# Track-Cluster (non)matching investigation

Matt Graham Tuesday August 22, 2023

#### The issue

In <u>my analysis workshop talk</u>, I noticed a very large number of tracks from V0s did not have a match to a cluster

- Most disturbing, this was true for positrons too
- The ratios of events for "both", "pos-noele", "nopos-ele", "no-no" in data is: 1.0:0.77,0.50, 0.41
  - a bit different from ana talk, but I tweaked some things, ran over smaller sample, no L2 requirement etc...conclusion is the same, lots of V0s with no positron cluster match
- Trigger required a cluster on the positron side, so there must be a cluster there...it's just not matching
  - I'm looking at 2021 pass0 data and we know we have issues with alignment that makes the track projection at the ECal skewed...but the requirements on matching are "wide-open"
  - Also an issue that pass0 used the wrong z position of ECal face...

#### Is there a positron cluster in these events?



#### Is track-cluster matching "wide-open"



...not really; looks like there is a cut at ~ delta +/- 20mm (but not exactly and asymmetric?) deltaX offset by ~10mm with positive, so that's going to cut off a bunch of lower-p tail events

#### Some code:

We use TrackClusterMatcherMinDistance.java to match tracks to clusters, and this uses cuts defined in standardCuts.java. There's a 20mm cut on both the X and Y maximum match distance. Also a cut on delta-t, but that is set fo 40ns (big) in the particle driver. Looking at the production of pass0. Options used in <u>HpsReconParticleDriver.java</u> pertinent for cluster matching:

<maxMatchDt>40</maxMatchDt>

<trackClusterTimeOffset>40</trackClusterTimeOffset>

 $<\!\! useCorrectedClusterPositionsForMatching \!\!>\!\! false <\!\! useCorrectedClusterPositionsForMatching \!\!>\!\! matching \!\!>\!\! mat$ 

<applyClusterCorrections>true</applyClusterCorrections>

 $<\!\!\text{useTrackPositionForClusterCorrection} \\ \text{true} \\ <\!\!\text{useTrackPositionForClusterCorrection} \\ \\ n \\ >$ 

But there are StandardCuts used: hps-java/record-util/src/main/java/org/hps/record/<u>StandardCuts.java</u>

public StandardCuts(double ebeam) { maxSharedHitsPerTrack = 5; maxMatchChisq = 10.0; maxMatchDt = 6.0; maxMatchDy = 20.0; maxMatchDy = 20.0; maxVertexClusterDt = 2.0; minVertexChisqProb = 0.00001; minMollerChisqProb = 0.00001; maxTrackChisqProb = 0.00001;

> maxElectronPset = false; minMollerPset = false; maxMollerPset = false; maxVertexPset = false; OffsetSet = false;

maxTrackChisq = new HashMap<Integer, Double>(); maxTrackChisq.put(5, new ChiSquaredDistribution(5).inverseCumulativeProbability(1.0-maxTrackChisqProb)); maxTrackChisq.put(7, new ChiSquaredDistribution(7).inverseCumulativeProbability(1.0-maxTrackChisqProb));

maxElectronP = 0.75\*ebeam; minMollerP = 0.8\*ebeam; maxMollerP = 1.2\*ebeam; maxVertexP = 1.2\*ebeam; if (ebeam < 2) trackClusterTimeOffset=43;

## Really opening up the matching





In hpstr, I did my own matching algorithm:

- track & cluster must point to same half
- |track-cluster time|<10ns

...and that's it.

It looks like this finds the matches at higher x (~lower p) Also a lot of what looks like junk...

## **Positron Match Quality**

positron E/p (mm)

0.8

0.6

0.4

0.2

50

100

150

Most of these new matches look like try matches but, as inferred from previous plot, there are clearly some mis-matches here...I'm not trying to replace track-matching algorithm.

250

300

200



## Conclusions

- My unmatched clusters in pass0 are due to a combination of matching cuts in hps-java and poor track extrapolation (due to wrong ECal face and alignment).
- This is good, it will get better as we run on the newer detectors