Debugging reconstruction

Maria Brigida Brunetti, Andy Chappell and Steve Dennis for the Pandora team25/10/20238th UK LArTPC Software and Analysis Workshop



Reconstruction session



Credit: These slides are based on previous LArSoft workshop slides by Andrew Smith

Reconstruction is hard

- The events you've looked at so far have been relatively simple
- Two track-like trajectories emerging from a common vertex
- Nonetheless, you may have seen some surprising reconstruction results, e.g.:



- Most neutrino interactions will be more complex than this:
 - Track-like and shower-like topologies
 - Re-interactions
 - High particle multiplicity

You will come across mis-reconstructed events!



What can go wrong?

- Any given reconstruction failure can depend on a wide variety of minute details of the event under consideration
- However, a number of circumstances exist that more reliably cause problems
 - We'll give some examples in the next few slides!
- Combinations of these issues can lead to some bizarre reconstruction errors that make no sense unless you walk through the sequence of (often small) mistakes that produced the final outcome

Overlapping and back-to-back trajectories

- Neutrino interactions happen in 3D, but we have (typically) three, 2D projections of the interaction
- Trajectories that are clearly distinct in 3D can appear indistinguishable in a 2D projection
- If the trajectories can be distinguished in two of the projections, it is still possible to effectively reconstruct the 3D trajectories
- If overlap occurs in multiple views however, you'll likely lose a particle



Overlapping and back-to-back trajectories (2)

- Neutrino interactions happen in 3D, but we have (typically) three, 2D projections of the interaction
- Trajectories that are clearly distinct in 3D can appear indistinguishable in a 2D projection
- If the trajectories can be distinguished in two of the projections, it is still possible to effectively reconstruct the 3D trajectories

Example:

If one particle has a direction exactly opposite another, it's very likely the resultant straight-line will be reconstructed as a single particle



Small opening angles and sparse showers

- For showers, in particular, a small opening angle between two showers can make it challenging to determine to which shower the hits belong
- This can result in an incorrect distribution of hits among the showers, or to a complete merging of the two showers
- This is a common failure mode



Small opening angles and sparse showers (2)

- The opposite of this problem is shower fragmentation
- If there are large gaps between the hits belonging to a given shower, it can be difficult to merge them together and so showers can be broken into multiple reconstructed particles



Awkward trajectories

- Pandora runs on discrete hits that it receives from signal processing steps that run before it
- However those hits are extracted from continuous waveforms produced by the drift electrons as they pass by induction planes and get deposited on the collection plane



- If a particle trajectory is perpendicular to the wire planes, its drift electrons interact with a single wire/strip, from which it is challenging to extract hits
 - The result is a small number of wide hits (i.e. a high uncertainty in the position along the drift direction)
 - Such hits can be difficult to cluster



Awkward trajectories (2)

- This can also occur if the component parallel to the planes aligns with a wire/strip (though this will only affect one view)
- The final awkward trajectory is what we call the **isochronous case**, where each (most) points along a particle trajectory have a common x coordinate
 - This is not a problem for reconstruction within a single view, but matching clusters between views uses the common x coordinate as a means to relate the clusters and so having all of the hits sharing a common x coordinate can be very unhelpful



Identifying a misbehaving algorithm

- Different algorithms target different topologies and so use different criteria for decision making, which sometimes will be inappropriate
- If you see a reconstruction problem in your fully reconstructed event, it can be very useful to intercept the reconstruction at intermediate points to understand where things started to go wrong
- You can do this using the techniques from the previous exercise
 - 1) Add visualization algorithms at various points in the XML configuration
 - 2) Look to see if the clusters/PFOs at each point appear well reconstructed
 - 3) Make a judgment for example, highly fragmented trajectories are often fine if the algorithm that targets these fragments hasn't run yet

Identifying a misbehaving algorithm (2)

• If you find an algorithm that broke your event, you have two broad choices:

1. Tune the algorithm

to modify its decision making to avoid the mistake

2. Develop a new algorithm

specifically designed to fix the kind of mistake you've found

• Today, we'll look at tuning, because you don't have time to develop a new algorithm, but keep in mind, if you tune things too much for one event, you'll break others

A mis-reconstructed primary electron

- The event we'll be looking at today mis-reconstructs a primary electron
 - The MIP-like stub connecting to the interaction vertex and the downstream cascade are reconstructed as separate particles



- The 2D algorithms we want to investigate are Longitudinal and Transverse association and extension algorithms
- We'll spend the next couple of slides getting an idea of what these algorithms do and then move onto the exercise to try to fix them



Longitudinal algorithms

- Given two relatively long (i.e. having welldefined directions) clusters, the longitudinal algorithms will check to see that they are end-to-end
 - Small, partially configurable, tolerances for gaps between clusters or overlap of clusters are allowed
- During association fits are performed of the upstream cluster and the downstream cluster
 - Directions must align to within a specified angular tolerance
 - Extremal points of the fits must be within specified longitudinal and transverse displacements
 - If these checks pass, clusters can be merged

Example: Longitudinal Association algorithm



Longitudinal algorithms

- During extension fits are performed that consider local direction at the extrema of clusters
 - Vertices must be within specified distances
 - Local directions should align within specified angular tolerances and impact parameters must be within specified displacements
 - If these checks pass, clusters can be merged

You can influence these decisions by tweaking allowed displacements and angular tolerances!



Example: Longitudinal Association algorithm



Transverse algorithms

- Transverse tracks tend to be somewhat shorter and more fragmented in early clustering, so direction tends to be less well-defined
 - Clusters are grouped into short, medium and long groups
 - Try to establish associations between short clusters (look for proximity of closest approach, allowing for some specified overlap)
 - An association must be between the two closest clusters, "jumping over" clusters not allowed
 - Attempt to define a direction by fitting a set of associated transverse clusters
 - Attempt to associate these groups of clusters based on proximity and direction

Transverse algorithms (2)

- During transverse extension, fits are performed that consider local direction at the extrema of clusters, much as in the longitudinal case
 - Vertices must be within specified distances
 - Local directions should align within specified angular tolerances and impact parameters must be within specified displacements
 - If these checks pass, clusters can be merged

• You can influence these decisions by tweaking allowed displacements and angular tolerances!