



Self calibration of LEDs in D-Eggs for IceCube-Upgrade

Ryo Nagai Chiba University

Ryo Nagai (Chiba Univ.)

Neutrino Workshop @ Chiba

IceCube-Upgrade



Ryo Nagai (Chiba Univ.)

D-Egg: Main Detector of IC-Upgrade



- Developed by **Chiba group**, the production was completed last year (2021)
- 4π detection allows us to improve the detection efficiency
- ~300 D-Eggs will be deployed



8 March 2022

LED Flasher Calibration System



Ryo Nagai (Chiba Univ.)

Neutrino Workshop @ Chiba



- MCU can control the LED intensity & masks
- ICM FPGA publishes the flashing triggers, but no feed-backs How do we know if it works or not in ice?

Ryo Nagai (Chiba Univ.)

Neutrino Workshop @ Chiba

Self Calibration of the LED Flasher!



- I modified firmware to work ICM ↔ FPGA GPIO as a PMT trigger line
- Can verify LEDs by looking signals from low-gain D-Egg PMT with the synchronized triggers

Ryo Nagai (Chiba Univ.)

Test Setup



Check intensity of each LED



Bias Voltage Scan



- To cover such wide range, have to divide into 3 regions with different PMT gains
- Could see the luminosity trend, but seems saturated at the high intensity regions

Comparison to stand-alone calibration



- Could not reach the maximum range ($10^9 \, \text{PE}$) by this work
- Difficult to know the absolute luminosities from the data, but we can see the relative ones precisely in short time

Ryo Nagai (Chiba Univ.)

Summary

- Chiba group developed the new detector "D-Egg" for the IceCube-Upgrade
- Recently, we developed the self calibration system by improving our firmware
- Now it's possible to detect LED signals with synchronized triggers
- Measurement of the absolute luminosity seems difficult (have to consider the location, direction, and so on...)
- At least, we can know the relative luminosity for each LED
- The calibration will be included into the tests before shipping to South-Pole, see the detector-to-detector variation

Ryo Nagai (Chiba Univ.)



Gain calibration



$$g = A \cdot (V [kV])^B$$
$$A = 6.127 \times 10^5$$
$$B = 7.445$$

- LED1 with 0x5800 bias, charge-stamp
- Fit them and each gain is evaluated from the parameters A and B

Raw observed charge



• [-10, +15] window, need to check waveform

Ryo Nagai (Chiba Univ.)

LED variation



- Can see clear difference among the LEDs
- Charge stamp makes possible to scan them by LED intensity settings in short time (~10 sec each)

Ryo Nagai (Chiba Univ.)

LED variation (waveform stream)



- Though takes much time, we also use the waveform stream, we can know the signal shape and timing information
- All waveforms are triggered by the periodical Cal Trig shown in the right figure

LED variation (timing)



- Peak timing in the waveform sampling window
- Width of 2 or 3 sampling-bin is observed for all LEDs (no difference)

Scanned result



- gain~1.3, charge-stamp scan
 - 50k events each, 0x200 interval, took only 30 min for the scan
- Mean is calculated by simple numpy.mean, so accurate for small values
 - should be Poisson, and difficult to separate from electronics noise
- Looks saturated in higher region

Ryo Nagai (Chiba Univ.)

Scanned result (low gain case)



- Lower PE region (PE < 1) is not reliable
- For the full range scan, need to control the PMT gain — LED is so bright, the PMT gain should start from very low gain

Very low gain result (Example, not enough)



- Can reach some higher intensities, but not all
- Divide horizontal / vertical LEDs and full-range scanning with very low gain (~500 V)

Ryo Nagai (Chiba Univ.)

Neutrino Workshop @ Chiba

Another sample: D-Egg2020-1-008



- Mainboard: 4.1-007
- LED brightness is much different from previous...
 → Need further study

Ryo Nagai (Chiba Univ.)

Another sample: D-Egg2020-1-008



- Mainboard: 4.1-007
- Tried full range with lower gain. Still observed saturation region

Another sample: D-Egg2020-1-008



- Mainboard: 4.1-007
- Tried full range with lower gain. Still observed saturation region