

$\eta \rightarrow 2\gamma\pi^0$ status

Igal Jaegle

Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility

for the GlueX Collaboration

07.01.2022



Table of contents

- 1 Introduction
- 2 PrimEx-eta “veto”
- 3 PrimEx-eta “veto” impact for $\eta \rightarrow 2\gamma\pi^0$
- 4 Improved MVA
- 5 Conclusion

Introduction

PrimEx-eta “veto” implemented in `ijaegle-veto` branch (`halld_recon` & `gluex_root_analysis`) and is currently reviewed by Sean, Simon, and Matt.


- Flag neutral showers which are not matched with a reconstructed tracks but match hits in SC and TOF
- Matching TOF & SC hits saved for $|\Delta x|/|\Delta y| < 10$ cm and $\Delta\phi < 25^\circ$, respectively

Increase signal sample by 50

SC veto

Select SC hits in coincidence with RF and an energy deposited above 0.2 in a.u.



- SC_RF_CUT_MIN = 1.0 ns
- SC_RF_CUT_MAX = 7.0 ns
- SC_Energy_CUT = 0.2 a.u.



SC veto

Then compare azimuthal angles between SC hits and BCAL/FCAL showers


- SC_FCAL_PHI_CUT = 25°
- SC_BCAL_PHI_CUT = 15°
- SC vs. BCAL (PrimEx-eta data set field off)
- SC vs. FCAL (PrimEx-eta data set field off)




SC veto

Then compare azimuthal angles between SC hits and BCAL/FCAL showers

- SC_FCAL_PHI_CUT = 25°
- SC_BCAL_PHI_CUT = 15°
- SC vs. BCAL (PrimEx-eta data set field on)
- SC vs. FCAL (PrimEx-eta data set field on)



No visible contamination





SC veto

Then compare azimuthal angles between SC hits and BCAL/FCAL showers for shower match

- SC_FCAL_PHI_CUT = 25°
- SC_BCAL_PHI_CUT = 15°

- SC vs. BCAL (PrimEx-eta data set field on)
- SC vs. FCAL (PrimEx-eta data set field on)




Magnetic field splits peak at zero and -330 into two

TOF veto

Select TOF hits in coincidence with RF



- TOF_RF_CUT = 6.5 ns



TOF veto

Then compare cartesian coordinates (x/y) between TOF hits and FCAL showers



- TOF_FCAL_x_match_CUT = 10 cm
- TOF_FCAL_y_match_CUT = 10 cm
- Δx (PrimEx-eta data set field off)
- Δy (PrimEx-eta data set field off)



TOF veto

Then compare cartesian coordinates (x/y) between TOF hits and FCAL showers

- TOF_FCAL_x_match_CUT = 10 cm
- TOF_FCAL_y_match_CUT = 10 cm
- Δx (PrimEx-eta data set field on)
- Δy (PrimEx-eta data set field on)



Large contamination of charge particles



Usefulness

Critical for GlueX/JEF (rare η decay) and PrimEx-eta if we want to use ReactionFilter/DSelector and also look at off neutron processes

Example: $\gamma p \rightarrow \eta p$ and $\eta \rightarrow 2\gamma\pi^0$

● Veto not applied (GlueX 2017-01 simulation)

● Veto applied (GlueX 2017-01 simulation)



Strongly reduced peaking background coming from $\eta \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ where γ undergoing "gamma conversion" between the target and TOF



Usefulness

Critical for GlueX/JEF (rare η decay) and PrimEx-eta if we want to use ReactionFilter/DSelector and also look at off neutron processes

Example: $\gamma p \rightarrow \eta p$ and $\eta \rightarrow 2\gamma\pi^0$

● Veto not applied (JEF simulation)

● Veto applied (JEF simulation)




Strongly reduced peaking background coming from $\eta \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ where γ undergoing "gamma conversion" between the target and TOF


Yield vs. cluster mass cut

Without and with TOF-veto applied

● Veto not applied (JEF simulation)



● Veto applied (JEF simulation)





TOF-veto decreases the yield by a factor 4

FOM vs. cluster mass cut

Without and with TOF-veto applied, and without (point) and with BDT (open point) applied

● Veto not applied (JEF simulation)

● Veto applied (JEF simulation)





- Cluster mass cut has no obvious effect
- FOM not adequate

Signal over background vs. cluster mass cut

Without and with TOF-veto applied, and without (filled marker) and with BDT (opened marker) applied

● Veto not applied (JEF simulation)

● Veto applied (JEF simulation)





- Cluster mass cut has no obvious effect
- With veto applied, MVA might not be needed!

Improved MVA

Un-anticipated improvement of the MVA by increasing the signal sample by 50

● Veto not applied (GlueX 2017-01 simulation)

● Veto not applied (JEF simulation)





Improved MVA

Un-anticipated improvement of the MVA by increasing the signal sample by 50

● Veto applied (GlueX 2017-01 simulation)

● Veto applied (JEF simulation)



Conclusion

For first time some real improvements are seen for FCAL2 compared to FCAL1 ...
Not clear yet if veto-detector is needed for insert part not covered by TOF