

TB2016 – noise analysis

Veta Ghenescu*

*Institute of Space Science







aboration

#Run	Hit position ~ pad no	Energy beam	Observation
Without charge divider			
588	$X = 87.5, y = -373.5 \sim Pad 18$	5 GeV	No target, no mag field
606	$X = 47.3, y = -373.5 \sim Pad 49$	5 GeV	No target, no mag field
636	$X = 47.3, y = -373.5 \sim Pad 49$	5 GeV	Target =1.5mm Magnetic field, I = 90A
704	$X = 47.3, y = -373.5 \sim Pad 49$	5 GeV	Target = 1.5mm Magnetic field, I = 90A
With charge divider*			
741	$X = 94.1, y = -348.1 \sim Pad 20$	5 GeV	No target , no mag field
767	$X = 94.1, y = -348.1 \sim Pad 20$	5 GeV	Target = 1.5 mm Magnetic field, I = 90A
789	$X = 94.1, y = -348.1 \sim Pad 20$	5 GeV	Target = 2.5 mm Magnetic field, I = 90A

* The charge divider wasn't installed on all APVs. The trackers were without charge divider all the time

Noise - #tracker 1



Noise - #tracker 2













Noise - #layer 6 -TAB





Conclusions

- The noise were analysis for all APVs and for different experimental conditions as follow:
 - w/ and w/o charger divider
 - w and w/o magnetic field
 - w/ and w/o target
- For trackers the noise is almost constant. The value is about (15 20) ADC;
- For LumiCal layers w/o charge divider the noise is two or three times higher than LumiCal layers w/ charge divider;
- For TAB bonding layer the noise is low, the values are almost the same like on the tracker;