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## Outline

- Elastics Simulations and Run Plan.
- ep Calibrations from Gep-3.
- Outlook.


## Ep Elastics Energy Calibration

- The purpose of the elastic calibrations is to provide an absolute energy calibration of scattered electrons in the calorimeter.
- Coincidence events with an electron detected in BigCal tagged with a proton in the HMS.
- Constraints in selecting the appropriate calibration kinematics:
- Deflection of the incident electron beam by the target magnetic field.
- Proton and electron angles must not be obstructed by the target coils.
- Desirable to calibrate with electrons of 0.8-2.4 GeV energy.
- An energy of 2.4 GeV beam and $0^{\circ} / 180^{\circ}$ target orientation are planned to be available (compatible with these requirements).
- As the target material will not be polarized, beam current up to $1 \mu \mathrm{~A}$ can be used to reduce the total beam-time required.
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## Target Magnetic Field Configuration



In order to calibrate most of the BigCal several scans will be needed as well as several HMS angular settings.

- Full strength (5.1 T) parallel \& anti-parallel fields.
- Half strength (2.55 T) parallel \& anti-parallel fields.
- Magnetic field turned off.


## Simulated BigCal Coverage ( $E_{\text {beam }}=2.400 \mathrm{GeV}$ )



## Simulated BigCal Coverage ( $E_{\text {beam }}=2.400 \mathrm{GeV}$ )
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## Elastic Coincidence Rates - $\mathrm{E}_{\text {beam }}=2.400 \mathrm{GeV}$

- In comparison to the 2.317 GeV beam energy assumed in the original calibration run-plan:
- $Q^{2}$ is about $0.1 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$ higher.
- BigCal is at same angle, but the beam energy is higher.
- ep coincidence rates are about $20 \%$ lower.
- Simulation now takes the cutoff due to the target coil obstruction into account.
- This eliminates about half of the events for the $\theta_{\text {HMS }}=30.0^{\circ}$ setting.
- Take only half statistics there to keep the run-times reasonable.
- At $60 \%$ beam taking efficiency, it will take 4 days of beam to calibrate $\sim 90 \%$ of the calorimeter with $\sim 400$ elastic counts per $4 \times 4 \mathrm{~cm}^{2}$ crystal.
- 5 target field configurations (Full @ 0,180 ${ }^{\circ}$ Half @0,180ㅇ Off).
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## Elastic Rates per Setting

| $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{e}^{\prime}} \\ (\mathrm{GeV}) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \theta_{\mathrm{e}}, \\ (\mathrm{deg}) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{p}} \\ (\mathrm{GeV}) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \theta_{\mathrm{p}} \\ (\operatorname{deg}) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Cou} \\ 0^{\circ} \end{gathered}$ | $180^{\circ}$ | /hr Off | Bea <br> $0^{\circ}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text {-time } \\ & 80^{\circ} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { (hrs) } \\ & \text { Off } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1.789 | 30 | 1.233 | 46.50 | 810 | 810 | 2160 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.2 |
| 1.706 | 33 | 1.334 | 43.75 | 1480 | 1440 | 1550 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 |
| 1.617 | 36 | 1.443 | 41.00 | 830 | 830 | 880 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 |
| 1.522 | 39 | 1.555 | 38.25 | 450 | 450 | 470 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0. |
| 1.423 | 43 | 1.670 | 35.50 | 240 | 250 | 260 | 1.7 | 1.6 | 1.5 |
| 1.318 | 47 | 1.789 | 32.75 | 118 | 120 | 122 | 3.4 | 3.3 | 3.3 |
| 1.213 | 50 | 1.907 | 30.00 | 36 | 36 | 42 | 5.6* | 5.6* | 4.8* |
| Total Time (100\% efficiency) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 13 | 13 | 12 |

* Take 200/cell instead of 400.
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## 100 counts vs. 400 counts per $4 \times 4 \mathrm{~cm} 2$ crystal ?



- No significant improvement in the energy resolution, but no background processes included in the simulation.
- The actual number of elastic events to be acquired will depend on the background conditions obtained when using ammonia target.
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## Elastic Events Selection for BigCal Calibration

- Assuming elastic scattering use the HMS tracking \& proton momentum to calculate electron hit position in the BigCal.
- Use a cut on the correlation between the predicted electron position $(X, Y)$ by the HMS and respectively the BigCal cluster position.
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## BigCal Calibration using Elastic Electrons

$E_{i j}=C_{j} A_{i j}$
$E_{i}=\sum_{j=1}^{1744} C_{j} A_{i j}$
$\sum_{i} E_{i} A_{i k}=\sum_{j=1}^{1744} C_{j} X_{k j}$
Where $X_{i j k}=\sum_{i} A_{i j} A_{i k}$

- $\mathrm{k}=1,1744$

E-electron energy (e_hms)
$A-A D C$ value
(2) C-calibration coefficient
i-event number
j-block number


- Solve 1744 linear equations (3) for calibration coefficients $C_{j}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
A \propto e^{\alpha V} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

- Use $C_{j}$ to calculate new High Voltage.
- 1 ADC channel $=1 \mathrm{MeV}$
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## Energy Calibration Results in Gep3



HMS proton momentum was used to predict the electron energy.
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## Parasitic Calibration using $\pi^{0}$ Events

- Select two cluster events with at least 4 blocks/cluster. with a deposited energy of at least $550 \mathrm{MeV} / \mathrm{block}$ and with a minimum 50 cm distance between the clusters.
- The ratio between the reconstructed mass of these events and the expected pion mass is used to calibrate each
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## Energy Resolution vs Electron Energy



## Energy Resolution vs Electron Energy

## Energy Resolution*E ${ }^{1 / 2}$ vs Elastic Electron Energy

SANE - no absorber
Removing lucite gain monitor and the support plate with 0.5 cm light holes will further improve the energy resolution.

## 10 cm absorber

2.5 cm absorber

$$
\frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{E}}=A \sqrt{E}+B+\frac{C}{\sqrt{E}}
$$


piO resolution is not directly related to the electron resolution because of the extra contribution due to the 2 gamma angle reconstruction. ep Elastic Events are free of this contribution.
The absorber thickness correction will also be different for photons and electrons.
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## To do list:

- Implement the target magnetic field in the HMS tracking code (use the RSS target field map).
- Implement the slow beam raster in the Analyzer.
- Look at backgrounds obtained in April Test Run. (conditions were similar to SANE Target Field Off configuration.)
- Complete a more detailed draft at 2.400 GeV for BigCal Elastic Calibration Run Plan by August.


## Parasitic Energy Calibration Monitor

- The use of HMS coincidences to parasitically monitor the BigCal energy calibration during the 4.6, 5.7 GeV physics runs has also been investigated.
- The elastic cross section drops steeply with angle, so the low rates preclude the use of more than one HMS angle per beam energy.
- Only a few dozen coincidences per crystal per 100 hours of running are expected.
- The most important use of these events may ultimately be to provide two higher energy calibration points to verify the linearity of the energy calibration.
- Would need to sum over several dozen adjacent crystals to obtain the necessary statistical precision.
- Might also measure the target packing fraction by comparing to the known elastic cross sections.
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