

Input mirrors thermal lensing effect Frequency modulation PRCL length in Virgo

Some results from a Finesse simulation J. Marque (EGO)

LIGO-G070338-00-Z



Overview

o The stakes

o Thermal lensing model with Finesse - PRCL length tuning

o The 2 "states" in Virgo

o Transient and demodulation phase change

o The double cavity model – Frequency modulation dependence



The stakes

Already, many people had discussions about the advantages and drawbacks of the Anderson modulation frequency choice. This talk intends to bring some arguments on the question...

Change the modulation frequency from the "Anderson" one (6.264MHz) to the "nominal" one (6.271MHz)?



Use Ward or Anderson technique for alignment controls?

Thermal lensing effects affect longitudinal controls in a different way depending on the modulation frequency choice?

Optimal PRCL macroscopic length is tricky in the case of the Anderson modulation frequency?



Thermal lensing model with Finesse & PRCL length tuning



The Finesse simulation

Thermal lensing model:

Based on the simple idea of inserting a thin lens in the substrates of the input mirrors of the Fabry-Perot cavities. Focal length is directly proportional to the inverse of the power absorbed by the mirror.

The model takes also into account the asymmetry of absorption between the 2 Fabry-Perot cavities (deduced from Michele Punturo mirror temperature measurement) and the slight expansion of the mirrors due to the temperature increase.

Next results assume that:

o Computation is done by projecting optical fields on a Hermite-Gauss basis (maximum order for higher order TEM modes = 6)
o CARM and DARM dof are locked with usual error signals B5_ACp and B1_ACp.
o MICH and PRCL dof are not locked.
o BS and PR are moved around the operating point by a few nm.
o Demodulation phases are tuned as in real conditions.



Carrier recycling gain

Carrier recycling gain



There are 3 dof in the Central ITF: lrec, ln and lw.

We are sensitive and we want to control 2 dof: MICH and PRCL.





Sidebands recycling gain

Distance between the 2 maxima recycling gain of the sidebands = d = lambda/2 * (Schnupp asymmetry / PRCL length) = 39nm (in Virgo)





B2_3f_ACp (A.U.)

B5_ACq (A.U.)



B2_3f_ACp (diode in reflection of ITF) = PRCL error signal B5_ACq (diode on a pick up beam of the BS) = MICH error signal



MICH error signal respect to PRCL lenght

B5_ACq(A.U.), Pabs(NI)= 0.0mW

B5_ACq(A.U.), Pabs(NI)= 0.0mW



Macroscopic PRCL lenght in Virgo may be mistuned by 4cm. This could lead to couplings between MICH and PRCL dof difficult to handle...



PRCL length general discussion

These 4cm discrepancy can be explained by 2 reasons:

1) When the PR mirror was changed 2 years ago, the change of payload shifted the mirror by 2cm towards the BS.

2) 12.06-12.07m is the optimal length when one makes the analytical computation (depending a bit on the length of the FP and on the modution of frequency) and that is verified by the simulation when using perfect gaussian beams. But using more higher order modes (6) in the simulation lead to 12.093m ...

One has to emphasize that the optimal PRCL length depends also on the phase in reflection of the FP cavities particularly in Virgo! This is true because of the "Anderson" frequency choice.

In the case we would have chosen the "nominal" frequency of modulation, the phase in reflection of the FP cavities would not depend on the modulation frequency itself, on the macroscopic length of the FP cavities, on the finesse of the FP cavities, mode matching, ...

Examples:

1) If we decide to change the FP Finesse from 50 to 150, optimal PRCL length is then 12.00-12.01m (analytical computation).

2) If we change the frequency modulation by 600Hz, optimal PRCL length is lower by 1cm...



The 2 "states" of Virgo





The ITF can jump between 2 states during the lock acquisition.

Only one allows us to keep the lock...



Carrier & Sidebands evolution during thermal transient



Some numbers about thermal lensing in Virgo:

300W in recycling cavity, input mirror substrate 10cm long, 5kW in FP cavities LMA absorption characterisation: 0.7ppm/cm + 1.2 ppm => 8mW absorbed Mirror temperature measurement (drum mode frequency shift) => 4 to 6 times more



EVOLUTION with thermal lensing

Carrier recycling gain, Pabs(NI)= 0.0mW

usb recycling gain, Pabs(NI)= 0.0mW

B2_3f_ACp(A.U.), Pabs(NI)= 0.0mW



BS position [nm]



Transient and demodulation phase change



No thermal lensing. PRCL error signal is unsensitive to a mistuning of the demodulation phase.



CARM, DARM and MICH are always controlled in this simulation.







































2 B2_3f_ACp B2_ACP B2_3f demodphase+50 B2_3f demodphase+70 1.5 1 Error signal [A.U.] 0.5 Û. -0.5 -1 -1.5 Powers in recycling cavity, Pabs(NI)=11mW carrier USD İsb "first resonance" 100 "second resonance" Power [W] 10 1 -8 -2 2 -6 Û -4 8 6 PRCL detuning [nm]

Error signals, Pabs(NI)=11mW

Second zone of resonance appeared.

A change by 50 degrees of the demodulation phase of B2_3f allows to jump to the "second resonance".

Critical: time window to operate this change is not well defined...



































Error signals, Pabs(NI)=20mW 2 B2_3f_ACp B2 ACp B2_3f demodphase+50 B2_3f demodphase+70 1.5 1 Error signal [A.U.] 0.5 Û -0.5 -1 -1.5 Powers in recycling cavity, Pabs(NI)=20mW carrier usb lsb 100 "second resonance" "first resonance" Power [W] 10 -2 -8 -6 Û 2 -46 8 PRCL detuning [nm]

"second resonance": operating
point depends slightly on
demodulation phase tuning =>
problem of offset between
various error signals

"first resonance": error signal sign has flipped! Looks very difficult to keep the lock on this operating point...



The double cavity model & how the resonance of the sidebands depend on the frequency modulation



The double cavity simulation



Next results assume that:
o FP cavity is locked
o PR is moved by a few nm.
o Macroscopic PRCL length is automatically adjusted to be optimal respect to the Fmod.





Sidebands behaviour with Anderson frequency



DC_evolution7 - LSB recycling gain - fmod=6.264M 0,05 80 70 0.04 60 50 40 0.03 30 20 10 Û. 0.01 Û -20 -10 0 10 20 PR position [nm]



2 error points for the control of PRCL. From which one is more critical.



Sidebands behaviour with "nominal" frequency

DC_evolution7 - USB recycling gain - fmod=6,271M 0,05 80 70 0.04 60 50 40 0.03 9 9 0.02 30 20 10 <u>∩</u> 0,01 <u></u> -20 -10 <u> </u> 10 20 PR position [nm]





1 error point for the control of PRCL. Sidebands recycling gain remains good.



Sidebands behaviour with various modulation frequencies





Resonnance of the sidebands in recycling cavity depends highly on the modulation frequency when there is thermal lensing. Resonance of usb and lsb are always asymmetric except when we choose the "nominal" frequency of modulation.

Back to Virgo: Anderson vs Nominal frequency





LSC-VIRGO joint meeting - Pisa



Conclusion

The PRCL macroscopic length may be mistuned by 4cm. Is that a problem??

The input mirrors thermal lensing effect leads to 2 operating points in Virgo. To keep the lock, we jump on the "most stable one" => difficult transition in the locking acquisition, decrease of the recycling gains => demodulation phase change, offsets in the error signals...

Double operating point could be avoided by choosing the "nominal" modulation frequency instead of the "Anderson" one. Would make the lock acquisition easier... In this case, PR tower would have to be shifted by 6cm and MC tower by 15cm (then FP Finesse could be changed without moving again PR tower).

Anyway, thermal lensing compensation system is mandatory for higher input power...