Subject: Re: update stable branch...
Posted by Lia Lavezzi on Tue, 26 Jan 2010 11:16:05 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hi Johan,
 thank you for giving me the print outs

Among the two limits in the resolution test, the upper limit is the really important one. The lower limit was just put there to check if too big statistical fluctuations were present (which might be related to some bugs), but it is also possible that while improving the code and fixing the bugs, the resolution gets better and so it turns out to be better than expected...

In this case I think it could be just a matter of statistics. The limits were tuned on 100 events, but I have seen that the number of events in macro 1 (which are then reconstructed in macro 2 and histogrammed in macro 3) has been turned from 100 to 50 some time ago by Mohammad.

Just to understand what to do, what was the reason for this? Are 100 events (with 6 track each, 3 mu+ and 3 mu-) too many for a qa macro? If so, no problem , I will change the limits for the tests to test only 50 events (I will enlarge them a little to account for bigger fluctuations from my values). If on the contrary it is possible to go back to 100 events, I would like to do it, just to lower the statistical fluctuations and see if everything runs fine. Mohammad, what do you think about this?

In any case, it seems to me that there is nothing we have to worry about for the code itself, it is just the macro that has to be fixed (in one of the two ways), since from the numbers: 0.0248863 is just like 0.025 and 0.0176549 is like 0.018

Please let me know about the number of events to use and I will fix the macro accordingly.

Cheers,
  Lia.