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## Software/Analysis Tasks

- Momentum resolution/scale calibration using trident kinematic fit:

$$
e(p)+W\left(P_{i}\right) \rightarrow e^{\prime}\left(p^{\prime}\right)+e^{+}\left(p^{+}\right)+e^{-}\left(p^{-}\right)+\left[W\left(P_{f}\right)\right]
$$

- standard HPS trigger;
- $e^{+}$and $e^{-}$have optimized acceptance;
- $e^{\prime}$ carries out small momentum reducing acceptance to first SVT layers.
- Momentum/angular resolution/scale calibration using Moller scattered electrons:

$$
e(p)+e^{*}\left(P_{i}\right) \rightarrow e^{\prime}\left(p^{\prime}\right)+\left[e^{* \prime}\left(P_{f}\right)\right]
$$

- require a non-standard (one electron) trigger or study of accidentals;
- $e^{* \prime}$ goes out of acceptance.


## Trident Reaction Variables

- measured 5 variables $\times 3$ particles $\Longrightarrow 15$ unknowns;
- recoil nucleus is not measured;
- one kinematic condition:

$$
\tilde{M}_{X}^{2}=\left(M_{X}^{2}-M_{W}^{2}\right) / 2=0
$$

- 9 vertex conditions:

$$
\vec{V}_{e^{\prime}}=\vec{V}_{e^{+}}=\vec{V}_{e^{-}}=\vec{V}_{\text {beam }}
$$

- one diffractive approximation condition (contradictory, used in MC generator):

$$
\tilde{E}_{X}=E_{X}-M_{W}=T_{W^{\prime}}=0
$$

- total 11 conditions to determine 15 unknowns:
- 9 spacial for 9 unknowns;
- 2 kinematic for 6 unknowns.


## Kinematic Fit Conditions

Assuming reference point is in the known beam position:

- (in LDC system) 6 linear equations:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& d_{0}^{e^{\prime}}=d_{0}^{e^{+}}=d_{0}^{e^{-}}=0 \\
& z_{0}^{e^{\prime}}=z_{0}^{e^{+}}=z_{0}^{e^{-}}=0
\end{aligned}
$$

- 2 non-linear equations:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \tilde{M}_{x}^{2}\left(\phi_{0}^{e^{\prime}}, \Omega^{e^{\prime}}, \operatorname{tg} \lambda^{e^{\prime}}, \phi_{0}^{e^{+}}, \Omega^{e^{+}}, \operatorname{tg} \lambda^{e^{+}}, \phi_{0}^{e^{-}}, \Omega^{e^{-}}, \operatorname{tg} \lambda^{e^{-}}\right)=0 \\
& \tilde{E}_{X}\left(\phi_{0}^{e^{\prime}}, \Omega^{e^{\prime}}, \operatorname{tg} \lambda^{e^{\prime}},, \phi_{0}^{e^{+}}, \Omega^{e^{+}}, \operatorname{tg} \lambda^{e^{+}}, \phi_{0}^{e^{-}}, \Omega^{e^{-}}, \operatorname{tg} \lambda^{e^{-}}\right)=0
\end{aligned}
$$

Limitations:

- only 1 rigorous kinematic condition and it is non-linear,
- spacial conditions do not help to reconstruct momenta and angles.


## Event Selection

- need to enhance low-momentum acceptance,
- reduced minimal number of layers in Helical fit.



## Missing Mass Distribution

- MS enhanced initial resolution $\sigma_{M_{x}^{2}}^{M C} \simeq 3 \times 10^{-3} \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$,
- reconstructed $\sigma_{M_{x}^{2}}^{\text {trk }} \simeq 3 \times 10^{1} \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$,
- kinematic fit $\sigma_{M_{x}^{2}}^{k f i t} \simeq 1 \times 10^{1} \mathrm{GeV}^{2} \sim \sigma_{M_{x}^{2}}^{\text {trk }} / 3$.



## Missing Energy Distribution

- MS enhanced initial resolution $\sigma_{E_{x}}^{M C}=6 \times 10^{-6} \mathrm{GeV}$,
- reconstructed $\sigma_{E_{x}}^{t r k}=0.1 \mathrm{GeV}$,
- kinematic fit $\sigma_{E_{x}}^{k f i t}=0.03 \mathrm{GeV} \sim \sigma_{E_{x}}^{t r k} / 3$.



## Fit Quality

- $\chi^{2}$ values are larger than expected for N.d.F.=8,
- Confidence Level is not acceptable $\ll 0.05$,
- possible reasons:
- underestimated covariance matrix,
- highly non-linear constraints.




## Fitted Position Sensitive Variables

- Correction of the order of $100 \%$ to all variables.
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## Fitted Kinematic Variables

- Correction of the order of $20 \%$.






## Fitted Kinematic Variables Cont.

- Correction of the order of $10 \%$.


- Qualitatively corrections have good behavior:
- vertex correction just moves all tracks to beam spot,
- kinematic corrections are smaller, in particular along $\vec{B}$.


## Momentum Resolution Improvements

- $X, Y$ components lost $20 \%$ of resolution,
- Z component resolution worsened by a factor of 3 .
- System is too undetermined ( 2 equations for 6 unknowns)?
- Bug of implementation?
- Linear approximation fails?




## Non-Linearity

- In missing mass condition the linear term $<70 \%$,
- in missing energy condition the linear term $<70 \%$.
- Non-linear contribution on the correction interval is suppressed by a factor of $\sim 2$,
- but in absolute value it gives $3 \div 6 \%$ (assuming linear relation to measured variables),
- this can be compared to resolution of $5 \%$.




## Conclusions

- Trident reaction is not closed, hence allowing to reconstruct strictly only 1 variable out of 6 ;
- diffractive assumption adds 1 (potentially 4) more variable, but at cost of a slight contradiction;
- still 4 variables remain unconstrained;
- fit quality is very bad, probably due to high non-linearity,
- momentum resolution was not improved.

ToDo:

- try to fit with complete diffractive assumption $P_{X}=0$.


## Initial State Problem

- initial $W$ has $P_{x}=67 \mathrm{MeV}$ and $P_{z}=1.5 \mathrm{MeV}$.




## Diffractive Assumption

- In elastic scattering on a heavy target ( $W$ ) one may neglect energy transfer:

$$
T_{W^{\prime}}=\frac{-t}{2 M_{W}}=o\left(\frac{1}{M_{W}}\right) \rightarrow 0
$$

- however, this assumption implies also:

$$
t \rightarrow 0 \text { and therefore } \vec{P}_{W^{\prime}} \rightarrow 0
$$

- but in practice the 3-momentum transfer is not suppressed:

$$
\vec{P}_{W^{\prime}} \simeq \sqrt{2 M_{W} T_{W^{\prime}}}=\sqrt{-t}
$$

## Moller Scattering

- Moller scattering:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& e(k)+e^{*}(p) \rightarrow e^{\prime}\left(k_{1}\right)+\left[e^{* \prime}\left(k_{2}\right)\right] \\
& \quad k\left(E_{b}, 0,0, E_{b}\right)+p(m, 0,0,0)=k_{1}\left(E_{1}, \vec{P}_{1}\right)+k_{2}\left(E_{2}, \vec{P}_{2}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

- expressing $k_{1,2}^{2}$, dividing on $2 E_{b}$ and neglecting $o\left(m^{2}\right)$ terms:

$$
\left(1-\cos \theta_{2,1}\right)=\frac{m}{E_{b}}\left[\frac{E_{b}}{E_{2,1}}-1\right]
$$

- using energy conservation $E_{2}=E_{b}-E_{1}$, for $\theta_{2}$ one gets:

$$
\left(1-\cos \theta_{2}\right)=\frac{m}{E_{b}}\left[\frac{1}{1-\frac{E_{1}}{E_{b}}}-1\right]
$$

## Moller Scattering Cont.

- using $E_{1}$ extracted from the first relation:

$$
E_{1}=\frac{E_{b}}{1+\frac{E_{b}}{m}\left(1-\cos \theta_{1}\right)}
$$

- one obtains:

$$
\left(1-\cos \theta_{2}\right)=\frac{m^{2}}{E_{b}^{2}} \frac{1}{\left(1-\cos \theta_{1}\right)}
$$

- expanding both for small angles ( $E_{b}=2.2 \mathrm{GeV}$ ):

$$
\theta_{2}=\left(\frac{m}{E_{b}}\right)^{2} \frac{1}{\theta_{1}} \sim \frac{5.4 \times 10^{-8}}{\theta_{1}}
$$

## Moller Scattering Cont.

- if electron $e^{\prime}\left(k_{1}\right)$ is detected in HPS:

$$
\theta_{1}>10 \mathrm{mrad}
$$

- the other electron of Moller scattering $\left(e^{* \prime}\left(k_{2}\right)\right)$ goes at polar angle:

$$
\theta_{2}<5.4 \mu \mathrm{rad}
$$

- it cannot be measured by HPS detector.

