# Energy, angle, position resolution with ORCA4

Valentin Pestel - ORCA Meeting Nikhef 15/01/2021

## Introduction

Based on neutrino MC samples

- Produced by Lodewijk at stbc
  - Jsh and Jgandalf

Method :

- Produce 2D map, e.g. energy :
  - For each bin in True energy, measure where are 15.9%, 50% and 84.1% of the distribution
  - Gives median +/- 1 σ



# [1:100] GeV (almost no, only E No cuts



100

1.0 3





Shower energy reco is better, even for nu\_mu

- Track energy reco is very bad above 10 GeV

- Looking at blue points, track energy reco is better for vertical tracks

- Shower energy reco not sensitive to direction (to detector size)

[1:100] GeV No cuts (almost no, only E





Small improvement with jsh compare to JGandalf for nu\_e and nu\_tau

Nu\_mu tracks angular resolution improve greatly with energy

Small effect with cos(theta), bad

Nu mu tracks angular deviation doesn't depend on cos(theta)

5

#### Vertex distance [m] :

Distance between true and reco interaction point

Gdf and Jsh pretty close for nu\_mu Degrade with energy (track length ?) 4m at 40GeV, so 10 m track length

Good results for showers !



Large variation for nu\_mu in function of cos(theta). Worst for upgoing ...



## No cuts : summary

**Energy resolution:** 

• Seems better in any case with Jsh, worth to trying it for Track energy reco

#### **Angular resolution:**

• Quite small improvement in performances for nu\_e and nu\_tau with Jsh. jgandalf performs well with nu\_mus, except in case of ambiguous reco.

### Interaction point resolution:

- Gdf and Jsh perform similarly with nu\_mu
- Good improvement with Jsh for nu\_e and nu\_tau





Most significant difference is on the angular resolution at low energy, and the mitigation of the spreading induced by ambiguous tracks.

# e impact nu . . Jannik cuts



Same behavior with or without cuts for nu\_e reconstructed with gandalf