

Muon g-2: experimental status

Anna Driutti

University and INFN Pisa

on behalf of the Muon g-2 Collaboration





Introduction: the muon anomaly

• **Muon:** elementary particle with spin-1/2 and magnetic moment proportional to spin through the **g-factor**:

$$\vec{\mu} = \mathbf{g} \frac{q}{2m_{\mu}} \vec{S}$$

 At first order (Dirac theory for s = 1/2 particles) g = 2 but with higher order corrections g > 2:

$$\underbrace{g_{\mu}=2}_{\underbrace{}}(1+a_{\mu}) \quad \Rightarrow \quad a_{\mu}=\frac{g-2}{2}$$

muon anomaly

Dirac

-> Theoretically calculated using the Standard Model (SM) :



A. Driutti (U. Pisa)



• Long-standing > 3σ discrepancy



• In the meantime: **FNAL Exp.** was build and is collecting data since 2018 aiming to improve uncertainty with 140 ppb goal

• In April 2021 were published:



• <u>This talk</u>: status of the FNAL Muon $g - 2 \exp (-Run - 1)$ result and beyond

Experimental technique

- 1. Inject polarized muons into a magnetic storage ring
- 2. Muons circulate around the ring at the cyclotron frequency:

$$\vec{\omega}_C = \frac{q}{\gamma m_\mu} \vec{B}$$

3. Muon spin precession frequency (Larmor) is given by:

 $\vec{\omega}_S = \frac{q}{\gamma m_\mu} \vec{B} (1 + \gamma a_\mu)$

4. Muon anomaly is related to **anomalous precession frequency**:

$$\vec{\omega}_a \cong \vec{\omega}_S - \vec{\omega}_C \cong a_\mu \frac{q}{m_\mu} \vec{B}$$

5. Measure *B* and ω_a to extract the anomaly



Final formula

Muon anomaly is determined with:

$$a_{\mu} = \frac{\omega_a}{\widetilde{\omega}'_p(T_r)} \frac{\mu'_p(T_r)}{\mu_e(H)} \frac{\mu_e(H)}{\mu_e} \frac{m_{\mu}}{m_e} \frac{g_e}{2}$$

ratio of frequencies (R_{μ}) measured by us

$N(t) = N_0 e^{-t/\tau_{\mu}} [1 + A\cos(\omega_a t + \phi)]$

fundamental factors (combined uncertainty 25 ppb):

> $\mu'_{n}(T_{r})/\mu_{e}(H)$ from [Metrologia 13, 179 (1977)] $\mu_e(H)/\mu_e$ from [Rev. Mod. Phys. 88 035009 (2016)] m_{μ}/m_e from [Phys. Rev. Lett. 82, 711 (1999)] ge/2 from [Phys. Rev. A 83 052122 (2011)]

 $\widetilde{\omega}'_{n}(\mathbf{T}_{r})$: magnetic field B in terms of (shielded) proton precession frequency (proton NMR $\hbar \omega_P = 2\mu_p B$) and weighted by the muon distribution (shielded = measured in spherical water sample at $T_r = 34.7$ °C)



 ω_a : muon anomalous

precession frequency

Extract from decay positron time spectra

Production of the muon beam

- Recycler Ring: 8 GeV protons from Booster are divided in 4 bunches
- Target Station: *p*-bunches are collided with target and π⁺ with 3.1 GeV/c (±10%) are collected
- Beam Transport and Delivery Ring: magnetic lenses select μ^+ from $\pi^+ \rightarrow \mu^+ \nu_{\mu}$ then μ^+ are separated from p and π^+ in circular ring
- Muon Campus: polarized μ⁺ are ready to be injected into the storage ring





The storage ring journey: from BNL to FNAL in Summer 2013



Storage ring magnet

- Three superconducting coils provide 1.45 T vertical magnetic field
- Vacuum chambers surrounded by a cryosystem and C-shaped **yokes** to allow the decay positrons to reach the detectors.
- Achieved 50 ppm on field uniformity thanks to low-carbon steel **poles**, **edge shims**, **steel wedges**, **surface correction coil**



final field ~ 3 times more uniform than at BNL





Injection of the muons into the ring

• Beam enters the ring through a 2.2 m-long 10 cm hole in the iron yoke



• T0 Counter (thin scintillator read out by PMTs) to measure beam time profile



• **Inflector magnet** provides nearly field free region for muons to enter the storage region





 Inflector Beam Monitoring System (scintillator fiber grids) to measure beam spatial profile



Muon storage

• Injected beam is 77 mm off from storage region center



Kicker Magnets

 3 pulsed magnets deflect beam ~10 mrad onto the closed storage orbit in less than 150 ns





Vertical focusing



Electrostatic Quadrupoles

• 4 sets of quads provide vertical beam focusing



• *E*-field component cancels out (at first order) when muons at *magic momentum*:

$$ec{\omega}_a \cong -rac{e}{m} \left[a_\mu ec{B} - \left(a_\mu - rac{1}{ec{\gamma^2 - 1}}
ight) rac{ec{eta} imes ec{E}}{c}
ight]$$

~0 if γ =29.3 *i.e.*, p_{μ} =3.094 GeV/c

Detectors and field probes







24 Calos around the ring

- Each made of 6×9 PbF₂ crystals read out by large-area SiPMs
- 1296 channels individually calibrated by 405nm-laser system

2 in-vacuum straw trackers

• Each with 8 modules consisting of 128 gas filled straws

2 types of field probes

- 378 fixed NMR probes above and below storage region
 - → measure B-field 24/7
- Trolley with 17-probe NMR
 - \rightarrow 2D profile of B over the entire azimuth when beam is OFF



ixed probes

First production run

Statistics:

- March 26 July 7 2018 : Run1
- 1.2 × BNL after data quality selection

Main challenges:

- Non-ideal kick
 - \rightarrow low amplitude and ringing
 - \rightarrow beam not centered in storage region



- 2 of 32 HV Quad resistors were damaged
 - → slow recovery time



Master formula for analysis of Run 1



Measuring the magnetic field seen by the muons

$$R_{\mu} = \begin{pmatrix} f_{clock} \cdot \omega_{a}^{meas} \cdot (1 + C_{e} + C_{p} + C_{ml} + C_{pa}) \\ \hline f_{calib} \cdot \omega'_{p}(x, y, \phi) \otimes M(x, y, \phi) \cdot (1 + B_{k} + B_{q}) \end{pmatrix}$$

- ω_p' is proportional to the magnetic field and it is mapped every 3 days using 17 NMR probes on a trolley
- During data taking fixed NMR probes located above and below the storage region monitor the field
- Fixed probes to interpolate the field between trolley runs
- Field maps are weighted by beam distribution (extrapolated from the decay *e*⁺ trajectory measured by the trackers and simulations)



Magnetic field corrections

Kicker transient field

- due to eddy currents produced by kicker pulses
- measured using Faraday magnetometers

 $B_k \sim 30 \, \text{ppb} \quad \delta_{B_k} \sim 40 \, \text{ppb}$

Quads transient field

• due to mechanicals vibrations from pulsing the quads

mapped using special NMR probes

 $B_q \sim 17 \,\mathrm{ppb}$ $\delta_{B_q} \sim 92 \,\mathrm{ppb}$

- $\rightarrow \delta_{B_q}$ dominated by incomplete map
- → expected to be reduced by factor 2 for Run 2 and after



Measuring ω_a

Polarized muon decay:

 $\mu^+ \rightarrow e^+ + \nu_e + \overline{\nu}_\mu$

- High energy e⁺ are preferentially emitted in direction of μ⁺ spin (parity violation of the weak decay)
- Energy spectrum modulates at the *ω_a* frequency
- Counting the number of e^+ with $E_{e^+} > E_{\text{threshold}}$ as a function of time (wiggle plot) leads to ω_a :





 $E_{e^{\scriptscriptstyle +}}$ and t are measured by the calorimeters with a blinding factor applied to the digitization rate

A. Driutti (U. Pisa)

Wiggle plot

- Calorimeters data is reconstructed into energies and times
 - -> Two independent reconstruction routines
- Different analysis techniques used to reduce systematic errors :
 - Threshold (T) Method
 - only energy threshold applied to select positrons
 - Asymmetry-Weighted (A) Method:
 - positrons divided into energy bins and weighted by g-2 asymmetry
 - Ratio (R) Method
 - exponential decay due to muon lifetime is removed before fitting
 - Integrated Charge (Q) Method:
 - sum of raw calorimeter traces (unique method independent of reconstruction)
 - -> 11 independent analysis performed





- Fit → Residuals → Fast Fourier Transform (FFT)
- Analyses of FFT fit residuals shows that simple 5-parameter model is inadequate
- Flat FFT of residuals using a 22-parameter fit function that includes beam dynamics effects



$$N_0 e^{-\frac{t}{\gamma \tau}} \left(1 + A \cdot A_{BO}(t) \cos(\omega_a t + \phi \cdot \phi_{BO}(t))\right) \cdot N_{\text{CBO}}(t) \cdot N_{\text{VW}}(t) \cdot N_y(t) \cdot N_{2\text{CBO}}(t) \cdot J(t)$$

$$\begin{split} A_{\rm BO}(t) &= 1 + A_A \cos(\omega_{\rm CBO}(t) + \phi_A) e^{-\frac{1}{\sqrt{c_{\rm BO}}}} \\ \phi_{\rm BO}(t) &= 1 + A_{\phi} \cos(\omega_{\rm CBO}(t) + \phi_{\phi}) e^{-\frac{1}{\sqrt{c_{\rm BO}}}} \qquad & \omega_{CBO}, \ \omega_{2CBO} \text{ radial oscillations} \\ N_{\rm CBO}(t) &= 1 + A_{\rm QCBO} \cos(\omega_{\rm CBO}(t) + \phi_{\rm QCBO}) e^{-\frac{1}{2\sqrt{c_{\rm BO}}}} \\ N_{\rm 2CBO}(t) &= 1 + A_{\rm QCBO} \cos(\omega_{\rm CBO}(t) + \phi_{\rm QCBO}) e^{-\frac{1}{2\sqrt{c_{\rm BO}}}} \\ N_{\rm 2CBO}(t) &= 1 + A_{\rm QCBO} \cos(\omega_{\rm CBO}(t) + \phi_{\rm QCBO}) e^{-\frac{1}{2\sqrt{c_{\rm BO}}}} \\ N_{\rm VW}(t) &= 1 + A_{\rm QCBO} \cos(\omega_{\rm VW}(t)t + \phi_{\rm VW}) e^{-\frac{1}{2\sqrt{c_{\rm BO}}}} \\ N_{\rm VW}(t) &= 1 + A_{\rm QCOS} (\omega_{\rm VW}(t) t + \phi_{\rm VW}) e^{-\frac{1}{2\sqrt{c_{\rm BO}}}} \\ N_{\rm y}(t) &= 1 + A_{\rm QCOS} (\omega_{\rm VW}(t)t + \phi_{\rm VW}) e^{-\frac{1}{2\sqrt{c_{\rm BO}}}} \\ M_{\rm y}(t) &= 1 + A_{\rm QCOS} (\omega_{\rm VW}(t) t + \phi_{\rm VW}) e^{-\frac{1}{2\sqrt{c_{\rm BO}}}} \\ M_{\rm y}(t) &= 1 - k_{LM} \int_{t_0}^{t_0} \Lambda(t) dt \qquad \text{Lost muons} \\ \\ \omega_{\rm CBO}(t) &= \omega_0 t + A e^{-\frac{1}{2}A} + B e^{-\frac{1}{2}B}} \\ \omega_{\rm y}(t) &= F \omega_{\rm CBO}(t) \sqrt{2\omega_c/F} \omega_{\rm CBO}(t) - 1 \\ \omega_{\rm VW}(t) &= \omega_c - 2\omega_{\rm y}(t) \end{split}$$

A. Driutti (U. Pisa)

MUONE22- November 14, 2022

- Fit → Residuals → Fast Fourier Transform (FFT)
- Analyses of FFT fit residuals shows that simple 5-parameter model is inadequate
- Flat FFT of residuals using a 22-parameter fit function that includes beam dynamics effects





- Fit → Residuals → Fast Fourier Transform (FFT)
- Analyses of FFT fit residuals shows that simple 5-parameter model is inadequate
- Flat FFT of residuals using a 22-parameter fit function that includes beam dynamics effects





- Fit → Residuals → Fast Fourier Transform (FFT)
- Analyses of FFT fit residuals shows that simple 5-parameter model is inadequate
- Flat FFT of residuals using a 22-parameter fit function that includes beam dynamics effects





- Fit → Residuals → Fast Fourier Transform (FFT)
- Analyses of FFT fit residuals shows that simple 5-parameter model is inadequate
- Flat FFT of residuals using a 22-parameter fit function that includes beam dynamics effects





- Fit → Residuals → Fast Fourier Transform (FFT)
- Analyses of FFT fit residuals shows that simple 5-parameter model is inadequate
- Flat FFT of residuals using a 22-parameter fit function that includes beam dynamics effects



Additional term to account for muons that hit the collimators and are lost:





- Fit → Residuals → Fast Fourier Transform (FFT)
- Analyses of FFT fit residuals shows that simple 5-parameter model is inadequate
- Flat FFT of residuals using a 22-parameter fit function that includes beam dynamics effects



$N_0 e^{-\frac{i}{\gamma \tau}} \left(1 + A \cdot A_{BO}(t) \cos(\omega_a t + \phi \cdot \phi_{BO}(t))\right) \cdot N_{CBO}(t) \cdot N_{VW}(t) \cdot N_y(t) \cdot N_{2CBO}(t) \cdot J(t)$ $A_{\rm BO}(t) = 1 + A_A \cos(\omega_{\rm CBO}(t) + \phi_A) e^{-\frac{t}{\tau_{\rm CBO}}}$ $\omega_{CBO}, \omega_{2CBO}$ radial oscillations $\phi_{\rm BO}(t) = 1 + A_{\phi} \cos(\omega_{\rm CBO}(t) + \phi_{\phi}) e^{-\frac{t}{\tau_{\rm CBO}}}$ $N_{\rm CBO}(t) = 1 + A_{\rm CBO}\cos(\omega_{\rm CBO}(t) + \phi_{\rm CBO})e^{-\frac{t}{\tau_{\rm CBO}}}$ $N_{2\text{CBO}}(t) = 1 + A_{2\text{CBO}}\cos(2\omega_{\text{CBO}}(t) + \phi_{2\text{CBO}})e^{-\frac{t}{2\tau_{\text{CBO}}}}$ $N_{VW}(t) = 1 + A_{VW} \cos(\omega_{VW}(t)t + \phi_{VW})e^{-\frac{t}{\tau_{VW}}}$ ω_{v}, ω_{VW} vertical oscillation $N_{y}(t) = 1 + A_{y}\cos(\omega_{y}(t)t + \phi_{y})e^{-\frac{t}{\tau_{y}}}$ Red = free parameters $J(t) = 1 - k_{LM} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \Lambda(t) dt$ Lost muons Blue= fixed parameters $\omega_{\rm CBO}(t) = \omega_0 t + A e^{-\frac{t}{\tau_A}} + B e^{-\frac{t}{\tau_B}}$ $\omega_{y}(t) = F \omega_{CBO(t)} \sqrt{2\omega_{c}/F} \omega_{CBO}(t) - 1$ $\omega_{\rm VW}(t) = \omega_{\rm c} - 2\omega_{\rm u}(t)$

+ beam dynamics corrections:



Electric field and pitch corrections

Electric Field

• due to momentum spread around *p_{magic}*

$$ec{\omega}_a \cong -rac{e}{m} \left[a_\mu ec{B} - \left(a_\mu - rac{1}{\gamma^2 - 1}
ight) rac{ec{eta} imes ec{E}}{c}
ight]$$

 measured using momentum distribution provided by the calorimeters in terms of equilibrium radius

$$C_e \sim 450 \text{ ppb}$$
 $\delta_{C_e} \sim 50 \text{ ppb}$

Pitch

• due to vertical beam oscillation



• measured using the beam vertical amplitude from the trackers, calorimeter data, and simulations

$$C_p \sim 200 \text{ ppb}$$
 $\delta_{C_p} \sim 20 \text{ ppb}$

$$R_{\mu} = \left(\frac{f_{clock} \cdot \omega_{a}^{meas} \cdot (1 + \boxed{C_{e}} + \boxed{C_{p}} + C_{ml} + C_{pa})}{f_{calib} \cdot \omega'_{p}(x, y, \phi) \otimes M(x, y, \phi) \cdot (1 + B_{k} + B_{q})}\right)$$





Muon loss and phase acceptance corrections

Weighted PI

Muon losses cause a phase shift

- because muon-phase and muon loss rate are momentum-dependent
- measured using data-driven technique

$$C_{ml} < 20\,\mathrm{ppb} \quad \delta_{C_{ml}} \sim 5\,\mathrm{ppb}$$

Phase acceptance

- phase changes due to early to late variations of the beam
- worsened by damaged quads resistors
- measured using tracker data and simulations

$$C_{pa} \sim 200 \,\mathrm{ppb}$$
 $\delta_{C_{pa}} \sim 80 \,\mathrm{ppb}$

$$R_{\mu} = \left(\frac{f_{clock} \cdot \omega_{a}^{meas} \cdot (1 + C_{e} + C_{p} + \boxed{C_{ml}} + \boxed{C_{pa}})}{f_{calib} \cdot \omega_{p}'(x, y, \phi) \otimes M(x, y, \phi) \cdot (1 + B_{k} + B_{q})}\right)$$





Simulations for phase-acceptance

- Time-dependence of beam spatial distributions are measured by trackers in two locations
- Two independent **simulations** are used to extrapolate beam profile from tracker locations around the ring
 - based on COSY-INFINITY and GEANT-4
 - cross-checked against data
- The beam profiles in the ring are then folded with calorimeter acceptance maps produced with the **GEANT-4** based simulation





Unblinding

$$R_{\mu} = \left(\frac{f_{clock}}{f_{calib} \cdot \omega_{p}^{meas} \cdot (1 + C_{e} + C_{p} + C_{ml} + C_{pa})}{f_{calib} \cdot \omega_{p}'(x, y, \phi) \otimes M(x, y, \phi) \cdot (1 + B_{k} + B_{q})}\right)$$

Clock frequency (*fclock*):

- frequency that our DAQ clock ticks
- stable at ppt level
- hardware-blinded to have (40 ε) MHz
 - -> *ɛ* kept **secret** from all collaborators
- **revealed** only when physics analysis is completed
 - -> Run-1 result was unblinded on Feb 25, 2021 during a virtual meeting:





Run-1 Result



More details in the papers!

- Run-1 result uncertainty is statistics dominated
- Major systematic uncertainties: PA and field transients
- Next: reduce as much as possible the experimental uncertainty on g-2!

(ppb) (ppb) (statistical) 434 ω_a (systematic) 56 C_e 53489 C_p 180 13 Cml -11 C_{pa} -158 $f_{\text{calib}}(\omega'_p(x, y, \phi) \times M(x, y, \phi))$ 56 -27 Br B_a -17 $\mu'_{p}(34.7^{\circ})/\mu_{e}$ m_{μ}/m_e $g_e/2$ 0 Total systematic 157Total fundamental factors 544

Totals

462

Statistics and Publications Plan





• Before Run-2:

- -> Replaced bad quads HV resistors
- -> Magnet covered with a thermal blanket



Before Run-2:

- -> Replaced bad quads HV resistors
- -> Magnet covered with a thermal blanket
- Before Run-3:
 - -> Hall temperature control improved









Before Run-2:

- -> Replaced bad quads HV resistors
- -> Magnet covered with a thermal blanket
- Before Run-3:
 - -> Hall temperature control improved
- During Run-2 and Run-3:
 - -> Replaced kicker cables \Rightarrow kickers at HV design value





A. Driutti (U. Pisa)

MUONE22- November 14, 2022

Run-2 and Run-3 Systematics Improvements

- Improved **quadrupole field transient** (*B_q*) by measuring both time and space
- Improved kicker field transient (*B_k*) by performing new measurement also with a new magnetometer





MUONE22- November 14, 2022

Run-4 and beyond Improvements

- New **Radio Frequency System** mounted on quadrupoles which reduces Beam Betatron oscillations
 - damps beam oscillations in the first 10 μ s
 - tested during Run-4 and in use during Run-5 (and Run-6)
- Improved knowledge of the **time-momentum correlation** with simulation and a new detector



Summary and Conclusions

- FNAL g 2 Experiment goal is to measure a_{μ} with a precision of 140 ppb (4×BNL precision)
- The result from the analysis of the Run-1 data confirmed result from BNL experiment
- Run-2 and Run-3 measurement in progress: we expected to achieve a factor 2 uncertainty reduction!
- With Run-4, Run-5 and Run-6 (on going now) we expect to achieve the uncertainty goal!

Thanks!





A. Driutti (U. Pisa)