

中国科学院高能物理研究所  
*Institute of High Energy Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences*

# Time reconstruction at Calorimeter

---

Yuzhi Che, Manqi Ruan

Institute of High Energy Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences

Joint Workshop of the CEPC Physics, Software and New Detector Concept

May 24, 2022, Beijing

# Content

1

Motivation

2

Basic configuration

3

Calorimeter response

4

Algorithm & performance

5



Further exploration

6



Conclusion

# 1. Motivation

- @LH-LHC: mitigate pileup effect
- **An effective  $K^\pm/\pi^\pm/p^\pm$  identification:** dE/dx information has not enough separation for charged particles ( $K^\pm/\pi^\pm/p^\pm$ ) in specific momentum region. **TOF information** could be a valuable compensation for it.
- **Better PFO clustering** (cluster fragments identification) can be achieved with the **cluster TOF** information.



Separation power of cluster TOF with resolution of 50 ps.[1]



Truth cluster TOF distribution of real photon and fake photon clusters.



## 2. Basic configurations

The baseline electromagnetic calorimeter (ECAL) optimized for the CEPC:


longitudinal direction: 30 (= 20 + 10) Layers

- First section: 20 layers
  - tungsten plate (2.1 mm) + silicon sensor ( $0.5 \text{ mm} \times (10 \times 10) \text{ mm}^2$ )
- Second section: 10 layers
  - tungsten plate (4.2 mm) + silicon sensor ( $0.5 \text{ mm} \times (10 \times 10) \text{ mm}^2$ )

ECAL inner radius: 1847 mm

B Field: 3 T ( set to 0 in this research )

**Sample:** Single particle with momentum 0 ~ 30 GeV and direction  $(x,y,z) = (0, 1, 0.1)$ .




# 3.1. Calorimeter response: Truth level


Compared to EM shower, hadronic shower

- leads less ECAL hits.
- contains a more compact fast component and lower energy distribution.


photon




$\pi^+$



photon



$\pi^+$



Number of (left) photon; (right)  $\pi^+$  hits in ECAL/HCAL versus MC truth particle energy. The error bar represents the standard deviation of number of hits.

Time vs. energy distribution of ECAL hits in (left) 10 GeV photon and (right) 10 GeV  $\pi^+$  hits sample, where the hit time is normalized as,

$$T_{delay} = T_{hit} - L_{IP \rightarrow hit}/c$$



## 3.2. Calorimeter response: Intrinsic hit time resolution

The time resolution of single silicon diode can be

parameterized as  $\sigma_T = \frac{A}{\sqrt{2}S_{eff}} \oplus C$ , where:

**A**: noise term, **C**: constant term, **S**: effective signal strength (by MIP)  $S_{eff} = S_1 S_2 / \sqrt{S_1^2 + S_2^2}$ ,

$\sqrt{2}$ : factor accounts for the two independent sensors.


Hit time digitization in simulation:

- Record the truth level ECAL hits time.
- Smear the hits time with a Gaussian distribution,

$$T_{hit}^{digitized} = Gaus(T_{hit}^{truth}, \sigma_{T_{hit}}),$$


$$\sigma_{T_{hit}} = \sqrt{\left(\frac{0.38 \text{ ns}}{E_{hit}}\right)^2 + (0.01 \text{ ns})^2}.$$

where  $E_{hit}$  is hit energy before digitization by unit of MIP.



Det 1	Det 2	Fit Function	A [ns×ADC]	C [ns]
<i>Measurement I</i>				
$S_1(133\text{-}\mu\text{m})$	$S_2(133\text{-}\mu\text{m})$	$\frac{\sigma(t_1 - t_2)}{\sqrt{2}} = \frac{A}{\sqrt{2}S_{eff}} \oplus C$	$0.69 \pm 0.01$	$0.010 \pm 0.001$
$S_1(211\text{-}\mu\text{m})$	$S_2(211\text{-}\mu\text{m})$		$0.38 \pm 0.01$	$0.009 \pm 0.001$
$S_1(285\text{-}\mu\text{m})$	$S_2(285\text{-}\mu\text{m})$		$0.34 \pm 0.01$	$0.010 \pm 0.001$

The current technology level: time resolution of single silicon sensor.




### Mimic detector response in Simulation:


Hit time digitization result. Smeared the truth hits time with a gaussian parameterized by the CMS measurement.

## 3.2. Shower time spectrum after digitization

Because the intrinsic time resolution is correlated with hit energy, the shower time spectrum shows highly none-gaussian, including a narrow peak and a long tail.



Time distribution of shower hits after digitization




Cumulative distribution of hit time in showers after digitization.

## 4. Algorithm & performance

A brief cluster TOF estimator:

1. Record the digitized ECAL hits
2. Sort the hits according to the digitized time
3. Define a fraction:  $R$
4. Select the fastest  $(R \cdot N_{cluster hits})$ th hit, and take its time as the cluster TOF evaluation value.





## 4.1. Algorithm & performance: Estimation bias & resolution

Selected the **single particle events** where the primary particle reached ECAL and at least 1 cluster is reconstructed.

**Perfect cluster:** include **all of hits** in the event.

Define the following concept to evaluate the timing performance for **perfect clusters**:

- **Truth** cluster TOF: fastest hit time in the shower
- Estimation **bias**:  $\Delta T = \text{mean}\{T_{reco} - T_{exp}(p)\}$
- Estimation **resolution**:  $\sigma_T = \text{StdDev}\{T_{reco} - T_{expect}(p)\}$


Set a  $\pm 5\sigma_{total}$  window around the mean value, to remove the extremely abnormal events.

## 4.2. Algorithm & performance: Performance vs. fraction R

Take the result of photon and pion samples,


The none-bias R and minimum resolution R are close to each other but not exactly equal.

Photon



The estimation (left) bias and (right) resolution versus fraction R for perfect photon clusters.

Pion



The estimation (left) bias and (right) resolution versus fraction R for perfect pion clusters.

## 4.3. Performance vs. incident momentum

- Optimize the hits number fraction  $R = 0.4$  for a minimum **time resolution**,

- time resolution for perfect hadronic clusters: 80–160 ps


- for perfect EM clusters: 5–20 ps.

- The time reconstruction is accompanied by a **certain bias**,


- Calibration.

- Close for  $K^\pm/\pi^\pm/p^\pm$ .

Resolution



Bias



The (left) bias and (right) resolution of perfect  $\gamma/e^-/\mu^-/\pi^\pm/K^\pm/p^\pm$  clusters versus the MC truth incident momentum.



## 4.3. Section Summary

- Under the current CMS technology, the time resolution:
  - for perfect EM clusters with 1 to 30 GeV energy can reach 5 ~ 20 ps,
  - for perfect hadronic cluster can reach 80 ~ 160 ps.

## Section 5.

Further exploration:

What's the cluster time  
resolution with:

Q:

realistic clustering?

for example: Arbor?

Q:




different hit time resolution

Q:



different #timing layers

# 5.1. Influence of the Arbor clustering

- **Arbor clustering** module partly removes the slow component of clusters, and improves the hadronic cluster time resolution by a factor  $\sim 1.5$  (85ps/55ps)



Estimator (left) bias and (right) resolution comparison between Arbor and perfect photon clusters.




Estimator (left) bias and (right) resolution comparison between Arbor and perfect pion clusters.



# 5.1. Influence of the Arbor clustering


Arbor clustering module with parameters optimized for the CEPC improve the time resolution of hadronic clusters by 50%~80%.

Perfect clustering




Time resolution for perfect clusters

Arbor clustering



Time resolution for Arbor clusters

Perfect/Arbor Ratio



The time resolution ratio of perfect clusters over Arbor clusters.

## Section 5.

Further exploration:

What's the cluster time  
resolution with:

**A: Impact of realistic clustering**

Arbor improves time resolution by ~50% for  
hadronic cluster.



**Q: different hit time resolution**

**Q: different #timing layers**

## 5.2. Intrinsic hit resolution

Scale the intrinsic hit resolution:  $\sigma_{T_{hit}} = factor \cdot \sqrt{\left(\frac{0.38 \text{ ns}}{E_{hit}}\right)^2 + (0.01 \text{ ns})^2}$ , and optimize the hit number fraction R.

The dependence of the cluster time resolution on the intrinsic hit resolution is approximately linear. The improvement of the timing performance is appreciated.





## Section 5.

Further exploration:

What's the cluster time  
resolution with:

**A: Impact of realistic clustering**

Arbor improves time resolution by ~20%/40% for EM/hadronic cluster.


**A: different hit time resolution**

linear!


**Q: different #timing layers**

## 5.3. Number of the timing layers

- In fact, maybe only a part of the ECAL layers are equipped with the timing electronic.
- Reducing the timing layers number by factor 2, 3, 5, 10, the cluster time resolution varies in a form of  $\propto 1/\sqrt{N_{layer}}$



A schematic diagram of timing layer isometric sampling. Only the **layers** whose number can be divided exactly by the reduce factor are served to record hit time information.



Cluster time resolution versus (left) layers number and (right) its square root for perfect (top) pion (bottom) photon clusters..

## Section 5.

Further exploration:

What's the cluster time  
resolution with:

**A: Impact of realistic clustering**

Arbor improves time resolution by ~20%/40% for EM/hadronic cluster.

**A: different hit time resolution**

linear!


**A: different #timing layers**

$$\sigma(T_{clus}) \propto 1/\sqrt{N_{layer}}$$



# 6. Conclusion

- A brief cluster TOF reconstruction algorithm are implemented.
- **Cluster Time:** Under current CMS silicon sensor timing technology, CEPC ECAL can provide the **time resolution**:
  - for perfect EM clusters with 0 to 30 GeV energy can reach 5 ~ 20 ps,
  - for perfect hadronic cluster, can reach 80 ~ 160 ps.
- **Influencing factors:**
  - **Arbor clustering module** improves the hadronic cluster time resolution by a factor of ~1.5
  - The cluster time resolution is proportional to the **intrinsic time resolution**.
  - Cluster time resolution is inversely proportional to the  $\sqrt{N_{layer}}$ .
- **Discussion:**
  - The shower timing performance is highly related on the intrinsic hit time resolution, especially in the case that the energy deposition is only several MIPs.
  - The shower timing performance is highly related on the hardware setup of channels. All of the contributions of hit timing uncertainty should be considered carefully.




中国科学院高能物理研究所  
*Institute of High Energy Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences*

# Thanks for your attention

---

Yuzhi Che, Manqi Ruan

May 24, 2022



中國科學院高能物理研究所

*Institute of High Energy Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences*

# Back Up

---




# BackUp. time resolution of CMS silicon sensor

Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research A 859 (2017) 31–36

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research A


journal homepage: [www.elsevier.com/locate/nima](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/nima)



**Fig. 1.** The schematic of the layout displays the main components and the readout scheme on the left. Downstream of the trigger counter (TRG) and wire chambers (WC), a micro-channel plate (MCP) photomultiplier tube was positioned to provide a timing reference in front of the silicon sensors. Various lead plates were placed in between the MCP and the sensors to evaluate their response to multi-MIPs. A typical response pattern of a 285- $\mu\text{m}$  thick silicon sensor ( $5 \times 5 \text{ mm}^2$ ) to 50 GeV electrons when normalized to the MIP signal is displayed on the right. Note that the sensors were placed behind  $2X_0$  of lead absorber in this case.

**Measurement I:** Fig. 8 presents the timing resolution as a function of the effective signal amplitude in units of MIPs and the effective signal-to-noise ratio. We defined the effective signal strength as  $S_{\text{eff}} = S_1 S_2 / \sqrt{S_1^2 + S_2^2}$ . It can be seen that the timing performance improves with increasing signal strength (Fig. 8-left), but that for equal  $S_{\text{eff}}/N$  the timing performance of the three sensor types is similar (Fig. 8-right). The solid lines in Fig. 8 represent the fits to a form

$$\frac{\sigma(t_1 - t_2)}{\sqrt{2}} = \frac{A}{\sqrt{2} S_{\text{eff}}} \oplus C$$



**Fig. 8.** The timing resolution based on two silicon sensors as a function of the effective signal strength in units of MIPs (left) and as a function of the signal-to-noise ratio (right). The fitted resolution functions with a noise ( $A$ ) and a constant term ( $C$ ) are also shown as solid lines. The dashed lines represent toy simulation results (see text for details).

## Section 5.

Further exploration:

What's the cluster time  
resolution with:

**A: Impact of realistic clustering**

Arbor improves time resolution by ~20%/40% for EM/hadronic cluster.

**A: different hit time resolution**

linear!

**A: different #timing layers**

$$\sigma(T_{clus}) \propto 1/\sqrt{N_{layer}}$$

**Q:**

**CMS HGCAL**



# CMS HGCAL


The electromagnetic compartment of the CMS endcap calorimeter:

WCu absorber + Silicon sensor (28 sampling layers)

Depth:  $26 X_0$  ( $1.7\lambda$ )

Active thickness ( $\mu\text{m}$ )	300	200	120
Area ( $\text{m}^2$ )	245	181	72
Largest lifetime dose (Mrad)	3	20	100
Largest lifetime fluence ( $n_{\text{eq}}/\text{cm}^2$ )	$0.5 \times 10^{15}$	$2.5 \times 10^{15}$	$7 \times 10^{15}$
Largest outer radius (cm)	$\approx 180$	$\approx 100$	$\approx 70$
Smallest inner radius (cm)	$\approx 100$	$\approx 70$	$\approx 35$
Cell size ( $\text{cm}^2$ )	1.18	1.18	0.52
Initial $S/N$ for MIP	11	6	4.5
Smallest $S/N$ (MIP) after $3000 \text{ fb}^{-1}$	4.7	2.3	2.2

Silicon sensors in CE-E and CE-H layers having only silicon sensors, showing thickness of active silicon, cell size, and S/N for a MIP before and after an integrated luminosity of  $3000 \text{ fb}^{-1}$ .





## 5.4. Alternative estimator

Time resolution of photons with traverse momentum of 5 GeV.

Radius range (cm)	30-70	70-100	100-180
p (pt = 5 GeV)	23.4 - 53.5 GeV	16.7 - 23.4 GeV	10.2 - 16.7 GeV
Reference shower time resolution (ps)	< 5 ps	6 - 6 ps	6 - 7 ps
Active thickness ( $\mu\text{m}$ )	120	200	300
Noise term A (ns * MIP) [1]	0.69	0.38	0.34
Constant term C (ns)	0.010	0.009	0.010
Thickness correction from intrinsic hit time resolution	1.8	1	0.9
Cell size correction	~ 1	< 1	< 1
Shower timing resolution on CMS (ps)	< 9 ps	5 - 6 ps	5.4 - 6.3 ps

[1] The noise term and constant term are from: N. Akchurin, etc, On the Timing Performance of Thin Planar Silicon Sensors, Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section A: Accelerators, Spectrometers, Detectors and Associated Equipment 859, 31 (2017).

## Section 5.

Further exploration:

What's the cluster time  
resolution with:

**A: Impact of realistic clustering**

Arbor improves time resolution by ~20%/40% for EM/hadronic cluster.

**A: different hit time resolution**

linear!

**A: different #timing layers**

$$\sigma(T_{clus}) \propto 1/\sqrt{N_{layer}}$$

**A: CMS HGCAL**

$\sigma(T_{cluster}) : 5 \sim 9$  ps for photon with  $p_T = 5\text{GeV}$