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Abstract

Luminosity determination in ALICE is based on visible cross sections measured in van der Meer scans. In 2012, the Large Hadron Collider provided proton-proton collisions at a centre-of-mass energy of $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV. A van der Meer scan was performed, in which the cross section was measured for two classes of visible interactions, based on particle detection in the ALICE luminometers: the T0 detector with pseudorapidity coverage $4.6 < \eta < 4.9$, $-3.3 < \eta < -3.0$ and the V0 detector with pseudorapidity coverage $2.8 < \eta < 5.1$, $-3.7 < \eta < -1.7$. This document describes the experimental setup for such a measurement and reports its results. The analysis procedure used was described in a previous publication dedicated to the 13 TeV luminosity determination.
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1 Introduction

Luminosity determination in ALICE (A Large Ion Collider Experiment) [1] at the Large Hadron Collider (LHC) is based on visible cross sections measured in van der Meer (vdM) scans [2, 3]. The visible cross section $\sigma_{\text{vis}}$ seen by a given detector (or set of detectors) with a given trigger condition is a fraction of the total inelastic interaction cross section $\sigma_{\text{inel}}$: $\sigma_{\text{vis}} = \epsilon \sigma_{\text{inel}}$, where $\epsilon$ is the fraction of inelastic events that satisfy the trigger condition. In the following, a class of inelastic events satisfying a given trigger condition will be referred to as a reference process. Once the reference-process cross section ($\sigma_{\text{vis}}$) is measured, the luminosity at the ALICE interaction point (IP2) is determined as the reference-process rate divided by $\sigma_{\text{vis}}$. This procedure does not require a knowledge of $\epsilon$.

In standard vdM scans the two beams are moved across each other in the transverse directions $x$ (horizontal) and $y$ (vertical). The $x$ and $y$ scans are performed separately, the beams being head-on in the non-scanned direction. Measurement of the rate $R$ of the reference process as a function of the beam separation $\Delta x$, $\Delta y$ allows one to determine the luminosity $L$ for head-on collisions of a pair of bunches with particle intensities $N_1$ and $N_2$ as

$$L = \frac{N_1N_2f_{\text{rev}}}{(h_x h_y)},$$

(1)

where $f_{\text{rev}}$ is the accelerator revolution frequency and $h_x$ and $h_y$ are the effective convolved beam widths in the two transverse directions. $h_x$ and $h_y$ are measured as the area below the $R(\Delta x, 0)$ and $R(0, \Delta y)$ curve (scan area), respectively, each divided by the head-on rate $R(0, 0)$. The cross section $\sigma_{\text{vis}}$ for the chosen reference process is then

$$\sigma_{\text{vis}} = \frac{R(0, 0)}{L}.$$  

(2)

The formalism of Eq. 1 assumes complete factorisation of the beam profiles in the two transverse directions, such that the beam overlap region is fully described by the product $h_x h_y$. Previous studies performed at the LHC [4–8] have shown that factorisation can be broken to a non-negligible level. Such non-factorisation effects can be studied and quantified by measuring the luminous region parameters via the distribution of interaction vertices, as a function of the beam separation.

In 2012, the LHC provided proton-proton (pp) collisions at a centre-of-mass energy $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV. The ALICE luminosity determination for this data sample is based on a vdM scan performed on July 17, in which the cross section was measured for two reference processes. In Sec. 2 the detectors used for the measurement are briefly described, along with the relevant machine parameters and the adopted scan procedure. The vdM scan analysis procedure is extensively described in a previous note [8] dedicated to the luminosity determination in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV; it is briefly recalled in Sec. 3 where the results and uncertainties for the visible cross-section and the luminosity measurement are presented and discussed.

2 Experimental setup

In the July vdM scan, the cross section was measured for two reference processes: one is based on the V0 detector, the other on the T0 detector. A detailed description of these detectors is given in [1], and their performance is discussed in [9, 11]. The V0 detector consists of two hodoscopes, with 32 scintillator tiles each, located on opposite sides of the IP2, at distances of 340 cm (V0A) and 90 cm (V0C) along the beam axis, covering the pseudorapidity ($\eta$) ranges $2.8 < \eta < 5.1$ (V0A) and $-3.7 < \eta < -1.7$ (V0C). The T0 detector consists of two arrays of 12 Cherenkov counters each, located on opposite sides of IP2, at distances of 370 cm (T0A) and 70 cm (T0C) along the beam axis, covering the pseudorapidity ranges $4.6 < \eta < 4.9$ (T0A) and $-3.3 < \eta < -3.0$ (T0C). Note that the clockwise-travelling LHC beam moves from side A to side C. The C side is the one hosting the ALICE muon arm [1].
The V0-based trigger condition, chosen as the reference process, requires at least one hit in each detector hodoscope, i.e. on both sides of IP2. A similar trigger condition defines the T0-based reference process, with the additional condition that the longitudinal coordinate of the interaction vertex lies in the range $|z| < 30$ cm, where $z = 0$ is the nominal IP2 position. More details on this online cut, which aims to reject the background from beam-gas and beam-satellite interactions, are given in [8].

During the vdM scan session, each proton beam consisted of 50 bunches and 31 bunch pairs were colliding at IP2. The minimum spacing between two consecutive bunches in each beam was 1 ms. The $\beta^*$ value at IP2 was 10 m. The nominal half vertical crossing angle of the two beams at IP2 was -212 $\mu$rad, the minus sign indicating that the two beams exit the crossing region with negative $y$ coordinate with respect to the beam axis. The current in the ALICE solenoid (dipole) was 30 kA (6 kA), corresponding to a field strength of 0.5 T (0.7 T). The maximum beam separation during the scan was about 0.6 mm, corresponding to about six times the RMS of the transverse beam profile ($\sigma_{\text{beam}}$). The reference-process rates were recorded separately for each colliding bunch pair. Two independent measurements per bunch pair were performed by repeating the horizontal and vertical scan pair twice. In addition, a length-scale calibration scan was performed.

The proton bunch intensities were on the order of $7-11 \times 10^{10}$ protons per bunch. The bunch-intensity measurement is provided by the LHC instrumentation [12]: a DC current transformer (DCCT), measuring the total beam intensity, and a fast beam current transformer (fBCT), measuring the relative bunch populations. For the relative bunch populations, data from a second device, the ATLAS beam pick-up system (BPTX [13]) is also used. The measured beam intensity is corrected for the fraction of ghost and satellite charges. A measurement of ghost charge is provided independently by the LHCb collaboration, via the rate of beam-gas collisions occurring in nominally empty bunch slots, as described in [15], and by the LHC Longitudinal Density Monitor (LDM), which measures synchrotron radiation photons emitted by the beams [16]. The resulting ghost-charge correction factor to the bunch-intensity product $N_1N_2$ is $0.989 \pm 0.002$, where the uncertainty includes the difference between the two measurements. The LDM provides in addition a measurement of the satellite-charge fraction. For this fill, the satellite-charge correction factor to the bunch intensity product amounts to $0.9930 \pm 0.0003$.

### 3 Analysis and results

The reader is referred to Ref. [8] for a detailed description of all the analysis steps. Here, we briefly recall the main analysis features and provide numerical values for the relevant quantities entering the analysis.

The rates for the T0- and V0-based reference process are determined from the raw trigger rates by taking into account contamination from beam-background, pileup effects and time-dependence of the bunch intensities. The correction for fake coincidences originating from pileup uses the ratios of single-side (A&!C and C&!A, i.e. no signal on one of the two sides) to two-side (A&C) events $\alpha = \mu_{A&!C}/\mu_{\text{vis}}$ and $\beta = \mu_{C&!A}/\mu_{\text{vis}}$, where $\mu$ is the average number of events of a given type in a bunch crossing: $\mu_{\text{vis}} = L \sigma_{\text{vis}}$, and similarly for $\mu_{A&!C}$ and $\mu_{C&!A}$. These were determined by means of dedicated data-taking at low interaction rate, and found to be $\alpha = 0.550$, $\beta = 0.467$ for the T0, $\alpha = 0.0725$, $\beta = 0.0725$ for the V0, with negligible statistical uncertainty. The nominal separation values are corrected for beam-beam deflection [17] and orbit drifts.

The luminous region parameters used for the length-scale and non-factorisation corrections are measured

---

1. The $\beta(z)$ function describes the single-particle motion and determines the variation of the beam envelope as a function of the coordinate along the beam orbit ($z$). The notation $\beta^*$ denotes the value of the $\beta$ function at the interaction point.

2. The radio-frequency (RF) configuration of the LHC is such that the accelerator orbit is divided in 3564 slots of 25 ns each. Each slot is further divided in ten buckets of 2.5 ns each. In nominally filled slots, the particle bunch is captured in the central bucket of the slot. Following the convention established in [13], the charge circulating outside of the nominally filled slots is referred to as ghost charge; the charge circulating within a nominally filled slot but not captured in the central bucket is referred to as satellite charge.
via the distribution of interaction vertices, determined with the ALICE Inner Tracking System \textsuperscript{18} and Time Projection Chamber \textsuperscript{19} detectors.

The scan curves are fitted with a modified Gaussian function; two more models, one based on a double Gaussian function and one which uses numerical integration instead of a fit, are also used to evaluate systematic uncertainties. For each scan, the effective beam widths $h_x$, $h_y$ and the head-on rate $R(0,0)$ are computed from the fit parameters. The beam widths are corrected by a length-scale calibration factor measured in a dedicated scan. The horizontal (vertical) factor is the slope parameter of a linear fit to the measured horizontal (vertical) vertex displacement versus the nominal one. Both fits are shown in Fig. 1. For both directions, the agreement between data and fit is not perfect ($\chi^2/\text{ndf} \approx 3-6$). To account for this, the fit is repeated after rescaling the uncertainties on the vertex position by $\sqrt{\chi^2/\text{ndf}}$. The final correction factor (obtained as the product of the two slopes) is $1.010 \pm 0.003$.

The measured beam widths are combined with the bunch intensities and head-on rates to determine the visible cross sections (Eq. 1 and 2). The results are corrected for non-factorisation effects, evaluated by simultaneously fitting the rates and the luminous region parameters (positions, sizes, transverse tilt) with a three-dimensional non-factorisable double-Gaussian model \textsuperscript{20}, and computing the bias on the head-on luminosity with respect to a factorisable model. An example of the fit is shown in Fig. 2. The resulting correction factor to $\sigma_{\text{vis}}$ is $1.046 \pm 0.005$ (stat.). The systematic uncertainty on this quantity is evaluated by comparing the results obtained with different fitting schemes, and by comparing the standard result, obtained from a bunch-integrated analysis, with that obtained using a bunch-by-bunch correction. The former test yields a maximum difference of 1%, the second of 0.3%. These values are combined with the statistical uncertainty, for a total uncertainty of 1.2%.

The measured visible cross sections for the T0-based (V0-based) reference process in the two scans are shown in Fig. 3 (Fig. 4) for all the colliding bunch pairs, as a function of the product $N_1N_2$ of the colliding bunch intensities. Within uncertainties, the visible cross-section does not depend on $N_1N_2$. The combined effect of the beam-beam deflection and orbit drift correction is about 2% for the first scan, and slightly smaller for the second scan. The effect of orbit drift alone is about 0.3%. For both T0 and V0, the results from the two scans are compatible within statistical uncertainties (Fig. 3 and 4). The weighted average of the results of the two scans is retained as the final result: $\sigma_{\text{T0}} = 25.50 \pm 0.01$ (stat.) mb, $\sigma_{\text{V0}} = 55.75 \pm 0.03$ (stat.) mb. In order to test the pileup correction, the ratio $\sigma_{\text{T0}}/\sigma_{\text{V0}}$ obtained from the vdM scan (where, for head-on beams, $\mu_{\text{vis}} \simeq 0.53$ for the V0 and $\simeq 0.24$ for the T0) was compared to the ratio between the T0 and V0 rates measured at lower interaction rate ($\mu_{\text{vis}} \simeq 0.05$ for the V0...
Fig. 2: (Colour online) Luminous region parameters and T0 rate as a function of separation during a horizontal scan, as fitted by a three-dimensional non-factorisable model [20] (dashed red line). The centroids are shown in the top row, the RMS sizes are shown in the middle row, the transverse tilt is shown in the bottom row together with the T0 rate.

and $\simeq 0.023$ for the T0) in a fill close in time to the vdM scan and a negligible (<0.1%) difference was found. A list of all the systematic uncertainties considered for the visible cross-section measurement is presented in Table 1. Uncertainties not discussed above are evaluated as detailed in [8]. Combining all the uncertainties one obtains for the T0 (V0) a total systematic uncertainty of 2.4% (2.6%), with an uncorrelated component between the two measurements arising from pileup and background subtraction.

The results for the visible cross sections are then

$$\sigma_{T0} = (25.5\pm0.5) \text{ mb}, \quad \sigma_{V0} = (55.8\pm1.2) \text{ mb},$$

where the statistical uncertainties are negligible with respect to the systematic ones.

In order to test the stability of the luminosity measurement provided by the T0 and the V0, the ratio between their trigger rates in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV has been computed for all runs recorded in 2012 at this collision energy. During this period (about 7 months of data-taking), collisions at IP2 were delivered in the so-called main-satellite mode, for which the high-intensity bunches of one of the two beams were collided with satellite bunches from the other. The minimum spacing between main bunches was 50 ns, leading to a minimum spacing between main-satellite encounters of 25 ns. ALICE took data with $\mu_{vis}$ ranging from 0.0005 to 0.015 for the V0. The reference process rates are determined from

---

3In the ALICE nomenclature, a run is a set of data collected within a start and a stop of the data acquisition, under stable detector and trigger configuration. For the considered data-taking period, the duration of a run ranges from $\simeq 10$ minutes to $\simeq 8$ hours.
Fig. 3: Visible cross section for the T0 measured in the first (top) and second (bottom) vdM scan, as a function of the product of the intensities of the colliding bunch pair. Only the statistical uncertainties are shown. The solid line is a constant fit to the data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Uncertainty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-factorisation</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orbit drift</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beam-beam deflection</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic $\beta^*$</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background subtraction</td>
<td>0.2% (T0), 1.2% (V0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pileup</td>
<td>0.5% (T0), &lt; 0.1% (V0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length-scale calibration</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit model</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h_x h_y$ consistency (T0 vs V0)</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luminosity decay</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunch-by-bunch consistency</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scan-to-scan consistency</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beam centreing</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunch intensity</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total on visible cross section</strong></td>
<td>1.91% (T0), 2.19% (V0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stability and consistency</strong></td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total on luminosity</strong></td>
<td>2.36% (T0), 2.60% (V0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Relative uncertainties on the measurement of visible cross sections and luminosity in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV.
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**Fig. 4:** Visible cross section for the V0 measured in the first (top) and second (bottom) vdM scan, as a function of the product of the intensities of the colliding bunch pair. Only the statistical uncertainties are shown. The solid line is a constant fit to the data.

**Fig. 5:** (Colour online) Ratio of the T0 rate to that of the V0 for pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV, as a function of the time-ordered run number. The central horizontal dashed line indicates the expected ratio from the vdM scan, the upper and lower lines define its uncertainty band.
the raw rates with the same procedure used in the vdM scan and described in [8]. In order to suppress the bias induced by after-pulses on the V0 rates for dense filling schemes, the raw rates are measured after the data-acquisition system veto and corrected by the trigger dead-time. The results are shown as a function of the progressive run number in Fig. 5. Although a slight decreasing trend is observed, the run-by-run ratio is generally compatible within uncertainties with the one measured in the vdM scan, and so is its average value over the whole data-taking period. The fluctuations observed in the first group of runs reflect initial setting-up of the T0 and V0 working parameters (gates, thresholds, high voltages). The RMS of the ratio distribution over this period is 1.4%, and it is assigned as an additional uncertainty to the luminosity measurement.

4 Conclusions

In 2012, ALICE took data with pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV. In order to provide a reference for luminosity determination, a vdM scan was performed and visible cross sections were measured for two processes, based on the T0 (with pseudorapidity coverage $4.6 < \eta < 4.9$, $-3.3 < \eta < -3.0$) and V0 ($2.8 < \eta < 5.1$, $-3.7 < \eta < -1.7$) detectors. The two detectors provide independent measurements of the luminosity, with a total uncertainty of 2.4% for the T0 and 2.6% for the V0. A detailed list of the origin and size of the considered uncertainties for both, the visible cross section and the luminosity measurement, is reported in Table 1.
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