coefficients of mixture have been calculated by WinXCom program.

Table 3 shows the experimental $(\mu_m)_{ex}$ and theoretical $(\mu_m)_{th}$ values of the mass attenuation coefficients for YSO:Ce and LYSO:Ce crystals at 662 keV γ-rays. The agreement between experiment and theory is within the experimental uncertainty.

Table 3: Total mass attenuation coefficient (cm^2/g) at 662 keV gamma rays for YSO:Ce and LYSO:Ce crystals.

Crystal	$(\mu_m)_{ex}$	$(\mu_m)_{th}$	RD(%)
YSO:Ce	7.46×10^{-2}	7.45×10^{-2}	0.13
LYSO:Ce	9.27×10^{-2}	8.92×10^{-2}	3.92

Conclusions

In spite of a much higher light yield, the energy resolution of LYSO:Ce is slightly superior than that of YSO:Ce. The main reason is due to a high contribution of intrinsic resolution, reflected by a large non-propportionality in the light yield, which seems to be a common feature in all silicate based scintillators. Moreover, inhomogeneities of Ce-doped and some defects in the crystals could affect the energy resolution, and the crystalline quality of these samples could be further improved. The experimental results of total mass attenuation coefficients are in good agreement with the theoretical values, calculated by WinXCom.

In conclusion, the main advantages of LYSO:Ce are high light yield, high density and photofraction which make it very promising scintillator for γ-ray detection and PET medical imaging.

Acknowledgments

References

1. C. W. E. van Eijk, "Inorganic-scintillator development", Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res. A **460** (2001), 1.
2. C.L. Melcher, "Perspectives on the future development of new scintillators", Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res. A **537** (2005), 6.
3. M. Nikl, " Scintillation detectors for x-rays", Meas. Sci. Technol. **17** (2006), R37.
4. P. Lecoq, A. Annenkov, A. Gektin, M. Korzhik and C. Pedrini, "Inorganic Scintillators for Detector Systems", The Netherlands, Springer (2006).
5. C. L. Melcher and J. S. Schweitzer, "Cerium-doped lutetium oxyorthosilicate: a fast, efficient new scintillator", IEEE Trans. Nucl. Sci. **39** (1992), 502.
6. D. W. Cooke, K. J. McClellan, B. L. Bennett, J.M. Roper, M. T. Whittaker and R. E. Muenchausen, "Crystal growth and optical characterization of cerium-doped $Lu_{1.8}Y_{0.2}SiO_5$", J. Appl. Phys. **88** (2000), 7360.
7. M. Kapusta, P. Szupryczynski, C. L. Melcher, M. Moszynski, M. Balcerzyk, A.A. Carey, W. Czarnicki, M. A. Spurrier and A. Syntfeld, " Nonproportionality and thermoluminescence of LSO:Ce", IEEE Trans. Nucl. Sci. **52** (2005), 1098.
8. Z. Guzik, S. Borsuk, K. Traczyk and M. Plominski, "Enhanced 8k pulse height analyzer and multichannel scaler (TUKAN) with PCI or USB interfaces", IEEE Trans. Nucl. Sci. **53** (2006), 231.
9. M. Bertolaccini, S. Cova and C. Bussolatti, "A technique for absolute measurement of the effective photoelectron per keV yield in scintillation counters", in Proc. Nuclear Electronics Symp., Versailles, France (1968).
10. M. Moszynski, M. Kapusta, M. Mayhugh, D. Wolski and S.O. Flyckt, "Absolute light output of scintillators", IEEE Trans. Nucl. Sci. **44** (1997), 1052.
11. J. Kaewkhao, J. Laopaiboon and W. Chewpraditkul, "Determiation of effective atomic numbers and effective electron densities for Cu/Zn alloy", JQSRT **109** (2007), 1260.
12. H. Suzuki, T. A Tombrello, C. L. Melcher and J. S. Schweitzer, "Light emission mechanism of $Lu_2(SiO_4)O:Ce$", IEEE Trans. Nucl. Sci. **40** (1993), 380.
13. C. M. Pepin, P. Berard, A. L. Perrot, C. Pepin, D. Houde, R. Lecomte, C. L. Melcher and H. Dautet, "Properties of LYSO and recent LSO scintillators for phoswich PET detectors", IEEE Trans. Nucl. Sci. **51** (2004), 789.
14. M. Balcerzyk, M. Moszynski, M. Kapusta, D. Wolski, J. Pawelke and C.L. Melcher, "YSO, LSO, GSO and LGSO. A study of energy resolution and nonproportionality", IEEE Trans. Nucl. Sci. **47** (2000), 1319.
15. L. Pidol, A. Kahn-Harari, B. Viana, E. Virey, B. Ferrand, P. Dorenbos, J. T. M. de Hass and C. W. E. van Eijk, "High efficiency of lutetium silicate scintillators, Ce-doped LPS, and LYSO crystals", IEEE Trans. Nucl. Sci. **51** (2004), 1084.
16. P. Dorenbos, J. T. M. de Haas and C. W. E. van Eijk, "Non-proportionality in the scintillation response and the energy resolution obtainable with scintillation crystals", IEEE Trans. Nucl. Sci. **42** (1995), 2190.
17. M. Moszynski, J. Zalipska, M. Balcerzyk, M. Kapusta, W. Mengeshe and J.D. Valentine, "Intrinsic energy resolution of NaI(Tl)", Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res. A **484** (2002), 259.
18. L. Gerward, N. Guilbert, K. B. Jensen and H. Levring, "WinXCom – a program for calculating X-ray attenuation coefficients", Rad. Phys. Chem. **71** (2004), 653.

Nuclear Physics,Radiation Physics, Radiation-Matter Interaction, Spectroscopies, Radioactivity, Radiation Protection and Safety Issues

< SCI - 317 >

(35)

Proceedings of the 6th Annual Conference of the Thai Physics Society
SPC2011. Pattaya, Chonburi, Thailand. March 23-26, 2011

Scintillation Properties of Ce-Doped LYSO and YSO Crystals

C. Wanarak[1*], W. Chewpraditkul[1], A. Phunpueok[1], and J. Kaewkhao[2]

[1]Department of Physics, King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi,
126 Pracha-uthit Rd., Thungkru District, Bangkok, 10140, Thailand
[2]The Center of Excellence in Glass Technology and Materials Science (CEGM),
Nakhon Pathom Rajabhat University, Nakorn Pathom, 73000, Thailand
*Corresponding author. E-mail: 52500406@st.kmutt.ac.th

Abstract

The gamma-ray detection properties of the new cerium-doped rare-earth scintillator lutetium-yttrium oxyorthosilicate ($Lu_{1.95}Y_{0.05}SiO_5$:Ce, LYSO:Ce) were investigated and compared to those of cerium-doped yttrium oxyorthosilicate (Y_2SiO_5:Ce, YSO:Ce) crystal. The light yield and energy resolution were measured using photomultiplier tube (PMT) readout. The non-proportionality of the light yield and energy resolution versus γ-ray energy were measured and the intrinsic resolution of the crystals was calculated. The mass attenuation coefficient of LYSO:Ce and YSO:Ce for 662 keV gamma rays was also measured by transmission method and compared with the theoretical values calculated by WinXCom program.

Keywords: Energy resolution, LYSO:Ce, Non-proportionality of the light yield, Scintillation crystals, YSO:Ce

Introduction

Inorganic scintillators play a major role in many fields of radiation detection, including medical imaging, astrophysics, high energy physics and exploring resources like oil. The last decade has seen the introduction of several new high luminosity scintillators, in particular Ce-doped complex oxide crystals, that are promising candidates for these applications [1- 4].

Lu_2SiO_5:Ce (LSO:Ce) [5] and $(Lu,Y)_2SiO_5$:Ce (LYSO:Ce) [6] have been developed as promising scintillators for positron emission tomography (PET) due to their desirable properties such as high density, fast decay time and high light output. Both crystals have the same emission spectra peaking at 420 nm and exhibit the highest light yield up to ~ 30,000 ph/MeV [6,7].

In this paper, we present the luminescence and gamma-ray detection properties of LYSO:Ce crystal, and compare to those of YSO:Ce crystal. The photoelectron yield, energy resolution as a function of γ-ray energy and the non-proportional response were measured, and the intrinsic resolution of the both crystals was calculated. The estimated photofraction for both samples at 662 keV gamma peak will also be discussed. The mass attenuation coefficient of LYSO:Ce and YSO:Ce for 662 keV gamma rays was also measured by transmission method and compared with the theoretical values calculated by WinXCom program.

Materials and Methods

The LYSO:Ce crystal with size of $10\times10\times2$ mm^3 was supplied by Photonic Materials. The YSO:Ce crystal with size of $10\times10\times5$ mm^3 was supplied by CTI. According to the manufacturer, the nominal cerium doped level is 0.2% for YSO:Ce sample and less than 1% for LYSO:Ce sample. The yttrium fraction in LYSO:Ce is about 2.5%.

Gamma-ray spectroscopy measurements

Photoelectron yield and energy resolution were measured by coupling the crystals to a Photonis XP5200B PMT using silicone grease. In order to maximize light collection, the crystals were wrapped in a reflective, white Teflon tape on all sides (except the one coupled to the PMT). The signal from the PMT anode was passed to a CANBERRA 2005 preamplifier and was sent to a Tennelec TC243 spectroscopy amplifier. The measurements were carried out with 4 μs shaping time constant in the amplifier. The PC-based multichannel analyzer (MCA), Tukan 8k [8] was used to record energy spectra. Gaussian functions were fitted to full energy peaks using procedures in the analyzer to determine their positions and FWHMs. It included also the analysis of complex double peaks, characteristic of K X-rays and those exhibiting an escape peak.

The photoelectron yield, expressed as a number of photoelectrons per MeV (phe/MeV) for each γ-peak, was measured by Bertolaccini method [9,10]. In this method the number of photoelectrons is measured

Figure 1 Energy spectra of 662 keV γ - rays from a ^{137}Cs source measured with LYSO:Ce, and YSO:Ce crystals.

by comparing the position of a full energy peak of γ-rays detected in the crystals with that of the single photoelectron peak from the photocathode, which determines the gain of PMT.

The total mass attenuation coefficients were determined by measuring the transmission of 662 keV gamma rays through studied crystals of known thickness. A narrow-beam setup in transmission geometry was used in this experiment, for more details see [11].

Results and Discussion

Energy Spectra and Light Yield

Figure 1 presents a comparison of the energy spectra for 662 keV γ-rays from a ^{137}Cs source measured with LYSO:Ce and YSO:Ce crystals. The energy resolution of 8.2% obtained with LYSO:Ce is better than that of 9.2% obtained with YSO:Ce. Note a higher photofraction in the spectrum measured with LYSO:Ce, as would be expected due to a higher effective atomic number and density of the LYSO:Ce crystal.

The number of photoelectrons produced by the studied crystals in the XP5200B PMT was determined by relating the position of the full energy peak of 662 keV γ-rays to the position of the single photoelectron peak. Table 1 summarizes comparative measurements of photoelectron yield, light yield and energy resolution at 662 keV γ-rays for the studied crystals coupled to the XP5200B PMT, as measured at 4 μs shaping time constant in the spectroscopy amplifier. The number of photoelectrons measured for both crystals was recalculated to the number of photons

assuming the quantum efficiency of 27% for the XP5200B PMT at the peak emission 420 nm for both crystals.

Note a significantly lower light yield of 16,100 ph/MeV for the studied YSO:Ce crystal, by about 30% compared with a small sample ($3\times3\times20$ mm^3) in Ref [14]. The studied LYSO:Ce showed the light yield of 39,900 ph/MeV. This value is slightly higher than the value of 34,100 ph/MeV measured with 1 cm^3 sample in Ref [15]. Interestingly, despite a much higher light output (a factor of 2.5), LYSO:Ce shows little gain in energy resolution compared with YSO:Ce. It suggested looking at the non-proportionality of the light yield versus γ-ray energy.

Table 1: Photoelectron yield, light yield and energy resolution at 662 keV γ-rays for the studied crystals as measured with the XP5200B PMT.

Crystal	Photoelec-tron yield [phe/MeV]	Light yield [ph/MeV]	Energy resolution [%]
LYSO:Ce	10,780	39,900	8.2
YSO:Ce	4,340	16,100	9.2

Non-proportionality of the Light Yield

Light yield non-proportionality as a function of energy is one of the most important reasons for degradation in energy resolution of established scintillators [16]. The non-proportionality is defined here as the ratio of photoelectron yield measured at specific γ-ray energies relative to the photoelectron yield at the 662 keV γ-peak.

Figure 2 presents the non-proportionality characteristics of YSO:Ce and LYSO:Ce crystals. Both crystals exhibit comparable non-proportional scintillation response curves, which is about 35% over the energy range from 1274.5 keV down to 22 keV. It appears so far, that all silicate scintillators (LSO, YSO, GSO or LGSO) exhibit large non-proportionality in the light yield [7, 13-15].


Figure 2 Non-proportionality of the light yield as a function of γ-ray energy, measured with LYSO:Ce and YSO:Ce crystals. Error bars are within the size of the points.

Nuclear Physics,Radiation Physics, Radiation-Matter Interaction, Spectroscopies, Radioactivity, Radiation Protection and Safety Issues

Figure 3 Total energy resolution of LYSO:Ce and YSO:Ce crystals versus energy of γ-rays.

The non-proportionality characteristics of the studied crystals should be reflected in their intrinsic resolutions, as it is known that the non-proportionality in the light yield is a fundamental limitation to the intrinsic energy resolution [16,17].

Energy Resolution

The energy resolution ($\Delta E/E$) of a full energy peak measured with a scintillator coupled to a PMT can be written as [17]

$$(\Delta E/E)^2 = (\delta_{sc})^2 + (\delta_p)^2 + (\delta_{st})^2, \quad (1)$$

where δ_{sc} is the intrinsic resolution of the crystal, δ_p is the transfer resolution and δ_{st} is the statistical contribution of PMT to the resolution. The statistical uncertainty of the signal from the PMT can be described as

$$\delta_{st} = 2.355 \times 1/N^{1/2} \times (1 + \varepsilon)^{1/2}, \quad (2)$$

where N is the number of the photoelectrons and ε is the variance of the electron multiplier gain, equal to 0.1 for an XP5200B PMT.

The transfer component depends on the quality of optical coupling of the crystal and PMT, homogeneity of quantum efficiency of the photocathode and efficiency of photoelectron collection at the first dynode. The transfer component is negligible compared to the other components of the energy resolution, particularly in the dedicated experiments [17].

The intrinsic resolution of a crystal is mainly associated with the non-proportional response of the scintillator [16,17]. Overall energy resolution and PMT resolution can be determined experimentally. If δ_p is negligible, intrinsic resolution δ_{sc} of a crystal can be written as follows

$$(\delta_{sc})^2 = (\Delta E/E)^2 - (\delta_{st})^2. \quad (3)$$

Figure 3 presents the measured energy resolution versus energy of γ-rays for LYSO:Ce and YSO:Ce crystals over the whole energy range from 22 to 1274.5 keV.


Figure 4 Intrinsic resolution of LYSO:Ce and YSO:Ce crystals versus energy of γ-rays.

Figure 4 presents a direct comparison of the intrinsic resolution for the studied crystals. Both crystals exhibit a comparable intrinsic resolution, reflected by a common non- proportionality of the light yield (see Figure 2).

To better understand the energy resolution of the studied crystals in γ-ray spectrometry, the contribution of various components to the overall energy resolution were analyzed for 662 keV photopeak, and the results are presented in Table 2. The second column gives N, the number of photoelectrons produced in the PMT. The third column gives $\Delta E/E$, the overall energy resolution at 662 keV photopeak. The PMT contribution (δ_{st}) was calculated using Eq.(2). From the values of $\Delta E/E$ and δ_{st}, the intrinsic resolution (δ_{sc}) was calculated using Eq.(3). The photoelectron yield of LYSO:Ce is almost a factor of two higher than that of YSO:Ce. However, there is a little progress in energy resolution, as this is reflected in a large contribution of intrinsic resolution to the overall energy resolution for both studied crystals.

Table 2: Analysis of the 662 keV energy resolution for LYSO:Ce and YSO:Ce crystals.

Detector	N [electrons]	$\Delta E/E$ [%]	δ_{st} [%]	δ_{sc} [%]
YSO:Ce	2,870	9.2	4.8	7.9
LYSO:Ce	7,140	8.2	3.1	7.6

Total Mass Attenuation Coefficient

A parallel beam of monoenergetic γ-rays is attenuated in absorber according to the Lambert-Beer law.

$$I = I_o \exp(-\mu_m \rho t), \quad (4)$$

where I_o and I are incident and transmitted intensities of gamma rays, respectively, μ_m is the mass attenuation coefficient, ρ is the density of the absorber, and t is the thickness of the absorber. The product $\mu_m \rho$ is called the linear attenuation coefficient. Theoretical values of the mass attenuation