**Thesis Brainstorm**

Title: Using cosmic-ray hodoscope data to validate misalignment measurements in small-strip thin gap chambers for the ATLAS experiment

Background – CHAP1

* ATLAS [1], LHC [2]
* ATLAS muon spectrometer [3]
* Motivation for replacing SW [4]
* NSW design (sTGC and MM)  [4]
  + Introduce sector and wedge idea, large and small, quadruplet type
* sTGC details [4]
  + Mechanical layout (pads, strips, wires)
  + How it works: ionization, avalanche, charge spreading, gas mixture, HV
  + Creation of clusters to extract position on each layer
* Detector construction process? 🡪 1 paragraph
  + Etching strip pattern 🡪 distortion
  + Briefly point to Carlson’s thesis for CMM misalignment model, although simple offset and rotation model is often used as base [5].
  + Cathode board (multilayer PCB) wound with wires, closed with another (gluing, brasses)
  + Doublet 🡪 quadruplet (pins) (gluing, brasses, microscope)
  + Result: sTGC strip misalignments
  + Cite TDR
  + Where can I cite uncertainties of brasses and microscope method and why they aren’t good enough alone? 🡪 Benoit, JINST, “why we use xray sentence”, misalignments exist is enough
* The alignment system [4,6] 🡪 Minimal
  + Transition: once the quadruplets are tested, they are assembled into wedges and the alignment platforms attached
  + Source plates and light fibres mounted on sTGC wedge
  + “chambers have internal alignment sensors to monitor their distortions, there is a global alignment system that monitors the positions of the chambers with respect to each other” [6]
  + Summary: Alignment system positions wedge surface, positions must be with respect to alignment platforms
* Transition: Next, description of the datasets used to characterize quadruplets in this work.

Cosmics data – CHAP2: Characterization of sTGC modules using cosmic rays

* Cosmic muons, hodoscope (figure of test bench)
* Mention gas system and slow control
* Collect 1 000 000 triggers / quadruplet, many metrics for characterization [7], but we focus on rebuilding tracks
* 2900V for construction defects (?), 3100V for pad efficiency cite? 🡪 Don’t need to mention
* Could show efficiency of strips at 3100V here to introduce the idea of wire supports 🡪 Instead use mechanical design schematic

Cosmics data and alignment studies

* Relative coordinate system only
* Fix two layers to build coordinate system [7]
* Calculate residuals and take mean as proxy – reference to appendix A: residual histogram bin size (plot of mu\_cosmics – mu\_reclustering and how that makes residual uncertainties) – reference to appendix B: Gaussian fit vs double gaussian fit
* Misalignments cause systematic shifts of the residual [7]
* Show resplot means TH2F for a single quadruplet (QL2C04), for a given tracking combination – reference to appendix C: why 10 cm is an appropriate bin size
* Show num entries TH2F to see connection with patterns due to hodoscope acceptance angle and wire support positions on three involved layers

*Other possible validation studies: DNL, track angle, area bin size*

*Resplots idea: Hollow black square highlighting alignment platform on TH2Fs to foreshadow?*

The xray method  [8] – CHAP3

* Transition: The position of each strip in ATLAS must be known to within 100um. The alignment platforms are able to position the wedge surface to within X um, (maybe in TDR? Ask people) so need strip positions wrt wedge surface
* Assembled wedges
* Source plates provide coordinate system  
  ^^^ These bullets may be duplication, shorten as required
* Interaction of x-rays with sTGC (photoeffect on copper, photoelectrons ionize gas and cause avalanches) -> many more delta rays
* X-ray gun holder
* X-ray gun
* Fitting to cluster mean, point to JINST for details [9]
* Reported uncertainties of 20 um, systematic uncertainties of 120 um. How do I cite this? “Private communication” and point to JINST
* Since these parameters will be used to calculate the as-built misalignment model to locate strips in ATLAS, they should be verified

Comparison results – CHAP4

* Presentation of theoretical method for comparison
* Show residual TH2Fs of QL2C04 for xray and cosmics (WNPPC plots)
* Show scatter plot comparing the two for all tracking combinations
* Point to appendix D: we are systematically limited and not statistically limited.

Somehow show results for all McGill quadruplets??

* Total percentage of x-ray survey tracks that agree with mean cosmics residual
* Histogram of difference between x-ray and cosmic residual (bin size 150 um might not show us much)
* For 1 combination, all QL2 data

Extension:

* Apply analysis to as-built model validation
* Use data from other quads / countries
* Cross check with Flores
* Use cosmics data as input to as-built model (constrained optimization of misalignment parameters, Paul)

Conclusion:

* The work is important in the goal towards the as-built model, since it validates one of the key datasets used to derive the misalignment parameters

Appendix A: residual histogram bin size

To assign bin size, need uncertainty on cosmics residuals => clustering uncertainty

Show mu\_cosmics – mu\_reclustering for a quad to motivate 45 um uncertainty on cluster position

Explain how this propagates mathematically to uncertainty on residuals of < 100 um for interpolation combinations

Can also show there is no advantage in going smaller by adding plot comparing residual histogram bin size if desired

Appendix B: Gaussian fit vs double gaussian fit

Show the scatter plot you made to prove a Gaussian fit is sufficient and fails less often

Appendix C: Why 10 cm is an appropriate bin size

Can show rough calculation of scale on which alignments change

Appendix D: Study of statistical uncertainty

… residualsStudy/QS3P18\_stats/peakOfMeanErrorsDistVsTrigger.pdf