Iceberg analysis with dataprep: Noise and SNR

Iceberg analysis

David Adams BNL June 4, 2020

Introduction

I continue look at Iceberg data

- Results plots posted at dedicated Iceberg link:
 - <u>https://internal.dunescience.org/people/dladams/protodune/iceberg/data/index.html</u>
- Today look more at time dependence of noise
 - Run-to-run variation of noise averaged over all wires
 - Noise summaries and DFT spectra for low, typical and high noise

And estimates of SNR

Noise evaluation procedure

3

Noise evaluation

How noise is measured

- Quick summary—see previous talks for more details
- Data preparation similar to protoDUNE
 - Identified sticky codes are flagged
 - Pedestal evaluated for each channel each event
 - Sticky codes mitigated (replace with interpolated values)
 - Tails (from amp-ADC AC coupling) are removed
 - Coherent noise removal (CNR) is applied
 - Subtracting median in each FEMB-plane (I think)
 - Noise results shown with and without CNR
- Signal-free regions selected
 - Dynamic threshold signal finder used to identify ROIs
 - Ticks inside ROIs are flagged as signal
 - Blocks of 1000 ticks w/o signal are identified
- Noise is defined as RMS over not-ROI ticks
- DFT power is evaluated us the signal-free 1000-tick blocks

Example waveform after dataprep

Cleaned signal for Iceberg collection planes



0.5

After signal finding



Noise ticks (i.e. inverting signal finding)



Noise summary

Noise summary plots

- Noise = RMS in signal-free regions
 - Sample noise = individual samples
 - Integrated noise = sums over 50 ticks
 - To approximate physics charge measurements
 - MIP deposit is 20-30 ke
- Eight curves with mean and median (new) are shown
 - Before and after CNR (top, bottom)
 - Sample and integrated (left, right)
 - Collection and induction (blue, red)
- One entry for each channel
 - Excluding channels flagged bad (134) or noisy (26)
- Summary for full run period on following page
 - Sample noise looks good
 - Integrated induction is very broad
 - Integrated collection and induction have tails

8

Early runs (4718 – 4832)



Noise vs. run

Mean noise vs. run



Median noise vs. run



June 4, 2020 12

Zoomed mean noise vs. run



Iceberg analysis

Zoomed median noise vs. run



Iceberg analysis

Noise w/o CNR vs. channel by run

Not-signal sample RMS for run 4860 All 0.35-Sample RMS [ke] 0.3 0.25 0.2 з 0.15 1 7 *** *** Ŧ Ι 0.1 **‡**_ I I 0.05 # т 0 L 0 200 400 600 800 1000 1200 Channel Not-signal 50-sample RMS for run 4860 All 50-sample RMS [ke] 5 4.5 4 3.5 J ť 3 I I_{I} 2.5 2 I 1.5 Ι 1 0.5 0 L 0 200 400 600 800 1000 1200 Channel

Not-signal sample RMS for run 4861 All



Not-signal sample RMS for run 4862 All



Not-signal sample RMS for run 4863 All 0.35-Sample RMS [ke] 0.3 0.25 0.2 0.15 ł 4 Ι ×.⊤ 0.1 0.05 т 0 L 0 200 400 600 800 1000 1200 Channel Not-signal 50-sample RMS for run 4863 All 5 50-sample RMS [ke] 4.5 4 3.5 J Ľ 3 II 2.5 2 1.5 II 朝 1 0.5 0 L 0 200 400 600 800 1000 1200 Channel

Not-signal sample RMS for run 4864 All



Not-signal sample RMS for run 4865 All 0.35-Sample RMS [ke] 0.3 0.25 0.2 0.15 į 2[#]1 7 1 y I I 0.1 Ι . € * ∃+. 0.05 4 0 L 0 200 400 600 800 1000 1200 Channel Not-signal 50-sample RMS for run 4865 All 5 50-sample RMS [ke] 4.5 4 3.5 3 Ŧ τI 2.5 2 1.5 Ι 11 1 ï Ι 0.5 0 L 0 200 400 600 800 1000 1200 Channel

Not-signal sample RMS for run 4866 All



Not-signal sample RMS for run 4867 All



Not-signal sample RMS for run 4868 All 0.35-Sample RMS [ke] 0.3 0.25 0.2 0.15 7 Ż ** * 1 * 1 I ± 0.1 1 0.05 0 200 400 600 800 1000 1200 Channel Not-signal 50-sample RMS for run 4868 All 5 50-sample RMS [ke] 4.5 4 3.5 ₽ 1 3 Ĩ Ţ $\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{T}}$ 2.5 2 1.5 Ι τl 1 0.5 0 L 0 200 400 600 800 1000 1200 Channel

Not-signal sample RMS for run 4870 All 0.35-Sample RMS [ke] 0.3 0.25 0.2 0.15 1 7 11 Ι т 0.1 I I I ± 0.05 12 0 L 0 200 400 600 800 1000 1200 Channel Not-signal 50-sample RMS for run 4870 All 5 50-sample RMS [ke] 4.5 4 3.5 ų Į 3 Ι $\mathbf{I}^{\mathbf{I}}$ 2.5 2 Ι I 1.5 П Ι ΙI I 1 0.5 0 L 0 200 400 600 800 1000 1200 Channel





Not-signal sample RMS for run 4872 All



Not-signal sample RMS for run 4873 All



Not-signal sample RMS for run 4874 All



Not-signal sample RMS for run 4875 All



Not-signal sample RMS for run 4876 All



Not-signal sample RMS for run 4877 All



Not-signal sample RMS for run 4878 All



Not-signal sample RMS for run 4879 All



Not-signal sample RMS for run 4880 All 0.35-Sample RMS [ke] 0.3 0.25 0.2 0.15 2 7 I ± 0.1 0.05 0 L 0 200 400 600 800 1000 1200 Channel Not-signal 50-sample RMS for run 4880 All 5 50-sample RMS [ke] 4.5 4 3.5 ₽ ī 3 I I II 2.5 2 I 1.5 I I I I I 1 5 0.5 0 L 0 200 400 600 800 1000 1200 Channel

Not-signal sample RMS for run 4881 All


Not-signal sample RMS for run 4882 All







Not-signal sample RMS for run 4884 All







Not-signal sample RMS for run 4886 All



Not-signal sample RMS for run 4887 All



Not-signal sample RMS for run 4888 All 0.35-Sample RMS [ke] 0.3 0.25 0.2 0.15 3 쿺 ₹ 1 1 Ι I 0.1 I 0.05 Ģ ŧ. ŧ 0 L 0 200 400 600 800 1000 1200 Channel Not-signal 50-sample RMS for run 4888 All 5 50-sample RMS [ke] 4.5 4 3.5 ł 3 1 Π 2.5 2 1.5 1 **e** 0.5 0 L 0 200 400 600 800 1000 1200 Channel





Not-signal sample RMS for run 4890 All 0.35-Sample RMS [ke] 0.3 0.25 0.2 0.15 노 문 Ι Ι 0.1 I 0.05 0 L 0 200 400 600 800 1000 1200 Channel Not-signal 50-sample RMS for run 4890 All 5 50-sample RMS [ke] 4.5 4 3.5 Ŗ J 3 T 1₁ 2.5 2 1.5 I_{I} 1 0.5 0 L 0 200 400 600 800 1000 1200 Channel

Noise summary selections

Want noise summary values

- For collection, induction with and w/o CNR
- Look at some run periods
 - First period (4718 -4832)
 - Typical: runs 4809 4823 (much of the data looks like this)
 - Quiet: runs 4865 4885

Iceberg analysis

• Very quiet:/runs 4877 4882



First period (4718 – 4832)



Iceberg analysis

Typical (4809 – 4823)



D. Adams, BNL

Iceberg analysis

Iceberg noise and SNR

Quiet (4865 – 4885)



Very quiet (4877 – 4882)



Noise summary medians

		Sample noise [e]					
	CNR	All	Typical	Quiet	V. quiet		
Collection	no	58	58	58	58		
	yes	57	56	57	57		
Induction	no	59	59	58	58		
	yes	55	54	54	54		

Integrated noise [e]

	CNR	All	Typical	Quiet	V. quiet
Collection	no	630	620	630	620
	yes	600	590	600	590
Induction	no	930	930	810	790
	yes	790	790	700	690

Noise comments

Preceding is direct measurement of collection noise

- Sample noise: $58 \rightarrow 57$ e (before \rightarrow after CNR)
 - CNR = coherent noise removal
 - ENC = 5.58 × (sample noise): $320 \rightarrow 320 e$
 - Dune doc 15523
- Integrated noise: $620 \rightarrow 590 e$
 - Expect this uncertainty for charge measurements
 - Deconvolution should not change it
 - protoDUNE values are 1250, 920 e

Corresponding results for induction planes

- Sample: $58 \rightarrow 54 e$
 - ENC: 320 → 300 e
- Integrated: 790 \rightarrow 690 e
 - Deconvolution \rightarrow much larger uncertainty on charge measurements
 - To be determined

DFT power

First period (4718-4832)



Typical (4809-4823)



Quiet (4865-4885)



Very quiet (4877-4882)



Very quiet (4877-4882) zoomed



Iceberg analysis

Signal to noise (SNR)

Signal to noise

Reported difficult to repeat protoDUNE SNR study

- Wanwei, Tingjun talk May 21
- Because tracks typically deposit charge on few wires
 - I.e. $\theta_{xz} \approx 0 \text{ deg}$
- But we expect signal height similar to that for $\theta_{xz} \approx 90$
 - See following slides
 - Need a different analysis to pull this out
- And there are quite a few tracks (1 in 10 events?) where track is not quite perpendicular
 - Charge is distributed over 20+ wires
 - Amenable to traditional analysis?
 - Example plot follows

Perpendicular tracks

Tracks perpendicular to wire plane

 $\mathbf{x} \uparrow \boldsymbol{\theta}_{xz}$

Expected signal for $\theta_{xz} \approx 0$

- I.e. track perpendicular to wire plane
- MIP produces 62 ke/cm after recombination
 - Smearing from shaping, diffusion have little effect on these tracks
 - As long as signal does not migrate to neighboring wire
 - Attenuated by electron lifetime
 - Boosted by $1/\cos(\theta_{zy})$ (Small effect with out trigger)
- Drift speed 1.6 mm/ μ s = 0.8 mm/tick \rightarrow 5.0 ke/tick
 - Sample noise of 0.06 ke \rightarrow SNR = 85
- CE response 40 ADC/ke → 200 ADC/tick
 - Examples follows
- Observed waveforms are not flat
 - Exponential decrease with drift time due to electron lifetime
 - Bumps in spectra from delta rays--expect 20% signal in deltas
 - Signal is doubled where track passes by collection wire
 - Many example follow

5001-12

Raw ADC for Iceberg collection planes



5001-12 z1



5001-12 z2



5001-15

Raw ADC for Iceberg collection planes



5001-15 z1



5001-15 z2

ADC raw run 5002 event 15



June 4, 2020 68

5001-32

Raw ADC for Iceberg collection planes



5001-32 z1



5001-32 z1



5001-32 z2


5001-32 z2



5002-17

Raw ADC for Iceberg collection planes



D. Adams, BNL

Iceberg analysis





5002-21

Raw ADC for Iceberg collection planes



D. Adams, BNL

Iceberg analysis

5002-21 z1



5002-21 z2



5003-17

Raw ADC for Iceberg collection planes









Comments on perpendicular tracks

We do observe large signals

- Height around 200 250 ADC counts
 - After correcting (by eye) for electron lifetime and doubling of signal near collection wire
- Prediction was 200 ADC counts without accounting for vertical angle
 - I.e. signal is enhanced by $1/\cos(\theta_{xy})$
 - Trigger counters are at 25 deg (near horizontal)
 - → enhancement is 1.09, i.e. expect 220 ADC
 - Consistent

Non-perpendicular tracks

Tracks not perpendicular to wire plane

Standard MIP signal: $\theta_{xz} \approx 90 \text{ deg}$

- I.e. nearly parallel to wire plane
- Integrated charge/wire is (4.8 mm) (62 ke/cm) = 30 ke
 - For track in horizontal plane
- Peak height is area/5.58 from shaping
 - $\circ~$ plus smearing due to path lengths and diffusion
 - \rightarrow Peak height \lesssim 5 ke = 200 ADC
- I.e. height is about the same as perpendicular tracks
- Trigger counters accept $|\theta_{xz}| \lesssim 25 \text{ deg}$
 - Far from parallel but there are some tracks significantly away from the perpendicular
 - Tracks cross fewer than 30 wires on either side of APA
 - Maybe 20-30 wires are enough for protoDUNE-like SNR study?
 - Following pages show a few tracks away from perpendicular



5001-13

Raw ADC for Iceberg collection planes



5001-13 z1

ADC raw run 5001 event 13



June 4, 2020 88

5001-13 z1



5001-13 z1



5005-5

Raw ADC for Iceberg collection planes











ADC raw run 5005 event 5



Iceberg analysis







5006-14

Raw ADC for Iceberg collection planes













ADC raw run 5006 event 14



Iceberg analysis

ADC raw run 5006 event 14



D. Adams, BNL

Conclusions

Summary noise levels presented

- Sample and integrated; before/after CNR, collection/induction
- And for various run periods
- Sample noise $\lesssim 58 \text{ e}$ (ENC 320 e)
- Integrated noise before \rightarrow after CNR
 - Collection: 620 → 590 e
 - Induction 790 → 690 e
 - Both are medians for "very quiet" run period

Calibration scale check

- Signals from perpendicular tracks have the expected ADC signal height → our calibration scale is roughly correct
- Height SNR for perpendicular tracks is around 85
 - Expect about the same for parallel tracks
- Area SNR for parallel tracks is (30 ke)/(600 e) = 50
- All before degradation from lifetime
Next

What might I/we do next?

- Charge calibration
- Identify sticky codes
- Tune reconstruction sequence

 - Timing mitigation?

 - Deconvolution
- Noise studies
 - ⊖ Sample and integrated estimates before deconvolution
 - → DFTs for each view

 - → Same after removing noisy channels
 - Same after deconvolution
 - Remove event channels with overflows

Extras

Track angles from Wanwei Trigger counter geometry (Shekhar) Analysis code packages Still more noise summary groups Analysis code Run groups

Track angles from Wanwei Today's Topics—Track Angle



CRT Vertical Angle



CRT Horizonal Angle



Quiet 2 (4866 – 4885)



Quiet 3 (4876 – 4885)



D. Adams, BNL

Iceberg analysis

Iceberg noise and SNR

Analysis code

I have been migrating my analysis scripts into github

- A series of small (and so quick to build) cmake projects
- For my use but available to all
- Happy to get feedback and have others create similar

Current projects

- myproj is a toy example showing the conventions:
 - Script "build" to build and install the project
 - Cmake examples to build utility libraries, art services and root dictionaries, and to install headers, fcl and python
 - o <u>https://github.com/dladams/myproj/blob/master/README.md</u>
- duneproc is my base level project
 - Script duneproc is a wrapper for running lar jobs
 - Fcl file for protoDUNE and (new) Iceberg
 - o <u>https://github.com/dladams/duneproc/blob/master/README.md</u>
 - Note link to Iceberg tutorial
- dunececalib has charge calibration code
- dunenoise has code for noise studies and DFT

Run groups

Iceberg Run 3 run grouping David Adams May 5, 2020

Run range Configuration

3366 3382 Initial CRT (cosmic trigger) configuration. 15 deg? 3384 3466 Final CRT. 15 deg? 3467 3611 Cosmics with CRT at 15 deg 3616 3626 TPC off 3627 3695 Cosmics with CRT at 15 deg? 3696 3839 Cosmics with CRT at 15 deg 3870 3874 TPC off 3875 4430 Cosmics with CRT at 15 deg? 4431 4480 Cosmics with CRT at 15 deg 4481 4507 Pulser runs 4508 4530 Cosmics with CRT at 15 deg 4531 4658 TPC off 4679 4698 Pulser runs 4699 4699 Pulser DAC=0 (cosmic0, random trigger?) 4700 4703 Pulser runs (pulser) 4704 4705 Pulser DAC=0 (pulser0) 4710 4711 Pulser runs 4714 4717 Pulser DAC=0 (pulser0)

Begin stable running 4718 4860 New 60 deg CRT (cosmic trigger) with S4 4861 5050 New 60 deg CRT w/o S4 5060 5108 Investigation of timing fragment 5109 5112 Random trigger with g=4.7. 5113 5132 Pulser with g=4.7 5133 5153 Pulser with g=7.8 5154 5174 Pulser with g=25 5175 5195 Pulser with s=0.5 5196 5222 Pulser with s=1.0 5223 5243 Pulser with s=3.0 5244 5264 Pulser with b=200 mV 5265 5285 Pulser with b=200/900 mV 5286 5306 Pulser with s=0.5 5307 5327 Pulser with I=1000 pA 5328-5348 Pulser with AC coupling 5349-5359 Cosmics vary settings run to run

4504, 4699, 5109 taken without cosmic trigger and TPC on.