



g – 2's Analysis Computing

James Mott g – 2 / SCD Workshop - 03/02/22





Introduction

- Aim: sketch out what we use for our analysis processes
- There are many different analyzers, each with their own workflow I won't capture all that detail
- I will try and give a representative picture of what roughly happens
- We have separate analysis programs for magnetic field and "fast" detectors that see µ⁺→e⁺ decays
 - Focus on e⁺ data as this is more relevant for computing resources





• Start with *art* files from production:



- Usually process 1 "dataset" at a time, defined by running conditions
 - Vary in size, but typically might have 35k files & 70 TB
 - Slimmed production files can reduce this to 10 20% in size
 - Add >1 datasets together at end, but need to check consistency first
- Whole process is **repeated many times**:
 - Run-2/3 analysis: ~20 datasets.
 - Run-4/5: 2 3 times as much data
 - Will need to run multiple times for some systematic scans







- art::analyzers used to create **histograms or trees** in ROOT files
- Usually perform simple operations like histogram filling, timerandomization, searching for nearby calo hits for pile-up estimation etc.
 - Some analyzers find it hard to maintain high CPU efficiency due to large fraction of i/o compared to computation
- Hard to keep **under 2 GB** memory target:
 - Basic unit is 5000 time bins x 200 energy bins x 24 calorimeters
 - Some analyzers do get under 2 GB, others ask for more slots
- Typically takes a few hours (< 12h) to run jobs + recovery







- **Histogram Input**: hadding many files (usually run locally takes ~1 2 h)
- **Tree Input**: Fill histograms (grid or local slower but with more flexibility)











Fitting & Analysis Frameworks



- We placed high value on independent analyses to ensure robustness
- Means every analyzer has their own code
 base I'd guess we have ~15 at one time
- Most use C++ and ROOT.
- Few use python: both with & without ROOT
- Some code is in **main redmine repositories**, and some is **separate**
- At least one uses **fhicl** for configuration settings.
- **Magnetic field** analysis has separate DAQ and workflow.
 - Smaller scale: production takes a few days and then analysis proceeds on single server





Default User Interface

- **4 x virtual machines** (gm2gpvm01,02,03,04) ۲
 - 4 single-core CPUs, 12G RAM, minimal local storage
- Worked well for early stages of analysis: mostly development, smaller • datasets, fewer users...
- Each machine is **easily overloaded** (single users kill machine by ٠ mistake) & **building is very slow**
- Doesn't match well to a lot of our current needs: ٠
 - **Fitting can be slow** (~1-2 m per fit) but is parallelizable: 4 separate machines with 4 cores doesn't make that easy
 - Large trees as input don't work well (network speed can be slow)
 - Similarly for hadding large numbers of histograms
- Needed something to **fill gap** between the grid and virtual machines



Other User Interfaces

• Several groups have bought own machines that are supported by SCD:



• Typically used for

‡ Fermilab

- Parallelization: fitting, toy MC, building
- Filling trees into histograms
- Memory intensive tasks (histogramming, 6D acceptance studies)
- GPU for ML training or frequency extraction (field)
- This **model works fine** for us now but there are some issues:
 - Not a universal resource for all collaborators some are running on personal machines or on clusters at their institutes
 - GPUs are generally underutilized