A new imaging technology based on Compton X-ray scattering
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Abstract

We describe a feasible implementation of a cellular microscope based on Compton X-ray scattering. The device, consisting largely of a 25 cm-thick sensitive volume filled with xenon at atmospheric pressure, forms photoelectron images by resorting to the electroluminescence produced in a custom multi-hole acrylic structure. Photon-by-photon counting can be achieved by processing the resulting images, taken in a continuous readout mode. The concept is amenable to permanent on-site 4π-coverage stations, but can be made portable at an acceptable performance compromise, targeting a nearly 2π-coverage instead. Based on Geant4 simulations, and a realistic detector design and response, we show that photon rates up to around $10^{11}$ ph/s on-sample (5 µm water-equivalent cell) can be processed, limited by the spatial diffusion of the photoelectrons in the gas. Following the Rose criterion and assuming the dose partitioning theorem, such a detector would allow obtaining 3d images of 5 µm unstained cells in their native environment in about 20 h, with a resolution below 40 nm.

I. INTRODUCTION

Recent work has shown that the use of incoherent (Compton) scattering offers a plausible path, at fourth-generation synchrotron Light Sources, towards obtaining 10’s of nm-accurate three-dimensional images of microscopic biological systems, before inducing structural damage. Notably, and despite its inelastic nature, the proposed Scattering Compton X-ray Microscopy (SCXM) makes an optimal use of the number of scattered photons per unit of deposited energy, contrary to coherent scattering at low energies, which is limited by photoelectric effect at the sample. As a result, the back-to-back comparison performed in [1] revealed that a 34 nm biomolecular feature embedded in a 5 µm-cell may be resolved at a much reduced surface dose: three orders of magnitude less than the one needed for leading techniques currently used at Light Sources, such as coherent diffraction imaging (CDI). Ultimately, when bench-marking SCXM against CDI under the same imaging criterion, a factor of two improvement in the achievable space resolution was obtained, due to a more favourable cell size ($l$) over feature size ($d$) scaling of the needed dose:

$D \propto l^4$ for SCXM compared to $D \propto l^2/d^6$ for CDI. Results for the case study chosen in this work, illustrating these observations, are presented in Fig. 1.

Given that in SCXM virtually all interactions are used, a nearly 4π-coverage is called for (Fig. 2), at an optimal energy around 64 keV if aiming at DNA structures [1]. This poses a formidable challenge for current detection technologies. At lower X-ray energies, imaging based on coherent scattering has benefited from the development of ultra-fast pixelated silicon detectors, capable of performing photon-counting up to $10^7$ counts/s/pixel. A nowadays typical detection area is $20 \times 20$ cm², sufficient for covering the coherent forward cone at a distance of about 1 m, at near 100% quantum efficiency [2]. At higher energies, silicon must be replaced by a semi-conductor with a higher stopping power to X-rays, e.g., CdTe. However, targeting a geometrical acceptance around 70% at 64 keV, while providing enough space for the sample holder, pipes, shielding and associated mechanics, would imply an imposing active area for these type of detectors, well above 100 cm² and possibly up to 1000 cm². For comparison, PILATUS3 X CdTe, one of the latest high-energy X-ray detectors used at synchrotron sources, has an active area of 30 cm² [3].
Clearly, the availability of a $4\pi$/high energy X-ray detector would allow to exploit the potential of SCXM, if it can be implemented in a practical way.

This situation has motivated us to consider a device borrowed from particle physics: the electroluminescent xenon Time Projection Chamber (EL-TPC), and discuss its performance as an SCX-microscope. TPCs, introduced by D. Nygren in 1974 [4] are nowadays ubiquitous in particle and nuclear physics, chiefly used for reconstructing interactions at high track multiplicities [5], and/or when very accurate event reconstruction is needed [6,7]. A recent review on the TPC technology by one of us can be found in [8]. The main characteristics of the particular TPC-flavour proposed here can be summarized as: i) efficient to high energy X-rays thanks to the use of xenon as the active medium, ii) continuous readout mode with a time sampling around $\Delta T_\text{r} = 0.5 \, \mu s$, iii) typical temporal extent of an X-ray signal (at mid-chamber): $\Delta T_\text{r-ray} = 1.35 \, \mu s$, iv) about 2000 readout pixels/pads, v) single-photon counting with a Fano-limited energy resolution potentially down to 2% FWHM for 60 keV X-rays, thanks to the electroluminescence mode. Importantly, the main advantage of using electroluminescence instead of conventional avalanche multiplication is the suppression of ion space charge, traditionally a shortcoming of TPCs under high rates.

Our design is inspired by the proposal in [9], that has been successfully adopted by the NEXT collaboration to measure neutrino-less double-beta decay [10]. However, compared to that, we propose three main simplifications here: i) operation at atmospheric pressure, ii) removal of the photomultiplier-based energy-plane, and iii) introduction of a compact all-in-one electroluminescence structure, purposely designed for counting. Armed with detailed Geant4 [11] simulations, we discuss first in section II the main ideas and working principles leading to the conceptual design of the microscope; second, in section III we introduce the TPC response and propagate the ionization clusters (stemming from the scattered X-rays) till the formation of 2d-images; finally, we discuss the counting performance, relying on custom algorithms. We present hence an assessment on the limits and scope of the proposed technology in section IV.

II. TPC DESIGN

i. Dose and intrinsic resolving power

The ability to resolve a feature of a given size embedded in a medium can be studied through the schematic representation shown in Fig. 1-top, that corresponds to an arbitrary step within a 2d-scan for a specific sample-beam...
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Working with surface dose is convenient because it has been used earlier, in the context of coherent scattering, as a metric for assessing the maximum radiation prior to inducing structural damage [15]. By resorting to that estimate (black line in Fig. 1-bottom), the doses required for resolving a feature of a given size can be put into perspective. These doses, obtained for a DNA feature embedded in a 5 μm water-equivalent cell using Geant4, are shown as continuous lines. Results resorting to NIST values [16] and Hubbell parameterization for dσ_c/dΩ [17] are displayed as dashed lines, highlighting the mutual consistency in this simplified case. Clearly, SCXM can potentially resolve 33 nm-size DNA features inside 5 μm cells, and down to 26 nm if a stable He atmosphere around the target can be provided.

Using surface dose as a valid metric for inter-comparison between SCXM and CDI is at the moment an open question and will require experimental verification. In particular, eq. 3 assumes implicitly that the energy is released locally. However, a 10 keV photoelectron has a range of up to 200 nm in water, while a 64 keV one can reach up to 1.5 μm. An approximate argument can be sketched based on the fact that the average energy of a Compton electron for 64 keV X-rays (in the range 0-14 keV) is similar to that of a 10 keV photo-electron stemming from 10 keV X-rays, a typical case for CDI. Given that at 64 keV most (around 70%) of the energy is released in Compton scatters, the situation in terms of locality will largely resemble that of coherent scattering. Hence, compared to CDI, only about 30% of the energy will be carried away from the interaction region by the energetic 64 keV photoelectrons. On the other hand, at 30 keV (the other energy considered in this study) the photoelectric effect contributes to 90% of the surface dose, so one can expect a higher dose tolerance for SCXM than the one estimated here.

Naturally, shielding pipes, structural materials of the detector, its efficiency, instrumental effects during the reconstruction and the accuracy of the counting algorithms will limit the achievable resolution, resulting in dose values larger than the ones in Fig. 1. These effects are discussed in the next sections.

II. Technical description of the TPC working principle

When X-rays of energies of the order of 10’s of keV interact in xenon gas at atmospheric pressure, the released photoelectron creates a cloud of secondary ionization (O(1000’s) electrons) with a typical (1σ) size of 0.25-1 mm (Fig. 3-top). If the X-ray energy is above that of the xenon K-shell, characteristic emission around 30-34 keV will ensue, in about 70% of the cases. At these energies, X-ray interactions in xenon take place primarily through photoelectric effect, with just a small (< 1%) probability of Compton scattering.

Table 1. Mean free path for different materials at the studied energies 30 and 64 keV, according to NIST.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Mean free path (cm)</th>
<th>ε = 30 keV</th>
<th>ε = 64 keV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>5.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNA</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air</td>
<td>4950.49</td>
<td>4945.60</td>
<td>4945.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ionization clouds (hereafter ‘clusters’) drift, due to the collection field of the TPC, towards the electroluminescence/anode plane, as shown in Fig. 4-top, following a diffusion law as a function of the drift distance \( z \):

\[
\sigma_z(x,y) = D_L(T) \sqrt{z}
\]  

(4)

where \( D_L \) and \( D_T \) are the longitudinal and transverse diffusion coefficients, respectively. Simulations performed with the electron transport code Magboltz [18,19], indicate that a small addition of CH\(_4\) will reduce the cluster size well below that in pure xenon, as required for photon-counting (Fig. 3-bottom). Recent work has demonstrated that the electroluminescence signal is still copious in these conditions [20]. For a collection field \( E_c = 110 \, \text{V/cm} \), the cluster’s longitudinal size can be kept at the \( \sigma_z = 4 \, \text{mm} \) level even for a 50 cm-long drift, corresponding to a temporal spread of \( \sigma_t = 0.75 \, \text{µs} \), while the transverse size will approach \( \sigma_{x,y} = 10 \, \text{mm} \). The electron drift velocity would be hence \( v_d = \sigma_z / \sigma_t = 5 \, \text{mm/µs} \).

The proposed detection concept is shown in Fig. 4-top, with Fig. 4-bottom displaying a close-up of the pixelated readout region, that relies on the recent developments on large-hole acrylic multipliers [21]. Provided sufficient field collection can be achieved at the structure, as shown in Fig. 4-bottom, the ionization clusters will enter a handful of holes, creating a luminous signal in the corresponding silicon photomultiplier (SiPM) situated right underneath, thus functioning as a pixelated readout. In summary: i) X-rays that Compton-scatter at the sample interact with the xenon gas and give rise to clusters of characteristic size somewhere in the range 1-10 mm-\( \sigma \), depending on the distance to the electroluminescence plane; ii) given the relatively large X-ray mean free path of around 20 cm in xenon at 1 bar, one anticipates a sparse distribution of clusters, that can be conveniently recorded with 10 mm-size pixels/pads, on a readout area of around 2000 cm\(^2\) (\( N_{\text{pix}} = 2000 \)).

From the FWHM per X-ray cluster at about half-chamber: \(\Delta x_{,y|x-,ray} = 2.35 / \sqrt{2} \cdot \sigma_{x,y} = 16 \, \text{mm} \), an average multiplicity \( M \) of around 4 per cluster may be assumed if resorting to 10 mm × 10 mm pixels/pads. The temporal spread, on the other hand, can be approximated by: \(\Delta T_{x-,ray} = 2.35 / \sqrt{2} \cdot \sigma_z / v_d = 1.35 \, \text{µs} \). Taking as a reference an interaction probability of \( P_{\text{int}} = 3.5 \times 10^{-4} \) (5 µm water-equivalent cell, 10 mm of air), a 70% detection efficiency \( \epsilon \), and an \( m = 20\% \) pixel occupancy, this configuration yields a plausible estimate of the achievable counting rate as:

\[
r_{\text{max}} = \frac{1}{\epsilon P_{\text{int}}} \frac{m \cdot N_{\text{pix}}}{M} \frac{1}{\Delta T_{x-,ray}} = 3 \times 10^{11} \, \text{s}^{-1}
\]  

(5)

compatible a priori with the beam rates foreseen at next-generation Light Sources [25]. However, in order to have a 1This unanticipated result, that might not look significant at first glance, results from a very subtle balance between the quenching of the xenon triplet state and the cooling of drifting electrons through inelastic collisions [22].
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\[ \Delta t = \frac{\Delta z}{v_d} \]

\[ \gamma = \frac{1}{p_{he}} \]

\[ t_3 = \frac{1}{p_{he}} \]

\[ E [\text{kV/cm}] \]

**Fig. 4.** Top: schematic representation of the working principle of the EL-TPC. Photons scattered at the sample reach the xenon gas, creating ionization clusters that drift, while diffusing, towards the anode plane, where they induce electroluminescence. Bottom: close-up of the electroluminescence region, based on the recently introduced acrylic-based electroluminescence multipliers, developed in collaboration between IGFAE and the CERN-RD51 workshops [21].

realistic estimate of the actual counting performance it is imperative to understand which level of occupancy/pile-up can be really tolerated by the detector, before the photon-counting performance deteriorates above the Poisson-limit or proportionality of response is lost. We address this problem specifically in section [III].

### iii. Geometry optimization with Geant4

The suitability of the TPC technology for SCXM depends primarily on the ability to detect ~60 keV photons within a realistic gas volume, in the absence of pressurization. This can be anticipated, given that the mean free path of 60 keV X-rays in xenon is 20 cm. Therefore, the most natural 4π-geometry adapting to this case is a hollow cylinder with a characteristic scale of around half a meter. On the other hand, the geometrical acceptance is a function of \( \arctan(2R_i/L) \), with \( L \) being the length and \( R_i \) the inner radius of the cylinder. In order to place the sample holder, step motor, pipes and associated mechanics, we leave an \( R_i = 5 \) cm inner bore. Finally, the xenon thickness (\( R_o - R_i \)), that is the difference between the outer and inner TPC radii, becomes the main factor for the detector efficiency, as shown in Fig. 5. We discuss two photon energies: 30 and 64 keV. The latter represents the theoretical optimum for SCXM in terms of dose, while the former, sitting just below the K-shell energy of xenon, is more convenient for counting due to the absence of characteristic X-ray emission inside the chamber. The mean free path is similar for the two energies, therefore no obvious advantage (or disadvantage) can be appreciated in terms of detector efficiency.

**Fig. 5.** Efficiency as a function of the thickness of the xenon cylinder (\( R_i - R_o \)) for different lengths, at energies of 30 and 64 keV. The dotted line indicates the benchmark geometry considered in text, for a length \( L = 50 \) cm.

We consider a realistic (and realizable) geometry, opting for an inner cylinder shell made out of 0.5 mm-thick aluminum walls, with 2 mm HDPE (high density polyethylene), 50 \( \mu \)m kapton and 15 \( \mu \)m copper, sufficient for making the field cage of the chamber, that is needed to minimize fringe fields (inset in Fig. 6). The HDPE cylinder can be custom-made and the kapton-copper laminates are commercially available and can be adhered to it by thermal bonding, bolting, or even epoxied, for instance. The external cylinder shell may well have a different design, but we have kept it symmetric for simplicity. We consider in the following a configuration that enables a good compromise in terms of size and flexibility: \( L = 50 \) cm and \( R_o = 25 \) cm. Additional 10 cm will be needed, axially, for instrumenting the readout plane and taking the signal cables out of the chamber, and another 10 cm on the cathode side, for providing sufficient isolation with respect to the vessel, given that the voltage difference will near 10 kV. Although those regions are not discussed here in detail, and have been
replaced by simple covers, the reader is referred to [10] for possible arrangements. With these choices, the geometry considered in simulations is shown in Fig. 5 having a weight below 10 kg.

The necessary structural material of the walls and the presence of air reduce the efficiency from 62.8% to 58.5% (64 keV) and 64.5% to 40.0% (30 keV). The beam enters the experimental setup from the vacuum pipes (not included in the figure) into two shielding cones (made of stainless steel and covered with lead) and from there into the sample region. Our case study is that of a 33 nm DNA feature inside a 5 µm cell, and 5 mm air to and from the shielding cones. The conical geometry is conceived not to crop the angular acceptance of the X-rays scattered on-sample, providing enough space to the focusing beam, and enabling sufficient absorption of stray X-rays from beam-air interactions along the pipes. In a $4\pi$ geometry as the one proposed here, the cell holder and step motor should be placed at 90 degrees, ideally along the polarization axis, where the photon flux is negligible.

![Fig. 6. A) TPC geometry in Geant4, aimed at providing nearly $4\pi$-coverage for SCXM. B) detail of the region faced by X-rays when entering the detector, that includes the vessel and field cage. C) detail of the sample region and the shielding cones.](image)

iv. Image formation in the TPC

The parameters used for computing the TPC response rely largely on the experience accumulated during the NEXT R&D program. We consider a voltage of -8.5 kV at the cathode and 3 kV across the electroluminescence structure, with the anode sitting at ground, a situation that corresponds to fields around $E_c = 110$ V/cm and $E_{el} = 6$ kV/cm in the collection and electroluminescence regions, respectively. The gas consists of Xe/CH$_4$ admixed at 0.4% in volume in order to achieve a 40-fold reduction in cluster size compared to operation in pure xenon (Fig. 3-bottom). The electroluminescence plane will be optically coupled to a SiPM matrix, at the same pitch, forming a pixelated readout. The optical coupling may be done with the help of a layer of ITO (indium-tin oxide) and TPB (tetraphenyl butadiene) deposited on an acrylic plate, following [10]. This ensures wavelength shifting to the visible band, where SiPMs are usually more sensitive. The number of SiPM-photoelectrons per incoming ionization electron, $n$, that is the single most important figure of merit for an EL-TPC, can be computed from the layout in Fig. 3-bottom, after considering: an optical yield $Y = 250$ ph/e/cm at $E_{el} = 6$ kV/cm [21], a TPB wavelength-shifting efficiency $W L S E_{TPB} = 0.4$ [25], a solid angle coverage at the SiPM plane of $\Omega_{SiPM} = 0.3$ and a SiPM quantum efficiency $Q E_{SiPM} = 0.4$. Finally, according to measurements in [20], the presence of 0.4% CH$_4$ reduces the scintillation probability by $P_{scin} = 0.5$, giving, for a $h = 5$ mm-thick structure:

$$n = Y \cdot h \cdot W L S E_{TPB} \cdot \Omega_{SiPM} \cdot Q E_{SiPM} \cdot P_{scin} = 3 \quad (6)$$

Since the energy needed to create an electron-ion pair in xenon is $W_i = 22$ eV, each 30-60 keV X-ray interaction will give rise to a luminous signal worth 4000-8000 photoelectrons (phe), spanning over 4-8 pixels, hence well above the SiPM noise. The expected energy resolution (FWHM) can be approximated by:

$$R(\epsilon=60 \text{ keV}) \simeq 2.355 \sqrt{F + \frac{1}{n} \left(1 + \frac{\sigma_{G}^{2}}{G^{2}}\right) \sqrt{\frac{W_{i}}{\epsilon}}} = 3.2\% \quad (7)$$

with $\sigma_{G}/G$ being the width of the single-photon distribution (around 0.1 for a typical SiPM) and $F \simeq 0.17$ the Fano factor of xenon. For comparison, a value compatible with $R(\epsilon=60 \text{ keV}) = 5\%$ was measured in [21]. These fluctuations in the detected light are correspondingly included in the TPC response.

Finally, the time response function of the SiPM is included as a Gaussian with a 7 ns width, convoluted with the transit time of the electrons through the electroluminescence structure $\Delta T_{EL} = 0.36 \mu s$, being both much smaller in any case than the typical temporal spread of the clusters (dominated by diffusion). The sampling time is taken to be $\Delta T_s = 0.5 \mu s$ as in [10], and a matrix of 1800 10 mm-pitch SiPMs is assumed for the readout. Images are formed after applying a 10 phe threshold to all SiPMs.

A fully processed TPC image for one time slice ($\Delta T_s = 0.5 \mu s$), obtained at a beam rate of $r = 3.7 \times 10^{10} \text{ s}^{-1}$, is shown in Fig. 2. The main clusters have been marked with crosses, by resorting to 'Monte Carlo truth', i.e., they represent the barycenter of each primary photoelectron in Geant4. The beam has been assumed to be continuous, polarized along the x-axis, impinging on a 5 µm water cube surrounded by air, with a 33 nm DNA
As mentioned, the attenuation in the structural materials, re-scatters, characteristic emission, as well as the detector inefficiency, are unavoidable limiting factors for counting. These intrinsic limitations can be conveniently evaluated from the signal to noise ratio, defined as the inverse of the relative spread in the number of clusters: $S/N = N_{cl}/\sigma_{N_{cl}}$. In simulation, where each photoelectron can be tagged, we define $N_{cl} \equiv N_{phe}$.2

To illustrate the effect, Fig. 8 shows $S/N$ for 64 keV photons as the realism of the simulation increases, from left to right. It has been normalized to the relative spread in the number of photons scattered on-sample, $\sqrt{N_{cl,0}}$ (case 0)\(^2\),

$$S/N^* = (N_{cl,0})^{-1/2} \cdot S/N \quad (8)$$

Overlaid, the $S/N$ in calorimetric mode is also shown, with the counting performed by integrating the total collected light, instead of photon-by-photon. $S/N$ is defined in that case, equivalently, as: $S/N^* = (\epsilon_{tot}/\sigma_{tot})/(\epsilon_{tot}/\sigma_{tot})[0]$. The values obtained are very close to the ones expected from the additional contribution of the binomial fluctuations originated from the detector inefficiency (see appendix):

$$S/N^* \simeq \frac{\epsilon}{\sqrt{2\epsilon - \epsilon^2}} \quad (9)$$

suggesting a small contribution from re-scatters in the materials.

As long as the counting algorithm employed does not increase the spread in the number of clusters or causes a strong loss of proportionality, $S/N^* = 0.7$ may be assumed. Given the nature of the data, consisting of voxels grouped forming ellipsoidal shapes, generally separable, and of similar size, a 2d implementation of the K-means clustering method [29], based on an iterative refinement technique, has been considered. The purpose is to illustrate the potential of the technology, although it is clear from the outset that the introduction of shape or energy dependent bounds, as well as considering counting in 3d will allow to disentangle many clusters that overlap in a given slice, but not in the volume. The algorithm proceeds as follows: i) the ‘countable’ clusters are first identified slice-by-slice in Monte Carlo, as those producing a signal

\[2\]Due to technical reasons, a beam rate corresponding to $N_{cl,0} \simeq 160$ was the typical value chosen in this study, for a total of 1000 simulations in order to reduce the error. The particular value chosen for $N_{cl,0}$ is immaterial in this calculation.

---

**Fig. 7.** A typical TPC image reconstructed from the SiPM signals (in phe), as recorded in one time-slice ($\Delta T_s = 0.5 \mu s$), for a beam rate of $r = 3.7 \times 10^{10} \text{ s}^{-1}$. The crosses show the clusters’ centroids, obtained from ‘MC-truth’ information.

**Fig. 8.** Intrinsic counting performance (using Monte Carlo truth information) for 64 keV X-ray photons, characterized by the signal to noise ratio (relative to case 0). Counting (green) and calorimetry (red) modes are displayed as a function of the realism of the simulations.
above a certain threshold $\varepsilon_{th}$ in that slice, with the threshold chosen to be much lower than the typical photoelectron energies ($\varepsilon_{th}=1-2.5$ keV); the assumption is that, for those, most of the energy will be collected in a neighbour time-slice to which the charge has spread due to diffusion, and where they will be properly counted once the algorithm is applied there; ii) a weighted inertia is then defined, as conventionally done in K-means, and a threshold is set ($I_{th}=10^3$), optimized for a certain operating condition (Fig. 9). We concentrated for this optimization on beam rates for which the average efficiency and purity of the cluster identification in 2d slides is ultimately above 85%, as the ones shown in Fig. 10. Once the K-means parameters are optimized for a certain beam rate, it is possible to study the counting performance as a function of it.

**Fig. 9.** The K-means cluster-counting algorithm evaluates the partition of $N$ observations (photoelectrons in voxels in our case) in $K$ clusters, so as to minimize the *inertia*, defined as the sum of the squared distances of the observations to their closest cluster center. In the plot: convergence of K-means for a beam rate of $10^{11}$ ph/s. A Savitzky-Golay filter is applied for the purpose of smoothing the data.

**Fig. 10.** Cluster counting performance for typical $\Delta T_s = 0.5 \mu s$ time-slices, for different energies ($\varepsilon$) and beam rates ($r$). Crosses indicate the cluster centroids from MC and circles are the clusters found by K-means. The average counting-efficiency and purity over 100 time-slices are given below in brackets. Top left: $\varepsilon=64$ keV and $r=3.7 \times 10^{10}$ ph/s (efficiency = 88.6%, purity = 90.7%). Top right: $\varepsilon=64$ keV and $r=7.5 \times 10^{10}$ ph/s (efficiency = 85.8%, purity = 86.7%). Bottom left: $\varepsilon=30$ keV and $r=6.5 \times 10^{10}$ ph/s (efficiency = 90.8%, purity = 86.2%). Bottom right: $\varepsilon=30$ keV and $r=1.3 \times 10^{11}$ ph/s (efficiency = 86.5%, purity = 85.1%). For $\varepsilon=30$ keV only about half of the clusters are produced, which enables measuring at higher beam rates than $\varepsilon=64$ keV, at comparable efficiency and purity.

are almost universally adopted, but suffer inevitably from practical limitations when aiming at $4\pi$-coverage. We have adopted approximations, that might be superseded in future work, and are scrutinized here:

1. 2d vs 3d counting: a complete reconstruction requires combining 2d time-slices as the ones studied here, in order to unambiguously identify photoelectrons. Given that each cluster extends over 4-6 slices due to diffusion, and the counting efficiency is above 85% per slice, one would easily reach 100% if the counting efficiencies were independent slice by slice, that clearly can not be the case. However, given that the positions of the clusters’ centroids are largely independent, they will overlap for few time-slices only, allowing 2-3 independent centroid estimates, that should raise the efficiency to 98-99%. Purity, on the other hand, being limited by low-energy clusters, will be greatly increased when the photoelectron energy is reconstructed in 3d. These facts should allow to iteratively improve the counting accuracy to the point where impurity and inefficiency levels will plausibly be %-level or less.
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2. Availability of photon-by-photon information: cluster reconstruction with high efficiency and purity enables $x, y, t + t_{\text{drift}}$ and $\varepsilon$ determination, and arguably the interaction time $t$ and $z$ position can be obtained from the study of the cluster size, as has been demonstrated for 30 keV X-rays at near-atmospheric pressure before \[27\]. This can help at removing backgrounds not accounted for as well as any undesired systematic effect (beam or detector related). Since this technique provides a parallax-free measurement, the concept may be extended to other applications, e.g., X-ray crystallography. The presence of characteristic emission from xenon will unavoidably create confusion, so if unambiguously correspondence between the photoelectron and the parent X-ray is needed, one must consider operation at $\lesssim$ 30 keV.

3. Data processing and realism: photon-by-photon counting in 3d through processing 2d-images at a cluster rate nearing 35 MHz (for the conditions discussed here) is a computer intensive task. Achieving this with sufficient speed and accuracy will require the optimization of the counting algorithm, something that will presumably need to be accomplished, ultimately, with real data. To this aim, both the availability of parallel processing as well as the possibility of operation in calorimetry mode are desirable features.

To summarize our results, we study the scan time needed to obtain a certain space resolution (appendix):

$$d = \left( \frac{\sqrt{2\ln2} \left( \frac{1}{\lambda_0} + 2\eta \frac{1}{\epsilon} \right)}{\left( \frac{1}{\lambda_f} - \frac{1}{\lambda_0} \right)^2} \frac{1}{S/N^2 \cdot r \cdot \varepsilon \cdot \Delta T_{\text{scan}}} \right)^{1/4} \tag{10}$$

We consider different scenarios: i) a relatively simple calorimetry mode, for which we assume a beam rate typical of next generation Light Sources as $r = 10^{12}$ ph/s, and ii) a rate-limited photon-by-photon counting scenario, at $r = 7.5 \times 10^{10}$ ph/s (64 keV) and $r = 1.3 \times 10^{11}$ ph/s (30 keV), according to the results obtained in the previous section. The remaining parameters are common to both modes: $S/N^* = 0.70$, efficiency $\varepsilon = 58.5\%$ (64 keV), $S/N^* = 0.55$, $\varepsilon = 40.0\%$ (30 keV); finally we assume $l = 5$ µm, $a = 5$ mm, $R = 5$, with the mean free paths ($\lambda$) taken from table \[I\]. The dose-limited resolution is slightly deteriorated compared to Fig. \[1\], given that the needed fluence depends on the efficiency as (appendix):

$$\phi \rightarrow \phi' = \frac{2\varepsilon - \varepsilon^2}{\varepsilon^2} \times \phi \tag{11}$$

A compilation of these results is shown in Fig. \[2\]. At 64 keV, a dose-limited resolution of 38.5 nm can be achieved in approximately 20 h, and 48.5 nm in 10 h at 30 keV. In the absence of systematic effects, the possibility of operation in calorimetry mode would bring the scan time down to around 1 h in both cases.

![Diagram](image-url)

**Fig. 11.** Counting performance, characterized through the average number of clusters counted per 2d time-slice (top) and relative spread (bottom), as a function of the beam rate. The $1/\sqrt{r}$ expectation (dashed) is shown for comparison. The K-Means parameters have been optimized for $r_0 = 7.5 \times 10^{10}$ ph/s.

**Fig. 12.** Resolution achievable with a 64 keV photon beam (left) and a 30 keV photon beam (right) as a function of the scan time for a cell of 5 µm (green line). The red line shows the limit in which a calorimetric measurement is performed and photon-by-photon counting is abandoned. The horizontal line shows the dose-limited resolution in each case, prior to inducing structural damage.

The detector geometry proposed here has been conceived as a multi-purpose permanent station. A portable device focused purely on SCXM, on the other hand, could simply consist of a cubic 25 cm × 25 cm × 25 cm vessel that may be positioned, e.g., on top of the sample (at a distance of...
about ~ 2cm). The geometry would thus have an overall efficiency around 30% for 64 keV photons. Evaluating the formulas above, in the approximation \( S/N^* \to \sqrt{\epsilon} \) (valid for low efficiencies, eq. 9 in appendix), a dose-limited resolution of 45.5 nm could be achieved in 40 h.

A further possibility could be considered, by resorting to ultra-fast (1.6 ns resolution) TimePix-based cameras (e.g., \cite{29, 30}) with suitable VUV-optics, allowing 256 \( \times \) 256 pixel readout at 80 MHit/s, and thus abandoning completely the SiPM readout. The vessel would consist barely a hole pitch of the acrylic hole multiplier should be reduced accordingly. Indeed, TimePix cameras are regularly used nowadays for photon and ion counting applications \cite{31, 32}, but have not been applied to X-ray counting yet, to the best of our knowledge. The readiness of such an approach, aiming at immediate implementation, represents an attractive and compelling avenue.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND OUTLOOK

We introduce a new 4\( \pi \) technology conceived for detecting ~60 keV X-ray photons at high rates and with high efficiency, and that could be optimally applied to Compton X-ray microscopy in upcoming Light Sources. It can be implemented either as a permanent facility or a portable device. We concentrate on 5 \( \mu \)m cells as our test case, for which we estimate that, under a Rose imaging criterion, 

\[ \frac{|N_f - N_0|}{\sqrt{\sigma_{N_f}^2 + \sigma_{N_0}^2}} = R \] (12)

where \( R = 5 \) corresponds to the Rose condition. \( N_f \) is the number of scattered photons from a water medium with a ‘to-be-resolved’ feature inside it, and \( N_0 \) contains water instead (Fig. 1-top in the main document). This equation can be re-expressed as:

\[ \frac{|N_f - N_0|}{\sqrt{N_f^2 \left( \frac{\sigma_{N_f}}{N_f} \right)^2 + N_0^2 \left( \frac{\sigma_{N_0}}{N_0} \right)^2}} = R \] (13)

that, under the assumption \( N_f \gg N_0 \), and \( S/N \equiv N_f/\sigma_{N_f} \approx N_0/\sigma_{N_0} \) can be rewritten as:

\[ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{N_f - N_0}{N_0} \times S/N = R \] (14)

It is convenient to use the definition \( S/N^* = \sqrt{N_0^{-1}} \cdot S/N \) as in text (again, we use \( N_f \approx N_0 \)). Substitution of \( N_f \) and \( N_0 \) by physical quantities yields:

\[ \frac{d(\lambda_f^{-1} - \lambda_w^{-1})}{\sqrt{2} \lambda_w^{-1} + 2a \lambda_a^{-1}} \times S/N^* \times \sqrt{N_0} = R \] (15)

We make use of the fact that \( N_0 = r \cdot \Delta T_{\text{step}} \cdot \left( \lambda_w^{-1} + 2a \lambda_a^{-1} \right) \cdot \epsilon \), with \( \epsilon \) being the beam rate, \( \Delta T_{\text{step}} \) a time step within the scan, and \( \Delta T_{\text{scan}} \) the total time for a 2d scan:

\[ \Delta T_{\text{scan}} = \left( \frac{1}{\epsilon} \right)^{1/2} \Delta T_{\text{step}} \] .

After substitution in previous equation we obtain:

\[ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2} (\lambda_f^{-1} - \lambda_w^{-1})} \times S/N^* \times \sqrt{r \cdot \Delta T_{\text{scan}} \cdot \epsilon} = R \] (16)

from which the time needed for a complete 2d scan can be expressed as:

\[ \Delta T_{\text{scan}} = \frac{R^2 2 \lambda_f^2 (\lambda_w^{-1} + 2a \lambda_a^{-1})}{d^3 (\lambda_f^{-1} - \lambda_w^{-1})^2} \frac{1}{S/N^* \epsilon} \] (17)
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A. RELATION BETWEEN RESOLUTION AND SCAN TIME

We start from the imaging criterion:

\[ \frac{|N_f - N_0|}{\sqrt{\sigma_{N_f}^2 + \sigma_{N_0}^2}} = R \]
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and, solving for $d$:

$$d = \left( \frac{R^2}{\sqrt{\lambda_1^{-1} + 2a\lambda_2^{-1}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{N_o}} \frac{S/N^*}{r \cdot e \cdot \Delta T_{\text{scan}}}} \right) \frac{1}{4}$$

(18)

that is the expression used in text, for the achievable resolution as a function of the scan time, under a given imaging criterion $R$. Expression 18 can be readily assessed if assuming that $S/N^*$ is mainly limited by Poisson statistics and by the efficiency of the detector, yielding:

$$\frac{S}{N^*} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N_o \sigma_N}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N_o \sqrt{\epsilon N_o + \epsilon (1 - \epsilon) \cdot N_o}}} = \frac{\epsilon}{\sqrt{2\epsilon - \epsilon^2}}$$

(19)

So, in the limit of low efficiencies eq. 18 becomes:

$$d = \left( \frac{R^2}{\lambda_2^{-1} + 2a\lambda_2^{-1}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_1^{-1} - \lambda_2^{-1}}} \frac{2}{r \cdot e \cdot \Delta T_{\text{scan}} \cdot \epsilon^2 \cdot \Delta T_{\text{scan}}} \right) \frac{1}{4}$$

(20)

underlining the importance of the detector efficiency, $\epsilon$, compared to the rate capability, $r$.

Last, the necessary increase in fluence (hence in dose) to satisfy Rose criterion in case of an inefficient detector, can be approximated, from inspection of eq. 15 and eq. 19, as:

$$\phi \rightarrow \phi' = \frac{2\epsilon - \epsilon^2}{\epsilon^2} \times \phi$$

(21)

$$D \rightarrow D' = \frac{2\epsilon - \epsilon^2}{\epsilon^2} \times D$$

(22)

B. EL-TPC PARAMETERS

Here we compile the main parameters used for the simulation of the TPC response, together with additional references when needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. Parameters of the TPC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$R_i$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_o$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3. Main gas parameters (xenon + 0.4% CH$_4$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>in the drift/collection region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_c$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$V_{cat}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$W_i$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D_T^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D_L^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$v_d$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>in the electroluminescence (EL) region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$E_{EL}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$V_{gate}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$v_{d,EL}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4. Parameters of the electroluminescent structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$r_h$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p_h$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_{opt}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_{scin}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5. Parameters of the readout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$p_{si}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta T_s$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_t$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_{G/G}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Omega_{TPB}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$QE_{wls}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$QE_{si}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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