Measurement of emission spectrum for gaseous argon electroluminescence in visible light region from 300 to 600 nm
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Abstract

A double-phase argon detector is excellent in particle identification and position reconstruction. However, the properties of the electroluminescence (EL) process for secondary light emission in the gas phase are not fully understood. The EL process was thought to be explained using an ordinary EL mechanism because of an argon excimer, but there were no visible light (VL) emissions in this mechanism. However, recent measurements indicated there were visible components in the argon gas electroluminescence, which was proposed to explain the visible light components by a new mechanism called neutral bremsstrahlung (NBrS). In this article, we studied gaseous argon electroluminescence in the VL region from 300 to 600 nm at room temperature and normal pressure using a gaseous time projection chamber (TPC). The secondary emission light from the TPC luminescence region was dispersed using a spectrometer. Then, the interpretation of the observed spectrum using the ordinary EL model, NBrS model, and the effect of nitrogen impurity was discussed.
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1. Introduction

Liquid argon is widely used for radiation detectors in particle physics experiments [1,2,3]. The most important feature of the liquid argon detector is that it possesses two signals; scintillation photons and ionization electrons. The combination of these two signals provides a lot of useful information such as particle identification and position reconstruction. In particular, the double-phase argon detector technique is employed by dark matter search experiments [2]. The ionization electrons drifted to upward direction are extracted from liquid to gas phases under a high electric field (few kV/cm). Then, the ionization electrons emit proportional electroluminescence (EL) by scattering using gas argon (GAr) atoms.

Figure 1: Simplified diagram of the electroluminescence mechanism of the argon-nitrogen mixture gas.

Figure 1 shows a simplified diagram of the electroluminescence mechanism of GAr. Three emission processes for pure GAr are described in the diagram (herein called “ordinary EL” in this paper). Two of them are well-known processes; 128 nm vacuum ultraviolet (VUV) light because of transitions of argon excimers,

$$\text{Ar}_2^+ \rightarrow 2\text{Ar} + h\nu (\text{VUV} : 128\text{nm})$$

(1)

and 700–850 nm infrared light (IR) due to argon atomic emission,

$$\text{Ar}_2^*(3p^54p^1) \rightarrow \text{Ar}_2^*(3p^54s^1) + h\nu (\text{IR} : 700 – 850\text{nm}).$$

(2)

Moreover, a 170–300 nm ultraviolet light (UV) emission due to the transitions of argon molecular ion exists (hereinafter called “third continuum”) [4],

$$\text{Ar}_2^{2+} \rightarrow 2\text{Ar}^+ + h\nu (\text{UV} : 170 – 300\text{nm}),$$

(3)

which is not well understood yet.

The EL process was explained by the ordinary EL mechanism, but without visible light (VL) emissions. However, recent measurements showed that there were VL components in the EL of GAr, which can be explained by a new mechanism called neutral bremsstrahlung (NBrS) by Buzulutskov et al. [5]. Since VL photons are easier to detect using photo-sensors than VUV photons, the use of VL component in particle detectors is actively discussed [6,7], and a detailed understanding of the wavelength spectrum is important to proceed with such applications. Figure 2 shows theoretical calculations of the EL emission yields as a function of reduced electric field (E/N) at room temperature (300 K) for the ordinary EL model (top) [8] and the NBrS model (middle) [5]. Although ordinary EL lights emit...
only above the 4 Td threshold, NBrS light emits even below this threshold. Theoretical calculations of wavelength spectra for the NBrS lights are shown in the bottom plot of Figure 2 [5]. The spectrum is a continuous distribution from 200 to 1000 nm, which are different from ordinary EL light.

As shown in Fig. 1, VL emissions (300–450 nm) for argon-nitrogen gas mixture due to the nitrogen excimer are given by the following process [9],

\[ \text{Ar}^* + \text{N}_2 \rightarrow \text{Ar} + \text{N}_2^*(C^3\Pi_u), \]  
\[ \text{N}_2^*(C^3\Pi_u) \rightarrow \text{N}_2^*(B^3\Pi_g) + \nu (300–450 \text{nm}). \]  

Thus, the effect of nitrogen impurity should be carefully considered for an understanding of VL components.

![Image](image-url)

Figure 2: Theoretical model calculations of emission light yields as a function of E/N for the ordinary EL model (top) and the NBrS model (middle). Emission light yield as a function of wavelength for the NBrS model (bottom). The axis labels on the right shown as red characters represent the light yield at room temperature (300 K), normal pressure (1 bar), and electron drift distance of 1 cm.

This article presents detailed measurements of the wavelength spectrum of the GAr EL in the VL region (300–600 nm) under electric fields up to \( E/N = 10 \) Td at room temperature (300 K) and normal pressure (1 bar) using a spectrometer. Then, interpretation of the spectrum using ordinary EL and NBrS and the nitrogen impurity is discussed. Note that these emission processes are described as a function of the reduced electric field \( E/N \), when temperature and pressure dependences at the same E/N are minor. Thus, the results of the measurement at room temperature and normal pressure are also applicable to the liquid argon temperature (87 K) as far as the same E/N (e.g. 1 Td at 87 K and 1 bar is equivalent to 3.4 Td at 300 K and 1 bar).

2. Experimental Apparatus

Figure 3 shows a schematic view of the experimental setup of a GAr time projection chamber (TPC) with a fiducial volume of 130 mm length and a 64 mm diameter. The TPC was constructed with polytetrafluoroethylene (PTFE) and copper field shaping rings. No wavelength shifter was used to measure pure argon luminescence. The grid was placed 10 mm away from the anode, then the luminescence and the drift fields were generated using the anode and cathode, respectively. The anode was transparent indium-tin-oxide (ITO) coated quartz. The transmittance of the ITO coated quartz was more than 95% for VL (>300 nm). An \( \alpha \)-ray source \( ^{241}\text{Am}, 300 \text{ Bq} \) was placed inside the TPC as a signal source.

TPC was placed inside a vacuum vessel with a quartz viewport, and a spectrometer (Shimadzu Corporation SPG-120S) was placed outside the vessel near the viewport. We attached 2 mm slits to both the inlet and outlet of the spectrometer. The distance between the anode and the outlet slit was approximately 250 mm. Figure 3 shows responses of the spectrometer to monochromatic laser light with a wavelength of 450 nm (left) and 520 nm (right). These responses were approximately modeled by triangle functions \( T(\lambda) \),

\[
T(\lambda) = \begin{cases} 
A \left[ 1 - \frac{|\lambda - \lambda_{\text{peak}}|}{w} \right] & (|\lambda - \lambda_{\text{peak}}| < w) \\
0 & (|\lambda - \lambda_{\text{peak}}| > w)
\end{cases},
\]  

(6)
where the width of the function $w = 14$ nm and height of the peak $A = 1$. There was a 5 nm shift in the responses caused by combination of performances of the spectrometer and the input laser. This shift was a source of systematic uncertainties for this measurement.

Two photomultiplier tubes (PMTs) with different wavelength sensitivities were arranged near the spectrometer and the cathode, respectively. The PMT near the spectrometer (Hamamatsu-R11065 "VL PMT" in this paper) which had a quartz window was sensitive to UV and VL, while that near the cathode (Hamamatsu-R6835 called “VUV PMT”) which has a MgF$_2$ window was only sensitive to VUV (Fig. 5). A Flash ADC (Struck Innovative Systeme SIS3316-250-14) with 250 Ms/s and 14-bit resolution was used to read the PMT signals.

The vacuum vessel was evacuated up to $10^{-2}$ Pa using a molecular turbo pump for at least one day before each measurement. Then, the detector was filled with GAr at room temperature and normal pressure and flowed at a constant flow rate of 10 L/min during the experiment to avoid impurities from outgassing. To evaluate the effect of the nitrogen impurities, three admixtures of argon and nitrogen gases (G1, N10, and N100) were used in this measurement. Specifications of the gases are shown in Table 1.

Three datasets were taken for this study. Details of each dataset are described below.

- **Data for the wavelength spectrum**
  High purity G1 gas was used. The spectrometer wavelength was scanned from 240 nm to 660 nm with 20 nm pitch at two luminescence fields of 4.6 Td and 8.3 Td.
  - Data for the electric field dependence
    High purity G1 gas was used. The luminescence field was scanned from 1 to 8 Td with 1 Td pitched at three wavelengths of 300, 400, and 500 nm, respectively. Additional data for the 300 nm wavelength was taken at 10 Td.
  - Data for the nitrogen effect
    The N10 and N100 gases were used. The spectrometer wavelength was scanned from 240 to 660 nm with 20 nm pitch at a luminescence field of 8.3 Td. The spectrometer wavelength for the N100 gas was scanned from 300 to 450 nm with 2.5 nm pitch.

  Note that 1 Td of the reduced electric field in the luminescence region (room temperature, normal pressure, and 1 cm luminescence region) corresponds to 245 V/cm.

3. **Data Analysis**

The primary scintillation lights (S1) and the ionization electrons were produced by the interaction between the $\alpha$-ray and the GAr atom. A typical flight distance of the $\alpha$-ray is 3 cm. The ionization electrons drifted to the direction of the grid under fixed drift field of 100 V/cm (0.4 Td). The electrons emitted the secondary EL lights (S2) while the electrons were in a 1 cm gap between the grid and the anode under luminescence field (1–10 Td).

![Typical waveform distributions of the VUV PMT (top) and VL PMT (bottom) for the setup without the spectrometer.](image)

Figure 6: Typical waveform distributions of the VUV PMT (top) and VL PMT (bottom) for the setup without the spectrometer.
PMT signal and the VL PMT signal. These waveform distributions were taken without the spectrometer. Actual light yield of the VL PMT with the spectrometer was less than 1 photoelectron (PE). Sharp peak for the VUV PMT at $t = 0$ corresponds to the S1 signal and broad peak around $t = 15 \mu s$ corresponds to the S2 signal.

As mentioned earlier, there were no photons observed most of the time and the peaks around 100 counts correspond to the single PE event. The VL PMT was operated with the gain for the single PE events about 130 counts, and the PMT had good separation between the noise level and the single PE events.

The single PE events were selected by the light yields within the range of 30–300 counts, and the selected events were $N_{\text{Signal}} = 943$, $N_{\text{BG1}} = 166$, and $N_{\text{BG2}} = 502$ for Signal, BG1, and BG2, respectively.

Table 2: Definition of light yield variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>PMT</th>
<th>Interval of integration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>VUV PMT</td>
<td>$[-0.4 \mu s, 5 \mu s]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>VUV PMT</td>
<td>$[5 \mu s, 80 \mu s]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>VL PMT</td>
<td>$[5 \mu s, 30 \mu s]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG1</td>
<td>VL PMT</td>
<td>$[-30 \mu s, -15 \mu s]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG2</td>
<td>VL PMT</td>
<td>$[35 \mu s, 80 \mu s]$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7: Integrated light yield distributions of the VUV PMT waveform in the S1 and S2 regions (top-left). Events in the red box are selected for wavelength spectrum calculation. Integrated light yield distribution of the VL PMT waveform is in the Signal (top-right), BG1 (bottom-left), and BG2 (bottom-right) regions.

Five light yields (S1, S2, Signal, BG1, and BG2) were calculated by integrating the waveform distributions of the VUV and VL PMT as defined in Table 2. The intervals of integration are shown as hatched regions in Fig. 5. Events were selected using S1 and S2 in the red box at the top-left plot in Fig. 7. Data in the plot was taken with the spectrometer wavelength of 400 nm and the luminescence field of 8.3 Td using the G1 gas, and the number of the selected events ($N_0$) was 157684. Distributions of Signal, BG1, and BG2, for the selected events are shown in top-right plot, bottom-left, and bottom-right of Fig. 7 respectively. As mentioned earlier, there were no photons observed most of the time and the peaks around 100 counts correspond to the single PE events. The VL PMT was operated with the gain for the single PE events about 130 counts, and the PMT had good quantum efficiency.

By repeating the same analyzes for different configurations (spectrometer wavelength, luminescence field, and gas type), the desired spectrum was obtained. The left plot in Fig. 8 shows the obtained wavelength spectra using the G1 gas at a luminescence field of 8.3 Td. The blue, red, and black points denote the light yields in the signal, the background, and the signal–background, respectively. Finally, the wavelength spectrum in the number of photons (right plot in Fig. 8) was obtained after correcting the VL PMT quantum efficiency.

The obtained wavelength spectra are summarized in Fig. 9.
The left plot shows the spectra for the G1 gas with electric fields of 4.6 Td (green points) and 8.3 Td (black points). The right plot shows the spectra for the G1 gas (black points), the N10 gas (blue points), and the N100 gas (red points) at E/N=8.3 Td.

4. Interpretation and Consideration

4.1. Electric Field Dependence

![Graphs showing electric field dependence](image)

Figure 10: Observed light yield as a function of E/N at a wavelength of 300 nm (top-left), 400 nm (top-right), and 500 nm (bottom-left). Three distributions are simultaneously fitted to the sum of the model function (black) of NBrS (purple, blue, and green) and ordinary EL (red). The plot in the bottom-right shows the scale factors for ordinary EL as a function of wavelength.

Figure 10 shows the results of the electric field dependence data at three wavelengths, λ = 300 nm (top-left), 400 nm (top-right), and 500 nm (bottom-left). There are observed lights at the low electric field below 4 Td and the light yields look saturated at higher electric field. Thus the ordinary EL model is not enough to explain the distributions. To quantitatively estimate the contribution of the NBrS model, the data points were simultaneously fitted to the following function,

\[ F_{\text{EL}}(\lambda, E/N) = S_{\text{EL}}(\lambda) F_{\text{EL}}(E/N) + S_{\text{NBrS}} F_{\text{NBrS}}(\lambda, E/N), \]

where \( F_{\text{EL}}(E/N) \) and \( F_{\text{NBrS}}(\lambda, E/N) \) are light yield functions for the ordinary EL model and the NBrS model in Eq. 2, respectively. The scale factors, \( S_{\text{EL}}(\lambda) \) and \( S_{\text{NBrS}} \), are determined by the fit. The result of the fit is summarized in Table 3 and the fitted functions are shown in Figure 10.

The bottom-right plot in Figure 10 shows \( S_{\text{EL}} \) as a function of the wavelength. The scale factor at 300 nm is the largest because of the significant UV contribution from the third continuum emission in Eq. 3. However, the scale factor at 500 nm is consistent with the zero within its uncertainty. The wavelength dependence of the scale factors is approximates a straight line,

\[ S_{\text{EL}}(\lambda) = \begin{cases} S_0(\lambda - \lambda_0) & (\lambda < \lambda_0) \\ 0 & (\lambda > \lambda_0) \end{cases}, \]

The parameters \( S_0 \) and \( \lambda_0 \) are obtained by fitting to the data as shown in Table 3.

4.2. Emission Light Yield of the NBrS Model

Predicted number of emitted photons by the NBrS mechanism \((N_\gamma)\) for this setup using \(^{241}\text{Am}\) α-ray and the spectrometer is calculated as follows,

\[ N_\gamma = N_e \times \rho \times d \times w \times F_{\text{NBrS}} \]

(9)

\[ \rho = 2.7 \times 10^{19} \text{ atom/cm}^3 \]

(10)

where \( N_e = E_\alpha/W_\gamma = 5.49 \text{ MeV/26.4 eV} = 2.1 \times 10^5 \) is the number of the drift electrons, \( \rho = 2.7 \times 10^{19} \text{ atom/cm}^3 \) is the number density of argon atom, \( d = 1 \text{ cm} \) is distance of the luminescence field, and \( w = 14 \text{ nm} \) is the width of the spectrometer response in Eq. (6). Since \( S_{\text{NBrS}} \) is defined as the ratio between the observed light yield \( F_{\text{Ar}} \) and the emission light yield \( F_{\text{NBrS}} \), it is related to the overall photon detection efficiency \( \epsilon \) of this setup.

\[ \epsilon = F_{\text{Ar}}/N_\gamma = \frac{F_{\text{Ar}}}{7.9 \times 10^5 \times F_{\text{NBrS}}} \]

(11)

(12)

On the other hand, geometrical acceptance \((A_{\text{geo}})\) of the photon is calculated using the distance from the luminescence region to the outlet slit (25 cm), and size of the slit (2 mm×5 mm),

\[ A_{\text{geo}} = \frac{2 \text{ mm} \times 5 \text{ mm}}{4\pi (25 \text{ cm})^2} = 1.3 \times 10^{-5}. \]

(13)

\( A_{\text{geo}} \) is two times larger than \( \epsilon \) and the factor of 2 is roughly explained by transmittance of the ITO quartz and the quartz viewport (about 95% each), and efficiency of the spectrometer (>50% \(^{12}\)). Thus absolute value of the observed light yield of this measurement is roughly consistent with the prediction of the NBrS model.

4.3. Wavelength Spectrum

Since the scale factors for the ordinary EL model \((S_{\text{EL}})\) and the NBrS model \((S_{\text{NBrS}})\) were obtained and applicable for arbitrary wavelength in the previous section, the model function of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fit parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( S_{\text{NBrS}} )</td>
<td>( 5.2 \pm 0.2 \times 10^2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( S_{\text{EL}}(300 \text{ nm}) )</td>
<td>( 1.65 \pm 0.16 \times 10^{-2} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( S_{\text{EL}}(400 \text{ nm}) )</td>
<td>( 0.92 \pm 0.17 \times 10^{-2} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( S_{\text{EL}}(500 \text{ nm}) )</td>
<td>( 0.25 \pm 0.23 \times 10^{-3} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( S_0 )</td>
<td>( -(7.1 \pm 1.2) \times 10^{-5} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \lambda_0 )</td>
<td>( 532 \pm 33 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Eq. (7) also explains the wavelength spectrum. Figure 11 shows an overlay of the model functions to the wavelength spectrum data at the reduced electric fields of 4.6 Td (top) and 8.3 Td (bottom), respectively. The spectrum data and the model functions are in good agreement. The spectrum at 4.6 Td is explained by the almost pure NBrS emission, and contribution of the EL emission is less than 10%.

Figure 12: Wavelength spectra for N2 concentrations of 0.3 ppm (black points), and 10 ppm (blue points), and 100 ppm (red points).

...are consistent with the measurement reported by Takahashi et al. [9]. The peak wavelengths (λ_{peak,i}) and the peak heights (A_i) of the resonances were obtained by fitting the N100 spectrum using the model function,

\[ F_{N100}(\lambda) = F_{A_i}(\lambda) + \sum_{i=1}^{6} T_i(\lambda), \]

where \( F_{A_i} \) is the model function of Eq. (7) and the triangle function \( T_i \) is

\[ T_i(\lambda) = \begin{cases} A_i \left[ 1 - \frac{|\lambda - \lambda_{peak,i}|}{w} \right] & (|\lambda - \lambda_{peak,i}| < w) \\ 0 & (|\lambda - \lambda_{peak,i}| > w) \end{cases}, \]

where the width of the function \( w \) is fixed at 14 nm. Fit results are summarized in Table 4. As mentioned earlier, a 5 nm of the systematic uncertainty is assigned for the wavelength because of the shift in Fig. [4].

Table 4: Summary of the fit results of 6 observed emission peaks in the N100 data. Predicted wavelengths for the \( ^2 \Pi_g \rightarrow ^2 \Pi_u \) transition are also shown [9].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( i )</th>
<th>( \lambda_i \pm \frac{\Delta \lambda_{fit}}{\lambda_{fit}} ) (nm)</th>
<th>( A_i \pm \frac{\Delta A_{fit}}{A_{fit}} ) (A.U.)</th>
<th>This work</th>
<th>Predicted [9]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>310.6 \pm 0.3 5.0</td>
<td>(2.7 \pm 0.1)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>315.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>336.1 \pm 0.1 5.0</td>
<td>(12.4 \pm 0.2)</td>
<td>337.1</td>
<td>333.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>356.3 \pm 0.1 5.0</td>
<td>(9.4 \pm 0.1)</td>
<td>357.7</td>
<td>353.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>378.7 \pm 0.2 5.0</td>
<td>(3.8 \pm 0.1)</td>
<td>380.5</td>
<td>375.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>403.9 \pm 0.5 5.0</td>
<td>(1.1 \pm 0.1)</td>
<td>405.9</td>
<td>399.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>438.9 \pm 3.9 5.0</td>
<td>(0.13 \pm 0.06)</td>
<td>434.4</td>
<td>427.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The wavelength spectrum with the N10 gas was modeled using the following function,

\[ F_{N10}(\lambda) = F_{A_i}(\lambda) + \alpha \sum_{i=1}^{6} T_i(\lambda), \]

4.4. Nitrogen Effect

As mentioned earlier, a possible explanation for the visible light component of the EL emission is the nitrogen eximer emission. This effect was estimated using the argon-nitrogen gas mixture. The right plot in Figure 9 shows a significant excess due to nitrogen between 300 nm and 400 nm in the N100 data. However, the N100 and G1 wavelength spectra are consistent above 450 nm wavelength. Thus, we can assume there are no significant nitrogen contributions above 450 nm. Figure 12 shows the wavelength spectra from 300 to 450 nm with the electric field of 8.3 Td using the G1 gas (black points), the N10 gas (blue points), and N100 gas (red points), respectively. There are six resonant structures in the N100 gas data which
where $F_{Ar}$ and $T_i(\lambda)$ are the same functions as those in Eq. \([14]\). The scale, $\alpha$, was determined by fitting to the wavelength spectrum, and the fit result was $\alpha = 0.12 \pm 0.01$ which is roughly consistent with the ratio of the nitrogen contents between the N10 gas (10 ± 1 ppm) and N100 gas (100 ± 10 ppm) of 0.1.

5. Summary

The GAr electroluminescence in the VL region (300 to 600 nm) was studied using the GAr TPC with $^{241}$Am $\alpha$-rays as the signal source at room temperature and normal pressure. The secondary emission light from the TPC luminescence region was dispersed using the spectrometer. The wavelength spectrum and the luminescence field dependence of the light yield was compared with the ordinary EL model and the NBrS model, and the effect of the nitrogen impurity was evaluated using the argon-nitrogen mixture gas. We conclude that the ordinary EL model and the nitrogen emission alone are not enough to explain the wavelength spectrum and the electric field dependencies of the observed light in the VL region, but they are reasonably explained by adding the NBrS model.
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