## Low Energy Polarimetry

R. Dollan, HU Berlin for the LEPOL Collaboration







#### Low Energy Polarimeter



- Optimization of the positron beam polarization/intensity at the source, commissioning
- Control of polarization transport

Criteria: (in spite of rather poor beam quality at the source)

- minimum influence on the positron beam
- · Reasonable sensitivity to longitudinal Polarization
- Reliability
- Accuracy few percent





#### Available Processes



- Laser Compton Scattering (ex.: SLC, HERA)
  - High intensity Laser on low emittance beam
  - Only after Damping Rings (Intensity, Energy)
  - High precision
- Bhabha/Møller (ex: SLAC, JLAB, VEPP-3)
  - Thin magnetized Target
  - Suitable for desired energy range
- Compton Transmission (ex.: E166, KEK-ATF Pol. Experiment)
  - Beam absorbed in thick target
  - Very low energy ( < 100 MeV)
- Mott
  - Transverse polarized positrons, high background
- Synchrotron radiation (ex.: VEPP-4 storage ring)
  - Transverse polarization
  - Near/in damping ring?
  - Low signal Asymmetry < 10<sup>-3</sup>



## **Compton Transmission Method**



- Destructive !
- Polarized positrons reconverted into polarized gammas in rel. thick target (1 to 3  $X_0$ )
- Polarization dependent transmission due to Compton scattering in magnetized Iron
- Working point:  $E_{e^+} < 100$  MeV ideal after capture section O(~30 MeV)
- Compact O(1m)
- The E166 experiment used this method we participated from the beginning during the experimental phase and did a major part of the data analysis
- Gained much experience !









E166

R. Dollan



#### E166 results







#### E166 results









Simulation of application at PPS

- 1\*10<sup>6</sup> positrons on reconversion target (per polarization state)
- reconversion target directly in front of the polarized absorber
- reconversion target: Tungsten ( $P_e^-$  7%)
- Absorber: Iron cylinder surrounded by a lead ring

2 X <sub>0</sub> (7 mm)			
Beam energy	30 MeV	125 MeV	
Absorber length [mm]	150	150	
analyzing power	16.7	19.0	
Measured asymmetry P <sub>e</sub> + 30% / 60 %	0.4% / 0.8%	0.5% / 1%	

Energy deposition in the target:  $2X_0$  (30 MeV): 17.3 MeV/e<sup>+</sup>  $2X_0$  (125 MeV): 33.2 MeV/e<sup>+</sup> Energy deposition in the absorber: 100 mm: (1X<sub>0</sub> T., 30 MeV): 9 MeV/e<sup>+</sup> 100 mm: (1X<sub>0</sub> T., 125 MeV): 56.2 MeV/e<sup>+</sup>

Only a fraction of the positron beam can be used for polarimetry -> kicker and parallel polarimeter beam line needed



#### Bhabha-Polarimeter



- E<sub>beam</sub>: after pre acceleration ~ 400 MeV
- diff. cross section:

$$\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega} = r_0^2 \frac{(1+\cos\theta)^2}{16\gamma^2 \sin^4\theta} \left\{ \left(9+6\cos^2\theta+\cos^4\theta\right) - P_{e^+}P_{e^-} \left(7-6\cos^2\theta-\cos^4\theta\right) \right\}$$

• theor. max. asymmetry bei 90°(CMS)

~ 7/9 ≈ 78 %

• example:  $P_{e+} = 80\%$ ,  $P_{e-} = 7\% A_{max} \sim 4.4\%$ 



For the simulation studies polarization extensions for GEANT4 necessary (available since release 4.8.2)



#### Principles



- 30 µm magnetized Fe-Foil (-> polarized)
- E<sub>beam</sub> : 400 MeV (10 % spread) Ang. Spread : 0.5°



asymmetry (analyzing power)



e<sup>-</sup> distribution





ang. range of interest: 0.03 - 0.1 rad -> Asymmetry in the ang. range:  $A_{e-}$  ~50 %  $(A_{e^+} \sim 5\%, A_v \sim -15\%)$ 



#### Bhabha-Polarimeter



- Mask/shielding: selection of angular range with max. asymmetry
- Spectrometer: charge, energy
- Polarization measurements
  - -> Asymmetry measurements of opposite polarization states of the target (and/or the incident beam)





#### Geometry







# Geometry in G4



#### detector

shielding





#### Bhabha results



Beam parameters: (from source simulation!)E [MeV]400 (± 3.5 %) $\sigma_x, \sigma_y [mm]$ 5.78, 5.76 $\epsilon_x, \epsilon_y [mm mrad]$ 5.67,5.65P(beam)-100%

- Target: 30 μm Fe P ±100%
- Spectrometer: BdL 0.1 Tm
- Detector
- charge sensitive 2x2 cm pads
- 2 x 10<sup>10</sup> positrons on target (per polarization state)

Example: distribution of scattered Bhabha electrons for opposite polarization states of the target:





#### Bhabha results



Beam parameters: (from source simulation!)E [MeV]400 (± 3.5 %) $\sigma_x, \sigma_y [mm]$ 5.78, 5.76 $\epsilon_x, \epsilon_y [mm mrad]$ 5.67, 5.65P(beam)-100%

- Target: 30 μm Fe P ±100%
- Spectrometer: BdL 0.1 Tm
- Detector
- charge sensitive 2x2 cm pads
- 2 x 10<sup>10</sup> positrons on target (per polarization state)

Example: Asymmetry of the **e**<sup>-</sup>+**e**<sup>+</sup> distribution for opposite polarization states of the target:





#### Bhabha results



Beam parameters: (from source simulation!)E [MeV] $400 (\pm 3.5 \%)$  $\sigma_x, \sigma_y$  [mm]5.78, 5.76 $\epsilon_x, \epsilon_y$  [mm mrad]5.67, 5.65P(beam)-100%

- Target: 30 μm Fe P ±100%
- Spectrometer: BdL 0.1 Tm
- Detector
- charge sensitive 2x2 cm pads
- 2 x 10<sup>10</sup> positrons on target (per polarization state)







#### Target inkl. w.r. to the beam, $P(e^{-})$ in target direction:

P(e <sup>-)</sup>	E <sub>cut</sub> [MeV]	Analyzing Power [%]	exp. Asymmetry [%]	
			P <sub>beam</sub> 30%	P <sub>beam</sub> 60%
	0	26(1.4)	0.39	0.77
	10	30(1.2)	0.45	0.89
	20	32(1.2)	0.48	0.95
	30	35(1)	0.52	1.04

(Knowledge of eff. target polarization !)

eff. long. foil polarization: 4.95%

Measuring time for 5% acuracy - O(few min) Energy deposition in the target: 29.2 keV /  $e^+$  (30 µm) (beam energy: 400 MeV) 1.25 MeV /  $e^+$  (1 mm) (G4)

Target heating  $\rightarrow$  O(20%) decrease of polarization







- Studied possibility of Compton Transmission Polarimeter and Bhabha Polarimeter as LEPOL at the positron source
- Compton transmission polarimeter
  - Polarisation measurements succesfully demonstrated with the E166 transmission polarimeter
  - Robust, compact
  - Energy low, only a fraction of the beam must be used
- Bhabha polarimeter
  - Less material in the beam, less energy deposition
  - Higher analyzing power even with inclined target (and polarization)
  - faster
- Lepol layout, energy, dimension depends on final positron source design
- Spin flip before the polarimeter would be advantagous to cancel systematic effects (as we learned from E166)

The LEPOL Collaboration: R.D., Thomas Lohse, HU Berlin Sabine Riemann, Andreas Schälicke, Peter Schüler, Andriy Ushakov, DESY Pavel Starovoitov, Minsk Gideon Alexander, TelAviv