# Making a Dark box Light Tight. <br> Ramez Kaupak <br> <br> Suffolk County Community College 

 <br> <br> Suffolk County Community College}

Outside dimensions: ( $68 \frac{1}{4}$ " $\times 23 \frac{3}{4}$ " $\times 11 \frac{5}{16}$ ") Inner dimensions: ( 60 " $\times 16 \frac{1}{4}$ " $\times 6$ ")

Figure 1.1 a Dark Box


We designed and built a dark box, and improved the dark box by making it impermeable to light. Our goal was to make the box completely light tight. To test its light tightness a Hamamatsu H2431-50 PMT was placed in the box and its dark rate recorded with the room lights on and then off. If the box is completely light tight then we expect that the PMT dark rate would be the same with the box completely covered with a black tarp and lights off, as when left uncovered and room light on. The PMT "dark rate" or "noise" is due to the PMT's cathode emitting thermionic electrons; the PMT powered up at a high voltage has a strong electric field between its dynodes creating a large gain in the number of electrons off the anode. By counting PMT dark rate under different room lighting condition we were able to test the dark box.

The original lid was made of plywood which splits easily with screws, it was not light tight and thus replaced. A new cover was designed and built using $3 / 4 "$ thick Particleboard Panel board. The new lid is an unhinged "cap" whereas the old lid was hinged on one side; the previous lid had three standard type hinges which were replaced by 8 compression loaded latches placed around the box perimeter (three on each side, and one on each end). The new latches pull down the cap cover equally on all 4 sides creating tension between the insulating gasket placed between the cap and body of the box. On both long sides of the box latches were placed $3 / 4$ the way out from the center to pull the cap down with more pressure on each corner of the box.

We screwed in additional "liners" made of particle panel board around the perimeter of the body of the box as shown in Fig. 1.6 as a second light seal. The original foam gasket that had been installed is porous having micro holes (Fig. 1.7), it was replaced by D-profile self-stick weatherseal rubber gasket material. The new gasket was placed around the top perimeter of the box's body where it meets the cap on the inside. More gasket was placed in a $2^{\text {nd }}$ location between the wood cover liners and the lid (running along the body of the box on the sides).

After replacing the lid, hinges, gasket, and installing the additional wood liners and gasket, DYNAFLEX 230 black silicon was used to fill in all corners, gaps on the inside and outside of the box. The box was measured to be $92 \%$ light tight. The leaks were found to be through the bulkhead connector panel. DYNAFLEX 230 black silicon was used to fill around all SHV and BNC connector interfaces through the metal bulkhead panel, and the unused bulkhead connectors were covered after the box was measured to be $99.6 \%$ light tight.

## List of improvements made:

1) Areas around screws filled with silicone.
2) Lid replaced with more solid wood, 3 hinges replaced with 8 compression loaded latches. Porous gasket replaced with non-porous foam rubber gasket.
3) Bulkhead panel connectors and metal plate interfaces sealed with black silicone inside and outside.
4) Unused bulkhead connectors covered.

| Lights on |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Voltage (V) | 2011 |  | 2109 |  | 2207 |  | 2305 |  | 2403 |  | 2501 |  |
| Trial | Count | Rate | Count | Rate | Count | Rate | Count | Rate | Count | Rate | Count | Rate |
| 1 | 2456 | 296 | 3780 | 455 | 4899 | 590 | 6437 | 776 | 10313 | 1243 | 16057 | 1935 |
| 2 | 2324 | 280 | 3718 | 448 | 4894 | 590 | 6644 | 800 | 10381 | 1251 | 15755 | 1898 |
| 3 | 2346 | 283 | 3627 | 437 | 5021 | 605 | 6722 | 810 | 10602 | 1277 | 15191 | 1830 |
| 4 | 2266 | 273 | 3731 | 450 | 4854 | 585 | 7093 | 855 | 10162 | 1224 | 15840 | 1908 |
| 5 | 2325 | 280 | 3725 | 449 | 5040 | 607 | 6799 | 819 | 10866 | 1309 | 15899 | 1916 |
| 6 | 2369 | 285 | 3784 | 456 | 5018 | 605 | 7156 | 862 | 10246 | 1234 | 16342 | 1969 |
| Average | 2348 | 283 | 3728 | 449 | 4954 | 597 | 6809 | 820 | 10428 | 1256 | 15847 | 1909 |


| Lights off |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Voltage (V) | 2011 |  | 2109 |  | 2207 |  | 2305 |  | 2403 |  | 2501 |  |
| Trial | Count | Rate | Count | Rate | Count | Rate | Count | Rate | Count | Rate | Count | Rate |
| 1 | 2308 | 278 | 3853 | 464 | 5216 | 628 | 6741 | 812 | 10808 | 1302 | 15206 | 1832 |
| 2 | 2292 | 276 | 3777 | 455 | 5338 | 643 | 6749 | 813 | 10503 | 1265 | 16523 | 1991 |
| 3 | 2335 | 281 | 3703 | 446 | 5099 | 614 | 6439 | 776 | 10292 | 1240 | 16183 | 1950 |
| 4 | 2480 | 299 | 3832 | 462 | 4983 | 600 | 6557 | 790 | 10208 | 1230 | 16520 | 1990 |
| 5 | 2487 | 300 | 3822 | 460 | 4967 | 598 | 6764 | 815 | 10892 | 1312 | 16190 | 1951 |
| 6 | 2436 | 293 | 3742 | 451 | 4987 | 601 | 6700 | 807 | 10810 | 1302 | 15930 | 1919 |
| Average | 2390 | 288 | 3788 | 456 | 5098 | 614 | 6658 | 802 | 10586 | 1275 | 16092 | 1939 |

Figure 1.2 Final test Data Tables.

Figure 1.3 Data table Before improvement of the metal plate.

|  | uncovered lights <br> off | uncovered lights on | covered lights on | covered lights off |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 7328 | 7569 | 7126 | 6963 |
| Voltage | 7449 | 7640 | 7286 | 6927 |
| $=2207(\mathrm{~V})$ | 7356 | 7587 | 7043 | 7107 |
|  | 7208 | 7516 | 7227 | 6975 |
|  | 7195 | 7544 | 7031 | 6969 |
|  | 7216 | 7686 | 7014 | 7182 |
| Average counts | 7292 | 7590 | 7121 | 7021 |

$\%$ error $=\left|\frac{(\# \text { uncovered,lights on }-\# \text { covered, lights off })}{\# \text { covered,lights off }}\right| * 100 \%=8 \%$

The bar chart below shows the results after improving the bulkhead panel; the number of counts with lights off is now higher than with lights on, a difference which is expected to be fluctuations in the photomultiplier tube dark rate.


Figure 1.4 Counts "before and after" graph.

## NIM bin setup used:

Power supply (BNL 106900)
Visual scaler (BNL-52935)
Sixteen channel amplifier (model 776) - (BNL 13175) - Set to 10x amplification.
Six channel discriminator (model 711) - (BNL 5052) - Set to 30(mV) threshold.
Quad gate/delay generator (model 794) - (BNL 20992) - Set to 8.3(s) delay.
Multimeter: Fluke 8022B (QCC- PHY 4713)


Figure 1.5 NIM bin setup.

Figure 1.6 Power supply testing.

| Tested Values |  |  | Expected values |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rotation | Voltage(V) | Error(V) | Rotation | Voltage(V) | Error(V) | Rotation | Voltage(V) | Error(V) |
| 0.1 | 50 | 1 | 2.1 | 1031 | 4 | 4.1 | 2011 | 6 |
| 0.2 | 100 | 1 | 2.2 | 1080 | 4 | 4.2 | 2060 | 6 |
| 0.3 | 149 | 1 | 2.3 | 1129 | 4 | 4.3 | 2109 | 6 |
| 0.4 | 199 | 1 | 2.4 | 1178 | 4 | 4.4 | 2158 | 6 |
| 0.5 | 248 | 2 | 2.5 | 1227 | 4 | 4.5 | 2207 | 7 |
| 0.6 | 297 | 2 | 2.6 | 1276 | 4 | 4.6 | 2256 | 7 |
| 0.7 | 346 | 2 | 2.7 | 1325 | 4 | 4.7 | 2305 | 7 |
| 0.8 | 392 | 2 | 2.8 | 1374 | 4 | 4.8 | 2354 | 7 |
| 0.9 | 443 | 2 | 2.9 | 1423 | 5 | 4.9 | 2403 | 7 |
| 1.0 | 491 | 2 | 3.0 | 1472 | 5 | 5.0 | 2452 | 7 |
| 1.1 | 540 | 2 | 3.1 | 1521 | 5 | 5.1 | 2501 | 7 |
| 1.2 | 588 | 2 | 3.2 | 1570 | 5 | 5.2 | 2550 | 7 |
| 1.3 | 640 | 3 | 3.3 | 1619 | 5 | 5.3 | 2599 | 7 |
| 1.4 | 690 | 3 | 3.4 | 1668 | 5 | 5.4 | 2648 | 8 |
| 1.5 | 738 | 3 | 3.5 | 1717 | 5 | 5.5 | 2697 | 8 |
| 1.6 | 788 | 3 | 3.6 | 1766 | 5 | 5.6 | 2746 | 8 |
| 1.7 | 835 | 3 | 3.7 | 1815 | 6 | 5.7 | 2795 | 8 |
| 1.8 | 883 | 3 | 3.8 | 1864 | 6 | 5.8 | 2844 | 8 |
| 1.9 | 932 | 3 | 3.9 | 1913 | 6 | 5.9 | 2893 | 8 |
| 2.0 | 982 | 3 | 4.0 | 1962 | 6 | 6.0 | 2942 | 8 |

Voltage output vs Rotation graph for (BNL 106900) Power supply.


Table 1-2. 8022B Specifications
The following specifications assume a 2 -year calibration cycle and an operating temperature of $18^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ to $28^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\left(64^{\circ} \mathrm{F}\right.$ to $\left.82^{\circ} \mathrm{F}\right)$ at a relative humidity up to $90 \%$, unless otherwise noted.
FUNCTIONS
DC Volts, AC Volts, DC Current, Resistance
DC VOLTS

| RANGE | RESOLUTION | ACCURACY FOR 2 YEARS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| $\pm 200 \mathrm{mV}$ | $100 \mu \mathrm{~V}$ |  |
| $\pm 2 \mathrm{~V}$ | 1 mV |  |
| $\pm 20 \mathrm{~V}$ | 10 mV | $\pm(.25 \%$ of reading + 1 digit $)$ |
| $\pm 200 \mathrm{~V}$ | 100 mV |  |
| $\pm 1000 \mathrm{~V}$ | 1 V |  |

1-2

Figure 1.7 Gate time testing.

Quad gate/delay generator (model 794) - (BNL 20992) Timer test


| Time(s) |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 8.44 | 8.34 |
| 8.31 | 8.18 |
| 8.35 | 7.97 |
| 8.30 | 8.21 |
| 8.38 | 8.28 |
| 8.35 | 8.24 |
| 8.38 | 8.25 |
| 8.35 | 8.28 |
| 8.40 | 8.20 |
| 8.40 | 8.25 |
| 8.37 | 8.30 |
| 8.31 | 8.35 |
| $\pm 0.21(\mathrm{~s})$ |  |
| $\mathrm{T}=8.3 \pm 0.21(\mathrm{~s})$ |  |



Figure 1.8 Types of Gaskets.


New rubber gasket.


Unsealed joints.


New rubbery to old foamy gasket comparison.


[^0]Figure 1.9 A Box before improvement.


Open connectors and unsealed connector plate.


Before.


Covered connecters and sealed connector plate.


After.

Figure 2.0 Before and after examples.


Figure 2.1 Final test graph.

Errors: The standard deviation estimates the uncertainty in our measurements of Counts, caused by random errors such as inconsistency of "dark rate" of PMT, uncertainty of scalar and equipment). According to Mechanics lab manual of the SCCC physics department edited by Robert L. Warasila the measurement uncertainties have a $68 \%$ probability of being within $\sigma$ of the average value. Calculating uncertainty of time for Quad gate/delay generator we sum uncertainty based on the measuring instrument division $\pm 0.01$ (s). The average reaction time for humans according to google search is 0.25 seconds to a visual stimulus, 0.17 for an audio stimulus, and 0.20 seconds for a touch stimulus. So, total uncertainty of time is equal to $\pm 0.21$ (s). To examine the propagation of error for Rate we must use propagation formula to take into count time and count errors.

## The standard deviation formula:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \sigma=\sqrt{\frac{1}{N} \sum\left(x_{i}-X_{a v e}\right)^{2}} \\
& \text { average or mean } \sigma_{\text {ave }}=\frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{N}}
\end{aligned}
$$

## Rate Error propagation:

$$
R=\frac{C}{T}=\frac{\text { Counts }}{\text { Time }}
$$

,Where $(\mathrm{T}=\mathrm{t} \pm$ ठt and $\mathrm{C}=\mathrm{c} \pm \sigma$.)

$$
ð R=R \sqrt{\left(\frac{\partial t}{T}\right)^{2}+\left(\frac{\sigma}{C}\right)^{2}}
$$

Figure 2.2 Error and uncertainty tables.

| Error table (lights on) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Voltage (V) | Counts | Counts error | Time(s) | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Time } \\ \text { error(s) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Rate(Hz) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Rate } \\ \text { error }(\mathrm{Hz}) \end{gathered}$ | Rate error Percentage |
| $2011 \pm 6$ <br> Average: | $\begin{aligned} & 2456 \\ & 2324 \\ & 2346 \\ & 2266 \\ & 2325 \\ & 2369 \\ & 2348 \\ & \hline \hline \end{aligned}$ | 24 | 8.3 | 0.21 | 283.0 | 7.7 | 2.7\% |
| $2109 \pm 6$ <br> Average: | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 3780 \\ & 3718 \\ & 3627 \\ & 3731 \\ & 3725 \\ & 3784 \\ & 3728 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 21 | 8.3 | 0.21 | 449.1 | 11.6 | 2.6\% |
| $2207 \pm 7$ <br> Average: | 4899 <br> 4894 <br> 5021 <br> 4854 <br> 5040 <br> 5018 <br> 4954 | 30 | 8.3 | 0.21 | 596.9 | 15.5 | 2.6\% |
| $2305 \pm 7$ <br> Average: | 6437 6644 6722 7093 6799 7156 6809 | 102 | 8.3 | 0.21 | 820.3 | 24.5 | 3.0\% |
| $2403 \pm 7$ <br> Average: | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \hline 10313 \\ & 10381 \\ & 10602 \\ & 10162 \\ & 10866 \\ & 10246 \\ & 10428 \end{aligned}$ | 97 | 8.3 | 0.21 | 1256.4 | 33.9 | 2.7\% |
| $2501 \pm 7$ <br> Average: | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \hline 16057 \\ & 15755 \\ & 15191 \\ & 15840 \\ & 15899 \\ & 16342 \\ & 15847 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 142 | 8.3 | 0.21 | 1909.3 | 51.2 | 2.7\% |


| Error table (lights off) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Voltage(V) | Counts | Counts error | Time(s) | Time error(s) | Rate(Hz) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Rate } \\ \text { error }(\mathrm{Hz}) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { error } \\ \text { Percentage } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| $2011 \pm 6$ <br> Average: | $\begin{aligned} & 2308 \\ & 2292 \\ & 2335 \\ & 2480 \\ & 2487 \\ & 2436 \\ & 2390 \\ & \hline \hline \end{aligned}$ | 33 | 8.3 | 0.21 | 288.0 | 8.4 | 2.9\% |
| $2109 \pm 6$ <br> Average: | 3853 3777 3703 3832 3822 3742 3788 | 22 | 8.3 | 0.21 | 456.4 | 11.8 | 2.6\% |
| $2207 \pm 7$ <br> Average: | 5216 5338 5099 4983 4967 4987 5098 | 56 | 8.3 | 0.21 | 614.3 | 16.9 | 2.8\% |
| $2305 \pm 7$ <br> Average: | 6741 6749 6439 6557 6764 6700 6658 | 49 | 8.3 | 0.21 | 802.2 | 21.1 | 2.6\% |
| $2403 \pm 7$ <br> Average: | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \hline 10808 \\ & 10503 \\ & 10292 \\ & 10208 \\ & 10892 \\ & 10810 \\ & 10586 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 109 | 8.3 | 0.21 | 1275.4 | 34.7 | 2.7\% |
| $2501 \pm 7$ <br> Average: | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 15206 \\ & 16523 \\ & 16183 \\ & 16520 \\ & 16190 \\ & 15930 \\ & 16092 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 182 | 8.3 | 0.21 | 1938.8 | 54.3 | 2.8\% |



Figure 2.3 Testing set up. Schematic drawing.

Figure 2.4 Test of the same
Photomultiplier tube in different dark box.

Data recorded by group in summer
2017.


Data recorded in fall 2017.

PMT58 AA720 Dark count in $8.3 \pm 0.21(\mathrm{~s}), 10 \mathrm{x}$ amplification, -30 mV discrimination,

| Voltage(V) | Rate(Hz) | Error(Hz) | Error(percent) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2011 \pm 6$ | 288 | 8 | $2.9 \%$ |
| $2109 \pm 6$ | 456 | 12 | $2.6 \%$ |
| $2207 \pm 7$ | 614 | 17 | $2.8 \%$ |
| $2305 \pm 7$ | 802 | 21 | $2.6 \%$ |
| $2403 \pm 7$ | 1275 | 35 | $2.7 \%$ |
| $2501 \pm 7$ | 1939 | 54 | $2.8 \%$ |



Sealed joints.



Figure 2.5 A Dark box Inside.


[^0]:    Poor gasket choice has micro holes in it.

