Ion backflow studies with a triple-GEM stack with increasing hole pitch
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ABSTRACT: Gas Electron Multipliers have undergone a very consistent development since their invention in 1997. Their production procedures have been tuned in such a way that nowadays it is possible to produce foils with areas of the order of the square meter that can operate at a reasonable gain, uniform over large areas and with a good stability in what concerns electrical discharges. For the 3\textsuperscript{rd} run of LHC, they will be included in the CMS and ALICE experiments after significant upgrades of the detectors, confirming that these structures are suitable for very large experiments. In the special case of Time Projection Chambers, the ion backflow and the energy resolution are sensitive issues that must be addressed and the GEM has shown to be able to deal with both of them.

In this work, a stack of three GEMs with different pitches has been studied as a possible future approach for ion-backflow suppression to be used in TPCs and other detection concepts. With this approach, an ion backflow of 1\% with an energy resolution of 12\% at 5.9 keV has been achieved with the detector operating in an Ar/CO$_2$ (90/10) mixture at a gain of $\sim$ 2000.
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1 Introduction

Gas Electron Multipliers (GEMs) [1, 2] and other Micropattern Gaseous Detectors, such as the MICROMEGAS [3], Thick-GEMs [4] or the Thick-COBRA [5] have become established technologies for very large detectors and their use is foreseen for upgrades in some High Energy Physics experiments, such as ALICE [6], CMS [7] or COMPASS [8]. The choice for this type of detectors is related to their cost per unit of sensitive area, moderate energy and position resolution and other less obvious — though important — effects, such as their intrinsic ion backflow (IB) suppression. IB is the flow of the positive ions resulting from the electron avalanches in the gas in the direction of the absorption region. The presence of these ions in the absorption region of the detector gives origin to distortions in the electric field that in most of the cases should be uniform. Not every detector concept is sensitive to IB but, for example, in Time Projection Chambers (TPC) the reconstruction of particle tracks relies on the assumption that the drift field is uniform to estimate the $x,y,z$ position of each voxel. Depending on the amount of IB, the position and $dE/dx$ resolution can be compromised.

There have been consistent and successful studies for the optimization of GEM geometries and high-voltage parameters to reduce the IB enough to make these structures suitable for their use in TPC readout chambers in continuous mode, which is a technological breakthrough, increasing its performance in terms of event rate capability [9–11]. In the case of the ALICE TPC upgrade the geometry studies converged to a cascade of four GEMs where the first and the last ones use a standard 140$\mu$m hole pitch and the two in between have a hole pitch of 280$\mu$m. The experiment required IB below 1% and energy resolution below 12% at 5.9 keV ($\sigma$). This geometry fulfilled the requirements with a gas mixture of Ne/CO₂/N₂ (90/10/5). The large amount of degrees of freedom in the high voltage parameters gives a very good flexibility for this setup, specially due to the fact that the ideal operational conditions that optimize the IB and the energy resolution demands extreme voltage configurations that are usually less stable in terms of discharge probability.
Despite the advantages of the quadruple GEM, it is interesting to address and compare the performance of a simpler, more standard stack. Therefore, we tried to benefit from the collection and extraction efficiencies of GEMs with different hole pitch to optimize the intrinsic IB suppression of the GEM. The work described in this paper studied the performance of a triple GEM stack where each of the three GEMs have a different pitch, operating in an Ar/CO\(_2\) (90/10) mixture. The work consisted of laboratory measurements and numerical simulations using Garfield [12].

2 Experimental setup

Throughout this text, the detector is described with the cathode on top with the electrons moving down towards the anode. The nomenclature of the fields follow the standard used in this type of detectors. The field upstream one GEM is called the drift field and the field downstream the GEM is called the induction field (sometimes also called extraction field). The field between two GEMs is the transfer field and can be seen as the induction field of the GEM at the top or the drift field of the GEM at the bottom. The numbering of the GEMs is also done from top to bottom.

2.1 Basic principle

The working principle proposed for this GEM stack is based on two important concepts related to the GEM: the collection efficiency and the extraction efficiency.

The collection efficiency is defined as the fraction of free electrons drifting towards the GEM that enter the holes. The ability of the GEM to focus the electrons towards the holes depends on the ratio between the drift field (the field above the GEM) and the field inside the holes. At moderate drift fields, just enough to prevent the recombination of the ion pairs, the drift electric field lines are mostly focused to the holes of the GEM. In this setup, most of the electrons in the drift region are able to reach the holes and the collection efficiency is close to unit. If the drift electric field is increased with respect to the GEM voltage, the field lines will curve towards the GEM holes closer to the GEM copper surface. Above a certain threshold, some of the field lines will no longer curve towards the holes, ending in the copper surface between the holes. As a consequence, some of the electrons in the drift region are lost on the copper surface, resulting in a continuous reduction of the collection efficiency as the drift field increases. To restore the collection efficiency, the voltage across the GEM must be increased (with the consequent increase of its absolute gain). It is relatively simple to understand that if the hole pitch is larger, the threshold in the drift field for collection efficiency reduction will be lower, and the opposite for smaller pitch.

After being multiplied, the electrons must be pulled out of the holes. Some of them will be collected on the bottom copper surface of the GEM and some of them will make their way through the induction field towards the anode. The extraction efficiency is defined as the fraction of electrons leaving the GEM and reaching the anode plane. The extraction depends on the ratio between the induction field (below the GEM) and the field inside the holes. When the voltage across the GEM is kept constant, at low induction fields, most of the electric field lines leaving the holes are curved back to the bottom copper surface of the GEM, resulting in a very small number of electrons reaching the anode. An increase of the induction field will bring these lines closer to the anode before they bend and more electrons reach the anode, increasing the extraction efficiency more or less linearly. Again, above a certain threshold, the induction field is so high that there are
no more lines bending from the holes towards the bottom surface. All lines start in the bottom of the GEM and end in the anode. In this regime, the extraction efficiency continues to rise, but the slope is not as steep as before the threshold. Eventually, at some even higher field, there will be Townsend avalanches also in this region. The threshold will also move for lower induction fields when the hole pitch is larger and the opposite will happen for smaller pitch.

Figure 1 shows the collection efficiency measured with GEMs with a standard pitch of 140 µm (S) and large pitch of 280 µm (LP).

**Figure 1.** The collection efficiency at different voltages of operation for two GEMs with different hole pitch. The collection efficiency depends on the ratio between the drift field (above the GEM) and its voltage difference. The threshold above which there is a decrease in the collection efficiency is clearly seen and depends on the hole pitch. The small decrease in the efficiency below the threshold is related to other effects, such as the depth of the drift field.

Figure 2 shows the extraction efficiency measured with the two GEMs from fig. 1.

For the case of ions, the same effect takes place, but coming from below the GEM in the opposite direction. Taking that into account, the way to increase the stream of electrons extracted from one GEM while reducing the number of ions in the opposite direction is to increase the induction field. In fact, as seen before, the electron extraction efficiency increases (fig. 2) while the amount of ions entering the holes from below decreases (fig. 1). However, in a GEM stack, although the transfer field is working as an induction field for the GEM on the top, it will work as the drift field for the GEM at the bottom, which means that the advantages of increasing this field to improve the extraction from the first GEM will be lost by the loss of collection efficiency on the second GEM. Fig. 1 suggests that using a second GEM with a smaller pitch, the field can go higher while keeping the collection efficiency close to unit.

A very good model describing these effects and their consequences, including parametrization of both the collection and extraction efficiencies can be found in [13]. In a very consistent study of parametrization of the collection and extraction efficiencies, the ratio between both is described in
Figure 2. The extraction efficiency at different voltages of operation for the same two GEMs used in the previous figure. The threshold above which the slope of the efficiency changes is clearly seen and, like for the collection efficiency, also happens for lower fields if the distance between the holes is larger.

In terms of the external field and the field inside the holes of the GEMs:

\[
\frac{X}{C} = \frac{1}{T_{\text{opt}}} \frac{E_{\text{ext}}}{E_{\text{h}}},
\]

where \(T_{\text{opt}}\) is the optical transparency of the GEM, \(E_{\text{ext}}\) and \(E_{\text{h}}\) are the external field and the field inside the holes of the GEM, \(X\) and \(C\) are the extraction and collection efficiencies, for ions/electrons and electrons/ions, according to the side to which \(E_{\text{ext}}\) refers to. The extraction and collection efficiencies can be represented as \(X^+\) and \(C^+\) for ions and \(X^-\) and \(C^-\) for electrons. For example, the effective gain of a single GEM detector is given by:

\[
G_{\text{eff}} = C^- G_{\text{abs}} X^-, 
\]

where \(G_{\text{eff}}\) and \(G_{\text{abs}}\) are the effective and absolute gain in charge, respectively. By definition, the IB is the number of positive ions reaching the cathode \((N_i)\) per electron reaching the anode \((N_e)\). For a triple GEM stack, this can be expressed in terms of the extraction and collection efficiencies for ions and electrons \((X_i^+\) and \(C_i^-\)) and the absolute gain of each GEM \((G_i)\):

\[
IB = \frac{N_i}{N_e} = \frac{C_i^+ G_1 X_i^+ \cdot C_i^+ G_2 X_i^+ \cdot G_3 X_i^+ + N_p}{N_p \cdot C_i^- G_1 X_i^- \cdot C_i^- G_2 X_i^- \cdot C_i^- G_3 X_i^-}
\]

where \(C_i^- G_1 X_i^- \cdot C_i^- G_2 X_i^- \cdot C_i^- G_3 X_i^-\), from the denominator, is the effective gain \(G_{\text{eff}}\) of the triple GEM stack.

Reorganizing and replacing according to equation 2.1, naming the external fields following the convention of GEM detectors, one gets:
\[ IB = \frac{X^+}{C_1} \cdot \frac{C^+}{X_1} \cdot \frac{X^+}{C_2} \cdot \frac{C^+}{X_2} \cdot \frac{1}{N_p X_3} \cdot + \frac{1}{G_{eff}} \]

\[ = \frac{1}{T_1} \cdot \frac{E_{drift}}{E_{h1}} \cdot T_1 \cdot \frac{E_{h1}}{E_{g1}} \cdot \frac{1}{T_2} \cdot \frac{E_{h2}}{E_{g2}} \cdot T_2 \cdot \frac{E_{h2}}{E_{g2}} \cdot + \frac{1}{N_p X_3} \cdot + \frac{1}{G_{eff}} \]

or

\[ IB = \frac{E_{drift}}{T_3 E_{h3} N_p X_e} + \frac{1}{G_{eff}} \]  

(2.2)

This expression confirms the well known effects of how the IB increases by increasing the magnitude of the drift field or by decreasing the gain in GEM-like detectors. It also shows that for the same effective gain of the detector, increasing the the absolute gain of the last GEM will help reducing the IB, which is somehow expected, since this means the absolute gain of the GEMs closer to the cathode must be reduced, reducing the number of ions in that region.

It is also very interesting how the optical transparency of the last GEM can also have a great influence in blocking the ions. This is the main principle exploited in this work. In fact, by using three GEMs with increasing optical transparency, it is possible to apply transfer fields that provide a high electron extraction efficiency from one GEM, while still providing a high electron collection efficiency in the following one.

### 2.2 The detector

The experimental setup used for this study is shown in fig. 3. A triple GEM stack was mounted using 50 \( \mu \)m thick GEMs built at CERN with hole pitch 280 \( \mu \)m (LP, top GEM), 140 \( \mu \)m (S, middle GEM) and 90 \( \mu \)m (SP, bottom GEM). The cathode was made of a copper clad 50 \( \mu \)m Kapton™ foil. The drift, transfer 1 and 2, and induction gaps were 7.2, 2.2 and 1.6 mm thick, respectively. The readout was composed of 120 10 \( \times \) 8.2 mm\(^2\) pads covering the whole 10 \( \times \) 10 cm\(^2\) area of the GEMs.

An Ar/CO\(_2\) (90/10) gas mixture was used in open flow at a rate around 6 l/h. To generate the electrons inside the drift gap, either an \( ^{55} \)Fe radioactive source or an Amptek Mini-X silver target X-ray tube were used.

The detector was biased using seven independent high voltage channels from CAEN VME power supplies, through load resistors which protected the GEMs in case of electrical discharge, draining the excess current to the ground instead of forcing it into the HV supply.

The current in the anode was measured with a Keithley 6517b electrometer and the current in the cathode was measured with a floating femtoamperemeter developed at CERN within the RD51 collaboration. The output of the femtoamperemeter was read by a Fluke Scopemeter 124 handheld oscilloscope. The charge pre-amplifier, shaping amplifier, logic and ADC for the pulse height distributions were all standard nuclear instrumentation NIM and CAMAC modules. Since the pulse height distributions and the currents were done simultaneously, the IB and the energy resolution measurements were done simply by interchanging the two X-ray sources, keeping the voltage settings.

The gain, tuned to 2000 \( \pm \) 50 throughout all the scans, was measured by counting the rate of the \( K_\alpha \) peak of the manganese line from the \( ^{55} \)Fe radioactive source to obtain the primary current and correcting the anode current to remove the small contribution of the argon escape peak. This gain
was used as a reference in order to have a comparison term with the baseline settings of ALICE, which is the most systematic study carried out so far, with all parameters unambiguously described.

\[ \text{Figure 3. Experimental setup. The GEM stack is composed of three GEMs with pitch 280} \mu\text{m}, 140 \mu\text{m} \text{ and 90}\mu\text{m. The IB was calculated by dividing the positive current in the cathode by the negative current in the anode when using an X-ray tube. The gain and the energy resolution were measured using a } ^{55}\text{Fe radioactive source.} \]

3 Results and discussion

The reliability of the GEMs manufactured at CERN nowadays is well known and the areal non-uniformity for small foils (10 × 10 cm²) such as the ones used in this work is negligible. Figure 4 shows a pulse height distribution obtained with a \(^{55}\text{Fe radioactive source, with the detector operating at gain 2000. The uniformity of the hole size over a large area of the foil results in a good energy resolution, even without collimating the source, such as in this case. The settings used for this pulse height distribution were not optimized for ion backflow suppression.} \]

3.1 Experimental

The energy resolution and ion backflow are two properties that are competing against each other. Figure 5 depicts the energy resolution as a function of the IB in this experimental setup. The data points were measured by scanning the voltage of the first GEM in the stack (the LP GEM), while tuning the gain by changing the voltage of the last GEM. None of the other voltages was optimized for IB suppression, but it shows clearly that when the IB decreases, the energy resolution increases and vice versa. The decrease of the IB as the voltage in the last GEM increases is understood from eq. 2.2. In fact, by increasing the voltage in the last multiplication stage while decreasing it in the first GEM the IB is reduced due to the smaller number of ions in the holes of the first GEM — they
Figure 4. Pulse height distribution from an $^{55}$Fe source, with the detector operating at a charge gain 2000. This distribution was obtained with a non-collimated source placed on the detector Kapton™ window (∼1 cm from the cathode). It shows a very good resolution for this gain regime, demonstrating the good quality of the GEMs manufactured at CERN. The voltages are not optimized for IB suppression.

are mostly concentrated in the last GEM and must flow through two GEMs before reaching the drift region. A drawback is the deterioration of the energy resolution in optimal IB conditions.

\[ \text{V}_{SP} / \text{V}_{LP} \text{ scan} \]

Figure 5. $V_{LP}$ and $V_{SP}$ scan. Since the gain was kept constant, when $V_{LP}$ increased, $V_{SP}$ decreased and vice-versa. The ratio $V_{SP}/V_{LP}$ is shown as the secondary x-axis to show that the ion backflow increases by decreasing $V_{SP}$. The ion backflow and the energy resolutions are two competing properties, since whenever one of them improves, the other worsens.

In GEM detectors, each multiplication or transfer stage is introducing statistical fluctuations that deteriorate the resolution. The charge collected in the anode of a triple GEM stack is given by:

\[ Q = n_0e G_1 G_2 G_3, \] (3.1)
where $N$ is the number of electrons from the primary cloud, $e$ is the electron charge and $G_1$, $G_2$ and $G_3$ are the effective gains of GEMs 1, 2 and 3, i.e.

$$G_i = C_i^{\ast} G_{\text{abs}} X_i$$

($C_i^{\ast}$, $G_{\text{abs}}$ and $X_i$ are the electron collection efficiency, absolute gain and electron extraction efficiency of each multiplication stage). Assuming the gain of each GEM independent from the others and from the number of primary electrons, one can estimate the detector energy resolution from the charge, applying the error propagation formula to eq. 3.1:

$$\left( \frac{\sigma_Q}{Q} \right)^2 = \left( \frac{\sigma_{n_0}}{n_0} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{\sigma_{G_1}}{G_1} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{\sigma_{G_2}}{G_2} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{\sigma_{G_3}}{G_3} \right)^2.$$  

(3.2)

The absolute gain of each GEM is the average of the multiplication factor of each independent avalanche $A$:

$$G_j = \frac{1}{N_j} \sum_{i=1}^{N_j} A_{ij}, \quad j = 1, 2, 3$$

(3.3)

where $N_j$ is the number of electrons available for multiplication in GEM $j$: $N_1 = n_0$, $N_2 = n_0 G_1$ and $N_3 = n_0 G_1 G_2$. Using the error propagation formula again, this time on eq. 3.3, one gets:

$$\sigma_{G_j}^2 = \frac{1}{N_j} \sum_{i=1}^{N_j} \sigma_{A_{ij}}^2,$$

$$\sigma_{G_j}^2 = \frac{1}{N_j} \sigma_{A_j}^2.$$  

Finally, equation 3.1 can be written by:

$$\left( \frac{\sigma_Q}{Q} \right)^2 = \frac{F}{n_0} + \frac{1}{n_0} \left( \frac{\sigma_{A_1}}{G_1} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{n_0 G_1} \left( \frac{\sigma_{A_2}}{G_2} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{n_0 G_1 G_2} \left( \frac{\sigma_{A_3}}{G_3} \right)^2,$$

demonstrating that changing the gain of GEM 1 has much more influence on the energy resolution than changing the gain of any other GEM.

Therefore, the best settings for improving energy resolution will be to increase the number of electrons as soon as possible after the ionization, i.e., in the first GEM.

However there are other parameters that can be tuned which bring the curve of fig. 5 to lower values. In fact, as it can be seen in fig. 6, by applying a high field in the first transfer region, between GEMs LP and S and a low field in the second transfer region, between GEMs S and SP, it is possible to minimize the IB, without changing much the energy resolution. The energy resolution is kept constant because the losses in collection efficiency from one GEM are compensated by the gains in the extraction efficiency from the previous GEM, giving origin to a long plateau with constant energy resolution. This is one of the expected consequences of using GEMs with decreasing pitch.

The most probable reason for the decrease of the ion backflow when the second transfer field is decreased is, in one hand, the very poor collection of ions in the LP GEM, due to the high field and, on the other hand, the poor extraction of the ions generated in the SP GEM.

Finally the voltage in the S GEM, in the middle of the stack was scanned, keeping the effective gain constant, with a constant $V_{SP}/V_{LP}$ ratio. Figure 7 shows again that while the energy resolution...
The best settings for ion backflow reduction are when the field in $T_1$ is highest and the field in $T_2$ is lowest. The energy resolution does not change much. Discussion in the text.

remains constant over a wide range of voltages, the ion backflow drops to a plateau of optimal values between 200 and 300 V. The increase of ion backflow for lower voltages can be explained by the need to increase both $V_{SP}$ and $V_{LP}$. This increases the number of ions generated in the first GEM (LP) which can drift to the cathode. For higher voltages, the collection efficiency of the few ions extracted from the SP GEM is close to unit and these are very well extracted from the S GEM due to the high field in the first transfer region. This can explain the increase of the ion backflow for voltages higher than 300 V in the S GEM.

By optimizing the transfer fields, several $V_{SP}/V_{LP}$ scans were again performed for different voltages in the S GEM, to try to reduce the values of the curve of fig. 5. Figure 8 shows the different scans of $V_{SP}/V_{LP}$ performed changing the voltage of the S GEM. As expected, as the voltage in the second GEM was close to the values in the plateau, the curves approached the optimal values for IB suppression and energy resolution. It can be seen that for voltages of 280 and 300 V it was possible to obtain an ion backflow around 1% and an energy resolution of 12%.

Figure 6. Scans of both transfer regions ($T_1$: between GEMs LP and S and $T_2$: between GEMs S and SP). The best settings for ion backflow reduction are when the field in $T_1$ is highest and the field in $T_2$ is lowest. The energy resolution does no change much. Discussion in the text.

Figure 7. Scan of the S GEM. The energy resolution is kept constant, but the ion backflow has an optimal value plateau between 200 and 300 V. Discussion in the body text.
Figure 8. $V_{SP}/V_{LP}$ scans performed at different voltages applied in the second GEM, after optimizing the transfer fields. It was possible to reach an ion backflow around 1% and an energy resolution around 12%.

3.2 Simulations

In conjunction with the experimental measurements, in this work, Garfield simulation framework [12] has been used to estimate the energy resolution and ion backflow fraction for the present configuration and have been compared with the available experimental data. The 3D electrostatic field simulation has been carried out using neBEM (nearly exact Boundary Element Method) toolkit. Besides neBEM, HEED has been used for primary ionization calculation and Magboltz for computing drift, diffusion, Townsend and attachment coefficients.

Figure 9. Model of the basic GEM cell used in the Garfield simulations.

The model of a basic GEM cell built using Garfield, is shown in fig. 9. It represents three GEM foils, having bi-conical shaped holes which are placed in between the drift and the read-out
plane. The first GEM after the drift plane has the pitch of 280 µm, whereas the second and third foils have the pitch of 140 and 90 µm, respectively. The central holes of the basic units from all the three GEM foils are perfectly aligned. The basic cell structure then has been repeated along both positive and negative X and Y-Axes to represent a real detector. With the help of these models, the field configurations of the detector have been simulated using appropriate voltage settings. These are followed by the simulation of energy resolution and ion backflow fraction.

For estimating electron transmission within GEM detector, electron tracks generated by 5.9 keV photons have been considered in the drift volume. The primary electrons created in the drift region are then made to drift towards the GEM foil and produce avalanche inside the holes. For this calculation Monte Carlo routine has been used. The procedure drifts the primary electrons from their starting position. At each step, a number of secondary electrons is produced according to the local Townsend and attachment coefficients and the newly produced electrons are traced like the initial electrons. In parallel, the ion drift lines are also traced. The primary ions in the drift region and the ions created in the avalanche have been considered for the estimation of the backflow fraction.

Numerically the back flow fraction has been estimated as:

$$IB = \frac{N_{\text{drift}}}{N_e},$$

where $N_{\text{drift}}$ and $N_e$ are the number of ions collected on the drift plane and the electrons collected in the read-out plane. The 5.9 keV photo-peak of the simulated charge spectrum has been fitted using a Gaussian distribution. The energy resolution has been estimated from the mean and the sigma of this distribution.

The variation of the energy resolution and ion backflow fraction with $V_{\text{LP}}$ and $V_{\text{SP}}$ are shown in figure 10, for a fixed $V_S = 300$ V, together with the experimental data. The large amplification in the first GEM (LP) is the main cause of improvement of the energy resolution, as discussed in section 2.1. On the other hand, the increase of the last GEM voltage is also suitable for getting low backflow fraction. Though the simulation data for the energy resolution follow the experimental trend, there is a clear discrepancy for the ion backflow data, where the simulated curve is roughly four times higher than the experimental.

Reference [14] shows that the misaligned holes can affect the backflow fraction by one order of magnitude. This was also confirmed in previous simulations of a quadruple GEM stack [15]. The simulations were done with the S GEM shifted by 70 µm in one direction, resulting in misaligned holes. The results obtained are also depicted in the plots and show a 10-fold change in the ion backflow fraction, bringing the simulated curve closer to the experimental results. This suggests that the main reason for the discrepancy between the experimental and simulated ion backflow results is related to the misalignment of holes in the experimental setup. In fact, besides the impossibility of perfectly align the holes, the first GEM in the stack (LP) is rotated by 90° with respect to the other two GEMs due to geometrical constraints of the chamber. On the other hand, the model used in the simulation is perfectly aligned.

Finally, fig. 11 shows the energy resolution vs ion backflow fraction. The discrepancy between two curves is again evident as explained by the discussion above.
Conclusions

This proposed geometry for ion backflow suppression using a stack of three GEMs has been able to reduce the flow of ions towards the absorption region to about 1%, while the energy resolution was kept below 12%, operating at a gain of 2000.

The simple model described in subsection 2.1 has suggested the advantage of using a GEM with a higher transparency in the last multiplication stage to reduce the ion backflow. Based on this, the proposed setup tried to take advantage of decreasing hole pitch between the GEMs which would allow to tune the transfer fields at magnitudes promoting a good extraction efficiency while keeping a high collection efficiency in the subsequent stage. This would mean that the second transfer field should be higher than the first. This work has shown that this is not the case. In fact, it seems that one of the most important features of a low ion backflow and good energy resolution detector is a stage with a very high electron extraction efficiency (and consequently low ion collection), followed

---

**Figure 10.** Energy resolution and ion backflow fraction obtained with simulation data and compared with the experimental data shown in the previous section. The plot also shows the result obtained when the S GEM is shifted by 70 µm in the simulation. Discussion in the body text.

**Figure 11.** Energy resolution and ion backflow fraction obtained with simulation data and compared with the experimental data shown in the previous section. Result obtained when the S GEM is shifted by 70 µm in the simulation is also shown. Discussion in the body text.
by a stage with a low field, providing a high electron collection efficiency (and low ion extraction). This is what happens in the transfer zones, suggesting that one of the functions of the S GEM is to provide this transition from high electric field to a smaller one.

Another important feature is the misalignment of the holes between different GEMs. The different GEM pitch can promote a larger misalignment, with the result of a smaller ion backflow, as has been noticed before. This can also be considered as an advantage of this setup. Nevertheless, the fact that the energy resolution was kept constant for a transfer field range larger than usual means that the transfer to a GEM with a smaller pitch is playing an important role.

Future work will consist on studying if it is possible to divide the transfer regions into a first zone with high electric field increasing the extraction of electrons, followed by a zone with a low field to focus the electrons into the holes of the next GEM. This setup would have the opposite behavior for ions, allowing for a system that would strongly suppress ion backflow, without jeopardizing the energy resolution. The division can be made using a dense conductive mesh. Preliminary tests are under way and results will be described in a future publication.
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