

Results from pion calibration runs for the H1 liquid argon calorimeter and comparisons with simulations

H1 Calorimeter Group

B. Andrieu^o, J. Bán^j, E. Barrelet^p, H. Bergstein^a, G. Bernardi^p, M. Besançon^t, E. Binder^h, H. Blume^m, K. Borrás^f, V. Boudry^o, F. Brasse^h, W. Braunschweig^a, V. Brissonⁿ, A.J. Campbell^g, T. Carli^o, M. Colombo^f, Ch. Coutures^t, G. Cozzika^t, M. David^t, B. Delcourtⁿ, L. DelBuono^p, M. Develⁿ, P. Dingus^o, A. Drescher^f, J. Duboc^p, O. Dünger^t, R. Ebbinghaus^f, S. Egli^v, N.N. Ellis^c, J. Feltesse^t, Y. Feng^p, F. Ferrarotto^s, W. Flauger^{t, h}, M. Flieser^m, K. Gamedinger^m, J. Gayler^h, L. Godfrey^e, L. Goerlich^d, M. Goldberg^p, R. Grässler^b, T. Greenshawⁱ, H. Greif^m, M. Haguenaer^o, L. Hajduk^d, O. Hamon^p, P. Hartz^f, V. Hausteinⁱ, R. Haydarⁿ, W. Hildesheim^p, N. Huot^p, M.-A. Jabiol^t, A. Jacholkowskaⁿ, M. Jaffreⁿ, H. Jung^b, F. Just^u, C. Kiesling^m, Th. Kirchhoff^h, F. Kole^e, V. Korbel^h, M. Korn^f, W. Krasny^{d, t}, J.P. Kubenka^m, H. Küster^h, J. Kurzhöfer^f, B. Kuznik^u, R. Lander^e, J.-F. Laporte^t, U. Lenhardt^f, P. Loch^h, D. Lüers^{t, m}, J. Marks^g, J. Martyniak^d, T. Merz^h, B. Naroskaⁱ, A. Nau^h, H.K. Nguyen^p, F. Niebergallⁱ, H. Oberlack^m, U. Obrock^f, F. Ould-Saadaⁱ, C. Pascaudⁿ, H.B. Pyo^h, K. Rauschnabel^f, P. Ribarics^m, M. Rietz^b, Ch. Royon^t, V. Rusinov^l, N. Sahlmann^b, E. Sánchez^m, P. Schacht^m, P. Schleper^a, W. von Schlippe^k, C. Schmidt^h, D. Schmidt^u, V. Shekelyan^{l, f}, H. Shoostari^s, Y. Sirois^o, P. Staroba^q, M. Steenbock^t, H. Steiner^p, B. Stella^s, U. Straumann^v, J. Turnau^d, J. Tutas^a, L. Urban^m, C. Vallee^p, M. Vecko^{q, o}, P. Verrecchia^t, G. Villet^t, E. Vogel^a, A. Wagener^b, D. Wegener^f, A. Wegnerⁱ, H.-P. Wellisch^m, T.P. Yiou^p, J. Žáček^{n, r}, Ch. Zeitnitz^h and F. Zomerⁿ

^a I. Physikalisches Institut der RWTH, Aachen, Germany *

^b III. Physikalisches Institut der RWTH, Aachen, Germany *

^c School of Physics and Space Research, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK **

^d Institute for Nuclear Physics, Cracow, Poland

^e Physics Department and IIRPA, University of California, Davis, CA, USA †

^f Institut für Physik, Universität Dortmund, Dortmund, Germany *

^g Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, UK **

^h DESY, Hamburg, Germany *

ⁱ II Institut für Experimentalphysik, Universität Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany *

^j Institute of Experimental Physics, Slovak Academy of Sciences, Košice, Slovakia

^k Queen Mary and Westfield College, London, UK **

^l Institute for Theoretical and Experimental Physics, Moscow, Russian Federation

^m Max-Planck-Institut für Physik, München, Germany *

ⁿ LAL, Université Paris-Sud, IN2P3-CNRS, Orsay, France

^o LPNHE, Ecole Polytechnique, IN2P3-CNRS, Palaiseau, France

^p LPNHE, Universités Paris VI and VII, IN2P3-CNRS, Paris, France

^q Institute of Physics, Czech Academy of Sciences, Praha, Czech Republic

^r Nuclear Center, Charles University, Praha, Czech Republic

^s INFN Roma and Dipartimento di Fisica, Università "La Sapienza", Roma, Italy

^t DAPNIA, Centre d'Études de Saclay, Gif-sur-Yvette, France

^u Fachbereich Physik, Bergische Universität Gesamthochschule Wuppertal, Wuppertal, Germany *

^v Physik-Institut der Universität Zürich, Zürich, Switzerland ††

Received 15 April 1993 and in revised form 30 June 1993

We present results on calibration runs performed with pions at the CERN SPS for different modules of the H1 liquid argon calorimeter which consists of an electromagnetic section with lead absorbers and a hadronic section with steel absorbers. The data cover an energy range from 3.7 to 205 GeV. Detailed comparisons of the data and simulation with GHEISHA 8 in the framework of GEANT 3.14 are presented. The measured pion induced shower profiles are well described by the simulation. The total signal of pions on an energy scale determined from electron measurements is reproduced to better than 3% in various module configurations. After application of weighting functions, determined from Monte Carlo data and needed to achieve compensation, the reconstructed measured energies agree with simulation to about 3%. The energies of hadronic showers are reconstructed with a resolution of about $50\%/\sqrt{E} \oplus 2\%$. This result is achieved by inclusion of signals from an iron streamer tube tail catcher behind the liquid argon stacks.

1. Introduction

During the years 1989 and 1990 several calibration runs with different modules of the H1 liquid argon (LAr) calorimeter were performed at the H6 beam at the CERN SPS. The main goals of these runs were to provide an energy calibration for electrons [1] in the H1 detector [2], to study electron-hadron separation [3] and to determine energy calibration functions for hadrons and jets.

In previous papers [4,5] we reported on the performance of prototype LAr test modules. Here we present results achieved with final modules actually used in the H1 experiment at HERA. The emphasis is put on the comparison of pion signals from calibration measurements with corresponding simulations. This includes results for the fully reconstructed pion energy obtained with the H1 standard energy reconstruction code as used in the actual experiment, running on experimental and simulated signals from test beam events without any further change.

The H1 calorimeter is non-compensating (i.e. the signals from electrons are on average higher than those from pions of the same energy), but its high segmentation allows to distinguish electromagnetic (e.m.) and hadronic shower components and to reconstruct the hadronic energies by applying weighting functions (as discussed first in ref. [6]) to the measured signals. The determination of such functions mainly from experimental data has already been studied by the H1 Calorimeter Group [4,5,7-9]. The quality of the Monte Carlo predictions for pion test data in the H1 calorimeters [10-14] now allows for extensive use of simulations for the determination of the parameters of these functions [11]. In this paper we first compare in various module configurations simulation and data for the mean total signal and other quantities characterizing the details of the shower development. We then study the deviations on the total hadronic energy reconstructed after having applied the same weighting functions to experimental and simulated data.

The outline of the paper is as follows: In sections 2 and 3 we briefly review the main features of the H1 LAr calorimeter and the experimental setup in the test beam including the iron streamer tube tail catcher. The Monte Carlo simulation procedure is described

in section 4. In section 5 we discuss the energy reconstruction first on the e.m. scale defined by electron calibration and then on the hadronic energy scale. Event selection criteria are given in section 6. Experimental data and simulation are compared in section 7 for several calorimeter modules in various test configurations. Results are presented for the total energy on the e.m. scale and after full reconstruction of weighted hadronic energy, the achieved energy resolutions, the effective electron-to-pion signal ratio, the longitudinal and lateral shower profiles and on signal distributions in single channels.

2. H1 liquid argon calorimeter

The H1 LAr calorimeter at HERA covers an angular range of $4^\circ \lesssim \theta \lesssim 154^\circ$, where θ is measured with respect to the proton axis at HERA (fig. 1). The calorimeter consists of 8 wheels which are divided in azimuth into 8 modules (octants) in the barrel and into 2 modules in the forward region. The modules are divided into an inner, e.m. lead/LAr stack (EMC) and an outer, hadronic steel/LAr stack (HAC). The depth of the EMC varies between 30 radiation lengths (X_0) in the forward and $20X_0$ in the central barrel part corresponding to 1.4 and 1.0 interaction lengths (λ) for hadrons. The total depth for hadrons including the EMC is in the forward region of IF and FB/OF 6 and 8λ respectively and near 5λ in the barrel region (CB).

The calorimeter is highly segmented in both the e.m. and hadronic sections of the modules with a total of around 45 000 geometric cells in a quasi projective geometry (fig. 1). The EMC has a 3 or 4 fold longitudinal segmentation while the HAC has 4 to 6 longi-




Fig. 1. Schematic view of the wheel and cell structure of the H1 liquid argon calorimeter with inner forward (IF) and outer forward (OF) wheels, the forward and central barrel wheels (FB and CB respectively) and the backward barrel e.m. wheel (BBE). The lines from the interaction point indicate the directions of flight of the particles in the test beam setup for the different calibration modules discussed here.

† Deceased.

* Supported by the Bundesministerium für Forschung und Technologie, Germany, under contract numbers 6AC17P, 6AC47P, 6DO57I, 6HH27I, 6MP17I, and 6WT87P, respectively.

** Supported by the UK Science and Engineering Research Council.

‡ Supported in part by USDOE grant DEF603 91ER40674.

‡‡ Supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation.

tudinal segments. The lateral cell size in the forward region corresponds to about 1 Molière radius in the e.m. and 1λ in the hadronic sections; the cells in the barrel region are typically twice this size.

The H1 LAr calorimeter is described in much more detail in refs. [2,15].

3. Experimental setup

The calibration program with electrons, pions and muons was performed in the H6 beam [16] at the CERN SPS. A survey of the setup at the test beam is shown in fig. 2. The good homogeneity and stability of LAr calorimeters allows to calibrate single representative module configurations rather than each individual module of each calorimeter wheel.

3.1. Liquid argon calorimeter configurations

In total 8 characteristic module configurations of the H1 LAr calorimeter (section 2) were tested in separate runs. In most cases the same modules were used as those later installed in the H1 cryostat at HERA. The configurations considered for this report are the inner forward calorimeter (IF, $\theta \approx 10^\circ$), parts of the forward barrel and outer forward calorimeter (FB/OF, $\theta \approx 25^\circ$), a section of the forward barrel alone (FB, $\theta \approx 34^\circ$), and a part of the central barrel (CB, $\theta \approx 101^\circ$) region. The wheel BBE is of EMC type only and it is not used for the results reported here. The modules were mounted into the cryostat such that the impact angle of the beam corresponds to the angle θ of a particle coming from the vertex of the e-p collisions at HERA (fig. 1). The cryostat could house two complete H1 modules with the exception of IF, where an extra module of half the transverse size, but otherwise identical, was built for the purpose of calibration.

The purity of the LAr was constantly monitored by probes identical to those in H1, positioned in the cryostat close to the calorimeter modules and consisting of a LAr ionisation chamber where the cathode is coated with a ^{207}Bi source. For more details see ref. [15].

3.2. Electronics and calibration

The front end electronics and calibration system was as close as possible to the present H1 system at HERA (described in more detail in refs. [15,17]). The signal lines of each calorimeter cell are fed out of the cryostat into an analog signal processing chain consisting of a warm charge sensitive preamplifier and a shaping amplifier yielding a bipolar signal (peak at $2.4 \mu\text{s}$) which is strobed into a sample and hold unit upon trigger. The signals feed the analog readout system after multiplexing by a factor 128. Two different gains are used to extend the dynamic range of a 12 bit ADC to 14 bit for half of the 2048 calorimeter channels available at the test. The ADC data were read out by a fast CAB processor as described in ref. [4]. No zero suppression nor data corrections were applied online.




Fig. 2. Schematic view on the setup in the test area at the H6 beam (dimensions in cm).

The charge calibration of the readout system is performed via capacitors of 47 pF (selected to within $\pm 1\%$) which are charged by voltage pulses of known amplitude. Two systems are available: one uses calibration capacitors in the liquid argon directly at the stacks (cold calibration), the other at the preamplifier level (warm calibration). The latter was used as a backup system only. The observed relation of ADC response vs. injected charge for each channel is represented by a polynomial fit of third order which is used in the off line data analysis. The overall precision of the calibration was 0.5%. The stability depended mainly on temperature variations which made it necessary to calibrate at least once in 24 hours.

3.3. Iron streamer tube calorimeter

A warm iron-gascounter calorimeter (also called "tail catcher") with a depth of 4.5λ located behind the LAr modules allows for the measurement of hadronic shower tails and punch through pions. It consists of 10 iron plates (area $2.7 \times 2.7 \text{ m}^2$, thickness 7.5 cm)

interleaved with 10 streamer tube layers. In addition, three layers are mounted in front as well as behind the iron structure. The detector planes are equipped with read-out pads (typical size $30 \times 30 \text{ cm}^2$) or strips. The digital read out of the wires (pitch 1 cm) and of the orthogonal strip electrodes (width 2 cm) serve for pattern recognition. The analog read out of the pad towers (two longitudinal segments of 5 pads/front-tower and 6 pads/back-tower, respectively) gives the energy measurement. The calorimeter has been calibrated in a stand-alone mode in the same beam line as the LAr calorimeter, using incident pions and muons. It is linear up to 40 GeV, the resolution amounts to $\sigma/E = 100\%/\sqrt{E \text{ (GeV)}}$ (for details see refs. [18,19]).

3.4. Beam

The setup of the H6 beam line [16], the trigger elements and the beam counters are practically the same as in previous 1986–88 test runs [4]. The main beam defining elements are two Cherenkov counters used to select either electrons or pions and a set of multi-wire proportional chambers (MWPC's) to measure the horizontal and vertical beam positions. Typical measured values for the horizontal and vertical beam widths are $\sigma \approx 0.8 \text{ cm}$ for the lower beam energies around 5–10 GeV and $\sigma \approx 0.3 \text{ cm}$ for 80 GeV; the momentum spread is 0.5%. The systematic uncertainty of the beam energy scale is $15\%/p \text{ (GeV)} \oplus 0.5\% \text{ }^{\#1}$. The phase space of the particles is mainly defined by two narrow scintillation counters limiting the acceptance for the beam to an area of $3 \times 3 \text{ cm}^2$. More detailed descriptions of the setups for the discussed run periods can be found in refs. [1,11,13,19,20]

4. Simulations

The calibration measurements have been simulated in the GEANT 3.14 [21] framework generating hadronic showers by GHEISHA 8 [22]. Electrons and photons produced in the hadronic showers are simulated with the default e.m. shower code of GEANT.

The simulation program contains a detailed description of the LAr calorimeter geometry and the gap and absorber structure which is identical to the standard H1 detector simulation. In addition it includes elements of the beam line, the cryostat and inactive material in front and behind the calibration modules. Also the central position of the beam, the spatial widths perpendicular to the beam axis and the known momentum spread (section 3.4) are simulated.

The thresholds for the tracking of particles in the simulation were set to 1 MeV for electrons/positrons, hadrons and to 0.2 MeV for photons.

Recombination effects were taken into account in the calculation of the signal. The energy dE deposited

per simulation step dx in the liquid argon is corrected by Birks' Law [23]:

$$dE'/dx = \frac{dE/dx}{(1 + kB \frac{dE}{dx})},$$

where dE' is the corrected deposited energy. A factor $kB = 0.005 \text{ g MeV}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ was assumed (compare ref. [24]).

Each event is overlaid by an experimental empty event from a random trigger to include the effects of electronic noise (section 5.2).

For physics analyses H1 uses a faster simulation with parametrized e.m. showers [25] and hadron terminators [14]. The results for the simulation of pion beam data are practically identical to those of the detailed simulation discussed here [14,26].

5. Energy reconstruction in the liquid argon calorimeter

The energy reconstruction in the H1 LAr calorimeter involves several levels of charge corrections for experimental data [1,15] and channel selection and cluster finding algorithms for data and Monte Carlo. The charges and the energies deposited in the LAr for data and simulation respectively are first reconstructed cell by cell on an electromagnetic (e.m.) energy scale (see below). This procedure is independent of the particle type and is the same for test beam electrons or pions, or for jets at HERA. On this energy scale the experimental and simulated calorimeter response are directly comparable. In addition, all further energy corrections and applied weighting functions are exactly the same for measured and simulated signals.

In the following we will briefly describe the most important steps of the energy reconstruction for hadrons; further details follow in ref. [2].

5.1. The electromagnetic energy scale

The transformation of signals in the calorimeter to the e.m. energy scale is performed for experimental

Table 1

The electron calibration constants used for experimental (c_{exp}) and for simulated (c_{sim}) signals for different wheels of the H1 LAr calorimeter. c_{sim} is just the inverse of the sampling fraction of electrons and therefore dimensionless

Calorimeter wheel name	EMC		HAC	
	c_{exp} [GeV/pC]	c_{sim}	c_{exp} [GeV/pC]	c_{sim}
CB	3.58	12.68	7.58	27.14
FB	3.41	12.76	6.70	25.23
IF	3.57	12.73	7.23	26.82
OF	–	–	6.70	24.93

^{#1} N. Doble, private communication (1991).

data by applying an electron calibration constant to the charge signal on the cell level. This constant has been determined for the EMC sections by calibration measurements with electrons [1]. Corrections for dead materials in front of the calorimeter or analysis cuts have been applied using detailed Monte Carlo simulation. For the hadronic sections, where no direct electron calibration measurements are yet available, the e.m. calibration constants are derived from the ones measured in the e.m. sections, correcting for the differences in the sampling fractions by detailed electron shower simulation using GEANT and EGS 4 [27] (compare ref. [28]).

In case of simulation the energies deposited in the LAr layers are converted by multiplication with the effective inverse sampling fraction for simulated electrons.

The calibration constants used are given in table 1. The present uncertainty is $\lesssim 3\%$. The main error source is due to impurities in the LAr and the determination of the charge collection efficiency. For more details on the definition of the e.m. scale and the determination of the electron calibration constants see refs. [1,29].

5.2. Noise suppression

The typical electronic noise of a single channel is about 3.5×10^4 electrons, equivalent to 20 (40) MeV on the e.m. energy scale, in the EMC (HAC) sections. A channel selection based on the energy signal on this scale is performed to reduce the possible noise contributions to the total signal. The selection is identical for experimental and simulated events. To the latter realistic electronic noise was added by overlaying random trigger events. The following cuts are also applied in the general H1 reconstruction code [2]:

A certain channel i contributes to the signal of an event only if its absolute energy signal $|E_0^i|$ on the e.m. scale passes the condition:

$$|E_0^i| > 4E_\sigma^i \quad \text{or} \quad (|E_0^i| > 2E_\sigma^i \text{ and } E_0^j > 4E_\sigma^j), \quad (1)$$

where E_σ^i, E_σ^j are the energy equivalents of the electronic noise of channels i, j , and j is a channel adjacent in space to channel i . The E_σ^i are standard deviations of the noise distributions on the e.m. energy scale obtained by random events. Note that $E_\sigma > 0$ always, while the energy signal E_0^i might be positive or negative, in the latter case representing a pure noise contribution. Thus only weak thresholds are applied around a significant signal seed and statistical compensation of positive and negative noise contributions is achieved.

5.3. Hadronic energy reconstruction

Since in the H1 LAr calorimeter the response to hadrons is typically 30% smaller than that for electrons of the same incident energy, an additional cor-

rection has to be applied to the signal obtained on the e.m. scale.

The aim is to equalize the response to the e.m. and pure hadronic components of a hadronic shower and, therefore, to suppress the influence of the large fluctuations in the hadronic shower composition on the reconstructed energy. The technique exploits the fact that local energy deposits of high density are mainly of electromagnetic origin while the hadronic component is much more spread out. Thus, in a well segmented calorimeter the amount of energy deposited in the cells can be used for statistical separation of e.m. and hadronic energy depositions for which different correction factors are needed.

Signal weighting techniques to get the proper hadronic energy scale have already been studied for single pions in test beams [4–6]. The reconstruction of e–p events at HERA, however, requires a good energy measurement also for jets in a wide energy range. Results of a first study of the application of weighting to signals from simulated jets have been presented in refs. [7,8]. In the present approach the weighting functions are derived by simulation of jets in the full H1 detector thereby making use in the reconstruction of clustering of cells as described below. In the remaining part of this chapter the signals are assumed to be already reconstructed on the e.m. energy scale (section 5.1).

5.3.1. Clustering

All cells passing the noise suppressing step (section 5.2) are subject to clustering which is based on the correlation between signals in neighbouring cells. The aim is the formation of groups of cells with signals corresponding to particle showers. The algorithms used are tuned such that the cells containing energy depositions from an individual e.m. shower, initiated by a photon or electron in the jet, are most probably collected into one cluster. Hadronic clusters, on the other hand, with their large spatial fluctuations are in general split into several clusters [30].

Each cluster of cells with total energy above 1 GeV is classified to be either of e.m. or hadronic nature. The former are identified using characteristics like the fraction of cluster energy deposited in EMC (containment in EMC), in the first layer of EMC (early shower development), and in the four most energetic cells of a cluster (compactness), see ref. [3]. Clusters above 1 GeV which are not recognized as of e.m. type are called *hadronic*. Below 1 GeV clusters with significance $\sqrt{\sum (E_0^i/E_\sigma^i)^2} > 8$ and developing deeply inside the calorimeter are called *hadronic* as well.

5.3.2. Weighting function application

Electromagnetic clusters are regarded as being calibrated on the e.m. energy scale while signals in cells

of hadronic objects have to be weighted. The latter are formed by cells which are not included into an e.m. cluster and located in a tube around a hadronic cluster ($r < 50$ cm in HAC and $r < 25$ cm in EMC).

The functions used to calculate the weights applied to signals in these cells are qualitatively the same as introduced in refs. [7,8], the weighted energy E_{rec}^i in a cell i is calculated by:

$$E_{\text{rec}}^i = \{a_0 + a_1 \exp(-\alpha E_0^i/V^i)\} E_0^i, \quad (2)$$

where E_0^i is the energy on the e.m. scale in this cell, V^i the volume of the cell, and a_0, a_1 and α are the parameters of the weighting function.

The parameters a_0, a_1 and α have to be determined for each calorimeter type (EMC, HAC). Two approaches have been studied to determine the weighting parameters as functions of quantities which are directly measurable inside the calorimeter alone. One possibility is to use simulated single pion response to determine the weighting parameters in different calorimeter wheels as functions of the signal of a hadronic cluster [11]. The other approach is to use the response to the hadrons in simulated jets to determine the parameters as functions of the reconstructed jet energy, calculated iteratively inside cones of 10° opening angle, as seen from the vertex. The results of the latter approach are applied in this paper. At low energies, below 7 GeV, the ansatz in eq. (2) is replaced by simple multiplicative factors corresponding to effective e/π ratios in EMC and HAC. In the region 7–10 GeV both methods contribute to the correction in order to get a smooth transition from the simple correction factors to the weighting according eq. (2).

We mention again, that there is no difference in the weighted energy reconstruction for jets and single hadrons or for simulated and experimental data, the same functions and parameters are used in all cases. The reconstructed energies for single pions shown in section 7 are obtained by running the above described standard H1 reconstruction algorithm – including the filtering of e.m. clusters – on the experimental and simulated signals.

6. Event selection

Pions are selected by Cherenkov counters in the beam line (section 3). For beam energies $E_{\text{beam}} \geq 10$ GeV all events are accepted if their total signal E_0 on the e.m. energy scale fulfills $E_0 \gtrsim (2-4)$ GeV, depending on the depth of the actual module. This suppresses contributions from possible beam muons in case of experimental data; the cut is, however, applied to simulated data as well. No additional cut is applied against events with longitudinal energy leakage to avoid in the calibration at high incident energies a bias towards hadronic showers with a large electromagnetic content.

For those results where the iron streamer tube tail catcher is included, we veto against punch through by requiring to observe no digital hits in the last 3 layers of the tail catcher. They are located behind its last iron plate, i.e. behind 10.5 interaction lengths in total.

At lower energies, $E_{\text{beam}} \leq 7$ GeV, the muon contamination of the test beam can not be neglected either. Here the tail catcher and parts of the veto system behind the tail catcher are used to eliminate these muons. These selections lead of course to a suppression of such events in the data sample, where the pions are passing the LAr calorimeter with a late or no inelastic interaction.

7. Experimental results and comparisons with simulations

7.1. Total energy signals in different calorimeter modules

Total energies are calculated by summing over the cells of the EMC and HAC sections of the LAr calorimeter, where each single channel has to pass the noise cut given in eq. (1). Electronic noise is also included in case of simulation (section 5.2). Results on the e.m. scale (E_0) and hadronic energy scale (E_{rec}) are shown in fig. 3 for experimental and simulated pions at the lowest energies available in the IF and FB/OF calorimeter modules. The distributions agree quite well, besides somewhat larger tails towards high energies in case of simulation. Examples for pions at higher beam energies in various calorimeter regions are shown in fig. 4. The tails of the distributions to lower energies are due to pions with late or no inelastic interaction in the calorimeter. They are already at incident energies as low as 30 GeV more enhanced in the CB mod-




Fig. 3. Distributions of the energy on the electromagnetic scale E_0 (\circ simulations, histograms experiment) and of the reconstructed energy E_{rec} after weighting (\bullet simulations, shaded histograms experiment) for the lowest available pion energies at the test beam.




Fig. 4. Distributions of the energy on the electromagnetic scale E_0 (\circ simulations, histograms experiment) and of the reconstructed energy E_{rec} after weighting (\bullet simulations, shaded histograms experiment) at various incident energies in different calorimeter modules.




Fig. 6. Energy reconstruction for pions at 120 and 205 GeV for LAr module IF with tail catcher (hatched histogram) and IF only (\circ). Solid line: fitted Gaussian distribution.




Fig. 5. The relative difference between simulated (E_0^{sim}) and experimental (E_0^{exp}) pion signals on the electromagnetic energy scale (top) and after weighting (E_{rec}^{sim} , E_{rec}^{exp}) (bottom), in three different calorimeter regions.

ule which is shorter (total depth $d \approx 5\lambda$) than other modules such as FB ($d \approx 8\lambda$).

based on fitted Gaussian distributions, for simulated and experimental pions as function of the beam energy is given in fig. 5. The maximal deviations are $< 3\%$ on the e.m. and $< 5\%$ on the hadronic energy scale. They are mainly systematic. A comparison of the results of the different stacks shows agreement better than $\pm 2\%$. If the results of the different stacks are averaged at a given beam energy, the deviations of simulation from experimental data are in the order of 3% . The reconstruction code applied to simulated events reproduces, under the condition of realistic electronic noise and analysis cuts, the energy deposited in the calorimeter to better than $\pm 2\%$. Further studies of the calibration with the full detector at HERA are in progress [2].

The above results are based on the LAr calorimeter only. The inclusion of the tail catcher (section 3.3) is essential at high energies. This is visible in fig. 6 which shows the reconstruction at pion energies of 120 and 205 GeV with the LAr calorimeter alone (6λ) and together with the tail catcher (10.5λ in total).

7.2. Hadronic energy resolution

The energy resolution for pions is determined by fitting a Gaussian function to the distribution of fully reconstructed energies E_{rec} , as for example shown in fig. 4, thereby excluding the low energy tails. The simulated distributions generally show larger fluctuations than the experimental data. This effect can be observed in all the different calorimeter modules. Table 2 gives the direct comparison on the e.m. scale for the IF stack and shows that the resolution for simulation is on average worse by 7% than the measured one. These systematic effects are under study and some improvement of GHEISHA at high energies appears

Table 2

Standard deviations of Gaussian distributions fitted to the total energy on the e.m. scale in the IF module for data and simulation with GHEISHA 8 (statistical errors)

E_{beam} [GeV]	Electromagnetic scale	
	σ_{exp} [GeV]	σ_{sim} [GeV]
5	0.93 ± 0.02	1.01 ± 0.02
10	1.39 ± 0.03	1.39 ± 0.02
30	3.25 ± 0.04	3.46 ± 0.04
50	5.08 ± 0.07	5.48 ± 0.09
80	7.80 ± 0.11	8.37 ± 0.14
120	11.06 ± 0.16	11.94 ± 0.35
170	15.63 ± 0.28	17.19 ± 0.47
205	18.42 ± 0.23	19.73 ± 1.10




Fig. 7. Measured energy resolution for pions in the IF module (o) as function of the beam energy. The reconstruction at the higher energies includes signals from the tail catcher (Δ).

to be possible [31].

The measured energy resolution as a function of the beam energy is shown in fig. 7. The data are fully reconstructed on the hadronic energy scale (section 5.3). The signals from the tail catcher, which at HERA is integrated into the instrumented iron muon system [2], have been included at beam energies $E_{\text{beam}} > 80$ GeV to recover energies leaking out of the liquid argon calorimeter. The curve results from a fit to the data points, using the resolution function

$$\frac{\sigma(E)}{E} = \sqrt{\frac{a^2}{E_{\text{beam}}} + \frac{b^2}{E_{\text{beam}}^2} + c^2}, \quad (3)$$

with a stochastic term $a/\sqrt{E_{\text{beam}}}$, a noise term b/E_{beam} and a constant term c . This fit yields

$$\begin{aligned} a &= (50.7 \pm 0.7)\% \sqrt{\text{GeV}}, \\ b &= (945 \pm 32) \text{ MeV}, \\ c &= (1.6 \pm 0.1)\%, \end{aligned}$$

which can be regarded as typical values for the whole calorimeter. As $c \sim (e/\pi - 1)$ [32], the relatively small constant term in eq. (3) shows the good compensation achieved with the weighting functions.

7.3. Effective electron-to-pion signal ratio in the liquid argon calorimeter

The energy E_0 reconstructed on the e.m. scale is a very good estimate of the energy E_{dep} deposited in the calorimeter in case of electrons, however it is on average smaller than E_{dep} or E_{beam} in case of incident pions.

The electron-to-pion signal ratio on the e.m. scale can be expressed by:

$$\frac{e}{\pi} = \frac{\langle E_{\text{dep}} \rangle}{\langle E_0 \rangle}. \quad (4)$$

As E_{dep} is known exactly only for Monte Carlo events, we have calculated an effective $(e/\pi)_{\text{eff}}$ for different




Fig. 8. The effective electron-to-pion signal ratio calculated as given in eq. (5) for experimental pions, as function of the beam energy E_{beam} in different calorimeter regions (a). Picture (b) shows e/π corrected by Monte Carlo for the effect of limited acceptance and longitudinal energy leakage. The curves show results from fits, as discussed in the text.

calorimeter wheels and pion energies E_{beam} :

$$\left(\frac{e}{\pi}\right)_{eff} = \frac{E_{beam}}{\langle E_0 \rangle}. \quad (5)$$

This quantity overestimates the e/π ratio, since it is affected by energy losses due to material in front of the calorimeters, limited lateral acceptance of the calibration modules and, especially at high beam energies, by longitudinal energy leakage. Measured values of $(e/\pi)_{eff}$ are shown in fig. 8a. Simulations yield similar results for $(e/\pi)_{eff}$ on the level of agreement observed in fig. 5. The shorter CB module shows a

different dependence on E_{beam} than the deeper IF and FB/OF. This is due to longitudinal energy leakage, which occurs in case of the CB module already significantly at beam energies around 30 GeV, leading even to a soft rise of $(e/\pi)_{eff}$ with increasing E_{beam} . The two deeper modules, IF and FB/OF, show practically the same absorption characteristics in terms of the energy dependence of $(e/\pi)_{eff}$.

The quantity e/π , as given in eq. (4), has also been calculated correcting for leakage by simulation, for which the deposited energy is known event by event (fig. 8b). The resulting e/π is falling with increasing particle energy, as expected, and is very similar for all the studied modules. The curves in fig. 8b are fits with functions falling linearly with increasing $\log E_{beam}$. This behaviour corresponds to a rise of the intrinsic electromagnetic fraction $f_{em} \sim \log E_{beam}$ of the hadronic shower [5,33].

7.4. Shower profiles

Longitudinal and transverse shower profiles have been measured at different beam energies and are compared with Monte Carlo simulation. The IF and CB calorimeter modules are especially well suited for this study because of the approximately perpendicular impact direction of the beam particles into these stacks.

Fig. 9 shows the average relative energy deposit, measured on the e.m. energy scale and normalized to the depth of each longitudinal segment, as a function of the calorimeter depth for pions at different beam energies in the IF and CB modules. In general the simulation follows quite well the experimental data. Some discrepancies are visible in the first segments of the hadronic stacks.




Fig. 9. The longitudinal shower profile for experimental (\bullet) and simulated (shaded histograms) pions at three different beam energies in IF and CB. Shown is the average relative energy deposition $dE_0/\langle E_0 \rangle$, as measured on the e.m. scale per unit absorption length λ , as a function of the calorimeter depth t .




Fig. 10. The transverse shower profiles for pions at different energies in the IF module, experiment (\bullet) and simulation (shaded histograms). The average relative energy deposition $dE_0/\langle E_0\rangle$, measured on the e.m. scale and integrated over the whole shower depth, is shown as function of the distance r from the shower axis.

The transverse profiles for experimental and simulated pions at 5, 30 and 80 GeV in the IF module are compared in fig. 10. The average relative energy loss, integrated over the whole shower depth, is shown as function of the perpendicular distance from the shower axis, which is measured for each event by determining the impact point at the front face of the calorimeter and the center of gravity of the shower. The lateral acceptance of the module is limited to about 2λ .

7.5. Signals in single channels

In fig. 11 we compare fluctuations of energies E_0^i of individual cells averaged over the FB/OF calorimeter modules at pion beam energies of 3.7, 30 and 80 GeV. The simulation follows very well the distribution

of the energies E_0^i over several orders of magnitude in probability. This is important if, as in the present energy reconstruction scheme for the H1 LAr calorimeter, the determination of weighting functions is based on simulation of hadrons or jets. The weights applied in the hadronic energy reconstruction (section 5.3) to the signal energies E_0^i are functions of these energies themselves.

8. Conclusions

Detailed comparisons of signals from pions in H1 liquid argon calorimeter modules and simulation in the GEANT/GHEISHA frame have been presented on the electromagnetic energy scale which is determined from electron measurements. The total signal




Fig. 11. The distributions of signals E_0^i in single cells for experimental (\bullet) and simulated (shaded histograms) pions in the FB/OF region, at different beam energies.

for pions is described within an uncertainty of $< 3\%$ for beam energies between 3.7 and 205 GeV. The longitudinal and lateral shower spreads are well reproduced by the simulation. The same is true for energy fluctuations in single cells.

Full reconstruction of the energy deposited by single pions in the calorimeter can be achieved by signal weighting functions determined from simulated jets. Here the deviations of experimental and simulated energies are about 3%. An energy resolution of about $50\%/\sqrt{E}$ (GeV) with a constant term below 2% is achieved.

Acknowledgement

We appreciate the big efforts of all the technical collaborators who constructed and maintained the calorimeters. The support of the CERN staff operating the SPS, the H6 beam line and the computer facilities is gratefully acknowledged. We thank all funding agencies for financial support. Finally we would like to thank H. Fesefeldt for useful discussions.

References

- [1] H1 Calorimeter Group, Calibration of the H1 liquid argon calorimeters by electrons, in preparation.
- [2] H1 Collaboration, The H1-detector HERA, DESY preprint 93-103 (1993), to be submitted to Nucl. Instr. and Meth.
- [3] H1 Calorimeter Group, B. Andrieu et al., Proc. 3rd Int. Conf. on Advanced Technol. and Part. Phys., Como, Italy, June 1992, to be published in Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.).
- [4] H1 Calorimeter Group, W. Braunschweig et al., Nucl. Instr. and Meth. A 265 (1988) 419; H1 Calorimeter Group, W. Braunschweig et al., Nucl. Instr. and Meth. A 275 (1989) 246.
- [5] H1 Calorimeter Group, W. Braunschweig et al., DESY preprint 89-022 (1989).
- [6] J.P. Dishaw et al., Phys. Lett. B 85 (1979) 142; J.P. Dishaw, SLAC-Report 216 (1979); and CDHS Collaboration, H. Abramowicz et al., Nucl. Instr. and Meth. 180 (1981) 429.
- [7] H1 Calorimeter Group, H. Jung et al., contributed paper to the XXV Int. Conf. on High Energy Physics, Singapore (1990).
- [8] H. Greif, MPI-PAE/Exp.El. 229 (1990), Thesis, Technical University of München (1990).
- [9] J. Marks, DESY F21-90-01 (1990), Thesis, University of Hamburg (1989).
- [10] J. Gayler, in: MC91, Workshop of Detector and Event Simulation, eds. K. Bos and B van Eijk, NIKHEF-H, Amsterdam (1991) p. 312.
- [11] P. Loch, Thesis, University of Hamburg (1992).
- [12] J. Žáček et al., H1 Internal report, H1-04/92-220 (1992); and E. Sánchez, H1 Internal report, H1-07/92-232 (1992).
- [13] M. Flieser, MPI-Phe/92-08, Diploma Thesis, Technical University of München (1992).
- [14] M. Rudowicz, MPI-PhE/92-14, Thesis, University of Hamburg, 1992.
- [15] H1 Calorimeter Group, B. Andrieu et al., DESY preprint 93-078 (1993), to be published in Nucl. Instr. and Meth.
- [16] P. Coet, CERN/EBS note 85-14 (1985); CERN preprint, SPS/EPB/PC (1981).
- [17] H1 Collaboration, C. Berger et al., DESY-report PRC 86-02, Hamburg (1986).
- [18] H1 Muon Group, H. Bergstein et al., H1 internal report, H1-10/91-197 (1991), and *ibid*, H1-01/93-261 (1993).
- [19] H. Bergstein, Thesis, RWTH Aachen (1993).
- [20] J.-F. Laporte, Thesis, University of Paris-Sud (1991); R. Haydar, Thesis, University of Paris-Sud (1991); and R. Grässler, Diploma Thesis, RWTH Aachen (1991).
- [21] R. Brun et al., CERN DD/EE/84-1 (1987).
- [22] H. Fesefeldt, PITHA-Report 85-02, RWTH Aachen (1985).
- [23] J.B. Birks, Proc. Phys. Soc. 64 (1951) 874.
- [24] C.W. Fabjan et al., Nucl. Instr. and Meth. 141 (1977) 61; and J. Brau and T.A. Gabriel, Nucl. Instr. and Meth. A 238 (1985) 489.
- [25] S. Peters, MPI-PhE/92-13, Thesis, University of Hamburg (1992).
- [26] M. Kuhlen, in: Proc. 26th Int. Conf. on High Energy Physics, Dallas, 1992, ed. J.R. Sanford, vol. 2, p. 1787.
- [27] R.L. Ford and W.R. Nelson, SLAC-Report-210; and SLAC preprint, EUN-SLAC-0.
- [28] R. Tamoschat, Diploma Thesis, University of Dortmund (1992).
- [29] J. Gayler, H. Küster and P. Loch, H1 Internal report, H1-04/91-171 (1991).
- [30] L. Görlich and H.P. Wellisch, H1 Internal report, H1-12/91-204 (1991).
- [31] A. Wagener, PITHA-Report 92/37, Diploma Thesis, RWTH Aachen (1992).
- [32] R. Wigmans, Nucl. Instr. and Meth. A 259 (1987) 389.
- [33] C.W. Fabjan, CERN preprint, EP/85-54 (1985).