

Stephen Kay University of Regina

01/04/20

- Trying to use RF timing in the same way SIDIS group are
 - $\circ~$ They have had some success in using the RF timing info for PID
- Whilst looking, I've also modified how I select prompt/random events in my script

01/04/20

18

2

Produced some other interesting PID plots

Selected Setting

- Want to see if RF timing can be used for PID
- Tested a set of runs from the spring
 - $Q^2 = 4.4 \ GeV^2c^{-2}$, $W = 2.74 \ GeV^2$, x = 0.4, centre setting, low ϵ
 - $P_{SHMS} = 5.389 \text{ GeV}/c$, $E_{Beam} = 8.2 \text{ GeV}$
 - Runs 7978–8002 (Excluding dummy)
- Chained all runs
 - Stats for proton are too crappy without doing this
- $\bullet\,$ This run had lots of "odd" kaon events with missing mass $\sim 0.85\,\,GeV/c^2$
 - Made some new PID plots to look into this a little more
- Applied fairly standard cuts to select particles

Common Cuts

Stephen Kay

- Have some cuts common to all particle types in SHMS
- Want events with e^- in HMS and a hadron in SHMS

Table: Common cuts before PID, events *not* in the range shown are removed.

Cut	HMS	SHMS
δ	< 8	$-10 < \delta < 20$
θ	< 0.08	< 0.06
ϕ	< 0.045	< 0.04
E _{TotNorm}	> 0.7	N/a
HMS Cer NPE	> 1.5	N/a

01/04/20

4 / 18

University of Regina

PID Cuts - Detectors

Stephen Kay

- PID is by detector hits, namely the Aerogel and HGC
- ${\circ}\,$ Requirement for a 'hit' in the detector is that there is > 1.5 NPE for the event
- Hit combinations for π , K and p are summarised below

Table: Hit combinations in the HGC and Aerogel for each hadron species

Hadron	HGC Hit	Aerogel Hit
π	\checkmark	\checkmark
K	×	\checkmark
p	×	X


<u>01</u>/04/20

5 / 18

University of Regina

Kaon MM vs Aerogel NPE

- 2D plot of missing mass vs aerogel NPE for "kaon" events
- Low MM events only distributed in low NPE region



Kaon Missing mass vs Aerogel NPE

Stephen Kay

University of Regina

18


6

MM vs HGC X Position 1/3

• Know hole region will be problematic

University of Regina

 Looking at HGC NPE distribution in X and Y shows the hole clearly



01/04/20

18

7

Stephen Kay

MM vs HGC X Position 2/3

Stephen Kay

- Plotted missing mass vs HGC X position for pions and kaons
- In pion plot, see clear vertical band of "missing" events at around the position of the hole
 - Implies they potentially look like they do *not* pass the HGC cut, treated as kaons

1000
101

1.1
1.1

1.2
1.1

1.3
1.1

1.4
1.1

1.1
1.1

1.2
1.1

1.3
1.1

1.4
1.1

1.1
1.1

1.1
1.1

1.2
1.1

1.3
1.1

1.4
1.1

1.5
1.1

1.1
1.1

1.2
1.1

1.3
1.1

1.4
1.1

1.1
1.1

1.1
1.1

1.2
1.1

1.1
1.1

1.1
1.1

1.1
1.1

1.1
1.1

1.1
1.1

1.1
1.1

1.1
1.1

1.1
1.1

1.1
1.1

1.1
1.1

1.1
1.1

1.1
1.1

1.1
1.1

1.1
1.1

1.1
1.1

1.1
1.1

1.1
1.1

1.1
1.1

1.1
1.1

1.1
1.

01/04/20

18


8

University of Regina

Pion Missing mass vs HGC X Position

MM vs HGC X Position 3/3

 $\bullet\,$ For the kaons, see an enhanced vertical band at x=0, likely the pions leaking in



01/04/20

18

9

Kaon Missing mass vs HGC X Position

Stephen Kay University of Regina

- From discussion with Peter Bosted and Hem, need to take difference between RF time and hodoscope start time
- Need to add an offset this difference, then take modulo
 - $\,\circ\,$ Take mod 4.008 \rightarrow from bunch spacing for this run set
 - Found that offset of 801 worked best
- Value plotted as time difference is -

 $fmod(P.hod.fpHitsTime[0] - T.coin.pRF_tdcTime + 801, 4.008)$

• Reminder -

Stephen Kay

• $Q^2 = 4.4 \ GeV^2c^{-2}$, $W = 2.74 \ GeV^2$, x = 0.4, centre setting, low ϵ

•
$$P_{SHMS} = 5.389 \text{ GeV}/c$$
, $E_{Beam} = 8.2 \text{ GeV}$

University of Regina


RF Timing - Pions

Stephen Kay

- RF time differences, after common cuts, shown in blue
- Events with pion PID cuts applied shown in red

University of Regina

• Can clearly distinguish pions from some other particle



01/04/20


11

18

RF Timing - Kaons

Stephen Kay

- RF time differences, after common cuts, shown in blue
- Events with pion PID cuts applied shown in black
- Kaons harder to disentangle



01/04/20

12

18

University of Regina


RF Timing - Protons

Stephen Kay

- RF time differences, after common cuts, shown in blue
- Events with pion PID cuts applied shown in magenta
- Other particle appears to be protons

University of Regina

• This is also what we were seeing previously



01/04/20

13


18

RF Timing - All Particles

Stephen Kay

- All events, overlaid with pions, kaons and protons
- Proton separation from pion/kaon seems easy
- Distinguishing kaons and pions harder

University of Regina



01/04/20


14

18

RF Timing vs δ 1/3

- \bullet Looking at the RF time vs $\delta,$ we can again see how clear the pion/kaon vs proton separation is
- Shown in the plot below is the distribution for all events, after common cuts

mod((pRFTime - pHodFpTime + 801), 4.008) vs δ




18

RF Timing vs δ 2/3

• Shown in the plot below is the distribution for all pions • Notice the "gap" around $\delta = 0$

mod((pRFTime - pHodFpTime + 801), 4.008) vs δ , π PID



Stephen Kay

University of Regina

01/04/20


16

18

RF Timing vs δ 3/3

• Shown in the plot below is the distribution for all protons

mod((pRFTime - pHodFpTime + 801), 4.008) vs δ , proton PID



Stephen Kay

University of Regina

01/04/20

Discussion

- Need to look at random subtracted 1D RF diff distributions for kaons/protons
 - Have this for pions, didn't look too different, didn't have time to add it in for others yet
- How can we incorporate this into a wider PID strategy?
 - Can easily be used for pion/proton selection, less obvious that it can be done easily for kaons
- \bullet Looks like we can recover "protons" from our kaon event selection with this method, should remove the weird peak at 0.85 GeV/c² hopefully
 - ${\scriptstyle \circ }$ Will test this later
- Need to see how this looks for other settings
 - Need to test a 2 ns bunch spacing run too