Spatial distribution of electron cloud footprints from microchannel plates: Measurements and modeling
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The measurements of the electron cloud footprints produced by a stack of microchannel plates (MCPs) as a function of gain, MCP-to-readout distance and accelerating electric field are presented. To investigate the charge footprint variation, we introduce a ballistic model of the charge cloud propagation based on the energy and angular distribution at the MCP output. We also simulate the Coulomb repulsion in the electron cloud, which is likely to cause the experimentally observed increase in the cloud size with increasing MCP gain. Calculation results for both models are compared to the charge footprint sizes measured both in our experiments with high rear-field values (≈200–900 V/mm) and in the experiments of Edgar et al. [Rev. Sci. Instrum. 60, 3673 (1989)] (accelerating electric field ≈30–130 V/mm). © 1999 American Institute of Physics.

I. INTRODUCTION

Operation of microchannel plate (MCP)-based imaging detectors with charge-division readouts often requires optimization of the event charge footprint to achieve high spatial resolution and good image linearity. The best performance of many readout schemes is obtained when the charge cloud is spread out in the plane of the anode, so that several pitches of the repetitive electrode structure are covered. In fact, a narrow charge cloud can bring about an image distortion in the form of periodic modulation. On the other hand, excessive spreading of the charge footprint leads to distortion at the image edges, thus reducing the effective area of the detector. For most charge-division readouts, where resolution depends on the charge division linearity, it is preferable to have a step-like profile for the charge spatial distribution instead of a superposition of a Gaussian-like central part and wide wings. As suggested recently by Lapington, a part of the wing component in such a distribution may be attributed to the secondary electron emission from the readout.

To achieve a better detector performance, the cloud footprint characteristics could be optimized by varying detector geometry and operational parameters. Edgar et al. suggested a method for measuring the charge footprint profile at the anode and then studied these profiles for several detector configurations. Computer simulation could considerably reduce the amount of experimental measurements for optimization purposes. A substantial experience has been accumulated to date in simulation of such detector characteristics as MCP gain, quantum efficiency, thermal behavior, temporal characteristics, etc. However, the development of a feasible model for the charge cloud propagation has apparently been impeded by such factors as the statistical nature of the MCP output and the self-consistency of the electric field in the electron cloud. To our knowledge, only few results on this matter have been reported so far. Zanodvorov et al. presented a “ballistic” model of the charge cloud propagation based on the differential electron distributions at the MCP output, which had been measured in the experiments of Bronshtein et al. In this approach, no interactions between the electrons in the cloud are taken into account (the reason why this model can be called ballistic), i.e., the electric field is assumed to be constant rather than self-consistent. In the present paper (Sec. III A) we use a similar ballistic approach for simulating the charge footprint profile and compare the results with both our own experimental data (for high values of the MCP-anode accelerating field, ≈200–900 V/mm) and the experimental results of Edgar et al. (for low values of the rear electric field, ≈30–130 V/mm).

However, with increasing MCP gain values the effects of Coulomb repulsion in the electron cloud may become more pronounced, thus requiring consideration. In Sec. III B, we present our attempt to estimate the contribution of the Coulomb repulsion to the charge cloud spreading. For this model, we also compare computation results with the experimental data of Edgar et al. and our own (for low and high rear-field values, respectively).

II. MEASUREMENTS

A stack of four back-to-back MCPs (40:1 L/D, 12 μm pore, 13° bias angle and 1 channel diameter end spoiling) was used in our measurements, Fig. 1. A P20 phosphor screen deposited onto a Schott fiberoptic (6 μm fiber) faceplate was positioned at 5 or 15 mm behind the stack. The input of the MCP stack was negatively biased. To produce a visible light output, a positive bias of 2500–4500 V was applied to the phosphor screen, providing a quasi-uniform accelerating electric field in the MCP-phosphor gap. The MCP gain was varied in the 3×10⁶–1.4×10⁷ range. A pinhole mask with 50 μm diameter holes positioned 6 mm apart was placed in contact with the front surface of the input MCP, and a mercury vapor UV lamp (2537 Å) was used to illuminate the detector. Digital imaging was performed with...
a lens-coupled PULNIX TM-7CN CCD camera. The imaging spatial resolution of the screen and readout system was about 52 μm, dominated by the CCD pixel size. Figures 2 and 3 show a typical image and a histogram of a ~50 μm wide section across it obtained at detector gain $1.4 \times 10^7$ with 5 mm gap between the phosphor screen and MCPs and a gap bias of 4000 V. Theoretically, one might expect the charge cloud shape to be nonsymmetric due to the presence of the MCP bias angle. The resolution in our measurements was not sufficient for a detailed investigation of the charge cloud shape, as the footprint size was relatively small due to the high accelerating field between the MCP output and the phosphor screen. Therefore, we did not observe any dependence of the charge cloud footprints on the pore bias angle.

III. CALCULATIONS

The statistical nature of the electron avalanche, originating at the output of the MCP channels, inhibits a precise calculation of the charge cloud evolution. The output electron angles and velocities exhibit large variations depending not only on the MCP intrinsic parameters (such as the length-to-diameter ratio L/D, the secondary electron emission coefficient of the semiconductive layer, the end spoiling, etc.), but also on the mode and sometimes even the history of operation. For instance, the saturated gain conditions are very different from the unsaturated mode of operation as reported elsewhere.15,16 Besides, the long term gain depression phenomena,17–19 as well as the local variation of MCP gain in the vicinity of a high count rate area,10 also determine the manner in which the electron avalanche originates and develops. The abruptly changing electric fields at the pore exit impose yet more difficulties on the direct calculations. The Coulomb repulsion between the electrons in the cloud itself is difficult to describe precisely due to the presence in the process of a large number of particles with different velocity vectors. However, below we suggest some
approximations which enable us to simulate the electron cloud development in the MCP-anode gap and obtain some information on the electron cloud footprint at the readout element of a detector.

A. Ballistic model

Following the same approach as Zanodvorov et al.,\textsuperscript{12} we assume the trajectories of all cloud electrons to be purely ballistic, and use the differential distribution function at the output of the MCP, measured by Bronshteyn et al.,\textsuperscript{13} (in fact, the results of Ref. 13 comprise the only available experimental data on that function, which is summarized in Fig. 4). It is assumed further that the distribution function represents the electron cloud which has been formed at some small distance from the MCP, where the electric field perturbations inflicted by the channel ends are negligible, and that starting from that point no interactions occur between the electrons in the cloud. Using the electron distribution function, it is possible to calculate the ballistic trajectories of all electrons and to estimate the cloud spatial distribution at any distance from the MCP. Ideally, the output distribution function should be measured separately for different MCP gain values, as this function may vary due to the Coulomb repulsion.

Figure 1 shows the coordinate system for our model described below. We use one of the experimental distributions from the results of Ref. 13 comprised the only available experimental information on the electron cloud footprint at the readout element of a detector.

Fig. 4. Energy distribution curves of electrons at MCP output at fixed output angles, measured by Bronshteyn et al. (Ref. 13). 60:1 L/D MCP with 20 \( \mu \)m pores and one pore diameter end spoiling. \( V_{\text{MCP}} = 1.4 \) kV.

\( E_0 = 3 \) eV, \( \sigma_0 = 12 \) eV, \( \Delta = 0.2 \),

\[ A(\tau) = 50.398e^{7.382\tau}, \quad B(\tau) = 25.992e^{9.864\tau}, \quad E_1(\tau) = 314.45e^{-6.9515\tau}, \quad \sigma_1(\tau) = 147.62e^{-9.7077\tau}. \]

In the present model, the function (1) is assumed to be symmetric, i.e., independent of the azimuthal angle \( \varphi \). Therefore, the function of our interest—the radial distribution function at the plane of the anode (positioned at the distance \( d \) from the plate), \( \rho(r, \varphi) \), is also symmetric: \( \rho(r, \varphi) = \rho(r) \) and is defined as

\[ 2\pi \int_0^\infty \rho(r) r dr = 1. \]

We introduce a transformation from variables \( (E, \theta) \) to variables \( (r, t) \)—the radial distance from the emission point and time, thus

\[ \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty f(E, \theta) dE d\theta = \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty f(E(r,t), \theta(t,t)) \frac{\partial(E, \theta)}{\partial(r, t)} dr dt = 1, \]

where \( \frac{\partial(E, \theta)}{\partial(r, t)} \) is the Jacobian of the transformation.

The equation of motion of an electron in the cloud at the moment \( t \) can be written as,

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{dr}{dt} &= \sqrt{\frac{2E}{m_e}} \sin \theta, \\
\frac{d\theta}{dt} &= \sqrt{\frac{2E}{m_e}} \cos \theta + \frac{q_e Ut^2}{2m_e d},
\end{align*}
\]

where \( d \) is the distance from the MCP, \( U \) the accelerating bias in the MCP-anode gap, \( q_e \) and \( m_e \) are the electron charge and mass, respectively. Using Eq. (5), we obtain:

\[
E(r, t) = \frac{m_e}{2} \left[ \left( \frac{d}{r} - \frac{q_e Ut^2}{2m_e d} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{r}{r} \right)^2 \right].
\]
Then the Jacobian of variable transformation takes the form:

\[ \frac{\partial(E, \theta)}{\partial(r,t)} = \frac{q_e U}{2 dt} + \frac{m_e d}{r^3}. \]  

Using two different expressions for the radial distribution function, Eqs. (3) and (4), and taking Eq. (8) into account, we obtain the following formula:

\[ \rho(r) = \frac{1}{2 \pi r} \int_0^\infty f(E(r,t), \theta(r,t)) \left( \frac{q_e U}{2 dt} + \frac{m_e d}{r^3} \right) dt. \]  

Figure 5 shows the calculated dependence of the charge cloud size on the MCP-anode gap distance, Eq. (9), with the distribution function (1) and parameters (2) for the ballistic model. The calculated spatial charge cloud distributions \( \rho(r) \) at different distances \( d \) from MCP and gap bias \( U \), are shown in Fig. 6. As seen from these results, variation of the accelerating bias changes mainly the size of the outer component (or the "wing component," Ref. 1) of the charge cloud, consisting of the low energy electrons emitted at large angles.

As mentioned earlier, our ballistic model is based on the assumption that at some distance from the MCP the interaction between the electrons in the charge cloud becomes negligible, since the Coulomb repulsion weakens with the increase of the cloud size. Therefore, the validity of this model is provided by the fact that experimentally electron distribution function (1) can only be measured at some distance from the MCP.

B. Coulomb repulsion

In this section, we consider how the Coulomb repulsion of the cloud electrons, determined by the spatial charge density, affects the charge cloud spreading. The repulsion process appears to be too complicated for an analytical description due to the spread of the pulse transit time and velocities of the electrons, which move in the self-consistent electric field, therefore some approximations will be introduced below.
where \([r(t), z(t)]\) are individual electron trajectories, \(q_e\) and \(m_e\) are the electron charge and mass, \(E_{\text{acc}}\) is the accelerating field and \(E_{\text{Coulomb}}(r,t)\) can be calculated from equation:

\[
E_{\text{Coulomb}}(r,t) = \frac{Q}{4\pi \varepsilon_0} \int_0^\infty \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{\rho(\xi, t)}{2\pi} \left(\frac{r - \xi \cos \varphi}{\xi^2 + r^2 - 2\xi r \cos \varphi}\right)^{3/2} \xi d\xi d\varphi. \tag{13}
\]

Equations (11)–(13) comprise a nonlinear system since individual electron trajectories depend on the electron distribution function which, in turn, changes with the electron motion.

If the solution of Eqs. (11)–(13) with initial conditions (10) is known (i.e., the electron trajectories are defined), then for each electron in the cloud the position at the moment \(t^{i+1}\) is determined by its position at the moment \(t^i\). We introduce a function \(F(r(t))\) to describe this relationship:

\[
r(t^{i+1}) = F[r(t^i)], \quad r(t^i) = F^{-1}[r(t^{i+1})], \tag{14}
\]

where \(F^{-1}\) is the inverse function to \(F\), which exists as function \(F\) is single valued (since for our initial conditions the distance between any two electrons in the cloud increases with time). We can write the charge conservation equation for \(r(t^i) \in [0, \infty)\) as

\[
\int_0^{r(t^i)} \rho(\xi, t^i+1) \xi d\xi = \int_0^{r(t^i)} \rho(\xi, t^i) \xi d\xi. \tag{15}
\]

By differentiating Eq. (15) and taking Eq. (14) into account, we obtain the following formula:

\[
\rho(r, t^{i+1}) = \rho(r, t^i) \frac{r(t^i)}{r(t^{i+1})} \frac{dF^{-1}[r(t^{i+1})]}{dr(t^{i+1})}, \tag{16}
\]

where \(\rho(r, t^i)\) is the spatial distribution at the moment \(t^i\).

The solution of Eqs. (11)–(13), (16), with initial conditions (10), can be obtained numerically as follows. For the initial moment \(t = t_0\), we introduce a logarithmically spaced grid \(\{r_0, \ldots, r_N\}, r_0 = R_{\text{cloud}}^0\). By solving Eq. (12), we can find the time \(T_{\text{max}}\) when the cloud reaches the anode positioned at distance \(d\):

\[
T_{\text{max}} = \sqrt{\frac{1 + \frac{q_e E_{\text{acc}} d}{E_0}}{q_e E_{\text{acc}}}}. \tag{17}
\]

Then for each time step \(t^i = t^{i+1} + \Delta t^i\), we follow the scheme:

1. We obtain \(E_{\text{Coulomb}}(r_{j-1}, t^i)\) by the numerical integration of Eq. (13) with \(\rho(\xi, t) = \rho(\xi, t^{i+1})\).

2. We assume that for \(t \in [t^{i-1}, t^i]\): \(E_{\text{Coulomb}}(r, t) = E_{\text{Coulomb}}(r_{j-1}, t^{i-1}) = \text{Const}\). By integrating Eq. (11) with the known values from the previous time step \(r_{j-1}^{i-1}\) (\(j = 0, \ldots, N\)), we find \(r_j^i (j = 0, \ldots, N)\).

3. We use the discrete analogue of Eq. (16) in the form:

\[
\rho(r_j^i) = \rho(r_{j-1}^{i-1}) \frac{r_{j-1}^{i-1} - r_{j-1}^{i-1}}{r_j^i - r_{j-1}^{i-1}}, \tag{18}
\]

\((j = 0, \ldots, N)\), to obtain the discrete distribution function values for the time step \(i\).
Steps (1)–(3) are repeated until $t^i$ reaches $T_{\text{max}}$. The calculation process starts with a small time increment $\Delta t^0 = 0.5$ ps, and then for the purposes of computing efficiency, we increase $\Delta t^i$ in geometrical progression (with factor 1.04), as the Coulomb repulsion decreases with charge propagation. A typical value of $N = 100$ was used in our computations.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Figure 8 compares the results of our measurements and calculations of the electron cloud size at 5 mm from the MCP stack. The ballistic calculations correlate well with the measured data for MCP gain of $3 \times 10^6$ and accelerating biases 3000–4500 V across the gap, although due to the phosphor cutoff no measurement results were available for lower accelerating biases for the same MCP stack. The cloud size increases with the increase of MCP gain, therefore the coefficients (2) of the output distribution function (1), used in the ballistic model, should vary with MCP gain increase.

As mentioned above, $A$ (10) is the only parameter in our repulsion model which needs to be adjusted to experimental data. Our calculations showed that the parameter $A$ of about 2% of the total charge yields a relatively good agreement between the results of calculations and our measurements. As seen in Fig. 8, simulation results for the cloud size increase solely due to the Coulomb repulsion are reasonably consistent with the measured data, and they are also close to the results of ballistic calculations for a low gain. However, for gains higher than $10^7$, the contribution of the Coulomb repulsion, calculated with the same parameters as for lower gains, appears overestimated. This can probably be corrected by adjusting the model parameter $A$ (10), as the increase of the pulse transit time spread and the variation of the output energy distribution should result in lower values of that parameter. Figure 9 shows the results of measurements and calculations for the 15 mm gap (with the same set of model parameters as in the case of 5 mm gap).

We also evaluated our calculations in the range of lower accelerating biases by comparing them with the detailed spatial distribution measurements reported by Edgar et al., who used a chevron stack with a 100 $\mu$m gap, no bias between the 80:1 L/D 36 mm diameter plates and the end spoiling of half a pore diameter (as opposed to one pore diameter in our measurements), Fig. 10. A split strip anode was positioned 6.2 mm behind the stack. We used the same value of $A = 0.02$ in these calculations of the Coulomb repulsion con-
tribution, as for the modeling of our measurements. In this case, the value $R_{\text{cloud}}$ corresponds to the active area of the second MCP, and it is equal to the size of the electron cloud footprint at the input surface of the second MCP. $R_{\text{cloud}}$ was then calculated ballistically (Sec. III A) with Edgar’s setup parameters and the distribution (1) and was found to be 50 $\mu$m. Not surprisingly, our ballistic calculations, based on the data of Bronshteyn et al., for the end spoiling of one pore diameter, yield lower values of the cloud size than can be expected for the end spoiling of half a pore diameter in Edgar’s experiments. In the latter case, the electrons are emitted in a wider angle, therefore the coefficients (2) in the distribution function (1) should be corrected for a smaller end spoiling. Our estimate of the repulsion contribution is also in a good agreement with Edgar’s data for 2.9 $\times$ 10$^7$, 50 $\mu$m and gains 2.9 $\times$ 10$^7$, and 4.6 $\times$ 10$^7$, respectively. Solid line—ballistic calculations; dashed/dotted lines—Coulomb repulsion calculations with $A = 0.02$, $R_{\text{cloud}}$ = 50 $\mu$m and gains 2.9 $\times$ 10$^7$, and 4.6 $\times$ 10$^7$.

FIG. 10. Variation of the charge cloud size $r$ for a 6.2 mm anode-to-MCP gap with accelerating bias. 80% of total charge is constrained within radius $r$. $\bigtriangleup$, $\bigtriangleup$—measurements by Edgar et al. (see Ref. 2) with the chevron stack of 36 mm in diameter, 80:1 L/D MCPs, 100 $\mu$m gap and no bias between the plates, the end spoiling of half a pore diameter, gains 1.0 $\times$ 10$^7$, 2.9 $\times$ 10$^7$, and 4.6 $\times$ 10$^7$, respectively. Solid line—ballistic calculations; dashed/dotted lines—Coulomb repulsion calculations with $A = 0.02$, $R_{\text{cloud}}$ = 50 $\mu$m and gains 2.9 $\times$ 10$^7$, and 4.6 $\times$ 10$^7$.
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