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## Samples

- Data:
- ran over pass 3 unblind run 5772
- MC:
- full tridents="tritrig"
- generated $\boldsymbol{\sigma}=1.76 \mathrm{mb}$
- ran over 6 Million total generated events
- uses the all trident diagrams (including exchange \& interference)
- radiative tridents="RAD"
- generated $\boldsymbol{\sigma}=0.12 \mathrm{mb}$
- ran ~ 5 Million total generated events
- Bethe-Heitler tridents = "BH"
- generated $\boldsymbol{\sigma}=0.12 \mathrm{mb}$
- ran ~ 3 Million total generated events


## Event Selection

- Prelims:
- pairs1 trigger
- pass-3 recon
- Tracks:
-\#of tracks < 5; \# of positrons == 1
- V0:
- $\chi^{2}$ unc $<10$
- $1.2>\mathrm{Pv}_{\mathrm{v} 0}(\mathrm{z})>0.55 \mathrm{GeV}$
$-\left|\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v} 0}(\mathrm{x})\right|<2 \mathrm{~mm} \&\left|\mathrm{~V}_{\mathrm{v} 0}(\mathrm{y})\right|<2 \mathrm{~mm} \&\left|\mathrm{~V}_{\mathrm{v} 0}(\mathrm{z})\right|<25 \mathrm{~mm}$
- $50 \mathrm{MeV}<\mathrm{P}_{\text {trk }}<900 \mathrm{MeV}$
- $\mathrm{P}_{\text {pos }}(\mathrm{y}) \times \mathrm{P}_{\text {ele }}(\mathrm{y})<0$
-exactly 1 V0 candidate passes all cut


## MC vs data summary (take 4)

|  | Run 5772 | tritrig | Bethe-Heitler | Radiative |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \# tridents <br> generated | xxxxxxx | 6 M | 3.00 M | 4.82 M |
| generated <br> trident XS | xxxxxxx | 1.76 mb | 8.28 mb | 0.12 mb |
| integrated <br> lumi | $4.8 / \mathrm{nb}$ | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx |
| \# of triggers <br> (pairs1) | 9.7 M | 81.7 k | 56.4 k | 656.4 k |
| \# of events <br> passing cuts | 288.5 k | 38.3 k | 20.4 k | 364.1 k |
| detected <br> cross-section | $60.1 \mu \mathrm{~b}$ | $112.5 \mu \mathrm{~b}$ | $56.3 \mu \mathrm{~b}$ | $9.1 \mu \mathrm{~b}$ |

Data vs tritrig XS: next slide tritrig vs $\mathrm{BH}+$ Rad: constructive interference

## Full trident vs data comparison

## Black=Data

Red=pure full tridents
plots are normalized to detected cross-sections on previous page
for $E\left(\mathrm{e}^{+}+\mathrm{e}^{-}\right)>0.8$ $\sigma($ data $)=32.5 \mu \mathrm{~b}$ $\sigma(M C)=42.4 \mu b$


## Electron vs Positron Momentum
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## Invariant mass distributions

## SLAC


...higher $E\left(e^{+}+e^{-}\right) \rightarrow$ higher mass (no shocker there)
...within the split, data pushed higher than MC
all plots are normalized to total area
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## Electron momentum distributions


...higher electron energy
...within the split, data pushed higher than MC (again)
all plots are normalized to total area


## Positron momentum distributions


...overall good agreement
...within the split, data pushed lower than MC (again)

I'm using SeedTracks everywhere, but conclusion same for GBL
all plots are normalized to total area


## Electron y-angle


...electrons pushed out a bit compared to MC
...funny business at -ive angle?
all plots are normalized to total area


## Positron y-angle


...positrons actually look pretty good?


## Electron y-angle > 30 mrad (Esum and Invariant Mass)


try cutting out events small angle tracks (either electron or positron)


## Data compared to BH \& Radiative (not full $|\mathrm{A}|^{2}$ )

SLAC
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## Colorful plots (compare to slide 6)
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## Requiring an ECAL match to both tracks



$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { match requirement efficiency: } \\
& \text { data }=0.81 \\
& \text { full trident } \mathbf{m c}=0.84
\end{aligned}
$$




## Now what?

- At high $E_{\text {sum }}$ data and MC seem to match up well...this is good! High $E_{\text {sum }}$ is where the dark photons are.
- the cross-sections about $\mathrm{E}_{\text {sum }}>0.8$
- radiative MC $\sim 6.3 \mu \mathrm{~b}$ vs $8.0 \mu \mathrm{~b}$ in the reach plot ( $\sim 80 \%$ )
- full trident (background) $\sim 42 \mu \mathrm{~b}$ vs $97 \mu$ b in the reach plot (~43\%)
- we win !??!
- Low $\mathrm{E}_{\text {sum }}$ is still (still) a mystery
- I'm starting to think we should take another look at MadGraph generator...how do we know it's correct? APEX got good shape (and rate?) ... but small bite ...


