

## Start Counter

Eric Pooser W. U. Boeglin L. Guo P. Khetarpal

- Experimental Setup
- SiPM Scan
- Attenuation Lengths
- Time Resolution Studies
- Future Plans







## **EJ-212 Scintillator Bar**

- Dimensions: 3 x 15 x 600 (mm)
  - Machined to form 30 paddle design
- With and without a VM2000 placed at the tip of the scintillator mounted in dark box
  - VM2000: highly reflective material
- SiPM coupled to the scintillator
- <sup>90</sup>Sr source



### **Geometry Of Bent Scintillator**

50





## **Experimental Set Up**





### VM2000 at Nose of Scintillator





### The SiPM





#### SiPM Measurements



• Source ~ 25 cm from SiPM

• Seven measurements (SiPM scan) were made across the face of the SiPM

- These are the "relative positions"
- New Pre-Amp greatly improved rise time of signal
  - Thanks Fernando Barbosa!
  - Old rise time ~ 20 ns
  - $\circ$  New rise time ~ 4 ns

### SiPM Scan



#### GIUE CITATIONS PERIMENT

## SiPM Scan



### SiPM Scan













## Coupling to SiPM (Sweet Spot)





**Attenuation Lengths** 

- Measured attenuation lengths of all five scintillators
   With and without VM2000
  - Coupling of scintillator to "sweet spot" of SiPM
- Scintillators were rated from 1 (best) to 5 (worst)
  - Based on visual inspection of surface quality
  - Rated *prior* to measurements
- Defects on surface of scintillators
  - Buffing scratches (poor polishing techniques)
    - Worst in region of bend
  - Crazing (stress of machining or improper handling)
  - Deep gashes on surface
  - Poor milling of edges



### Damaged Surface on Bend





## **Defective Milling of Edges**





#### Attenuation Length Plot for Scintillator 1 (Typical Response)



• Fit Range (0.0 - 40.0 cm)



#### **Average Attenuation Lengths**



• The attenuation lengths of all five scintillators are approximately the same

**Attenuation Lengths Summary** 



- Poor light output due to poor surface quality

  Damaged surface attributable to Plastic Craft manufacturing and polishing techniques

  Light output is worst in the region of the bend

  ~ 41.6 cm down stream of SiPM

  Small improvement with VM2000 backing
- Bent scintillator has worse attenuation length compared to straight scintillator

   3.7x without VM2000
   6.5x with VM2000



## **Time Resolutions Studies**

- Coupling of scintillator to "sweet spot" of SiPM
- We measured the time resolution as a function of distance of source from SiPM
- Comparative measurement with straight scintillator
  - Both with and without VM2000
- Comparative time resolution measurements with FM-PMT, Old SiPM, and New SiPM



#### **Time Resolution Plots**





#### **Comparison of Time Resolutions**





#### Time Resolution Comparisons (Straight Bar)





# **Time Resolution Summary**

- Without VM2000
  - Time resolution is relatively constant in nose
- With VM2000 at tip of the nose
  - Time resolution improves as a function of increasing distance
- Worst time resolution occurs in the bent region Same as light output
- Time resolution measurements were relatively consistent among all of the scintillators
- Overall we find: 230 ps < σ < 640 ps for the bent scintillators</li>
- New Pre-Amp improved the time resolution as expected



## Summary

- SiPM is suitable for timing measurements
- Geometry of nose results in:
  - Faster propagation of light (~60ns > c)
  - Relatively constant time resolution in bend
  - Better time resolution with VM2000
- Bad surface quality results in:
  - Broad range of timing resolution
  - Poor light output
  - Short attenuation lengths
- More care must be taken by Plastic Craft



# Future Plans

- Scintillators have been sent back to Plastic Craft for repolishing with advised polishing techniques
  - This should improve light output and timing resolution
- Techniques of wrapping VM2000 to bent scintillators will be investigated
- Comparative measurements will be made
  - Re-polished scintillators
  - Wrapped scintillators (VM2000)
- Coupling of scintillators to light guides and SiPM
  - Associated measurements
- Final design of start counter has yet to be finalized
   0 40, 30, 24 ?





## Thank you for your time!

## **Questions?**



# **Propagation Studies**

• We measured the speed of light within the five scintillators

 $\circ$  With and without VM2000

- Fit two separate linear functions
  - Straight Section
  - Bent Section

#### Propagation Studies (Scintillator 4)





Similar traits were noticed among the five scintillators



## **Propagation Speed Summary**

- Linear relationship was found between the time of propagation and the distance from the SiPM (as expected)
- There exists a difference in the fitted slopes when comparing the nose and the straight section
- On average the propagation speeds differed in the nose when compared to the straight section as:
  - Without VM2000
    - 4.61 cm/ns faster
  - With VM2000
    - 6.23 cm/ns faster
- Due to the change in geometry of the scintillator after the bend
  - $\circ$  Fewer number of reflections in nose



### Light Output (SiPM Scan)





### **Comparative Plot (Light Output)**



Collaboration Meeting, Oct 6 2011: Start Counter





Collaboration Meeting, Oct 6 2011: Start Counter



## **Comparison of Time Resolutions**

Scintillator Number	No VM2000 [Min / Max] (ps)	With VM2000 [Min / Max] (ps)
1 (best)	234 / 600	235 / 601
2	231 / 606	232 / 612
3	243 / 614	244 / 623
4	234 / 587	238 / 592
5 (worst)	270 / 623	247 / 636
Unbent Scintillator	229 / 354	229 / 353



## **Attenuation Lengths**

Scintillator Number	No VM2000 (cm)	With VM2000 (cm)
1 (best)	18.3	19.5
2	18.9	18.7
3	18.5	18.5
4	20.0	21.4
5 (worst)	18.7	20.4
Unbent Scintillator	70.6	129.0



## Trigger PMT and <sup>90</sup>Sr Source

