# Comparison of two calorimeter concepts for the International Linear Collider (ILC)

#### Study of different energy reconstruction methods





Coralie Neubüser DPG Frühjahrestagung Wuppertal, 11.03.15









Main Linac



#### **Calorimeters for the ILC**



### **CALICE** hadron calorimeters overview



Coralie Neubüser | DPG 2015, Wuppertal | 11.03.15 | Page 3

#### **Idea and outline**

With analogue read-out, (semi-) digital energy reconstruction is possible, too

- Understand impact on energy resolution
- Study trade-offs between spatial and energy information

- > Data selection
- > Analogue, digital and semi-digital reconstruction modes
- Response and resolution
- Further steps



# **CALICE AHCAL test beam 2007 at CERN**



- > SPS at CERN 2007 (10-80GeV π/e/μ)
- Silicon-Electromagnetic Calorimeter (Si-ECAL) +
  1m<sup>3</sup> Analog Hadronic Calorimeter (Fe-AHCAL) +
  Tail Catcher/Muon Tracker (TCMT)
- > Fe-absorber ~2cm
- > 38 layers Scintillator tile Analog HCAL (12bit readout)
- Granularity: 12x12, 6x6 and 3x3cm<sup>2</sup> tiles/cells
- Read out of scintillation light by SiPMs







# **π**<sup>-</sup> runs 10-80GeV: Event Selection

> Test beam is a composition of different particle types



- MC sample with GEANT 4 version 9.6, physics list FTFP\_BERT
- Same runs like data with corresponding noise files
- FTFP\_BERT describes HCAL response for energies below 45GeV



# **Pion responses in AHCAL**

10<sup>-3</sup>

10

10<sup>-5</sup>

normalized entries



# Mean pion responses in AHCAL



#### Non-linear response

- > Multi-traversing particles & pad size
- Requires more sophisticated reconstruction method to linearise



# **Analogue energy reconstruction**



- Mean deposited track energy in ECAL 0.3805GeV
- Conversion factor  $\omega$  taken from positron runs
- Non-compensation (response for electrons 1.19 times higher than for pions)
- Non-linearity less than 5%
- Good agreement between data and MC



80 E<sub>beam</sub> [GeV]

10

20

30

40

50

60

¥0.0 ЧШ ЧШ (∨

# **Digital energy reconstruction**



- > Tail on left hand side of distributions due to multiple particles traversing same cell
- > Non-linearity less than 8% after correction
- > Agreement between data and MC better with increasing energies



## **Semi-digital energy reconstruction**

$$E_{rec,3thr} = \alpha N_1 + \beta N_2 + \gamma N_3$$



- > Weighting hits depending on energy content  $N_1: 0.5MIP < E_{hit} < 5MIP$  $N_2: 5MIP < E_{hit} < 15MIP$  $N_3: E_{hit} > 15MIP$
- α,β and γ assumed to be quadratic polynomials of N<sub>hits</sub>

$$\chi^{2} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{\left(E_{beam}^{i} - E_{rec,semi-digital}^{i}\right)^{2}}{E_{beam}^{i}}$$

- From minimisation: α,β and γ show none or linear dependence on N<sub>hits</sub>
- Results in bad linearity, additional linearisation step needed



# **Semi-digital energy reconstruction**



#### **Energy Resolution**



Study the impact on an AHCAL with 1x1cm<sup>2</sup> granularity, in simulation

Geant4 output

mip <= hit energy

5.4

**Real AHCAL response** 

1x1cm<sup>2</sup> AHCAL response



# **Further steps**

Study the impact on an AHCAL with 1x1cm<sup>2</sup> granularity, in simulation



Full analysis coming soon

#### **Backup: Event Selection**

> Test beam is a composition of different particle types



Event selection follows "Hadronic energy resolution of a highly granular scintillator-steel hadron calorimeter using software compensation techniques" 2012\_JINST\_7\_P09017: 29 Runs, 11 Energies



#### **Backup: Mean extraction procedure**

- 1. Gaussian pre-fit within Mean±3RMS
- 2. Novosibirsk fit within  $\mu \pm 3\sigma$  of Gaussian ( $\chi 2 < 3$ )
- Novosibirsk parameters for filling histogram randomly from 0 to 3σ
- 4. Mean & RMS of histogram



(d) Novosibirsk hist, 80 GeV



Analogue reconstruction without (detailed) ECAL and TCMT compared to ECAL+AHCAL+TCMT analysis from "Software Compensation"-paper

- > 0.5% (in absolute values) above "paper"-values
- Fitting method including tail show expected increase with increasing energy





#### Run list & event selection

#### ~20% of all event selected from data and MC

run	beam	pre-	selected	in %	selected	in %
number	energy	selection	pions in		pions in	
	[GeV]	data	data		MC	
330332,	10	587,793	111,133	18.9	81,974	20.5
330643,						
330777,						
330850						
330328	15	140,441	28,024	20.0	21,063	21.1
330327	18	148,516	29,600	19.9	21,040	21.0
330649,	20	379,270	73,942	19.5	41,718	20.9
330771						
330325,	25	364,170	72,530	19.9	41,474	20.7
330650						
330551,	35	404,309	70,438	17.4	40,868	20.4
330960						
330390,	40	509,168	101,617	20.0	61,394	20.5
330412,						
330560						
330550,	45	520,600	102,898	19.8	61,181	20.4
330559,						
330961						
330391,	50	384,581	76,855	20.0	41,081	20.5
330558						
331556,	60	787,208	153,464	19.5	81,565	20.4
331568,						
331655,						
331664						
330392,	80	898,307	176,476	19.7	100,278	20.1
330962,						
331554,						
331567,						
331654						



ECAL track energy contribution:

- Energy deposits from all selected events
- Deviation from different beam energies max. 10%







