
Subject: Strategy discussion on Track objects
Posted by [Ralf Kliemt](#) on Wed, 29 Apr 2009 12:05:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hello everyone,

Currently we have several track objects:

Quote:genfit: Track, TrackCand

pnddata: PndTrack, PndTrackCand

lhetrack: PndTpcLheCMTrack (monte carlo track?), PndTpcLheTrack, PndLhePidTrack

riemannfit: PndRiemannTrack, PndTpcRiemannTrack

trackbase: FairTrackPar

stt: PndSttTrack

gem: PndGemTrack

dch: PndDchTrack

fsim: PndFsmTrack

tpc: PndTpcClusterTrack

Now the question is how we can proceed.

My first suggestion on this is to get rid of the detector specific objects by using only PndTrack and PndTrackCand. Be reminded to make use of the detector numbering definitions in pnddata/PndDetectorList.h.

The second point is more complex and is regarded to the unification of the track objects used by the finders and fitters in general. A point which was made is that a track object should be able to provide a propagation functionality. This however conflicts with the policy to have data classes only storing their data, as far as I think.

I would be glad to have some comments by the different experts on this. When it is needed to discuss this more directly I'll set up an evo meeting.

Kind regards, Ralf.
