## Updates on the FTM tests in Bari

FTM meeting

Antonello Pellecchia University and INFN Bari July 29, 2020



## Outline

- Prototype design
- Laser test bench
- First test and HV stability
- Characterization tests

## FTM small-size prototype design



## Laser test bench



Validation: gain measurements on a triple-GEM TPC

## Collimated setup





### Focused setup

High intensity, point-like ionization





## First FTM test in the laser box



# **Prototype HV (in)stability**



- Prototype was opened and solderings replaced several times
- When  $V_{foil}$  >500 V, ground voltage "follows" anode
- Currently unable to operate the prototype with foils beyond 500  ${\sf V}$

## First gain measurement – signal method



- ~ 10000 signals collected at each foil voltage
- A signal is observed even at 0 V (electrons collected by the DLC anode)
- Signal amplitudes at 0 and 100 V are the same

## First gain measurement – signal method



#### Collected charge vs foil voltage

- Exponential fit at high  $V_{foil}$
- Constant fit at  $V_{_{\rm foil}} < 200~V$ 
  - ➔ Primary charge estimation: 2.31 pC
- Average collected charge vs laser pulse energy is not quadratic (hint at some non-linear effect)

#### Gain curve interpretation

- High primary charge (10<sup>7</sup> electrons)
- Low gain (<10), may be due to
  - Space charge
  - Foil charging up
  - Resistivity

# New goal: repeat measurements at lower laser beam intensity

# **COVID** interlude

## Trying to investigate the high flux behaviour

Simulation of a high primary charge event in a single hole

- Transient simulation
  - → Garfield is inappropriate
  - → Gmsh + Elmer
- 2D cylindrical-symmetric geometry
- FEM approach (non-Monte Carlo)
  - Unable to simulate avalanche fluctuations
- Three coupled PDEs:

$$\begin{cases} \nabla^2 V = \frac{1}{\epsilon_0} (\rho_i - \rho_e) & \text{Potential} \\ \frac{\partial \rho_e}{\partial t} = \alpha |\vec{v_e}| \rho_e - \eta |\vec{v_e}| \rho_e - \nabla \cdot (\vec{v_e} \rho_e) + D_e \nabla^2 \rho_e & \text{Electron cl} \\ \frac{\partial \rho_i}{\partial t} = \alpha |\vec{v_e}| \rho_e - \nabla \cdot (\vec{v_i} \rho_i) & \text{Ion cloud} \end{cases}$$





- Heavy calculations (~30h to simulate a single event)
- Currently too preliminary for quantitative results

## Second gain measurement – current method



Laser ionizes the gas in the top layer

- Optical setup same as before
- **Current readout** Keisight B2981A femtoammeter connected to both ground electrodes
- Measurement aim estimate gain from direct primary current measurement at low laser energy





to scope

Current vs pulse energy plot at increasing filter optical densities Quadratic trend recovered at  $E_p < 8 \text{ uJ}$ 

## Ground current and primary current



It is not possible to measure the primary current from the femtoammeter at low pulse energies  $\rightarrow$  primary ionization current measured at maximum beam energy

$$i_P @8\mu J = i_P @51\mu J \left(\frac{8\mu J}{51\mu J}\right)^2$$

 $i_{_{\rm P}}=0.178$  pA at 8  $\mu J$ 

## Effective gain (work in progress)



- At 450 V gain of 6000 seems too high
- Error on primary current is neglected here (would be 100 %)
  - Measurements to be repeated trying to reduce the noise
- The current measured at the foil bottom in the plateau at  $\widetilde{}$  20 V may not be equal to the full primary ionization current

- Current measurements
  - ➤ Noise reduction
  - Primary current measured from cathode
- Reading **signals** again
  - → **Spectrum** at decreasing laser energies
  - Single-electron spectrum?

# Backup

## Why a laser test bench for the FTM



No distinct photopeak at gaps < 500  $\mu m \rightarrow$  X-ray energy deposit is subjected to large fluctuations

Laser beams can be used as ionization sources in gas gaps of any volume with small fluctuations

## Laser specs

Pulse energy	51 µJ	Can provide a MIP-like energy deposit
Waist radius	400 µm	Low angular divergence
Wavelength	266 nm / 4.7 eV	Two-photon ionization of hydrocarbons
Pulse duration	1 ns FWHM	Lower than triple-GEM time resolution
Spatial mode	TEM <sub>00</sub>	Gaussian beam Beam quality < 1.5





## Laser-gas interaction

Ionization energy in Ar/CO2 70/30: 13-15 eV

Typical laser photon energy:  $\sim 4.7 \text{ eV} \otimes 266 \text{ nm} \leftarrow \text{too low}!$ 

Laser ionization made possible by multi-photon absorption of



At low beam intensity, two-photon ionization dominates: ionization rate  $\propto$  (later beam intensity)<sup>2</sup>

## **Optical setup preparation**

**Collimated setup** 

# $f = 75 \text{ mm} \qquad f = 200 \text{ mm} \qquad f = 75 \text{ mm} \qquad f = 750 \text{ mm} \quad f = 200 \text{ mm} \qquad f = 750 \text{ mm} \quad f = 200 \text{ mm} \qquad f = 750 \text{ mm} \quad f = 750 \text{ mm} \quad f = 200 \text{ mm} \quad f = 750 \text{ mm} \quad f = 750 \text{ mm} \quad f = 200 \text{ mm} \quad f = 750 \text{ mm} \quad f = 75$

	Collimated	Focused
Waist radius	1500 µm	23.4 µm
Angular divergence	0.06 mrad	~ 5 mrad
Beam intensity	$34 \ \mu J/mm^2$	$3   imes  10^4 \; \mu J/mm^2$
Features	Optical filter + Pinhole to reduce pulse energy	Point-like primary ionization

#### **Focused setup**

**Problem** Determining the number of primaries created by a single laser pulse



**Solution** Measuring the counting efficiency scan vs laser pulse energy @ 100 Hz:

$$\epsilon = \frac{\text{anode signal rate}}{\text{laser pulse rate}}$$

**Assumption** Primary electron number is Poisson-distributed

$$\epsilon = 1 - \sum_{n=0}^{n_t h} \frac{\exp[n_0 (E/E_0)^2]}{n!} n_0^n (E/E_0)^{2n_t}$$

$$\begin{split} E_{_0} &= \text{reference pulse energy} \qquad n_{_0} = \text{primary electrons per laser pulse at } E_{_0} \\ n_{_{th}} &= n. \text{ of primary electrons corresponding to the discriminator threshold} \end{split}$$

Result:  $n_0 = 30.7 \pm 0.5$  electrons at 10 µJ in the active gas volume

## Charge spectra at different gains – mar 2020



## Charge spectra at different gains – mar 2020



## Laser pulse energy scan - mar 2020



- ✤ Expected: quadratic
- ➤ Observed: possibly linear
- Linear trend of ionization vs pulse energy is expected in high laser flux regime
- Two possibilities:
  - 1. Loss of quadratic behaviour in the primary ionization itself
    - To be confirmed or rejected by measuring laser energy scan at low amplification fields
  - 2. The amplification is not linear (non-proportional regime) because of the large primary charge
    - Measurements to be repeated with strong laser attenuation







# Calibration referring to the following beam setup:

- → 1500 µm waist radius
- Collimated beam
- → 770 µm pinhole radius
- → 10 µJ pulse energy
- → 30 e<sup>-</sup> created per laser pulse

Found two-photon cross-section by numerical integration:

$$\frac{N\sigma^{(2)}}{(h\nu)^2} = \frac{R}{\int dx dy dz \, I(x, y, z)^2} = 29.5 \times 10^8 \text{mm}^4 / \mu \text{J}^2$$

## Ionization in the bottom layer – july 2020

I tried to measure the ground current at different laser attenuations (0.0<OD<0.5)



## Ionization in the bottom layer: considerations



- When the laser is turned on, the current increases sharply, then "exponentially" decreases
- The current "delta"  $(i_{on}-i_{off})$  increases with the laser pulse energy
- Charging up effect?

This only happens when the laser is shot in the bottom layer. Subsequent measurements have been done only ionizing in the top layer, where the current remains steady after turning on the laser

## Ionization in the top layer



## Looking for the quadratic ionization trend



Current vs pulse energy plot at increasing filter optical densities Quadratic trend recovered at  $E_P < 8 \text{ uJ}$ 

## Found quadratic trend at low laser flux



**My interpretation** is that at high laser fluxes the trend is not quadratic not because saturation in the laser, but because of loss of linearity in the detector due to the high primary charge (space charge, charging up, resistivity effects etc.)

The trend is quadratic at pulse energies < 8  $\mu J$   $\rightarrow$  current vs amplification field is measured with filter at OD = 0.8 - 1.0



Ground current measured at OD = 0.8, attenuator 100%  $\rightarrow$   $E_{_{\rm P}}=8~\mu J$