# Raster Calibration Via Multi-Track Vertex Reconstruction

Derek Holmberg 3-12-24



# Raster Calibration (RG-C)

- **Raster System:** Two dipoles deflect the electron beam in a spiral pattern to evenly distribute radiation dose over the target
- **Calibration:** Find conversion factor from the dipole current ADC signal to beam  $\bullet$ position
- Use multi-track vertex reconstruction to relate ADC signal to reconstructed particle  $\bullet$ vertices (detached vertex tracking)





# Raster Calibration (RG-C)

- Detached Vertex Tracking: Process by which two coincidental particles ( $e^-$  and  $\pi^+$ ) are extrapolated back to a common scattering vertex
- Offline analysis: performed on runs that have already been cooked
- CLARA micro-service package developed by Veronique Ziegler



# **Detached Vertex Finder Algorithm**

minimal

- 1. For each track
  - 1. Swim backwards to fixed Z to get starting point of trajectory
  - 2. Swim forward to fixed Z to get starting point of trajectory
- 2. Compute Doca of track2(1) to track1(2) obtained from swimming track2(1) where the swimming is stopped when the Doca to trajectory2(1) is minimal
- 3. Compute r as the distance between the so-obtained doca points of each track





Slide Credit: Veronique Ziegler

# **Detached Vertex Finder Algorithm**

- 1. For each track
  - 1. Swim backwards to fixed Z to get starting point of trajectory
  - 2. Swim forward to fixed Z to get starting point of trajectory
- 2. Compute Doca of track2(1) to track1(2) obtained from swimming track2(1) where the swimming is stopped when the Doca to trajectory2(1) is minimal
- 3. Compute r as the distance between the so-obtained doca points of each track



vertex used in analysis



## Calibration Constants:

- Plot extracted x, y vertices vs.  $ADC_{x,y}$  signals and fit data directly to a straight line
- $V_{x,y} = P_0 + P_1 * ADC_{x,y}$
- Converts raster signal (ADC) to vertex position
- Two constants each for x, y (four total for each data set)



## Run 16296: Plot of Vy vs. ADCy

6

## Calibration Constants:

- Plot extracted x, y vertices vs.  $ADC_{x,y}$  signals and fit data directly to a straight line
- $V_{x,y} = P_0 + P_1 * ADC_{x,y}$
- Converts raster signal (ADC) to vertex position
- Two constants each for x, y (four total for each data set)

## • Profile fit:

- Break data set up into 10 separate ADC bins (between green lines) to account for non-gaussian distributions
- Fit each of the bins to a double gaussian to find average vertex for the ADC signal bin
- Fit results using  $V_{x,y} = P_0 + P_1 * ADC_{x,y}$



7

## Run 16296: Plot of Vy vs. ADCy

## Calibration Constants:

- Plot extracted x, y vertices vs.  $ADC_{x,y}$  signals and fit data directly to a straight line
- $V_{x,y} = P_0 + P_1 * ADC_{x,y}$
- Converts raster signal (ADC) to vertex position
- Two constants each for x, y (four total for each data set)

## • Profile fit:

- Break data set up into 10 separate ADC bins (between green lines) to account for non-gaussian distributions
- Fit each of the bins to a double gaussian to find average vertex for the ADC signal bin
- Fit results using  $V_{x,y} = P_0 + P_1 * ADC_{x,y}$



## Run 16296: Plot of Vy vs. ADCy

8



## *ADC*<sub>Y</sub> Bin: 1828.2

• Fit data with double gaussian

$$- G(V_i) = A_1 * \exp\left(\frac{\mu - V_i}{\sigma_1}\right)^2 + A_2 * \exp\left(\frac{\mu - V_i}{\sigma_2}\right)^2 \text{ for } divergence in the set of the$$

- Fitting Procedure:
  - 1. Fit distribution to a single gaussian
  - 2. Use parameters from that fit to initialize double gaussian
  - 3. Fit again with double gaussian
- Plot  $\mu$  (*cm*) *vs*. *ADC* signal
- Bin ADC signal taken as average ADC value for the bin
- Error on mean is  $\delta \mu = \sigma_1 / \sqrt{N}$ , N = number of counts in the histogram



 $\mu$  = reconstructed vertex for fixed ADC signal

## *ADC*<sub>Y</sub> Bin: 1828.2

Run 16296: Plot of  $V_X$  vs.  $ADC_X$ 

Run 16296: Plot of  $V_Y$  vs.  $ADC_Y$ 



- Cuts to the Data:
  - $-e^{-}$  seen in DC,  $\pi^{+}$  seen in CVT
  - $-\chi^2_{pid} < 3$  for  $e^-, \pi^+$
  - $-8 cm < V_z < 2 cm$ ,  $|V_{x,v}| < 2.05 cm$  for all data points
  - Separation distance  $0 \ cm < \Delta R < 1.0 \ cm$
- All the data came from the first 20 HIPO files of the runs, and no additional  $\bullet$ kinematic cuts were made (i.e. no SIDIS skims, DVCS skims, etc.)

# **Running the Analysis**

- Analyzed all runs over the entire Summer '22 run period (inbending electrons)
  - Using roughly 330 runs from across the run period
  - Calibration, empty target, luminosity scans skipped
  - /volatile/clas12/rg-c/production/pass0/mon/v0.17/mon/recon \_\_\_\_
- Runs ranging from 16128 to 16772  $\bullet$ 
  - Runs 16292 16297 from /v0.15/ directory
  - Carbon, NH3, and ND3 runs were used
- Used events where  $e^-$  is in the forward detector,  $\pi^+$  is in the central detector  $-\pi^{+}\pi^{-}$  cases had too few events (<1000 per run) to have useful results
- Used analysis procedure as outlined, fitting to  $V_{x,y} = P_0 + P_1 * ADC_{x,y}$

13



# Calculating Average Beam Position

- Average beam position is the average position of the beam over the entire run  $\bullet$
- For each of the runs, I calculated the average value of all ADC signals measured  $\bullet$  $ADC_{run} = \sum_i ADC_i / N$ , N = total counts over run
- Plotted  $P_0 + P_1 * ADC_{run}$  for X,Y using my raster calibration constants •
- Also plotted against  $P_0 + P_1 * ADC_{run} + B$  using the values currently in CCDB, where B is the beam offset

## $P_0 + P_1 * ADC$ (Average Beam Position)



## $P_0 + P_1^*ADC_y$ vs. Run Number



- NH3 Runs
- ND3 Runs

ADC values used for the plots are the average value across the first 20 HIPO files

# Work Still To Be Done

- Recooked multiple runs using my raster calibration constants; carbon foil runs 16296, 16297 and empty target run 16194
- Plot the reconstructed vertex distributions to check for any systematic effects of the calibration  $\bullet$
- My Raster Calibration Values:

 $-P_{0,X} = -1.984, P_{1,X} = 0.0009487; P_{0,Y} = 2.299, P_{1,Y} = -0.0010739$ 

- Beam Offset: All Zero
- Current Raster CCDB Values:

 $-P_{0,X} = -2.29552 P_{1,X} = 0.001004; P_{0,Y} = 2.29812, P_{1,Y} = -0.001162$ 

- Beam Offset:  $X_{offset} = 0.1544833$ ;  $Y_{offset} = 0.150292$ —
- Still a work in progress; checking slight discrepancies in vertex distributions



# Any Questions?

# **Backup Slides**

- What do the histograms look like? lacksquare
- Effects of binning on raster calibration constants  ${\color{black}\bullet}$
- Changes in reconstructed vertices using my constants versus what's in CCDB



# **Backup Slides**

- What do the histograms look like?
- Effects of binning on raster calibration constants
- Changes in reconstructed vertices using my constants versus what's in CCDB













## Run 16296: X-Vertex Histograms



## Run 16296: 2D Histograms

 $V_X$  vs. ADC<sub>X</sub>



## V<sub>Y</sub> vs. ADC<sub>Y</sub>

## (Same as Before)

Run 16296: Plot of  $V_X$  vs.  $ADC_X$ 





## Run 16296: Plot of $V_Y$ vs. $ADC_Y$

# **Backup Slides**

- What do the histograms look like?
- Effects of binning on raster calibration constants
- Changes in reconstructed vertices using my constants versus what's in CCDB





- Current goal is to recook at least one run using the raster calibration constants calculated  $\bullet$ using my method
- However, I investigated how binning the ADC data would affect the extracted constants  $\bullet$ 
  - Does the ADC value used for the bin affect the constants?
  - Does the number of data points in each bin affect the constants? Does the number of bins used affect the constants?
- My old method had some issues, but I believe they may be fixed now!



- Plot extracted x, y vertices vs.  $ADC_{x,y}$  signals and perform profile ۲ fits to find  $V_{x,y} = P_0 + P_1 * ADC_{x,y}$
- **Old method**: partition data into 10 bins, with the ADC value used to represent that bin taken as the average of the bin edges:  $ADC_{bin} = (ADC_i + ADC_{i+1})/2$



## Run 16700 X-Vertex vs. ADC<sub>x</sub>

- Plot extracted x, y vertices vs.  $ADC_{x,y}$  signals and perform profile • fits to find  $V_{x,v} = P_0 + P_1 * ADC_{x,v}$
- **Old method**: partition data into 10 bins, with the ADC value used to represent that bin taken as the average of the bin edges:  $ADC_{hin} = (ADC_i + ADC_{i+1})/2$
- **New method**: use the average value of ADC signal in each bin instead of central value:  $ADC_{bin} = \sum_{i}^{N} ADC_{i} / N$ 
  - N = number of data points in bin •



## Run 16700 X-Vertex vs. ADC<sub>v</sub>



- Plot extracted x, y vertices vs.  $ADC_{x,y}$  signals and perform profile ۲ fits to find  $V_{x,v} = P_0 + P_1 * ADC_{x,y}$
- **Old method**: partition data into 10 bins, with the ADC value used to represent that bin taken as the average of the bin edges:  $ADC_{hin} = (ADC_i + ADC_{i+1})/2$
- **New method**: use the average value of ADC signal in each bin instead of central value:  $ADC_{bin} = \sum_{i}^{N} ADC_{i} / N$ 
  - N = number of data points in bin
- **Another Method**: use modulated bin widths so that each bin contains roughly the same number of data points
- Tested all of these using fixed and modulated bins ullet
- Also used tighter vertex cut:  $-8 \ cm < V_z < 2 \ cm$ ,  $|V_{x,v}| < 2.05 \ cm$  $\bullet$



## Run 16700 X-Vertex vs. ADC<sub>x</sub>

# **Updates From Last Time**

- Using the average ADC signal for each bin gave consistent results, no matter the binning  $\bullet$
- Should we use these new values for any future cooking?  $\bullet$



# **Backup Slides**

- What do the histograms look like?
- Effects of binning on raster calibration constants
- Changes in reconstructed vertices using my constants versus what's in CCDB



# Work Still To Be Done

- Made new cuts to the data:
  - $V_X^2 + V_Y^2 < 10 \ cm^2$ ,  $-8 \ cm < V_Z < 2 \ cm$
  - All particles have  $\chi^2_{pid} < 3$ ,  $e^-$  seen in the FD,  $\pi^+$  seen in the CD
  - Made cuts to the track reconstruction  $\chi^2_{red} \equiv \chi^2_{track}/NDF < 10.0$ —
- New method: for  $\pi^+$ , use vertices from REC::UTrack instead of REC::Track Made new plots for runs 16296, 16297 using REC::UTrack and comparing it to REC::Track
- Also made plots for for run 16194 (using REC::UTrack for  $\pi^+$ )
- Using REC::UTrack didn't shift the z-vertices of the  $\pi^+$ , but it was harder to tell if the x,y vertices shifted
  - Poor results for the gaussian fits of x,y vertices
  - There does seem to be some sort of small shift, but it's hard to explicitly quantify













