JGW-T1910142

Apr 23, 2019

### Noise and range calculations for using High Power Coil Driver for the test mass stage of cryopayload

#### Yuta Michimura

Department of Physics, University of Tokyo

# Motivations

- Nominal actuator parameters were set to meet the noise requirement for final bKAGRA
  Y. Michimura+, <u>CQG 34, 225001 (2017)</u>
- We want higher power actuation for the early phase of commissioning to ease the lock acquisition
- Noise requirements can be relaxed for O3
- How about using High Power Coil Driver for the test mass stage of the cryopayload (at least for one of the ETMs)?
- \* NB model used for the calculation lives in <a href="https://granite.phys.s.u-tokyo.ac.jp/svn/LCGT/trunk/kagranoisebudget/Suspensions">https://granite.phys.s.u-tokyo.ac.jp/svn/LCGT/trunk/kagranoisebudget/Suspensions</a>
- \* See, also JGWwiki/KAGRA/Subgroups/VIS/ActuatorDesign

# **Actuation Range and Noise**

- High Power Coil Driver gives x100 range and noise
- High Power Coil Driver can output 0.12 A to coils
- Maximum current we can apply to cryopayload coils is ~100mA (according to Ushiba and Miyamoto)
- Using High Power for TM seems fine

	Coil Driver	Max force [N]	Efficiency at DC [m/V]	Sum of noises at 10 Hz [m/rtHz]
Test Mass	Low power	7.7e-6	1.8e-9	1.0e-19
	High power	7.4e-4	1.7e-7	9.8e-18
Intermediat e mass	Modified low	1.5e-4	1.7e-8	4.4e-20
Marionette	Modified low	8.2e-3	3.9e-7	3.6e-20 3

## **Actuator Noise**

- Actuator noise of 9.8e-18 m/rtHz @ 10 Hz correspond to 3.2e-21 /rtHz @ 10 Hz in strain, which is roughly aLIGO O1 excess noise x 12
- Within the range of O3 goal (see <u>JGW-T1809078</u>), but maybe not a good idea to use High Power for both ETMs Nominal Case
  High Power TM Case

