

* The Microphysics of Noble Liquids

Brian Lenardo, Kareem Kazkaz, Aaron Manalaysay, Matthew Szydagis, and Mani Tripathi

Workshop on Low Energy Particle Physics with Liquid Xenon Detectors, National Research Nuclear University MEPhI, Thursday 10/23/2014

- *The working model of the physics of the ionization and scintillation processes
- *Recent improvements in our understanding
- *Examples of both postdictive and predictive power of approach presented today
- *Focusing exclusively on liquid xenon here
 *Gas xenon, argon, and other noble elements and phases should work within same framework
- *Work is incorporated into NEST (Noble Element Simulation Technique) which is a MC tool



biexcitonic quenching (NR: worst at high energy) $N_{ex} \rightarrow N_{ph} \rightarrow S1$ (geometric light collection **times** quartz VUV transmission **times** PE conversion probability,...) $N_i \rightarrow N_{e} \rightarrow Drift$, diffuse, die \rightarrow Extraction \rightarrow Gas photons \rightarrow S2 Heat (NR: worst at low energy)

Free parameters used at every step have physical meaning



*Approximation of the Platzman approach *Compute average W to generate exciton or ion *Electron recombination varies with electric field, energy, type of scattering, and density/phase * Thomas-Imel model of recombination *Lindhard theory of electronic stopping power * Permit variations within default prescription *Quenches the *total* yield, not just scintillation *Biexcitonic quenching of light yield *Birks' Law, a function of the total dE/dx *Dobi/Mozumder recombination fluctuations Mozumder, Chem. Phys. Lett. 245 (1995) 359

* Models Within Model

- *W = 13.7 +/- 0.2 eV (higher than excitation or ionization potentials because of heat loss)
- *If N_{ex}/N_i = 0.15 for ER (best-fit NEW model)
 then
- *W_i = (traditional definition)
 *E / N_i = (N_{ex}+N_i) * W / N_i = (N_{ex}/N_i + 1) * W =
 1.15 * 13.7 ~ 15.8 eV
 *Compare to Takabashi 1975 result of 15.6 +/- 0

* Compare to Takahashi 1975 result of 15.6 +/- 0.3
* This is <u>not</u> forced: pieces fit together naturally

*Continuity of zero and non-zero field models *Reduction in free parameters *Less splining and more physical motivation *Over-conservativeness (low yields) removed *Global fit over as much data as possible *Moving far beyond C.E. Dahl thesis data *Combined fit of light & charge simultaneously *For ER, fit to electron data only and gammas/xrays must follow: much simpler approach

*What's New?



*NR Charge/Light Ratio







*Relative Yield x. Field





Zero Field

Non-zero Field (450 V/cm)



As we approach minimally-ionizing, the curve asymptotes

* ER Scintillation Yield



* A True Prediction for ER



* ER With Retector Effects



*ER Ionization Yield



*ER Energy Resolution



Singlet lifetime	3.1 ± 0.7 ns
Triplet lifetime	$24\pm1~\mathrm{ns}$
Singlet/Triplet - ER from direct excitation (γ induced)	0.17 ± 0.05
Singlet/Triplet - ER from recombination (γ induced)	0.8 ± 0.2
Singlet/Triplet - ER from both processes (α induced)	2.3 ± 0.51
Singlet/Triplet - NR (neutron induced)	7.8 ± 1.5

*S1 PHIse Shape



XENON10 Data (Sorensen 2008)

Model:

Without extraction delay With extraction delay



*S2 Pulse Shape This physics is described in

- B. Lenardo et al., In preparation, to be submitted to the IEEE Transactions on Nuclear Science
- J. Mock et al., JINST 9 (2014) T04002. <u>arXiv:1310.1117</u>
- M. Szydagis et al., JINST 8 (2013) C10003. arXiv:1307.6601
- M. Szydagis et al., JINST 6 (2011) P10002. <u>arXiv:1106.1613</u>



nest.physics.ucdavis.edu, albany.edu/physics/NEST.shtml

*Publications

*Questions?