

Pions in the SiW ECAL using FNAL 2008 data (CAN-025)

Philippe Doublet Roman Pöschl François Richard

CALICE Analysis Meeting, November 8th, 2010

Introduction

- Interactions of pions in the SiW ECAL
- Aim to use granularity and energy deposition to classify interactions
- And have a look at differences between models in physics lists

 CAN paper v2 submitted, now finalising answers to the questions of the EB

Data samples

- We study and compare interactions of pions
 (π⁻) with E = 2, 4, 6, 8 and 10 GeV
- TB data were recorded at FNAL in 2008 and reconstructed (v0409)
- MC data are simulated + digitised for 5 physics lists : QGSP_BERT, FTFP_BERT, LHEP, QGS_BIC and QGSP_BIC (Geant4 9.2)
- Calice soft v02-00 is used for both TB and MC data

Outline

- The SiW ECAL (in 2008)
- The test beam at FNAL (May & July 2008)
- MC simulations
- Finding the interaction point
- Classification and optimisation
- Observables
- Ongoing work
- Conclusions

Important slides for today's meeting topic

The SiW ECAL in 2008

- Fully equipped ECAL
- 3 x 3 wafers of 6 x 6 pads
- Sensors = Si pixels of 1 cm x
 1 cm → tracking possibilities
- Absorber = W
- 30 layers in 3 different stacks :
 - 1.4 mm of W
 - 2.8 mm
 - 3.6 mm

• $\approx 24 X_0 \approx 1 \lambda_1 \approx$ half of the hadrons interact inside the ECAL volume



Picture of the fully equiped SiW ECAL



- 3 CALICE calorimeters installed : SiW ECAL, Analogue HCAL, TailCatcher (TCMT)
- Triggers : scintillators, Cherenkov counters
- Muon cuts added on the basis of simulated muons : < 0.6% remaining
- Ask for only one primary track found with the MipFinder
 - Events left:
 E (GeV)
 2
 4
 6
 8
 10

 N evts
 212942
 126222
 73590
 233820
 454714

Monte Carlo simulations

- For comparisons, different physics lists were simulated in Geant4 9.2
- QGSP BERT is used as reference for optimisation

E (GeV)	2	4	6	8	10
QGSP BERT	BERT			BERT + LEP	
QGS BIC	LEP (+ BIC for secondaries < 1.2 GeV)				
QGSP BIC	LEP				
LHEP	LEP				
FTFP BERT	BERT FTFP				

Content of the physics lists for pions

A look at interactions of hadrons



- Picture of a generic interaction in the calorimeters :
 - 1) A primary track enters the detector (« MipFinder »)
 - 2) The interaction occurs
 - 3) Secondaries emerge from the interaction zone

Visual examples (1/2)

 2D profiles of an event at 10 GeV in the SiW ECAL

 High energy deposition when the interaction starts

- Interaction layer confirmed by visual inspection
- Large number of secondaries created
- Equation to be satisfied:

 $E_i > \text{Ecut}$, $E_{i+1} > \text{Ecut}$, $E_{i+2} > \text{Ecut}$

direction (pad number



Visual examples (2/2)

- Previous example not always valid, especially at low energies
- Sometimes, slow increase in energy
- Here, local energy deposition
- Quantified by the relative increase in energy:



Classification



Works here and meant for small energies

Event view of the « FireBall » type at 10 GeV

z direction (layer number)

z direction (layer number)

Classification



« Pointlike » type at 2 GeV

Classification

- High energy deposition
 → « FireBall »
- Increase continues + veto for backscattering → « FireBall »
- Local increase \rightarrow « Pointlike »
 - Others = non interacting
 - « MIP »
 - « Scattered »
- Remark : delta rays are naturally included in « Pointlike » but contribute less than 4%



Real TB data event at 2 GeV



Event view of the « Scattered » type at 2 GeV

Optimisation

 Cuts need to be optimised (not discussed today, see my talk at <u>CASABLANCA</u>)

- After optimisation \rightarrow
- Choice was made to merge all Fcut to one single value for simplicity

E (GeV)	Ecut	Fcut
2	3	4 → 6
4	8	5.5 → 6
6	10	6.5 → 6
8	13	7 → 6
10	10	6 → 6

Efficiencies after optimisation

- The efficiency to find the true interaction layer within ±1 and 2 layers is the result of the optimisation.
- It is compared with another method.

E (GeV)	η (±1)	η (±2)	η (3-4, ±2)
2	56 %	67 %	28 %
4	60 %	73 %	61 %
6	62 %	76 %	69 %
8	64 %	78 %	71 %
10	72 %	84 %	76 %

Rates of interactions





Observables

- The following results are still under discussion with the EB
- We compare TB data and MC using
 - Rates of interactions (previous slide)
 - Mean shower radius (rms of transverse profile)
 - Longitudinal profile

 (as defined in the CALICE
 pions in the SiW ECAL paper)





Examples

Mean shower profile (log)

Longitudinale profile



Example of data vs QGSP_BERT simulation at 2 GeV

Ongoing

- Agreement with hadrons in SiW ECAL paper
- Redoing style of the figures
- Text improvement on comparison data MC
- Quantitative check of systematics of optimisation with physics lists
- Write a new version of the note

Conclusions

- Interactions of hadrons in the SiW ECAL at energies from 2 GeV to 10 GeV are found and classified into 4 kinds, using energy deposition and high granularity
- Efficiencies to reconstruct the interaction layer within ± 2 layers are > 67 %
- Still answering to the EB (good progress)
- Hope for a validation before the end of the year