The n3He experiment: Hadronic parity violation in cold neutron capture on ³He.

Spokespersons

D. Bowman (ORNL), C. Crawford (U. Kentucky), M. Gericke (U. Manitoba)

Project Manager S. Penttila (ORNL)

S. Baessler (UVA), L. Barrón (UNAM),

J. Calarco (U. New Hampshire), V. Cianciolo (ORNL), C. Coppola (U. Tennessee),

N. Fomin (U. Tennessee), I. Garishvili (U. Tennessee),

G. Greene (ORNL), J. Hamblen (U. Tennessee Chattanooga),

C. Hayes (U. Tennessee), K. Latiful (U Kentucky), M. McCrea (U. Manitoba),

A.R. Morales (UNAM), P. Mueller (ORNL), I. Novikov (Western Kentucky), C. Wickersham (U. Tennessee Chattanooga)

\vec{n} + ³He \rightarrow T + p + 764 keV



$$\boldsymbol{A}_{PV}^{exp} = \boldsymbol{f}_{exp} \left(\boldsymbol{A}_{PV} \cos \theta_{\vec{s}_n \cdot \vec{k}_p} + \boldsymbol{A}_{PC} \cos \phi_{\vec{s}_n \times \vec{k}_n \cdot \vec{k}_p} \right)$$

Proposal Goal:

- Measure the up-down PV spin asymmetry to $\sim 2 \times 10^{-8}$
- Measure the left right PC spin asymmetry to $\sim 5 \times 10^{-8}$

- Full four-body calculation of strong scattering wave functions
- Evaluation of the weak matrix elements in terms of the DDH potential:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_{\rho_{V}} &= a_{\pi}^{1} h_{\pi}^{1} + a_{\rho}^{0} h_{\rho}^{0} + a_{\rho}^{1} h_{\rho}^{1} + a_{\rho}^{2} h_{\rho}^{2} + a_{\omega}^{0} h_{\omega}^{0} + a_{\omega}^{1} h_{\omega}^{1} \\ \hline \begin{array}{c} DDH \ Weak \\ Coupling \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} (\mathcal{A}^{P}_{2}) \ n^{3}He \rightarrow tp \\ \hline a_{\pi}^{1} & -0.189 \\ \hline a_{\rho}^{0} & -0.036 \\ \hline a_{\rho}^{1} & 0.019 \\ \hline a_{\rho}^{2} & -0.0006 \\ \hline a_{\omega}^{0} & -0.0334 \\ \hline a_{\omega}^{1} & 0.0413 \\ \end{array} \end{aligned}$$

M. Viviani, R. Schiavilla, Phys. Rev. C. 82 044001 (2010) L. Girlanda et al. Phys. Rev. Lett. 105 232502 (2010)

- Full four-body calculation of strong scattering wave functions
- Evaluation of the weak matrix elements in terms of the EFT potential:

$$A_{PV} = a_0 h_{\pi}^1 + a_1 C_1 + a_2 C_2 + a_3 C_3 + a_4 C_4 + a_5 C_5$$

	EFT coefficents	Λ = 500 MeV	Λ = 600 MeV
$A_{PV}(th.) \approx 1.7 \times 10^{-8}$ $\Lambda = 500 MeV$	a ₀	-0.1444	-0.1293
$A_{PV}(th.) \approx 3.5 imes 10^{-8}$ $\Lambda = 600 \ MeV$	<i>a</i> ₁	0.0061	0.0081
	<i>a</i> ₂	0.0226	0.0320
	a ₃	-0.0199	-0.0161
	a4	-0.0174	-0.0156
	a ₅	-0.0005	-0.0001

M. Viviani, et al. Phys. Rev. C 89, 064004 (2014)



Proposal Goal:

- Measure the up-down PV spin asymmetry to $\sim 2 \times 10^{-8}$
- Measure the left right PC spin asymmetry to $\sim 5 \times 10^{-8}$

The Fundamental Neutron Physics Beam (FnPB)

- LH2 moderator
- 17 m long guide ~ 20 m to experiment
- one polyenergetic cold beam line
- one monoenergetic (0.89 nm) beam line
- . ~ 40 m to nEDM UCN source
- 4 frame overlap choppers
- . 60 Hz pulse repetition





Measure the asymmetry in the number of forward going protons in a ³He wire chamber as a function of neutron spin:

 $\vec{\sigma}_n \cdot \vec{k}_T$

Directional PV asymmetry in the number of tritons

 $\vec{\sigma}_n \cdot \vec{k}_p$

Directional PV asymmetry in the number of protons

(much larger track length)

- wire chamber is both target and detector
- wires run vertical or horizontal
- no crossed wire: keep the field simple to avoid electron multiplication (non-linearities)



$$\vec{n} + {}^{3}\text{He} \rightarrow p + t + 764 \text{ keV}$$



Split the ³He target volume into 144 equally spaced cells using wires:



The asymmetry is determined either from the yield of a single wire for two different spin states, or

from the yield of two opposite (conjugate) wire pairs in the same spin state.

2018-03-15

Target-Detector Chamber:



From Mark McCrea Ph.D. thesis.

Beam Profile:



The size of the wire frame was designed to cover the beam profile including beam divergence.

Target-Detector Chamber:



From Mark McCrea Ph.D. thesis.

Target-Detector Chamber:



From Mark McCrea Ph.D. thesis.

Target-Detector Chamber:



From Mark McCrea Ph.D. thesis.

Using trans-impedance amplifiers to convert signal wire current to voltage signal.

Wire signal:



Each neutron pulse window signal yield is divided into 49 TOF bins of 0.34 ms width.

We usually integrate over the a TOF range within each pulse to get the wire yield.

PV asymmetry collected ~ 30000 good runs with 25000 pulses each.

Measurement principle of the chamber:



$$\boldsymbol{A}_{PV}^{exp} = \boldsymbol{f}_{exp} \left(\boldsymbol{A}_{PV} \cos \theta_{\vec{s}_n \cdot \vec{k}_p} + \boldsymbol{A}_{PC} \cos \phi_{\vec{s}_n \times \vec{k}_n \cdot \vec{k}_p} \right)$$

Measurement principle of the chamber:



Finite geometry correction factors:





Comparisons between data and Simulation were used to verify the geometry effect of the chamber and the beam.

$$\cos \theta_{\vec{s}_n \cdot \vec{k}_p} \to \mathcal{G}_{UD}$$
$$\cos \phi_{\vec{s}_n \times \vec{k}_n \cdot \vec{k}_p} \to \mathcal{G}_{LR}$$



Finite geometry correction factors:



$$\boldsymbol{A}_{PV}^{exp} = \boldsymbol{f}_{exp} \left(\boldsymbol{A}_{PV} \boldsymbol{G}_{UD} + \boldsymbol{A}_{PC} \boldsymbol{G}_{LR} \right)$$

Detector wire yield: $\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega} = \left(\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega}\right)_{c} \left(1 + A_{PV} \cos \theta_{\vec{s}_{n} \cdot \vec{k}_{p}} + A_{PC} \cos \phi_{\vec{s}_{n} \cdot \vec{k}_{p}}\right)$

$$\mathbf{Y}^{\pm} = \mathbf{Y}_{0} \left(\mathbf{1} \pm \varepsilon \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}_{PV} \mathbf{G}_{UD} \pm \varepsilon \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}_{PC} \mathbf{G}_{LR} \right) \text{ per wire}$$

Raw asymmetry: $A_{raw} = \left(\frac{y^+}{y^+}\right)$

$$\frac{-\mathbf{Y}^{-}}{+\mathbf{Y}^{-}} \qquad \text{(theoretically: } \varepsilon PA_{PC/PV} = \left(\frac{\sigma^{+} - \sigma^{-}}{\sigma^{+} + \sigma^{-}}\right)^{2}$$

Things that one has to take care off:

- Pedestals and possible electronic false asymmetries
- Beam fluctuations and associated false asymmetries
- Correlations between wires

Incorporating the pedestal and neutron beam intensity asymmetries in the analysis:

• So the yield for wire (i)

$$Y_i^{\pm} = Y_i^{o^{\pm}} (1 \pm \varepsilon P g_i A_{PV}) + p_i^{\pm}$$

Leads to an asymmetry (from beam normalized yields)

$$A_{i,raw} = \varepsilon P g_i A_{PV} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{p_i^+}{Y_i^{o^+}} - \frac{p_i^-}{Y_i^{o^-}} \right)$$

Define

$$A_{i,ped} = \frac{p_i^+ - p_i^-}{Y_i^{o^+} + Y_i^{o^-}}$$
 pulse-pair beam off
asymmetry

$$A_{Beam} = \frac{Y_i^{o^+} - Y_i^{o^-}}{Y_i^{o^+} + Y_i^{o^-}} = \frac{I^+ - I^-}{I^+ + I^-}$$

neutron beam intensity asymmetry

Incorporating the pedestal and neutron beam intensity asymmetries in the analysis :

Leads to:

$$A_{i,raw} = Pg_i A_{PV} + \frac{p_i^+}{2Y_i^{o^+}} \left(1 - \frac{1 + A_{Beam}}{1 - A_{Beam}}\right) + \frac{A_{i,ped}}{1 - A_{Beam}}$$

The measured asymmetries are small (or zero), so we can expand to first order in the asymmetries to get

$$A_{i,raw} = Pg_i A_{PV} - \frac{p_i^+}{Y_i^{o^+}} A_{Beam} + A_{i,ped} + A_{i,ped} A_{Beam} + \mathcal{O}(A^2) + \dots$$

If we can ignore everything of order A^2 then we can just average the pulse pair asymmetries, so that for all pulses, the wire asymmetry would be

$$\langle A_{i,raw} \rangle \approx \langle P \rangle g_i A_{PV} - \left(\frac{p_i^+}{Y_i^{o^+}} \right) \langle A_{Beam} \rangle + \langle A_{i,ped} \rangle$$

Incorporating the pedestal and neutron beam intensity asymmetries in the analysis :

- From Latiful Kabir's (U. Kentucky) thesis: $A_{Beam} \sim O(10^{-7})$ (beam monitor data over all runs)
- From data $\frac{p_i^+}{Y_i^{o^+}} \sim \mathcal{O}(10^{-3})$
- From this analysis $A_{ped} = (0.26 \pm 1.97) \times 10^{-9}$
- So that over all runs we get a contribution from these factors of order

$$A_{i,raw} = Pg_i A_{PV} \pm \mathcal{O}(10^{-9})$$

Future experiments that want to push the error boundary will have to pay extreme attention to beam fluctuations and electronic noise/asymmetries.

This isn't unique to n3He (all e,p,n, analyzing power measurements, etc...)



Compare with simulated form factor structure:



Corrected PC (LR) asymmetry:



Corrected PV (UD) asymmetry:







(Latiful Kabir, Ph.D. thesis)

Summary

- Development and Construction
- Installation
- Commissioning
- Production Data Taking
- Analysis

2010 - 2014 Fall 2014 Fall 2014 - January 2015 February - December 2015 To be completed this spring

Thank you