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Gamma-ray tracking Ge spectrometers

## Gamma-Ray Tracking Paradigm



PSCS technique at IPHC

## PSCS = Pulse Shape Comparison Scan



IPHC scanning table

> XY positioning $+/-10 \mu \mathrm{~m}$
> Adjustment frame: detector position fine tuning using micrometric screws

$>360^{\circ}$ rotation of the crystal
> Laser alignment reference

## Optical module



## laser beam

IPHC scanning table



-

## IPHC scanning table

## Electronics

> 10 TNT2 boards (L. Arnold et al., IEEE TNS 53 (2006)723)
> $100 \mathrm{MHz}, 14$ bits flash ADCs

- Common clock; up to 40 channels sync.
- Mixed mode: energy + samples readout
> USB data transfer


AGATA B type crystal


## Scan characteristics

|  | source | mode | pitch [mm] | timeout <br> [s] | number of points | total time [days] | $\begin{gathered} \text { volume } \\ \text { of raw } \\ \text { data [Go] } \end{gathered}$ | info |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| VERTICAL POSITION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | ${ }^{137} \mathrm{Cs}$ | E | 1 | 100 | 5520 | 7.5 | 260 | charge collection analysis |
| 2 | ${ }^{137} \mathrm{Cs}$ | M | 2 | 110 | 1310 | 2 | 1500 | PSCS |
| 3 | ${ }^{137} \mathrm{Cs}$ | E | 0.2 | 150 | 300 | 0.6 | 22 | check vertical tilt 4 |
| 4 | ${ }^{241} \mathrm{Am}$ | E | 0.05 | 60 | 160 | 0.1 | 41 | segmentation line analysis |
| HORIZONTAL POSITION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | ${ }^{137} \mathrm{Cs}$ | M | 2 | 110 | 1840 | 2.7 | 1400 | PSCS $0^{\circ}$ |
| 6 | ${ }^{137} \mathrm{Cs}$ | M | 2 | 120 | 1840 | 3 | 1500 | PSCS $90^{\circ}$ |
| 7 | ${ }^{137} \mathrm{Cs}$ | E | 0.2 | 150 | 400 | 0.8 | 25 | PSCS check lateral tilt |

$\Rightarrow E=$ energy mode
$\Rightarrow M=$ Mixte mode

2D ${ }^{137}$ Cs scans

## Photopeak efficiency: Core signal

Front scan 1mm pitch


Lateral scan 2 mm pitch


## 2D ${ }^{137}$ Cs scans

Photopeak efficiency: Segment signals
Front scan 1mm pitch
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Front scan 2 mm pitch
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Ucioder 1Y-LJ, LUIJ

2D scans

## Crystal lattice

 anisotropy$>{ }^{137} \mathrm{Cs}$
$>2 \mathrm{~mm}$ pitch
$>$ Slowest axis in corner of segment A
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2D scans

## Other possibilities

> Image charge asymmetry
> Photopeak shift -> charge trapping
> FWHM
> Charge sharing on segmentation lines
> Li contact thickness 3D scans

Data analysis
> $\quad 50000$ voxels to evaluate by $x^{2}$
> Each voxel: 15000 (A) x15000 (B) supertraces to evaluate

- Each supertrace: 4400 samples of 2 bytes
> 100 peta bytes of data to compare
~170 days needed

A faster analysis is mandatory

Calculation speed improvements
$>$ Same segment hit in both data sets (A) and (B)
> Consider only Core, hit segment, direct neighbor segments (left/right + top/down)
> Only 40 samples compared among the 120
> Take into account only the 200 lowest $x^{2}$ values
NB: at the end of the comparison process, the final $X^{2}$ value is a confidence criterion

Effective data analysis duration
Reduced to 5 days

3D scans

3D scans in full volume -> ${ }^{137}$ Cs

Typical AGATA scan planning:
$>\mathrm{T}_{\text {init }}$ : crystal @ IPHC
> $\mathrm{T}_{0}=\mathrm{T}_{\text {init }}+1$ week: crystal operational in the test cryostat (AGATA)
> $T_{0}+2$ weeks: scans performed
> $\mathrm{T}_{0}+3$ weeks: database available


## 3D scans

PSCS: no detector geometry input
$>$ Voxel inside the crystal $->$ large statistics $->$ low final $x^{2}$ value
> Voxel outside crystal -> low statistics -> high final $X^{2}$ value



## 3D scans: pulse shapes

Example along azimuth


## 3D scans: pulse shapes

Example along depth


## 3D scans: pulse shapes

## Example along radius $Z=50 \mathrm{~mm}$



3D scans: pulse shapes

## Example along radius $Z=2 \mathrm{~mm}$



3D scans






3D scans: hit segments



 3D scans: hit segments
segment hit $Y=-30$

segment hit $Y=-28$

segment hit $Y=-26$

segment hit $Y=-24$


3D scans: hit segments
segment hit $Y=-22$

segment hit $Y=-20$

segment hit $Y=-18$

segment hit $Y=-16$
 3D scans: hit segments
segment hit $Y=-14$

segment hit $\mathrm{Y}=-12$

segment hit $\mathrm{Y}=-10$

segment hit $Y=-8$


3D scans: hit segments
segment hit $Y=-6$

segment hit $Y=-4$

segment hit $Y=-2$

segment hit $Y=0$


Databases comparison


Slice $Z=6 \mathrm{~mm}$
Average shift : 4.2 mm


Slice $Z=68 \mathrm{~mm}$
Average shift : 3.8 mm

Databases comparison


## Conclusions

2D scans -> many parameters may be studied
$>$ Efficiency

- Lattice anisotropy
> Segmentation line
> Peak shift for charge trapping
> Li contact thickness
PSCS technique is operational at IPHC
> Efficient
Reconstructs the 3D crystal geometry
- Enables comparing pulse-shape databases
> Time considerations for AGATA crystal full-volume scan
$\square 2$ weeks of scans
- 1 week of offline analysis

Construction of a pulse-shape database of 48500 points

- Mean pulse shape results

Shapes well differentiated with 2 mm pitch
Very low noise level in the final average pulse shapes
> Take care

- Proper alignment mandatory
- Collimated beam diameter limitation

Outlook

## Outlook

> Convert the B006 pulse-shape database to insert it in the AGATA PSA algorithm

Improved in-beam energy resolution?
$\square$ Tracking efficiency improvement?
>R\&D on Ge detectors
$\square$ Improvement of pulse-shape modellingInfluence of dead layers on Ge bulk responseResponse of non-standard Ge crystal geometries
$\square$ Others...
> Collaborations

- AGATA

ENSAR2 JRA PSeGe

- Canberra France

Any other is welcome...

## THANK YOU <br> for your attention

Adjustment frame


Supertraces

## supertrace - noise evaluation B1 fired

FULL scale



- residual electronic noise $<0.1 \%$
- segments away from the hit one: variations due to crosstalk


## Segment boundaries

HPGe active crystal


Fit with equation 3.1


Linear fit


Rotation in vertical position
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Horizontal alignment



Peak shift

## Average Core peak shift

Average Seg. peak shift


2D ${ }^{137}$ Cs scans

Core $\mathbf{T 9 0}=\mathbf{t}(\mathrm{ampl} 90 \%)-\mathrm{t}(\mathrm{ampl} 10 \%)$
Front scan 2 mm pitch
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Slice 6


Charge sharing


- no efficiency loss if segments in addback mode IF large integration (55-61 keV) range

Charge sharing

$\gamma$ spot cross-section


## If Hole collection on inter-electrode gap

- 1 interaction, 2 segments hit
- $4 \%$ energy loss
- recognizable with $\sum E_{\text {segment }} \ll E_{\text {Core }}$

|  | low-energy component | full-energy component |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Centroid [keV] | 57.0 | 59.5 |
| FWHM [keV] | 2.20 | 1.16 |
| Area [counts] | 416 | 441 |

Charge sharing

## segment $\mathbf{A 1}$ spectrum vs scanning position



Charge sharing

## segment F1 spectrum vs scanning position



Charge sharing

## segment $A 1+F 1$ addback spectrum vs scanning position



Charge sharing



- hole cloud reaching inter-segment gap
- charge NOT collected within the integration time
- readout value misses the weighting potential value @ hole cloud position


Charge sharing

(a)

(b)

Charge sharing

## Charge charing intensity map
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slice 3

slice 6
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## Charge sharing

## Charge charing intensity map

1－2 interface


4－5 interface


2－3 interface


5－6 interface
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