Centrality determination for Bi+Bi collisions at $\sqrt{S_{NN}}$ =9.2 GeV(REQUEST 25)

Idrisov Dim, Ilya Segal, Peter Parfenov

NRNU MEPhI

02.08.2022

Comparison of impact parameter distribution from model and MC-Glauber



The difference between impact parameter distribution from model and MC-Glauber due to elastic collisions

Impact parameter distribution for inelastic collisions



To select inelastic collisions, the numbers of protons and nucleons in the event was taken into account(n+p!=418)

The track selection criteria



Centrality determination methods

MC-Glauber



The Bayesian inversion (Γ-fit)



Implemantation for MPD: <u>https://github.com/FlowNICA/CentralityFramework</u> **P. Parfenov, et al., Particles. 2021; 4(2):275-287**

Implementation for MPD: https://github.com/Dim23/GammaFit

Fit results from MC-Glauber method(Primary tracks)



Good fit quality for MC-Glauber method

Fit results from Bayes inversion method (Primary tracks)



Good fit quality for Bayes inversion method method

Fit results from MC-Glauber method(Reconst. tracks)



Good fit quality for MC-Glauber method

Fit results from Bayes inversion method (Reconst. tracks)



Good fit quality for Bayes inversion method

Conclusions

- There are no problems in the production for using the centrality procedure
- Cluster's CPU time and storage usage might be optimized by rejecting all elastic events before the reconstruction chain
- Both methods can be effectively used for the centrality determination procedure in MPD experiment