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Abstract

A parallelization scheme with GPU is introduced for event reconstruction in the cylindrical drift chamber of COMET Phase-I experiment. The experiment is aiming for a discovery of charged lepton flavor violation by observing 104.97 MeV electrons from neutrinoless muon to electron conversion in muonic atoms. Helical trajectories of signal electrons, inside the cylindrical drift chamber, should be reconstructed with a good momentum resolution to distinguish them from background electrons. However, events with multiple helix turns require huge amount of computation in classifying hits for each turn. The computing was accelerated by parallelizing track extrapolations in which a modified least square estimator is calculated for each seed based on the residuals between the hits and the extrapolated track representing a specific turn. The hits whose distances to the track are less than a cutoff value were classified as hits belonging to the track. The event reconstruction algorithm was applied to the multiple turn events of electrons from 90 MeV to 104.97 MeV, where we confirmed a consistency in the momentum resolution for each energy. A performance comparison between the GPUs and parallelized CPU threads is also presented with technical aspects: For a specific GPU model, the computing speed increased by an order of magnitude.
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1. Introduction

The COMET experiment\textsuperscript{[1]}, located at J-PARC in Japan, will investigate charged lepton flavor violation by searching for neutrinoless muon to electron conversion in the field of a nucleus, namely $\mu^{-} + N(A, Z) \rightarrow e^{-} + N(A, Z)$. This transition is highly suppressed in the Standard Model with an unobservable branching ratio of $O(10^{-54})$\textsuperscript{[2]}. However, many extensions of the Standard Model predicts that the transition rate may become an observable level\textsuperscript{[3]}. In the Phase-I of COMET experiment, the target upper limit of the muon conversion is $7 \times 10^{-15}$ with a 90% confidence level, which is about 100 times improvement beyond the latest result\textsuperscript{[4]}.

The schematic layout of the COMET Phase-I experiment is shown at Fig. 1: A proton beam from the J-PARC main ring hits the graphite target to generate pions. The pions captured in the solenoid decay into muons which are transported through the curved solenoid. Some fractions of the muons are stopped by the aluminum stopping target inside the detector solenoid and form muonic atoms. The muons on the orbit subsequently cascade down to the 1s orbital, followed either by muon captures by a nucleus (69%) or muon decay (31%). The neutrinoless muon to electron conversion can occur where the energy of signal electrons is monochromatic as 104.97 MeV which is equal to the muon mass subtracted by the 1s orbital binding energy and the nucleus recoil energy. Meanwhile, almost all muon decays emit two additional neutrinos, i.e. $\bar{\nu}_e$ and $\nu_\mu$, as well as an electron to preserve the lepton flavor. This is called decay-in-orbit (DIO) and the emitted electrons have an endpoint energy close to 104.97 MeV where the kinetic energies of two neutrinos are almost zero\textsuperscript{[5]}. Therefore, the detector should have a good momentum resolution to discriminate signal electrons from DIO electrons. It also should be noted that the actual energy of electrons we observe in the detector is reduced due to the energy loss inside the stopping targets. Figure 2 shows how the energy loss affects the signal electrons.

Inside the detector solenoid region (see Fig. 3 for its layout), the cylindrical drift chamber (CDC) is used as the detector to measure the momentums of electrons. Its inner and outer wall have the radius of 49.6 cm and 83.5 cm, respectively, while the space in between is filled with the wires and a gas mixture of helium and isobutane for the ionization of charged particles. A cluster of the ionized electrons, referred as a hit, drifts to the closest anode wire and its drift distance ($r$) is obtained by measuring the drift time. Now that an exact path relative to the wire is not provided explicitly, the so-called left-right ambiguity happens about whether the hit was generated at the left or right side of the wire. Therefore, a ghost hit always persists at the opposite side of real one, and they are referred as a left and right hit through the paper.
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Figure 1: The layout of the COMET Phase-I experiment

Figure 2: The red and blue histograms with the solid borderlines represent the very initial energy of signal and DIO electrons emitted from muonic atoms, respectively. The red histogram with the dashed borderline represents the signal electron energy distribution convoluted by a landau distribution corresponding to the energy loss inside the stopping targets. It is assumed that the number of muonic atoms is $10^{15}$ and the branching ratio of $\mu^- + N \rightarrow e^- + N$ is $7 \times 10^{-15}$.

Meanwhile, there are 4482 anode wires arranged across the eighteen layers where the radius of first layer is 53 cm and the gap between each layer is 1.6 cm. The wires are slightly tilted from the longitudinal axis by rotating them about their radial vectors. The tilting angle is about 0.07 radian and the tilting direction alternates between positive and negative signs for every layer. This configuration in stereo gives a resolution in the longitudinal position ($z$) by calculating crossing points between the wires in adjacent layers. To obtain the momentum, the electron trajectory is reconstructed with a hypothetical track that connects the inferred positions of hits.

At both downstream and upstream ends of the CDC, trigger hodoscopes composed of 48 pairs of cherenkov detectors and scintillators are located to identify electron events. Their fast response provides a reference time for the drift time measurement. Out of the outer wall, there is a superconducting solenoid to apply the 1T magnetic field directing to the downstream, therefore, any charged particle in the CDC propagates with a helical trajectory. Around 32% of the signal electrons that reach the trigger hodoscopes make multiple helix turns, as illustrated at Fig. 3. Such multiple turn events put a challenge in the hit-to-turn classification because hits from different turns easily overlap in the same wire, as implied by Fig. 4. This makes it hard to calculate $z$ position of a track since a
highly combinatorial problem occurs in matching the fired wires from the same turn partition.

In this paper, we cope with the complexity of the multiple turn events by introducing a parallelization to accelerate the event reconstruction. The main idea is scanning the set of possible tracking seeds where a seed represents the initial position and momentum of the track \((\vec{x}, \vec{p})_0\). A goodness of a seed is evaluated by extrapolating a track from the seed in inhomogeneous magnetic field and calculating a modified least square estimator based on the distances between the hits and the extrapolated track. The hits close to the extrapolated track were classified as hits belonging to it. The scanning and extrapolating processes were fully parallelized on the GPU device using CUDA (Compute Unified Device Architecture) which is a parallel computing platform [6]. Both of the consumer-grade and server-grade graphic cards were tested to measure speedups over the CPU with multi-threading.

The paper is organized as follows: The generalized parallelization schemes for GPU and CPU are described in Section 2. Its detailed application to the simulated multiple turn events and event reconstruction results are explained in Section 3. The performance of each device is benchmarked in Section 4. Summary and outlooks follow in Section 5.

2. Parallelization scheme

2.1. Seed scanning and hit classification

The modified least square estimator for a seed is defined by:

\[
E = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left( \min_{j \in [1,m]} \{d_{ij}^l, d_{ij}^R, \lambda \} \right)^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{N} d_i^2, \tag{1}
\]

where \(i\) and \(j\) represent the index of wire and hit, respectively. \(N\) is the number of wires and \(m\) is the number of hits of wire. \(d_{ij}^l\) and \(d_{ij}^R\) are the distances of the closest approach (DCA) of left and right hit, respectively. DCA is obtained by finding the point of the closest approach (PCA) of extrapolated track to wire. \(d_i\) is the minimum DCA bounded by \(\lambda\), a cutoff value, which is introduced to ignore the contributions from outliers. The track extrapolation employs the Runge-Kutta-Nyström (RKN) method [7] with an adaptive step size that adjusts to the roughness of magnetic field.

After all prepared seeds are scanned for the calculation of estimators, several distant seeds with the lowest \(E\) are selected as reference points where new seeds at their vicinity are fetched with finer granularity. This seed selection is repeated until enough resolution is obtained for the components of seed. The finally selected seeds are used for hit classification: Among hits in a wire, the hit that contributes to \(E\) with \(d_i\) smaller than \(\lambda\) is classified as a hit of the track. Since each of the selected seed has a different set of classified hits, their track reconstruction results should be evaluated and compared using a precise fitting method based on the Kalman filtering [8], which is described in Section 3.

For the parallelization of the seed scanning, a two-levels hierarchy in the algorithm can be considered: (1) The calculations of \(E\) are parallelized over seeds. (2) For every seed, DCA finding procedures are also parallelized over wires that have hits. The detailed implementations on GPU and CPU are explained at the next subsections.

2.2. Implementation on GPU

The architecture of GPU is designed for parallelized computation by embedding thousands of cores at the cost of memory access speed. The computing power of a single GPU core is much weaker than a single CPU core due to the lower clock rate and smaller cache, however, its throughput can exceed the CPU by processing tasks in parallel. An access to the resources of NVIDIA GPU devices is enabled by a CUDA kernel function written in C/C++ language. The kernel function is executed with the aids of the threads that are grouped into blocks. A block is composed of warps, where a warp is the hardware entity that is an ensemble of 32 parallel threads. The schedule and execution of the warps are managed by streaming multiprocessors (SMP), which constitute the whole GPU device.

CUDA follows the SIMT (Single Instruction, Multiple Threads) execution model for parallel computing. Unlike to the SIMD (Single Instruction, Multiple Data) model where common instructions must be executed simultaneously over vectorized data, the SIMT model allows data-dependent instructions over vectorized threads in the same warp. However, each conditional branch of the data-dependent instruction can only be executed serially while disabling the threads not on the branch. This is called branch divergence, which is one of the major reasons of GPU performance degradation.

The algorithms are divided into two kernel functions to minimize the branch divergence in the DCA finding. Their overall schematics are described in Fig. 5 and 6. At the beginning, the seed set and magnetic field information in a grid format is transferred to the device memory, and the first kernel function is executed for track parameter recording: Each thread extrapolates a track from each seed to the target region where all positions of wires contributing to \(E\) can be passed through during the propagation. The track parameters \(((\vec{x}, \vec{p})_i)\) of all steps are recorded and transferred to the host device. The number of threads in a block is kept to be multiples of 32 so that all threads in the warps can be busy during the calculation.

The recorded track parameters of all seeds are transferred to the GPU with the magnetic field information and the drift distance information of hits. Afterwards, the second kernel function for DCA finding is executed, where each block is in charge of each seed. Each thread in a block finds \(d_i\) of each wire by starting off an extrapolation from the track parameter closest to the wire. Therefore,
Figure 5: The schematics of the first kernel to record track parameters for every step. GPU blocks are omitted in the schematics for better visibility.

Figure 6: The schematics of the second kernel to find \( d_i \) of each wire and obtain \( E \) of each wire. \( \{ r \} \), represents the set of drift distances of hits.

Figure 7: The jobs done per thread for each kernel function. (1) Track parameters recording and (2) DCA finding (view from wire axis).

The number of threads assigned in a block is same with the number of wires. The extrapolation is non-adaptive and sets its step size to the distance between the current track position and a virtual plane which is normal to the track momentum vector and contains the wire axis. The virtual plane is updated after every extrapolation. The extrapolation repeats until the new track point gets enough close to the updated virtual plane where the PCA is defined. Once the DCA finding is done by all threads, \( E \) is calculated for every block and transferred to the host device. The jobs done per thread are illustrated in Fig. 7 where the left and right part represent the first kernel and second kernel, respectively.

2.3. Implementation on CPU

Compared to GPU, CPU has faster core clock speed and relatively large portion of caches while having less cores and memory bandwidth. These different features make it efficient in processing serial tasks with a low latency instead of a high throughput. Therefore, to allocate more tasks for CPU threads, the algorithm was parallelized in the seed-level only: Each thread calculates \( E \) of each seed by executing an unified function that includes both track recording and DCA finding for all wires.

3. Application and results

3.1. Application of the parallelization scheme

The multiple scattering in material was the main issue to consider in applying the parallelization scheme to the multiple turn events. The scattering inside the detector materials induces the uncertainty in the trajectory, and the ambiguity of the track parameters gets larger as the total extrapolation length gets longer. Therefore, instead of fitting an event with a single continuous track, discrete tracks that are distant in \( z \) direction were fitted for each turn partition. In order to reduce the extrapolation length further, a turn partition was split into two half tracks whose seeds are at the CDC entrance and exit sides, respectively. The track extrapolation was done in the forward direction from the entrance and the backward direction from the exit by flipping the charge and momentum. The hits of an event were also grouped into two sets for each half track.

For the both sides, seeds were defined in front of the first layer of wires with the fixed radius of 50 cm. Therefore, we have five degrees of freedom for a seed: \((\theta, z)\) for the position in the cylindrical coordinate and \((p_x, p_y, p_z)\) for the momentum in the cartesian coordinate. The transverse components of \((\theta, p_x, p_y)\) were extracted by finding a circle which is the transverse projection of a helical trajectory, as illustrated at Fig. 8. To find the circle, the Hough transform [9] was applied to the set of transverse positions of the fired wires. The resolutions of \((\theta, p_x, p_y)\) were estimated to be 0.02 radian, 3.2 MeV, and 3.2 MeV, respectively, for both entrance and exit. The ranges of the longitudinal parameters \((z, p_z)\) of the last turn partition are also confined because triggering electron trajectories end up at the trigger hodoscopes, as shown at Fig. 9.

Since all seed components of the last turn partition are predictable with the known ranges, the event reconstruction started from fitting the last turn partition. A seed set was prepared by combining each component from the grids of the ranges. The number of seeds in the parallelization scheme was few tens of thousands.
Figure 8: The scheme for extracting the transverse seeds \((θ, p_x, p_y)\) from a circle found by the Hough transform. The seeds for the CDC entrance and exit are defined at the orange-shaded regions where \(R\) is fixed to 50 cm. \(p_T\), the transverse momentum or \((p_x, p_y)\), is obtained from the radius and tangent line of the found circle.

Figure 9: The longitudinal seed \((z, p_z)\) distributions of the last turn partition of the multiple turn events. The shaded areas at left and right side are where the trigger hodoscopes are located for downstream and upstream, respectively.

After the seed scanning is finished, a few seeds that are finally selected have their own half sets of classified hits. The complete sets of classified hits were formed by combining a half set from each direction. Each complete set was fitted with a deterministic annealing filter (DAF) method [10, 11] implemented in the GENFIT2 package [12, 13]. The DAF method is an iterative Kalman filtering method which weights left and right hits on a scale from 0 to 1, where one with a low weight is regarded as an outlier. If the fitting results were not converged for any of complete sets, the event reconstruction process was stopped.

The quality of each complete set was evaluated by the p-values of converged fitting results. The complete set with the highest p-value was self-refined by repeating the DAF method and following hit selection processes: (1) A hit is removed from the set of classified hits if both of its left and right hit have weights lower than 0.9. (2) If any hits in a wire have not been classified, their \(d_L^{ij}\) and \(d_R^{ij}\) are obtained again by extrapolating a track from the fitted track parameter of the adjacent wire. If the closest hit has \(d_L^{ij}\) or \(d_R^{ij}\) smaller than \(λ\), it is added to the set of classified hits.

The fitted track was backwardly extrapolated to the seed regions where new longitudinal seeds were collected for the previous turn partition, as illustrated at Fig. 10. For the transverse seeds, the same seed set from the Hough transform was provided because the resolution of Hough transform was still better than the extrapolated values. The hits classified previously were excluded in the seed
scanning, therefore, the number of wires gets reduced whenever a track is fitted. The event reconstruction was continued until the number of remaining wires gets less than 30 or the number of fitted tracks becomes five. The flowchart of whole event reconstruction process is drawn at Fig. 11.

For every fitted track, the set of classified hits was divided into the subsets which contain the hits induced by the same turn partition. The track was considered corresponding to the turn partition with the largest subset. A hit classification efficiency of the track was defined by the ratio of the size of the largest subset to the total number of hits induced by the corresponding turn partition. A hit classification purity of the track was defined by the ratio of the size of the largest subset to the size of the set of classified hits. These performance metrics for the hit classification largely depend on the value of $\lambda$.

Figure 11: The flowchart for the event reconstruction process

Figure 12: The graph of the turn reconstruction efficiency (red), averaged hit classification efficiency (green) and purity (blue) of the first iteration vs. the cutoff values. The dashed lines and solid lines represent the values before and after the self-refining, respectively.

Figure 13: The bar chart of the turn reconstruction efficiency (red), averaged hit classification efficiency (green) and purity (blue) of the first iteration after self-refining vs. the number of turns of events. $\lambda$ was set to 0.4 mm, the optimized value. The percentages in parentheses represent the fraction of each event type.

3.2. Cutoff value optimization

The signal electrons simulated by the Geant4 package [14] were used for the optimization of $\lambda$. The drift distances of hits were smeared by the gaussian distribution with a 0.15 mm standard deviation, corresponding to the measurement noise [1]. There was an event preselection, to reject events in bad shapes, in which electrons should pass at least five layers and the number of fired wires should
be less than 250. This excludes 3% of the multiple turn events that trigger the hodoscopes.

The objective of optimization process was to maximize a turn reconstruction efficiency at the first iteration of the event reconstruction process. It is because the more precisely the track of the first iteration is fitted, the better resolution we get for the longitudinal seeds of the next iteration. The turn reconstruction efficiency is defined as the fraction of the preselected events in which the fitting result satisfies the following track selection criteria: number of degrees of freedom (NDF) ≥ 30 and the reduced chi-square (χ²/NDF) < 2. Figure 12 shows how λ affects the turn reconstruction efficiency and the performance metrics of the hit classification averaged across the preselected events: The metrics were taken before and after the self-refining, where the improvement from it is discernible. The turn reconstruction efficiency after the self-refining was maximized when λ = 0.4 mm. Each metrics from the optimized cutoff value were broken down in terms of the turn numbers of the events, as shown at Fig. 13. The performance improves with less turn numbers since the hit overlaps get less significant.

3.3. Results with various electron energy

The momentum of an event should be obtained from the first turn partition or closest one to it where the energy loss during the propagation through detector materials is most trivial. Since the track reconstructed at the first iteration is intended to point to the last turn partition, reading the momentum from it should be avoided. Therefore, an event reconstruction efficiency was defined as the fraction of the preselected events in which any of tracks fitted after the first iteration satisfy the track selection criteria applied to the turn reconstruction efficiency. Figure 14 shows the event reconstruction efficiency measured for electrons with their energy from 90 to 104 MeV as well as 104.97 MeV ones. It can be observed that the efficiency falls off for low energy electrons. The electrons with lower energy usually leave less hits in the detector with lower transverse momentum, and this leads to the smaller NDF that is not
sufficient to pass the track selection criteria.

The fitted tracks of an event that satisfy the track selection criteria were ordered based on their distances to the trigger hodoscopes region that was triggered by the electron: The farthest and closest track were considered the first and last turn partition, respectively. For the momentum resolution, a normalized momentum residual ($\Delta p/p_0$) was defined where $\Delta p$ is calculated by subtracting the true CDC entrance momentum of the first turn partition ($p_{01}$) from the fitted momentum of track ($p_{fit}$). At Fig. 15, the distributions of $\Delta p/p_0$ are presented for the first and last turn partitions of signal electrons, respectively, where events with $\Delta p/p_0 > 0.05$ were trimmed. Whereas the distribution of the last turn partition is shifted to the negative side due to the energy loss, the distribution of the first turn is fitted well with a double gaussian function consisting of a core and base part. The mean values have small offsets from zero but they are almost negligible.

To verify a consistency in the momentum resolution, the double gaussian fitting parameters of $\Delta p/p_0$ distributions were extracted from each energy, as shown at Fig. 16. Despite of some fluctuations in the standard deviations and fractions of the base parts, a good agreement among the distributions can be seen. The fractions of the trimmed events vary around 2–8% depending on the electron energy.

4. GPU tracking performance

The speed of double precision computing was measured for both CPU (Intel Xeon E5-2630, 2.4 GHz) and GPUs (Tesla K40m, Tesla K80, Quadro P4000, and GTX 1070) from NVIDIA. The number of CPU threads in parallel was set to 32, equivalent to its maximum number of concurrent threads. The computing times spent during the first iteration of the parallelization scheme are compared for the signal multiple turn events as shown at Fig. 17: The left part represents the averaged times spent in two kernel functions and the shaded right part represents their sums. The CPU time does not appear on the left part as the algorithms implemented on the CPU is unified in the single function. The computing time of each event with respect to the number of wires is also shown at Fig. 18, where a linear dependence can be observed. The GPU tracking times for the next iterations are decreased because wires are excluded as the event reconstruction proceeds.

The specifications of each GPU device and the speedups beyond the CPU are enumerated in Table. 1. FP64 performance indicates the maximum throughput of device in double precision floating point operations. It is proportional to the clock rate and the number of SMPs, while a normalization factor may differ depending on the chipset; for example, the Tesla products, despite of their lower clock rates, have superior flop rates in double precision computing due to the dedicated architecture of their chipsets. However, the computing speed can be benefited from the flop rate only if the memory is transferred to the chipset enough fast so that the computing units operate continuously without a dead time. In other words, the overall computation will be stalled if the memory transaction is slower than the computing operation corresponding to the flop rate. This memory bound condition happens to the Tesla products whose memory transactions are slow due to their lower clock rates, resulting into the lower speedups compared to other products.

5. Summary and outlooks

A parallelized tracking with GPU has been developed to accelerate multiple turn event reconstruction in the COMET Phase-I experiment. The parallel algorithm consists of extrapolating RKN tracks from possible seeds and evaluating a modified least square estimator of each seed by finding the DCAs of hits. The tracking efficiency of 60% was obtained for the signal multiple turn events after optimizing the cutoff value. We also confirmed a consistency in the momentum resolution for the electron energy from 90 to 104.97 MeV.

The codes were optimized by separating the algorithms into two kernel functions to achieve better occupancy in device resources. As a result, the GPUs outperformed the parallelized CPU threads with 4–9 speedups. A linearity in computing time depending on the event size was also manifest.

The application of algorithm will be extended to the byproducts from other muon decay as well as the electrons emitted from the stopping targets. They include (1) a 92.3 MeV positron emission through $\mu^- + N(A,Z) \rightarrow e^+ + N(A,Z - 2)$ which is lepton number violation process forbidden in the Standard Model [15], and (2) an electron and positron emission from the pair production, followed by the radiative muon capture. The same algorithm with an opposite charge may be applicable to the positron events as we have shown that it works down to the 90 MeV electrons. Meanwhile, the reconstruction of pair production events might require more dedicated study.
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Figure 17: The averaged computing time of the first iteration spent in each device. The left part and the shaded right part shows the time spent for each kernel function and their sums, respectively.

Figure 18: The computing time of the first iteration in the CPU (Intel Xeon E5-2630, 2.4 GHz) and GPU (GTX 1070) depending on the number of fired wires in an event.

Table 1: The specifications of GPU devices and their speedups beyond the CPU (Intel Xeon E5-2630, 2.4 GHz) with 32 threads. Since the K80 has two chipsets in one device, (x2) is denoted for some of its figures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architecture</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Chipset</th>
<th>SMP clock</th>
<th># of SMP</th>
<th>FP64 performance</th>
<th>Speedup</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kepler</td>
<td>Tesla K40m</td>
<td>GK110</td>
<td>745 MHz</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$1.43 \times 10^{12}$ FLOPS</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tesla K80</td>
<td>GK210 (x2)</td>
<td>824 MHz</td>
<td>13 (x2)</td>
<td>$1.37 \times 10^{12}$ FLOPS (x2)</td>
<td>3.8 (x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pascal</td>
<td>Quadro P4000</td>
<td>GP104</td>
<td>1.48 GHz</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$1.66 \times 10^{11}$ FLOPS</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GTX 1070</td>
<td>GP104</td>
<td>1.76 GHz</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$2.11 \times 10^{11}$ FLOPS</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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