

---

Subject: EMC energy and position correction  
Posted by [donghee](#) on Thu, 17 Jul 2014 21:56:49 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Hi all experts,

I am interested in the way of EMC correction.

I have learn that GetEnergyCorrected() of the PndEmcCluster is obsolete and in principle should be removed.

Instead of above method, corrected energy can be accessed by PndEmcClusterCalibrator class via fEmcCalibrator->Energy(cluster).

It looks like following way.

Quote:

```
PndEmcAbsClusterCalibrator * calibrator1=  
PndEmcClusterCalibrator::MakeEmcClusterCalibrator(1, version);  
...  
PndEmcCluster *cluster=(PndEmcCluster*)cluster_array->At(i);  
Double_t energy_corr1 = calibrator1->Energy(cluster);
```

What is the difference between old method GetEnergyCorrected() and new method suggested above?

New method for EMC calibration can be only used, if we are working on the EMC cluster. In the pure analysis level, we have only neutral candidate thus we don't have a chance to calibrate them.

However, at analysis level neutral candidate has an information of EMC calibrated energy, which can be accessed by GetEmcCalEnergy().

What is this correctly? Is it created with new methods? or still from old method using GetEnergyCorrected().

Best wishes,  
Donghee

---

Subject: Re: EMC energy and position correction  
Posted by [StefanoSpataro](#) on Thu, 17 Jul 2014 22:31:44 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In the neutral candidate the energy is already calibrated, using the correct PndEmcClusterCalibrator.

---

Subject: Re: EMC energy and position correction  
Posted by [donghee](#) on Fri, 18 Jul 2014 09:57:38 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Hi Stefano,

The cluster calibrator has two different methods. The first one is with histogram and the other one is based on the parametrization.

In our standard calibration for neutral candidates in PID correlator is the histogram method. (I checked in PndPidCorrelator)

And geometry version is set to 3 during EMC calibration.

But in PndEmcClusterCalibrator I found only version 1.

Quote:

```
// Versions of the correction:
```

```
// 1 -
```

```
"emc_module12.dat", "emc_module3_2011_new.root", "emc_module4_StraightGeo24.4.root",  
"emc_module5_fsc.root" (+ full PANDA geometry) TGeant3
```

What is the geometry configuration with version=3?

Best wishes,  
Donghee

---

Subject: Re: EMC energy and position correction  
Posted by [donghee](#) on Fri, 18 Jul 2014 10:05:14 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi Stefano,

I found the meaning of version.  
That is related correction parameters in macro/param/

```
emc_correction_hist_gamma_1.root  
emc_correction_hist_gamma_2.root  
emc_correction_hist_gamma_3.root  
emc_correction_hist_gamma_4.root
```

So one more question is what is the difference between them?

I assume that most likely version 4 is the latest calibration file.

Best wishes,  
Donghee

---

Subject: Re: EMC energy and position correction

Posted by [Dima Melnychuk](#) on Fri, 18 Jul 2014 10:44:10 GMT

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

---

Hi Donghee,

In the post

[https://forum.gsi.de/index.php?t=tree&th=4030&goto=15671&#msg\\_15671](https://forum.gsi.de/index.php?t=tree&th=4030&goto=15671&#msg_15671)

the versions are explained.

Dima

---

---

Subject: Re: EMC energy and position correction

Posted by [Stefano Spataro](#) on Fri, 18 Jul 2014 11:03:40 GMT

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

---

Hi Dima,

currently in the pid correlator we are using:

```
fEmcCalibrator= PndEmcClusterCalibrator::MakeEmcClusterCalibrator(1, 3);  
Should it be corrected to 2,3?
```

---

---

Subject: Re: EMC energy and position correction

Posted by [Dima Melnychuk](#) on Fri, 18 Jul 2014 11:49:10 GMT

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

---

Hi Stefano,

```
fEmcCalibrator= PndEmcClusterCalibrator::MakeEmcClusterCalibrator(1, 3);
```

is proper version

2,3 appeared to be buggy.

Dima

---

---

Subject: Re: EMC energy and position correction

Posted by [Stefano Spataro](#) on Fri, 18 Jul 2014 11:57:33 GMT

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

---

Thanks, in the old post you were suggesting to use 2,3. Just to be sure.

---