Università di Pisa

DIPARTIMENTO DI FISICA "ENRICO FERMI"
Corso di Laurea in Fisica

Tesi di laurea

Commissioning and first data analysis of the Mainz radius experiment.

Candidato:
Adriano Del Vincio
Matricola 562946

Relatore:
Prof. Francesco Forti, Prof.ssa Concettina Sfienti

Anno Accademico 2022-23

Contents

Abstract

short introduction

Chapter 1

Introduction

- explain neutron skin thickness.
- connection to neutron stars radious, and neutron stars description.
- Equation of state (EoS) for high density nuclear matter.
- Parity-violating scattering experiment for extracting neutron skin thickness.
- mention the weak form factor.
- Transverse asymmetry as background for Parity-violating experiment.
- Mention the other experiment, like PREX, that measure zero A_n for Lead.

1.1 Neutron skin thickness and EOS

In this section we have to explain what is the neutron skin thickness and why this parameter is related to the Equation of State for nuclear matter (in particular, the slope of the Symmetry energy in the semiempirical mass formula). Then, explain the parallelism between Neutron stars and Nuclear matter (the share the same EOS), and underline the relation between radius of the neutron stars and EOS.

1.2 Parity-violating scattering experiment

This section is for describing the way it's possible to extract the neutron skin thickness. Here I have to mention the weak form factor and the important fact that the neutrons are more important than the protons in the parity-violating scattering, because of the weak mixing angle.

1.3 Transverse asymmetry

Here we have to introduce the aim of this thesis: the transverse asymmetry is a source of background for the parity-violating experimets. Furthemore the theory is not working well for some nuclei (^{208}Pb), so mention PREX paper about the last mesurement on carbon and lead, the problem that they measure 0 trasverse asymmetry.

1.3.1 Motivation

Here present all the motivation for this thesis, so the fact that we want to measure the rates on lead for the future experiment, test the new electronics, measure another time the trasverse asymmetry on ^{12}C

1.3.2 Conventions used

It could be usefull, here, to have a subsection to explain the terminology for this thesis, to avoid misunderstanding.

Chapter 2

Transverse Asymmetry

- Physics behind the A_n asymmetry, dependence on Q^2, the formula $\frac{\sigma_\uparrow - \sigma_\downarrow}{\sigma_\uparrow + \sigma_\downarrow}$
- state of the art of the Exp. (?already a description of the experiment at A1?)
- Model description: so scattering amplitude, theoretical prediction
- Expected error δA_t
- open question: problems with lead, dependence of E_{beam}, dependence from Z, Z/A

2.1 Description of the process

Explain the scattering process we are studying (at least one figure to visualize the kinematics of the scattering). Mention the link between this process and time-reversal operator. Add two figures for elastic and inelastic scattering.

2.1.1 Elastic scattering

Write the amplitude for the elastic (how to manipulate expression, maybe in the appendix).

2.1.2 Inelastic scattering

Explain how it's possible to compute the inelastic expression, what kind of approximations are used (optical theorem...)

2.1.3 Model description

Present the theoretical formula for the Transverse asymmetry, and comment on energy, Z, Z/A depencencies

2.2 State of the Experiment

Write down the formula $\frac{\sigma_\uparrow - \sigma_\downarrow}{\sigma_\uparrow + \sigma_\downarrow}$. Hints at how to measure the Transverse asymmetry, explain the expected error for the recostructed asymmetry, the last mesurement obtained by the other collaborations. (remember to mention we have a polarized beam against a unpolarized target). Maybe add also how we want to measure the transverse asymmetry (so structure of the event, polarities patterns...)

Chapter 3

Experimental setup

- description of MAMI, how the beam is produced, how the electrons are polarized.
- description of A1.
- description of beam stabilization, how the monitors measure the beam parameters.
- Electronics description, DAQ system, VFC monitors.
- Detectors A and B.

3.1 First description of the experiment

First description of the experiment, how we want to collect data, new picture of the kinematic of the experiment. Maybe here it's a good point to describe the structure of the event.

3.2 Mami

How Mami produces polarized electron and how the particle are accelerated (the way Mainz Mikroton is working is completely different from the other accelerators, so maybe this section will be too long).

3.2.1 Polarized Beam

Here a subsection to explain how the polarized electrons are produced. Important to mention the systematic error for the polarization mesurement (in our beam time we couldn't measure with Moller polarimeter, so this discussion is important for future experiment, however it's important to say something about it).

3.3 A1 spectrometers hall

Describing the A1 room, how the spectrometers are operating (+ figures), a picture of the target (+ figure) and the important parameters for the target, like thickness. Mention that we need the Wobbler magnet to change the hitting position of the beam to prevent the target from melting.

3.4 Detectors, and Monitors

3.4.1 Detectors A and B

Describe the two detectors we placed inside the spectrometers, the Q^2 for our mesurement. The way the counts are collected, so the expected signal for the Čerenkov detector. Explain also how we will use the old detectors of the two spektrometers to align the elastic scattering plane to our detectors.

3.4.2 Monitors and stabilization

Explain how the monitors for the beam parameters work. (this section could be long, however the way these parameters are measured is particular, so it's important to explain everything properly).

3.5 Electronics

Short introduction about the old electronics setup and why a new versions is needed, then describe all the electronics used for our experiment:

- Nino board for collecting the data from the pmts
- VFCs for collecting the data from X21,X25,Y21,Y25,ENMO,I21,I13
- master board for collecting the monitors data/controlling the source
- small boxes for switching from new electronic read-out to the old electronics read-out (spectrometers DAQ)

Chapter 4

Test and beam time analysis

1. development of the analysis program (description of the Levenberg-Marquardt-Algorithmus.
2. testing the analysis program with montecarlo data.
3. Test of the detectors in the Lab.
4. Beam line description.
5. Data Analysis
   (a) Rates on Pb^{208}.
   (b) Stabilization Monitors.
   (c) C^{12} Asymmetry.

4.1 Model for fitting the data

Here I have to explain the model used for describing the data, so the problem of the false asymmetry induced by variations in beam position, angle, current and energy. Here is a good point to explain the De Brujin sequence for the polarity patterns

4.2 Data tree

Explain how we compute all the values for the data tree, the position of the beam on the target, the angle, the correlated-difference values...

4.3 Detectors test

Explain the test of the two detectors in the lab, how we select the threshold, the correlation of the pmts and coincidence to select the threshold

4.4 Analysis

4.4.1 Alignment of the scattering plane

4.4.2 Calibration of the VFCs monitors

4.4.3 Calibration of the PIMO, Current and ENMO monitors

For the current monitors I13 and I21, we perform the calibration changing the current of the beam and observing the output values of the monitors (Voltage values). The we perform a fit (for the beam current, we used the nominal values that we communicate to MAMI, has the values for the x-axis).

For the two monitors we are able to compute the offset and scale factor:

$$\begin{aligned} I_{13}^{volt} &= m_{13} \cdot I_{13}^{Nom} + q_{13} \\ c_{13} = \frac{1}{m} \qquad & offset = -\frac{q_{13}}{m} \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$



Figure 4.1: •

The same formula for current monitor I21.

The Enmo calibration is performed in a different from the other monitors. The polarity signal is sent to MAMI, and they produce a signal for the ENMO that somehow (need to investigate exactly how they do that) shows a difference between the first two subevents and the last two. This difference is equal (nominal) to 22,6 keV. The idea now is to produce an histogram for the quantity δE (with E_{18} being the energy monitor):

$$\delta E = \frac{E_{18}[2] + E_{18}[3]}{2} - \frac{E_{18}[0] + E_{18}[1]}{2}$$

3 runs of data where taken with different Beam current. Taking the mean it is possible to exstimate the scaling factor for the ENMO monitors, obtaining the physical quantity in this way.

$$c_{E18} = \frac{22{,}6\,\mathrm{keV}}{\overline{\delta E}}$$



Figure 4.2: δE for 20 20 µA

Taking the average over E_{18} voltage values, and using the formula above, we obtain the coefficient c_{E18}. Then, the next step it's to study the dependence of the response of E_{18} on the current. The calibration was performed taking three acquisitions with different current for the beam current : 20 µA, 15 µA and a run without beam.



Figure 4.3: Calibration of ENMO monitor

4.4.4 Calibration of the pmts

4.4.5 Rates on lead

4.5 ^{12}C asymmetry

4.5.1 least square fit

4.5.2 False asymmetries

4.5.3 ??Boostrap??

4.5.4 ??interval estimation??

Chapter 5

Conclusion and outlook

- result of the Analysis

Appendices

Appendix A

Some Appendix

The contents...