



**WHY LIGO'S RANGE IS LIMITED
BY GROUND MOTION:
THE LIKELY SOURCE OF UPCONVERSION**

September 2010 **LIGO-G1000923-v1**

Robert Schofield (University of Oregon)

LHO UPCONVERSION BEFORE AND AFTER TEST MASS MAGNET SWAP AND PREDICTED PAM MAGNET FORCES


Test mass	Upconversion noise fit to A/f^4			Predicted PAM magnet forces		
	pre-swap A	recent A	ratio	before	after	ratio
ETMX	3.8e-12	b 5.6e-12	1.48	12	8.2	0.7
ETMX		a 6.5e-12	1.72			
ETMY	1.2e-11	c 1.2e-11	1.01	14	8.4	0.6
ETMY		b 1.1e-11	0.90			
ETMY		a 1.3e-11	1.06			
ITMX	3.5e-12	6.2e-12	1.76	24	4.4	0.2
ITMY	7.1e-12	5.3e-12	0.74	49	26	0.5

To test upconversion from individual test masses, directed LSC control to each test mass using Rana's resonant gain technique.

Take home message: TM magnet swap didn't reduce upconversion and no evidence that switching PAM magnets would have helped.

LLO RESULTS ALSO INDICATE THAT PAM MAGNETS DID NOT DOMINATE



At LLO, Test mass magnets were swapped on ETMY and ETMX and PAM magnets were swapped on ETMY. Post-swap upconversion same from each optic.



*T0=05/01/2010 01:52:22 *Avg=20/Bin=2L


*BW=0.374994

MECHANISMS OTHER THAN BARKHAUSEN?




UPCONVERSION GOES WITH COIL CURRENT NOT BEAM JITTER


DARM upconversion region



Low f beam jitter from OMC quad diodes (pitch)




Low f coil current



UPCONVERSION GOES WITH COIL CURRENT NOT TEST MASS MOTION

100 fold increase in common mode motion of test masses




*T0=13/12/2009 20:51:36

*Avg=2/Bin=2L

BW=0.0468742

Leads to small increase in upconversion predicted from small increase in coil current due to angular damping




UPCONVERSION BURSTS GO WITH COIL CURRENT NOT BEAM JITTER


70 - 110 band of DARM

Beam jitter as seen by OMC quad diodes


Actuation coil current



BARKHAUSEN NOISE FROM SUSPENSION WIRE ?




CAN MAGNETIC FIELDS REPRODUCE SEISMIC UPCONVERSION ?




Coils in position at ITMY for injecting magnetic fields to test Barkhausen magnetic domain change noise hypothesis

UPCONVERSION FROM EXTERNAL 8 HZ MAGNETIC INJECTION



Reproduces spectral shape of seismic upconversion
Similar plot for 2 test masses, 3 injection frequencies

CHECK: COIL CURRENT MUCH SMALLER FOR EXTERNAL INJECTION




*T0=06/05/2010 03:47:17

*Avg=1

BW=0.0468742

CHECK: ONLY SMALL MAGNETIC FIELDS AT HARMONICS




*T0=06/05/2010 02:10:20

*Avg=1

BW=0.04687


CHECK: PITCH AND YAW MOTION FOR EXTERNAL INJECTION IS MINIMAL

Pitch




YAW: external magnetic injection (RED) produces only slightly more yaw motion than H1:SUS-ETMY_LSC_Ext injection (BLACK)

Yaw



CHECK: BEAM LINE MOTION WAS 10X LESS THAN FOR OSEM INJECTION

DARM: For same level of upconversion, external injection (RED) produces 1/10 POS motion of H1:SUS-ETMY_LSC_EXC injection (BLACK)



*T0=06/05/2010 02:06:11

*Avg=2

BW=0.0468

LOCATION OF BARKHAUSEN NOISE SOURCE

Source is assumed to be located where magnetic fields from external and OSEM injections are equal, for equal upconversion

- Not suspension wires, because externally generated field at wires was >100 times larger than OSEM field for same upconversion level**
- Not other locations distant from OSEM (e.g. earthquake stops)**

EXTERNAL AND OSEM FIELDS MATCH AT OSEM CENTER FOR EQUAL LEVELS OF UPCONVERSION

Estimated magnetic fields at center of OSEM coil

Location and frequency	From external coil	From OSEM coil	OSEM/external coil
ITMY 8 Hz	9.8 e-6 T	8.94e-6 T	0.91
ETMY 8 Hz	5.86e-6 T	5.50e-6 T	0.94
ETMY 4 Hz	1.06e-5 T	7.20e-6 T	0.68
ETMY 2.5 Hz	9.33e-6 T	1.11e-5 T	1.19

DETERMINING FIELDS TO NARROW LOCATION OF NOISE SOURCE

Predicting fields inside BSC chamber from external coil

- **Fields assumed to drop off as $1/r^3$**
- **Small correction for eddy current shielding (knee ~20 Hz)**
- **Measured at 6 external locations to test prediction (including opposite side of chamber)**
- **Magnetometer calibrated at 2.5, 4, 8 Hz**
- **Standard deviation of predicted/measured was 0.34, n=6**

DETERMINING FIELDS TO NARROW LOCATION OF NOISE SOURCE

Predicting fields from OSEM coil

$$B_{\text{center}} = 4\pi \times 10^{-7} \text{ N I} / \text{sqrt}(L^2 + 4R^2)$$





N = number of turns in OSEM coil, 400 (unraveled and counted)

**I = current through OSEM coil, from COIL channel, calibration:
6.67e-6 A/count**

L = length of OSEM coil, 0.0047 (checked by measuring)


R = radius of OSEM coil, 0.01m (measured)

FERROMAGNETIC MATERIALS FOUND NEAR OSEM CENTER



FASTENERS CAN BECOME MAGNETIC WHEN COLD WORKED

Figure 7 WHEN COLD WORKING IS EMPLOYED, SOME NORMALLY NON-MAGNETIC AUSTENITIC STEELS BECOME SUBSTANTIALLY MAGNETIC



WHAT ABOUT ADVANCED LIGO?


Electrostatic control of test mass, magnetic control of penultimate mass, so noise will be filtered by test mass pendulum

Barkhausen upconversion should not limit adLIGO if:

- Displacement noise at penultimate test mass is no more than for iLIGO**
- Noise is not greater at low frequencies than predicted from spectral shape at 100 Hz**

FERROMAGNETIC COMPONENTS IN AOSEMS

Connector (with suspended test mass magnet)




Diode chips, both transmitter and receiver, can be suspended from magnet




Fasteners



FERROMAGNETIC COMPONENTS IN BOSEMS





Connector,
flexicircuit, LED
and photodiode
assembly
suspended from
test mass magnet



Connector (with
suspended test
mass magnet)






Fasteners



RISK REDUCTION PLAN FOR ADLIGO

- Use 316ss at indicated locations in all AOSEMs
- Replace the indicated fasteners in BS and FM BOSEMs



SUMMARY

- 1) External magnetic injections were used to test the hypothesis that seismic upconversion is mainly Barkhausen magnetic domain noise.**
- 2) External magnetic injections did produce upconversion and the spectral shape matched that of seismic upconversion.**
- 3) For matched levels of upconversion, the OSEM and externally injected magnetic fields were estimated to be equal at the OSEM, suggesting that the source of the Barkhausen noise is in the OSEM.**
- 4) Ferromagnetic parts were found inside the OSEMs, the largest was the PAM magnet screw.**
- 5) A measurement of the Barkhausen noise from this screw should be made to confirm that it was the source of seismic upconversion.**
- 6) Barkhausen noise is unlikely to limit adLIGO (test mass actuation is electrostatic) but to reduce risk, some screws in the penultimate mass magnetic actuators will be replaced with 316ss.**