

---

Subject: eta\_c drop in efficiency

Posted by [Gianluigi Boca](#) on Wed, 19 Oct 2011 16:02:01 GMT

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

---

hello,

I investigated the discrepancy in efficiency in the Eta\_c channel when using the july11 release or the latest trunk version. ( pandaroot/macro/run/tdrct/eta\_c directory).

In my opinion the problem is in the generation/digitization of the Eta\_c events.

In fact, when I use the events generated and digitized (i.e. the evt\_points\_stt.root and evt\_params\_stt.root and evt\_digi\_stt.root files) with the july11 libraries AND I ANALYSE THEM WITH THE CURRENT TRUNK REVISION I obtain the same Eta\_c plots obtained when I ANALYSE THE SAME EVENTS WITH THE july11 VERSION OF THE CODE.

Please look at the attachment plots : trunk.pdf is when the analysis is done with trunk, july11.pdf when I use the july11 library.

Gianluigi

#### File Attachments

---

- 1) [trunk.pdf](#), downloaded 485 times
  - 2) [july11.pdf](#), downloaded 423 times
- 

---

Subject: Re: eta\_c drop in efficiency

Posted by [Dima Melnychuk](#) on Wed, 19 Oct 2011 20:22:42 GMT

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

---

Hi Gianluigi,

From the plots you posted, actually I see that the number of counts in eta\_c peak for trunk is 2 times lower than for july11. Number of entries in histograms are almost the same but it's not an indicative number since it includes underflow/overflow.

Dima

---

---

Subject: Re: eta\_c drop in efficiency

Posted by [Stefano Spataro](#) on Thu, 20 Oct 2011 08:00:09 GMT

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

---

Probably using the same bin range and size would be helpful to compare the plots. And I admit I have not well understood what you have done exactly.

---