Compton polarimetry at IP6

Ciprian Gal









right) where we saw that the US location produced a very distorted signal that was very close to the beam

-0.1

0

20

40

120

Electron: 18 GeV

100

80

60

uXsec q03US :998810

Previous results



X position [mm]
The positional distribution at the electron detector and the asymmetry see a very small effect due to the smearing as expected



/EPol/input/vertexPosX 0.3985 m Transverse beam smearing /EPol/input/vertexPosY 0 cm /EPol/input/vertexPosZ 73.4 m /EPol/input/vertexRotY -0.01527 rad

Beam sampling



vtx_hits.y {vtx_hits.pID==11}



• Using the start position at the midpoint between Q7 and Q6 (code available at https://github.com/cipriangal/comptonE

##high divergence

##high acceptance

/EPol/input/beamEmmX 24 nm /EPol/input/beamEmmY 2 nm

#/EPol/input/beamEmmX 24 nm #/EPol/input/beamEmmY 1.2 nm

- The beam sampling (without taking into account the laser size) on the left has the correct size at the "vertex"
- Putting in the constraint that the vertex needs to be within the laser envelop significantly reduces the phase space (on the right)









- When sampling from the entire beam envelope with the correct x, xp, y, yp correlation (green) shows that the first order estimation I did last time was accurate enough
- Restricting the sampling to only the laser width recovers the original analyzing power shape (shift is due to repositioning of the interaction vertex to the mid-point between the quads)

Conclusions

- Sampling from the laser width alone allows us to recover the analyzing powers we had seen directly from the generator
- The beam SR should be evaluated starting further US to check whether the edet will be affected
 - The photon detector should be able to suppress most of the SR using a pre-radiator, however the power deposition should be calculated once we know the detector geometry
- Study should be repeated for 5 and 12 GeV