Test beam particle ID

Event filtering

Vladimir Bocharnikov AHCAL analysis workshop, 13-19 Dec 2018





P.N.Lebedev Physical Institute of the Russian Academy of Science







Particle ID

Reminder from AHCAL main meeting

Method* developed for physics prototype by Marina Chadeeva was taken as basement:

Calorimeter-based id by topology and cluster properties

Clustering and shower start finding precedes particle identification. Set of cut-based topological discriminants is based on published CANs and papers.

- Multi-particle events: OR-based combination of discriminants
 - several clusters in first layers
 - parallel tracks
 - too high deposition
- Muons or muon-like: complex combination of discriminants
 - number of hits
 - energy comparison in calorimeters
 - track finding
- Electrons: AND-based combination of discriminants
 - cluster radius <37 mm
 - CoG depth $< 10 \cdot X0$
 - 90% of measured energy deposited in first 24·X0
 - shower start before $6 \cdot X0$
- Hadrons:
 - remaining species after above rejection
 - Cherenkov-based discrimination of hadron types

https://agenda.linearcollider.org/event/7454/contributions/38731/attachments/31380/47203/chadeeva_Fe-W_LLR2017.pdf

- Same approach
- Same variables are used
- First cut adjustment was done using MC data sets simulated and fully reconstructed according to TBMay18 and TBJune18 setups using QGSP BERT HP physics list
- CALICE software was modified to centralise the calculation of all common variables
- Clustering and tracking analyses are not implemented yet
- Only AHCAL hits are taken into account

For event filtering

Algorithm rejects events that have too much clusters in first layers



For event filtering

- Algorithm rejects events that have too much clusters in first layers
- For such as events output is 1 cluster
- \Rightarrow Energy weighted method is needed



For event filtering

- Algorithm rejects events that have too much clusters in first layers
- For such as events output is 1 cluster
- \Rightarrow Energy weighted method is needed
- Can reject multi-particle events

nClusters in 1st layer: 5 nClusters in 2nd layer: 6



For event filtering

- Algorithm rejects events that have too much clusters in first layers
- For such as events output is 1 cluster
- \Rightarrow Energy weighted method is needed
- Can reject multi-particle events

nClusters in 1st layer: 5 nClusters in 2nd layer: 6

• Problem in AHCAL_hits collection:

For TBMay18 "1st layer" - 1st AHCAL layer (K=1)

For TBJune18 "1st layer" - pre-shower layer



For event filtering

- Algorithm rejects events that have too much clusters in first layers
- For such as events output is 1 cluster
- \Rightarrow Energy weighted method is needed
- Can reject multi-particle events

nClusters in 1st layer: 5 nClusters in 2nd layer: 6

• Problem in AHCAL_hits collection:

For TBMay18 "1st layer" - 1st AHCAL layer (K=1)

For TBJune18 "1st layer" - pre-shower layer

Additional parameter in the IDprocessor or set K = 0 for the pre-shower layer?



Conclusion & ToDo list

Particle ID

- ☑ At 10GeV we have satisfying cut-based identification
 - Software infrastructure is ready for more precise studies
 - **I** First attempt of implementation by Amine and Anna
 - MC check of energy dependent cuts is needed
 - Investigate problem with energy and number of hits in simulations

Naive clustering can partly reject this events

- **D** We need to implement event quality selection for data:
 - Multi-particle events
 - Early showering particles
 - □ ...
- **Model** BDT method gives promising results
 - **Cuts for training samples**
 - □ Train BDT with all TB energies
 - □ ...
 - □ After better agreement MC with data there will be more BDT studies



Background rejection vs signal efficiency

Another representation of performance.



Electron rejection factor vs Pion selection efficency

New cut for BDT input

On shower start layer. Muon vs pion separation

Cut: Pion events w/o shower are thrown away.

Muon F_{rej} Muon F_{rej} 1800 1800 1600 1600 1400 1400 1200 1200 1000 000 800 800 600 600 400 400 200 200 0 0 0.985 0.99 0.995 0.98 0.985 0.99 0.995 1.005 1 0.98 Pion ID efficency Pion ID efficency

Muon rejection factor vs Pion ID efficency



For particle ID



For particle ID

Center of gravity in z

- μ^- : z_{cog} peaks in the middle of detector
- e^- : z_{cog} peaks in the first half of detector
- π^- : z_{cog} more-less spread





zcog

For particle ID



eSum

For particle ID

0.2



frac25

For particle ID

Shower start layer number

- "clean" μ^- : no shower
- e^- : in the first half of detector
- π^- : more-less spread





For particle ID

Shower radius

- "clean" μ^- : no shower (R = 0)
- e^- : R has a peak
- π^- : more-less spread





r

Particle ID

Cut-based method

Method* developed for physics prototype by Marina Chadeeva was taken as basement:

Calorimeter-based id by topology and cluster properties

Clustering and shower start finding precedes particle identification. Set of cut-based topological discriminants is based on published CANs and papers.

- Multi-particle events: OR-based combination of discriminants
 - several clusters in first layers
 - parallel tracks
 - too high deposition
- Muons or muon-like: complex combination of discriminants
 - number of hits
 - energy comparison in calorimeters
 - track finding
- Electrons: AND-based combination of discriminants
 - cluster radius <37 mm
 - CoG depth $< 10 \cdot X0$
 - 90% of measured energy deposited in first $24 \cdot X0$
 - shower start before $6 \cdot X0$
- Hadrons:
 - remaining species after above rejection
 - Cherenkov-based discrimination of hadron types

https://agenda.linearcollider.org/event/7454/contributions/38731/attachments/31380/47203/chadeeva_Fe-W_LLR2017.pdf

Current cuts

For particle ID (10 GeV particles)

Electron events:

- **Hits**: 45 < nHits < 95
- (&)Shower start layer: st < 10
- (&)Shower radius: 0 < r < 65 [mm]
- (&)COGz: zcog < 400 [mm]
- (&)Fraction in first 25 layers: frac25 > 0.9

Empty events(optional):

• **Hits**: nHits < nHits_min

Remaining events are classified as hadron events.

Note: multi-particle event filtering not implemented yet (in todo list).

Muon (muon-like) events:

- **Hits**: 0 < nHits < 70
- (&)Energy: 0 < E < 5 GeV (will be used after proper calibration)
- (&)Shower radius: 0 < R < 30 [mm]
- (&)COGz: 260 < zcog < 800 [mm]
- (&)Fraction in first 25 layers: frac25 < 0.95

Performance

Of cut-based ParticleID method for 10GeV particles.

Input. 🚽 Output 🔶	Hadron events	Muon-like events	Electron events	Empty (nHits < 30)
MC pions	18811 events	536 events	653 events	Cut is not applied (0 events)
20000 events	94%	2,7%	3,3%	
MC muons	56 events	19941 events	3 events	Cut is not applied (0 events)
20000 events	0,3%	99,7%	~0%	
MC electrons	57 events	0 events	19943 events	Cut is not applied (1 event)
20000 events	0,3%	0%	99,7%	
10GeV pion run TBJune18 23000 events	17505 events 76,1%	3685 events 16%	807 events 3,5%	1003 events 4,3%
10GeV pion run TBMay18 23000 events	7630 events 33,2%	9824 events 42,7%	3664 events 15,9%	1887 events 8,2%

>12 main cut values making tuning of selection efficiency complicated

DESY. | Test beam Particle ID | AHCAL Analysis workshop, DESY, 13-19 Dec 2018 | Vladimir Bocharnikov

BDT method.

BDT input

10GeV pion selection.

Training data:

- •10GeV MC pions 20k events (signal)
- 10GeV MC muons 20k events(bckgr)
- 10GeV MC electrons 20k events
 (bckgr)

Variables:

- Shower radius (st)
- Number of hits (nHits)
- COGz (**zcog**)
- Fraction in first 25 layers (frac25)
- Shower start layer (st)

No cuts



BDT output 10GeV pion selection.

Test data:

- 10GeV MC pions 20k events (signal)
- 10GeV MC muons 20k events (bckgr)
- 10GeV MC electrons 20k events (bckgr)

Backgroung rejection 0.8 0.6 0.4 0.2 0₀ 0.2 0.6 0.4 0.8 Signal efficency

Backgroung rejection vs Signal efficency

BDT output **10GeV** pion selection.

Test data:

- 10GeV MC pions 20k events (signal)
- 10GeV MC muons 20k events (bckgr)

Backgroung rejection vs Signal efficency



Pions vs electrons & pions vs muons

BDT output.

Training/test data:

- 10GeV MC pions 20k events (signal)
- 10GeV MC electrons 20k events (bckgr)
- No cuts



Backgroung rejection vs Signal efficency

Training/test data:

- 10GeV MC pions 20k events (signal)
- 10GeV MC muons 20k events (bckgr)
- No cuts

Pions vs electrons & pions vs muons

BDT output.

Training/test data:

- 10GeV MC pions 20k events (signal)
- 10GeV MC electrons 20k events (bckgr)
- No cuts

Backgroung rejection vs Signal efficency • No cuts



- 10GeV MC pions 20k events (signal)
- 10GeV MC muons 20k events (bckgr)





DESY. | Test beam Particle ID | AHCAL Analysis workshop, DESY, 13-19 Dec 2018 | Vladimir Bocharnikov

Separation of pion "background"

Comparison of different BDT output



Confluence page

TBParticleID processor

Content:

- Description including using variables
- Input
- Output
- Important parameters

Important parameters:

- Beam energy in GeV using only to find shower start layer
- IDMode: 0 keep all, 1 only hadron events, 2 - only muon-like events, 3 - only electron events
- Minimum number of hits to reject empty events
- Path to IDCuts.txt file

link: https://confluence.desy.de/display/Calice/TBParticleID+processor

Adjustment of cuts

2D plots are useful to check the cuts

Number of hits vs CoG in z



Fraction in first 25 layers vs CoG in z



MC 10GeV particles

Before cuts:

- π^- : 70118 events
- μ^- : 41858 events
- e^- : 26419 events
- total: 138395 events



Fraction in first 25 layers vs number of hits.



Fraction in first 25 layers vs number of hits.

After cuts:

- π^- : 64529 events (92%)
- μ^- : 41783 events (99.7%)
- *e*⁻: 26230 events (99.2%)



Fraction in first 25 layers vs number of hits.



MC 10GeV particles

Before cuts:

- π^- : 70118 events
- μ^- : 41858 events
- e^- : 26419 events
- *total* : 138395 events



Fraction in first 25 layers vs number of hits.

Fraction in first 25 layers vs number of hits.

After cuts:

- π^- : 64529 events (92%)
- μ^- : 41783 events (99.7%)
- *e*⁻: 26230 events (99.2%)



Fraction in first 25 layers vs number of hits.

120

140

160

20



200

MC 10GeV particles

Before cuts:

- π^- : 70118 events
- μ^- : 41858 events
- e^- : 26419 events
- total: 138395 events



Fraction in first 25 layers vs number of hits. 0.9 2500 0.8 F 2000 0.7 E 0.6 F 1500 0.5 0.4 **Rejected electrons** 1000 0.3 0.2 500 0.1 200 20 120 140 160 180

Fraction in first 25 layers vs number of hits.

After cuts:

- π^- : 64529 events (92%)
- μ^- : 41783 events (99.7%)
- *e*⁻: 26230 events (99.2%)



Fraction in first 25 layers vs number of hits.



MC 10GeV particles

Before cuts:

- π^- : 70118 events
- μ^- : 41858 events
- e^- : 26419 events
- total: 138395 events



Fraction in first 25 layers vs number of hits. 0.9 2500 0.8 F 2000 0.7 E 0.6 F 1500 0.5 0.4 **Rejected electrons** 1000 0.3 0.2 500 0.1 200 120 140 160 180

Fraction in first 25 layers vs number of hits.

After cuts:

- π^- : 64529 events (92%)
- μ^- : 41783 events (99.7%)
- *e*⁻: 26230 events (99.2%)



Fraction in first 25 layers vs number of hits.



MC 10GeV particles

Before cuts:

- π^- : 70118 events
- μ^- : 41858 events
- e^- : 26419 events
- total: 138395 events



 $\begin{array}{c} 0.9 \\ 0.8 \\ 0.7 \\ 0.6 \\ 0.5 \\ 0.4 \\ 0.3 \\ 0.4 \\ 0.3 \\ 0.4 \\ 0.4 \\ 0.4 \\ 0.5 \\ 0.5 \\ 0.4 \\ 0.5 \\ 0.4 \\ 0.5 \\$

Fraction in first 25 layers vs number of hits.

2500

2000

1500

1000

500

Fraction in first 25 layers vs number of hits.

After cuts:

- π^- : 64529 events (92%)
- μ^- : 41783 events (99.7%)
- *e*⁻: 26230 events (99.2%)



Fraction in first 25 layers vs number of hits.







Fraction in first 25 layers vs number of hits.





Additional cut for shower radius vs CoG in z. **MC 10GeV particles**



250

350

Shower radius vs CoG in z

250

6000

Additional cut for shower radius vs CoG in z. **MC 10GeV particles**



250

350

Shower radius vs CoG in z

250

6000

Additional cut for shower radius vs CoG in z.

MC 10GeV particles

 π^{-}



Additional cut for shower radius vs CoG in z.

MC 10GeV particles



- π^- : 63748 events (90,9%)
- e^- : 26264 events (99.4%)

After additional diagonal cut:

- π^- : 64529 events (92%)
- e^- : 26230 events (99.2%)



900



Shower radius vs CoG in z







Software architecture studies

To implement particle ID as a standard tool

Current state



Current state





Current state





Current state & goal













