CERN 62-37 Data Handling Division 28 December 1962

 $\sim$ 

# ORGANISATION EUROPEENNE POUR LA RECHERCHE NUCLEAIRE CERN EUROPEAN ORGANIZATION FOR NUCLEAR RESEARCH

INFORMAL MEETING ON TRACK DATA PROCESSING

**held** at **CERN**  on 19th July, 1962

 $\sim$ 

 $\overline{\phantom{a}}$ 

 $\mathfrak{t}$  $\bar{\gamma}$  $\frac{1}{2}$ 

 $\ddot{\phantom{1}}$ 

PROCEEDINGS

edited by

M. **'** Benet B. Elliott

GENEVA 1962

### **©** Copyright CERN, **Genéve, 1962**

Propriété littéraire et **scientifique** réservée pour **tous** les pays du **monde.** Ce **document** ne **peut étre** reproduit ou **traduit** en **tout** ou en **panic sans** l'autorisation **écrite** du Directeur général du CERN, **.titulaire** du **droit** d'auteur. Dans les cas appropriés, et **s'il s'agit d'utiliser'** 1e **document** *a* des fins non **commerciales.** *ce'tte'*  **autorisation** sera **volontiers accordée.** 

Le CERN ne revendique pas la propriété des inventions brevetables et dessins on modéles susceptibles de **dépét** qui pourraient **étre** décrits **dans** le présent document; **ceux-ci** peuvent **étre**  librement utilisés par les instituts de recherche, les industriels et autres intéressés. **Cependant,**  1e CERN se réserve 1e droit de **s'opposer** a toute revendication qu'un usager pourrait faire dc la propriété scientifique ou industrielle de toute invention at tout dessin ou **modéle** décrits dans le présent **document.** 

e Co

**Literary** and **scientific** copyrights reserved in all **countries** of the world. **This** report, or any part of it, may not be reprinted or translated **without** written permission of the **copyright** holder, the Director-General of CERN. However, permission will be freely **granted** for **appropriate non-commercial** use. If any patentable invention or registrable **design** is described in the report, CERN makes no claim to property rights in it but offers it for the **free** use of research institutions, **manu**facturers and others. **CERN,** however, may oppose **any.** attempt by **a user** to claim any **proprietary** or patent rights in **such** inventions or designs as may be described in the **present**  document.

CERN 62-37 Data Handling **Division**  28 December 1962

#### INFORMAL MEETING ON TRACK **DATA** PROCESSING

held at **CERN**  on 19th July, 1962

**PROCEEDINGS** 

**edited** by

M. Benot B. Elliott

G **E** N E V **A**  1962

# ' **TABLE** OF **CONTENTS**

Time-table

**Foreword** 

I. MORNING SESSION (Chairman: L. Alvarez)

**'iii** 

1





 $\lambda=10^4\,{\rm g\,cm}^{-1}$ 

5327/ga

 $\sim$ 

INFORMALEMETTING ON TRACK DATA PROCESSING A PROCESSING A RESOLUTION

 $-$  iii $-$ 

I. Morning session (Chairman: L. Alvarez)



 $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{Z})$ 



s Any

 $- i v \sim$ 



**Concluding** remarks

L. Kowarski (CERN)

**5527/p** 

 $\overline{1}$ 

 $\ddot{\phantom{1}}$ 

#### F O R E W O R D

The processing of the visual information contained in bubble-chamber and spark **chamber** photographs is an-essential part of these detecting techniques, and the instruments needed for such processing are rapidly -growing in importance. This **growth** presented the organizers of the 1962 Instrumentation Conference, held at CERN on July 16-18, **with** a **problem whidh**  their immediate predecessors (at Berkeley, in 1960) had already had to face: how to **provide** an adequate **discussion** forum for this **specializéd subject**  while keeping a balanced view of its place in the instrumentation field as a **Whole.** Following the Berkeley precedent, it was **decided** to supplement the sessions of the Conference devoted to data handling by an additional day of **discussions, which would** be open to all those specially interested in these **techniques.** 

**-The** meeting was organized, on informal lines, by the Data Handling Division of **CERN (Dr.** L. Kowarski **acting.for** the Division as <sup>a</sup>**whole,**  Mr. M. Bénot and Mr. B. **Elliott** as **scientific** secretaries, and **Mrs.** G. **Andreossi**  as executive **secretary).** 

**Communications** and discussions were invited on the **three following topics:** 

- 1. Present state and **prospects** of semi-autbmatic **devices** for the processing of bubble **pictures:** the Rough-Powell system **(CERN,** Berkeley, Brookhaven and Harwell), the Scanning and Measuring **Projector** (Berkeley), the Precision Encoding and Pattern Recognition **device (M.I.T.),** etc.
- 2. Ideas and reports on similar **devices** for spark **pictures.**
- 3. New developments in programming for the **systems currently** used (digitizing projector) and for those about to be used.

In the **course** of the Meeting 19 **communications** were presented and many of them **were** followed by lively discussions. **Since** the Meeting was meant to be a discussion platform rather than a **publication** medium, and **since** the authors of communications were not bound by any **formal** rules, the accuracy **with which** individual **communications could** be **reported** in the present **Preceedings**  had to depend on the efforts put in by their respective authors. Some of the speakers (not the majority) had prepared formal papers **which could** be presented in the **usual** way and were ready for **inclusion** in the Proceedings. One paper was **written** after the meeting. other speakers **based** the presentation and the

5327/ga

subsequent **discussion** on papers **which** had been **previously** released as laboratory **reports,** or *—* <sup>a</sup>day or two before our Meeting - at the **Instru**  mentation Conference: in these latter cases the presentation at the **Meeting, with** its freer timetable and more specialized audience, gave an **opportunity**  for a **more** detailed treatment of the **subject** matter than was possible at the Conference. In a few cases the editors were left **with** ho document other than a tape **recording** of the spoken **communication** and they made an **attempt,**  under their own responsibility, to summarize its contents. Of the total **volfime** of **communications which** were presented at the Meeting only abouxjone half appears here in *a* **completely written~up form;** the rest is répresented by summaries, bibliographical references and discussions. (In the list of communlcatlons **Which** immediately **follows this** ForeWord, **P** stands for "submitted paper", R for "reference", S for "summary" and T for "condensed **transcript").** *~* ""

 $-2-$ 

the contract of the contract of the com-

gailth The figures and pictures appear at the end of each corresponding paper and, although no **Captions were provided** by the authors, the references and the context may be **hoped** to establish an unambiguous **connection.** 

 $\sim 10^{11}$  m  $_{\odot}$ 

start of the start of the target and construction A Provincial de debiero con permitir como libro de cir-e de la constitución de la constit<br>La constitución de la constitución some way to be presented to be a support-Control of Beauty Co.

 $\mathcal{T}=\mathcal{T}=\mathcal{T}=\mathcal{T}$ 

 $\sim 10^{11}$  km s  $^{-1}$ 

 $\mathcal{F}^{\mathcal{A}}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{M})$  and  $\mathcal{F}^{\mathcal{A}}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{A})$  and  $\mathcal{F}^{\mathcal{A}}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{A})$ the Sectional Property

the company of the

 $\sim$   $\sim$ 

 $\alpha = 1, \ldots, \alpha, 1, \ldots$ 

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}$ 

 $\mathcal{F}^{(1)}$  ,  $\mathcal{F}^{(2)}$  and  $\mathcal{F}^{(1)}$  $\label{eq:3.1} \mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{A}}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{A}}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{A}}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{A})$  $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{O}))$  . In  $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{O})$  $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{A})$  $\label{eq:2} \begin{split} \mathcal{L}^{(1)}(x) &= \mathcal{L}^{(1)}(x) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{L}^{(2)}(x)\\ &= \mathcal{L}^{(1$ 

 $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}$ 

 $\gamma$  -d  $\gamma$  -  $\gamma$ 

5327/ga

I **. MORNING** SESS ION

**Chairman:** L. **Alvarez** 

 $\bullet$ 

# Influence of ionisation loss and coulomb scattering on the geometrical reconstruction of tracks in bubble chambers

# R. Bock, S. Shapira  $\mathcal{C}(\text{CERN})$

This paper describes results obtained by geometrical reconstruction of tracks created artificially by a programme, in simulating the behaviour of tracks in a bubble chamber.

The programme for artificial track construction (ATC) uses a 1. number of parameters as starting information. Those are:

 $\widetilde{\chi}_{0}$  = initial point co-ordinates

 $\lambda_{\circ}$ ,  $\beta_{\circ}$  = initial dipping and azimuthal angles  $R_{\alpha}$  = initial momentum, particle mass

 $\Delta t$  = step length for successive points (chosen to be 0.5 mm).

Furthermore, the quantities necessary to transform space co-ordinates into film co-ordinates, a range-energy table, a coulomb scattering constant K and a r.m.s. measurement error  $\triangle$  x are prescribed. The results quoted below were obtained using the data for the Saclay 81 cm hydrogen bubble chamber with three cameras.

Tracks are constructed according to the following formulae, until a prescribed length L of the track has been constructed.  $\sim 10^{-10}$ 

(1) 
$$
\vec{x}_y = \vec{x}_{y-1} + \vec{\lambda} \vec{y} + \vec{\lambda} \vec{x}
$$
  
\nwhere:  $la \rightarrow \Delta \vec{y} = \Delta L$   
\n $\sin \lambda y = 1$ 

 $-5-$ 

1b) 
$$
\overrightarrow{\hat{\triangle}}_{0}^{T} = (\triangle L \cos \lambda_{0-1})^{2}/2\rho_{0-1} \qquad \begin{cases} -\sin \phi_{0-1} \\ \cos \phi_{0-1} \\ 0 \end{cases}
$$

(2)  $\theta_{\rho} = \mathbb{N}_{\rho} \frac{K}{\beta_{\rho} P_{\rho}} \sqrt{\Delta L}$  ( $\mathbb{N}_{\rho} = \text{random number out of a normal distribution with width = 1}$ )

 $-6 -$ 

- (3)  $\sqrt{3}$  = S<sub>2</sub> 24 (S<sub>2</sub> = random number between 0 and 1) (4)  $P_{\nu} = \mathbb{P}[\overline{\mathbb{R}} F(P_{\nu-1}) - \Delta \underline{L}]/(PF, RF \text{ momentum} \Leftrightarrow \text{range conversion})$ 
	- (5)  $\lambda_{\nu} = \lambda_{\nu 1} + \theta_{\nu} \cos \theta_{\nu}$
	- (6)  $\psi_{\nu} = \psi_{\nu-1} + \theta_{\nu} \sin \theta_{\nu} + \Delta L \cos \theta_{\nu-1} / \theta_{\nu-1}$

(7) 
$$
\int \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{P} \mathbf{v} \cos \lambda \mathbf{v} / \mathbf{B}
$$

In these formulae  $\widetilde{X}$  represents the space co-ordinates for a point,  $\lambda$ and  $\psi$  are the dip and azimuthal angles,  $1/\rho$  is the projected curvature,  $\Delta$  L the step length along the track and  $\lambda$  the step index. Further  $P =$  momentum,  $\theta =$  scattering angle for a step (in space),  $K =$  scattering constant,  $\beta =$  velocity and  $\alpha' =$  random angle to give the direction of scattering in space.

- This ATC programme was linked directly into the geometry programme  $2.1$ used at CERN, the formulae of which are described in detail in CERN  $60-33$ <sup>1)</sup>. This programme uses the chamber geometry and the measured film co-ordinates to fit a helix in space, assuming approximately that Gaussian measurement errors have been made on the film.
- 3. To study the systematic influence of ionisation loss on the reconstructed results and to obtain corrections for them, the ATC programme was mainly used with  $K = 0$  and  $\triangle X = 0$ , i.e. producing "ideal" trajectories.

2. 医窝层

The parameters varied were  $P_{\alpha}$ , M and L.

(a) Influence on the reconstructed curvature.

To study the  $1/\gamma$  resulting from the geometry programme the quantity  $L_{\rho}$  /L was plotted against  $L_{\rho}$  for equal sets of  $P_0$ , M. Ip is defined as the length along the track between the starting point and the point at which the particle had a momentum corresponding to the reconstructed curvature. In the existing geometry and kinematics programmes this quantity  $L\rho$  /L is assumed to be 0.5. The results for "ideal" trajectories showed that  $L\rho /L$  can vary between .4 and .65 in a systematic way with generally two maxima, one of which is always reached when the "measured" length is equal to the range. The considerable deviations from  $\text{L}\rho$  /L = .5 occur mainly for light particles and long tracks. The maximum error one can make with the assumption  $L\rho$  /L = .5 was estimated to be  $\Delta P/P = 2\%$ for the corrected P at the starting point of the track. In addition the results show (Fig. 1) that both measurement errors and coulomb scattering cause uncertainties for  $L \rho$  /L which overrule by far the systematical deviations.

 $-7 -$ 

 $(b)$ Influence on the reconstructed azimuthal angle.

It is obvious that the helix assumption in the geometry programme also causes a systematic error in the azimuthal angle. Although this difference generally is within the uncertainty following from  $K$  and  $\Lambda X$ , its systematic behaviour could be studied by setting these influences zero. The differences between  $\psi_o$  and  $\psi_R$  (reconstructed) at the starting point (particle travelling away) were found to be consistent (Fig. 2)

5327/ga

with

$$
\Delta = \varphi_o - \varphi_R = \frac{1}{2} \cdot 0.000135 \left(\frac{L}{R}\right)^2 \left(\frac{R}{M}\right)^2
$$

 $(R = \text{range in } \cos, M \text{ in } \cos, \sqrt{1} \text{ in } \sin)$ The sign is positive for a track curved anti-clockwise.

 $R -$ 

- $4.$ (i) For the coulomb scattering the aim was to find a suitable formula to express the uncertainty of the reconstructed results. If one recalls the definition of an error matrix term  $G_{ij}^{-1} = \overline{G_{i} G_{j}}$  it seems easy to find such a matrix. Each  $\sigma$ , is defined with i, j referring respectively to  $1/\varphi$  ,  $\lambda$  ,  $\varphi$  as the difference between the original quantity entered into the ATC-programme and its corresponding reconstructed result. To avoid systematical influences the energy loss was assumed to be zero in this investigation.  $\sigma_i$   $\sigma_i$  were formed in each event and averaged All products for a sample of events with exactly the same starting conditions. In order to get an uncertainty of  $\sim$  10% for the diagonal elements of the average error matrix each sample had to comprise  $\sim$  100 events. The average of each sample was regarded as the error matrix for the given starting conditions.
	- (ii) To find a formula consistent with these results, the assumption was used that the expression for the average scattering angle holds for any distance L (i.e. this angle is proportional to  $\sqrt{L}$ ) and that furthermore all actual points lie on the same side of the ideal particle trajectory. As this obviously leads to an overestimation of the actual influence, a constant factor must be expected. With these assumptions the expected behaviour is (apart from the influences of the number of measured points, which is within  $\pm$  5%)

5327/ga

$$
\frac{C_1}{\rho} = C \frac{f}{\sqrt{L}}
$$
  

$$
\frac{C_2}{\sqrt{L}} = C_2 f \sqrt{L}
$$
  

$$
= C \varphi f \sqrt{L}
$$
  
e f =  $\frac{K}{\sqrt{R}}$ 

where  $f = \frac{f}{\beta}$ 

(iii) The **matrices** obtained by the ATC **programme** were **consistent with** these formulae and no systematic behaviour of the **coefficients,** C, **could** be observed.

The average values **are:** 

$$
c_{\rho} = 0.39
$$
  $c_{\lambda} = 0.50$   $c_{\phi} = 0.38$ 

each obtained with an accuracy of  $\vee$   $\frac{1}{2}$  3% from 50 different starting **conditions.** 

In **addition** the non—diagonal terms in the **error matrix** were looked at. The only element **which** turned out to be not zero within the fluctuation inherent to the method was  $\widehat{\sigma}_{1/p} \widehat{\sigma}_{\varphi}$ . After normalisation this term seemed to After normalisation this term seemed to be

constant and was averaged to give

$$
\frac{\widehat{\sigma\cdot\varphi}\circ\widehat{\sigma\varphi}}{\widehat{\sigma\cdot\varphi}\circ\widehat{\sigma\varphi}} = -.31
$$

No influence of these results from the dip angle  $\lambda$  was studied, all numbers given refer to  $\lambda = 0$ .

1) **W.G.** Moorhead, "Programme for the Geometrical **Reconstruction** of Curved **Tracks** in a Bubble **Chamber",** CERN 60-533



Figure 2

# **<sup>A</sup>criterion** for the goodness of measurements of tracks in hydrogen bubble chambers, and how to measure the tracks in **order** to make it significant

E. Fett (CERN)

#### 1. **IntroductiOn**

It is wellknown that the **Geometry** Programme **used** by **CERN** fits <sup>a</sup>**helix** to the measurements of tracks *from* hydrogen **bubble** chambérs. The helix is defined by the radius of curvature, dip angle, azimuthal angle and the co—ordlnates of tne starting **point.** The **errors** were calculated in the least squares procedure using the fact that each measurement gives rise to one linear equation and these equations are assumed to have the same weight.

The new Geometry Programme, THRESH, will **calculate** the errors in <sup>a</sup>**different** manner. THRESH assumes that each **co-ordinate** given by the measuring **devicé** has a wellknown and constant **errar** *8* **,** and the **error** ' matrix is found using the method of propagation of errors. In other words: THRESH assumes that the measurements are good, or at least normal. **This** paper suggests a way of testing **this** assumption for each single measured track.

#### 2. Description

Let us, as a **first** approximation, assume that the actual **track**  and the fitted helix are identical. The true measure for the goodness of measurements would then be the spread of the measured points (on  $the film-views)$  along the reprojections of the fitted helix on these film-planes. Thus if the distance from a measured point P<sub>1</sub> to the reprojected curve is  $D_i$ , we may define.



where N is the number of all measured points.

# 3. Significance

. Unfortunately the actual track and the fitted helix are not quite identical, therefore  $S^2$  will not be zero even if you have a 100% efficient measuring device. Due to multiple scatter we will have a mean effect  $\overline{S}_7^2$  (where we average over all tracks of particles with the same starting condition). If we have normal measurement errors , and if the effects are uncorrelated, the mean of  $S^2$  will be

 $S^2 = S_1^2 + S^2 + S_2^2$ where  $S_2^2$  is due to energy loss and systematic distortion. Thus  $S^2$ will be significant as a measure for the goodness of measurements only if  $s_1^2 + s_2^2 \lt s \delta^2$ . For IEP 5 we have  $\delta \sim 70 \mu$  (in space). Therefore in order to know the significance of the  $s^2$  test we must know the contributions of  $S_1^2$  and  $S_2^2$  for different particles, momenta and measured lengths.

4. Multiple scattering

Let me first discuss the influence of multiple scattering. Figure 1 shows  $S_1^2$  for  $\gamma$  -mesons of four different momenta as function of the measured length. It shows that the influence increases enormously if a larger part of the track is measured, especially for "slow" tracks. The obvious conclusion is that the  $s^2$  -test is were

5327/ga

meaningless if we measure a larger **fraction** of **"slow" tracks,** wheréas we have no trouble of that kind for fast tracks. The question is, consequently, **whether** we should measure a smaller part of "slow" **tracks,** for instance **7** cm only of a 100 MeV/c pion although the range is 34 cm (in **hydrogen).**  To answer this question we have to know What we lose or gain in accuracy of the other parameters. I have used a programme written by  $R_$ . Bock<sup>1</sup>) to create artificially tracks of particles with **specified** starting **con ditions.** 100 tracks are created for each set of starting Conditions and the spread of each parameter is **studied.** 

Figure 2 shows  $\triangle (1/\rho)/(1/\rho)$  (  $\rho$  = radius of curvature) **corresponding** to the curves in figure 1. One sees that for a 100 **MeV/c pion** the uncertainty is 5.5% if we measure **7** cm, whereas 2.3% only if we measure 34 cm. Figure 3 shows the corresponding curves for the uncertainty of the dip:  $\tan \chi$  . One sees that one gains accuracy if one measures a smaller fraction of the track. The **correspohding carves**  for the uncertainty of the azimuthal angle look very similar to those in figure 3.

Another point is that it is **very difficult** to have a "slow" track **converging** in the Geometry Programme if one measures *a* large fraction. Therefore the dotted curves are just extrapolations.

### 5. Other contributions

Using the same procedure I have found that for the "slow" tracks in question, the contribution due to **multiple** scatter and its dependence of the measured length is the dominant factor both for  $s^2$ and for the uncertainties of the parameters. I have always found that  $s<sub>2</sub><sup>2</sup> \ll s<sub>1</sub><sup>2</sup>$  if I use data from the 81 cm hydrogen bubble chamber of Saclay; further the measurement errors of IEP 5 do not change the essential features of the **curves** in figures 2 and 3 **except** for measured lengths less than 7 cm. The\_influence of the number of **points** meagurgd is negligible.

 $-13-$ 



 $-14 -$ 

It seems to me that it is desirable even for "slow" tracks to measure in a manner which makes the S<sup>2</sup> test significant.

#### 7. **Test** of real tracks-

If, **now,** real tracks are measured in a manner **which** makes the S<sup>2</sup> test significant we expect the distribution of S<sup>2</sup> to have a similar shape to the  $\chi^2$  distribution, but with a rather long tail corresponding to bad measurements. Figure 4 shows the distribution for 649 tracks of pions all of momenta less than 3 GeV/c. While measuring these tracks no attention 2was paid to the length being measured **Therefore,** in **this** case  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  may be important, thus making  $S > d$  **.** However, the tendency is still clear.

The WOlk **w\_th** real. tracks **will** go on, also **diffferent** machines and operators **will** be compared

1) R. Bock, "Influence of ionization loss and coulomb scattering on the geometrical **reconstruction** of tracks in **bubble chambers".** 





Eigure 2

**↓** erngi¶





Figure 3



Figure 4

#### DISCUSSION

*\_* 15 -

(Communications **1** and 2)

**ALVAREZ:** You can never gain by not measuring something, so you **should** always measure the longest length possible. Then, perhaps, you can use a small segment of the measured track to get the angle and the **long** segment of the track to get the **momentum.** 

**FETT:** my suggestion of not measuring all the track is mainly relevant for a good angular result and to **avoid difficulties** in recons**truction** by too large deviation **from** a helix. You can, of course, measure the full track and just use the optimum length for the **reconstruction. Thus** my results **confirm** the **procedure which** is in the Fog programme.

**ROSENFELD:** Did you **find** any **sort** of **correlation** at the **middle** of the track?

BOOK: In our geometry **programme** we do not get any data in the middle of the track so we did not study that. Out of the geometry programme we come **with** a **fitted** set of data **-** curvature and two angles *—* **which**  belong to the beginning of the track.

**TYCKO:** was the magnetic field in your ATC uniform?

**BUCK:** Our magnetic **field** was assumed constant in this **test.** In our present experiments, the variation is rather small compared to all other influences; it **could** be studied **with** the same **programme,** of **course.** 

SELOVE: When you generate tracks, can you say something about the influence of the mesh size? You said you used 1/2 mm steps.

**BUCK:** we have not **studied this** seriously. I made a short test on **this** in doubling the step size and the results were **exactly** the **same.** 

DERRICK: (Made a comment **which** is amplified in the **Proceedings** of the Conference on Instrumentation in a paper by **C.J.B.** Hawkins).

**Cast River** 

The grands to graph

 $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{A}})$  and  $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{A}})$ 

 $\sim$   $\sim$ 

in thuy

# The programming system used by

# the Alvarez Group

 $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B})\cong \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})\cong \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})$ 

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}$  and  $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}$  .

 $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$  and  $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$  are the set of the set of the set of the set of  $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$ 

 $\sim 10$ 

 $\sim$   $\sim$ 

**A.H.** Rosenfeld, (Berkeley)

(Note by the editors: a paper on **this subject** was **submitted** to the Instrumentation Conférence, **held** at **CERN** on **July** 16 **-** 18 and is **included**  in the Proceedings of that Conference, to be published **shortly** in **"Nuclear**  Instruments and Methods". The Informal Meeting of **July** 19 **offered** the author the **opportunity** for a more detailed presentation and **discussion).** 

e e contro de composições de la proposição de la control de la proposição de la proposição de la proposição de<br>A control de la proposição de la proposiçã  $\mathcal{E}_\mathbf{z}$  ,  $\mathcal{E}_\mathbf{z}$  ,  $\mathcal{E}_\mathbf{z}$  ,  $\mathcal{E}_\mathbf{z}$  ,  $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  , where  $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ i de la composició de la<br>Entre el composició de la ות המשפט מועד המועד המשפט המועד המועד המועד.<br>באישי האת למשך האירוע המועד השי

 $\mathcal{F}^{(1)}$  and the contribution of  $\mathcal{G}^{(1)}$  and  $\mathcal{G}^{(2)}$  and  $\mathcal{G}^{(3)}$  and  $\mathcal{G}^{(4)}$  and  $\mathcal{G}^{(4)}$ 

#### *\_ I* **DISCUSSION** *'*

(Communication 3)

McCORMICK: Have you done anything about trying to get rid of your bias by looking at the actual signs of the corrections in your  $\chi^2$ fit. In other words, looking at how many standard deviations each of the **variables shift** to see whether **they** systematically move in one way.

**ROSENFELD:** I **think** the reason that less **work** has **been** done, and that nobody worried about it, . is that on every experiment we make three sets of plots - we always plot our  $\chi$ <sup>2</sup>'s - which incidentally turn out usually to be too large by only something like 20% to 30%. When we cal**culate errors,** then **-** mass errors **—** we assume, in the simplest Way, that all errors are too large by  $\sqrt{1.3}$ , and so we scale everything by  $\sqrt{1.3}$ . But it seems not to be terribly serious. Then we plot also the fault markers, which are how much the individual momenta are displaced, and we have never found anything **seriously** systematic.

 $\star$ **MACLEOD:** Can you explain to me how the time-sharing in Q is. operated?

**ROSENFEID:** It is done in the most simple way. We let Q\* have control with ten words or so and as soon as it is through and written **"Control",** it **simply** reads itself out of core and reads in **whatever** else is running under **FORTRAN monitor** and that **churns** away **until** we are ready to go again, so it is not *very* elegant and on each **switch** we waste *2* **seconds.** 

 $\ddot{\phantom{0}}$ 

#### ield and energy-loss corrections Magneti for strongly curved tracks

J. Zoll (Cambridge)

This paper presents a new solution to the problem of correcting for an inhomogeneous magnetic field and the energy-loss of particles in the bubble chamber. The spirit and context of this solution is a PANGtype approach to the reconstruction of the tracks in space.

Take two stereoscopic photographs of a track and measure a series of points on each; find by the usual methods a string of spacepoints on the track.

First approximation: Fit an ideal helix (circle and straight line) to these points in cartesian coordinates. This gives a "center" of the track and a first approximation momentum (which may be improved for slow tracks<sup>1)</sup>). Convert the cartesian co-ordinates (xyz) into cylinder co-ordinates (røz) with origin in the "center",  $\phi = o$  for the middle of the track.  $\mathcal{E}_\bullet$ situación de 197

Second approximation: We wish to fit a new helix.

 $r = \chi_0 + \chi_1 \phi + \chi_2 \phi^2 + \chi_3 \phi^3 + \chi_4 \phi^4 = \chi_1 \chi_1 \phi^1$  $-(1)$  $z = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \phi + \beta_2 \phi^2 + \beta_3 \phi^3 + \beta_4 \phi^4 = \sum \beta_1 \phi^4$ 

For an ideal helix, the coefficients for  $i = 2$ ,  $3$ , 4 would be zero; for the track we want to calculate them, using our knowledge of the magnetic الاستيراد field and the momentum-loss.

Here are first some formulae in cylindrical coordinates which  
\nwe shall need:  
\n  
\na point: 
$$
\hat{T}(\beta) = \begin{pmatrix} r(\beta) \\ 0 \\ z(\beta) \end{pmatrix}
$$
  
\nderivative:  $\vec{r} = -\frac{d\vec{r}}{d\beta} - \begin{pmatrix} r^2 \\ r \\ z \end{pmatrix}$ ;  $(r^2) = \frac{d\vec{r}}{d\beta} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \frac{1}{2} \\ 0 & \frac{1}{2} \end{pmatrix}$  (2)  
\n  
\nunit tangent  
\nvector:  $\vec{n} = \frac{d\vec{r}}{ds} = \vec{r} \cdot \vec{r}$   
\n  
\n $\vec{r} = (r^2 + r^{12} + z^{12})^{-\frac{1}{2}} \approx \frac{\cos \lambda}{r} \quad (\text{infinite terms})$   
\n  
\n  
\n**mgaretic**  
\nfield:  $\vec{r} = \frac{1}{r} \begin{pmatrix} 3r \\ 160 \end{pmatrix}$ , units:  $MeV/\circ$  cm<sup>-1</sup>  
\nThe *curvature* vector is  $\vec{n} \times \frac{d\vec{n}}{ds}$   
\n  
\n $\vec{r} = \frac{1}{r} \begin{pmatrix} 160 \\ 160 \end{pmatrix}$ , units:  $MeV/\circ$  cm<sup>-1</sup>  
\n  
\nThe equation of motion of the particle is

$$
p \frac{d\vec{n}}{ds} = \vec{n} \times e\vec{B}
$$
 (7)

p is the momentum; the line-element ds is taken positive in the positive sense of rotation;  $e = \frac{1}{n} \ln \theta$  the charge,  $=$   $\pm$  1 for tracks turning like right - or left-handed screws.

a Participa method as a market of the p Consider figure 1: this is a drawing of a segment of the track, projected onto the xy-plane.  $\overrightarrow{t}$  is its 2-dimensional tangent-vector. Through the point  $(r/\phi)$  of projected track is drawn the circle r round the origin and also its tangent  $\overrightarrow{n_{s}}$ .

 $\psi$ , the azimuthal angle of the projected tangent t is:

 $-21 -$ 

$$
\psi = \phi + \frac{\sqrt{1}}{2} - \eta \tag{8}
$$

Here  $\eta$  is the angle between the track and  $\hat{n}_{g}$ . This angle specified the deviation of the track from an exact helix.  $\eta$  is small, and this is the point of the whole approach, as will be obvious in a minute. Except for a factor we get the curvature:

$$
\frac{d\psi}{d\phi} = 1 - \frac{d\eta}{d\phi} \quad \text{from} \quad (8)
$$
\n
$$
= \frac{g^2}{r^3} (\vec{n} \times \frac{d\vec{n}}{ds})_z \quad \text{cf.} \quad (6)
$$
\n
$$
= \frac{e \epsilon g^2}{pr^3} \vec{f} \times (\vec{n} \times \vec{B}) \tag{9}
$$

 $G = (r^2 + r^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ ; the factor  $G^2/F^3$  follows from some algebra. Writing (9) in components and re-shuffling gives

$$
\int f'(\phi) = \frac{d\eta}{d\phi} = 1 + \frac{e \epsilon B_Z}{pF} - \frac{e \epsilon G^2 Z}{pF} (r^i B_r + r B_\phi)
$$
 (10)

For the ideal helix the first two terms would cancel; the third term would be zero, it results from the inhomogeneous field,

Proceed further as in PANG: take three representative points on the track, e.g.  $\phi = 0$  the center,  $\phi$  and  $\phi$  downstream and upstream,<br>and calculate  $\gamma^{\dagger}(\phi)$ ,  $\gamma^{\dagger}(\circ)$  and  $\gamma^{\dagger}(\phi)$  using the momentum-range relation and the magnetic field. Fit a quadratic function

$$
\eta'(\phi) = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 \phi + \gamma_2 \phi^2 \tag{11}
$$

. OSS own and the state of the control specialistic conditions of the second schedules of

5327/ga

and integrate to get

$$
\eta = \eta_o + \gamma_o \phi + \frac{1}{2} \gamma_1 \phi^2 + 1/3 \gamma_2 \phi^3 \qquad (12)
$$

 $\approx$  22  $\sim$   $\sim$ 

From the definition of  $\eta$  and (2)<br>We have  $\frac{\mathbf{r}^{\prime}}{\mathbf{r}} = \tan \eta = \eta$  to a very good approximation. 一字字。

Since r varies little we may take the average value  $r_0$  of the first approximation and write

$$
r' = r_o \gamma = r_o \gamma_o + r_o \sqrt{o^2 + \frac{r_o}{2} \gamma_1 \rho^2 + \frac{r_o}{3} \gamma_2 \rho^3}
$$
 (13)

which when integrated gives (1) with

$$
o'_{2} = \frac{1}{2} r_{o} \bigg\{_{0}
$$
\n
$$
\chi_{3} = 1/6 r_{o} \bigg\{_{1} : \chi_{4} = \frac{r_{o}}{12} \bigg\{_{2}, \chi_{3} = 1/2 \bigg\} \bigg\}
$$
\n(14)

A least-squares fit to the data gives us the coefficients  $\chi$  and  $\chi$  . The polynomial  $(1)$  in Z may be obtained in the same manner by using the expression - The Condition Section (報告) (Windows

$$
Z^{\dagger \dagger} = \frac{e \mathcal{L} q^2}{p F^3} \left( \dot{\mathbf{r}}^{\dagger} B_{\phi} - r B_{\mathbf{r}} \right) + r^{\dagger} z^{\dagger} G^2 \left( r + r^{\dagger} \mathbf{r}^{\dagger} \right) \tag{15}
$$

whose conductive attenuate all all conduction rates for

)<br>사진 가장 : 1000 (Wings

which may be derived directly from the equation of motion  $(8)$ . From the two expression (1) momenta and angles are easily obtained.

1) F. Solmitz, "Modifications of fitting procedures", Berkeley Memo 220.





#### Programming at the Rutherford Laboratory

# **J.W.** Burren

### (Rutherford Laboratory)

#### **SUMMARY**

Dr. **Burren explained** that the **N.I.R.N.S. programmes were divided**  into thrée **parts:** 

a) An **input** programme to give a standard output onto magnetic tape from a number of different measuring machines.

b) **A** geometry programme using the **FANG first** fit, and the **Solmitz helix-fitting method.** This **first** used a K mass, and then for long tracks a  $\Pi$  and  $\flat$  mass for slowing down. The output was used as a library **tape.** 

0) **A hypothesis** testing **andgstatistics** routine, **which** up—dated the **library** tape **with fitting** results anfi gave a **printed** output. **A** hypothesis was specified by labelling a track at beginning and end, and by giving it a **charge** and mass. When all tracks had been **specified,** the programme **tried**  to fit the pattern to the event, in the sequence **specified** (for *a* multi **vertex** fit).

The **first** version had been used at Oxford and Padova, and was in the production—debugging stage.

international

Programmes used at Moscow

 $\langle \tau_{\rm L2} \rangle \langle \tau_{\rm L1} \rangle$ Al Area a Angli

S. Ya. Nikitin The BR pages of example

> (Academy of Science, Moscow) أتهاد الطاري يبري العاق

Sicago <sub>in i</sub>  $\alpha_{\rm{eff}}$  ) and

是本身,

**Support** 

ה מולי הגרון (מולי האוגר)<br>האמצות (מולי היה הגרון)<br>האמצות (מולימי הגרון)

 $\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}}}{\partial \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}}} & = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}}}{\partial \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}}} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}}}{\partial \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}}} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}}}{\partial \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}}} \end{aligned}$ 

 $\sim 10^{-11}$ 

dir luga gris

t i Padi<br>1830 - Navarê Mez

 $\mathcal{L}_{\rm{c}}$  .

 $\Delta\phi$  and  $\Delta\phi$  are  $\phi$ 

高超 经股票的

From the page of the

जो से माठ्य

 $\alpha$  , and  $\alpha$  , where  $\alpha$ 

 $\mathcal{O}(2\pi/3L)\times 0.1$  and  $\mathcal{O}(2\pi/3)$ 

SUMMARY

 $\sim$ 

中国,中国人民人民的 Control of a Central Research sent a la forma polarization The fire of the weak order as it is

the companion of the companion

Dr. Nikitin indicated that in Russia, general trends in programming were very similar to those which had already been described by other laboratories. The main effort at present was being directed towards the development of the filtering programme for the Moscow flying-spot device.

> Spart Constitution P. and the first state and save construction The STEP and Service Contract the Contract of the 2. 4. 国际经济和国际通过通知 - コールブルまいのないが、Pa対 TO FAILT SHAND JACK AT

> > and the company of the set of the the country of the first parties of the Safety Companies and Companies success of the money of a little in supervision of the street of  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  are  $\mathcal{B}$  . In the  $\mathcal{B}$  ,  $\mathcal{B}$ The control of the company's film and

> > > $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}})$  , where  $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$  is the contribution of  $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$

#### **DISCUSSION**

 $-26-$ 

(Communications 4, 5 and 6)

**ZOLL;** Are you **supposed** to type the table of mass **assignments** on <sup>a</sup>tape, or **does** the computer generate this tape?

**BURREN:** No, you just **type** the **hypothesis** on a card and **specify** for **which reel** of tape or between **which** event **numbers** you wanted to try that" ' **hypothesis;** or else you **type half** a dozen cards because you **usually** want to test more than one hypothesis at a time.

*'* **HUISIZER: Could** you **give** us an idea of what it cost t9 **write** those programmes in **FORTRAN, with respect** to speed and memory **load.** *.* 

BURREN: We started writing the hypothesis-testing programme last JUne and we **actually** used the **fitting** part of it **before** Christmas, and the **hypothesis programme** in May or June for the **first time.** The geometry we started **only** about November and **actually** for **production purposes** the helix **fitting** is not yet in, but it has **worked -** I **think** it is **prdbably** the **first**  time F. **Solmitz'** method has been programmed. That is still going on, and is **just** about finished **now.** 

As to the size of programme, the **hypothesis-testing** programme a<sup>t</sup> the moment takes 13,000 IBM **instructions** and 13,000 **words** of **store,** but **this** is probably **reducible** by, at least 5,000, **probably** 10,000. **When** the **fitting programme** was **written,** we did not **know** how we **were** going to **write**  the **hypothesis** programme and at the **moment** we have to do'a rather **messy dump** in-between to get the data **from** one *form ifito* the other, So **probably**  5 to 10,000 can be saved on that quite easily.

The geometry is about 4,000 **words** of store and about 10 *-* 12,000 **words** of **programme.** 

**MACLEOD: Could** you **explain** a **little** how the masses are **introduced into** your programme or am I mistaken in understanding the programme does make *a* mass—dependent fit to the tracks?

**ZOLL: Well** this is a bit **complicated.** We are using a coding system and a special **kind** of measuring procedure, **Where** you measure **first**  all the tracks **which** belong to one **vertex** or **subsidiary vertex.** You **punch**  a code after the last track and **this** tells the computer **what** possible **hypo— thesis** to use, for any one of these tracks and code **runs,** along **with** the tracks **specifying** on binary **digits which** mass assignments need to be **used.**  The mass-independent fit is calculated, then the mass-dependent iterations are **performed** before **writing** the results for each track.

**POWELL: Could** you say a few **words** about the FSD **device** to **which**  you have **just** referred?

**NIKITIN:** It is being built mostly on the lines of your machine. I can give you some details about it, **perhaps,** but the overall design is **very** near to that you have.

# Preliminary results on pattern recognition at Brookhaven

 $-29 -$ 

*P.V.C.* Hough, (Brookhaven)

Over the past couple of years a number of us have been working on improvements in methods for measuring bubble chamber-photographs. **A** challenging statement of goal by **Prof;** AlVarez was <sup>a</sup>**million** éfients per year. Essentially equivalent to this goal and challenging too, is an aim to **extract** the **scientific** content of the **fraction** of **bubble** chamber **pic**tures **produced** at *a* large accelerator **which** any single large group might aspire to analyze. Presenily developing **systems,** whether FSD or SMP, plan to accomplish this by multiplexing the human scanning function while automating the measuring function.

To introduce some specific numbers, the AGS at Brookhaven may be expected to produce some five million triads of photographs of one **chamber**  or another each year. The bubble chamber group at Brookhaven might aspire to analyze **half this** number. Let me assume that *our.* measuring and computing **systems will** be able to handle all events from this sample so as to **focus**  attention on scanning. Then if you will accept 1 minute scanning time per .trfigi and 500 minutes per shift (or 125, 000 minutes per **shift** per **working**  year) ten human scanners can scan 1.1/4 million triads per year per shift or the full 2.1/2 million triads in two shifts. Thé **bubble chamber group\_**  must hire some 30 scanners to man the two shifts. This plan of operation is in fact about that visualised at Brookhaven, but the cost and perhaps **especially** the organizational problems are considerable, so we are led to ask **Whether machines** can **help** put on\_the scanning function as well.
In addition to this bubble chamber logistics motivation, I feel it is reasonable to add the motivation of the intrinsic interest of the problem, and, as Prof. McCormick has mentioned, the usefulness of any concrete results for other areas of visual data processing.

 $-30 - 11$ 

Prof. J. Pasta of Illinois spent the Summer of 1961 at Brookhaven, and with the aid of W.J. Beard set up some specific programming attacks on the problem of track-element recognition by means of a 7090 computer which read raw co-ordinate data from an HPD. They were joined in late fall by B. Marr and G. Rabinowitz, and recently by B. Wereser.

This group has accomplished two things which have aroused our interest and which are leading us to consider seriously whether the HPD is a suitable input device for computer scanning as well as measuring.

The first is this. By the Spring, various combinations of the first four people mentioned had produced working programmes of rather similar nature and performance. These programmes were tested using binary tapes of raw HPD co-ordinates from the CERN prototype, especially a set of 20 photographs of the BNL 20" chamber which were digitized at CERN last December by B.W. Powell and R. Palmer. The 20 photographs are from the K excitation experiment of Samios et al., and were selected to contain real and false two-prongs in situations of varying complexity. There were 10,000 to 20,000 co-ordinates per picture. As a specific example, a programme of G. Rabinowitz linked individual co-ordinates into track elements using only the criterion of "nearness" - i.e. points were associated into elements in their lateral co-ordinates were nearly enough the same on adjacent or nearly adjacent scan lines. The programme processed about 3,500 co-ordinates per second. No point was ever lost, and the results of a pass through the programme was a collection of "track-element" tables consisting of elements with say 6 or more linked points and a residue of "unrecognized" data.

Figure 1 shows the original data from one of the 20 pictures; figure 2 shows the "recognized" portion and figure 3 the residue. Typically,

 $\gg W$  .

10% of the original data make up the residue. While you can see some tracks in the residue, in all cases these tracks appear also in the **reco**gnised portion, so <sup>a</sup>further pass of the residue for association **with**  *'* **established** tracks **would** we believe leave **just** a noise pattern.

Going back to figure 2, two defects of the **recognition** process are lostip **this plot** and need to be émphasised. **A partiéular** track-element table fairly often contains pieces of two crossing tracks and so is tabulated as an erroneous track—element **with** a kink. Secondly, fie computer plot has put back together all the track-elements forming a track-segment, whereas **they** are just separate tables in the **cdmputér. Névertheless** we are quite encouraged by the degree of success of a programme using such a single **criterion** for linking **points.** 

The second result of the group was the discovery of tight programme **loops\_ which would perform** linking operations while **processing** 15,000 **co-ordinates** per second.\_ B. **Marr** and G. Rabinowitz in particular have been **writing** a programme\_ using: these tight **loops** over the past **cOuple** of months and it is **expected** to get its **first** trials in August. The new **pro**gramme initiates over an area of perhaps 10% of the **picture** at the beamr entry end, using **only** the nearness **criterion** as before. It **then** "track-' **follows",** i. 9. links new **points** by look—ahead **with** a current slope, for all the track-elements **found** in the initiation phase. As the analysis wave **Passes down** the **picture** new points **which** do not join to **existing**  tracks are used in **continuing** attempts at initiation. Well-established tracks are\_ collapsed **into** master-points **which** are **16—point** averages so the **whole plcture W111** fit into the **core** store. Again, no **points** are ever **thrown** away, so the **residue** can be studied visually and can bé **subjected** to further passes.

**Now,** suppose this does some good, or even suppose it **works** very **well,**  there remains the **problem** of event recognition, assuming that good track tables have been prepared. I think everyone agrees that **While this** is

iya ay

 $-31 -$ 

expected to be a very interesting problem and perhaps tricky, it will not require appreciable computing time in comparison with the first phase.

 $-32 - - -$ 

Let's continue, and suppose that event recognition works well and ask **whether** our auto—scan **system will** over~all be useful. As a **specific optlmlstic example,** suppose 2 seconds 7090 computing time are required for two stereo **views** and **1** second for the third, then our **system** scans 12 triads per minute and by our earlier convention equals 12 human scanners. On **around—thé—clock** operation we get 36 scanner-shifts. The 80" **chamber film will go about**  $2\frac{1}{2}$  **times slower, but the 7094 gets us back a factor**  $1\frac{1}{2}$ **. We** and up in this **optimistic** guessing game **with** one 7094 **providing** us **with**  about our required 20 scanner shifts per day to scan our  $2\frac{1}{2}$  million triads of 80" chamber **film.** 

Whether such a procedure is economically justified seems doubtful. However, specific circumstances may alter the economics. For example, if a 7094 is **owned** and not yet saturated around the **clock, a** great deal bf 20" chamber film could be scanned on an "owl shift". If a CDC 6600 existed, and it were 10 **times** faster than *a* **7094,** and a laboratory had one it **would**  seem reasonable to devote a few hours per day of it to scanning all the **bubble** chamber **films.** Finally, one of the fast small **computers now'** bécoming available may be suitable for the *very* elementary **arithmetic** operations used in the first and most time-consuming part of the pattern recognition pro**gramme.:** One pf our most general and Lost **basic** reasons for **preferring digital**  pattern recognltlon to analogue recognltlon (say of the Pless **type)** was the **desire** to be **carrled** along by advances in the **computer** arts **once** our **basic**  techniques were established. These are some specific examples of how this ings of Parish .3": *\_* **might** occur.

v Charles the College Office and Charles College  $\label{eq:2.1} \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}$ complex damage and the common off pages, and promote the  $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{O}(\log n))$  . The first part of  $\mathcal{A}_\mathrm{c}$  , and  $\mathcal{A}_\mathrm{c}$  , and 网络大型子宫 编译器 医二甲基苯甲基  $\label{eq:2.1} \mathcal{L}=\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}^{\prime}(\mathcal{L}^{\prime})-\mathcal{L}^{\prime}(\mathcal{L}^{\prime})-\mathcal{L}^{\prime}(\mathcal{L}^{\prime})-\mathcal{L}^{\prime}(\mathcal{L}^{\prime})-\mathcal{L}^{\prime}(\mathcal{L}^{\prime}(\mathcal{L}^{\prime})-\mathcal{L}^{\prime})-\mathcal{L}^{\prime}(\mathcal{L}^{\prime}(\mathcal{L}^{\prime})-\mathcal{L}^{\prime}(\mathcal{L}^{\prime})-\mathcal{L}^{\prime}(\mathcal{L}^{\prime})-\mathcal$ 

5327/ga

k, gima

stand and the origin



Figure **1** 

G

Figure 2



Figure

 $\rm{SIS/R}/5613$ 

## An automatic scanning system for bubble chambers

# H.S. White, (Berkeley)

With the operation during 1962 at Berkeley, Brookhaven and CERN of the Flying Spot Digitizer (FSD) as an automatic measurement system, the most serious bottle-neck in bubble chamber data processing operation will be eliminated. The remaining impediments to data processing seem to lie equally in two areas. One of these is the scanning of film to find events of a type suitable for measurement. The other area in which a difficulty of achieving optimum data flow is experienced is that of interpretation of the numerical results. The FAIR and QUEST systems have been formulated at Berkeley to facilitate this data interpretation problem and as they are extended will serve to speed this part of the total data analysis effort so that it becomes commensurate with the rates of automatic measuring and the initial production of film. There remains, therefore, the serious problem of producing scanning rates commensurate with the remaining parts of the entire system. The system being described is designed to remedy this problem.

Total event processing is separated into several phases: the abstraction, event recognition, measurement, and computation. After film has been developed, it is immediately submitted to the abstraction phase. This has as its purpose the recognition of track elements within each view and the abstraction onto magnetic tape of certain basic information describing each track segment so that future access to the scanning-type information content of the picture may be had in a form most efficient for computer usage. The first phase ends with each picture of the film having been area-scanned and information describing each track having been recorded onto magnetic tape. This magnetic tape is therefore a summary in extremely condensed form of the total scanning information available in the film.

 $5327/ga$ 

 $\sim$   $\sim$ 

conduction is

di mato

A second phase is the scanning (event recognition) process and is **done without** reference to the **film.** Track segments **descrlbéd** on the **magnetic**  tape abstract are compared to scanning criteria egtablished at the **time** of **execution** of **this** phase, and the **result** is *a* magnetic tape **identical** in **for**mat and content to the tape **produced** by the manual FSD'gqan **tables** and that is used to control the measurement process.

The third phase of the total automatic scanning and measuring pro**cess** is the measurement and numerical analysis by FSD hardware and **programs**of the events selected during the scanning phase in exactly the same manner that manually-scanned events are analyzed.

If a high-precision measuring device like the FSD is used for abstrac**tion** aswell as-for measuring, it is **possible** to **combine** the **first** agd **third. phases** of **this** analysis by producing during the **first** (abstraction) phasel the **compressed** scanning information and also a group of **precision points**  describing each track segment. In this case the second (computer scanning) .phase produces output resembling Frandkenstein measurements and the associated **descriptors** characterizing the **physics** information. **This** output is then **processed** through the usual FOG and CLOUDY analysis **procedures.**  ل جدالتين

There are several reasons that make appropriate the separation of track recognition, scanning, measuring and analysis into at least two parts. If one were to plan **complete** analysis of all "interesting" events in the: **film,** it is probable that the volume of data to be handled **would** seriously impede achievement of early analysis of "most interesting" events. Further**more,** the few **"most** interesting" events are **buried** in a large sea of data, causing an information-retrieval problem of considerable magnitude.

'It seems that manual Scanning frequently follows another route **from**  this; namely, that of looking for "most interesting" events to be measured immediately, selecting but reserving "interesting" events for future measurement, and noting **still** less interesting but more frequently **occurring**  events for possible future scans of **limited** sections of the total **film. This procedure** is **admittedly** *a* **compromise** between the **conflicting** requirements

 $-34 -$ 

of a **complete** scan and a **necessity** for **rapid identification** of the **most**  interesting events. However, it avoids the pitfall of having important results **delayed** by and **buried** in a sea of less important data.

The **automatic** scanning **system** is **designed** to facilitate this épprbaéh **without** paying the cost of re-examinatibn of the **film** for each new scanning purpose. The abstraction pass is comparatively slow and expensive, but does not need to be repeated for **each** new scanning purpose. Rather, the abstrac**tion** pass is made in **such** a way as to optimizé the storage of **information**  required by the scanning **function** so that it is feasible to "scan" for a class of **events within** data **described** on an abstract **tape** and **efficiently** to **select**  those events for speedy analysis and measurement.

Furthermore, separation of the abstraction and scanning phase allows *a* cheap **rescan with revised** scanning **criteria.** .Frequently one **finds** it .desirable to revise scanning **criteria** on the basis of information **acquired**  using earlier **criteria,** and therefore the **resulté** of manual scanning are frequently divi<sup>2</sup>d into separate groups of data which must be independently treated to eliminate **known** scanning biases, **With** separated **automatic** scanning, one merely rescans using the new **Criteria,** and thus has one consistent **group.**  The **problem** of maintaining consistent scanning standards is, of **course,** removed by use of a computer in **this application.** 

-I **believe** an earlier **stability will** be achieved in the abstraction programs than in the scanning programs. It is in the area of scanning that I **would** anticipate the greatest **modification** of program **abilities.** The separa tion of scanning from abstraction enables a continuous improvement of scanning**program-ability\_without** making obsolete the **expensive** results of the **initiéi:**  area search of the film.

Several independent approaches have been made to the problem of track recognition. One such approach by Irwin Pless at M.I.T. incorporates special hardware built by Digital Equipment Corporation into a device called the Pre**cision** Encoder and **Pattern** Recognition **device (PEER).** Another approach **initiated** by John Pasta of Brookhaven National Laboratory and the **University** 

of Illinois uses a computer program in conjunction with the FSD effectively to simulate the PEPR hardware. J Both of these approaches begin with an unscanned section of film and produce inside the computer memory a list of track elements found within that frame. For economical reasons there may be very significant preferences for one technique as compared with the other. However, hardware of each is presently feasible for the production of such scanning data and either of them could be used in a prototype system.

 $-36 - 38 -$ 

Flexibility must remain to employ the most economically advantageous one when production volume becomes large.

One feature of the FSD approach is that ionization may be measured as well as geometric position, since film images are searched by a dense serial scan using a small round spot as probe. It is possible to detect and measure gaps in tracks as well as to sense individual bubbles. This ionization information is considered a major input to the scanning system. However, it is not necessary that numerical values of ionization parameters be extremely precise. What is wanted is something that simulates the human scanner's ability to separate the tracks into categories by inspection.

The function of the abstraction program is therefore to interrogate the photographic image in such a manner as to detect all track elements contained within the picture. The term "track element" denotes a short segment of track perhaps 1 mm in length on the film that is the basic output of the track search operation. The term "track segment" is used to denote the longest assemblage of the track elements that can be achieved without resorting to stereo kinematics or reconstruction. Thus a track segment normally results from linking many track elements togother and this linking process is terminated only by the occurrence of a vertex or kink or else the disappearance of the track. Such a disappearance is attributed to either the physical end of the track or to a long gap or obstruction through which the track may not safely be extrapolated without resorting to the other views. The abstraction phase outputs data associated with track segments and thus performs the linkage of track elements together into segments. The abstraction program is therefore truly the track recognition program.

**A** It is **anticipated** that for **each** track in each **view** three 36-bit **words**  of information are to be **written** onto the abstraction tape. These **words** are **'12-bit** X—Y **coordinates** for the two ends and the **mid—point** of a track segmen<sup>t</sup> (72-bits) as **well** as <sup>a</sup>**collection** of additional data **edited** together into the **third** 36—bit **word.** This **third word includes** the **classification** of the track by ionization (3-bits), linkage at each end (4-bits), sign and deter*minancy* of curvature (2—bits), length, (3-bits), initial **direction** .(6-bits), end direction  $(6-bits)$ , and curvature  $(6-bits)$ .

 $-37 -$ 

If one assumes that each frame contains 25 track **segments** and that ' three views of a triad are scanned, 225 words are obtained for each stereo **triad. This** number seems **typical** of many pictures in large **chambers.** Presen£ **computer** technology allows 10,000 to 20,000 **such** triads to be recorded oh one reel of magnetic **tape. Thus** oné or two good days Of Bevatron operation are abstracted onto one reel of magnetic tape that can be completely searched by an IBM 7096 in ten minutes (aSSuming the **search** can be **performed** at **twice**  tape reading-speed). The abstraction process is therefore an **extremely**  efficient one from the viewpoint of information accessibility to the computer.

The separation of abstraction from other operations allows a different and **much** more convenient organization of programs to handle a **variety** of film formats **including** several views on one film as well as one **View** on each **film.'**  By separating the frame-by-frame track-recognition and abstraction phase from the triad-by-triad scanning phase, it is possible to abstract independently the several **views** of one **triad** and thus hardware may be used **which accépts**  only one piece of film at a time. There is no loss of efficiency in having *only* one **unit\_of** hardware available to transport film and in using **this** hardware to read separately in time the pieces of film containing the stereo views.

Much advanced thinking and program development of this phase of activity has been done at Brookhaven National Laboratory, and it is our inten-'tion to **capitalize** upon **developments** being made there. Present **development** 

कुरु न

 $-4.25$ ...

has demonstrated the feasibility of the track recognition phase with existing techniques.

 $-38 -$ 

The scanning phase program assumes as its input one tape containing the results of the track search and abstraction having all views merged together. This program searches for vertices of a given nature, tracks of given length, orientation, momentum or ionization and may require that the vertex be linked in some pre-specified manner to other vertices in the picture. Positional criteria may also be imposed to limit events to those contained within a fiducial volume. In general, these are the parameters that are observed by the human scanner to provide the basis of his scanning decision. sa ndiki sebagai pada pada

Setting Corp.

Further thought processes occuring within the human scanner's mind may be grouped into two categories. One of these consists of applying predefined event types to the data at hand to test the hypothesis that these. data fit a given event type. The second category of scanner thought includes reasoning about those events which fail to fit previously-defined criteria or which "seem worth considering further". This division-making process in the scanner's mind is subjective; in the computer it is objective. One might operate in such a manner that all expected occurrences in the film are described to the program, and then ask that all vertices be identified with one or more such descriptions or else reported as exceptions. In this way frequently-occurring exceptions may be added to the repertoire of configurations known to the scanning program so that exceptions would become less frequent. The process is then restarted with the new criteria. Thus it is possible efficiently to combine a person exercising reasoning ability with the computer program exercising objective classification ability in such a way that constant improvement of the system is achieved.

This separation of scanning from abstraction allows multiple passes through the scanning program. Since approximately 2,000 pictures can be

"scanned" per minute with an IBM 7090, scanning of entire runs of 200,000 pictures can be done in perhaps three hours. The scanning process is efficient even when used to search for a small subset of the total data. Some scanning-type experiments may be performed on this tape without further measurement. Calibration of scanning procedures can reasonably be ... made over the entire experiment. Events of one particular type may be selected in one pass or events of several tapes may be equally-well selected. Thus the scanning procedure is flexible to meet the needs of scanning and priority of interest. It is possible to sample portions of the data just as manual scanning is done in a selective way over part of the film.

 $-39 -$ 

When scanning and precision measuring phases are separated, the output of the scanning operation is a tape that has the same physical format and some logical content as the output tape from the present FSD scanning table. Sufficient information for road coordinates is contained in the abstracted data. The scanning program has the ability to identify tracks, to assign events to given lists of data, to specify masses and, in general, to perform all of the functions presently performed by human scanners with the FSD scan table. This output tape contains sufficient information to allow completely automatic measurement by the FSD system as it is presently being developed. The tape produced in the scanning process may be merged with tapes produced by a manual process so that occasional manual intervention will gradually replace completely manual operation.

When scanning and precision measuring phases are combined, the abstraction tape is produced in the same format as before but also an additional tape is produced containing perhaps 10 precision points for each track segment in each view. The scanning phase program then edits the contents of this precision tape into a format suitable for input to the FOG-CLOUDY analysis program.

 $5327/ga$ 

" In the future, additional media other than bubble **chambers will** be used as particle detectors. It is likely that these other devices will have resolution comparable to thaf of bubble chambers and that the **kind** of infor~ nation **uSed will approach** that presently used in **bubble** chambers. Early **experiments with** these deVides will probably **record** data on photographic film as is conventional in bubble chambers. However, because of very different data rates and slight differences in resolution, it may be feasible to have immediate transmission of data from the device to the computer. Development of *a* scanning **procedhre** along the lines of **this proposal will** pave the way for this possibility in two ways. Experience will have been gotten with the techniques of **specifying criteria.** Large data rates **will** have\_been handled, so as to give experience with the problems occurring in extremely large scale data analysis.

**"This** program **could** be adapted to the réquireménfs of a **direct** transfer system by producing two tapes during the real-time (simultaneous with accelerator operation) abstraction phase in the same manner as **described** for thé **operation from** film **with** a **high precision** scanning **deVice. This would prdvide**  <sup>a</sup>linkage during tfie transition from experiments to be recorded on **film** to **those** not to be **recorded** on **film.** 

 $\sim 10^{-11}$ 

 $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$  . We have a set of the set of  $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$ 

 $\mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}$  and  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}$  and  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}$ 

 $\mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}$  , which is the constant of the  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}$ 

 $\label{eq:2.1} \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}})) = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}))$ 

 $\label{eq:3.1} \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{2} \right) \left( \frac{1}{2} \right$ 

医心室 计图 and company

 $\mathcal{L} = \{ \mathbf{r}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{r}_N \}$ 

 $\sim$ 

**Contract Contract** 

Service St

a en su

Seguitors

 $\pm$  .  $\pm$  :

*-4o-'* 

 $\sim$ 

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{2} \right) \left( \frac{1}{2} \right) \right) \left( \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{2} \right) \right) \left( \frac{1}{2} \right) \left( \frac{1}{2$ 

**特征** 医反应

### **DISCUSSION**

 $-41 -$ 

(Communications **7** and 8)

ROSENFELD: I do not think that Rough quite does **justice** to the **point**  that he is making, **Without** mentioning that he replaces our investment of \$40 **-** 50,000.00 in maintenance and in **digitised** scan tables for each scanner.

At first **this** business of recognising **track** segments on everything seemed a **little** shocking, but if one is **shocked** by the idea of devoting lots of 7090 time or 6600 **time** to doing **this** on everything that is exposed, at least one **should** recognise that once roads are made on data one is really interested in, then if one can put that on tape, one very **quickly** generates a magnificently—useful track—segment or **road library which** one can then go back and use for other experiments **without** having to go all the way **back** to the beginning of the **tedious system.** 

**MCCORMICK:** One **comment** I **would like** to make is on the use of magnetic tape as <sup>a</sup>storage device. It Seems that <sup>a</sup>**very** minor investment in a filmrreading **device would** be **probably** much more effective storage. **After**  all, the bubble chamber film is already ideally stored, it is not going to be changed, it does not get rubbed out in the light, and with a minor scanner **attached** to that you have a film—tape transport **which** seems much more **appro**priate to **this** area.

WHITE: **This** is certainly true, I see the Bough-Powell **device** as a film-tape transport, but there is the **problem** of converting the information content as it comes out of the **film** through that tape—transport into date the **computer** can easily deal **with,** and the magnetic tape is really a reser**voir** in **which** the **results** of **this process** are **stored** and one does not have to **re-do** it each time a new scanning pass is made.

5327/ga

### **Results obtained with** the Spiral Reader

L.W. Alvarez, (Berkeley)

#### **SUMMARY**

The **Spiral** Reader was originally **conceived** by B. **McCormick,** and was **developed** under his **direction until** he left for the **University** of Illinois. At that time, the responsibility was transferred to **J.A.G.** Russell, **with**  the mechanical design **divided** between J. Franck and F. **Plunder,** and the **electrohic** design **divided** between T. Taussig and J. Salvador. The **filter programme** was originally written by D. Innes who has been **joined** by W. Graziano. Since J. Russell **left** for Brookhaven, J. Salvador has been in charge of the programme, and has brought the machine to its present state.

**(Prof.** Alvarez **showed** some slides of the Spiral Reader giving general details and results of scanning different **track** configurations).

The **first** figure shows the scanning table designed by J. Franck. 0n **figure** 2 one can see the back end of the machine, showing the housing that holds the rotating **device** that makes the spiral **scan.** Figure 3 is lodking.-i**into** the **spiral device which** now has a periscope **which** moves up and **down** and rotates around (designed by F. Plunder). In the upper part of figures 4 and 5 the data that goes onto magnetic tape is shown i.e. this is What the Spiral Reader sees. The magnetic tape is then fed **into** a 709, **later** of **course** the 7090, **Where** the filtering operation takes place and in the **lower** part of the figures one sees the results after **filtering.** 

 $-43 -$ 



Figure 1



Figure <sup>2</sup>



Figure 3





Figure 5

On-line aspects of SMP

 $-45 -$ 

 $\log\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)_{\rm F}=\log 2$ 

J.N. Snyder

(University of Illinois)

Note by the editors: this paper is a condensed transcript from magnetic tape, which has not been revised by the speaker.

In Prof. Hulsizer's presentation at the Instrumentation Conference he barely had time, in describing the SMP system, to do more than describe the device itself. The complete system, however, encompasses not only the device, but also the on-line aspects of a computer. In the following, references will be made to the 7090, since this computer is the most familiar one, but this choice is in no way crucial: any computer with a fast data channel and interruption facilities would suffice. Let us consider briefly the interruption facilities and the method in which several SMP's may be connected to a 7090. About ten SMP's will saturate a 7090, an estimate which is probably quite conservative. These are connected through a multiplexer to the direct data channel. The multiplexer is simply a rotary switch, which goes around fast enough to sample each SMP output within that interval of time for which a given co-ordinate measurement will remain in the output register of an SMP. If ever a 7090 has to handle so many SMP's that this could not be achieved, then buffering would become necessary.

In addition to this each SMP is provided with a typewriter. It is rather unconventional to use the 10 available sense lines in, and the 10 available sense lines out to operate these typewriters. Most on-line applications of 7090's tend to use the Direct Data buses for this kind of operation. There have to be again two multiplexing boxes, one which contains an input, and one which distributes the output, from each typewriter. Four of the ten sense lines can be used to select any of 16 typewriters. The other 6 then

suffice to transmit a conventional TBM character which is encoded in 6 bits.

 $-46 -$ 

Let us see now the set of programmes that will be used to operate the system. These can be divided into several parts, of which we shall mainly discuss the executive routine, but three other categories of routines are also present. One is a filter programme: this type of programme and the techniques used have become quite familiar. They are used in all second generation machines and, I believe, hark back to the really ancient airtraffic control problem which started in 1952. There is a group which we shall for the moment call "short routines", and see later what type of routine would be entered into that category; and then there is the traditional kinematic and spatial reconstruction routines - PANG and KICK or as it is now called FAKAGE. At Berkeley this runs to about 28,000 words which is probably too long. It could probably be pruned a little; especially it could have its event type sub-programmes removed and stored temporarily on tape, which would probably free enough of the memory to allow all four of these routines to be in a 32,000 word memory at the same time. Even if this is not true, there would be very little degradation of the system by storing the appropriate parts of PAKAGE on a magnetic tape. These need be called. forth only once per event that is processed, and hence, the time delay in calling them forth would not be serious. Events will be processed on each SMP in a period of about one to five minutes (depending on which generation SMP you are talking about) and will continue to improve.

We return now to the executive routine which also contains all of the time sharing and interruption facilities which such a system must have. The routine actually consists of several loops. The first loop we will label "examine each SMr in turn, round-robin fashion, asking if filtering of the data from that SMP is necessary". It is implicit here that all SMP's feed their data down a common line into a common "circular buffer". This term means a list of words which is in the memory and which is successively filled by these co-ordinate observations. Each observation when it appears

on one of these lines will automatically be given a label indicating which **table** it originated **from.** ' *'* **<sup>l</sup>***'* 

This buffer will gradually fill up with interleaved measurements from the **mixéd SMP'S** and **when** the data has **filled** fihe buffer it **automatically**  starts **overwriting** the starting **point** in this **circular buffer. 'How** the buffer is emptied is, of course, the duty of the processing routines. But the main**executive programme which** is a big loop **with three'minor** loops therein **lodks**  as follows: **first loop** is **simply** to examine each SMP in turn in sequence and **ask:** "ié'fhere a **complete** track **from** that SMP in the buffer? If not, go onto thé nexf **SMP.** If so, **filter** that information out of the **buffer thereby**  freeing a portion of the buffer, clean that information up, put it in a separate bank where complete tracks (sorted by SMP table) are recorded.

**Circulating** around this loop has **highest priority,** of course, because as is probably obvious we must **empty** the buffer as **quickly** as possible. **While**  ydu are not **doing** that you go around another **loop which** asks if there are any short **processes** that need to be **carried** out. **Circulation** around here means: "examine each 8MP once in **round—robifi process** for either any **short processes**  *-* that need to be **carried** out for that **SMP;** if **none,** try the **next** SM? and so on. Now what do we mean by "a short process"? Each SMP will have a separate **buffer** *—* <sup>a</sup>separate area of storage in **Whidh** tracks for that SMP are being **built** up as an event is being **processed.** Before one goes into the **complete kinematic** analysis of the **complete** event, but on a track level as each track comes in, there are certain things that have to be done for each track. In **particular,** it must be **optically** corrected both for the camera lens of the chamber and for the second lens through **which** the SMP **projects. This** has to be done once for **each** track so you get around to it quite frequently. Finally, at lowest **priority,** you can run around a loop, asking once for each SMP in **sequence,** if the tracks necessary to **process** <sup>a</sup>complete event **have** yet been **accumulated** from that **SMP.** If the answer is yes, then **proceed** to do the conventional things **which** we all **know** about-FANG, KICK and so **forth,** and **then**  back to the beginning.

 $-47 -$ 

This sequence is smooth enough, but it is complicated by all of the interrupt procedures. There is no interruption necessary to handle the direct data connection. The buffer is circular, and if the 7090 can be given the order at  $8$  in the morning to connect and put into action the direct data connection, that suffices for the entire day. The only interruptions will be those connected with communications, operator to computer and computer to operator. For example, a key stroke on a typewriter. The end of an answer which the operator has provided the computer in response to some question. is very naturally indicated by a period, and so forth. Or the end of the question that the computer is giving the operator, can probably be recognised by a question mark and special characters appearing or those six lines we spoke about. Any key stroke on the typewriter will cause an interruption and you will go into a routine which now must take action. It examines what character has appeared on the six lines. This can be one of many kinds. For example, this could be simply the return of some character of a message, a letter for example that the operator is typing in "yes", or something, as the response to a question. This very complicated testing sequence will recognise that this is the intermediate stage in the acquisition of some response from the operator, and if that be the case simply store it and go on further. If on the other hand the computer is typing a message to the operator, the typewriter takes a few milliseconds to type the characters.  $\sim$  $\pm$  1925

 $\sim$ 

 $\omega_{\rm{max}}$ 

and States

 $\lambda=\lambda_1-\lambda_2$ 

 $\sim 10^{-11}$ 

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}(\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}})$  . The  $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}(\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}})$ 

Concert Magnesia (1997)

 $\sim 10^{-11}$ 

Service Street

 $-48 -$ 

 $\mathbb{Z}^n \hookrightarrow \mathbb{Z}^n$ 

are and contact

计计划时值 经可以利益的

 $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}$  , and  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}$ 

 $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}))$ 

 $\mathcal{O}(10^6)$  and  $\mathcal{O}(10^6)$  . The second state  $\mathcal{O}(10^6)$ 

and the company of provided with the company of the

 $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{A}})$  . The  $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{A}})$ 

Service Control

demonstration of a controller and control part of the state

 $\label{eq:2.1} \mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}(\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}, \mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}) = \mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}(\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}),$ 

 $\sim 10^{-1}$ 

in the C

## Results from the SMP

R. Hulsizer, (Berkeley)

(Note by the editors: a paper on this subject was submitted to the Instrumentafion Conference, **held** at CERN on **July** 16 *—* l8 and is **included**  in the Proceedings of that Conference, to be published shortly in "Nuclear Instruments and Methods". The Informal Meeting of July 19 offered the author the **opportunity** for a more detailed presentation and discussion).

 $\mathcal{L} = \{ \mathcal{L} \}_{\mathcal{L} \in \mathcal{L}}$ 

#### DISCUSSION

(Communications 9, 10 and 11)

ROSENFELD: Snyder **talked** abgut the time—sharing problems. It looks hard for a **place** like Berkeley where we have plenty of PAKAGE to do **just**  to run **yesterday's PAKAGE** from the FSD **with** the same SMP to **fill** in the spare time.

**SNYDER:** That **would** be fine if you **could** shorten **PAKAGE** a llttle so that the SMP executive programme can be in there at the same time.

ALVAREZ: The Berkeley HPD has a memory of its own, so that we do not have to take Snyder<sup>1</sup>s way out. We have the **\_:',r;** ..;

WHITE: 128 18—bit **words** is all the memory we have.

**E%RKER:** How about drums, can they be emptied **rapidly** enough to make **typewriter** times?

SNYDER: Unfortunately the 7090 does not have a drum, but the new Illinois computer, for example, **will** have a\_drum **with 7 usec** transfer time. **This would** be a very fine computer for it. The best you can do on a 7090 is 90 kc/s character rate.

**TYCKO:** Are **discs commercially** available for 7090 and how do they compare **with** the tapes?

**SNYDER:** 9O **kc/s** character rate-exactly the same. The only advantage being fheir better access. It is not serial, you do not have to **wait** two minutes to **rewind** the tape.

HULSIZER: I do not **thin** the **typewriter** handling is a **problem,** the thing is that the programmes to handle the typewriter characters can be **brief**  enough so that they do not use up an **appreciable** fraction of the **memory** and can be left in as part of an **executive system.** It is the filtering and par**ticularly** PAKAGE that is going to rob another user of his memory space.

**POWELL:** I would like to ask three small questions. **Firstly,** do you have any comments to make on closely—spaced roughly—parallel tracks as to how you might measure them? **Secondly,** how do you **expect** to handle **fiducial marks and short tracks such as the**  $\Sigma$  **'s for instance? And** lastly, do you see any **difficulty** with tracks which-are obtained **With** a rather cold chamber, that is to say when there are many gaps and perhaps **when** the bubble diameter is rather smaller then you usually have in the 72 **inch** chamber?

AINAREZ: The last question first. All of the testing of the SMP to date has. been made on the worst film that we **could find.** *About* the **fiduciaISy**  we have two plans **-** one that will be in on the **first** model and that is we **will** bring the three **fiducials** into the centre of the chamber so you can juét measure them like that; we are using the ones **whiéh** you and your **friends prevailed** upon us to put on a 72 **inch** film.

.HUISIZER: We have not yet followed any closely parallel **tracks.** We have had our filtering running for about a month. We have been able to distinguish small kinks in the tracks, 5<sup>0</sup> scatter and hang around the kink, and we have followed tracks through intersections where other tracks have come right through at small angles, but we have not actually taken any beam tracks that ran parallel for the whole length of thé chamber and **tried** to hang on to both of them, **which would** be the **acid** test.

AINAREZ: In later models we will **build** something that is **automatic**  measurement of all the **fiducials.** You just put *a* little **cross** of fibres, take the fibres to 2 **photo-diodes** and these things sit at the **four** corners of the **projection** screen where the fiducials are going to be approximately. 'Then you take the **Whole thing,** put a wedge over the lens — you just rotate the thing around so that the whole **picture** stays parallel to itself and the track will cross twice to give you a **nice solid** signal. You find the **posi**  tion of the fiducials **from** the difference in phase of the two signals.

POWELL: What do you **think** the shortest track length you can measure **would** be?

 $-51 -$ 

ALVAREZ; I **think** We **Would** do as we do at present *-* let the **computer STORY calculaté** it by tracklng **back.** *'*  medicine de differencia plumonalità del

**\_HULSIZER:** The filter routine is experimental - it is in FORTRAN 50' we can understand it, but it **would** go in **machine** language when we have it working well.

**SNYDER:** One comment having to do with the parallel track problem, and one about the **short** track problem. The **filter** routine **will discover;**  it is in **trouble'if** in the **buffer.it** extracts all of those **points from** one SMP and suddenly finds two tracks. Being on line it can then branch to a **special error script which** calls upon the operator "please **mark** the track that you are interested in", which the operator can do with a cross-hair. Then it has a firm point to start with. The computer can do the same thing for the short track.

*AINAREZ:* The same general technique has been used in the **filter**  programme for the **Spiral** Reader, We now have a **programme** called CRUTCH **rwhich** allows the operator to mark a point'on tracks. 'It is even **nicer** on the SMP because you only use the CRUTCH when it turns out that the filter is having **trouble.** With the Spiral Reader you do not know that it is having trouble until you feed the tapes in the next day, but the SMP can ask you for **this help** at that **particular** moment.

Application of the control

2. 全地产于2002年

 $\label{eq:1} \mathcal{L}_{\text{max}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{max}} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{2} \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{L}_{\text{max}} \left( \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{2} \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{L}_{\text{max}} \right)$ 

 $\label{eq:2} \begin{split} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) & = \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}\left(\frac{1}{2}\right$ 

The Committee of the Committee of

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}$  .

II. AFTERNOON SESSION

Chairman: Y. Goldschmidt-Clermont

## Multiple **slit** rotating analyser

G; Brautti, (Trieste)

The HERA is a device of intermediate speed and **precision, which** may allow to.small.laboratories a.reasonably fast analysis of some type of **bubble chamber** events **Without** the need of a large on—line **computer.** The mechanical part of it is shown in figure 1.

The vertex of the event may be centered on the **center** of a continuously rotating **disc.** This holds a slit, **under which** are located 12 equally spaced photocells. Each **time** the shadow of a track falls on the **cell,** one obtains <sup>a</sup>pulse. The position at **which** a pulse appears is **digitized** by counting with a photodiode the pulses from a graduation drawn on a suitable transparent **disc connéctéd** to the rotating **part. 'Thé'sensitivity** Of the digitizer is now 6480 **div/Z'fi** ' rad, **which Wiil** soon'be increased to 19440 **div/21f rad.** 

Pulses from the photocells are shown in figure 2: 2a shows the output of the outer **cell,** and 2b the output of a **cell** near the center of the event, where one oscilloscope sweep corresponds to a complete revolution; 20 shows a pulse corresponding to a single **track.** 

**<sup>A</sup>**straight radial index (not shown in figure 1) may be **superimposed**  on the rotating **disc** 31d orientated by hand. **This** gives **coincident** pulses from the **photocells,** and may be used as a reference **direction** or to measure the line of **flight** of a neutral particle.

The first **method** of using the pulses is shown in figure 3. The **center**  of the pulses has been found simply by differentiation, taking the reset pulse of the **discriminator** as the center time. The pulse from the adder corresponds to the **index position,** and **with** the **circuit** shown the polar coordinates of the twelve points on the first track crossed by the **slit** after the index position are measured.

A faster type of analysis will be probably used in the future, with the circuit shown in figure 4. After amplification and discrimination the pulses will be memorised in twelve shift—registers, using the **pulses** *from* the graduation as shift—pulses.

*—* 56 —"' **H** 

**w** a **curved** track coming out of the center of the **disc** gives approximately equally-spaced pulses in the photocells, so that a track of well **determined** Curvature may be detected by *a* delayed **coincidence** system.

This is obtained by summing the pulses in the sense wires through the shift registers cares, assnhematically shown in the figures. **A "high" pulsé** in a Sense wire determines so both the angle and **curvature** of the track.

Some **tests** were made to **check** the precision obtainable by **plotting**  the measured angle versus the **cell** distance from the center for single tracks. 'Those preliminar? tests gave a **r.m.s.** deviation of 8 **microns** on\_ the film, most of **which** seem to be due to the **lack** of noise filters in the amplifiers, and to the reduced sensitivity of the digitizer.

single strong executive  $\sim$  2  $^\circ$ ~;Th9 main **expected** features 9f the **device** are summarized in Table I.

Support Ford

A

5327/ga

 $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{C}) = \{ \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{C}) \mid \mathcal{C} \}$ 

MULTIPLE SLIT ROTATING ANALYSER

 $\Delta_{\rm c}$  and  $\Delta_{\rm c}$ 



Table **1** 

5327/ga



Figure 1a



Figure 1b



Figure 2a



Figure 2b



Figure 2c



MSRA-I MODE

BLOCK DIAGRAM







## **RHODA: A proposed Rapid** Hand-Operated Digitizihg Apparatus for the measurement of track chamber photographs

O.R. Frisch, (Cambridge)

### 1. Introduction

**This** apparatus has been inspired by the **"shaky** table? of Luis Alvarez and has these points in common with it; it uses a projector to throw a pic**ture** of the **film** down onto a horizontal table, a lattice of accurate **"bench**  marksflfifiqémeasure against, and it does not ask the **operator** to make accurate settings. It is simple and cheap and needs no computer on line; it should be accurate as the bench marks and quite fast though it requires a little more skill and thought in use.

## 2. General **description** (Figure 1)

The part handled by the operator is a flat round box, white on top, about 10 cm in diameter. It is slid along the projection table until the track wanted falls on it, and then adju§fiéd **ufitil** the track lies between the two red lines R and is about parallel to them, with the point whose **cooraifiates** are wanted on the centre line. That setting can be done quite fast as it need not be accurate. The operator then presses a pedal; this causes the sliding piece S to travel about I'cm (as shown by the arrow) in about half a second and then quickly back again. A **photocell** under the scanning slit A records the dip in brightness as **A** crosses the track image; the distance the slit **A** 'has f0 travel to the middle of the track is **digitized** (see later).

In addition we need the accurate location of the box, and the angle  $\triangleleft$ between the X-axis and the **direction** in **which** the sliding **piece** moved. **A**  simple coded disc can give us  $\alpha$  to  $\frac{1}{n}$  0.7<sup>0</sup> (8 bits) which is good enough. The **apgroximate** position of the box is obtained by two fUrther **coded discs which**  measuée the angles between the arms of *a* simple elbow linkage by **which** the box is connected to the table. **~Such** a **system** has been **built** by **Adair** and 15' known to give quite good accuracy, certainly the  $\frac{1}{2}$  mm which we need here.

The accurate **position** of the box is obtained by reference to <sup>a</sup> **lattice** of **precisely positioned bench** marks. A raster of clear "polka **dots"'**  (about 0.1 mm in diameter, **with** a lattice constant of about 0.5 mm) on <sup>a</sup> coloured, say **yellow,** background is clamped against the track **film** and **projected** together **with** it. The **photocell behind** the slit **A** is protected by a **yellow filter** so that the dots **don't affect** it; but there are two mofe **slits** B and 'C On the movable slide, and the **photocells behind** them are\_ protécted by a blue **filter** so that they receive no **light** unless the **slit**  B (dr- 0) moves **over** a dot. B and C are of **such** length and are staggered so that neither'dan pass two dots at once **(which** might **cause** ambiguous signals), yet one or the **othér** is bound to **cross** a dot **within** the **1** cm travel of the sliding **piece** 3 **Which** carries all the slits; The sigfial from the **photocell**  behind **B** (or C) is used to digitize the distance S has to travel to the nearest dot; if both B and C **produce** signals thé **better** signal is **selected**  (see below).

### 3. Details

Let us assume 10-fold magnification for the projector, which should be enough for the crude settings required. The projected dots are then 1 mm in diameter, 5 mm apart. The tracks will look about 0.2 mm wide. Slit A: should have about that same width, 0.2 mm. Its length might be 5 mm; **with** that **length** a misalignment by 2° (easily avoided) or a radius of curvature of 15 mm (on the table) will not worsen the signal much.

The signal **— light** intensity through A, as a function of the **dis**tance A has travelled - will look somewhat like figure 2, and we require the distance  $\underline{a}$  to the centre of the track, accurate to 0.02 mm (i.e., 2  $\mu$ on the film). It is easy to set to  $\frac{1}{2}$  mm, hence 6 bits of information are enough. To get that information I propose to square the signal (see fig. 2) **<sup>I</sup>**and use it to gate a **clock** signal **(c),** generated by a magnetic **pickup,** from <sup>a</sup>tape attached to the **sliding piece** S. The **clock** signal **will** be transmitted **atfull** freguency **until** the gate opens, then at half frequency until thé gate **closes** again, and then no **more;** in that way the total number of pulses

transmitted is a measure of the distance to the middle of the track. That number is converted into digital form (binary or decimal) by electronics outside the box and finally punched on tape.

Slits B and C are 3.5 mm long and staggered with an overlap (Fig. 3) of 1 mm; hence neither can touch two dots at once, but one of them must traverse a whole dot before long, giving a standard signal (3a). Sub--standard signals (when only the end of a slit passes over a dot, or when a dot is partly obscured by a track or a smudge) will be rejected by the electronics; if both slits produce standard signals the one from slit C will be rejected. If both signals are substandard the operator will receive an acoustic signal, telling him to try another point along the track; this should not happen often. The signals will be squared and digitized in much the same way as those from slit A. The gate that halves the rate of the clock signals must not operate before the photocell has been in darkness (the slit may have been on a dot when it started to move, and that dot must of course be disregarded), and both trains of pulses must be counted and the numbers stored, before one of them is rejected (or both) as being substandard. Probably a signal can be accepted if it has the correct number of halfrate pulses, corresponding to the full width of the dot, though one might think up other tests.

The longest travel needed will be about  $\frac{3}{2}$  mm (see Fig.  $\frac{3}{2}$ ), so about 9 bits of information are required; one further bit must be punched to tell the computer whether the signal came from slit B or C.

So each time the pedal is pressed the following data will be punched on the tape; the "elbow angles", indicating the approximate coordinates X and Y of the centre of the box, accurate to about  $\pm \frac{1}{2}$  mm (say 10 bits each if an area of not quite a square metre is to be covered on the table); the angle  $\chi$ ; the distance a by which S had to travel before the slit A passed the centre of the track; the distance  $\underline{b}$  (or  $\underline{c}$ ) by which S had to travel before the slit  $B$  (or  $C$ ) passed the centre of the nearest dot;

 $-61 -$
and one more digit which is 1 if b and 0 if c is punched. That makes 44 bits in all; on 5-hole tape, with each number recorded as a separate row of holes, each row with a parity check, we need 13 rows.

 $-62 - -$ 

That, and the need for a special computation to obtain the accurate coordinates. is the price we pay for getting accurate figures by a stepwise. roundabout procedure from fairly crude and hence cheap equipment. However, both the reading of the extra rows (ideally, 8 rows would be enough to record the accurate coordinates) and the special computation should add less than a second to the time taken for each event. The computer would first compute X and Y from the recorded "elbow" angles, and then the coordinates of the midpoint of slit  $B$  (or  $C$ ) after it has travelled the distance  $\underline{b}$ (or c) in the direction  $\chi'$ . Knowing the coordinates of all the raster dots, it will identify the one nearest to the computed point and will use its accurate coordinates to correct  $X$  and  $Y$  by moving the point  $(X, Y)$  in the direction  $\chi$ ; from that it will then compute the coordinates of the midpoint of slit A on crossing the track. Those coordinates will correspond to a point that lies accurately on the track, but whose position along is uncertain by about  $\frac{1}{2}$  mm; usually that won't matter.

To measure a point (e.g. an endpoint) that cannot be identified by the photocell behind A one will set that point as accurately as possible on the mark M and then press a button that causes the fixed distance AM to be punched as the value of  $a$ . To eliminate the uncertainty across  $\chi$  one turns the box by about 90° and repeats. Fiducial marks in the shape of a cross can be measured accurately by letting Ascan over two arms of the cross. The computer programme can see to it that two successive measurements, close together and with the  $\chi$ 's about orthogonal, get combined to give a point that is accurate in both directions.

5327/ga

 $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{O}(\log n))$ 

in a comp

### 4. **Eistory** and acknowledgment

The first proposal for **RHODA** was made in July 1961, rather in <sup>a</sup> **hurry. A** "wash board" was to be used instead of **Optical bench** marks; that **would** have been hard to make and **would** no **doubt** have corrugated the soul of the operator. "Polka **dots"** were suggested in **April** 1962, **thrown**  onto the table by a separate projector. Alan Oxley then suggested that a **coloured** raster should be embodied in the film guide and the **film** clamped against it, eliminating differential **distortion** and unsteadiness. At **first**  I thought of a box **with** no mechanical constraints, containing a transmitter to send out its information, running on dry batteries, and with its **posi**tion roughly **digitized** by servo-operated light beams. That **could** be done and **would** be very pleasant to use but is more expensive and has been **dropped**  for the time being.









 $\mathcal{L}^{\pm}$ 



Figure *3* 

 $\sim$ 

Digitized measuring projector for the analysis of spark chamber photographs

 $-65-$ 

**L.T.** Kerth, (Berkeley)

(Note by the editors: the **subject** matter of Dr. **Kerth's communication**  is contained in the report UCRL-10251 of May 25, 1962 by J.C. Hodges, D. Keefe, L.T. Kerth, J.J. Thresher and W.A. Wenzel).

**\_———~—m** 

# A point position digitizer based on maggetic **induction**

R. Chase, (Brookhaven)

Ĝ.

»Dr.\_Chase **described** a **device which could** be **moved** freely'over <sup>a</sup> photograph standing on a.mesh of.1024 **wires.** An operator **would just** desa : **cribe** a track **with** the instrument, and the **position woul&.automatically'-wv**  be digitised by the position of the **curser** in the mesh. Preliminary tests **with** *a* mesh of 16 **Wires** had given encouraging **results,** and the **work**  was **proceeding.**   $\label{eq:2} \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{F}) = \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{F})) \otimes \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{F})$  $\sim 10^6$  $\sigma_{\rm{max}}$ 

 $\label{eq:3.1} \left\langle \left\langle \phi \right\rangle \right\rangle \left\langle \left\langle \phi \right\r$ 

**SAMPLE STATE** 

 $\label{eq:2.1} \mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}(\mathcal{M}) = \mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}(\mathcal{M}) = \mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}(\mathcal{M}) = \mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}(\mathcal{M})$ 

Signal State

and the state of the state of the state of the state of the

an artist of the control of the pretto be-

den das Statistics (Statistics Constructed and management

a characteristic and the material controller

 $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}})$  . The set of  $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}})$ 

 $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{L}}$  , and the second contribution of  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{L}}$ 

一个后去。

Site and project

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}$ 

こあげい 他 こうりょうしょ  $\label{eq:3.1} \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{1},0) = \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{1}}) = \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{1}})$ 

(三) "学院等"

2002年6月10日

 $\label{eq:2.1} \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})$ 

and a significant

and the state of the control of the state of

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$  , where  $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$ 

 $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}$  , where  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}$  is the contribution of the contribution of  $\mathcal{A}$ 

. The following the sequence

 $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}})$  , and  $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}})$ 

 $\mathcal{C}^{\text{in}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  , where  $\mathcal{C}^{\text{in}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $\mathcal{C}^{\text{in}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ 

 $\label{eq:2.1} \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G})\left(\mathcal{H}^{\mathcal{G}}\right) = \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G})\left(\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{G})\right) = \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G})\left(\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{G})\right)$ 

 $\mathcal{A}_\mathbf{z}$  ,  $\mathcal{A}_\mathbf{z}$  ,  $\mathcal{A}_\mathbf{z}$  ,  $\mathcal{A}_\mathbf{z}$ 

Development of the control

 $\mathbf{L}^{\text{max}}$ 

 $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  ,  $\mathbf{y}$  ,

 $\mathbb{R}^2$ 

 $\sim 10^{-10}$ 

 $\sim 10^{11}$  GeV  $^{-1}$ 

 $\mathcal{L}$ 

5327/ga

 $-67 -$ 

### **DISCUSSION**

-68—

(Communications 12, 13, 14 and 15) and control is a same as

**ALVAREZ: Frisch's** machine seems to.havg all of the **electronics, mechanical** parts, and **optical parts** of the SMP so I **think** it **will** cost about the same amount and have about the same amount of **complexity.** It seems to have three digitisers; 2 coarse digitisers and 1 fine digitiser. It has **all-of** the attributes of an SMP so **i** think it is a fine machine but I do not see how it is going to save any money; or how it is going to be .\_\_.., \_,. . **smallér'** x'ofi' **Simpler** *. '*   $\mathcal{F}^{\text{in}} = \mathcal{F}^{\text{in}}_{\text{in}}$  , with Technological approach

(A) 出版 (A) (A) (A) (A) (A) (A) (A) (A) (A)

FRISCH: Well it does not need the big plate with the accuratelydrilled marks. Instead it uses a raster which, I hope, can be reproduced **photographically** by contact printing and **would** be cheaper. All the **digi**  tisers used, record each of them separately only a moderate **number** of bits, say ten **bits** in **each direction.** It does not need a computer on line. It **grinds** out its result on the tape and so it can be **used** by small **laboratories which** have **limited** access to a **computer** but **would** not have a computer on hand all the time.

**ALVAREZ:** I **think** there is a feeling around that an SMP can **only work** on line. It can **certainly work** on **tape. This,** however, robs us of the error correction. Certainly the gocuracy of the digitisers is the same in both directions as far as I can see. The problems are the same, the methods of solution are **basically** the same, **they** seem to be to be **different manifestations** of the same basic **philosophy** and I do not see how the **electronics** can be **very** much **cheaper.** Perhaps they can.

**ROSENFELD:** The two devices are very similar, so if you **decided** to put one on line you **would** probably **decide** to put the other on line. The real **difference** is the **place** you put the **bench** marks. **Frisch's idea** of putting them at the back of the **film** sounds *very* attractive, on the other hand one does then have to go to two different colours and filters; whereas in the **Alvarez** system you just mill the thing and that is done.

**PARKER:** Has Kerth tested his lens using Bureau of Standards cards or some **similar** device?

KERTH: We frequently use a different lens in the camera because **eaéh** experiment demands\_a different magnification. We **accept** at the labora**tory** only lenses **with** a **fairly** high standard, we have in several **cases** taken lenses on **trial** and **selected** the best ones.

PARKER: The film we use can easily **resolve.two** lines **microns apart.** <sup>I</sup> am sure that one can get better films but we have found many quite expensive lenses that **could** not even resolve lines 30 or 40 **microns** apart, the **sorf** of **errors** you are quoting are usually due to astigmatism, and we have to test each lens we get independent of cost.

**KERTH:** Good lenses are available, but the **distortions** that we **have**  had **trouble with** between the **projector** and the screen usually **occur** in **mirrors,**  now I also realise it is quite possible to mount mirrors of almost any size as accurately as you like **providing** you are **willing** to take the time and **trouble**  in the **design** stage, and as I **tried** to **indicate** we were in a **hurry** for **this device** and that is mainly the reason why we **felt** thaf we wanted not to have to **worry** about any more **distortions** in the **optical system** than necessary. I **think**  in the **next machines** that we may **build.it** is quite **possible** that we **will pro**bably still digitise.on the **film** but **certainly** we **will** not be so **reticent** to' use **mirrors,** in that we **will** have **time** to do a **more«careful** job on the design and supported **mirrors,** and so forth.

MCCORMICK: Has Kerth had any **experience** in measuring the spark **chamber** film on a Frankenstein **device** (for example taking two **points** on each part) and does **this compare** in time **with** the other **approach** in accuracy?

**KERTH:** In either **system** the movement of the **film** to the **fiducial**  line takes the adjustment of two co—ordinates. At **present,** it is manually operated, but in the **next** version it may be possible to have it zero on the track itself. In our case in **this** one operation you get all of the sparks in all of the tracks **whereas** in the other case you **would** have to take two

co-ordinates per spark for say 10 sparks, we have not tried it because we felt confident that it was quite a bit slower.

**-** 70 **— m** 

**PARKER:** Is this 1/4 Of a degree **which** you quote for the samé person just moving the **curser** away and back or is it **rééily** putting the film on another time and having another person measure it.

KERTH: The **film** was actually not taken **from** the machine. These events that were done were events that occurred at various places during a run. The scanner measured a couple of times at each place on several days -I think a total of five scanners measured these events.

MACLEOD: How long does it take to read out the X and Y-co-ordinates to **precision** of **1** in 1024?

**<sup>y</sup>***.* **CHASE:** .The time scale is **determined primarily** by the inductance represented by the orthogonal **wire** rays and by **the~power** that you can make available by the pulsing\_transistors. In our **prototype** we **find** we can make our decision on each bit in 20 **microseconds,** and we allow something like **lOO\_microéeconds** settling time between pulses in order that we do not get paralysis problems **with** our amplifier, so that **with** 22 pulses of.lOO'micro—' ' seconds spacing it takes us about 2.2 milliseconds for digitising. In 2.2 milliseconds the scanner can not move the curser *very* far.

**医心脏病 医心脏病 医心脏病 化** 

 $\label{eq:3.1} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{4} \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{2} \right) \left( \frac{1}{2} \$ 

(于) 医三类的

 $\sim 10^{11}$  m  $^{-1}$ 

 $\sim 10^{-11}$ 

 $\label{eq:2} \mathcal{E} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{$ 

 $\label{eq:2} \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \, \frac$ 

 $\mathcal{A}=\frac{1}{2}$  ,  $\mathcal{A}=\frac{1}{2}$  ,  $\mathcal{A}=\frac{1}{2}$ 

 $\mathbf{E}^{(1)}_{\text{max}}$  and  $\mathbf{E}^{(1)}_{\text{max}}$ 

# Hardware development at the Rutherford Laboratory

B. Burren, (Harwell)

#### SUMMARY

B. Burren talked of the development of *a* flying-line **device which would** scan **with** a line of dimensions **1** mm X *20'»,* giving about 30 scans per mm. The information resulting **would** be much less than **with** the **HPD,**  though in other hardware aspects, the machine **would** be very **similar.**  Encouraging results had been obtained on **tests,** and photographs **were shown** of the **sort** of signals **produced.** 

The programming problem was formidable but some use **could** be made of present programmes and techniques.

### **"Chloe"**

# A system for the automatic handling of

## **spark.pictures**

J.W. Butler, (Argonne)

#### 1. **Foreword**

The **system** to be described was **conceived** by Donald Hodges and **myself**  in the early part of 1961, and has **since** been designed and constructed by an engineering group led by Hodges with software assistance by **Richard**  Royston. Substantial support and encouragement were **provided** by the High **Energy Physiés** Division of the Laboratory, **particularly** by Roger Hildebrand. The equipment is now operating but has not been put through the usual **tidying**  up and debugging **process** necessary to **produce** a **productive** system.

### 2. **Introduction**

The evolution of this **particular** design was guided by three **circum—** *'*  stances **which** obtained at about mid-1961.

**Firstly,** advances in cathode ray tube and **fiber optics** technology **were occurring** at a rate such that we **could** confidently **expect** suitablé tubes to be available by the time they were needed. **A firm** decision was therefore made to concentrate our efforts in this area and **avoid considera**  tion of various **types** of mechanical scanning schemes. The correctness of **this** decision has been borne out, since good tubes are now obtainable **from <sup>2</sup>** several manufactures.

**Work performed** under the auspices of the **U.S.** *Atomic* **Energy** Commission.

5327/p

 $\ast)$ 

We are now writing a program which will enable us to attempt the processing of data from an actual spark chamber experiment, but not enough **CEPTER** has been done to justify discussion at this time.

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}$ 

 $\sim 10^{-5}$ 

## 6. Acknowledgments

program to the company of the second state

It is a pleasure to acknowledge the contributions of Robert Conderone to the CRT circuit development and the able assistance of Richard Wehmann in design and construction of the entire system. Service of Gas

**Report that the control of the construction of the control of the control of the control of the control of the** 

 $\Delta \epsilon = 10^{-1}$  ,  $\Delta \epsilon = 10^{-1}$ 

and we have a state

standard opened

construction of the construction

**SACTO STATE OF BUILDING** 

control and great control of the control of the control of the control and the control and control and control and  $\sim 10^{-11}$ **2010年1月1日 年度** Special and possible said. Health Store  $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}))$  , where  $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}))$ and the country The Common State of  $\omega\omega\mapsto \rho(\mathcal{A})$  . South State  $\sim$   $\sim$  $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$  , and  $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$  , and  $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$  , and  $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$ services and services during in Service  $\label{eq:1} \mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}} = \mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$ 医指肠炎 网络大麦米属大麦  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{B})$  ,  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})$  , and  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})$  , and  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})$  , and  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})$  $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}$  . 医支气管 医松木 医美洲白  $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathcal{L}}$  , where  $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathcal{L}}$ **Some Bank Company**  $\sim 10^{-1}$  $\mathcal{F}=\mathcal{F}^{\mathcal{F}}$  .  $\sim 10^{11}$  km s  $^{-1}$ s en volgoner dem≵e  $\frac{1}{2} \left( \left( \frac{1}{2} \right)^2 \right)^{1/2} \left( \left( \frac{1}{2} \right)^2 \right)^{1/2} \left( \frac{1}{2} \right)^{1/2} \left( \frac{1}{2} \right)^{1/2} \left( \frac{1}{2} \right)^{1/2}$ , we define the sequence  $\mathcal{E}^{\mathcal{A}}_{\mathcal{A}}$  , and  $\mathcal{H}^{\mathcal{A}}_{\mathcal{A}}$  , and  $\mathcal{E}^{\mathcal{A}}_{\mathcal{A}}$  $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$  ,  $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$ Service Control Service Pressure Carbarat Chicago Cathy Service and Sandwick and Control

- 1) Arthur Roberts, "Review of Scientific Instruments" 32, 531 (1961)
- 2) Advanced Scientific Instruments, Inc., Minneapolis, Minnesota.
- 3) Private communication from L. Leipuner (BNL) to Arthur Roberts (ANL), August 1961.  $\hat{L}_1$  , where  $\hat{L}_2$  $\mathcal{A}=\mathcal{A}$  , we have the  $\mathcal{A}$  $\overline{\phantom{a}}$

grams in a congress of the general and control an anti-conductor of the anti-conduction of the state of t

manded the providence of the company of the second control of the second term of the property of the second providence

 $5327/ga$ 



**Figure 1** 



Figure *<sup>2</sup>*



Figure 3



Figure 4













Figure 8





Figure 9

## **A description** of the PRU **device**

13.3. **McCormick,** (Urbana, **111.)** 

(Note by the **editors:** a paper on **this subject** was **submitted** to the Instrumentation Conference, **held** at **CERN** on **July** <sup>16</sup>*-* 18 and is **included**  in the Proceedings of that **Conference,** to be **published** shortly in **"Nuclear Instruments** and **Methods".** The Informal **Meeting** of **July** 19 offered the author the **opportunity** for a *more* **detailed** presentation and **discussion).** 



# A scheme for automatic processing of bubble chamber and spark chamber photographs

A.R. Edmonds. (London)

The report which follows is a brief account of the present state of work which has been carried out at Imperial College over the last eighteen months. It is a sequel to two previous reports (May and November 1961) by the present author.

As to the state of the project: detailed design and drawing of the mechanical and optical parts were started some time ago, and experiments to test some aspects of the mechanical design are at present being made. A large part of the work has been a study of the properties of commercial computing and data processing equipment with respect to the track measuring problem.

### 1. Study of the system

The current assumption is made that the film processing system may be taken to consist of three connected parts, viz:  $(i)$  the human scanner equipped with a suitable picture-projection device and possibly with facilities for rough measurement of events, (ii) an automatic machine which measures selected events sufficiently accurately according to the instructions of the computer and scanner, (iii) a computer which selects the relevant information from the output of the measuring machine and processes it in various ways for spatial reconstruction, kinematical fitting, etc..

It is immediately evident that one of the objects of research must be to decrease materially the extent of human intervention i.e. to lighten the task of the scanner, if not to eliminate this stage in suitable circumstances.

 $\mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ 

**The properties of the computer requlred in this** system **are particularly important. Wé must consider the** size **and speed of** a **éomputer which may be expected to** cope **with thé various processes in'vblved at** a satisfac**tory rate;** something **of the .order of** several events a minute **is** generally accepted **as desirable. The follbi-Iing discussion.** fakes **into** account **condi**tions prevailing **in the United Kingdom; however, it is** hoped that some, **at least, of the conclusions may have** a **wider relevance,** 

**Plara are being** made **by the bubble** chamber group **at the** Rutherford-Laboratory, Harwell, to use a Hough-Powell type measuring machine with the **output fed directly to** a Ferranti Orion **computer. In approximate terms the**  Orion **is** equivalent **in** speed **to the 709,** although **it has** many **more** advanced features **.** 

It has been known for some time that the 7090 rather than the 709 **(a** factor **of** about **six** slower) matches **the** natural speed **of the Hough-Powell syst'em. The** Brookhaven **group,** led. **by** *R.P.* **Shutt,** havé' reached this **conclusion. They already have an IBM** 7090, **and up to two shifts per day can be allocated solely to bubble** chamber **work. They** plan **to use most of the time with** <sup>a</sup> **Hough-Powell input during 1963. Is has already been agreed, however, to replace the 7090 by a 7094 which is somewhat faster (probably a factor of 1.5 to 2). Embryonic** plans **are** being **discussed for** a **much** larger **and** fastér **<sup>I</sup> computer. if** pattern recognition **problems gre to be tackled in the future,'**  then **it is** essential **thaf** a very large computer **ba parélof the overall** measu**rement system.** 

**It is pertinent to** inquire **if any** time **on** a *very* much. faster **machine than Orion 'is** likely **to be** available **in the U.K.** *.* **The only** attractive **pos sibility** appears **to be** Atlas. **The present** author **has sfudied the technical problems involved in connecting** a measuring **machine to one or other of the**  three Atlas machines (Manchester, London, N.I.R.N.S.). Consultations have been held with Atlas experts at Manchester University and with Ferranti Ltd. **It** appears that **the supervisor programme** being **supplied with the** normal Atlas operates **in** such a **way** that **all the** data **for** a given computation **must** have

5327/ga

 $-84 -$ 

been read **into** the computer and stored on magnetic tape before the **computation**  in question can start. **'With** this **System** it is clearly **impossible** for the computer to cantrol the measuring machine in any manner; for example, it **could** not require **more** careful measurement of the coordinates from oné **pérticular** scanning line after **having** made a first study of the data. It is, of course, possible but very inconvenient to alter the Atlas supervisor programme **whiéh** is located in the **fixed store.** One **then discovers,** hpfiéver, that **Atlas** in its **present** *form* is unable to accept **input from any-ékternal device** other than at a rather **slow** rate\*). Ferranti Ltd **have** stated. **informally,** that a fast rate of **input** of 105 to 106 bits per **second** might be attained by the **addition** to Atlas of a **special** unit resembling the **present**  magnetic tape ppordinator. **This special** purpose unit **might** cost afiout *£* 250,000 and **would take** several years to develoy. Facing **this** rather-unr promising situation led the author to **consider** the **possibility** of carrying; out the **first** stage of processing **information** in a **special** data-handling **device which would** prepare *a* suitable output, **preferably** paper tape, **which would** become an *inpfit* for Atlas to handle the **bulk** of the **calculation,** namely; geometr§, **kinematics** and **sorting** of events using its time **Sharing'facilitiéé;**  ,For **example,** if the **device** is **capable** of **selecting** the measurements relating to the event of **interest** and **processing** the track coordinates so that each. track may be represented by a smoothed set of points, a **typical** event may be encoded as rather less than 10,000 **bits. This** amount of **informatipn would**  be output by a Creed type 3000 fast paper-tape punch in a few seconds, and read into Atlas in a similar time. Although transfer of information to Atlas via maghetié rather than *pébér* tape **would** haVe **obvious operational** advantages, the abbié argument **shows that** it is not essential; a magnetic tape deck and

) **Since** the date when **this** paper was presented further study of **this** problem by Ferranti has **yielded** a **solution which will permit** a **high** data rate for direct **input** at *a* significantly **lower** cost. **-** Editors.

 $\mathcal{N}$  ,  $\mathcal{N}$  ,  $\mathcal{N}$ 

\* *,* 

*<sup>~</sup>*85 '-

\_\_\_-\_-+g,\_\_p\_-

associated electronics might cost around \$ 20.000. It should also be noted that the paper tape scheme referred to would have built-in error detecting and correcting facilities.

contact the same The data-processing unit would have to satisfy a number of requirements for the combined system to be equivalent to computers such as the IBM 7090 or 7094. The most important of these is that rapid input of information from the measuring machine should be possible, preferably in such a manner that normal computation is not impeded. The memory of the device must be large enough to accomodate both the processing programme and input and output buffer stores. To keep the size of the memory (and hence the cost of the device) to a minimum the operating speed must be very high; otherwise there will be a need for undue amounts of buffer storage. Finally the cost of the device must be small compared with that of one of the usual large computers.

A number of small computing devices intended for real-time data processing have been developed in the last few years in the U.S.A. and in the U.K. and these have been considered with the above application in mind.

a millent the

Little Bally House Co.

ang S Several such machines are currently available in modest versions  $(4 - 8000$  words of core store) at prices of the order of  $\frac{1}{2}$  50,000; more than one of them seems a likely candidate for the job.

Although the original impulse to consider a small intermediate data processing unit arose from the problems of working with Atlas, it is possible that such a philosophy may have advantages even with large computers with less restricted facilities for rapid input and output of data. A small relatively cheap device may more easily be monopolized by a development programme, and in any case such machines are specially designed for real time multi-channel operation. or order

The Course

 $5327/ga$ 

### 2. The proposed measuring machine

**A** data-processing **system** of the **type** just **described will** impose **cer**  tain conditions on the design of the associated measuring machine. We may assume that the amount of fast storage is **limited** and that no tape **decks** are **directly** available to the small **computing machine. This** makes it **advisable**  to **process** all 3 or 4 **views** concurrently, though **this** is **probably** also an advantage when only one large computer is used. The measuring **machine** should be operated in **such** a way that it can, on command, wait for the data **processor**  to digest the last **block** of **input** before attempting to measure **further.** The **possibility** of re—measuring **would** be valuable. The measuring machine should also be designed in **such** a way that it can take advantage of the **sophisticated:**  control **capabilities which** are **characteristic** of these real-time **computers.** 

 $-87 -$ 

A machine with the above properties has been sketched out (figure 1), and **mechanical** and **optical** design is well advanced. It is essentially <sup>a</sup> **flying-spot** scanner **which covers** the photographs line by line. The **most radical**  feature is its **cylindrical symmetry** (figure 2); the 3 or 4 films associated **with** the different views are sucked down onto the surfaces of parallel glass plates each about 220 mm long. The surfaces of these plates lie on the same **cylinder, with radius** about 170 mm and axis parallel to the length of the films. The film carriage is designed so that 35, 50 or 70 mm film may be accomodated. The **film** transport **system** is expected to be **similar** to that now being **developed**  for the Rutherford **Laboratory.** The **films** are scanned by twelve **spots** of light emitted radially by a rotor whose axis **coincides with** that of the **cylinder** on **which** the **films** lie. **Relntive** motion of the **rotor** and film carriage **allows**  for the scanning of the whole of each frame. Condensers and **photomultipliers**  are positioned **behind** the films to **pick** up the **transmitted** light.

The twelve **spots** of **light** are **produced** by twelve radial **qptical projec**tion systems. Each of these systems consists of a pentaprism, and adjusting lens and a **modified microscope objective** of N.A. about 0.25. **Light\_from** <sup>a</sup> collimator is led into the rotor through a ring of twelve portholes in the side, and turned through  $90^{\circ}$  by each of the pentaprisms.

Successive optical systems are adjusted so that the spots travel over twelve separate lines about 20 microns apart, thus covering a strip of the films about 240 microns wide. The size of the spots produced on the film may be varied down to a diffraction-limited minimum of about 2 microns. The optical system wastes relatively little of the light and very high scanning speeds are in principle possible without much reduction of signal-to-noise ratio. It will be seen that this arrangement of scanning spots presents a number of advantages when it is remembered that the intention is to measure the films with the rotor and films at rest with respect to relative axial motion. It is, for example, possible by programming the measurements, to select tracks with particular orientations to the direction of scan, and to deal with tracks lying nearly parallel to this direction. Thus no measures need be taken to supply an orthogonal scanning facility, as in the Hough-Powell scheme.

This cylindrical symmetry implies that measurement of distance across the film may be replaced by measurement of instantaneous angular position of the rotor. This angular position moreover would have to be measured to a very high degree of accuracy to secure the precision required, (of the order of 2 microns on the film). But by careful mechanical design we can ensure that the rotor runs at a very constant speed. Measurement of position is then replaced by electronic measurement of time intervals, which is easily achieved by modern techniques. If the speed of the rotor is monitored at frequent intervals and the result fed into the data-processor, it is not necessary to require absolute precision of speed or long-term constancy. A very constant speed over short periods of time is adequate. The alternatives of mounting the rotor in oil or air hydrostatic bearings are at present being investigated, and experiments to check the constancy of speed obtainable are in progress. Such bearings offer an additional advantage; the axis of the rotor may be located with a high degree of accuracy without the need for unusually precise methods of fabrication. In spite of certain advantages of air bearings, it is likely that pressurized oil hydrostatic bearings will be chosen. High pressure oil will in any case be needed for a hydraulic ram, and the very high stiffness. obtainable with oil bearings, often greater than 100 kg/nicron, means that it

 $-88 -$ 

 $\overline{X} \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ 

is possible to move the rotor **with** respect to the main frame, rather than the **film** carriage. **This** offers several practical advantages.

The philosophy of measurement associated **with** the use of a small data processor leads us to favour start-stop operation of the axial motion of the rotor relative to the film.

The rotor carriage is to be mounted on linear hydrostatic or roller bearings and moved back and forth by an hydraulic **ram,** under **control** of an' **electro-hydraulic** servo valve. The reiatively high accelerations (several g) needed for reasonably fast start-stop operation demand a counterpoise system for the moving carriage (figure 3). The preliminary design **work** for this has been completed. The intention is systematically to measure all 3 or 4 films together, measurements being done while the rotor carriage is at rest. 0n **com**  pletion of a set of measurements, a signal from the data processor causes the rotor carriage to move on to a new position. The corresponding coordinate is read of the counter of a linear **moiré** fringe grating into the data processor. The maximum speed of the linear motion would be of the order of 200 mm/soc.

### 3. Associated electronics

The wdrk already done has produced *a* scheme **which** although quite feasible, is too **complex** to **describe** adequately in a brief **report. A** few features **may,**  however, be of interest. One principle adopted is to convert the photomultiplier outputs into digifal **form** at the earliest opportunity. **This** gives several advantages; standard commercial logical packages may be used on a large scalé, and a great part of the system may be independent of the rate of operation of the measuring machine. **A** figure of 2,000 *r.p.m.* for the **rotor**  has been considered, but it may be profitable to vary this considerably. The **problem** arises of how to carry out rapid analogue-digital conversion? The answer to **this** is probably the use of tunnel diodes. Experiments in this **direction** are in progress at Imperial College.

**I** 

 $- 89 -$ 

"-The **general** scheme **will have** similarities to the Bough-Powell **philosophy; however** fheré are a-number of differences. **Since** no provision is made for a scan in the axial direction, the system must be able to deal **with** signals representlng tracks making a small angle **with** the line of **scan.**  The small amount of **core** storage assumed in the data—processing **device** makes it necessary to have a highly **efficient procedure** for rejecting signals arising from unwanted tracks. It is believed that these requirements are taken **care of in the proposed system.** An important feature is that the digitizing, **circuits** are to be.constructed so that the system **will work** over <sup>a</sup>**wide** range of scanning speeds. In **this** way it is **hoped** tQJable to make a best match between the measuring machine and the data-processing unit. The rate of processing of events **will** probably be **limited first** by the speed of operation. of the film transport and the rate of punching of paper tape: 10-20 seconds **per-event** is contemplated. **This** should leave plenty of **computing** time available for elementary pattern **recognition** operations **which** may eventually reduce the amount of preliminary information (the "rough digitizations?) to be **supplied**  by the **human** scanner.

The data-processing **device will** have another function; namely, the **control** of the **hydraulic servo-system which moves** thé **rotor** carriage in the axial **direction.** Measurements are made at **rest** and **choice** of scanning lines on the **films** (three or **four** at once) is-made by programme according to immeq diate requirements. The total flow of information into the device is thus. reduced to the minimum **necessary.** .The engineering design of the measuring machine will make the time lost **while** the **rotor carriage** is moving a **matter**  of milliseconds; **with** the above scheme *a* hundred steps per event will **pro**bably be adequate. The staggering of the lenses in the rotor, mentioned earlier in **this report,** will make fine adjustments of the axial coordinate unnecessary *<sup>o</sup>*

The recording of track signals while the rotor carriage is at rest has **certain practical** advantages (c.f. the Hough-Powell **system).** For example, it **would** be expensive to equip the data—processing **device with sufficient** 

 $-90 -$ 

core storage to be able to buffer the numbers of digitizations arising<sup>1</sup> under **exceptional** circumstances (e.g. large numbers of beam tracks, tracks parallel to the **scan). With** our scheme, **however,** overflow of the buffer **region** may be detected, causing **entry** to a special subroutine **which** processes the data already in the **buffer,** and **carries** on measurement at an **appropriate**  point on the next available scan. **Thus,** we can save on fast storage in return for a somewhat more elaborate engineering design of the measuring **machine** and **poSSibly** a longer **time** for processing **exceptional** casesi' Conversely, processing may be speeded up significantly when simple patterns have to be dealt **with (e.g. spark** chamber **photographs).** In **such.circumstances,** *a* few'doZen steps of the rotor carriage may be'adequate.

### 4. Conclusions

The design study already **carried** out demonstrates that a high speed **film** measuring **system** can be **built Without** the necessity for the measuring machine being on-line to a very large and expensive getral purpose computer. The **proposed** scheme **will** be at least as fast as the Brookhaven Hough-Powell system using the IBM 7090 and **probably** as fast as the IBM 7094 **system.** It will, however, be much **more flexible** in several **aspects;** for example, *a* **wide** range of scanning speeds **will** be readily available and the selection of axial coordinates can be programmed **efficiently.** 

The proposed system should be considerably more economic that the Brookhaven scheme **since** the on—line **computer** is probably **much** less expensive than using part of the large IBM machine. The use of a large computer also **limits** the way in **which** on uses the measuring machine because it is **uneconomic**  to waste the large computer's time. It has been **indicated that** the time required for measuring 3 or perhaps 4 stereo runs of an event will not be longer than about 20 sec. and in simple cases may be significantly shorter. **A** few seconds *-* say up to 5 *-* of Atlas time will be needed to **complete** the remaining **stages** of the calculation *-* namely, **geometry, kinematics** and **sorting.** 

 $-91 -$ 

 $-92 -$  if .

This time, however, can be obtained using the normal time-sharing arrangements for Atlas. and the company of the company

It may also be noted that the proposed system can undoubtedly be used for the evaluation of some kinds of spark chamber pictures. Development work on this problem would also be included in the programme for the machine.

In the early years of the project a considerable amount of operating time with the measuring machine and small computer would need to be devoted to development work with the aim of reducing considerably the amount of work to be done on the scanning table. Thus we envisage the system being used as soon as possible for some production measurements, but most of its time would be used for research work on the development of the technique.  $\label{eq:1} \begin{split} \mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}(\mathbf{X}_{\text{max}}^{\text{max}}) & = \mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}(\mathbf{X}_{\text{max}}^{\text{max}}) \end{split}$ 

 $\sim 10^{11}$  m  $^{-1}$  .

 $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{A}}$  and  $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{A}}$  and  $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{A}}$ 

in the 1

 $\sim$ 

 $1.32 - 7$ 

计算的人

 $\sigma$  of  $\mu$  , and  $\sigma$ 

 $\label{eq:2} \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{F})=\{ \mathcal{F}_\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{F}) \mid \mathcal{F}_\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{F}) \leq \mathcal{F}_\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{F}) \}$ 

 $\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2} \left( \mathcal{L}_{\text{max}} \right)$ 

 $\sim$ 

Sunday of Williams

 $\sim 3.3 \times 10^{11}$ 

**VISEN STATE** 

 $\mathcal{L}^{(n)}$  and  $\mathcal{L}^{(n)}$  are the set of the set of the set of the  $\mathcal{L}^{(n)}$ 

**SAMPLE STATE** 

, 化酸性 医第二次的第三  $\label{eq:R1} \mathcal{M}^{(1)}_{\text{max}} = \mathcal{M}^{(1)}_{\text{max}} + \mathcal{M}^{(2)}_{\text{max}} + \mathcal{M}^{(3)}_{\text{max}}$ 

The communications of the communication of the communication

a shekara ta 19

 $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{E}^{\mathcal{E}}_{\mathcal{E}})$  , where  $\mathcal{E}^{\mathcal{E}}_{\mathcal{E}}$ 

 $5327/ga$ 





Figure 2



Figure 3

 $\overline{\mathbf{c}}$ 

### $-93 -$

#### **DISCUSSION**

(Communications 16, 17, 18 and 19)

**ROSENFELD:** I **would** like to ask **McCormick** when **will this** machine be ready to use?

McCORMICK: The time scale depends largely upon financial questions. When those are resolved I will be willing to quote a time.

WEEFORD: **With** Dr. Butlef's systém the cathode-ray **tubé** is imaged by a **lens** on to the film in his **scanning device** and yet it is a **fibre-optics**  tube. Can you say What is the purpose of the **fibre-optics?** 

**BUTLER:** We bought the **fibre optics** because we want to eliminate the lenses but we are not quite ready to face the problems that go with running the film **directly** against the tube.

'MACLEODz' Edmonds Said that it was an advantage'fo be **ablé** £0 measure stereoscopic **views** in parallel. Even on a large computer it is not **obvious**  that **this** is an advantage, and on a small computer I **should** have thought the ' **high** data-rate **would definitely counter-indicate** it.

Secondly, why does scanning the picture in bands of 12 lines remove the need for orthogonal scanning?<sub>sq</sub>Thirdly, what sort of measuring times does he expect with this machine? Fourthly, could he say in a little more. **detail what kind** of processing he proposes to do in the small computer **before**  hand-over to the large one.

**EDMONDS:** The advantage of Wofking in stereo is **primarily** associated **with cross** referencing beffiéen different views, and **the\_possibility** of re-measuring an event immediately if it fails. Now, if you have one big computef and you have **redorded** the **digitisations** *from* eaqh of **your** three **Views**  on three separate magnetic tapes then it is a relatively straignt forward business to run these tapes back and try the whole thing again.

The small computer should deal with the problems of gating the information which comes in. It would select from the input information the digitisations belonging to the tracks we were interested in. It would put these digitisations together in the sense of making lines out of them and then replace these lines by numbers, possibly just in the form of a sequence of co-ordinates or chosen points along the lines. The eventual output would be rather similar to what J. Burren calls a Tape A. The main idea is to absorb the information from the measuring machine and control it.

 $-94 -$ 

MACLEOD: The most advanced programming techniques for this are those being developed at Brookhaven and so far they have been able to produce a programme which would just about keep rate with one measuring machine measuring one view. I do not see how, with a small computer which is much less powerful than a 7090, you can hope to process three views simultaneously.

EDMONDS: The small special purpose computer is designed for the job, it is not just a cut-down version of the 7090. Some of these machines have facilities for micro-programming which the 7090 does not. They are designed especially to deal with information in this fashion rather than to do. floating-point arithmetic. The fact that we are measuring our three views all at once, does not necessarily mean that the machine has to run three times as fast as one HPD will. We have to match the speed of this machine to the small computer and this is something that we will find cut in due course. The basic reason for the small computer is not that the small computer would be better than the big one. Rather that in England we are faced with the likelihood of having three Atlases and one of their properties is that they are very very bad at taking in large amounts of information. We are therefore looking for a possibility of making use of these big machines for this kind of work, and the small computer is a possible way of doing it. There are other obvious advantages of a small computer  $e.g.$  if we are doing development work with a measuring machine on a small computer we have the machine to ourselves, we do not have to share it.

WISKOTT: What is the advantage of having a two micron flying spot?

**EDMONDS:** There is no particularity advantage at the **moment.** The main point is that because of the optical design, the **spot** can be chosen so as to be anything **down** to 2 **microns.** 

I have done some experiments on a **flying-spot** scanner at Imperial **College** on varying the **spot** size and I believe that there is some advantage in having a **spot** appreciably smaller than 10 **microns, particularly** in the case of certain **types** of **film.** my View is that the spot size **shbuld** be <sup>a</sup>variable parameter, that one should not be **limited** to a rather large size of spot as one would be with the cathode-ray tube system, or as I believe one **Would** be **with** the **HPD.** 

WELFORD: I **would** like to **reply** more **fully** to the question on **spot**  size; If you have **a spot** image **which** is **limited** by **diffraction** and **possibly**  abberations in the lens, then for the same intensity of source, the amount of light you get in any size of spot is the same. If you decrease the spot, it is formed **with** a larger cone. If you make your **optical system** able to give you a diffraction-limited spot of 2 microns instead of  $10$ , then you can increase *your* original pinhole to the equivalent of 10 and then you have 25 **times** the amount of light **flux** that you **would** have had in a 10 **micron**  spot which was diffraction-limited.

**POWELL:** I believe that in England there **will** be a number of KDF 9 computers. **Would** that be easier to operate with the advantages of a large computer.

**EDMONDS:** The answer to that is **this,** and I have **checked** on this **with** English **Electric.** The KDF 9 does have an **interrupt facility** and one **could** use the KDF *9* reasonably conveniently for **direct input.** It **probably wouldn't** be as **efficient** at **direct** input and output operations as the smali. machine **would.** It **would** probably be not as good as a 7090 but much better than an Atlas.

The drawback is that the KDF 9's on **order** are **very** cut-down versions. **They** have 8,000 **words** of **core** store and I **think they** have only two tape **decks.** 

 $-95 -$ 

Thus, as **they** stand, they are too small to **substitute** for an Atlas.:1'

~96-

*'* The advantage of the small machines for **this applicatibn** is that *tfiéy\_*  are **specially** designed for real time **working,** for **working with** short **words,**  for doing logical Operations, for in and out operations and for **working** in the **interrupt mode,** and they are just a **cut—down** version of a big **computer..**  They are very much more flexible. For example, the RW 530 has micro-program**ming** facilities available. **This** gives the **customer** the Option to *a* large **extent,** of establishing **exactly What** the **computer** does, and **exactly** how the **individual instructions work. With** the small machine, you pay <sup>a</sup>relatively **Small** amount of money for the parts of the machine you need and you do not have the rest of the equipment standing **idle.** 

BUTLER: One comment on the RW 530. It is a very interesting machine but I **think** you pay quite a steep penalty for getting **this micro—programming facility.~ A** rough analysis showed that by linking two **computers** together; you have two **arithmetic units** going at.once on the same **problem** and this is <sup>a</sup> **fairly powerful** combination.

**ROSENFELD:** I **would just** like to know how **much** this A31 210 costs and perhaps how much some of these **machines** you are suggesting, the small **special** purpose **machines, cost.** 

**BUTLER:** The A81 210 **with** two **"in—out"** channels costs **\$117,** 000. We do not have a tape unit but we have **direct** data **connection into** the **larger computer.** We have nothing but a **typewriter** and a **paper** tape for programme input.

MACLEOD: I would like to ask Dr. Butler what is the scanning pattern **developed** on the scanning tube of his **device,** as I understand it can be *\_* varied under computer control as far as the area of film that it covers but <sup>I</sup>have not **properly** understood **whéther** the computer can **vary** the scanning patterns itself.

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}$ 

**BUTLER:** We have arranged the scanning pattern to be **simply left** or **right** and then start on the **next** line. It costs you quite a bit in time to have to address each point-transmitting an instruction from the **computer;** we can do it if we like by **just** setting the upper and lower **limits**  to be one **different.** We can hit any **point** We like but **this** is rather slow.

**MACLEOD:** What is the time taken for one complete serial scan?

**BUTLER:** As I said, the oscillator runs at 100 **kilocycles** so that is the **time** it takes to develop each **spot** in microseconds.

**WISKOTT:** I **would like** to ask Dr. Butler Whether the deflection **circuitry** of his cathode—ray tube was **sufficiently** linear, or **whether** some calibration was always necessary.

BUTLER: We have not measured this yet, so I cannot answer that question.
## Concluding remarks

 $-99 -$ 

L. Kowarski, (CERN)

At the close of this one-day meeting it is appropriate. first of all, to thank all those who came and contributed; one would like to do something more - to summarize in a few words the gist of what we have heard and learned - but this does not seem to me easy. One obvious remark is that the subject matter of to-day's proceedings is not homogeneous in time. We can already speak of a first generation - hardware which, at present, is in actual use; a second generation, in the state of advanced development; a third one, almost wholly in the future, and even one or two intermediates.

The first generation - the actual use of Franckensteins, Ieps and so on, was mentioned in the first part of the morning session. The experience reported was programming experience and it gave a rather terrifying glimpse of the amount of work which goes into straightening out seemingly unimportant details. In fact each of these details is quite essential for the quality of the scientific output; this means that we shall have to hire more and more programmers. Here, as in many other things, Berkeley shows the way and the figures which were quoted by Rosenfeld in his paper at the Instrumentation Conference are instructive enough.

In the second part of the morning session the two main contenders  $\blacksquare$ or should we say colleagues?  $\rightarrow$  of the second generation made their appearance side by side. Both of them pursue the same aim - to solve the problem of man vs machine (or, rather, the scanning and measuring girl vs. machine) but their ways of approach are diametrically opposed. HPD segregates, SMP combines; the first results of these two lines of development, both of which have by now been well launched, will be fascinating to watch. For what a prophesy at this level may be worth, I think we shall find that they both will be useful in their separate and even slightly diverging ways, HPD holding its own in highstatistics research, and SMP being particularly valuable in cases where the events show a more pronounced individuality.

5327/ga

Some **physicists,** in the **recent** past, felt.that they **could** not **wait**  for the second generation to **become** fully operative, and endeavoured to **improve** on the **first** generation in a less radical way. Of this "generation 1%", the **Spiral** Reader is the most advanced and the *most* **conspicuous** example; we heard this mérning *from* Alvarez about the results **obtained with** this **device.**  Later on, Brautti described a European variant of essentially the same approach and, as we heard on another occasion this afternoon, European versions usually are cheaper than their'American counterparts. Kerth's proposed **addi~ tioh** to thé digitized **projector** technique is an interesting improvement, based on *a* **sbecifib propérty** of spark chamber **pictures.** 

The contributions of Chase and **Frisch** belong definitely to the second generation, Chase's scanning table being intended to **work** as a part of <sup>a</sup> Hough-Powell system and Frisch's travelling box being essentially a European (we have seen what that means) version of the SMP. Both Burren and Edmonds seek to **decisively improve** on the HPD and therefore **merit** the label "genera- $\text{tion } 2\frac{1}{2}$ ".

Finally, in the second part of the afternoon, we heard from Butler and McCormick about pattern-recognizing machines; a third generation is on its way, and already we hear a warning. The old dream of "let the computer**worry"** may require an entirely new **kind** of computers, and who shall **worry**  then?

Many interesting results and ideas, some serious warnings; with all these in mind, we shall go on working, and such is life.

 $\sim 10^{-11}$ 

 $\overline{a}$ 

 $\frac{1}{2}$  ,  $\frac{1}{2}$  ,  $\frac{1}{2}$ 

 $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$  and  $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$  and  $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$  and  $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$  and  $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$ 

State Andre

**—** 100 **-** 

建立 医单元体

 $\label{eq:3.1} \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{C})=\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{C})\times\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{C})=\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{C}).$ 

 $\mathcal{F}_{\text{max}}$  , and  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{max}}$ 

 $\label{eq:3.1} \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{2\pi}\$ 

**SATURA STATE STATE** ा समेता हुन्

 $\mathcal{A}=\mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}$  , we are  $\mathcal{A}=\mathcal{A}$  , and

 $\sim 10^{11}$ 

**LIST** OF. **PARTICIPANTS** .

**AINAREZ,** L. Lawrence Radiation Laboratory **BRAUTTI,** G. University of Trieste **BURREN, J.W.** Rutherford Laboratory, Harwell **BUTLER,** J.W. The University, Argonne **CHASE,** R. Brookhaven National Laboratory DERRICK, **A.H.** Lawrence Radiation Laboratory **EDMONDS,** A.R. Imperial College, London FRISCH, **O.R.** Cavendish Laboratory, Cambridge HOUGH, **P.V.C.** Brookhaven National Laboratory HULSIZER, R. Lawrence Radiation Laboratory **MCCORMICK,** B.H. University of **Illinois**  NIKITIN, S.Ya. Institute of Theoretical *&* Experimental **Physics,** Mbscow PARKER, S. The Enrico Fermi Institute, Chicago **ROSENFEID, A.H.** Lawrence Radiation Laboratory **SELOVE,** W. University of Pennsylvania SNYDER, J.N. University of Illinois TYCKO, D. University of **Columbia**  WHITE, H. Lawrence Radiation Laboratory **ZOLL,** A.J. University of Cambridge

and

**CERN** staff and visiting scientists.

 $\sum_{i=1}^{n}$