

# Very hand wavy... comparison

- Comparing old fastMC sample and new PFA
- For a list of "issues" see last week benchmarking talk





# Last week: What we need to do

• In order to compare fastMC and PFA: Need to run fast MC on same events.

•Work in progress, unfortunately not there yet (series of small "features" propped up)... very close

• In order to get a better understanding of realistic performance: Need to implement weights!

• Again... Work in progress. Norman and Jeremy implemented it. SLIC has been rerun (sid02)... testing

# Part 1 successful!



# Comparison (more like it...)

Comparing new fastMC sample and new PFA sample





# When switching to PFA: Comments - Question...

- •Minimal degradation observed in both Top mass and W mass.
- Improvement in reconstruction efficiency (after cuts we get more events).
- •improved b-assymetry and mistag (charge+flavour) after cuts.
- Seems good improvement?
- Is it real or from V0s?



- BTag output for b guarks neural net of b 10 Entries 14494 Mean 0.7487 0.3644 RMS 10<sup>3</sup> 102 0.5 0.6 0.7 0.2 0.3 0.4
- Small difference in b tagging
- Maybe slight improvement



### When switching to PFA: Comments - Question...



- Most of the
- difference from here...
- This implies need V0 finding (will try soon...ish to look at this)
- And need to try with proper tracks (comments?)
- Still looks extremely good for first iteration...
- Also Ron developed 2 versions of slcio file containing and not containing hits both work great.



## A comment on tWb and 6 fermion sample...

#### 6 fermion

#### tWb (only fast MC)





# Coming up next + Mass Template Fitting

- Looking at using a simple V0 finder before analysis.
- Implement weights in my code
- Deal with new
- Implemented Mass Template Fitting code
- Need to look at some details... Thanks Tim For help.
- •First results to be expected soon! ( but not before Boulder)

• BUT mainly data! – Just got new sid02 events thanks Norman