

Cause and effect of point absorbers on test masses

> Mirror

- (A) > Point absorption on mirror surface causes thermal distortion of the surface and substra $\frac{g}{200}$
 - Many HOMs are induced on reflection
- ➢ FP cavity
- (B) > aLIGO arm is close to resonance of TEMnn n+m=7, and this mode is amplified in the cavity,
- (C) > HOM has long power tail and induces large RTL
 - Mirror coating aberration reduces HOM, and reduces excess RTL by PA
- ➤ aLIGO IFO, DRFPM
 - Large RTL reduces PRG
 - Curvature mismatch of fields from two arms reduces PRG









Fig.1 Modes of induced fields

Fig.2 Modes of resonating field in FP





PRG = CC(sum of arm losses

one or two point absorbers (RoC unaffected)





Effect of the phasemap non-uniformity on the loss by the point absorber





Effects of clipping loss and effective RoC change







Phasemap vs HOM&RTL in FP cavity





ווווו





Test mass phasemaps reduces excess RTL by PA





LIGO-G200(









Absorber location dependence first peak of LG(3,1) is at 2cm





PRG vs CD same sets as RTL vs PRG







PRG vs HOM same sets as RTL vs PRG



PRG vs HOM from arm 0.016 X (2cm) 0~50mW X (2cm), Y (2cm,P<0) 10~50mW</p> 0.014 --- X (2cm), Y (2cm) 10~50mW w/TM map - - X (2cm), Y (2cm,P<0) 10~50mW w/TM map 0.012 HOM fraction from X and Y arm 900'0 800'0 800'0 4 - - X (2cm), Y(-2cm) 10~50mW w/TM map X (0~5cm) 30mWexp(-2r²) X (2cm), Y (-4cm~4cm) 30mWexp(-2r²) X (2cm), Y (0,0~4cm) 30mWexp(-2r²) 0.004 0.002 0 10 15 45 50 5 20 25 30 35 40 55 PRG

LIGO-G200028

12



PRG vs 7th mode same sets as RTL vs PRG







RTL vs HG7 fraction same sets as RTL vs PRG





LIGO-G20(

Effect of the difference of clipping losses on ITM and ETM







dRTL = RTL - RTL0, RTL0 = RTL(without map and absorber) = 48ppm



