## Measuring the electron energy: A comparison between two different setups

Riccardo Nunzio Pilato





## 1.a) $E_e = 1$ GeV. Start from 1st module: Spatial distribution of the hit point on the calorimeter

SETUP 1

**SETUP 2** 



No substantial differences between two setups

SETUP 2 distribution is slightly wider ( $\sigma \approx 22.4$  cm compared to  $\sigma \approx 21.5$  cm of SETUP 1)

Increased MS effect

### **SETUP1**



energy Using SETUP 2 the energy spectrum is much broader, probably because of MS effects, which are increased with respect to 5 **SETUP 1** 

## 1.b) E<sub>a</sub> = 2 GeV. Start from 1st module: Spatial distribution of the hit point on the calorimeter

#### **SETUP1**



SETUP 2 distribution is slightly wider ( $\sigma \approx 16.8$  cm compared to  $\sigma \approx 14.8$  cm of SETUP 1)

Increased MS effect

#### SETUP 1

 $N_{e} = 20k$  $N_{e} (E_{cal} > 0) = 20k$ 

N<sub>e</sub> (E<sub>cal</sub>> 1 GeV) = 19998

**SETUP 2** 

 $N_e = 50k$  $N_e (E_{cal} > 0) = 49998$ 

 $N_{e} (E_{cal} > 1 \text{ GeV})$ 

= 49988

>99,9% of electrons reach the calorimeter
>99,9% of electrons reach the calorimeter

All the electrons

electrons reach

the calorimeter with >50% their

initial energy

reach the

calorimeter

>99.9% of

the calorimeter with E > 1 GeV

## 1.c) $E_e = 10$ GeV. Start from 1st module



SETUP 2: energy spectrum is much broader and peak is at lower energy with respect to SETUP 1. 7

### 1.c) $E_e = 10$ GeV. Start from 1st module: Spatial distribution of the hit point on the calorimeter SETUP 1 SETUP 2



SETUP 2 distribution is slightly wider ( $\sigma \approx 5,2$  cm compared to  $\sigma \approx 4,1$  cm of SETUP 1)



1.a)  $E_a = 1$  GeV. Start from 25th module



## 1.a) $E_e = 1$ GeV. Start from 25th module: Spatial distribution of the hit point on the calorimeter



SETUP 2 distribution is slightly wider ( $\sigma \approx 13,6$  cm compared to  $\sigma \approx 11,8$  cm of SETUP 1)

Increased MS effect

### 1.b) $E_{e} = 2$ GeV. Start from 25th module



## 1.b) $E_e = 2$ GeV. Start from 25th module: Spatial distribution of the hit point on the calorimeter

SETUP 1

**SETUP 2** 

Increased MS effect



SETUP 2 distribution is slightly wider ( $\sigma \approx 7.8$  cm compared to  $\sigma \approx 6.5$  cm of SETUP 1)

1.c)  $E_{e} = 10$  GeV. Start from 25th module



# 1.c) $E_e = 10$ GeV. Start from 25th module: Spatial distribution of the hit point on the calorimeter



SETUP 2 distribution is slightly wider ( $\sigma \approx 1.8$  cm compared to  $\sigma \approx 1.4$  cm of SETUP 1)

Increased MS effect



2.a)  $E_e = 1 \text{ GeV}, \theta_e = 31,85 \text{ mrad. Start from 1st module}$ After 26 m  $x_c \approx 80 \text{ cm}$  Out of calorimeter

#### **SETUP 1**

#### **SETUP 2**



Punto di impatto nel calorimetro (E<sub>a</sub> = 1 GeV, partenza: 50 modulo,  $\theta_e$  = 31.82 mrad)



## With a 2 m x 2 m calorimeter

Energia rilasciata nel calorimetro ( $E_{e} = 1 \text{ GeV}$ , partenza: 50 modulo,  $\theta_{e} = 31.82 \text{ mrad}$ )

30 25 20

15 10 5

100<sup>6</sup> 1(cm) 50

C





2.b)  $E_e = 2 \text{ GeV}, \theta_e = 22,44 \text{ mrad.}$  Start from 1st module





SETUP 2 has more statistics (34,1%) compared to SETUP 1 (26,4%) due to increased MS effect

Punto di impatto nel calorimetro (E<sub>a</sub> = 2 GeV, partenza: 50 modulo,  $\theta_e$  = 22.44 mrad)



2.c)  $E_{a} = 10 \text{ GeV}, \theta_{a} = 9,74 \text{ mrad.}$  Start from 1st module



2.c)  $E_e = 10$  GeV,  $\theta_e = 9,74$  mrad. Start from 1st module

→ After 26 m  $x_c \approx 25$  cm → Hits the calorimeter

#### **SETUP 1**

#### SETUP 2



SETUP 2 distribution is slightly wider compared to SETUP 1

2.a)  $E_e = 1 \text{ GeV}, \theta_e = 31,85 \text{ mrad}$ . Start from 25th module



2.a)  $E_a = 1 \text{ GeV}, \theta_a = 31,85 \text{ mrad.}$  Start from 25th module

**SETUP 1** 

→ After 13,5 m  $x_{r}$  ≈ 43 cm → Hits the calorimeter

#### **SETUP 2**



2.b)  $E_e = 2 \text{ GeV}, \theta_e = 22,44 \text{ mrad.}$  Start from 25th module



2.b)  $E_e = 2 \text{ GeV}, \theta_e = 22,44 \text{ mrad.}$  Start from 25th module

→ After 13,5 m  $x_c \approx 30$  cm → Hits the calorimeter

#### SETUP 1 **SETUP 2** Punto di impatto nel calorimetro (E<sub>a</sub> = 2 GeV, partenza: 25 modulo, $\theta_e$ = 22.44 mrad) Punto di impatto nel calorimetro ( $E_a = 2 \text{ GeV}$ , partenza: 25 modulo, $\theta_e = 22.44 \text{ mrad}$ ) histo2 9995 Entries histo2 Mean x 30.4 Entries 99948 Mean v 0.00652; 4.21 Std Dev x 30.38 Mean x 4.28 Std Dev Mean v -0.005474 1400 1000 Std Dev x 4.947 1200 800 Std Dev y 5.02 1000 600 800 400 600 200 400 200 1 (cm) y [cm] 20 20 0 0 40 x [cm] -20 40 x [cm] -20 20 20 0 -40 -20 -40-20-40 -40

No substantial differences between two setups

2.c)  $E_{e} = 10 \text{ GeV}, \theta_{e} = 9,74 \text{ mrad.}$  Start from 25th module



2.c)  $E_e = 10 \text{ GeV}, \theta_e = 9,74 \text{ mrad}$ . Start from 25th module

→ After 13,5 m  $x_c \approx 13$  cm → Hits the calorimeter

#### **SETUP 1**

#### **SETUP 2**



STEP 3:  $\theta_{a}$  [0, 35 mrad] generated according to LO distribution.  $\varphi_{\alpha}$  generated uniformly between [0, 2 $\pi$ ],  $E_{\alpha} = E_{\alpha}(\theta_{\alpha})$ e<sup>-</sup> start from 25th module  $R = \frac{N_e(E_{cal} > 1GeV)}{N_e}$ **SETUP 2 SETUP 1**  $N_{a} = 3 Mln$ ſ  $N_{2} = 1 Mln$ ſ 0.9998 R < 99,9% if 0.9998 R < 99,9% if 0.9996  $\theta_{a} > 20 \text{mrad}$  $\theta_{2}$  > 22mrad 0.9996 0.9994 0.9994 0.9992 0.9992 0.999 0.999 0.005 0.01 0.015 0.02 0.025 0.03 0.035  $\theta_{o}$  true [rad] 0.02 0.005 0.01 0.015 0.025 0.03 0.035 0  $\theta_{a}$  true [rad]



#### SETUP 2



R < 99,9% when  $E_e < 2,2$  GeV

R < 99,9% when  $E_e < 2,4$  GeV

## Further developments

- Add scattered muon to the primary vertex
- Measure (using a virtual detector) distance between em shower and muon, in order to determine the calorimeter granularity
- Modify calorimeter setup: from a unique block to a segmeted calorimeter
- Study of energy deposit of e/mu at ~2,5 mrad for PID
- Study the efficiency of the energy cut as a function of the module position
- Use all the information (=likelihood function) to improve energy determination

## Conclusions

- Results from STEP 1 (θ<sub>e</sub> = 0) show that using SETUP 2 does not change statistics (same amount of electrons hits the calorimeter compared to SETUP 1). However in SETUP 2 energy spectra and spatial distributions are wider than SETUP 1, mainly because of increased MS effects introduced by doubling Si layer thickness. Moreover in SETUP 2 the mean value of calorimeter energy deposit of electrons is lower than SETUP 1, because electrons lose more energy in Si layers.
- Results from STEP 2 ( $\theta_e = \theta_e(E_e)$ ) show that using SETUP 2 increases statistics of electrons with E = 1 2 GeV generated at the 1st module by few percent compared to SETUP 1, mainly due to MS which is increased. Energy spectra and spatial distributions are slightly wider than SETUP 1, but this effect is less prononunced with respect to STEP 1, because in STEP 2 electrons are generated with  $\theta_e \neq 0$ . This means that electrons after few modules don't hit Si layers anymore, so after few modules they are no more subjected to MS.
- A 2 m x 2 m calorimeter is necessary in order to reconstruct the electron energy in range of 1 2 GeV when this electrons start from the first module..
- Results from STEP 3 ( $\theta e$  random,  $E_e = E_e(\theta_e)$ ) show that for SETUP 1 applying an energy cut of  $E_{cal} > 1$ GeV allows to use the calorimetric measure of the electron energy for 99,9% (or higher) of the events with  $E_e > 2,2$  GeV ( $\theta_e < 22$ mrad). For SETUP 2 the same percentage is obtained with  $E_e > 2,4$  GeV ( $\theta_e < 20$ mrad).