## **DISCUSSION** session









#### Simulation :

#### **Question :**

A module of km3tray contains Sirene, A module of km3tray contains GEANT4 (Claudio)

Smith and Baker water absorption still to be simulated : we will keep NEMO water as reference

#### **Communication** :

Each code (gen, sim, rec) has to read/write ascii files (tags; format already defined and easily usable) ?? : <u>final conclusion : when data files are provided, they have to</u> <u>be associated to a clear documentation in order to be decoded by the receiver.</u> <u>Repository for documentation</u>

**Detector files :** will be as simple as possible for exchange between software frameworks : (PMT\_NUMBER) x y z vx vy vz : coordinates of the photocathode center and of the vector indicating the orientation of the photocathode.

#### **Reconstruction :**

Work has to be continued to use different reconstructions and filtering. Criterions to compare reconstructions : effective area has to be given with the corresponding sensitivity and atm muon contamination.

#### **Optimization :**

Fast tools useful to rapidly test simple variations. Other tools to test more deeply the main possibilities, with muons Energy estimator : in a first instance, possibility to use a degraded MCTruth ? : <u>to avoid</u> Optimization/comparison criterian : <u>Point source sensitivity plot vs declination for a given</u> cost.



Smith and Baker water absorption still to be simulated : we will keep NEMO water as reference

**Data exchange :** <u>final conclusion : when data files are provided, they have to</u> <u>be associated to a clear documentation in order to be decoded by the receiver.</u>

Detector files : will be as simple as possible for exchange between software frameworks : (PMT\_NUMBER) x y z vx vy vz : coordinates of the photocathode center and of the vector indicating the orientation of the photocathode.

Energy estimator : in a first instance, possibility to use a degraded MCTruth ? : <u>to avoid</u> Optimization/comparison criterian : <u>Point source sensitivity plot vs declination for a given</u> <u>cost.</u> "Not intuitive" results Depth effect not so big for point sources ?

In case of tower: bar length no so important ?

PMT orientation not so important ?

Work to do

Better understanding of reconstruction effect & cuts : different, depending on the study. **Point sources have to be the main guideline.** 

Diffuse fluxes (and showers) are not a first priority Energy estimator has to be developed now.

Distance between lines : important, but strongly constrained by deployment : <u>2 reference layout : 1 for each design (lines, towers)</u>

Fix the level of relevancy of WP2 outputs, Cost Model

### Point sources have to be the main guideline. Diffuse fluxes (and showers) are not a first priority Energy estimator has to be developed now.

2 reference layout : 1 for

each design (lines, towers)



#### Work sharing/Responsabilities





# LAYOUTS to be used for the optimization within each design (start points) :



