Transverse momentum Dependence of π^0 SSA in FMS Run 11 CIPANP

S. Heppelmann (PSU)

June 2 , 2012

- Background
  - Physics Questions
  - FMS History
- FMS Event Topology; Event Selection
- **Cross Ratio** method

vs.

$\mathbf{A(\phi)=A_N \cos(\phi)}$ Fitting method

- Explore high statistics A_N for Run 11
  - P_T dependence for fixed X_F
  - Dependence on event topology

Proton Forward Scattering at High PT
QCD Perspective

PQCD (Leading Twist):

Factorized Cross Section= (initial state) x (quark scattering) x (fragmentation)

• Does good job of predicting the "> 90% " of the cross section that does not depend on spin.

• Leading twist cross section does not depend on transverse polarization.
•Spin Dependence requirrefinements like:
- Beyond Collinear Factorization **(Sivers)**
- Models of spin dependent factorization **(Collins)**
- Models that go **beyond leading twist.**





Forward EM Calorimetry In STAR.

1) Cross Ratio Transverse Asymmetry

vs

2) A(ϕ) Fit

Method 1:
Cross Ratio:

$$A_N = \frac{d\sigma^{\uparrow} - d\sigma^{\downarrow}}{d\sigma^{\uparrow} + d\sigma^{\downarrow}} \cong \frac{1}{P} \frac{\sqrt{N^{\uparrow}S^{\downarrow}} - \sqrt{S^{\uparrow}N^{\downarrow}}}{\sqrt{N^{\uparrow}S^{\downarrow}} + \sqrt{S^{\uparrow}N^{\downarrow}}}$$



Slope = A_N
Y Intercept=Luminosity Ratio

Left(N): Cos(ϕ)<-0.5



Method 2: $a_N(\phi) = a_0 + A_N \cos(\phi)$

Right(S): Cos(ϕ)>0.5

Fix a_0 for full data set

For many small data subsets ….. one parameter fit for A_N

Advantage: Every fitted value of A_N comes with error and chi^2.

New paper on η/π^0 at X_F>0.5





- π^0 cross section in **good agreement with PQCD calculation.**
- η/π^0 cross section ratio similar to that observed where jet fragmentation is dominant.
- $A_N(\eta) > A_N(\pi^0)$ for $X_F > 0.55$



STAR Published Run 6 (FPD $\sqrt{s}$ =200GeV)

- Rising A_N with X_F ($0<X_F<0.5$) from 0% to 5-10%
- No evidence of fall in A_N with increasing P_T.





From FMS Run 8, STAR has Expanded Rapidity Coverage -1<Y<4.2

STAR Forward Meson Spectrometer
2.5 < Y < 4.0



arXiv:0901.2763 +
A.Ogawa @CIPANP09

• Leading twist cross section does not depend on transverse polarization.
•Spin Dependence require refinements like:
  • Beyond Collinear Factorization **(Sivers)**
  • Models of spin dependent factorization **(Collins)**
  • Models that go **beyond leading twist.**

Sivers Model: Initial quark picks up k_T from initial state wave function, proportional to orbital angular momentum.

Jet based Asymmetry, significant dependence of A_N on the details of near side jet fragments is not expected!

Collins Model: Final π^0 picks up k_T from fragmentation of polarized quark. Vanishing jet asymmetry. Observed A_N will depend on the details of near side fragmentation!

Transverse momentum $\mathbf{p_T} \Longrightarrow \mathbf{p_T \pm k_T}$
increases/decreases with transverse **spin up/down**

A toy model for proton Cross Section

$$\sigma(p_T) \sim \frac{(1-x_F)^5}{p_T{}^6}$$

$$A_N \sim \frac{\sigma(p_T + k_T) - \sigma(p_T - k_T)}{2\sigma(p_T)} \sim \frac{6k_T}{p_T} \sim \frac{1}{p_T}$$

Similar transverse momentum dependence **for higher twist.**

Isolation of π^0 's



Event Selection:

1. **Analyze FMS for all photon** candidates. (Showers that are fit successfully to photon hypothesis)
   A photon candidates must have a minimum of 6 GeV in the small inner detector or 4 GeV in the outer cells.
2. **Find Clusters of EM energy** grouping photon candidates that are within opening angle cone $\Delta\theta$ (relative to energy weighted center)
3. We consider 2 event classes {1 and 2}
   1. $\Delta\theta$ =0.07 2 Photon clusters, Pi0 Mass (**isolation radius of .07 radians**).
   2. $\Delta\theta$ =0.03 2 Photon clusters ,Pi0 Mass (**isolation radius of .03 radians**).



Class 1 Events: $\Delta\theta$ **=0.07** 2 Photon clusters, π^0 Mass (less inclusive)?

- 40 GeV < Epair <100 GeV
- Z=|(E1-E2)/(E1+E2)| <.7
- 2.6 < Y < 4.1 (Full FMS Pseudo-rapidity)
- Selection of π^0 Peak





STAR Preliminary

Cross Ratio Transverse Single Spin Asymmetry for Run 11

π^0 (2 Photon Cluster) **Cluster size = 0.07 Rad**

For **Blue** Beam (Forward)

Full FMS rapidity range (2.6<Y<4.1)





Left: Cos(ϕ)<-0.5



Left: Cos(ϕ)>0.5

X_F=0.16

X_F=0.4

Compare New √s=500 GeV Run 11 Full FMS Data on right with **Run 6 published data below.**





Compare **new √s=500 GeV Run 11** Full FMS Data on right with **Run 6 √s=200** published data below.

Scale of A_N similar but starts at lower X_F in Run 11 data.







Blue Beam A_N

As and alternative to Cross Ratio, the raw asymmetry

Can be plotted as a function of Cos(Phi)

(with polarization axis at Phi=π/2)

Slope =A_N

Intercept = Luminosity Ratio for data set

Luminosity ratio for all **~ - 0.25 ±.05 %**







Blue Beam Polarization Measurements

- CNI polarimeter data
- Average polarization for 51 consecutive time periods each data set represents ~ ½ day of running.



As from previous slide:

For the **"A_N vs cos(ϕ)"** fits to all FMS data divided into the 51 consecutive time periods.

- 22.4 pb^{-1}
- 2.6< pseudorapidity<4.1
- 40 GeV < Energy π^0< 100 GeV
- Average polarization 48%
- Corrected each of of 51 sets (each set ~ ½ day of data)



Transverse Single Spin π^0 Asymmetry vs P_T for small and large π^0 isolation cones. (Errors shown are statistical)





Transverse Single Spin π^0 Asymmetry vs P_T for small and large π^0 isolation cones. (Errors shown are statistical)





Transverse Single Spin π^0 Asymmetry vs P_T for small and large π^0 isolation cones. (Errors shown are statistical)





Transverse Single Spin π^0 Asymmetry vs P_T for small and large π^0 isolation cones.
Fits to power of P_T. (Errors shown are statistical)



Transverse Single Spin π^0 Asymmetry vs P_T for small and large π^0 isolation cones.
Fits to power of P_T. (Errors shown are statistical)



Transverse Single Spin π^0 Asymmetry vs P_T for small and large π^0 isolation cones.
Fits to power of P_T. (Errors shown are statistical)



Systematic Errors

- Run 11 blue beam polarization 48% ± 5%

$$\frac{\Delta A_N}{A_N} < 10\%$$

- Non π^0 signal <10%
- Similar asymmetries for Background:

$$\frac{\Delta A_N}{A_N} < 5\%$$

$$\frac{\Delta P_T}{P_T} < 12\%$$

$$\frac{\Delta A_N}{A_N} < 5\%$$

- PT uncertainty
  - Energy 10%
  - Angle 6%

$$\frac{\Delta P_T}{P_T} < 12\%$$

$$\frac{\Delta A_N}{A_N} < 5\%$$

Total Systematic Asymmetry Error
Common to all data points.

$$\frac{\Delta A_N}{A_N} < 15\%$$

Conclusion

- A_N less dependent on P_T that models predict.
- A_N larger for isolated π^0s.

- π^0 events with additional E&M signals in the same general direction as the π^0 (>~5 GeV between .03 and .07 radians from the π^0) contribute little to the observed Transverse Single Spin Asymmetry.



Extra

$$\Delta\sigma_x^{\,2} = \frac{\sum_{i_{(e_i>e_0)}} (x_i - x_0)^2 \ln(e_i / e_0)}{\sum_{i_{(e_i>e_0)}} \ln(e_i / e_0)}$$

$$\Delta\sigma_x \Delta\sigma_y = \frac{\sum_{i_{(e_i>e_0)}} (x_i - x_0)(y_i - y_0) \ln(e_i / e_0)}{\sum_{i_{(e_i>e_0)}} \ln(e_i / e_0)}$$

Separation of single photon cluster from two photon cluster based upon distribution of shower energy along a preferred axis.

$$\sigma_{\max} \equiv Max\ Eigenvalue\ of \begin{bmatrix} \Delta\sigma_x^{\,2} & \Delta\sigma_x\Delta\sigma_y \\ \Delta\sigma_y\Delta\sigma_x & \Delta\sigma_y^{\,2} \end{bmatrix}$$

$\sigma_{\max}$



$\sigma_{\max}$

Old algorithm with
Energy weighted moments

Improved algorithm with
log energy weighted moments.

Provides clearer separation
Between π^0 and single photon.
Clusters up to ~80 GeV.

From Len's Analysis,

-Single Photon peak changes little with Energy
Single peak at SigmaMax~.5

-Two Photon peak moves toward the Single photon peak as energy increases
Double SigmaMax Peak

38 GeV <SigmaMax>~.85
73 GeV <SigmaMax>~.75

drupal.star.bnl.gov/STAR/blog/leun/2010/jan/11/sigmamax-data-mc-comparision-

heppel's blog | The ... | Index of /protected/... | Google Voice - Inbo... | ScienceDirect - Phys...

March (2)
February (4)
January (2)
010
December (2)
November (3)
October (3)
September (5)
August (6)
July (2)
June (4)
May (3)
April (4)
March (4)
February (2)
January (4)
009
December (5)
November (6)
September (4)
June (6)
May (20)
April (3)
008
October (1)
blog
t new blog entry
blogs

Protected
499 members
Manager: testadmin
My membership

oups
Unread
account
eate content
cent posts
g out

ar Content
y's:
Software & Computing
Run 9 W/Z Cross
Section Paper Proposal
Page
General information

BLACK: Data (only set 61)

RED: flat-distribution pi0 toy events + GSTAR, with digitization and 1-count pedesta

BLUE: Pythia 6.4 + GSTAR, with digitization and 1-count pedestal uncertainty

Clusters are divided into 4 categories, and for each catgegoy there are 8 plots for 8

1. Inner central



Run 11 distributions of SigmaMax as a indicator of single photon vs π^0 only slowly degrades with higher energy.