

Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare Sezione di Roma Tre



# KLM overview and µ identification algorithm

#### Alberto Martini University & INFN Roma Tre

5th Starter Kit, 30 January 2020, PID session - μID

















Only scintillators;





### KLM layers: RPC and scintillators

#### **RPC= Resistive Plate Chamber**

Gas detector supplied with 4.7kV

2.4 mm thick float glass (73% SiO2, 14% Na2O, 9% CaO, and 4%)

#### **Scintillator strips:**

Supplied with ~73V

Wavelength shifting (WLS) fibers coupling and photons read out by silicon photomultiplier (SiPMs)



### KLM layers: RPC and scintillators

Supplied with ~73V

**Scintillator strips:** 

Wavelength shifting (WLS) fibers coupling and

photons read out by silicon photomultiplier

#### **RPC= Resistive Plate Chamber**

Gas detector supplied with 4.7kV

#### 2.4 mm thick float glass (73% SiO2, 14% Na2O, 9% CaO, and 4%)

![](_page_7_Figure_4.jpeg)

Alberto Martini - Physics/Performance session - 34th B2GM - 23 October 2019

### KLM and µID acceptance

![](_page_8_Figure_1.jpeg)

Range of $\theta$ (radians)	Range of $\theta$ (degrees)	
$0.820 < \theta < 2.129$	$47^{\circ} < \theta < 122^{\circ}$	
$0.646 < \theta < 0.820 \ + \ 2.129 < \theta < 2.269$	$37^{\circ} < \theta < 47^{\circ} + 122^{\circ} < \theta < 130^{\circ}$	
$0.314 < \theta < 0.646 \ + \ 2.269 < \theta < 2.705$	$18^{\circ} < \theta < 37^{\circ} + 130^{\circ} < \theta < 155^{\circ}$	
$0.646 < \theta < 2.269$	$37^{\circ} < \theta < 130^{\circ}$	
$0.314 < \theta < 0.820 + 2.129 < \theta < 2.705$	$18^{\circ} < \theta < 47^{\circ} + 122^{\circ} < \theta < 155^{\circ}$	

![](_page_8_Picture_3.jpeg)

### KLM and µID acceptance

![](_page_9_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_9_Picture_2.jpeg)

### $\mu$ and K<sub>L</sub> difference (I)

KLM provides 3.9 hadronic interaction lengths of material, beyond the 0.8 interaction lengths of the calorimeter

![](_page_10_Picture_2.jpeg)

# $\mu$ and K<sub>L</sub> difference (I)

KLM provides 3.9 hadronic interaction lengths of material, beyond the 0.8 interaction lengths of the calorimeter

#### **Muons characteristics:**

Muons have a high penetration power (no hadronic interactions) → crossing lot of matter before being stopped. Muons can reach the outermosts layers of KLM leaving a very contained interaction shower

![](_page_11_Figure_4.jpeg)

**µ:** 0.7 GeV in Fe→~12 MeV/cm lost

![](_page_11_Picture_5.jpeg)

# $\mu$ and K<sub>L</sub> difference (I)

KLM provides 3.9 hadronic interaction lengths of material, beyond the 0.8 interaction lengths of the calorimeter

#### **Muons characteristics:**

Muons have a high penetration power (no hadronic interactions) → crossing lot of matter before being stopped. Muons can reach the outermosts layers of KLM leaving a very contained interaction shower

#### $K_L^0$ characteristics:

 $K_L^0$  can hadronically interact in the KLM or the calorimeter  $\rightarrow$  hadronic showers appear in the KLM  $\rightarrow$  clear  $K_L^0$  signature

![](_page_12_Figure_6.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Picture_7.jpeg)

### $\mu$ and K<sub>L</sub> difference (II)

![](_page_13_Figure_1.jpeg)

# $\mu$ and K<sub>L</sub> difference (II)

![](_page_14_Figure_1.jpeg)

Belle II

#### **Muons**

Geant4e is used to extrapolate tracks reconstructed from the inner detectors by the tracking software

When the track reaches the KLM layers the  $\mu$ ID algorithm provides the probability of the track to be a muon.

### $\mu$ and K<sub>L</sub> difference (II)

![](_page_15_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### **Muons**

Geant4e is used to extrapolate tracks reconstructed from the inner detectors by the tracking software

When the track reaches the KLM layers the  $\mu$ ID algorithm provides the probability of the track to be a muon.

KL Reconstructed by looking at KLM signals only. Usage of clusters (bunch of consequential layers)

![](_page_15_Picture_6.jpeg)

#### **Algorithm steps:**

• Track extrapolated from last CDC layer hit towards the KLM. Always µ hypothesis.

![](_page_16_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_16_Picture_4.jpeg)

#### **Algorithm steps:**

- Track extrapolated from last CDC layer hit towards the KLM. Always µ hypothesis.
- Check the presence of hits in KLM layers within  $3.5\sigma$  from the extrapolated position.

![](_page_17_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_17_Picture_5.jpeg)

#### **Algorithm steps:**

- Track extrapolated from last CDC layer hit towards the KLM. Always µ hypothesis.
- Check the presence of hits in KLM layers within  $3.5\sigma$  from the extrapolated position.

![](_page_18_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Picture_5.jpeg)

#### **Algorithm steps:**

- Track extrapolated from last CDC layer hit towards the KLM. Always µ hypothesis.
- Check the presence of hits in KLM layers within  $3.5\sigma$  from the extrapolated position.
- If there are hits in the KLM layers  $\rightarrow$  the track is considered most likely as a muon.

![](_page_19_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Picture_6.jpeg)

# µID probability calculation (I)

 $L_{\text{Ln}}$ = probability of having a hit in the Ln layer, for a particle hypothesis (MC pre-calculation)  $L_{\text{long}} = \prod_{n=1}^{n_{OuterExt}} L_{\text{Ln}}$  is the longitudinal probability of a track to be the hypothesised particle.

![](_page_20_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Picture_3.jpeg)

# µID probability calculation (I)

 $L_{\text{Ln}}$  = probability of having a hit in the Ln layer, for a particle hypothesis (MC pre-calculation)  $L_{\text{long}} = \prod_{n=1}^{n_{OuterExt}} L_{\text{Ln}}$  is the longitudinal probability of a track to be the hypothesised particle.

In order to correctly treat inefficient layers, if there are no hits in the layer  $\rightarrow$  take into account efficiencies and store: 1-  $L_{Ln}$  \* Eff<sub>Ln</sub>

![](_page_21_Figure_3.jpeg)

Algorithm is corrected for both BKLM and EKLM since release 4

![](_page_21_Picture_5.jpeg)

# µID probability calculation (II)

Following the same layer per layer logic the  $L_{\chi^2}$  probability is also defined and it depends on how much broad the hit pattern made by the tracks is (due to transverse shower effects)

The  $\mu$  hypothesis follows the reduced  $\chi 2$  distribution.

![](_page_22_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_22_Picture_4.jpeg)

 $L_{\chi^2}$  has significantly less discrimination power of L defined in the previous slide

Alberto Martini - Physics/Performance session - 34th B2GM - 23 October 2019

# µID problems

#### The most relevant issues with the algorithm are:

• Very similar behaviour from other particles (mostly pions).  $\mu$ - $\pi$  discrimination can be done almost completely by the KLM.

The interaction length  $\lambda_l$  for a pion of p~few GeV is:

 $\lambda_l = \frac{A}{\sigma N_A \rho} \simeq$  17 cm in iron

• Low momentum regions: tracks do not reach KLM for kinematics reasons

![](_page_23_Picture_6.jpeg)

# µID problems

#### The most relevant issues with the algorithm are:

• Very similar behaviour from other particles (mostly pions).  $\mu$ - $\pi$  discrimination can be done almost completely by the KLM.

The interaction length  $\lambda_l$  for a pion of p~few GeV is:

$$\lambda_l = \frac{A}{\sigma N_A \rho} \simeq 17 \text{ cm in iron}$$

• Low momentum regions: tracks do not reach KLM for kinematics reasons

#### **Recoverable issues:**

- Not instrumented regions;
- KLM inefficiencies;

Direct implication on pion fake rate  $\rightarrow$  not having some hits allows the algorithm to identify tracks more likely as hadrons

![](_page_24_Picture_10.jpeg)

### µID performances

 $\mu$  ID eff VS  $\mu$  momentum

![](_page_25_Figure_2.jpeg)

μID performances depend a lot on the momentum of the tracks:

Once  $\mu$  reaches KLM performances are good

Remember  $\mu$  energy looses from the first slides...

0.7 GeV is the minimum momentum to reach KLM

![](_page_25_Picture_7.jpeg)

### µID performances

 $\mu$  ID eff VS  $\mu$  theta Efficiency / (0.1 rad)  $= 0.6 \\ 5 \\ = 0.6 \\ = 0.6 \\ 5 \\ = 0.6 \\ 5 \\ = 0.6 \\ 5 \\ = 0.6 \\ 5 \\ = 0.6 \\$ μμ**(**γ) 0.4 MC 0.3 0.2 **EKLM EKLM BKLM** 0.1 0<sup>1</sup> 0 0.5 2.5 1.5 2 Theta [rad]

### $\mu$ ID performances depend a lot on the polar angle $\theta$ of the tracks:

If  $\mu$  pass through instrumented part of the detector  $\rightarrow$  performances are good

Between BKLM and EKLM there is a small no instrumented area...

![](_page_26_Picture_5.jpeg)

Alberto Martini - Physics/Performance session - 34th B2GM - 23 October 2019

### µID performances

![](_page_27_Figure_1.jpeg)

 $\mu$ ID performances depend a lot on the polar angle  $\theta$  of the tracks:

If  $\mu$  pass through instrumented part of the detector  $\rightarrow$  performances are good

Between BKLM and EKLM there is a small no instrumented area...

remember the chimney?

![](_page_27_Picture_6.jpeg)

### KLM and µID acceptance

![](_page_28_Figure_1.jpeg)

µID behaviour based on data performances:

#### µID momentum behaviour:

- P<0.7GeV μ do not reach KLM</li>
  0.7 GeV < P < 1 GeV μ reach KLM but no much info</li>
- P > 1 GeV  $\mu$  reach KLM and most of them exit it.

#### $\mu$ ID $\theta$ acceptance:

EKLM- backward: 131°-142° BKLM: 40°-51° - 115°-131° EKLM-forward: 24° - 40°

![](_page_28_Picture_8.jpeg)

### Summary and µID references

- KLM subdetector is made of layer of Resistive Place Chambers, scintillators (active volumes) and iron (absorber)  $\rightarrow$  Aim: identify long lived particles:  $K_L^0$  and  $\mu$
- *µ* identification algorithm working principle is based on the penetration power of muons in the material and <u>*NOW*</u> it takes into account KLM efficiencies.
- $K_L^0$  identification algorithm is not yet in a good shape: work is ongoing
- $\mu$  identification performances are giving good results and additional work is going on:
  - -Fine tuning of the algorithm and debug (if necessary) [A. Martini]
  - Performances in different channels:  $J/\Psi$  decay,  $\mu\mu(\gamma)$  and 4I events and more to come [all interested people, so far: Yo Sato, A. Martini, M. Milesi]
  - -Performance comparison with different approaches, like MVA [M. Milesi, Jo Yamanouchi]
  - $-\pi$  fake-rate study using different channels: J/ $\Psi$  K<sub>S</sub> [**D.** Ferlewicz, **M.** Milesi, A. Martini],
    - $\tau \rightarrow 3\pi$  (P. Feichtinger, N. Molina, A. Martini), D<sup>\*</sup>  $\rightarrow$  D  $\pi$  (all interested people, so far S. Sandilya, J. Strube)
  - Data analysis results/official plots on J/\mathcal{Y} [G. De Pietro, D. Farlewicz, Yosuke Yusa, M. Milesi], on 4l [Yo Sato, Akimasa Ishikawa]

# Emergency slides!!

![](_page_30_Picture_1.jpeg)

### RPC strips detail

layer	phi strips	z strips
1	37	54 (*38)
2	42	54 (*38)
3	36	48 (*34)
4	36	48 (*34)
5	36	48 (*34)
6	36	48 (*34)
7	48	48 (*34)
8	48	48 (*34)
9	48	48 (*34)
10	48	48 (*34)
11	48	48 (*34)
12	48	48 (*34)
13	48	48 (*34)
14	48	48 (*34)
15	48	48 (*34)

\* backward, sector#3, z strips are fewer, due to the chimney