Megatiles for the AHCAL: hardware improvements and measurements with cosmic ray and testbeam data

Anna Rosmanitz

On behalf of the JGU team:

Volker Büscher, Phi Chau, Karl-Heinz Geib, Antoine Laudrain, Lucia Masetti, Sebastian Ritter, Marisol Robles, Christian Schmitt

Including the PRISMA detector lab team:

Peter Bernhard, Anastasia Mpoukouvalas, Quirin Weitzel

CALICE Collaboration Meeting - 25.03.2021





Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung





JOHANNES GUTENBERG UNIVERSITÄT MAINZ

AHCAL Technological Prototype Design

- Individually wrapped 3 x 3 cm² scintillator tiles
- Tile thickness: 3 mm
- Read out with SiPMs
- 144 channels per board





Megatile Concept

- Simplification of assembly process
- 36x36 cm² scintillator plate
 - Trenches filled with glue + TiO₂
 - Scintillator wrapped in reflective foil
 ⇒Air gap
- Trench angle optimised for LY
 - Angle = 30°: minimal dead area
- 7 versions produced since 2017





Glue + TiO₂ Mixture

- LY depends on glue + TiO₂ mixture
 - Absorption/reflection vs λ depends on concentration, size and shape of TiO₂ granulate
- Trade-off:
 - Liquid enough to fill trenches
 - Adequate granularity
- Tested various mixtures
- Improved in latest prototypes



Glue + TiO₂ Mixture

- Glues known to yellow with time
 - Amplified with UV light and additives (like TiO₂)
 - Current choice: lowest ageing effect (10% yellowing threshold after > 15 years)
 - ⇒Epotek 301-2-FL



Development of Megatile

- Continuously tested in cosmic test stand in Mainz
- Megatile lying flat with pressure on top
- Scintillators on top and bottom as triggers



Megatile: A Promising Concept

High LY ≈ 32 pe/MIP (in MT6)
 ≈ as single wrapped tile



Edge Channels

- High LY ≈ 32 pe/MIP
 ≈ as single wrapped tile
- But: Edges ≈ 20 pe/MIP
- Reason: Coating of edges technically difficult
- Simple workaround:
 - Adhesive reflective foil on edges
 - Limited improvement (included above)
- New solution: spray white varnish

	L	15.223	20.765	21.148	20.154	21.833	21.219	21.186	19.468	20.799	21.524	20.005	15.534		pe
	к	21.010	24.744	32.833	30.889	32.759	32.575	33.326	31.828	30.354	32.292	29.243	18.307	-	35
	J	19.499	30.607	33.137	32.796	34.949	33.749	33.907	32.087	31.232	32.417	29.506	20.434		
	I	19.982	29.750	32.416	33.635	33.087	34.655	32.719	33.466	31.523	29.975	29.186	20.314	_	30
	н	19.398	29.878	27.449	37.333	34.279	33.779	34.332	33.890	34.831	32.380	29.963	20.305		
	G	17.056	28.444	25.276	31.338	34.043	32.897	34.425	34.225	32.313	31.504	29.906	20.768		25
25	F	19.619	26.796	30.062	30.926	30.714	32.247	37.278	33.257	32.807	24.485	29.476	19.549		20
	Е	18.728	27.746	30.064	30.403	30.019	31.346	33.313	31.395	31.226	31.539	29.188	20.534		
	D	19.280	28.537	29.976	29.255	30.157	30.876	32.397	30.587	32.128	32.234	31.451	20.621	-	20
	с	19.886	30.597	32.138	31.719	32.344	33.296	33.484	33.180	32.709	32.496	31.207	19.402		
	в	18.901	22.853	31.994	32.637	34.072	33.427	31.465	32.574	32.132	32.389	31.560	18.787	_	15
	А	14.917	20.033	21.582	22.359	21.501	21.441	21.850	22.607	22.138	21.681	21.855	16.347		
		А	в	С	D	Е	F	G	н	I	J	к	L		
				41		. 4					1				
F		Concession of	-		8		-				1				
1					Glu							+TiO2			
1	Older HOZ														
											C	(,			
		-		-	-						-				
								-		3					
Refle	eC.	tive	e fo	oil	Varnish										

Edge Channels



- Uniformity map: For each quadrant, plot LY/<LY in central channels>
- Average ratio of 44 edge channels: 0.67->0.84
- Not yet perfect, but already >15% improvements
 - More studies ongoing

Test Beams

- 3 test beams at DESY II: 2019 with MT4 and 2020 with MT6
- Electron beam at 3 GeV
- Megatile layer (MT), 2 single tile layers, beam telescope in front





Cross Talk

- Light escaping central cell through airgap \Rightarrow CT depends on air gap XTE
- CT = energy in neighbour channel / energy central channel



3mm

1. Central channel of MT defined by coincidence in single tile layers





25.03.2021



- 1. Central channel of MT defined by coincidence in single tile layers
- 2. Pe cut on central tile
- Fill not triggered channels with threshold value (3 pe)
- 4. $CT \le pe$ neighbour channel / pe central channel



Results of MT4, Cosmic Ray Test Stand

- In Cosmic Ray Test Stand:
 - Very uniform LY and CT in central channels
 - Magnitude as expected



MT4: First Attempt at Test Beam (2019)

- Values at center of Megatile of expected magnitude
- Not uniform compared to Cosmic Ray Test Stand
- Anticorrelation between LY and CT



MT4: First Attempt at Test Beam (2019)

- Numbers in center of expected magnitude
- Not uniform compared to Cosmic Ray Test Stand
- Anticorrelation between LY and CT



Foil Bending in Air Stack

- In cosmic ray test stand: MT lying flat, heavy metal plate on top
 Foil
- In TB: MT upright **Optical Trench** \Rightarrow Foil is bending (Glue + TiO_2) Megatile, 3 mm

Solution: Glue Foil

• Glue foil to Megatile along the trenches ⇒ MT6



LY of MT6 at Test Beam (2020)

Quite uniform



LY

LY Comparison

Ratio between test beam and cosmic ray test stand results

LY, ratio

• Compatible within 15%

1.2 Lo350 ≻300 1.042 0.958 1.01 1.004 0.938 0.955 0.958 0.973 0.967 0.928 -1.15 0.936 1.013 1.017 0.984 1.023 0.996 0.932 0.925 0.918 0.963 0.954 0.968 0.953 0.96 0.994 0.937 0.99 0.956 0.996 0.95 0.93 0.916 0.952 0.956 1.1 250 0.935 0.916 0.966 0.957 0.988 0.961 0.977 0.922 0.945 0.943 0.965 0.998 - 1.05 0.943 0.935 0.959 0.983 0.924 0.916 0.911 0.963 0.932 0.927 0.986 1.053 200 0.994 0.95 0.962 0.965 0.925 0.933 0.92 0.899 0.976 0.971 0.99 0.941 1 1.007 0.929 0.938 0.977 0.975 0.946 0.952 0.889 0.93 0.939 0.905 0.983 150 0.95 1.068 0.981 0.947 0.964 0.937 0.927 0.906 0.897 0.937 0.932 1.007 0.952 100 0.931 0.948 1.001 1.019 0.923 0.921 0.911 0.89 0.963 0.925 0.95 0.9 0.938 0.928 0.932 0.893 0.933 0.968 0.896 0.912 0.917 0.915 0.922 0.899 50 0.85 0.926 0.993 0.929 0.912 0.907 0.878 0.864 0.879 0.915 0.987 1.019 0.856 0.997 0.963 0.957 0.912 0.949 0.903 0.955 0.95 0.962 0.923 0.978 0.879 0.8 0 50 100 200 250 350 150 300 x position

Cross Talk in Cosmic Ray Test Stand, MT6

- Similar to MT4
- Cross talk for TB: work in progress



СТ

Ageing Studies

• Optical stability of trenches linked to TiO₂ + glue mixture December 2019 August 2020





- 15% lower LY after 8 month
- Repeat LY measurement periodically (couple month) to spot evolution

Ageing Studies

- MT6 seems to be stabilised after August 2020
- No significant effects in MT5 and 7
- Temperature stable within 0.5°C
 ⇒Not the cause
- Most likely explanation: accidental exposure to light during first lockdown
- Further tests ongoing



Conclusion

Conclusion:

- LY values in test beam confirm results from cosmic ray test stand
- LY in edge cells on average 84% of central cells
- Airgap between scintillator and foil under control both at cosmic ray test stand and TB
- Cross talk at acceptable level with cosmic ray
- No unexpected ageing observed

Outlook

- Cross talk in 2020 test beam data
- More data available, to be analysed
 - Including uniformity scans with beam telescope
- Ongoing monitoring of ageing

Thank you for your attention!

Backup

Impact of pe Cut on Cross Talk

