

Extending the Dynamic Range of Electronics in a Time Projection Chamber

J. Estee^{a,b}, W.G. Lynch^{a,b}, J. Barney^{a,b}, G. Cerizza^{a,b}, G. Jhang^a, J. W. Lee^c, R. Wang^a, T. Isobe^d, M. Kaneko^e, M. Kurata-Nishimura^d, T. Murakami^e, R. Shane^a, S. Tangwancharoen^a, C. Y. Tsang^a, M. B. Tsang^a, B. Hong^c, P. Lasko^f, J. Łukasik^f, A.B. McIntosh^g, P. Pawłowski^f, K. Pelczarⁱ, C. Santamaria^a, D. Suzuki^d, S.J. Yennello^g, Y. Zhang^h, and the S π RIT collaboration

^aNational Superconducting Cyclotron Laboratory, East Lansing, Michigan, 48824, USA

^bDepartment of Physics and Astronomy, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, 48824, USA

^cDepartment of Physics, Korea University, Seoul 136-703, Republic of Korea

^dRIKEN Nishina Center, Hirosawa 2-1, Wako, Saitama 351-0198, Japan

^eDepartment of Physics, Kyoto University, Kita-shirakawa, Kyoto 606-8502, Japan

^fInstitute of Nuclear Physics PAN, ul. Radzikowskiego 15231-342 Kraków, Poland

^gCyclotron Institute, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843, USA

^hDepartment of Physics, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, P. R. China

ⁱFaculty of Physics, Astronomy and Applied Computer Science, Jagiellonian University, ul. Gołębia 24, 31-007 Kraków

Abstract

When Time Projection Chambers (TPCs) are used in low to intermediate heavy ion collisions, the mass and momentum range of the emitted particles cover a wide range in energy losses. Many TPC readout electronics currently only have a single gain output with a fixed dynamic range. In a recent set of experiments using the SAMURAI Pion-Reconstruction and Ion-Tracker (S π RIT) TPC, it was important to simultaneously measure relativistic pions and heavy ion tracks from the same collisions. As the ionization from a track's energy loss is collected and multiplied by the anode wires, a distribution of image charges are induced on the TPC read out pads. If the avalanche on a wire is large enough, the charge collected on a pad will saturate the electronics, though only for pads directly underneath the avalanche; pads further away in the distribution will not be saturated. Using these unsaturated pads and the known distribution function, we can estimate the charge on saturated pads, increasing the dynamic range by a factor of 5.

Keywords: `elsarticle.cls`, L^AT_EX, Elsevier, template

2010 MSC: 00-01, 99-00

1. Introduction

As charged particles resulting from a Heavy Ion Collision (HIC) pass through a Time Projection Chamber (TPC), they ionize the gas in the drift region of the chamber. These electrons drift under influence of the electric and magnetic fields until they arrive at the avalanche region where they are multiplied in the presence of the high electric fields of wire [1], GEM [2], or Mircromega structures [3]. Image currents induced in nearby pad electrodes are read out into electronics to obtain the trajectories and stopping powers, $\langle dE/dx \rangle$, of the charged particles traversing the TPC.

- 10 In high energy HICs most of the resulting particles have charge signs of $\pm e$ and stopping powers which span a relatively narrow range; the dynamic range of TPC readout electronics typically reflects this narrow range. Challenges emerge when applying TPCs to low or intermediate energy HICs where stopping powers range from the very small values of minimum ionizing particles to much higher
15 stopping powers of slower moving, heavy fragments.

Figure 1 shows some of the stopping powers of light particles with $Z=1-3$ typically measured in Sn + Sn collisions at an intermediate incident energy of $E/A=270$ MeV by the SAMURAI Pion Reconstruction and Ion-Tracker (S π RIT) TPC, [4]. Here the red lines in the figure are the predicted energy loss curves, the
20 most probable dE/dx , as a function of rigidity, or p/q , generated from Geant4 [5] simulations.

The typical dynamic range expected from TPC electronics is on the order of 1000:1 for the signal to noise ratio of the maximum measurable signal. To determine a track's position at a certain point with sufficient position resolution,
25 a cluster of several pads from the induced charge distribution must be observed. This typically requires calculating or fitting the mean value position from 2-3 adjacent pads. To measure minimum ionizing particles, one typically would like

the smallest charge in the distribution to have a signal to noise ratio of at least 6:1. If the central pad containing the largest fraction of charge induced in the cluster holds 80%, the two pads adjacent each hold 10%. For these adjacent pad to have a 6:1 signal to noise ratio, the middle pad, holding the largest charge, would have a signal to noise of around 50:1.

This means the effective dynamic range in a TPC is roughly $1000/50 = 20$ times that of a minimum ionizing particle's signal in a given pad. The dashed lines and vertical blue bar in Figure 1 are separated by a factor of 20, representing the typical effective dynamic range in a TPC. This dynamic range estimate should be regarded as approximate because the energy loss fluctuates significantly about the most probable energy loss, with a long "Landau" like tail, as described in Bichsel [6]. Nevertheless, the blue dashed lines and vertical blue bar illustrate that the range of energy losses that any fixed gain readout system can sample is limited. One can change the gain and shift the energy loss range that can be sampled, but the range itself cannot be increased.

The rapid increase in the stopping powers at low momentum illustrates the degree to which the effective dynamic range can be exceeded and highlights the problems encountered in studies of intermediate HICs, in which light particles with low momenta are abundantly produced along with highly charged particles. Similar problems are encountered when TPCs are used as active targets in direct reaction studies with rare isotope beams [7].

Several techniques have been employed to increase the range of energy losses observable. This can be done by lowering the electronics gain of selected readout channels or by changing the gas amplification at the readout plane in certain areas of the TPC. In the EOS TPC [8] this was done by decreasing the voltages in ~~select~~ anode wires in the multi-wire readout. With the prototype Active Target TPC lowering or increasing the gain was achieved by decreasing or increasing the electric fields on selected pads within a Micromegas [7]. The results of changing the gas-gain, or the electronic gain, are rather similar in that reducing the gain to sample a range of higher energy loss makes the TPC effectively blind to minimum ionizing particles in the regions of lower gain.




Figure 1: The expected dE/dx lines of different particles are given in red as calculated by GEANT4. The approximate dynamic range of the TPC is shown for the gain setting used in the experiment. Anything outside of this region would be saturated to some degree.

While future developments in TPC electronics may ultimately provide means
 60 to significantly improve the dynamic range of TPC electronics, it is useful to consider whether software strategies can be developed to compensate for the dynamic range limitations of existing devices. In this paper, we illustrate one approach to expand the dynamic range within the context of a standard multi-wire TPC, without the need of extra hardware or dedicating regions of lower
 65 gain.

1.1 TPC Overview. We begin our discussion by describing some basic properties of the S π RIT TPC [4]. It is a rectangular TPC with 12,096 pads designed to constrain the density dependence of the nuclear symmetry energy at densities on the order of twice saturation density. In order to study central collisions
 70 of Sn isotopes at 270 AMeV, the TPC was designed to identify isotopes from Z=1-3 with the ability to detect minimum ionizing particles such as pions.

For ease of illustration and discussion in this paper, we use a coordinate systems for the S π RIT TPC, that has the beam traveling along the +z direction. The positive y axis points away from the pad plane and is also the direction of the magnetic field. The positive x axis runs parallel to the wires.




Figure 2: Cartoon graphic showing the 3 wire planes and a section of the pad plane. $h1 = 4$ mm, $h2 = 8$ mm, $h3 = 14$ mm, $d1 = 4$ mm, $d2 = 1$ mm.

Configuration of the pad and wire planes. The S π RIT TPC pad plane is composed of rectangular charge sensitive pads, each with an x dimension of 8 mm and a z dimension of 12 mm. These pads are arranged in a grid measuring 112 by 108 pads with a total area of 1344 mm \times 864 mm.

As illustrated in Figure 2, there are three wire planes below the pad plane, with the wires aligned along the x axis. The wire plane farthest from the pad plane (14 mm) operates as an ion-gate or a gating grid. Details on the design and operation of the gating grid can be found in [9]. The middle wire plane (8 mm) is grounded. When the gating grid is open, electrons ionized by reaction products in the drift volume drift in the y direction along the electric field lines through both the gating grid and ground planes and eventually avalanche on

the anode wires.

The anode wire plane is closest to the pad plane (4 mm), consisting of 20 μm diameter wires spaced 4 mm apart. In the vicinity of these wires an avalanche occurs multiplying the secondary electrons on the order of 1000 times creating electron and ion pairs. It is the motion of these slow moving ions drifting away from the anode wires that induces image charges on the read out pads. The distribution of image charges on the pad plane is centered about the avalanche position on the anode wires and its width is fixed by the distance from the anode wire to the pad plane.

The anode wires are sectioned off into 14 independent sections, each containing 26 wires with 12 sections biased to 1460 V. This setting was optimized to ensure minimum ionizing particles such as pions would have a signal to noise ratio of around 20:1. The two remaining sections were biased to 1214 V, reducing the gas gain by a factor of 10 times as compared to the other anode sections. As demonstrated by the EOS TPC [8], lowering the anode wires effectively extended the dynamic range. This gain reduction allowed for a direct validation of the new method for extending the dynamic range presented here.

Generic Electronics for TPCs. Signals in the S π RIT TPC are amplified and digitized by the Generic Electronics for TPCs (GET) system, which can allow a large number of readout configuration [10]. As details of our implementation of the GET system are described in [11], our description can be focused on the options that are relevant to this paper.

The electronics for each pad has a shaping constant of 117 ns and reads out the induced signal on the pads at a 25 MHz sampling rate. The dynamic range of the GET electronics was set to 120 fC and digitized over a 12 Bit ADC range which corresponds to 4096 channels of resolution. The typical r.m.s. noise level was about 5 ADC, corresponding to a signal to noise ratio of the maximum signal of about 800:1.

In the data discussed here, the variations between electronics channels were calibrated by measuring the response of each channel to an injected reference

pulse, covering the full dynamic range of each channel, reducing the variations to less than a few percent.

Analysis Software. A software package called S π RITROOT was developed to
120 reconstruct the events in the TPC based on the FAIRROOT container package
written in c++ [12]. Due to the large number of particles emitted in HICs,
there may be several signals coming from tracks passing under the same pad
separated by arrival time. Using an expected pulse shape, S π RITROOT fits
125 all the signals within a pad, giving the arrival time and height of the signal for
each particular track. The height of the fitted pulse is proportional to the total
charge of that event, Q, and the y-coordinate is calculated as $y = v \cdot t_0$ where v
is the drift velocity and t_0 the arrival time. We define the x and z position from
the center of each pad, and combine the summary of information (x,y,z,Q) into
a "hit".

130 An algorithm then finds the collection of hits belonging to each unique helix
track. We then reduce these several adjacent hits along a particular track into
"clusters". A cluster's position is defined as the charge-weighted average position
of the hits within a cluster, with the total charge of the cluster being the
sum of the charges of each hit. The clusters represent our best measurement
135 of the tracks path and are then fitted in the GENFIT track fitting package [5],
giving the final momentum of the track. A final vertex of the event is fitted
from all tracks using the package RAVE [13].

Definition of clustering. A brief description of the method of clustering is il-
lustrated in Figure 3. When the projection onto the pad plane, of a track, is
140 passing nearly parallel to the z axis, little can be learned from the distribution
of hits along the z axis; precise position information can be obtained from the
mean value of the hit distribution along the x axis. If the segment of a track is
traveling along the x axis, little can be learned from the x distribution while the
precise position can be estimated from the hits along the z axis. We have illus-
145 trated this as the three clusters at the bottom of Figure 3 are clustered along

the x axis and the upper three are along the z axis, as shown by the bolded pads for one of the clusters in each direction.




Figure 3: Cartoon graphic of a top down view of a fit to a track passing through several pads. The bolded pads and the charges q_i represent the hits belonging to that pad and the clusters of the track representing the average position of the track. The three clusters at the bottom are clustered in the x -direction for the upper three are clustered in the z -direction. The estimated position of the avalanche is given by the track fit, and the position from the center to each pad to the \bar{x} position is given as λ_i .

We define the clustering direction depending on the angle of the track with

respects to the x axis, defined as θ . For example, for a track going along the z axis the crossing angle is defined as 90° , and for a track going along the x axis is defined as 0° . In the case that the crossing angle is $45^\circ < \theta \leq 90^\circ$ the clustering direction is along the x axis. For $0^\circ < \theta \leq 45^\circ$ it is along the z axis.

The position along the clustering direction is calculated by weighting the individual hit's positions by their charges q_i and getting the mean value. The other direction is set to the center of the pad. For example if we are clustering along the x axis for a cluster, the z -position is set to the center of the pad in the z -direction and vice versa.




Figure 4: A cartoon illustration of the charge distribution resulting from an electron avalanche on one wire and the projections of the distribution onto the two axis $\rho(x)$ onto the x axis and $\rho(z)$ onto the z axis. The orientation of the wire planes is flipped upside down to display the perspective better.

2. Pad Response Function

The charge distribution on the pad plane resulting from an electron avalanche is two dimensional, as illustrated in 4, with the projections onto the x and z axis of this distribution labeled as $\rho(x)$ and $\rho(z)$. The charge observed on each

pad is the integral of this distribution over the pad's dimensions, which is called the Pad Response Function (PRF).

In this example the clustering direction would be along the \mathbf{x} axis, as illustrated by the bolded pads. By choosing to cluster only in one direction, we have not included the charge in adjacent pads along the \mathbf{z} axis resulting from the tails of $\rho(z)$. Therefore the charge not included in the bolded pads will be incorporated into adjacent clusters, introducing small correlations in charge between neighboring clusters.

Gatti Pad Response Function. Gatti [14] derived a semi-empirical equation for the charge distribution in a simple multi-wire TPC. The function given in Eq. 1, depends only on the width of a pad (w), the distance of the anode plane to the pad plane (h), and the distance of the pad center to the avalanche point λ . It is a single parameter equation where the two parameters $K_1 = \frac{K_2\sqrt{K_3}}{4\tan(\sqrt{K_3})}$ and $K_2 = \frac{\pi}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\sqrt{K_3}}{2}\right)$ depend on the parameter K_3 , which is a function of the ratio of the anode wire diameter to the height of the anode wires to the pad plane. K_3 can be looked up in a graph in [1] and [14].

$$PRF_{gatti}(\lambda) = \frac{K_1}{K_2\sqrt{K_3}} [\arctan(\sqrt{K_3} \tanh[K_2(\frac{\lambda}{h} + \frac{w}{2h})]) - \arctan(\sqrt{K_3} \tanh[K_2(\frac{\lambda}{h} - \frac{w}{2h})])] \quad (1)$$

Experimental Pad Response Function. The correlations we introduced by only clustering along one direction do not play a significant role in the particle identification, but cause deviations from the expected Gatti distribution. Also, analytic PRFs only exist for classical multi-wire TPCs. For these reasons it is useful to experimentally measure the PRF and fit it with an empirical function, typically a Gaussian, to describe its behavior.

As in Figure 3, we postulate that the PRF is a function of the total charge deposited in a cluster $Q = \sum_i q_i$ and the difference in position of the center of the i^{th} pad, x_i , to the mean position $\bar{x} = \sum_i x_i q_i / Q$, defined as $\lambda_i = x_i - \bar{x}$. The PRF is simply defined as the charge fraction of each pad as a function of

λ , as shown in Equation 2.

$$PRF(\lambda_i) = \frac{q_i(\lambda_i)}{Q} \quad (2)$$

Averaging over many events in the experimental data, the resulting PRF for
 190 the S π RIT TPC is shown in Figure 5. Here we see the deviations from the expected analytic Gatti distribution (black curve), whereas fitting with a two parameter Gaussian function (red curve) gives a better description of the data,
 Equation 3. With the two parameters being the normal coefficient, N_0 , sigma σ ,
 and with a mean value assumed to be 0.

$$PRF_{gaus}(\lambda) = N_0 e^{\frac{-\lambda^2}{2\sigma^2}} \quad (3)$$




Figure 5: Experimental pad response function of many events for a crossing angle of $85^\circ < \theta \leq 90^\circ$.

195 **3. Pad Response Function vs. crossing angle**

The shape of the PRF depends on the crossing angle of the track [14]. Plotted in Figure 6 is the PRF of π^- tracks vs. the crossing angle θ . The PRF gets wider starting from 90° and going to 45° ; if we did not switch clustering directions the PRF would become wider until it was a uniform distribution and there was no position resolution. Since we switch the clustering direction from x to the z direction at 45° , the opposite trend is seen where the PRF becomes narrower as the position resolution gets better going from 45° to 0° .




Figure 6: Experimental pad response function as a function of the crossing angle θ

Fits were performed to the experimental data with 5° width bins from $0^\circ < \theta \leq 90^\circ$. The two parameters of the Gaussian fits are plotted versus θ in Figure 7; a 4^{th} order polynomial fit between these points allowed for interpolating between θ .




Figure 7: Parameters N_0 and σ as a function of the crossing angle θ with the 4th order polynomial fits.

Method of Desaturation. We will use the term “desaturation” for our process of correcting the charge values of the saturated pads. Figure 8 shows a typical situation of saturated signals. When an avalanche causes a large induced signal, the pads directly underneath collect the largest charge becoming saturated represented by q_2 and q_3 . Pads further away experience smaller, non saturating charges represented by q_1 and q_4 . Though we do not know the saturated charge values, the distribution of all charges must follow the PRF which we have experimentally measured. From the clusters crossing angle, we can get the corresponding parameters for the PRF as described above and in Figure 7.

We assume the distance of each pad to the track, λ_i , is fixed, defining the fraction of charge each pad receives as given by the $PRF(\lambda_i)$ function.

$$\chi^2 = \sum_i \frac{(q_i^{obs} - q_i^{expect})^2}{q_i^{expect}} \quad (4)$$

To determine the best estimate for the charge values of each saturated pad,

a chi squared function is minimized, given in Equation 4, where q_i^{obs} are the observed, non-saturated charges q_1 and q_4 , and q_i^{expect} are the expected charges observed; calculated as $q_i^{expected} = Q \cdot PRF(\lambda_i)$. The charges, $q_{2'}$ and $q_{3'}$, make up the unknown variable and are allowed to vary in the χ^2 minimization but are added to make up the total expected charge Q .




Figure 8: A typical case of a saturating event. The red pulses represent the time bucket signal for each collected charge. The pads directly underneath the avalanche point, $q_{2'}$ and $q_{3'}$, are saturated while pads farther away, q_1 and q_4 are not saturated.

4. Experimental data

Two sets of data were used for the testing and validation of this method. A cocktail beam consisting of ($p, d, t, {}^3He, {}^4He, {}^6Li, {}^7Li$) light charged particles was injected into the TPC for calibration purposes, and tuned to two different rigidity, $B\rho$, settings. The momentum resolution was approximately 1%, as determined by the slits of the BigRIPS fragment separator of the Radioactive Isotope Beam Factory (RIBF) in RIKEN [15]. A 21 mm thick aluminum target was inserted for part of the lower $B\rho$ setting, further degrading the energy of

the beam for a third calibration point.

Shown in Figure 9 is a typical cocktail event, where one particle enters the TPC volume at a time and parallel to the pad plane, representing an ideal case for momentum and dE/dx determination; as it does not suffer from inefficiencies of high multiplicity events seen in the collision experimental data.




Figure 9: Pad plane projection for a cocktail event in the TPC.

The other type of data was the collision of a ^{132}Sn beam onto a ^{124}Sn target triggered on central nuclear collisions. Shown in Figure 10 is the typical pad plane response for a central nuclear collision. During the experiment the voltages of two anode sections (as indicated by red arrows in Figure 10) were biased to 1214 V. The gain of these sections were also reduced by a factor of about 10 times as compared with the other sections which were biased to 1460 V. We refer to the 1460 V region as high gain and the 1214 V region as low gain.

5. Results

Low gain vs corrected high gain. Tracks which saturate pads in the high gain region are not saturated in the low gain region. By comparing the dE/dx values




Figure 10: Pad plane projection for a collision event in the TPC. **Highlighted by red arrows** are two regions of anode wires which had a reduced voltage of 1214 V. The voltage of the rest of the TPC anode wires are 1460 V. The reduction in voltage reduces the gain by a factor of about 10 \times .

of these two sections, we can directly measure the success of the desaturation in the high gain regions using the method described above.

In Figure 11, the effect of saturation can be seen in the high gain region for 250 the uncorrected data. For signals below 400 ADC/mm the electronics are not saturated, and therefore the high and low gain sections agree. The data starts to saturate above 400 ADC/mm in the high gain channels eventually reaching a plateau while the low gain sections are not saturated and provide the true dE/dx values. After applying the desaturation method, the correlation between 255 the high and low gain sections is restored, as seen in Figure 11. From this comparison, we infer that the correction works up to signals 2000 ADC/mm, increasing the dynamic range by a factor of at least 5.

Particle Identification (PID). Comparing the low to high gain sections provides a direct measurement for determining the success of the desaturation technique,




Figure 11: The left figure shows the uncorrected the method of desaturation was not applied. While in the right figure the desaturation technique was applied to the dE/dx in the high gain region. After matching the low gain dE/dx does not suffer from saturation and represents the true dE/dx value.

260 but the goal of this exercise is to improve the particle identification (PID). In the following PID plots the red lines represent the most probable energy loss as given by Geant4 straggling functions. A linear calibration was performed to convert keV in Geant4 to ADC in the experiment given by $\frac{ADC}{mm} = 19 \frac{keV}{cm}$.

265 There are pronounced PID lines of several particle species in both the uncorrected and corrected cocktail beam PID shown in the subplots of Figure 12. Three ovals around a momentum of 1700 and two near 900 MeV/c/Z correspond to the three $B\rho$ settings injected into the TPC. The tails of the PID lines is resulting from the particle passing through the walls and other materials outside the main detector volume; therefore lowering initial momentum.

270 The uncorrected data in Figure 12 shows the effects of saturation; the PID lines deviate from their theoretical expectations starting at around 400 ADC/mm eventually reaching a plateau. After applying the desaturation technique, we see a large improvement; most notably for the He and Li particles, which suffer the most from saturation. A more subtle improvement of the lighter particles, (p,d,t), can also be seen in the PID lines at lower momentum.

275 Looking at the collision data, in Figure 13, we also see a similar result. In the




Figure 12: Uncorrected (left panel) and desaturated (right panel) cocktail data.

collision data, the PID suffers from more background and inefficiencies than the cocktail beam, nevertheless we can see a similar improvement in the PID lines when comparing before and after applying desaturation. Notably the largest
 280 improvement is the separation of particle species at lower momenta and the separation of the Li species into ${}^6\text{Li}$ and ${}^7\text{Li}$. In these regions, there was little to no PID resolution before desaturation.




Figure 13: Uncorrected (left panel) and desaturated (right panel) collision data at polar angles of $\theta < 40^\circ$ and azimuthal angles between $-80^\circ < \phi < 80^\circ$

6. Conclusion

The saturation of the electronics reduces dE/dx resolution and even the
285 maximum charge observable inside of a TPC. We have shown that some of
the saturated information is recoverable. Since the Pad Response Function
of the TPC is fixed by the anode wire geometries, an experimental PRF can
be calculated from the unsaturated experimental data. The charge distribution
resulting from an avalanche on a wire must follow this PRF even if the electronics
290 of some channels directly under the avalanche are saturated while the pads
further away are not saturated. By using these unsaturated pads and minimizing
a χ^2 fit to the PRF we recover the unknown saturated charges.

The dynamic range was extended by at least a factor of 5, as demonstrated by
the improved PID lines, and quantified by direct comparison to low gain sections
295 of the TPC. This improved PID will allow for us to extend the momentum
distributions of all species to lower momenta and to heavier ions than what was
previously available.

7. Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the U.S. Department of Energy under Grant
300 Nos. DE-SC0004835, DE-SC0014530, DE-NA0002923, US National Science
Foundation Grant No. PHY-1565546, the Japanese MEXT KAKENHI(Grant-
in-Aid for Scientific Research on Innovative Areas) grant No. 24105004, and Pol-
ish National Science Center (NCN), under contract Nos. UMO-2013/09/B/ST2/04064
and UMO-2013/10/M/ST2/00624. The computing resources for analyzing the
305 data was provided by the HOKUSAI-GreatWave system at RIKEN and the
MSU HPCC and the EMBER cluster at the NSCL.

References

- [1] W. Blum, W. Riegler, L. Rolandi, Particle Detection with Drift Chambers,
Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2008.

- 310 [2] S. Bachmann, et al., Charge amplification and transfer processes in the
gas electron multiplier, Nucl. Instr. Meth. Phys. Res. A 438 (2-3) (1999)
376–408. doi:[10.1016/S0168-9002\(99\)00820-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-9002(99)00820-7).
- 315 [3] Y. Giomataris, et al., Micromegas: A high-granularity position-sensitive
gaseous detector for high particle-flux environments, Nucl. Instr. Meth.
Phys. Res. A 376 (1) (1996) 29–35. doi:[10.1016/0168-9002\(96\)00175-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0168-9002(96)00175-1).
- [4] R. Shane, et al., S π rit: A time-projection chamber for symmetry-energy
studies, Nucl. Instr. Meth. Phys. Res. A 784 (2015) 513–517. doi:[10.1016/j.nima.2015.01.026](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nima.2015.01.026).
- 320 [5] C. H”oppner, et al., A novel generic framework for track fitting in complex
detector systems, Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A 620 (2-3) (2010) 518–525. doi:
[10.1016/j.nima.2010.03.136](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nima.2010.03.136).
- [6] H. Bichsel, A method to improve tracking and particle identification in tpc’s
and silicon detectors, Nucl. Instr. Meth. Phys. Res. A 562 (2006) 154–197.
doi:[10.1016/j.nima.2006.03.009](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nima.2006.03.009).
- 325 [7] D. Suzuki, et al., Prototype at-tpc: Toward a new generation active target
time projection chamber for radioactive beam experiments, Nucl. Instr.
Meth. Phys. Res. A 691 (1) (2012) 39–58. doi:[10.1016/j.nima.2012.06.050](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nima.2012.06.050).
- [8] G. Rai, et al., A tpc detector for the study of high multiplicity heavy
330 ion collisions, IEEE Transactions on Nuclear Science 37 (2) (1990) 56–64.
doi:[10.1109/23.106592](https://doi.org/10.1109/23.106592).
- [9] S. Tangwancharoen, et al., A gating grid driver for time projection cham-
bers, Nucl. Instr. Meth. Phys. Res. A 853 (2017) 44–52. doi:[10.1016/j.nima.2017.02.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nima.2017.02.001).
- 335 [10] E. Pollacco, et al., Get: A generic and comprehensive electronics system
for nuclear physics experiments, Physics Procedia 37 (2012) 1799–1804.
doi:[10.1016/j.phpro.2012.02.506](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.phpro.2012.02.506).

- [11] T. Isobe, et al., Application of the generic electronics for time projection chamber (get) readout system for heavy radioactive isotope collision experiments, Nucl. Instr. Meth. Phys. Res. A 899 (11) (2018) 43–48.
340 doi:[10.1016/j.nima.2018.05.022](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nima.2018.05.022).
- [12] M. Al-Turany, et al., The fairroot framework, J. Phys.: Conf. Ser. 396 (2).
doi:[10.1088/1742-6596/396/2/022001](https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/396/2/022001).
- [13] W. Waltenberger, Rave a detector-independent toolkit to reconstruct vertices, IEEE Transactions on Nuclear Science 58 (2) (2011) 434–444. doi:
345 10.1109/TNS.2011.2119492.
- [14] E. Gatti, et al., Optimum geometry for strip cathodes or grids in mwpc for avalanche localization along the anode wires, Nucl. Instr. Meth. Phys. Res. A 163 (1979) 83–92. doi:[10.1016/0029-554X\(79\)90035-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0029-554X(79)90035-1).
- 350 [15] T. Kubo, In-flight ri beam separator bigrips at riken and elsewhere in japan, Nucl. Instr. Meth. Phys. Res. B 204 (2003) 97–113. doi:[10.1016/S0168-583X\(02\)01896-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-583X(02)01896-7).