Systematic Studies for the π^0 Calibration of the Crystal-Ball Detector

Martin Sobotzik

Johannes-Gutenberg Universität Mainz

xx.yy.2017

Inhaltsverzeichnis

$$\gamma + p \to \pi^0 + p \to p + \gamma_1 \gamma_2 \tag{1}$$

$$m_{\pi^0} = \sqrt{2E_1 E_2 (1 - \cos(\alpha))}$$
 (2)

$$\gamma + p \to \pi^0 + p \to p + \gamma_1 \gamma_2 \tag{1}$$

$$m_{\pi^0} = \sqrt{2E_1 E_2 (1 - \cos(\alpha))}$$
 (2)

 How can it be checked if there is a energy dependency in the CB?

$$\gamma + p \to \pi^0 + p \to p + \gamma_1 \gamma_2 \tag{1}$$

$$m_{\pi^0} = \sqrt{2E_1 E_2 (1 - \cos(\alpha))}$$
 (2)

 How can it be checked if there is a energy dependency in the CB?

$$\to |E_1 - E_2| < 25 \, \text{MeV}$$

$$\gamma + p \to \pi^0 + p \to p + \gamma_1 \gamma_2 \tag{1}$$

$$m_{\pi^0} = \sqrt{2E_1 E_2 (1 - \cos(\alpha))}$$
 (2)

 How can it be checked if there is a energy dependency in the CB?

$$\rightarrow |E_1 - E_2| < 25 \, \text{MeV}$$

• What are the reasons for the dependency?

Crystal-Ball-Function / Reduction of the Underground

 $\bullet \ \, \text{Gaussian Fit Function} \to \text{Crystal-Ball Fit Function} \\$

Crystal-Ball-Function / Reduction of the Underground

- ullet Gaussian Fit Function o Crystal-Ball Fit Function
- Check if the registered particles are charged
 - \rightarrow Reduction of the underground

Crystal-Ball-Function / Reduction of the Underground

- ullet Gaussian Fit Function o Crystal-Ball Fit Function
- Check if the registered particles are charged
 - \rightarrow Reduction of the underground




Abbildung: Beamtime: Example for not reduced and reduced underground

- The condition $|E_1-E_2|<25\,\mathrm{MeV}$ is a strong cut
 - \rightarrow There is no package with enough events

- The condition $|E_1-E_2|<25\,{\rm MeV}$ is a strong cut \to There is no package with enough events
- Creating a new package with enough events would take to much time (multiple days on blaster)

- The condition $|E_1-E_2|<25\,{\rm MeV}$ is a strong cut \to There is no package with enough events
- Creating a new package with enough events would take to much time (multiple days on blaster)
- It would be better if the same generator is used for all studies
 → The generator should be able to simulate MAMI-Beam and
 isotropic decay

No Additional Cut

- Beamtime October 2014
- No additional cut




Abbildung: Beamtime: No additional cut

Detectors on the Edge

- Beamtime October 2014
- Neglect the detectors at the edge




Abbildung: Beamtime: With and without considerations of the detectors on the edge of the beam entrance and exit



Martin Sobotzik

Detectors on the Edge

- Simulation
- Red: No additional cut
 Black: Neglect the detectors on the edge




Abbildung: Simulation: Left: Example for the two dimensional histogram with simulated data. Right: Deviation with and without the detectors on the edge

Minimum Opening Angle

- Simulation
- ullet Opening angle lpha has to be bigger than 30° degree
- $m_{\pi^0} = \sqrt{2E_1E_2(1-\cos(lpha))}$ with $E_1 pprox E_2$ $\to E_{max} pprox 250 \, {\rm MeV}$




Abbildung: Left: Number of reconstructed candidates for different opening angles. Right: Deviation with $\alpha>30\,{\rm MeV}$

Isotropic Decay

- Simulation
- \bullet π^0 decay in the origin of the target
- π^0 are boosted isotropic with an energy of $1420\,\mathrm{MeV}$ to $1580\,\mathrm{MeV}$




Abbildung: Simulation: Isotropic decay in the origin of the target



z-Vertex Dependency

- Simulation
- Neglect the detectors on the edge
- Devide the target in smaller sections of 1 cm




Abbildung: Simulation: Deviations for different z-Vertices



Angle between Generated and Reconstructed Candidates

- Simulation
- The angle between generated and reconstructed candidate is calculated





Abbildung: Simulation: Angle between gen. and rec. candidates. Left: Photon energy between $125\,\text{MeV}$ and $150\,\text{MeV}$. Right: Photon energy between $425\,\text{MeV}$ and $450\,\text{MeV}$



Difference between Generated and Reconstructed Opening Angle

- Simulation
- $\Delta \alpha = \alpha_{rec} \alpha_{gen}$






Abbildung: Simulation: $\Delta \alpha$ for different photon energies. Left $125\,\mathrm{MeV}$ to $150 \,\mathrm{MeV}$. Right from $425 \,\mathrm{MeV}$ to $450 \,\mathrm{MeV}$



$\Delta \alpha$ for Different z-Vertices

- Simulation
- $\Delta \alpha$ for different z-Vertices





Abbildung: Simulation: $\Delta \alpha$ for different photon energies. Decay at different z-Vertices



Hot Crystals

- Beamtime October 2014
- ullet Photon energy between $0\,\mathrm{MeV}$ and $100\,\mathrm{MeV}$






Abbildung: text

Number in the figures 1 2 3 4 5 Element Number 549 565 597 677 26



Dead Crystals

- Beamtime October 2014
- \bullet Photon energy between $300\,\mathrm{MeV}$ and $400\,\mathrm{MeV}$




Tabelle: Beamtime: Probably Dead Crystals in CB Map

No. in Fig.	Element Number	No. of Hits
6	678	48
	677	0
	676	11808
7	17	21
	16	3311
	18	7175
	19	3439
8	125	513
	122	6613
	128	5307
	126	4103
9	89	2500
	99	9501

Conclusion

- There is a energy dependency in the detector
- The reconstructed opening angle is too big for high energies
 - \rightarrow wrong reconstruction of the photon impact position is probably the reason for the dependency (Clustering Algorithm)
- The hardware of some PIDs has to be checked (too few events)
- ullet There is a strange ϕ distribution in the detector
 - \rightarrow reason for this has also to be determined