

Health Physics Journal

Preliminary Thermoluminescent Dosimeter Glow Curve Analysis with Automated Glow Peak Identification for LiF:Mg,Ti --Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	HPJ-D-21-00003R1
Full Title:	Preliminary Thermoluminescent Dosimeter Glow Curve Analysis with Automated Glow Peak Identification for LiF:Mg,Ti
Article Type:	Paper
Section/Category:	Health Physics Journal
Corresponding Author:	Kimberlee J. Kearfott, ScD University of Michigan Ann Arbor, MI UNITED STATES
Corresponding Author Secondary Information:	
Corresponding Author's Institution:	University of Michigan
Corresponding Author's Secondary Institution:	
First Author:	Jack H Thiesen
First Author Secondary Information:	
Order of Authors:	Jack H Thiesen Jeremy M Hepker, BS Wenjin Yu Keegan D Pombier, BS Kimberlee J. Kearfott, ScD
Order of Authors Secondary Information:	
Abstract:	When appropriately analyzed, thermoluminescent dosimeter glow curve analysis allows for improved quantification of thermoluminescent material behavior while flagging abnormalities. The mathematical separation of a glow curve into contributions from energetically unique trap states, or glow curve analysis, may be utilized to remove undesired effects of signal fading for complex materials. A generalized glow curve analysis software for the separation of glow curves is presented in this paper. Written in C++, the software uses the first-order kinetics model with automatic peak identification. The automatic identification of peaks is achieved through a unique peak-finding algorithm. The program was performance tested using experimental glow curve data from LiF:Mg,Ti, and comparative results are presented.
Suggested Reviewers:	John Harvey, PhD Chief Medical and Health Physicist, The University of Western Australia Department of Physics harveyja@gmail.com Mohammed Farukhi, PhD CEO, Rexon TLD Systems and Components farukhi@rexon.com Mohammed Rafique, PhD Professor, University of Azad Jammu and Kashmir mrafique@gmail.com Robert Gunter, MS CEO, : Chpolansky rjgunter@chpconsultants.com Runs dosimetry business. Potential user of code described.

**Preliminary Thermoluminescent Dosimeter Glow Curve Analysis with Automated Glow
Peak Identification for LiF:Mg,Ti**

Jack H. Thiesen, Jeremy M. Hepker, Wenjin Yu, Keegan D. Pombier, Kimberlee J. Kearfott

Corresponding author: Kimberlee J. Kearfott, Department of Nuclear Engineering and
Radiological Sciences, University of Michigan, 2355 Bonisteel Boulevard, Ann Arbor, Michigan
48109-2104 USA

e-mail: kearfott@umich.edu; Telephone: 1 (734) 763-9117; Fax: 1 (734) 763-4540

Conflicts of Interest and Sources of Funding: Funding was received from U.S. Department of Energy
National Nuclear Security Administration and from the University of Michigan Fastest Path to Zero
Initiative mini-grant and maker space programs.

Acknowledgements

This work was funded by the Department of Energy National Nuclear Security Administration
Consortium for Monitoring, Technology, and Verification award number DE-FOA-0001875. Additional
support was received from the University of Michigan Fastest Path to Zero Initiative mini-grant and
maker space programs, courtesy of Prof. Todd Allen. Mr. Jordan D. Noey supported laboratory
operations.

1
2
3
4 **Preliminary Thermoluminescent Dosimeter Glow Curve Analysis with Automated Glow**
5
6 **Peak Identification for LiF:Mg,Ti**
7
8
9

10
11 **ABSTRACT**
12

13
14 When appropriately analyzed, thermoluminescent dosimeter glow curve analysis allows for
15
16 improved quantification of thermoluminescent material behavior while flagging abnormalities.
17
18 The mathematical separation of a glow curve into contributions from energetically unique trap
19
20 states, or glow curve analysis, may be utilized to remove undesired effects of signal fading for
21
22 complex materials. A generalized glow curve analysis software for the separation of glow curves
23
24 is presented in this paper. Written in C++, the software uses the first-order kinetics model with
25
26 automatic peak identification. The automatic identification of peaks is achieved through a unique
27
28 peak-finding algorithm. The program was performance tested using experimental glow curve
29
30 data from LiF:Mg,Ti, and comparative results are presented.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 **Keywords:** dosimetry, first order kinetics, glow curve, Levenberg Marquardt
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

INTRODUCTION

Thermoluminescent dosimeters (TLDs) are broadly used for environmental and external personnel radiation dosimetry. The thermoluminescence (TL) properties of many materials are known. Analysis of the behavior of TL material benefits from the separation of individual glow curves of the emitted TL spectra called glow curve analysis (GCA). Glow curve analysis is also useful for quality control, neutron-gamma dosimetry, and surface dose estimation (Horowitz and Moscovitch 1986, Horowitz and Yossian 1995, Basun et al. 2003).

While the exact mathematical function of TL spectra is a subject of debate, many GCA programs have been written using the first-order kinetics model (Moscovitch et al. 1983, Lilley and McKeever 2000). The first-order kinetics model is often fit to experimental data using the Levenberg-Marquardt algorithm (LMA) (Kitis et al. 1998, Harvey et al. 2011). The earliest GCA codes were developed using programming languages, but more recent work employed mathematics parsing platforms such as MATLAB. Mathematics parsing platforms are difficult to integrate into portable embedded systems. Most importantly, the overwhelming majority of GCA programs require the manual input of initial peak fitting parameters. This approach is susceptible to convergence failures and errors, turning the process of creating accurate glow curves into more of an art form than a science.

This paper presents a new Glow Curve Analysis (GCA) software that automates the identification and fitting of individual glow peaks for TLD eliminating human intervention. The code is based on the first-order kinetics model because of its simplicity and universal application. The fitting is implemented using the Levenberg-Marquardt algorithm because of its stability. The program's performance on a variety of TLD input is presented. Additionally, the GCA software in this paper utilizes only C++ and its standard libraries, ensuring portability.

METHODS

Physics Methods

First-Order Kinetics Model: Models explaining the nature of TL glow curves have been developed with parameters determined using experimental data for many TLD materials. A first-order kinetics (FOK) model for TL glow curves is (Kitis et al. 1998):

$$I(T) = I_m \exp \left[1 + \frac{E}{kT} \frac{T - T_M}{T_M} - \frac{T^2}{T_m^2} \times \exp \left(\frac{E}{kT} \frac{T - T_M}{T_M} \right) (1 - \Delta) - \Delta_m \right]$$

Equation 1 – First Order Kinetics Model

where $I(T)$ is the peak intensity I at temperature T in K, I_m is the intensity at the peak maximum, E is the activation energy in eV, k is Boltzmann constant in eV K⁻¹, and T_m is the temperature at the peak maximum in K, Δ is $2kT(E)^{-1}$, and Δ_m is $2kT_m(E)^{-1}$.

Activation Energy: The activation energy, E , is approximated as (Chen 1969):

$$E = C_\tau \frac{kT_m^2}{\tau} - b (2kT_m)$$

Equation 2 – Activation Energy

where C_τ is $1.5 + (3 \times (m_g) - 0.42)$, b is $1.48 + (4.2 \times (m_g) - 0.42)$, m_g is $\frac{w_l}{w_r}$, where w_l and w_r are the half-width at the low temperature side of the peak and the half-width toward the fall-of the glow peak respectively, τ is $T_2 - T_1$. The first-order kinetics model parameters are shown explicitly in Figure 1.

Software Methods

Overview: The GCA software in this paper is written for C/C++17. (ISO Standard 2017) C++ was chosen for its quick processing speeds, cross-platform compatibility, and lightweight distribution. This software utilizes the Standard Template Library (STL). The software accepts a directory of comma-separated values (CSV) files as input. This is a popular format for TLD readers, and file conversion to CSV is easily achieved. The software consists of a five-stage

1
2
3
4 process: batch file handling, data noise reduction, automated peak detection, curve fitting, and
5
6 output. This process flow is visualized in Figure 2. Additionally, the software offers the user the
7
8 option to input initial peak values, which will override the automated peak detection portion of
9
10 the code.
11

12
13
14 *Time Complexity:* In this paper, the time complexity (sometimes called the “complexity”) of
15
16 various algorithms will be approximately given. The time complexity of an algorithm or program
17
18 is defined as how many operations are performed before completion, sometimes as a function of
19
20 the input. Thus, the time complexity is an effective method of measuring the speed of a function
21
22 or of a program as a whole (Cobham 1965).
23

24
25
26 *Batch File Handling:* The GCA software begins by requesting user input of a directory
27
28 containing the CSV input files. Using the C++17 Filesystem library, the software accesses the
29
30 number of CSV files present in the root directory recursively and prompts the user to confirm its
31
32 findings. The files are then opened one at a time, with raw data saved into the corresponding
33
34 vectors. The time complexity of the batch handling process implemented for this code is
35
36 determined by the number of files, n , and the number of lines in those files, m , a time complexity
37
38 of $O(n^m)$.
39

40
41
42
43 *Data Noise Reduction:* A preliminary analysis indicated that data containing large amounts of
44
45 noise or sudden spikes in the signal caused convergence failure. As a result, a number of
46
47 smoothing methods were explored and tested. The moving average smoothing algorithm was
48
49 chosen to smooth the data (Klopfenstein 1998). This average smoothing algorithm averages
50
51 values based on a variable number of neighbors. In this implementation, the five nearest
52
53 neighbors are used. One iteration of the average smoothing algorithm has a time complexity of
54
55 $O(n)$. Moving average algorithm is then run iteratively five times, making the complexity $O(n^5)$.
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 *Automated Peak Detection:* The most unique feature of this GCA software is the automatic
5
6 identification of glow peaks and their associated fitting parameters. Historically, this has been
7
8 the step in GCA software, which requires the most human attention requiring the researcher to
9
10 analyze individual spectra one at a time. A researcher would estimate the temperature at each
11
12 glow peak maximum and intensity, and then approximate the activation energy for each of the
13
14 glow peaks. The presented GCA software employs an automated method for determining glow
15
16 peak locations and fitting parameter estimates.
17
18
19
20

21 *Peak Detection through Subtraction:* The first attempt at identifying glow peaks was based
22
23 purely on the identification of global maxima and subtraction of the globally largest peaks from
24
25 the signal. Preliminary results indicated that this was not effective. Often, subtracted peaks were
26
27 found to be in the wrong location resulting in too many or too few identified peaks.
28
29
30

31 *Peak Detection through Derivatives and Subtraction:* Peak identification begins instead by
32
33 finding all local maxima, minima, and inflection points. These features are identified using first
34
35 and second derivatives of the input. Derivatives are created in $O(n)$ time using the one-
36
37 dimensional five-point stencil method (Mai-Duy and Tran-Cong 2013). The local maxima and
38
39 inflection points are then subject to an iterative filtration process eliminating any maxima or
40
41 inflection points resulting from noise. Next, all peaks remaining are passed to the FOK model
42
43 and subtracted from the original signal. If the integrated counts after this subtraction are above a
44
45 threshold, the maxima, minima, and inflection points of the remaining signal are again identified
46
47 and vetted. Each successively identified peak is passed to the FOK model and subtracted from
48
49 the remaining signal. This process is iteratively repeated until the remaining signal is reduced
50
51 below a threshold. Finally, the initial guesses for peak parameters are then passed into the LMA.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 *Peak Fitting using Levenberg-Marquardt Algorithm (LMA)*: The peak identification method
5 described above generates approximate peak parameters, similar to human input. For analysis,
6 these initial parameters must be refined, presenting a non-linear least squares minimization
7 problem. LMA is a common solution to such problems and relies heavily on matrix mathematics
8 (Moré 1978, Bellavia et al. 2018). The software utilizes a modified iterative LMA, which
9 minimizes the error between the original emission spectra and the summation of the fitted glow
10 peaks. LMA is run iteratively until convergence is met or failure occurs due to iterative
11 exhaustion.

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23 *Figure-of-Merit*: The chief metric used to assess the goodness of a glow curve fitting is called
24 the figure-of-merit (FOM). (Balian and Eddy 1977, Bos et al. 1993) This FOM is the average of
25 the percent difference between the fitted points and measurements, as given by:
26
27
28
29

$$FOM = \sum_{j_{start}}^{j_{stop}} \frac{|y_j - y(x_j)_j|}{A} \times 100$$

30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Equation 3 – FOM

where j_{start} is the initial temperature in the fit region, j_{stop} is the ending temperature in the fit region, y_j is the photomultiplier tube (PMT) current at temperature j , $y(x_j)_j$ is the value of the fit function at temperature j , and A is the area under the peak for glow curves. The original publication on this FOM for GCA describes a “good fit” to have a FOM less than 3% (Balian and Eddy 1977), while others describe a “few percent” as a good fit (Horowitz and Yossian 1995).

Output: Upon completion of the LMA algorithm, a list of identified peaks and their respective curve areas are created. The separated peaks are written to an output file in CSV format and placed in an automatically created batch output folder. The output file can be easily plotted. A batch statistics file is also created, containing a list of information pertaining to each input file,

1
2
3
4 including sample barcode, heating rate, FOM, total curve area, and a list of the areas under each
5
6 glow peak. This batch file is intended to allow for the analysis of trends amongst samples.
7
8

9 **Materials**

10
11 *Thermoluminescent Dosimeters:* The thermoluminescent dosimeters (TLDs) used in this paper
12
13 were LiF:Mg,Ti chips (TLD-100, Thermo Fisher, 168 Third Avenue, Waltham MA 02451).
14

15
16 These chip-type TLDs have dimensions of 3.2 mm width by 3.2 mm length by 0.89 mm height.
17

18
19 A single set of 100 TLDs was used to create all data in the time-temperature profile and dose
20
21 variation experiments. A number of historical glow curves from LiF:Mg,Ti and CaF₂:Dy (TLD-
22
23 200) dosimeters were used for the time complexity experiment described below.
24

25
26 *Thermoluminescent Dosimeter Reader:* The Rexion UL-320-FDR thermoluminescent reader
27
28 (UL-320-FDR, Rexion, 24500 Highpoint Road, Beachwood OH 44122) was used to obtain the
29
30 glow curves analyzed in this paper. This reader automates the TLD readout process through the
31
32 use of contact heated planchets with an infrared temperature feedback system (Kuchta et al.
33
34 2020). This TLD reader integrates photon counts over time intervals of 0.1 s during heating for
35
36 all measurements used in this paper.
37
38

39
40
41 *Irradiation Process:* An ~269 GBq Cs-137 irradiator (Model 28- 8A Irradiator, J.L. Shepherd
42
43 and Associates, San Fernando CA 91340) which had been fully characterized (Boria et al. 2017,
44
45 Mapes et al. 2018) and undergone thorough quality control (Noey et al. 2020), was utilized for
46
47 the experiment. Doses ranging between 2.4 mGy and 30 mGy were delivered, corresponding to
48
49 irradiation times of 5.5 min to 68 min, respectively. Dosimeters were irradiated on a standard 40
50
51 cm x 40 cm by 15 cm thick polymethyl methacrylate (PMMA) irradiation phantom (Parker et al.
52
53 2011) located at 1 m from the source.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 *Personal Computer:* All results reported in this paper were generated using a stock 2015
5
6 Macbook Pro (A1398, Apple Inc, One Apple Park Way, Cupertino CA 95014) running macOS
7
8 Catalina version 10.15.7 using the Terminal application with clang version 12.0.0. All runtime
9
10 measurements were taken using the onboard real-time clock. The code was also tested and
11
12 performed equivalently on Windows and Linux systems.
13
14

15
16 *GlowFit:* A freely downloadable first-order kinetics GCA software based on Levenberg-
17
18 Marquardt minimization was used to provide a point of comparison for the presented GCA
19
20 software's performance. The software used for comparison is called GlowFit (Puchalska and
21
22 Bilski 2006). It was chosen for its pleasant graphical interface and ease of download.
23
24

25 26 **Experimental Methods**

27
28 *Experimental Motivation:* For any piece of software, it is critical to assess its performance under
29
30 real conditions. Two factors that cause variance in TLD output signals are the dose applied and
31
32 the heating rate used at readout. If a lower dose is applied, the glow peaks have a lower intensity.
33
34 Conversely, if a higher dose is delivered the peaks will have a higher intensity. Furthermore, if a
35
36 higher heating rate is used, the glow peaks will appear to be closer together because TLD readers
37
38 have a fixed sampling rate. The opposite is true of lower heating rates. Thus, in order to test the
39
40 GCA program on the most diverse set of inputs, two experimental datasets were created to test
41
42 both of these factors.
43
44
45
46
47

48 *Time-Temperature Profile Variation Experiment:* The first dataset was generated to test the GCA
49
50 program's performance on a variety of heating rates. The set of one hundred LiF:Mg,Ti chips
51
52 were annealed at 400°C for 1 h in a benchtop muffle furnace (Thermolyne Type 1300,
53
54 ThermoFisher Scientific, 168 Third Avenue, Waltham, MA 02451). This set of 100 TLDs was
55
56 then irradiated on the phantom to an air kerma of approximately 15 mGy. The 100 TLDs were
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 grouped into ten sets of 10 TLDs, and each set was then read out at differing time-temperature
5 profiles (TTPs). This process was repeated three times, representing thirty sets of ten files.
6
7 However, only twenty-two sets of ten were used for this analysis representing 220 files. The
8
9 TTPs used in this experiment began with a 5 s increase to 40°C. Next, a linear heating rate
10
11 between 1°C s⁻¹ and 6°C s⁻¹ increased the temperature to 250°C. All TTPs ended with a 5 s hold
12
13 at 250°C. Due to the variable readout length, the minimum time between irradiation and readout
14
15 was 10 min, the maximum time was 24 h. A mild correction was applied to account for this. The
16
17 reader settings during the experiment were held constant throughout. The photomultiplier tube
18
19 high voltage was 1,200 V with a max dark current of 50 counts and a maximum light current of
20
21 1,000,000 counts. Thermoelectric contact heating was employed, with a recommended
22
23 continuous flow of N₂ gas with a pressure of 20 psi used to decrease chemoluminescence and
24
25 maintain a low dark current for all measurements (Kuchta et al. 2020). The resulting dataset of
26
27 TLD signals was then processed using the GCA software running on the MacBook Pro
28
29 previously described. This dataset was also fed to GlowFit for contrast.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 *Dose Variation Experiment:* The second dataset was generated to test the performance
39
40 dependence on dose. The same 100 TLDs were oven annealed as described above. TLDs were
41
42 then irradiated on the phantom in groups of ten for between 5.5 min and 68 min. These times
43
44 correspond to air kerma values between 2.4 mGy and 30 mGy. The time between irradiation and
45
46 readout was between 30 min and 4 h. All readouts were conducted under the same TTP for this
47
48 experiment. This TTP begins with a 5 s preheat to 40°C, then a 155 s linear rise to 250°C, and
49
50 finally, a 5 s hold at 250°C. The reader settings described in the previous section were used for
51
52 this experiment also. As in the first experiment, these files were used as a testing dataset for the
53
54 GCA program and also processed using GlowFit for comparison.
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 *Time Complexity Motivation:* During preliminary testing, it was discovered that the runtime of
5
6 the GCA software has a strong dependence on three factors: the number of input files, the length
7
8 of the input files, and the noisiness of the input files. Therefore, a dataset using a large number of
9
10 files to test the relation between file length and runtime was created. The noisiness of a specific
11
12 file was not measured or calculated directly; however, files showing prohibitively long runtimes
13
14 were visually examined and removed from the dataset.
15
16

17
18
19 *Time Complexity Experiment:* A total of 2,377 input files were used for the purpose of testing the
20
21 average runtime and time complexity of the GCA program. These spectra were procured from
22
23 the same TLD reader used in the previous two experiments. These data come from a large
24
25 number of experiments utilizing a variety of reader settings and TLDs. TLD-100 glow curves
26
27 constitute 87% of this dataset, with the remainder consisting of TLD-200. In this dataset, TLDs
28
29 received a variable amount of air kerma and were read out with a diverse assortment of TTPs.
30
31 This dataset was run only with the GCA program. First, the GCA software was fed a variable
32
33 number of files from the large dataset in random order. Total runtimes were measured to
34
35 determine any relationship between the number of files input and the total runtime. Second, the
36
37 entire dataset was run, each file runtime was measured, and the number of rows in the file
38
39 counted.
40
41
42
43
44

45 **RESULTS**

46
47
48 The total size of the GCA program accompanying this paper is 339 kB, which is
49
50 incredibly lightweight. Figure 3 outlines the intermediate steps of the glow curve analysis
51
52 software. First, the initial signal is read into the software. Next, the data are smoothed, as
53
54 depicted in Figure 3a. In Figure 3b-f an example peak identification process is portrayed. These
55
56 figures include identification of local maxima and inflection points, the initial identification of
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 only three glow peaks, and the signals remaining after subtraction of those identified peaks.
5
6 Figure 3g shows the final output of the peak identification process with all four commonly
7
8 identified TLD-100 glow peaks correctly found (Harvey et al. 2011, Horowitz and Yossian
9
10 1995). Figure 3h illustrates the GCA output following LMA with well-fit glow peak output. The
11
12 TL signal is closely approximated by the summation of the separated peaks with a FOM of
13
14 2.25%.
15
16
17

18
19 *Time-Temperature Profile (TTP) Variation Experiment:* The glow curve analysis of the acquired
20
21 signals using the experimental method above was completed in less than an hour with a 100%
22
23 convergence rate. The peak identification algorithm successfully located the four observed glow
24
25 peaks of TLD-100 for 97.7% of the input spectra. There were five spectra for which the GCA
26
27 program did not find four peaks. Three spectra separated into five glow peaks, and two spectra
28
29 finished with three peaks. A minor modification of the peak identification algorithm might
30
31 resolve this 2.3% misidentification rate. The average FOM was 2.6%. The FOMs ranged from
32
33 1.9% to 29.8%. This final value is an outlier stemming from excessively noisy input data. The
34
35 next highest FOM is 9.8%, as shown in Figure 4, which details the distribution of FOM for the
36
37 whole dataset without the highest outlier. It is notable that 91% of the dataset has a FOM of 3.5%
38
39 or less. The average FOM of each group of ten TLDs is plotted as a function of the linear heating
40
41 rate in Figure 5. This result demonstrates that there is no relationship between FOM and heating
42
43 rate for the GCA program. GlowFit also processed this dataset and produced an average FOM of
44
45 2.9% based on user-created initial guesses and ranges. GlowFit failed to produce any output for
46
47 the noisy outlier commented on previously. This result is extremely close to the 2.6% average
48
49 found by the GCA software. This demonstrates that the GCA program presented is comparable
50
51 to other previously published GCA programs of the same type. The low value of the average
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 FOM and high peak identification rate indicate that the GCA software is very successful for
5
6 TLD-100 at a dose of 15 mGy, irrespective of the readout process. This experiment effectively
7
8 demonstrates the robustness of the GCA software for variations in TLD-100 glow peak locations.
9

10
11 *Dose Variation Experiment:* The glow curve analysis of these 100 TLD spectra was completed in
12
13 under an hour with a 98% convergence rate. The two files for which it did not converge
14
15 contained signals below a set threshold for peak identification. The peak identification algorithm
16
17 correctly located four glow peaks in 68% of the spectra. It incorrectly found that 4% had two
18
19 peaks, 12% had three peaks, and 15% had five peaks. There is a correlation between low doses
20
21 and the number of peaks identified, as shown in Figure 6a. This indicates that the peak
22
23 identification algorithm should be modified to better assess air kermas lower than 7 mGy. Above
24
25 7 mGy there is no clear correlation between dose and the number of peaks identified. The
26
27 average figure-of-merit was 5.5%, with a minimum FOM of 1.93% and a maximum of 25.21%
28
29 (again a noisy outlier). As dose varied from 2.4 mGy to 30 mGy, the relationship between FOM
30
31 and dose was graphed in Figure 6b. It is clear from this plot that below 7 mGy there is a
32
33 correlation between FOM and dose. There may be a weak relation between higher dose and
34
35 lower FOM; however, such a statement is outside of the uncertainty interval of this experiment.
36
37 GlowFit produced an average FOM of 7.5% for this dataset. Again, the presented average FOM
38
39 of 5.5% compares well to this number. Based on these results, the GCA performs as intended
40
41 above 7 mGy. However, it is not recommended that this GCA program be used for TLD-100 at
42
43 doses below 7 mGy, without human input. For doses above 7 mGy this experiment definitively
44
45 shows the reliability of the GCA software for variations in TLD-100 glow peak height.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54
55 *Time Complexity Experiment:* The overall runtime of this program depends strongly on the
56
57 number of input files and input file length. For this work, 2,377 CSV input files having an
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 average length of 1,168 rows were processed. The distribution of input file length is shown in
5
6 Figure 7a. The convergence rate was approximately 95%. The files which did not converge were
7
8 overly noisy and had a runtime that was prohibitively long. For example, the Levenberg-
9
10 Marquardt algorithm took more than 39 min to successfully run one iteration on the signal
11
12 plotted in Figure 7b. When visually examined, it is clear that the data in these files is primarily
13
14 resultant from non-TLD phenomena. For this reason, this signal and others like it were aborted
15
16 during glow curve analysis. The average number of peaks identified for this dataset was 3.87.
17
18 Figure 7c shows the distribution of the number of files that presented between 1 and 8 glow
19
20 peaks. Analysis of this distribution indicates that the average number of glow peaks identified in
21
22 the TLD-100 files was 4.1 peaks. Approximately 63% of the TLD-100 input files successfully
23
24 found four glow peaks. For the TLD-200 spectra, the average number of identified peaks was
25
26 2.5. This clearly indicates that the peak identification algorithm is not well calibrated for TLD-
27
28 200. However, a large number of these spectra are the result of aberrant readout conditions. As a
29
30 result, this does not properly measure the effectiveness of the peak identification process. The
31
32 average FOM of this dataset was found to be 9.4%. A histogram of FOM is shown in Figure 7d.
33
34 This distribution is multimodal, resulting from the heterogeneity of the input. These results are
35
36 presented only for reference; they are not suggested to demonstrate the performance of the GCA
37
38 software due to the abnormality of the dataset.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 The total runtime of the software is directly linear with respect to the number of files
49
50 input. This result is shown in Figure 8a. The average length of a file in this dataset is 1,168 rows,
51
52 and the corresponding average runtime was fit to be approximately 14.7 s with a standard error
53
54 of 0.046 s. The Levenberg-Marquardt algorithm dominates file runtime. This is clearly
55
56 demonstrated when the individual file runtimes are recorded. Runtimes of files with the same
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 length were averaged to create Figure 8b. The function describing the increase in runtime is
5
6 exponential with respect to the number of rows. As previously mentioned, the GCA software
7
8 processed TLD-100 and TLD-200 spectra differently. The principal difference pertains to the
9
10 number of identified and therefore fit peaks. On average, TLD-200 spectra had 1.6 fewer
11
12 identified peaks. Therefore, TLD-200 spectra are, on average, processed faster than TLD-100
13
14 spectra due to fewer Levenberg-Marquardt steps. This is an important result indicating that the
15
16 runtime of any file is strongly linked to the number of rows input as well as the number of glow
17
18 peaks being fit.
19
20
21
22

23 CONCLUSION

24
25
26 The GCA software tool described in this paper is the first step towards fully-automated
27
28 glow curve analysis. The software is incredibly lightweight and is compatible with all major
29
30 operating systems running C++17. The GCA tool is fast, with an average runtime of
31
32 approximately 15 s for a 1,200-row input file. The runtime of the program depends linearly on
33
34 the number of input files. The runtime of a specific file depends on the number of rows
35
36 exponentially. Runtimes also depend on the number of glow peaks being fit per file and the
37
38 noisiness of the input files. The output quality is comparable to those produced by other available
39
40 GCA software. The GCA program has a 98% correct peak identification rate for TLD-100 at 15
41
42 mGy, independent of the readout heating rate. This software is not recommended for use at doses
43
44 below 7 mGy without human input. This code presents a framework for future research and
45
46 improvement in fully-automated peak identification.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 **REFERENCES**
5
6

7 Azorín NJ. Thermoluminescence dosimetry (TLD) and its application in medical physics. AIP
8 conference proceedings. 724(1):20; 2004.
9

10 Balian HG, Eddy NW. Figure-of-merit (FOM), an improved criterion over the normalized chi-
11 squared test for assessing goodness-of-fit of gamma-ray spectra peaks. Nucl Instrum Methods
12 145:389–395; 1977.
13
14

15 Basun S, Imbusch GF, Jia DD, Yen WM. The analysis of thermoluminescence glow curves. J
16 Lumin 104:283–294; 2003.
17
18

19 Bellavia S, Gratton S, Riccietti E. A Levenberg–Marquardt method for large nonlinear least-
20 squares problems with dynamic accuracy in functions and gradients. Numerische Mathematik
21 140:791-825; 2018.
22
23

24 Boria AJ, Rucinski BD, Abraham SA, Dawson AS, Jawad AH, Miklos JA, Kearfott KJ. Cs-137
25 Dosimeter irradiation facilities: Calibration frequency, precision, and accuracy. Health Phys
26 112:357-363, 2017
27
28

29 Bos AJJ, Pitors TM, Gomez Ros JM, Delgado A. An intercomparison of glow curve analysis
30 computer programs: I. Synthetic glow curves. Radiat Prot Dosim 47 (1-4):483–487; 1993.
31
32

33 Chen R. On the calculation of activation energies and frequency factors from glow curves. J
34 Appl Phys 40:570-585; 1969.
35
36

37 Cobham A. The intrinsic computational difficulty of functions. Logic, Methodology and
38 Philosophy of Science: Proceedings of the 1964 International Congress (Studies in Logic and the
39 Foundations of Mathematics). North-Holland Publishing. pp. 24-30. 1965.
40
41

42 Harvey JA, Rodrigues ML, Kearfott KJ. A computerized glow curve analysis
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 (GCA) method for WinREMS thermoluminescent dosimeter data using MATLAB. Appl Radiat
5
6 Isot 69(9):1282-1286; 2011.

7
8
9 Horowitz YS, Moscovitch M. Computerized glow curve deconvolution applied to high dose
10
11 (10^2 – 10^5 Gy) TL dosimetry. Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Phys. Research 243:07-214;
12
13 1986.

14
15
16 Horowitz YS, Yossian D. Computerised Glow Curve Deconvolution: Application to
17
18 Thermoluminescence Dosimetry. Radiat. Prot. Dosim. 60.1, 3. 1995.

19
20
21 International Organization for Standardization (ISO). IEC 14882:2017 Information Technology -
22
23 -- Programming languages --- C++. pub-ISO 5:1605. 2017.

24
25
26 Kitis G, Gomez-Ros JM, Tuyn JWN. Thermoluminescence glow-curve deconvolution functions
27
28 for first, second and general orders of kinetics. J. Phys. D: Appl. Phys. 31, 2636–2641. 1998.

29
30
31 Klopfenstein R. Data smoothing using a least squares fit C++ class. ISA transactions 37.1
32
33 (1998): 3-19. 1998.

34
35
36 Kuchta JR, Thiesen JH, Noey JD, Chung Long Kiu, Kearfott KJ. Preliminary experiences with
37
38 the Rexion UL-320-FDR: An automated thermoluminescent dosimeter reader with removable
39
40 contact heating planchets and an infrared temperature feedback system. Health Phys, submitted
41
42 January 24, 2020, accepted October 21, 2020. HPJ-D-20-00009R2.

43
44
45 Lilley E, McKeever SWS. On the order of kinetics for thermoluminescence in LiF (TLD-100).
46
47 Journal of Applied Physics, 16.2. 2000.

48
49
50 Mai-Duy N, Tran-Cong T. A compact five-point stencil based on integrated RBFs for 2D
51
52 second-order differential problems. Journal of Computational Physics, 235, 302-321. 2013

53
54
55 Mapes JL, Liu K, Abraham SA, Wilhelm AS, Latosz LV, Kearfott KJ. Setup and
56
57 Characterization of a Cesium-137 Dosimetry Calibration Source in a Space-
58
59

1
2
3
4 Constrained Environment. Health Phys, 115(5):569-580, 2018.

5
6 Moré JJ. The Levenberg-Marquardt algorithm: implementation and theory. Numerical analysis.

7
8 Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1978. 105-116. 2006.

9
10 Moscovitch M, Horowitz YS, Oduko J. LiF Thermoluminescence Dosimetry via Computerised

11
12 First Order Kinetics Glow Curve Analysis. Radiat. Prot. Dosim., 6.1-4, 157–159. 1983.

13
14 Noey JD, Golduber RM, Kearfott KJ. Analysis of long-term quality control data for a ¹³⁷Cs

15
16 dosimetry calibration Source. Health Phys 120(2):227-242. 2021

17
18 Parker LW, Harvey JA, Kearfott KJ. An Integrated System for the Beta, Gamma and Neutron

19
20 Calibration and Storage of Thermoluminescent Dosimeters for a Research Laboratory. Health

21
22 Phys 100(S1):S43-S49. 2011.

23
24 Puchalska, M., Bilski, P. GlowFit-a new tool for thermoluminescence glow-curve deconvolution.

25
26 Radiation Measurements, 41.6:659-664. 2006.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

LIST OF FIGURE CAPTIONS

Figure 1. The parameters of the first-order kinetics model. I_M is the maximum intensity of the glow peak and T_M is the temperature at which it occurs. T_1 is the temperature where the left full-width half maximum of the glow curve is found and T_2 is the temperature at which the right full-width half maximum is located. E corresponds to the activation energy of the glow peak, directly related to the width of the full-width half maximum. The arrow below the activation energy is intended to indicate that this parameter determines the width of the glow peak in the first-order kinetics model.

Figure 2. Flow chart detailing the process flow of the glow curve analysis software.

Figure 3. The glow curve analysis program process flow, showing a) initial operation of the average smoothing algorithm with the original input signal (light gray) and the input signal after smoothing (black), b) the identified local maxima (light grey circles) and inflection points after vetting (dark grey diamonds), c) the first three identified glow peaks (black and dark grey) after initial fitting parameters have been generated, d) the difference in signal (black) between the first three identified glow peaks and the original signal with the nearby inflection points and maxima (grey), e) the fourth identified glow peak (black), f) the remaining signal difference (black) after the subtraction of the fourth peak (this signal is found to be below a set threshold; thus the peak identification algorithm terminates), g) four peaks recognized by the peak identification algorithm (dark grey), (these peaks are now passed into Levenberg-Marquardt algorithm for iterative fitting), h) the final program output depicting the original input signal (light grey), the fitted glow peaks, (grey) and their sum (black). The final fitting has a figure-of-merit of 2.25%.

Figure 4. Fractional figure-of-merit among the 220 files used in the time-temperature profile variation experiment. The dark grey bars behave as bins with a thickness of 1, containing FOM

1
2
3
4 values within 0.5 of the number shown. Values are placed in the upper bin if the value is 0.4999
5
6 greater than the bin number. One file having a FOM of 29.8% was omitted from this figure, it
7
8 was determined to be a noisy outlier. Shown in light grey is the cumulative percentage of files
9
10 having figure-of-merits below selected values. Notably, 91% of the data has a figure-of-merit of
11
12 3.5% or lower.
13
14


15
16 **Figure 5.** Fractional figure-of-merit as a function of heating rate, demonstrating that the heating
17
18 rate does not affect the glow curve analysis software's performance and the TLD reader's
19
20 consistency.
21
22


23
24 **Figure 6.** Results of the dose variation experiment. Shown are a) the average number of
25
26 discovered peaks as a function of the dose, and b) the relationship between figure-of-merit and
27
28 dose. It is notable that there is a dramatic drop in the number of peaks identified below 7 mGy.
29
30 Above 7 mGy, there is little to no change in the number of peaks identified. As a result, the files
31
32 below 7 mGy have higher figure-of-merits owing to the lower number of peaks identified, and at
33
34 higher doses, the change in figure-of-merit is lower than the uncertainty.
35
36
37


38
39 **Figure 7.** Statistics regarding the challenging nature of the time complexity dataset, including a)
40
41 the distribution of the lengths of the input files in terms of rows (the bars in this plot behave as
42
43 bins with a thickness of 200 centered around the number given), b) an example of a highly
44
45 aberrant signal which caused exorbitantly long convergence time when passing through
46
47 Levenberg-Marquardt algorithm, c) the quantity of files for which a certain number of peaks was
48
49 identified (because the number of identified peaks are integers, there is no width to these bins),
50
51 and d) the distribution of figure-of-merits over this large heterogeneous dataset (dark grey) with
52
53 the cumulative percent of files at each bin (light grey). It is noted that such a dataset would be
54
55 inappropriately challenging for algorithm performance testing.
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65


1
2
3
4 **Figure 8.** The runtime of the program a) as a function of the number of input files,
5
6 demonstrating a linear increase, and b) averaged for files of the same length with trendlines
7
8 added to guide the eye; the upper curve shows the exponential increase in runtime for LiF:Mg,Ti
9
10 spectra versus the lower curve displaying an exponential increase in runtime for CaF₂:Dy
11
12 spectra; the black circular points are primarily resultant from LiF:Mg,Ti spectra, the black
13
14 triangles primarily are resultant from CaF₂:Dy spectra, and the grey squares are a mix of these
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65


Figure 1


























Figure 4




Figure 5






Figure 6a










Figure 7b








Figure 8a




Figure 8b

[Click here to access/download;Figure;Fig8b.tiff](#)

