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## I. Introduction

This report documents the thickness and area tests of the LET detectors on the Voyager CRS experiment. For reference Figure'I-1 shows a schematic of a nominal LET telescope.

## II. LET 35 Thickness Measurements

The thickness of each LET $35 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ detector was determined by measuring the energy loss of normally incident, penetrating $\alpha$-particles from a ${ }^{228} \mathrm{Th}$ source (see Figure II-1 and Figure II-2a). The data and analysis are in the notebook labeled: "LET $35 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ Dectectors - Particle Thickness Data".

Each raw data set consisted of 11 pulse height spectra. For pulse height spectra 4 and $8-9$, all but an annular ring of the detector was masked off so that thickness measurements could be made at various distances from the center (see Figure II-2b). The inner and outer radii of the exposed annular area for these runs are listed on the third page of each data set. The other six pulse height spectra were taken for special purposes as follows:
nos. $1,2,10,11$ - pulser calibrations of the electronics before and after each complete set of spectra
no. 5 - a measurement with the detector at half bias
no. 3 - a measurement with all but an $r=1 \mathrm{~mm}$ hole masked off to determine the Landau contribution to the sigma of the other thickness distributions

The raw data for all spectra are listed and plotted on pages five through ten of
each data set. Calculations to obtain an average thickness and an average path length for an isotropic flux (L1-L2 required) are shown on page three.

To determine the average secant $\vartheta$ of an isotropic flux for each annular ring, it was necessary to numerically intergrate over acceptable solid angles. Plots of the secant $\vartheta$ distributions, as well as listings of all programs involved in this thickness determination are in the "Analysis" section of the notebook. The final results for all flight detectors are listed in Table VIII.

## III. LET 450 Thickness Measurements

The thickness of each $450 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ detector at a point on its surface was determined by comparison with a gaugeblock of known thickness ( $457.2 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ ). The data and analysis are in the notebook labeled: "LET - $450 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ Detectors - Thickness Data, Depletion Voltage Data".

The two sides of a detector (or gaugeblock) were shorted and the surface was pulsed. Probes were then brought near both sides of the detector (gaugeblock) causing pulses to be capacitively induced in them. By adjusting the probe - surface distance, $d$, so that the ratio of the number of output pulse above some threshold to input pulses, $\frac{0}{1}$, was one half, a fixed d could be obtained (see Figure III-1). The actual measurements were done as follows: A probe - gaugeblock - probe "sandwich" was formed with one probe fixed. The gaugeblock was pulsed, and its position was adjusted until $\left[\frac{0}{I}\right)_{\text {nxed }}=0.5$. Next, the position of the free probe was adjusted until $\left[\frac{0}{I}\right)_{\text {tree }}=0.5$. The probe - surface distance on both sides of the guageblock was thus set. The gaugeblock was then replaced by the detector of unknown thickness, $\mathrm{T}_{\text {detootor }}$. The detector was now pulsed and its position adjusted until $\left[\frac{0}{1}\right]_{\text {nxod }}=0.5$, thereby
reproducing the fixed probe - surface distance of the gaugeblock run. Finally, the free probe was moved a distance $\Delta$ such that $\left[\frac{0}{I}\right]_{\text {tree }}=0.5$, reproducing the free probe surface distance of the gaugeblock run. Therefore, as shown in Figure III-2:

$$
\mathrm{T}_{\text {detootor }}=457.2 \mu \mathrm{~m}-\Delta .
$$

Two measurements at the center of the detector were averaged to give $T_{\text {oenter }}$ measurements at four positions around the edge were averaged to give $\mathrm{T}_{\text {edge. }}$ All numbers can be found in the "Data" section of the notebook. By comparing the two measurements at the center of each detector the rms uncertainty on each thickness measurement is estimated to be $1.7 \mu \mathrm{~m}$

In order to calculate the average thickness and path length of a detector, it was necessary to know its shape. Since all the $450 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ detectors measured were found to have $T_{\text {oenter }}>\mathrm{T}_{\text {odge }}$, it was assumed as a first approximation that the two sides were identical spberical sections (see Figure III-3a) so that:

$$
\begin{equation*}
T(r)=T_{\text {oenter }}-\left(T_{\text {center }}-T_{\text {odge }}\right) \frac{r^{2}}{r^{2} \text { edge }} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $r_{\text {edgo }}=8 \mathrm{~mm}$, is the distance from the center of the detector to the position at which $T_{\text {edge }}$ was measured (see Figure III-3b). This relation is derived in the "Analysts" section of the notebook. Using equation (1), the average thickness was easily determined. In order to approximate the average particle path length for an isotropic flux (L1-L2 required), the detector was divided into several annular rings. The average detector thickness for each annular area was determined using equation (1), and the average secant $\vartheta$ for each area was computed by the program RINGSPLT. The product was then averaged over all annular rings weighted by geometry factor to give the average path length. The result is slightly dependent on whether the detector is an L3 or an L4 detector.

This analysis, as well as a listing of RINGSPLT, is in the "Analysis" section of the notebook. The average thicknesses and path lengths for all flight detectors are listed
in Tables I and II.

## IV. LET 35 Active Area Measurements

The active area of each $35 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ detector was determined by counting the total number of stopping $\alpha$-particles from a ${ }^{241} \mathrm{Am}$ source in a constant time, and then comparing to the standard detector, 15-158C (see Figure IV-1). The data, program listings and analysis are in the notebook labeled "LET $35 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ Detectors - Particle Area Data, Optical Size Scans, Testing Charts, Warranties".

The data for each detector are made up of a pulser calibration of the electronics at $0.5,2$ and 5 MeV and a pulse-height analysis spectrum of the detector's output during a 400 second exposure to the source. The calibration analysis was done using the program DETAREA (see notebook). The various detectors were run in groups on several different days. Each group run included a measurement of 15-158C as a standard. The pulse-height analysis spectra were similar for all detectors and can best be described by considering three energy regions:
$<2 \mathrm{MeV} \quad$ variable tail due to background and extreme edge effects
$2-4.9 \mathrm{MeV} \quad$ flat nonvarying tail due to poor energy collection
near the edge of the detector
$4.9-5.7 \mathrm{MeV} \quad$ a peak ( $\sim 5.5 \mathrm{MeV}$ ); the spectra fall off more
steeply for $\mathrm{E}>5.5 \mathrm{MeV}$ than for $\mathrm{E}<5.5 \mathrm{MeV}$.

The total number of counts above 4.9 MeV was used to obtain the fully active area of each detector relative to the optical area of the standard detector, 15-158C. The results are listed in Table VII.
r The lower limit of 4.9 MeV is $\sim 10 \%$ below the nominal incident a energy and is intended to approximate a limit that might be used in real data analysis, for example separating a-particles from protons on a $\frac{d E}{d x}-E$ plot. The summation was also perfomed for all channels above 2 MeV as a consistency check. Three items of concern were found in the data:

1) The pulse-height spectrum of the standard detector, $15-158 \mathrm{C}$, on $4 / 14 / 76$ is $20 \%$ below average. It is suspected that the run time was less than the normal 400 seconds. 2) There was a problem with the electronic calibration on $6 / 28 / 76$. The spectra look normal, however, and could possibilty be integrated using the a peak to aid in the calibration. The data was not analyzed since it did not include any flight detectors.
2) The detectors run on $4 / 06 / 76$ were rerun on $4 / 23 / 76$, because of suspected problems. The data sets are reasonably consistent, but only the latter run was used in the final analysis.

There were a total of six runs used in the final analysis. The number of counts above 4.9 MeV for detector $15-158 \mathrm{C}$ for these runs is listed in Table IV-1.

Table IV-1

| date | $N$ (integrated counts) |
| :---: | :---: |
| $3 / 17 / 76$ | 673523 |
| $4 / 18 / 76$ | 673591 |
| $4 / 21 / 76$ | 673032 |
| $4 / 23 / 78$ | 674978 |
| $4 / 28 / 76$ | 675071 |
| $4 / 30 / 76$ | 673049 |

The sample is small, but if a statistical distribution is assumed, $\overline{\mathrm{N}}=873874$ and $\frac{\sigma_{\mathrm{N}}}{\overline{\mathrm{N}}}=0.14 \pm 0.04 \%$. The relative sigma is consistent with counting statistios, $\frac{\sqrt{\mathrm{N}}}{\overline{\mathrm{N}}}=0.12 \% . \overline{\mathrm{N}}$ was therefore used as the standard for comparison with the results of other detectors.

Prior to these active-area measurements, a metallization goodness number had been assigned to most detectors as an aid in flight detector selection. The numbers ranged from one to six and were determined by optical inspection of the Au metallization as follows:

1 - distinct edge

6 - hazy edge, implying a thin metallization near the edge

Figure IV-2 is a plot of this number vs. the relative active area for all detectors that were inspected. As expected, there is a correlation between thin metallization regions and reduced active areas.

Another check on the reliability of the active-area measurement technique was made by redoing two detectors with different equipment and setup, approximately one year later. The results are listed in Table IV-2.

Table IV-2

| detector | 1976 measurement <br> (detector area - 15-158C area) | 1977 measurement <br> (detector area - 15-158C area) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 15-158C area | 15-158C area |
| 414-734 B | $-2.79 \pm 0.13 \%$ | $-2.52 \pm 0.04 \%$ |
| 514-546 E | $0.40 \pm 0.13 \%$ | $0.43 \pm 0.04 \%$ |

Finally, the active areas were used to calculate the relative geometry factors for all LET flight telescopes. These are listed in Table VIII. The L1-L2 separation distance was calculated from numbers in the LET assembly data notebooks. The error analysis can be found in the "Analysis" section of the notebook containing the area data.

## V. LET 35 Optical Area Measurements

The optical area of each $35 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ detector was determined by measuring its diameter using a microscope with a calibrated scan platform. The data are: in the notebook labeled "LET $35 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ Detectors - Particle Area, Optical Size Scans, Testing Charts, Visual Inspections Warranties".

Two diameters of the metallization, $d_{\mathbf{x}}$ and $\mathrm{d}_{\mathbf{y}}$, were measured in perpendicular directions on both the Au and Al sides of the detector. The area of each side was then:

$$
\mathrm{A}=\pi \frac{\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{x}}}{2} \frac{\mathrm{~d}_{\mathrm{y}}}{2} .
$$

Figure V-1a is a plot of the Au area vs. the Al area for all detectors.
A measurement was also made of the concentricity (distance between centers) of the Lavite mounting ring and the metallization on both sides. Unfortunately the absolute concentricity between the Au and Al metallizations could not be determined. In an effort to find out if the masking procedure during production caused similar concentricities in the same direction on both sides, a plot was made of the concentricity on the Al side vs. the concentricity on the Au side (see Figure $\mathrm{V}-1 \mathrm{~b}$ ). The concentricities did not seem well correlated and we were therefore forced to assume that, as a worst case, the maximum absolute concentricity could be the sum of the concentricities on the two sides.

The final optical areas of the Al side for all flight detectors are listed in Table VII.

Numbers in parenthesis are the areas of overlap of the Au and Al metallizations computed assuming the worst-case absolute concentricity.

## VI. LET 450 Optical Area Measurements

The optical areas of the $450 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ detectors were measured in the same way as those of the $35 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ detectors (see Section V). The data are in the notebook labeled "LET - $450 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ Detectors - Optical Size Scans, Testing Charts, Visual Inspections, Warranties".

For these detectors, the concentricities of the metallizations were not measured. Table VII lists the epoxy-free optical areas for all flight $450 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ detectors.

## Table VII

(FU-1, VGR 1)

|  | Serial Number | Thickness | Average Path Length* |  | Optical Area | Active Area** |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ector |  | $(\text { mean } \pm \sigma)^{\wp}$ | $(\text { mean } \pm \sigma)^{\oint}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{L} 1, \mathrm{~L} 2 \\ & \mathrm{~L} 3, \mathrm{~L} 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { (Al-(overlap)) } \\ & \text { (epoxy free) } \end{aligned}$ |  |

LET A

| $(09)+$ | L1 | $14-297 B$ | $36.98 \pm 0.26 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ | $37.91 \pm 0.66 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ | $2.834-(2.80) \mathrm{cm}^{2} 2.8384 \mathrm{~cm}^{2}$ |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| L2 | $14-629 D$ | $34.60 \pm 0.42$ | $35.46 \pm 0.82$ | $2.832-(2.81)$ | 2.8259 |
| L3 | $14-773 E$ | $396.4 \pm 14.6$ | $409.3 \pm 13.2$ | 3.890 | - |
| L4 | $15-558 B$ | $450.8 \pm 5.8$ | $463.0 \pm 9.0$ | 4.071 | - |

LET B
(13)

| L1 | $14-631 D$ | $30.16 \pm 0.24$ | $30.91 \pm 0.64$ | $2.839-(2.81)$ | 2.8228 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| L2 | $14-546 \mathrm{C}$ | $37.58 \pm 0.63$ | $38.51 \pm 0.99$ | $2.841-(2.82)$ | 2.8466 |
| L3 | $14-773 F$ | $386.2 \pm 12.2$ | $398.3 \pm 11.5$ | 3.878 | - |
| L4 | $15-561 \mathrm{~F}$ | $449.2 \pm 11.2$ | $462.3 \pm 11.5$ | 4.102 | - |

LET C
(07)
L1 14-630C
$36.17 \pm 0.61$
$37.07 \pm 0.98$
2.839-(2.81)
2.8273

L2 14-544C
$32.26 \pm 0.28$
$33.07 \pm 0.63$
2.838-(2.82)
2.8222

L3 14-295I
$397.1 \pm 24.2$
$411.9 \pm 21.0$
3.871

L4 $15-721 \mathrm{H}$
$451.4 \pm 9.7 \quad 464.4 \pm 10.6$
4.108

LET D
(16)

| L1 | $14-548 \mathrm{E}$ | $34.58 \pm 0.49$ | $35.45 \pm 0.72$ | $2.831-(2.81)$ | 2.8112 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| L2 | $14-548 D$ | $33.82 \pm 0.46$ | $34.66 \pm 0.80$ | $2.831-(2.82)$ | 2.8152 |
| L3 | $14-772 A$ | $400.7 \pm 17.4$ | $414.8 \pm 15.1$ | 3.958 | - |
| L4 | $15-796 G$ | $464.3 \pm 7.2$ | $477.1 \pm 9.7$ | 4.053 | - |

$\S_{\sigma}$ is the rms deviation of the thickness (pathlength) distribution.

* Isotropic Flux; L1•L2 required.
** The relative accuracy of these areas is $\pm 0.0037 \mathrm{~cm}^{2}$ compared to the assumed area of $15-158 C$ of $2.82932 \mathrm{~cm}^{2}$ (only absolutely known to a few percent).
+ Telescope Serial Number.

Table VII cont.
(FU-2, VGR 2)

| Detector | Serial Number | Thickness | Average Path Length* |  | Optical Area | Active Area** |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $(\text { mean } \pm \sigma)^{\wp}$ | $(\text { meàn } \pm \sigma)^{\text {§ }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{L}, \mathrm{~L} 2 \\ & \mathrm{~L} 3, \mathrm{~L} 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { (Al-(overlap)) } \\ & \text { (epoxy free) } \end{aligned}$ |  |

LET A
(11) +
L1 14-541D
$33.53 \pm 0.65 \mu \mathrm{~m} \quad 34.35 \pm 1.03 \mu \mathrm{~m}$
$2.837-(2.81) \mathrm{cm}^{2} 2.8180 \mathrm{~cm}^{2}$
L2 14-544A
$35.34 \pm 0.51$
$36.23 \pm 0.72$
2.834-(2.81)
2.8299

L3 15-796I
$447.9 \pm 8.5$
$461.2 \pm 7.2$
3.985

L4 15-720G
$448.6 \pm 9.7$
$461.2 \pm 10.7$
4.034

LET B
(15)
L1 15-164C
$37.62 \pm 0.32$
$38.55 \pm 0.81$
$2.831-(2.81)$
2.8064

L2 14-541E
$29.93 \pm 0.48$
$30.67 \pm 0.81$
$2.835-(2.82)$
2.8251

L3 14-294E
$412.4 \pm 22.3$
$428.0 \pm 18.9$
3.969
4.065

LET C
(10)

L1 14-546B
$34.47 \pm 0.57$
$35.33 \pm 0.97$
$2.832-(2.79)$
2.8364

L2 15-164D
$33.21 \pm 0.39$
$34.04 \pm 0.77$
2.834-(2.82)
2.7900

L3 15-717F
$460.9 \pm 11.5$
$475.2 \pm 11.4$
3.984

L4 15-796E
$445.1 \pm 10.3$
$457.5 \pm 10.9$
4.006

LET D
(14)

L1 14-544D
$33.90 \pm 0.41$
$34.76 \pm 0.65$
$2.842-(2.81)$
2.8344

L2 14-455D
$35.33 \pm 0.50$
$36.21 \pm 0.92$
2.832-(2.81)
2.8039

L3 14-771D
$393.9 \pm 21.7$
$408.5 \pm 18.6$
3.923

L4 15-558F
$441.6 \pm 4.2$
$453.3 \pm 8.8$
4.083

* Isotropic Flux; L1-L2 required.
** The relative accuracy of these areas is $\pm 0.0037 \mathrm{~cm}^{2}$ compared to the assumed area of $15-158 \mathrm{C}$ of $2.82932 \mathrm{~cm}^{2}$ (only absolutely known to a few percent).
+ Telescope Serial Number.
$\rho^{\circ}$ is the rms deviation of the thickness (pathlength) distribution.

Table VIII

| $\mathrm{L}^{\mathrm{L}}$ | L 2 | $\mathrm{~L} 1-\mathrm{L} 2$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Active Area* | Active Area | Separation | | A $\Omega * *$ |
| :---: |
| $\left( \pm 0.0037 \mathrm{~cm}^{2}\right)$ |$\left( \pm 0.0037 \mathrm{~cm}^{2}\right) \quad( \pm 0.005 \mathrm{~cm}) \quad\left( \pm 0.0012 \mathrm{~cm}^{2}-\mathrm{sr}\right)$

FU-1

| LET A | $2.8384 \mathrm{~cm}^{2}$ | $2.8259 \mathrm{~cm}^{2}$ | 4.076 cm | $0.4366 \mathrm{~cm}^{2}-\mathrm{sr}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| LET B | 2.8228 | 2.8466 | 4.081 | 0.4364 |
| LET C | 2.8273 | 2.8222 | 4.079 | 0.4338 |
| LET D | 2.8112 | 2.8152 | 4.075 | 0.4312 |

FU-2

| LET A | 2.8180 | 2.8299 | 4.075 | 0.4344 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| LET B | 2.8064 | 2.8251 | 4.064 | 0.4341 |
| LET C | 2.8364 | 2.7900 | 4.084 | 0.4295 |
| LET D | 2.8344 | 2.8039 | 4.061 | 0.4357 |

* Area relative to the optical area of $15-158 \mathrm{C}\left(2.82932 \mathrm{~cm}^{2}\right)$; see comment for Table VII.
** L1.L2 required; fourth place accuracy is only relative.


Nominal LET Telescope
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## ILLUSTRATIVE CALCULATION

$E_{i}$ and $\Delta E$ are known; $d$ is to be determined.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& R_{\alpha}\left(E_{f}\right)=d_{f} \\
& R_{\alpha}\left(\Delta E+E_{f}\right)=d+d_{f}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $R_{\alpha}(E)$ is the range in silicon of an $\alpha$-particle of energy $E$ (S. Vidar's range energy table was used).

Solving for $d$ with $E_{f}=E_{i}-\Delta E$ :

$$
d=R_{\alpha}\left(E_{i}\right)-R_{\alpha}\left(E_{i}-\Delta E\right)
$$
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