

Abstract We summarize a procedure of estimating unpolarized pp cross section from beam current data in a transmission experiment. The methodology presented is grounded in the use of the optical theorem.

I. TRIC PROGRAM

TRIC (test of Time-Reversal Invariance at COSY) is a transmission experiment planned at the cooler synchrotron COSY-Juelich for the purpose of testing Time-Reversal Invariance. Its physical foundation is the use of a genuine null-observable for T-symmetry, — the total cross section asymmetry in double-polarized proton-deuteron scattering, — whose existence is guaranteed by the optical theorem. [1] TRIC is aimed at achieving the accuracy of 10^{-6} in the cross section asymmetry estimate.

The total cross section in a double-polarized scattering involves a number of polarization-dependent terms:

$$\sigma_{tot} = \sigma_0 \cdot \left(1 + \sum_{i,j} A_{i,j} P_i P_j^t \right),$$

where P_j^t and P_i are respectively the j -projection of target and i -projection of beam polarizations, σ_0 is the unpolarized cross section component, and $A_{i,j}$ is the appropriate asymmetry.

The asymmetry that serves as the null-observable of T-symmetry is $A_{y,xz}$, all others being faking observables. TRIC's experimental design limits the influence of all faking observables to below the experimental accuracy; except for that of $A_{y,y}$, caused by the misalignment of the target and beam polarizations. [2, p. 11] Thus arises the problem of knowing the extent to which vector target polarization must be controlled, for which the knowledge of the value of $A_{y,y}$ is required.

Unpolarized cross section is a parameter in both estimators' distributions, and hence it must be known as well.

II. THEORY

A. Physics

The intensity of a particle beam revolving inside an accelerator decreases according to the Beer-Lambert law:

$$\begin{aligned} I_{n+1} &= I_n \cdot \exp \left(- \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_i \cdot \int_0^L n_i(z) dz \right) \\ &= I_n \cdot \exp \left(- \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_i \cdot \Theta_i \right) \\ &= I_n \cdot \exp \left(- \sum_i \frac{1}{\tau_i} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where L is the beam path length, N is the number of attenuating species, σ_i is the attenuation cross section, n is the number of passed revolutions, $\Theta_i = \int_L n_i(z) dz$ is the thickness of the corresponding attenuating species.

For the average beam current, integration of the above yields

$$I_t = I_0 \cdot \exp(\beta \cdot t), \quad (1)$$

with $\beta = \sum_i \beta_i = -\nu \cdot \sum_i 1/\tau_i$, ν — the beam revolution frequency.

Within the confines of the experiment, an unpolarized proton beam interacts with an unpolarized deuterium target with cross section σ_0 ; to that add all extra-target losses ($\sigma_x \Theta_x$), to produce the following expression for beam loss:

$$\beta = -\nu (\sigma_0 \Theta + \sigma_x \Theta_x). \quad (2)$$

Since $\sigma_x \Theta_x$ is independent from the target state, an estimate of the cross section is obtained from

$$\hat{\sigma}_0 = \frac{\hat{\beta}_{off} - \hat{\beta}_{on}}{\nu \Theta_{on}}, \quad (3)$$

where $\hat{\beta}_{on/off}$ is the slope estimate in an on-/off-cycle.

The expression for the polarized beam loss is

$$\beta = -\nu (\sigma_0 (1 + A_{y,y} P_y^t P_y) \Theta_{on} + \sigma_x \Theta_x),$$

from which an asymmetry estimate can be computed as the difference between the slopes with spin states *up* and *down*:

$$\hat{A}_{y,y} = \frac{\hat{\beta}_{on}^- - \hat{\beta}_{on}^+}{\nu P_y^t \Delta P_y \cdot \sigma_0 \Theta_{on}}.$$

B. Statistics

We estimate β by fitting a linear model to logarithmized beam current data, $\ln I_t = \ln I_0 + \beta \cdot t + \epsilon_t$, using the least squares method. In order that the estimate be minimum-variance mean-unbiased, the data must satisfy the Gauss-Markov conditions: [3]

1. Linearity and additivity of the relationship;
2. Independence of the time and error variables (strict exogeneity);
3. No serial correlation of the error;
4. Constant variance of the error (homoskedasticity).

Linearity is necessary for the validity of using linear regression; homoskedasticity and absence of serial correlation are required for the efficiency, and exogeneity for the consistency of the estimator.

This means the following series of questions has to be answered in order to verify the validity of our results:

1. Is the logarithm of beam current a linear function of time?
2. Are the errors uncorrelated with time?
 - Is measurement time measured with negligible error?
 - Are there predictors other than time?
 - Is there among the omitted variables a predictor dependent on current?
3. What is the interpretation of the slope?

Below, we will be concerned with the former two.

III. OVERVIEW OF DATA

We have analyzed two data sets: one was measured in 2012, the other in 2016.

In the 2012 experiment, the beam and the target both consisted of unpolarized protons; the beam was cooled using electron cooling and bunched by the barrier bucket; the cycles lasted for one hour each. In the 2016 experiment the proton beam was scattered on the deuteron target, both polarized; the beam had undergone RF-bunching and electron-cooling; the cycles lasted for 12 minutes, the first half of which the target was turned on, in the second off; the beam spin state alternated from spin up to spin down through no spin, while the target spin state remained constant (spin up).

IV. ESTIMATION OF SLOPE

To make correct slope estimates, we subtract the offset Δ from the data. This is done because

$$\tilde{\beta} = \frac{d \ln \tilde{I}_t}{dt} = \frac{1}{\tilde{I}_t} \frac{d \tilde{I}_t}{dt},$$

where, if the measured current

$$\tilde{I}_t = I_t + \Delta_t = I_0 \exp(\beta \cdot t) + \Delta_t,$$


then

$$\tilde{\beta} = \frac{1}{1 + \lambda_t} \left(\beta + \frac{1}{I_t} \frac{d \Delta_t}{dt} \right),$$


$$\lambda_t = I_0^{-1} \cdot \Delta_t \cdot \exp(-\beta \cdot t).$$

In the favorable case of a constant offset, it still must be removed in order to have a constant slope to estimate. A time-dependent offset violates the exogeneity assumption, and hence biases the slope estimate. At this stage, estimation was done assuming offset was constant within a cycle, and only changed from cycle to cycle.

Each cycle's data were subtracted its respective offset, and fitted a linear model via the ordinary least squares




(a) Experiment in 2012. The cycles with the target are drawn in red, those without in black.




(b) Experiment in 2016. The cycles are colored according to the beam spin state.

FIG. 1: Average beam current as a function of time.

method. The models' reduced chi-squares deviate from one in the fourth decimal place; however, one should note that the data do not pass linearity tests, and are likely to have structural slope changes as well (see TABLE I). Since the model residuals exhibit serial correlation (FIG. 2), the slope estimates' standard errors are estimated with robust estimators.



(a) Logarithm of measurement data as a function of time. The fitted line is colored red, the gray dashed lines mark the fit region.



(b) Residuals vs fitted values.




TABLE I: Characteristics of a typical cycle.

Characteristic	Test	Effect size	P-value ^a
Linearity	Harvey-Collier	0.8	0%
-	Rainbow	0.06	10%
Constant slope	Chow ^b		100%
-	Moving estimates		1%
Homoskedasticity	Breusch-Pagan		17%
Autocorrelation	Durbin-Watson		0%

^a The p-value of the effect size.

^b The Chow test was performed at every point in the fitting range. The average of F-statistics is used as the test statistic.




FIG. 3: Slope estimates plotted against initial beam current.

V. ESTIMATION OF CROSS SECTION

In estimating cross section, only the estimates from adjacent cycles are used. This is done to minimize the effect of drifts of environmental variables such as target thickness, which is estimated to increase by 0.5 %/hour. (The thickness by which the slope differences are divided, assumed constant, was provided by a Schottky measurement.)

This reduces the number of estimates from 20 to seven. As can be observed in FIG. 3, the biggest predictor of slope is beam current. It follows then that when obtaining a cross section estimate, the difference in the involved estimates' beam intensities has to be taken into account. We do that by first fitting the cycle slopes on the initial beam currents, and

An estimate of a cross section estimate's standard error (SE) is made by adding the squared standard errors of

the paired slopes, not taking account of the covariance term:

$$\hat{\sigma}[\hat{\sigma}_0] = \sqrt{\hat{\sigma}[\hat{\beta}_{off}]^2 + \hat{\sigma}[\hat{\beta}_{on}]^2}. \quad (4)$$

This is done so because depending on whether an on-slope is paired with the preceding or succeeding off-slope, the covariance term changes sign. Since there's no criterion favoring either of the two mappings, the covariance term was omitted.

VI. ESTIMATION OF ASYMMETRY

TABLE II: Cross section summary statistics.

Year	Soundness	Closeness	#	Mean ^a (a.u.)	SE (a.u.)
2012	Sound	Close	4	507(507)	7
	Sound	Far	8	553(563)	14
	Unsound	Close	3	562(580)	36
	Unsound	Far	5	515(512)	20
	All		20	536(544)	10
2016	Sound	Close	40	409(411)	48
	Sound	Far	92	396(385)	34
	Unsound	Close	4	1400(1418)	170
	Unsound	Far	8	1453(1457)	69
	All		144	486(473)	35

^a The value in parentheses is the weighted mean with measurements' variance estimates used as weights.

TABLE III: Slope summary statistics.

Target	#	Mean (a.u.)	SE (a.u.)
Off	5	$-9.04 \cdot 10^{-5}$	$6 \cdot 10^{-7}$
On	4	$-1.20 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$1 \cdot 10^{-6}$


VII. RESULTS

The summary statistics of cross section estimates, grouped by soundness and closeness of the slope estimates they are based on, are presented in TABLE II and FIG. 4a; the slopes themselves are shown in FIG. 4b and summarized in TABLE III. Group density estimates with the rectangular kernel are shown in FIG. 4c.


Our best estimate for cross section is 507 ± 7 a.u.

-
- [1] Homer E. Conzett. "On Null Tests of Time-Reversal Invariance," 6. Paris, France, 1990.
[2] P.D. Eversheim, et al. "Test of Time-Reversal Invariance

- in Proton-Deuteron Scattering."
[3] D.S.G. Pollock. "Topics in Econometrics."



(a) Cross section estimates plotted against their off-cycle number.



(b) Slope estimates as a function of time.

