# **Status of W-DHCAL Calibration**

Christian Grefe (CERN)

on behalf of the CERN PH-LCD group

21. March 2014



#### Outline

#### 1 Introduction

- 2 Efficiency and Multiplicity
- 3 Calibration





2

W-DHCAL setup Goal of Calibration

### Data Taking at CERN (2012)

- 54 RPC layers:
  39 with tungsten absorber (main stack),
  15 with steel absorber (tail catcher)
- Each layer instrumented with 96  $\times$  96  $1\times1\,{\rm cm^2}$  pads  $\Rightarrow$   $\sim$  500000 channels
- PS (1-10 GeV): 1 run period of 2 weeks
- SPS (10-300 GeV): 2 + 1 + 1 weeks
- Dedicated µ and high rate runs
- In total  $\sim$  30 million events recorded



W-DHCAL setup Goal of Calibration

# Data Taking at CERN (2012)



- 39 layers W-DHCAL + 15 layers Fe-DHCAL
- $10\times 10\,{\rm cm^2}$  scintillator triggers (30  $\times$  30  ${\rm cm^2}$  for dedicated muon runs)
- Three wire chambers  $\Rightarrow$  beam profile
- Two Cerenkov counters  $\Rightarrow$  particle identification



W-DHCAL setup Goal of Calibration

#### **Goal of Calibration**

• DHCAL only measures number of hits

 $\Rightarrow$  control efficiency (  $\epsilon$  ) and multiplicity (  $\mu$  )

- Depends on temperature, pressure, voltage, ...
- Remove layer-to-layer and run-to-run fluctuations
- Determine nominal efficiency  $(\epsilon_0)$  and multiplicity  $(\mu_0)$  for digitization tuning





#### **Determination of Efficiency and Multiplicity**

- Lose pre-selection for muon events based on number of active layers (> 30) and total number of hits (< 150)
- $\bullet\,$  For each layer finds mip stub candidate in neighboring layers (±3 layers, min 4 valid clusters)
- Only use clusters with 3 or less hits for mip stub candidates (no cut on layer of interest)
- $\bullet\,$  Straight line fit to identify intersection with layer of interest,  $\chi^2$  cut to validate mip stub
- Determine if nearby cluster exists in layer of interest
- Efficiency: fraction of events with cluster found
- Multiplicity: mean cluster size for events with cluster found



Determination of Efficiency and Multiplicity Efficiency and Multiplicity in Muon Runs

#### Layout of one DHCAL Layer



Determination of Efficiency and Multiplicity Efficiency and Multiplicity in Muon Runs



- $\bullet\,$  Combine 18 muon runs taken with 30  $\times\,$  30  $cm^2$  triggers at 9 positions
- More than 500k events at each position allow to extract local efficiencies and multiplicities for each pad
- Beam runs only allow to extract efficiency and multiplicity for central region  $(10 \times 10 \text{ cm}^2 \text{ trigger with narrow beam spot})$
- Average:  $\epsilon_0 = 87.1\%$ ,  $\mu_0 = 1.55$  (Raw calibration)

Determination of Efficiency and Multiplicity Efficiency and Multiplicity in Muon Runs



- Remove module boundaries and fishing lines to determine nominal values in clean regions
- Effect of fishing lines included in GEANT4 through material
- Module boundaries effect added in digitization by lowering effective charge depending on position
- Average:  $\epsilon_0 = 94.6\%$ ,  $\mu_0 = 1.61$  (Cleaned calibration)

Determination of Efficiency and Multiplicity Efficiency and Multiplicity in Muon Runs



 $\bullet\,$  Drop of efficiency in the centre of each module  $\Rightarrow$  not visible in Fe-DHCAL

• Multiplicity not affected in a similar fashion



10

Determination of Efficiency and Multiplicity Efficiency and Multiplicity in Muon Runs

#### Warping of Frontend Boards



Dime for size reference

• Front end boards warped over time leading to larger gaps at the edges



Determination of Efficiency and Multiplicity Efficiency and Multiplicity in Muon Runs



- Remove frontend board boundaries for final values
- Average:  $\epsilon_0 = 95.3\%$ ,  $\mu_0 = 1.61$  (Final calibration)



Procedure Response

#### **Calibration Procedure**

• Correct each hit for its local efficiency and multiplicity to nominal values:

$$\mathbf{W}^{\text{calibrated}} = \sum_{i}^{N} \frac{\mu_0 \ \epsilon_0}{\mu_i \ \epsilon_i}$$

•  $\mu_i$  and  $\epsilon_i$  are determined for each module if possible (more than 100 entries)  $\Rightarrow$  works well only for central module



Procedure Response

#### **Correlation between Calibrations**



Procedure Response

#### Time Dependence of Efficiency Drop





Procedure Response

#### **Response at 40 GeV**

Muons

Pions



Runs taken at same beam momentum and significantly different conditions
 allows to check calibration



Procedure Response

#### Response at 40 GeV - Calibrated

Muons

Pions



• Calibration improves the agreement but still slightly different response



Procedure Response

# Response at 40 GeV - Calibrated (with centre) Muons Pions



- Including the central region in the calibration gives best results
- $\bullet\,$  Most hits end up in the region with reduced efficiency
  - $\Rightarrow$  important to describe this well

Procedure Response

#### Longitudinal Shower Profiles (40 GeV)

#### Calibration excluding centre

#### Calibration including centre





Procedure Response

#### **Calibrated Muon Response**



Procedure Response

#### **Calibrated Electron Response**



Procedure Response

#### **Calibrated Pion Response**



Procedure Response

#### Linearity (Very Preliminary)



• Parametrize using  $N = \alpha E^{\beta}$ 



Procedure Response

#### **Resolution (Very Preliminary)**



# Summary and Outlook

- It is crucial to have data and MC on the same level
- Option 1:
  - Include efficiency drop in digitization
  - Will likely only be an average description
  - Will require good description of beam profile
  - Data from different runs will not be normalized
- Option 2:
  - Apply local calibration (depending on z) where possible
  - Digitization can stay as it is (flat efficiency) using the nominal calibration constants in the clean region
  - Data from different runs will be normalized

