 4.6, the ^{137}Cs source emits a 662 keV photon in 85% of the decays. An activity of 740 GBq was measured on the 5th March 1997. To estimate the strength of the flux in 2014, it is necessary to consider the nuclear decay through time assiciated to the Cesium source whose half-life is well known ($t_{1/2} = (30.05 \pm 0.08)$ y). The GIF tests where done in between the 20th and the 31st of August 2014, i.e. at a time $t = (17.47 \pm 0.02)$ y resulting in an attenuation of the activity from 740 GBq in 1997 to 494 GBq in 2014.

1354




Figure 4.6: ^{137}Cs decays by β^- emission to the ground state of ^{137}Ba ($BR = 5.64\%$) and via the 662 keV isomeric level of ^{137}Ba ($BR = 94.36\%$) whose half-life is 2.55 min.

1355 4.2.1.2 GIF++

1356 The new Gamma Irradiation Facility (GIF++), located in the SPS North Area at the downstream end
 1357 of the H4 test beam, has replaced its predecessor during LS1 and has been operational since spring
 1358 2015 [56]. Like GIF, GIF++ features a ^{137}Cs source of 662 keV gamma photons, their fluence being
 1359 controlled with a set of filters of various attenuation factors. The source provides two separated large
 1360 irradiation areas for testing several full-size muon detectors with continuous homogeneous irradiation,
 1361 as presented in Figure 4.7.

1362




Figure 4.7: Floor plan of the GIF++ facility. When the facility downstream of the GIF++ takes electron beam, a beam pipe is installed along the beam line (z -axis). The irradiator can be displaced laterally (its center moves from $x = 0.65$ m to 2.15 m), to increase the distance to the beam pipe.

1363 The source activity was measured to be about 13.5 TBq in March 2016. The photon flux being
 1364 far greater than HL-LHC expectations, GIF++ provides an excellent facility for accelerated aging
 1365 tests of muon detectors.

1366




Figure 4.8: Simulated unattenuated current of photons in the xz plane (Figure 4.8a) and yz plane (Figure 4.8b) through the source at $x = 0.65$ m and $y = 0$ m. With angular correction filters, the current of 662 keV photons is made uniform in xy planes.

1367 The source is situated in the muon beam line with the muon beam being available a few times a
 1368 year. The H4 beam, composed of muons with a momentum of about 150 GeV/c, passes through the
 1369 GIF++ zone and is used to study the performance of the detectors. Its flux is of 104 particles/ s cm^2

1370 focused in an area similar to $10 \times 10 \text{ cm}^2$. Therefore, with properly adjusted filters, one can imitate
 1371 the HL-LHC background and study the performance of muon detectors with their trigger/readout
 1372 electronics in HL-LHC environment.

1373

1374 4.3 Preliminary tests at GIF

1375 4.3.1 Resistive Plate Chamber test setup

1376 During summer 2014, preliminary tests have been conducted in the GIF area on a newly produced
 1377 RE4/2 chamber labelled RE-4-2-BARC-161. This chamber has been placed into a trolley covered
 1378 with a tent. The position of the RPC inside the tent and of the tent related to the source is described
 1379 in Figure 4.9. To test this CMS RPC, three different absorber settings were used. First of all,
 1380 measurements were done with fully opened source. Then, to complete this preliminary study, the
 1381 gamma flux has been attenuated from a factor 2 and a factor 5. The expected gamma flux at the level
 1382 of our detector will be discussed in subsection ??.




Figure 4.9: Description of the RPC setup. Dimensions are given in mm. A tent containing RPCs is placed at 1720 mm from the source container. The source is situated in the center of the container. RE-4-2-BARC-161 chamber is 160 mm inside the tent. This way, the distance between the source and the chambers plan is 2060 mm. Figure 4.9a provides a side view of the setup in the xz plane while Figure 4.9b shows a top view in the yz plane.



Figure 4.10: RE-4-2-BARC-I61 chamber is inside the tent as described in Figure 4.9. In the top right, the two scintillators used as trigger can be seen. This trigger system has an inclination of 10° relative to horizontal and is placed above half-partition B2 of the RPCs. PMT electronics are shielded thanks to lead blocks placed in order to protect them without stopping photons from going through the scintillators and the chamber.

1383 At the time of the tests, the beam not being operationnal anymore, a trigger composed of 2 plastic
 1384 scintillators has been placed in front of the setup with an inclination of 10 deg with respect to the
 1385 detector plane in order to look at cosmic muons. Using this particular trigger layout, shown on Fig-
 1386 ure 4.10, leads to a cosmic muon hit distribution into the chamber similar to the one in Figure 4.11.
 1387 Measured without gamma irradiation, two peaks can be seen on the profil of partition B, centered
 1388 on strips 52 and 59. Section ?? will help us understand that these two peaks are due respectively to
 1389 forward and backward coming cosmic particles where forward coming particles are first detected by
 1390 the scintillators and then the RPC while the backward coming muons are first detected in the RPC.




Figure 4.11: Hit distributions over all 3 partitions of RE-4-2-BARC-161 chamber is showed on these plots. Top, middle and bottom figures respectively correspond to partitions A, B, and C. These plots show that some events still occur in other half-partitions than B2, which corresponds to strips 49 to 64, in front of which the trigger is placed, contributing to the inefficiency of detection of cosmic muons. In the case of partitions A and C, the very low amount of data can be interpreted as noise. On the other hand, it is clear that a little portion of muons reach the half-partition B1, corresponding to strips 33 to 48.

1391 4.3.2 Data Acquisition

1392 4.3.3 Geometrical acceptance of the setup layout to cosmic muons

1393 In order to profit from a constant gamma irradiation, the detectors inside of the GIF bunker need
 1394 to be placed in a plane orthogonal to the beam line. The muon beam that used to be available was
 1395 meant to test the performance of detectors under test. This beam not being active anymore, another
 1396 solution to test detector performance had to be used. Thus, it has been decided to use cosmic muons
 1397 detected through a telescope composed of two scintillators. Lead blocks were used as shielding to

¹³⁹⁸ protect the photomultipliers from gammas as can be seen from Figure 4.10.

¹³⁹⁹ An inclination has been given to the cosmic telescope to maximize the muon flux. A good com-
¹⁴⁰⁰ promise had to be found between good enough muon flux and narrow enough hit distribution to
¹⁴⁰¹ be sure to contain all the events into only one half partitions as required from the limited available
¹⁴⁰² readout hardware. Nevertheless, a consequence of the misplaced trigger, that can be seen as a loss
¹⁴⁰³ of events in half-partition B1 in Figure 4.11, is an inefficiency. Nevertheless, the inefficiency of ap-
¹⁴⁰⁴ proximately 20 % highlighted in Figure 4.12 by comparing the performance of chamber BARC-161
¹⁴⁰⁵ in 904 and at GIF without irradiation seems too important to be explained only by the geometri-
¹⁴⁰⁶ cal acceptance of the setup itself. Simulations have been conducted to show how the setup brings
¹⁴⁰⁷ inefficiency.




Figure 4.12: Results are derived from data taken on half-partition B2 only. On the 18th of June 2014, data has been taken on chamber RE-2-BARC-161 at building 904 (Prevessin Site) with cosmic muons providing us a reference efficiency plateau of $(97.54 \pm 0.15)\%$ represented by a black curve. A similar measurement has been done at GIF on the 21st of July with the same chamber giving a plateau of $(78.52 \pm 0.94)\%$ represented by a red curve.

¹⁴⁰⁸ 4.3.3.1 Description of the simulation layout

¹⁴⁰⁹ The layout of GIF setup has been reproduced and incorporated into a Monte Carlo (MC) simulation
¹⁴¹⁰ to study the influence of the disposition of the telescope on the final distribution measured by the
¹⁴¹¹ RPC. A 3D view of the simulated layout is given into Figure 4.13. Muons are generated randomly
¹⁴¹² in a horizontal plane located at a height corresponding to the lowest point of the PMTs. This way,
¹⁴¹³ the needed size of the plane in order to simulate events happening at very big azimuthal angles (i.e.
¹⁴¹⁴ $\theta \approx \pi$) can be kept relatively small. The muon flux is designed to follow the usual $\cos^2\theta$ distribution
¹⁴¹⁵ for cosmic particle. The goal of the simulation is to look at muons that pass through the muon
¹⁴¹⁶ telescope composed of the two scintillators and define their distribution onto the RPC plane. During
¹⁴¹⁷ the reconstruction, the RPC plane is then divided into its strips and each muon track is assigned to a
¹⁴¹⁸ strip.




Figure 4.13: Representation of the layout used for the simulations of the test setup. The RPC is represented as a yellow trapezoid while the two scintillators as blue cuboids looking at the sky. A green plane corresponds to the muon generation plane within the simulation. Figure 4.9a shows a global view of the simulated setup. Figure 4.9b shows a zoomed view that allows to see the 2 scintillators as well as the full RPC plane.

1419 In order to further refine the quality of the simulation and understand deeper the results the
 1420 dependance of the distribution has been studied for a range of telescope inclinations. Moreover,
 1421 the threshold applied on the PMT signals has been included into the simulation in the form of a
 1422 cut. In the approximation of uniform scintillators, it has been considered that the threshold can be
 1423 understood as the minimum distance particles need to travel through the scintillating material to give
 1424 a strong enough signal. Particles that travel a distance smaller than the set "threshold" are thus not
 1425 detected by the telescope and cannot trigger the data taking. Finally, the FEE threshold also has
 1426 been considered in a similar way. The mean momentum of horizontal cosmic rays is higher than
 1427 those of vertical ones but the stopping power of matter for momenta ranging from 1 GeV to 1 TeV
 1428 stays comparable. It is then possible to assume that the mean number of primary e^- /ion pairs per
 1429 unit length will stay similar and thus, depending on the applied discriminator threshold, muons with

1430 the shortest path through the gas volume will deposit less charge and induce a smaller signal on the
 1431 pick-up strips that could eventually not be detected. These two thresholds also restrain the overall
 1432 geometrical acceptance of the system.

1433 **4.3.3.2 Simulation procedure**

1434 The simulation software has been designed using C++ and the output data is saved into ROOT
 1435 histograms. Simulations start for a threshold T_{scint} varying in a range from 0 to 45 mm in steps
 1436 of 5 mm, where $T_{scint} = 0$ mm corresponds to the case where there isn't any threshold apply on
 1437 the input signal while $T_{scint} = 45$ mm, which is the scintillator thickness, is the case where muons
 1438 cannot arrive orthogonally onto the scintillator surface. For a given T_{scint} , a set of RPC thresholds
 1439 are considered. The RPC threshold, T_{RPC} varies from 2 mm, the thickness of the gas volume, to
 1440 3 mm in steps of 0.25 mm. For each $(T_{scint}; T_{RPC})$ pair, $N_\mu = 10^8$ muons are randomly generated
 1441 inside the muon plane described in the previous paragraph with an azimuthal angle θ chosen to follow
 1442 a $\cos^2\theta$ distribution.

1443 Planes are associated to each surface of the scintillators. Knowing muon position into the muon
 1444 plane and its direction allows us, by assuming that muons travel in a straight line, to compute the
 1445 intersection of the muon track with these planes. Applying conditions to the limits of the surfaces
 1446 of the scintillator faces then gives us an answer to whether or not the muon passed through the
 1447 scintillators. In the case the muon has indeed passed through the telescope, the path through each
 1448 scintillator is computed and muons whose path was shorter than T_{scint} are rejected and are thus
 1449 considered as having not interacted with the setup.

1450 On the contrary, if the muon is labeled as good, its position within the RPC plane is computed
 1451 and the corresponding strip, determined by geometrical tests in the case the distance through the
 1452 gas volume was enough not to be rejected because of T_{RPC} , gets a hit and several histograms
 1453 are filled in order to keep track of the generation point on the muon plane, the intersection points
 1454 of the reconstructed muons within the telescope, or on the RPC plane, the path traveled through
 1455 each individual scintillator or the gas volume, as well as other histograms. Moreover, muons fill
 1456 different histograms whether they are forward or backward coming muons. They are discriminated
 1457 according to their direction components. When a muon is generated, an (x, y, z) position is assigned
 1458 into the muon plane as well as a $(\theta; \phi)$ pair that gives us the direction it's coming from. This way,
 1459 muons satisfying the condition $0 \leq \phi < \pi$ are designated as backward coming muons while muons
 1460 satisfying $\pi \leq \phi < 2\pi$ as forward coming muons.

1461 This simulation is then repeated for different telescope inclinations ranging in between 4 and 20°
 1462 and varying in steps of 2°. Due to this inclination and to the vertical position of the detector under
 1463 test, the muon distribution reconstructed in the detector plane is asymmetrical. The choice as been
 1464 made to chose a skew distribution formula to fit the data built as the multiplication of gaussian and
 1465 sigmoidal curves together. A typical gaussian formula is given as 4.1 and has three free parameters
 1466 as A_g , its amplitude, \bar{x} , its mean value and σ , its root mean square. Sigmoidal curves as given by
 1467 formula 4.2 are functions converging to 0 and A_s as x diverges. The inflection point is given as x_i
 1468 and λ is proportional to the slope at $x = x_i$. In the limit where $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$, the sigmoid becomes a
 1469 step function.

$$g(x) = A_g e^{-\frac{(x-\bar{x})^2}{2\sigma^2}} \quad (4.1)$$

$$s(x) = \frac{A_s}{1 + e^{-\lambda(x-x_i)}} \quad (4.2)$$

¹⁴⁷⁰ Finally, a possible representation of a skew distribution is given by formula 4.3 and is the product
¹⁴⁷¹ of 4.1 and 4.2. Naturally, here $A_{sk} = A_g \times A_s$ and represents the theoretical maximum in the limit
¹⁴⁷² where the skew tends to a gaussian function.

$$sk(x) = g(x) \times s(x) = A_{sk} \frac{e^{\frac{-(x-\bar{x})^2}{2\sigma^2}}}{1 + e^{-\lambda(x-x_i)}} \quad (4.3)$$

¹⁴⁷³ 4.3.3.3 Results

¹⁴⁷⁴ Influence of T_{scint} on the muon distribution

¹⁴⁷⁵ Influence of T_{RPC} on the muon distribution

¹⁴⁷⁶ Influence of the telescope inclination on the muon distribution

¹⁴⁷⁷ Comparison to data taken at GIF without irradiation

¹⁴⁷⁸ 4.3.4 Photon flux at GIF

¹⁴⁷⁹ 4.3.4.1 Expectations from simulations

¹⁴⁸⁰ In order to understand and evaluate the γ flux in the GIF area, simulations had been conducted in
¹⁴⁸¹ 1999 and published by S. Agosteo et al [55]. Table 4.1 presented in this article gives us the γ flux
¹⁴⁸² for different distances D to the source. This simulation was done using GEANT and a Monte Carlo
¹⁴⁸³ N-Particle (MCNP) transport code, and the flux F is given in number of γ per unit area and unit time
¹⁴⁸⁴ along with the estimated error from these packages expressed in %.

Nominal ABS	Photon flux F [$s^{-1}cm^{-2}$]			
	at $D = 50$ cm	at $D = 155$ cm	at $D = 300$ cm	at $D = 400$ cm
1	$0.12 \cdot 10^8 \pm 0.2\%$	$0.14 \cdot 10^7 \pm 0.5\%$	$0.45 \cdot 10^6 \pm 0.5\%$	$0.28 \cdot 10^6 \pm 0.5\%$
2	$0.68 \cdot 10^7 \pm 0.3\%$	$0.80 \cdot 10^6 \pm 0.8\%$	$0.25 \cdot 10^6 \pm 0.8\%$	$0.16 \cdot 10^6 \pm 0.6\%$
5	$0.31 \cdot 10^7 \pm 0.4\%$	$0.36 \cdot 10^6 \pm 1.2\%$	$0.11 \cdot 10^6 \pm 1.2\%$	$0.70 \cdot 10^5 \pm 0.9\%$

Table 4.1: Total photon flux ($E\gamma \leq 662$ keV) with statistical error predicted considering a ^{137}Cs activity of 740 GBq at different values of the distance D to the source along the x -axis of irradiation field [55].




Figure 4.14: γ flux $F(D)$ is plot using values from table 4.1. As expected, the plot shows similar attenuation behaviours with increasing distance for each absorption factors.

The simulation doesn't directly provides us with an estimated flux at the level of our RPC. First of all, it is needed to extract the value of the flux from the available data contained in the original paper and then to estimate the flux in 2014 at the time the experimentation took place. Figure 4.14 that contains the data from Table 4.1. In the case of a pointlike source emitting isotropic and homogeneous gamma radiations, the gamma flux F at a distance D to the source with respect to a reference point situated at D_0 where a known flux F_0 is measured will be expressed like in Equation 4.4, assuming that the flux decreases as $1/D^2$, where c is a fitting factor.

$$F^{ABS} = F_0^{ABS} \times \left(\frac{cD_0}{D} \right)^2 \quad (4.4)$$

By rewriting Equation 4.4, it comes that :

$$c = \frac{D}{D_0} \sqrt{\frac{F^{ABS}}{F_0^{ABS}}} \quad (4.5)$$

$$\Delta c = \frac{c}{2} \left(\frac{\Delta F^{ABS}}{F^{ABS}} + \frac{\Delta F_0^{ABS}}{F_0^{ABS}} \right) \quad (4.6)$$

Finally, using Equation 4.5 and the data in Table 4.1 with $D_0 = 50$ cm as reference point, we can build Table 4.2. It is interesting to note that c for each value of D doesn't depend on the absorption factor.

Nominal ABS	Correction factor c		
	at $D = 155$ cm	at $D = 300$ cm	at $D = 400$ cm
1	$1.059 \pm 0.70\%$	$1.162 \pm 0.70\%$	$1.222 \pm 0.70\%$
2	$1.063 \pm 1.10\%$	$1.150 \pm 1.10\%$	$1.227 \pm 0.90\%$
5	$1.056 \pm 1.60\%$	$1.130 \pm 1.60\%$	$1.202 \pm 1.30\%$

Table 4.2: Correction factor c is computed thanks to formulae 4.5 taking as reference $D_0 = 50$ cm and the associated flux F_0^{ABS} for each absorption factor available in table 4.1.

¹⁴⁹⁶ For the range of D/D_0 values available, it is possible to use a simple linear fit to get the evolution
¹⁴⁹⁷ of c . The linear fit will then use only 2 free parameters, a and b , as written in Equation 4.7. This gives
¹⁴⁹⁸ us the results showed in Figure 4.15. Figure 4.15b confirms that using only a linear fit to extract c is
¹⁴⁹⁹ enough as the evolution of the rate that can be obtained superimposes well on the simulation points.

$$c \left(\frac{D}{D_0} \right) = a \frac{D}{D_0} + b \quad (4.7)$$

$$F^{ABS} = F_0^{ABS} \left(a + \frac{b D_0}{D} \right)^2 \quad (4.8)$$

$$\Delta F^{ABS} = F^{ABS} \left[\frac{\Delta F_0^{ABS}}{F_0^{ABS}} + 2 \frac{\Delta a + \Delta b \frac{D_0}{D}}{a + \frac{b D_0}{D}} \right] \quad (4.9)$$




Figure 4.15: Figure 4.15a shows the linear approximation fit done via formulae 4.7 on data from table 4.2. Figure 4.15b shows a comparison of this model with the simulated flux using a and b given in figure 4.15a in formulae 4.4 and the reference value $D_0 = 50\text{cm}$ and the associated flux for each absorption factor F_0^{ABS} from table 4.1

In the case of the 2014 GIF tests, the RPC plane is located at a distance $D = 206\text{ cm}$ to the source.
 Moreover, to estimate the strength of the flux in 2014, it is necessary to consider the nuclear decay through time associated to the Cesium source whose half-life is well known ($t_{1/2} = (30.05 \pm 0.08)\text{ y}$).
 The very first source activity measurement has been done on the 5th of March 1997 while the GIF

1504 tests where done in between the 20th and the 31st of August 2014, i.e. at a time $t = (17.47 \pm 0.02)$ y
 1505 resulting in an attenuation of the activity from 740 GBq in 1997 to 494 GBq in 2014. All the needed
 1506 information to extrapolate the flux through our detector in 2014 has now been assembled, leading
 1507 to the Table 4.3. It is interesting to note that for a common RPC sensitivity to γ of $2 \cdot 10^{-3}$, the
 1508 order of magnitude of the estimated hit rate per unit area is of the order of the kHz for the fully
 1509 opened source. Moreover, taking profit of the two working absorbers, it will be possible to scan
 1510 background rates at 0 Hz, ~ 300 Hz as well as ~ 600 Hz. Without source, a good estimate of the
 1511 intrinsic performance will be available. Then at 300 Hz, the goal will be to show that the detectors
 1512 fulfill the performance certification of CMS RPCs. Then a first idea of the performance of the
 1513 detectors at higher background will be provided with absorption factors 2 (~ 600 Hz) and 1 (no
 1514 absorption). *[Here I will also put a reference to the plot showing the estimated background rate at
 1515 the level of RE3/1 in the case of HL-LHC but this one being in another chapter, I will do it later.]*

Nominal ABS	Photon flux F [$s^{-1}cm^{-2}$]			Hit rate/unit area [$Hz cm^{-2}$] at $D^{2014} = 206$ cm
	at $D_0^{1997} = 50$ cm	at $D^{1997} = 206$ cm	at $D^{2014} = 206$ cm	
1	$0.12 \cdot 10^8 \pm 0.2\%$	$0.84 \cdot 10^6 \pm 0.3\%$	$0.56 \cdot 10^6 \pm 0.3\%$	1129 ± 32
2	$0.68 \cdot 10^7 \pm 0.3\%$	$0.48 \cdot 10^6 \pm 0.3\%$	$0.32 \cdot 10^6 \pm 0.3\%$	640 ± 19
5	$0.31 \cdot 10^7 \pm 0.4\%$	$0.22 \cdot 10^6 \pm 0.3\%$	$0.15 \cdot 10^6 \pm 0.3\%$	292 ± 9

Table 4.3: The data at D_0 in 1997 is taken from [55]. In a second step, using Equations 4.8 and 4.9, the flux at D can be estimated in 1997. Then, taking into account the attenuation of the source activity, the flux at D can be estimated at the time of the tests in GIF in 2014. Finally, assuming a sensitivity of the RPC to γ $s = 2 \cdot 10^{-3}$, an estimation of the hit rate per unit area is obtained.

1516 **4.3.4.2 Dose measurements**




Figure 4.16: Dose measurements has been done in a plane corresponding to the tents front side. This plan is 1900 mm away from the source. As explained in the first chapter, a lens-shaped lead filter provides a uniform photon flux in the vertical plan orthogonal to the beam direction. If the second line of measured fluxes is not taken into account because of lower values due to experimental equipments in the way between the source and the tent, the uniformity of the flux is well showed by the results.

¹⁵¹⁷ 4.3.5 Results and discussions




Figure 4.17

1518 4.4 Longevity tests at GIF++

1519 Longevity studies imply a monitoring of the performance of the detectors probed using a high inten-
1520 sity muon beam in a irradiated environment by periodically measuring their rate capability, the dark
1521 current running through them and the bulk resistivity of the Bakelite composing their electrodes.
1522 GIF++, with its very intense ^{137}Cs source, provides the perfect environment to perform such kind
1523 of tests. Assuming a maximum acceleration factor of 3, it is expected to accumulate the equivalent
1524 charge in 1.7 years.

1525 As the maximum background is found in the endcap, the choice naturally was made to focus the
1526 GIF++ longevity studies on endcap chambers. Most of the RPC system was installed in 2007. Nev-
1527 ertheless, the large chambers in the fourth endcap (RE4/2 and RE4/3) have been installed during
1528 LS1 in 2014. The Bakelite of these two different productions having different properties, four spare
1529 chambers of the present system were selected, two RE2,3/2 spares and two RE4/2 spares. Having
1530 two chambers of each type allows to always keep one of them non irradiated as reference, the per-
1531 formance evolution of the irradiated chamber being then compared through time to the performance
1532 of the non irradiated one.

1533 The performance of the detectors under different level of irradiation is measured periodically dur-
1534 ing dedicated test beam periods using the H4 muon beam. In between these test beam periods, the
1535 two RE2,3/2 and RE4/2 chambers selected for this study are irradiated by the ^{137}Cs source in order
1536 to accumulate charge and the gamma background is monitored, as well as the currents. The two
1537 remaining chambers are kept non-irradiated as reference detectors. Due to the limited gas flow in
1538 GIF++, the RE4 chamber remained non-irradiated until end of November 2016 where a new mass
1539 flow controller has been installed allowing for bigger volumes of gas to flow in the system.

1540 Figures 4.18 and 4.19 give us for different test beam periods, and thus for increasing integrated
1541 charge through time, a comparison of the maximum efficiency, obtained using a sigmoid-like func-
1542 tion, and of the working point of both irradiated and non irradiated chambers [**SIGMOID2005**]. No
1543 aging is yet to see from this data, the shifts in γ rate per unit area in between irradiated and non
1544 irradiated detectors and RE2 and RE4 types being easily explained by a difference of sensitivity due
1545 to the various Bakelite resistivities of the HPL electrodes used for the electrode production.

1546 Collecting performance data at each test beam period allows us to extrapolate the maximum effi-
1547 ciency for a background hit rate of $300\text{ Hz}/\text{cm}^2$ corresponding to the expected HL-LHC conditions.
1548 Aging effects could emerge from a loss of efficiency with increasing integrated charge over time,
1549 thus Figure 4.20 helps us understand such degradation of the performance of irradiated detectors in
1550 comparison with non irradiated ones. The final answer for an eventual loss of efficiency is given in
1551 Figure 4.21 by comparing for both irradiated and non irradiated detectors the efficiency sigmoids
1552 before and after the longevity study. Moreover, to complete the performance information, the Bake-
1553 lite resistivity is regularly measured thanks to Ag scans (Figure 4.22) and the noise rate is monitored
1554 weekly during irradiation periods (Figure 4.23). At the end of 2016, no signs of aging were observed
1555 and further investigation is needed to get closer to the final integrated charge requirements proposed
1556 for the longevity study of the present CMS RPC sub-system.




Figure 4.18: Evolution of the maximum efficiency for RE2 (4.18a) and RE4 (4.18b) chambers with increasing extrapolated γ rate per unit area at working point. Both irradiated (blue) and non irradiated (red) chambers are shown.




Figure 4.19: Evolution of the working point for RE2 (4.19a) and RE4 (4.19b) with increasing extrapolated γ rate per unit area at working point. Both irradiated (blue) and non irradiated (red) chambers are shown.




Figure 4.20: Evolution of the maximum efficiency at HL-LHC conditions, i.e. a background hit rate per unit area of 300 Hz/cm², with increasing integrated charge for RE2 (4.20a) and RE4 (4.20b) detectors. Both irradiated (blue) and non irradiated (red) chambers are shown. The integrated charge for non irradiated detectors is recorded during test beam periods and stays small with respect to the charge accumulated in irradiated chambers.




Figure 4.21: Comparison of the efficiency sigmoid before (triangles) and after (circles) irradiation for RE2 (4.21a) and RE4 (4.21b) detectors. Both irradiated (blue) and non irradiated (red) chambers are shown.




Figure 4.22: Evolution of the Bakelite resistivity for RE2 (4.22a) and RE4 (4.22b) detectors. Both irradiated (blue) and non-irradiated (red) chambers are shown.




Figure 4.23: Evolution of the noise rate per unit area for the irradiated chamber RE2-2-BARC-9 only.

4.4.1 Description of the Data Acquisition

For the longevity studies, four spare chambers of the present system are used. Two spare RPCs of the RE2,3 stations as well as two spare RPCs from the new RE4 stations have been mounted in a Trolley. Six RE4 gaps are also placed in the trolley. The trolley is placed inside the GIFT++ in the upstream region of the bunker, taking the cesium source as a reference. The trolley is oriented for the detection surface of the chambers to be orthogonal to the beam line. The system can be moved along the orthogonal plane in order to have the beam in all η -partitions. For the aging the trolley is

1565 moved outside the beam line and is placed in a distance of 5.2 m to the source, which irradiates the
 1566 bunker using an attenuation filter of 2.2 which corresponds to a fluence of 10^7 gamma/cm^2 .

1567 During GIF++ operation, the data collected can be divided into different categories as several
 1568 parameters are monitored in addition to the usual RPC performance data. On one hand, to know
 1569 the performance of a chamber, it is need to measure its efficiency and to know the background
 1570 conditions in which it is operated. To do this, the hit signals from the chamber are recorded and
 1571 stored in a ROOT file via a Data Acquisition (DAQ) software. On the other hand, it is also very
 1572 important to monitor parameters such as environmental pressure and temperature, gas temperature
 1573 and humidity, RPC HV, LV, and currents, or even source and beam status. This is done through the
 1574 GIF++ web Detector Control Software (DCS) that stores this information in a database.

1575 Two different types of tests are conducted on RPCs via the DAQ. Indeed, the performance of the
 1576 detectors is measured periodically during dedicated test beam periods using the H4 muon beam. In
 1577 between these test beam periods, when the beam is not available, the chambers are irradiated by the
 1578 ^{137}Cs in order to accumulate deposited charge and the gamma background is measured.

1579 RPCs under test are connected through LVDS cables to V1190A Time-to-Digital Converter
 1580 (TDC) modules manufactured by CAEN. These modules, located in the rack area outside of the
 1581 bunker, get the logic signals sent by the chambers and save them into their buffers. Due to the
 1582 limited size of the buffers, the collected data is regularly erased and replaced. A trigger signal is
 1583 needed for the TDC modules to send the useful data to the DAQ computer via a V1718 CAEN USB
 1584 communication module.

1585 In the case of performance test, the trigger signal used for data acquisition is generated by the
 1586 coincidence of three scintillators. A first one is placed upstream outside of the bunker, a second one
 1587 is placed downstream outside of the bunker, while a third one is placed in front of the trolley, close by
 1588 the chambers. Every time a trigger is sent to the TDCs, i.e. every time a muon is detected, knowing
 1589 the time delay in between the trigger and the RPC signals, signals located in the right time window
 1590 are extracted from the buffers and saved for later analysis. Signals are taken in a time window of
 1591 400 ns centered on the muon peak (here we could show a time spectrum). On the other hand, in the
 1592 case of background rate measurement, the trigger signal needs to be "random" not to measure muons
 1593 but to look at gamma background. A trigger pulse is continuously generated at a rate of 300 Hz using
 1594 a dual timer. To integrate an as great as possible time, all signals contained within a time window of
 1595 10us prior to the random trigger signal are extracted form the buffers and saved for further analysis
 1596 (here another time spectrum to illustrate could be useful, maybe even place both spectrum together
 1597 as a single Figure).

1598 The signals sent to the TDCs correspond to hit collections in the RPCs. When a particle hits
 1599 a RPC, it induce a signal in the pickup strips of the RPC readout. If this signal is higher than the
 1600 detection threshold, a LVDS signal is sent to the TDCs. The data is then organised into 4 branches
 1601 keeping track of the event number, the hit multiplicity for the whole setup, and the time and channel
 1602 profile of the hits in the TDCs.

1603 4.4.2 RPC current, environmental and operation parameter monitoring

1604 In order to take into account the variation of pressure and temperature between different data taking
 1605 periods the applied voltage is corrected following the relationship :

$$1606 HV_{eff} = HV_{app} \times \left(0.2 + 0.8 \cdot \frac{P_0}{P} \times \frac{T}{T_0} \right) \quad (4.10)$$

¹⁶⁰⁶ where T_0 (=293 K) and P_0 (=990 mbar) are the reference values.

¹⁶⁰⁷ **4.4.3 Measurement procedure**

¹⁶⁰⁸ Insert a short description of the online tools (DAQ, DCS, DQM).

¹⁶⁰⁹ Insert a short description of the offline tools : tracking and efficiency algorithm.

¹⁶¹⁰ Identify long term aging effects we are monitoring the rates per strip.

¹⁶¹¹ **4.4.4 Longevity studies results**

5

1612

1613

Investigation on high rate RPCs

1614 **5.1 Rate limitations and ageing of RPCs**

1615 **5.1.1 Low resistivity electrodes**

1616 **5.1.2 Low noise front-end electronics**

1617 **5.2 Construction of prototypes**

1618 **5.3 Results and discussions**

6

1619

1620

Conclusions and outlooks

¹⁶²¹ **6.1 Conclusions**

¹⁶²² **6.2 Outlooks**

A

1623

1624

1625

A data acquisition software for CAEN VME TDCs

1626 Certifying detectors in the perspective of HL-LHC required to develop tools for the GIF++ experi-
1627 ment. Among them was the C++ Data Acquisition (DAQ) software that allows to make the commu-
1628 nications in between a computer and TDC modules in order to retrieve the RPC data [57]. In this
1629 appendix, details about this software, as of how the software was written, how it functions and how
1630 it can be exported to another similar setup, will be given.

1631 A.1 GIF++ DAQ file tree

1632 GIF++ DAQ source code is fully available on github at [https://github.com/afagot/GIF_](https://github.com/afagot/GIF_DAQ)
1633 DAQ. The software requires 3 non-optional dependencies:


- 1634 • CAEN USB Driver, to mount the VME hardware,
1635 • CAEN VME Library, to communicate with the VME hardware, and
1636 • ROOT, to organize the collected data into a TTree.

1637 The CAEN VME library will not be packaged by distributions and will need to be installed man-
1638 ually. To compile the GIF++ DAQ project via a terminal, from the DAQ folder use the command:

1639 `make`

1641 The source code tree is provided below along with comments to give an overview of the files' con-
1642 tent. The different objects created for this project (`v1718`, `v1190a`, `IniFile` & `DataReader`) will be
1643 described in details in the following sections.

1644



1645 A.2 Usage of the DAQ

1646 GIF++ DAQ, as used in GIF++, is not a standalone software. Indeed, the system being more com-
 1647 plexe, the DAQ only is a sub-layer of the software architecture developped to control and monitor
 1648 the RPCs that are placed into the bunker for performance study in an irradiated environment. The top
 1649 layer of GIF++ is a Web Detector Control System (webDCS) application. The DAQ is only called
 1650 by the webDCS when data needs to be acquired. The webDCS operates the DAQ through command
 1651 line. To start the DAQ, the webDCS calls:

1652
 1653 bin/daq /path/to/the/log/file/in/the/output/data/folder

1654 where /path/to/the/log/file/in/the/output/data/folder is the only argument required. This
 1655 log file is important for the webDCS as this file contains all the content of the communication of the
 1656 webDCS and the different systems monitored by the webDCS. Its content is constantly displayed
 1657 during data taking for the users to be able to follow the operations. The communication messages
 1658 are normally sent to the webDCS log file via the functions declared in file MsgSvc.h, typically
 1659 MSG_INFO(string message).

1660

A.3 Description of the readout setup

1662 The CMS RPC setup at GIF++ counts 5 V1190A Time-to-Digital Converter (TDC) manufactured
 1663 by CAEN [58]. V1190A are VME units accepting 128 independent Multi-Hit/Multi-Event TDC
 1664 channels whose signals are treated by 4 100 ps high performance TDC chips developed by CERN
 1665 / ECP-MIC Division. The communication between the computer and the TDCs to transfer data is
 1666 done via a V1718 VME master module also manufactured by CAEN and operated from a USB
 1667 port [59]. These VME modules are all hosted into a 6U VME 6021 powered crate manufactured by
 1668 W-Ie-Ne-R than can accommodate up to 21 VME bus cards [60]. These 3 components of the DAQ
 1669 setup are shown in Figure A.1.

1670




Figure A.1: (A.1a) View of the front panel of a V1190A TDC module [58]. (A.1b) View of the front panel of a V1718 Bridge module [59]. (A.1c) View of the front panel of a 6U 6021 VME crate [60].

1671

A.4 Data read-out

1672 To efficiently perform a data readout algorithm, C++ objects to handle the VME modules (TDCs
 1673 and VME bridge) have been created along with objects to store data and read the configuration file

1674 that comes as an input of the DAQ software.

1675

1676 A.4.1 V1190A TDCs

1677 The DAQ used at GIF takes profit of the *Trigger Matching Mode* offered by V1190A modules.
 1678 This setting is enabled through the method `v1190a::SetTrigMatching (int ntdcs)` where `ntdcs`
 1679 is the total number of TDCs in the setup this setting needs to be enabled for (Source Code A.1). A
 1680 trigger matching is performed in between a trigger time tag, a trigger signal sent into the TRIGGER
 1681 input of the TDC visible on Figure A.1a, and the channel time measurements, signals recorded from
 1682 the detectors under test in our case. Control over this data acquisition mode, explained through
 1683 Figure A.2, is offered via 4 programmable parameters:

- 1684 • **match window:** the matching between a trigger and a hit is done within a programmable time
 1685 window. This is set via the method

1686 `void v1190a::SetTrigWindowWidth(Uint windowHeight, int ntdcs)`

- 1687 • **window offset:** temporal distance between the trigger tag and the start of the trigger matching
 1688 window. This is set via the method

1689 `void v1190a::SetTrigWindowWidth(Uint windowHeight, int ntdcs)`

- 1690 • **extra search margin:** an extended time window is used to ensure that all matching hits are
 1691 found. This is set via the method

1692 `void v1190a::SetTrigSearchMargin(Uint searchMargin, int ntdcs)`

- 1693 • **reject margin:** older hits are automatically rejected to prevent buffer overflows and to speed
 1694 up the search time. This is set via the method

1695 `void v1190a::SetTrigRejectionMargin(Uint rejectMargin, int ntdcs)`




Figure A.2: Module V1190A Trigger Matching Mode timing diagram [58].

1696 Each of these 4 parameters are given in number of clocks, 1 clock being 25 ns long. It is easy to
 1697 understand at this level that there are 3 possible functioning settings:

- 1698 • **1:** the match window is entirely contained after the trigger signal,

- 1699 • **2:** the match window overlaps the trigger signal, or

- 1700 • **3:** the match window is entirely contained before the trigger signal as displayed on Figure A.2.

1701 In both the first and second cases, the sum of the window width and of the offset can be set to
1702 a maximum of 40 clocks, which corresponds to 1 μ s. Evidently, the offset can be negative, allowing
1703 for a longer match window, with the constraint of having the window ending at most 1 μ s after the
1704 trigger signal. In the third case, the maximum negative offset allowed is of 2048 clocks (12 bit) cor-
1705 responding to 51.2 μ s, the match window being strictly smaller than the offset. In the case of GIF++,
1706 the choice has been made to use this last setting by delaying the trigger signal. During the studies
1707 performed in GIF++, both the efficiency of the RPCs, probed using a muon beam, and the noise or
1708 gamma background rate are monitored. The extra search and reject margins are left unused.
1709 To probe the efficiency of RPC detectors, the trigger time tag is provided by the coïncidence of
1710 scintillators when a bunch of muons passes through GIF++ area is used to trigger the data acquisi-
1711 tion. For this measurement, it is useful to reduce the match window width only to contain the muon
1712 information. Indeed, the delay in between a trigger signal and the detection of the corresponding
1713 muon in the RPC being very contant (typically a few tens of ns due to jitter and cable length), the
1714 muon signals are very localised in time. Thus, due to a delay of approximalety 325 ns in between
1715 the muons and the trigger, the settings where chosen to have a window width of 24 clocks (600 ns)
1716 centered on the muon peak thanks to a negative offset of 29 clocks (725 ns).
1717 On the otherhand, monitoring the rates don't require for the DAQ to look at a specific time window.
1718 It is important to integrate enough time to have a robust measurement of the rate as the number of
1719 hits per time unit. The triggerring signal is provided by a pulse generator at a frequency of 300 Hz
1720 to ensure that the data taking occurs in a random way, with respect to beam physics, to probe only
1721 the irradiation spectrum on the detectors. The match window is set to 400 clocks (10 μ s) and the
1722 negative offset to 401 clocks as it needs to exceed the value of the match window.

```

1723
class v1190a
{
private :
    long             Handle;
    vector<Data32>   Address;
    CVDataWidth      DataWidth;
    CVAddressModifier AddressModifier;

public:
    v1190a(long handle, IniFile *inifile, int ntdcs);
    ~v1190a();
    Data16 write_op_reg(Data32 address, int code, string error);
    Data16 read_op_reg(Data32 address, string error);
    void Reset(int ntdcs);
    void Clear(int ntdcs);
    void TestWR(Data16 value,int ntdcs);
    void CheckTDCSstatus(int ntdcs);
    void CheckCommunication(int ntdcs);
    void SetTDCTestMode(Data16 mode,int ntdcs);
    void SetTrigMatching(int ntdcs);
    void SetTrigTimeSubtraction(Data16 mode,int ntdcs);
    void SetTrigWindowWidth(Uint windowHeight,int ntdcs);
    void SetTrigWindowOffset(Uint windowOffset,int ntdcs);
    void SetTrigSearchMargin(Uint searchMargin,int ntdcs);
    void SetTrigRejectionMargin(Uint rejectMargin,int ntdcs);
    void GetTrigConfiguration(int ntdcs);
    void SetTrigConfiguration(IniFile *inifile,int ntdcs);
    void SetTDCDetectionMode(Data16 mode,int ntdcs);
    void SetTDCResolution(Data16 lsb,int ntdcs);
    void SetTDCDeadTime(Data16 time,int ntdcs);
    void SetTDCHeadTrailer(Data16 mode,int ntdcs);
    void SetTDCEventSize(Data16 size,int ntdcs);
    void SwitchChannels(IniFile *inifile,int ntdcs);
    void SetIRQ(Data32 level, Data32 count,int ntdcs);
    void SetBlockTransferMode(Data16 mode,int ntdcs);
    void Set(IniFile *inifile,int ntdcs);
    void CheckStatus(CVErrorCodes status) const;
    int ReadBlockD32(Uint tdc, const Data16 address,
                    Data32 *data, const Uint words, bool ignore_berr);
    Uint Read(RAWData *DataList,int ntdcs);
};

1724

```

1725 *Source Code A.1: Description of C++ object v1190a.*

The v1190a object, defined in the DAQ software as in Source Code A.1, offers the possibility to concatenate all TDCs in the readout setup into a single object containing a list of hardware addresses (addresses to access the TDCs' buffer through the VME crate) and each constructor and method acts on the list of TDCs.

1731 A.4.2 DataReader

1732 Enabled thanks to v1190a::SetBlockTransferMode(Data16 mode, int ntdcs), the data transfer
1733 is done via Block Transfer (BLT). Using BLT allows to tranfer a fixed number of events called a
1734 *block*. This is used together with an Almost Full Level (AFL) of the TDCs' output buffers, defined

1735 through `v1190a::SetIRQ(Data32 level, Data32 count, int ntdcs)`. This AFL gives the maximum amount of 32735 words (16 bits, corresponding to the depth of a TDC output buffer) that can
 1736 written in a buffer before an Interrupt Request (IRQ) is generated and seen by the VME Bridge,
 1737 stopping the data acquisition to transfer the content of each TDC buffers before resuming. For each
 1738 trigger, 6 words or more are written into the TDC buffer:

- 1740 • a **global header** providing information of the event number since the beginning of the data
 acquisition,
- 1742 • a **TDC header**,
- 1743 • the **TDC data** (*if any*), 1 for each hit recorded during the event, providing the channel and the
 time stamp associated to the hit,
- 1745 • a **TDC error** providing error flags,
- 1746 • a **TDC trailer**,
- 1747 • a **global trigger time tag** that provides the absolute trigger time relatively to the last reset,
 and
- 1749 • a **global trailer** providing the total word count in the event.

1750 As previously described in Section ??, CMS RPC FEEs provide us with 100 ns long LVDS output
 1751 signals that are injected into the TDCs' input. Any avalanche signal that gives a signal above the
 1752 FEEs threshold is thus recorded by the TDCs as a hit within the match window. Each hit is assigned
 1753 to a specific TDC channel with a time stamp, with a precision of 100 ps. The reference time, $t_0 = 0$,
 1754 is provided by the beginning of the match window. Thus for each trigger, coming from a scintillator
 1755 coïncidence or the pulse generator, a list of hits is stored into the TDCs' buffers and will then be
 1756 transferred into a ROOT Tree.

1757 When the BLT is used, it is easy to understand that the maximum number of words that have
 1758 been set as ALF will not be a finite number of events or, at least, the number of events that would
 1759 be recorded into the TDC buffers will not be a multiple of the block size. In the last BLT cycle to
 1760 tranfer data, the number of events to transfer will most probably be lower than the block size. In that
 1761 case, the TDC can add fillers at the end of the block but this option requires to send more data to the
 1762 computer and is thus a little slower. Another solution is to finish the transfer after the last event by
 1763 sending a bus error that states that the BLT reached the last event in the pile. This method has been
 1765 chosen in GIF++.

1766 Due to irradiation, an event in GIF++ can count up to 300 words per TDC. A limit of 4096 words
 1767 (12 bits) has been set to generate IRQ which represent from 14 to almost 700 events depending on
 1768 the average of hits collected per event. Then the block size has been set to 100 events with enabled
 1769 bus errors. When an AFL is reached for one of the TDCs, the VME bridge stops the acquisition by
 1771 sending a BUSY signal.

1772

The data is then transferred one TDC at a time into a structure called `RAWData` (Source Code A.2).

```
1774     struct RAWData{
1775         vector<int>           *EventList;
1776         vector<int>           *NHitsList;
1777         vector<int>           *QFlagList;
1778         vector<vector<int>> > *ChannelList;
1779         vector<vector<float>> > *TimeStampList;
1780     };
1781 }
```

Source Code A.2: Description of data holding C++ structure RAWData.

In order to organize the data transfer and the data storage, an object called `DataReader` was created (Source Code A.3). On one hand, it has `v1718` and `v1190a` objects as private members for communication purposes, such as VME modules settings via the configuration file `*iniFile` or data read-out through `v1190a::Read()` and on the other hand, it contains the struture `RAWData` that allows to organise the data in vectors reproducing the tree structure of a ROOT file.

```
1782 class DataReader
{
    private:
        bool      StopFlag;
        IniFile *iniFile;
        Data32   MaxTriggers;
        v1718    *VME;
        int       nTDCs;
        v1190a   *TDCs;
        RAWData  TDCData;

    public:
        DataReader();
        virtual ~DataReader();
        void     SetIniFile(string inifilename);
        void     SetMaxTriggers();
        Data32  GetMaxTriggers();
        void     SetVME();
        void     SetTDC();
        int      GetQFlag(Uint it);
        void     Init(string inifilename);
        void     FlushBuffer();
        void     Update();
        string  GetFileName();
        void     WriteRunRegistry(string filename);
        void     Run();
};

1783
```

Source Code A.3: Description of C++ object DataReader.

1785 Each event is transferred from `TDCTData` and saved into branches of a ROOT `TTree` as 3 integers
 1786 that represent the event ID (`EventCount`), the number of hits read from the TDCs (`nHits`), and the
 1787 quality flag that provides information for any problem in the data transfer (`qflag`), and 2 lists of
 1788 `nHits` elements containing the fired TDC channels (`TDCC`) and their respective time stamps (`TDCTS`),
 1789 as presented in Source Code A.4. The ROOT file file is named using information contained into
 1790 the configuration file, presented in section A.5.2. The needed information is extracted using method
 1791 `DataReader::GetFileName()` and allow to build the output filename format `ScanXXXXXX_HVX_DAQ.root`

1792 where ScanXXXXXX is a 6 digit number representing the scan number into GIFT++ database and HVX
 1793 the HV step within the scan that can be more than a single digit. An example of ROOT data file is
 1794 provided with Figure A.3.

```
1795
RAWData TDCData;
TFile *outputFile = new TFile(outputFileName.c_str(),"recreate");
TTree *RAWDataTree = new TTree("RAWData","RAWData");

int EventCount = -9;
int nHits = -8;
int qflag = -7;
vector<int> TDCCh;
vector<float> TDCTS;

RAWDataTree->Branch("EventNumber",&EventCount, "EventNumber/I");
RAWDataTree->Branch("number_of_hits",&nHits,"number_of_hits/I");
RAWDataTree->Branch("Quality_flag",&qflag,"Quality_flag/I");
RAWDataTree->Branch("TDC_channel",&TDCCh);
RAWDataTree->Branch("TDC_TimeStamp",&TDCTS);

1796
//...
//Here read the TDC data using v1190a::Read() and place it into
//TDCData for as long as you didn't collect the requested amount
//of data.
//...

for(Uint i=0; i<TDCData.EventList->size(); i++){
    EventCount = TDCData.EventList->at(i);
    nHits = TDCData.NHitsList->at(i);
    qflag = TDCData.QFlagList->at(i);
    TDCCh = TDCData.ChannelList->at(i);
    TDCTS = TDCData.TimeStampList->at(i);
    RAWDataTree->Fill();
}
```

1797 *Source Code A.4: Highlight of the data transfer and organisation within DataReader::Run() after the data has been collected into TDCData.*




Figure A.3: Structure of the ROOT output file generated by the DAQ. The 5 branches (EventNumber, number_of_hits, Quality_flag, TDC_channel and TDC_TimeStamp) are visible on the left panel of the ROOT browser. On the right panel is visible the histogram corresponding to the variable nHits. In this specific example, there were approximately 50k events recorded to measure the gamma irradiation rate on the detectors. Each event is stored as a single entry in the TTree.

1798 A.4.3 Data quality flag

1799 Among the parameters that are recorded for each event, the quality flag, defined in Source Code A.5,
 1800 is determined on the fly by checking the data recorded by every single TDC. From method `v1190a::Read()`,
 1801 it can be understood that the content of each TDC buffer is readout one TDC at a time. Entries are
 1802 created in the data list for the first TDC and then, when the second buffer is readout, events corre-
 1803 sponding to entries that have already been created to store data for the previous TDC are added to
 1804 the existing list element. On the contrary, when an event entry has not been yet created in the data
 1805 list, a new entry is created.

```
1806
  typedef enum _QualityFlag {
    GOOD      = 1,
    CORRUPTED = 0
} QualityFlag;
```

1808 *Source Code A.5: Definition of the quality flag `enum`.*

1809 It is possible that each TDC buffer contains a different number of events. In cases where the first
 1810 element in the buffer list is an event for corresponds to a new entry, the difference in between the
 1811 entry from the buffer and the last entry in the data list is recorded and checked. If it is greater than 1,
 1812 what should never be the case, the quality flag is set to CORRUPTED for this TDC and an empty entry
 1813 is created in the place of the missing ones. Missing entries are believe to be the result of a bad hold

1814 on the TDC buffers at the moment of the readout. Indeed, the software hold is effective only on 1
 1815 TDC at a time and no solution as been found yet to completely block the writting in the buffers when
 1816 an IRQ is received.

1817 At the end of each BLT cycle, the ID of the last entry stored for each TDC buffer is not recorded.
 1818 When starting the next cycle, if the first entry in the pile corresponds to an event already existing
 1819 in the list, the readout will start from this list element and will not be able to check the difference
 1820 in between this entry's ID and the one of the last entry that was recorded for this TDC buffer in
 1821 the previous cycle. In the case events were missing, the flag stays at its initial value of 0, which is
 1822 similar to CORRUPTED and it is assumed that then this TDC will not contribute to `number_of_hits`,
 1823 `TDC_channel` or `TDC_TimeStamp`.

1824 Finally, since there will be 1 `RAWData` entry per TDC for each event (meaning `nTDCs` entries,
 1825 referring to `DataReader` private attribute), the individual flags of each TDC will be added together.
 1826 The final format is an integer composed `nTDCs` digits where each digit is the flag of a specific TDC.
 1827 This is constructed using powers of 10 like follows:

```
1828 TDC 0: QFlag = 100 × _QualityFlag
1829 TDC 1: QFlag = 101 × _QualityFlag
1830 ...
1831 TDC N: QFlag = 10N × _QualityFlag
```

1832 and the final flag to be with N digits:

```
1833 QFlag = n....3210
```

1834 each digit being 1 or 0. Below is given an example with a 4 TDCs setup.

1835 If all TDCs were good : `QFlag = 1111`,

1836 but if TDC 2 was corrupted : `QFlag = 1011`.

1837 When data taking is over and the data contained in the dynamical `RAWData` structure is transferred
 1838 to the ROOT file, all the 0s are changed into 2s by calling the method `DataReader::GetQFlag()`.
 1839 This will help translating the flag without knowing the number of TDCs beforehand. Indeed, a flag
 1840 111 could be due to a 3 TDC setup with 3 good individual TDC flags or to a more than 3 TDC setup
 1841 with TDCs those ID is greater than 2 being CORRUPTED, thus giving a 0.

1842 The quality flag has been introduced quite late, in October 2017 only, to the list of GIFT++ DAQ
 1843 parameters to be recorded into the output ROOT file. Before this addition, the missing data, corrupting
 1844 the quality for the offline analysis, was contributing to artificially fill data with lower multiplicity.
 1845 Looking at `TBranch number_of_hits` provides an information about the data of the full GIFT++
 1846 setup. When a TDC is not able to transfer data for a specific event, the effect is a reduction of the
 1847 total number of hits recorded in the full setup, this is what can be seen from Figure A.4. After offline
 1848 reconstruction detector by detector, the effect of missing events can be seen in the artificially filled
 1849 bin at multiplicity 0 shown in Figure A.5. Nonetheless, for data with high irradiation levels, as it is
 1850 the case for Figure A.5a, discarding the fake multiplicity 0 data can be done easily during the offline
 1851 analysis. At lower radiation, the missing events contribution becomes more problematic as the mul-
 1852 tiplicity distribution overlaps the multiplicity 0 and that in the same time the proportion of missing

events decreases. Attempts to fit the distribution with a Poisson or skew distribution function were not conclusive and this very problem has been at the origin of the quality flag that allows to give a non ambiguous information about each event quality.

1856




Figure A.4: The effect of the quality flag is explained by presenting the content of TBranch `number_of_hits` of a data file without `Quality_flag` in Figure A.4a and the content of the same TBranch for data corresponding to a `Quality_flag` where all TDCs were labelled as `GOOD` in Figure A.4b taken with similar conditions. It can be noted that the number of entries in Figure A.4b is slightly lower than in Figure A.4a due to the excluded events.




Figure A.5: Using the same data as previously showed in Figure A.4, the effect of the quality flag is explained by presenting the reconstructed hit multiplicity of a data file without `Quality_flag` in Figure A.5a and the reconstructed content of the same RPC partition for data corresponding to a `Quality_flag` where all TDCs were labelled as `GOOD` in Figure A.5b taken with similar conditions. The artificial high content of bin 0 is completely suppressed.

1857

A.5 Communications

1858
1859

To ensure data readout and dialog in between the machine and the TDCs or in between the webDCS and the DAQ, different communication solutions were used. First of all, it is important to have a

1860 module to allow the communication in between the TDCs and the computer from which the DAQ
 1861 operates. When this communication is effective, shifters using the webDCS to control data taking
 1862 can thus send instructions to the DAQ.

1863

1864 A.5.1 V1718 USB Bridge

1865 In the previous section, the data transfer has been discussed. The importance of the `v1718` object
 1866 (Source Code A.6), used as private member of `DataReader`, was not explicated. VME master
 1867 modules are used for communication purposes as they host the USB port that connects the pow-
 1868 ered crate buffer to the computer where the DAQ is installed. From the source code point of view,
 1869 this object is used to control the communication status, by reading the returned error codes with
 1870 `v1718::CheckStatus()`, or to check for IRQs coming from the TDCs through `v1718::CheckIRQ()`.
 1871 Finally, to ensure that triggers are blocked at the hardware level, a NIM pulse is sent out of one of the
 1872 5 programmable outputs (`v1718::SendBUSY()`) to the VETO of the coincidence module where the
 1873 trigger signals originate from. As long as this signal is ON, no trigger can reach the TDCs anymore.
 1874

```
1874
class v1718{
    private:
        int             Handle;
        Data32          Data;           // Data
        CVIRQLevels    Level;         // Interrupt level
        CVAddressModifier AM;          // Addressing Mode
        CVDataWidth     DataSize;      // Data Format
        Data32          BaseAddress;   // Base Address

    public:
        v1718(IniFile *inifile);
        ~v1718();
        long            GetHandle(void) const;
        int             SetData(Data16 data);
        Data16          GetData(void);
        int             SetLevel(CVIRQLevels level);
        CVIRQLevels    GetLevel(void);
        int             SetAM(CVAddressModifier am);
        CVAddressModifier GetAM(void);
        int             SetDatasize(CVDataWidth datasize);
        CVDataWidth     GetDataSize(void);
        int             SetBaseAddress(Data16 baseaddress);
        Data16          GetBaseAddress(void);
        void            CheckStatus(CVErrorCodes status) const;
        void            CheckIRQ();
        void            SetPulsers();
        void            SendBUSY(BusyLevel level);
};
```

1876 *Source Code A.6: Description of C++ object v1718.*

1877 A.5.2 Configuration file

1878 The DAQ software takes as input a configuration file written using INI standard [61]. This file is
 1879 partly filled with the information provided by the shifters when starting data acquisition using the
 1880 webDCS, as shown by Figure A.6. This information is written in section [`General`] and will later

1881 be stored in the ROOT file that contains the DAQ data as can be seen from Figure A.3. Indeed,
 1882 another `TTree` called `RunParameters` as well as the 2 histograms `ID`, containing the scan number,
 1883 start and stop time stamps, and `Triggers`, containing the number of triggers requested by the shifter,
 1884 are available in the data files. Moreover, `ScanID` and `HV` are then used to construct the file name
 1885 thanks to the method `DataReader::GetFileName()`.




Figure A.6: WebDCS DAQ scan page. On this page, shifters need to choose the type of scan (Rate, Efficiency or Noise Reference scan), the gamma source configuration at the moment of data taking, the beam configuration, and the trigger mode. These information will be stored in the DAQ ROOT output. Are also given the minimal measurement time and waiting time after ramping up of the detectors is over before starting the data acquisition. Then, the list of HV points to scan and the number of triggers for each run of the scan are given in the table underneath.

1886 The rest of the information is written beforehand in the configuration file template, as explicated
 1887 in Source Code A.7, and contains the hardware addresses to the different VME modules in the
 1888 setup as well as settings for the TDCs. As the TDC settings available in the configuration file are not
 1889 supposed to be modified, an improvement would be to remove them from the configuration file and
 1890 to hardcode them inside of the DAQ code itself or to place them into a different INI file that would
 1891 host only the TDC settings to lower the probability for a bad manipulation of the configuration file
 1892 that can be modified from one of webDCS' menus.

1893

```
[General]
TdcS=4
ScanID=$scanid
HV=$HV
RunType=$runtype
MaxTriggers=$maxtriggers
Beam=$beam
[VMEInterface]
Type=V1718
BaseAddress=0xFF0000
Name=VmeInterface
[TDC0]
Type=V1190A
BaseAddress=0x00000000
Name=Tdc0
StatusA00-15=1
StatusA16-31=1
StatusB00-15=1
StatusB16-31=1
StatusC00-15=1
StatusC16-31=1
StatusD00-15=1
StatusD16-31=1
[TDC1]
Type=V1190A
BaseAddress=0x11110000
Name=Tdc1
StatusA00-15=1
StatusA16-31=1
StatusB00-15=1
StatusB16-31=1
StatusC00-15=1
StatusC16-31=1
StatusD00-15=1
StatusD16-31=1
[TDC2]
Type=V1190A
BaseAddress=0x22220000
Name=Tdc2
StatusA00-15=1
StatusA16-31=1
StatusB00-15=1
StatusB16-31=1
StatusC00-15=1
StatusC16-31=1
StatusD00-15=1
StatusD16-31=1
[TDC3]
Type=V1190A
BaseAddress=0x44440000
Name=Tdc3
StatusA00-15=1
StatusA16-31=1
StatusB00-15=1
StatusB16-31=1
StatusC00-15=1
StatusC16-31=1
StatusD00-15=1
StatusD16-31=1
[TDCSettings]
TriggerExtraSearchMargin=0
TriggerRejectMargin=0
TriggerTimeSubtraction=0b1
TdcDetectionMode=0b01
TdcResolution=0b10
TdcDeadTime=0b00
TdcHeadTrailer=0b1
TdcEventSize=0b1001
TdcTestMode=0b0
BLTMode=1
```

1894

Source Code A.7: INI configuration file template for 4 TDCs. In section [General], the number of TDCs is explicitated and information about the ongoing run is given. Then, there are sections for each and every VME modules. There buffer addresses are given and for the TDCs, the list of channels to enable is given. Finally, in section [TDCSettings], a part of the TDC settings are given.

1895 In order to retrieve the information of the configuration file, the object `IniFile` has been developed
 1896 to provide an INI parser, presented in Source Code A.8. It contains private methods returning a
 1897 boolean to check the type of line written in the file, whether a comment, a group header or a key line
 1898 (`IniFile::CheckIfComment()`, `IniFile::CheckIfGroup()` and `IniFile::CheckIfToken()`). The
 1899 key may sometimes be referred to as *token* in the source code. Moreover, the private element
 1900 `FileData` is a map of `const string` to `string` that allows to store the data contained inside the
 1901 configuration file via the public method `IniFile::GetFileData()` following the formatting (see
 1902 method `IniFile::Read()`):

```
1904
  1905     string group, token, value;
  // Get the field values for the 3 strings.
  // Then concatenate group and token together as a single string
  // with a dot separation.
  token = group + "." + token;
  FileData[token] = value;
```

1906 More methods have been written to translate the different keys into the right variable format
 1907 when used by the DAQ. For example, to get a `float` value out of the configuration file data, knowing
 1908 the group and the key needed, the method `IniFile::floatType()` can be used. It takes 3 arguments
 1909 being the group name and key name (both `string`), and a default `float` value used as exception in
 1910 the case the expected combination of group and key cannot be found in the configuration file. This
 1911 default value is then used and the DAQ continues on working after sending an alert in the log file for
 1912 further debugging.

```

1913 typedef map< const string, string > IniFileData;
1914
class IniFile{
    private:
        bool          CheckIfComment (string line);
        bool          CheckIfGroup(string line, string& group);
        bool          CheckIfToken(string line, string& key, string& value);
        string         FileName;
        IniFileData   FileData;
        int           Error;

    public:
        IniFile();
        IniFile(string filename);
        virtual      ~IniFile();

        // Basic file operations
        void          SetFileName(string filename);
        int           Read();
        int           Write();
        IniFileData GetFileData();

        // Data readout methods
        Data32         addressType (string groupname, string keyname, Data32
→     defaultvalue);
        long          intType     (string groupname, string keyname, long
→     defaultvalue);
        long long    longType    (string groupname, string keyname, long long
→     defaultvalue );
        string         stringType  (string groupname, string keyname, string
→     defaultvalue );
        float         floatType   (string groupname, string keyname, float
→     defaultvalue );

        // Error methods
        string         GetErrorMsg();
    };

```

1915 *Source Code A.8: Description of C++ object `IniFile` used as a parser for INI file format.*

1916 A.5.3 WebDCS/DAQ intercommunication

1917 When shifters send instructions to the DAQ via the configuration file, it is the webDCS itself that
 1918 gives the start command to the DAQ and then the 2 softwares use inter-process communication
 1919 through file to synchronise themselves. This communication file is represented by the variable **const**
 1920 **string** __runstatuspath.

1921 On one side, the webDCS sends commands or status that are readout by the DAQ:

- 1922 ● INIT, status sent when launching a scan and read via function `CtrlRunStatus(...)`,
- 1923 ● START, command to start data taking and read via function `CheckSTART()`,
- 1924 ● STOP, command to stop data taking at the end of the scan and read via function `CheckSTOP()`,
 1925 and
- 1926 ● KILL, command to kill data taking sent by user and read via function `CheckKILL()`

1927 and on the other, the DAQ sends status that are controled by the webDCS:

- 1928 ● `DAQ_RDY`, sent with `SendDAQReady()` to signify that the DAQ is ready to receive commands
1929 from the webDCS,
- 1930 ● `RUNNING`, sent with `SendDAQRunning()` to signify that the DAQ is taking data,
- 1931 ● `DAQ_ERR`, sent with `SendDAQError()` to signify that the DAQ didn't receive the expected com-
1932 mand from the webDCS or that the launch command didn't have the right number of argu-
1933 ments,
- 1934 ● `RD_ERR`, sent when the DAQ wasn't able to read the communication file, and
- 1935 ● `WR_ERR`, sent when the DAQ wasn't able to write into the communication file.

1936 **A.5.4 Example of inter-process communication cycle**

1937 Under normal conditions, the webDCS and the DAQ processes exchange commands and status via
1938 the file hosted at the address `__runstatuspath`, as explained in subsection A.5.3. An example of
1939 cycle is given in Table A.1. In this example, the steps 3 to 5 are repeated as long as the webDCS tells
1940 the DAQ to take data. A data taking cycle is the equivalent as what is called a *Scan* in GIFT++ jargon,
1941 referring to a set a runs with several HV steps. Each repetition of steps 3 to 5 is then equivalent to a
1942 single *Run*.

1943

1944 At any moment during the data taking, for any reason, the shifter can decide that the data taking
1945 needs to be stopped before it reached the end of the scheduled cycle. Thus at any moment on the
1946 cycle, the content of the inter-process communication file will be changed to `KILL` and the DAQ will
1947 shut down right away. The DAQ checks for `KILL` signals every 5s after the TDCs configuration is
1948 over. So far, the function `CheckKILL()` has been used only inside of the data taking loop of method
1949 `DataReader::Run()` and thus, if the shifter decides to KILL the data taking during the TDC con-
1950 figuration phase or the HV ramping in between 2 HV steps, the DAQ will not be stopped smoothly
1951 and a *force kill* command will be sent to stop the DAQ process that is still awake on the computer.
1952 Improvements can be brought on this part of the software to make sure that the DAQ can safely
1953 shutdown at any moment.

1954

1955 **A.6 Software export**

1956 In section A.2 was discussed the fact that the DAQ as written in its last version is not a standalone
1957 software. It is possible to make it a standalone program that could be adapted to any VME setup
1958 using V1190A and V1718 modules by creating a GUI for the software or by printing the log mes-
1959 sages that are normally printed in the webDCS through the log file, directly into the terminal. This
1960 method was used by the DAQ up to version 3.0 moment where the webDCS was completed. Also, it
1961 is possible to check branches of DAQ v2.X to have example of communication through a terminal.

1962

1963 DAQ v2.X is nonetheless limited in it's possibilities and requires a lot of offline manual interven-
1964 tions from the users. Indeed, there is no communication of the software with the detectors' power
1965 supply system that would allow for a user a predefine a list of voltages to operate the detectors at

step	actions of webDCS	status of DAQ	__runstatuspath
1	launch DAQ ramp voltages ramping over wait for currents stabilization	readout of IniFile configuration of TDCs	INIT
2		configuration done send DAQ ready wait for START signal	DAQ_RDY
3	waiting time over send START		START
4	wait for run to end monitor DAQ run status	data taking ongoing check for KILL signal	RUNNING
5		run over send DAQ_RDY wait for next DCS signal	DAQ_RDY
6	ramp voltages ramping over wait for currents stabilization		DAQ_RDY
3	waiting time over send START		START
4	wait for run to end monitor DAQ run status	update IniFile information data taking ongoing check for KILL signal	RUNNING
5		run over send DAQ_RDY wait for next DCS signal	DAQ_RDY
7	send command STOP	DAQ shuts down	STOP

Table A.1: Inter-process communication cycles in between the webDCS and the DAQ through file string signals.

1966 and loop over to take data without any further manual intervention. In v2.X, the data is taken for a
1967 single detector setting and at the end of each run, the softwares asks the user if he intends on taking
1968 more runs. If so, the software invites the user to set the operating voltages accordingly to what is
1969 necessary and to manual update the configuration file in consequence. This working mode can be a
1970 very first approach before an evolution and has been successfully used by colleagues from different
1971 collaborations.

1972
1973 For a more robust operation, it is recommended to develop a GUI or a web application to inter-
1974 face the DAQ. Moreover, to limit the amount of manual interventions, and thus the probability to
1975 make mistakes, it is also recommended to add an extra feature into the DAQ by installing the HV
1976 Wrapper library provided by CAEN of which an example of use in a similar DAQ software devel-
1977 opped by a master student of UGent, and called TinyDAQ, is provided on UGent's github. Then, this
1978 HV Wrapper will help you communicating with and give instructions to a CAEN HV powered crate
1979 and can be added into the DAQ at the same level where the communication with the user was made
1980 in DAQ v2.X. In case you are using another kind of power system for your detectors, it is stringly
1981 adviced to use HV modules or crates that can be remotely controled via a using C++ libraries.
1982

B

1983

1984

Details on the offline analysis package

1985 The data collected in GIF++ thanks to the DAQ described in Appendix A is difficult to interpret by
1986 a human user that doesn't have a clear idea of the raw data architecture of the ROOT data files. In
1987 order to render the data human readable, a C++ offline analysis tool was designed to provide users
1988 with detector by detector histograms that give a clear overview of the parameters monitored during
1989 the data acquisition [62]. In this appendix, details about this software in the context of GIF++, as of
1990 how the software was written and how it functions will be given.

1991 **B.1 GIF++ Offline Analysis file tree**

1992 GIF++ Offline Analysis source code is fully available on github at https://github.com/aafagot/GIF_OfflineAnalysis. The software requires ROOT as non-optionnal dependency
1993 as it takes ROOT files in input and write an output ROOT file containing histograms. To compile the
1994 GIF++ Offline Analysis project is compiled with cmake. To compile, first a build/ directory must
1995 be created to compile from there:


```
1997     mkdir build  
1998     cd build  
1999     cmake ..  
2000     make  
2001     make install
```

1999 To clean the directory and create a new build directory, the bash script cleandir.sh can be used:

```
2000  
2001     ./cleandir.sh
```

2002 The source code tree is provided below along with comments to give an overview of the files' con-
2003 tent. The different objects created for this project (`Infrastructure`, `Trolley`, `RPC`, `Mapping`, `RPCHit`,
2004 `RPCCluster` and `Inifile`) will be described in details in the following sections.

2005



2006

B.2 Usage of the Offline Analysis

2007

In order to use the Offline Analysis tool, it is necessary to know the Scan number and the HV Step of the run that needs to be analysed. This information needs to be written in the following format:

2009

2010

```
Scan00XXXX_HVY
```

2011

where XXXX is the scan ID and Y is the high voltage step (in case of a high voltage scan, data will be taken for several HV steps). This format corresponds to the base name of data files in the database

2012

2013 of the GIF++ webDCS. Usually, the offline analysis tool is automatically called by the webDCS at
 2014 the end of data taking or by a user from the webDCS panel if an update of the tool was brought.
 2015 Nonetheless, an expert can locally launch the analysis for tests on the GIF++ computer, or a user can
 2016 get the code on its local machine from github and download data from the webDCS for its own anal-
 2017 ysis. To launch the code, the following command can be used from the `GIF_OfflineAnalysis` folder:

2018
 2019 `bin/offlineanalysis /path/to/Scan00XXXX_HVY`

2020 where, `/path/to/Scan00XXXX_HVY` refers to the local data files. Then, the offline tool will by itself
 2021 take care of finding all available ROOT data files present in the folder, as listed below:

- 2022
 - `Scan00XXXX_HVY_DAQ.root` containing the TDC data as described in Appendix ?? (events, hit
 2023 and timestamp lists), and
 - `Scan00XXXX_HVY_CAEN.root` containing the CAEN mainframe data recorded by the monitor-
 2025 ing tool webDCS during data taking (HVs and currents of every HV channels). This file is
 2026 created independently of the DAQ.

2027 **B.2.1 Output of the offline tool**

2028 **B.2.1.1 ROOT file**

2029 The analysis gives in output ROOT datafiles that are saved into the data folder and called using the
 2030 naming convention `Scan00XXXX_HVY_Offline.root`. Inside those, a list of `TH1` histograms can be
 2031 found. Its size will vary as a function of the number of detectors in the setup as each set of histograms
 2032 is produced detector by detector. For each partition of each chamber, can be found:


- 2033
 - `Time_Profile_Tt_Sc_p` shows the time profile of all recorded events (number of events per
 2034 time bin),
 - `Hit_Profile_Tt_Sc_p` shows the hit profile of all recorded events (number of events per chan-
 2036 nel),
 - `Hit_Multiplicity_Tt_Sc_p` shows the hit multiplicity (number of hits per event) of all recorded
 2038 events (number of occurrences per multiplicity bin),
 - `Strip_Mean_Noise_Tt_Sc_p` shows noise/gamma rate per unit area for each strip in a se-
 2039 lected time range. After filters are applied on `Time_Profile_Tt_Sc_p`, the filtered version
 2040 of `Hit_Profile_Tt_Sc_p` is normalised to the total integrated time and active detection area
 2041 of a single channel,
 - `Strip_Activity_Tt_Sc_p` shows noise/gamma activity for each strip (normalised version of
 2043 previous histogram - strip activity = strip rate / average partition rate),
 - `Strip_Homogeneity_Tt_Sc_p` shows the *homogeneity* of a given partition ($\text{homogeneity} = \exp(-\text{strip rates standard deviation(strip rates in partition/average partition rate)})$),
 - `mask_Strip_Mean_Noise_Tt_Sc_p` shows noise/gamma rate per unit area for each masked
 2047 strip in a selected time range. Offline, the user can control the noise/gamma rate and decide to
 2048 mask the strips that are judged to be noisy or dead. This is done via the *Masking Tool* provided
 2049 by the webDCS,

- 2051 ● `mask_Strip_Activity_Tt_Sc_p` shows noise/gamma activity per unit area for each masked
2052 strip with respect to the average rate of active strips,
- 2053 ● `NoiseCSize_H_Tt_Sc_p` shows noise/gamma cluster size, a cluster being constructed out of
2054 adjacent strips giving a signal at the *same time* (hits within a time window of 25 ns),
- 2055 ● `NoiseCMult_H_Tt_Sc_p` shows noise/gamma cluster multiplicity (number of reconstructed
2056 clusters per event),
- 2057 ● `Chip_Mean_Noise_Tt_Sc_p` shows the same information than `Strip_Mean_Noise_Tt_Scp` us-
2058 ing a different binning (1 chip corresponds to 8 strips),
- 2059 ● `Chip_Activity_Tt_Sc_p` shows the same information than `Strip_Activity_Tt_Scp` using
2060 chip binning,
- 2061 ● `Chip_Homogeneity_Tt_Sc_p` shows the homogeneity of a given partition using chip binning,
- 2062 ● `Beam_Profile_Tt_Sc_p` shows the estimated beam profile when taking efficiency scan. This
2063 is obtained by filtering `Time_Profile_Tt_Sc_p` to only consider the muon peak where the
2064 noise/gamma background has been subtracted. The resulting hit profile corresponds to the
2065 beam profile on the detector channels,
- 2066 ● `L0_Efficiency_Tt_Sc_p` shows the level 0 efficiency that was estimated **without** muon track-
2067 ing,
- 2068 ● `MuonCSize_H_Tt_Sc_p` shows the level 0 muon cluster size that was estimated **without** muon
2069 tracking, and
- 2070 ● `MuonCMult_H_Tt_Sc_p` shows the level 0 muon cluster multiplicity that was estimated **without**
2071 muon tracking.

2072 In the histogram labels, *t* stands for the trolley number (1 or 3), *c* for the chamber slot label in
2073 trolley *t* and *p* for the partition label (A, B, C or D depending on the chamber layout) as explained
2074 in Chapter ??.

2075 In the context of GIF++, an extra script called by the webDCS is called to extract the histograms
2076 from the ROOT files. The histograms are then stored in PNG and PDF formats into the correspond-
2077 ing folder (a single folder per HV step, so per ROOT file). the goal is to then display the histograms
2078 on the Data Quality Monitoring (DQM) page of the webDCS in order for the users to control the
2079 quality of the data taking at the end of data taking. An example of histogram organisation is given
2080 below:

2082



2083 *Here can put some screens from the webDCS to show the DQM and the plots available to users.*
 2084

2085 **B.2.1.2 CSV files**

2086 Moreover, up to 3 CSV files can be created depending on which ones of the 3 input files were in the
 2087 data folder:

- 2088 • `Offline-Corrupted.csv` , is used to keep track of the amount of data that was corrupted and
 2089 removed from old data format files that don't contain any data quality flag.
- 2090 • `Offline-Current.csv` , contains the summary of the currents and voltages applied on each
 2091 RPC HV channel.
- 2092 • `Offline-L0-EffC1.csv` , is used to write the efficiencies, cluster size and cluster multiplicity
 2093 of efficiency runs. Note that `L0` refers here to *Level 0* and means that the results of efficiency and
 2094 clusterization are a first approximation calculated without performing any muon tracking in

2095 between the different detectors. This offline tool provides the user with a preliminar calculation
 2096 of the efficiency and of the muon event parameters. Another analysis software especially
 2097 dedicated to muon tracking is called on selected data to retrieve the results of efficiency and
 2098 muon clusterization using a tracking algorithm to discriminate noise or gamma from muons
 2099 as muons are the only particles that pass through the full setup, leaving hits than can be used
 2100 to reconstruct their tracks.

- 2101 • `Offline-Rate.csv`, is used to write the noise or gamma rates measured in the detector readout
 2102 partitions.

2103 Note that these 4 CSV files are created along with their *headers* (`Offline-[...]-Header.csv`
 2104 containing the names of each data columns) and are automatically merged together when the offline
 2105 analysis tool is called from the webDCS, contrary to the case where the tool is runned locally from
 2106 the terminal as the merging bash script is then not called. Thus, the resulting files, used to make
 2107 official plots, are:

- 2108 • `Corrupted.csv`,
 2109 • `Current.csv`,
 2110 • `L0-EffCl.csv`.
 2111 • `Rate.csv`.

2112 B.3 Analysis inputs and information handling

2113 The usage of the Offline Analysis tool as well as its output have been presented in the previous section.
 2114 It is now important to dig further and start looking at the source code and the inputs necessary
 2115 for the tool to work. Indeed, other than the raw ROOT data files that are analysed, more information
 2116 needs to be imported inside of the program to perform the analysis such as the description of the
 2117 setup inside of GIFT++ at the time of data taking (number of trolleys, of RPCs, dimensions of the
 2118 detectors, etc...) or the mapping that links the TDC channels to the coresponding RPC channels in
 2119 order to translate the TDC information into human readable data. 2 files are used to transmit all this
 2120 information:
 2121

- 2122 • `Dimensions.ini`, that provides the necessary setup and RPC information, and
 2123 • `ChannelsMapping.csv`, that gives the link between the TDC and RPC channels as well as the
 2124 *mask* for each channel (masked or not?).

2125 B.3.1 Dimensions file and InFile parser

2126 This input file, present in every data folder, allows the analysis tool to know of the number of active
 2127 trolleys, the number of active RPCs in those trolleys, and the details about each RPCs such as
 2128 the number of RPC gaps, the number of pseudo-rapidity partitions (for CMS-like prototypes), the
 2129 number of strips per partion or the dimensions. To do so, there are 3 types of groups in the INI file
 2130 architecture. A first general group, appearing only once at the head of the document, gives information
 2131 about the number of active trolleys as well as their IDs, as presented in Source Code B.1. For

2132 each active trolley, a group similar to Source Code B.2 can be found containing information about
 2133 the number of active detectors in the trolley and their IDs. Each trolley group as a `Tt` name format,
 2134 where `t` is the trolley ID. Finally, for each detector stored in slots of an active trolley, there is a group
 2135 providing information about their names and dimensions, as shown in Source Code B.3. Each slot
 2136 group as a `TtSs` name format, where `s` is the slot ID of trolley `t` where the active RPC is hosted.

```
2137 [General]
2138 nTrolleys=2
  TrolleysID=13
```

2139 *Source Code B.1: Example of `[General]` group as might be found in `Dimensions.ini`. In Gif++, only 2 trolleys are available to hold RPCs and place them inside of the bunker for irradiation. The IDs of the trolleys are written in a single string as "13" and then read character by character by the program.*

```
2140 [T1]
  nSlots=4
  SlotsID=1234
```

2141 *Source Code B.2: Example of trolley group as might be found in `Dimensions.ini`. In this example, the file tells that there are 4 detectors placed in the holding slots of the trolley `T1` and that their IDs, written as a single string variable, are 1, 2, 3 and 4.*

```
2142 [T1S1]
  Name=RE2-2-NPD-BARC-8
  Partitions=3
  Gaps=3
  Gap1=BOT
  Gap2=TN
  Gap3=TW
  AreaGap1=11694.25
  AreaGap2=6432
  AreaGap3=4582.82
  Strips=32
  ActiveArea-A=157.8
  ActiveArea-B=121.69
  ActiveArea-C=93.03
```

2143 *Source Code B.3: Example of slot group as might be found in `Dimensions.ini`. In this example, the file provides information about a detector named `RE2-2-NPD-BARC-8`, having 3 pseudo-rapidity readout partitions and stored in slot `S1` of trolley `T1`. This is a CMS RE2-2 type of detector. This information will then be used for example to compute the rate per unit area calculation.*

2144 This information is readout and stored in a C++ object called `IniFile`, that parses the information
 2145 in the INI input file and stores it into a local buffer for later use. This INI parser is the exact same
 2146 one that was previously developed for the Gif++ DAQ and described in Appendix A.5.2.

2147 B.3.2 TDC to RPC link file and Mapping

2148 The same way the INI dimension file information is stored using `map`, the channel mapping and mask
 2149 information is stored and accessed through `map`. First of all, the mapping CSV file is organised into
 2150 3 columns separated by tabulations (and not by commas, as expected for CSV files as it is easier using
 2151 streams to read tab or space separated data using C++):

2152

2153 RPC_channel TDC_channel mask

2154 using as formatting for each field:

2155

2156	TSCCC	TCCC	M
------	-------	------	---

2157 TSCCC is a 5-digit integer where τ is the trolley ID, s the slot ID in which the RPC is held insite
 2158 the trolley τ and ccc is the RPC channel number, or *strip* number, that can take values up to
 2159 3-digits depending on the detector,

2160 TCCC is a 4 digit integer where τ is the TDC ID, ccc is the TDC channel number that can take values
 2161 in between 0 and 127, and

2162 M is a 1-digit integer indicating if the channel should be considered ($M = 1$) or discarded ($M = 0$)
 2163 during analysis.

2164 This mapping and masking information is readout and stored thanks to the object `Mapping`, pre-
 2165 sented in Source Code B.4. Similarly to `IniFile` objects, this class has private methods. The first
 2166 one, `Mapping::CheckIfNewLine()` is used to find the newline character '`\n`' or return character
 2167 '`\r`' (depending on which kind of operating system interacted with the file). This is used for the
 2168 simple reason that the masking information has been introduced only during the year 2017 but the
 2169 channel mapping files exist since 2015 and the very beginning of data taking at GIF++. This means
 2170 that in the older data folders, before the upgrade, the channel mapping file only had 2 columns, the
 2171 RPC channel and the TDC channel. For compatibility reasons, this method helps controling the
 2172 character following the readout of the 2 first fields of a line. In case any end of line character is
 2173 found, no mask information is present in the file and the default $M = 1$ is used. On the contrary, if
 2174 the next character was a tabulation or a space, the mask information is present.

2175 Once the 3 fields have been readout, the second private method `Mapping::CheckIfTDCCh()` is
 2176 used to control that the TDC channel is an existing TDC channel. Finally, the information is stored
 2177 into 3 different maps (`Link`, `ReverseLink` and `Mask`) thanks to the public method `Mapping::Read()`.
 2178 `Link` allows to get the RPC channel by knowing the TDC channel while `ReverseLink` does the op-
 2179 posite by returning the TDC channel by knowing the RPC channel. Finally, `Mask` returns the mask
 2180 associated to a given RPC channel.

```

2181 typedef map<Uint,Uint> MappingData;

2182 class Mapping {
2183     private:
2184         bool          CheckIfNewLine(char next);
2185         bool          CheckIfTDCCh(Uint channel);
2186         string        FileName;
2187         MappingData  Link;
2188         MappingData  ReverseLink;
2189         MappingData  Mask;
2190         int           Error;
2191
2192     public:
2193         Mapping();
2194         Mapping(string baseName);
2195         ~Mapping();
2196
2197         void SetFileName(const string filename);
2198         int  Read();
2199         Uint GetLink(Uint tdcchannel);
2200         Uint GetReverse(Uint rpcchannel);
2201         Uint GetMask(Uint rpcchannel);
2202     };

```

2183 *Source Code B.4: Description of C++ object Mapping used as a parser for the channel mapping and mask file.*

2184 B.4 Description of GIF++ setup within the Offline Analysis tool

2185 In the previous section, the tool input files have been discussed. The dimension file information is
 2186 stored in a map hosted by the `IniFile` object. But this information is then used to create a series of
 2187 new objects that helps defining the GIF++ infrastructure directly into the Offline Analysis. Indeed,
 2188 from the `RPC`, to the more general `Infrastructure`, every element of the GIF++ infrastrucutre is
 2189 recreated for each data analysis based on the information provided in input. All this information
 2190 about the infrastructure will be used to assign each hit signal to a specific strip channel of a specific
 2191 detector, and having a specific active area. This way, rate per unit area calculation is possible.
 2192

2193 B.4.1 RPC objects

2194 `RPC` objects have been developped to represent physical active detectors in GIF++ at the moment
 2195 of data taking. Thus, there are as many `RPC` objects created during the analysis than there were
 2196 active `RPC`s tested during a run. Each `RPC` hosts the information present in the corresponding INI
 2197 slot group, as shown in B.3, and organises it using a similar architecture. This can be seen from
 2198 Source B.5.

2199 To make the object more compact, the lists of gap labels, of gap active areas and strip active
 2200 areas are stored into `vector` dynamical containers. `RPC` objects are always contructed thanks to the
 2201 dimension file information stored into the `IniFILE` and their ID, using the format `TtSs`. Using the
 2202 `RPC` ID, the constructor calls the methods of `IniFILE` to initialise the `RPC`. The other constructors
 2203 are not used but exist in case of need. Finally, some getters have been written to access the different
 2204 private parameters storing the detector information.

```

2205
class RPC{
    private:
        string      name;           //RPC name as in webDCS database
        Uint        nGaps;          //Number of gaps in the RPC
        Uint        nPartitions;    //Number of partitions in the RPC
        Uint        nStrips;         //Number of strips per partition
        vector<string> gaps;       //List of gap labels (BOT, TOP, etc...)
        vector<float>  gapGeo;        //List of gap active areas
        vector<float>  stripGeo;      //List of strip active areas

    public:
        RPC();
        RPC(string ID, IniFile* geofile);
        RPC(const RPC& other);
        ~RPC();
        RPC& operator=(const RPC& other);

        string GetName();
        Uint GetNGaps();
        Uint GetNPartitions();
        Uint GetNStrips();
        string GetGap(Uint g);
        float GetGapGeo(Uint g);
        float GetStripGeo(Uint p);
};

2206

```

2207 *Source Code B.5: Description of C++ objects RPC that describe each active detectors used during data taking.*

2208 B.4.2 Trolley objects

2209 Trolley objects have been developped to represent physical active trolleys in GIFT++ at the moment
 2210 of data taking. Thus, there are as many trolley objects created during the analysis than there were
 2211 active trolleys hosting tested RPCs during a run. Each Trolley hosts the information present in the
 2212 corresponding INI trolley group, as shown in B.2, and organises it using a similar architecture. In
 2213 addition to the information hosted in the INI file, these object have a dynamical container of RPC
 2214 objects, representing the active detectors the active trolley was hosting at the time of data taking.
 2215 This can been seen from Source Code B.6.

2216 Trolley objects are always contructed thanks to the dimension file information stored into the
 2217 IniFILE and their ID, using the format Tt. Using the Trolley ID, the constructor calls the methods
 2218 of IniFILE to initialise the Trolley. Retrieving the information of the RPC IDs via SlotsID, a new
 2219 RPC is constructed and added to the container RPCs for each character in the ID string. The other
 2220 constructors are not used but exist in case of need. Finally, some getters have been written to access
 2221 the different private parameters storing the trolley and detectors information.

```

2222
class Trolley{
    private:
        Uint           nSlots; //Number of active RPCs in the considered trolley
        string         SlotsID; //Active RPC IDs written into a string
        vector<RPC*> RPCs;   //List of active RPCs

    public:
        //Constructors, destructor and operator =
        Trolley();
        Trolley(string ID, IniFile* geofile);
        Trolley(const Trolley& other);
        ~Trolley();
        Trolley& operator=(const Trolley& other);

        //Get GIFTrolley members
        Uint   GetNSlots();
        string GetSlotsID();
        Uint   GetSlotID(Uint s);

        //Manage RPC list
        RPC*   GetRPC(Uint r);
        void   DeleteRPC(Uint r);

        //Methods to get members of RPC objects stored in RPCs
        string GetName(Uint r);
        Uint   GetNGaps(Uint r);
        Uint   GetNPartitions(Uint r);
        Uint   GetNStrips(Uint r);
        string GetGap(Uint r, Uint g);
        float  GetGapGeo(Uint r, Uint g);
        float  GetStripGeo(Uint r, Uint p);
    };

```

Source Code B.6: Description of C++ objects `Trolley` that describe each active trolley used during data taking.

2225 B.4.3 Infrastructure object

2226 The `Infrastructure` object has been developped to represent the GIFT++ bunker area dedicated to
 2227 CMS RPC experiments. With this very specific object, all the information about the CMS RPC
 2228 setup within GIFT++ at the moment of data taking is stored. It hosts the information present in the
 2229 corresponding INI general group, as shown in B.1, and organises it using a similar architecture. In
 2230 addition to the information hosted in the INI file, this object have a dynamical container of `Trolley`
 2231 objects, representing the active tolleys in GIFT++ area. This can be seen from Source Code B.7.

2232 The `Infrastructure` object is always contructed thanks to the dimension file information stored
 2233 into the `IniFILE`. Retrieving the information of the trolley IDs via `TrolleysID`, a new `Trolley` is
 2234 constructed and added to the container `Trolleys` for each character in the ID `string`. By extension,
 2235 it is easy to understand that the process described in Section B.4.2 for the construction of RPCs
 2236 takes place when a trolley is constructed. The other constructors are not used but exist in case of
 2237 need. Finally, some getters have been written to access the different private parameters storing the
 2238 infrastructure, tolleys and detectors information.

```

2239   class Infrastructure {
2240     private:
2241       Uint           nTrolleys; //Number of active Trolleys in the run
2242       string         TrolleysID; //Active trolley IDs written into a string
2243       vector<Trolley*> Trolleys; //List of active Trolleys (struct)
2244
2245     public:
2246       //Constructors and destructor
2247       Infrastructure();
2248       Infrastructure(IniFile* geofile);
2249       Infrastructure(const Infrastructure& other);
2250       ~Infrastructure();
2251       Infrastructure& operator=(const Infrastructure& other);
2252
2253       //Get Infrastructure members
2254       Uint  GetNTrolleys();
2255       string GetTrolleysID();
2256       Uint   GetTrolleyID(Uint t);
2257
2258       //Manage Trolleys
2259       Trolley* GetTrolley(Uint t);
2260       void    DeleteTrolley(Uint t);
2261
2262       //Methods to get members of GIFTrolley objects stored in Trolleys
2263       Uint  GetNSlots(Uint t);
2264       string GetSlotsID(Uint t);
2265       Uint   GetSlotID(Uint t, Uint s);
2266       RPC*  GetRPC(Uint t, Uint r);
2267
2268       //Methods to get members of RPC objects stored in RPCs
2269       string GetName(Uint t, Uint r);
2270       Uint   GetNGaps(Uint t, Uint r);
2271       Uint   GetNPartitions(Uint t, Uint r);
2272       Uint   GetNStrips(Uint t, Uint r);
2273       string GetGap(Uint t, Uint r, Uint g);
2274       float  GetGapGeo(Uint t, Uint r, Uint g);
2275       float  GetStripGeo(Uint t, Uint r, Uint p);
2276   };

```

Source Code B.7: Description of C++ object Infrastructure that contains the full information about CMS RPC experiment in GIF++.

2242 B.5 Handeling of data

2243 As discussed in Appendix A.4.2, the raw data as a `TTree` architecture where every entry is related to
 2244 a trigger signal provided by a muon or a random pulse, whether the goal of the data taking was to
 2245 measure the performance of the detector or the noise/gamma background respectively. Each of these
 2246 entries, referred also as events, contain a more or less full list of hits in the TDC channels to which
 2247 the detectors are connected. To this list of hits corresponds a list of time stamps, marking the arrival
 2248 of the hits within the TDC channel.

2249 The infrastructure of the CMS RPC experiment within `GIF++` being defined, combining the
 2250 information about the raw data with the information provided by both the mapping/mask file and the
 2251 dimension file allows to build new physical objects that will help in computing efficiency or rates.

2252 B.5.1 RPC hits

2253 The raw data stored in the ROOT file as output of the GIFT++ DAQ, is readout by the analysis tool
 2254 using the structure `RAWData` presented in Source Code B.9 that differs from the structure presented
 2255 in Appendix A.4.2 as it is not meant to hold all of the data contained in the ROOT file. In this sense,
 2256 this structure is in the case of the offline analysis tool not a dynamical object and will only be storing
 2257 a single event contained in a single entry of the `TTree`.

```
2258
  class RPCHit {
    private:
      Uint Channel;      //RPC channel according to mapping (5 digits)
      Uint Trolley;     //0, 1 or 3 (1st digit of the RPC channel)
      Uint Station;     //Slot where is held the RPC in Trolley (2nd digit)
      Uint Strip;       //Physical RPC strip where the hit occurred (last 3
→   digits)
      Uint Partition;   //Readout partition along eta segmentation
      float TimeStamp; //Time stamp of the arrival in TDC

    public:
      //Constructors, destructor & operator =
      RPCHit();
      RPCHit(Uint channel, float time, Infrastructure* Infra);
      RPCHit(const RPCHit& other);
      ~RPCHit();
      RPCHit& operator=(const RPCHit& other);

      //Get RPCHit members
      Uint GetChannel();
      Uint GetTrolley();
      Uint GetStation();
      Uint GetStrip();
      Uint GetPartition();
      float GetTime();
    };

    typedef vector<RPCHit> HitList;
    typedef struct GIFHitList { HitList rpc[NTROLLEYS][NSLOTS][NPARTITIONS]; }
→   GIFHitList;

    bool SortHitbyStrip(RPCHit h1, RPCHit h2);
    bool SortHitbyTime(RPCHit h1, RPCHit h2);
  
```

2260 *Source Code B.8: Description of C++ object `RPCHit`.*

```
2261
  struct RAWData{
    int iEvent;        //Event i
    int TDCNHits;    //Number of hits in event i
    int QFlag;         //Quality flag list (1 flag digit per TDC)
    vector<Uint> *TDCCh; //List of channels giving hits per event
    vector<float> *TDCTS; //List of the corresponding time stamps
  };

```

2262 *Source Code B.9: Description of C++ structure `RAWData`.*

2263 Each member of the structure is then linked to the corresponding branch of the ROOT data tree,
 2264 as shown in the example of Source Code B.10, and using the method `GetEntry(int i)` of the ROOT
 2265 class `TTree` will update the state of the members of `RAWData`.

```

2266 TTree* dataTree = (TTree*)dataFile.Get("RAWData");
2267 RAWData data;
2268
2269 dataTree->SetBranchAddress("EventNumber", &data.iEvent);
2270 dataTree->SetBranchAddress("number_of_hits", &data.TDCNHits);
2271 dataTree->SetBranchAddress("Quality_flag", &data.QFlag);
2272 dataTree->SetBranchAddress("TDC_channel", &data.TDCCh);
2273 dataTree->SetBranchAddress("TDC_TimeStamp", &data.TDCTS);

```

2268 *Source Code B.10: Example of link in between RAWData and TTree.*

2269 The data is then analysed entry by entry and to each element of the TDC channel list, a `RPCHit` is
 2270 constructed by linking each TDC channel to the corresponding RPC channel thanks to the `Mapping`
 2271 object. The information carried by the RPC channel format allows to easily retrieve the trolley and
 2272 slot from which the hit was recorded (see section B.3.2). Using these 2 values, the readout partition
 2273 can be found by knowing the strip channel and comparing it with the number of partitions and strips
 2274 per partition stored into the `Infrastructure` object.

2275 Thus `RPCHit` objects are then stored into 3D dynamical list called `GIFHitList` (Source Code B.9)
 2276 where the 3 dimensions refer to the 3 layers of the readout in `GIF++` : in the bunker there are *trolleys*
 2277 (τ) holding detectors in *slots* (s) and each detector readout is divided into 1 or more pseudo-rapidity
 2278 *partitions* (p). Using these 3 information allows to assign an address to each readout partition and
 2279 this address will point to a specific hit list.

2280

2281 **B.5.2 Clusters of hits**

2282 All the hits contained in the ROOT file have been sorted into the different hit lists through the
 2283 `GIFHitList`. At this point, it is possible to start looking for clusters. A cluster is a group of adjacent
 2284 strips getting hits within a time window of 25 ns. These strips are then assumed to be part of the same
 2285 physical avalanche signal generated by a muon passing through the chamber or by the interaction of
 2286 a gamma stopping into the electrodes of the RPCs.

2287 To keep the cluster information, `RPCCluster` objects have been defined as shown in Source
 2288 Code B.11. Using the information of each individual `RPCHit` taken out of the hit list, it stores
 2289 the cluster size (number of adjacent strips composing the cluster), the first and last hit, the center for
 2290 spatial reconstruction and finally the start and stop time stamps as well as te time spread in between
 2291 the first and last hit.

```

2292
class RPCCluster{
    private:
        Uint ClusterSize; //Size of cluster #ID
        Uint FirstStrip; //First strip of cluster #ID
        Uint LastStrip; //Last strip of cluster #ID
        float Center; //Center of cluster #ID ((first+last)/2)
        float StartStamp; //Time stamp of the earliest hit of cluster #ID
        float StopStamp; //Time stamp of the latest hit of cluster #ID
        float TimeSpread; //Time difference between earliest and latest hits
                           //of cluster #ID

    public:
        //Constructors, destructor & operator =
        RPCCluster();
        RPCCluster(HitList List, Uint cID, Uint cSize, Uint first, Uint firstID);
        RPCCluster(const RPCCluster& other);
        ~RPCCluster();
        RPCCluster& operator=(const RPCCluster& other);

        //Get Cluster members
        Uint GetID();
        Uint GetSize();
        Uint GetFirstStrip();
        Uint GetLastStrip();
        float GetCenter();
        float GetStart();
        float GetStop();
        float GetSpread();
};

typedef vector<RPCCluster> ClusterList;

//Other functions to build cluster lists out of hit lists
void BuildClusters(HitList &cluster, ClusterList &clusterList);
void Clusterization(HitList &hits, TH1 *hcSize, TH1 *hcMult);

```

Source Code B.11: Description of C++ object cluster.

To investigate the hit list of a given detector partition, the function `Clusterization()` defined in `include/Cluster.h` needs the hits in the list to be time sorted. This is achieved by calling function `sort()` of library `<algorithm>` using the comparator `SortHitbyTime(RPCHit h1, RPCHit h2)` defined in `include/RPCHit.h` that returns `true` if the time stamp of hit `h1` is lower than that of `h2`. A first isolation of strips is made only based on time information. All the hits within the 25 ns window are taken separately from the rest. Then, this sub-list of hits is sorted this time by ascending strip number, using this time the comparator `SortHitbyStrip(RPCHit h1, RPCHit h2)`. Finally, the groups of adjacent strips are used to construct `RPCcluster` objects that are then stored in a temporary list of clusters that is at the end of the process used to know how many clusters were reconstructed and to fill their sizes into an histogram that will allows to know the mean size of muon or gamma clusters.

2307 B.6 DAQ data Analysis

All the ingredients to analyse GIF++ data have been defined. This section will focus on the different part of the analysis performed on the data, from determining the type of data the tool is dealing with

2310 to calculating the rate in each detector or reconstructing muon or gamma clusters.

2311 B.6.1 Determination of the run type

2312 In GIF++, both the performance of the detectors in detecting muons in an irradiated environment and
 2313 the gamma background can be independantly measured. These corresponds to different run types
 2314 and thus, to different TDC settings giving different data to look at.

2315

2316 In the case of performance measurements, the trigger for data taking is provided by the coïncidence
 2317 of several scintillators when muons from the beam passing through the area are detected. Data
 2318 is collected in a 600 ns wide window around the arrival of muons in the RPCs. The expected time
 2319 distribution of hits is shown in Figure B.1a. The muon peak is clearly visible in the center of the
 2320 distribution and is to be extracted from the gamma background that composes the flat part of the
 2321 distribution.

2322 On the other hand, gamma background or noise measurements are focussed on the non muon
 2323 related physics and the trigger needs to be independant from the muons to give a good measurement
 2324 of the gamma/noise distribution as seen by the detectors. The trigger is then provided by a pulse
 2325 generator at a frequency of 300 Hz whose pulse is not likely to be on time with a muon. In order
 2326 to increase the integrated time without increasing the acquisition time too much, the width of the
 2327 acquisition windows are increased to 10 μ s. The time distribution of the hits is expected to be flat, as
 2328 shown by Figure B.1b.




Figure B.1: Example of expected hit time distributions in the cases of efficiency (Figure B.1a) and noise/gamma rate per unit area (Figure B.1b) measurements as extracted from the raw ROOT files. The unit along the x-axis corresponds to ns. The fact that "the" muon peak is not well defined in Figure B.1a is due to the contribution of all the RPCs being tested at the same time that don't necessarily have the same signal arrival time. Each individual peak can have an offset with the ones of other detectors. The inconsistency in the first 100 ns of both time distributions is an artefact of the TDCs and are systematically rejected during the analysis.

2329 The ROOT files include a TTree called RunParameters containing, among other things, the in-
 2330 formation related to the type of run. The run type can then be accessed as described by Source
 2331 Code B.12 and the function IsEfficiencyRun() is then used to determine if the run file is an effi-
 2332 ciency run or, on the contrary, another type of run (noise or gamma measurement).

```

2333
2334     TTree* RunParameters = (TTree*)dataFile.Get("RunParameters");
2335     TString* RunType = new TString();
2336     RunParameters->SetBranchAddress("RunType", &RunType);
2337     RunParameters->GetEntry(0);

```

2335 *Source Code B.12: Access to the run type contained in TTree* RunParameters.*

2336 Finally, the data files will have a slightly different content whether it was collected before or after
 2337 October 2017 and the upgrade of the DAQ software that brought a new information into the ROOT
 2338 output. This is discussed in Appendix A.4.3 and implies that the analysis will differ a little depending
 2339 on the data format. Indeed, as no information on the data quality is stored, in older data files, the cor-
 2340 rections for missing events has to be done at the end of the analysis. The information about the type
 2341 of data format is stored in the variable **bool** `isNewFormat` by checking the list of branches contained
 2342 in the data tree via the methods `TTree::GetListOfBranches()` and `TCollection::Contains()`.

2343 **B.6.2 Beam time window calculation for efficiency runs**

2344 Knowing the run type is important first of all to know the width of the acquisition window to be used
 2345 for the rate calculation and finally to be able to seek for muons. Indeed, the peak that appears in the
 2346 time distribution for each detectors is then fitted to extract the most probable time window in which
 2347 the tool should look for muon hits. The data outside of this time window is then used to evaluate the
 2348 noise or gamma background the detector was subjected to during the data taking. Computing the
 2349 position of the peak is done calling the function `SetBeamWindow()` defined in file `src/RPCHit.cc` that
 2350 loops a first time on the data. The data is first sorted in a 3D array of 1D histograms (`GIFH1Array`, see
 2351 `include/types.h`). Then the location of the highest bin is determined using `TH1::GetMaximumBin()`
 2352 and is used to define a window in which a gaussian fit will be applied to compute the peak width.
 2353 This window is a 80 ns defined by Formula B.1 around the central bin.

$$t_{center}(ns) = \text{bin} \times \text{width}_{\text{bin}}(ns) \quad (\text{B.1a})$$

$$[t_{low}; t_{high}] = [t_{center} - 40; t_{center} + 40] \quad (\text{B.1b})$$

2354 Before the fit is performed, the average number of noise/gamma hits per bin is evaluated using
 2355 the data outside of the fit window. Excluding the first 100 ns, the average number of hits per bin
 2356 due to the noise or gamma is defined by Formula B.2 after extracting the amount of hits in the time
 2357 windows $[100; t_{low}]$ and $[t_{high}; 600]$ thanks to the method `TH1::Integral()`. This average number
 2358 of hits is then subtracted to every bin of the 1D histogram, in order to *clean* it from the noise or
 2359 gamma contribution as much as possible to improve the fit quality. Bins where $\langle n_{\text{hits}} \rangle$ is greater
 2360 than the actual bin content are set to 0.

$$\Delta t_{noise}(ns) = 600 \overbrace{-t_{high} + t_{low}}^{-80ns} - 100 = 420ns \quad (\text{B.2a})$$

$$\langle n_{\text{hits}} \rangle = \text{width}_{\text{bin}}(ns) \times \frac{\sum_{t=100}^{t_{low}} + \sum_{t=t_{high}}^{600}}{\Delta t_{noise}(ns)} \quad (\text{B.2b})$$

2361 Finally, the fit parameters are extracted and saved for each detector in 3D arrays of **float**
 2362 (`muonPeak`, see `include/types.h`), a first one for the mean arrival time of the muons, `PeakTime`,

2363 and a second one for the width of the peak, `PeakWidth`. The width is defined as 6σ of the gaussian
 2364 fit. The same settings are applied to every partitions of the same detector. To determine which one
 2365 of the detector's partitions is directly illuminated by the beam, the peak height of each partition is
 2366 compared and the highest one is then used to define the peak settings.

2367 B.6.3 Data loop and histogram filling

2368 3D arrays of histogram are created to store the data and display it on the DQM of GIF++ webDCS
 2369 for the use of shifters. These histograms, presented in section B.2.1.1, are filled while looping on
 2370 the data. Before starting the analysis loop, it is necessary to control the entry quality for the new
 2371 file formats featuring `QFlag`. If the `QFlag` value for this entry shows that 1 TDC or more have a
 2372 `CORRUPTED` flag, then this event is discarded. The loss of statistics is low enough to be neglected.
 2373 `QFlag` is controled using the function `IsCorruptedEvent()` defined in `src/utils.cc`. As explained
 2374 in Appendix A.4.3, each digit of this integer represent a TDC flag that can be 1 or 2. Each 2 is
 2375 the sign of a `CORRUPTED` state. Then, the data is accessed entry by entry in the ROOT `TTree` using
 2376 `RAWData` and each hit in the hit list is assigned to a detector channel and saved in the corresponding
 2377 histograms. In the first part of the analysis, in which the loop over the ROOT file's content is
 2378 performed, the different steps are:

2379 **1- RPC channel assignment and control:** a check is done on the RPC channel extracted thanks
 2380 to the mapping via the method `Mapping::GetLink()`. If the channel is not initialised and is 0, or if
 2381 the TDC channel was greater than 5127, the hit is discarded. This means there was a problem in the
 2382 mapping. Often a mapping problem leads to the crash of the offline tool.

2383 **2- Creation of a `RPCHit` object:** to easily get the trolley, slot and partition in which the hit has
 2384 been assigned, this object is particularly helpful.

2385 **3- General histograms are filled:** the hit is filled into the time distribution and the general hit
 2386 distribution histograms, and if the arrival time is within the first 100 ns, it is discarded and nothing
 2387 else happens and the loop proceeds with the next hit in the list.

2388 **4- Multiplicity counter:** the hit multiplicity counter of the corresponding detectors incremented.

2389 **5-a- Efficiency runs - Is the hit within the peak window? :** if the peak is contained in the peak
 2390 window previously defined in section B.6.2, the hit is filled into the beam hit profile histogram of
 2391 the corresponding chamber, added into the list of muon hits and increments the counter of *in time*
 2392 hits. The term *in time* here refers to the hits that are likely to be muons by arriving in the expected
 2393 time window. If the hit is outside of the peak window, it is filled into the noise profile histogram
 2394 of the corresponding detector, added into the list of noise/gamma hits and increments the counter of
 2395 noise/gamma hits.

2396 **5-b- Noise/gamma rate runs - Noise histograms are filled:** the hit is filled into the noise profile
 2397 histogram of the corresponding detector, added into the list of noise/gamma hits and increments the
 2398 counter of noise/gamma hits.

2399

2400 After the loop on the hit list of the entry is over, the next step is to clusterize the 3D lists filled
 2401 in the previous steps. A 3D loop is then started over the active trolley, slot and RPC partitions to
 2402 access these objects. Each `NoiseHitList` and `MuonHitList`, in case of efficiency run, are clusterized
 2403 as described in section B.5.2. There corresponding cluster size and multiplicity histograms are filled
 2404 at the end of the clustering process. Then, the efficiency histogram is filled in case of efficiency run.
 2405 The selection is simply made by checking whether the RPC detected signals in the peak window
 2406 during this event. Nevertheless, it is useful to highlight that at this level, it is not possible yet to
 2407 discriminate in between a muon hit and noise or gamma hit. Thus, `MuonCSize_H`, `MuonCMult_H`
 2408 and `Efficiency0_H` are subjected to noise and gamma contamination. This contamination will be
 2409 estimated and corrected at the moment the results will be written into output CSV files. Finally, the
 2410 loop ends on the filling of the general hit multiplicity histogram.

2411 **B.6.4 Results calculation**

2412 As mentioned in section B.2.1, the analysis of DAQ data provides the user with 3 CSV files and
 2413 a ROOT file associated to each and every ROOT data file. The fourth CSV file is provided by the
 2414 extraction of the CEAN main frame data monitored during data taking and will be discussed later.
 2415 After looping on the data in the previous part of the analysis macro, the output files are created and a
 2416 3D loop on each RPC readout partitions is started to extract the histograms parameters and compute
 2417 the final results.

2418

2419 **B.6.4.1 Rate normalisation**




Figure B.2: The effect of the quality flag is explained by presenting the reconstructed hit multiplicity of a data file without `Quality_flag`. The artificial high content of bin 0 is the effect of corrupted data.

2420 To analyse old data format files, not containing any quality flag, it is needed to estimate the amount
 2421 of corrupted data via a fit as the corrupted data will always fill events with a fake "0 multiplicity".
 2422 Indeed, as no hits were stored in the DAQ ROOT files, these events artificially contribute to fill
 2423 the bin corresponding to a null multiplicity, as shown in Figure B.2. In the case the mean of the

hit multiplicity distribution is high, the contribution of the corrupted data can easily be evaluated for later correction by comparing the level of the bin at multiplicity 0 and of a skew fit curve that should indicate a value consistent with 0. A skew fit has been chosen over a Poisson fit as it was giving better results for lower mean multiplicity values. Nevertheless, for low irradiation cases, as explained in Appendix A.4.3, the hit multiplicity distribution mean is, on the contrary, rather small and the probability to record events without hits can't be considered small anymore, leading to a difficult and non-reliable estimation of the corruption. As can be seen in Source Code B.13, conditions have been applied to prevent bad fits and wrong corruption estimation in cases where :

- The difference in between the data for multiplicity 1 and the corresponding fit value should be lower than 1% of the total amount of data : $\frac{|n_{m=1} - sk(1)|}{N_{tot}} < 0.01$ where $n_{m=1}$ is the number of entries with multiplicity 1, $sk(1)$ the value of the skew fit, as defined by Formula 4.3, for multiplicity 1 and N_{tot} the total number of entries.

- The amount of data contained in the multiplicity 0 bin should not exceed 40% : $\frac{n_{m=0}}{N_{tot}} \leq 0.4$ where $n_{m=0}$ is the number of entries with multiplicity 0. This number has been determined to be the maximum to be able to separate the excess of data due to corruption from the hit multiplicity distribution.

Those 2 conditions need to be fulfilled to estimate the corruption of old data format files. If the fit was successful, the level of corruption is written in `Offline-Corrupted.csv` and the number of corrupted entries, refered as the integer `nEmptyEvent`, is subtracted from the total number of entries when the rate normalisation factor is computed as explicit in Source Code B.13. Note that for new data format files, the number of corrupted entries being set to 0, the definition of `rate_norm` stays valid.

```

2446   if(!isNewFormat){
      TF1* GaussFit = new TF1("gaussfit","[0]*exp(-0.5*((x-[1])/[2])**2)",0,Xmax);
      GaussFit->SetParameter(0,100);
      GaussFit->SetParameter(1,10);
      GaussFit->SetParameter(2,1);
      HitMultiplicity_H.rpc[T][S][p]->Fit(GaussFit,"LIQR","");
      HitMultiplicity_H.rpc[T][S][p]->Fit(GaussFit,"LIQR","");
      TF1* SkewFit = new TF1("skewfit","[0]*exp(-0.5*((x-[1])/[2])**2) / (1 +
→      exp(-[3]*(x-[4])))",0,Xmax);
      SkewFit->SetParameter(0,GaussFit->GetParameter(0));
      SkewFit->SetParameter(1,GaussFit->GetParameter(1));
      SkewFit->SetParameter(2,GaussFit->GetParameter(2));
      SkewFit->SetParameter(3,1);
      SkewFit->SetParameter(4,1);
      HitMultiplicity_H.rpc[T][S][p]->Fit(SkewFit,"LIQR","");
      HitMultiplicity_H.rpc[T][S][p]->Fit(SkewFit,"LIQR","");
      double fitValue = SkewFit->Eval(1,0,0,0);
      double dataValue = (double)HitMultiplicity_H.rpc[T][S][p]->GetBinContent(2);
      double difference = TMath::Abs(dataValue - fitValue);
      double fitTOdataVSentries_ratio = difference / (double)nEntries;
      bool isFitGOOD = fitTOdataVSentries_ratio < 0.01;

2447      double nSinglehit = (double)HitMultiplicity_H.rpc[T][S][p]->GetBinContent(1);
      double lowMultRatio = nSinglehit / (double)nEntries;
      bool isMultLOW = lowMultRatio > 0.4;

      if(isFitGOOD && !isMultLOW){
          nEmptyEvent = HitMultiplicity_H.rpc[T][S][p]->GetBinContent(1);
          nPhysics = (int)SkewFit->Eval(0,0,0,0);
          if(nPhysics < nEmptyEvent)
              nEmptyEvent = nEmptyEvent-nPhysics;
      }
}

double corrupt_ratio = 100.*(double)nEmptyEvent / (double)nEntries;
outputCorrCSV << corrupt_ratio << '\t';

float rate_norm = 0.;
float stripArea = GIFIInfra->GetStripGeo(tr,sl,p);

if(IsEfficiencyRun(RunType)){
    float noiseWindow = BMTDCWINDOW - TIMEREJECT - 2*PeakWidth.rpc[T][S][p];
    rate_norm = (nEntries-nEmptyEvent)*noiseWindow*1e-9*stripArea;
} else
    rate_norm = (nEntries-nEmptyEvent)*RDMNOISEWDW*1e-9*stripArea;

```

Source Code B.13: Definition of the rate normalisation variable. It takes into account the number of non corrupted entries and the time window used for noise calculation, to estimate the total integrated time, and the strip active area to express the result as rate per unit area.

2449 B.6.4.2 Rate and activity

2450 At this point, the strip rate histograms, StripNoiseProfile_H.rpc[T][S][p], only contain an in-
 2451 formation about the total number of noise or rate hits each channel received during the data taking.
 2452 As described in Source Code B.14, a loop on the strip channels will be used to normalise the content
 2453 of the rate distribution histogram for each detector partitions. The initial number of hits recorded for
 2454 a given bin will be extracted and 2 values will be computed:

- 2455 ● the strip rate, defined as the number of hits recorded in the bin normalised like described in
 2456 the previous section, using the variable `rate_norm`, and

- 2457 ● the strip activity, defined as the number of hits recorded in the bin normalised to the average
 2458 number of hits per bin contained in the partition histogram, using the variable `averageNhit`.
 2459 This value provides an information on the homogeneity of the detector response to the gamma
 2460 background or of the detector noise. An activity of 1 corresponds to an average response.
 2461 Above 1, the channel is more active than the average and bellow 1, the channel is less active.

```

int nNoise = StripNoiseProfile_H.rpc[T][S][p]->GetEntries();
float averageNhit = (nNoise>0) ? (float)(nNoise/nStripsPart) : 1.;

for(Uint st = 1; st <= nStripsPart; st++){
    float stripRate =
        StripNoiseProfile_H.rpc[T][S][p]->GetBinContent(st)/rate_norm;
    float stripAct =
        StripNoiseProfile_H.rpc[T][S][p]->GetBinContent(st)/averageNhit;

    StripNoiseProfile_H.rpc[T][S][p]->SetBinContent(st,stripRate);
    StripActivity_H.rpc[T][S][p]->SetBinContent(st,stripAct);
}

```

2463 *Source Code B.14: Description of the loop that allows to set the content of each strip rate and strip activity
 channel for each detector partition.*

2464 On each detector partitions, which are readout by a single FEE, all the channels are not processed
 2465 by the same chip. Each chip can give a different noise response and thus, histograms using a chip
 2466 binning are used to investigate chip related noise behaviours. The average values of the strip rate
 2467 or activity grouped into a given chip are extracted using the using the function `GetChipBin()` and
 2468 stored in dedicated histograms as described in Source Codes B.15 and B.16 respectively.

```

float GetChipBin(TH1* H, Uint chip){
    Uint start = 1 + chip*NSTRIPSCHIP;
    int nActive = NSTRIPSCHIP;
    float mean = 0.;

    for(Uint b = start; b <= (chip+1)*NSTRIPSCHIP; b++){
        float value = H->GetBinContent(b);
        mean += value;
        if(value == 0.) nActive--;
    }

    if(nActive != 0) mean /= (float)nActive;
    else mean = 0.;

    return mean;
}

```

2471 *Source Code B.15: Function used to compute the content of a bin for an histogram using chip binning.*

```

2472   for(UInt ch = 0; ch < (nStripsPart/NSTRIPSCHIP); ch++) {
2473     ChipMeanNoiseProf_H.rpc[T][S][p]->
2474       SetBinContent(ch+1,GetChipBin(StripNoiseProfile_H.rpc[T][S][p],ch));
2475     ChipActivity_H.rpc[T][S][p]->
2476       SetBinContent(ch+1,GetChipBin(StripActivity_H.rpc[T][S][p],ch));
2477   }

```

Source Code B.16: Description of the loop that allows to set the content of each chip rate and chip activity bins for each detector partition knowing the information contained in the corresponding strip distribution histograms.

The activity variable is used to evaluate the homogeneity of the detector response to background or of the detector noise. The homogeneity h_p of each detector partition can be evaluated using the formula $h_p = \exp(-\sigma_p^R / \langle R \rangle_p)$, where $\langle R \rangle_p$ is the partition mean rate and σ_p^R is the rate standard deviation calculated over the partition channels. The more homogeneously the rates are distributed and the smaller will σ_p^R be, and the closer to 1 will h_p get. On the contrary, if the standard deviation of the channel's rates is large, h_p will rapidly get to 0. This value is saved into histograms as shown in Source Code B.17 and could in the future be used to monitor through time, once extracted, the evolution of every partition homogeneity. This could be of great help to understand the apparition of eventual hot spots due to ageing of the chambers subjected to high radiation levels. The monitored homogeneity information could then be combined with a monitoring of the activity of each individual channel in order to have a finer information. Monitoring tools have been suggested and need to be developed for this purpose.

```

2486   float MeanPartSDev = GetTH1StdDev(StripNoiseProfile_H.rpc[T][S][p]);
2487   float strip_homog = (MeanPartRate==0)
2488     ? 0.
2489     : exp(-MeanPartSDev/MeanPartRate);
2490   StripHomogeneity_H.rpc[T][S][p]->Fill("exp -#left(#frac{\#sigma_{Strip}
2491     \rightarrow Rate}{\#mu_{Strip Rate}}\#right)",strip_homog);
2492   StripHomogeneity_H.rpc[T][S][p]->GetYaxis()->SetRangeUser(0.,1.);
2493
2494   float ChipStDevMean = GetTH1StdDev(ChipMeanNoiseProf_H.rpc[T][S][p]);
2495   float chip_homog = (MeanPartRate==0)
2496     ? 0.
2497     : exp(-ChipStDevMean/MeanPartRate);
2498   ChipHomogeneity_H.rpc[T][S][p]->Fill("exp -#left(#frac{\#sigma_{Chip}
2499     \rightarrow Rate}{\#mu_{Chip Rate}}\#right)",chip_homog);
2500   ChipHomogeneity_H.rpc[T][S][p]->GetYaxis()->SetRangeUser(0.,1.);

```

Source Code B.17: Storage of the homogeneity into dedicated histograms.

B.6.4.3 Strip masking tool

The offline tool is automatically called at the end of each data taking to analyse the data and offer the shifter DQM histograms to control the data quality. After the histograms have been published online in the DQM page, the shifter can decide to mask noisy or dead channels that will contribute to bias the final rate calculation by editing the mask column of `ChannelsMapping.csv` as can be seen in Figure B.3.




Figure B.3: Display of the masking tool page on the webDCS. The window on the left allows the shifter to edit ChannelsMapping.csv. To mask a channel, it only is needed to set the 3rd field corresponding to the strip to mask to 0. It is not necessary for older mapping file formats to add a 1 for each strip that is not masked as the code is versatile and the default behaviour is to consider missing mask fields as active strips. The effect of the mask is directly visible for noisy channels as the corresponding bin turns red. The global effect of masking strips will be an update of the rate value showed on the histogram that will take into consideration the rejected channels.

2495 From the code point of view, the function `GetTH1Mean()` is used to retrieve the mean rate par-
 2496 tition by partition after the rates have been calculated strip by strip and filled into the histograms
 2497 `StripNoiseProfile_H.rpc[T][S][p]`, as described through Source Code B.18.

2498 Once the mask for each rejected channel has been updated, the shifter can manually run the of-
 2499 fline tool again to update the DQM plots, now including the masked strips, as well the rate results
 2500 written in the output CSV file `Offline-Rate.csv`. If not done during the shifts, the strip masking
 2501 procedure needs to be carefully done by the person in charge of data analysis on the scans that were
 2502 selected to produce the final results.

```

2503
2504     float GetTH1Mean(TH1* H) {
2505         int nBins = H->GetNbinsX();
2506         int nActive = nBins;
2507         float mean = 0.;

2508         for(int b = 1; b <= nBins; b++) {
2509             float value = H->GetBinContent(b);
2510             mean += value;
2511             if(value == 0.) nActive--;
2512         }

2513         if(nActive != 0) mean /= (float)nActive;
2514         else mean = 0.;

2515         return mean;
2516     }

```

Source Code B.18: The function `GetTH1Mean()` is used to return the mean along the y-axis of `TH1` histograms containing rate information. In order to take into account masked strips whose rate is set to 0, the function looks for masked channels and decrement the number of active channels for each null value found.

2506 B.6.4.4 Output CSV files filling

2507 All the histograms have been filled. Parameters will then be extracted from them to compute the
 2508 final results that will later be used to produce plots. Once the results have been computed, the very
 2509 last step of the offline macro is to write these values into the corresponding CSV outputs. Aside of
 2510 the file `Offline-Corrupted.csv`, 2 CSV files are being written by the macro `offlineAnalysis()`,
 2511 `Offline-Rates.csv` and `Offline-L0-EffCl.csv` that respectively contain information about noise
 2512 or gamma rates, cluster size and multiplicity, and about level 0 reconstruction of the detector effi-
 2513 ciency, muon cluster size and multiplicity. Details on the computation and file writing are respec-
 2514 tively given in Sources Codes B.19 and B.20.

2515 **Noise/gamma background variables** are computed and written in the output file for each detector
 2516 partitions. A detector average of the hit and cluster rate is also provided, as shown through Sources
 2517 Code B.19. The variables that are written for each partition are:

- 2518 • The mean partition hit rate per unit area, `MeanPartRate`, that is extracted from the histogram
 2519 `StripNoiseProfile_H` as the mean value along the y-axis, as described in section B.6.4.3. No
 2520 error is recorded for the hit rate as this is considered a single measurement. No statistical error
 2521 can be associated to it and the systematics are unknown.
- 2522 • The mean cluster size, `cSizePart`, is extracted from the histogram `NoiseCSize_H` and it's
 2523 statistical error, `cSizePartErr`, is taken to be 2σ of the total distribution.
- 2524 • The mean cluster multiplicity per trigger, `cMultPart`, is extracted from the histogram `NoiseCMult_H`
 2525 and it's statistical error, `cMultPartErr`, is taken to be 2σ of the total distribution. It is impor-
 2526 tant to point to the fact that this variable gives an information that is dependent on the buffer
 2527 window width used for each trigger for the calculation.
- 2528 • The mean cluster rate per unit area, `ClustPartRate`, is defined as the mean hit rate normalised

2529 to the mean cluster size and it's statistical error, `ClustPartRateErr`, is then obtained using the
 2530 relative statistical error on the mean cluster size.

```

for (UInt tr = 0; tr < GIFInfra->GetNTrolleys(); tr++) {
  UInt T = GIFInfra->GetTrolleyID(tr);

  for (UInt sl = 0; sl < GIFInfra->GetNSlots(tr); sl++) {
    UInt S = GIFInfra->GetSlotID(tr,sl) - 1;

    float MeanNoiseRate = 0.;
    float ClusterRate = 0.;
    float ClusterSDev = 0.;

    for (UInt p = 0; p < GIFInfra->GetNPartitions(tr,sl); p++) {
      float MeanPartRate = GetTH1Mean(StripNoiseProfile_H.rpc[T][S][p]);
      float cSizePart = NoiseCSIZE_H.rpc[T][S][p]->GetMean();
      float cSizePartErr = (NoiseCSIZE_H.rpc[T][S][p]->GetEntries()==0)
        ? 0.
        : 2*NoiseCSIZE_H.rpc[T][S][p]->GetStdDev() /
          sqrt(NoiseCSIZE_H.rpc[T][S][p]->GetEntries());
      float cMultPart = NoiseCMult_H.rpc[T][S][p]->GetMean();
      float cMultPartErr = (NoiseCMult_H.rpc[T][S][p]->GetEntries()==0)
        ? 0.
        : 2*NoiseCMult_H.rpc[T][S][p]->GetStdDev() /
          sqrt(NoiseCMult_H.rpc[T][S][p]->GetEntries());
      float ClustPartRate = (cSizePart==0) ? 0.
        : MeanPartRate/cSizePart;
      float ClustPartRateErr = (cSizePart==0) ? 0.
        : ClustPartRate * cSizePartErr/cSizePart;

      outputRateCSV << MeanPartRate << '\t'
        << cSizePart << '\t' << cSizePartErr << '\t'
        << cMultPart << '\t' << cMultPartErr << '\t'
        << ClustPartRate << '\t' << ClustPartRateErr << '\t';

      RPCarea += stripArea * nStripsPart;
      MeanNoiseRate += MeanPartRate * stripArea * nStripsPart;
      ClusterRate += ClustPartRate * stripArea * nStripsPart;
      ClusterSDev += (cSizePart==0)
        ? 0.
        : ClusterRate*cSizePartErr/cSizePart;
    }

    MeanNoiseRate /= RPCarea;
    ClusterRate /= RPCarea;
    ClusterSDev /= RPCarea;

    outputRateCSV << MeanNoiseRate << '\t'
      << ClusterRate << '\t' << ClusterSDev << '\t';
  }
}

```

Source Code B.19: Description of rate result calculation and writing into the CSV output `Offline-Rate.csv`. Are saved into the file for each detector, the mean partition rate, cluster size and cluster mutiplicity, along with their errors, for each partition and as well as a detector average.

2533 **Muon performance variables** are computed and written in the output file for each detector parti-
 2534 tions as shown through Sources Code B.20. The variables that are written for each partition are:

- 2535 ● The muon efficiency, `eff`, extracted from the histogram `Efficiency0_H`. It is reminded that
2536 this offline tool doesn't include any tracking algorithm to identify muons from the beam and
2537 only relies on the hits arriving in the time window corresponding to the beam time. The con-
2538 tent of the efficiency histogram is thus biased by the noise/gamma background contribution
2539 into this window and is thus corrected by estimating the muon data content in the peak re-
2540 gion knowing the noise/gamma content in the rate calculation region. Both time windows
2541 being different, the choice was made to normalise the noise/gamma background calculation
2542 window to it's equivalent beam window in order to have comparable values using the variable
2543 `windowRatio`. Finally, to estimate the data ratio in the peak region, the variable `DataRatio`
2544 is defined as the ratio in between the estimated mean cluster multiplicity of the muons in the
2545 peak region, `MuonCM`, and of the total mean cluster multiplicity in the peak region, `PeakCM`.
2546 `MuonCM` is itself defined as the difference in between the total mean cluster multiplicity in the
2547 peak region and the normalised mean noise/gamma cluster multiplicity calculated outside of
2548 the peak region. The statistical error related to the efficiency, `eff_err`, is computed using a
2549 binomial distribution, as the efficiency measure the probability of "success" and "failure" to
2550 detect muons.
- 2551 ● The mean muon cluster size, `MuonCS`, is calculated using the total mean cluster size and multi-
2552 plicity in the peak region, respectively extracted from histograms `MuonCSize_H` and `MuonCMult_H`,
2553 the noise/gamma background mean cluster size and normalised multiplicity, extracted from
2554 `NoiseCSize_H` and `NoiseCMult_H`, and of the estimated muon cluster multiplicity `MuonCM` pre-
2555 viously explicated. The associated statistical error, `MuonCM_err`, is calculated using the propa-
2556 gation of errors of the mentioned variables.
- 2557 ● The mean muon cluster multiplicity in the peak region, `MuonCM`, explicated above whose sta-
2558 tistical error, `MuonCM_err`, is the sum of statistical error associated to the total mean clus-
2559 ter multiplicity in the peak reagion, `PeakCM_err`, and of the mean noise/gamma cluster size,
2560 `NoiseCM_err`.

2561 In addition to these 2 CSV files, the histograms are saved in ROOT file `Scan00XXXX_HVY_Offline.root`
2562 as explained in section B.2.1.1.

2563

```

for (UInt tr = 0; tr < GIFInfra->GetNTrolleys(); tr++) {
    UInt T = GIFInfra->GetTrolleyID(tr);
    for (UInt sl = 0; sl < GIFInfra->GetNSlots(tr); sl++) {
        UInt S = GIFInfra->GetSlotID(tr,sl) - 1;
        for (UInt p = 0; p < GIFInfra->GetNPartitions(tr,sl); p++) {
            float noiseWindow =
                BMTDCWINDOW - TIMEREJECT - 2*PeakWidth.rpc[T][S][p];
            float peakWindow = 2*PeakWidth.rpc[T][S][p];
            float windowRatio = peakWindow/noiseWindow;

            float PeakCM = MuonCMult_H.rpc[T][S][p]->GetMean();
            float PeakCS = MuonCSize_H.rpc[T][S][p]->GetMean();
            float NoiseCM = NoiseCMult_H.rpc[T][S][p]->GetMean() *windowRatio;
            float NoiseCS = NoiseCSize_H.rpc[T][S][p]->GetMean();
            float MuonCM = (PeakCM<NoiseCM) ? 0. : PeakCM-NoiseCM;
            float MuonCS = (MuonCM==0 || PeakCM*PeakCS<NoiseCM*NoiseCS)
                ? 0.
                : (PeakCM*PeakCS-NoiseCM*NoiseCS) / MuonCM;
            float PeakCM_err = (MuonCMult_H.rpc[T][S][p]->GetEntries()==0.)
                ? 0.
                : 2*MuonCMult_H.rpc[T][S][p]->GetStdDev() /
                    sqrt(MuonCMult_H.rpc[T][S][p]->GetEntries());
            float PeakCS_err = (MuonCSize_H.rpc[T][S][p]->GetEntries()==0.)
                ? 0.
                : 2*MuonCSize_H.rpc[T][S][p]->GetStdDev() /
                    sqrt(MuonCSize_H.rpc[T][S][p]->GetEntries());
            float NoiseCM_err = (NoiseCMult_H.rpc[T][S][p]->GetEntries()==0.)
                ? 0.
                : windowRatio*2*NoiseCMult_H.rpc[T][S][p]->GetStdDev() /
                    sqrt(NoiseCMult_H.rpc[T][S][p]->GetEntries());
            float NoiseCS_err = (NoiseCSize_H.rpc[T][S][p]->GetEntries()==0.)
                ? 0.
                : 2*NoiseCSize_H.rpc[T][S][p]->GetStdDev() /
                    sqrt(NoiseCSize_H.rpc[T][S][p]->GetEntries());
            float MuonCM_err = (MuonCM==0) ? 0. : PeakCM_err+NoiseCM_err;
            float MuonCS_err = (MuonCS==0 || MuonCM==0) ? 0.
                : (PeakCS*PeakCM_err + PeakCM*PeakCS_err +
                    NoiseCS*NoiseCM_err + NoiseCM*NoiseCS_err +
                    MuonCS*MuonCM_err) / MuonCM;

            float DataRatio = MuonCM/PeakCM;
            float DataRatio_err = (MuonCM==0) ? 0.
                : DataRatio*(MuonCM_err/MuonCM + PeakCM_err/PeakCM);
            float eff = DataRatio*Efficiency0_H.rpc[T][S][p]->GetMean();
            float eff_err = DataRatio*2*Efficiency0_H.rpc[T][S][p]->GetStdDev() /
                sqrt(Efficiency0_H.rpc[T][S][p]->GetEntries()) +
                Efficiency0_H.rpc[T][S][p]->GetMean()*DataRatio_err;

            outputEffCSV << eff << '\t' << eff_err << '\t'
                << MuonCS << '\t' << MuonCS_err << '\t'
                << MuonCM << '\t' << MuonCM_err << '\t';
        }
    }
}

```

2564

2565

Source Code B.20: Description of efficiency result calculation and writing into the CSV output Offline-L0-EffCl.csv. Are saved into the file for each detector, the efficiency, corrected taking into account the background in the peak window of the time profile, muon cluster size and muon cluster multiplicity, along with their errors, for each partition and as well as a detector average.

2566 B.7 Current data Analysis

2567 Detectors under test at GIF++ are connected both to a CAEN HV power supply and to a CAEN
2568 ADC that reads the currents inside of the RPC gaps bypassing the supply cable. During data tak-
2569 ing, the webDCS records into a ROOT file called `Scan00XXXX_HVY_CAEN.root` histograms with the
2570 monitored parameters of both CAEN devices. Are recorded for each RPC channels (in most cases,
2571 a channel corresponds to an RPC gap):

- 2572 • the effective voltage, HV_{eff} , set by the webDCS using the PT correction on the CAEN power
2573 supply,
- 2574 • the applied voltage, HV_{app} , monitored by the CAEN power supply, and the statistical error
2575 related to the variations of this value through time to follow the variation of the environmental
2576 parameters defined as the RMS of the histogram divided by the square root of the number of
2577 recorded points,
- 2578 • the monitored current, I_{mon} , monitored by the CAEN power supply, and the statistical error
2579 related to the variations of this value through time to follow the variation of the environmental
2580 parameters defined as the RMS of the histogram divided by the square root of the number of
2581 recorded points,
- 2582 • the corresponding current density, J_{mon} , defined as the monitored current per unit area,
2583 $J_{mon} = I_{mon}/A$, where A is the active area of the corresponding gap,
- 2584 • the ADC current, I_{ADC} , recorded through the CAEN ADC module that monitors the dark
2585 current in the gap itself. First of all, the resolution of such a module is better than that of
2586 CAEN power supplies and moreover, the current is not read-out through the HV supply line
2587 but directly at the chamber level giving the real current inside of the detector. The statistical
2588 error is defined as the RMS of the histogram distribution divided by the square root of the
2589 number of recorded points.

2590 Once extracted through a loop over the element of GIF++ infrastructure via the C++ macro
2591 `GetCurrent()`, these parameters, organised in 9 columns per detector HV supply line, are written in
2592 the output CSV file `Offline-Current.csv`. The macro can be found in the file `Current.cc`.

References

- 2594 [1] T. Massam et al. “Experimental observation of antideuteron production”. In: *Il Nuovo Cimento A* 63 (1965), pp. 10–14.
- 2595
- 2596 [2] UA1 Collaboration. “Experimental observation of isolated large transverse energy electrons with associated missing energy at $s = 540 \text{ GeV}$ ”. In: *Physics Letters B* 122 (1983), pp. 103–116.
- 2597
- 2598
- 2599 [3] UA2 Collaboration. “Observation of single isolated electrons of high transverse momentum in events with missing transverse energy at the CERN pp collider”. In: *Physics Letters B* 122 (1983), pp. 476–485.
- 2600
- 2601
- 2602 [4] UA1 Collaboration. “Experimental observation of lepton pairs of invariant mass around $95 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ at the CERN SPS collider”. In: *Physics Letters B* 126 (1983), pp. 398–410.
- 2603
- 2604 [5] UA2 Collaboration. “Evidence for $Z_0 \rightarrow e^+e^-$ at the CERN pp collider”. In: *Physics Letters B* 129 (1983), pp. 130–140.
- 2605
- 2606 [6] ALEPH Collaboration. “Determination of the number of light neutrino species”. In: *Physics Letters B* 231 (1989), pp. 519–529.
- 2607
- 2608 [7] CERN, ed. (1985).
- 2609 [8] CERN, ed. (1986).
- 2610 [9] CERN, ed. (1994).
- 2611 [10] CERN, ed. (1998).
- 2612 [11] CERN, ed. (1999).
- 2613 [12] CERN. Geneva. LHC Experiments Committee. *Letter of Intent for A Large Ion Collider Experiment [ALICE]*, note = CERN-LHCC-93-016. Tech. rep. ALICE Collaboration, 1993.
- 2614
- 2615 [13] CERN. Geneva. LHC Experiments Committee. *ATLAS : technical proposal for a general-purpose pp experiment at the Large Hadron Collider at CERN*, note = CERN-LHCC-94-43. Tech. rep. ATLAS Collaboration, 1994.
- 2616
- 2617
- 2618 [14] CERN. Geneva. LHC Experiments Committee. *CMS : letter of intent by the CMS Collaboration for a general purpose detector at LHC*, note = CERN-LHCC-92-003. Tech. rep. CMS Collaboration, 1992.
- 2619
- 2620
- 2621 [15] CERN. Geneva. LHC Experiments Committee. *LHCb : letter of intent*. Tech. rep. CERN-LHCC-95-5. LHCb Collaboration, 1995.
- 2622
- 2623 [16] L. Evans and P. Bryant. “LHC Machine”. In: *JINST* 3 (2008). S08001.
- 2624
- 2625 [17] CMS Collaboration ATLAS Collaboration. “Combined Measurement of the Higgs Boson Mass in pp Collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ and 8 TeV with the ATLAS and CMS Experiments”. In: *Physical Review Letters* 114 (2015). 191803.
- 2626
- 2627 [18] LHCb Collaboration. “Observation of $J/\psi p$ Resonances Consistent with Pentaquark States in $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K^- p$ Decays”. In: *Physical Review Letters* 115 (2015). 072001.
- 2628

- [19] LHCb Collaboration. “Observation of $J/\psi\phi$ Structures Consistent with Exotic States from Amplitude Analysis of $B^+ \rightarrow J/\psi\phi K^+$ Decays”. In: *Physical Review Letters* 118 (2017). 022003.
- [20] CERN. Geneva. *High-Luminosity Large Hadron Collider (HL-LHC) Technical Design Report V. 0.1*. Tech. rep. CERN-2017-007-M. 2017.
- [21] CERN. Geneva. LHC Experiments Committee. *The CMS muon project : Technical Design Report*. Tech. rep. CERN-LHCC-97-032. CMS Collaboration, 1997.
- [22] CERN. Geneva. LHC Experiments Committee. *Technical Proposal for the Phase-II Upgrade of the CMS Detector*. Tech. rep. CERN-LHCC-2015-010. CMS Collaboration, 2015.
- [23] CERN. Geneva. LHC Experiments Committee. *CMS, the Compact Muon Solenoid : technical proposal*. Tech. rep. CERN-LHCC-94-38. CMS Collaboration, 1994.
- [24] R. Santonico and R. Cardarelli. “Development of resistive plate counters”. In: *Nucl. Instr. Meth. Phys. Res.* 187 (1981), pp. 377–380.
- [25] Yu.N. Pestov and G.V. Fedotovich. *A picosecond time-of-flight spectrometer for the VEPP-2M based on local-discharge spark counter*. Tech. rep. SLAC-TRANS-0184. SLAC, 1978.
- [26] W.W. Ash, ed. *Spark Counter With A Localized Discharge*. Vol. SLAC-R-250. 1982, pp. 127–131.
- [27] I. Crotty et al. “The non-spark mode and high rate operation of resistive parallel plate chambers”. In: *NIMA* 337 (1993), pp. 370–381.
- [28] I. Crotty et al. “Further studies of avalanche mode operation of resistive parallel plate chambers”. In: *NIMA* 346 (1994), pp. 107–113.
- [29] R. Cardarelli et al. “Avalanche and streamer mode operation of resistive plate chambers”. In: *NIMA* 382 (1996), pp. 470–474.
- [30] E. Cerron Zeballos et al. “A new type of resistive plate chamber: The multigap RPC”. In: *NIMA* 374 (1996), pp. 132–135.
- [31] M.C.S. Williams. “The development of the multigap resistive plate chamber”. In: *Nucl. Phys. B* 61 (1998), pp. 250–257.
- [32] H. Czyrkowski et al. “New developments on resistive plate chambers for high rate operation”. In: *NIMA* 419 (1998), pp. 490–496.
- [33] P. Camarri et al. “Streamer suppression with SF₆ in RPCs operated in avalanche mode”. In: *NIMA* 414 (1998), pp. 317–324.
- [34] E. Cerron Zeballos et al. “Effect of adding SF₆ to the gas mixture in a multigap resistive plate chamber”. In: *NIMA* 419 (1998), pp. 475–478.
- [35] CERN. Geneva. LHC Experiments Committee. *ATLAS muon spectrometer: Technical design report*. Tech. rep. CERN-LHCC-97-22. ATLAS Collaboration, 1997.
- [36] CERN. Geneva. LHC Experiments Committee. *ALICE Time-Of-Flight system (TOF) : Technical Design Report*. Tech. rep. CERN-LHCC-2000-012. ALICE Collaboration, 2000.
- [37] The CALICE collaboration. “First results of the CALICE SDHCAL technological prototype”. In: *JINST* 11 (2016).
- [38] PoS, ed. *Density Imaging of Volcanoes with Atmospheric Muons using GRPCs*. International Europhysics Conference on High Energy Physics - HEP 2011. 2011.
- [39] C. Lippmann. “Detector Physics of Resistive Plate Chambers”. PhD thesis. Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität, 2003.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [40] M. Abbrescia et al. “Properties of C₂H₂F₄-based gas mixture for avalanche mode operation of resistive plate chambers”. In: *NIMA* 398 (1997), pp. 173–179.
- [41] G. Battistoni et al. “Sensitivity of streamer mode to single ionization electrons”. In: *NIMA* 235 (1985), pp. 91–97.
- [42] W. Riegler. “Induced signals in resistive plate chambers”. In: *NIMA* 491 (2002), pp. 258–271.
- [43] E. Cerron Zeballos et al. “A comparison of the wide gap and narrow gap resistive plate chamber”. In: *NIMA* 373 (1996), pp. 35–42.
- [44] M. Abbrescia et al. “Cosmic ray tests of double-gap resistive plate chambers for the CMS experiment”. In: *NIMA* 550 (2005), pp. 116–126.
- [45] ALICE Collaboration. “A study of the multigap RPC at the gamma irradiation facility at CERN”. In: *NIMA* 490 (2002), pp. 58–70.
- [46] B. Bonner et al. “A multigap resistive plate chamber prototype for time-of-flight for the STAR experiment at RHIC”. In: *NIMA* 478 (2002), pp. 176–179.
- [47] S. Yang et al. “Test of high time resolution MRPC with different readout modes for the BESIII upgrade”. In: *NIMA* 763 (2014), pp. 190–196.
- [48] A. Akindinov et al. “RPC with low-resistive phosphate glass electrodes as a candidate for the CBM TOF”. In: *NIMA* 572 (2007), pp. 676–681.
- [49] JINST, ed. *Development of the MRPC for the TOF system of the MultiPurpose Detector*. RPC2016: XII Workshop on Resistive Plate Chambers and Related Detectors. 2016.
- [50] M.C.S. Williams. “Particle identification using time of flight”. In: *Journal of Physics G* 39 (2012).
- [51] A. Alici et al. “Aging and rate effects of the Multigap RPC studied at the Gamma Irradiation Facility at CERN”. In: *NIMA* 579 (2007), pp. 979–988.
- [52] M. Abbrescia et al. “The simulation of resistive plate chambers in avalanche mode: charge spectra and efficiency”. In: *NIMA* 431 (1999), pp. 413–427.
- [53] M. Abbrescia et al. “Study of long-term performance of CMS RPC under irradiation at the CERN GIF”. In: *NIMA* 533 (2004), pp. 102–106.
- [54] H.C. Kim et al. “Quantitative aging study with intense irradiation tests for the CMS forward RPCs”. In: *NIMA* 602 (2009), pp. 771–774.
- [55] S. Agosteo et al. “A facility for the test of large-area muon chambers at high rates”. In: *NIMA* 452 (2000), pp. 94–104.
- [56] PoS, ed. *CERN GIF ++ : A new irradiation facility to test large-area particle detectors for the high-luminosity LHC program*. Vol. TIPP2014. 2014, pp. 102–109.
- [57] A. Fagot. *GIF++ DAQ v4.0*. 2017. URL: https://github.com/afagot/GIF_DAQ.
- [58] CAEN. *Mod. V1190-VX1190 A/B, 128/64 Ch Multihit TDC*. 14th ed. 2016.
- [59] CAEN. *Mod. V1718 VME USB Bridge*. 9th ed. 2009.
- [60] W-Ie-Ne-R. *VME 6021-23 VXI*. 5th ed. 2016.
- [61] Wikipedia. *INI file*. 2017. URL: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/INI_file.
- [62] S. Carrillo A. Fagot. *GIF++ Offline Analysis v6*. 2017. URL: https://github.com/afagot/GIF_OfflineAnalysis.