OSCAR/G4 Simulation of the 2002 Hcal Test Beam

V. Daniel Elvira

JetMET Meeting

Motivation

- Validation of GEANT4-OSCAR towards the data challenge
- Understanding of the successive Hcal test beam experiments (02,03,04)

Started using OSCAR_1_4_0 (G4.4.1), physics list 1.8 (October 2001), default cuts: 1 cm production cuts

- Beam Line System (trigger tiles & wire chambers)
- Customized Ecal (7x7 Crystal Matrix in aluminum box)
- HCal from OSCAR_1_4_0 library
- Customized HO
- BL and Ecal translation & rotation capability
- Incorporate Root analysis package
- Study energy resolution, linearity, shower profiles

Visualization



Angle view of the full TB02 detector

10 GeV electron



100 GeV pion

MC Analysis: mimic data analysis

Based on 1-5,000 π^- events onto the $(\eta,\phi)=(7,3)$ tower of the HB and crystal 25 of the ECal matrix



Should be tower (9,4) !



MC Analysis: Calibration & Noise

HCal calibration with 50 GeV pions on HB only: less than 1% of the energy in scintillators (5x5 matrix)

ECal calibration with 100 GeV electrons on Ecal only: ~95% of the energy is contained (3x3 matrix)



$$E^{\pi}_{corr} = 121.5 * E^{HB}_{5x5} + 1.05 * E^{ECal}_{3x3}$$

Calibration factors

$$E^{ECal}_{tower} \longrightarrow E^{ECal}_{tower} + 115\ MeV * Rand$$

Electronic Noise

$$E^{HB}_{scint} \longrightarrow E^{HB}_{scint} + 0.1 * E^{HB}_{scint}\ MeV * Rand$$

Long. Non-uniformity

$$E^{HB}_{tower} \longrightarrow E^{HB}_{tower} + 262\ MeV * Rand$$

Electronic Noise

Pion Energy Resolution











M.C. & data agreed above ~70 GeV but M.C gave increasingly better resolution at lower energies (20% difference at 20 GeV)

But what's the uncertainty in the data analysis? (need for M.C physics validation)

Comments on Data Analysis



From
J. Damgov

Data analysis: sources systematic errors:

- muon (pion decay) & electrons (from scrapping?) backgrounds
- calibration

Data Analysis

From J.Damgov





It should be possible to estimate background subtraction error by defining a band limited by an "aggressive" and a "conservative cut"





The resolution comes down from 31% to 26.7% !

Data & MC e- Resolution

E^{ECal}_{tower} E^{ECal}_{tower} + 115 MeV * Rand

TB02 Data

Electronic noise







Data & MC e- Resolution

- $E^{ECal}_{tower} \rightarrow E^{ECal}_{tower}$ + 115 MeV * Rand (noise)
- 2.3%/ sqrt(E_{ele}) (photo-statistics)
- 0.3% (longitudinal non-uniformity)
- 0.4% (calibration)

$E^{ECal}_{tower} \rightarrow E^{ECal}_{tower} + \sigma_{match} * Rand$

(To match the measured electron resolution)





Improved M.C. Simulation

$$E^{ECal}_{tower} \longrightarrow E^{ECal}_{tower} + \sigma_{match} * \text{Rand}$$

(To match the measured electron resolution-much worse than M.C.)

- Add more energy points at 10, 25, 200, 250, 300 GeV (in addition to 20, 30, 50, 100, 150 GeV)
- 5 times more statistics 10-30 GeV

Improved Analysis: Pions

All known contributions to ECal and HB resolutions added

Ecal resolution "matched" to data measured e^- resolution





Very good agreement between OSCAR/G4 and data

Improved Analysis: Pions

Add more energy points at below 20 and above 150 GeV:
10, 25, 200, 250, 300 GeV, and higher stats as low energy





Resolutions: M.C. & data agree very well

Source of discrepancy could be e/h (e.m. & nuclear x-sec), punch through (shower length) ?

Systematic Studies (I)

Use of M.C. to study bias in data measurement & background subtraction cut effects

Is the M.C. derivation also biased due to muon background?



Systematic Studies (II)

Fit double Gaussian (independently pion & muon peak)

What if I apply the same cut as in the data ?

$E_{hcal}>2$ GeV & $(E_{hcal}+1.3*E_{em})>8$





Systematic Studies (III)



The cuts applied to the data remove a non-negligible fraction of the pion signal:

In M.C: σ_E/E= 25.6 reduced to 22.8%

Solution: measure a band around this nominal value (limited by maximum efficiency & maximum rejection)

Error shouldn't be more than +-3% for 20 GeV π

Pion Shower Profiles: 20 GeV

20 GeV pions onto HB tower: $(\eta,\phi)=(9,4)$

Long. Prof. is:

$E_{\text{scint layer}}$ fraction (area normalized)







Pion Shower Profiles: 50 GeV

50 GeV pions onto HB tower:
$(\eta,\phi)=(9,4)$

Long. Prof. is:
$E_{\text{scint layer}}$ fraction
(area normalized)







Pion Shower Profiles: 100 GeV

100 GeV pions onto HB tower: $(\eta,\phi)=(9,4)$

Long. Prof. is:

$E_{\text{scint layer}}$ fraction (area normalized)







Pion Shower Profiles: 300 GeV

300 GeV pions onto HB tower: $(\eta,\phi)=(9,4)$

Long. Prof. is:

$E_{\text{scint layer}}$ fraction (area normalized)







Technical Issues

- Started migration to OSCAR2.

  - Used ToAscii package to translate G4 geometry to XML files (thanks P.Arce & M. Liendl)
  - Need to produce one per sub-detector to use library Hcal
  - Still to implement analysis package, play with cuts & physics lists

- Delay due to lxplus6 decommissioning since Thurs 22nd jobs pending, crashes (run iteratively in the bckgnd)

- LXPLUX6 replaced by a few "migration nodes" on Friday 30th. It will allow a smother transition to OSCAR2.

Conclusions

Significant progress since last CMS week in February

Need to:

- Understand data systematics (Jordan?)
- Complete OSCAR1 to OSCAR2 transition
- Play with cuts, physics lists
- Physics validation conclusions (TB02) & document