
Subject: Eta_c efficiency

Posted by [Gianluigi Boca](#) on Fri, 25 Nov 2011 18:20:37 GMT

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

Hi,

I modified again PndSttMvdTracking.cxx in order to get the 'old' efficiency level, as in July11 release, for the Eta_c channel.

The difference, as anticipated, was a stricter cut on the association of the Parallel STT hits.

Please analyzers update and try again at your convenience

Tschuess Gianluigi

Subject: Re: Eta_c efficiency

Posted by [Dima Melnychuk](#) on Sun, 27 Nov 2011 22:27:15 GMT

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

Hi,

I just want to quote two numbers concerning eta_c reconstruction efficiency I obtained with 1000 events statistics.

Before the last modification I obtained 28.4% after it 30.9%, so indeed it improves additionally reconstruction efficiency.

Both numbers are for the same data set.

It's still a question how those numbers changes with higher statistics.

Dima

Subject: Re: Eta_c efficiency

Posted by [Dima Melnychuk](#) on Mon, 28 Nov 2011 11:43:20 GMT

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

Hi,

Just an additional number for eta_c efficiency.

For the data produced on grid without latest update I have eta_c reconstruction efficiency 23.5% with analysed 70.000 events.

Somehow with the grid data I have efficiency lower than with data produced by myself (28.4%). And it's not the first time I observe this behaviour.

Dima

Subject: Re: Eta_c efficiency

Posted by [StefanoSpataro](#) on Mon, 28 Nov 2011 15:05:21 GMT

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

Could you please check if some subjob has 0 entries in the tree? Maybe there are some empty files, maybe...

Subject: Re: Eta_c efficiency
Posted by [Dima Melnychuk](#) on Mon, 28 Nov 2011 16:14:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Event if there are files which has 0 entries in the tree it would not change the efficiency which I quote since I normalise for the actual number of entries, at least if it is obtained correctly from:

```
PndEventReader evr(inPidFile);  
nevs=evr.GetEntries();
```

Subject: Re: Eta_c efficiency
Posted by [Stefano Spataro](#) on Mon, 28 Nov 2011 16:43:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Considering that the efficiency is something like 20%, there should be no empty files. In such a case, maybe the reconstruction macros had some problems and have created a tree with no entry, without giving an error. The subjob is simply failing and it should not be counted in the 70000 statistics.

But I don't know if this can happen.

Subject: Re: Eta_c efficiency
Posted by [Dima Melnychuk](#) on Tue, 29 Nov 2011 13:43:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi,

With the latest STT reconstruction update the following results are obtained for eta_c channel with data produced on grid.

run926 (99500 events, copy of one file (500 events) fails)
Invariant mass distribution:

Reconstruction efficiency - 25.8%, result is good but again somehow lower than I obtained with 1000 events (30.9%)
 $\sigma(\eta_c)=31.6$ MeV, $\sigma(\phi)=3.87$ MeV

With cleanup - run926cu

Efficiency drops to 18.1%, but still is reasonable.
 $\sigma(\eta_c)=28.7$ MeV, $\sigma(\phi)=3.70$ MeV



And here are the multiplicities of charged tracks, without and with cleanup:

So I still try to understand why on grid efficiency is lower than I have locally, but otherwise data look reasonable.



Dima

File Attachments

1) [mfinal_926.png](#), downloaded 1198 times




2) [mfinal_926cu.png](#), downloaded 1181 times




3) [n_charged926.png](#), downloaded 1036 times

n charged



4) [n_charged926cu.png](#), downloaded 1198 times

n charged



Subject: Re: Eta_c efficiency

Posted by [Gianluigi Boca](#) on Tue, 29 Nov 2011 14:42:50 GMT

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

Hi Dima,
is the 'cleanup' result obtained with the DPM Background or not yet ?
Gianluigi

Subject: Re: Eta_c efficiency

Posted by [Stefano Spataro](#) on Tue, 29 Nov 2011 14:54:31 GMT

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

Without