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## HELIX INTERSECTION BUG？

 This iterative calculation（for finding helix intercept with tilted sensor plane）called by：

hps－tracking＊潧 src／main／java＂她 org．hps．recon．tracking＊© MultipleScattering＊a FindScatters

$\leftrightarrows$ hps－tracking＊典 src／main／java＊由 org．hps．recon．tracking＊G MultipleScattering＊$\stackrel{\text { getHelixIntersection（＊）}}{ }$（＊）



## But only getHelixIntersection $\left(^{*}\right.$ ）contains a protective check：

／／TODO Catch special cases where the incidental iteration procedure seems to fail
if（Math．abs（helix．R（））＜ 2000 \＆\＆Math．abs（helix．dca（））＞10．0）\｛
if（＿debug）\｛
System．out．printf（＂\％s：momentum is low（ $\mathrm{p}=\% \mathrm{f}, \mathrm{R}=\% \mathrm{f}, \mathrm{B}=\% \mathrm{f}$ ）and d 0 is big（ $\mathrm{d} 0=\% \mathrm{f}$ ），skip the iterative calculation $\backslash \mathrm{n}$＂
What＇s up with this check？Does its absence in other calling methods ever matter？

## HELIX INTERSECTION BUG?

- If this check fails, getHelixIntersection uses "approximate" calculation rather than trying iterative method
- What if we remove this check? (Tried ~IIK tracks from Run 5772)
- Didn't crash, even though many of these tracks failed the check
- Plotted iterative intersection position minus "approximate", for tracks that failed. Small difference, so iterative result seems reasonable!
[Approx - Iter] X



## HELIX INTERSECTION BUG?



- So if this check ever matters, it must only be very rarely!
- Good news: its sometimes-absence isn't a significant bug
- Bad news: not sure why it was included in the first place
- Looked in source of algorithm (Avery CBX 98-39), no stated limits on applicability


## "MATRIX IS SINGULAR" BUG

- Is it the cause of Norman's bug https://github.com/JeffersonLab/hps-java/issues/243 ?
- Offending track's HelicalTrackFit:
$d 0=106.85803180556117$
phi0 $=-0.8 \mid 42691936809715$
curvature $=-0.0031|3| 4609 \mid 491068$
$z 0=1.03962| | \mid 76748624$
$\operatorname{tanLambda}=-0.020735453823318976$
- Would indeed be caught by the large-d0 / low-R check; crash only happens in absence of the check
- But, a much more specialized check would work to catch it ...


## "MATRIX IS SINGULAR" BUG

```
public static Hep3Vector getHelixPlaneIntercept(HelicalTrackFit helfit, HelicalTrackStripGbl strip, double bfield) {
    Hep3Vector point_on_plane = strip.origin();
    Hep3Vector unit_vec_normal_to_plane = VecOp.cross(strip.u(), strip.v());// strip.w();
    double S_Orlgın = HelixUtil`.PathToXPlane(helfit, strip.origin().x(), 0., 0).get(0);
    Hep3Vector intercept_point = getHelixPlaneIntercept(helfit, unit_vec_normal_to_plane, point_on_plane, bfield, S_origin
    return intercept_point;
}
public static Hep3Vector getHelixPlaneIntercept(HelicalTrackFit helfit, Hep3Vector unit_vec_normal_to_plane,
    Hep3Vector point_on_plane, double bfield, double initial_s) {
    WTrack wtrack = new WTrack(helfit, bfield); //
    if (initial_s != 0)
        wtrack.setTrackParameters(wtrack.getHelixParametersAtPathLength(initial_s, B));
    Hep3Vector intercept_point = wtrack.getHelixAndPlaneIntercept(point_on_plane, unit_vec_normal_to_plane, B);
Value in red box is NaN
Core iterative
algorithm
```


## "MATRIX IS SINGULAR" BUG

Icsim-tracking * (曹 src/main/java * org.Icsim.fit.helicaltrack © HelixUtils *s PathToXPlane

- 『PathCalc
- Calculation of value in red box: (helfit is HelicalTrackFit)

```
double x = point on_plane.x();
double y = helfit.yc() + Math.signum(helfit.R()) * Math.sqrt(helfit.R() * helfit.R() - Math.pow(x - helfit.xc(), 2));
double phi1 = Math.atan2(helfit.y0() - helfit.yc(), helfit.x0() - helfit.xc());
double phi2 = Math.atan2(y - helfit.yc(), x - helfit.xc());
double dphi = phi2 - phi1;
if (dphi > Math.PI)
    dphi -= 2. * Math.PI;
if (dphi < -Math.PI)
    dphi += 2. * Math.PI;
double s = -1.0 * helfit.R() * dphi;
point_on_plane:[705.49, -29.009, -32.166]
helfit: x0 77.709743,y0 73.347357 ,xc 3II.307572 ,yc 293.83I72I ,R -32I.2I8462
y=NaN , phil = - 2.385066 , phi2 = NaN,dphi = NaN
    Problem: Quantity in orange box is negative
```

Suggests using a more specialized check: $x-x c>R$

