



# Update on Charge Transfer Properties Through Graphene Layers in Gas Detectors

<u>P. Thuiner<sup>1,2</sup></u>, R. Hall-Wilton<sup>3</sup>, R. B. Jackman<sup>4</sup>, H. Müller<sup>1</sup>,
 T. T. Nguyen<sup>4</sup>, R. de Oliveira<sup>1</sup>, E. Oliveri<sup>1</sup>, D. Pfeiffer<sup>1,3</sup>, F. Resnati<sup>1</sup>, L. Ropelewski<sup>1</sup>,
 J. A. Smith<sup>4</sup>, M. van Stenis<sup>1</sup>, R. Veenhof<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>CERN, <sup>2</sup>Technische Universität Wien, <sup>3</sup>ESS, <sup>4</sup>University College London, <sup>5</sup>Uludağ University



## Graphene Layers in Gas Detectors



- Goal: create a device fully transparent to electrons and fully opaque to ions
- Graphene is narrowest and thinnest possible conductive mesh with pore size < 1 Å</li>
- Study of charge transfer through graphene layer suspended on Cu meshes





# Motivation



- Best case scenario: create a membrane which is fully transparent to electrons and fully opaque to ions
- More realistic: create a membrane which is mostly transparent to electrons and fully opaque to ions



#### Methods









- Standard GEM setup with additional conversion volume on top
- Mesh partly covered with graphene layer between conversion volumes
- GEM powered through resistor divider
- Cathode and Mesh powered individually







# Ratio of peak positions from conversion below/above the mesh







# Ratio of peak positions from conversion below/above the mesh





HV ⊶

HV ⊶

HV ⊶

### Ion Transparency

Graphene



Current measurements on cathode and mesh

Cathole

Mest

GEM 1

GEM 2

GEM (

Anode

E<sub>D1</sub>

 $E_{D2}$ 

lons

ons

Electrons

$$T_{ion} = \frac{I_{cath}}{I_{cath} + I_{mesh}}$$

while maintaining const. ion back-flow into both conversion volumes for different field ratios

$$IBF = \frac{I_{cath} + I_{mesh}}{I_{anode}} = const.$$

550 kΩ

1 MΩ 500 kΩ

1 MΩ

1 MΩ

450 kΩ

шш

c

шШ

ĉ

шШ

mm

2

2 mm

Pre-Ar











- 1. Find "good" side of copper foil
- 2. Etch away "bad" layer in nitric acid
- 3. Spin-coat with PMMA
- 4. Etch away copper foil with Fe 3 nitrate
- 5. PMMA with graphene layer on bottom floating on Fe 3 nitrate
- 6. First step of cleaning with demineralized water
- Second step of cleaning with demineralized water
- 8. PMMA with graphene on bottom scooped out with mesh/GEM
- 9. PMMA dissolved with acetone in Critical Point Dryer







CVD graphene on Cu foil



PMMA floating on liquid with graphene attached



Small part of foil cut and spin-coated with PMMA



Sample scooped out with Si waver



Put into etching liquid



Two steps of cleaning with demineralized water







Moved to bigger beaker to enable transfer onto mesh



Sample dryed in Critical Point Dryer



Sample scooped up with mesh





Sample put into aceton to dissolve PMMA



Sample checked with SEM to qualify coverage and with Raman Spectroscopy to check layer quality and PMMA contaminations

























#### Measurements









- Ar/CO<sub>2</sub> 90/10
- Detector irradiated with Cu x-ray gun
- Collimated beam
  ~1 mm<sup>2</sup> beam size
- Electron transparency
  5 kHz, Gain 1.5×10<sup>4</sup>
- lon transparency
  2×10<sup>5</sup> Hz, Gain 1.5×10<sup>4</sup>



- Copper mesh with 30  $\mu m$  holes and 120  $\mu m$  pitch



# First Results



- Lower transparency both for electrons and ions on the covered side
- Layer not opaque for electrons or for ions!





# First Results



- We conclude that charge transfer is with high probability due to defects in graphene layer
  - Layer should be opaque to both electrons and ions in the field configurations and gas mixtures used
  - Transparencies increase with higher field ratios: comparable to mesh with smaller hole diameter
  - Transparency higher than optical transparency



# First Results



- Lower transparency both for electrons and ions on the covered side
- Layer not opaque for electrons or for ions!

Transparencies of graphene layer exceeds optical transparency of mesh → Field focussing effect, defects in layer





### Next Steps



- Multilayer to verify if charge transfer is due to defects
- Improved transfer technique to achieve undamaged single-layers
- Graphene deposited on GEM to increase energy of electrons in front of layer



## From Single Layer to Triple Layer Graphene





Patrik Thuiner







CVD graphene on Cu foil



Clean, dry, qualify









#### Spin-coat, etch, clean, prepare for transfer









Spin-coat, etch, clean, prepare for transfer



Sample scooped up with mesh



Sample scooped up with mesh and placed on layer















Transfer two additional layers of CVD graphene onto the single layer already on the copper foil







Spin-coat, etch, clean, prepare for transfer



Triple layer under PMMA scooped up with mesh



Triple layer graphene on copper mesh



Clean, dry, qualify







- Ar/CO<sub>2</sub> 70/30
- Detector irradiated with Cu x-ray gun
- Collimated beam
  ~0.2 mm<sup>2</sup> beam size
- Electron transparency up to 30 kHz, Gain 1.5×10<sup>4</sup>
- Ion transparency 80 kHz, Gain 1.5×10<sup>4</sup>



• Copper mesh with 30  $\mu m$  holes and 60  $\mu m$  pitch







- Electron transparency by peak ratios
- Uncovered mesh
  - Transparency > 95%
  - Loss of primaries for low field D1
- Triple layer
  - Transparency > 10% for low field D1
  - For higher fields D1 peak still visible but peak-fit not possible





# Results



- Ion transparency by cathode and mesh current measurements
- Uncovered mesh
  - Transparency > 80% for high field D1
- Triple layer
  - Transparency ~5% for high fields D1





# Conclusions



- Triple layer not fully opaque to electrons and ions but effect less dominant than with single layer
- Change in transparency on different positions on layer suggests transfer through defects



#### Next steps



- Ongoing: study of transparency with double and triple layers to fully understand charge transfer
- Increasing Ar content of gas-mixture
- Changing to Ne gas-mixtures
- Graphene deposited on GEM to increase energy of electrons in front of layer



## Appetizer



