Quenching Measurements and Modeling for Organic Scintillators

Thibault Laplace

Department of Nuclear Engineering University of California, Berkeley







GOAL: predictive, reliable ionization quenching model

- 1. Response of organic scintillators reported quantities
- 2. Challenges associated with different experimental techniques
- 3. Challenges in interpreting results modeling
- 4. Stopping power data

5. Recommendations

Response of organic scintillators

- Response of material to nuclear recoil is required to model an organic scintillator-based neutrino detection system but:
- No accurate physics-based model of ionization quenching
- Few measurements on most materials, highly discrepant



Response of organic scintillators in the literature



Common Measurement techniques and potential biases



Bias if multiple scatters and energy dependence of the resolution function are not properly accounted for

Extensive discussion in: Weldon et al. NIM A 953 (2020)

 Coincident scatter technique
 Uses multiple detectors and a series of mono-energetic neutron sources (e.g., DD, DT, TOF) to measure coincident events between detectors – Each detector pair yields a single data point



Light Yield measurements at the 88-Inch Cyclotron



- Broad-spectrum neutron source for continuous measurement
- Kinematically over-constrained system
- Simultaneous proton and carbon light yield measurements



J.A. Brown, B.L. Goldblum, et al. Journal of Applied Physics 124, 045101 (2018).

Impact of electron light nonproportionality on QF/light calibration



For nonproportional materials:

Quenching factors do not provide a measure of ionization quenching (if defined as relative to electron light)

→MeVee unit is not proportional to the number of photons

Problematic when comparing results from



Models of ionization quenching

$$\frac{dL}{dx} = \frac{S\left(\frac{dE}{dx}\right)}{1 + kB\left(\frac{dE}{dx}\right)}$$

Birks Relation

Model	Physics
Birks (1951)	Canonical quenching model
Chou (1952)	Second order quenching term
Voltz (1968)	Treats the prompt and delayed components of scintillation light independently Separate contribution from δ rays
Hong (2002)	Separate treatment of electronic and nuclear components of the stopping power
KamLAND (2010)	Extension of Hong with higher-order quenching

Model predicting both proton/carbon light



Each group introduced a new model to fit their data

Scintillator understanding and development is generally the responsibility of a given project

Published measurements of stopping power on plastic scintillators: Gooding T.S., Phys. Rev. 105 (1957) 37 MeV protons Kloppenburg J., Z. Physik 181 (1964) 200-900 keV protons and deuterons



Recommendations

Issues with material development and understanding being tied to a project

 no core capability and knowledge – high variability of measurements
 understanding of basic mechanisms replaced by model/function that fits

Need a physical model of ionization quenching

- Need for a database compiling the different experimental measurements (similar to EXFOR for nuclear reaction data)
 - Can be used as reference (saving researchers time and money)
 - → Facilitate benchmarking of models
 - → Help inform if more measurements are needed
 - → First step towards an "ENDF of scintillator response"

- Measure scintillator response for different materials of interest (informed by data deficiencies illuminated by compilation effort)
- Stopping power data
- Electron light yield measurements to inform quenching







This work was performed under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Energy National Nuclear Security Administration by Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory under Contract DE-AC02-05CH11231.

This work was also supported by the Department of Energy National Nuclear Security Administration through the Nuclear Science and Security Consortium under Award Number DE-NA-0003180.