# **Polarization Update**

Justin Stevens August 16, 2016



$$\begin{array}{rcl} & & Vector \ meson \ angular \ distributions \\ & & & \\ &$$

- \* Integrate angular distributions over  $\theta$
- \* The simplified model I've been using in previous studies to extract the polarization values assumes

$$\rho_{1-1}^{1} = -\text{Im}\rho_{1-1}^{2} = 0.5$$
$$\Sigma_{h}^{d} = \Sigma = 1 \qquad \Sigma_{h}^{e} = 0$$

\* And all other SDMEs are small enough to be neglected, consistent with old SLAC data



#### Nominal Σ asymmetry

 $W_h^L(\phi, \Phi) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \left[ 1 - P_\gamma \Sigma_h^d \cos 2\left(\Phi - \phi\right) - P_\gamma \Sigma_h^e \cos 2\left(\Phi + \phi\right) \right]$ 



Run 11366-11555: 8.4  $< E_{\chi} < 9$  GeV

#### New asymmetry term

$$W_h^L(\phi, \Phi) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \left[ 1 - P_\gamma \Sigma_h^d \cos 2\left(\Phi - \phi\right) - P_\gamma \Sigma_h^e \cos 2\left(\Phi + \phi\right) \right]$$



 $P\Sigma_h^e \sim -0.02$ 

Run 11366-11555: 8.4 < E<sub>γ</sub> < 9 GeV

#### p asymmetries: Runs 11366-11555

**Amorphous** 

PERP



**PARA** 

PERP+PARA



### p asymmetries: cut comparison

#### **Nominal Cuts**



#### Tighter exclusivity cuts **Mike Staib** # Unused Tracks # Unused Tracks $8.4 < E_{\chi} < 9 \text{ GeV}$ 3.5 10' 2.5 1.5 0.5 0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8 1.2 1.6 1.8 1.4 Unused Shower Energy (GeV) Select more "exclusive" events by requiring no unused tracks or showers Unused Shower Energy (GeV) $3 < E_{\chi} < 5 \text{ GeV}$ $5 < E_{\chi} < 7 \text{ GeV}$ 10<sub>□</sub> # Unused Tracks # Unused Tracks 9₽ 10<sup>1</sup> 10' Unused Shower Energy (GeV) Unused Shower Energy (GeV)

![](_page_7_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_7_Figure_1.jpeg)

Δ

6

0.3

0.2

0.

-0.

![](_page_8_Figure_0.jpeg)

### Comparison of TPOL and $\pi^0$

![](_page_9_Figure_1.jpeg)

\* Latest TPOL values from Mike Dugger (preliminary)

\* Currently running more triplet MC to provide finer binning in beam energy

### Summary

- \* Small contribution to  $\rho$  angular distributions from cos  $2(\Phi + \phi)$  term. Indicating  $\Sigma_{\rho} < 1$  as expected from previous data
- Several systematic checks on event selection, etc. which all show ~5% asymmetry at low energy
- \* Comparison of π<sup>0</sup> asymmetry with TPOL polarization show good agreement in coherent peak
- Propose to move forward with TPOL polarization values for user analyses (limited to the coherent peak region) after more TPOL MC statistics are complete

## Backup

![](_page_12_Figure_0.jpeg)

- \* No kinematic fit
- \* 50 < Vertex Z < 78 cm
- $|t_{beam} t_p| < 2.004$
- # Proton dE/dx
- **₩** |MM2| < 0.02
- \* Missing Energy
- $* 0.6 < M_{\pi\pi} < 0.88$

![](_page_12_Figure_8.jpeg)

### p asymmetry: method

- Subtract accidentals from  $\phi$ -dependent yield
- Fit to PERP and PARA yields separately
- Fit to asymmetry to cancel acceptance effects
- Measure both in bins of  $E_{\chi}$  (next slide)

#### Run 11366-11555: $3 < E_{\chi} < 5$ GeV

**PARA** 

![](_page_13_Figure_6.jpeg)

Φ

![](_page_13_Figure_7.jpeg)

|| Polarization

 $\pi$ 

![](_page_13_Figure_8.jpeg)

![](_page_13_Figure_9.jpeg)

![](_page_13_Figure_10.jpeg)

![](_page_13_Figure_11.jpeg)

### $\pi^0$ asymmetry: method

- Subtract accidentals from  $\phi$ -dependent yield
- Fit to PERP and PARA yields separately
- Fit to asymmetry to cancel acceptance effects
- Measure both in bins of  $E_{\chi}$  (next slide)

![](_page_14_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_14_Figure_6.jpeg)

#### PERP

![](_page_14_Figure_8.jpeg)

#### **PARA**

-150 -100 -50

0

50 100

150

Φ

Run 11366-11555: 3 < E<sub>γ</sub> < 5 GeV

![](_page_14_Figure_10.jpeg)

![](_page_14_Figure_11.jpeg)

### Comparison of accidentals

![](_page_15_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### Runs 11366-11555

Runs 11569-11663