

A Novel Generic Framework for Track Fitting in Complex Detector Systems

C. Höppner¹, S. Neubert, B. Ketzer, S. Paul

Technische Universität München, Physik Department, 85748 Garching, Germany

Abstract

This paper presents a novel framework for track fitting which is usable in a wide range of experiments, independent of the specific event topology, detector setup, or magnetic field arrangement. This goal is achieved through a completely modular design. Fitting algorithms are implemented as interchangeable modules. At present, the framework contains a validated Kalman filter. Track parameterizations and the routines required to extrapolate the track parameters and their covariance matrices through the experiment are also implemented as interchangeable modules. Different track parameterizations and extrapolation routines can be used simultaneously for fitting of the same physical track. Representations of detector hits are the third modular ingredient to the framework. The hit dimensionality and orientation of planar tracking detectors are not restricted. Tracking information from detectors which do not measure the passage of particles in a fixed physical detector plane, e.g. drift chambers or TPCs, is used without any simplifications. The concept is implemented in a light-weight C++ library called GENFIT, which is available as free software.

Keywords: track fitting, track reconstruction, Kalman filter, drift chamber, TPC

1. Introduction

Spectrometers in nuclear and particle physics have the purpose of identifying the 4-momenta and vertices of particles stemming from high-energy collisions and decays of particles or nuclei. In addition to calorimetric and other particle identification measurements, the 3-momenta and positions of charged particles are measured by tracking them in magnetic fields with the use of position sensitive detectors. Cluster finding procedures can be applied in some detectors to combine the responses of individual electronic channels in order to improve the accuracy of the position measurements. The position measurements will be called *hits* throughout this paper, regardless of whether they stem from a single detector channel or from a combination of several of them. Pattern recognition algorithms determine which hits contribute to the individual particle tracks. The hits identified at this stage to belong to one track then serve as the input for a fitting procedure, which determines the best estimates for the position and momentum of a particle at any point along its trajectory. A novel framework for this task of track fitting in complex detector systems is presented in this paper. It organizes the task of track fitting, i.e. the interplay between fitting algorithms, detector hits, and particles trajectories, with a minimal amount of interfaces. It is a toolkit which is independent of specific detector setups and magnetic field geometries and hence can be used for many particle physics experiments.

¹corresponding author, email: christian.hoepfner@cern.ch

20 Tracking of particles is usually performed with a combination of different species of detectors. They can be cate-
21 gorized according to the different geometrical information they deliver:

22 1) detectors which measure the particle passage along one axis in a detector plane, e.g. silicon strip detectors or mul-
23 tiwire proportional chambers;

24 2) detectors which measure the two-dimensional penetration point of a particle through a plane, e.g. silicon pixel
25 detectors;

26 3) detectors which measure a drift time relative to a wire position, i.e. a surface of constant drift time around the wire
27 through which the particle passed tangentially, e.g. drift chambers or “straw tubes”;

28 4) detectors which measure three-dimensional space points on particle trajectories, like time projection chambers
29 (TPC).

30 But also higher dimensional hits can occur:

31 5) detector systems which measure two-dimensional position information in combination with two-dimensional di-
32 rection information, including correlations between these parameters. Examples could be stations of several planes of
33 detectors of categories 1 and 2, or electromagnetic calorimeters.

34 For detectors which do not deliver tracking information in physical detector planes, e.g. those of categories 3 and
35 4, the track fitting software of many experiments resorts to simplifications, which may be justified for a particular
36 application but prevent the usage of the same program for different experimental environments. Examples are the
37 projection of TPC data onto planes defined by pad rows or the projection of the surfaces of constant drift time in drift
38 chambers onto predefined planes, just leaving two lines with left-right ambiguities. This approach is problematic if
39 the drift cells are not arranged in a planar configuration and if there is no preferred direction in which the detector is
40 passed by the particles. Another common simplification is the treatment of two-dimensional hits (e.g. from silicon
41 pixel detectors) as two independent one-dimensional measurements.

42 In the framework presented here these problems have been overcome to make optimal use of the information from
43 combinations of all types of tracking detector systems. All detector hits are defined in detector planes. For hits in
44 detectors which do not have physical detector planes, so-called *virtual detector planes* are calculated dynamically for
45 every extrapolation of a track to a hit. The dimensionality of detector hits is not restricted. One-dimensional hits
46 constrain the track only along the coordinate axis in the detector plane which they measure. Two-dimensional hits
47 are used in one fitting step to constrain the track in two dimensions in their detector planes. For hits in non-planar
48 detectors (categories 3 and 4), the hit information (e.g. a surface of constant drift time) is converted into a position
49 measurement in a plane perpendicular to the track, so that a fit is able to minimize the perpendicular distances between
50 the track and the position measurements. The information from hits with higher dimensionality, like those of category
51 5, is used in four-dimensional hits, which contain all correlations between the parameters.

52 Tracks of charged particles in magnetic fields are (usually) described by five parameters and a corresponding covari-
53 ance matrix. The ability to extrapolate a track described by these parameters and their covariances, taking into account
54 the effects of materials and magnetic fields, to different positions in the spectrometer is mandatory for track fitting.

55 The concept presented here provides a well defined interface for the invocation of external programs or libraries to
56 perform these track extrapolations. It thus allows the straightforward use of established track following codes with
57 their native geometry and magnetic field interfaces, such as GEANE [1], which is nowadays distributed as part of
58 CERN’s Virtual Monte Carlo (VMC) package [2]. This is the most significant difference to other projects (e.g. Rec-
59 Pack [3]), which offer more monolithic approaches to track fitting (e.g. defining their own geometry classes). The
60 concept allows the simultaneous fitting of several representations of tracks to the same set of hits, i.e. to the same
61 physical track. This flexibility is especially useful in the early phase of an experiment when different track parame-
62 terizations and extrapolation approaches can be compared with each other, in order to identify the ones with optimal
63 performance. But also the flexible coverage of different phase space regions with different track models, or the fitting
64 of different mass hypotheses with the same track model can be desirable. The implementation of the concept has been
65 realized in a software toolkit called GENFIT. It is written in C++ and is designed in a fully object oriented way. It
66 has been developed in the framework of the PANDA experiment [4], as part of the computing framework PANDARoot
67 [5], but is now distributed as a stand-alone package [6].

68 GENFIT contains a validated Kalman Filter. This algorithm is commonly used for track fitting in particle spec-
69 trometers [7], since it performs much better than global minimization approaches in the presence of materials and
70 inhomogeneous magnetic fields. The concept is however not limited to the use of the Kalman Filter. Other fitting
71 algorithms, like Gaussian Sum Filters [8] or Deterministic Annealing Filters [9], can be implemented easily.

72 Section 2 describes the concept of this new approach to track fitting in detail. Section 3 points out the key
73 features of the implementation of GENFIT. Some examples of concrete track representations, on the dimensionalities
74 of reconstruction hits and track representations, and the interplay between them follow in Sec. 4. Simulation studies
75 which validate the Kalman filter implemented in GENFIT are presented in Sec. 5.

76 **2. Concept**

77 The basic functionalities which are required for any procedure of track fitting are the extrapolation of tracks to the
78 positions of the hits in the detectors, and the calculation of the distances between hits and tracks, i.e. the residuals. The
79 concept discussed here divides the problem of track fitting into three main entities which are separated from each other
80 as much as possible and interact through well defined interfaces: 1) track fitting algorithms, 2) track representations,
81 and 3) reconstruction hits. Figure 1 shows this structure. The following sections explain these objects in detail.

82 *2.1. Track Fitting Algorithms*

“Progressive” fitting algorithms like the extended Kalman filter [7, 10] are widely used for track fitting in high
energy physics experiments. Although the track fitting concept discussed in this paper is not limited to the use of the
Kalman filter, this algorithm shall serve as an example to illustrate which functionalities are generally required.
The extended Kalman filter is an efficient recursive algorithm that finds the optimum estimate \vec{x}_k for the unknown true




Figure 1: General structure of objects for track fitting: Fitting Algorithm, Track Representation, and Reconstruction Hit. The arrows indicate the interactions between the objects, which are described in this chapter. POCA stands for point of closest approach.

state vector \hat{x}_k of a system from a series of noisy measurements, together with the corresponding covariance matrix C_k of \hat{x}_k . The state vector contains the track parameters and the index k indicates that the state vector, and its covariance matrix are given at the detector plane of hit k .

Before a recursion step, the state vector \vec{x}_{k-1} and covariance matrix C_{k-1} contain the information of all hits up to index $k - 1$. In the **prediction** step the state vector and covariance matrix are extrapolated to the detector plane of hit k by the track following code. The predicted state vector is denoted by \tilde{x}_k and the predicted covariance matrix by \tilde{C}_k . This covariance matrix is the sum of the propagated track covariance matrix C_{k-1} (Gaussian error propagation by transformation with the Jacobian matrix of the propagation operation $\tilde{x}_k = f(\vec{x}_{k-1})$), and a noise matrix which takes into account effects like multiple scattering and energy loss straggling. Then, the algorithm calculates the **update** for the state vector and the covariance matrix by taking into account the measurement \vec{m}_k :

$$\vec{x}_k = \tilde{x}_k + K_k \vec{r}_k \quad (1)$$

$$C_k = (I - K_k H_k) \tilde{C}_k \quad (2)$$

with the residual

$$\tilde{\vec{r}}_k = \vec{m}_k - H_k \tilde{\vec{x}}_k, \quad (3)$$

the weight of the residual (or Kalman gain)

$$K_k = \tilde{C}_k H_k^T (H_k \tilde{C}_k H_k^T + V_k)^{-1}, \quad (4)$$

83 and the covariance matrix V_k of the measurement \vec{m}_k . I is the unit matrix of corresponding dimensionality. The
 84 projection matrix H_k is a linear transformation from the coordinate system of the state vector \vec{x}_k , to the coordinate
 85 system of the position measurement \vec{m}_k of hit k , i.e. the detector plane of the hit. A discussion about dimensions of the
 86 vectors and matrices in the above equations can be found in Sec. 4.2 together with concrete examples for the matrix
 87 H_k . The elements of the covariance matrix C_k shrink with the inclusion of more hits, thus reducing the impact of a
 88 single hit on the value of the state vector. The χ^2 -contribution of hit k is $\chi_k^2 = \vec{r}_k^T (V_k - H_k C_k H_k^T)^{-1} \vec{r}_k$ with the filtered
 89 residual $\vec{r}_k = \vec{m}_k - H_k \vec{x}_k$. It adds $\dim(\vec{m}_k)$ degrees of freedom to the total χ^2 .

90 After the Kalman steps have been performed on all hits of the track, the track can still be biased due to wrong starting
 91 values \vec{x}_0 . This bias can be reduced by the repeated application of the procedure in the opposite order of hits, using the
 92 previous fit result as starting values for the track parameters. Before the fit is repeated, the elements of the covariance
 93 matrix have to be multiplied with a large factor ($\mathcal{O}(1000)$) in order not to include the same information in the track
 94 several times.

95 As can be seen in Fig. 1 the fitting algorithm operates on entities called reconstruction hits and track representations,
 96 which are detailed in the following.

97 2.2. Track Representations

98 A particle track is described by a set of track parameters and a corresponding covariance matrix, which are defined
 99 at a given position along the track. Often, the track parameters are e.g. given at a particular z -position. In the concept
 100 presented here, track parameters are always defined in reference planes.

101 In order to use a track model in a track fitter, one needs to be able to extrapolate the track parameters to different
 102 places in the spectrometer. The combination of the track parameterization and the track extrapolation functionality
 103 will be called a *track representation*. A track representation holds the data of the state vector \vec{x}_k , and the covariance
 104 matrix C_k of a track, as well as the reference plane at which these are defined. Also it provides a well defined interface
 105 for the invocation of the external routines needed to extrapolate the parameters to different positions. As can be seen
 106 in Fig. 1, there are three track extrapolation functions which are needed for each track representation: Extrapolation
 107 to a plane, extrapolation to the point of closest approach (POCA) to a point, and extrapolation to the point of closest
 108 approach to a line. Fitting algorithms access the track parameters and extrapolation functions in a common way via
 109 the track representation interface without knowledge of the specific form of the track parameterization or the way the
 110 extrapolations are carried out.

111 Different track representations can be used in parallel. It is possible to fit the same track, i.e. the same set of hits, with
112 different track representations simultaneously. There are several reasons why this is desirable: For low momentum
113 particles the fitting of different mass hypotheses with the same track representation can give a clue to the particle
114 identity via the χ^2 of the fits, because the different energy loss for different particle masses at a given momentum leads
115 to different extrapolations. Fitting of the same track with different parameterizations and extrapolation tools can be
116 advantageous as well. In the early phase of an experiment one can compare different track representations to identify
117 the ones which perform best, or there could be regions in phase space in experiments where it might not be clear
118 beforehand which track representation will give the best results. Then one can just fit several of them simultaneously
119 and retain the best result.

120 2.3. Reconstruction Hits

121 The object which represents a position measurement from a detector used in a track fit is called a *reconstruction hit*.
122 It contains the vector of the raw measurement coordinates and its corresponding covariance matrix. As discussed in
123 the introduction, the nature of this raw hit information can be quite diverse. It can e.g. be a direct position measurement
124 or a drift time. As can be seen in Fig. 1, a reconstruction hit provides its detector plane, the measurement coordinates
125 \vec{m}_k in the detector plane coordinate system, the covariance matrix V_k in the detector plane coordinate system, and
126 the projection matrix H_k to the fitting algorithm. For detectors, which measure positions in a physical detector plane
127 (categories 1 and 2 of Sec. 1), the detector plane is identical with the physical plane.

128 For non-planar detectors like wire-based drift chambers or TPCs (categories 3 and 4 of Sec. 1), no such physical
129 detector planes are defined. Instead, the concept of virtual detector planes is introduced. For space-point detectors,
130 the track fit has to minimize the perpendicular distances of the track to the hits. Therefore, the virtual detector plane
131 for each hit must contain the hit position and the point of closest approach of the track to the hit point. Then the
132 residual vector which points from the hit point to the point of closest approach will be perpendicular to the track. This
133 geometry is illustrated in Fig. 2. The orientation of the spanning vectors \vec{u} and \vec{v} is chosen arbitrarily in the plane. For
134 wire-based drift detectors the virtual detector plane contains the point of closest approach of the track to the wire, and
135 is oriented to contain the whole wire. The spanning vectors are chosen to lie perpendicular (\vec{u}) and along (\vec{v}) the wire.
136 This geometry is shown in Fig. 3. The wire position and drift time are then measurements of u (the v coordinate could
137 be measured via double-sided readout with charge sharing or time of propagation). In both cases, the orientation of
138 the plane will directly depend on the track parameters. The consequence is that virtual detector planes have to be
139 calculated each time a hit is to be used in a fitting step. The reconstruction hit uses the corresponding extrapolation
140 function of the given track representation to find the point of closest approach as indicated in Fig. 1.

141 Different kinds of reconstruction hits are accessed via a common interface. When the fitting algorithm obtains the
142 detector plane from a reconstruction hit, it does not know whether it will receive a physical or a virtual detector plane.
143 This distinction is fully handled inside the reconstruction hit.

144 After the detector plane is defined, the reconstruction hit can provide the measurement coordinate vector \vec{m}_k , and the

145 hit covariance matrix V_k . For non-planar detectors, these quantities are results of coordinate transformations into the
146 virtual detector plane (hence the difference between the raw hit coordinates/covariance and the vector \vec{m}_k and matrix
147 V_k in Fig. 1). The three-dimensional hit vector and the 3×3 covariance matrix of a space-point hit are transformed
148 into a two-dimensional vector in the detector plane and a 2×2 covariance matrix. Even if the errors of the space
149 point were uncorrelated, the matrix V_k will in general contain a correlation, which is taken into account in the fit. For
150 wire-based drift chambers, the drift time information is converted to a position information in the calculation of \vec{m}_k
151 and V_k .

152 The projection matrix H_k transforms the state vector from the given track parameterization into the coordinate system
153 of the hit. In order to determine this matrix, the concrete coordinate systems of the track representation and the
154 reconstruction hit must be known. Since there will be typically more different types of reconstruction hits than track
155 representations, the projection matrix is determined in the reconstruction hit object. The matrix H_k provides the only
156 link between a given track parameterization and the different hit coordinate systems. If a fit is performed with several
157 track representations, the same reconstruction hit will provide a different matrix H_k for each track representation.

158 3. Implementation - GENFIT

159 The software package which implements the concept presented in this paper is called GENFIT [6]. It is completely
160 written in C++ and makes extensive use of object oriented design. It uses the C++ standard template library [11] and
161 the ROOT data analysis framework [12].

162 Figure 4 presents the general class structure of GENFIT. The classes representing the fitting algorithms operate on
163 instances of the class `GFTrack`². A `GFTrack` object contains a `std::vector<GFABsRecoHit*>` and a
164 `std::vector<GFABsTrackRep*>`. The reconstruction hits and track representations of Secs. 2.2 and 2.3 are realized
165 as polymorphic classes. The class `GFABsRecoHit` is the interface class to the reconstruction hits, and `GFABsTrackRep`
166 is the interface class to the track representations.

167 The reconstruction hit objects are created from the position information acquired in the detectors. The pattern recog-
168 nition algorithms, which precede the use of GENFIT, determine which of these detector hits belong to a certain track.
169 They deliver an instance of the class `GFTrackCand`, which holds a list of indices which identify the hits belonging
170 to the track. A mechanism called `GFRecoHitFactory` has been implemented to load the reconstruction hits into the
171 `GFTrack` object.

172 3.1. Track Representations

173 In order to use a particular track parameterization for track fitting in GENFIT, one needs code which can ex-
174 trapolate such track parameters, taking into account material effects on the track parameters and their covariance
175 matrix. In order to interface the track model to GENFIT, one implements a C++ class which inherits from the

²class names or other code fragments are set in `typewriter` font.

176 abstract base class `GFabsTrackRep` and provides an implementation for the virtual methods `extrapolate(...)`,
177 `extrapolateToPoint(...)`, and `extrapolateToLine(...)`. Section 4.1 presents examples of concrete track
178 representations.

179 3.2. Reconstruction Hits

180 The fitting algorithms interact with the reconstruction hits via the abstract base class `GFabsRecoHit`. The recon-
181 struction hits do, however, not inherit directly from this class, but from the intermediate interface class
182 `GFRecoHitIfc<Policy>`. This is illustrated in Fig. 5. For more information about the policy design pattern, please
183 see [13]. There are (currently) three geometrical categories of reconstruction hits: Hits in planar detectors, space-
184 point hits, and hits in wire-based drift chambers, which deliver their wire position and a drift time. This catego-
185 rization is expressed in the code by the three different policy classes `GFPlanarPolicy`, `GFSpacepointPolicy`, and
186 `GFWirePolicy`. These policy classes all implement functions for calculating or delivering the detector plane, the
187 hit coordinates in the detector plane, and the hit covariance matrix in the detector plane. They are used to unify the
188 geometrical properties of reconstruction hits to avoid any code duplication in the implementation of similar recon-
189 struction hits. The latter two policies use the corresponding track representations to calculate the virtual detector
190 planes, as detailed in Sec. 2.3.

191 As described in Sec. 2.1, the fitting algorithm needs a matrix H_k which is a linear transformation from the vector space
192 of track parameters to the coordinate system defined by the detector plane. The virtual method
193 `GFabsRecoHit::getHMatrix(...)` is overridden in the implementations of the concrete reconstruction hits. In
194 order to provide the correct matrix, the reconstruction hit determines the concrete type³ of the track representation it
195 is asked to interact with in this particular fitting step. This type checking is represented by the lower arrow in Fig. 1.
196 It is the only place in GENFIT where a direct type compatibility of tracks and hits is checked. A maximal modularity
197 of the system is achieved through this mechanism. If one adds an additional track representation, it is quite obvious
198 that one has to provide new coordinate transformations from this new parameter space into the coordinate systems in
199 which the hits are defined.

200 4. Examples

201 4.1. Concrete Track Representations

202 A concrete interface to an external track propagation package which has been realized with GENFIT is the track
203 representation called `GeaneTrackRep2`. It is based on the FORTRAN code GEANE. The detector geometry is in-
204 cluded via the `TGeo` classes of ROOT [12] and the magnetic field maps are accessed via a simple interface class called
205 `GFabsBField`. State vectors for this track representation are defined as $\vec{x}_k = (q/|\vec{p}|, du/dw, dv/dw, u, v)^T$, where the

³by performing a C++ `dynamic_cast` on the base class pointer `GFabsTrackRep*`.

206 detector plane is spanned by the vectors \vec{u} and \vec{v} (normal vector $\vec{w} = \vec{u} \times \vec{v}$). q denotes the particle charge and \vec{p} is the
 207 particle momentum. The quantitative tests of GENFIT in Sec. 5 are carried out with this track representation.

208 Another track representation included in the GENFIT distribution is called RKTrackRep. It was adopted from the
 209 COMPASS experiment [14] and uses a Runge-Kutta solver to follow particles through magnetic fields. It has the
 210 same state vector definition as GeaneTrackRep2. It also uses the TGeo classes for the geometry interface.

211 4.2. Interplay between Track Representations and Reconstruction Hits

212 The classes which represent the fitting algorithms just carry out their linear algebra without knowing about the
 213 dimensions of the state vectors \vec{x}_k and the measurement vectors \vec{m}_k . The matrix H_k is provided by the reconstruction
 214 hit class to transform state vectors and covariance matrices of a specific parameterization into the measurement vector
 215 coordinate system. This projection matrix ensures that the dimensionalities of the vectors and matrices in the fitting
 216 algorithm are compatible with each other. The following examples shall illustrate this:

217 1. A four-dimensional track model can be used for tracking without magnetic fields. The state vector is defined
 218 as $\vec{x}_k = (u, v, du/dw, dv/dw)^T$ for a straight line where \vec{u} and \vec{v} span the detector plane, and $\vec{w} = \vec{u} \times \vec{v}$ is the
 219 normal vector. A strip detector shall measure the u coordinate. Then the measurement vector of equation (3),
 220 \vec{m}_k , is a scalar. The projection matrix is defined as $H_k = (1, 0, 0, 0)$, so that $H_k \cdot \vec{x}_k$ is one-dimensional, just as
 221 the residual \tilde{r}_k . The Kalman gain is a 4×1 matrix, and the χ^2 -increment is correctly calculated for one degree
 222 of freedom, in the sense that \vec{r}_k and $(V_k - H_k C_k H_k^T)$ are scalars.

2. A pixel detector is used in combination with a five-dimensional trajectory model for charged particle tracking
 in magnetic fields. The detector measures the coordinates u and v in the detector plane, and the state vector is
 $\vec{x}_k = (q/|\vec{p}|, du/dw, dv/dw, u, v)^T$. The 2×5 projection matrix is then:

$$H_k = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

223 All matrices and vectors automatically appear with correct dimensions: \vec{m}_k and \tilde{r}_k are 2-vectors, V_k is a 2×2
 224 matrix, the Kalman gain is a 5×2 matrix, and χ^2 is a scalar which is calculated from two degrees of freedom
 225 (\vec{r}_k is a 2-vector, and $(V_k - H_k C_k H_k^T)$ is a 2×2 matrix).

226 If the next hit in the same track only measures one coordinate (e.g. u in the detector plane coordinate system of
 227 the next hit), \vec{m}_k will be scalar, H_k will be of dimension 1×5 , and there will be only one degree of freedom
 228 added to the overall χ^2 .

229 3. A TPC delivers space-point hits. The track model is the same as in example 2. The TPC measures three spatial
 230 coordinates but this information is transformed into a two-dimensional hit in the virtual detector plane, which
 231 is perpendicular to the track. This two-dimensional hit is treated identically to example 2. This is the desired
 232 behaviour, since measurements or errors along the flight direction do not contribute to the track fit.

233 5. Simulation Studies

234 The statistical and numerical correctness of a Kalman filter fit depends on the following items: 1) The mathematics
235 of the Kalman filter have to be implemented correctly. 2) The projections of the covariance matrices of the hits onto
236 the (virtual) detector planes have to be correct. 3) The propagation of the track parameters and the covariance matrix
237 are done correctly. For the covariance matrix this means the correct estimation of the Jacobian matrices needed for
238 the Gaussian error propagation. 4) The effects of traversed materials must be taken into account correctly: the state
239 vector has to be modified (momentum loss) and the entries of the covariance matrix need to be increased by the
240 addition of noise matrices (e.g. due to multiple scattering) [7]. Since the track representations are external modules,
241 the Kalman filter and the reconstruction hit implementation in GENFIT are tested with a simplified setup, where the
242 particles traverse a vacuum. This way, the effects number 1 to 3 are tested, while the effect number 4 is decoupled
243 and not tested here. The setup contains a homogeneous magnetic field, since possible problems arising from field
244 inhomogeneities would only point to problems in the external track representation module and not in the GENFIT core
245 classes. Instead of detector responses with full digitization simulations, which result in unknown detector resolutions,
246 known measurement errors are used.

247 The track representation `GeaneTrackRep2` is used for these tests. The program samples 30 space points on the
248 trajectory at distances of 1 cm, which are smeared with Gaussian distributions of known widths. Like in a TPC,
249 the x - and y -measurements are assumed to have equal and better resolutions than the z -coordinate measurements
250 ($\sigma_x = \sigma_y = 1/2 \cdot \sigma_z$). These smeared points are used in the fit as reconstruction hits based on `GFSpacepointPolicy`
251 similar to TPC measurements (see Fig. 5). In front of the first hit, a reference plane is defined in which the fitted track
252 parameters are compared to their true values to obtain residual and pull distributions⁴. If the fit is able to correctly
253 determine the track parameters and their errors, the pull distributions will be Gaussians of width $\sigma = 1$ and of mean
254 value 0. Figure 6 shows the five pull distributions for the track parameters, which fulfill these criteria within the
255 corresponding errors, proving that the non-uniform errors of the hits are taken into account correctly.

256 Another test is carried out with a slightly different detector geometry. Hits from 15 crossed planes of strip detectors
257 are fitted together with 15 space-point hits. The strip hits each contribute one degree of freedom, the space-point hits
258 each contribute two degrees of freedom (they only constrain the track in a plane perpendicular to the track), and the
259 track parameters subtract five degrees of freedom ($15 + 2 \cdot 15 - 5 = 40$). The χ^2 -probabilities for these fits are shown
260 in Fig. 7. If the number of degrees of freedom is taken into account correctly, this distribution is expected to be flat.
261 A χ^2 -test against a uniform distribution results in a $\chi^2/\text{n.d.f.} = 87.1/99$, close to unity, as expected.

262 The execution time per track is 14 ms on one core of an AMD PhenomTM II X4 940 CPU for 30 space-point hits
263 with one forward and one backward fitting pass of all hits. Of this time, a fraction of 91% is spent in the external
264 extrapolation routines of `GeaneTrackRep2`, as determined with `Valgrind` [15]. The GENFIT core classes have not

⁴the pull of a variable x is defined as $(x_{\text{fit}} - x_{\text{true}})/\sigma_x$.

265 yet been optimized for execution time, but the above result shows that optimizations would be most rewarding in the
266 track extrapolation routines.

267 **6. Conclusions and Outlook**

268 A novel framework for track fitting in particle physics experiments has been presented in this paper. Its implemen-
269 tation is a C++ library called GENFIT, which is available freely. Its modular design consists of three major building
270 blocks: Fitting algorithms, track representations, and reconstruction hits. GENFIT contains a validated Kalman filter.
271 A standard Kalman smoother is planned to be implemented in the future, as well as other fitting algorithms. The
272 possibility of the application of GENFIT to pattern recognition tasks seems promising and will be investigated.
273 The generic design of the track representation interface enables the user to use any external track following code
274 with GENFIT. The framework allows simultaneous fits of the same particle track with different track representations.
275 Possible applications of this feature are the fitting of different mass hypotheses with the same track model, or the test
276 and validation of different track parameterizations and track following codes. Also the coverage of different regions of
277 phase space with specialized track representations is an important feature in many experiments. At present, GENFIT
278 contains two track representations which provide interfaces to the track following code GEANE and a Runge-Kutta
279 based track extrapolation code adopted from the COMPASS experiment. New track representations which allow the
280 use of other track following codes can be implemented in a straightforward way. The interfaces to the detector geom-
281 etry and the magnetic field maps can be chosen freely and are all encapsulated in the track representation class.
282 The geometrical properties of reconstruction hits are not restricted in this framework. The dimensionality of hits is not
283 fixed to particular values, and the orientation of detector planes can be chosen freely. Hits from detectors which do not
284 measure the passage of particles in predefined planes, such as drift chambers or TPCs, are handled in the concept of
285 virtual detector planes. This leads to a direct minimization of the perpendicular distances between the particle tracks
286 and the position measurements from the detectors, i.e. the surfaces of constant drift time or the space points measured
287 in a TPC.
288 GENFIT provides an easy-to-use toolkit for track fitting to the community of nuclear and particle physics. It is used
289 in the PANDA computing framework. Applications in other experiments are being considered (e.g. Belle II).

290 **Acknowledgements**

291 This project has been supported by the Sixth Framework Program of the EU (contract No. RII3-CT-2004-506078,
292 I3 Hadron Physics) and the German Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung.

293 **References**

294 [1] M. Innocente, V. Mairie, E. Nagy, GEANE: Average Tracking and Error Propagation Package, CERN Program Library, W5013-E (1991).

- 295 [2] I. Hrivnacova, D. Adamova, V. Berejnoi, R. Brun, F. Carminati, A. Fasso, E. Futo, A. Gheata, I. Gonzalez Caballero, A. Morsch, for the
296 ALICE Collaboration, The Virtual Monte Carlo, ArXiv Computer Science e-prints, cs/0306005.
- 297 [3] A. Cervera-Villanueva, J. J. Gomez-Cadenas, J. A. Hernando, "RecPack" a reconstruction toolkit, Nuclear Instruments and Methods in
298 Physics Research A 534 (2004) 180–183.
- 299 [4] The PANDA Collaboration, Physics Performance Report for PANDA: Strong Interaction Studies with Antiprotons, ArXiv e-prints 0903.3905.
- 300 [5] S. Spataro, Simulation and event reconstruction inside the pandaroot framework, Journal of Physics: Conference Series 119 (3) (2008) 032035
301 (10pp).
- 302 [6] <http://sourceforge.net/projects/genfit>.
- 303 [7] R. Frühwirth, Application of Kalman filtering to track and vertex fitting, Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research A 262 (1987)
304 444–450.
- 305 [8] G. Kitagawa, The two-filter formula for smoothing and an implementation of the gaussian-sum smoother, Annals of the Institute of Statistical
306 Mathematics 46 (4) (1994) 605–623.
- 307 [9] R. Frühwirth, A. Strandlie, Track fitting with ambiguities and noise: a study of elastic tracking and nonlinear filters, Computer Physics
308 Communications 120 (1999) 197–214.
- 309 [10] R. E. Kalman, A new approach to linear filtering and prediction problems, Transactions of the ASME–Journal of Basic Engineering, Series
310 D 82 (1960) 35–45.
- 311 [11] B. Stroustrup, The C++ Programming Language, Special Edition, Addison-Wesley Longman, Amsterdam, 2000.
- 312 [12] R. Brun, F. Rademakers, Root - an object oriented data analysis framework, in: AIHENP'96 Workshop, Lausanne, Vol. 389, 1996, pp. 81–86.
- 313 [13] A. Alexandrescu, Modern C++ Design: Generic Programming and Design Patterns Applied, Addison-Wesley Professional, 2001.
- 314 [14] The COMPASS Collaboration, The COMPASS experiment at CERN, Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research A 577 (2007)
315 455–518.
- 316 [15] <http://valgrind.org>.




Figure 2: Virtual detector plane (spanning vectors \vec{u} and \vec{v}) for a space-point hit.




Figure 3: Virtual detector plane (spanning vectors \vec{u} and \vec{v}) for a wire-based drift detector.




Figure 4: Class structure of GENFIT. The detailed inheritance structure of reconstruction hits is shown in Fig. 5.




Figure 5: Inheritance structure of reconstruction hits in GENFIT.




Figure 6: Pull distributions for the five track parameters of GeaneTrackRep2. The pull of a variable x is defined as $(x_{\text{fit}} - x_{\text{true}})/\sigma_x$.




Figure 7: χ^2 -probability distribution for a series of track fits through 15 planes of strip detectors and 15 space points.