Development of a double-sided ladder for tracking in high energy physics

Ph. D. defense

Benjamin BOITRELLE
Supervisors: Jérôme Baudot, Ingrid Maria Gregor

Strasbourg

February 13, 2017

Outlines

Standard Model

- Well-tested physics theory: predicts precisely a wide variety of phenomena with elementary particles
- Predicts a mechanism which breaks the electroweak symmetry (EWSB) and generates mass of particles
  $\Rightarrow$ Higgs mechanism: one gauge boson is expected in the SM (the Higgs boson)
- Last milestone: discovery of a particle compatible with the Higgs Boson, which would confirm the EWSB

$\Rightarrow$ Complete spectrum of Standard Model that could be correct up to very high energies

Open questions

Limitations

- Why electroweak symmetry is broken?
- Is there only one Higgs boson as defined in SM?
- Why are they 3 generations of leptons and quarks?
- Neutrino oscillation (theory does not predict mass of neutrino)
- What are the dark matter and the dark energy?

How to study particle physics?



How to study particle physics?





EWSB and physics beyond SM: from 100 GeV to TeV scale

How to study particle physics?





EWSB and physics beyond SM: from 100 GeV to TeV scale

What tools do we have to reach this energy scale?

Large Hadron Collider (LHC)

LHC: a discovery machine

- Centre-of-mass energy $\sqrt{s} = 14$ TeV
- Collision with composites particles (protons or Pb)
    - Unknown momentum distribution of partons
    - Unknown polarisation of colliding partons
    - Trigger needed
    - Background made of complex Standard Model reactions

Large Hadron Collider (LHC)

LHC: a discovery machine

- Centre-of-mass energy $\sqrt{s} = 14$ TeV
- Collision with composites particles (protons or Pb)
  - Unknown momentum distribution of partons
  - Unknown polarisation of colliding partons
  - Trigger needed
  - Background made of complex Standard Model reactions

$\Rightarrow$ **Need complementary experimental program**

International Linear Collider





- Future e^+e^- linear collider at $\sqrt{s} = 250 - 500$ GeV (upgrade up to $\sqrt{s} = 1$ TeV)
- Polarised beam
- Luminosity $\simeq 2 \times 10^{34}$ cm^{-2}s^{-1}
- Candidate site: Kitakami in nothern Japan
- To study properties of the Higgs boson, top physics and discovery potential new physics

SiD and ILD





Silicon Detector

- Silicon tracking (radius = 1.2 m)
- $B_{\mathtt{field}} = 5$ T

International Large Detector

- TPC + silicon envelope (radius = 1.8 m)
- $B_{\mathtt{field}} = 3.5$ T

Both detectors designed for Particle Flow Calorimetry

- High granularity calorimeters (ECAL and HCAL) inside solenoid
- Low mass tracker to reduce interactions and conversions

Particle Flow Algorithm



Outlines

Higgs boson study

Measurements @ LHC

- Higgs boson discovered in 2012 (ATLAS and CMS collaborations)
- Mass: 125.7 ± 0.4 GeV
- Spin: 0



Missing measurements

- Couplings of Higgs boson to c-quarks and gluons
- Higgs self-coupling

$\Rightarrow$ Is the boson discover compatible with the Higgs boson defined in the SM?

Higgs boson study at the ILC



At the LHC

- Higgs boson to quarks difficult to observe
- $\mathrm{H} \to \mathrm{b}\overline{\mathrm{b}}$ observed in special kinematics
- $\mathrm{H} \to \mathrm{c}\overline{\mathrm{c}}$ and $\mathrm{H} \to gg$ are challenging to observe

At the ILC

- $\mathrm{H} \to \mathrm{b}\overline{\mathrm{b}}, \mathrm{c}\overline{\mathrm{c}}, WW^*, \tau\tau$ and gg able to be separately identified with high efficiency

Analysis of simulated data at the ILC @ 350 GeV with different polarisations:

- $\mathrm{e}^+_\mathrm{L}\mathrm{e}^-_\mathrm{R}$
- $\mathrm{e}^+_\mathrm{R}\mathrm{e}^-_\mathrm{L}$

Study of Hνν final state

- Study final state leading to Hνν channel where the Higgs boson decays into a pair of quarks or gluons
- Focus on Higgs Strahlung and WW fusion:

$m_H \simeq$ 125 GeV and $\sqrt{s} = 350$ GeV $\Rightarrow$ Higgs Strahlung and WW-fusion have comparable cross sections.





Using polarised beam to separate the processes.

Reconstruction of the H$\nu\nu$ channel

Final state signature

- 2 jets coming from the Higgs boson decay
- Missing energy

Events selection

1. Reject events with isolated leptons
2. Remove $\gamma\gamma$ overlay interactions
3. Look for jets
4. Find displaced vertices of the jets
5. Tag 2 jets coming from Higgs boson decay

Background processes

Events which give same detector response or same final state

- W-boson pair production
  - Semi-leptonic decay: $e^+e^- \rightarrow W^+W^- \rightarrow \nu_l l^\pm q\bar{q}$
  - Hadronic decay: $e^+e^- \rightarrow W^+W^- \rightarrow q\bar{q}q\bar{q}$
- Z-boson pair production
  - $e^+e^- \rightarrow ZZ \rightarrow \nu_l\overline{\nu_l}q\bar{q}$
  - $e^+e^- \rightarrow ZZ \rightarrow l^+l^-q\bar{q}$
  - $e^+e^- \rightarrow ZZ \rightarrow q\bar{q}q\bar{q}$
- Single W-boson production
  - $e^+e^- \rightarrow W^\pm e^\pm\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_e e^\pm q\bar{q}$
- Single Z-boson production
  - $e^+e^- \rightarrow Ze^-e^+ \rightarrow q\bar{q}e^-e^+$
  - $e^+e^- \rightarrow Z\,q\bar{q} \rightarrow q\bar{q}q\bar{q}$
- Higgsstrahlung:
  - $e^+e^- \rightarrow ZH \rightarrow q\bar{q}q\bar{q}$
  - $e^+e^- \rightarrow ZH \rightarrow l^+l^-q\bar{q}$

Distribution of the visible invariant mass with background

$\sqrt{s} = 350$ GeV, luminosity: 250 fb^{-1} and polarisation: e^-_L, e^+_R



Reducing the background

Find optimized cuts

- For each cut, try to find the one which reduces the signal the least

$$significance = \frac{signal}{\sqrt{signal + background}}$$

- Apply the cuts from the one which gives best significance to the one gives the worst

Sequential cuts strategy

cut0 Number of isolated lepton (niso): niso = 0

cut1 Transverse Momentum visible (P_t^{vis}): 35 < P_t^{vis} < 155 GeV

cut2 Visible mass (m_{vis}): 95 < m_{vis} < 140 GeV

cut3 Angle between the momentum axis of both jets ($\cos\alpha$): -1 < $\cos\alpha$ < 0.22

...

Reduction table after applying cuts

Process	Background	Signal	Significance
Cross-section (fb)	$5.69 \cdot 10^4$	$6.82 \cdot 10^2$	
Expected event number	$1.88 \cdot 10^7$	$2.25 \cdot 10^4$	5.2
No isolated leptons	$1.65 \cdot 10^7$	$2.23 \cdot 10^4$	5.5
$35 < P_t^{vis} < 155$ GeV	$9.31 \cdot 10^5$	$1.82 \cdot 10^4$	18.7
$95 < m_{vis} < 140$ GeV	$1.50 \cdot 10^5$	$1.66 \cdot 10^4$	40.6
$-1 < \cos_{,} < 0.22$	$8.76 \cdot 10^4$	$1.57 \cdot 10^4$	48.8
$26 < (\mathrm{N.R.C} > 1\mathrm{GeV}) < 99$	$2.25 \cdot 10^4$	$1.19 \cdot 10^4$	56.3
$0.11 < \mathrm{DurhamjD2ym} < 1$	$1.78 \cdot 10^4$	$1.05 \cdot 10^4$	62.3
$0 < \mathrm{abs}(P_z^{vis}) < 113$ GeV	$1.51 \cdot 10^4$	$1.01 \cdot 10^4$	63.5
$156 < E_{miss} < 230$ GeV	$1.37 \cdot 10^4$	$9.85 \cdot 10^3$	64.1

Outlook

- Relative uncertainty on branching ratio is impacted by significance to measure signal
- Higher significance is needed to study Higgs decay (TMVA solution)
- Focus on Higgs boson decay mode, especially $\mathrm{H} \rightarrow c\bar{c}$
  $\Rightarrow$ determine vertex detector geometry for c-tagging ability

Outlines

The ILD Vertex Detector

Vertex detector





ILD vertex detector

Impact parameter resolution

$$\sigma_{r\phi} \simeq \sigma_{rz} \simeq a \oplus \frac{b}{p \cdot \sin^{2/2}\theta}$$

- Hit resolution: $a \simeq 4\ \mu m \Rightarrow \sigma_{spatial} < 3\ \mu m$
- Multiple scattering: $b \simeq 9 - 15\ \mu m \Rightarrow$ material budget per measurement point $\simeq 0.15\ \%\ X_0$

Double-sided layer concept



- 1 mechanical structure for 2 measurement points
- Alignment
- Possibility to use 2 different technologies

Double-sided VXD: PLUME

PLUME = **P**ixelated **L**adder with **U**ltra-low **M**aterial **E**mbedding

Motivation

To build double-sided ladder with a geometry adapted for the ILD vertex detector at the ILC

Goals

- Reach a constraint material budget $< 0.3\ \%\ X_0$
- Study the added values of double-sided measurement
- Study the mechanical structure and its impact on sensors' performance

What does it look like?





PLUME in real



t



- 2 mm SiC foam
- 50 μm CMOS pixel sensor
- 100 μm flex-cable
- Air-flow cooling system

MIMOSA-26 sensor







Monolithic Active Pixels Sensor (MAPS)

- Well known sensors $\Rightarrow$ used for EUDET telescope
- Extended to MIMOSA-28 exploited in STAR-PXL vertex detector @ RHIC-BNL since 2014
- Thickness: 50 μm
- Pitch: 18.4 μm (square pixels)
- Active area: $10.6 \times 21.2\text{mm}^2$ (576 rows x 1152 columns)
- Integration time: 115.2 $\mu(s)$ (200 ns per line)
- Binary output with Zero suppression

Test beam

Motivation

Test detector under real conditions to determine its performance

Set-up



Track-hit residual





Outlines

Metrology of module's surface

Are our ladders completely flat?

Peak-to-peak flatness $\sim 100\ \mu\mathrm{m}$





Test performed at Bristol with a dummy ladder

Question

What is the impact of such deformations on ladder's performance?

Test of the first fully functional prototype



Test beam 2011

- CERN-SPS with 120 GeV π^-
- Reference plane: 4 MIMOSA-26
- DUT: first double-sided ladder equipped with 12 MIMOSA-26 sensors
- Ladder performance studies with different configurations

Impact of deformations

- Already observed and studied by 2 Ph. D. students
- Method to correct manually and locally these deviations

Is it possible to include the deformations observed during the offline analysis?

Geometrical configurations studied



Module perpendicular to the beam.



Module tilted (between 28° and 40°).



Module tilted ($\simeq 60°$).

⇒ Study track-hit residual and the distribution of this residual as a function of the relative position of the beam on the sensor.

Analysis performed with TAF (TAPI Analysis Framework).

Module perpendicular to the beam



Module perpendicular to the beam

Threshold 6 σ, air flow speed < 5m/s and 1.8M events.



Spatial residual obtained after alignment:

$\sigma_U \simeq 4.2\ \mu m$ and $\sigma_V \simeq 4.1\ \mu m$

Module tilted in one direction (36°)



Module tilted in one direction (w.r.t. to the beam axis)

Threshold 6 σ, air flow speed < 5m/s, 720k events and 36°tilt.



Spatial residual obtained after alignment:

$\sigma_U \simeq 6.8$ μm and $\sigma_V \simeq 4.0$ μm

Origin of deviations

Consequence of the ladder's characteristics

- Use of ultra-thin (50 μm) and precise sensors (spatial resolution less than 4 μm)
- Mechanical constraints induce permanent deformations ($\simeq$ 100 μm) which can not be flattened during the ladder assembly

Origin of the deviations

Artefacts from the modelling of our sensors during the analysis

- Sensors modeled as completely flat planes
- The track extrapolation is sensitive to the exact position of the hit on the plane and the angle of incidence



Deviations of the residual

$$\delta W = \frac{\delta U}{\tan\theta}$$

How to describe deviations from the flat plane?

arXiv:1403.2286 [physics.ins-det] CMS paper

- Sensor shape parametrised as a sum of products of modified Legendre polynomials:

$$\begin{aligned} w(u_r, v_r) &= w \\ &+ w_{10} \cdot u_r + w_{01} \cdot v_r \\ &+ w_{20} \cdot (u_r^2 - 1/3) + w_{11} \cdot (u_r \cdot v_r) + w_{02} \cdot (v_r^2 - 1/3) \end{aligned}$$

- In our case, we used Legendre polynomials of the 11^{th} order only in the direction of the deformation.



Deformation's parametrisation for 36°

Possibility to parametrise the deformation with Legendre polynomials of the 11^{th} order .



$$\delta W = \frac{\delta U}{\tan\theta}$$

Summary before/after correction at 36°

Before correction





$\sigma_u = 6.8\ \mu m$

After correction





$\sigma_u = 5.9\ \mu m$

Summary of correction for different angles and same planes

Spatial residuals

Side	Tilted angle (°)	σ_U^{Def} (μm)	σ_U^{Cor} (μm)	Improvement
Front	28	9.0 $\pm$ 0.1	4.9 $\pm$ 0.1	46.6 %
Back	28	5.7 $\pm$ 0.1	4.7 $\pm$ 0.1	17.5 %
Front	36	14.1 $\pm$ 0.1	6.1 $\pm$ 0.1	56.0 %
Back	36	6.8 $\pm$ 0.1	5.9 $\pm$ 0.1	13.2 %
Front	60	41.2 $\pm$ 0.15	25.8 $\pm$ 0.2	37.4 %
Back	60	23.3 $\pm$ 0.13	21.7 $\pm$ 0.1	6.8 %

$\sigma_{tel} = 2.2\mu m$ for 36°and $\sigma_{tel} = 18.8\mu m$ for 60°.

Outlines

Multiple scattering

Charged particles traveling through matter

- Lose energy via inelastic collisions with atomic electrons
- Deflection by many small angles (Coulomb scattering from nuclei)
- Standard deviation of the scattering angle distribution described by Highland formula

$$\theta_0 = \frac{13.6(MeV)}{p}\left(\frac{x}{X_0}\right)^{0.555}$$



Motivation of measuring the material budget

- Key parameter for tracking algorithm: has to take into account multiple scattering and energy degradation
- Compare material budget prediction to its result after construction
- Goal: mapping in uv of X_0

Test beam @ DESY with 5 GeV e^- (April 2016)



- Test Beam 21
- Reference plane: 4 EUDET telescope planes
- Goal: material budget measurement

Kink angle measurement



Kink angle measurement at 4 GeV



Determination of projected scattering angle θ_0

$$\theta_0 = \sqrt{sigma^2 - F}$$

- $sigma$ = sigma of the kink angle distribution fit
- F = Offset parameter from the GBL track fitting algorithm

Material budget



Measurement

$$\text{Highland formula: } \theta_0 = \frac{13.6(MeV)}{p}\left(\frac{x}{X_0}\right)^{0.555}$$

$$\frac{x}{X_0}\Big|_{measured} \simeq 0.47 \pm 0.02\ \%\ X_0$$

Estimation of the radiation length





Total material budget

Depends on flex-cable fill factor (25 % or 30 %)

$$\Rightarrow \frac{x}{X_0} \simeq 0.498 \ - \ 0.515\ \%\ X_0$$

Estimation of the radiation length





Total material budget

Depends on flex-cable fill factor (25 % or 30 %)

$$\Rightarrow \frac{x}{X_0} \simeq 0.498 \; - \; 0.515 \; \% \; X_0$$

$$\frac{x}{X_0}\Big|_{\text{measured}} \simeq 0.47 \pm 0.02 \; \% \; X_0$$

Lower estimation of X_0



Possible explanation

- During analysis, hit position is located in middle of the epitaxial layer
- Missing 6 µm of the electronic layers and 7 µm of epitaxial layer
- For 2 sensors $\Rightarrow$ $\sim 0.028\ \%\ X_0$ not included in the calculation

Outlines

Conclusion 1/2

Context

- The ILC is the next colliding machine to study precisely EWSB (and other physics scenarios)
- The Higgs boson will be more precisely characterised
- Physics performance to achieve requires a new R&D detector development

Higgs boson study

To achieve a precision of ~ 1 % in the Higgs boson branching ratio measurement a simple sequential cuts is not the best option

Conclusion 2/2

PLUME development

PLUME is the first double-sided layers developed according to the ILD requirements

- Impact of the mechanical structure
  - Mechanical structure induces permanent deformations which have an impact on ladder's performance
  - Algorithm based on Legendre polynomials is able to reduce the impact of these deformations on ladder's performance
- Material budget
  - Material budget is predicted from construction
  - Measurement of this material budget for PLUME-1 gives:

$$\frac{x}{X_0}\Big|_{measured} \simeq 0.47 \pm 0.02\ \%\ X_0$$
$$\frac{x}{X_0}\Big|_{estimated} \simeq 0.498 - 0.515\ \%\ X_0$$

Outlook 1/2

Test beam 2016

- Mapping in uv of X_0
- Study ladder performance at low energy

PLUME-2

New prototype with a material budget of 0.35 % X_0 has been built and tested in the laboratory but not yet in real conditions

Next PLUME ladder

- Higher constraint on material budget (0.3 % X_0)
- Enriching double-sided layer concept with sensors having different characteristics (fast integration time VS good spatial resolution)
- Adapt sensor technology and cooling system to the ILC beam structure

Outlook 2/2

BEAST project

PLUME-2 will be used in the BEAST project at SuperKEKB



Thanks for your attention !!!

Higgs boson potential



Higgs boson physics at the ILC

- Same measurements as LHC: couplings, mass and spin
- Model independent measurement: no dependence on theory
- Total Higgs width
- $\mathrm{H} \to c\bar{c}/gg$
- Higgs self couplings

Higgs branching ratio



Higgs-strahlung kinematics

$$E_H = \frac{s - M_Z^2 + M_H^2}{2\sqrt{s}}$$

$$E_Z = \frac{s - M_H^2 + M_Z^2}{2\sqrt{s}}$$

$$|\overrightarrow{p_H}| = |\overrightarrow{p_Z}| = \frac{\sqrt{[s - (M_H + M_Z)^2] \cdot [s - (M_H - M_Z)^2]}}{2\sqrt{s}}$$

If $M_H = 125$ GeV, $M_Z = 91.2$ GeV and $\sqrt{s} = 350$ GeV, then:

$$E_H \simeq 185.4 \text{ GeV}$$

$$E_Z \simeq 164.6 \text{ GeV}$$

$$|\overrightarrow{p_H}| = |\overrightarrow{p_Z}| \simeq 68.5 \text{ GeV}$$

Higgs production cross-section



Sequential cuts strategy

cut0: Number of isolated lepton (niso): niso = 0

cut1: Transverse Momentum visible (Ptvis): $35 < P_t^{vis} < 155$ GeV

cut2: Visible mass (mvis): $95 < m_{vis} < 140$ GeV

cut3: Angle between the momentum axis of both jets ($\cos\alpha$): $-1 < \cos\alpha < 0.22$

cut4: Number of reconstructed particle

cut5: D2YM

cut6: Visible longitudial momentum ($\mathrm{abs}(P_z^{vis})$)

cut7: E_{miss}

ZH production

Z boson will decay yo:

- Charged leptons $\simeq 10\%$
- Neutrinos $\simeq 20\%$
- Hadrons $\simeq 70\%$

Hadronic decay channel has large statistics but model dependency and large background

Beam polarisation

Simulated data: 100 % left or right events

$$\sigma_{P_{(e^+,e^-)}} = \left(\frac{1-P_{e^-}}{2}\right)\left(\frac{1+P_{e^+}}{2}\right)\sigma_{RL} + \left(\frac{1+P_{e^+}}{2}\right)\left(\frac{1-P_{e^-}}{2}\right)\sigma_{LR}$$

$$\sigma_{P_{(e^+,e^-=\mathbf{0.3},-\mathbf{0.8})}} = 0.585 \cdot \sigma RL + 0.035 \cdot \sigma_{LR}$$

Ladder assembly



Ladder assembly



PLUME history

PLUME-V0 (2009)



PLUME-V1 (2010)



Silicon-Carbide foam support structure





Properties

- Open-cell foam
- Macroscopically uniform
- No tensioning needed
- Density: 4 to 8 % (2-3 % possible)
- Low thermal and electrical conductivity (50 W/m/K)

Young Modulus



MIMOSA-26 description



MIMOSA-26 architecture



Zero Suppression logic (SUZE)



SUZE logic split in 3 blocks:

- **Sparse Data Scan (SDS)** Hit detection per line and data encoding, until 6 states consecutive pixels (1 to 4 pixels) per block of 64 columns;
- **Multiplexing Logic (Mux)** giving up to 9 states;
- **Memory storage** 2 blocks to store the states of the full frame, switching to avoid dead time (during one acquire states of event N, the other one transfer the information of frame N-1).

Column parallel readout



MAPS principle



Spatial resolution for different pitch (IPHC-Strasbourg)



Characterization of one sensor



Noise estimation



Threshold scan

Normalised response of pixels in a sub-matrix (288 discriminators) as a function of threshold applied (mV).

Noise performances

- Temporal noise (derivative of the S-curve): 0.79 mV
- Fixed pattern noise (thresholds' dispersion for a mid-point): 0.2 mV
- Offset: 0.16 mV

$\Rightarrow$ **Can now define different thresholds**

Correction of the deviations between real hits and extrapolated ones



Spatial residual obtained after correction:
$\sigma_U \simeq 5.9$ μm instead of $\sigma_U \simeq 6.1$ μm

Kink angle measurement between 1 and 4 GeV

Fitted kink angle distributions









Detector performances

Vertexing

$$\sigma_{IP} = 5 \oplus \frac{10}{p \sin^{3/2}\theta} (\mu m)$$

Tracking

$$\sigma(1/p) = 2x10^{-5}(GeV^{-1})$$

Jet ernergy

$$\sigma_E/E = 0.3/\sqrt{E(GeV)}$$

Particle Flow Algorithm

- Typical jet:
  - Charged hadrons $\simeq$ 60 %
  - Photons $\simeq$ 30 %
  - Neutral $\simeq$ 10 %
- Standard approch
  - All jet components energy measured in ECAL/HCAL
  - $E_{jet} = E_{ECAL} + E_{HCAL}$
- Particle flow calorimetry
  - Measurement of charged particles in tracker
  - Measurement of photon in ECAL
  - Measurement of hadrons in HCAL
  - $E_{jet} = E_{Track} + E_{\gamma} + E_{n}$

Why a linear collider?

Limitations of e^+e^- colliders

- Synchroton radiation loss $\sim \mathrm{E}^4/r$
- Synchroton cost: $\sim$ quadratically with energy
- Power consumption

Avantages of linear colliders

- Not limited by synchrotron radiation
- Cost: $\sim$ linear with energy
- Polarisation of both beams
- Detectors close to the IP $\Rightarrow$ optimum for c-tagging

ILC interaction region



- 1 interaction region for 2 detectors
- Push-pull:
  - Detectors mounted on movable platforms
  - Sharing of beam time
  - Switching time: 24h to 48h
  - Allow cross-checking

ILC environment



- Bunch spacing of $\sim$ 554 ns
- 1312 bunches in a 1 ms long pulse (train)
- Quiet time: 199 ms
- Occupancy dominated by beam background and noise
- Reading during quiet time possible

Overview of the ILD