EMCCD Photometry

Alejandro Ferrero School of Physics University College Dublin alejandro.ferrero@ucd.ie

13/08/2008

< (27) > < 25 >

- ∢ ≣ →

Introduction EMCCD vs CCD EMCCD in Photometry

Characterization

Experimental setup Parameters choice Reproducibility Actual Gain Saturation Linearity Spectral responsivity and external guantum efficiency

A⊒ ▶ ∢ ∃

< ∃ >

EMCCD vs CCD EMCCD in Photometry

イロン 不同と 不同と 不同と

3

EMCCD vs CCD

▶ EMCCD allows higher temporal resolution than CCD.

EMCCD vs CCD EMCCD in Photometry

æ

- EMCCD allows higher temporal resolution than CCD.
- Readout noise is negligible in EMCCD.

EMCCD vs CCD EMCCD in Photometry

|田子 (日子)(日子)

- EMCCD allows higher temporal resolution than CCD.
- Readout noise is negligible in EMCCD.
- Dynamic range depends on gain. The dynamic range is better for slow scan. Lower dynamic range than CCD.

EMCCD vs CCD EMCCD in Photometry

・回 と く ヨ と く ヨ と

- EMCCD allows higher temporal resolution than CCD.
- Readout noise is negligible in EMCCD.
- Dynamic range depends on gain. The dynamic range is better for slow scan. Lower dynamic range than CCD.
- ► A noise factor (√2) is introduced by the additional multiplication channel. This factor does not affect readout noise, but photon, dark and CIC noises.

EMCCD vs CCD EMCCD in Photometry

EMCCD vs CCD

- EMCCD allows higher temporal resolution than CCD.
- Readout noise is negligible in EMCCD.
- Dynamic range depends on gain. The dynamic range is better for slow scan. Lower dynamic range than CCD.
- ► A noise factor (√2) is introduced by the additional multiplication channel. This factor does not affect readout noise, but photon, dark and CIC noises.
- ► Not cooled below -95°C, the limiting noise source is readout darkcurrent, which is not important in conventional CCDs. Cooled below -95°C, the limiting noise source is CIC.

- 《聞》 《臣》 《臣》

EMCCD vs CCD EMCCD in Photometry

- EMCCD allows higher temporal resolution than CCD.
- Readout noise is negligible in EMCCD.
- Dynamic range depends on gain. The dynamic range is better for slow scan. Lower dynamic range than CCD.
- ► A noise factor (√2) is introduced by the additional multiplication channel. This factor does not affect readout noise, but photon, dark and CIC noises.
- ► Not cooled below -95°C, the limiting noise source is readout darkcurrent, which is not important in conventional CCDs. Cooled below -95°C, the limiting noise source is CIC.
- When photon noise limited, SNR in EMCCDs is half that in CCDs, because of the noise factor.

EMCCD vs CCD EMCCD in Photometry

EMCCD in Photometry

Temporal resolution improves by a factor 1/G, if readout time negligible with respect to the integration time.

EMCCD vs CCD EMCCD in Photometry

- Temporal resolution improves by a factor 1/G, if readout time negligible with respect to the integration time.
- The advantage disappears when limiting uncertainty is not due to sensitivity of the detector (readout, dark, charge transfer or spurious charge noises), but to the light level of the source.

EMCCD vs CCD EMCCD in Photometry

▲圖 ▶ ▲ 臣 ▶ ▲ 臣 ▶

- Temporal resolution improves by a factor 1/G, if readout time negligible with respect to the integration time.
- The advantage disappears when limiting uncertainty is not due to sensitivity of the detector (readout, dark, charge transfer or spurious charge noises), but to the light level of the source.
- When source is bright and shot noise higher than the detector noise; EM unable to overcome the noise and puts an additional noise in the measurement.

EMCCD vs CCD EMCCD in Photometry

- Temporal resolution improves by a factor 1/G, if readout time negligible with respect to the integration time.
- The advantage disappears when limiting uncertainty is not due to sensitivity of the detector (readout, dark, charge transfer or spurious charge noises), but to the light level of the source.
- When source is bright and shot noise higher than the detector noise; EM unable to overcome the noise and puts an additional noise in the measurement.
- When the source is faint and shot noise of the background makes the source undetectable; EM useless, because the multiplication does not distinguish between source and background photo-electrons.

EMCCD vs CCD EMCCD in Photometry

EMCCD in Photometry



Figure: Different illumination levels in a source. Some pixels are favoured by EM, whereas the SNR of other pixels may decrease due to the EM. $_{\pm}$

EMCCD vs CCD EMCCD in Photometry

_∢ ≣ ▶

EMCCD in Photometry

In any case, the SNR of the brighter sources will be always higher than the SNR of the fainter sources.

EMCCD vs CCD EMCCD in Photometry

- In any case, the SNR of the brighter sources will be always higher than the SNR of the fainter sources.
- ▶ Therefore, if a chosen gain allows to detect a faint star, it should be never a problem the detection of brighter sources, although the relative uncertainty will increase a factor $\sqrt{2}$ for these sources.

EMCCD vs CCD EMCCD in Photometry

æ

EMCCD in Photometry

SNR is proportional to $\sqrt{Gt_{int}}$.

EMCCD vs CCD EMCCD in Photometry

・ 同 ト ・ ヨ ト ・ ヨ ト

- SNR is proportional to $\sqrt{Gt_{int}}$.
- The lower limit of t_{int} depends on the photon flux, but above all on the CCD, because the accuracy decreases below 0.1 sec of integration time. In addition, below t_{int} << t_{readout} temporal resolution can not be improved.

EMCCD vs CCD EMCCD in Photometry

イロン イヨン イヨン ・ ヨン

- SNR is proportional to $\sqrt{Gt_{int}}$.
- ▶ The lower limit of t_{int} depends on the photon flux, but above all on the CCD, because the accuracy decreases below 0.1 sec of integration time. In addition, below $t_{int} << t_{readout}$ temporal resolution can not be improved.
- The upper limit of G is imposed by the aging. The higher G, the more the aging. Very high gains decrease the dynamic range of the detector. Since the sources are distributed in a wide range of irradiance levels on the EMCCD, the largest dynamic range gain should be chosen.

EMCCD vs CCD EMCCD in Photometry

EMCCD noise

$$\sigma^2(n_{pe}) = \sigma_r^2(n_{pe}) + n_{pe} + n_d \tag{1}$$

$$\sigma^2(n_{ae}) = \sigma_r^2(n_{ae}) + 2G(n_{ae} + n_{ad})$$
(2)

$$\sigma^2(N) = \sigma_r^2(N) + 2GKN \tag{3}$$

$$GK = \frac{\sigma^2(N) - \sigma_r^2(N)}{2N}$$
(4)

< □ > < □ > < □ > < Ξ > < Ξ > ...

æ

EMCCD vs CCD EMCCD in Photometry

Theoretical effect of EM on a source



Figure: Theoretical effect of EM on a source in the border of the detection (SNR \sim 3).

EMCCD vs CCD EMCCD in Photometry

EMCCD vs CCD in Photometry



Figure: EMCCD (G=3.8) SNR vs conventional mode CCD SNR.

< ∃⇒

◆ 御 ▶ ◆ 臣

Experimental setup

Parameters choice Reproducibility Actual Gain Saturation Linearity Spectral responsivity and external quantum efficiency

<ロ> (四) (四) (三) (三)

Experimental setup



Figure: Radiant source for radiometrical calibration.

Experimental setup Parameters choice Reproducibility Actual Gain Saturation Linearity Spectral responsivity and external quantum efficiency

- 4 同 2 4 日 2 4 日 2

Andor IXON DU-897 EMCCD: Parameters choice

- ▶ Integration time > 0.05*sec*.
- Vertical Pixel Shift: Shift Speed 2.2 µs, Vertical Clock Voltage Normal
- Horizontal Pixel Shift: Readout rate 1MHz@16bits, Preamplifier Gain × 1.
- ► Temperarature -80°C.

Experimental setup Parameters choice **Reproducibility** Actual Gain Saturation Linearity Spectral responsivity and external quantum efficiency

< //>
</

3

2

Stabilization



Figure: The response of the EMCCD is clearly temperature dependent and it is stabilized at 0.16% after around 5 minutes.

Experimental setup Parameters choice **Reproducibility** Actual Gain Saturation Linearity Spectral responsivity and external quantum efficiency

A ■

Reproducibility



Figure: At G=300 and at conventional mode the stability was 0.1% and 0.2%, respectively.

Experimental setup Parameters choice Reproducibility Actual Gain Saturation Linearity Spectral responsivity and external quantum efficiency

< P

Photon Transfer Technique



Figure: Photon transfer technique result.

Experimental setup Parameters choice Reproducibility Actual Gain Saturation Linearity Spectral responsivity and external quantum efficiency

ъ

< 1 >

GK product



Figure: GK product and readout noise as a function of the software displayed gain.

 Experimental setup

 Parameters choice

 Outline
 Reproducibility

 Introduction
 Actual Gain

 Characterization
 Saturation

 Linearity
 Spectral responsivity and external quantum efficiency

< 1 >

Actual Gain



Figure: Actual gain as a function of the software displayed gain, assuming that they are identical at G=3.

Experimental setup Parameters choice Reproducibility Actual Gain Saturation Linearity Spectral responsivity and external quantum efficiency

< 🗇 > <

ъ

Saturation



Figure: Saturation of EMCCD at several gains.

Experimental setup Parameters choice Reproducibility Actual Gain Saturation Linearity Spectral responsivity and external quantum efficiency

æ

2

< 🗇 >

Linearity



Figure: EMCCD linearity.

Experimental setup Parameters choice Reproducibility Actual Gain Saturation Linearity Spectral responsivity and external quantum efficiency

Spectral responsivity and external quantum efficiency



Figure: Spectral responsivity and external quantum efficiency.

Experimental setup Parameters choice Reproducibility Actual Gain Saturation Linearity Spectral responsivity and external quantum efficiency

イロト イポト イヨト イヨト

Alejandro Ferrero

School of Physics University College Dublin alejandro.ferrero@ucd.ie