

# Progress on the final TWIST measurement of $P_{\!\mu}\xi$

James Bueno, University of British Columbia and TRIUMF

on behalf of the Triumf Weak Interaction Symmetry Test

#### Outline



- Muon production and decay
- Previous measurements of  $P_{\mu}\xi$
- Sources of depolarisation, and their simulation.
  Depolarisation in fringe field of solenoid.
  Depolarisation in the muon stopping target.

## Muon production and $P_{\mu}\xi$



Muons from stationary pion decay are perfectly polarised (for massless neutrinos)

2/20

TWIST only accepts a narrow momentum range
→ muon beam is highly polarised

## Muon decay and $P_{II}\xi$





TWIST measures e<sup>+</sup> energy (x) and angle (θ) relative to muon spin.

 $\frac{d^2\Gamma}{dx \ d\cos\theta} \propto F_{IS}(x,\rho,\eta) + F_{AS}(x,\delta) P_{\mu}\xi \ \cos\theta$ 

## Muon decay and $P_{\mu}\xi$





TWIST measures e<sup>+</sup> energy (x) and angle (θ) relative to muon spin.

 $\frac{d^2\Gamma}{dx \ d\cos\theta} \propto F_{IS}(x,\rho,\eta) + F_{AS}(x,\delta)P_{\mu}\xi\cos\theta$ 

determines forwardbackward asymmetry

## Muon decay and $P_{\mu}\xi$





TWIST measures e<sup>+</sup> energy (x) and angle (θ) relative to muon spin.

 $\frac{d^2\Gamma}{dx \ d\cos\theta} \propto F_{IS}(x,\rho,\eta) + F_{AS}(x,\delta)P_{\mu}\xi\cos\theta$ 

 $P_{\mu}\xi$  appears as an inseparable product

determines forwardbackward asymmetry

#### Physics motivation



muon handedness

SM predicts LH muon decays to LH positron.

Probability of RH muon decay to a LH or RH positron is  $Q_{R}^{\mu} = \frac{1}{2} \left[ 1 + \frac{1}{3} \xi - \frac{16}{9} \xi \delta \right]$ 

#### Physics motivation



muon handedness

#### left-right symmetric models

 $W_{L} = W_{1} \cos \zeta + W_{2} \sin \zeta$  $W_{R} = -W_{1} \sin \zeta + W_{2} \cos \zeta$ 



## SM predicts LH muon decays to LH positron.

Probability of RH muon decay to a LH or RH positron is  $Q_{R}^{\mu} = \frac{1}{2} \left[ 1 + \frac{1}{3} \xi - \frac{16}{9} \xi \delta \right]$ 

## Previous measurements of $P_{\!\mu}\xi^{-5/20}$

Standard model, $P_{\mu}$ =	=1,	$\zeta = I$
-----------------------------	-----	-------------

1987, Beltrami et al. (PSI)	1.0027 ± 0.0079 (stat.) ± 0.0030 (syst.)
2006, Jamieson et al. (TWIST, TRIUMF)	1.0003 ± 0.0006 (stat.) ± 0.0038 (syst.)

#### 5/20Previous measurements of $P_{II}\xi$

 $P_{\mu} = 1, \xi = 1$ Standard model,

 $1.0027 \pm 0.0079$  (stat.) 1987, Beltrami et al. (PSI) ± 0.0030 (syst.)  $1.0003 \pm 0.0006$  (stat.) 2006, Jamieson et al. (TWIST, TRIUMF)

± 0.0038 (syst.)

 $0.9960 < P_{II} \xi < 1.0040$ 2004, Jodidio et al. with TWIST  $\rho$ ,  $\delta$  (Indirect) (90% confidence)

## Previous measurements of $P_{\mu}\xi$ 5/20

Standard model,  $P_{\mu} = 1$ ,  $\xi = 1$ 

1987, Beltrami et al. (PSI)	1.0027 ± 0.0079 (stat.)
	± 0.0030 (syst.)
2006, Jamieson et al. (TWIST, TRIUMF)	1.0003 ± 0.0006 (stat.)
	± 0.0038 (syst.)
2004, Jodidio et al. with	$0.9960 < P_{\mu} \xi < 1.0040$ (90% confidence)
TWIST ρ, δ (Indirect)	(90% confidence)

2009, final result from TWIST (goal) *±* 0.0003 (stat.) *±* 0.0010 (syst.)

## Previous measurements of $P_{\mu}\xi$ 5/20

Standard model,  $P_{\mu} = 1$ ,  $\xi = 1$ 

1987, Beltrami et al. (PSI) $1.0027 \pm 0.0079$  (stat.)<br/> $\pm 0.0030$  (syst.)2006, Jamieson et al. $1.0003 \pm 0.0006$  (stat.)

(TWIST, TRIUMF)

Previous TWIST direct measurement limited by uncertainties in simulating  $P_{\mu}$ 

± 0.0038 (syst.)

## TWIST measurement of $P_{\!\mu}\xi$

6/20

#### Michel spectrum

#### from real data



## TWIST measurement of $P_{\!\mu}\xi$



#### Michel spectrum from real data

Spectrum from GEANT simulation



Spectra from decay (depolarised)  $\mu$  are compared  $\rightarrow$  depolarisation in simulation must match data







### Simulating the depolarisation

#### symmetric tracking volume





7/20

Beam is measured by time expansion chambers BEFORE the fringe field

### Simulating the depolarisation

#### symmetric tracking volume





Beam is measured by time expansion chambers BEFORE the fringe field Time dependence of e<sup>+</sup> forward-backward asymmetry gives P<sub>μ</sub>(t) in target

7/20

#### Simulating muon trajectories

1. Measure each **muon's** position and angle with time expansion chambers.



8/20

#### Simulating muon trajectories

1. Measure each **muon's** position and angle with time expansion chambers.



8/20

2. Correct angles for multiple scattering.

3. Simulate muons with GEANT and track spin to predict  $P_{\mu}$  at target.

Uncertainties due to beam instability, initial position & angle of beam, position & shape of B-field.

#### Beam stability (1 of 2)



During data acquisition, we needed a stable muon beam for weeks on end.

#### Beam stability (1 of 2)



During data acquisition, we needed a stable muon beam for weeks on end.

And a method of detecting beam instabilities without the time expansion chambers in place. (too much multiple scattering)

#### Beam stability (2 of 2)



#### For 2006/7, internal beamspots are fit to a helix.



Helix fit parameters indicate position and momentum.



#### Misalignment uncertainties

# For 2006/2007 data, the beam was steered onto the solenoid axis.

11/20



### Misalignment uncertainties

# For 2006/2007 data, the beam was steered onto the solenoid axis.

11/20



### Spin tracking in the B-field

To validate GEANT's spin tracking: two weeks of low  $P_{\rm H}$  data taken in 2006/7.

12/20



### Spin tracking in the B-field

# To validate GEANT's spin tracking: two weeks of low $P_{\rm H}$ data taken in 2006/7.





12/20

### Spin tracking in the B-field

# To validate GEANT's spin tracking: two weeks of low $P_{\rm H}$ data taken in 2006/7.

12/20



## Stopping target depolarisation 13/20

Ideally, the muons would not depolarise at the stopping target (it's 99.999% pure aluminium, or silver).

However, an individual muon spin can interact with local magnetic fields and reverse sign.

### Stopping target depolarisation

The simulation must include the correct model for  $P_{\mu}(t)$  in the target.

14/20

#### 14/20Stopping target depolarisation The simulation must include the correct model for $P_{\mu}(t)$ in the target. $P_{\mu}(t) = P_{\mu}(0) \cdot \exp(-at)$ 0.995 £ 0.99 TWIST result theoretically ⊥for silver 0.985 preferred 0.98 0.975 $P_{\mu}(t) = P_{\mu}(0) \cdot \exp(-bt^2)$ 0.97 also possible 2 8 0 Δ 6 10 t (µs)

#### 14/20Stopping target depolarisation The simulation must include the correct model for P<sub>u</sub>(t) in the target. $P_{\mu}(t) = P_{\mu}(0) \cdot \exp(-at)$ 0.995 ์<del>1</del> 0.99 **TWIST** result theoretically $_{\downarrow\downarrow}$ for silver 0.985 preferred 0.98 0.975 no data below $P_{\mu}(t) = P_{\mu}(0) \cdot \exp(-bt^2)$ 0.97 ~ 1 $\mu$ s (or above 10 $\mu$ s) also possible 8 10 t (µs)

A subsidiary experiment would be helpful...






16/20

### Advantages:

- Higher rate (~30kHz compared to ~3kHz)
- Larger time fiducial

(~5 ns  $\rightarrow$  14 µs, compared to ~1 µs  $\rightarrow$  ~9 µs).

16/20

### Advantages:

- Higher rate (~30kHz compared to ~3kHz)
- Larger time fiducial (~5 ns  $\rightarrow$  14 µs, compared to ~1 µs  $\rightarrow$  ~9 µs).

#### Disadvantages:

- Background from beam positrons.
- A fraction of muons stop in the scintillator.

Unfortunately, still no discrimination between  $P_{\mu}(t) = P_{\mu}(0) \cdot \exp(-at)$  and  $P_{\mu}(t) = P_{\mu}(0) \cdot \exp(-bt^{2})$ 

Unfortunately, still no discrimination between  $P_{\mu}(t) = P_{\mu}(0) \cdot \exp(-at)$  and  $P_{\mu}(t) = P_{\mu}(0) \cdot \exp(-bt^{2})$ 

17/20

exp(-at)	Aluminium	Silver
	a (x10 <sup>-6</sup> ns <sup>-1</sup> )	a (x10 <sup>-6</sup> ns <sup>-1</sup> )
TWIST	$1.4 \pm 0.1$	1.1 ± 0.3
muSR	1.7 ± 0.2	1.2 ± 0.2

Unfortunately, still no discrimination between  $P_{\mu}(t) = P_{\mu}(0) \cdot \exp(-at)$  and  $P_{\mu}(t) = P_{\mu}(0) \cdot \exp(-bt^{2})$ 

17/20

exp(-at)	Aluminium a (x10 <sup>-6</sup> ns <sup>-1</sup> )	Silver a (x10 <sup>-6</sup> ns <sup>-1</sup> )
TWIST	$1.4 \pm 0.1$	$1.1 \pm 0.3$
muSR	1.7 ± 0.2	1.2 ± 0.2

Experiment confirmed no fast depolarisation between ~5 ns and 1 µs, and results are consistent with TWIST.

proportional chambers <u>closest to stopping</u> target

> stopping target μ can stop in chamber gas

18/20

proportional chambers <u>closest to stopping</u> target

pulse width in final PC greater for muons that stop here (more energy deposited) stopping target

18/20

in chamber gas

µ can stop



pulse width in final PC greater for muons that stop here (more energy deposited)



18/20

### deep cut selects target stop µ



pulse width in final PC greater for muons that stop here (more energy deposited)

### proportional chambers closest to stopping target

stopping
target
μ can stop

18/20

in chamber gas

### 19/20

### Summary

- Validation of the spin tracking is well underway.
- Improvements in data acquisition in 2006/7 will reduce  $P_{\!\mu}$  uncertainties.

### 19/20

### Summary

- Validation of the spin tracking is well underway.
- Improvements in data acquisition in 2006/7 will reduce  $P_{\!_{I\!I}}$  uncertainties.
- Subsidiary muSR experiment has confirmed no fast depolarisation exists (this could not be measured by TWIST).
- Time dependent depolarisation uncertainties can be minimised by selecting genuine target stops.

James Bueno, WNPPC 2008, 15 February

### The TWIST collaboration

### 20/20

#### TRIUMF

Ryan Bayes\*† Yuri Davydov Wayne Faszer Makoto Fujiwara David Gill Alexander Grossheim Peter Gumplinger Anthony Hillairet\*† Robert Henderson Jingliang Hu

> Regina Ted Mathie Roman Tacik

Kurchatov Institute Vladimir Selivanov Glen Marshall Dick Mischke Mina Nozar Konstantin Olchanski Art Olin† Robert Openshaw Jean-Michel Poutissou Renée Poutissou Grant Sheffer Bill Shin‡‡

<u>Montréal</u> Pierre Depommier

#### <u>Valparaiso</u> Don Koetke Shirvel Stanislaus

\* graduate student, \*\* graduated† also UVic, ‡‡ also Saskatchewan

#### **Alberta**

Andrei Gaponenko\*\* Peter Kitching Robert MacDonald\* Maher Quraan

British Columbia James Bueno\* Mike Hasinoff Blair Jamieson\*\*

> Texas A&M Carl Gagliardi Jim Musser\*\* Bob Tribble

TWIST is supported in part by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council and the National Research Council of Canada, the Russian Ministry of Science, and the U.S. Department of Energy.

Computing resources for the analysis are provided by Westgrid.

James Bueno, WNPPC 2008, 15 February