Subject: Re: Forward spectrometer tracking
Posted by donghee on Thu, 04 Jun 2009 17:30:23 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Dear Christian,

Thank you for your kind teaching. I have few question to work the FS tracking, efficiently.
I have few references, but every suggestions indicate slightly different way. That is a bit confusing!
If I have some misconcept, please corret me!

Quote:
1. You would have to modify the recotasks/KalmanTask.cxx very slightly to contain hit producers for the three detectors.

2. take the following TClonesArray of reconstructed clusters and for each one I call the ctor SomeRecoHit(SomeCluster*).

3. a pattern recognition which makes one TrackCand object containing all clusters from the 3 detectors

4. If you would like to try this, I could tell you a little more with the TPC example, how it is done.

Concerning your comment 1:
Actually, we don't need to use MVDPoint, PndDchPoint and GEMPoint class, which are produced in simulation file for the fitting purpose. Is it correct?
Thus, I'm going to use hit containers in the digi file.
GEMHit, MVDHitPixel, MVDHitsStrip and PndDchCylinderHit classes are probably important to use three detectors.

Concerning your comment 2 & 3.
DemoPatternRecoTask or PndDchPrepareKalmanTracks has roughly same structure.
I assume that these two file has only different name, but they have same purpose.
They make a track candidate from local track including local detector hits!
This procedure can be called a pattern recognition, is it right?
After this setp, we have now quasi-reconstructed track(candidate) and quasi-reconstructed hit(according quasi-reconstructed track).
Finally, in the Kalmantask, the actual fitting can be performed for all quasi-reconstructed track candidate and find real reconstructed track candidate when the kalma fits are finished successfully.
I have one trouble to make clear understanding.
I thought that a pattern recognition simply can be made only with hit information as suggested in DemoPatternRecoTask.
But for example, PndDchPrepareKalman prefer to use local track, which is defined with one detector component in digi procedure.
I expect that it doesn't matter what we use, because local track have some hit information in any case. This is only different approach, is it correct?

Concerning your comment 4.
Where is it? Could you show me that?

Thank you for your time!
Cheers, donghee