Light yield and field dependence measurement in PandaX-II dual-phase xenon detector
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ABSTRACT: The dual-phase xenon detector is one of the most sensitive detectors for dark matter direct detection, where the energy deposition of incoming particles can be converted into light and electrons through xenon excitation and ionization. The detector response to signal energy deposition varies significantly with the electric field in liquid xenon. We study the detector light yield and its dependence on the electric field in PandaX-II dual-phase detector containing 580 kg liquid xenon in the sensitive volume. From measurement, the light yield at electric field from 0 V/cm to 317 V/cm is obtained for energy deposition up to 236 keV.
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1 Introduction

In Recent years, dual-phase xenon detectors has been driving the dark matter direct detection sensitivity by several orders of magnitudes[1–7]. When an incident dark matter particle scatters with liquid xenon target, certain amount of energy will be deposited in the detector and prompt scintillation light ($S_1$) and ionized electrons are produced. The scintillation light with a wavelength of 178 nm travels in the liquid or gaseous xenon, gets reflected by polytetrafluoroethylene (PTFE) reflectors and is eventually collected by photo-multiplier tubes (PMTs) at the top and bottom of the detector. The ionized electrons, which move upward to the liquid xenon surface under a electric field, are then extracted into the gaseous xenon and converted into secondary scintillation light($S_2$) by a stronger extraction electric field. In energy region of a few tens keV to several hundreds keV, the signals were triggered by $S_1$. The following $S_2$ was paired with the triggered $S_1$ and they form a complete physical event. Based on the $S_2$ light pattern on the top PMT array and the time difference between $S_1$ and $S_2$ signals (drift time), 3-D position information of a physical event can be reconstructed [2]. The corresponding energy deposition is reconstructed using $S_1$ and $S_2$ with the formula

$$E_{\text{dep}} = 0.0137 \text{ keV} \left( \frac{S_1}{\text{PDE}} + \frac{S_2}{\text{EEE} \times \text{SEG}} \right),$$

(1.1)

where PDE, EEE, and SEG are photon detection efficiency, electron extraction efficiency, and single electron gain, respectively.

The integrated charge of $S_1$ produced by energy deposition in liquid xenon is one of the key parameters of the xenon detector response. We can define the xenon light yield as the number of photons per unit energy deposition (keV),

$$LY = \frac{S_1}{\text{PDE} \times E_{\text{dep}}},$$

(1.2)
where PDE $(12.0 \pm 0.5\%)$ follows Ref. [4].

For a given energy deposition, there are several factors affecting the light yield. Part of the energy of nuclear recoil (NR) events will lost to atom motion [8]. This effect yields less light signal for NR, and that did not show in electron recoil (ER). The electron-ion recombination probability also depends on the strength of drift electric field. A stronger field is expected to give a smaller light yield. Recent large-scale dual-phase xenon experiments include PandaX-II with 580 kg xenon [3, 4], XENON1T [6] with 2 tonne and LUX with 180 kg [5]. For the optimization of detector operation, the three experiments chose different high voltages on the detector electrodes, the corresponding strength of drift electric field is 317 V/cm (PandaX-II), 81 V/cm (XENON1T) and 180 V/cm (LUX), respectively. For the low energy WIMP search region, Ref. [9, 10](PandaX-II), Ref. [11, 12](XENON1T) and Ref. [13–15](LUX) have described the detector response and both NR ER signal yield of these three experiments.

In this paper, we report a measurement of xenon light yield under various electric field strength at PandaX-II detector, from 0 V/cm to 317 V/cm. The energy points include 9.4 keV, 32.1 keV, 41.5 keV, 164 keV and 236 keV. The measured values are compared with other experiment and also a widely used model, NEST model [16].

2 Mono-energetic data

In order to measure the light yield values in different energy regions, activated xenon and $^{83m}$Kr calibration sources were injected into the PandaX-II detector in February 2019, after Run11 data taking accomplished [4], yielding mono-energetic ER data covering energy from 9 keV to 236 keV. These ER events were taken under four electric field conditions, 317 V/cm, 180 V/cm, 81 V/cm and 0 V/cm, as summarized in Table 1.

### Table 1. Calibration data taking conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drift field strength</th>
<th>317 V/cm</th>
<th>180 V/cm</th>
<th>81 V/cm</th>
<th>0 V/cm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duration($^{83m}$Kr)</td>
<td>17 hours</td>
<td>204 hours</td>
<td>272 hours</td>
<td>174 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event number($^{83m}$Kr)</td>
<td>$\sim 6 \times 10^4$</td>
<td>$\sim 4.5 \times 10^5$</td>
<td>$\sim 6 \times 10^5$</td>
<td>$\sim 6 \times 10^5$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration(Act. Xe)</td>
<td>190 hours</td>
<td>204 hours</td>
<td>272 hours</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event number(Act. Xe)</td>
<td>$\sim 5 \times 10^3$</td>
<td>$\sim 4 \times 10^3$</td>
<td>$\sim 4 \times 10^3$</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum drift time</td>
<td>360 $\mu$s</td>
<td>387 $\mu$s</td>
<td>435 $\mu$s</td>
<td>$\infty$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1 Activated xenon

One bottle of xenon was stored on the ground surface and exposed to cosmic ray for around three months, containing approximately 18 kilograms of xenon. This bottle of xenon was injected into the PandaX-II detector through the circulation system. Due to the neutron activation, natural xenon can be excited to some meta-stable high energy states, such as $^{129m}$Xe, $^{131m}$Xe, and transformed to unstable isotope, like $^{127}$Xe. They produce mono-energetic ER events in the detector, of which 164 keV originates from the $^{131m}$Xe de-excitation and 236 keV is from both $^{129m}$Xe and $^{127}$Xe contributions [17].
From the energy reconstruction formula, mono-energetic events are expected to have an anti-correlation relationship between $S_1$ and $S_2$, as shown in the $S_1$-$S_2$ distribution of activated xenon events in Fig. 1(a), where the two distinguishable ellipse-shaped contours are from 164 keV and 236 keV respectively. Based on this relationship, we selected those mono-energetic events. The reconstructed energy spectrum shows the two energy peaks clearly as well (see Fig. 1(b)).

![Figure 1](a) Activated xenon event selection in the $S_1$-$S_2$ distribution. Two anti-correlated contours of the $S_1$ and $S_2$ signals represent 164 keV events (left red box) and 236 keV events (right magenta box); (b) Activated xenon energy deposition spectrum. Two major energy peaks are distinguishable and identified at 164 keV and 236 keV (red Gaussian curves).

We should note that such a data selection approach is only valid for non-zero drift electric field, because the ionized electrons would not drift to the gaseous xenon region and produce the $S_2$ signature without a drift electric field. For the zero electric field case, it is difficult to identify the unpaired $S_1$ signal of activated xenon from large detector background. Instead, we relied on the $^{83m}$Kr isotope whose characteristic decay mode provides a unique signature to select the $S_1$ signal, as described in next section 2.2.

2.2 $^{83m}$Kr

$^{83m}$Kr is an effective short-lived calibration source, which is usually prepared through $^{83}$Rb decay with a half-life of 86.2 days [18]. The decay product $^{83m}$Kr has $J^\pi = \frac{1}{2}^-$, and de-excites to a $J^\pi = \frac{7}{2}^+$ state and then the ground state, releasing 32.1 keV and 9.4 keV energy, respectively. The half-life of the first decay is 1.8 hours, and that of the second is only 156.9 ns [19].

The typical $S_2$ signal waveform width is at a level of microseconds, so the two sets of ionized electrons from $^{83m}$Kr cascade decays are overlapping with each other and unable to be separated. For prompt scintillation light with a width of several nanoseconds, there is probability to observe two $S_1$ signals in the detector [4, 18]. Figure 2(a) shows the $^{83m}$Kr event $S_2$-$S_1$ distribution, most of the events have two $S_1$s merged as one, but some
of them have smaller $S1$ corresponding to 32.1 keV decay which indicates that there is another smaller $S1$ from 9.4 keV decay following it. The reconstructed energy spectrum shows a similar behavior (see Fig. 2(b)). Therefore, from $^{83m}$Kr cascade decay, there exist $S1$ signals corresponding to three energy points: 9.4 keV, 32.1 keV and 41.5 keV, which can be selected to study the light yields.

![Figure 2](image_url)

**Figure 2.** (a) $^{83m}$Kr event $S2$-$S1$ distribution. The $S1$ in this figure represents either two $S1$s combination or 32.1 keV $S1$ only. The two $S2$s are overlapping in the waveform. (b) $^{83m}$Kr energy deposition spectrum. The major peak is the total cascade decay energy when the two $S1$s from 32.1 keV and 9.4 keV are merged into one. The minor peak corresponds to a lower energy with 9.4 keV $S1$ lost.

Figure 3(a) shows the event $S1$ pair distribution, with $S1_a$ as the largest $S1$ in the event, and $S_b$ as the second largest one following $S1_a$. Double $S1$ events from $^{83m}$Kr are indicated as the circled region in the figure. The time separation of the two $S1$ peaks in figure 3(b) obeys the exponential law and the fitted half life is $156.3 \pm 2.4$ ns which is consistent with the NNDC data [19].

These $^{83m}$Kr events can be selected through the double $S1$s feature even in zero field condition, although there is no $S2$ signal. Without $S2$, the event position can not be reconstructed. However the normalized ratio of $S1$ charge collected in the top PMT array to that in the bottom array,

$$A_{TB} = \frac{S1_{top}/S1_{bottom} - 1}{S1_{top}/S1_{bottom} + 1},$$

reflects the event position in vertical direction $Z$, as demonstrated in Fig. 4 which gives $A_{TB}$-$Z$ distribution of $^{83m}$Kr events under non-zero electric field conditions. A cubic polynomial function is fitted to the mean values of $Z$ slices of the band to build the relationship between vertical position and normalized $S1$ top-bottom ratio $A_{TB}$, which has no significant discrepancy at three non-zero electric field condition. Also the $\pm 1 \sigma$ Gaussian widths of $Z$ slices are fitted. These functions are used for zero field condition to derive the detector correction factors in the vertical direction for $S1$ signals.
Figure 3. (a) $^{83m}$Kr $S1$ pair. The horizontal axis represents the largest $S1$ in one event. The vertical axis represents the following second largest $S1$. The red circle region shows the two isolated $S1$s from the $^{83m}$Kr cascade decay. (b) Distribution of $^{83m}$Kr events on time separation between two peaks. The horizontal axis is the peak time separation of the two signals, indicating the time feature of the second decay. Blue histogram presents two isolated $S1$s events within the red circle region in figure 3(a) while the green one represents one merged $S1$ events which consists of two peaks. The black histogram is the summation of above two. To suppress the peak time calculation uncertainty or artificial cut effect, only events whose delta time is within time interval from 400 ns to 1500 ns are selected to fit and the fitted result is 156.3 ± 2.4 ns.

Shortly after injection, the krypton atoms get distributed uniformly in the detector. However, near the edge of detector, there could be some deformation of electric field which yields a radial component $E_r$ along with the dominant vertical component $E_z$. Therefore, given the large statistics of the $^{83m}$Kr events, the reconstructed horizontal position distribution can reflect the $E_r$ component of the drift electric field. The longer the drift distance is, the more distortion the reconstruction horizontal position would have.

Figure 5 shows the reconstructed position distributions of $^{83m}$Kr events under various electric field strengths of 81 V/cm, 180 V/cm and 317 V/cm respectively. For events close to the detector bottom ($Z = -600$ mm), the horizontal position distribution shifts to smaller radius. The weaker the drift field strength is, the more significant the distortion is. For field strength of 317 V/cm, corresponding to -24 kV cathode voltage, the position reconstruction shift is negligible. Events inside the fiducial volume are used in this study. For 317 V/cm condition, this volume is the same with Run 11 fiducial volume in Ref. [4], i.e., 50 $\mu$s < drift time < 350 $\mu$s and $R^2 < 7.2 \times 10^4$ mm$^2$. For other non-zero field condition, they share the same $R^2$ range and the drift time confinements are scaled by the maximum drift times. For zero field condition, from the $A_{TB}$-Z relation, the equivalent drift time cut is applied. And the $R^2$ range is unlimited (no $S2$ signal at all). Even through horizontal position reconstruction shift a lot in weak field condition, this effect hardly affects the light yield measurement results by comparing the $^{83m}$Kr data with and without $R^2$ constraint.
**Figure 4.** Distribution of $^{83m}$Kr events on normalized top-bottom ratio of S1 charge versus vertical position $Z$. $Z = -600$ mm and $Z = 0$ mm represent the cathode grid and gate mesh respectively. The 2-D histogram shows the $^{83m}$Kr event distribution. The magenta (cyan) data points are the mean ($\pm 1\sigma$) of the histogram along the vertical position axis. These relations can be fitted well as the green and red curves show.

(figure 6(a),6(b),6(c)). This good results come from the low background of the selection region in figure 3(a). For activated xenon data, the mean value of the Gaussian function is biased by the events from the surface (figure 6(d),6(e)). By comparing the different horizontal position reconstruction methods, introduced by Ref. [20], the reconstruction uncertainty is trivial to affect the final measurement results. Similarly the uncertainty that lack of horizontal position can be neglected in $^{83m}$Kr data for zero field condition.

**Figure 5.** $^{83m}$Kr event reconstructed position in different drift field condition. The magenta dashed lines represent the corresponding fiducial volume.
3 Results and discussion

For a dual phase xenon detector, the light yield is an intrinsic parameter that evaluates the detector response. From previous section, the $S1$ components of these mono-energy events were selected precisely. In this kind of large detector (646 mm in diameter and 600 mm in height), due to geometry non-uniformity, the signal yields can vary with event position. A 3-D position-based correction is applied to improve the resolution. The correction mapping follows Run 11 $S1$ mapping in Ref. [4]. And all of the $S1$ charges are normalized to the mean value of $S1$ mapping inside the fiducial volume. Also the $^{131m}$Xe mapping, used for Run 9 data in Ref. [4], is selected for mapping uncertainty estimation in this analysis. Different mapping results in little measurement difference.

Besides position correction, the baseline suppression (BLS) non-linearity, another hardware limitation will affect the signal yield. In a standard way, a fixed threshold is set to ignore noise which comes from baseline fluctuation. When the PMT’s gain is high enough, every hit originating from physical event will be recorded as it is amplified larger than the threshold significantly. However, this effect results in smaller detected $S1$ than the true $S1$ especially for the low energy signal when some of the PMTs’ gain is relatively low in 2019. A novel PMT gain calibration methodology is applied to these low gain PMTs as Ref. [4] introduced. Following Ref. [4], the BLS non-linearity also can be quantified and it is applied to this analysis.

After position-based correction and BLS correction, each $S1$ spectrum was fitted by a Gaussian function and the mean value of the fitting result represented the mean $S1$ response in light yield formula (1.2). Figure 6 and 7 show the $S1$ spectra of various energy points at 317 V/cm and zero drift electric fields respectively. In association with PDE and the true energy of the decay, the light signal yield was obtained. The light yield as a function of energy and drift field strength is summarized in Tab. 2.

The dominant systematic uncertainty originates from the Gaussian function fitting range, the event selection methodology and the error of PDE. The selection region in Fig. 1(a) and 3(a) could be more strict and that yields different mean value of fitting result. The difference was taken as the systematic error. The calibration data statistics is large enough and the statistical uncertainty in determining the light yield is negligible compared with systematic uncertainties. For the zero field data with no $S2$ signal, the $A_{TB}$-Z relation is another major uncertainty source which results in larger systematic uncertainty than other non-zero field condition.

In liquid-phase noble gas based experiments, NEST model as presented in Ref. [16, 21, 22], has been widely used for signal prediction. It is worthwhile measuring the light yield at several energy points to validate the NEST model. The measured light yield of these mono-energy points are plotted in Fig. 8, overlaid with results from other experiment [13, 23] and NEST model (v2.1.0) predictions [22]. The comparison shows a good consistency in general between the measurement in our detector response and NEST model for various energies except the 9.4 keV energy point from $^{83m}$Kr cascade decay, which is to be discussed in the next paragraph.

The second decay in $^{83m}$Kr cascade has quite different light yield from other energies,
Figure 6. S1 spectra and Gaussian function fitting at 317 V/cm electric field. Blue (green) histograms are the S1 distribution of multiple energy points with (without) fiducial volume constraint. The red curves are fitting functions.

Figure 7. S1 spectra of multiple energy points and fitting functions at zero electric field.
Table 2. Light yield results, unit: photons/keV. These center values are calculated from the calibration events in table 1. Both systematic uncertainty and statistical uncertainty are considered. Due to the lack of S2 signal, these uncertainties in the 0 V/cm column is larger than others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Energy deposition (keV)</th>
<th>317 V/cm</th>
<th>180 V/cm</th>
<th>81 V/cm</th>
<th>0 V/cm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>66.1 ± 2.9</td>
<td>68.9 ± 3.0</td>
<td>70.5 ± 3.0</td>
<td>72.0 ± 5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>52.4 ± 2.4</td>
<td>56.8 ± 2.7</td>
<td>60.7 ± 2.7</td>
<td>68.7 ± 5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>55.6 ± 2.6</td>
<td>59.6 ± 2.9</td>
<td>62.9 ± 2.8</td>
<td>69.5 ± 5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>40.7 ± 2.9</td>
<td>46.2 ± 2.9</td>
<td>53.2 ± 2.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>41.1 ± 3.0</td>
<td>46.3 ± 2.7</td>
<td>52.4 ± 3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8. Light yield comparison. Dashed curves represent general gamma responses of NEST prediction in Ref. [21]. The data points in this work and other experiments [13, 23] are also shown. The color set, cyan, magenta, blue, green, red stand for different drift electric field strength.
which were observed in other experiments as well [23, 24]. One possible interpretation is that the local high xenon ion density caused by the first decay energy deposition can enhance the ion-electron recombination rate of the nearby second decay significantly and result in a much higher light yield than general gamma responses. The half-life of $^{83\text{m}}$Kr atom($J^\pi = \frac{7}{2}^+$) is 156.9 ns, we can expect that for the second decay happening after a longer period will have less enhancement from the first decay. Figure 9 shows the dependence of the second decay light on the time interval between two decays. Also the NEST model has a similar trend as the measurement and they agree within the uncertainties.

![Graph showing light yield variation as a function of separation time for $^{83\text{m}}$Kr 9.4 keV events.](image)

**Figure 9.** Light yield variation as a function of separation time for $^{83\text{m}}$Kr 9.4 keV events. The solid colored points are from measurement under various electric. Events with two decays time separation from 400 ns to 1800 ns are selected, whose two S1 signals are able to be identified in the waveform. The 9.4 keV energy light yield is decreasing with time separation as expected. The NEST model predictions for $^{83\text{m}}$Kr are shown in dashed lines for comparison.

## 4 Summary and outlook

After PandaX-II detector completed its scientific mission [4], two kinds of gaseous calibration sources, activated xenon and $^{83\text{m}}$Kr, had been injected into the detector. In total, five mono-energetic events were reconstructed under four different electric drift field conditions. The signal yields were studied and show a great agreement with the NEST model. Also, this
study provides valuable experience for the next-generation experiment, PandaX-4T [7, 25] and its successor [26, 27].
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