



#### The 13<sup>th</sup> International Workshop on e+e- collisions from Phi to Psi

# Current Status of Muon g-2 Experiment at Fermilab

# Bingzhi Li Shanghai Jiao Tong University

2022.08.15

饮水思源•爱国荣校



- 1. Introduction & Motivation
- 2. Overview of the Fermilab Muon g-2 Experiment
- 3. Run1 Result: Measuring  $\omega_a$  and  $\widetilde{\omega}'_p$
- 4. Challenges and Improvements Beyond Run1
- 5. Outlook





## **Introduction & Motivation**

- The muon is the secondary generation lepton
- ~200 times heavier than the electron, ~40,000 times more sensitive
- $\mu = g \frac{e}{2m} S$ , with g=2 given by Dirac for spin  $\frac{1}{2}$  particles
- Existence of the magnetic "anomaly"

>Known as Schwinger term:  $a_l^{QED,1loop} = \frac{\alpha}{2\pi} \approx 0.00116$ 

• Contributions to  $a_{\mu}$  come from QED, EW and Hadronic

$$a_{\mu} = \frac{g-2}{2} = a_{\mu}^{QED} + a_{\mu}^{EW} + a_{\mu}^{HVP} + a_{\mu}^{HLbP}$$











# **Comparison between experiment and SM**



**Discrepancy between SM and experiment before 2021 April: 3.7** $\sigma$ BNL Result Phys Rev D73, 072003 (2006):  $a_{\mu}^{\text{Exp}} = 116\,592\,089\,(63) \times 10^{-11}$  (540 ppb) 2020 Whitepaper Result arXiv:2006.04822v1:  $a_{\mu}^{\text{SM}} = 116\,591\,810\,(43) \times 10^{-11}$  (370 ppb)

**Goal:** Measure  $a_{\mu}$  to 140 ppb, a fourfold improvement over BNL result Probe Standard Model predictions for new physics effects



$$\vec{\omega}_{\text{cyclotron}} = \frac{e}{\gamma m} \vec{B} \approx 2\pi \times 6.7 \text{ MHz}$$
  
$$\vec{\omega}_{\text{spin}} = g \frac{e}{2m} \vec{B} - (1 - \gamma) \frac{e}{\gamma m} \vec{B} \approx 2\pi \times 6.9 \text{ MHz}$$
  
$$\vec{\omega}_{a} = a_{\mu} \left[ \frac{e}{m} \vec{B} \right] \approx 229 \text{ kHz}$$



- Want  $a_{\mu} \Rightarrow$  need to measure  $\omega_a$  and  $\vec{B}$
- Muon anomalous precession frequency  $\omega_a$
- Uniform magnetic field B in terms of proton NMR frequency:  $\hbar \omega_p = 2\mu_p |B|$



#### **Storage Ring Magnet**



cross-section of the yoke



muon storage ring

- Superconducting coils
- C-shaped yoke
- 1.45T field strength



#### **Muon Storage**



muon storage ring

- Injection: inflector magnet
- Kick: fast-kickers
- Vertical focus: electrostatic quadrupoles (ESQ)



## Anomalous Precession Measurement $\omega_a$



- Self-analyzing decay:  $\mu^+ \rightarrow e^+ + \nu_e + \bar{\nu}_{\mu}$
- 24 calorimeters of 9×6 PbF<sub>2</sub> crystals detect e<sup>+</sup>
- Highest-energy  $e^+$  emitted preferentially along muon spin
- Results in a "wiggle" arrival time of these  $e^+$  in calorimeters

 $e^+$  Signal from Muon Decay:  $N_{\text{ideal}}(t) = N_0 \exp(-t/\gamma \tau_{\mu}) \left[1 + A \cos(\omega_a t + \phi)\right]$ 







#### Method: Pulsed Nuclear Magnetic Resonance

**Fixed Probe** 



Fixed Probe:

- 378 fixed probes
- 72 azimuthal positions
- continuously track field drift



Trolley:

- 9,000 measurements for each of the 17 probes
- map the field every 2 or 3 days
- Synchronizes the fixed probes to field maps





Calibration probe (CP):

- Moveable probe
- Pure water sample
- Calibrate the trolley measurement

Correcting







#### Measurement of $a_{\mu}$







Precession Frequency Analysis

- Analysis Method
- Measured g-2 Frequency
- Beam Dynamics Correction





#### **Analysis Method**

 $e^+$  Signal from Muon Decay:  $N_{\text{ideal}}(t) = N_0 \exp(-t/\gamma \tau_{\mu}) \left[1 + A \cos(\omega_a t + \phi)\right]$ 

- Counting the number of e<sup>+</sup> above the threshold energy using different weight w(E) introduces two ω<sub>a</sub> analysis methods
  1. T-method: w(E) = 1
  - 2. A-method: w(E) = A(E)
- The statistical uncertainty  $\propto 1/\sqrt{NA^2}$
- Fourier transform of residuals from a fit to simple 5-parameters fit function reveals additional frequencies
- Software blinded analysis:

 $\omega_a(R) = 2\pi \times 0.2291 MHz \left[ 1 + (R + \Delta R) \cdot 10^{-6} \right]$ 







#### **Measured g-2 Frequency**



$$F(t) = N_0 \cdot N_x(t) \cdot N_y(t) \cdot \Lambda(t) \cdot e^{-t/\gamma \tau_{\mu}} \cdot [1 + A_0 \cdot A_x(t) \cdot \cos(\omega_a^m t + \phi_0 \cdot \phi_x(t))]$$

$$\begin{split} N_x(t) &= 1 + e^{-t/\tau_{\rm CBO}} A_{N,x,1} \cos(\omega_{\rm CBO}t + \phi_{N,x,1}) \\ &+ e^{-2t/\tau_{\rm CBO}} A_{N,x,2} \cos(2\omega_{\rm CBO}t + \phi_{N,x,2}) \\ N_y(t) &= 1 + e^{-t/\tau_y} A_{N,y,1} \cos(\omega_y t + \phi_{N,y,1}) \\ &+ e^{-2t/\tau_y} A_{N,y,2} \cos(\omega_{VW}t + \phi_{N,y,2}) \\ \Lambda(t) &= 1 - K_{\rm loss} \int_0^t e^{t'/\gamma\tau_\mu} L(t') \, \mathrm{d}t' \\ A_x(t) &= 1 + e^{-t/\tau_{\rm CBO}} A_{A,x,1} \cos(\omega_{\rm CBO}t + \phi_{A,x,1}) \\ \phi_x(t) &= 1 + e^{-t/\tau_{\rm CBO}} A_{\phi,x,1} \cos(\omega_{\rm CBO}t + \phi_{\phi,x,1}) \end{split}$$

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{ndf} \left[\frac{N_{bin} - N_{fit}}{\sigma(N_{bin})}\right]^2$$

Detector effect:

Event **pileup** which changes the phase and normalization



#### Gain change in calorimeter determined from laser data







#### **Measured g-2 Frequency**



60

Run-1a Run-1b

Run-1d

500

$$F(t) = N_0 \cdot N_x(t) \cdot N_y(t) \cdot \Lambda(t) \cdot e^{-t/\gamma \tau_{\mu}} \cdot [1 + A_0 \cdot A_x(t) \cdot \cos(\omega_a^m t + \phi_0 \cdot \phi_x(t))]$$

$$\begin{split} N_x(t) &= 1 + e^{-t/\tau_{\rm CBO}} A_{N,x,1} \cos(\omega_{\rm CBO}t + \phi_{N,x,1}) \\ &+ e^{-2t/\tau_{\rm CBO}} A_{N,x,2} \cos(2\omega_{\rm CBO}t + \phi_{N,x,2}) \\ N_y(t) &= 1 + e^{-t/\tau_y} A_{N,y,1} \cos(\omega_y t + \phi_{N,y,1}) \\ &+ e^{-2t/\tau_y} A_{N,y,2} \cos(\omega_{VW}t + \phi_{N,y,2}) \\ \Lambda(t) &= 1 - K_{\rm loss} \int_0^t e^{t'/\gamma\tau_\mu} L(t') \, \mathrm{d}t' \\ A_x(t) &= 1 + e^{-t/\tau_{\rm CBO}} A_{A,x,1} \cos(\omega_{\rm CBO}t + \phi_{A,x,1}) \\ \phi_x(t) &= 1 + e^{-t/\tau_{\rm CBO}} A_{\phi,x,1} \cos(\omega_{\rm CBO}t + \phi_{\phi,x,1}) \end{split}$$

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{ndf} \left[\frac{N_{bin} - N_{fit}}{\sigma(N_{bin})}\right]^2$$

Beam Dynamic effect: Coherent Betatron Oscillations (CBO) due to beam motion





• Uncertainty for Run1:

Statistic: 434ppb / Systematic: 56ppb

- 2 different algorithms to reconstruct positrons
- 6 different analysis groups with 4 different methods
- Final combination come from the 4 A-method due to statistically optimal



R (ppm) for each dataset						Naive R	
Recon.	Method	Pileup	Run-1a	Run-1b	Run-1c	Run-1d	Average (ppm
global	А	empirical	$-82.98 \pm 1.21$	$-81.70 \pm 1.03$	$-82.30 \pm 0.82$	$-82.34 \pm 0.68$	$-82.30 \pm 0.43$
local	А	shadow	$-83.23 \pm 1.20$	$-81.77 \pm 1.02$	$-82.35\pm0.82$	$-82.48 \pm 0.67$	$-82.41 \pm 0.43$
local	А	shadow	$-83.17 \pm 1.21$	$-81.84 \pm 1.03$	$-82.50 \pm 0.83$	$-82.45 \pm 0.68$	$-82.44 \pm 0.44$
local	А	pdf	$-83.39 \pm 1.22$	$-81.72 \pm 1.04$	$-82.32 \pm 0.83$	$-82.42 \pm 0.68$	$-82.39 \pm 0.44$
local	Т	shadow	$-83.55 \pm 1.36$	$-81.80 \pm 1.16$	$-82.67 \pm 0.93$	$-82.45 \pm 0.76$	$-82.54 \pm 0.49$
global	Т	empirical	$-82.96 \pm 1.34$	$-81.96 \pm 1.14$	$-82.77 \pm 0.91$	$-82.47 \pm 0.75$	$-82.52 \pm 0.48$
local	Т	shadow	$-83.64 \pm 1.33$	$-81.83 \pm 1.12$	$-82.64 \pm 0.91$	$-82.63 \pm 0.74$	$-82.62 \pm 0.48$
local	Т	shadow	$-83.49 \pm 1.34$	$-81.75 \pm 1.13$	$-82.64 \pm 0.91$	$-82.42 \pm 0.75$	$-82.50 \pm 0.48$
local	Т	pdf	$-83.37 \pm 1.33$	$-81.76 \pm 1.13$	$-82.65 \pm 0.91$	$-82.47 \pm 0.74$	$-82.51 \pm 0.48$
local	R	shadow	$-83.72 \pm 1.36$	$-81.96 \pm 1.16$	$-82.67 \pm 0.93$	$-82.52 \pm 0.76$	$-82.62 \pm 0.49$
n/a	0	n/a	$-83.96 \pm 2.07$	$-79.70 \pm 1.76$	$-81.03 \pm 1.45$	$-82.74 \pm 1.29$	$-81.82 \pm 0.78$



## **Beam Dynamic Correction**

- *C<sub>e</sub>*: Muons with p ≠ 3.09 GeV/c are slightly affected by the radial electric field
- $C_p$ : A small pitch angle (vertically) modulates  $\beta \times \mathbf{B}$  term and the correction is required
- *C<sub>ml</sub>*: Muon losses (ML) induce a (tiny) phase shift
- *C<sub>pa</sub>*: Muon phase change due to 1) beam changing from early to late and 2) the measured phase depends on the decay coordinates

	Correction (ppb)	Uncertainty (ppb)
$\omega_a^m$ statistical		434
C <sub>e</sub>	489	53
$C_p$	180	13
$C_{ml}^{r}$	-11	5
$C_{\rm pa}$	-158	75
C <sub>total</sub>	499	93





# Magnetic Field Analysis

- Field Calibration
- Measured Field
- Muon Weighting
- Transients Correction



 A specially designed calibration probe provides the connection to a shielded proton in a spherical water sample: (accuracy of 15 ppb)

$$\omega_p'(T_r) = \omega^{cp}(T) \left[ 1 + \delta^T \left( \mathbf{H}_2 \mathbf{O}, T_r - T \right) + \delta^b \left( \mathbf{H}_2 \mathbf{O}, T \right) + \delta^s + \delta^w + \delta^{\mathrm{RD}} + \delta^d \right]$$

• Calibration correction that relates trolley/calibration probe measurement to equivalent shielded proton in spherical water sample frequency  $\omega'_p$  is needed

$$\omega_{p,trolley} \leftrightarrow \omega_{p,cp} \leftrightarrow \omega'_p$$

- The trolley calibration requires to measure the "same" field at the "same" position
  - ✓ Same field: uniform field (<20ppb/mm)
  - ✓ Same position: align CP and trolley probe (<0.5mm)



• the magnetic field is measured at ~9,000 azimuthal slices  $\phi$ 

Field Mapping

• The trolley frequency measurements at each slice can be expressed in terms of multipole moments:  $B_y = a_0 + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (r/r_0)^n [a_n cos(n\theta) + b_n sin(n\theta)]$ 

n=1



![](_page_19_Picture_0.jpeg)

## **Field Tracking**

- When the beam is on, the trolley is parked in the garage
- The muon orbit field can not be measured directly
- Need to use fixed probes to track the field during data taking
- Interpolate between trolley runs using fixed probe data

![](_page_19_Figure_6.jpeg)

# **Muon Weighting / Transient Correction**

Relative Field (ppb

200

-200

-400

- M(x, y, φ): Want the field actually experienced by muons, need to know the muon spatial & time distribution
- B<sub>q</sub>: The ESQs are pulsed every 10ms and the motion of these plates causes a magnetic field perturbation
- $B_k$ : The fast kickers pulse induces eddy currents in the surrounding metal and perturb the field

Data set	$\tilde{\omega}_p'(T_r)/2\pi$ (Hz)	Uncertainty (ppb)
Run-1a	61,791,871.2	115
Run-1b	61,791,937.8	127
Run-1c	61,791,845.4	125
Run-1d	61,792,003.4	108
	Average over all data se	ets
Field	56	
ES	92	
Kic	37	
	114	

![](_page_20_Figure_5.jpeg)

# Measurement of $a_{\mu}$ Run1 result

![](_page_21_Figure_1.jpeg)

Quantity	Correction Terms	Uncertainty
	(ppb)	(ppb)
$\omega_a^m$ (statistical)		434
$\omega_a^m$ (systematic)	_	56
$C_e$	489	53
$C_p$	180	13
$C_{ml}$	-11	5
$C_{pa}$	-158	75
$\overline{f_{\text{calib}}}\langle\omega_p(x,y,\phi)\times M(x,y,\phi)\rangle$		56
$B_k$	-27	37
$B_q$	-17	92
$\mu_p'(34.7^\circ)/\mu_e$	_	10
$m_{\mu}/m_e$	_	22
$g_e/2$	_	0
Total systematic	_	157
Total fundamental factors	_	25
Totals	544	462

• Measured  $a_{\mu}$  to 0.46 ppm

- $4.2\sigma$  differ from the SM value
- Only 6% of the full data set

![](_page_22_Figure_0.jpeg)

#### Changing CBO frequency

Muon distribution

Quantity	Correction Terms	Uncertainty
	(ppb)	(ppb)
$\omega_a^m$ (statistical)		434
$\omega_a^m$ (systematic)	_	56
$C_e$	489	53
$C_p$	180	13
$C_{ml}$	-11	5
$C_{pa}$	-158	75
$f_{\text{calib}}\langle\omega_p(x,y,\phi)\times M(x,y,\phi)\rangle$	_	56
$B_k$	-27	37
$B_q$	-17	92
$\mu_p'(34.7^\circ)/\mu_e$	_	10
$m_{\mu}/m_e$	_	22
$g_e/2$	_	0
Total systematic	_	157
Total fundamental factors	_	25
Totals	544	462

# **Challenges in Run1**

#### Bad resistors:

- 0.8 了

- 2 of 32 HV resistors on quad plates were damaged
- Observe a changing CBO frequency by tracker
- Larger phase acceptance  $(C_{pa})$  uncertainty Kick Strength and Shape:
- Sub-standard, non-uniform kick
- Muon equilibrium orbit displaced by ~6 mm
- Larger E-field correction ( $C_e$ ) and CBO amplitude Quad transient correction ( $B_q$ ):
- Substructure not measured in Run1

Hall temperature instability

- ppm level variations of the magnetic field
  Many kicker/ESQ setting
- Need to perform individual analysis for four sub-datasets and then combine

![](_page_23_Figure_0.jpeg)

# Major Upgrades beyond Run1

- Replaced damaged resistors
- Higher kicker voltage to center beam
- More systematic measurement of transient field
- More stable temperature control
- More stable run & minimize configuration change
- Develop optimal methods in both  $\omega_a$  and  $\omega_p$

analysis to reduce the systematic uncertainties

# **Theory Update Since 2021 April**

- HVP lattice calculations vary in a wide range, converging not easy
- Weight the lattice results to concentrate on an intermediate energy range where the calculations are thought to be more reliable
- Mainz/CLS and ETMC(2022) results agree with BMW20
- The lattice results conflict with the longstanding data-driven number
- New results expected soon from FNAL/MILC & RBC/UKQCD

![](_page_24_Figure_6.jpeg)

![](_page_25_Picture_0.jpeg)

#### Outlook

![](_page_25_Picture_2.jpeg)

- The Fermilab Muon g-2 experiment measured  $a_{\mu}$  to 0.46ppm in Run1
- The discrepancy with the Standard Model prediction is  $4.2\sigma$
- Run 1 is only 6% of the final data set
- Up to date, 5 Runs of data have been collected: 19xBNL statistics
- Stay tuned for more results to come

![](_page_25_Figure_8.jpeg)

![](_page_26_Picture_0.jpeg)

# Thanks!

![](_page_27_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Picture_0.jpeg)

#### **Overview of the Experiment**

![](_page_28_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Picture_3.jpeg)

muon storage ring

![](_page_28_Figure_5.jpeg)

- Muon Injection
  - Need to cancel field in beam channel
  - Prevents strong deflection of the beam
  - Minimal perturbation to storage magnetic field
  - Superconducting inflector magnet are used to achieve above requirements

![](_page_28_Picture_11.jpeg)

![](_page_29_Picture_0.jpeg)

#### **Overview of the Experiment**

![](_page_29_Picture_2.jpeg)

muon storage ring

![](_page_29_Figure_4.jpeg)

#### Muon Storage: Kicker

- After inflector, muons enter storage region at 77 mm outside central closed orbit
- The fast-kicker system steers muons onto stored orbit
- Muon Storage: Electrostatic Quadrupoles (ESQ)
  - Drives the muons towards the central part of storage region vertically
  - Aluminum ESQ cover ~43% of total ring

$$\boldsymbol{\omega}_{\boldsymbol{a}} = -\frac{e}{m_{\mu}} [a_{\mu}\boldsymbol{B} - (a_{\mu} - \frac{1}{\gamma^2 - 1}) \frac{\boldsymbol{\beta} \times \boldsymbol{E}}{c}]$$

 $\gamma = 29.3$