

EXPERIMENTS WITH A METASTABLE HELIUM  
ATOMIC TRAP

By  
Massimiliano Colla

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE  
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY  
AT  
AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL UNIVERSITY  
CANBERRA ACT, AUSTRALIA  
JUNE 2006

© Copyright by Massimiliano Colla, 2006

AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL UNIVERSITY  
DEPARTMENT OF  
AMPL, RESEARCH SCHOOL OF PHYSICAL SCIENCES AND  
ENGINEERING

The undersigned hereby certify that they have read and recommend to the Faculty of Science for acceptance a thesis entitled **“Experiments with a Metastable Helium Atomic Trap”** by **Massimiliano Colla** in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of **Doctor of Philosophy**.

Dated: June 2006

External Examiner:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ian Whittingam

Research Supervisor:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ken Baldwin

Examining Committee:

\_\_\_\_\_  
John Close

\_\_\_\_\_  
Robert Sang

AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL UNIVERSITY

Date: **June 2006**

Author: **Massimiliano Colla**

Title: **Experiments with a Metastable Helium Atomic  
Trap**

Department: **AMPL, Research School of Physical Sciences and  
Engineering**

Degree: **Ph.D.** Convocation: **December** Year: **2006**

Permission is herewith granted to Australian National University to circulate and to have copied for non-commercial purposes, at its discretion, the above title upon the request of individuals or institutions.

---

Signature of Author

THE AUTHOR RESERVES OTHER PUBLICATION RIGHTS, AND NEITHER THE THESIS NOR EXTENSIVE EXTRACTS FROM IT MAY BE PRINTED OR OTHERWISE REPRODUCED WITHOUT THE AUTHOR'S WRITTEN PERMISSION.

THE AUTHOR ATTESTS THAT PERMISSION HAS BEEN OBTAINED FOR THE USE OF ANY COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL APPEARING IN THIS THESIS (OTHER THAN BRIEF EXCERPTS REQUIRING ONLY PROPER ACKNOWLEDGEMENT IN SCHOLARLY WRITING) AND THAT ALL SUCH USE IS CLEARLY ACKNOWLEDGED.

*Dedicated to my wife, Agnieszka.*

# Table of Contents

<b>Table of Contents</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>List of Figures</b>	<b>vii</b>
<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2 Laser cooling and trapping techniques</b>	<b>10</b>
2.1 Introduction . . . . .	10
2.2 The Metastable Helium Atom . . . . .	11
2.3 Theory of cooling and trapping of neutral atoms . . . . .	13
2.3.1 Reactive and Dissipative forces . . . . .	13
2.3.2 Doppler cooling . . . . .	17
2.3.3 Magneto Optic Trap theory . . . . .	19
2.3.4 Limits of Laser Cooling - Doppler Limit . . . . .	21
2.4 SubDoppler cooling . . . . .	22
2.4.1 Recoil Limit . . . . .	23
<b>3 Atomic beam line</b>	<b>25</b>
3.1 Introduction . . . . .	25
3.2 Diode lasers . . . . .	27
3.2.1 He Discharge locking cell . . . . .	29
3.3 Beam line . . . . .	33
3.3.1 Metastable atoms source . . . . .	33
3.3.2 Collimation Stage . . . . .	35
3.3.3 Zeeman Slower . . . . .	36
3.3.4 Compression stage . . . . .	38
3.3.5 Summary . . . . .	41
<b>4 Magneto Optic Trap</b>	<b>42</b>
4.1 Introduction . . . . .	42
4.2 Trap Construction . . . . .	42
4.2.1 Trap Chamber . . . . .	42
4.2.2 Quadrupole field . . . . .	43

4.2.3	Trapping laser . . . . .	44
4.2.4	Making the trap . . . . .	49
4.3	Fast switching of magnetic fields in a MOT . . . . .	51
4.3.1	Introduction . . . . .	51
4.3.2	Experimental description . . . . .	52
4.3.3	Eddy current compensation results . . . . .	56
4.3.4	Conclusion . . . . .	59
4.4	Trap number measurements: fluorescence . . . . .	59
4.5	Relative trap number measurements: Phase Modulation Spectroscopy	65
4.5.1	Introduction . . . . .	65
4.5.2	Theory . . . . .	66
4.6	Temperature measurements . . . . .	75
4.7	Inter-atomic collisions mediated by 389 nm laser radiation . . . . .	80
4.7.1	Introduction . . . . .	80
4.7.2	Theoretical background and practical implementation . . . . .	80
4.7.3	Experimental procedure . . . . .	84
4.7.4	Results and discussion . . . . .	85
4.7.5	Conclusions . . . . .	86
4.8	Summary . . . . .	89
<b>5</b>	<b>Electron scattering experiment</b>	<b>90</b>
5.1	Introduction . . . . .	90
5.2	Theoretical background . . . . .	92
5.3	Previous alkali $e^-$ -MOT scattering experiments . . . . .	96
5.4	Experimental description . . . . .	98
5.5	The electron gun . . . . .	99
5.5.1	Signal extraction . . . . .	106
5.5.2	Acquisition sequence . . . . .	109
5.6	Experimental operation . . . . .	109
5.7	Results, error analysis . . . . .	111
5.8	Discussion . . . . .	114
<b>6</b>	<b>Conclusions</b>	<b>116</b>
6.1	Summary of achievements . . . . .	116
6.2	Suggestions for future work . . . . .	118
6.3	Conclusions . . . . .	120
Appendix A	- Electron beam size . . . . .	121
Appendix B	- Trap expansion . . . . .	125
	<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>131</b>

# List of Figures

2.1	<i>Energy levels for helium. The trapping transition at 1083 nm and other transitions used for this experiment are shown . . . . .</i>	12
2.2	<i>Absorption and stimulated emission of photons: the force resulting from this process is called dipole force. . . . .</i>	14
2.3	<i>Absorption and spontaneous emission of photons: the dissipative force</i>	16
2.4	<i>Forces applied by two detuned and counterpropagating laser beams as a function of normalized velocity <math>k_L v / \Gamma</math>. In this figure <math>\delta = -\Gamma/2</math> which maximizes friction. The two components reach their maxima for opposite values of the detuning. . . . .</i>	18
2.5	<i>Representation of the model used to explain the principles governing the MOT. Two counterpropagating beams with opposite circular polarizations illuminate an atom placed in a position-dependent magnetic field. The dotted line indicates the laser detuning from resonance. An atom displaced to the right of the zero magnetic field position has its <math>m_J = -1</math> level closer to resonance with the field propagating from the right, the only one that can produce a transition <math>\Delta m_J = -1</math> . . . . .</i>	20
2.6	<i>The sublevel ground states for the <math>\perp</math> configuration. Atoms starting at origin in the <math>m = +1/2</math> substate climb a potential hill before being optically pumped to <math>m = -1/2</math>. The kinetic energy lost while climbing up the potential profile is not recovered on de-excitation. This process repeats itself until the atom kinetic energy is too small to climb the potential and undergo excitation where (top of the potential hill) the light polarization is appropriate for the process. (figure from [22]) . . . . .</i>	23

3.1	<i>From right to left the following sections are visible: the source, the collimator, the Zeeman slower, the compressor and the trapping chamber. The supporting structure is also visible . . . . .</i>	26
3.2	<i>Back and front views of the Distributed Bragg reflector diode laser model SDL-6702-H1 . . . . .</i>	27
3.3	<i>The transmission signal of the saturated He* absorption spectrum. Peaks 1 and 2 are due to saturated absorption at the line center of the two Doppler broadened He transitions <math>2^3S \rightarrow 2^3P_2</math> and <math>2^3S \rightarrow 2^3P_1</math> respectively. The saturated absorption peaks are 2.3 GHz apart and each has a width of 50 MHz due to a combination of pressure broadening, laser spectral width and natural width. Peak 3 occurs at the cross-over frequency, midway between the two transitions. Figure from [32]. . . . .</i>	28
3.4	<i>Schematic representation of the diode laser mount . . . . .</i>	29
3.5	<i>Discharge cell used for the saturation spectroscopy. High voltage (1.6-2.3 kV) is applied across the cell to generate a discharge. To prevent the power supply from being damaged and to stabilise the discharge, a ballast resistor is also employed to limit the impedance drop. A low power (&lt;1mW) probe laser beam is passed through the cell and its absorption monitored. . . . .</i>	30
3.6	<i>The modulation operated on the Zeeman sublevels translates into modulation of the laser detuning. The rate of absorption is consequently modulated and the signal produced is coherently detected to extract information relative to the laser detuning with respect to the absorption peak (represented here and corresponding to peak 1 of figure 3.3.) . . .</i>	31
3.7	<i>The inner coil is connected to an AC current source (freq. <math>\cong</math> 5-11 KHz). The outer coil is connected to a DC current source: the first is responsible for modulating the laser detuning, the second for its offset. . . . .</i>	32



3.8	<i>Laser lock scheme. The probe laser is passed through the cell and subsequently split. One of the two emerging beams is back reflected and saturates the transition whereas the other is reflected at an angle; when the laser current (frequency) is scanned, a photodetector reveals the absorption Doppler profile which is subtracted from the saturated absorption profile. The result is a trace which is mostly flat, with peaks corresponding to the transitions in question. The coils are used to produce static and oscillating magnetic fields: the first is used for adjusting the detuning and the second as modulated input for the lock-in amplifier.</i>	33
3.9	<i>Schematic representation of the discharge setup . . . . .</i>	34
3.10	<i>Bi-dimensional representation of the collimation principle . . . . .</i>	35
3.11	<i>Gold plated mirror directing the laser beam into the slower. The hole in the middle of the mirror is used to let the atoms through and it is small enough not to alter the slowing laser beam significantly. Note that the atomic beam expands transversely as it moves down the slower for two reasons: firstly atoms are not cooled along the plane perpendicular to the direction of the atomic beam and secondly the random direction of the impulse <math>\hbar k</math> they receive makes them diffuse transversely . . . . .</i>	39
3.12	<i>Magnetic field strength along the Zeeman Slower . . . . .</i>	40
3.13	<i>Quadrupole magnetic field generated by the permanent magnets around the compressor. . . . .</i>	40
3.14	<i>Assembly of 6 retro-reflectors made of 10 mirrors producing an interaction length of 100 mm. The <math>\sigma+</math> polarization is changed to <math>\sigma-</math> and vice versa after two <math>90^\circ</math> reflections. Figure derived from [31,32]. . . . .</i>	41
4.1	<i>Trap chamber. The two re-entrant windows are here located behind large blank flanges. Drawing by Mr. Graeme Cornish . . . . .</i>	44
4.2	<i>Trap chamber as during the last stage of its development. The compression stage can be seen on the right. . . . .</i>	45
4.3	<i>Trap chamber mechanical details. The arrows represent the laser beams</i>	45

4.4	<i>Optical layout for the trapping laser. The AOM1 is double passed and positioned along the portion of the laser beam going to the trap. AOM2 produces a detuning identical to AOM1; the beam is then directed to the absorption cell for stabilization. . . . .</i>	47
4.5	<i>Generic relative spectral response of a Silicon based CCD chip (model Hitachi KP-M2R). . . . .</i>	50
4.6	<i>Magneto Optic Trap, approx. <math>10^7</math> atoms; the false colors show the density gradient across the cloud. This image was taken in presence of the trapping laser (1083 nm) and the confining magnetic field . . . .</i>	50
4.7	<i>(a) Schematic diagram of the circuit for rapidly switching the coil current. (b) Winding current (solid line) and voltage (dashed line) waveforms for the circuit shown. . . . .</i>	53
4.8	<i>Winding current and pickup coil voltage waveforms for the circuit shown in fig. 4.7(a). Solid line: winding current. Dotted line: pickup coil voltage. Note that the magnetic flux (indicated by the pickup coil voltage) decays much more slowly than the magnetic coil current . .</i>	55
4.9	<i>Simplified schematic diagram of the bipolar current amplifier for providing a current compensation waveform to rapidly decrease the magnetic field to zero . . . . .</i>	56
4.10	<i>Dotted lines: with compensation; solid lines without compensation. (a) Amplifier input voltage (dashed line) and winding current . . . . .</i>	57
4.11	<i>Waveforms for the current compensation circuit shown in 4.9. Dotted lines: with compensation; solid lines without compensation. (b) pickup voltage. The decay time of the magnetic field is greatly reduced by the addition of the reverse compensation current . . . . .</i>	57
4.12	<i>Electron gun pulses produced with variable delays, after switching off the trapping laser simultaneously with the confining quadrupole magnetic field at <math>t=0</math>. Delays as short as 1 ms were possible only thanks to the rapid extinction of the magnetic field. For delays shorter than 800 <math>\mu</math>s the current pulse starts to be affected by the residual magnetic field (for this particular configuration of deflector voltages), as it can be seen by the pulse front bending away from <math>t=0</math>. . . . .</i>	58

4.13	<i>Block diagram showing the CCD calibration procedure. The percentage power reflected by the beam splitter is known and it is used to determine power incident on the CCD chip. The brightness profile shown is relative to a line passing through the center of the trap. . . . .</i>	61
4.14	<i>Plot of the integrated pixel value as a function of the power incident on the CCD chip. The data points have been obtained correcting for background. The line shown is the linear fit. . . . .</i>	63
4.15	<i>(a) Phasor diagram of phase modulation of light in the complex plane, and (b) the decomposition into a carrier and sidebands (assuming small modulation depth). The initial direction of <math>E_0</math> in the complex plane constitutes an offset and depends only on <math>\omega_L</math>: it is important to notice that the small contribution of phase modulation is orthogonal to the initial field. . . . .</i>	68
4.16	<i>Vector representation of phase modulation. This figure shows schematically (arrows up and down) the sidebands and their phase relationship with the carrier (sidebands in anti-phase) . . . . .</i>	68
4.17	<i>(a) Saturated absorption signal showing the relative position of the sidebands with respect to the allowed transitions from the initial metastable state. The peak indicated as 2 represents <math>2^3S_1 \rightarrow 2^3P_1</math>, 1 is <math>2^3S_1 \rightarrow 2^3P_2</math> and 3 is the cross-over between the two (b) Side bands and carrier relative phases indicated by the solid red curve. The dotted lines show the relative position of these peaks along the absorption spectrum of metastable helium. . . . .</i>	70
4.18	<i>Probe laser setup and detection . . . . .</i>	73
4.19	<i>(a) The PMS decay curves for two traps with different trap laser detuning when the trapping laser beams and magnetic field are turned off, and (b) the logarithms of the decay data and relative linear fits. Different detunings produce different natural decay rates. . . . .</i>	74

4.20	<i>Experimental data (red) and calculated trap decay curve (blue). As reported here, the agreement between the two curves is better than 10%. The small difference visible at around 4 ms is an artifact due to the limited number of particles (10,000) used in this simulation. Technical limitations prevented the use of a larger number. The simulation used is described later in this section. For details see Appendix B. . . . .</i>	75
4.21	<i>Simulated and measured decay curves and the effect of a change in the (a) offset; (b) atomic cloud size (mm); (c) probe laser beam radius (mm); (d) the trap symmetry, (<math>\epsilon=1</math> is equivalent to circular cross section); (e) trap temperature parameter . . . . .</i>	77
4.22	<i>Quasi-molecular potentials for a pair of metastable helium atoms undergoing an optical collision. PI is the Penning ionization region. The laser excitation occurs at an interatomic distance <math>R_C</math> (Condon distance) selected by choosing the appropriate negative detuning from the transition <math>He(2^3S)-He(2^3P)</math>. At large distances the complex <math>2^3S+2^3S</math> is excited (1) to a <math>2^3S+2^3P</math> state which has attractive branches [55]. The atoms in this state are accelerated by the attractive potential (2) <math>V(R)=-C_3/R^3</math> and undergo PI at short internuclear distance (3). Figure from [45] . . . . .</i>	82
4.23	<i>Dipole-dipole interaction potentials. In the shielding case represented, with blue detuning on the laser <math>U_e^+</math> has a Condon point with <math>U_g</math> . . .</i>	84
4.24	<i>Timing scheme used for the atom-atom scattering experiment. A and B correspond to the periods when the ion counting occurs. The probe laser is off and on respectively. Figure from [31] . . . . .</i>	85
4.25	<i>Ratio of probe laser on/off ion counts under different conditions, as a function of 389 nm laser detuning. The laser detuning frequency shown was subject to drift and for this reason these scans were performed in around 10 s, time is which the detuning frequency changed within the experimental uncertainty of these measurements. . . . .</i>	87
5.1	<i>A comparison of the measured value of <math>F</math> (see following text) with values calculated using the RMPS method for superelastic electron scattering from <math>He 2^3P_2</math> at an incident energy of 9.2 eV. Figure from [70] . . .</i>	91

5.2	<i>Total electron collision cross section - theoretical predictions for the helium and some experimental results <math>2^3S</math>. [72](F. B.), [75](N., absolute cross section), [73](B.), [71](W. W., relative cross section), [74](T.) .</i>	92
5.3	<i>Timing diagram for one electron-beam pulse cycle in reference [82]. Initially the trap was turned off by shutting off the magnetic field and changing the repumping laser detuning. Then the electron gun produced a short pulse, following which the trap was turned back on to recapture the remaining neutral atoms. The acquisition sequence in the case of [83] was similar but the interaction and loading time were different.</i>	96
5.4	<i>Photos of the e-gun. In evidence the gun aperture . . . . .</i>	99
5.5	<i>The experimental setup showing the electron gun and the emitted electron beam, the trap and the probe laser beam going through it, the fast photodiode detecting the probe, the scanning wire and the Faraday cup.</i>	100
5.6	<i>E-gun layout. The longitudinal cross section showing the emitting element is also present The deflectors are in evidence Drawing by Mr. Kevin Roberts. . . . .</i>	102
5.7	<i>The wire scanning across the electron beam . . . . .</i>	103
5.8	<i>Acquisition sequence. Trap lasers and magnetic field were switched off simultaneously. A delay of generally 1 ms allowed for any residual magnetic field to dissipate before the electron pulse was emitted. The e-gun was on for 2-3 ms after which all the trap fields were restored. The next cycle followed 80-100 ms later. . . . .</i>	103

5.9	<i>Plot of the current intercepted while scanning the wire and its derivative, showing the beam profile. Stray magnetic fields influence the beam shape, particularly for low energies (20 eV for the plot above). The two traces shown here refer to the data taken before and after the experiment: this way the constancy of the electron beam current can be checked and it is possible to estimate the uncertainty associated with the current density at the trap position. A second small peak centred at about 44 mm is evidence of a small fraction of the electron beam being deflected off target; this fact did not affect the results as only the average current value where the trap was formed was important for the calculations. . . . .</i>	104
5.10	<i>Trap decay for two different conditions: electron gun on and off. The electron pulse as detected by the Faraday cup is shown for reference. The incident electron energy in this particular case was 50 eV. The shape of the electron pulse detected by the Faraday cup is not rectangular because of the residual magnet field present in the chamber after switching the quadrupole field off, distorting the beam. . . . .</i>	108
5.11	<i>Trap decay curves from the spectrum analyzer output as a function of the probe laser detuning. The indicated values are relative to the resonance of the <math>{}^3S_1 \rightarrow {}^3P_2</math> transition. The effect over the signal amplitude and decay times is clearly visible. Also, a "broader" initial decay curve, as in the case of the red and blue curve, is indicative of some radiation pressure applied by the probe on the trap. . . . .</i>	111
5.12	<i>Difference curve between the two trap decay traces from the trap on/off acquisition cycles (average over 2000 pulses). The current pulse detected by the Faraday cup is shown for reference. . . . .</i>	112
5.13	<i>Scatter for total cross section data at three different energies - 50, 62 and 75 eV - over a single day of operation. Same shape and colour symbols correspond to measurements taken on the same day of operation.</i>	112

5.14	<i>Experimental grand total cross sections as a function of electron energy compared to the values predicted by the CCC theory. The error bars on the electron beam energies show the total uncertainty in the determination of the total scattering cross sections at various energies. The data points shown here were fitted using a linear regression fit. . . . .</i>	113
6.1	<i>Total cross section for electrons scattered from metastable He <math>2^3S</math> : (●) present results; (◇) Neynaber et al. [74]; (□) Wilson and Williams [75] (normalized to the CCC calculation); (solid line) the convergent close coupling [76] result; (dashed line) the R matrix with pseudostate calculations [77] . . . . .</i>	117
6.2	<i>Two circles intersecting each other and representing the electron beam and the Faraday cup. . . . .</i>	122
6.3	<i>Faraday cup current vs. deflection (mm) . . . . .</i>	123

## Abstract

In this work I report on the development of a Magneto Optic Trap (MOT) for metastable helium atoms ( $\text{He}^*$ ). The metastable helium atoms are produced in a discharge nozzle source and collimated, slowed and compressed to provide a slow bright beam for loading the trap. The trap confines approximately  $10^7$  atoms, has a diameter of about 3 mm and with temperature approximately 1 mK. The trap is used for intra-trap and electron-atom scattering experiments. The results from these two experiments are reported. The electron scattering experiment is unique and employs a  $\text{He}^*$  MOT for the first time, in combination with a new diagnostic technique (Phase Modulation Spectroscopy) to measure the trap loss. The results of these experiments have yielded the first total electron-metastable atom collision cross section measurements at intermediate (10-100 eV) electron energies.



*It is the mark of an instructed mind to rest satisfied with that degree of precision which the nature of the subject admits, and not to seek exactness where only an approximation of the truth is possible.*

**Aristotle**