



Carlos Escobar
Peter Kodyš

Cooperation between
IFIC (Valencia) and CU (Prague)


<http://ific.uv.es/sct/lasertest>

Cluster Meeting - April 5, 2005

Status

- Stable mechanical setup
- Laser detection only on one side (metal backside of detectors is not transparent to light)
- Automatic focus algorithm with precision 40 μm in z and 4 μm in x
- Automatic algorithms to test:
 - All channels (*for production and QA*)
 - Channels from the *mask file* (*checking response and noise*)
 - Bond mixing (*for production and QA*)
 - Channels from a *custom file* (*optional*)
 - Punchthrough channels test with gain confirmation
- No crosstalk observed inside chip
- Pulse shape reconstruction done
- Possibility to test modules up to 4° C in hyb. (-20° C in chiller) with dry air or nitrogen
- Automatic logbook generated and saved with all important information

Setup



Carlos Escobar Cluster Meeting - April 5, 2005

<http://ific.uv.es/sct/lasertest>

Setup




LaserTest lab.



Laser source



Pulsar and Scope



Hardware inside the black box



Optical converter

Laser parameters

Wavelength of light: 1060 nm
 Laser energy of photon: 1.170 eV

Pure Silicon properties


Real part of dielectric const.: 12.65
 Imag. part of dielectric const.: 0.00075
 Index of refraction: 3.557
 Imag. part of index of refr.: 0
 Absorption coefficient: 12.07 cm⁻¹

Carlos Escobar Cluster Meeting - April 5, 2005


<http://ific.uv.es/sct/lasertest>

Focus Algorithm

Main conclusion: The alg. is based on light reflection on strip metal material (Al).



Focusing in x (perpendicular to strips)




Focusing in z (up and down)

Simple Requirements: Strip number (strip to focus) as input



Focus Algorithm

Method

- Independent of starting point
- Based on *TriggerBurst Scans*: it finds channel position in x and z using the reflection over the aluminium and calculates strip width (pitch)
- Dynamic threshold selection based on strip output
- In each Z and X distance, we acquire *Trigger Burst* and *Median Charge* data
- Finally, we found the minimum point in a 3D plot




Fine 2D scan in range 360 x 20 mm to find focus point




QA Tests (I)


BOND & CHANNEL TEST: Test for checking the response of all channels using laser beam. Results are ready in ~30 min per detector (full channel test), this is 2 hours per module (with 4 detectors).



Production module (back)



Production module (front)



Prequalification module


Carlos Escobar Cluster Meeting - April 5, 2005

<http://ific.uv.es/sct/lasertest>


QA Tests (II)

We re-bond some bonds to different positions to look dependence of chip channel stability base of neighbored high powered channel.


The channels are detected in unexpected positions. We can calculate the bond mixing with precision. *This is a good test to check the bonds.*



In the results, you can see the differences...



Before



After


Channels re-bonded

Carlos Escobar Cluster Meeting - April 5, 2005


<http://ific.uv.es/sct/lasertest>

QA Tests (III)


BAD CHANNEL TEST: This test is for checking of response from bad channels based on *mask file* and compare it with neighbours channels



Testing channels normalized to 1 using their neighbours: average of them was the reference value. Two channels shows some response but in very high level - un-trimm channels






Testing channels (red) with their neighbours (blue). up: response - noise, bottom: response from channels and noise (yellow/green)



Map of testing bad channels on module


Pulse Shape Reconstruction

Pulse shape reconstruction vs. interstrip position of laser spot was done (Hamamatsu module type).






Also quality of laser spot was measured using fit of edges over metal strip: σ (3.3 ± 1.3) μm , strip width = (23.3 ± 1.4) μm

Pulse Shape Reconstruction




3D reconstructed pulse. On point 0 (in x) practically whole light beam is reflected out, so this is the position of the strip.



Strip Width

Pitch Ham: (23.9 +- 0.4) μm
Pitch CiS: (18.2 +- 0.9) μm



Hamamatsu Vs CiS

Previous status:

- Not well known optical properties of sensors (detectors)
- No comparison between Hama and CiS was done (no testbeams, no beta tests, etc)

First LaserTest results: Ratio CiS/Hama ~ 1.6

So, to know where was the problem, we had to:

1 - Repeat LaserTest measurements under many different conditions:

- * Temperature dependencies
- * Bias dependencies
- * Detector type dependencies (W21, W22, etc)
- * Humidity dependencies


2 - Comparing results with a charged particle beam: **BetaTest**

3 - Measure the reflectivity of the sensors

Ratio ~ 1.513
CiS/Hama

Beta tests

We tested both modules (Hama and CiS) to be sure if the problem was an optical problem or a sensor problem.




Thanks to the PRAGUE group

Beta tests

Example

Module: laser00005
 Scanned: 41 = THRESHOLD (fC)
 Start run 16 scan 4
 Stop run 16 scan 31
 No. of points: 28
 No. of ext. trigs.: 20000 ...
 Used events: 0 + 20000 ...
 Bias: 150.0 V
 Start date: 25/03/2005
 Start time: 13:55:48
 Stop date: 25/03/2005
 Stop time: 14:35:28




Carlos Escobar Cluster Meeting - April 5, 2005

<http://ific.uv.es/sct/lasertest>

Beta tests

Hamamatsu			CiS		
Point 1	Point 2	Point 3	Point 1	Point 2	Point 3
3.00 fC	2.91 fC	3.00 fC	3.02 fC	2.88 fC	3.05 fC

NOTE: These values are not corrected by the calibration factors of each chip, but $C_{CiS} > C_{Hama}$, so they have very good agreement



This shows the perfect agreement (up to 0.05 fC) in both cases, so the ratio we observed should be due to optical properties



Carlos Escobar Cluster Meeting - April 5, 2005

<http://ific.uv.es/sct/lasertest>

Reflectivity

Preliminary results:

Reflectivity coefficient is higher in Hamamatsu than in CiS. We measured them last week so we are working in exact numbers, but... here is the explanation we were looking for!



References

<http://ific.uv.es/sct/lasertest>