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Abstract—Particle identification plays an important role in the challenging physics programme of the LHCb experiment. Pion-kaon separation in the wide momentum range 1-100 GeV/c will be achieved by a pair of Ring Imaging Cherenkov detectors, using three radiators. Cherenkov photons in the wavelength range 200–600 nm will be detected by pixel Hybrid Photon Detectors (HPDs) developed by LHCb in collaboration with industry. The HPDs and associated electronics have been designed to operate at 40 MHz, the bunch–crossing frequency of the LHC. Final production photon detectors and the full readout chain, coupled to the LHCb data handling system, have been tested for the first time in a particle beam, operating with the nominal 25 ns bunch spacing, in September 2006. A total of 48 HPDs mounted on three RICH columns have been installed inside a customised RICH detector using N\(_2\) and C\(_4\)F\(_{10}\) gas radiators and exposed to a 80 GeV/c pion beam at the CERN Super Proton Synchrotron. The results of the tests demonstrate that the HPD is a reliable photon detector that meets the LHCb stringent requirements on photon detection efficiency and Cherenkov angle resolution.

I. INTRODUCTION

The LHCb experiment at the LHC has been optimized for high precision measurements in the beauty quark sector [1], [2]. Its main objective is to precisely determine and over–constrain the parameters of the CKM mixing matrix, and to search for further sources of CP violation and New Physics beyond the Standard Model in rare decays of B–hadrons.

Particle identification over the range 1–100 GeV/c is crucial to many LHCb analyses and it will be provided by two Ring Imaging Cherenkov (RICH) detectors which use solid silica aerogel and C\(_4\)F\(_{10}\) gas radiators. The RICH system uses custom–built pixel Hybrid Photon Detectors (HPDs) [3] to collect the Cherenkov photons over the wavelength range 200–600 nm. Details on the HPD can be found elsewhere [4].

The HPD has been developed and optimized in close collaboration with industry. Previous beam tests [5], [6] have successfully tested the design of individual components and demonstrated that the HPD is a reliable photon detector that meets the LHCb stringent requirements on photon detection efficiency and Cherenkov angle resolution.

To test the overall performance of the final components and exercise the complete RICH operation and data acquisition (DAQ) system, a dedicated beam test has been performed in September 2006 at the SPS facility at CERN. The time structure of the particle beam has been configured to match the operating conditions of the LHC (25 ns bunch spacing).

II. EXPERIMENTAL SET–UP

Figure 1 shows the experimental set–up used in the beam test. The green line indicates the direction of the particle beam, the blue lines represent the trajectory of (some) Cherenkov photons. To simplify the illustration, only one detector column with two HPDs is shown whereas three fully mounted columns were used during the test.

A total of 48 HPDs from the final production batch have been installed in the set–up together with the final versions of the readout electronics and DAQ system to be used for the physics data–taking with the LHCb experiment. The data quality has been monitored online with an early version of the LHCb RICH online–monitoring software. Data are analysed using the full LHCb reconstruction and analysis software framework and simulation studies are performed using the official LHCb simulation and digitization software. This test therefore provides a unique opportunity to check the RICH operations, DAQ and subsequent analysis in an environment as close to the one anticipated for the LHCb experiment as possible. This test is therefore an important milestone in the commissioning phase of the RICH system.

Fig. 1. Overview of the set–up used in the beam test. The green line indicates the direction of the particle beam, the blue lines represent the trajectory of (some) Cherenkov photons. To simplify the illustration, only one detector column with two HPDs is shown whereas three fully mounted columns were used during the test.
photon yields. A coincident signal from both scintillators was used to trigger the event.

### III. Photoelectron Yields

The efficiency of a RICH detector can be evaluated by counting the number of photons detected on Cherenkov rings produced in the radiator. The ultimate aim of the photoelectron yield studies is the determination of a model for photoelectron production and detection that can be checked on the beam test data and used to calculate the expected number of detected photoelectrons per charged particle in the final experiment.

The gas vessel was filled with two different Cherenkov radiators: dry $N_2$ and $C_4F_{10}$. In case of $N_2$, thanks to its low refractive index the Cherenkov ring is fully contained on a single HPD. Data were taken on three different HPDs. The use of $C_4F_{10}$ has a twofold advantage: this is the gas to be used in RICH1 detector, so that results from the beam test can be easily translated to the final detector; secondly, its refractive index (and therefore the Cherenkov angle $\theta_C$) is big enough that the ring in the photon detection plane covers up to four HPDs, allowing timing and performance studies and cross-checks of the electronics on all the columns at the same time. Figure 2 shows examples of Cherenkov rings from $N_2$ and $C_4F_{10}$ runs.

#### A. Event Selection

An unambiguous definition of the ring region is needed in order to proceed with photoelectron counting. Hits are then considered to originate from a Cherenkov photon if they lie within a well-defined region around the average Cherenkov ring. The number of hits in this “road” per event is then taken as the figure of merit for the Cherenkov photoelectron yield and detection efficiency. To disentangle as much as possible from ion feedback and background hits induced by radiation timed with the beam or similar unpredictable effects, events are selected if at least four hits are within the road and rejected.
if more than three hits are recorded outside the road. The width of the road around the average Cherenkov ring is fixed to $\Delta R = 3$ pixels in $N_2$ runs, while in $C_{4}F_{10}$ studies, $\Delta R$ has been assumed to be one sigma ($\sigma_R$) of the ring radius distributions, with an average value of about 1.7 pixels.

### B. Photoelectron Yield: the model

The photoelectron yield is extracted by a constrained fit to the distribution, $N(n)$, of hit pixels on an event–by–event basis. The model takes into account several contributions:

- pixel–to–pixel charge sharing fraction, $s$, where one photoelectron produces hits in two neighbouring pixels;
- double hits fraction, $d$, where hits are lost due to two photoelectrons striking a single silicon pixel but only one hit being recorded because of the the binary readout of the pixel chip;
- multiple particle occupancy in the beam;
- the beam composition, a mixture of charged particles, approximately 80% $\pi$, 10% $e$, 7% $K$ and 3% $p$ above the Cherenkov threshold.

Assuming saturated electrons to be indistinguishable from the pion fraction of the beam, the histogram of hit pixels per event $N(n)$ is described by:

$$N(n) = \sum_{i=\pi,K,p} N_{1,i} \cdot P(n;\mu_i,s,d) + N_2 \cdot P(n;2\mu,s,d) + \ldots$$  

where:

$$P(n;\mu,s,d) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} P(n-i+j;\mu) \times P(i;(n-i)s) \times P(j;(n-i+j)(n-i+j-1)d)$$  

(1)

and $P(a;b)$ is the Poisson probability of getting $a$ given a mean value $b$. The relation in (1) is a sum over all the possible particle types with weights $N_{1,i}$; a two–particle and a possible three–particle terms with weights $N_2$ and $N_3$ respectively have been considered. In the multiple particle case, only pions have been assumed.

The $P(n;\mu_i,s,d)$ in (2) are Poisson–like probabilities that are the underlying Poisson distribution for the number of hits on a ring that is corrected for combinations where hits are gained due to charge sharing or lost due to the binary readout (double hits). The charge sharing fraction has been fixed for each HPD to the corresponding value measured in dedicated LED and dark count runs. The typical value of the charge sharing fraction is $\sim\text{3\%}$.

The fit has been performed in the limited range between 5 and 30 hits for all runs. In case of $C_{4}F_{10}$ the absolute value of $\mu$ depends on the fraction of the ring overlapping with the photocathode of the HPD under study. This fraction has been calculated from the geometric distribution of the hits on the anode, by plotting the occupancy as a function of the angle $\phi$ with respect to the fitted centre of the ring. The ratio $\mu/\Delta\phi$ is then used as the figure of merit for the photoelectron yield. Figure 3 shows a typical distribution of the number of hits in the road and superimposed is the resulting fit function.

### C. Photoelectron yield analysis in $N_2$

The number of events with two or more particles is reduced by requiring that there is only one cluster of hits making a track in each of the tracking stations. This selects approximately 40% of events. Rings are then fitted to the $N_2$ events on an event–by–event basis (as shown in Figure 4) and the average ring centre and radius used to define the valid ring region ($\Delta R = 3$ pixels about this average ring position). This removes events with no Cherenkov ring or large clusters of hits on the anode that come from charge settling effects and selects 87% of the events passing the tracker cut.

The photoelectron yield $\mu$ is extracted from (1); one– and two–particle contributions in the beam and the double hit fraction are also found as free parameters in the fit. An example distribution of hit pixels with its corresponding fit can be seen in Figure 3. The $\chi^2$/NDF found in the shown run is 31.52/23, so the model accurately reproduces the distribution seen in the data. A summary of the yields for each of the three...
mirror reflectivity $R$, the transmission $T$ of the quartz window that separates the radiator and HPD volume and $n(E)$ the refractive index of the N$_2$ gas. Results are given in Table I, where the quantum efficiencies measured by the manufacturer have been used.

The largest contribution to the error on the expected yield comes from an assumed 5% error on the product of $QRT$. The error in Table I also includes a small contribution from pressure and temperature variations during data taking.

Systematic uncertainties that appear with the measured yield in Table I have been determined by introducing a series of Gaussian penalty terms to the fit so that the function minimised is now given by:

$$\chi^2_f \equiv \left( \frac{s - \hat{s}}{\sigma_s} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{d - \hat{d}}{\sigma_d} \right)^2 + \ldots$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)

and allow the previously fixed parameters ($s, d, \ldots$) to vary accordingly:

- the charge sharing fraction $s$ is typically $\sim$3%;
- the probability to lose a hit as a double hit depends on the number of hits in the ring. In the fit the probability per hit is assumed to be linear with the event size, $(n - 1) \times d$, where $d = (5 \pm 1) \times 10^{-3}$. This quantity is estimated both from a toy model and a "fake–event" method and these give comparable results. In the fake event method hits are selected at random from multiple different events to build a new event that contains only one hit from any one contributing event.
- the fraction of kaons and protons in the fit are taken to be $7 \pm 2$ and $3 \pm 2$ respectively.

From the N$_2$ photoelectron yield analysis the conclusion is that measured values are in good agreement with the analytic expected ones.

### D. Photoelectron yield analysis in C$_4$F$_{10}$

A similar approach has been used to analyze C$_4$F$_{10}$ data. Firstly the region is defined as in the following. For each event, the fit results are the coordinates of the centre of the circle and its radius. The average values of these parameters, $x_C$, $y_C$ and $R$, together with their standard deviations are computed for all the events in the run whose fit resulted in a $\chi^2/\text{NDF} < 4$. A road is defined as the ring–like region enclosed by two concentric circles. The coordinates of the common centre of the circles are $x_C$ and $y_C$, and the radii are $R \pm \sigma_R$. Figure 3 shows, for a typical C$_4$F$_{10}$ run, the hit distribution on the anode and, superimposed, the road. A single event display is shown in Figure 4.

A hit on the pixel chip is considered as a genuine Cherenkov photon if it lies within the road. Events are selected if there are at least four hits within the road and no more than three recorded outside. In this way, 8% of the events are rejected on average.

The C$_4$F$_{10}$ analysis assumes only one–particle species (saturated pion). Two– and three–particle terms have been added to the fit function; however, the multiple particle fraction is only $\sim$2% of the total.
For all the runs taken at the optimal timing setting the photoelectron yield per radian $\mu/\Delta \phi$ has been calculated. To check the reproducibility of the results, the comparison of the photoelectron yield for the same HPD in different runs has been performed. The results are stable to within 5%. A possible explanation for the run to run deviations lies in a slight non–uniformity of the photocathode in terms of its quantum efficiency, since in different runs different regions of the HPDs are illuminated by Cherenkov photons. A summary of the $\mu/\Delta \phi$ results is shown in Figure 5. The average photoelectron yield is $8.9\pm0.1$ per radian, with 10% spread from HPD to HPD. This is consistent with the different quantum efficiencies of the photon detectors measured during the quality assessment phase. Systematic uncertainties contribute at the 5% level.

A comparison with expected yields from full Monte–Carlo simulation has been done, finding good agreement.

IV. CHERENKOV ANGLE RESOLUTIONS

The Cherenkov angle resolution studies started recently. This kind of analysis strongly depends on the alignment of the many parts of the detector (such as HPDs, mirror, tracking stations) and on the good knowledge of the Cherenkov gas purity. Encouraging preliminary results have been found using the ray tracing procedure.

For both $N_2$ and $C_4F_{10}$ data, a single photon resolution $\sigma(\theta_C) \sim 1.6$ mrad has been found, in agreement with expectations. These excellent resolutions have been reached due to an iterative alignment procedure, but the work is still ongoing to better understand the various contributions to the resolution. A more precise calibration of the gas compositions is mandatory. Typical distributions of the Cherenkov angle $\theta_C$ for the radiators are reported in Figure 6.

V. CONCLUSIONS

The September 2006 beam test has been a very important milestone in the commissioning of the two RICH detectors of the LHCb experiment. A set of 48 HPDs from the final production has been successfully tested together with the final versions of the readout electronics, DAQ system and software frameworks (online monitoring, reconstruction, simulation and analysis). The encouraging preliminary results demonstrate that the photon detectors to be used in the LHCb RICH detectors meet the stringent requirements in terms of photoelectron yield, efficiency and Cherenkov angle resolution.
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