

---

Subject: Re: plane id in track candidate

Posted by [Tobias Stockmanns](#) on Tue, 23 Feb 2010 19:48:18 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Dear Radek,

I am not in favor for your suggestion to separate the detectorId and the type of data which is stored. The data is structured in different ways in the subdetectors.

In my point of view all branches stored in a root file should have a unique ID to retrieve the data in an automatic way. This is mandatory to use the MC information propagation as I tried to explain in my presentation during the last EVO meeting.

If you replace now the single enum fDetectorType by two you can have combinations that are not reasonable (for example MVD plus bump) and for me it is not clear how to match non-detector data in this scheme.

I fear we are mixing up two different things. The structure of the detector enum and the request to have a common planeId for each hit. In the MVD such a method to get the planeID already exists. The STT and the TPC do not need such a thing, so only the GEMs are missing. We could think about a common interface which should clearly go into the FairHit but to change the enum has nothing to do with it.

I thought that we fixed the enum last EVO meeting but we can discuss this again during the PANDA meeting in two weeks.

Just as a remark. The Riemann track finder in the MVD already excludes hits on the same detector for one track.

Cheers,

Tobias

---