

Développement d'une échelle double face pour la trajectométrie en physique des hautes énergies.

Ph. D. defense

Benjamin BOITRELLE

Supervisors: Jérôme Baudot, Ingrid Maria Gregor

DESY

February 13, 2017



Outlines

1 Introduction

- Standard Model
- ILC and ILD
- Example of study

2 PLUME project

- ILD vertex detector
- Design
- Main aims

3 Mechanical deformation

- Test Beam @ SPS
- Origin of deviations and how to take them into account
- Results on the correction of deviations

4 Radiation length measurement

- Motivation
- Test beam @ DESY
- Theoretical estimation
- Results

5 Conclusion and outlook

What is the Universe made of?

Matter:

Fermions

What is the Universe made of?

Matter:

Leptons Quarks
Fermions

What is the Universe made of?

Matter:

	Leptons			Quarks		
Fermions	e^-	μ	τ			
	ν_e	ν_μ	ν_τ			

What is the Universe made of?

Matter:

	Leptons			Quarks		
Fermions	e^-	μ	τ	u	c	t
	ν_e	ν_μ	ν_τ	d	s	b

What is the Universe made of?

Matter:

	Leptons			Quarks		
Fermions	e^-	μ	τ	u	c	t
	ν_e	ν_μ	ν_τ	d	s	b

Antimatter:

- To each fermion is associated an anti-fermion
- Same quantum numbers as fermions BUT opposite electric charge

What is the Universe made of?

Matter:

	Leptons			Quarks		
Fermions	e^-	μ	τ	u	c	t
	ν_e	ν_μ	ν_τ	d	s	b

Antimatter:

- To each fermion is associated an anti-fermion
- Same quantum numbers as fermions BUT opposite electric charge

Forces:

γ

Bosons



What is the Universe made of?

Matter:

	Leptons			Quarks		
Fermions	e^-	μ	τ	u	c	t
	ν_e	ν_μ	ν_τ	d	s	b

Antimatter:

- To each fermion is associated an anti-fermion
- Same quantum numbers as fermions BUT opposite electric charge

Forces:

$$\gamma \rightarrow \text{E.M. interaction}$$

Bosons



What is the Universe made of?

Matter:

	Leptons			Quarks		
Fermions	e^-	μ	τ	u	c	t
	ν_e	ν_μ	ν_τ	d	s	b

Antimatter:

- To each fermion is associated an anti-fermion
- Same quantum numbers as fermions BUT opposite electric charge

Forces:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \gamma & \rightarrow & \text{E.M. interaction} \\ Z^0/W^\pm & \rightarrow & \text{Weak interaction} \end{array}$$

Bosons



What is the Universe made of?

Matter:

	Leptons			Quarks		
Fermions	e^-	μ	τ	u	c	t
	ν_e	ν_μ	ν_τ	d	s	b

Antimatter:

- To each fermion is associated an anti-fermion
- Same quantum numbers as fermions BUT opposite electric charge

Forces:

Bosons	γ	\rightarrow	E.M. interaction
	Z^0/W^\pm	\rightarrow	Weak interaction
	g	\rightarrow	Strong interaction



What is the Universe made of?

Matter:

	Leptons			Quarks		
Fermions	e^-	μ	τ	u	c	t
	ν_e	ν_μ	ν_τ	d	s	b

Antimatter:

- To each fermion is associated an anti-fermion
- Same quantum numbers as fermions BUT opposite electric charge

Forces:

Bosons	γ	\rightarrow	E.M. interaction
	Z^0/W^\pm	\rightarrow	Weak interaction
	g	\rightarrow	Strong interaction
	graviton	\rightarrow	Gravitation



What is the Universe made of?

Matter:

	Leptons			Quarks		
Fermions	e^-	μ	τ	u	c	t
	ν_e	ν_μ	ν_τ	d	s	b

Antimatter:

- To each fermion is associated an anti-fermion
- Same quantum numbers as fermions BUT opposite electric charge

Forces:

Bosons	γ	\rightarrow	E.M. interaction
	Z^0/W^\pm	\rightarrow	Weak interaction
	g	\rightarrow	Strong interaction
	graviton	\rightarrow	Gravitation
	H	\rightarrow	Higgs field



Standard Model

Quantum field theory

- Lagrangian field theory
- Particles \Rightarrow matter field
- Bosons \Rightarrow gauge field
- Symmetries

Standard Model

- Interactions: QED + EW + QCD
- Symmetry group: $U(1) \times SU(2) \times SU(3)$
- Spontaneous electroweak symmetry via Higgs mechanism
 \Rightarrow particles' mass

Open questions


Limitations

- Why are there 3 families of particles?
- Neutrino oscillation (theory does not predict mass of neutrino)
- Dark matter and dark energy
- ...

Other theories

- SUSY
- GUT
- Technicolor
- ...


How to study matter?



LHC


- Centre-of-mass energy $\text{sqrt}s = 14 \text{ TeV}$
- Collision with composites particles (protons or Pb)
 - Unknown momentum distribution of partons
 - Unknown polarisation of colliding partons
 - Trigger needed
- Discovery machine
- Need a complementary machine to perform more precise

International Linear Collider



- Future e^+e^- linear collider at $\sqrt{s} = 250 - 500$ GeV (upgrade up to $\sqrt{s} = 1$ TeV)
- Polarised beam
- Luminosity $\simeq 2 \times 10^{34}$ cm $^{-2}$ s $^{-1}$
- Candidate site: Kitakami in northern Japan
- To study properties of the Higgs boson, top physics...

SiD and ILD



Silicon Detector

- Silicon tracking
(radius = 1.2m)
- $B_{field} = 5\text{ T}$





International Linear Detector

- TPC + silicon envelope
(radius = 1.8 m)
- $B_{field} = 3.5\text{ T}$

Both detectors designed for Particle Flow Calorimetry

- High granularity calorimeters (ECAL and HCAL) inside solenoid
- Low mass tracker to reduce interactions and conversions

Overview of the ILD




Higgs boson study

- Particle's mass: electroweak symmetry breaking via Higgs-Brout-Englert mechanism
- Discovery of the Higgs boson in 2012 by CMS and ATLAS (LHC)

Measurements @ LHC:

- Mass: 125.7 ± 0.4 GeV
- Spin: 0
- Couplings of Higgs boson to fermions and bosons, except c-quarks, gluons and Higgs self-coupling

Higgs boson study at the ILC




- Analysis of simulated data at the ILC @ 350 GeV with different polarisations:

- $e_L^+ e_R^-$
- $e_R^+ e_L^-$

How to perform the analysis?

- Study final state leading to $H\nu\nu$ channel where the Higgs boson decays into a pair of quarks or gluons
- Focus on Higgs Strahlung and WW fusion:
 $m_H \simeq 125 \text{ GeV}$ and $\sqrt{s} = 350 \text{ GeV} \Rightarrow$ Higgs Strahlung and WW-fusion have comparable cross sections.



Using polarized beam to separate the processes.

Reconstruction of the $H\gamma\gamma$ channel

Final state signature:

- 2 jets coming from the Higgs boson decay
- Missing energy

Events selection:

- ① Reject events with isolated leptons
- ② Remove $\gamma\gamma$ overlay interactions
- ③ Look for jets
- ④ Find displaced vertices of the jets
- ⑤ Tag 2 jets coming from Higgs boson decay

Background processes


Events which give same detector response or same final state

- W-boson pair production
 - Semi-leptonic decay: $e^+e^- \rightarrow W^+W^- \rightarrow \nu_l l^\pm q\bar{q}$
 - Hadronic decay: $e^+e^- \rightarrow W^+W^- \rightarrow q\bar{q}q\bar{q}$
- Z-boson pair production
 - $e^+e^- \rightarrow ZZ \rightarrow \nu_l \bar{\nu}_l q\bar{q}$
 - $e^+e^- \rightarrow ZZ \rightarrow l^+l^- q\bar{q}$
 - $e^+e^- \rightarrow ZZ \rightarrow q\bar{q}q\bar{q}$
- Single W-boson production
 - $e^+e^- \rightarrow W^\pm e^\pm \nu_e \rightarrow \nu_e e^\pm q\bar{q}$
- Single Z-boson production
 - $e^+e^- \rightarrow Ze^-e^+ \rightarrow q\bar{q}e^-e^+$
 - $e^+e^- \rightarrow Z q\bar{q} \rightarrow q\bar{q}q\bar{q}$
- Higgsstrahlung:
 - $e^+e^- \rightarrow ZH \rightarrow q\bar{q}q\bar{q}$
 - $e^+e^- \rightarrow ZH \rightarrow l^+l^- q\bar{q}$



Distribution of the visible invariant mass with background

$\sqrt{s} = 350 \text{ GeV}$, luminosity: 250 fb^{-1} and polarisation: e_L^-, e_R^+



Distribution of each processes

Process	Expected events
Zhad	$1.3 \cdot 10^7$
WW had	$2.2 \cdot 10^6$
WW semilep	$3.7 \cdot 10^6$
ZZ had	$2.0 \cdot 10^5$
ZZ semilep	$1.9 \cdot 10^5$
singleW semilep	$5.4 \cdot 10^5$
singleZee semi	$1.0 \cdot 10^5$
singleZnn semi	$1.2 \cdot 10^5$
Higgs BG	$5.3 \cdot 10^4$
Other Higgs boson decay	$1.0 \cdot 10^4$
Background	$1.9 \cdot 10^7$
Signal	$2.2 \cdot 10^4$

Reducing the background

Find optimized cuts

- For each cut, try to find the one which reduces the signal the least

$$\text{significance} = \frac{\text{signal}}{\sqrt{\text{signal} + \text{background}}}$$

- Apply the cuts from the one which gives best significance to the one gives the worst

Cuts to reduce the background

cut0 Number of isolated lepton (niso): niso = 0

cut1 Transverse Momentum visible (Ptvis): $35 < \text{Ptvis} < 155 \text{ GeV}$

cut2 Visible mass (mvis): $95 < \text{mvis} < 140 \text{ GeV}$

cut3 Angle between the two jets (cosa): $-1 < \text{cosa} < 0.22$

...



Reduction table after applying cuts

Process	Background	Signal	Significance
Cross-section (fb)	$5.69 \cdot 10^4$	$6.82 \cdot 10^2$	
Expected event number	$1.88 \cdot 10^7$	$2.25 \cdot 10^4$	5.2
No isolated leptons	$1.65 \cdot 10^7$	$2.23 \cdot 10^4$	5.5
$35 < P_t^{\text{vis}} < 155 \text{ GeV}$	$9.31 \cdot 10^5$	$1.82 \cdot 10^4$	18.7
$95 < m_{\text{vis}} < 140 \text{ GeV}$	$1.50 \cdot 10^5$	$1.66 \cdot 10^4$	40.6
$-1 < \cos \theta < 0.22$	$8.76 \cdot 10^4$	$1.57 \cdot 10^4$	48.8
$26 < (\text{N.R.C} > 1\text{GeV}) < 99$	$2.25 \cdot 10^4$	$1.19 \cdot 10^4$	56.3
$0.11 < \text{DurhamjD2ym} < 1$	$1.78 \cdot 10^4$	$1.05 \cdot 10^4$	62.3
$0 < \text{abs}(\text{RefinedjPzvis}) < 113 \text{ GeV}$	$1.51 \cdot 10^4$	$1.01 \cdot 10^4$	63.5
$156 < \text{RefinedjEmiss} < 230 \text{ GeV}$	$1.37 \cdot 10^4$	$9.85 \cdot 10^3$	64.1

Outlook

- Other method of selection could improve the significance (TMVA)
- Focus on Higgs boson decay mode, especially $H \rightarrow c\bar{c}$


⇒ determine vertex detector geometry

Outlines


- 1 Introduction
- 2 PLUME project
 - ILD vertex detector
 - Design
 - Main aims
- 3 Mechanical deformation
- 4 Radiation length measurement
- 5 Conclusion and outlook

The ILD Vertex Detector

Two geometry options



5 single-sided layers



3 double-sided layers

Impact parameter resolution

- $\sigma_{r\phi} \simeq \sigma_{rz} \simeq a \oplus \frac{b}{p \cdot \sin^{3/2}\theta}$
- Hit resolution: $a \simeq 5\mu\text{m} \Rightarrow \sigma_{\text{spatial}} < 3\mu\text{m}$
- Multiple scattering: $b \simeq 10 - 15\mu\text{m} \Rightarrow \text{material budget per layer} \simeq 0.15 \% X_0$

Double-sided VXD: PLUME



PLUME = Pixelated Ladder with Ultra-low Material Embedding




Motivation

ILD Vertex detector at ILC


Design

- Double-sided ladder with an active area of $1 \times 12\text{cm}^2$
- On each side: six MIMOSA-26 CMOS sensors thinned down to $\sim 50\text{ }\mu\text{m}$ on a kapton-metal flex cable
- 2 mm of silicon carbide foam as mechanical support and spacer between two modules

What does it look like?





Picture of one module with copper traces.



Scheme of one PLUME ladder.




Foam support structure



Properties

- Open-cell foam
- Macroscopically uniform
- No tensioning needed
- Density: 4 to 8 % (2-3 % possible)
- Low thermal and electrical conductivity (50 W/m/K)

MIMOSA-26 sensor



Monolithic Active Pixels Sensor (MAPS)

- Pitch: 18.4 μm (square pixels)
- Active area: $10.6 \times 21.2\text{mm}^2$ (576 rows x 1152 columns)
- Integration time: 115.2 μs (200 ns per line)
- Binary output with Zero suppression
- Well known sensors \Rightarrow used for EUDET telescope
- Extended to MIMOSA-28 exploited in STAR-PXL vertex detector @ RHIC-BNL since 2014




Main aims

- Constraint material budget $\Rightarrow < 0.3 \% X_0$
- Study how to implement power pulsing and its impact on a strong magnetic field
- Study the advantage of having two measurement points (mini vectors)
- Study impact of the mechanical structure on sensor performance

Outlines

- 1 Introduction
- 2 PLUME project
- 3 Mechanical deformation
 - Test Beam @ SPS
 - Origin of deviations and how to take them into account
 - Results on the correction of deviations
- 4 Radiation length measurement
- 5 Conclusion and outlook

Test beam @ SPS with 120 GeV π^- in November 2011



- Beam test on line H6a @ SPS
- Reference plane: 4 Mimosa 26
- Validation of the first double-sided ladder equipped with 12 Mi26 sensors


Ladder performance studies:

- In threshold (5 and 6 mV)
- In position (sensor 1-2, 3-4 and 5-6)
- Without and with angle (between 30° and 40°)
- With two different air flow speeds ($\simeq 3$ to 6 ms^{-1})


Jérôme Baudot, Gilles Claus, Loïc Cousin, Mathieu Goffe, Rohrry Gold, Joel Goldstein, Ingrid Gregor, Robert Maria.

Test beam @ SPS with 120 GeV π^- in November 2011


Three configurations studied:



Module perpendicular to the beam.



Module tilted (between 28° and 40°).




Module tilted ($\simeq 60^\circ$).

⇒ Study track-hit residual and the distribution of this residual as a function of the relative position of the beam on the sensor.

Analysis performed with TAF (TAPI Analysis Framework).

Track-hit residual









Device Under Test (DUT) alignment:

- Telescope planes defined particle's track
- Alignment of DUT in local coordinate system:
 - Define a maximal range in which a hit can be associated to a track
 - Find the best tilt and position to minimise the distance between a hit and its associated track.

Module perpendicular to the beam

Threshold 6σ , air flow speed $< 5\text{m/s}$ and 1.8M events.





Spatial residual obtained after alignment:

$$\sigma_u \simeq 4.2 \mu\text{m} \text{ and } \sigma_v \simeq 4 \mu\text{m}$$

Module titled in one direction (w.r.t. to the beam axis)

Threshold 6 σ , air flow speed < 5m/s, 720k events and 36° tilt.



Spatial residual obtained after alignment:

$\sigma_u \simeq 6.1 \mu\text{m}$ and $\sigma_v \simeq 3.8 \mu\text{m}$


Origin of deviations

Consequence of the ladder's characteristics


- Use of ultra-thin ($50 \mu\text{m}$) and precise sensors (spatial resolution less than $4 \mu\text{m}$)
- Mechanical constraints induce permanent deformations ($\simeq 10 \mu\text{m}$) which can not be flattened during the ladder assembly

Metrology of the module's surface (performed at Bristol)

Plume Ladder Side A




Plume Ladder Side B



Origin of the deviations

Artefacts from the modelling of our sensors during the analysis

- Sensors modeled as completely flat planes
- The track extrapolation is sensitive to the exact position of the hit on the plane and the angle of incidence



Deviations of the residual

$$\delta W = \frac{\delta U}{\tan \theta}$$

How to describe deviations from the flat plane?

arXiv:1403.2286 [physics.ins-det] CMS paper




- Sensor shape parametrised as a sum of products of modified Legendre polynomials:

$$w(u_r, v_r) = w$$

$$+ w_{10} \cdot u_r + w_{01} \cdot v_r$$


$$+ w_{20} \cdot (u_r^2 - 1/3) + w_{11} \cdot (u_r \cdot v_r) + w_{02} \cdot (v_r^2 - 1/3)$$

- In our case, we used Legendre polynomials of the 11th order only in the direction of the deformation.




Deformation's parametrisation

Possibility to parametrise the deformation with Legendre polynomials of the 11th order .



Correction of the deviations between real hits and extrapolated ones




Spatial residual obtained after correction:
 $\sigma_u \simeq 5.9 \mu\text{m}$ instead of $\sigma_u \simeq 6.1 \mu\text{m}$

Module tilted with an angle of 28°


Threshold: 5σ , air flow speed: 6 m/s, 720k events.

Before correction



$$\sigma = 9.855 \mu\text{m}$$

After correction



$$\sigma = 5.346 \mu\text{m}$$

Summary of correction for different angles and same planes

Spatial residuals


Side	Tilted angle (°)	$\sigma_u^{\text{Def}} (\mu\text{m})$	$\sigma_u^{\text{Cor}} (\mu\text{m})$	Improvement
Front	28	9.0 ± 0.1	4.9 ± 0.1	46.6 %
Back	28	5.7 ± 0.1	4.7 ± 0.1	17.5 %
Front	36	14.1 ± 0.1	6.1 ± 0.1	56.0 %
Back	36	6.8 ± 0.1	5.9 ± 0.1	13.2 %
Front	60	41.2 ± 0.15	25.8 ± 0.2	37.4 %
Back	60	23.3 ± 0.13	21.7 ± 0.1	6.8 %

$\sigma_{\text{tel}} = 2.2 \mu\text{m}$ for 36° and $\sigma_{\text{tel}} = 18.8 \mu\text{m}$ for 60° .

Outlines

- 1 Introduction
- 2 PLUME project
- 3 Mechanical deformation
- 4 Radiation length measurement
 - Motivation
 - Test beam @ DESY
 - Theoretical estimation
 - Results
- 5 Conclusion and outlook

Multiple scattering



Charged particles traveling through matter:

- Lose energy via inelastic collisions with atomic electrons
- Deflection by many small angles (Coulomb scattering from nuclei)

$$\theta_0 = \frac{13.6(\text{MeV})}{p} \left(\frac{x}{X_0} \right)^{0.555}$$


Motivation of measuring the radiation length:

- Tracking system has to detect particle's path and minimise its energy degradation
- Physics analysis: reconstruction of events depends strongly on the energy loss inside the different part of detectors

Test beam @ DESY with 5 GeV e^- (April 2016)



- Test Beam 21
- Reference plane: 4 EUDET telescope planes
- Goal: radiation length measurement



Estimation of the radiation length





Beam passes through

- 2× Mi-26 (thinned down to $\sim 50 \mu\text{m}$): 0.053 % X_0
- 4× glue layers: $\sim 0.01 \% X_0$
- 1× SiC foam: $\sim 0.184 \% X_0$
- 2× flex-cable:
 $\sim 0.084 - 0.092 \% X_0$


$$\Rightarrow \frac{x}{X_0} \simeq 0.498 - 0.515 \% X_0$$

Kink angle measurement between 1 and 4 GeV

Fitted kink angle distributions



Material budget



$$\frac{x}{X_0} \text{ | estimated } \simeq 0.498 - 0.515 \% X_0$$
$$\frac{x}{X_0} \text{ | measured } \simeq 0.47 \pm 0.02 \% X_0$$

Summary

- Mechanical deformations are impacting the spatial resolution
- An offline algorithm reduces this impact
- Radiation length measured confirms the theoretical estimation


$$\frac{x}{x_0} \text{ |}_{\text{estimated}} \simeq 0.498 - 0.515 \% X_0$$
$$\frac{x}{x_0} \text{ |}_{\text{measured}} \simeq 0.47 \pm 0.02 \% X_0$$

Outlook

- Study ladder performance for low energy (test beam April 2016)
- New prototype with a material budget of $0.35\% X_0$ has been built, tested in laboratory but not yet in real conditions
- Double-sided ladders could be enriched with sensors having different characteristics (fast integration time VS good spatial resolution)
- Using the beam structure to apply a power-pulsing method

Thanks for your attention !!!


Higgs boson potential



Higgs boson physics at the ILC

- Same measurements as LHC: couplings, mass and spin
- Model independent measurement: no dependence on theory
- Total Higgs width
- $H \rightarrow c\bar{c}/gg$
- Higgs self couplings


Zero Suppression logic (SUZE)




SUZE logic split in 3 blocks:

- **Sparse Data Scan (SDS)** Hit detection per line and data encoding, until 6 states consecutive pixels (1 to 4 pixels) per block of 64 columns;
- **Multiplexing Logic (Mux)** giving up to 9 states;
- **Memory storage** 2 blocks to store the states of the full frame, switching to avoid dead time (during one acquire states of event N, the other one transfer the information of frame N-1).

Column parallel readout




MAPS principle




Young Modulus


Material Selection Graphs



Spatial resolution for different pitch (IPHC-Strasbourg)



Characterization of one sensor



Threshold scan

Normalised response of pixels in a sub-matrix (288 discriminators) as a function of threshold applied (mV).

Noise performances

- Temporal noise (derivative of the S-curve): 0.79 mV
- Fixed pattern noise (thresholds' dispersion for a mid-point): 0.2 mV
- Offset: 0.16 mV

⇒ Can now define different thresholds

Higgs Strahlung kinematics

$$E_H = \frac{s - M_Z^2 + M_H^2}{2\sqrt{s}}$$

$$E_Z = \frac{s - M_H^2 + M_Z^2}{2\sqrt{s}}$$

$$|\vec{p}_H| = |\vec{p}_Z| = \frac{\sqrt{[s - (M_H + M_Z)^2] \cdot [s - (M_H - M_Z)^2]}}{2\sqrt{s}}$$

If $M_H = 125$ GeV, $M_Z = 91.2$ GeV and $\sqrt{s} = 350$ GeV, then:

$$E_H \simeq 185.4 \text{ GeV}$$

$$E_Z \simeq 164.6 \text{ GeV}$$

$$|\vec{p}_H| = |\vec{p}_Z| \simeq 68.5 \text{ GeV}$$

Detector performances

Vertexing

$$\sigma_{\text{IP}} = 5 \oplus \frac{10}{p \sin^{3/2} \theta} (\mu\text{m})$$

Tracking

$$\sigma(1/p) = 2 \times 10^{-5} (\text{GeV}^{-1})$$

Jet energy

$$\sigma_E/E = 0.3/\sqrt{E(\text{GeV})}$$

Particle Flow Algorithm

- Typical jet:
 - Charged hadrons \simeq 60 %
 - Photons \simeq 30 %
 - Neutral \simeq 10 %
- Standard approach
 - All jet components energy measured in ECAL/HCAL
 - $E_{jet} = E_{ECAL} + E_{HCAL}$
- Particle flow calorimetry
 - Measurement of charged particles in tracker
 - Measurement of photon in ECAL
 - Measurement of hadrons in HCAL
 - $E_{jet} = E_{Track} + E_{\gamma} + E_n$

Why a linear collider?

Limitations of e^+e^- colliders

- Synchrotron radiation loss $\sim E^4/r$
- Synchrotron cost: \sim quadratically with energy
- Power consumption

Advantages of linear colliders

- Not limited by synchrotron radiation
- Cost: \sim linear with energy
- Polarisation of both beams
- Detectors close to the IP \Rightarrow optimum for c-tagging

ILC interaction region

- 1 interaction region for 2 detectors
- Push-pull:
 - Detectors mounted on movable platforms
 - Sharing of beam time
 - Switching time: 24h to 48h
 - Allow cross-checking

- Bunch spacing of ~ 554 ns
- 1312 bunches in a 1 ms long pulse (train)
- Quiet time: 199 ms
- Occupancy dominated by beam background and noise
- Reading during quiet time possible

Beam polarisation

Simulated data: 100 % left or right events

$$\sigma_{P(e^+, e^-)} = \left(\frac{1 - P_{e^-}}{2} \right) \left(\frac{1 + P_{e^+}}{2} \right) \sigma_{RL} + \left(\frac{1 + P_{e^+}}{2} \right) \left(\frac{1 - P_{e^-}}{2} \right) \sigma_{LR}$$

$$\sigma_{P(e^+, e^- = 0.3, -0.8)} = 0.585 \cdot \sigma_{RL} + 0.035 \cdot \sigma_{LR}$$