
Subject: Checking psi(2s) with genfit2

Posted by [StefanoSpataro](#) on Tue, 15 Mar 2016 15:33:12 GMT

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

Dear all,

I decided to test genfit2 performances with the psi(2S) sample macros we are using from our analysis qa, i.e. psi(2s) -> J/psi pi+pi- and J/psi->mu+ mu-

I am comparing results with genfit1 (1 iteration) with genfit2 (1 iteration) and genfit2 (3 iterations).

I have taken the macros in macro/qa/run3 and modified the reco_complete and the pid_complete, in the following way:

reco_complete.C

Genfit1: untouched

Genfit2: PndRecoKalmanTask2 instead of PndRecoKalmanTask for both TS and FS kalman tasks. Removed the lines SetTrackRep(0);

Genfit2 3 iter: as Genfit2, but adding the lines ->SetNumIterations(3) for both TS and FS kalman tasks

pid_complete.C

In the three cases, in order to remove the "non fitted tracks" selection (which does not work in genfit2 up to now), added corr->SetFlagCut(kFALSE);

Here the comparison genfit1 (1 iter) vs genfit2 (1 iter):

genfit2 (1 iter) vs genfit2 (3 iter)

genfit2 (3 iter) vs genfit1 (1 iter)

For 1 iteration genfit, it seems that genfit2 has more counts than genfit1 in the low p range (below 0.3 GeV/c), but checking the full truth match invariant mass distributions, J/psi is narrower with genfit1 while psi(2s) is more or less the same.














Comparing genfit2 with 1 and 3 iterations, we can see that the gain in low p vanishes, maybe they were just fakes and with 3 iterations such tracks are ruled out. The J/psi and psi(2s) invariant mass are almost equivalent.

Comparing genfit2 3 iterations against genfit1, even in this case genfit1 seems to win but just for a bit.














Are these results coherent to what presented before?

File Attachments

1) [comp_gf2_gf.gif](#), downloaded 725 times



2) [comp_gf2_gf23.gif](#), downloaded 795 times



3) [comp_gf23_gf.gif](#), downloaded 680 times

