# Experimental Investigation of Secondary Back-Reflection

Aaron Spector - University of Florida NASA Grants - NNXIIALI6H and NNHI0ZDA00IN

LISA X - Gainesville, Fl May 22, 2014



## **On-Axis Telescope**

- Telescope transmits and receives lasers between SC
- On-axis quadpod (Cassegrain) design
  - Larger aperture to weight ratio than off-axis designs
    - 5% of light lost to shadows from Secondary support and struts
    - Symmetric shadows on quadrant photodetectors
  - Material stability confirmed to meet requirements
    - Thermal and dimensional stability tested at UF with GSFC using a SiC test spacer
      - J Sanjuan et al.
    - Potential Problem:

Back-reflection from the secondary mirror

Secondary

Primary

# Telescope Back-Reflection

- Secondary and primary mirrors axially aligned
  - Outgoing beam incident normal to secondary mirror
    - Light reflected from secondary back to the optical bench
- Distance between OB and telescope not stabilized
  - Motion between the OB and telescope introduces phase noise to the BR light

2/10

Couples into measurement signal via small vector phase noise



### **Back-reflected** Phase Noise

LISA pm phase noise requirements < 10<sup>-6</sup> cycles/rtHz

3/10

- BR phase noise proportional to spatial overlap ( $\eta$ ) of the far-field and BR field

$$\delta \phi = \eta \sqrt{\frac{P_o}{\chi P_I} \frac{\delta x}{\lambda}} \qquad \delta \phi < 10^{-6} \frac{\text{cycles}}{\sqrt{\text{Hz}}} \to \eta < 5 \times 10^{-5}$$

| variable  | description                                    | value                 |
|-----------|--|-----------------------|
| Po        | outgoing power                                 | $\lesssim$ 2 W        |
| $P_{I}$   | local oscillator power                         | $\gtrsim$ 500 $\mu$ W |
| $\lambda$ | laser wavelength                               | 1064 nm               |
| δx        | distance changes between OB and telescope      | 10 nm/ $\sqrt{Hz}$    |
| $\chi$    | extinction ratio of polarizing beam splitter   | 1000                  |
| $\eta$    | spatial overlap between recieved and BR fields | $< 5 \times 10^{-5}$  |

Technical noise sources must be a factor of 10 below the LISA requirements:

 $\eta < 5 \times 10^{-6}$ 

• Unmitigated spatial overlap is 3×10<sup>-4</sup>

## Lotus Shape

- Must cast shadow along optical axis
  - Use dark spot in the center of the Highly Reflective (HR) coating on the secondary
  - Initial simulations used a circular hole in the HR coating
    - Produces a bright spot along the optical axis (spot of Arago)  $\eta = 8 \times 10^{-5}$
  - Must use irregular shape to break spatial coherence of the edge of the hole

### Simulations:

- IO shapes investigated
- Huygen's integral and FFT propagation codes
- 'Lotus' shape chosen to investigate further
  - Axial power suppression limited by:
    - Petal tips minimum feature size (MFS)
    - Anti-Reflective (AR) coating reflectivity



# On-Axis Telescope Simulations Experimental Investigation Future Work & Conclusions Simulated Distributions Simulated Distributions

5/10

Lotus

### Rough Circle



- Lotus is an improvement over the rough circle
  - Do not meet requirements with 2 micron petal tips ( $\eta = 1.1$  to  $3.8 \times 10^{-5}$ )

# Secondary Prototypes

- Deposited dielectric HR coating over curved substrate
  - I6 mm radius of curvature
- Imm diameter hole secondaries
  - 30 micron chipping region
- 'Lotus' secondaries manufactured using photo-lithographic techniques
  - 180 micron gold HR layer deposited over curved substrate (convex)
  - AR coating has reflectivity of 2.5×10<sup>-3</sup>
  - 2 mm diameter pattern etched into gold
  - Minimum feature size in petal tips of 2 microns
  - I micron undercut at the edge of the structure









# Experimental Testbed



Experimental Investigation Future Work & Conclusions

#### Secondary prototypes tested on optical bench

 Telescope aperture beam shaping optics recreate simulated received field

Simulations

**On-Axis** Telescope

 Amplitude of interference signal between BR and received field measured on PD



# Preliminary Results

- Results for Secondary Prototypes
  - Goal:  $\eta < 5 \times 10^{-6}$
  - Measured unmitigated BR  $\eta = 3.2 \times 10^{-4}$  (theory:  $3.0 \times 10^{-4}$ )
  - Rough circular hole:  $\eta = 4.1$  to  $6.2 \times 10^{-5}$  (theory:  $4.8 \pm 0.4 \times 10^{-5}$ )
  - Lotus:  $\eta = 0.8$  to  $2.2 \times 10^{-5}$  (theory: 1.1 to  $3.8 \times 10^{-5}$ )

| Shape           | Radius of Curvature | Max $\eta$ (Experiment) | Max $\eta$ (Simulation)      |
|-----------------|---------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|
| No Hole         | 16 mm               | 3.2×10 <sup>-4</sup>    | 3.0×10 <sup>-4</sup>         |
| Circular Hole 1 | 16 mm               | 4.1×10 <sup>-5</sup>    | $4.8\pm0.4\times10^{-5}$     |
| Circular Hole 2 | 16 mm               | 5.4×10 <sup>-5</sup>    | $4.8 \pm 0.4 \times 10^{-4}$ |
| Circular Hole 3 | 16 mm               | 6.2×10 <sup>-5</sup>    | $4.8 \pm 0.4 \times 10^{-4}$ |
| Lotus 1         | 39 mm               | 2.2×10 <sup>-5</sup>    | 1.7×10 <sup>-5</sup>         |
| Lotus 1 (DL)    | 39 mm               | 1.5×10 <sup>-5</sup>    | 1.3×10 <sup>-5</sup>         |
| Lotus 2         | 45 mm               | 9.8×10 <sup>-6</sup>    | 2.9×10 <sup>-5</sup>         |
| Lotus 2 (DL)    | 45 mm               | 8.4×10 <sup>-6</sup>    | 1.1×10 <sup>-5</sup>         |
| Lotus 3         | 51 mm               | $1.1 \times 10^{-5}$    | 2.2×10 <sup>-5</sup>         |
| Lotus 3 (DL)    | 51 mm               | 1.2×10 <sup>-5</sup>    | 1.4×10 <sup>-5</sup>         |
| Lotus 4         | 77 mm               | 1.7×10 <sup>-5</sup>    | 3.7×10 <sup>-5</sup>         |
| Lotus 4 (DL)    | 77 mm               | 1.7×10 <sup>-5</sup>    | 3.8×10 <sup>-5</sup>         |

# Preliminary Results

- Results for Secondary Prototypes
  - Goal:  $\eta < 5 \times 10^{-6}$
  - Measured unmitigated BR  $\eta = 3.2 \times 10^{-4}$  (theory:  $3.0 \times 10^{-4}$ )
  - Rough circular hole:  $\eta = 4.1$  to  $6.2 \times 10^{-5}$  (theory:  $4.8 \pm 0.4 \times 10^{-5}$ )
  - Lotus:  $\eta = 0.8$  to  $2.2 \times 10^{-5}$  (theory: 1.1 to  $3.8 \times 10^{-5}$ )



### Future Work

### Apodized Shapes

- Etch sub-wavelength features into gold coating
- Forms a tunable effective index of refraction
- Allows for smooth transition from AR to HR
  - Reduces light scattered due to diffraction effects
    - For ideal AR coating  $\eta = 1$  to  $4 \times 10^{-7}$
    - For practical AR coating (R = 0.25%)  $\eta$  = 2 to 4 × 10<sup>-6</sup>





90



### Conclusions

#### Results: We are close but not quite there

- Best Lotus pattern etching within a factor of 1.7 of the requirements
- Different results for different telescope designs
- Simulations: limited by minimum feature size in the petal tips

#### Future: Apodized coatings present a possible solution

- Simulated back-reflection below spatial overlap requirements
- Work with practical AR coatings
- Have procedure to manufacture coatings at UF, with help from the NRF

### Thank You!

### **Experimental Testbed**



extra

- Secondary prototypes tested on optical bench
  - 2 Lasers phase locked at 10 MHz with clocks synchronized to acromag card
  - Telescope aperture beam shaping optics recreate simulated received field
  - $\lambda/4$  wave plate and PBS used to separate back-reflected and incident beams
    - PZT mirror scans incident beam over mirror positions
  - Interference signal of far-field and BR field sent from PD to acromag card
    - Amplitude of both quadratures measured to eliminate path length noise
    - Amplitude of the signal is calibrated to give the spatial overlap

### Lotus Shape

### Average Reflectivity for a given radial length



extra

Spiral Simulations



extra