Vertexing and 2D clustering in Pandora

Andy Chappell

13th January | FD Sim/Reco Meeting





Status of the primary vertexing paper

- DUNE paper on primary vertexing with deep learning in Pandora
 - Responded to comments from first round of Collaboration Review
 - Second round of Collaboration Review will start soon



Secondary vertices

Learn distance from hits to closest, rather than primary vertex



- Attempt to capture topological features rather than exactly match simulation
 - Want the network to replicate the decisions you would make by eye
 - Tag start of charge deposition for photons as a vertex, rather than true vertex
 - Ignore small elastic scatters
 - Track endpoints/exiting particles treated as vertices



Refining reconstruction using higher order vertices



Work in progress

- Network region finding quite good, but location imprecise
- Re-run at high resolution too computationally expensive
- Refine the vertices by considering how cleanly hits align with angular bins around the estimated vertex region





Restricting topologies

- Anecdotally, the shower regions are the most challenging
- What if we ignore them?
- Only consider vertices with track-like topologies
- Track/Shower tagging network may allow more precise identification of vertices by filtering shower hits



Work in progress

Improving provisional 2D re-clustering

- In addition to fixing problems after they've occurred, there is an ongoing effort to improve the quality of the initial clustering
- The very first clustering algorithm that runs in Pandora is very beam-centric
- To the right is an example of a collection of candidate associations between hits
- Note the beam-aligned hits have good associations, but the wide, transverse hits have only sparse connections between hits on adjacent wires
- Not ideal, even in an LBL scenario
- Isotropic samples even more subject to this

fine Current provisional cluster associations Relies heavily on hit width alg **Beam direction**



Cheating workflow to test alternative approach

- Cheating 2D clustering is quite tricky
 - Simply clustering hits based on true parent particle leads to perfect 2D clusters
 - This makes downstream steps trivial
 - End up with an unrealistically good reconstruction
 - Learn nothing about the likely effect of a real algorithm
- Developed two cheating algorithms
 - Cheated cluster splitting: Let the 2D reco proceed in the usual way for one view, then identify substantial contributions to clusters from additional true particles, and split them based on truth (i.e. let small errors remain)
 - 2. View matching: Use the clusters in one view to match to hits in the other views, and create the corresponding clusters in those views improving the inter-view coherence
- The idea here is to see if a Kalman filter (or similar), that considers view correspondence, can produce better provisional clusters
 - By considering the views together, we have fewer ambiguities in 3D than in 2D (more complete provisional clusters while maintaining purity, easier 2D->3D matching)
 - By using a Kalman filter approach we can remove the dependence on a preferred direction





See backup for other track-like particles

Summary and next steps

- Significant gains in secondary vertexing performance if we can filter out shower-like contributions to network inputs
- Cheating studies indicate improvements to the very first 2D clustering algorithm can have large downstream effects



Backup









See backup for other track-like particles