## Split-Off Recognition for the Forward Endcap

Jonas Kohlen

Helmholtz-Institut für Strahlen- und Kernphysik

#### OVERVIEW

- investigating photon reconstruction of the forward endcap for my master thesis
- mostly working within Ben Salisbury's restructured EMC code
- currently focusing on recognition of split-off maxima

#### FIRST STEP

• developed a reliable way to identify split-offs based on MC information

#### Now

• developing split-off recognition operating without the use of MC information

#### WHAT ARE SPLIT-OFFS? - IN-CLUSTER SPLIT-OFFS



#### WHAT ARE SPLIT-OFFS? - IN-CLUSTER SPLIT-OFFS



#### WHAT ARE SPLIT-OFFS? - IN-CLUSTER SPLIT-OFFS



#### WHAT ARE SPLIT-OFFS? - OUT-OF-CLUSTER SPLIT-OFFS



- in order to separate real maxima from split-off maxima, the external MC tracks need to be matched to the calorimeter crystals
- first implementation based on angles and crystal positions unreliable

#### IDEA

- match tracks based on energy depositions on MCPoint level
- algorithm for setting cluster Ids in the MCHitProductionProcess, written by T. Stockmanns, already fulfilling similar purpose
  → algorithm can be adapted to fit my needs

#### MC TRACK MATCHING ALGORITHM



Jonas Kohlen

- track matching algorithm stores all external tracks that deposited energy in a specific crystal in the corresponding EmcMCHit
- stored tracks need to be filtered for relevant "maxima-causing" tracks

#### Split-Off Recognizer Filtering

- EmcMCHit must be the maximum in which the track left the most energy
- track must deposit at least  $10 \, \mathrm{MeV}$  in considered crystal
- crystal in which the track left the most energy must lie within the same cluster

## 1 PED Clusters - Separation by Distance - $2\gamma$ Test Simulation



## 1 PED Clusters - Separation by Distance - $2\gamma$ Test Simulation



distance to closest cluster vs E1/E9 for 1 PED clusters containing split-off maxima

72% correctly identified

distance to closest cluster vs E1/E9 for 1 PED clusters not containing split-off maxima

>99% correctly identified

### 2 PED Clusters - Separation by Shower Mass - $2\gamma$ Test Simulation



## 2 PED Clusters - Separation by Shower Mass - $2\gamma$ Test Simulation



## High PED Clusters - Separation by Shower Mass - $2\gamma$ Test Simulation



shower mass vs cluster energy for 2 PEDshopseudo-clusters coming from high PEDpsclusters not containing split-off maximacontaining

shower mass vs cluster energy for 2 PED pseudo-clusters coming from high PED clusters containing split-off maxima

## High PED Clusters - Separation by Shower Mass - $2\gamma$ Test Simulation



shower mass vs cluster energy for 2 PED pseudo-clusters coming from high PED clusters containing split-off maxima

shower mass vs cluster energy for 2 PED pseudo-clusters coming from high PED clusters not containing split-off maxima



## Results - $\bar{p}p \rightarrow 6\gamma$ @ 8 GeV simulation - cut Subcluster Energies





## Results - $\bar{p}p \rightarrow \eta \pi^0 \pi^0 \rightarrow 6\gamma$ @ 1.94 GeV Simulation - cut Subcluster Energies



#### SUMMARY

- effective cuts in place to find split-off maxima in any type of cluster
- able to identify well over 90 % of split-off maxima
- only fraction of a percent of "real" maxima cut by mistake
- more "real" maxima cut for low subcluster energies, but majority of low energy primaries survive
- split-off/primary separation weakens for low energy simulations, but still reasonable

#### NEXT STEPS

- implement tagging of supposed split-offs into reconstruction chain
- investigate merging of out-of-cluster split-offs into main cluster

# THANKS FOR YOUR ATTENTION!

Jonas Kohlen