Status of SiD/Iowa PFA

^{by} Usha Mallik The University of Iowa

for Ron Cassell, Mat Charles, TJ Kim, Christoph Pahl

The Detector (SiD02)



The Particle Flow Algorithm

Goal: To obtain dijet mass resolution $\Delta M/M < 3-4\%$ (Z width)

→ $\Delta E(cm)/E(cm) < 3-4\%$ for e⁺e⁻ → qq (q=u,d,s)

Resolution for PFA :

$$\sigma = \sigma_{\text{EM}} \oplus \sigma_{\text{neu.had}} \oplus \sigma_{\text{conf}}$$

Attempt to minimize $\,\sigma_{\text{conf}}$ in the PFA

In calorimetry $\sigma/E \propto 1/\sqrt{E}...$... but in a PFA the confusion increases with E At high energies leakage is also important

Generally $\sigma_{\rm PFA} \sim {\rm between} \ \sqrt{{\rm E}} \ {\rm and} \ {\rm E}$

Overview at LOI (April 2009)

e⁺e⁻ → qq (q=u,d,s) at $E_{cm} = 100 \text{ GeV} \rightarrow qq100$ e⁺e⁻ → Z (qq) Z (vv) at $E_{cm} = 500 \text{ GeV} \rightarrow ZZ$



For qqbar events, $E_1 = E_2 = E_{cm}/2$ and $\Delta E_1 = \Delta E_2 = \Delta E_{cm} / \sqrt{2}$ $M_{12} = 2E_1E_2(1 - \cos \theta_{12})$ and $\Delta M_{12} / M_{12} = \Delta E_{cm} / E_{cm}$

In December 2008

Barrel	(0 <cos(< th=""><th>(θ)</th><th>(8.0>(</th><th>E</th></cos(<>	(θ)	(8.0>(E
--------	--	-----	--------	---

 $Endcap(0.8 < cos(\theta) < 0.95)$

т

	Before	After		Before	After
001pp	3.7%	3.6%	00 l pp	3.8%	3.6%
qq200	3.0%	2.9%	qq200	3.2%	3.1%
qq500	3.5%	3.4%	qq500	3.3%	3.2%
ZZ	4.7%	4.7%	ZZ	3.9%	3.8%

Energy dependence



Leakage study at 500 GeV and 1 TeV

Marty Breidenbach helped produce a SiD02-like detector with 6 λ HCAL Ron Cassell generated the events and produced the files for 1 TeV, 500 GeV, 200 GeV

- Change Steel for Cu for absorber
- Increase to 54 layers from 40 layers in HCAL
- 1.7 λ more material in HCAL
- No gap between HCAL and Muon endcap (instead of 10 cm)

Compare sid02 with sid02-Cu at various energies by looking at:

- # hits in Muon detector (indicates punch through, a measure of leakage)
- Energy resolution

Punch-through muon hits

SiD02-Cu -----SiD02 -----





Lessons learned

- Leakage is present in substantial amount
- Not the whole story at all
- Confusion clearly important at 500 GeV, dominant at 1 TeV
- Back to the drawing board
- Anatomy of the events

has a low energy 12 GeV neutral hadron and several photons present in the ECAL; interaction of charged hadron

RefinedCheatCluster

•



p (orange) = 119 GeV, E/p match, enough hits (green) = 17 GeV





RefinedCluster - sharedhits



ECAL

Backscatter p(orange) = 97 GeV p(blue) = 105 GeV In 97 GeV track-cluster `cone' gives high score to the stub and is connected; 105 GeV can not access the stub





p (green) = 40.8 GeV, p (blue) = 2.7 GeV Higher score by cone to green cluster seed, blue has implied cluster connected to seed

ECAL

Algorithm modifications/additions

- Cone algorithm is too aggressive!
 - Mostly the cone algorithm picks up MIP-like pieces
 - Use reconstructed shower information (not only stubs)
 - Use directional information

•Low-momentum tracks steal pieces from high-momentum showers

- Iteration starts with lowest momentum track and assigns clusters
- Keep clusters available for others tracks even if assigned
- Use geometry information (proximity) to adjudicate cluster assignments between tracks
- Misc:
 - Can Barrel Muon be used as a backing calorimeter, for merged high p tracks ?
 - Backscattering ?

Conclusion

- Much better understanding of weak points of algorithm
- Hitting our stride in aftermath of LOI
- Christoph Pahl joined the effort, can now afford an FTE
- Clear path to improve pattern recognition
- Lots of work to do!

Leakage study (SiD02-Cu comparison) cheat tracking



17