

Tritium Inclusive SRC Experiment Update



Shujie Li

On behalf of the E12-11-112 Collaboration

Mar 20, 2019



University of New Hampshire

Jefferson Lab E12-11-112 (Hall A) :

Precision Measurement of the Isospin Dependence in the 2N and 3N Short-range Correlation Region

Tritium Experiment Group:

2017.12: Commissioning

2018.2-2018.5: E12-11-103 MARATHON

2018.5 E12-14-011 e'p (exclusive SRC)

2018.5 : E12-11-112 $x > 1$ (inclusive SRC) 2.2 GeV beam

2018.9-11 : E12-11-112 $x > 1$ (inclusive SRC) 4.3 GeV beam

2018.11: E12-17-003 e'K

**E12-14-009 Elastic –not scheduled




Run Summary

Fall 2018
LHRS: Dedicated NN and 3N SRC
study ($1 < x_{bj} < 3$) with 4.3 GeV beam
RHRS: QE scan


May 2018:
QE scan with 2.2 GeV beam

Dec 2017:
Commissioning
Target “boiling” study (also QE data at
 $Q^2=0.4 \text{ GeV}^2$)




Probing 2N SRC at $x > 1$

In inclusive (e,e') quasi-elastic scattering, high momentum nucleons dominate the $x = Q^2/2m\nu > 1$ kinematics



The $x > 1$ plateau of A/D **cross section ratios** give the percentage of high momentum pairs in each nucleus



Precision Measurement of the Isospin Dependence in the 2N and 3N Short-range Correlation Region

Spokespersons:

Patricia Solvignon (UNH), John Arrington (ANL), Donal Day (UVa), Douglas Higinbotham (Jefferson Lab), Zhihong Ye (ANL)

Students:

Shujie Li (UNH), Nathaly Santiesteban (UNH), Tyler Kutz (Stony Brook)

Measurements:

1H, 2H, 3H, 3He, (C12, Ti48) inclusive cross sections at $0.6 < x_{bj} < 3$

Primary Physics Topics:

Check the 2N SRC isospin dependence at $1 < x < 2$, and also 3N momentum sharing configuration.



np pair dominates:

$$\frac{\sigma_{^3H}}{\sigma_{^3He}} = \frac{\sigma_{np} + \sigma_n}{\sigma_{np} + \sigma_p} \simeq \frac{\sigma_{np}}{\sigma_{np}} = 1$$

no isospin preference:

$$\frac{\sigma_{^3H}}{\sigma_{^3He}} = \frac{2\sigma_{nn} + \sigma_{pp}}{\sigma_{nn} + 2\sigma_{pp}} \xrightarrow{\sigma_p \sim 3\sigma_n} 0.7$$

Jefferson Lab, Hall A Experiment Configuration




High Resolution Spectrometer (HRS)



Beam energy: 4.3 GeV
Momentum : 3.57 - 3.93 GeV
Angle : 17 degree
 Q^2 : 1.4 GeV²

Electron beam

target




The Gas Target System:




The Gas Target System: special handling

- ❖ Maximum current = 22.5 μA on gas cells to minimize the risk of gas leak.
- ❖ Endcap(75mg/cm² Aluminum) being mis-reconstructed into thin gas body (77mg/cm² Tritium)
- ❖ “Boiling”: gas density change along beam path (after reached equilibrium which takes less than 1 second)




The Tritium density reduced by ~ 10 percent at 22.5 μA

S. Santiesteban et al. , [arXiv:1811.12167](https://arxiv.org/abs/1811.12167)



The Gas Target System: special handling

- ❖ Maximum current = 22.5 μA on gas cells to minimize the risk of gas leak.
- ❖ **Endcap(75mg/cm² Aluminum) being mis-reconstructed into thin gas body (77mg/cm² Tritium)**
- ❖ “Boiling”: gas density change along beam path



The endcap contamination (after vertex cut) varies from less than 0.1% to 10% depends on spectrometer angle and kinematics.

Extract Yield from Data

For a given good production run i , periods of data with stable currents are first identified. Then for events from each good current (allow $1.5\mu A$ fluctuation) we calculated the following quantities:

- C_i : raw good electron counts per x_{bj} bin,
- PS_i : the prescale factor for the production trigger,
- LT_i : the computer livetime in fraction for the production trigger,
- eff_i : the product of all efficiencies including trigger, tracking, cut efficiencies,
- Q_i : charge with stable beam current,
- ρ_l : effective area density of the target (g/cm^2). For a gas cell it should represent the amount of gas after vertex z cut (target length cut),
- $Boiling_i$: the ratio of the effective gas target density at given beam current comparing to no beam. See the boiling study for details.

The yield for this run

$$Y_i = \frac{\# \text{ of observed events}}{\text{Effective Luminosity}} = \frac{C_i}{Q_i \cdot \rho_l \cdot Boiling_i \cdot eff_i \cdot LT_i / PS_i}$$





with $\frac{1}{\sqrt{C_i}}$ as the fractional statistical uncertainty.

The overall yield of a given kinematics is the weighted arithmetic mean of all good production runs under this kinematics:

$$Y_{overall} = \frac{\sum_i C_i}{\sum_i Q_i \cdot \rho_l \cdot Boiling_i \cdot eff_i \cdot LT_i / PS_i}$$

with a fractional statistical uncertainty of $\frac{1}{\sqrt{\sum_i C_i}}$.

Compare Data vs MC Simulation





SRC Analysis Status:

Combined analysis of data from 2 experiments:

- 1.4 GeV² data from this experiment (red)
- 1.8 GeV² data from the exclusive SRC (blue)

Calibration result: $^3\text{He}/^2\text{H}$ ratio




Only stat. uncertainties!

SRC Analysis Status:

Combined analysis of data from 2 experiments:



- 1.4 GeV² data from this experiment (red)
- 1.8 GeV² data from the exclusive SRC (blue)



Only stat. uncertainties!

Low Q^2 $x > 1$ Data

- ❖ The transition of $2N$ plateau in Tritium/Deuterium ratio with increasing Q^2



$x > 1$ analysis status:

- Pass 1 analysis finished, pass 2 in progress.
- Expected to have preliminary results at APS april

To do:

- Compare to theory
- $x > 2$ data analysis

Thanks to:

The tritium group students

Florian, Evan, Meekins

Shift workers

Hall A engineer/tech group

The GMP collaboration

LHRS PID: electron/pion discrimination

Kinematics (Run 100684):

Ebeam = 4.3 GeV

Angle = 17.8 degree,

p0 = 3.543 GeV

Electrons:

large Cerenkov and calorimeter signals

Pion contaminations:

A. π^- :

No Cerenkov signal,
small energy deposit in calorimeter


B. π^- knock out electron (ionization)

before/in Cerenkov:

Cerenkov triggered,
small calorimeter signal

C. $\pi^- n \rightarrow \pi^0 p \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$:

No Cerenkov signal,
large calorimeter signal



- The combination of B(C) and detector inefficiency is less than 0.1% $\Rightarrow$ detector inefficiency alone $\ll$ 0.1%

Trigger Efficiency

Production
Trigger!



LHRs:

T1: S0 && S2

T2: (S0 && S2) && Cer

T3: (S0 || S2) && Cer

Cerenkov trigger
efficiency

Scintillators (s0, s2)
trigger efficiency

Run 100684, events passed
PID and one-track cuts

Evtypebits =

2 -> only T1


-> Cerenkov trigger inefficient

8 -> only T3

-> S0 or S2 triggers inefficient



14 -> T1 + T2 + T3

-> good



The Gas Target System: surprise (>_<)

Hydrogen in the 2nd Tritium cell (used in the fall 2018)



Tritium replaced by hydrogen:


$$1.6\% * 0.0708 \text{ g/cm}^2 * 3 \text{ (H}_2\text{O} \rightarrow \text{HTO)} / 0.0851 \text{ g/cm}^2 = 4.0 \%$$

Remained tritium density:

$$0.0851 \text{ g/cm}^2 * (1-4\%) \Rightarrow 0.0817 \text{ g/cm}^2 ??$$

Beam Current and Charge, Livetime:

1. Find beam on currents, loop over fast scaler readout (evLeft/evRight) to find current associated with every TTree event.
2. For each stable beam current, find corresponding events ($\pm 1.5 \mu\text{A}$), also discard events within the first 5 seconds of stable beam, then accumulate charge and raw trigger signals from scaler, and triggered events (DL.bit2) counts
3. Save event list of events passed beamtrip cuts, record corresponding mean current, charge,, and livetime.



Yield (rate) Calculation from Monte-Carlo Simulation

$$rate_{MC} = I \cdot \rho_l / A \sum_{N_{tot}} \boxed{\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega}} \varepsilon(\Omega) \frac{\Omega_{tot}}{N_{tot}} \cdot efficiency$$

20 uA

Good events in simulation and XEMC

of **trials** in simulation
(!! The single arm simulation will only record good events)

Cross section tables generated from XEMC model:

- from Zhihong
- Included bremsstrahlung radiation
- y-scaling. Use He3 fitting parameter for H3