

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

Martin Sobotzik

Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz

29.05.2017

The Process

$$\gamma + p \rightarrow \pi^0 + p \rightarrow \gamma_1 \gamma_2 + p$$

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

The Process

$$\gamma + p \rightarrow \pi^0 + p \rightarrow \gamma_1 \gamma_2 + p$$

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

- Is there an energy dependency in the CB?

The Process

$$\gamma + p \rightarrow \pi^0 + p \rightarrow \gamma_1 \gamma_2 + p$$

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

- Is there an energy dependency in the CB?
- How can it be checked?
 $\rightarrow |E_1 - E_2| < 25 \text{ MeV}$

The Process



$$\gamma + p \rightarrow \pi^0 + p \rightarrow \gamma_1 \gamma_2 + p$$

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

- Is there an energy dependency in the CB?
- How can it be checked?
 $\rightarrow |E_1 - E_2| < 25 \text{ MeV}$
- What are the reasons for the dependency?

Reduction of the Underground / Crystal-Ball Function

- Check if the registered particles are uncharged
→ Reduction of the underground
- Used signal line shape: Crystal-Ball Function



Event-Generator

- $|E_1 - E_2| < 25 \text{ MeV}$ is a strong cut. Large MC statistics are required
→ There is no MC sample with enough events

Event-Generator

- $|E_1 - E_2| < 25 \text{ MeV}$ is a strong cut. Large MC statistics are required
→ There is no MC sample with enough events
- Creating a new sample with enough events with an already existing Event-Generator would take too much time (multiple days on blaster). Not Efficient!

Event-Generator

- $|E_1 - E_2| < 25 \text{ MeV}$ is a strong cut. Large MC statistics are required
→ There is no MC sample with enough events
- Creating a new sample with enough events with an already existing Event-Generator would take too much time (multiple days on blaster). Not Efficient!
- It is better to use the same generator in all studies
→ The generator should be able to simulate MAMI-Beam and isotropic boost

Event-Generator in ANT

New Event-Generator integrated in ANT

```


auto cmd_Emin      = cmd.add<TCLAP::ValueArg<double>>    ("", "Emin",      "Minimal incident energy [MeV]", false, 0.0, "double [MeV]");
auto cmd_Emax      = cmd.add<TCLAP::ValueArg<double>>    ("", "Emax",      "Maximal incident energy [MeV]", false, 1.6*GeV, "double [MeV]");
auto cmd_events     = cmd.add<TCLAP::ValueArg<int>>       ("n", "",         "number of events", false, 10000, "n");
auto cmd_reqsym     = cmd.add<TCLAP::SwitchArg>          ("", "sym",       "Require symmetric photon energies");
auto cmd_zboost     = cmd.add<TCLAP::SwitchArg>          ("", "zboost",     "Boost the Pions in z-Direction; True or False");
auto cmd_Prod       = cmd.add<TCLAP::SwitchArg>          ("", "Prod",       "Get the Product of the Pion; Change Beam Energy with E_min and E_max" );

```

- Emin: Minimal energy of the beam/boost
- Emax: Maximal energy of the beam/boost
- Events: Number of events
- Sym: Require $|E_1 - E_2| < 25$ MeV
- ZBoost: Boost the π^0 in z -Direction, if false than isotropic boost
- Prod: Also takes the proton into account

First look at real data


- Beamtime October 2014
- Well-calibrated



→ There is a energy dependency

Detectors on the Edge


- Beamtime October 2014
- Neglect the detectors at the edge: They are difficult to calibrate because they have less neighbors



→ Slight improvement

How does MC look like?

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





MC also shows this raise

→ it can be used for further studies


Isotropic Boost

- π^0 decay in the origin of the target
- π^0 are boosted with an energy of 1420 MeV to 1580 MeV isotropically
→ all detector elements are hit roughly equally




→ Raise is not caused by specific detector elements

Dimension of the Target



z -Vertex Dependency



- Neglect the detectors on the edge
- Divide the target in sections of 1 cm



→ Some dependence but small in compared to the main effect

Angle between Generated and Reconstructed Candidates




- The angle between generated and reconstructed candidate is calculated



→ Angular resolution $\sim 1^\circ$ to 2°

Difference between Generated and Reconstructed Opening Angle

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



→ Systematic bias for high photon energies

Reason for the Deviation?

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

$$\rightarrow \Delta m_{\pi^0} = \sqrt{E_1 E_2} \cdot \cos\left(\frac{\alpha}{2}\right) \cdot \Delta\alpha$$

with $E_1 = E_2 = 450 \text{ MeV} \rightarrow \alpha \approx 17.3^\circ$







Lets assume: $\Delta\alpha = 1.0^\circ \cdot \frac{\pi}{180^\circ}$

$$\rightarrow \Delta m_{\pi^0} = 7.8 \text{ MeV}$$

Which is a deviation of about 6% to the true m_{π^0} mass



$\Delta\alpha$ for Different z -Vertices

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



Hot Crystals


- Beamtime October 2014
- Photon energy between 0 MeV and 100 MeV



Number in the figures	1	2	3	4	5
Element Number	549	565	597	677	265

Hot Crystals and Clustersize > 3


- Beamtime October 2014
- Photon energy between 0 MeV and 100 MeV
- Clustersize > 3



→ Neighbors of some dead crystals appear hot for low energies

Hot Crystals for Higher Energies


- Beamtime October 2014
- Photon energy between 300 MeV and 400 MeV



→ *Hot Neighbors* disappear at larger energies

Additional Dead Crystals


- Beamtime October 2014
- Photon energy between 300 MeV and 400 MeV



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
	88	8591
	90	7975
	91	4652

ϕ -Distribution in the CB


- Beamtime October 2014
- Photon energy between 200 MeV and 225 MeV
- Unexpected bump



Conclusion

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

Appendix

Position of the π^0 peak in different energy intervals of 25 MeVPosition of the π^0 peak in different energy intervals of 25 MeV