## Paper 1: High-Energetic Pions in a Highly Granular Calorimeter

Ivan Marchesini, Uni. Hamburg, 2012-02-20

## Content

Repetition of the electromagnetic validation of the AHCAL:
 check EM scale with up-to-date calibrations;
 check MC response after recently fixed mokka bugs;
 no fiducial volume: EM scale to be applied to pions;
 combine CERN+FNAL electron data.

Hadronic dataset: CERN 2007 pion data, 8-100 GeV.

Setup: SiW-ECAL + Iron AHCAL + TCMT.

For direct comparison with FNAL low-energy data (Nils' talk) require the shower start. in AHCAL.

Move to Geant4 9.4.

Geant4 validation for hadronic showers:

• pion response;

Iongitudinal and radial development of pion showers.

### **Electromagnetic Validation**

#### Response

Combined FNAL+CERN data: reduce fit errors and extend to low energies.

Good agreement with EM paper.

$$\langle E_{rec}^{\rm e} 
angle = \langle E_{vis}^{\rm e} 
angle \cdot u - v$$
  
GeV MIP

	<i>u</i> [Mip2GeV]	<i>v</i> [MIP]
EM Paper	42.4 ± 0.6	-1.4 ± 7.0
Data	42.4 ± 0.3	-1.1 ± 0.9

#### Response

Good agreement Mip2GeV MC/Data, but discrepancy in the offset: ~120 MeV effect, non-perfect treatment of threshold+noise.

Residual saturation-simulation issues at high energies within calibration uncertainties (~2%).



## **Longitudinal Development**



- Fine segmentation:
  - detailed reconstruction of the shower development;
  - precise determination of shower maximum.
- Good agreement data/MC and CERN/FNAL.



## **Radial Development**



- Residual discrepancies data/MC.
  - Data give 9% broader showers.
  - Energy-independent effect.
- Probable contribution of two causes • cross-talk;
  - EM shower modeling (e.g. seen by ATLAS too).





## **Hadronic Response**

#### Response



MIP track in ECAL.
 Containment cut: shower starting point in first 5 layers AHCAL.
 No TCMT: known worse calibration.

#### **Response: Data vs MC**



Excellent agreement of QGS lists at high energies.
 Excellent improvement of CHIPS with respect to previous versions.

## **Longitudinal Development**



## **Longitudinal Development**



**Identify shower starting point**: development without fluctuations of initial interaction.

For MC/data comparison two options give same message.

- Refer to calorimeter front-face:
  - algorithm-independent;
  - compare to low energies (Nils' talk).

# Mean<sub>z</sub> : Data vs MC



Excellent agreement of FTF lists.

Energy-dependent trend of QGS lists, but disagreement < 5%.</p>

## $\sigma_{2}$ : Data vs MC



Similar message as mean.

#### **Radial Development**



$$\mathbf{R} = \frac{\Sigma(\mathbf{E}_i \cdot \mathbf{r}_i)}{\Sigma \mathbf{E}_i}$$

Cell size: 30 mm.

## Mean<sub>R</sub>: Data vs MC



Data broader than MC, as EM, but energy dependence not seen in EM. Only CHIPS agrees with data, but not possible to draw firm conclusions, due to EM discrepancy.





## Conclusions

Analysis repeated with most up-to-date software.

Compatibility with FNAL analysis: allow direct comparison.

Good agreement data/MC for response/longitudinal observables.

Known remaining discrepancy in the radial development, also for EM showers.

Soon available also:

- lateral/longitudinal profiles with MC decomposition.
- observables sensitive to event-to-event fluctuations, such as sigmas of mean<sub>7</sub>,  $\sigma_7$ , mean<sub>8</sub>,  $\sigma_8$  distributions.
- a few historical plots with older Geant4 versions.

Paper draft soon ready for review.







## **Backup**



20