#### Hadron Calorimetry with 1-2 bits

Vishnu V. Zutshi NIU/NICADD



## Introduction

 We are basically talking about a calorimeter with a finite number of thresholds (1-3)

 Will look at gas and scintillator: energy resolution shower widths <u>clustering</u>





#### Ncells for hadrons

![](_page_3_Figure_1.jpeg)

# Single particle resolutions

![](_page_4_Figure_1.jpeg)

# Single Particle Resolution (10GeV)

![](_page_5_Figure_1.jpeg)

# Single Particle Resolution (50GeV)

![](_page_6_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### Nhit correlations

![](_page_7_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### Nhit correlations

![](_page_8_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### Nhit correlations

![](_page_9_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### Alternatively..

![](_page_10_Figure_1.jpeg)

# Compensation

 So in a sense counting has its own version of the compensation problem in scintillators

- With multiple threshold this can be overcome by weighting cells differently (according to the threshold they passed)
- In MC 3 thresholds seem to be adequate

![](_page_11_Picture_4.jpeg)

#### After semi-digital treatment

![](_page_12_Figure_1.jpeg)

# Single Particle Resolution (50 GeV)

![](_page_13_Figure_1.jpeg)

### Similar treatment to 10 GeV....

![](_page_14_Figure_1.jpeg)

# Single particle resolutions

![](_page_15_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_16_Figure_0.jpeg)

# ToF dependence

![](_page_17_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### 1cm x 1cm scintillator

![](_page_19_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Picture_2.jpeg)

#### Gas vs. scintillator

![](_page_20_Figure_1.jpeg)

2'

# Single particle resolutions

![](_page_21_Figure_1.jpeg)

# Non-linearity

- Note that the nhit/GeV does not remain constant
- This will introduce additional pressure on the constant term
- For scintillator the non-linearity can be effectively removed by 'semi-digital' treatment

![](_page_23_Picture_0.jpeg)

- Need a hierarchy in the absence of an energy measurement
- Clumpiness of the surrounding
- A simple-minded realization of this used here:

 $d_i = \Sigma (1/dR_{ij})$  where  $dR_{ij}$  is the angular

distance between cell 'i' and cell

![](_page_23_Picture_6.jpeg)

### 10 GeV π<sup>±</sup>

#### Thanks Ben

![](_page_24_Figure_2.jpeg)

# Density vs. E

Gas (1cm x 1cm)	Scint (1cm x 1cm)	Scint (3cm x 3cm)
10	40-	40-
19 -	39 -	39-
7-	38-	38-
77 - 16 -	36-	36-
5-	35- 0 0	35-
4 -	34-	34-
3-	33-	33-
12-	32-	32-
1-	31-	31-
9-	30	29-
	28-	28-1
7-	27 - <b>matil ma</b>	
16 <b>-</b>	26-	26-
5-0	25-	25-22222222222222222222222222222222222
4 -	24-	24-
3-	23-	23-
2-	22-	22-
0-	20-	
9-1		
8-	18-	18-
7-	17-	17-
6-	16-	16-
5-0	15-	15-
4-	14-	14-
3-	13-	13-
1-5	12	112
0-1		
- 9-11		
8-	8- <sup>1</sup> 11111111111111111111111111111111111	
7-11	7- <mark></mark>	7-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1
6-	6-	6-
5-	5-	5-
4-	4-	4-
0.000 0.005 0.010 0.015 0.020 0.025 0.030 0.035 0.040 0.045 0	.050 0.000 0.005 0.010 0.015 0.020 0.025 0.030 0.035 0.040 0.045 0.050	0.000 0.005 0.010 0.015 0.020 0.025 0.030 0.035 0.040 0.045 0.050

# Width Definition

• Find centroid  $\{w_i x_i / \Sigma w_i\}$ • 'width' =  $sqrt(w_i dR_i^2/w_i)$ • Three w<sub>i</sub> were used: Unweighted (=1) E weighted (=cell energy) 'Density' weighted (nearest neighbor occupancy in 5x5 window in lyrs n-1, n, n+1

#### Distance to Farthest Cell

![](_page_27_Figure_1.jpeg)

### Density of Farthest Cell

![](_page_28_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### Distance to Farthest Cell

![](_page_29_Figure_1.jpeg)

### Density of Farthest Cell

![](_page_30_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### Backscatter

![](_page_31_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### Shower Width for 10GeV $\pi^{\pm}$

![](_page_32_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### Shower Width for 50GeV $\pi^{\pm}$

![](_page_33_Figure_1.jpeg)

# π<sup>±</sup> Angular Width

![](_page_34_Figure_1.jpeg)

# π<sup>±</sup> Angular Width

![](_page_35_Figure_1.jpeg)

# π<sup>±</sup> Angular Width

![](_page_36_Figure_1.jpeg)

# Comments

- Previous slides indicate that shower separation may not suffer at all
- There is no clear cut case either way at the moment; detailed studies of assessing impact needed
- Going to look at cluster separability next
- Need to evaluate this in the global context of calorimeter performance

![](_page_38_Picture_0.jpeg)

- Local 'density' maxima based clustering seems to work
- Alternative to track initiated clustering
- Can be used in the ECal and HCal
- Full PFlow implementation has shown encouraging results

![](_page_38_Picture_5.jpeg)

# 10 GeV $\pi^0$

![](_page_39_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_40_Figure_0.jpeg)

 $D\pi$ 

# Summary

- Large phase space in the nbitsegmentation plane for hadron calorimetry. Is there an optimum? The answer may be medium dependent.
- Scintillator and Gas 'digital' calorimeters behave differently
- Needs verification in data
- More studies underway

![](_page_41_Picture_5.jpeg)