# The TKR-Converter as pre-shower

Nicola Mazziotta Nov 14, 2006 mazziotta@ba.infn.it

### Longitudinal shower profile 5 GeV Elec

Black: Data (run 1460)

#### Red: MC (run 122)



### **Transverse shower profile 1 GeV Elec**



### **Possible discrepancies causes**

- Number of secondary particles
- Elastic/inelastic scattering angle
- Electromagnetic shower description
- Halo beam
- Double particle in the beam
- Rough description of the media
- Charge sharing effect
- Tracking
- Recon tools
- Calibration
- Thresholds
- Noisy strip

### **Transverse cluster distribution**

- The distances of the clusters in each view have been studied with respect to:
  - The first track (best track)
  - The first vertex (best vertex)
  - Shower axis
- Relevant distributions:
  - Cluster distance,  $D_i$ , weighted with its size,  $S_i$ ,
  - The average cluster distances, <D>, in each event

$$< D >= \sum_{Clusters} D_i \times S_i / \sum_{Clusters} S_i$$

- The maximum value  $(D_i \times S_i)$  in each event

$$Max_{Clusters} (D_i \times S_i)$$

### **Shower axis definition**

- In each view, the top Z fired plane have been identified,  $Z_{top}$
- The top position in the X (Y) view, X<sub>top</sub> (Y<sub>top</sub>), is evaluated as average of the X (Y) cluster positions in the top plane in that view
- In each view, the shower axis slope is evaluated as: (in the X view)

$$Slope = \sum_{Clusters} (X_i - X_{top}) / (Z_i - Z_{top}) \times S_i / \sum_{Clusters} S_i$$

## Input root files and cuts

- The recon root files have been used (latest version available)
  - TkrRecon method to point
    - The cluster collection TkrCluster
    - The track collection TkrTrack
    - The vertex collection TkrVertex
- The CU has been used as standalone detector, i.e. no geometrical cuts have been imposed
  - Cuts:
    - At least one track, for the distances with the respect the first track
    - At least one vertex, for the distances with the respect the first vertex
    - At least 5 clusters in both views, for the distances with the respect the axis shower

### **Distance Cluster-First Track**



### Mean Distance Cluster-First Track



### **Max Distance Cluster-First Track**



### **Distance Cluster-Axis**



### Mean Distance Cluster-Axis



### **Max Distance Cluster-Axis**





### Electron 2.5 GeV 0° - Dist. Cls-Track



### Electron 2.5 GeV 0° - Dist. Cls-Axis





Max Cluster Distance from Axis X-View



Max Cluster Distance from Axis Y-View







### Electron 100 GeV 0° - Dist. Cls-Track





Maximum TKR Cluster Transverse Position, Max(Di x Si) (mm x Size)

### **Electron 100 GeV 0° - Dist. Cls-Axis**



1000

1000

raction

Fractio

### Halo beam studies

"Clean" low energy e± PS test beam set-up

#### Beam: negative/positive polarity

p = 0.5 - 3 GeV/c



### Positron 1 GeV, -35°



19

### Pos/Ele 1 GeV -35° - Dist. Cls-Track



### **Pos/Ele 1 GeV -35° - Dist. Cls-Axis**



### Photon (2.5 GeV ele.) Dist. Cls – First Vertex

#### **Remarks:**

Average Cluster Distance from First Vertex X-View

Average Cluster Distance from First Vertex Y-View

10

- 1. There are extra clusters the data due to the pion punch through in Tower 3
- 2. The dump position was not the best one

MC: Run 129

250

MC: Run 129

Transverse

Average TKR Cluster



### Photon (2.5 GeV ele.) Dist. Cls – Axis

#### **Remarks:**

- 1. There are extra clusters the data due to the pion punch through in Tower 3
- 2. The dump position was not the best one





### Search for double particles in the beam

- The Cal Raw Energy has been studied by mean of CalRecon method
  - The Total Raw Energy has been evaluated by adding the average energy of the two faces for the best range from CalXtalRecData method
- A cut has been used to avoid double particles
  - The Cal Raw Energy should be less than a maximum value for a given beam energy
    - For instance, CalRawEnegy<900 for 1 GeV

### Cal Raw Energy Vs. TKR Cluster Size



### Electron 1 GeV



1000 Max TKR Cluster Transverse Position, Max(Di x Si) (mm x Size)

1000

### **Noisy Strip studies**

- The noisy strip contribution to the shower profile could be studied from run with uncorrelated trigger
- The Run 1467 (5 GeV electrons) has been analyzed with the usual Macro



### Run 1467: Cluster map

### The beam is still there!



TKR Cluster Y(mm)

The Fake First Track in the Run 1467 has been set by using the average values of Position and Direction as in the Run 1460



Cluster distance – "Fake First Track"



### **Cluster Distance – Shower Axis**

10

The distributions have been normalized to unit area!



600

700

800

Maximum TKR Cluster Transverse Position, Max(Di x Si) (mm x Size)

900

1000



### **Conclusions**

- The EM shower in the transverse plane is narrower in the MC
  - The discrepancy increases as the energy decreases
  - Double particles do not affect the width of the shower at low energy, even though the longitudinal shower profile is little bit lower
  - The electromagnetic interactions should be reviewed at low energy
- Low cuts in G4 are not enough to reduce the discrepancies
- The halo beam does not explain the discrepancies, at least at 1 GeV
- It seems there is a problem in the Tracking Alg, in particular for high energy electrons, maybe due to large clusters in the bottom planes
- The calibrations do not affect the behavior of the shower profile in the data, maybe in the MC
- At high energy the cluster size could be increased due to the sharing effect, when large energy is deposited in a small region of the silicon detector
  - For vertical tracks about 10% of the charge is shared in the neighboring strips
- Low threshold to fired strips could increase the EM shower size
- The current MC includes thicker W layer
  - The next MC will generate less secondary particles, maybe they can go away from the primary electron and the EM shower could be larger