

The stopped K^+ decay experiment TREK/E36 at J-PARC

Bishoy H. Dongwi

For the TREK Collaboration

Hampton University, Hampton VA 23668

January 28, 2020



*This work has been supported by DOE awards DE-SC0003884 and DE-SC0013941

New Physics beyond the Standard Model



New Physics beyond the Standard Model




In the world of weak interactions do electrons, muons and tauons behave the same way?

Lepton universality violation?

 $\mu - \tau$

$$R_{D(*)} = \frac{\mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow D^* \tau \nu)}{\mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow D^* \mu \nu)}$$




HFLAV average of combined $R(D)$ and $R(D^*)$ is 3.0σ from the SM prediction

LHCb (Phys. Rev. Lett. 113)

 $\mu - e$

$$R_K[q_{\min}^2, q_{\max}^2] = \frac{\int_{q_{\min}^2}^{q_{\max}^2} dq^2 \frac{d\Gamma(B \rightarrow K \mu^+ \mu^-)}{dq^2}}{\int_{q_{\min}^2}^{q_{\max}^2} dq^2 \frac{d\Gamma(B \rightarrow K e^+ e^-)}{dq^2}}$$




$$R_K = 0.745^{+0.090}_{-0.074} \pm 0.036 \text{ (sys)}$$

2.6σ deviation!

Lepton universality violation?

 $\mu - \tau$

$$R_{D(*)} = \frac{\mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow D^* \tau \nu)}{\mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow D^* \mu \nu)}$$




HFLAV average of combined $R(D)$ and $R(D^*)$ is 3.0σ from the SM prediction

LHCb (Phys. Rev. Lett. 113)

Lepton non-universality is the flagship for physics beyond the Standard Model

 $\mu - e$

$$R_K[q_{\min}^2, q_{\max}^2] = \frac{\int_{q_{\min}^2}^{q_{\max}^2} dq^2 \frac{d\Gamma(B \rightarrow K \mu^+ \mu^-)}{dq^2}}{\int_{q_{\min}^2}^{q_{\max}^2} dq^2 \frac{d\Gamma(B \rightarrow K e^+ e^-)}{dq^2}}$$




$$R_K = 0.745^{+0.090}_{-0.074} \pm 0.036 \text{ (sys)} \\ 2.6\sigma \text{ deviation!}$$

Lepton universality in K^+ decays

2-body decay of K^+


$$\Gamma(K_{l2}) = g_l^2 \left(\frac{G^2}{8\pi} \right) f_K^2 m_K m_l^2 \left[1 - \left(\frac{m_l^2}{m_K^2} \right) \right]^2$$



Lepton universality in K^+ decays

2-body decay of K^+

$$\Gamma(K_{l2}) = g_l^2 \left(\frac{G^2}{8\pi} \right) f_K^2 m_K m_l^2 \left[1 - \left(\frac{m_l^2}{m_K^2} \right)^2 \right]^2$$



Decay width ratio of electronic (K_{e2}) and muonic ($K_{\mu 2}$) decay modes

$$R_K^{SM} = \frac{\Gamma(K^+ \rightarrow e^+ \nu)}{\Gamma(K^+ \rightarrow \mu^+ \nu)} = \frac{m_e^2}{m_\mu^2} \left(\frac{m_K^2 - m_e^2}{m_K^2 - m_\mu^2} \right)^2 (1 + \delta_r)$$

- Hadronic form factors cancel
- Strong helicity suppression of electronic channel enhances sensitivity to effects beyond SM
- SM prediction is highly precise: $R_K^{SM} = (2.477 \pm 0.001) \times 10^{-5}$

Other measurements of lepton universality

- Highly precise SM value

$$R_K = (2.477 \pm 0.001) \times 10^{-5} \text{ (with } \delta_r = -0.036\text{), } \delta R_K/R_K = 0.04\%$$

V. Cirigliano, I. Rosell, Phys. Rev. Lett. 99, 231801 (2007)

- KLOE @ DAΦNE (in-flight decay)

$$R_K = (2.493 \pm 0.025 \pm 0.019) \times 10^{-5}$$

F. Ambrosino et al., Eur. Phys. J. C64, 627 (2009)

- NA62 @ CERN-SPS (in-flight decay)

$$R_K = (2.488 \pm 0.007 \pm 0.007) \times 10^{-5}$$

C. Lazzeroni et al., PLB719, 105 (2013)


- World average (2012)

$$R_K = (2.488 \pm 0.009) \times 10^{-5}, \delta R_K/R_K = 0.4\%$$

- Systematics:

- In-flight-decay experiments: kinematics overlap
- E36 stopped K^+ : detector acceptance and target
- E36 complementary to in-flight experiments

- E36 goal: $\delta R_K/R_K = \pm 0.2\% \text{ (stat)} \pm 0.15\% \text{ (syst)} [0.25\% \text{ total}]$**



The TREK/E36 Experiment at J-PARC: an overview

1 Preliminaries

- Lepton universality in K^+ decays

2 Introduction

- Big Bang nucleosynthesis

3 Additional mass Dark matter from high energy physics

4 Simulation study

• Geant4 geometry

• Verification of the e36g4MC

5 Analysis

• Overview

• Generator


• CsI(Tl) Analysis

6 Closing

• Summary

Big bang and nucleosynthesis to present

From the Big Bang to the present





Rotation curves of galaxies



Vera Rubin


DISTRIBUTION OF DARK MATTER IN NGC 3198



- Studied rotation curves of galaxies
- Found that they are FLAT!


► Katherine Freese (Public lecture)

Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB)



(▶ Jeff Filippini, UC Berkeley Cosmology Group (August 2005))


Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB)



Jeff Filippini (► UC Berkeley Cosmology Group)


CMB and power spectrum:

- Left over heat of the Big Bang
- Almost uniform background of radio waves that fill the universe
- Due to redshifting as the universe expands
- Power spectrum of CMB measures the amount of fluctuation in the CMB



- temperature spectrum at different angular scales
- Oscillations in the hot gas of the early universe, resonant frequencies and amplitudes

Energy of the universe



2014 P5 report

"It is imperative to search for dark matter along every feasible avenue," and the breadth of "well-motivated ideas for what dark matter could be, [which] include weakly interacting massive particles (WIMPs), gravitinos, axions, sterile neutrinos, asymmetric dark matter, and hidden sector dark matter"

Anomalies



THE DAILY GALAXY

The experiment known as DarkLight, developed by MIT physics professor Pet Fisher and Milner in collaboration with researchers at the Jefferson National Accelerator Laboratory in Virginia and others, will look for evidence of a massive dark photon with a specific energy postulated in one particular theory about

Has a Hungarian physics lab found a fifth force of nature?

Radioactive decay anomaly could imply a new fundamental force, theorists say.

Popular Mechanics

Given the excitement over the experiment at Arizona State University, is our new experiment called DarkLight that could confirm this gap? Randal Walker Popular Mechanics through what this news is understanding dark matter, and how DarkLight might prove it exists.

"DARK MATTER MIGHT INTERACT WITH ITSELF VIA
SOME YET UNKNOWN 'DARK FORCE.'"

PHYS.ORG

The paper uploaded by the UoC team has created some excitement, as well as public examinations of doubt—reports of the possibility of a fifth force of nature have been heard before, but none have panned out. But still, the idea is intriguing enough that several teams have announced plans to repeat the experiments conducted by the Hungarian team, and all eyes will be on the DarkLight experiments at the Jefferson Laboratory, where a team is

R. Corliss, MIT


PHOTON

Experiment DarkLight u Jefferson Laboratoriju, koji trazi tamne fotone, moći će za raznjeđe godinu dana provjeriti ovu tvrdnju. MIT fizik Ivica Frček je istraživač



Dongwi (Hampton U)

TREK/E36



- Proton radius puzzle, $(g - 2)_\mu$
- Strong CP problem
- Positron excess and ^8Be anomaly

Kohl (2016)

Dark matter quagmire



[G. Bertone and T. Tait, ARXIV:1701.01840]

Neutral boson search in stopped K^+ decays

K^+ decays $\sim 10^{10}$

Signal 1: $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ A'$, $A' \rightarrow e^+ e^-$

Background: $\text{BR}(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ e^+ e^-) \sim 2.9 \times 10^{-7} \sim 2,900 \text{ ev.}$

Signal 2: $K^+ \rightarrow \mu^+ \nu A'$, $A' \rightarrow e^+ e^-$

Background: $\text{BR}(K^+ \rightarrow \mu^+ \nu e^+ e^-) \sim 2.5 \times 10^{-5} \sim 250,000 \text{ ev.}$

Add. background from $K^+ \rightarrow \mu^+ \nu \pi^0 \rightarrow \mu^+ \nu e^+ e^-(\gamma)$

π^0 decays



1) 3×10^8

2) 2×10^9

π^0 production: $K^+ \rightarrow \mu^+ \nu \pi^0$ (3.3%) $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0$ (21.1%)

Signal 3: $\pi^0 \rightarrow \gamma A'$, $A' \rightarrow e^+ e^-$


Background: $\text{BR}(\pi^0 \rightarrow \gamma e^+ e^-) \sim 1.2\% \sim 0.3 (2.3) \times 10^7 \text{ ev.}$



Onto the Land Of The Rising Sun we go!



Bird's eye view of J-PARC



Timeline of TREK/E36

TREK: Time Reversal Experiment with Kaons



December 2014

- Installed detector components


February - June 2015

- Completed installation of C3 & C4
- Cabling
- Detector maintenance

September - December 2015

- Physics run
- Data taking

E36 detector geometry






Stopped K⁺ method
K1.1BR beamline
K⁺ stopping target

Momentum measurement
MWPC (C2, C3, C4)
Spiral fiber tracker (SFT)
Thin trigger counter (TTC)

Particle ID
TOF
AC
PGC

Gamma ray
CsI(Tl)

Geant4 generated geometry



- e36g4MC detector geometry



• Detector Assembly

Dongwi (Hampton U)

TREK/E36


LLNL Seminar 01.28.2020

Geant4 cont.: Central Detector




- Central Detector


Tracking package and the e36g4MC comparison





- Consistency check: propagation and magnetic field evaluation
- Simulated data: tracks propagated and reconstructed with Kalman Filter (KF)
- Established that KF tracking/propagation fully consistent with G4




Tracking package and the e36g4MC comparison




- Energy loss/material budget comparison
- Anode plane → anode wires







Tracking package and the e36g4MC comparison




- Energy loss/material budget comparison
- Momentum distribution of $K_{\mu 2}$ and $K_{\pi 2}$ at C4
- No detector resolution in the simulation



$K^+ \rightarrow \mu^+ \nu_\mu \quad (P_{\mu^+} = 236 \text{ MeV}/c)$


- Trigger on Target \otimes TOF1 \otimes TTC \otimes TOF2
- $z = 2.5\text{cm}$ and $x = y = 0.0\text{cm}$ $\sigma_z = 8.75\text{cm}$, $\sigma_{x,y} = 0.15\text{cm}$
- Updates in progress

Analysis overview



Generator channels

K⁺ Channels


Label	Branch	Ratio
0	$K^+ \rightarrow e^+ \nu$	1.582×10^{-5}
1	$K^+ \rightarrow \mu^+ \nu$	6.355×10^{-1}
2	$K^+ \rightarrow e^+ \pi^0 \nu$	5.07×10^{-2}
3	$K^+ \rightarrow \mu^+ \pi^0 \nu$	3.352×10^{-2}
4	$K^+ \rightarrow e^+ \pi^0 \pi^0 \nu$	2.55×10^{-5}
5	$K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- e^+ \nu$	4.247×10^{-5}
6	$K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \mu^+ \nu$	1.4×10^{-5}
7	$K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0$	2.067×10^{-1}
8	$K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0 \pi^0$	1.760×10^{-2}
9	$K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^+ \pi^-$	5.583×10^{-2}
10	$K^+ \rightarrow \mu^+ \nu \gamma$	6.2×10^{-3}
11	$K^+ \rightarrow e^+ \nu \gamma$	9.4×10^{-6}
12	$K^+ \rightarrow \mu^+ \pi^0 \nu \gamma$	1.25×10^{-5}
13	$K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^+ \pi^- \gamma$	1.04×10^{-4}
14	$K^+ \rightarrow \mu^+ \nu A'$	$\epsilon^2 \times \text{ratio of channel 16}$
15	$K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ A'$	$\epsilon^2 \times \text{ratio of channel 17}$
16	$K^+ \rightarrow \mu^+ e^+ e^- \nu$	2.5×10^{-5}
17	$K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ e^+ e^-$	3×10^{-7}

π^0 Channels

Label	Branch	Ratio
0	$\pi^0 \rightarrow \gamma \gamma$	9.8823×10^{-1}
1	$\pi^0 \rightarrow e^+ e^- \gamma$	1.174×10^{-2}
2	$\pi^0 \rightarrow \gamma A'$	$\epsilon^2 \times \text{ratio of channel 2}$


ROOT based generator

- Interactive: utilizes Messenger Classes
- Allows for selection of decay modes and branching ratios

Generator in action: Cut range for $\delta(m_{A'})$ 

- σ is determined by Gaussian fit of $m_{e^+e^-}$
- Relationship between σ and $m_{A'}$

CsI(Tl) analysis



- PIN photodiodes: readout the scintillation light of the CsI(Tl) crystals
- PIN diodes and pre-amplifier was assembled in an Al container
- Output signal from pre-amplifier was fed into shaping amplifier with 1 μ s shaping time
- VF48 flash ADCs used to record shaping amplifier outputs

J. A. Macdonald (Nucl. Instrum. Meth., A506 2003)



CsI(Tl) waveform analysis

- μ rising factor


$$F(t) = \frac{A}{1 - e^{-(t-\tau_0)/\lambda}} \cdot \text{Freq} \left[\frac{t-\tau_0-d}{\mu} \right] \cdot \left(\frac{t-\tau_0}{\tau_1} e^{\left[1 - \frac{t-\tau_0}{\tau_1}\right]} + e^{\frac{t-\tau_0}{\tau_2}} e^{\left[1 - \frac{t-\tau_0}{\tau_2}\right]} \right)$$

- λ is slow shape constant
- τ_0 is rise time
- τ_1 decay constant
- τ_2 local decay constant

H. Ito (Nucl. Instrum. Meth., A901 2018)




Pulse fitting in action: Pulse height distribution



$K_{\mu 2}$ selection criteria


- Require single crystal per event
- First pulse time coincides with the K^+ decay
- Require a second peak

Pulse fitting in action: energy calibration from $K_{\mu 2}$




Pulse fitting in action: energy calibration from $K_{\mu 2}$

CsI: reconstructed energy for $K_{\mu 2}$




- $C_i = \frac{dE_{CsI}}{(A-P)_i}$, $i = 1, \dots, 768$
- Correction for energy loss from CD system



Visual Cooker



Obtaining clusters



Obtaining clusters cont...







Cluster criterion:

- High hardware trigger due to high rate
- Several clustering patterns need to be considered
- $N_{\text{crys}} \geq 2$ and $N_{\text{crys}} = 1$ (single crystal clusters)
- Currently single crystal clusters are considered as well
- Analysis is performed for $\pi^0 \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$, while allowing for a maximum of 3 cluster
- In case of 3 clusters, sum over combinations in search for which clusters have

$$.90 \leq M_{\text{inv}}(\pi^0) \leq .140 \text{ GeV}/c^2$$

CsI(Tl) cluster sanity plots



Summary

Summary and future work

- Universe is littered with anomalies that must be explained
(exciting times!)
- Generator that has been successfully integrated into e36g4MC
- Generator is being used to produce exclusion limits for our experiment → **Currently underway**
- Preliminary energy calibration for CsI(Tl) using both $K_{\mu 2}$ and $K_{\pi 2}$
- Event viewer has been fully integrated into Cooker as has been shown

ありがとうございました
(Thank You)




Backup

Tracking: propagation with G4 and reconstruction with Kalman Filter

Use geantinos as the primary particle

Propagate through magnetic field and compare the results



Geantinos propagate in the field without any physics.


- Two important corrections are taken, including the setup of the field map and the module for the field evaluation.
- Initial vectors: C4; End-points: C2
- Pictures show differences of parameters of state vectors at C2 extracted from two packages
 - ✓ Magnetic field map is consistent with each other
 - ✓ Evaluation of magnetic field is consistent with each other

Runge-Kutta methods are consistent

μ/e miss-identification

PID with:

- TOF
- Aerogel Č
- Lead glass



TOF

Flight length	250 cm
Time resolution	<100 ps
Mis-ID probability	7×10^{-4}

Aerogel Č counter

Radiator thickness	4.0 cm
Refraction index	1.08
e^+ efficiency	>98%
Mis-ID probability	3%



Lead glass (PGC)

Material	SF6W
Refraction index	1.05
e^+ efficiency	98%
Mis-ID probability	4%

$$P_{\text{mis}} (\text{total}) = P_{\text{mis}} (\text{TOF}) \times P_{\text{mis}} (\text{AČ}) \times P_{\text{mis}} (\text{LG}) = 8 \times 10^{-7} < O(10^{-6})$$