

Monitoring the tagging efficiency of the Low-Energy Muon beamline through background analysis: Insights into the long-term performance of ultrathin carbon foils

Gianluca Janka,^{1,*} Herman Ishchenko,^{1,2} Zaher Salman,¹ Andreas Suter,¹ and Thomas Prokscha^{1,†}

¹*PSI Center for Neutron and Muon Sciences CNM, 5232 Villigen PSI, Switzerland*

²*Department of Physics, University of Basel, Klingelbergstrasse 82, CH-4056 Basel, Switzerland*

(Dated: February 26, 2025)

The efficient tagging of individual muons, along with the stability of the involved ultrathin carbon foil, is critical for ensuring fast, reliable and reproducible low-energy muon spin rotation (LE- μ SR) measurements. At the Paul Scherrer Institute's Low-Energy Muon (LEM) beamline, we developed a method to monitor the tagging efficiency of the beamline using routinely collected muon decay histograms. This method leverages background comparison before and after the arrival time of the muons at the sample to extract the tagging efficiency, eliminating the need for additional detectors or measurements. By analyzing data collected between 2018 and 2024, we confirm the method's reliability and validate its results using independent reference measurements. Furthermore, we establish a correlation between the tagging efficiency and foil thickness by investigating the impact of contamination and outgassing on the carbon foil, as well as the restoration effects of laser cleaning. The findings underscore the importance of monitoring the carbon foil's condition to maintain consistent beamline performance and reproducibility. This method offers a practical approach for detector efficiency monitoring, applicable to other beamlines employing similar setups.

I. INTRODUCTION

The Low-Energy Muon (LEM) beamline (see Fig. 1) receives a continuous beam of over $4 \times 10^8/s$ spin-polarized, positively charged surface muons (μ^+) with a momentum of 28 MeV/c from the μ E4 beamline at the Paul Scherrer Institute (PSI) [1]. These muons are focused onto a moderation target consisting of a 125 μ m thick silver foil, cooled to approximately 10 K, and coated with a thin (several hundred nm) layer of a solid rare gas, such as argon or neon [2]. Approximately half of the surface muons stop and decay in the silver grating. A small fraction (5×10^{-5} to 10^{-4} [3]) of μ^+ particles are moderated in the solid rare gas layers to eV energies, preserving their polarization [4], and re-accelerated through a set of grids into a monoenergetic low-energy μ^+ beam of up to 20 keV. To separate the low-energy μ^+ beam from the remaining surface muons, an electrostatic mirror tuned to the energy of the low-energy μ^+ deflects them by 90°, while the surface muons remain unaffected. These surface muons continue their straight path, stopping and decaying in a beam monitor (MCP1) at the end of the beamline, where a set of scintillators (PosM1) is positioned as an additional monitor for the decay positrons.

The continuous nature of the low-energy beam means that there is no inherent starting time for muons passing through the beamline. To address this, a tagging setup consisting of an ultrathin (sub 10 nm) carbon foil and a microchannel plate detector (trigger detector, TD) was implemented [5, 6]. When a μ^+ passes through the carbon foil, it interacts with the material, loses 5% to 10% of its energy, and releases secondary electrons [7].

The yield of secondary electrons strongly depends on the surface cleanliness of the carbon foils [8–10]. These secondary electrons are guided onto the TD and generate the trigger signal for the next measurement; the μ^+ has been tagged (in experimental jargon).

The low-energy muons are eventually implanted into the sample. The most common measurements performed at the LEM beamline are either temperature or implantation depth scans conducted in a weak transverse magnetic field of 50 G to 100 G. The magnetic field is oriented parallel to the incoming beam, but perpendicular to the muon spin. The muon spin starts precessing around the magnetic field orientation. The μ^+ is unstable and decays with a lifetime of 2.2 μ s into a positron and two neutrinos. Due to parity violation in the muon decay, the positron is preferentially emitted in the direction of the muon spin. Detecting the emission direction of the positron provides information on the muon's spin polarization as a function of time and, therefore, on the local magnetic and electronic properties at the muon's stopping site (see Refs. [11, 12] for more information about the muon spin rotation (μ SR) technique). To detect the positrons from the muon decay, the sample is surrounded by positron counters at the top, bottom, left, and right (PosT, PosB, PosL, PosR) with respect to the incoming muon beam. A typical decay histogram recorded with PosL is shown in Fig. 2.

For the low-energy μ SR (LE- μ SR) measurements, accurate knowledge of the implantation energy and beam spot size is crucial to ensure reproducible results. Additionally, since the beam spot size is directly influenced by multiple scattering in the carbon foil, the foil should be as thin as possible to minimize energy loss and beam straggling. All these parameters depend on a stable carbon foil [7], meaning that the foil must maintain a consistent thickness over long periods. Over time, we observe that the carbon foil thickness increases due to residual gas ac-

* gianluca.janka@psi.ch

† thomas.prokscha@psi.ch




FIG. 1. Simplified schematic of the LEM beamline. The uncorrelated e^+ background is depicted as a light-blue shaded region, with common pathways represented by dashed lines. The trajectory of the low-energy muons is shown as an orange line, ending on the sample. The path of fast surface muons is illustrated with a black line, stopping on the beam monitor MCP1.

cumulation or outgassing from samples. In addition, prolonged usage of a carbon foil can lead to the formation of holes, reducing the effective coverage and consequently lowering the tagging efficiency. Thus, a method is required to monitor the condition of the carbon foil and enable timely intervention in case of significant changes.

In this work, we present such a method based on comparing the background levels of LE- μ SR decay histograms before and after the time a muon reaches the sample, to estimate the tagging efficiency of the TD, which is closely related to the thickness of the carbon foil. The required data for this method are routinely collected at the LEM beamline, enabling the extraction of the tagging efficiency as a byproduct, without the need for additional detectors or measurements. We compare the results of this method with those obtained using an additional detector replacing the sample. We show tagging efficiency trends for the years 2018 to 2024 and demonstrate the efficacy of cleaning the carbon foil by laser illumination.

II. EXTRACTION OF TAGGING EFFICIENCY

The method is based on counting the decay positrons (e^+) with the positron counters surrounding the sample region, in coincidence with a trigger signal generated by the TD. Specifically, comparing the background lev-

els before and after the time a muon reaches the sample (t_0) allows us to extract the tagging efficiency ϵ_{TD} of the TD. In LE- μ SR measurements, the trigger logic is configured such that events are rejected when a TD signal has already been generated within the previous 13 μs (pre-pileup rejection). However, post-pileup events, such as multiple hits on the tagging detector after the initial trigger, are recorded.

A. Background levels comparison

The positron background of a raw LE- μ SR histogram before t_0 ($N_{\text{BKG}}^{(t < t_0)}$) can be described as:

$$N_{\text{BKG}}^{(t < t_0)} \propto \underbrace{r_{e^+}^{\text{uncorr}}}_{\text{uncorrelated}} + \underbrace{(1 - \epsilon_{\text{TD}}) \cdot r_{e^+}^{\mu}}_{\mu^+ \text{ not tagged}}. \quad (1)$$

The first term, labeled $r_{e^+}^{\text{uncorr}}$, represents the contribution from the rate of uncorrelated e^+ originating from scattered beam positrons, for example coming from the moderator target or the beam monitor MCP1. Muons decaying in-flight present a negligible contribution to the background. The second term accounts for correlated background events, where the μ^+ was not detected by the TD, but a different background event triggered the TD and provided the trigger signal. The μ^+ nonetheless

reached the sample and decayed, and therefore its decay positron generated a signal in a positron counter. $r_{e_{\mu}^+}$ is the detected rate of e^+ originating from μ^+ decaying in the sample region.

The positron background after the t_0 , $N_{\text{BKG}}^{(t>t_0)}$, is similar; it includes the uncorrelated rate $r_{e_{\text{uncorr}}^+}$ and the rate of untagged μ^+ , as both rates are independent of the exact timing of the tagging detector relative to positron detection. However, an additional term must be included to account for post-pileup events. This term describes cases where a μ^+ is detected by the TD, but the initial trigger signal was generated by a different background event such as an ion or beam positron. The full background $N_{\text{BKG}}^{(t>t_0)}$ can be written as:

$$N_{\text{BKG}}^{(t>t_0)} \propto \underbrace{r_{e_{\text{uncorr}}^+}}_{\text{uncorrelated}} + \underbrace{(1 - \epsilon_{\text{TD}}) \cdot r_{e_{\mu}^+}}_{\mu^+ \text{ not tagged}} + \underbrace{\epsilon_{\text{TD}} \cdot r_{e_{\mu}^+}}_{\text{post-pileup}} \quad (2)$$

$$\propto r_{\text{LEM}}, \quad (3)$$

which is also proportional to the total detected positron rate r_{LEM} :

$$r_{\text{LEM}} = r_{e_{\text{uncorr}}^+} + r_{e_{\mu}^+} \quad (4)$$

The ratio α between the two background levels is given by:

$$\alpha = \frac{N_{\text{BKG}}^{(t>t_0)}}{N_{\text{BKG}}^{(t<t_0)}} = \frac{r_{\text{LEM}}}{r_{e_{\text{uncorr}}^+} + (1 - \epsilon_{\text{TD}}) \cdot r_{e_{\mu}^+}}, \quad (5)$$

which can be solved for the tagging efficiency ϵ_{TD} :

$$\epsilon_{\text{TD}} = \frac{\alpha(r_{e_{\text{uncorr}}^+} + r_{e_{\mu}^+}) - r_{\text{LEM}}}{\alpha \cdot r_{e_{\mu}^+}} \quad (6)$$

$$= \frac{(\alpha - 1) \cdot r_{\text{LEM}}}{\alpha(r_{\text{LEM}} - r_{e_{\text{uncorr}}^+})}, \quad (7)$$

where we used the relation from Eq. 4 in the step from Eq. 6 to Eq. 7.

Eq. 7 demonstrates that by determining the background rates before and after t_0 to calculate α , and by measuring the total LEM positron rate along with a dedicated measurement for the uncorrelated positron rate, the tagging efficiency for individual muons can be extracted.

B. LEM rate r_{LEM}

Fig. 2 shows a typical decay histogram from a weak transverse field LE- μ SR measurement. The LEM rate r_{LEM} , as indicated in Eq. 4, is the total rate of tagged events for which a positron was detected by a positron counter. r_{LEM} can be extracted from a decay histogram by integrating the counts over the entire acquisition window of 13 μs across all positron counters, then dividing




FIG. 2. Typical decay histogram for a silver sample in a field of 50 G, measured at the LEM beamline with the positron detector PosL. The blue solid line represents the single-histogram fit described by Eq. 8, the blue dash-dotted line indicates the background level after t_0 , while the orange dash-dotted line represents the background level before t_0 .

by the total acquisition time and normalizing to the proton beam current that generates the initial surface muon beam (up to 2.4 mA from the PSI High Intensity Proton Accelerator (HIPA) [13]). A typical value for r_{LEM} is currently around 1 kHz/mA. With future improvements, such as an upgrade to the μE4 beamline, this rate is expected to be increased by a factor of 1.4 in 2026 [14].

C. Background ratio α

$N_{\text{BKG}}^{(t<t_0)}$ is extracted from the decay histogram by fitting a horizontal line. The fitting interval is limited to a maximum of 0.3 μs . The fitting model used to extract $N_{\text{BKG}}^{(t>t_0)}$ is as follows:

$$N(t > t_0) = N_0 \underbrace{e^{-t/\tau_{\mu}}}_{\mu^+ \text{ decay}} \left[1 + \underbrace{A(t)}_{\text{decay asymm.}} \right] + N_{\text{BKG}}^{(t>t_0)} \quad (8)$$

$$A(t) = A_0 \underbrace{e^{-\lambda t}}_{\text{relaxation}} \underbrace{\cos(2\pi\nu t + \frac{\pi\phi}{180})}_{\text{oscillations}}. \quad (9)$$

This fitting model represents a standard single-histogram fit (Eq. 8), which includes the total number of counts at t_0 (N_0), the muon decay with its natural lifetime ($\tau_{\mu} = 2.2 \mu\text{s}$), the background level $N_{\text{BKG}}^{(t>t_0)}$, and a term for the decay asymmetry $A(t)$ of the muon spin relaxation. The decay asymmetry $A(t)$ is modeled here as an exponentially damped oscillation (Eq. 9), including an initial asymmetry A_0 , an exponential term describing the signal damping (characterized by λ), and an oscillatory cosine term defined by the frequency ν and phase ϕ . Additional details on polarization functions of μSR data can be found in Refs. [11, 12, 15]. A fit was performed on an




FIG. 3. Uncorrelated e^+ background rate $r_{e^+_{uncorr}}$ at the LEM beamline for each detector segment (PosT, PosB, PosR, PosL), extracted for the years 2018 to 2024. The black curves, obtained via LOESS regression, are included as visual guides.

example dataset shown in Fig. 2, represented by the blue solid line. The fitting range is restricted to the interval between $0.6 \mu\text{s}$ to $13 \mu\text{s}$.

This analysis enables the extraction of background levels before and after t_0 (see Fig. 2, dashed lines), which can then be used to calculate α .

D. Uncorrelated e^+ background $r_{e^+_{uncorr}}$

During a LE- μSR measurement, the rate $r_{e^+_{uncorr}}$ cannot be directly separated from the LEM rate, and therefore must be measured independently. The simplest approach involves either turning off the high voltages of the electrostatic mirror or closing the BPVX valve (see Fig. 1), which both prevents the slow μ^+ beam from reaching the sample. During normal operation, the BPVX valve is closed automatically while warming up the sample to prevent sudden vacuum spikes in the moderator region. This provides ideal conditions to measure and record the uncorrelated e^+ background rate $r_{e^+_{uncorr}}$. The $r_{e^+_{uncorr}}$ values for the years 2018 to 2024 are shown in Fig. 3, categorized by the positron counters (PosT, PosB, PosR and PosL). For visualization, the data were smoothed using LOESS regression [16, 17], included in the scikit-misc Python package [18]. As shown in Fig. 3, PosT and PosB exhibit similar rates, while PosR shows nearly double the rate, and PosL is slightly lower. This discrepancy can be attributed to a gap in the lead shielding of the μSR spectrometer. This gap is caused by a vacuum connection going through the lead shield, which allows more scattered positrons to pass through towards the PosR detector.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

By extracting the total background levels across all four positron counters, as well as the LEM rate from all the standard weak transverse field (50 G to 100 G) data collected at the LEM beamline between 2018 and 2024, and accounting for the varying uncorrelated background rate shown in Fig. 3, the tagging efficiency ϵ_{TD} was calculated and is presented in Fig. 4. As an initial validation, the presented method shows good agreement with tagging efficiencies determined using a dedicated second detector installed at the end of the beamline instead of a sample (red crosses in Fig. 4, for method details see Ref. [7]). The LOESS regression of the data (black curves in Fig. 4) reveals that the tagging efficiency is rarely stable over time, exhibiting significant dips and fluctuations. The majority of the dips coincide with the red dashed lines in Fig. 4, which mark the start time of a laser experiment conducted at the LEM beamline. In these experiments, the laser is directed through a view port at the mirror (Fig. 1), passes through the carbon foil, and reaches the sample. Previous work has demonstrated that laser irradiation removes contamination from the ultrathin carbon foil used in the tagging setup, thereby lowering the secondary electron yield and leading to a decrease in tagging efficiency [7]. The observed increases in tagging efficiency are correlated with the type of samples being studied and the frequency of sample changes during experiments. Frequent (often daily) sample changes introduce significant contamination into the vacuum system, which gradually accumulates on the carbon foil, thereby increasing the tagging efficiency. In extreme cases, such as heavily outgassing samples or experimental incidents, the carbon foil's effective thickness can increase rapidly. An exam-




FIG. 4. Tagging efficiency, calculated using Eq. 7, plotted for the years 2018 to 2024. The black curves, obtained via LOESS regression, are included as visual guides. The red dashed vertical lines mark the time of laser experiments. The red crosses represent reference measurements of the tagging efficiency performed using the method described in Ref. [7]

ple of severe contamination occurred in July 2021, when a sample mounted on an oven setup, capable of reaching temperatures above $500\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$, overheated due to a malfunctioning oven controller, ultimately burning the sample. This incident caused substantial deposition of contaminants on the carbon foil, as evidenced by the abrupt increase in tagging efficiency from 0.8 to 0.95. The original tagging efficiency of 0.8 was never fully restored, reaching only 0.85 following laser irradiation during the 2022 shutdown. In July 2022, a heavily outgassing sample (Methylammonium lead iodide, MAPI) was studied, which again increased the tagging efficiency to 0.93. Similar to the previous cases, only an extended laser experiment was able to restore the foil afterwards.

Another valuable aspect that can be studied by monitoring the tagging efficiency is the effective coverage of the carbon foil. Examining the trend in tagging efficiency from 2018 to the end of 2020, it appears that the efficiency gradually decreases. A supporting indicator is the minimum tagging efficiency observed after laser irradiation; it decreased from approximately 0.75 in 2018 to 0.70 in 2020. This trend suggests that the aging of the carbon foil, possibly due to the formation of holes over time, may have contributed to a reduction in active area for secondary electron emission.

During the shutdown in 2023, the carbon foil was replaced, which explains the shift of the baseline tagging

efficiency from 0.70 to 0.85, likely due to better foil coverage and fewer holes. The new foil underwent extensive laser irradiation to achieve optimal thinness, minimizing the energy loss and straggling, and thereby optimizing the beam spot size [7].

In September 2024, another heavily outgassing sample, combined with being heated on the oven setup, again caused the carbon foil thickness to increase. This change went undetected for the remainder of the measurement campaign. However, with the newly developed monitoring tool, such incidents can now be identified in real-time, allowing the foil parameters to be restored immediately via laser irradiation. This significantly improves the reproducibility of LE- μ SR measurements and ensures more consistent experimental conditions.

IV. SUMMARY AND PROSPECTS

We devise a new method to extract the tagging efficiency ϵ_{TD} of the LEM beamline, a key parameter for achieving efficient and reproducible LE- μ SR measurements, by comparing the background levels before and after the time t_0 in LE- μ SR decay histograms. Our results reveal significant variations in tagging efficiency over time, with increases attributed to sample-related outgassing and contamination, which lead to a greater effective thickness of the carbon foil. Similarly, decreases in efficiency are linked to laser experiments that remove contamination and reduce the foil's effective thickness. This new monitoring method represents a valuable addition to the LEM beamline diagnostics, providing timely insights for determining when laser cleaning, or in extreme cases a replacement, of the carbon foil is required. A major advantage of this method is that it requires no additional detectors or dedicated measurements, as the tagging efficiency can be extracted entirely as a byproduct of routine LE- μ SR measurements. While developed for the LEM beamline, this method is broadly applicable to other beamlines that employ dual detection setups (e.g. in our case tagging detector and positron counters), provided that the background contributions differ at specific times, are well-characterized, and measurable.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

All the measurements have been performed at the Swiss Muon Source $S\mu$ S, Paul Scherrer Institute, Villigen, Switzerland. This work is funded by the Swiss National Science Foundation under the grant number 220823 (GJ).

[1] T. Prokscha, E. Morenzoni, K. Deiters, F. Foroughi, D. George, R. Kobler, A. Suter, and V. Vrankovic, Nu-

clear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section A: Accelerators, Spectrometers, Detectors and As-

- sociated Equipment **595**, 317 (2008).
- [2] T. Prokscha, E. Morenzoni, C. David, A. Hofer, H. Glückler, and L. Scandella, *Applied Surface Science* **172**, 235 (2001).
- [3] E. Morenzoni, T. Prokscha, A. Suter, H. Luetkens, and R. Khasanov, *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter* **16**, S4583 (2004).
- [4] E. Morenzoni, F. Kottmann, D. Maden, B. Matthias, M. Meyberg, T. Prokscha, T. Wutzke, and U. Zimmermann, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **72**, 2793 (1994).
- [5] A. Hofer, *Niederenergetische Myonen: Eigenschaften und Anwendungen*, Ph.D. thesis, Universität Konstanz (1998).
- [6] K. Khaw, A. Antognini, P. Crivelli, K. Kirch, E. Morenzoni, Z. Salman, A. Suter, and T. Prokscha, *Journal of Instrumentation* **10** (10), P10025.
- [7] G. Janka, M. Mendes Martins, X. Ni, Z. Salman, A. Suter, and T. Prokscha, *Phys. Rev. Accel. Beams* **27**, 054501 (2024).
- [8] F. Allegrini, R. W. Ebert, and H. O. Funsten, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics* **121**, 3931 (2016).
- [9] F. Allegrini, R. F. Wimmer-Schweingruber, P. Wurz, and P. Bochsler, *Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section B: Beam Interactions with Materials and Atoms* **211**, 487 (2003).
- [10] H. Rothard, M. Jung, B. Gervais, J. Grandin, A. Billebaud, and R. Wünsch, *Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section B: Beam Interactions with Materials and Atoms* **107**, 108 (1996).
- [11] S. Blundell, R. De Renzi, T. Lancaster, and F. L. Pratt, *Muon Spectroscopy: An Introduction* (Oxford University Press, 2022).
- [12] A. Amato and E. Morenzoni, *Introduction to Muon Spin Spectroscopy* (Springer, 2024).
- [13] J. Grillenberger, C. Baumgarten, and M. Seidel, *SciPost Physics Proceedings* **5**, 002 (2021).
- [14] L.-P. Zhou, X.-J. Ni, Z. Salman, A. Suter, J.-Y. Tang, V. Vrankovic, and T. Prokscha, *Phys. Rev. Accel. Beams* **25**, 051601 (2022).
- [15] P. D. de Réotier and A. Yaouanc, *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter* **9**, 9113 (1997).
- [16] W. S. Cleveland, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **74**, 829 (1979).
- [17] W. S. Cleveland and S. J. Devlin, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **83**, 596 (1988).
- [18] scikit-misc GitHub, <https://github.com/has2k1/scikit-misc>, accessed: (29.01.2025).