

The search of the X17 boson at the n_TOF facility: demonstrator data analysis

Nicholas Pieretti on behalf of the n_TOF collaboration

21 November 2024 – n_TOF collaboration national meeting

X17 at n_TOF: detector design

- **Large acceptance**
- **Tracking and PID**
- \cdot 2D μ -RWELL
- Array of scintillator bars
- 500 Gauss magnetic field

First detector prototype test (2023)

- Large acceptance
- **Tracking and PID**
- Al and C fiber capsule
- \cdot 2D μ -RWELL
- Array of scintillator bars

The scintillator bar array

- Provide trigger and neutron TOF
- Improve spatial resolution

- Readout and DAQ with SiPM + FERS (CAEN)
- Only timing data available:
	- Time of Arrival (ToA)
	- Time over Threshold (ToT)

The scintillator bar array: analysis performed

- Background estimation
- Dead time estimation
- Hit map reconstruction
- Neutron energy dependence

Background estimation

- Pedestal data (beam off)
- Threshold on ToT as event selection cut \approx 22 ns
- Mainly electronic noise
- Visible γ -flash peak at \approx 175 ns

Background estimation

- Pedestal data (beam off)
- Threshold on ToT as event selection cut \approx 22 ns
- Mainly electronic noise
- Visible γ -flash peak at \approx 175 ns

Dead time estimation

• ToT vs time difference between two consecutive events Δt

Dead time estimation

• To T vs time difference between two consecutive events Δt

- Dead time ≈ 100 ns
- Possible pileup events

Dead time estimation

• To T vs time difference between two consecutive events Δt

- Dead time ≈ 100 ns
- Possible pileup events
- ν -flash saturates the detector

Hit map reconstruction Time window estimation

MMMMMMMMMMMMMMMM

- Coincidences between signals at opposite ends of a bar
- First estimation $Ln/c \approx 2.5$ ns
- Account for several delays $\rightarrow \Delta t_c = 10$ ns

Hit map reconstruction Coincidence rate

www.www.www.www.mww.www.www.ww

- Low coincidence rate, except for γ -flash
- Very low single bar coincidence rate
- Noisy bars flagged in the analysis

<u>MAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA</u>

- Reconstruction on channels and bars
- Different response and non-uniform background

- Reconstruction on channels and bars
- Different response and non-uniform background
- Very few crossed coincidences

- Reconstruction on channels and bars
- Different response and non-uniform background
- Very few crossed coincidences (except for γ -flash)

Neutron energy dependence

- Main background: elastically scattered neutrons
- Other channels open from 1500 ns (1 MeV)
- Relevant γ -flash tail

Conclusions

- Performance evaluation of scintillator bar array
- Detector suitable for neutron energies of interest
- γ -flash sensitivity, but short dead time
- Different DAQ system for extended acquisition time window and amplitude information

Thank you for your attention!

Phys. Rev. Lett. 116 (2016) 042501

The X17 anomaly

- Significant anomalies observed at ATOMKI, Hungary, in:
	- \circ ⁷Li(p, e⁺e⁻)⁸Be
	- \circ ³H(p, e⁺e⁻)⁴He
	- $_0$ $^{11}B(p, e^+e^-)^{12}C$
- Excess of e^+e^- pairs emitted at large relative angle

The ATOMKI setup

- ³H on Ti layer
- **6 plastic scintillators**
- 6 double-sided silicon strip detectors
- \bullet 1 mm thick carbon fiber tube
- ❖ **Detector acceptance only** ∼ ° **with respect to the beam axis**
- ❖ **No tracking or PID**

EPJ Web Conf. 232 (2020) 04005

The X17 anomaly

- A new particle with mass ≈ 17 MeV/c^2 ?
- Not confirmed or refuted by independent experiments

- Study of the conjugate reaction ${}^{3}He(n,e^{+}e^{-}){}^{4}He$
- Wide energy range \rightarrow explore different J^{π}
- Large detector acceptance \rightarrow statistics and kinematics

The X17 anomaly: a genuine effect?

- The statistical significance of the observations is always >6 standard deviations.
- The anomaly has been observed in 8 Be using two different experimental setups: 5 and 6 arms spectrometers.
- The anomaly has been observed using different position sensitive detectors: multiwire chambers and silicon strip detectors.
- The anomaly has been observed in two different target nuclei ⁸Be and ⁴He and shows up at different value of the angle.
- The anomaly has been observed with different proton beam energies.
- The anomaly has not been observed in calibration atoms i.e. ^{16}O during the same data taking period.
- The anomaly has not been observed in events with asymmetric momentum e⁺e⁻ pairs

The X17 anomaly: new physics?

- The anomalies are statistically significant. They are both roughly 7σ excesses and are unlikely to disappear with more data.
- \bullet The excesses are bumps. They are localized in opening angle 0 and invariant mass $m_{e^+e^-}$. Diffuse excesses or excesses that appear at an experiment's kinematic limit are much more likely to have mundane explanations.
- The excess rises and falls as one scans through the resonance by varying the proton beam energy
- There are no compelling SM or experimental explanations
- The fit improves drastically with the introduction of a single new particle. A priori the excess need not have a shape consistent with the simplest new physics explanations.
- The ⁸Be and 4 He results support each other. In particular, the excess shifts from $\theta \approx 140^\circ$ for ⁸Be to 115° for ⁴He. Such a shift excludes many experimental systematic error explanations, but it is exactly what is expected for all of the simplest new particle explanations. Additionally, the size of the ⁴He excess is consistent with the prediction of the protophobic gauge boson explanation of the ⁸Be anomaly.

The X17 anomaly: features and constraints

- X17 is produced through its nuclear (quark) couplings and decays through its electron coupling.
- The bumps at $\Theta \approx 140^\circ$ for 8 Be and 115° for ⁴He imply that the X17 has a two-decay X17 $\rightarrow e^+e^-$ and $m_{X17} \approx 17$ MeV.
- X17 is therefore a neutral boson, and the discovery of X17 implies the discovery of a fifth force with a characteristic range of 12 fm.
- The signal rate is determined by σ (8 Be $* \rightarrow 8$ Be X17) \times BR(X17 $\rightarrow e^+e^-$).
- Other decay modes are possible $(X17 \rightarrow \bar{\nu}\nu, DM, ...)$, but to maintain the signal rate, these would require larger nuclear couplings, which are more prone to exclusion. One can assume BR(X → e+e−) $= 1$.
- With this assumption, X's nuclear couplings are completely determined by the signal rate.
- X17's electron coupling cannot be too small, since the X cannot travel too far before decaying.
- The quantum numbers of the reactions and symmetries of the physics models impose theoretical constraints on possible explanations.
- All experiments that have probed the 10 MeV-scale since the early days of nuclear and particle physics impose additional experimental constraints on possible explanations.

First detector prototype test (2023)

- Large acceptance
- **Tracking**

Assess noise and saturation effects as a function of:

- Target type
- Demonstrator distance from the beam
- Time after γ -flash

Differential cross sections for the ³He(n, e⁺ e)⁴He and ³H(p, e⁺ e)⁴He processes at θ k = 90∘ and six different incident nucleon energies as a function of the correlation angle Θ. The panels labeled S, P, V, and A show the results obtained by assuming a scalar, pseudoscalar, vector, and axial X17, respectively. The dashed (black) and solid (red) curves represent the theoretical results obtained by including the electromagnetic interaction only or both the electromagnetic and X17 amplitudes. The coupling constants have been adjusted to reproduce the ATOMKI ³H(p, e ⁺ e -) ⁴He cross section data at Ep = 0.90 MeV (blue dots)

Differential cross sections for the 3H(p, e+ e–)4He processes at Ep = 0.90 MeV and different emission angle $θ = θ' = θk$ with respect to the beamline, as a function of the difference in azimuthal coordinate $\Delta \phi = \phi' - \phi$ of the positron and electron. The curves labeled S, P, V, and A show the results obtained by including the exchange of a scalar, pseudoscalar, vector, and axial X17, respectively. The coupling constants have been adjusted to reproduce the ATOMKI data at θ k = 90∘ (orange dots)

Protons Electrons

First detector prototype test (2023)

- A target of Al and Carbon_fibre capsule projected to contain \mathbb{I} T at high pressure \mathbb{I} g d \mathbb{I} a')
- A large μ -Rwell and an array of scintillator bars
- A small μ -Rwell
- A cubic scintillator

Each detector has a specific readout and DAQ chain. The goal of the demonstrator is to assess noise and saturation effects as a function of:

- Target type
- Demonstrator distance from the beam $(10, 20, 30 \text{ cm})$:
- Time after γ -flash (0, 500, ... \rightarrow 10000 ns)

The scintillator bar array

- Provide trigger and neutron TOF
- Improve spatial resolution

- Readout and DAQ with SiPM + FERS (CAEN)
- Only timing data available:
	- Time of Arrival (ToA)
	- Time over Threshold (ToT)

Hit map reconstruction Time window estimation

- Coincidences between signals at opposite ends of a bar
- First estimation $L n/c \approx 2.5$ ns
- Account for several delays $\rightarrow \Delta t_c = 10$ ns

- Low coincidence rate, except for γ -flash
- Very low single bar coincidence rate
- Noisy bars flagged in the analysis

ToA information

Time of Arrival (ToA) of signal on the channels can be used to map the hit position on the scintillator bars

Neutron energy dependence

- Main background: elastically scattered neutrons
- Other channels open from 1500 ns (1 MeV)
- Relevant γ -flash tail

- **Neutrons produced through** spallation of 20 GeV/c protons from PS $\rightarrow \gamma$ -flash
- **Time of Flight technique**
	- EAR1: Best energy resolution
	- **EAR2: high n flux**

- Wide energy range: $10 \text{ meV} \leq E_n \leq 1 \text{ GeV}$
- High PS current $\sim 10^{13}$ p/bunch \implies 10⁷ n/pulse
- **•** Energy resolution $\frac{\Delta E}{E}$ \overline{E} : \circ ≈ 10⁻⁴ in EAR1 \circ ≈ 10⁻³ in EAR2

