



《曰》 《聞》 《言》 《言》

1

### Physical aspects of data format

Dmitriy Kostunin March 6, 2018

INSTITUT FÜR KERNPHYSIK



KIT – Die Forschungsuniversität in der Helmholtz-Gemeinschaft

### Disclaimer



- This talk describes the problem from the phisicist's point of view (unrelated to stucture of metadata, etc)
- Hereafter only air-shower data is discussed (e.g. particles, light, radio, etc)
- Many things are already implemented, we only need to formalize them and write corresponding software
- The discussed approach will be presented at ECRS2017 conference by D. Kostunin
- This talk is the mixture of physics, math, programming, etc and might be not very clear

### The problem



#### Initial idea

- APPDS is aimed to operate with big data, i.e. it is neccessary to provide flexible interface for selection and joins (otherwise end-user have to download more data and perform cuts locally)
  - Database should understand sophisticated queries
  - End-user should be able to upload custom macroses

#### Two main requirements from physicist

- More sophisticated cuts (in most interfaces only Θ(x) cut is implemented)
- More sophisticated left joins (virtual observables, recalibration on the fly, etc)

### The example of custom cut



The Earth's magnetic field B(x, y, z, t) plays important role in radio measurements of cosmic rays

 People use coordinate system transfomations or geometrical operations to handle this

Very common query in Tunka-Rex database:

```
select * from reconstruction where \
energy*sin(geomag_angle(71.7571, -2.7625, zenith, azimuth))>=0.1;
```

where geomag\_angle is a custom SQL macros

▲ロ▶▲圖▶▲≣▶▲≣▶ ≣ のQで

```
create function geomag_angle(incl double, decl double, zen double, az do
begin
         declare th1 double:
         declare th2 double;
         declare ph1 double:
         declare ph2 double:
         declare x1 double:
         declare v1 double:
         declare z1 double:
         declare x2 double:
         declare v2 double;
         declare z2 double:
         declare scalar double:
        declare angle double;
         set th1 = 3.0 \cdot pi()/2.0 + incl \cdot pi()/180.0:
         set ph1 = pi()/2.0 - decl*pi()/180.0;
         set th2 = zen \cdot pi()/180.0;
         set ph2 = az \cdot pi()/180.0;
         set x1 = sin(th1).cos(ph1);
         set x_2 = sin(th_2) \cdot cos(ph_2);
         set y1 = sin(th1).sin(ph1);
         set y_2 = sin(th_2) \cdot sin(ph_2);
         set z1 = cos(th1);
         set z^2 = cos(th^2);
         set scalar = x1 \cdot x2 + y1 \cdot y2 + z1 \cdot z2;
         set angle = acos(scalar);
         return angle;
end;
                                                    ◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ → □ → へへや
11
```

## **Description of data**



It is suggested to consider full description of air-shower using CORSIKA conventions:

- air-shower consists of a number of layers  $X_0, X_2, ..., X_g$ , where  $X_0$  and  $X_g$  is a first interaction and the ground, repectively
- each layer is described by the set of particles P(E, p, t), where E, p, t is an energy, momentum and type, respectively

The other observables are derived from the basic ones via mapping:

- electromagnetic energy  $\int P(E, p, t = e, \gamma) \mathrm{d}E$
- detected muons  $P_{X=X_g}(E > E_{th}, p, t = \mu)$
- Top-down mapping in case of simulations, bottom-up in case of real measurements

# Types of data and mapping (arbitrary)



#### Observables

- "Direct" D (e,  $\mu$ ,  $\gamma$ , etc)
- "Reconstructed" R (E,  $X_{max}$ ,  $\ln A$ , etc)
- "Virtual" V ("ideal measurements", EM component, hadr.component, neutrino, etc)

#### Mapping

- Calibration (hardware response)  $D \rightarrow R$ : provided by experiments, but can be change on the flight by the end-user
- Models V =: provided by experiments (reconstruction methods), theorists (proposed methods), end-users.

This mapping can be implemented in the frame of our system, indexed with DOI and be cited in papers.

The external reader can test this mapping (methods) using DOI from paper and simulations (for example)

## **Example of application**



KG-Tunka joint paper "A comparison of the cosmic-ray energy scales of Tunka-133 and KASCADE-Grande via their radio extensions Tunka-Rex and LOPES"

- DOI: 10.1016/j.physletb.2016.10.031
  - Radio is left joined to host detector with timestamp1=timestamp2
  - LOPES and Tunka-Rex data are recalibrated "on the fly":  $D_1 \rightarrow D_1'$ ,  $D_2 \rightarrow D_2'$  to be consistent
  - LOPES and Tunka-Rex events were re-simulated with CORSIKA:  $D_1 \rightarrow V_1$  and  $D_2 \rightarrow V_2$
  - Finally, KG and Tunka-133 were joined via modified radio observables: D1c=D2c or V1=V2

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □



- The idea is to follow CORSIKA conventions for air-shower description (and to be more consistent with simulations)
- It is suggested to integrate calibration and reconstruction into aggregation service and call this *mapping*
- Allow end-user to implement his/her own macroses for cuts and joining
- Optimize APPDS to support and execute these macroses