

Muon Scan Testbeam 2024

In this presentation


- Ancillaries pedestal studies
- Proposal cuts
- Scintillant - Cerenkov distribution vs muon energy scan

General info


- Run considered for testing: 992
- Pedestal run: 974, 993

XDWC2 and YDWC2

XDWC2



YDWC2




$$x_{min} = \text{Mean} - 2 \sigma < X < \text{Mean} + 2 \sigma = x_{max}$$

$$y_{min} = \text{Mean} - 2 \sigma < Y < \text{Mean} + 2 \sigma = y_{max}$$


If considered gaussian, 2σ corresponds to more than 95% of efficiency.

Tail Catcher



Cut: TailC < 180, TailC > 242

Leakage





Long queue probably not coming from muon or electron deposits.
Maybe pion contribution (?)

Cut: **totLeakage < 4600**

Leakage - after cut - effect on PMT energy


The adding of the leakage cut has an effect on the peak at 80 (60) in the tot energy deposited in the PMT Scint (Cherenkov).




PShower

$350 < \text{PShower} < 450$ for MIP identification and removing the pedestal.

PShower




PShower ((XDWC1 < 21.8)&&(XDWC1 > -18.2) &&(YDWC1 < 13.76) &&(YDWC1 > -26.24) &&(TailC<180) &&(toLeakage<4600))




Muon Counter

Pedestal

MCounter




MCounter




Cut proposed : **Mcounter <8000, MCounter >160**

C2

Pedestal C2




C2



Possible cut is at 150, but it reduce of 50% the data. -> as expected

Efficiency run 992

cutefficiency





XDWC2<xmax	0.4%
XDWC2>xmin	0.3%
YDWC2<ymax	2%
YDWC2>ymin	0.5%
PShower>350	4%
PShower <450	12%
TailC<180 TailC>242	6%
totLeakage<4600	5%
MCounter<800	0.011%
MCounter>160	9%
tot lost eff	39%

Efficiency per run



Run #	Energy [GeV]	XDWC2	YDWC2	PShower	TailC	totLeak	MCounter	Efficiency
992	110	0.7%	3%	16%	6%	5%	9%	61%
982	120	0.7%	2%	16%	5%	5%	9%	62%
983	130	0.6%	3%	16%	4%	4%	8%	65%
988	140	0.7%	3%	16%	3%	3%	7%	68%
989	150	0.6%	3%	16%	2%	2%	6%	71%
990	160	0.6%	3%	15%	2%	1%	5%	73%
991	170	0.6 %	3%	15%	1%	1%	5%	74%

The most fluctuating variables are TailC, totLeak and MuonCounter. I can try to tune better the totLeak, while the other cuts depend on the pedestals.

tot Cherenkov energy



tot Scintillant energy



Analysis scope

Energy contribution for muons in the calorimeter:


- Ionizing
- Radiation emissions

For geometric reasons, the cherenkov does not see the ionization (I), but only the radiation contribution (R).

While scintillator can see both.

muon ionizing
(landau)

Bremsstrahlung



Analysis scope

Consideration:

- cherenkov and scintillator are calibrated at the same energy value
- that the radiation contribution is energy **dependent**.


We expect that:

$$S(E) = I_1 + R(E)$$


$$C(E) = I_2 + R(E)$$

$S(E) - R(E) = I_1 - I_2$ which is constant in energy, (if we suppose the ionizing contribution is constant as well).


The idea is to reproduce the plot on the right measured with DREAM, in this [article](#), where the difference $S - C$ was found to be constant.



S-C Muon Energy




S-C Muon Energy



S vs C correlation

For the S-C subtraction, I could not directly propagate the error since the uncertainty was overestimated. We have to take into account also the strong correlation between the two distributions. (Thanks Bob for the suggestion).



Conclusions

- Proposal of several cuts on ancillaries, looking at the pedestals
- Efficiency decrease with the energy run increasing, can be tuned a bit better the totLeak, but not sure how to proceed with Muon Counter and Tail Catcher.
- The new cuts remove totally the “gaussian” peak
- The Scintillant and Cherenkov distribution results correlated, necessary to take it into consideration for the uncertainty estimation of S-C
- S-C good estimation as constant

To Do:

Energy Mean calculated as the MPV of a landau fit and see the results

Something else?