


92-206



ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫЙ
ИНСТИТУТ
ЯДЕРНЫХ
ИССЛЕДОВАНИЙ
ДУБНА

E1-92-206

I.A.Golutvin, S.A.Movchan, V.D.Peshekhonov,
T.Preda

TWO METHODS TO ESTIMATE THE POSITION
RESOLUTION FOR STRAW CHAMBERS
WITH STRIP READOUT

Submitted to "Nuclear Instruments and Methods"

1992

1. INTRODUCTION

The chambers with cathode readout are a good alternative to the drift chambers of muon detector systems for the future colliders SSC or LHC, due to their high position resolution. The straw chambers with strip readout possess a big advantage over, for example, honeycomb strip chambers: if one chamber is damaged the other chambers continue working due to the external strips.

While processing the experimental data we have used only induced signals on three significant strips; for big detectors, it would avoid the storage of a great amount of information per event. The position resolution computing was done with the centroid and charge-ratio methods. In this article we present both methods in connection with the straw chamber particular case.


2. EXPERIMENTAL SET-UP

A vaste description of our experimental set-up is given in [1]. The straw chambers 10 mm in diameter were constructed of mylar with a 0.1 μm aluminium film, partially covering the circumference of the tubes. The chosen window had a 36° open angle which was the maximum allowed angle for good behaviour of the chamber. The external cuprum strips were laid on a fiber glass support and were normal to the anode wires. The evaluation of the position resolution was done for 3, 4 and 5 mm strip pitches. Here we present the best results, achieved for the strip pitch of 5 mm; this is in agreement with those reported in [2].

The signals from the three adjacent strips have been fed to CAMAC ADCs (ORTEC) after passing through charge preamplifiers and amplifiers. The information was stored on tape for subsequent off-line processing.

In our testings we have used a gas mixture Ar/CH_4 (50/50) at 1 atm.

The chambers were tested with narrow X-ray beam (8 KeV) with $< 100 \mu\text{m}$ at FWHM, passing through the chamber normal to the anode wire.



3. PROCESSING METHOD

In processing, only those events were taken into account when the induced signal on the middle strip was equal or greater than the corresponding ones from the adjacent strips. This condition was not fulfilled for all the events when the strips were uniformly irradiated, or when the narrow X-ray beam was between two strips.

For position resolution we have used two algorithms: the centroid method [3] and charge-ratio method, improved by H. van der Graff et al. [4].

3.1. Centroid Method

The avalanche position in the centroid method is found fitting a Gaussian curve to the charge induced on the three more significant strips:

$$x = w \frac{\ln Q_L - \ln Q_R}{2(\ln Q_R - 2\ln Q_M + \ln Q_L)}, \quad (1)$$

where:

w is the strip pitch

Q_M , Q_L and Q_R are the charges induced on the middle, left and right strip; $Q_M \geq Q_R$ (Q_L).

As is shown in [3,5,6], in this method and in other centroid methods (like: center of gravity, Lorentzian curve fitting to the charges, parabolic curve fitting) the computed position of the avalanche, x_c , differs from the real one, x_a . This can be clearly seen in the case of uniform irradiation of the strips with a 5 mm strip pitch (fig.1a).

For an accurate estimation of the position resolution, we corrected this shift using an empirical transformation which maps the estimated centroid x_c onto the avalanche position x_a [6]. This transformation was obtained in the following way: for the uniform irradiation of the strips, $dN/dx = 1/k$, the experimental distribution, (fig.1a), is

$$\frac{dN}{dx_c} = \frac{dN}{dx_a} \cdot \frac{dx_a}{dx_c} \quad (2)$$

Taking into account that at the edges of the strips $x_c = x_a = \pm w/2$ and from (2) one can get:

$$x_a = k \int_{-w/2}^{x_c} (dN/dx_c) dx_c - w/2 \quad (3)$$

with

$$k = \frac{w}{\int_{-w/2}^{w/2} (dN/dx_c) dx_c} \quad (4)$$

This transformation was computed for the three kinds of strips used in our experiment and for every signal/noise ratio. In our measurements no significant dependence of this transformation on the signal/noise ratio could be observed.

Figure 2 shows the relation between x_a and x_c , obtained by fitting the results from (3) with a polynomial of degree six for the signal/noise ratio of 50 and 5 mm strip pitch. Figure 1b gives the distribution dN/dx_c after correction.

Figure 3 gives the dependence of the position resolution on the signal/noise ratio after correction for the 5 mm strip pitch.




Fig.1. Events distribution for uniform irradiation of the strips before (a) and after (b) empirical transformation.




Fig. 2. Relation between estimated centroid and avalanche position.




Fig. 3. Position resolution dependence on the signal/noise ratio for \square centroid method and Δ charge ratio method at $x_a \approx 2$ mm.

For strips with a 3 mm pitch, the maximum signal/noise ratio was about 20 ± 25 and $\sigma \approx 250$ μ m.

3.2. Charge-Ratio Method

When strips are uniformly irradiated, the ratio Q_R/Q_M depending on Q_L/Q_M is given in figure 4a, for 5 mm strip pitch and $S/N = 60 \pm 65$, and in figure 4b, for narrow X-ray beam.




Fig. 4. The ratio Q_R/Q_M depending on Q_L/Q_M for (a) uniform irradiation and (b) narrow X-ray beam.

It is possible to relate the points in the precedent scatter plots to the avalanche position. The angle

$$\alpha = \text{arctg} \frac{(1 - Q_R/Q_M)}{(1 - Q_L/Q_M)} \quad (5)$$

depends on the avalanche position x_a . The induced charge along the X-axis (normal to the strips) is of the form [5]:

$$Q = Q_a g f(x, x_a), \quad (6)$$

where Q_a is the avalanche charge; g , a geometrical factor; f , the profile of the induced charge. The charge induced on the i -th strip is given by the following equation:

$$Q = Q_a g \int_{x_i}^{x_i+w} f(x, x_a) dx. \quad (7)$$

If function f is known, then it is possible to find numerically or analytically the relation between α and x_a using relations (5) and (7). It was the case shown in [6], but geometrical factor g was changed to obtain the minimum position resolution. In our case, we could not apply this method because we did not accurately know function f .

One more way to determine the position resolution is to use an empirical relation $\alpha = \alpha(x_a)$ [3]. We have used the following expression for the 5 mm and 3 mm strip pitches

$$x_a = A \text{ arctg} [B(\alpha - \pi/4)] \quad (8)$$

with $A = 2.4065$, $B = 2.0995$ for the 5 mm strip pitch respectively $A = 1.4439$, $B = 2.0995$ for 3 mm. In processing, the uniformity test described in 3.1 was used.

This method has two advantages over the first one [6]:

- it does not depend on the common bias-level subtraction
- it does not strongly depend on the cross talk.

Figure 5a shows the avalanche distribution for the narrow X-ray beam estimated with the relation (1); and 5b, the corresponding one computed with the relations (5) and (8) after uniformity test. The dependence of the position resolution on the signal/noise ratio computed with the charge-ratio method, is given in figure 3.




Fig.5. Avalanche distribution estimated with (a) centroid method, $\sigma = 135 \mu\text{m}$ (b) charge/ratio method, $\sigma = 121 \mu\text{m}$.

Along the strip (X-axis) the position resolution estimated with the charge-ratio method, gives almost the same results as the centroid method, excepting the points near the edges of the strips where the position resolution is smaller by $\approx 10\%$ than the position resolution estimated with the centroid method.

4. CONCLUSIONS

The centroid and charge-ratio methods can be applied to estimate the position resolution for the straw chambers with strip readout. The second method gives $\approx 10\%$ better resolution than the first one at the edges of the strip. Its advantage: it is not sensitive to the pedestal subtraction or to the cross talk between strips. It means that the charge-ratio method is more suitable for data processing of big detectors having straw chambers with strip readout.

REFERENCES

1. Golutvin I.A. et al. - JINR Preprint E1-92-199, Dubna, 1992.
2. Gatti E. et al. - Nucl. Instr. and Meth., 1979, 163, p.83.
3. Peshekhonov V.D. - Wire Conference Viena, Austria, 1992,

4. Endo I. et al. - Nucl. Instr. and Meth., 1981, 188, p.51.
5. H. van der Graaf et al. - Nucl. Instr. and Meth. in Physics Research, 1991, A307, p.220.
6. Radeka V., Boie R.A. - Nucl. Instr. and Meth., 1980, 178, p.543.
7. Chiba J. et al. - Nucl. Instr. and Meth., 1983, 206, p.451.

Голутвин И.А. и др.

E1-92-206

Два метода вычисления пространственного разрешения для строу-камер со стриповым считыванием

При получении пространственного разрешения для строу камер со стриповым считыванием использовались методы деления заряда и центра тяжести. Для строу камеры с диаметром трубки 10 мм и шагом между стрипами 5 мм была получена лучшая (в нашем случае) величина пространственного разрешения. С помощью метода центра тяжести и при использовании перпендикулярных рентгеновских лучей была получена величина пространственного разрешения 120 мкм при отношении сигнал/шум $60 \div 65$. Метод деления заряда показал 10% улучшения пространственного разрешения на границе стрипа.

Работа выполнена в Лаборатории сверхвысоких энергий ОИЯИ.

Препринт Объединенного института ядерных исследований. Дубна 1992

Golutvin I.A. et al.

E1-92-206

Two Methods to Estimate the Position Resolution for Straw Chambers with Strip Readout

The centroid and charge-ratio methods are presented to estimate the position resolution of the straw chambers with strip readout. For the straw chambers of 10 mm in diameter, the highest position resolution was obtained for a strip pitch of 5 mm. With the centroid method and perpendicular X-ray beam, the position resolution was $\approx 120 \mu\text{m}$, for the signal-to-noise ratio of $60 \div 65$. The charge-ratio method has demonstrated $\approx 10\%$ better position resolution at the edges of the strip.

The investigation has been performed at the Particle Physics Laboratory, JINR.

Preprint of the Joint Institute for Nuclear Research. Dubna 1992