Add insight, such ashow the field effect is strong in s2 than in s1 at low energy and vice versa, and how to deal with making xy maps with low stats (best way to average, fiducial, etc), etc. When is doing field corrections worth it (aka, when is the systematic in the energy peak worse from doing nothing than from going through the complicated process to try to fix it.. also consider things like band width, and spatial uniformity). Also, insight into effects on the Doke plot… corrections move up down left and right, field moves diagonally.. can cross check corrections with the slope of each source, and could get lucky with one, but not all, sources falling on the doke line with wrong corrections. Also insight into the ER band, and how the field adds width, etc. Also insight into “it doesn’t matter where you normalize the field to” with math from white board phone pic. Also insight into how to define the “z\_center” of the detector—using field maps, etc, and that radial cuts when averaging over z will artificially give you a “center” at higher drift time (and that the “hump” in the z\_center v radial cut drift is due to the low field pockets in the corners, which is separate issue from the artificially z\_center inflation.. look at C:\Program Files\MATLAB\R2012a\bin\LUXCode\Scratch\RichardKnoche\KrypCal\_RD\KrypCal\_2p21\Misc v radius code).

Overcorrection of ER and NR bands shifts them upward at higher Z. This is the opposite of what we expect from the field effects. Further, the ER band is more sensitive to the field effects than NR. Therefore we overcorrect the NR more than we overcorrect the ER band, and discrimination should be worse.