The silicon tracker elements

1

Marcel Vos – IFIC Valencia

for the SiLC collaboration

thanks to V. Saveliev, A. Savoy-Navarro



Inner silicon: Mokka implementation SIT

SITMat = CGAGeometryManager::GetMaterial("silicon_2.33gccm");

Silicon Intermediate Tracker (SIT) 0.5 % X (275 μm silicon + 1mm C support)





Inner silicon: Mokka implementation.

Forward Tracking Disks **3 pixel disks (1 % X₀)** 4 strip disks (0.5 % X₀) extended layout wrt TESLA

phpMyAdmin

Database

E common parameters

ftd02 (2)

ftd02 (2)

🗏 disk

SQL query

Query results operations

칠 Print view

Print view (with full texts)

Export 1

Marcer vus, inte valencia

Field_name	Min_value	Max_value	Min_length	Max_length
ftd02.disk.disk_number	1	7	1	1
ftd02.disk.z_position	220	1900	3	4
ftd02.disk.inner_radious	29	113	2	3
ftd02.disk.outer_radious	140	290	3	3



• FTD parameters

CSIC

(⁴)



• ETD Mokka implementation

End-cap tracking disks Silicon – carbon sandwich

5

3 XUV layers x 0.65 % X_o







• SET Mokka implementation

Silicon External Tracker Silicon + carbon support 2 XUV layers x 0.65 % X₀



LDCPrime							
Sub-Detector	Parameter	GLD	LDC	GLD'	LDC'		
ТРС	R _{inner} (m)	0.45	0.30	0.45	0.30		
	R _{outer} (m)	2.00	1.58	1.80	1.80		
	Z _{max} (m)*	2.50	2.16	2.35	2.35		
Barrel ECAL	R _{inner} (m)**	2.10	1.60	1.85	1.82		
	Material	Sci/W	Si/W	Sci/W	Sci/W		
Barrel HCAL	Material	Sci/W	Sci/Fe	Sci/Fe	Sci/Fe		
Endcap ECAL	Z _{min} (m)***	2.80	2.30	2.55	2.55		
Solenoid	B-field	3.0	4.0	3.50	3.50		
VTX	Inner Layer (mm)	20	16	18	18		

From Frank Gaede, December 6th.



Convergence for detector parameters linked to B or R. TPC inner radius or innermost silicon unchanged in "Primed" layouts

The principal challenge is reducing the material to the bare minimum

Final detector optimisation must be done with realistic estimates for detector elements, support and services





Now: evaluate sensitivity of physics programme to increased material by defining a pessimistic scenario?

• TPC inner radius

A crucial decision on the path to the LOI. Particularly important for the design of the inner silicon tracker (SIT/BIT) and (FTD/FIT)

The TPC geometries of GLDPrime and LDCPrime in the excel file sent by Jenny List last December:

inner radius; 39.5 cm (GLD') 30.05 cm (LDC') inner radius sensitive volume; 43.0 cm (GLD') 37.1 cm (LDC')

Final TPC inner radius depends on a large number of issues: **Engineering constraints:** Opening scenario foresees TPC to slide over Beam Delivery System. TPC Inner radius therefore limited by size of BDS. **Technology constraints:** minimal TPC radius to cope with background and positive ion flux, minimal thickness (cm) of the TPC field cage? **Tracking performance:** central detector global performance benefits from reduction in material associated with small TPC radius, forward track matching between FTD and TPC benefits from larger inner radius, two-track resolution in jets



Central tracking

Precise space points in SIT/BIT are needed to bridge the gap **betwee**n VXD and TPC

- for momentum resolution
- for pattern recognition (non-prompt tracks)

How many layers are needed clearly depends on the width of the gap.

The impact of additional layers on tracking is well-established, but the effect of the material on global performance needs to be evaluated.



Forward tracking

(Very) forward tracking in a gaseous + silicon tracker

For track polar angles below 40° reduced TPC coverage Below $\sim 30^{\circ}$ FTD starts to contribute Below $\sim 20^{\circ}$ FTD dominates the measurements

TPC/FTD hits vs. polar angle Large Detector Concept (Tesla layout of FTD)



Forward tracking

Connection FTD – TPC at small angle becomes more difficult for small TPC inner radius



Number of TPC read-outs vs number of Silicon layers

A TPC of outer radius of 170 cm and a length of 200 cm is considered. A pad row width of 7.8 mm is considered (note that this is a more conservative assumption than keeping the number of pad rows constant). For the FTD and SIT layout the one in LDC01_05Sc is used. The inner radius of the TPC is varied, taking values of 20, 30 and 40 cm. SIT and FTD are simply squashed (all z-values remain the same, but the outer radii are scaled to match the varying TPC radius). The number of pad rows and FTD layers can now be counted as a function of polar angle.

CSIC





Apart from TPC inner radius and the number of layers in SIT and BIT, important differences between both concepts occur in:

FTD/FIT: FTD covers full length of LDC TPC, FIT is much shorter

ETD: Encap Tracking Disks may consist of multiple layers in GLD

SET: not present in GLD

A starting point for the discussion between the GLD and LDC members of SILC. Expect to come up with a real plan in Sendai.



Silicon tracker parameters for optimization

The questions we would like to see answered in the next year(s)

Parameter	Affects	Changed in	LDC/GLD differences
Material	Overall performance, PatRec	Mokka description	All
Number of layers	All aspects	Mokka description	SIT, ETD
Layout	Momentum resolution	Mokka description	FTD
Rø resolution	Momentum resolution	Digitizer	FTD, ETD
R/z segmentation	Pattern recognition	Digitizer	SIT, FTD

Comparison of physics impact of optimistic/pessimistic scenarios for material in SIT/FTD, integrated scenarios for TPC endplate material (ETD), VXD services (FTD)?

Basic tracking performance studies varying TPC inner radius/number of SIT layers?

Other parameters: small-scale dedicated productions could be very interesting.



SiLC has provided the layout of SIT, FTD, ETD and SET.

Analysis of differences between GLD and LDC within SiLC ongoing.

The LOI exercise provides important tools for physics optimization of key parameters of silicon tracker elements.

