PID Temperature Controller Autotuning for Skipper-CCDs Evan Jones, Wellesley College, 2023 SIST Intern | Supervisor: Ana Martina Botti

Introduction

Proportional-integral-derivative (PID) temperature control of Skipper-CCDs is important for dark matter directdetection experiments, e.g., SENSEI@MINOS. The project goal is to create an autotuned PID controller in Python to replace expensive Lake Shore temperature controllers.



Set up

- Skipper-CCD on metal block inside Ideal Vacuum Cube
- ~10⁻⁴ Torr with Hi Cube pump
- ~102 K with Polycold PCC cryocooler
- Lake Shore 336 Temperature Controller for reading ullettemperature, providing heater power
- Perform step tests and fit with first order response equation

Fig. 1. Skipper-CCD inside an Ideal Vacuum Cube

$$T(t) = T_0 + K(1 - e^{-\frac{t}{\tau}})$$

T = Temperature (K) $K = \text{Gain}(\mathbf{K})$ $\tau = \text{Time constant (s)}$ t = Time (s)

First order step test response with bias and no deadtime

Ideal Approach



Fig. 2. Experimental step test results for outputs 5% to 25% fitted with first order response trendline, alongside simulated results. Simulation aligns well with 20% step test, poorly with others.

- Approximates block with uniform temperature for each time step
- Physical system-specific variables incorporated into scale factors
- Unsuccessful fitting scale factors insufficient for fitting heater output responses (Fig. 2)
- Further investigation of unaccounted factors needed

Phenomenological Approach

- Finds rate of temperature change vs. temperature for each step-tested output
- Uses this to simulate changes in block temperature



Fig. 3. Experimental step test results for outputs 5% to 55% with first order response equation (a) and linear trendline (b), alongside simulated results. 0% and 60% omitted for figure readability.



Heat transfer equations for physics-based simulation. Calculated each time step.

PID Controller Results

- Working solution achieved!
- Simulated and experimental results have similarly shaped curves with potential for improvement
- Data-based simulation gives estimate for initial parameters
- Easily scalable for future applications on other systems

$$e(t) = SP(t) - T(t)$$
 Error informs
 $e(t) = \text{Error (K)}$ SP = Set point(K) SP = S



Fig. 4. Slope (a) and intercept (b) of Fig. 3(b) trendlines. Outputs 0% to 60%. Third degree polynomial trendlines. 5% output (slope -0.0043 K²/s, intercept 0.44 K/s) considered an outlier due to noise at temperatures close to 102 K. Step tests <20% seem out of range for reliable results.



$$u(t) = K_P e(t) + \frac{K_P}{T_I} \int_0^t e(t) dt + K_P T_D \frac{dT(t)}{dt}$$
$$u(t) = \text{Controller output (\% of 50 W)}_{K_P = \text{Proportional gain}} \quad T_I = \text{Integral time}_{T_D = \text{Derivative time}}$$

Controller output is the sum of proportional, integral, and derivative terms, with a 60% maximum cutoff due to range of step test data. The proportional term reacts to the current error, the integral term to accumulated error, and the derivative term to rate of change of temperature.



This manuscript has been authored by Fermi Research Alliance, LLC under Contract No. DE-AC02-07CH11359 with the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, Office of High Energy Physics.

Fig. 5. Temperature control experiments and simulations. Target temperature 130 K. No derivative term due to its destabilizing tendency and lack of system deadtime. Discrepancies show room for improvement, possibly by collecting more or different step test data. Fig. 5. (a) (b) (c) No set point ramping, $K_P = 1.768$, $T_I = 848.7$

Fig. 5. (d) (e) (f) Set point ramping of 0.75 K/min, K_P = 25.2, T_I = 777



