Problem Set 3 solutions Question 1: Relativistic Expressions for Accelerator Performance Learning objectives In this question you will: · Derive the expressions for the center-of-mass energy at colliders and in fixed target experiments • Show that when the masses of the beam and target can be neglected, the expressions reduce to a simple form In the pdf file for Lecture 4, page 6 defines the configuration of the beams for colliding beam and fixed target experiments and gives expressions for the center-of-mass energy \sqrt{s} in the limit where the mass of the beam particle(s) is small compared to its energy. Solution Explicitly derive the expressions for the center-of-mass energy for the collider and fixed target case NOT assuming that the masses of the colliding particles are small. **Collider case:** $s=\left(p_1+p_2
ight)^2$ $=\left(E_{1}+E_{2}
ight)^{2}-\left(ec{p}_{1}+ec{p}_{2}
ight)^{2}$ $=E_1^2+2E_1E_2+E_2^2-ec{p}_1^2-2ec{p}_1\cdotec{p}_2-ec{p}_2^2$ $=E_1^2-ec{p}_1^2+E_2^2-ec{p}_2^2+2E_1E_2-2ec{p}_1\cdotec{p}_2$ $= m_1^2 + m_2^2 + 2 E_1 E_2 - 2 ec{p}_1 \cdot ec{p}_2$ $=m_1^2+m_2^2+2E_1E_2+2\,|ec{p}_1|\,\,|ec{p}_2|$ where the final line uses the fact that the two collider beams are colliding head-on. Note, we could write $|ec p|=\sqrt{E^2-m^2}$ to remove the momentum from the equation. Then, in the limit $m_1 o 0$ and $m_2 o 0$ we get: $s = 2E_1E_2 + 2E_1E_2 = eE_1E_2$ which is the expression quoted in class **Fixed Target case** The target is at rest so its four vector is $(m\{target\},0,0,0)$. Therefore: $\{begin\{eqnarray*\}\}$ s & = & $|left(E\{beam\}+m\{target\}|right)^2 - |left(|vecp\{beam\}+0 right)^2 \le E\{beam\}^2 + 2 m\{target\}$ $E\{beam\} + m\{target\}^2 - vec p\{beam\}^2 \mid \& = \& m\{beam\}^2 + 2 m\{target\} E\{beam\} \setminus end\{eqnarray*\}$ In the limit where $m_{beam} << E_{beam}$, this reduces to $s=2m_{target}E_{beam}$ which is the expression quoted in class **Question 2: Cherenkov Imaging** Learning objectives In this question you will: • Review the expression that determines when Cherenkov light is emitted and how the angle of the Cherenkov cone is related to a particle's speed and the index of refraction of the medium Apply the concepts of resolution and of confidence level to the case of a Cherenkov detector In BaBar, the DIRC detector identifies charged particles (eg distinguishes π^\pm from K^\pm) by reconstructing Cherenkov rings produced in a thin quartz bar. The index of refraction of quartz is n = 1.2. 2a. What is the minimum momentum below which K^+ do not produce Cherenkov light? The expression for the angle of the Cherenkov radiation is $\cos \theta = \frac{1}{n\beta}$ Since $\cos \theta \leq 1$, to give Cherenkov light. Using the relativistic expression for β in natural units: $\beta = \frac{p}{F}$ $=rac{p}{\sqrt{p^2+m^2}}$ $rac{p}{\sqrt{p^2+m^2}}\geq rac{1}{n}$ The smallest momentum is then we have the equal sign above $rac{p}{\sqrt{p^2+m^2}}=rac{1}{n}$ $p^2=rac{1}{n^2}ig(p^2+m^2ig)$ $p^2\left(1-rac{1}{n^2}
ight)=rac{m^2}{n^2}$ $p^2=rac{m^2}{n^2\left(1-rac{1}{n^2}
ight)}$ $p = \frac{m}{n\sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{n^2}}}$ The mass of the K^\pm is 0.493 GeV so the minimum p for Cherenkov light is $p = 0.493/\left(1.2\sqrt{1-1.2^2}
ight) = 0.74~{
m GeV}$ 2b A charged particle is observed to have a momentum of 2.5 GeV. What are the predicted angles of the Cherenkov cone produced if the particle is a π^\pm and if it is a K^\pm ? For the kaon: $\cos heta = rac{1}{n eta}$ $=rac{\sqrt{p^2+m_K^2}}{1.2 imes p}$ $\cos \theta = 0.849$ $\theta = 0.556$ For the pion with mass = 0.1396 GeV. we find: $\cos \theta = 0.8346$ $\theta = 0.583$ So the difference in angle is 0.583-0.556=0.0273 radians, or 27.3 mradians **2c** The angular resolution for the Cherenkov cone of the DIRC detector is approximately $\sigma(heta_c)=2.5$ ~mrad. This means that the measured Cherenkov angle distributed about the true value such that $heta_c^{meas} - heta_c^{true} \;\; = \;\; rac{1}{\sigma_c \sqrt{2\pi}} \mathrm{exp}iggl[-rac{1}{2\sigma^2} iggr]$ As the charged particle momentum increases, the Cherenkov angles for π^\pm and K^\pm of the same momentum converge towards the same value. The largest momentum for which the two hypothesis can be distinguished depends on σ_c . Scientists use the term confidence level to describe how well we can tell two hypothesis apart A 90\%\ confidence level separation means that it we start with equal populations in the two possibilities, we will choose the wrong hypothesis 10\%\ of the time. See, for example, the PDG review of statistics Figure 40.4 and Table 40.1. From that table, you learn that a 90\%\ confidence level separation corresponds to 1.64σ for a two-sided cut. Here, however, we are doing something slightly different. If we have two Gaussians where one is centered at heta=0 and the other is centered at $heta=n\sigma$ then the natural way to assign particles by species is to say all the measurements with $heta>n\sigma/2$ belong to the Gaussian centered at $heta=n\sigma$ and the others belong to the Gaussian centered at heta=0. The probability of getting the wrong assignment with this strategty is called a one-sided confidence limit. In our case, we must ask that 10% of the events be in one tail (so 20% in both tails). That corresponds to having the distance be 1.28σ from each peak, or 2.56 σ between the peaks, as shown here: Drawing Here, the hatched regions correspond to the cases where the species are misidentified. Using this definition of confidence level, what is the maximum momentum for which π^+ and K^+ can be separated at the 90\%\ confidence level in the BaBar DIRC? Since the resolution is 2.5 mrad and we want a 90\%\ confidence limit separation, we want 2.56 imes 2.5 = 6.4 mrad separation. The easiest way to find this momentum is graphically. Question 3: Luminosity of a Collider (Thomson problem 1.11) At the LEP e^+e^- collider, which had a circumference of 27~km, the electron and positron beam currents were each 1.0 mAmps. Each beam consisted of four equally spaced bunches of electrons/positrons. The bunches had an effective area of $1.8 \times 10^4~\mu \text{m}^2$. Calculate the instantaneous luminosity on the assumption that the beams collided head-on. The instantaneous luminosity at a collider is $l=frac{n_1n_2}{4\pi\sigma_x\sigma_y}$ There is some ambiguity as to how these σ 's relate to the area of the beam. We'll assume here that σ_x and σ_y correspond to the semi-major and semi-minor axes of the beam so that the area of the beam is $A_{beam} = \pi \sigma_x \sigma_y$ However, we will give full credit for any reasonable assumption for how the area is related to the σ 's. If the number of electrons/positrons in each bunch is n_e and each bunch circulates the ring at a frequency of $f_b = c/(27 imes 10^3) = 11.1$ kHZ, the bunch current I is given by $I=f_b imes n_e e$ A current of 1 mA therefore corresponds to $n_e=5.6 imes10^{11}~$ 10 $^\circ$ 3 \; {\rm kper bunch, $n_1 = n_2 = 5.6 \times 10^{11}$ With four bunches per beam, the bunch-crossing frequency of $f = 4 \cdot c/27000 = 4 \text{ fb} = 44.4 \text{ kHz}$ The instantaneous luminosity is $\mathcal{L} = 44.4 imes 10^3 \; ext{kHz} rac{\left(5.6 imes 10^{11}
ight)^2}{4 imes 1.8 imes 10^4 \; \; \mu ext{m}^2} = 6 imes 10^{32} = 2.4 imes 10^{31} \; ext{cm}^{-2} ext{s}^{-1}$ Looking at https://pdg.lbl.gov/2020/reviews/rpp2020-rev-hep-collider-params.pdf Table 32.2, you will see that this result is in good agreement with the actual luminosity of LEP when running at the energy of the Z boson Question 4: Central Limit Theorem Learning objectives In this question you will: • See that you can use σ as a measure of resolution even for distributions that are not Gaussian · Learn how to write a simple Monte Carlo and use it to reproduce an analytical result The <u>Central Limit Theorem</u> tells us that the distribution of the sum (or average) of a large number of independent, identically distributed measurements will be approximately normal, regardless of the underlying distribution (subject to the condition that mean and variance of the underlying distribution are not infinite). We'll see how this works for the simplest pdf (probability density function), a random variable x uniformly distributed: $f(x) = \left\{ egin{array}{ll} rac{1}{b-a} & ext{if } a \leq x \leq b \ 0 & ext{otherwise} \end{array}
ight.$ 4a. Show that the mean $\mu\equiv\int_\infty^\infty xf(x)dx$ is $rac{b+a}{2}$ and the variance $\sigma^2\equiv\int_\infty^\infty x^2f(x)dx-\mu^2$ is $rac{(b-a)^2}{12}$ for the above distribution. **Solution:** For the mean: $\mu \equiv \int^{\infty} x f(x) dx$ $=\int_{0}^{1}\frac{x}{b-a}dx$ $=\frac{1}{2}\frac{x^2}{b-a}\Big|_a^b$ $=rac{1}{2}igg(rac{b^2-a^2}{b-a}igg)$ $=\frac{a+b}{2}$ For the variance: $\sigma^2 \equiv \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x^2 f(x) dx - \mu^2$ $=\int_{0}^{1}x^{2}dx-rac{1}{4}\left(rac{b^{2}-a^{2}}{b-a}
ight)^{2}$ $=rac{1}{3}x^{3}ig|_{a}^{b}-rac{1}{4}(a+b)^{2}$ $=rac{1}{3}igg(rac{b^3-a^3}{b-a}igg)-rac{1}{4}(a+b)^2$ $=rac{a^2}{3}+rac{ab}{3}+rac{b^2}{3}-rac{a^2}{4}+rac{ab}{2}+rac{b^2}{4}$ $=rac{1}{12}ig(a^2-2ab+b^2ig)$ $=\frac{1}{12}(a-b)^2$ 4b. Let a=0 and b=1. Using your favorite random number generator, generate 1000 random numbers from the uniform distribution, f(x). Calculate the mean and variance of the numbers you generate. Hint: You can use the NumPy (Numerical Python) library to generate random numbers from the (0,1) uniform distribution: #Import the NumPy library as "np" In [99]: import numpy as np #Use NumPy to generate a list (it's actually a numpy.ndarray) of 1000 random numbers samples = np.random.rand(1000)#Print the first 10 random numbers print(samples[0:10]) [0.50530506 0.18439254 0.51488023 0.81991371 0.89529383 0.78487876 0.71686778 0.98827103 0.22221948 0.95705558] Write your own functions to find the mean and variance of a list of numbers: In []: def find_mean(num_list): """Your code here to calculate mean""" return mean def find_variance(num_list): """Your code here to calculate variance""" return variance **Solution:** In [100]: def find_mean(num_list): return sum(num_list)/len(num_list) def find_variance(num_list): average = find_mean(num_list) variance = sum((average - value) ** 2 for value in num_list) / len(num_list) return variance Feel free to compare against NumPy's built-in functions: In [101]: #NumPy's functions print("np values of mean: ",np.mean(samples)," and variance: ",np.var(samples)) **#Your functions** print("My values of mean: ",find_mean(samples)," and variance: ",find_variance(samples)) np values of mean: 0.49860792871841114 and variance: 0.08437073153209712 My values of mean: 0.4986079287184117 and variance: 0.08437073153209715 4c. Do these numerical results agree with the analytical results you found above? **Solution:** The predicted mean is 0.5 and the predicted variance is $\frac{1}{12}=0.833$, in good agreement with our numeric results 4d. Make a histogram with 100 bins where the lower edge of the first bin is at x=0 and the upper edge of the last is at x=1. Fill your histogram with the random numbers you generated above. We'll use the **matplotlib.pyplot** module to make several histograms throughout the assignment, so we should go ahead and import it now. Making a histogram from a list of numbers is as simple as calling plt.hist(), with the list as the input parameter. There are many optional parameters, like the number of bins and the color of the bars. Since our histograms will share similar formatting, it's also useful to define a function rather than typing the same thing over and over. For this homework, we'll supply the histogramming routine. In the future, you will write this code yourself. In [102]: #Import the pyplot module of matplotlib as "plt" import matplotlib.pyplot as plt #Makes a histogram filled with the random numbers we generate def plot_histogram(samples,xtitle,ytitle, title, limits): #It would be nice to have the mean and standard deviation in the title, so let's get these mean, sigma = np.mean(samples), np.sqrt(np.var(samples)) #Plot the histogram of the sampled data with 100 bins and a nice color plt.hist(samples, bins=100, range=limits, color=(0,0.7,0.9)) #Set the color using (r,g,b) value es or # use a built-in matplotlib colo r""" #Add some axis labels and a descriptive title plt.xlabel(xtitle) plt.ylabel(ytitle) plt.title(title+ $'\n$ $\mu=\{0:.3f\},\ \sigma=\{1:.3f\}$, format(mean,sigma)) #Get rid of the extra white space on the left/right edges (you can delete these two lines witho ut a problem) xmin, xmax, ymin, ymax = plt.axis() plt.axis([limits[0],limits[1],ymin,ymax]) #Not necessarily needed in a Jupyter notebook, but it doesn't hurt plt.show() Take some time to play with the plot formatting and choose a <u>color</u> you like for the bars. Then call the function with your random samples. **Solution:** In [103]: | plot_histogram(samples,"x value","Number of Entries","Randomly Distributed Numbers 0:1",[0.0,1.0]) Randomly Distributed Numbers 0:1 $\mu = 0.499$, $\sigma = 0.290$ 17.5 15.0 Number of Entries 12.5 10.0 7.5 5.0 2.5 0.0 0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8 1.0 x value 4e. Now suppose you make an ensemble of 1000 pseudoexperiments where each pseduoexperiment consists of Nuniformly distributed random numbers. For each pseudoexperiment, define the measurement S to be $S \equiv rac{1}{N} \sum_{i}^{N} x_i$ Make histograms of S with the same x-axis as above for the cases N=2, N=5 and N=10. Determine the mean and the σ of the distributions displayed in these histograms. In [42]: #Calculates and returns S as defined above def pseudoexperiment(N): samples = np.random.rand(N) $\#samples = [x_1, x_2, \dots x_N]$ s = 0 #replace this with your calculation of s """Your code here""" return s #Performs each pseudoexperiment 1000 times and plot a histogram of the results def run_pseudoexperiments(N): $s_list = []$ #run the ensemble of 1000 pseudoexperiments and store measurements for i in range(1000): s_list.append(pseudoexperiment(N)) #plot a histogram of these 1000 mesa plot_histogram(s_list, "Mean Value of x", "Number of Entries", "1000 PseudoExperiments, each with "+str(N)+" Randomly Distributed x values",[0.0,1.0]) In [43]: # Uncomment this and run it after you have completed the code above #for N in [2,5,10]: run_pseudoexperiments(N) In each case, compare the σ you obtain to what you would predict if you assumed the experiments followed a normal distribution. **Solution:** #Calculates and returns S as defined above In [104]: def pseudoexperiment(N): samples = np.random.rand(N) $\#samples = [x_1, x_2, ..., x_N]$ s = sum(samples)/len(samples) **return** s for N in [2,5,10]: run_pseudoexperiments(N) 1000 PseudoExperiments, each with 2 Randomly Distributed x values $\mu = 0.505$, $\sigma = 0.209$ 25 20 Number of Entries 15 10 0.0 0.4 0.6 0.8 0.2 Mean Value of x 1000 PseudoExperiments, each with 5 Randomly Distributed x values $\mu = 0.497$, $\sigma = 0.131$ 35 30 Number of Entries 20 15 10 5 0.4 0.0 0.2 0.8 1.0 Mean Value of x 1000 PseudoExperiments, each with 10 Randomly Distributed x values $\mu = 0.505$, $\sigma = 0.092$ 50 40 Number of Entries 30 20 10 0.4 0.0 0.2 0.6 0.8 1.0 Mean Value of x **Question 5: Detector Resolution and Monte Carlo methods** Learning objectives In this question you will: • Understand what position resolution means using a silicon strip detector as an example • Demonstrate that you can use simulation to solve problems that are more complicated than what can be done analytically Learn how noise affects measurements In this problem we will study how the position resolution of a detector depends upon the properties of that detector. For our example, we will consider a silicon strip detector. We will describe our detector as an x-y plane segmented into strips, each of width ℓ in the y-direction. When a track moving in the z-direction passes through the plane, it deposits energy in the detector and that energy is collected using charge sensitive amplifiers (one per strip). You many assume that the incident track is normal to the silicon plane. Looking down on the strip detector (so that the incident tracks are traveling into the page), the detector looks like this: Drawing The position x=0, y=0 is taken to be the center of the middle strip. 5a. Suppose all the energy is deposited in a single strip (the strip the track passes through). Find an expression for the position resolution of the detector as a function of ℓ . The position resolution is defined to be $\sigma_x = \sqrt{var[(x_{meas}-x_{true})]}$ where x_{true} is the position where the track actually hit the detector. Because we only know which strip is hit, in this example x_{meas} is the center of the strip that is hit. **Solution:** This is essentially the same as the Central Limit Theorem problem. The expression for the variance is $\sigma^2 = \int (x-x_{meas})^2 f(x) dx$ where f(x) is the probability distribution function for x. If we let $x_{true}=x$ range from $-\ell/2$ to $\ell/2$ then x_{meas} always is 0 and $f(x)=1/\ell$. Thus $\sigma^2 = \int_{-\ell/2}^{\ell/2} x^2 (1/\ell) dx = rac{\ell^2}{12}$ Thus $\sigma = \ell/\sqrt{12}$. 5b. Suppose that the charge deposited in our detector spreads out due to physical effects such as diffusion. It is possible for more than one strip to register a signal. Assume in this part that our electronics is binary (i.e. registers a 1 if the deposited energy on the strip is above a specified threshold and 0 otherwise). Assume the threshold on the electronics is such that particles hitting within a distance of $\pm \ell/3$ of the center of the strip only register on a single strip while all particles hitting further from the strip center register on two strips. What is the position resolution now? (Here, if only one strip is hit, x_{meas} is the center of the strip. If two strips are hit, then x_{meas} is the common edge of the two hit strips). **Note:** this is *not* an unrealistic example. The ATLAS silicon strip detector has such binary readout. **Solution:** The only difference from part (a) is that $x_{meas}=0$ for the inner two thirds of the strip and $x_{meas}=\ell/2$ for the left sixth and $-\ell/2$ for the right sixth. So $\sigma^2 = \int_{-\ell/2}^{-\ell/3} (x - (-\ell/2))^2 (1/\ell) dx + \int_{-\ell/3}^{\ell/3} x^2 (1/\ell) dx + \int_{\ell/3}^{\ell/2} (x - \ell/2)^2 (1/\ell) dx = rac{\ell^2}{36}$ Thus $\sigma = \ell/6$ 5c. So far, it has been possible to calculate the position resolution analytically. In cases where the detector response is more complicated, this may not be the case. Typically, physicists model detector performance using Monte Carlo simulations. In the remainder of this problem, you will write a simple simulation to determine the position resolution of a silicon detector. Let's begin by reproducing the analytic results obtained above. Consider a silicon strip detector that consisting of several strips of width ℓ . Assume that the incident particles have a uniform distribution in x with $-\ell/2 < x < \ell/2$ and all have y=0. (We'll just focus on this "center strip", so x_{meas} can either be $-\ell/2$, 0, or $\ell/2$ depending on where the particle hits.) Generate 10,000 such particles for the case described in part 2(a) and for the case described in part 2(b). For each case, make a histogram of $(x_{meas}-x_{true})$ and verify that the resolution is consistent with that obtained in problem 2. You can use np.random.uniform() to sample from a uniform distribution with arbitrary bounds. We'd like 10,000 samples for this problem, so we set size = 10000. Note that we take $\ell=1$ for simplicity. In [2]: import numpy as np samples = np.random.uniform(-0.5, 0.5, size=10000) For the case of **2(a)**, $x_{meas}=0$ (the center of the strip), so we can simply find the variance of these samples and take the square root to find the position resolution. Note that this is really just a repetition of the first problem, but with our bounds shifted from (0,1) to (-0.5,0.5). Solution: #Import the pyplot module of matplotlib as "plt" In [8]: import matplotlib.pyplot as plt #Makes a histogram filled with the random numbers we generate def plot_histogram(samples,xtitle,ytitle, title, limits): #It would be nice to have the mean and standard deviation in the title, so let's get these mean, sigma = np.mean(samples), np.sqrt(np.var(samples)) #Plot the histogram of the sampled data with 100 bins and a nice color plt.hist(samples, bins=100, range=limits, color=(0,0.7,0.9)) #Set the color using (r,g,b) value es or # use a built-in matplotlib colo r""" #Add some axis labels and a descriptive title plt.xlabel(xtitle) plt.ylabel(ytitle) plt.title(title+'\n \$\mu={0:.3f},\ \sigma={1:.3f}\$'.format(mean,sigma)) #Get rid of the extra white space on the left/right edges (you can delete these two lines witho ut a problem) xmin, xmax, ymin, ymax = plt.axis() plt.axis([limits[0],limits[1],ymin,ymax]) #Not necessarily needed in a Jupyter notebook, but it doesn't hurt plt.show() In [4]: plot_histogram(samples,"x value","Number of Entries","True minus Measured Position",[-0.5,0.5]) True minus Measured Position $\mu = 0.001, \ \sigma = 0.289$ 140 100 of Entries 60 40 20 -0.4-0.2 0.2 0.4 0.0 x value 5d. For the case where two strips are sometimes hit, we need to consider the three different cases for x_{meas} . In [11]: #We'll call the quantity (x_meas - x_true) the "error" of the measurement errors = [] #Go through each of our random samples and append (x_meas - x_true) to the error list for x_true in samples: #particle hits the left third of strip **if** x_true < -1/3: x_meas = # """Your code here""" #particle hits the right third of strip **elif** $x_{true} > 1/3$: x_meas = #"""Your code here""" else: x meas = #"""Your code here""" errors.append(x_meas - x_true) plot_histogram(errors, "x value", "Number of Entries", "Measured-True Position", [-0.5, 0.5]) **Solution:** In [107]: #We'll call the quantity (x_meas - x_true) the "error" of the measurement #Go through each of our random samples and append (x_meas - x_true) to the error list for x_true in samples: #particle hits the left third of strip **if** x_true < -1/3: $x_meas = -0.5$ #particle hits the right third of strip **elif** $x_{true} > 1/3$: $x_{meas} = 0.5$ else: $x_meas = 0.0$ errors.append(x_meas - x_true) plot histogram(errors, "x value", "Number of Entries", "Randomly Distributed Numbers 0:1", [-0.5,0.5]) Randomly Distributed Numbers 0:1 $\mu = -0.001$, $\sigma = 0.168$ 200 Number of Entries 150 100 50 0 0.0 Note that this distribution has a rather funny shape, but the variance of 0.166 is much less than in the previous case (0.289). The diffusion helps us estimate the position.