Progress on A_N of Pi0 TSSA using FCS

David Kapukchyan

October 9, 2024

STAR Spin PWG Meeting

Recap and Outline

- Looking at Run 22 fwd_stream production
 - Production finished
 - Filling spin database in progress
 - Request page: <u>https://drupal.star.bnl.gov/STAR/blog/dkap7827/Run-22-Data-Production-Request</u>
 - Used a file from every single run number greater than 23005043
 - Only runs after and including this run are calibrated
 - When I included runs before this one got bad results
 - Trigger list is in backup, focuses on all EM calorimeter triggers
- Last update: showed some results of $A_{\rm N}$ of pi0s by picking the pair closest to the mass
- This update: refining pi0 selection
 - Using only highest energy pair of points with energy>1 GeV
 - Also cutting on EPD nmip<0.7



Plot descriptions from top left going clockwise

- 1. Point distributions look normal
- 2. EPD projections of points do show some some outside a central region
 - This may be due to vertex
- 3. EPD nmip of projected points normal
- 4. Energy distribution of points and clusters have large spikes
 - Possibly from hot spots
- Energy distribution of two highest energy pairs look normal but show same spikes as energy

Point Level QA







Energy of FCS Points



Distribution of nmip values from matching projected clusters and points

3





Zoom in on ~80 GeV Points





- Point position reconstruction in energy region without spike is uniform
- Point position reconstruction in energy region with spike has a hot spot at near beam pipe
- Fiducial volume cut may get rid of this

Highest Energy Pairs No cuts

- Most distributions look normal
- Energy spikes same as the photon energy distributions
- Invariant mass with just highest pairs shows bump at pi0 mass over Gaussian background
- Invariant mass of all point pairs has similar shape but different Gaussian as background







Mear

RMS

Mea

RMS

Invariant Mass (Ge)

Underflow

0.387

1 987e+08

0 2327

Underflow

0.452

0.2285

0.494

Underflo

Pt (GeV

0.4878

Highest Energy Pairs both EPD projections 0.001<nmip<0.7

- **Distributions very** ٠ similar to the highest energy case
- Point multiplicity has • decreased significantly
- Pi0 bump slightly • enhanced (Overlay plot will be shown soon)

2500 2000

300 F

200





.1 0.2 0.3 0.4 0.5 0.6 (



Energy of Pi0s using highest energy pairs and Epd Cut Photons H1E EndPhEn



Invariant mass of all point pair combinations with Epd Cut Photons 0.370 1200 0.2228 Underflow 1 767e+0 1000 800





Highest energy Pairs both EPD projections and nmip>=0.7

- Most distributions look • similar to the "less than" nmip cut ones
- Here I extended the range • of invariant mass to 5 to see if J/psi is visible
 - Nothing obvious at • first glance



Invariant Mass (Ge)





0.4254

0.3121

1.561e+04

RMS

Invariant Mass (GeV

Underflow



Phi of Pi0s using highest energy pairs and Epd Cut Charged

0.0174

1.867





Invariant Mass (GeV)

0.035

0.03

0.025

0.02

0.015

0.01

0.005

0.0045

0.004 E

0.0035

0.003

0.0025 0.002

0.0015

0.001

0.0005

0.25 Invariant Mass (GeV

- Black histograms have no cut
- Blue histogram is EPD nmip<0.7 cut
- Green histogram is EPD nmip>=0.7 cut

H1F BestPi0Phi

RMS

Underflo

-0.01312

.901e-07

1.885 .015e-07

- Point multiplicity clearly reduced
- Looking at just highest pairs of points see a clear suppression of pi0 mass peak with EPD nmip cut
- Even the all point combinations shows a suppression

Conclusions

- Vertex information coming mostly from VPD and EPD
 - Resolution may be improved if we had TPC calibrated vertex data
- Point reconstruction shows spikes in energy distribution
 - This is also evidenced from the pi0 reconstruction
 - It may be coming from hot spots in the detector
- EPD nmip cut working to give cleaner pi0s
 - More cuts need to be added

Backup

List of triggers

- fcsJPsi
- fcsJPDE1
- fcsJPDE0
- fcsJPBC1
- fcsJPBC0
- fcsJPA1
- fcsJPA0
- fcsJP2
- fcsEM3
- fcsEM2
- fcsEM1
- fcsEM0
- fcsEHT-N/S
- fcsDYAsy
- fcsDY
- fcsDiJPAsy
- fcsDiJP