# The status of pass2 cascade 11 year data diffuse analysis

Zelong Zhang <a href="mailto:zelong.zelong.1@stonybrook.edu">zelong.zelong.zelong.zelong.1@stonybrook.edu</a>

## **Background And Purpose**

- GlobalFit with diffuse numu and cascade project is on-going.
  - <u>https://events.icecube.wisc.edu/event/127/contributions/7505/attachments/5869/6940/</u> <u>GlobalFit\_SnowStorm.pdf</u>
  - Going to use pass2 data and pass2 snowstorm mc
- Cascade analysis based on Hans Niederhausen's work on pass1 (2012-2015) 4 year data.
  - <u>https://wiki.icecube.wisc.edu/index.php/Multi\_Year\_Cascades</u>
  - https://wiki.icecube.wisc.edu/index.php/Multi\_Year\_Cascades/Paper
- Goal: Request to unblind pass2 (2010-2020) 11 year cascade data for the GlobalFit numu+cascades
- https://wiki.icecube.wisc.edu/index.php/Pass2\_Multi\_Year\_Cascade\_Analysis

## **Cascade Final level Cuts**

- Event selections we use are the same as for previous (pass1) cascade analysis
  - Low energy (H. Niederhausen): <u>https://wiki.icecube.wisc.edu/index.php/Multi\_Year\_Cascades/Low\_Energy</u>
    - Some clean cuts:
      - anti-dust layer cuts
      - containment cuts
      - large delay time cuts (safetymargin)
    - boosted decision tree event classification
      - final\_cascade
      - final\_hybrid
      - final\_muon
  - High energy (Y. Xu): https://wiki.icecube.wisc.edu/index.php/Multi\_Year\_Cascades/High\_Energy

#### Pass2 comparison of variables across years Distribution of all L3 events\*

- Goal: 11 year data (2010-2020)
- Pass2 data is uniform across years (2010 is to be checked)
- Some reconstructed variables







#### Pass2 comparison of variables across years Distribution of all L3 Events\*

- Goal: 11 year data (2010-2020)
- Pass2 data is uniform across years (2010 is to be checked)
- Some low filter level variables







## Pass2 vs Pass1 comparison Level3 single contained event rate

- 2012 is special, 2012 pass1 data used 'CascadeFilter\_12' online filter while other years used 'CascadeFilter 13' online filter. And all pass2 data used 'CascadeFilter\_13' online filter
- For other years pass1 and pass2 data match with each other, except certain runs, which will be removed by good run list if they are outliers.



event rate burn sample 2012



event rate burn sample 2014

runid

0.200

0.175

0.150

0.075

0.050

0.025

pass]

pass2



## Pass2 vs Pass1 comparison Level3 single contained event energy distribution

- Low energy part matches well  $\bullet$
- High energy part: the difference is caused by background, has been verified that it will disappear at final cut level



## Pass2 Good Run List

- Basing on official Good Run List for pass2
- Select runs with 86-string configuration
- Remove outliers (find by eyes, larger than 20% deviation) according to
  Cascade L3 rate
- Final Good Run Lists are uploaded to my wiki page https:// wiki.icecube.wisc.edu/index.php/ Pass2\_Multi\_Year\_Cascade\_Analysis





## **Final cut level:** Pass2 and Pass1 comparison

- Good match for high energy events (>30 TeV)
  - Only four events are lost and no event introduced. The reason of lost events are known (one due to early hit pulse, two due to good run list and one located at the boundary of LE and HE selection)
- Pass1 has overall higher rate at low energy
  - Part of the reason (version of xgboost) have been found and fixed.

50

0

10<sup>2</sup>



10<sup>5</sup>

106

cscdSBU MonopodFit4 final.energy [GeV]

 $10^{4}$ 

10<sup>3</sup>

## Safetymargin Issue

- Safetymargin is a parameter in function ACausalHitSelector '/data/user/zzhang1/combo/ stable/src/CascadeL3 IC79/ python/level4/veto.py'. It is used to count early hit pulses.
- Changed safetymargin from 50 to 60 compared to previous pass1 cascade analysis
- Have studied the effect of change.





Energy [GeV]

2013 final cut level energy distribution

- 2012-2014: only several events are different,
- pass1 and pass2 spectrum almost perfectly match with each other

• 2015: the difference is relatively larger, total number of events is 1144(safetymargin50)/

1145(safetymargin60), and the number of overlap events are 1095

- pass1 and pass2 spectrum basically match with each other
- Doing the double check

## **Final level** Fit result - Pass2 vs Pass1 data cross check

- I reproduced Hans' fit result with Pass1 data and Pass1 mc as a proof of I use his code correctly
  - 4 years (2012-2015) Pass1 data Final\_cascade (66 bins), Final\_hybrid (11 bins), Final\_muon (1bin) samples,
  - Plus 2 years (2010-2011) data cascade\_mlb (45 bins) samples.
- Fitted Pass2 data with Pass1 mc. I get a reasonable fit result and goodness of fit (115, given the number of degrees of freedom of chisquare distribution which is 112, so the Cumulative distribution function is 0.596)
  - 4 years (2012-2015) pass2 data Final\_cascade (66 bins), Final\_hybrid (11 bins), Final\_muon (1bin) samples,
  - Plus 2 years (2010-2011) pass1 data cascade\_mlb (45 bins) samples.
  - Different data point at highest energy bin dues to treatment of dust layer. Energy reconstruction of dust layer events will be done with GBDT or/and DirectFit for pass2 analysis, as it was done for pass1 cascade analysis.



#### **Final level** Fit result - pass2 vs pass1 cross check

NEvents [livetime\_1] 0 02 0 01 RESULTS (fitstatus: 0, edm: 5.00117e-05) muon\_norm =  $1.44998 \pm 0.04$ prompt v (UL) conv\_norm =  $1.0689^{+0.13}_{-0.12} imes \Phi_{HKKMS06}$ data prompt\_norm = 0.00929372 muon\_norm\_mlb = 0.864457 delta\_cr =  $0.0168859 \pm 0.03$ absorption =  $1.03359^{+0.05}_{-0.04}$ dom\_efficiency =  $1.025^{+0.08}_{-0.07}$ **10**<sup>0</sup> scattering =  $1.02091 \pm 0.03$ zholeice\_scattering =  $1.72221 \pm 0.19$ astro\_norm =  $1.65672^{+0.25}_{-0.27}$ astro\_index =  $2.5277 \pm 0.07$ likelihood value (gof): 84.37 likelihood value (abs): 437.836 W1.0 - 0.0 data/ 10<sup>5</sup>  $10^{4}$  $10^{3}$ 10 time to find minimium and evaluate exact likelihood: 1063.82s number of llh evaluations: 765 GeV 6

The fit result of pass1 data and pass1 mc. Energy distribution of final cascade sample.



Pass1 data pass1 mc fit result:

Pass2 data pass1 mc fit result:

From Hans' paper https://wiki.icecube.wisc.edu/ index.php/Multi\_Year\_Cascades/Paper



## Finallevel pass2 data vs pass2 snowstorm mc

- No systematic fit, the parameters are only conv\_norm, muon\_norm, astro\_norm, astro\_index
- Final\_cascade, final\_hybrid, final\_muon sample (78 bins in total)
- Reasonable fit result:

 $muon_norm = 1.265$ 

 $conv_norm = 1.053$ 

 $astro_norm = 1.527$ 

 $astro_index = 2.608$ 

- Goodness of fit is poor (135, given dof of chi2 distribution is 74).
- Study of pass2 data vs pass2 snowstorm mc is on going.



## Outlook asimov profile IIh scan over different livetime

- Asimov fit injected point:
  - astro\_norm: 1.7
  - astro\_index: 2.5
- profile IIh scan across 30, 40, 50, 100 years livetime
- Give us a feeling of the statistic and systematic uncertainty of Gen2





## Conclusions

- Goal: Request to unblind 11-year (2010-2020) pass2 cascade filter data for GlobalFit (numu+cascades)
- The pass2 cascade selections were slightly modified compared to pass1 analysis (Good Run List and safetymargin)
- Pass2 data is uniform and match with pass1 data for overlapping years (2012-2015) Pass2 2010 and 2011 data are being processed.
- Pass2 data (2012-2015) vs pass1 mc fit are made as a cross check of pass1 data vs pass2 data comparison.
- See https://wiki.icecube.wisc.edu/index.php/Pass2 Multi Year Cascade Analysis for more detailed information



## Back up

#### Pass2 comparison across years Event rate (includes 2010) - all L3 events

- Goal: 11 year data (2010-2020)
- Pass2 data is uniform across years (2010 is to be checked)
- All L3 events (includes single contained, single uncontained and coincidences contained events)

