Realizing Cosmic Explorer 2 with Evolved LIGO A+ or Voyager Technology

> Kevin Kuns for the Cosmic Explorer Project

> > May 18, 2021



CE-G2100019 / LIGO-G2101087





✤ 40 km L-shaped surface facility







 ★ 40 km L-shaped surface facility
♦ Immediate sensitivity improvement "just" by increasing the arm length





✤ 40 km L-shaped surface facility

- Immediate sensitivity improvement "just" by increasing the arm length
- Additional 20 km detector for post-merger physics





- ✤ 40 km L-shaped surface facility
 - Immediate sensitivity improvement "just" by increasing the arm length
 - Additional 20 km detector for post-merger physics
- ✤ Realized in two stages with two technology options for the second stage





- ✤ 40 km L-shaped surface facility
 - Immediate sensitivity improvement "just" by increasing the arm length
 - Additional 20 km detector for post-merger physics
- ✤ Realized in two stages with two technology options for the second stage
- ★ CE1: built in the 2030's using LIGO A+ technology





✤ 40 km L-shaped surface facility

- Immediate sensitivity improvement "just" by increasing the arm length
- Additional 20 km detector for post-merger physics
- ✤ Realized in two stages with two technology options for the second stage



★ CE2: built in the 2040's using either evolved A+ or Voyager technology





🔆 40 km L-shaped surface facility

- Immediate sensitivity improvement "just" by increasing the arm length
- Additional 20 km detector for post-merger physics
- ★ Realized in two stages with two technology options for the second stage



- ★ CE2: built in the 2040's using either evolved A+ or Voyager technology
- 券 Facility can support future detectors



Cosmic Explorer 2 LIGO A+ Technology

Voyager Technology



Newtonian noise



- * Suppression techniques are facility upgrades common to both technologies resulting in the same Newtonian noise for both

- * Berms, trenches, and seismic metamaterials



Test mass thermal noise



Seismic noise and inertial isolation



- Both detector technologies have similar seismic noise
- ✤ Both technologies use suspensions with final stage blade springs to reduce vertical resonances: Sebastien's talk
- * CE2 target requires 100× improvement over aLIGO inertial isolation performance at 1 Hz
- ★ Several novel isolator ideas: Mow-Lowry & Martynov, van Heijningen, ...

Suspension thermal noise





Quantum noise



- * Same quantum noise for both technologies
- * Shot noise $\propto \sqrt{\lambda/P_{arm}}$ $\Rightarrow P_{arm} = 1.5 \text{ MW for } \lambda = 1 \mu \text{m}$
 - $\Rightarrow P_{arm} = 3 \text{ MW for } \lambda = 2 \, \mu m$
- ✤ 10 dB frequency dependent squeezing for both technologies
- ✤ 500 ppm SEC loss limits HF sensitivity



















* Absorbed power in ITM's can't exceed radiative cooling power

$$P_{\rm abs} = \pi \alpha_{\rm sub} h_{\rm TM} \frac{P_{\rm arm}}{\mathcal{F}} + \alpha_{\rm coat} P_{\rm arm}$$



* Absorbed power in ITM's can't exceed radiative cooling power

$$P_{abs} = \pi \alpha_{sub} h_{TM} \frac{P_{arm}}{\mathcal{F}} + \alpha_{coat} P_{arm}$$

✤ SEC loss

at HF
$$\propto \sqrt{rac{\mathcal{F}}{P_{\mathrm{arm}}}},$$
 at LF $\propto \sqrt{\mathcal{F}P_{\mathrm{arm}}}$



* Absorbed power in ITM's can't exceed radiative cooling power

$$P_{abs} = \pi \alpha_{sub} h_{TM} \frac{P_{arm}}{\mathcal{F}} + \alpha_{coat} P_{arm}$$

✤ SEC loss

at HF
$$\propto \sqrt{\frac{\mathcal{F}}{P_{\rm arm}}}$$
, at LF $\propto \sqrt{\mathcal{F}P_{\rm arm}}$

* Large beams: intensity ~ $2 \times less$ than Voyager for $P_{arm} = 10 \text{ MW}$



* Absorbed power in ITM's can't exceed radiative cooling power

$$P_{abs} = \pi \alpha_{sub} h_{TM} \frac{P_{arm}}{\mathcal{F}} + \alpha_{coat} P_{arm}$$

✤ SEC loss

at HF
$$\propto \sqrt{\frac{\mathcal{F}}{P_{\mathrm{arm}}}},$$
 at LF $\propto \sqrt{\mathcal{F}P_{\mathrm{arm}}}$

- ***** Large beams: intensity ~ $2 \times$ less than Voyager for $P_{arm} = 10 \text{ MW}$
- * Thermal lensing, coating absorption, angular instabilities, PI's, ...?

Summary

 CE2 can reach similar strain sensitivities using either evolved LIGO A+ or Voyager technology



- Risk mitigation in the event that significant challenges are discovered in one of the technologies
- ★ However, many required R&D activities (Newtonian noise suppression, inertial isolation, ...) are common to both realizations of CE2
- * Many generations of detector technologies are expected to be used in the CE observatories
- * Voyager technology has greater potential for increased arm powers in the future