Alignment of the CMS Tracker

Latest Results from LHC Run-II

Gregor Mittag
on behalf of the CMS Collaboration

Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron (DESY)

22nd International Conference on Computing in High Energy and Nuclear Physics
12 October 2016

Motivation

Precise tracking is key to CMS physics performance

- What alignment precision is needed?
  - Track-p_T resolution

$$\frac{\delta p_T}{p_T} = \underbrace{C_1 \cdot p_T}_{\text{position res.}} \oplus \underbrace{C_2}_{\text{multiple scat.}}$$

with $C_1 \propto \frac{\sigma_{meas}}{B \cdot L^2 \sqrt{N}}$

  - Effective position resolution
    - $\sigma_{meas} \propto \sigma_{hit} \oplus \sigma_{align}$
  - Intrinsic hit-position resolution
    - $\sigma_{hit} \approx 9\,\mu m$ (pixel)
    - $\sigma_{hit} \approx 20-60\,\mu m$ (strip)



Need to keep $\sigma_{align} \ll \sigma_{hit}$

CMS experiment



CMS tracker



- 1440 silicon pixel modules
  - 3D hit-position measurements
- 15 148 silicon strip modules (24 244 sensors)
  - 2D measurements ($r\phi$ direction)
  - In some layers: additional modules rotated by 100 mrad

Track-based alignment

- Difference between real and assumed geometry affects track measurement
- **Idea:** track-hit residuals r between predicted and measured hit positions as a measure of misalignment



Track-based alignment

- Difference between real and assumed geometry affects track measurement
- **Idea:** track-hit residuals r between predicted and measured hit positions as a measure of misalignment



Track-based alignment

- Difference between real and assumed geometry affects track measurement
- **Idea:** track-hit residuals r between predicted and measured hit positions as a measure of misalignment
- Simply moving module by $-r$ means
  - Change of position (alignment) parameters
  - Change of track parameters
  - Change of other residuals
- Tracks correlate alignment parameters
- Need many tracks to determine parameters for all tracker modules



Track-based alignment

- Difference between real and assumed geometry affects track measurement
- **Idea:** track-hit residuals r between predicted and measured hit positions as a measure of misalignment
- Simply moving module by $-r$ means
  - Change of position (alignment) parameters
  - Change of track parameters
  - Change of other residuals
- Tracks correlate alignment parameters
- Need many tracks to determine parameters for all tracker modules



Alignment challenge

- Deriving the optimal positions, orientations, and surface deformations that minimize residuals
- Two independent approaches in CMS complementing each other
  - HipPy (local fit)
  - MillePede-II (global fit)

CMS Tracker Alignment in 2016



- Starting point for alignment
  - Only high-level-structure movements expected
- Start-up alignment
  - Using 0 T cosmics
  - Only high-level-structure alignment
  - Addresses effects accumulated during shut-down
- Refined 2016 alignment
  - Alignment at module level
  - Take advantage of various 3.8 T data sets
    - Cosmics
    - Minimum bias
    - Isolated muons
    - $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ events $\rightarrow$ Use constraint on invariant di-muon mass
- Preparations for reprocessing of 2016 data to reach ultimate performance

Cosmic track split validation





- Split cosmic tracks in horizontal plane at point of closest approach to interaction region
- Differences in track quantities between the two parts indicate misalignment

- Derived updated alignment with 0 T cosmic data prior to 2016 data-taking start-up
- Mean & RMS values show reduced bias of updated alignment wrt. 2015 geometry
  - 2015-EOY geometry no longer valid due to temperature and magnetic field changes
  - Performance of updated geometry very close to ideal Monte Carlo

Distribution of median residuals (DMR)



- Unbiased track-hit residuals of 1 M collision events @ 3.8 T
- Pixel-detector position known to be very sensitive to condition changes
- Updated alignment produced using 3.8 T cosmic-ray and collision data
- EOY-2015 no longer valid for 2016 data, mainly due to temperature and magnetic field changes
- RMS values show improvement over the 2015 geometry by a factor of 5

Primary vertex validation





- Study unbiased residuals between tracks and primary vertices
  - In longitudinal and transverse plane
  - In bins of η and ϕ

- Cosmic-ray and collision data @ 3.8 T are used for alignment
- Sample of 1 M events collected through minimum bias triggers @ 3.8 T used for validation
- Systematic z-offset of the pixel half-shells is corrected by the updated alignment

Prompt Calibration Loop

- Since this year, CMS employs automatic procedure to continuously monitor high-level-structure movements in the pixel tracker
  - Occur for example due to temperature changes or changes of the magnetic field
- Online alignment of the high-level structures for each run with more than 20 000 events
  - Measuring the movements relative to the geometry used in data processing
- Geometry is automatically updated, if alignment corrections exceed certain thresholds



Prompt Calibration Loop



- Run 276318 was taken shortly after a magnet ramp during July 4 2016
  - Resulted in movements of the pixel detector structures
  - Up to 30 μm wrt. the geometry used in data processing
- Red horizontal lines indicate the thresholds to trigger updates
  - Histogram color changes from green to orange if limit is exceeded

Prompt Calibration Loop



- Geometry was updated afterwards
  - Much improved performance during run 276327
  - Only small residual movements
    - Below 2 μm in x, y direction
    - Below 10 μm in z direction
- Such plots are routinely produced per run as part of the CMS data-quality monitoring

Prompt Calibration Loop



- Evolution of the pixel's high-level-structure movements
  - Covers period from June 21 to July 12 2016, corresponding to 7 fb^{-1}
  - Error bars represent the statistical uncertainties
  - Grey bands represent runs during which CMS magnet was not at 3.8 T
  - Vertical dashed lines illustrate updates of the alignment

- Typical movements during magnet-cycles are smaller than 50 µm in x and y, and smaller than 150 µm in z

Summary

- CMS has two independent algorithms in place to solve the highly non-trivial alignment task
- Tracker-alignment updates in 2016 significantly improved the performance at start-up and during data taking
- Geometry changes due to temperature and magnetic-field changes are nicely compensated
- An automatic online calibration workflow successfully put in place
  - Clear improvement of the prompt reconstruction
  - Note: Ultimate performance needed for reprocessing still requires more fine-grained alignment

- References
  - *CMS Tracker Alignment Performance Results Summer 2016*, CMS-DP-2016-063, http://cds.cern.ch/record/2221746/
  - *Alignment of the CMS tracker with LHC and cosmic ray data*, 2014 JINST 9 P06009, doi:10.1088/1748-0221/9/06/P06009
  - *Alignment of the CMS silicon tracker during commissioning with cosmic rays*, 2010 JINST 5 T03009, doi:10.1088/1748-0221/5/03/T03009

Back-Up

Cosmic track split validation









Distribution of median residuals (DMR) – Pixel









Distribution of median residuals (DMR) – Strip









Primary vertex validation



Prompt Calibration Loop



Prompt Calibration Loop



Prompt Calibration Loop



Prompt Calibration Loop



Prompt Calibration Loop



Prompt Calibration Loop



Global Fit with Millepede-II

- Local linearisation of track model and minimisation requiring $\mathrm{d}\chi^2(a)/\mathrm{d}a \stackrel{!}{=} 0$
  - Linear equation system: $\boldsymbol{C}\boldsymbol{a} = \boldsymbol{b}$ with $\boldsymbol{a}^T = (\boldsymbol{\Delta p}, \boldsymbol{\Delta q})$
- Track parameters $\boldsymbol{q}$ in part of data only
  - Block structure in $\boldsymbol{C}$
- Only interested in alignment parameters $\boldsymbol{p}$
  - Problem can be reduced to $\boldsymbol{C}'\boldsymbol{\Delta p} = \boldsymbol{b}'$
  - Solution provides alignment parameters
  - All correlations still taken into account
- $\boldsymbol{C}'$, $\boldsymbol{b}'$ by solving $N_{\text{track pars}} \times N_{\text{track pars}}$ per track
- Dramatic cost reduction:
  $N^2_{\text{align pars}} + N_{\text{tracks}} \cdot N^2_{\text{track pars}} \ll \left(N_{\text{align pars}} + N_{\text{tracks}} \cdot N_{\text{track pars}}\right)^2$
  - Full-scale alignment performed within $\lesssim 24\,\text{h}$



http://cms.desy.de/sites/site_cms/content/e53612/e234315/e241962/e241763/posterCCP2010_brokenlines.pdf