Physics and AI enhanced reconstruction at the CEPC



Manqi Ruan

Yields ~ Xsec * Lumi * Time





- 4 Million Higgs (10 years)
- ~ 1 Giga W (1 year) + 4 Tera Z (2 years)
- Upgradable: Top factory (500 k ttbar)

CEPC Physics study







Chinese Physics C Vol. 43, No. 4 (2019) 043002

Precision Higgs physics at the CEPC*

Fenfen An(安芬芬)[4,23] Yu Bai(白羽)[9] Chunhui Chen(陈春晖)[23] Xin Chen(陈新)[5] Zhenxing Chen(陈振兴)[3] Joao Guimaraes da Costa[4] Zhenwei Cui(崔振葳)[3] Yaquan Fang(方亚泉)[4,6,34;1)] Chengdong Fu(付成栋)[4] Jun Gao(高俊)[10] Yanyan Gao(高艳彦)[22] Yuanning Gao(高原宁)[3] Shaofeng Ge(葛韶锋)[15,29] Jiayin Gu(顾嘉荫)[13;2)] Fangyi Guo(郭方毅)[1,4] Jun Guo(郭军)[10] Tao Han(韩涛)[5,31] Shuang Han(韩爽)[4] Hongjian He(何红建)[11,10] Xianke He(何显柯)[10] Xiaogang He(何小刚)[11,10,20] Jifeng Hu(胡继峰)[10] Shih-Chieh Hsu(徐士杰)[32] Shan Jin(金山)[8] Maoqiang Jing(荆茂强)[4,7] Susmita Jyotishmati[33] Ryuta Kiuchi[4] Chia-Ming Kuo(郭家铭)[21] Peizhu Lai(赖培筑)[21] Boyang Li(李博扬)[5] Congqiao Li(李聪乔)[3] Gang Li(李刚)[4,34;3)] Haifeng Li(李海峰)[12] Liang Li(李亮)[10] Shu Li(李数)[11,10] Tong Li(李通)[12] Qiang Li(李强)[3] Hao Liang(梁浩)[4,6] Zhijun Liang(梁志均)[4] Libo Liao(廖立波)[4] Bo Liu(刘波)[4,23] Jianbei Liu(刘建北)[1] Tao Liu(刘涛)[14] Zhen Liu(刘真)[26,30;4)] Xinchou Lou(娄辛丑)[4,6,33,34] Lianliang Ma(马连良)[12] Bruce Mellado[17,18] Xin Mo(莫欣)[4] Mila Pandurovic[16] Jianming Qian(钱剑明)[24;5)] Zhuoni Qian(钱卓妮)[19] Nikolaos Rompotis[22] Manqi Ruan(阮曼奇)[4;6)] Alex Schuy[32] Lianyou Shan(单连友)[4] Jingyuan Shi(史静远)[9] Xin Shi(史欣)[4] Shufang Su(苏淑芳)[25] Dayong Wang(王大勇)[3] Jin Wang(王锦)[4] Liantao Wang(王连涛)[27;7)] Yifang Wang(王贻芳)[4,6] Yuqian Wei(魏彧骞)[4] Yue Xu(许悦)[5] Haijun Yang(杨海军)[10,11] Ying Yang(杨迎)[4] Weiming Yao(姚为民)[28] Dan Yu(于丹)[4] Kaili Zhang(张凯栗)[4,6;8)] Zhaoru Zhang(张照茹)[4] Mingrui Zhao(赵明锐)[2] Xianghu Zhao(赵祥虎)[4] Ning Zhou(周宁)[10]

[1] Department of Modern Physics, University of Science and Technology of China, Anhui 230026, China
[2] China Institute of Atomic Energy, Beijing 102413, China
[3] School of Physics, Peking University, Beijing 100871, China
[4] Institute of High Energy Physics, Beijing 100049, China
[5] Department of Engineering Physics, Physics Department, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, China
[6] University of Chinese Academy of Science (UCAS), Beijing 100049, China
[7] School of Nuclear Science and Technology, University of South China, Hengyang 421001, China
[8] Department of Physics, Nanjing University, Nanjing 210093, China
[9] Department of Physics, Southeast University, Nanjing 210096, China
[10] School of Physics and Astronomy, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, KLPPAC-MoE, SKLPPC, Shanghai 200240, China
[11] Tsung-Dao Lee Institute, Shanghai 200240, China
[12] Institute of Frontier and Interdisciplinary Science and Key Laboratory of Particle Physics and Particle Irradiation (MOE), Shandong University, Qingdao 266237, China
[13] PRISMA Cluster of Excellence & Mainz Institute of Theoretical Physics, Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz, Mainz 55128, Germany
[14] Department of Physics, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Hong Kong
[15] Kavli IPMU (WPI), UTIAS, The University of Tokyo, Kashiwa, Chiba 277-8583, Japan
[16] Vinca Institute of Nuclear Sciences, University of Belgrade, Belgrade 11000, Serbia
[17] School of Physics and Institute for Collider Particle Physics, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg 2050, South Africa

Received 9 November 2018, Revised 21 January 2019, Published online 4 March 2019

* Supported by the National Key Program for S&T Researh and Development (2016YFA0400400); CAS Center for Excellence in Particle Physics; Yifang Wang's Science Studio of the Ten Thousand Talents Project; the CAS/SAFEA International Partnership Program for Creative Research Teams (H751S018S5); IHEP Innovation Grant (Y4545170Y2); Key Research Program of Frontier Sciences, CAS (XQYZDY-SSW-SLH002); Chinese Academy of Science Special Grant for Large Scientific Project (113111KYSB20170005); the National Natural Science Foundation of China(11675202); the Hundred Talent Programs of Chinese Academy of Science (Y3515540U1); the National 1000 Talents Program of China; Fermi Research Alliance, LLC (DE-AC02-07CH11359); the NSF(PHY1620074) ; by the Maryland Center for Fundamental Physics (MCFP); Tsinghua University Initiative Scientific Research Program; and the Beijing Municipal Science and Technology Commission project(Z181100004218003)

1) E-mail: fangyq@ihep.ac.cn
2) E-mail: jiagu@uni-mainz.de
3) E-mail: li.gang@mail.ihep.ac.cn
4) E-mail: zliuphys@umd.edu
5) E-mail: qianj@umich.edu
6) E-mail: manqi.ruan@ihep.ac.cn
7) E-mail: liantaow@uchicago.edu
8) E-mail: zhangkl@ihep.ac.cn



Table 2.1: Precision of the main parameters of interests and observables at the CEPC, from Ref. [1] and the references therein, where the results of Higgs are estimated with a data sample of 20 ab^{-1}. The HL-LHC projections of 3000 fb^{-1} data are used for comparison. [2]

Higgs			W, Z and top		
Observable	HL-LHC projections	CEPC precision	Observable	Current precision	CEPC precision
M_H	20 MeV	3 MeV	M_W	9 MeV	0.5 MeV
Γ_H	20%	1.7%	Γ_W	49 MeV	2 MeV
$\sigma(ZH)$	4.2%	0.26%	M_{top}	760 MeV	$\mathcal{O}(10)$ MeV
$B(H \to bb)$	4.4%	0.14%	M_Z	2.1 MeV	0.1 MeV
$B(H \to cc)$	-	2.0%	Γ_Z	2.3 MeV	0.025 MeV
$B(H \to gg)$	-	0.81%	R_b	3×10^{-3}	2×10^{-4}
$B(H \to WW^*)$	2.8%	0.53%	R_c	1.7×10^{-2}	1×10^{-3}
$B(H \to ZZ^*)$	2.9%	4.2%	R_μ	2×10^{-3}	1×10^{-4}
$B(H \to \tau^+\tau^-)$	2.9%	0.42%	R_τ	1.7×10^{-2}	1×10^{-4}
$B(H \to \gamma\gamma)$	2.6%	3.0%	A_μ	1.5×10^{-2}	3.5×10^{-5}
$B(H \to \mu^+\mu^-)$	8.2%	6.4%	A_τ	4.3×10^{-3}	7×10^{-5}
$B(H \to Z\gamma)$	20%	8.5%	A_b	2×10^{-2}	2×10^{-4}
$Bupper(H \to inv.)$	2.5%	0.07%	N_ν	2.5×10^{-3}	2×10^{-4}

Scientific Significance quantified by **CEPC physics** studies, via full simulation/phenomenology studies:

- Higgs: Precisions exceed HL-LHC ~ 1 order of magnitude.
- EW: Precision improved from current limit by 1-2 orders.
- Flavor Physics, sensitive to NP of 10 TeV or even higher.
- Sensitive to varies of NP signal.
- …

White papers +
~300 Journal/AxXiv citables

Higgs & Snowmass White Paper

	240 GeV, 20 ab^{-1}		360 GeV, 1 ab^{-1}		
	ZH	**vvH**	ZH	**vvH**	**eeH**
inclusive	**0.26%**		**1.40%**	\	\
H→bb	**0.14%**	**1.59%**	**0.90%**	**1.10%**	**4.30%**
H→cc	**2.02%**		**8.80%**	**16%**	**20%**
H→gg	**0.81%**		**3.40%**	**4.50%**	**12%**
H→WW	**0.53%**		**2.80%**	**4.40%**	**6.50%**
H→ZZ	**4.17%**		**20%**	**21%**	
$H \to \tau\tau$	**0.42%**		**2.10%**	**4.20%**	**7.50%**
$H \to \gamma\gamma$	**3.02%**		**11%**	**16%**	
$H \to \mu\mu$	**6.36%**		**41%**	**57%**	
$H \to Z\gamma$	**8.50%**		**35%**		
$\mathrm{Br}_{upper}(H \to inv.)$	**0.07%**				
Γ_H	**1.65%**		**1.10%**		





EW measurements & SMEFT

Observable	current precision	CEPC precision (Stat. Unc.)	CEPC runs	main systematic
Δm_Z	2.1 MeV [37–41]	0.1 MeV (0.005 MeV)	Z threshold	E_{beam}
$\Delta\Gamma_Z$	2.3 MeV [37–41]	0.025 MeV (0.005 MeV)	Z threshold	E_{beam}
Δm_W	9 MeV [42–46]	0.5 MeV (0.35 MeV)	WW threshold	E_{beam}
$\Delta\Gamma_W$	49 MeV [46–49]	2.0 MeV (1.8 MeV)	WW threshold	E_{beam}
Δm_t	0.76 GeV [50]	$\mathcal{O}(10)$ MeV[a]	$t\bar{t}$ threshold	
ΔA_e	4.9×10^{-3} [37, 51–55]	1.5×10^{-5} (1.5×10^{-5})	Z pole ($Z \to \tau\tau$)	Stat. Unc.
ΔA_μ	0.015 [37, 53]	3.5×10^{-5} (3.0×10^{-5})	Z pole ($Z \to \mu\mu$)	point-to-point Unc.
ΔA_τ	4.3×10^{-3} [37, 51–55]	7.0×10^{-5} (1.2×10^{-5})	Z pole ($Z \to \tau\tau$)	tau decay model
ΔA_b	0.02 [37, 56]	20×10^{-5} (3×10^{-5})	Z pole	QCD effects
ΔA_c	0.027 [37, 56]	30×10^{-5} (6×10^{-5})	Z pole	QCD effects
$\Delta\sigma_{had}$	37 pb [37–41]	2 pb (0.05 pb)	Z pole	lumiosity
δR_b^0	0.003 [37, 57–61]	0.0002 (5×10^{-6})	Z pole	gluon splitting
δR_c^0	0.017 [37, 57, 62–65]	0.001 (2×10^{-5})	Z pole	gluon splitting
δR_e^0	0.0012 [37–41]	2×10^{-4} (3×10^{-6})	Z pole	E_{beam} and t channel
δR_μ^0	0.002 [37–41]	1×10^{-4} (3×10^{-6})	Z pole	E_{beam}
δR_τ^0	0.017 [37–41]	1×10^{-4} (3×10^{-6})	Z pole	E_{beam}
δN_ν	0.0025 [37, 66]	2×10^{-4} (3×10^{-5})	ZH run ($\nu\nu\gamma$)	Calo energy scale







Flavor Physics White paper

Flavor Physics at CEPC: a General Perspective

Contents



Figure 18: Projected sensitivities of measuring the $b \to s\tau\tau$ [70], $b \to s\nu\bar{\nu}$ [34] and $b \to c\tau\nu$ [35, 62] transitions at the Z pole. The sensitivities at Belle II @ 50 ab^{-1} [6] and LHCb Upgrade II [17, 71] have also been provided as a reference. Note, the LHCb sensitivities are generated by combining the analyses of $\tau^+ \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^-(\pi^0)\nu$ and $\tau \to \mu\nu\bar{\nu}$. This plot is adapted from [35].



Figure 21: Illustrative Feynman diagrams for the $B_s \to \phi\nu\bar{\nu}$ transitions in the SM. **LEFT**: EW penguin diagram. **RIGHT**: EW box diagram.



Figure 22: **LEFT**: Relative precision for measuring the signal strength of $B_s \to \phi\nu\bar{\nu}$ at Tera-Z, as a function of its BR. **RIGHT**: Constraints on the LEFT coefficients $C_L^{\rm NP} \equiv C_L - C_L^{\rm SM}$ and C_R with the measurements of the overall $B_s \to \phi\nu\bar{\nu}$ decay rate (green band) and the ϕ polarization F_L (orange regions). These plots are taken from [34].

40+ benchmarks + ... Access to NP at 10 TeV or higher

New Physics White paper

ABSTRACT (TO BE UPDATED)

The Circular Electron Positron Collider (CEPC) is a large-scale collider facility that can serve as a factory of the Higgs, Z, and W bosons and is upgradable to run at the $t\bar{t}$ threshold. This document describes the latest CEPC nominal operation scenario and particle yields and updates the corresponding physics potential. A new detector concept is also briefly described. This submission is for consideration by the Snowmass process.

CONTENTS

Phase Transition in early Universe, LLP, exotic Higgs decays...









Performance requirements

- To reconstruct all kinds of Physics Object
  - Identification & Measurements
  - Objects:
    - Lepton, Photons, Kaon,
    - pi-0, Tau, Lambda, Kshort,
    - Heavy flavor hadrons,
    - Jets
    - Missing energy/momentum
    - Exotics...
- Massive Four in Standard Model:
  - Z & W: ~ 70% goes to a pair of jets
  - Higgs: ~90% final state with jets (ZH events)
  - Top: t → W + b



- Requirements:
  - Excellent pattern. Reco. & Object id ->

    1-1 correspondence reco.
  - Larger acceptance...
  - Excellent intrinsic resolutions
  - Extremely stable...
- Be addressed by state-of-art detector design, technology, and reconstruction algorithm!

CEPC Detector & Reconstruction







Full simulation reconstruction Chain with **Arbor, JoI, etc**

Jet origin id

Hao Liang, Yongfeng Zhu, Yuzhi Che, Yuexin Wang, Huiling Qu, Cen Zhou, etc

PHYSICAL REVIEW LETTERS **132,** 221802 (2024)

Jet-Origin Identification and Its Application at an Electron-Positron Higgs Factory

Hao Liang,[1,2,*] Yongfeng Zhu,[3,*] Yuexin Wang,[1,4] Yuzhi Che,[1,2] Manqi Ruan,[1,2,†]
Chen Zhou,[3,‡] and Huilin Qu[5,§]
[1]*Institute of High Energy Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, 19B Yuquan Road, Shijingshan District, Beijing 100049, China*
[2]*University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, 19A Yuquan Road, Shijingshan District, Beijing 100049, China*
[3]*State Key Laboratory of Nuclear Physics and Technology, School of Physics, Peking University, Beijing 100871, China*
[4]*China Center of Advanced Science and Technology, Beijing 100190, China*
[5]*CERN, EP Department, CH-1211 Geneva 23, Switzerland*

(Received 16 October 2023; revised 26 April 2024; accepted 1 May 2024; published 31 May 2024)

To enhance the scientific discovery power of high-energy collider experiments, we propose and realize the concept of jet-origin identification that categorizes jets into five quark species (b, c, s, u, d), five antiquarks $(\bar{b}, \bar{c}, \bar{s}, \bar{u}, \bar{d})$, and the gluon. Using state-of-the-art algorithms and simulated $\nu\bar{\nu}H, H \to jj$ events at 240 GeV center-of-mass energy at the electron-positron Higgs factory, the jet-origin identification simultaneously reaches jet flavor tagging efficiencies ranging from 67% to 92% for bottom, charm, and strange quarks and jet charge flip rates of 7%–24% for all quark species. We apply the jet-origin identification to Higgs rare and exotic decay measurements at the nominal luminosity of the Circular Electron Positron Collider and conclude that the upper limits on the branching ratios of $H \to s\bar{s}, u\bar{u}, d\bar{d}$ and $H \to sb, db, uc, ds$ can be determined to 2×10^{-4} to 1×10^{-3} at 95% confidence level. The derived upper limit for $H \to s\bar{s}$ decay is approximately 3 times the prediction of the standard model.

Eur. Phys. J. C (2024) 84:152
https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-024-12475-5
THE EUROPEAN PHYSICAL JOURNAL C
Check for updates

Regular Article - Experimental Physics

ParticleNet and its application on CEPC jet flavor tagging

Yongfeng Zhu[1,a], Hao Liang[2,3], Yuexin Wang[2,3], Huilin Qu[4], Chen Zhou[1,b], Manqi Ruan[2,3,c]
[1] State Key Laboratory of Nuclear Physics and Technology, School of Physics, Peking University, Beijing 100871, China
[2] Institute of High Energy Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, China
[3] University of Chinese Academy of Sciences (UCAS), Beijing 100049, China
[4] EP Department, CERN, 1211 Geneva 23, Switzerland

Received: 15 November 2023 / Accepted: 23 January 2024

https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.03440

https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.13231

Geo. & Tools







- **Jet origin identification: 11 categories (5 quarks + 5 anti quarks + gluon)**
- Full Simulated vvH, Higgs to two jets sample at CEPC baseline configuration: CEPC-v4 detector, reconstructed with **Arbor + ParticleNet (Deep Learning Tech.)**
  - Input: measurable information of all reconstructed jet particles (~ 10 float)
  - Output: 10(11)-likelihoods to different categories
- 1 Million samples each, 60/20/20% for training, validation & test

11-dim migration behavior

- Let the jet be identified as the category with highest likelihood:
- Pid: ideal Pid – three categories
  - Lepton identification
  - **Charged Kaon identification**
  - Neutral Kaon identification
- Patterns:
  - ~ Diagonal at quark sector...
  - P(g→q) < P(q→g)...
  - Light jet id...

True \ Predicted	b	$\bar{b}$	c	$\bar{c}$	s	$\bar{s}$	u	$\bar{u}$	d	$\bar{d}$	G
b	0.738	0.167	0.034	0.026	0.005	0.003	0.002	0.003	0.002	0.002	0.018
$\bar{b}$	0.167	0.737	0.026	0.034	0.003	0.004	0.003	0.002	0.002	0.003	0.018
c	0.015	0.015	0.740	0.057	0.037	0.032	0.026	0.010	0.009	0.017	0.043
$\bar{c}$	0.015	0.015	0.055	0.741	0.032	0.037	0.010	0.026	0.016	0.010	0.043
s	0.003	0.003	0.020	0.018	0.541	0.104	0.030	0.082	0.062	0.045	0.092
$\bar{s}$	0.002	0.003	0.018	0.021	0.101	0.543	0.085	0.028	0.044	0.062	0.092
u	0.002	0.003	0.019	0.012	0.044	0.132	0.375	0.057	0.079	0.168	0.109
$\bar{u}$	0.003	0.002	0.011	0.020	0.132	0.043	0.062	0.368	0.166	0.084	0.108
d	0.003	0.003	0.012	0.020	0.111	0.093	0.083	0.223	0.261	0.080	0.110
$\bar{d}$	0.003	0.003	0.020	0.013	0.093	0.113	0.226	0.079	0.076	0.265	0.110
G	0.015	0.014	0.025	0.025	0.053	0.053	0.043	0.044	0.033	0.035	0.661



Performance with different PID scenarios & H→ss measurements





Flavor tagging: type that maximize {L_q + L_q_bar, L_g}

If quark jet: jet charge ~ compare {L_q, L_q_bar}

Remark: current jet flavor tagging efficiency & jet charge flip rates are projections of the 11-dim arrays produced by Jet origin id

Benchmark analyses: Higgs rare/FCNC



TABLE I: Summary of background events of $H \to b\bar{b}/c\bar{c}/gg$, Z, and W prior to flavor-based event selection, along with the expected upper limits on Higgs decay branching ratios at 95% CL. Expectations are derived based on the background-only hypothesis.

	Bkg. (10^3)			Upper limit (10^{-3})						
	H	Z	W	$s\bar{s}$	$u\bar{u}$	$d\bar{d}$	sb	db	uc	ds
$\nu\bar{\nu}H$	151	20	2.1	0.81	0.95	0.99	0.26	0.27	0.46	0.93
$\mu^+\mu^-H$	50	25	0	2.6	3.0	3.2	0.5	0.6	1.0	3.0
e^+e^-H	26	16	0	4.1	4.6	4.8	0.7	0.9	1.6	4.3
Comb.	-	-	-	0.75	0.91	0.95	0.22	0.23	0.39	0.86

[28] J. Duarte-Campderros, G. Perez, M. Schlaffer, and A. Soffer. Probing the Higgs–strange-quark coupling at e^+e^- colliders using light-jet flavor tagging. *Phys. Rev. D*, 101(11):115005, 2020.

[50] Alexander Albert et al. Strange quark as a probe for new physics in the Higgs sector. In *Snowmass 2021*, 3 2022.

[59] J. de Blas et al. Higgs Boson Studies at Future Particle Colliders. *JHEP*, 01:139, 2020.

[60] Jorge De Blas, Gauthier Durieux, Christophe Grojean, Jiayin Gu, and Ayan Paul. On the future of Higgs, electroweak and diboson measurements at lepton colliders. *JHEP*, 12:117, 2019.

Recent update at more benchmarks





- From Jet Flavor Tagging to Jet Origin ID (**Preliminary**):
  - vvH, H→cc: 3% → 1.7%
  - Vcb: 0.75% → 0.5%

Updated result on $\sin^2\theta_{eff}^{l}$ measurement

Table 2. Sensitivity S of different final state particles.

$\sqrt{s}$/GeV	S of $A_{FB}^{e/\mu}$	S of A_{FB}^{d}	S of A_{FB}^{u}	S of A_{FB}^{s}	S of A_{FB}^{c}	S of A_{FB}^{b}
70	0.224	4.396	1.435	4.403	1.445	4.352
75	0.530	5.264	2.598	5.269	2.616	5.237
92	1.644	5.553	4.200	5.553	4.201	5.549
105	0.269	4.597	1.993	4.598	1.994	4.586
115	0.035	3.956	1.091	3.958	1.087	3.942
130	0.027	3.279	0.531	3.280	0.520	3.261

Table 3. Cross section of process $e^+e^- \to f\bar{f}$ calculated using the ZFITTER package. Values of the fundamental parameters are set as m_Z = 91.1875 GeV, m_t = 173.2 GeV, m_H = 125 GeV, α_s = 0.118 and m_W = 80.38 GeV.

$\sqrt{s}$/GeV	σ_μ/mb	σ_d/mb	σ_u/mb	σ_s/mb	σ_c/mb	σ_b/mb
70	0.039	0.032	0.066	0.031	0.058	0.028
75	0.039	0.047	0.073	0.046	0.065	0.043
92	1.196	5.366	4.228	5.366	4.222	5.268
105	0.075	0.271	0.231	0.271	0.227	0.265
115	0.042	0.135	0.122	0.135	0.118	0.132
130	0.026	0.071	0.068	0.071	0.066	0.069

Verify the RG behavior... using ~1 month of data taking

Expected statistical uncertainties on $\sin^2\theta_{eff}^{l}$ measurement.
(Using one-month data collection, ~ *4e12/24 Z events* at Z pole)



$\sqrt{s}$	b	c	s
70	1.6×10^{-5}	3.2×10^{-5}	2.2×10^{-5}
75	1.3×10^{-5}	1.8×10^{-5}	1.8×10^{-5}
92	1.6×10^{-6}	2.2×10^{-6}	2.2×10^{-6}
105	1.0×10^{-5}	2.4×10^{-5}	1.4×10^{-5}
115	1.9×10^{-5}	6.8×10^{-5}	2.7×10^{-5}
130	3.9×10^{-5}	2.3×10^{-4}	5.4×10^{-5}

B-charge flip rate: Bs oscillations

Opposite side
- p charged Leptons with impact param.
- p charged Kaons with impact param.
- p charged pions with impact param.
- p protons with impact param. ?



- Using all reco P (exc. Bs decay final state):
- Flip rate ~ 15%, Eff. Tagging power > 40%

Same side
- p charged Kaons with impact param.
- p charged pions with impact param.



V.S. Hadronization models





Fast/Full Simulation



Z->μμ (91.2 GeV)



- Delphes ~ Perfect PFA (1 – 1 correspondence..)

1-1 correspondence between visible $\leftrightarrow$ reconstructed

=

Confusion Free PFA + Pid

Boson Mass Resolution: Key Per. Para





BMR decomposition @ CDR baseline



- *1st, Ultimate Precision ~ 2.8 with CDR baseline3rd, HCAL*
- *2nd, HCAL resolution dominant the uncertainties from intrinsic detector resolution: need better HCAL*
- *3rd Leading contribution: Confusion from shower Fragments (fake particles), need better Pattern Reco.*

Preliminary: Identify & veto charged shower fragments using AI





Trained at 12E4 events,

Test & Applied at 4E4 events

score > 0.75
efficiency ~83%
purity ~95%

After frag. Veto

Fake particle originated Confusion reduced by 1 order of magnitude, at nominal vvH, H→gg event

>95% of the visible energy preserves 1-1 correspondence



TABLE I. Most probable values of the number/count and total energy of $f^{\pm}$ before and after removing identified $f^{\pm}$ and corresponding BMR.

	Counts	Total energy (GeV)	BMR (%)
Before	75	6.34	3.35
After	10	0.68	2.88



... At Boson Mass Resolution ...





Pid



- Next step: to improve the neutral hadron reco & to optimize the detector configuration

Impact of Neutral hadron id: Preliminary







- With 1-1 correspondence:
  - Fast Sim Prediction: BMR: 2.9 → 2.6
    - Need excellent CALO + ToF ~ o(10 ps)
    - Assume Low energy neutron can be tamed... still very challenge...
- Strongly Boost the light quark ID.

Summary

- Electron positron Higgs factory: extremely rich physics program requires excellent physics performance
  - Excellent Pattern, reco → high eff/purity & precision reco. of all physics objects
  - Large acceptance, Extremely stable & excellent intrinsic det performance
- AI: the trends & indispensable tool towards this requirements
  - Significantly enhance the physics reach & alters the detector design/optimization
  - Jet Origin ID: 'see' quark & gluon as lepton & photon
    - *...A “game changer” and opens new horizon for precise flavor studies at all future experiments...*
  - PFA: reduces significantly the leading confusion,
    - BMR improved from 3.7% to 2.9%, save ~o(10)% of luminosity for all physics measurements with hadronic events
    - Towards One-to-one correspondence Reco.
- Lots to be explored

One to one correspondence reco. at Higgs factory

A goal should be pursued,
and we could achieve it...

Via state-of-art det. Design & technology + AI enhanced algorithms

Back up

Performance V.S. Jet Kinematics





Performance @ Z and Higgs





- *M10 instead of M11*

BMR: impact on critical measurements



Arbor

Tree topology of particle shower

Ori. Idea from Henri Videau @ ALEPH

Eur. Phys. J. C (2018) 78:426
https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-018-5876-z

THE EUROPEAN PHYSICAL JOURNAL C

CrossMark

Special Article - Tools for Experiment and Theory

Reconstruction of physics objects at the Circular Electron Positron Collider with Arbor

Manqi Ruan[1,a], Hang Zhao[1], Gang Li[1], Chengdong Fu[1], Zhigang Wang[1], Xinchou Lou[6,7,8], Dan Yu[1,2], Vincent Boudry[2], Henri Videau[2], Vladislav Balagura[2], Jean-Claude Brient[2], Peizhu Lai[3], Chia-Ming Kuo[3], Bo Liu[1,4], Fenfen An[1,4], Chunhui Chen[4], Soeren Prell[4], Bo Li[5], Imad Laketineh[5]

[1] Institute of High Energy Physics, Beijing, China
[2] Laboratoire Leprince-Ringuet, Ecole Polytechnique, Palaiseau, France
[3] Department of Physics and Center of high energy and high field physics, National Central University, Taoyuan City, Taiwan
[4] Iowa State University, Ames, USA
[5] Institute de Physique Nucleaire de Lyon, Lyon, France
[6] Institute of High Energy Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China
[7] Physics Department, University of Texas at Dallas, Richardson, TX, USA
[8] University of Chinese Academy of Sciences (UCAS), Beijing, China



20 GeV Klong reconstructed @ ILD Calo
Curves indicating expected particle trajectories (from MC-truth)

Validation: Arbor Branch Length Vs MC Truth





Arbor: successfully tag sub-shower structure

Samples: Particle gun event at ILD HCAL (readout granularity 1cm^2 & layer thickness 2.65cm)
Length:
Charged MCParticle: spatial distance between generation/end points
Arbor branch: sum of distance between neighboring cells


Z→2 muon,
H→2 b
~2%
Z→2 jet,
H→2 tau
~5%
ZH→4 jets
~50%
Z→2 muon
H→WW*→eevv
~1%

CMS Experiment at LHC, CERN
Data recorded: Thu Jan 1 01:00:00 1970 CEST
Run/Event: 1 / 1201
Lumi section: 13



V.S. Multiplicity





- *...many patterns need further understanding & towards further optimization...*

s-jets: dependency on Leading hadron





Fragmentation comparison







Lots to be studied...