

### Reconstruction of leptonic physic objects at future e+e-Higgs factory

Dan Yu

### ► To cite this version:

Dan Yu. Reconstruction of leptonic physic objects at future e+e- Higgs factory. High Energy Physics - Experiment [hep-ex]. Université Paris Saclay (COmUE); Institute of high energy physics (Chine), 2018. English. NNT: 2018SACLX018. tel-01852267

### HAL Id: tel-01852267 https://pastel.hal.science/tel-01852267

Submitted on 1 Aug 2018

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.





中國科学院為能物現為完備 Institute of High Energy Physics Chinese Academy of Sciences

# Reconstruction of leptonic physics objects at future e+e- Higgs factory

Thèse de doctorat de l'Université Paris-Saclay préparée à Ecole Polytechnique

Ecole doctorale n°576 particules hadrons énergie et noyau : instrumentation, image, cosmos et simulation (Pheniics) Spécialité de doctorat : Physique des particules

Thèse présentée et soutenue à Palaiseau, le 08/02/2018, par

### DAN YU

Composition du Jury :

Zhiqing Zhang LAL-IN2P3 Mark Thomson University of Cambridge Luca Malgeri CERN Florian Beaudette LLR-IN2P3 Vincent Boudry LLR-IN2P3 Manqi RUAN IHEP-CAS

Président Rapporteur Rapporteur Examinateur Co-directeur de thèse Co-directeur de thèse

Thèse de doctorat

#### 1 Abstract

The Standard Model of elementary particle interactions is the outstanding achievement 2 of the past forty years of experimental and theoretical activity in particle physics. Since 3 the discovery of the Higgs boson in 2012 by the experiments at the Large Hadron Col-4 lider (LHC), precise measurement of Higgs boson has become the challenge in high 5energy physics experiments. Many electron-positron Higgs factories with improved 6 accuracy on the Higgs total width measurements have been proposed, including the 7 International Linear Collider (ILC), the Circular Electron Positron Collider (CEPC), the 8 Future Circular Collider  $e^+e^-$  (FCCee). The Higgs physics program to be carried out 9 in the future  $e^+e^-$  colliders has been evaluated and the reachable precision on many 10 of couplings is estimated to percent or sub-percent levels. In order to achieve this pre-11 cision, the use of Particle Flow Algorithm (PFA) has become the paradigm of detector 12 design for the high energy frontier. The key idea is to reconstruct every final state parti-13cle in the most suited sub-detectors, and reconstruct all the physics objects on top of the 14 final state particles. The PFA oriented detectors have high efficiency in reconstructing 15physics objects such as leptons, jets, and missing energy. 16

The lepton identification is essential for this physics programs, especially for the precise
 measurement of the Higgs boson.

In this thesis, a PFA based lepton identification (Lepton Identification for Calorimeter 19 with High granularity (LICH) has been developed for detectors with high granularity 20 calorimeters. Using the conceptual detector geometry for the CEPC, featuring typical  $^{21}$ calorimeter granularity of 1000 and 400 cells / cm<sup>3</sup> respectively for the electromagnetic 22 and hadronic parts, and samples of single charged particles with energy larger than 2 23GeV, LICH identifies electrons or muons with efficiencies higher than 99.5% and con-24trols the mis-identification rate of hadron to muons or electrons to better than 1% or 250.5% respectively. Reducing the calorimeter granularity by 1 or 2 orders of magnitude, 26the lepton identification performance is stable for particles with E > 2 GeV. Applied to 27fully simulated eeH or  $\mu\mu$  H events at  $\sqrt{s} = 250$ GeV, the lepton identification perfor-28 mance is consistent with the single particle case: the efficiency of identifying all the high 29 energy leptons in an event ranges between 95.5% and 98.5%. 30

Oppositely to muons and electrons,  $\tau$ 's are extremely intriguing physics objects as their 31 Yukawa coupling to the Higgs boson is relatively large. Due to their rich decay prod-32 ucts, properties such as the Higgs CP and EW parameters at a Z-factory can be mea-33 sured. The  $\tau$ -decay products have low multiplicity and in high energy colliders are 34 tightly collimated and have low multiplicity, providing excellent signatures to probe. In 35 this thesis, the H $\rightarrow \tau \tau$  channel is analyzed in different Z decay modes with SM back-36 ground taken into account. The combined final accuracy of  $\sigma \times Br(H \to \tau \tau)$  is expected 37 to be 0.89%. 38

#### 39 Résumé

Le Modèle Standard des interactions des particules élémentaires est la réalisation en 40 cours des quarante dernières années d'activité expérimentale et théorique en physique 41 des particules. Depuis la découverte du boson de Higgs en 2012 par les expériences 42du Grand collisionneur de hadrons (LHC), une mesure précise de Higgs boson est 43devenu le défi dans les expériences de physique des hautes énergies. De nombreux 44électrons-positons usines de Higgs avec une meilleure précision sur les mesures de 45largeur totale de Higgs ont été proposées, y compris le collisionneur linéaire interna-46 tional (ILC), la circulaire de sollicitation collisionneur électron-positon (CEPC), future 47collisionneur circulaire  $e^+e^-$  (FCCee). Le programme de la physique du Higgs à réaliser 48dans l'avenir  $e^+e^-$  collisionneurs a été évaluée et la précision accessible à un grand nom-49bre d'accouplements est estimé à cent ou niveaux au dessous de pour-cent. Pour attein-50dre cette précision, l'utilisation de l'algorithme de flux de particules (PFA) est devenu le 51paradigme de la conception du détecteur pour la frontière de haute énergie. L'idée prin-52cipale est de reconstruire chaque particule d'état final dans les sous-détecteurs les plus 53adaptés, et de reconstruire tous les les objets de la physique au-dessus des particules 54d'état final. les détecteurs orientés PFA ont une efficacité élevée dans la reconstruction 55des objets physiques tels que leptons, jets, et de l'énergie manquante. 56

L'identification des leptons est essentielle pour ce programme de physique, en partic-57ulier pour la mesure précise du boson de Higgs. L'identification du lepton est fonda-58mentale pour les mesures de Higgs. Environ 7% des bosons de Higgs au CEPC ou au 59ILC sont générés avec une paire d'électrons ou de muons. Ces événements sont les sig-60 naux d'or pour l'analyse de recul de Higgs, qui est l'ancre pour les mesures absolues 61 de Higgs. Une fraction indéfinissable du boson de Higgs se désintègre, directement ou 62 par cascade, en états finaux avec des leptons. C'est-à-dire que 0.02 % des SM Higgs se 63 désintègrent en muons; les leptons sont les bougies essentielles de l'identification des 64 états finaux  $H \rightarrow WW/ZZ \rightarrow$  leptoniques / semi-leptoniques. En outre, une fraction 65 significative des événements Higgs  $\rightarrow bb/cc$  génère des leptons dans leur cascade de 66 désintégration. Une identification du lepton à haute efficacité est également très appré-67 ciée pour les mesures EW. Le système de suivi et le système calorimétrique hautement 68 granulaire fournissent des variables discriminantes pour l'identification des particules, 69 et la boîte à outils TMVA offre une utilisation optimale de ces variables. 70

Dans cette thèse, un PFA basé identification des leptons (leptons identification pour 71 calorimètre avec une granularité élevée (LICH) a été mis au point pour les détecteurs 72 avec calorimètre haute granularité. En utilisant la géométrie du détecteur conceptuel 73 du CEPC, avec une granularité de calorimètre typique de 1000 et 400 cellules / cm<sup>3</sup> 74respectivement pour les parties électromagnétiques et hadroniques, et des échantillons 75de particules individuelles chargées avec une énergie supérieure à 2 GeV, LICH identifie 76des électrons ou muons avec des rendements supérieurs à 99,5 % et contrôle la vitesse 77 identification erronée de hadrons à muons ou des électrons à mieux que 1 % ou 0,5 78

<sup>79</sup> % respectivement. la réduction de la granularité du calorimètre par 1 ou 2 ordres de <sup>80</sup> grandeur, la performance d'identification de lepton est stable pour des particules avec <sup>81</sup> E> 2 GeV. appliquée à eeH entièrement simulé ou  $\mu\mu$ événementsH à  $\sqrt{s} = 250$  GeV, les <sup>82</sup> performances d'identification de lepton est compatible avec le cas de particules unique: <sup>83</sup> l'efficacité de l'identification de tous les leptons de haute énergie dans un événement se <sup>84</sup> situe entre 95,5 % et 98,5 %.

À l'opposé de muons et électrons, les  $\tau$  sont des objets de physique extrêmement intri-85 gante que leur couplage Yukawa au boson de Higgs est relativement importante. En 86 raison de leurs produits riches en désintégration, propriétés telles que les paramètres 87 CP Higgs et EW à Z-usine peut être mesurée. Le  $g(H\tau\tau)$  devrait être mesuré avec une 88 précision relative supérieure à 1% au CEPC. La mesure de la polarisation  $\tau$  au Z-pole 89 conduit à une détermination précise de l'asymétrie  $A_{FB}(\tau)$ . La reconstruction des fonc-90 tions spectrales tau a également un potentiel convaincant au CEPC. Dans cette thèse, 91 la reconstruction de tau couvre le canal de Higgs se désintégrant en tau tau accompa-92 gné de leptons ou de jets. L'idée de base est de profiter de la haute granularité et de la 93 propriété de la multiplicité. Les *tauproduits – decayde* ont une faible multiplicité et à 94colliders haute énergie sont étroitement collimaté et ont une faible multiplicité, offrant 95d'excellentes signatures de sonde. dans ce mémoire, le H rightarrow tau tau canal est 96 analysé en différents modes de désintégration de Z avec le fond de SM pris en compte. 97 La précision finale combinée de  $\sigma \times Br(H \to \tau \tau)$  devrait être 0,89 %. 98

# 100 **Contents**

101	1	Intr	ntroduction			
102	2	The	ory	4		
103		2.1	Standard Model	5		
104			2.1.1 The Electroweak symmetry breaking	6		
105			2.1.2 Higgs mechanism	7		
106		2.2	Beyond Standard Model	13		
107	3	$e^+e^-$	Collider as Higgs factory	15		
108		3.1	Production processes	17		
109		3.2	The Circular Electron-Positron Collider (CEPC)	19		
110			3.2.1 Accelerator design	19		
111			3.2.2 Machine Detector Interface (MDI)[1]	22		
112		3.3	The International Linear Collider (ILC)	23		
113			3.3.1 ILC Subsystems[2]	24		
114		3.4	The Future Circular Collider (FCC) and High Luminosity LHC (HL-LHC)	28		
115	4	Det	ector	29		
116		4.1	Particle Flow Algorithm (PFA) oriented detector	30		
117		4.2	Detector design	31		
118	5	Soft	wares and Particle Flow Algorithm (PFA)	34		
119		5.1	Particle Flow Algorithm	34		
120			5.1.1 Jet Energy Resolution	34		
121			5.1.2 PandoraPFA	35		
122			5.1.3 Arbor	37		
123		5.2	Tools	42		
124			5.2.1 LCIO[3]	42		
125			5.2.2 Simulation	42		
126			5.2.3 Marlin Framework[4]	42		
127		5.3	Detector optimization			
128			5.3.1 ECAL optimization	43		

129			5.3.2 HCAL and B field optimization	45		
130	6	Part	icle identification	48		
131		6.1	Detector geometry and sample	48		
132		6.2	Discriminant variables and the output likelihoods	49		
133		6.3	Performance on single particle events	56		
134		6.4	Lepton identification performance on single particle events for different			
135		011	geometries	62		
136		6.5	Performance on physics events	66		
137		6.6	Conclusion	68		
138	7	<b>Measurement of</b> $H \rightarrow \tau \tau$ <b>Branching Ratio</b> 73				
139		7.1	Introduction	73		
140			7.1.1 $\tau$ physics	73		
141			7.1.2 $\tau$ decay modes	74		
142			7.1.3 Measurements and precisions	77		
143		7.2	Samples	77		
144		7.3	Leptonic channels	78		
145			7.3.1 $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$	79		
146			7.3.2 $Z \rightarrow \nu \nu$	85		
147		7.4	Hadronic channel, $Z \rightarrow qq$	87		
148		7.5	Combined Results	97		
149		7.6	Extrapolating in ILC	99		
150		7.7	Discussion	99		
151	8	Con	clusion 1	01		

152 **References** 

103

# <sup>153</sup> Chapter 1

# **Introduction**

The basic rules of the Universe are always attractive to the physicists. They focus on the 155 elementary particles, the fundamental interactions, the beginning and the future of the 156Universe, etc. Ever since the discovery of the way to combine the electromagnetic and 157 weak interactions by Sheldon Glashow in 1961[5], and the Higgs mechanism incorpo-158rated by Steven Weinberg and Abdus Salam[6], the Standard Model has been developed 159to describe the fundamental structure of matter and its interactions [7, 8, 9, 10]. With this 160 model, all matter can be built from twelve particles of spin 1/2 and their anti-particles. 161 The interactions between these particles can be explained by the existence of four fun-162damental forces mediated by spin 1 or 2 quanta. The last unverified part of this model, 163 the Higgs boson, was successfully discovered at the Large Hadron Collider (LHC) by 164 ATLAS and CMS experiments in 2012[11, 12], after decades of hunting, from LEP to 165Tevatron. Up to the most recent measurements, this Higgs boson behaves as the SM 166 predicts. However, more precise measurements are still needed to fully validate the 167 Higgs mechanism. 168

The Standard Model agrees with the experimental observations. Nevertheless, there are questions not answered by SM: why are there three generations of elementary fermions, why is the mass hierarchy so enormous, what is the nature of gravitational forces, what is the nature of dark matter and dark energy, why is there such an matter-antimatter asymmetry of the Universe.... These questions are expected to be solved in the new physics beyond the Standard Model. Even though the models proposed vary from each other, most of them predict deviations of Higgs couplings of  $O \sim 1\%$ [13, 14, 15].

While the LHC has huge discovery power, its final accuracy is always limited by the usage of protons as colliding particles, as the huge QCD backgrounds leads to a low signal to background ratio. On the contrary, the electrons and positrons - in the current state of knowledge - are point-like objects which interact through electroweak interactions (much weaker than the strong interactions), yielding events that are relatively free

of background debris. This makes possible to treat the events as a whole and to con-181 strain the new particle properties with the knowledge of the initial state. Two advanced 182 proposals of  $e^+e^-$  Higgs factories are the International Linear Collider (ILC)[16, 17], the 183 Circular Electron-Positron Collider (CEPC)[18], and the Future Circular Collider  $e^+e^-$ 184 (FCCee)[19]. The ILC provides polarized beams and leaves the possibility to be up-185 graded to higher energy, while the CEPC provides higher luminosity and can be up-186 graded to a proton-proton collider. The FCC is a design study of CERN to extend the 187 research after LHC reaches the end of its lifespan, and FCCee is part of it. 188

The high precision to be reached at  $e^+e^-$  Higgs factories imposes stringent requirements 189 on the detector. A typical event at ILC or CEPC will feature a multi-jet final state 190 topology. Many physics channels have to be reconstructed with unconstrained kine-191 matics, e.g. each time neutrinos are involved. A calorimetric system is then required 192 with resolution far beyond what has been achieved so far. An approach named Particle 193Flow (PF), which exploits the synergy of hardware and software developments to the 194 level of individual particle reconstruction and identification, is believed to address these 195requirements[20]. It consists in reconstructing every visible particle in an event, using 196at best each of the sub-detectors. In turn, detectors with high efficiency and reliability, 197 maximum hermeticity, and a highly segmented calorimeter allowing particle shower 198 separation, are mandatory. Thus the baseline of the detectors at  $e^+e^-$  Higgs factories 199 contains a tracking system with excellent resolution and a highly granular calorimeter 200 system. 201

The lepton identification is fundamental to the Higgs measurements. About 7% of 202 Higgs bosons at the CEPC or ILC are generated together with a pair of electrons or 203 muons. Those events are the golden signals for the Higgs recoil analysis, which is the 204 anchor for the absolute Higgs measurements. A unneglagable fraction of the Higgs bo-205son decays, directly or via cascade, into final states with leptons[21]: i.e., 0.02% of SM 206Higgs decays into muons; the leptons are the essential candles of the identification of 207 $H \rightarrow WW/ZZ \rightarrow$  leptonic /semi-leptonic final states. In addition, a significant fraction 208 of Higgs  $\rightarrow bb/cc$  events generate leptons in their decay cascade. A highly efficiency 209lepton identification is also highly appreciated for the EW measurements. The track-210 ing system and highly granular calorimetic system provide discriminant variables for 211the particle identification, and the TMVA toolkit[22] offers optimal utilization of these 212 variables. 213

The  $\tau$  lepton[21] is an extremely intriguing physics object. As the heaviest lepton in the SM,  $\tau$  has a large Yukawa coupling  $g(H\tau\tau)$  to the Higgs boson, leading to a significant branching ratio  $Br(H \to \tau\tau)$ . The  $g(H\tau\tau)$  is expected to be measured with a better than 1% relative accuracy at the CEPC. Measuring the  $\tau$  polarization at the Z pole leads to a precise determination of the backward-forward asymetry  $A_{FB}(\tau)$ [23]. The reconstruction of the tau spectral functions also have compelling potential at the CEPC. In this thesis, the  $\tau$  reconstruction is covering the channel of Higgs decaying to  $\tau\tau$  accompanied with leptons or jets. The basic idea is to take advantage of the high granularity and
 the property of multiplicity.

The content of this paper is organized as follows. A brief overview of the Standard 223 Model is described in Chapter 2. In Chapter 3, we describe the CEPC and ILC as  $e^+e^-$ 224colliders. The PFA oriented detectors will be introduced in Chapter 4, followed by the 225presentation of two PFAs and their application in detector optimization in Chapter 5. 226The description of the particle identification package and its performance on single par-227 ticles as well as in fully simulated events are discussed in Chapter 6. In Chapter 7, we 228 will discuss the signal strength of the Higgs boson decaying into tau lepton pairs at the 229 CEPC, taking into account all the SM backgrounds. 230

## <sup>231</sup> Chapter 2

# <sup>232</sup> Theory

The Standard Model of elementary particle interactions is the outstanding achievement 233 of the past forty years of experimental and theoretical activity in particle physics. In one 234word, the Standard Model is a field-theory description of strong and electroweak inter-235actions at the energy of several hundred GeV. So far it is a theoretical structure which 236has worked splendidly. In the Standard Model, the fundamental fermionic constituents 237of matter are quarks and leptons[24]. Both of them have spin  $\frac{1}{2}$  and are point-like at the 238 smallest distances currently probed by the highest-energy accelerators. There are three 239 generations of these particles, namely: (a)(u, d) and  $(\nu_e, e)$ , (b)(c, s) and  $(\nu_\mu, \mu)$ , (c)(t, b)240and  $(\nu_{\tau}, \tau)$ . We have a relatively simple picture of quarks and leptons with their interac-241tions (gravitation excepted). These interactions are mediated by spin 1 particles follow-242 ing the Bose-Einstein statistics[?]. They are referred as "bosons". Gluons correspond 243to strong interactions, W and Z to the weak interactions and gamma to electromagnetic. 244The weak interactions involve pairs of quarks and leptons, these are sources for the  $W^{\pm}$ 245and  $Z^0$  fields. Charged particles are sources for the photon field, which is the medium 246of electromagnetic interaction. The theory is to describe the forces between fermions by 247the exchange of these bosons [25]. The elementary particles and there interactions are 248 shown in Figure 2.1. 249

In modern physics, symmetry almost is one of the highest principles of the new laws of
 physics for a physicist to explore.

When physicists want to invent a new mechanism (for example, construct a Lagrangian quantity) to explain some new phenomenon, this mechanism has to meet certain symmetry and to adjust within this framework to try to find the necessary mechanisms. According to Noether's theorem, any differentiable symmetry of the action of a physical system has a corresponding conservation law. We know that the action of a classical physical system is the integral over time of a Lagrangian function, and it is invariant due to conservation laws. In this chapter, we will develop this subject for relativistic field



Figure 2.1: The Standard Model particles and the interaction in between them

theories. If the transformation is identically performed at every point in space-time, we 259 call it a global symmetry. In gauge theory, it is required that the system is invariant 260 under a local symmetry, which means that the transformation is labeled by a spacetime-261 dependent phase so that the transformation can be applied in a local area without influ-262 encing other areas. These transformations are called gauge transformations. For each 263 set of interaction mediating boson, the Lagrange function in gauge transformations, 264therefore these bosons are called gauge bosons. In fact, the gauge transformation is an 265 element of a unitary group called gauge group[26]. For strong interaction, the gauge 266 group is SU(3), and it is SU(2)  $\times$  U(1) for electroweak interactions. In group theoretical 267 language, the Standard Model is encoded in the symmetry group  $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ . 268

### 269 2.1 Standard Model

The Standard Model Lagrangian is written in three parts, the kinematic terms, the coupling terms, and mass terms, it can be written in a simplified formula as:

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{4} F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu} + i\bar{\psi} D\psi + h.c. + \psi_i y_{ij} \psi_j \phi + h.c. + |D_{\mu} \phi|^2 - V(\phi)$$
(2.1.1)

the terms in this formula are: the scalar product of the field strength tensor  $F_{\mu\nu}$  containing the mathematical encoding of all interaction particles except the Higgs boson, the term describing how interaction particles interact with matter particles, the term describing how matter particles couple to the Brout–Englert–Higgs field  $\phi$  and obtaining mass, how the interaction particles couple to the BEH field, and the potential of the BEH field.

#### <sup>278</sup> 2.1.1 The Electroweak symmetry breaking

The Lagrangian of a classical theory subjected to a non-zero vacuum expectation value describes a system with *n* real scalar fields  $\phi_i(x)$  (vectors) by[25]:

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2} \left( \partial_{\mu} \phi^{i} \right)^{2} + \frac{1}{2} \mu^{2} (\phi^{i})^{2} - \frac{\lambda}{4} (\phi^{i})^{4}$$
(2.1.2)

where a sum over all i = 1, ..., n is conducted in each term.  $\mu^2$  corresponds to the ordi-281 nary mass term  $m^2$  with a changed sign. We identify the first term as the kinetic energy 282 of the system and deduce that the rest is the potential  $V(\phi^i)$ . The altered sign of the mass 283  $m^2 \rightarrow \mu^2$  term will allow for a potential with negative minima, which will be crucial in 284our depict of symmetry breaking. This is an example of a self-interacting theory where 285 $\lambda$  is a dimensionless coupling constant describing the strength of the interaction (a more 286 basic example than the QED Lagrangian which also encodes a self-interacting theory). 287 By setting an even power of the fields, we will be able to obtain positive definite en-288 ergies (and scalar field theories with fields of an even higher order than 4 will not be 289 renormalizable). The lowest energy value of  $\mathcal{L}$  is obtained when we are dealing with a 290 uniform constant field  $\phi(x) = \phi_0^i$ . It is chosen as the field which minimizes the potential 291term in  $\mathcal{L}$ , i.e.: 292

$$V(\phi^{i}) = -\frac{1}{2}\mu^{2}(\phi^{i})^{2} + \frac{\lambda}{4}(\phi^{i})^{4}$$
(2.1.3)

<sup>293</sup> This optimization problem is straightforward to solve and we find

$$(\phi^i)^2 = \frac{\mu^2}{\lambda} \tag{2.1.4}$$

However, this equation only defines the length of the vector  $\phi_0^i$  leaving its direction arbitrary. In two dimensions, this can be investigated visually as the two fields are then constrained by

$$\phi_1^2 + \phi_2^2 = \frac{\mu^2}{\lambda} \tag{2.1.5}$$

which corresponds to a circle. Drawing the potential as in Figure 2.2, we discern that the minima will be found on this circle and not where  $\phi_1^2 + \phi_2^2 = 0$ . The system, therefore, has an infinite number of possible solutions that obey this minima condition as any point on the circle will do. Moreover, the system may choose one of these spontaneously and in doing so, its O(2)-symmetry is hidden from our experimental surveys since we cannot perceive the other solutions not chosen. The symmetry is broken spontaneously by the choice of one of the solutions.



**Figure 2.2:** A visualization of the potential *V* in the case where n = 2. Notice that the minima where *V* has negative values are found on the circle defined by 2.1.5 which physically correspond to a set of degenerate vacua.

#### <sup>304</sup> 2.1.2 Higgs mechanism

Introducing a complex scalar field  $\phi$  will satisfy Lorentz invariance as well as rotational invariance, due to its scalar nature. This field might yield a non-zero expectation value of the vacuum as we have seen in the calculations above and let us construct a gauge invariant Lagrangian which gauge bosons will acquire mass. A usual choice is to call this complex scalar field  $\phi$  and to write it as:

$$\phi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\phi_1 + i\phi_2) \tag{2.1.6}$$

where  $\phi_1, \phi_2$  are real fields. This field is known as the Higgs field. Moreover, by combining two of these in a doublet, we transform them in a SU(2) spinor, i.e. we are in a model with a spinorial representation of SU(2). Let us use the rotational freedom of SU(2) to compute the vacuum expectation value of this field as

$$\langle \phi \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v \end{pmatrix}$$
 with  $v = \sqrt{\frac{\mu^2}{\lambda}}$  (2.1.7)

<sup>314</sup> Once again we are on the circle and our symmetry is broken.

#### 315 Boson mass

To see how this affects the Lagrangian of the system, we have to investigate how its kinetic term, involving the covariant derivative arising from the gauge symmetry, couples to this new field. We will find some terms which we are able to recognize as "mass terms" as we did previously for the linear sigma model. This can be done if we insert the covariant derivative of SU(2)

$$D_{\mu}\phi = \left(\partial_{\mu} + igA^{a}_{\mu}\tau^{a}\right)\phi \tag{2.1.8}$$

where the index a = 1, 2, 3 runs over all of the generators  $i\tau^a = i\sigma^a/2$  of SU(2) in its two dimensional representation ( $\tau^a$  Hermitian matrices). In the part of the Lagrangian corresponding to a kinetic term and let it couple to the field, and the charge of the Lagrangian  $\Delta \mathcal{L}$  be written as

$$\Delta \mathcal{L} = \frac{g^2 v^2}{8} A_\mu A^\mu \tag{2.1.9}$$

with the mass coefficient for the three gauge bosons as

$$m_A = \frac{gv}{2} \tag{2.1.10}$$

That particle can obtain mass by interacting with a field of this kind is known as the Higgs mechanism or with more names occasionally the Englert–Brout–Higgs mechanism[27, 28].

Given that the weak interactions are to be mediated by our gauge vector bosons, we 329 thus required three vector mesons  $W^a_{\mu}(a = 1, 2, 3)$ , at this stage all massless. The simplest 330 group that contains the required three generators is SU (2). However, it is clear that this 331 is not enough if we wish to include electromagnetic interaction as well. Given that the 332  $W^a_\mu$  couple in a parity-violating fashion only to the left-handed parts of the leptons, as 333 required for the weak interactions, whereas the electromagnetic interaction conserves 334 parity and involves both left and right parts of the leptons. Thus we need one further 335 gauge vector meson,  $B_{\mu}$ , and correspondingly a group with one generator, U (1). The 336 overall gauge group is then U (1)×SU (2)<sub>L</sub> with a total of four generators. The subscript 337 L on SU (2)<sub>L</sub> indicates that among fermions, only left-handed states transform nontriv-338 ially under weak isospin. For the electroweak force, fermions live in representations of 339 the hypercharge U(1) and weak isospin SU(2) which are tensored together. Its mediat-340 ing particles, the  $W_{\pm}$ -bosons,  $Z_0$ -boson and the photon span the complexified adjoint 341 representation. 342

Since we desire to end up with three heavy vector bosons associated with the weak interactions and a massless vector boson, the photon, we require 4 independent scalar fields. The simplest choice is a doublet of complex scalar fields, one charged, one neutral:

$$\psi = \begin{pmatrix} \psi^+ \\ \psi^0 \end{pmatrix} \tag{2.1.11}$$

The  $2 \times 2$  matrices representing the generators of U (1) and SU (2) are just the unit matrix *I* and the Pauli matrices divided by two, and the Lagrangian should be:

$$\mathcal{L} = (D^{\mu}\psi)^{*} (D_{\mu}\psi) - V(\psi)$$
(2.1.12)

where the potential V is to produce spontaneous symmetry breaking, and  $D_{\mu}$  should have the form:

$$D_{\mu} = \partial_{\mu} + \frac{i}{2}g_1 W^a_{\mu} \tau^a + \frac{i}{2}g_2 I B_{\mu}$$
(2.1.13)

<sup>351</sup> Generally, we put

$$\begin{cases} B_{\mu} = \cos \omega_W A_{\mu} + \sin \omega_W Z_{\mu} \\ W_{\mu}^3 = \sin \omega_W Z_{\mu} - \cos \omega_W A_{\mu} \end{cases}$$
(2.1.14)

where  $\omega_W$  is called Weinberg angle and we shall adjust its value so that  $A_{\mu}$  turns out to be the photon field and  $Z_{\mu}$  will be then the massive neutral boson. The term concerning  $W^3$  and  $P_{\mu}$  in 2.1.12 will become:

 $_{354}$   $W^3_\mu$  and  $B_\mu$  in 2.1.12 will become:

$$\frac{i}{2} \left( g_1 W_{\mu}^3 \tau^3 + g_2 I B_{\mu} \right) \psi 
= \frac{i}{2} \left[ A_{\mu} \left( g_1 \tau^3 \sin \omega_W + g_2 I \cos \omega_W \right) 
Z_{\mu} \left( g_2 I \sin \omega_W - g_1 \tau^3 \cos \omega_W \right) \right]$$
(2.1.15)

The photon field  $A_{\mu}$  couples through the unbroken generator with the charge *e*, thus:

$$e = g_1 \sin \omega_W = g_2 \cos \omega_W \tag{2.1.16}$$

Introducing the charged field  $W^{\pm}_{\mu}$  as

$$W^{\pm}_{\mu} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} \left( W^{1}_{\mu} \mp i W^{2}_{\mu} \right)$$
(2.1.17)

<sup>357</sup> corresponding to the gauge bosons  $W^{\pm}$ , and by using the vacuum Higgs configuration <sup>358</sup> in 2.1.7, the Lagrangian in 2.1.12 becomes

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{8}g_1^2 v^2 \left[ 2W_{\mu}^+ W^{-\mu} + \frac{Z^2}{\cos_W} \right] + \frac{1}{2}\partial_{\mu}v \cdot \partial^{\mu}v$$
(2.1.18)

 $A_{\mu}$  does not appear in this equation, which means that a massless electromagnetic field exists as required. The charged W-boson masses can be read off directly as

$$M_{W^{\pm}} = \frac{1}{2}g_2v \tag{2.1.19}$$

because the term proportional to the bosons corresponds to charged intermediate boson
 masses. And we can define the mass of neutral gauge boson Z by using the relations in
 2.1.16, we get

$$M_Z = \frac{M_W}{\cos \omega_W} = \frac{v}{2} \sqrt{g_1^2 + g_1^2}$$
(2.1.20)

Thus the masses for the W bosons and  $Z^0$ -boson have been found, and of course a similar method can be used for a larger and more complicated group SU(3)× SU(2) × U(1), which leads to the construction of the complete Standard Model.

367 Fermion mass

<sup>368</sup> The fermion term of the Lagrangian is:

$$\mathcal{L} = -m\bar{\psi}\psi = -m(\bar{\psi}_L\psi_R + \bar{\psi}_R\psi_L) \tag{2.1.21}$$

However this lagrangian is not gauge invariant since the left handed fermions form an isospin doublet and the right handed fermions form isospin singlets. In order to construct an SU(2)L × U(1)Y invariant term for fermions, we used the complex doublet introduced in the previous section, which gives:

$$\mathcal{L} = -\lambda_f (\bar{\psi}_L \phi \psi_R + \bar{\psi}_R \phi \psi_L) \tag{2.1.22}$$

<sup>373</sup> where  $\lambda_f$  is the so-called Yukawa coupling between the fermions and the scalar field.

For all generations of quarks and leptons, the complete Lagrangian for the Yukawa interaction with the Higgs field can be expressed as:

$$\begin{split} L &= Y_{ij}^{d} \bar{Q}_{L}^{i} \phi d_{R}^{j} + Y_{ij}^{u} \bar{Q}_{L}^{i} \tilde{\phi} u_{R}^{j} + Y_{ij}^{l} \bar{L}_{L}^{i} \phi l_{R}^{j} + h.c. \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} Y_{ij}^{d} \left( \bar{u}_{L}^{i}, \bar{d}_{L}^{i} \right) \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v \end{pmatrix} d_{R}^{j} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} Y_{ij}^{u} \left( \bar{u}_{L}^{i}, \bar{d}_{L}^{i} \right) \begin{pmatrix} v \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} u_{R}^{j} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} Y_{ij}^{l} \left( \bar{\nu}^{i}, \bar{e}^{i} \right) \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v \end{pmatrix} e_{R}^{j} + h.c. \\ &= \frac{Y_{ij}^{d} \cdot v}{\sqrt{2}} \bar{d}_{L}^{i} d_{R}^{j} + \frac{Y_{ij}^{u} \cdot v}{\sqrt{2}} \bar{u}_{L}^{i} u_{R}^{j} + \frac{y_{ii} \cdot v}{\sqrt{2}} \bar{e}^{i} e^{i} \end{split}$$

$$(2.1.23)$$

where *i* and *j* run over all generations. Thus the mass of quarks matrix is introduced as:  $\frac{Y_{ij}^{u,d} \cdot v}{\sqrt{2}}$  and lepton mass of each generation as:  $\frac{y_l \cdot v}{\sqrt{2}} \bar{l} l$  (The Yukawa matrix for lepton is diagonal and the neutrino are massless in this model).

#### 379 Higgs coupling

It is interesting to study details of the Higgs boson properties like its coupling to fermions and gauge bosons as that determines if and how the Higgs boson is produced in exper-

- <sup>382</sup> iments and what the event topology will be.
- <sup>383</sup> If we parameterize the scalar field  $\phi$  in 2.1.6 to be:

$$\phi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0\\ v+h \end{pmatrix} \tag{2.1.24}$$

where v is the vacuum expectation of  $\phi$  and h is a fluctuating real valued field with  $\langle h \rangle = 0$ .

Rewriting the Lagrangian in the unitary gauge, the protential energy term takes the
 form:

$$\mathcal{L}_{V} = -\mu^{2}h^{2} - \lambda vh^{3} - \frac{1}{4}\lambda h^{4}$$
(2.1.25)

The field *h* is thus a scalar particle with mass  $m_h = \sqrt{2}\mu^2 = \sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{2}}v$ . This particle is known as Higgs boson.

Rewriting the Lagrangian in 2.1.12, the kinematic energy term yields the gauge boson mass term plus additional terms involving the Higgs boson field:

$$\mathcal{L}_{boson} = \frac{1}{2} \partial_{\mu} h \cdot \partial^{\mu} h + \left[ M_W^2 W_{\mu}^+ W^{-\mu} + \frac{1}{2} M_Z^2 Z_{\mu} Z^{\mu} \right] \cdot \left( 1 + \frac{h}{v} \right)^2$$
(2.1.26)

<sup>392</sup> where the  $M_W$  and  $M_Z$  are given in the previous section.

Rewriting the Lagrangian that couples the Higgs doublet to the fermion fields, these terms in unitarity gauge can be evaluated:

$$\mathcal{L}_{fermion} = -m_f \bar{f} f\left(1 + \frac{h}{v}\right) \tag{2.1.27}$$

From 2.1.25, 2.1.26 and 2.1.27, the coupling of the Higgs boson to other particles of the weak interaction theory are proportional to the masses of those particles.

### **397** 2.2 Beyond Standard Model

Even though the Standard Model explains some of the matters in particle physics, it is not a truly fundamental theory. There are quite some open problems left: the reason for three generations of elementary fermions, the scheme of grand unification, the hierarchy problem[29], the nature of gravitational forces, dark matter and dark energy, the matter over anti-matter dominance in the Universe, etc.

The only naturally defined mass of the SM is the Planck Mass  $M_{Pl} = 2.4 \times 10^{18} GeV/c^2$ , 403sitting 16 orders of magnitude above the ElectroWeak mass scales. The radiative correc-404 tions to the Higgs being quadratic in energy and masses, the tuning of the SM param-405eters requires an unrealistic precision over such a large scale gap. This is the hierarchy 406problem. It is partly solved by the Grand Unification which sets a unification of forces at 407  $\sim 10^{15} GeV/c^2$ , but for which a scheme compatible with observations has to be defined, 408 or by SuperSymmetry which cancels out the corrections above a scale which could be 409not too far from the EW one. On cosmological grounds, the evolution of the Universe 410 metric suggests a content of the universe made of 68% of Dark Energy and 27% of Dark 411 Matter (for 5% of standard matter) of unknown nature, no corresponding particle hav-412ing been observed (hence the "dark" quality). Some ideas such as SUSY, extra dimen-413 sions, or Minimal Dark Matter are proposed to describe this issue. What is observed 414is the complete predominance of matter over anti-matter, whereas initial conditions of 415 the Big-Bang predicts symmetry. No symmetry breaking mechanism has proven strong 416 enough in the SM to explain this fact. That is why the theorists proposed the mechanism 417 in SUSY, extended Higgs sector, etc. The Einstein theory of gravity, which has proven 418 correct in all tests (the latest being the existence of gravitational waves) is not yet com-419 patible with quantum theory. New theories of gravity exists but are still far beyond 420 experimental scope. 421

In order to explain these problems, plenty of models are proposed by theoretical physicists and to be tested at the future e+e- colliders.

**Grand Unification** The basic hypothesis of grand unification states that  $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$  is the remnant of a larger, simple or semi-simple group *G*, whose symmetry is lost at currently reachable energies. Several groups have been used for grand unification, including SU(5), SO(10), *E*<sub>6</sub> or *E*<sub>8</sub>[30, 31, 32].

**Supersymmetry**[33] Supersymmetry (SUSY) is a symmetry relating particles of integer spin, i.e. spin–0 and spin-1 bosons, and particles of spin  $\frac{1}{2}$ , i.e. fermions. The basic idea of SUSY is that the generators transform fermions into bosons and vice-versa. When the symmetry is exact, the bosonic fields, i.e. the scalar and gauge fields of spin 0 and spin 1, respectively, and the fermionic fields of spin  $\frac{1}{2}$  have the same masses and quantum numbers, except for the spin. The particles are combined into super fields and the simplest case is the chiral or scalar super field which contains a complex scalar field with two degrees of freedom and a Weyl fermionic field with two components.

In the breaking of Supersymmetry, we obviously need to preserve the gauge invari-436ance and the renormalizability of the theory and, also, the fact that there are still no 437quadratic divergences in the Higgs boson mass squared. Since up to now there is no 438 completely satisfactory dynamical way to break SUSY, a possibility is to introduce by 439hand terms that break SUSY explicitly and parametrize our ignorance of the fundamen-440tal SUSY–breaking mechanism. This gives a low energy effective SUSY theory, the most 441 economic version being the Minimal Supersymmetric Standard Model (MSSM), provid-442 ing candidate dark matter particles. In a supersymmetric theory, Planck-scale quantum 443corrections cancel between partners and superpartners (owing to a minus sign asso-444ciated with fermionic loops). Thus the hierarchy between the electroweak scale and 445the Planck scale is achieved in a natural manner. Besides, the running of the gauge 446 couplings are modified, and precise high-energy unification of the gauge couplings is 447 achieved. 448

<sup>449</sup> The precise measurement of the Higgs boson is a key to verify these proposed models.

<sup>450</sup> If there is new physics beyond the Standard Model, the coupling deviates from the <sup>451</sup> Standard Model prediction. The deviation depends on the new physics beyond the

452 Standard Model but is estimated to be  $O(\sim 1\%)$  in many models[34, 35, 36]. Therefore,

<sup>453</sup> a precision of a few percent or less is required to shed light on a signal of new physics

concealed in the coupling constants, which can be achieved with the next generation ofcolliders.

# 456 Chapter 3

# $_{457} e^+e^-$ Collider as Higgs factory

After the discovery of the Higgs boson, the precise measurement of its properties has 458become the challenge in high energy physics experiments. Several projects as the next 459generation of LHC are proposed for this purpose. The ATLAS and CMS experiments 460 at the LHC will continue to improve the measurement of the Higgs boson properties 461including couplings to gauge bosons and Yukawa couplings. It will integrate into a 462High Luminosity LHC with an integrated luminosity to 3000  $fb^{-1}$ [37], however, the 463 accuracy of HL-LHC will be at the levels of a few percent achievable for some of the 464couplings, which does not meet the requirement needed to explore new physics regime. 465

In the Large Hadron Collider (LHC), the proton-proton collisions result in many frag-466 mented pieces of what was originally a proton, each fragment producing its own shower 467 of particles or jets. On the contrary, the  $e^+e^-$  are point-like particles which interact 468 through forces much weaker than the strong interactions at LHC, so that the annihila-469tions produce events that are relatively free of background debris. This makes it possi-470ble to analyze the events as a whole and to use all of the details to constrain the particle 471 properties. In LHC, the huge QCD backgrounds leads to a low signal to background 472ratio. The total signal produced is estimated to  $10^8$  events in HL-LHC, the efficiency 473for the signal is to the order of  $10^{-3}$ , while this efficiency for  $e^+e^-$  collider is of order 1. 474Another strong advantage of the  $e^+e^-$  collider is that the Higgs can be detected through 475the recoil mass method by reconstructing the Z boson decay only, without examining 476the Higgs decays. This method establishes the denominator for an absolute measure-477ment of branching fractions, and will consequently allow the incorporation of the LHC 478 results to obtain the best world averages. The recoil mass method also provides the best 479 probe into the Higgs invisible decays and search for dark matter and exotic particles 480produced in the Higgs decays. The experimental conditions will be much cleaner, al-481 lowing the reconstruction of detectors with unprecedented precision in energy and mo-482 mentum measurement. For example, as compared to the detectors designed for LHC 483

events, the ILC detectors will have only one-tenth of the amount of material in front of
 the calorimeters that measure photon energies.

In conclusion, the  $e^+e^-$  collider is an appreciated collider for precision measurements with high sensitivity to effects of new physics.

Various proposals are claimed to be the  $e^+e^-$  Higgs factory, including linear and circular. The International Linear Collider (ILC) is a flagship program of linear ones, based on Superconducting RF technology. While the Circular Electron Positron Collider(CEPC) and Future Circular Collider of  $e^+e^-$  (FCCee) are two of the proposals for the circular ones. These two kinds of collider have the examples in the previous century, the two  $e^+e^-$  *Z*-factories, the circular LEP and the linear SLC. Both of them were successfully designed, constructed and operated, and both achieved important physics results.

The main difficulty for the linear collider comes from the high cost of the project. Recently the Japan HEP community proposed to build a 250 GeV center of mass linear collider in Japan as the first stage of the ILC serving as a Higgs factory[38]. The advantage of ILC is that the beams are polarised, and there is potential for an energy upgrade.

For circular collider, the technology is kind of mature, since all circular  $e^+e^-$  colliders 499are similar except for the sizes, and there are several which have been successfully con-500structed sharing a number of common features. The challenge for CEPC is that, due 501to high beam intensity and small beam size, the beamstrahlung (synchrotron radiation 502of individual particles in the opposing beam's field) will limit the beam lifetime. High 503 synchrotron radiation power is another major challenge. The main advantage of a cir-504cular  $e^+e^-$  collider of sufficiently large size is to offer a higher luminosity than a linear 505one at 240 GeV and below. Also, a circular collider can accommodate more than one 506 interaction point. Even though the energy is limited by synchrotron radiation and thus 507has no potential for an energy upgrade, a circular  $e^+e^-$  collider could be converted to a 508*pp* collider in the future as the next energy frontier, which is a plan for CEPC to SPPC. 509 Another disadvantage is that there is no polarization in CEPC. 510

Plenty of issues have been studied for ILC, CEPC and FCCee. For ILC, the Technical 511Design Report[39] was published in 2013 and recently the project for 250GeV[38] has 512been reported and waits for an action from the Japanese government. According to the 513timeline of ILC, once there is a positive decision, there will be 4 to 6 years of preparation 514and about 9 years of construction and 20 years of operation. For CEPC, the Preliminary 515Conceptual Design Report (PreCDR)[40] was published by the end of 2014 and the CDR 516is under preparation and supposed to come out in the beginning of 2018. The R&D, as 517well as the Engineering Design, is ongoing until 2022, and the construction is estimated 518to be finished by the end of 2030, that means CEPC data-taking will start before the LHC 519program ends around 2035. After the operation of ten years, the CEPC will be upgraded 520to SPPC, if needed. For FCCee, or TLEP, the studies are set up since 2014, and is part 521

<sup>522</sup> and parcel of the FCC design study.

<sup>523</sup> In this chapter, the ILC and the CEPC will be introduced in detail, including the physics

<sup>524</sup> of these colliders and their technologies.

### **525** 3.1 Production processes

As shown in Figure 3.1, the leading production processes for the SM Higgs boson at  $e^+e^-$  collider operating at 250 GeV are: a)  $e^+e^- \rightarrow ZH$  (Higgsstrahlung or ZH), b)  $e^+e^- \rightarrow \nu\nu H$  (WW fusion), c)  $e^+e^- \rightarrow e^+e^-H$  (ZZ fusion), as shown in Figure 3.2, and the estimated statistics for CEPC ( $5ab^{-1}$ ) and ILC ( $1ab^{-1}$ ) are shown in Table 3.1 and Table 3.2, the polarization for ILC 250GeV is either  $P(e^+, e^-) = (+30\%, -80\%)$  or  $P(e^+, e^-) = (-30\%, +80\%)$ .



**Figure 3.1:** Unpolarized cross sections of main standard model processes of e + e – collisions as functions of center- of-mass energy (from 50GeV to 400GeV), the dotted line indicates 250GeV

At the energy of 250 GeV, near the peak of the cross section for  $e^+e^- \rightarrow ZH$ , the *Z* boson recoil can tags the Higgs boson events. At higher energy, the *WW* fusion process of Higgs production,  $e^+e^- \rightarrow \nu\nu$ H, turns on. Measurement of this process at the full ILC energy of 500 GeV gives a model-independent precision measurement of the total Higgs boson width. Experiments at 350 GeV and 500 GeV also allow first measurements of the Higgs boson coupling to the top quark and of the Higgs boson self-coupling with



**Figure 3.2:** Feynman diagrams of the Higgs production processes in  $e^+e^-$  collider

**Table 3.1:** The cross section  $(fb^{-1})$  of various SM processes for CEPC and ILC. eL.pR represents electron left polarized and positron right polarized, eR.pL represents right polarized and positron left polarized

Process	CEPC	ILC (eL.pR)	ILC (eR.pL)
qq	50216	129148	71272
ll	4404	21226	16470
Single Z	4733	2192	1506
Single W	5144	13335	114
Bhabha	25060	25286	24228
WW	15483	35219	323
ZZ	1033	2982	1418
ffH	219	515	319

**Table 3.2:** The cross section  $(fb^{-1})$  of Higgs signal for CEPC and ILC. eL.pR represents electron left polarized and positron right polarized, eR.pL represents right polarized and positron left polarized

Process	CEPC	ILC (eL.pR)	ILC (eR.pL)
eeH	7.60	17.60	11.16
$\mu\mu H$	7.10	17.14	10.98
$\nu\nu H$	48.96	128.64	65.10
qqH	143.39	173.01	110.98

the  $t\bar{t}$  events. The measurement of the forward-backward asymmetry is a probe to new physics.

### <sup>540</sup> 3.2 The Circular Electron-Positron Collider (CEPC)

The CEPC is a circular electron-positron collider in a tunnel with a circumference of 541100 km and is envisioned to operate with a center-of-mass energy of 250 GeV where 542the Higgs events are produced primarily through the interaction  $e^+e^-$ . With a nominal 543luminosity of  $2 \times 10^{34} cm^{-2} s^{-1}$  about 1 million clean Higgs events will be produced by 544CEPC over a period of 10 years. The large statistics of this Higgs sample will enable 545CEPC to measure the Higgs boson production cross sections and most of its properties 546with precisions far beyond what is achievable at the LHC. The CEPC can also serve as 547 a high luminosity  $(10^{35\sim36}cm^{-2}s^{-1})$  Z factory at a centre of mass energy of 91 GeV, i.e. 548 $10^{10\sim 11}$  Z boson in one year. 549

The beam current at CEPC, determined by the synchrotron radiation budget, is 100 MW for two beams. The preliminary layout of 50km tunnel CEPC (2014) is shown in Figure 3.3, the CEPC collider is designed with four interaction points, where IP1 and IP3 are for e+e- collisions, while the other two IP's are reserved for the future pp collider, SPPC. The progressed collider[41] circumference is 100 km, including 8 arcs of 5852.8 m, 4 arc straight sections of 849.6 m each and 4 interaction region straights of 1132.8 m each.

#### **556** 3.2.1 Accelerator design

The CECP design aims to be a Higgs factory producing  $10^6$  Higgs operating at 250 GeV center of mass energy and a W&Z factory producing  $10^{10}$  Z<sup>0</sup> operating at 90 GeV or 160 GeV center of mass energy. It should also leave the opportunity to be upgraded to a 100TeV proton-proton collider.

<sup>561</sup> The CEPC contains several subsystems[40]:

 Injector In this part, 10GeV electrons /positrons will be produced and sent to the 562Booster. A strong focusing lattice consisting of several tens of quadrupoles main-563 tains the transverse beam size. A pair of x-y correction dipoles and a stripline 564beam position monitor are associated with each quadrupole for trajectory correc-565tion. High resolution profile monitors are located along the Linac. Monitors for 566 the energy, energy spectrum, and emittance growth are placed near the end of the 567Linac to allow either automatic or operator controlled correction during opera-568tions. 569



LTB : Linac to Booster BTC : Booster to Collider Ring

Figure 3.3: CEPC preCDR Layout

#### 24.03.2018 3.2. THE CIRCULAR ELECTRON-POSITRON COLLIDER (CEPC)

- Electron Source The CEPC electron source is a thermionic gridded cathode 570 driven by high voltage pulser for the baseline design. After leaving one of 571these guns, the bunches pass through a Y bend and into two sub-harmonic 572bunching cavities. Two operation modes are required: one is to provide a 5733.2 nC bunch charge for electron injection, and the other is to provide an 57411 nC bunch charge as the primary electron beam for positron production. 575The electron beams are accelerated to 200MeV before going into the same 576accelerating section as positrons. 577
- **Positron Source** In CEPC, positrons are generated using a 4 GeV electron 578beam impinging on a high-Z, high density tungsten target. The positron yield 579per incident electron is approximately proportional to the electron energy so 580that the positron current is proportional to the incident power of electron 581beam. The large transverse emittance of the positron beam emerging from 582the target is transformed to match the capture section aperture with a pseudo-583adiabatically changing solenoidal field. Three constant-gradient accelerator 584sections will boost the captured positrons to 200 MeV. The positrons are then 585transported back to the beginning of Linac through a quadrupole lattice and 586 reinjected into the Linac where they are accelerated to 10 GeV. 587
- Damping Rings The primary purpose of the damping ring (DR) is to reduce the transverse phase space of the positron beam to a suitably small value at the beginning of the linac and also to adjust the time structure of the positron beam for reinjection into the Linac. a bunch compressor system is added after the damping ring to reduce the bunch length in the ring, thus to minimize wake field effects in the Linac.
- Accelerating section In CEPC, the klystrons and their associated modula-594tors are the keys to acceleration. A first acceleration section containing 11 595klystrons of 18 MeV/m is providing 1.1GeV electrons and positrons before 596the positrons are sent to the Damping Rings. Then the second acceleration 597 section containing 20 klystrons of 27 MeV/m accelerate the beams to 4GeV, 598where the electron beam is used to produce the positron beams. Finally, 599 the beams are accelerated to 10GeV through a third section containing 42 600 klystrons of 27 MeV/m. The procedure for acceleration in the Linac is shown 601 in Figure 3.4 602
- Booster After being accelerated to 10GeV, electron and positron beams are injected from the Linac through the LTB transfer line (Linac to Booster) into the Booster. In CEPC, the Booster is in the same tunnel as the collider, placed 2m above the collider ring and has about same circumference (10km). Bypasses are arranged to avoid the detectors at IPs. Because of the very low synchrotron radiation damping rate, a scheme of single bunch injection from Linac to Booster is adopted. The two



Figure 3.4: Schematic layout of the CEPC Linac, the stars represent the continuous of figure[42]

radiofrequency cavities (RFs) regions of 84 cavities each, with the cavity frequency of 1.3GHz, is ramping the energy of electron and positron beams to 45GeV(Z factory) or 120GeV (Higgs factory). Then the beams are extracted from the Booster through BTC transfer line (Booster to Collider Ring) into the Main Ring.

**Main Ring** The Main Ring is a double ring system and is in the same channel 613 with the Booster[43]. Two stations of radiofrequency cavities (RFs) are shared 614 by these two rings for Higgs production, with a cavity frequency of 650MHz. 615 Twin-aperture dipoles and quadrupoles are adopted in the arc region to reduce 616 the power. The distance between two beams is 0.35m. For W/Z production, only 617 half the number of cavities will be used and bunches can be filled in full ring, 618 to lower the impedance. The layout of the double ring accompanying with the 619 Booster is shown in Figure 3.5. 620

#### <sup>621</sup> 3.2.2 Machine Detector Interface (MDI)[1]

MDI plays a very important role on the way to achieve the physics goals at the electron positron collider. The MDI for CEPC is about  $\pm 7m$  long from the Interaction Points. The interaction region of the CEPC partial double ring consists of two beam pipes, and the positron and electron beams collide with a 33 mrad crossing angle and the final focusing length is 2.2m. The accelerator components inside the detector without shielding



Figure 3.5: The CEPC Booster and Double Ring Layout

are within a conical space with an opening angle of  $\cos \theta = 0.993$ . There are two high 627 gradient quadrupole magnets (QD0 for horizontal and QF1 for vertical) in the interac-628 tion region, inside the detector solenoid magnet which has a field of about 3.0 T. The 629 distance from IP to the last quadrupole (QD0) is 2.2m, which is much smaller than for 630 the ILC. To minimize the effect of the longitudinal detector solenoid field on the accel-631 erator beam, anti-solenoid coils are used. Their magnetic field direction is opposite to 632 the detector solenoid field, and the strength is 7.0 T to make the combined total integral 633 longitudinal field generated by the detector solenoid and anti-solenoid coils are nearly 634 zero. A Luminosity Calorimeter (Lumical) will be installed on the outgoing beam at a 635 distance of 0.95  $\sim$ 1.11 m, with an inner radius 28.5 mm and outer radius 100 mm. 636

### <sup>637</sup> 3.3 The International Linear Collider (ILC)

The ILC is one of the most mature among all the proposed particle accelerators. Both beams at ILC will have the capability to be polarized which is important for many measurements. The left- and right-handed electrons couple differently to the SU(2) and U(1) components of the Standard Model gauge group, so the different polarized reactions access different slices of the electroweak interaction. This increases the power of the ILC in several different respects.

<sup>644</sup> The overall layout of the baseline in the TDR is shown in Figure 3.7. The latest ILC <sup>645</sup> staging report 2017 proposes that ILC will collide electrons and positrons with initial



Figure 3.6: The CEPC MDI Layout

<sup>646</sup> center of mass energy 250GeV, as shown in Figure 3.8. The beam power of ILC250 is

<sup>647</sup> 5.26MW, with the total luminosity to be  $1.35 \ 10^{-34} cm^{-2} s^{-1}$ . Following several years of

successful operation of the initial ILC250, a luminosity upgrade is possible. The basic
 change in the luminosity upgrade is the increase in the number of bunches from 1312 to

649 change in 650 2625.

The ILC will leave the opportunity to operate at higher center of mass energy: 350GeV, 500 GeV or 1TeV.

#### **3.3.1** ILC Subsystems[2]

<sup>654</sup> The accelerating system of ILC contains several subsystems:

 Electron Source The required trains of polarized electron bunches are produced with a laser hitting a photocathode in a DC gun, then bunched and pre-accelerated in normal-conducting structures. The beam is then accelerated in a superconducting linac. The spin vector is rotated into the vertical plane by superconducting solenoids, and a separate superconducting RF structure is used for energy compression before the beam is transported to the Damping Ring.

- Positron Source After accelerated to suitable energy, the electron beam is then
   extracted to a parallel beam line to create positrons and return the positrons to the
   electron main linac.
- In ILC the electrons pass through a helical undulator and a dogleg, generating a



**Figure 3.7:** Schematic layout of the ILC complex for 500 GeV CM[2] 25



Figure 3.8: Schematic layout of the ILC250GeV staging options

monochromatic and polarized photon beam of about 10MeV. Part of this polar-665 ization is conserved when the photons hit a rotating Ti-alloy target to produce 666 electron and positron pairs. An alternative approach uses Compton scattering of 667 a laser beam on an electron beam from a storage ring or a linac. The laser beam 668 is stored in optical cavities that provide several interaction points. The scattered 669 photons are polarized. This polarization is kept with a high purity during their 670 conversion on a fixed target. The resulting positrons are stacked in the damping 671 ring. The independence of the system avoids the disturbance of the main electron 672 beam due to the pass through the undulator. The cavities and the laser system are 673 still in the focus of R&D work. 674

The beam is then captured, focused and pre-accelerated. After separation and dumping of the electrons and photons, the positrons enter another phase of acceleration (to 400MeV) with focusing, then transported further downstream in a superconducting linac that accelerates them to 5GeV. Before injection into the damping rings, the spin vector is rotated to the vertical direction and energy compression is performed. The polarization of the beam is about 30% and is foreseen to be upgraded to 60% later.

Damping Rings In ILC, in order to achieve the design luminosity, the beam emittance has to be lowered by five orders of magnitude. In the central region, two separate damping rings, one for positron and the other one for electrons with a circumference of ~ 6.7 km are housed in a single tunnel. A low operation energy of 5 GeV has been chosen. The frequency of the integrated superconducting RF system is half the frequency used in the main linac to be able to easily handle different bunch patterns.

• **Main Linac** The compressed bunch is ready to enter the Main Linac. At a distance of about 11 km, the beam particles will be accelerated to 250 GeV in ILC<sup>1</sup>. The un-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>This is the design for 500 GeV ILC. The Main Linac has been reduced to 125 GeV for 250GeV ILC,

24.03.2018

691

692

693

694

695

696

derlying technology is based on supra-conducting 1.3 GHz RF units. The average accelerating gradient is 31.5MV/m. Three cryomodules, containing 26 nine-cell cavities make up the so-called RF units. About 280 of those are needed for each of the main linacs. This makes some 17.000 cells in total. High resolution beam pair monitors will allow having precise orbit control in order to preserve the small beam emittances over the acceleration.

- Beam Delivery System After exiting the main linacs the beam enters the Beam Delivery System. One of the first things needed is a measurement of the beam (energy, polarization, and emittance). Corrections are then applied on the way to the Interaction Point (IP), including the removal of the beam halo to avoid large backgrounds in the detector. A fast extraction system can be used to protect the detector and the beam line in case of failure or miss-steered beams.
- Machine Detector Interface MDI In ILC part of the beam delivery system will be integrated into the detector. The beam passes through a conical beam-pipe of minimal radius, as low as 15 mm at the IP. In the very forward region, sub-detector systems will record remnants of the interaction and monitor beam properties. These detectors will suffer big radiation doses.
- The beam crossing angle of ILC is 14 mrad. This angle reduces the cross section for the interaction. To provide effective head-on collisions, Crab cavities will be used to turn the beams in the horizontal plane. After the interaction and a second measurement of their properties to cross-check their stability, the beams are extracted and dumped.
- In ILC, the interaction region is shared by two detectors in a so-called "push-pull"
   configuration. The quadrupoles for final focus closest to the interaction point are
   integrated into the detector to facilitate the push-pull operation.

and 5km of each side have been reduced

# 716 3.4 The Future Circular Collider (FCC) and High Lumi 717 nosity LHC (HL-LHC)

The FCC is a post-LHC particle accelerator project proposed by CERN [19], with different particle collider scenarios explored with the aim of significantly expanding the current energy and luminosity frontiers. The FCC-ee project is part of it, it is a highluminosity, high-precision  $e^+e^-$  circular collider with a center-of-mass energy from 90 to 400 GeV, envisioned in a new 80~100 km tunnel in the Geneva area.

<sup>723</sup> The HL-LHC is an update of LHC with luminosity increased by a factor of 10 beyond the

<sup>724</sup> LHC's design value. The up-to-date(Oct. 2017) instantaneous luminosity have already

achieved  $2.0 \times 10^{34} cm^{-2} s^{-1}$ . A instantaneous ultimate luminosity of  $7.5 \times 10^{34} cm^{-2} s^{-1}$ 

and integrated luminosity to 3000 fb<sup>-1</sup> is expected[37]. The preliminary studies which

have been done in CMS and Atlas show that HL-LHC can extend the precision of mea surements on Higgs boson couplings, Higgs width, Higgs self-couplings, etc.
## 729 Chapter 4

## 730 **Detector**

Detectors at the electron positron collider face a very different set of challenges com-731 pared to the previous state-of-the-art employed for LEP and hadron colliders. While the 732 detectors at ILC and CEPC will enjoy lower rates, less background and lower radiation 733 doses than those at the LHC, the electron positron collider will be pursuing physics that 734 places challenging demands on precision measurements and particle tracking and iden-735 tification. The reasons for this can be illustrated by several important physics processes, 736 namely measuring the properties of a Higgs boson, identifying strong electroweak sym-737 metry breaking, identifying supersymmetric (SUSY) particles and their properties. Tak-738 ing W and Z for example, in order to distinguish them in their hadronic decay mode, 739 the di-jet mass resolution should be comparable to their natural width, say a few GeV 740 or less. Besides, the detector at an  $e^+e^-$  collider should be able to distinguish the Higgs 741signal from the SM background and to classify the Higgs events according to the gener-742 ation/decay modes of the Higgs boson. 743

Except for the basic demands of Higgs measurements, there are slight differences be-744 tween detectors at CEPC and ILC. For CEPC, the EW measurements are mostly limited 745by the systematics, which makes alignments, calibration, and stability crucial for the 746 detector. For example, the CEPC detector is required to determine the luminosity to a 747relative accuracy of  $10^{-3}$  for the Higgs measurements, and an accuracy of  $10^{-4}$  for the Z 748 pole operation. For higher energy ILC, the measurement requirements for new physics 749 should be satisfied. For example, the low mass difference between SUSY states requires 750an adequate detector in the very forward direction, including an electron veto capability 751 in the extreme forward region. 752

In order to meet the need for precise measurement, the Particle Flow, a full concept of detectors involving trackers and calorimeters to reconstruct individual particles is proposed as a solution.

#### <sup>756</sup> 4.1 Particle Flow Algorithm (PFA) oriented detector

PFA[44, 45] is an algorithm reconstructing all the final state particles instead of measuring jet energies globally without identifying particles. With all the final state particles
correctly reconstructed, the final physics objects can be recognized with a high efficiency
and purity. For example, in the flavor physics, the charged kaons/pions separation is
very important.

The requirement of detector for PFA is that it should contain different sub-detectors suitable for different kind of particles. By combining the information in these sub-detectors, the PFA oriented detector design could significantly enhance the reconstruction efficiency of the key physics objects and largely improve the accuracy of jet energy resolution, since the majority of jet energy is stored in the charged hadrons, whose momentum is usually measured with a much better accuracy than its cluster energy measured at the calorimeter system.

A PFA oriented detector requires a precise tracking system with limited material bud-769 get and limited dead space between different sub-detectors. Low-material tracker is 770 required to limit the probability of interactions before the particle reaches the calorime-771 ter, i.e., via multi-scattering, bremsstrahlung, and hadron-nuclear interactions. To fully 772 reconstruct individual particles from the interaction, an efficient separation of show-773 ers from charged particles, photons, and neutral hadrons in the calorimeter is required. 774 That implies a high granularity calorimeter system. Besides, the short readout time is 775 needed because of the high granularity. 776

The PFA is widely used in data analyses, both for the existing experiments and for 777 the projects under developments, for highly granular calorimetry and for experiments 778 without highly granular calorimetry. At the LHC, the high granularity calorimetry has 779 already been proposed into CMS (CMS-HGC)[46] and ATLAS (ATLAS-HPTD)[47] as 780 part of their HL-LHC upgrade program. The PFA have already been used in CMS[46], 781 the overall JER takes a value between 6% (at  $P_t < 20$  GeV) to 3% (at  $P_t > 100$  GeV). 782 The two detector designs for ILC, ILD and SiD are PFA oriented[39]. In CEPC, the 783 baseline of detector (CEPC\_v1) takes the ILD as a reference. In order to accommodate 784 the CEPC collision environment, some necessary changes have been made to the sub-785 detector design. Recently another version of detector (APODIS) has been reported with 786 optimized parameters. 787

#### 788 **4.2** Detector design

The proposed concept is designed as a multi-purpose detector, which meets the re-789 quirements in spatial and energy measurement over a large solid angle. The prototype 790 and components of ILD and CEPC\_v1 are similar, as shown in Figure 4.1, namely the 791 multi-layer pixel-vertex detector (VTX) for reconstruction of vertices; the central silicon 792 components SIT, SET, and ETD, providing extra precise space points to track; the large 793 volume time projection chamber (TPC), measuring tracks with a large number of three-794 dimensional space points (providing a point resolution of better than 100  $\mu m$  for the 795 complete drift and a double hit resolution of less than 2 mm); the calorimetry system 796 containing the ECAL to identify photons and measure their energy complemented by 797 a HCAL to measure neutral hadrons; LCAL in the very forward region to measure the 798 luminosity and in ILC the BCAL is to monitor beam parameters; the iron yoke instru-799 mented to measure showers escaping the hadron calorimeter, and the confining mag-800 netic field. Here the CEPC\_v1 detector is introduced in detail. 801



Figure 4.1: Overview of the CEPC detector in the baseline of preCDR.

• **VTX** - **Vertex Detector** The VTX consists of six layers of silicon pixels grouped in pairs. Optimal point resolution ( $< 3\mu m$ ) while keeping a low material budget (  $< 0.15\%X_0$ /layer) is the primary design goals. This needs to be combined with a first measurement point very close to the interaction point (i.e. 16mm), which is imposed by the extreme radiation conditions as well as the strong pair background at this distance. The vertices reconstructed in VTX are important in many physics events, such as the b/c quark tagging and tau tagging.

- **FTD Forward Tracking Discs** A set of disks equipped with silicon-pixels or silicon-strips extends the tracking down to essentially the radius of the beam tube.
- SIT Silicon Internal Tracker The strong background imposes another constraint: even with a strong magnetic field, the core component of the tracking, the Time Projection Chamber, has to be kept at a distance of approximately 30 cm from the IP. To provide linking points between the VTX and the TPC, two layers of Si strips are installed in the barrel region. This will not only improve pattern recognition and momentum resolution but give also time stamps for each bunch crossing.
- TPC Time Projection Chamber TPC is a cylinder with a radius of 1.8m and half-817 length of 2.35m. The advantage of a TPC over a silicon-based tracking system 818 (e.g. as used in LHC experiments) is the high number of space points provided 819 per track. The position resolution provided by TPC can be  $100\mu m$  in  $r - \phi$ . This 820 will play a major role in achieving the goal of a visual tracking. It will not only be 821 possible to identify backscattering from the calorimeters, to see kinks in a track, 822  $V_0$  reconstruction, as well as to recover pair production or hadronic interactions in 823 the tracker region. Another advantage over silicon tracking is the lower material 824 budget, a must for the best calorimeter performance. Additionally, particle ID 825 can be performed by measuring dE/dx. This holds for K separation to isolate 826 Kaon modes as well as for electron separation that is especially important at low 827 energies where ID based on the calorimeter is not so good. 828
- SET Silicon External Tracker Another set of two layers of silicon strip detectors in the barrel region are providing additional high precision spacepoints. These will not only improve the precision of the momentum measurement but can also be used to align the TPC in interplay with the SIT. Furthermore, a measurement point so close to the ECAL entry can be used as starting point for clustering algorithms.
- **ECAL** The particle flow approach requires excellent pattern recognition in the 835 calorimeters to reconstruct individual particles. This is only possible with a short 836 Moliere radius and with a very high granularity, cell sizes inferior to the Moliére 837 Radius. The design of the calorimeters is driven by this goal and not by the op-838 timization of single particle energy resolutions, although these needs still to be 839 taken into consideration in order to achieve the desired jet energy resolutions. 840 Both the electromagnetic as well as the hadronic calorimeters are planned as sam-841 pling calorimeters with highly segmented active layers. The materials proposed 842 for the ECAL are tungsten as absorber and silicon as active material. It has a high 843 longitudinal (30 layers, 24  $X_0$ ) as well as transversal segmentation (  $5 \times 5mm^2$  cell 844 size), as shown in Fig. 4.2. Alternative designs include signal collection in scin-845 tillators, implemented as strips with alternating orientation to match effectively 846 the separation capabilities of smaller area square cells, as well as a concept for a 847

digital ECAL, realized with Monolithic Active Pixel Sensors (MAPS). Pixel-sizes in the order of 50  $\mu$ m can ensure linearity up to high energies, leading to a total number of pixels of the order of  $10^{12}$  for the complete ECAL.



Figure 4.2: The electromagnetic calorimeter within the CEPC Detector.

850

HCAL The HCAL is as highly segmented (48 layers for CEPC\_v1 and 40 layers for APODIS, 1 cm<sup>2</sup> cellsize). It is a sampling calorimeter with steel as the absorber and scintillator tiles or gaseous devices with embedded electronics. The proposed structure of active layer is Glass Resistive Plate Chamber(GRPC) at CEPC. To handle the readout of such a high granularity, cells would not read out unless in a digital or semi-digital mode.

 Coil A superconducting coil providing a nominal field of 3.5 Tesla and representing 2.2 interaction lengths surrounds the two calorimeters. A field of this strength will contain the core of the pair background in the beampipe. Also the curvature of the track of a charged particle scales proportional to B. This means improvement in the momentum resolution with higher field strength as well as a better separation of charged tracks from neutrals at a given inner radius of the calorimeter.

Yoke A magnetic field of this strength has to be closed to minimize stray fields.
 An iron yoke is used for this purpose. This yoke is then instrumented with RPC's.
 The system serves like this as tagger for high energy muons.

## <sup>867</sup> Chapter 5

# Softwares and Particle Flow Algorithm(PFA)

To accomplish the goal of future electron positron collider, the hadronic decays of W and Z bosons should be separated via the reconstruction of the di-jet invariant masses. This implies that a di-jet mass resolution of about 3.5% for jets has to be achieved. A broadly accepted approach to reach these resolutions is the Particle Flow concept. In this chapter, it will be shown that this method will impose constraints on the detector that demand a very special design that has never been attempted before. The tools used are also introduced.

#### **5.1** Particle Flow Algorithm

Several Particle Flow Algorithms (PFA) have been developed, such as GARLIC (GAmma
Reconstruction at a LInear Collider)[48], specified to identify photons in the high granularity calorimeter, or global to identify and measure particles reaching the semi-digital
hadron calorimeter, with good separation between nearby showers, such as PandoraPFA[45]
and Arbor[49].

#### **5.1.1** Jet Energy Resolution

A jet is defined as a narrow cone of particles produced by the hadronization of a quark
 or gluon, it is an important object to be observed in particle physics experiments because
 of its high production cross section. In the traditional calorimetry, jet energy is obtained

from the sum of energies deposited in ECAL and HCAL, pointing to a jet energy res-887 olution with a stochastic term greater than 60%[50], which does not allow to separate 888 the hadronic decays of W and Z and does not meet the requirements of ILC and CEPC. 889 In PFA, a jet is the sum of the individual particles divided into three part: charged par-890 ticles whose momenta are measured in the tracking detectors (providing a momentum 891 resolution as good as  $\sigma_{tracker} \sim 5 \cdot 10^{-6} p_T^2$ ), photons whose energies are best measured 892 in ECAL (with energy resolution typically of  $\sigma(E)/E \sim 0.16/\sqrt{E}$ ) and neutral hadrons 893 whose energy obtained from the HCAL (with energy resolution of  $\sigma(E)/E \sim 0.5/\sqrt{E}$ ). 894 Since the average jet energy content is of 65% from the charged track(s), 26% from the 895 photon(s) and 9% from neutral hadron(s), the HCAL which has the worst resolution 896 used to measure only less than 10% of the energy in the jet. Thus the energy resolution 897 of a jet can be as good as needed. Since  $\sigma(E)/E = a/sqrtE \oplus b/E \oplus c$  where a/sqrtE, 898 b/E and c are the stochastic response, electronic noise term and constant term caused 899 by dead material, the assumption that the constant term for ECAL and HCAL to be 1% 900 and 2% can be made (more dead zones in HCAL), while the noise term for ECAL and 901 HCAL assumed to be 0.3/E and 0.1/E (more electronics in ECAL). Taking the above 902 resolutions as hypothesis, one can see in Figure 5.1 and Figure 5.2 that the tracker mea-903 surement would only be beaten by calorimeters for particles above 500 and 700 GeV for 904 electrons and hadrons, which is not the case in 250 GeV  $e^+e^-$  colliders, see Figure 5.3. 905

#### 906 5.1.2 PandoraPFA

PandoraPFA has been created by Mark Thomson[45] after the 2005 Snowmass work whop on the Linear Collider. There are eight main steps to reconstruct particle flow in
 PandoraPFA:

1) Track topology Tracking is done separately in PandoraPFA, track topologies of neu trals in the detector volume are identified and classified according to their ways of de cays, and they are projected onto the front face of the ECAL.

2) Calorimeter Hit Selection and Ordering Isolated hits defined by proximity to oth ers in the calorimeter are removed at this stage, and the selected hits are stored with
 four-vector information after calibration, geometry, isolation, MIP identification and or dering.

3) Clustering Hits are either added to existing clusters (if a hit lies within the cone defined by existing cluster, and is suitably close) or they are used to seed new clusters (if the hit is unmatched) in this stage. This process starts at innermost layers and works outward, considering each calorimeter hit in turn. In order to follow tracks in the calorimeters, the algorithm clusters are assigned a direction (or potentially directions) in which they are propagating.



**Figure 5.1:** The energy resolution of TPC, ECAL and HCAL at different energy (for a direction perpendicular to the magnetic field).

4) Topological Cluster Merging Clusters which have not been identified as photons are
 associated together making use of high granularity for tight cluster association, or clear
 topologies.

5) **Statistical Re-clustering** For jets with energy higher than 50GeV, the performance degrades due to the increasing overlap between hadronic showers from different particles. If a significant discrepancy between the energy of a cluster and momentum of its associated track is identified, this stage is applied by altering clustering parameters, or changing clustering algorithm entirely, until cluster splits in such a way that sensible track-cluster associations are obtained.

6) Photon Identification and Recovery The tagging of photons is improved by applying
photon identification algorithm to the clusters and the cases where a primary photon is
merged with a hadronic shower from a charged particle are recovered.

7) **Fragment Removal** Relevant clusters are merged together in this stage by removing neutral clusters (no track-associations) that are really fragments of charged (trackassociated) clusters and merging them with the appropriate parent charged cluster.



**Figure 5.2:** The critical energy where the energy resolution of ECAL or HCAL is the same as TPC for different direction.

8) **Formation of Particle Flow Objects** The final stage of PandoraPFA is to build Particle Flow Objects (PFOs) from the results of the associated clustering combined with tracks. Relatively primitive particle identification is applied and the reconstructed PFOs, including four-momenta, are written out in LCIO(Linear Collider I/O)) format, which will be introduced in next section.

For R&D study in ILD, the JER got from Pandora can reach 3% for high energy jets, as shown in Figure 5.4.

#### 945 5.1.3 Arbor

Arbor algorithm is inspired by the fact that the shower spatial development follows the
topology of a tree.[49] With a granularity calorimeter, Arbor could efficiently separate
nearby particle showers and reconstruct the inner structure of a shower. Arbor also
maintains a high efficiency in collecting the shower hits or energy, which is appreciated
for the shower energy estimation.



**Figure 5.3:** Charged particle energy spectra for different physics processes with different final states: *ZH*, *WW*, *ZZ*, or 2 fermions events at center of mass 250 GeV

<sup>951</sup> The steps to reconstruct particle flow in Arbor is:

1) Hits Connecting After necessary hit cleaning, if the distance between any pair of
hits is smaller than a given threshold, a local connector is build. The connector is an
orientated arrow which links a pair of hits and ends at the hit with larger transverse
distance to the origin.

2) **Clean Connectors** After the first step, there can be multiple connectors end or begin at a given hit. Using the directions and length of these connectors as well as the spatial position of the hit, a reference direction can be calculated. From all the connectors ending at this hit, Arbor keeps at most one connector that has the minimal angle to the reference direction. Therefore, no loop structure will be kept after the cleaning and a tree structure based on the connectors emerges.

3) Iteration New connectors can be added according to the relative positions between
hits as well as their reference directions, and the set of connectors can always be cleaned
with similar criteria. The purpose of the iteration is simply to find the best connector
configurations, in the sense that every branch should be as smooth as possible and al-



**Figure 5.4:** Jet Energy Resolution (JER) of PandoraPFA for various angles and energies for ILC using  $Z \rightarrow uds$  samples. For  $\cos(\theta) < 0.95$  and energy > 45 GeV, it meets the requirement of separating W and Z bosons. The JER is expressed in RMS<sub>90</sub>, the RMS in the smallest range of reconstructed energy which contains 90% of the events.

<sup>966</sup> lowance for long connectors.

4) Clustering After the last step the tree structure is built and decoupled into sets of
 branches. The topology of each cluster is used in a pre-identification.

<sup>969</sup> 5) **Building Particle Flow Objects** The final stage is to build Particle Flow Objects <sup>970</sup> (PFOs) from the results of the associated clustering combined with tracks, similar as <sup>971</sup> for PandoraPFA.

- <sup>972</sup> The performance of Arbor PFA can be revealed in two aspects:
- The separation performance, i.e., to successfully reconstruct nearby incident particle.
- The jet reconstruction performance.

As shown in Figure. 5.5 and Figure 5.6, Arbor could efficiently separate nearby particle
 showers and reconstruct the inner structure of the shower. For physics events with only
 two jets, the boson mass could be measured to a relative accuracy better than 4% at
 CEPC reference detectors.



**Figure 5.5:** Reconstruction efficiency depending on distance of the di-photon system. The different lines corresponds to different ECAL cell sizes. The efficiency is defined as the probability of successfully reconstructing two photons with anticipated energy and incident positions.

BMR(Boson Mass Resolution), the resolution of the mass of Higgs boson in  $\nu\nu\mu H$  with  $H \rightarrow qq$  events is used as a standard expression of performance in CEPC. In order to focus on the performance of the detectors or reconstructions, the events with ISR photons, with neutrinos from Higgs, or with jets shooting to the endcaps are not taken into account. As shown in Figure 5.7.



**Figure 5.6:** Reconstructed boson masses from cleanned  $\nu\nu$  events ,  $l\nu qq$  events and  $\nu\nu H$  with  $H \rightarrow qq$  events. Here only events with final state jets to be fragmented from either light flavor quarks or gluons are taken into account. The events with ISR are also excluded.



**Figure 5.7:** Reconstructed boson masses from  $\nu\nu\mu$  with  $H \rightarrow qq$  events depending on  $P_t$  of ISR,  $P_t$  of Higgs decayed neutrino, and  $\cos\theta$  where  $\theta$  is the maximum angle of the jet direction. The dashed line shows the event selection for BMR.

#### 985 **5.2 Tools**

#### 986 5.2.1 LCIO[3]

LCIO (Linear Collider Input/Output) is a persistence framework and event data model for linear collider detector studies. It is intended to be used in both simulation studies and analysis frameworks. Its lightweight and portability make it also suitable for use in detector R&D testbeam applications. It provides a C++ and a Java implementation with a common interface (API): a Fortran interface to the C++ the implementation also exists.

<sup>992</sup> Using a common persistence format and event data model allows to easily share results
<sup>993</sup> and compare reconstruction algorithms. LCIO is used by almost all groups involved in
<sup>994</sup> linear collider detector studies and thus has become a de facto standard.

#### 995 5.2.2 Simulation

The tool applied in this report for simulation is MOKKA[51], based on GEANT4[52]. 996 In order to run Mokka, the first step is to set up the environment parameters, defining 997 the global environment variables such as the working directory, where GEANT4 is in-998 stalled, the implementation of the Mokka database, the installation of LICO and GEAR, 999 as well as the shared libraries path to be scanned when running Mokka. After Mokka 1000 is built, a steering file containing the information of the simulation should be prepared. 1001 This file defines the database and user to obtain the geometry information, the output 1002 files, the Macro file to give commands, detector mode (one can change the geometry of 1003 detector by removing subdetectors) and so on. The physics list (see GEANT4) is also 1004 chosen in this file, which is used to describe the modeling of the interaction of high 1005 energy hadrons, here QGSP. In the Macro file, the information of the particles can be 1006 generated from particle gun (where the particle type, position, direction, smearing and 1007 others are set) or by events generated from elsewhere (from HEPevt input file), the en-1008 ergy and events number of simulation are also defined in this file. 1009

#### <sup>1010</sup> 5.2.3 Marlin Framework[4]

The software tool used for full simulation is Mokka, based on Geant4, which can write an LCIO file defining the parameters for subdetectors. After the generation of the events, and the simulation of the detector response using MOKKA, reconstruction software is used to reconstruct and analyze the events. In order to identify individual particles, new tools for reconstruction are required.

Marlin(Modular Analysis and Reconstruction for the LINear collider) is a modular C++ 1016 application framework for ILC detector reconstruction and analysis LCIO data. Marlin 1017 is first configured by an XML steering file containing parameters defined for individual 1018 processors or globally, the order in which the processors are called and the conditions 1019 applied to Processors (plug-in modules that can be loaded at runtime to implement 1020 some core functionality) evaluating with the runtime. The LCIO files, which contain 1021 data such as hits, tracks, and clusters, will be used by processors according to the need 1022 for reconstruction. 1023

#### **1024** 5.3 Detector optimization

The optimization of detectors for CEPC and ILC is a balance between the budget and the performance. In this section, two examples of optimization using the tools above will be shown.

#### <sup>1028</sup> 5.3.1 ECAL optimization

The cost of detectors for CEPC and ILC is always a matter to consider. Therefore op-1029 timization is ongoing to reduce the price and mantain good performance at the same 1030 time. The ECAL is the major cost of ILD, because of the high price of silicon wafers. 1031 This provides options to optimize, such as the inner radius of ECAL, the number of Si 1032 layers in the ECAL, etc. In this section, the performances of modified detector with a 1033 reduced radius and number of Si layers in ECAL is studied. The detector model used 1034 here is an ILD detector with the TPC radius reduced from 1800 to 1400mm (the length 1035 is modified accordingly), and the ECAL layer number reduced from 30 layers to 26/201036 layers. The total absorber thickness, the ratio of W thickness between inner and outer 1037 absorber layers, carbon fiber, cooling layers, Si thickness, etc., remain the same for the 1038 three models. The  $Z \rightarrow qq$  events with the centre of mass energy range from 91GeV 1039 to 500GeV are generated and reconstructed with PandoraPFA, after calibration to set 1040 the digitization constant depending on different sampling fraction in the ECAL of each 1041 model. The resolution is expressed with RMS90, defined as the RMS in the smallest 1042range of reconstructed energy which contains 90% of the events, in order to handle 1043 properly the non-Gaussian energy distribution with a tail corresponding to the pop-1044 ulation of events where the confusion is significant. As shown in Figure 5.8, the JER 1045 increases 10% to 91 GeV di-jets and less than 5% for 100 GeV di-jets by decreasing the 1046 number of Si layers from 30 to 20. At the 250GeV  $e^+e^-$  colliers the typical jet energy is 1047 less than 70GeV, as shown in Figure 5.9, corresponding to the 91 GeV di-jets. 1048

<sup>1049</sup> A comparison with Arbor using the invariant mass resolution of 250GeV  $\nu\nu gg$  events is



**Figure 5.8:** JER comparison for different jets energy in function of layer numbers, a cut  $|\cos(\theta_{jet})| < 0.7$  is applied to avoid the endcap area.



**Figure 5.9:** jet energy spectra for different physics processes with different final states: ZH or 4 fermions from W bosons or Z bosons decays, at center of mass 250 GeV

shown in Figure 5.10, with the resolution expressed in BMR and not only the number
of layers but also the ECAL cell size is taken into account. Since the total number of
readout will decrease with the cell size, the cooling system might be inactive if the cell
size enlarged. The events with ISR and events with jet direction to the endcaps are
excluded. It is shown that the degradations of performance using the two frameworks are similar to each other.



**Figure 5.10:** The invariant mass resolution of 250GeV  $\nu\nu gg$  events in CEPC for different number of ECAL layers and different ECAL cell sizes.

1055

#### **1056** 5.3.2 HCAL and B field optimization

For HCAL, the optimization is done for a reduced number of layers while the thickness of each layer remains the same. The B field is allowed to be reduced because of the high granularity. The  $\nu\nu gg$  events are generated in CEPC detector with HCAL layers range from 20 to 48 and B field to be (2.5T, 3.0T, 3.5T) and reconstructed with Arbor (v3.3). The resolution is expressed as the resolution of the reconstructed invariant mass, with final state jets from either light flavor quarks or gluons and the events with ISR excluded. As shown in Figure 5.11 and Figure 5.12, the resolution degrades by 0.1 while the number
of layers reduces from 48 to 20. This result also leaves an opportunity to degrade the
B field in CEPC to 3 Tesla, which is appreciated by the MDI and will be applied for
the baseline of CDR. In the new version of CEPC detector, the baseline of HCAL layer
number is chosen to be 40.



**Figure 5.11:** The invariant mass resolution of 250GeV  $\nu\nu gg$  events in CEPC for different number of HCAL layers.



**Figure 5.12:** The Higgs boson invariant mass for 250 GeV  $\nu\nu qq$  events, with different B fields and different HCAL layer numbers, comparing with the baseline geometry in preCDR. The last plot is the baseline for CDR.

## <sup>1068</sup> Chapter 6

## **Particle identification**

The lepton identification is essential to the precise Higgs boson measurements. The 1070 Standard Model Higgs boson has roughly 10% chance to decay into final states with 1071 leptons, for example,  $H \to WW^* \to ll\nu\nu/l\nu qq$ ,  $H \to ZZ^* \to llqq$ ,  $H \to \tau\tau$ ,  $H \to \mu\mu$ , etc. 1072 The SM Higgs also has a branching ratio  $Br(H \rightarrow bb) = 58\%$ , where the lepton identifica-1073 tion provides an important input for the jet flavor tagging and the jet charge measure-1074 ment. On top of that, the Higgs boson has a significant chance to be generated together 1075 with leptons. For example, in the ZH events, the leading Higgs generation process at 1076 240-250 GeV electron-positron collisions, about 7% of the Higgs bosons are generated 1077 together with a pair of leptons (  $Br(Z \rightarrow ee)$  and  $Br(Z \rightarrow \mu\mu) = 3.36\%$  ). At the electron-1078 positron collider, ZH events with Z decaying into a pair of leptons is regarded as the 1079 golden channel for the HZZ coupling and Higgs mass measurement[53]. Furthermore, 1080 leptons are intensively used as a trigger signal for the proton colliders to pick up the 1081 physics events from the huge QCD backgrounds. 1082

#### **1083** 6.1 Detector geometry and sample

<sup>1084</sup> In this section, the reference geometry is the CEPC conceptual detector [18], which is <sup>1085</sup> developed from the ILD geometry.

<sup>1086</sup> To study the lepton identification performance, we simulated single particle samples

<sup>1087</sup> (pion+, muon-, and electron-) over an energy range of 1-120 GeV (1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 10, 20, 30,

<sup>1088</sup> 40, 50, 70, 120 GeV). At each energy point,100k events are simulated for each particle

type. These samples follow a flat distribution in theta and phi over the  $4\pi$  solid angle.

<sup>1090</sup> These samples are reconstructed with Arbor (version 3.3). To disentangle the lepton

<sup>1091</sup> identification performance from the effect of PFA reconstruction and geometry defects, <sup>1092</sup> we select those events where only one charged particle is reconstructed. The total num-<sup>1093</sup> ber of these events is recorded as  $N_{1Particle,}$  and the number of these events identified <sup>1094</sup> with correct particle types is recorded as  $N_{1Particle,T}$ . The performance of lepton identifi-<sup>1095</sup> cation is then expressed as a migration matrix in Table 6.1, its diagonal elements  $\epsilon_i^i$  refer <sup>1096</sup> to the identification efficiencies (defined as  $N_{1Particle,T}/N_{1Particle}$ ), and the off diagonal <sup>1097</sup> element  $P_i^i$  represent the probability of a type *i* particle to be mis-identified as type *j*.

	$e^{-}like$	$\mu^{-}like$	$\pi^+ like$	undefined
$e^-$	$\epsilon^e_e$	$P^e_\mu$	$P_{\pi}^{e}$	$P^e_{und}$
$\mu^-$	$P_e^{\mu}$	$\epsilon^{\mu}_{\mu}$	$P^{\mu}_{\pi}$	$P^{\mu}_{und}$
$\pi^+$	$P_e^{\pi}$	$P_{\mu}^{\pi}$	$\epsilon^{\pi}_{\pi}$	$P_{und}^{\pi}$

Table 6.1: Migration Matrix

#### <sup>1098</sup> 6.2 Discriminant variables and the output likelihoods

LICH takes individual reconstructed charged particles as input, extracts 24 discriminant variables for the lepton identification, and calculates the corresponding likelihood to be an electron or a muon. These discriminant variables can be characterized into five different classes:

• **dE/dx** 

For a track in the TPC, the distribution of energy loss per unit distance follows a Landau distribution. The dE/dx estimator used here is the average of this value but after cutting tails at the two edges of the Landau distribution (first 7% and last 30%). The dE/dx has a strong discriminant power to distinguish electron tracks from others at low energy (under 10 GeV) (Figure 6.1).

• Fractal Dimension

The fractal dimension (FD) of a shower is used to describe the self-similar behavior of shower spatial configurations, following the original definition in [54], the fractal dimension is directly linked to the compactness of the particle shower. The FD of a shower is expressed as  $FD_{\beta} = \langle log()R_{\alpha,\beta}/log\alpha \rangle + 1$  where  $R_{\alpha,\beta} = N_{\beta}/N_{\alpha}$ represents the ratio of the number of hits at different scales. Here  $\beta$  range from 10mm to 150mm and  $\alpha$  is 10mm.

At a fixed energy, the EM showers are much more compact than the muon or hadron shower, leading to a large FD. The muon shower usually takes the config-



**Figure 6.1:** dE/dx for  $e^-$ ,  $\mu^-$  and  $\pi^+$ , for electrons it is stable around  $2.4 \times 10^{-7}$ , for muon and pion it is smaller at energy lower than 10 GeV and after that they start mixing with electron

uration of a 1-dimensional MIP(Minimum Ionizing Particle) track, therefore has
 an FD close to zero. The FD of the hadronic shower usually lays between the EM
 and MIP tracks, since it contains both EM and MIP components. A typical dis tribution of F\_all (the fractal dimension using both ECAL and HCAL) for 40 GeV
 showers is presented in Figure 6.2,

For any calorimeter cluster, LICH calculates 5 different FD values: from its ECAL hits, HCAL hits, hits in 10 or 20 first layers of ECAL, and all the calorimeter hits.



**Figure 6.2:** Fractal dimension using both ECAL and HCAL for  $e^-$ ,  $\mu^-$  and  $\pi^+$  at 40 GeV

#### • Energy Distribution

LICH builds variables out of the shower energy information, including the proportion of energy deposited in the first 10 layers in ECAL to the entire ECAL, or the energy deposited in a cylinder around the incident direction with a radius of 1 and 1.5 Moliere radius.

#### • Hit Information

Hits information refers to the number of hits in ECAL and HCAL and some other
information obtained from hits, such as the number of ECAL (HCAL) layers hit
by the shower, number of hits in the first 10 layers of ECAL.

#### • Shower Shape, Spatial Information

The spatial variables include the maximum distance between a hit and the extrapolated track, the maximum distance and average distance between shower hits and the axis of the shower (defined by the innermost point and the center of gravity of the shower), the depth (perpendicular to the detector layers) of the center of gravity, and the depth of the shower defined as the depth between the innermost hit and the outermost hit.

The correlations of those variables at energy 40 GeV are summarized in Figure 6.4, the definitions of all the variables are:

- NH\_ECALF10: Number of hits in the first 10 layers of ECAL 1143 FD\_ECALL20: FD calculated using hits in the last 20 layers of ECAL 1144 FD\_ECALF10: FD calculated using hits in the first 10 layers of ECAL 1145 AL\_ECAL: Number of ECAL layer groups (every five layers forms a group) with 1146 hits 1147 av\_NHH: Average number of hits in each HCAL layer groups (every five layers 1148 forms a group) 1149 rms\_Hcal: The RMS of hits in each HCAL layer groups (every five layers forms a 1150 group) 1151 EEClu\_r: Energy deposited in a cylinder around the incident direction with a ra-1152dius of 1 Moliere radius 1153 • EEClu\_R: Energy deposited in a cylinder around the incident direction with a ra-1154dius of 1.5 Moliere radius 1155 EEClu\_L10: Energy deposited in the first 10 layers of ECAL 1156 MaxDisHel: Maximum distance between a hit and the helix 1157 minDepth: Depth of the innermost hit 1158 cluDepth: Depth of the cluster position 1159
- graDepth: Depth of the cluster gravity center
- EcalEn: Energy deposited in ECAL
- avDisHtoL: Average distance between a hit to the axis from the innermost hit and

1163	the g	gravity	center
------	-------	---------	--------

- maxDisHtoL: Maximum distance between a hit to the axis from the innermost hit and the gravity center
- NLHcal: Number of HCAL layers with hits
- NLEcal: Number of ECAL layers with hits
- HcalNHit: Number of HCAL hits
- EcalNHit: Number of ECAL hits

<sup>1170</sup> The distribution of all the variables used in TMVA are shown in Figure 6.3

<sup>1171</sup> It is clear that the dE/dx, measured from tracks, does not correlate with any other vari-<sup>1172</sup> ables which are measured from calorimeters. Some of the variables are highly corre-<sup>1173</sup> lated, such as FD\_ECAL (FD calculated from ECAL hits) and EcalNHit (number of <sup>1174</sup> ECAL hits). However, all these variables are kept because their correlations change <sup>1175</sup> with energy and polar angle.

LICH uses TMVA[22] methods to combine these input variables into two likelihoods, corresponding to electrons and muons. Multiple TMVA methods have been tested and the Boosted Decision Trees with Gradient boosting (BDTG) method is chosen for its better performance. The e-likeness ( $L_e$ ) and  $\mu$ -likeness ( $L_{\mu}$ ) for different particles in a 40 GeV sample are shown in Figure 6.5.

<sup>1181</sup> The overtraining check of Muon BDT response at 40GeV is shown in 6.6 as an example.

<sup>1182</sup> The weight of the 24 variables varies with different energies, at 2GeV the 5 most impor-

tant variables are: dE/dx, cluDepth, EcalNHit, E\_r, and maxDisHtoL, while at 40GeV

the 5 most important variables are: E\_10, FD\_all, NLEcal, EcalNHit, and avDisHtoL.

Taking the 5 GeV energy point as an example, the charged particle identification effi-

ciency for 15, 10, 5 variables are shown in Table 6.2.

**Table 6.2:** The efficiency of charged particle identification at 40 GeV (%), training with different number of variables

Number of variables	5	10	15	24
<i>e</i> <sup>-</sup>	96.3	98.3	98.7	99.7
$\mu^-$	97.1	99.2	99.2	99.9
$\pi^+$	94.7	97.7	98.2	99.3



Figure 6.3: Calorimeter based variables used in TMVA (40GeV) (to be continued)



Figure 6.3: Calorimeter based variables used in TMVA (40GeV)



Figure 6.4: The correlation matrix of all the variables

#### **1187** 6.3 Performance on single particle events

The phase space spanned by the lepton-likelihoods ( $L_e$  and  $L_\mu$ ) can be separated into different domains, corresponding to different catalogs of particles. The domains for particles of different types can be adjusted according to physics requirements. In this paper, we demonstrate the lepton identification performance on single particle samples using the following catalogs:

- Muon:  $L_{\mu} > 0.5$
- Electron:  $L_e > 0.5$
- Pion:  $1-(L_{\mu}+L_e) > 0.5$
- Undefined:  $L_{\mu} < 0.5 \& L_e < 0.5 \& 1 (L_{\mu} + L_e) < 0.5$

The probabilities of undefined particles are very low ( $<10^{-3}$ ) at single particle samples with the above catalog.

<sup>1199</sup> Since the distribution of these variables depends on the polar angle of the initial particle



**Figure 6.5:** The e-likeliness and  $\mu$ -likeness of  $e^-$ ,  $\mu^-$  and  $\pi^+$  at 40 GeV, grey lines are the cuts for different catalogs in next section



**Figure 6.6:** Muon BDT response of  $e^-$ ,  $\mu^-$  and  $\pi^+$  at 40GeV (training and test samples)

 $_{1200}$  ( $\theta$ ), the TMVA is trained independently on four subsets:

- **barrel 1**: middle of barrel ( $|\cos \theta| < 0.3$ ),
- **barrel 2**: edge of barrel  $(0.3 < |\cos \theta| < 0.7)$ ,

• overlap: overlap region of barrel and endcap  $(0.7 < |\cos \theta| < 0.8)$ ,

• endcap:  $(0.8 < |\cos \theta| < 0.98)$ .

Take the sample of 40 GeV charged particle as an example, the migration matrix is shown in Table 6.3. Comparing this table to the result of ALEPH for energetic taus[55], the efficiencies are improved, and the mis-identification rates from hadrons to leptons are significantly reduced.

Туре	$e^{-}like$	$\mu^{-}like$	$\pi^+ like$
$e^-$	$99.71\pm0.08$	< 0.07	$0.21\pm0.07$
$\mu^-$	< 0.07	$99.87 \pm 0.08$	$0.05\pm0.05$
$\pi^+$	$0.14 \pm 0.05$	$0.35 \pm 0.08$	$99.26 \pm 0.12$

**Table 6.3:** Migration Matrix at 40 GeV (%)

The lepton identification efficiencies (diagonal terms of the migration matrix) at dif-1209 ferent energies are presented in Figure 6.7 for the different regions. The identification 1210 efficiencies saturate at 99.9% for particles with energy higher than 2 GeV. For those with 1211 energy lower than 2 GeV, the performance drops significantly, especially in **barrel2** and 1212 **overlap** regions. For the overlap region, the complex geometry limits the performance; 1213 while for the **barrel2** region, charged particles with Pt < 0.97 GeV cannot reach the bar-1214 rel, they will eventually hit the endcaps at large incident angle, hence their signal is 1215 more difficult to catalog. 1216

Concerning the off-diagonal terms of the migration matrix, the chances of electrons to 1217 be mis-identified as muons and pions are negligible ( $P_{\mu}^{e}, P_{\pi}^{e} < 10^{-3}$ ), the crosstalk rate 1218  $P_e^{\mu}$  is observed at even lower level. However, the chances of pions to be mis-identified 1219 as leptons  $(P_e^{\pi}, P_{\mu}^{\pi})$  are of the order of 1% and are energy dependent. In fact, these 1220 mis-identifications are mainly induced by the irreducible physics effects: pion decay 1221 and  $\pi^0$  generation via  $\pi$ -nucleon collision. Meanwhile, the muons also have a small 1222 chance to be mis-identified as pions at energy smaller than 2 GeV. Figure 6.8 shows the 1223 significant crosstalk items ( $P_e^{\pi}$ ,  $P_{\mu}^{\pi}$  and  $P_{\pi}^{\mu}$ ) as a function of the particle energy in the 1224 endcap region. The green shaded band indicates the probability of pion decay before 1225reaching the calorimeter, which is roughly comparable with  $P_{\mu}^{\pi}$ . 1226



**Figure 6.7:** The efficiency of lepton identification for  $e^-$ ,  $\mu^-$  and  $\pi^+$  as function of particle energy in the four regions



**Figure 6.8:** The mis-identification rates of lepton identification for  $\mu$  and  $\pi$  in ~ 5000 events for the endcap region; Pion decay rate band (to account for the polar angle spread) is indicated for comparison

## 6.4 Lepton identification performance on single particle events for different geometries

The power consumption and electronic cost of the calorimeter system scale with the number of readout channels. It's important to evaluate the physics performance of different calorimeter granularities, at which the LICH performance is analyzed.

<sup>1232</sup> The performance is scanned over certain ranges of the following parameters:

- the number of layers in ECAL, taking the value of 20, 26, 30 (total absorber thickness unchanged);
- the number of layers in HCAL: 20, 30, 40, 48 (absorber thickness of each layer unchanged);
- the ECAL cell size =  $5 \times 5 \text{ mm}^2$ ,  $10 \times 10 \text{ mm}^2$ ,  $20 \times 20 \text{ mm}^2$ ,  $40 \times 40 \text{ mm}^2$

• HCAL cell size =  $10 \times 10 \text{ mm}^2$ ,  $20 \times 20 \text{ mm}^2$ ,  $40 \times 40 \text{ mm}^2$ ,  $60 \times 60 \text{ mm}^2$ ,  $80 \times 80 \text{ mm}^2$ 

In general, the lepton identification performance is extremely stable over the scanned parameter space. Only for HCAL cell size larger than  $60 \times 60 \text{ mm}^2$  or HCAL layer number less than 20, marginal performance degradation is observed: the efficiency of identifying muons degrades by 1-2% for low energy particles (E  $\leq$  2 GeV), and the identification efficiency of pion degrades slightly over the full energy range, see Figure 6.9 to Figure 6.12.



Figure 6.9: The efficiency of lepton identification for different ECAL layer number



Figure 6.10: The efficiency of lepton identification for different ECAL cell size



Figure 6.11: The efficiency of lepton identification for different HCAL layer number


Figure 6.12: The efficiency of lepton identification for different HCAL cell size

### **6.5** Performance on physics events

The Higgs boson is mainly generated through the Higgsstrahlung process (ZH) and 1246 more marginally through vector boson fusion processes at electron-positron Higgs fac-1247 tories. A significant part of the Higgs bosons will be generated together with a pair of 1248 leptons (electrons and muons). These leptons are generated from the Z boson decay of 1249 the ZH process. For the electrons, they can also be generated together with the Higgs 1250boson in the Z boson fusions events, see Figure 6.13. At the CEPC,  $3.6 \times 10^4 \ \mu\mu$ H events 1251and  $3.9 \times 10^4$  eeH events are expected at an integrated luminosity of 5 ab<sup>-1</sup>. In these 1252events, the particles are rather isolated. 1253



**Figure 6.13:** Feynman diagrams of major Higgs production with leptons at CEPC: the Higgsstrahlung and ZZ fusion processes.

The eeH and  $\mu\mu$ H events provide an excellent access to the model-independent measurement to the Higgs boson using the recoil mass method [53]. The recoil mass spectrum of eeH and  $\mu\mu$ H events is shown in Figure 6.14, which exhibits a high energy tail induced by the radiation effects (ISR, FSR, bremsstrahlung), while in CEPC the beamstrahlung effect is negligible. The bremsstrahlung effects for the muons are significantly smaller than that for the electrons, therefore, it has a higher maximum and a smaller tail.

Figure 6.15 shows the energy spectrum for all the reconstructed charged particles in 10k eeH/ $\mu\mu$ H events. The leptons could be classified into 2 classes, the initial leptons (those generated together with the Higgs boson) and those generated from the Higgs boson decay cascade. For the eeH events, the energy spectrum of the initial electron exhibits a small peak at low energy, corresponding to the Z fusion events. The precise identification of these initial leptons is the key physics objective for the lepton identification performance of the detector.

<sup>1267</sup> Since the lepton identification performance depends on the particle energy, and most of <sup>1268</sup> the initial leptons have an energy higher than 20 GeV, we focused on the performance



**Figure 6.14:** The recoil mass spectrum of  $ee/\mu\mu$ 



**Figure 6.15:** Energy Spectrum of charged particles in eeH and  $\mu\mu H$  event at 250 GeV center of mass energy, low energy peak in eeH corresponds to the Z fusion events

	Geom 1 (ECA	AL and HCAL	Geom 2 (ECAL and HCAL		
	Cell Size 1	$0 \times 10 \ mm^2$ )	Cell Size $20 \times 20 mm^2$ )		
	$\mu\mu$ H	eeH	$\mu\mu$ H	eeH	
$\mu$ definition	$L_{\mu}$ >0.1	$L_{\mu} > 0.1$	$L_{\mu}$ >0.1	$L_{\mu}$ >0.1	
e definition	$L_e > 0.01 L_{\mu} < 0.1$	$L_e$ >0.001 $L_\mu$ <0.1	$L_e > 0.01 L_{\mu} < 0.1$	$L_e$ >0.001 $L_\mu$ <0.1	
$\varepsilon_e$	$93.41 \pm 0.92$	$98.64 \pm 0.08$	$91.60 \pm 1.02$	$97.89 \pm 0.11$	
$\eta_e$	$92.02 \pm 1.00$	$99.74 \pm 0.04$	$89.89 \pm 1.10$	$99.67 \pm 0.04$	
$\varepsilon_{\mu}$	$99.54 \pm 0.05$	$95.53 \pm 0.76$	$99.19 \pm 0.06$	$86.48 \pm 1.26$	
$\eta_{\mu}$	$99.60 \pm 0.04$	$96.31 \pm 0.70$	$99.83 \pm 0.03$	$95.38 \pm 0.81$	
$\overline{\varepsilon_{event}}$	$98.53 \pm 0.13$	$97.06\pm0.19$	$97.24 \pm 0.18$	$95.40\pm0.24$	

**Table 6.4:**  $\mu\mu$ H/eeH events lepton identification efficiency ( $\varepsilon$ ) and purity ( $\eta$ ) (for leptons with erergy > 20GeV)

study of lepton identification on these high energy particles at detectors with two dif-ferent sets of calorimeter cell sizes.

The  $\mu$ -likeliness and e-likeliness of electrons, muons, and pions, for eeH events and 1271 $\mu\mu$ H events are shown in Figure 6.16 and Figure 6.17. Table 6.4 summarizes the defi-1272nition of leptons and the corresponding performance under different conditions. The 1273 identification efficiencies for the initial leptons are degraded by 1-2% with respect to 1274the single particle case. This degradation is mainly caused by the shower overlap, and 1275is much more significant for electrons as electron showers are much wider than that of 1276muon, leading to a larger chance of overlapping. The electrons in  $\mu\mu$ H events and vice 1277 versa are generated in the Higgs decay. Their identification efficiency and purity still 1278 remain at a reasonable level. For charged leptons with energy lower than 20 GeV, the 1279performance degrades by about 10% because of the high statistics of background and 1280 the cluster overlap, as shown in Table 6.5. The event identification efficiency, which is 1281 defined as the chance of successfully identifying both initial leptons, is presented in the 1282 last row of Table 6.4. The event identification efficiencies are roughly the square of the 1283 identification efficiency of the initial leptons. Comparing the performance of both ge-1284 ometries, it is shown that when the number of readout channels is reduced by 3/4, the 1285 event reconstruction efficiency is degraded by 1.3% and 1.7%, for  $\mu\mu$ H and eeH events 1286 respectively. 1287

# 1288 6.6 Conclusion

The high granularity calorimeter is a promising technology for detectors in collider facilities of the High Energy Frontiers. It provides good separation between different final state particles, which is essential for the PFA reconstructions. It also records the shower



**Figure 6.16:** e-likelihood and  $\mu$ -likelihood of charged particles with different energy bins in eeH event



**Figure 6.17:** e-likelihood and  $\mu$ -likelihood of charged particles with different energy bins in  $\mu\mu$ H event

	5GeV < Er	n < 20GeV	En < 5GeV		
	$\mu\mu H$	eeH	$\mu\mu H$	eeH	
$\mu$ definition	$L_{\mu}$ >0.1	$L_{\mu} > 0.1$	$L_{\mu}$ >0.1	$L_{\mu}$ >0.1	
e definition	$L_e > 0.001 L_{\mu} < 0.1$				
$\varepsilon_e$	$91.30\pm0.71$	$92.52 \pm 0.52$	$94.86 \pm 0.29$	$95.31 \pm 0.27$	
$\eta_e$	$70.24 \pm 0.92$	$80.22\pm0.65$	$81.90 \pm 0.47$	$79.27 \pm 0.47$	
$\varepsilon_{\mu}$	$79.92 \pm 0.99$	$79.89 \pm 1.02$	$60.78 \pm 0.95$	$61.11\pm0.98$	
$\eta_{\mu}$	$82.25\pm0.96$	$81.69 \pm 0.99$	$22.73 \pm 0.49$	$22.42\pm0.50$	

Table 6.5:	$\mu\mu$ H/eeH	H events lep	oton ide	ntification	efficiency	γ (ε) an	nd purity	$(\eta)$ (fo	or leptons	with
erergy < 20	)GeV)									

spatial development and energy profile to an unprecedented level of details, which canbe used for the energy measurement and particle identifications.

To exploit the capability of lepton identification with high granularity calorimeters and 1294 also to provide a viable toolkit for the future Higgs factories, LICH, a TMVA based 1295 lepton identification package dedicated to high granular calorimeter, has been devel-1296 oped. Using mostly the shower description variables extracted from the high granu-1297 larity calorimeter and also the dE/dx information measured from tracker, LICH calcu-1298 lates the e-likeness and  $\mu$ -likeness for each individually reconstructed charged particle. 1299 Based on these output likelihoods, the leptons can be identified according to different 1300 physics requirement. 1301

Applied to single particle samples simulated with the CEPC\_v1 detector geometry, the 1302 typical identification efficiency for electron and muon is higher than 99.5% for ener-1303 gies higher than 2 GeV. For pions, the efficiency is reaching 98%. These efficiencies are 1304 comparable to the performance reached by ALEPH, while the mis-identification rates 1305 are significantly improved. Ultimately, the performances are limited by the irreducible 1306 confusions, in the sense that the chance for muon to be mis-identified as electron and 1307 vice versa is negligible, the mis-identification of pion to muon is dominated by the pion 1308 decay. 1309

The tested geometry uses an ultra-high granularity calorimeter: the cell size is 1 by 1 cm<sup>2</sup> and the layer number of ECAL/HCAL is 30/48. In order to reduce the total channel number, LICH is applied to a much more modest granularity, it is found that the lepton identification performance degrades only at particle energies lower than 2 GeV for an HCAL cell size bigger than  $60 \times 60$  mm<sup>2</sup> or with an HCAL layer number less than 20.

The lepton identification performance of LICH is also tested on the most important physics events at CEPC. In these events, multiple final state particles could be produced in a single collision, the particle identification performance will potentially be degraded by the overlap between nearby particles. The lepton identification on  $eeH/\mu\mu$ H event at 250 GeV collision energy has been checked. The efficiency for a single lepton identification is consistent with the single particle results. The efficiency of finding two leptons decreases by  $1\sim2$  % when the cell size doubles, which means that the detector needs  $2\sim4\%$  more statistics in the running. In eeH events, the performance degrades because the clustering algorithm still needs to be optimized.

To conclude, ultra-high granularity calorimeter designed for ILC provides excellent lep ton identification ability, for operation close to ZH threshold. It may be a slight overkill
 for CEPC and a slightly reduced granularity can reach a better compromise. And LICH,

<sup>1327</sup> the dedicated lepton identification for future e+e- Higgs factory, is prepared.

# 328 Chapter 7

# Measurement of $H \rightarrow \tau \tau$ Branching Ratio

### **1331** 7.1 Introduction

In this chapter, the Higgs boson decaying into tau lepton pairs will be discussed. After  $\tau$ lepton was discovered in the 1970s at SLAC, its properties have been studied in several experiments and projects. The world average for the  $\tau$  mass is  $1776.86 \pm 0.12 MeV$ , and the average for the  $\tau$  lifetime is  $290.3 \pm 0.5 fs$ [21]. As the heaviest SM lepton,  $\tau$  has a larger coupling to Higgs than  $\mu$  or e, i.e., a larger cross section, which makes  $H \rightarrow \tau \tau$ channel a tool to test the Higgs properties and search for new physics at higher scales.

#### 1338 7.1.1 au physics

**QCD** The mass of  $\tau$  is heavy enough to decay to hadrons, this turns out to be useful for studying strong interaction effects at low energies. This makes the  $\tau$  useful as a probe for QCD and many electroweak phenomena. Decays including strangeness enable measurements of the mass of the strange quark and the CKM matrix element  $V_{us}$ [56].

The polarity and spin are measured in hadronic decay with a better precision than in the case of leptonic decays. In leptonic decays, one cannot reconstruct the direction of the polarimeter vector, the polarization measurement cannot be performed with the full sensitivity of the polarimeter. The polarization vector can be reconstructed for the hadronic decays in one or two pions and so the angle between the polarization vector and the  $\tau$  direction can be measured. A measurement of the distribution will then allow conclusions on the  $\tau$  polarization. Leptonic decay The leptonic decays of the  $\tau$  lepton probe the structure of the weak currents and the universality of their couplings to gauge boson. One of the basic ideas in the SM is that all lepton doublets have identical couplings to the Z and W bosons. Comparing the measured decay widths of leptonic or semi-leptonic decays which only differ in the  $\tau$  decay, one can test experimentally that the interaction is indeed the same, i.e., that  $g_e = g_\mu = g_\tau \equiv g[57, 58]$ .

**New physics** The  $\tau$  is also an important probe to the new physics, by observing the coupling constants deviation from the Standard Model prediction or exploring lepton flavor violating  $\tau$  decay. A few samples are heavy scalar resonances decaying to a  $\tau$ lepton pair and charged Higgs bosons decays predicted in the MSSM[59]. In the HH searches, the H $\rightarrow \tau\tau$  decay channel is one of the most sensitive to both SM and many BSM production modes[60]. Besides, differences in the  $\tau^+$  and  $\tau^-$  lifetimes would indicate the violation of CPT[61].

**B physics** The  $\tau$  lepton could also be used also a probe of some particular process where heavy meson decays into final states containing  $\tau$  leptons[62]. Decays such as  $B^- \rightarrow \tau^- \bar{\nu}_{\tau}$ ,  $B \rightarrow D^* \tau^- \bar{\nu}_{\tau}$ ,  $B_c^- \rightarrow \tau^- \bar{\nu}_{\tau}$  or  $D_s^- \rightarrow \tau^- \bar{\nu}_{\tau}$  involve the heaviest elementary fermions that can be directly produced at flavor factories, providing important information about the underlying dynamics mediating these processes.

Higgs measurement[63, 64] The  $\tau$  is the heaviest SM lepton, which leads to a large coupling to Higgs, i.e. a significant fraction of the SM Higgs boson decays into  $\tau\tau$  final states. This makes it possible to measure  $g(H \to \tau\tau)$  with a better accuracy.

As one of the most important channel in the future  $e^+e^-$  Higgs factory,  $H \rightarrow \tau \tau$  channel performance also provides evidence for detector optimization and the PFA developments. The requirement to separate photons and hadrons decayed from  $\tau$  should be satisfied by a relatively high granularity and an efficient PFA. On the other hand, to distinguish different  $\tau$  decay modes, the PFA should provide reasonable particle identification.

#### 1377 7.1.2 au decay modes

The leptonic decay of  $\tau$  lepton follows  $\tau^- \rightarrow \nu_{\tau} l^- \bar{\nu}_l$ , with  $l = e, \mu$ . These two neutrinos make it difficult to reconstruct the  $\tau$  mass. In the hadronic decays, only one neutrino is involved, its direction can thus be reconstructed by measuring all other decay products. This is not used in this thesis, but can be a continuetion to the studies. The hadronic decay of  $\tau$  lepton can be classified in:

• final state without photon:  $\tau^- \rightarrow \nu_{\tau} h^-$ , with  $h = \pi, K$ 

• final state with two photons dominated by  $\rho$  production:  $\tau^- \rightarrow \nu_\tau \rho^- \rightarrow \nu_\tau \pi^- \pi^0$ and  $\pi^0 \rightarrow \gamma \gamma$ 

• final state with four photons dominated by  $a_1^-$  production:  $\tau^- \to \nu_\tau a_1^- \to \nu_\tau \pi^- 2\pi^0$ and  $\pi^0 \to \gamma \gamma$ .

The branching ratio of these dominant  $\tau$  decay modes [21] is shown in table 7.1.

**Table 7.1:**  $\tau^-$  decay modes and branching fraction (%). The first five decay modes with only one track in final state are called "1-prong", and the decay modes with three track in final state are "3-prong" decay

$e^-\bar{\nu}_e\nu_{\tau}$	$17.82\pm0.04$
$\mu^- \bar{ u}_\mu  u_ au$	$17.39\pm0.04$
$\pi^-  u_{ au}$	$10.82\pm0.05$
$\pi^-\pi^0 u_ au$	$25.49\pm0.09$
$\pi^{-}2\pi^{0}\nu_{\tau}$	$9.26\pm0.10$
$\pi^-\pi^+\pi^-\nu_\tau$	$9.31\pm0.05$
others	< 10



**Figure 7.1:** Feynman diagram for  $\tau \rightarrow \nu_{\tau} X$  decay modes

The topology of  $\tau$  in the high granular detector is shown in the event display in Figure 7.2.

As shown in the event display, the  $\tau$  decay in high energy colliders is tightly collimated and low multiplicity, which provide excellent signatures to probe.



**Figure 7.2:** Event display of a  $\mu\mu\tau\tau$  event with one  $\tau \to e^-\bar{\nu}_e\nu_{\tau}$  and the other  $\tau \to \pi^-\nu_{\tau}$  (up) and a  $qq\tau\tau$  event with one  $\tau \to e^-\bar{\nu}_e\nu_{\tau}$  and the other  $\tau \to \pi^-\pi^+\pi^-\nu_{\tau}$  (down) at CEPC (reconstructed with Arbor)

#### <sup>1393</sup> 7.1.3 Measurements and precisions

The deviation of coupling constants from the Standard Model prediction to new physics 1394 beyond the Standard Model depends on the new physics model, and this deviation is 1395 estimated to be 1% level by many models proposed. At the LHC, the process of the 1396 Higgs boson decaying into tau pairs will be measured using proton–proton collision. 1397This decay has been studied by the ATLAS and the CMS experiments, who reported a 1398 combined signal yield consistent with the Standard Model expectation, with a combined 1399 observed significance at the level of  $6\sigma$ . With an uncertanty of 9% at HL-LHC (300 fb<sup>-1</sup>), 1400 the LHC experiment may not have sufficient sensitivity for new physics described in the 1401 previous section. 1402

On the other hand, previous studies of the Higgs boson decaying into tau pairs at the ILC show that the measurement can be of the order of a few percent[65] and that the measurement at the ILC plays a crucial role after the LHC experiments. However, these studies did not take into account some of the relevant background processes (such as  $\nu\nu$ H), nor based on the jet clustering algorithm. Therefore in this thesis, this channel is studied independently from the jet clustering while taking into account the whole SM background.

### 1410 7.2 Samples

The CEPC luminosity is supposed to be 5000 fb<sup>-1</sup>. For the *ZH* signal, the cross section for different Z decay modes is summarized in table Chapter 2, as well as the branching ratio of Higgs decaying to  $\tau\tau$ . All the samples in this chapter are generated by the MC generator Whizard, version 1.95[66]. The detector used in the simulation is the CEPC detector.

The cross section shown here gives the first view to the efficiency and purity that need to be achieved. Taking qqH channel, for example, the statistics for signal qq $\tau\tau$  and backgrounds are 44872 and 488 million respectively. Using the simple expression of accuracy as  $\sqrt{S + B}/S$ , if the efficiency to identify qq $\tau\tau$  event is 80%, the background should be suppressed by 99.98% in order to achieve the 1% accuracy.

The studies on Higgs decaying into the  $\tau$  channel are treated individually for each Z decaying channel, in order to distinguish the signal with the different type of backgrounds. The selection of events is done in two steps:

• **Pre-selection** Due to the limited computing resource, the inclusive *ZH* events, and SM categories background events are filtered by some preselection using MC truth information to simplify the samples. The excellent performance of PFA ensures that this preselection would not lose information. The information used in the preselection is different for each Z decaying channel, including the number of muons  $(N_{\mu^+/-})$ , the recoil mass of the muon pair  $(M_{recoil})$ , the invariant mass of the muon pair  $(M_{invariant})$ , the missing mass  $(M_{missing})$ , the total visible mass  $(M_{tot})$ , the transverse momentum  $(p_T)$ , the visible energy  $(E_{vis})$ , the number of charged particles  $(N_{charge})$ .

•  $\tau$  tagging The  $\tau$  tagging process is applied using the topology of events. The impact parameters are used in order to deduce the statistics of signal and backgrounds.

A successful reconstruction of the  $\tau$  lepton is not a trivial task, for the  $\tau$  lepton could be generated with various different event topology, and it has diverse decay final states. In the  $e^+e^-$  collision environment, we summarize the  $\tau$  events into two categories according to the event topology, in which the reconstruction algorithm and performances have been studied separately.

# **1441** 7.3 Leptonic channels

The first category is the leptonic one, where no physics objects, or only lepton / photon / missing energy is generated together with the  $\tau$  candidates.<sup>1</sup> These events include, for example:

- $ZH, Z \rightarrow l^+l^- / \nu\nu, H \rightarrow \tau\tau$  events; golden channel for  $g(H\tau\tau)$  measurements
- ZZ,  $l^+l^- / \nu\nu / \tau\tau$  events
- *WW* events with  $l\nu\tau\nu$  final states.
- $Z \rightarrow \tau \tau$  events at Z pole operation.

In these events, the global multiplicity is limited while the additional physics objects, if they exists, are easy to identify. A successful identification of these events relies highly on the reconstruction of photons and charged hadrons. In the following section, the physics performances of  $\tau$  reconstruction at  $\mu\mu H$  and  $\nu\nu H$  channel are shown as well as their Br( $H \rightarrow \tau \tau$ ) measurement.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>The charge is ignored for event classifications.

#### 7.3.1 $Z \to \mu \mu$ 1454

The easiest channel to study is the  $\mu\mu H$  channel since the two muons are easy to be 1455vetoed by calculating their invariant mass. According to the different behavior of  $\mu\mu H$ 1456and backgrounds shown in Figure 7.3, the preselection applied to select  $\mu\mu H$  are: 1457

- $N_{\mu^+} > 1, N_{\mu^-} > 1$ 1458
- 1459

1462

```
• 110 GeV < M_{recoil} < 180 GeV
```

• 
$$40GeV < M_{invariant} < 180GeV$$



**Figure 7.3:** Distribution of invariant mass and recoil mass (MC information) for  $\mu\mu H$  and backgrounds at  $\sqrt{s} = 250$ GeV, the red/black line is for signal( $\mu\mu H$ )/background(inclusive), the green arrows indicates the cuts applied in the preselection. The invariant mass of  $\mu\mu H$  peaks at the mass of Z while only the ZZ background have this peak. The recoil mass of  $\mu\mu H$  peaks at the mass of H while ZZ background peaks at the mass of Z

Thank the excellent efficiency and purity of the muon identification, the efficiency of this 1461 preselection can achieve 97.68%, while most of the SM backgrounds are vetoed except

for  $\mu\mu$  (3.51% remaining). 1463

Most of the decaying modes of  $\tau$  are with one or three tracks and an even number of 1464 photons, as can be seen in Table 7.1, this is the main idea in the  $\tau$  tagging. From the decay 1465 modes, the topology of  $\tau$ s is simpler than jets, which provides the way to distinguish  $\tau$ 1466 events from the others. The steps for  $di-\tau$  events tagging are: 1467

- Veto the  $\mu$ s decayed from Z by choosing the  $\mu$  pair with invariant mass closest to 1468 Z mass 1469
- Find the leading track among the remaining particles and collect the tracks and 1470 photons close to this track (< 1 rad, to be grouped in region A), and their numbers 1471 are noted as NTrkA and NPhA. 1472

1473 1474	• Collect the rest tracks and photons and group them in region B with their numbers noted as NTrkB and NPhB.
1475 1476	• Get the angle between the leading tracks in region A or B and the furthest track in this region, noted as $Cone_{T-T}(A/B)$ .
1477 1478	• Cone <sub><i>T-P</i></sub> (A/B) is the angle between the leading tracks in region A or B and the furthest photon in this region.
1479 1480	• Cone <sub><i>P-P</i></sub> (A/B), the angle between the leading photon in a region and the furthest photon in this region.

The distributions of these numbers in  $\tau$  events and other decay channels of Higgs is shown in Figure 7.4 and the cuts of NTrk and NPh are chosen to be less than 6 and less than 7.

**Table 7.2:** Cut Flow of MC sample for  $\mu\mu H \rightarrow \tau\tau$  selection on signal and inclusive SM backgrounds

	$\mu\mu H\tau\tau$	$\mu\mu H$ inclusive bkg	ZZ	WW	singleW	singleZ	2f
total generated	2292	33557	5711445	44180832	15361538	7809747	418595861
after preselection	2246	32894	122674	223691	0	86568	1075886
$N_{Trk}(A/B) < 6$ & $N_{Ph}(A/B) < 7$	2219	1039	2559	352	0	9397	25583
BDT>0.78	2135	885	484	24	0	157	161
efficiency	93.15%	2.63%	<0.01%	< 0.01%	< 0.01%	< 0.01%	<0.01%

After the cut of the number of tracks and photons, these parameters are trained in TMVA and optimized to the signal significance giving the BDT cut to 0.78, the cut flow is summarized in Table 7.2, the efficiency of the signal after training is 93%. The correlation matrix and overtraining check are shown in Figure 7.5 and Figure 7.6.

However, the channels such as Higgs decaying into W and W leptonic decay are the
 main backgrounds after the selections. This is due to the topologies of these events are
 similar to our signal.

By looking at the starting points for the tracks, those stemming from  $\tau$  decays are further away from the vertex than the others. From the sum of transverse and longitudinal impact parameters (D0 / Z0<sup>2</sup>) of the two leading tracks in regions A and B normalized by their uncertainty  $\sigma_{D0/Z0}$ , a "pull" can be defined as:  $D0^2/\sigma_{D0}^2 + Z0^2/\sigma_{Z0}^2$ , since D0 and Z0 are comparable in CEPC detector, the pull are simplified as  $D0^2 + Z0^2$ . The pull

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>The impact parameter D0 is the signed distance from the origin to the point of closest approach in the  $r - \phi(x - y)$  plane. The impact parameter Z0 is the Z position of the perigee.



**Figure 7.4:** Distribution of number of tracks and photons, the angle between track to track, track to photon, or photon to photon in the two opposite regions A and B. The black/red line represents the MC information of the inclusivel  $\mu\mu H$  backgrounds / signal ( $\mu\mu H \rightarrow \tau\tau$ ), the green/blue line is for the reconstructed information.



Figure 7.5: The correlation matrix of all the variables



**Figure 7.6:** BDT response of di- $\tau$  finding

<sup>1496</sup> distribution is shown in Figure 7.7 for signal and SM inclusive background with a fit.

<sup>1497</sup> The branching ratio  $Br(H \to \tau \tau)$  can be calculated from the fitted signal event number

1498 S, the total event number T and previous selection efficiency  $\varepsilon$ , as  $Br = S/(\varepsilon \cdot T)$ , to be

<sup>1499</sup>  $6.40 \pm 0.18$ . The expected accuracy  $\sigma \times BR = \delta(S)/S$  to be 2.68%, where the  $\delta(S)$  is the <sup>1500</sup> fitted signal event number error.



**Figure 7.7:** Fit of the sum of  $D0^2$  and  $Z0^2$  of the leading tracks of two cones with SM background included

Assuming that the efficiency of  $\tau\tau$  event tagging is the same for  $\mu\mu H$  and eeH events, the accuracy for the eeH event can be extrapolated. The difference between this two channel is that the efficiency for preselection is not the same, as shown in Table 7.3. The

extrapolated accuracy or eeH event is deduced to be 2.72%.

#### 24.03.2018

Table 7.3: Preselection efficiency for *eeH* selection on signal and inclusive SM backgrounds

	eeH	ZZ	WW	singleW	single $Z$	2f
total generated	38357	5711445	44180832	15361538	7809747	418595861
after preselection	37901	4075	4072	256892	561237	5278241

#### <sup>1505</sup> **7.3.2** $Z \to \nu \nu$

According to the different behavior of  $\nu\nu$ H and backgrounds, the cut flow of the preselection for  $\nu\nu$ H events is:

1508 •  $65GeV < M_{missing} < 225GeV$ 

• 
$$M_{total} > 50 GeV$$

•  $10GeV < p_T < 100GeV$ 



**Figure 7.8:** Distribution of total invariant mass  $M_{Inv}^{tot}$ , transverse momentum  $P_T^{tot}$ , and missing mass  $M_{Mis}$  for  $\nu\nu$ H and backgrounds at  $\sqrt{s} = 250$ GeV, the red/black line is for signal( $\nu\nu$  H)/background(inclusive), the green arrows indicates the cuts applied in the preselection.

<sup>1511</sup> However, a bias exists on the different signal channel in this cut flow, which leads to a

<sup>1512</sup> 1.7% degradation of  $BR(H \rightarrow \tau \tau)$  and the final result needs to be corrected according <sup>1513</sup> to this number.

The procedure of  $\tau$  tagging in  $Z \rightarrow \nu \nu$  event is similar to the one in  $Z \rightarrow \mu \mu$ , but without

the step to veto the  $\mu$  pair. However, there exists a huge irreducible background coming

from WW and W  $\rightarrow \nu \tau$ , whose impact parameters are not distinguishable, as shown in

<sup>1517</sup> Figure 7.9. Therefore the only statistic result is deduced in this channel by ignoring the

<sup>1518</sup> error of the fraction of signal and background.



**Figure 7.9:** Pull of the leading track and the next to leading track for  $\nu\nu$ H and backgrounds.

1519	The efficiency	of tagging after	· TMVA	training is 95%	, and the $\tau$ e	vent number is calcu-
1019					i and the $i$ c	V CITE ITAITECT ID CATCA

lated from the statistics, as shown in Table 7.4. The branching ratio  $Br(H \rightarrow \tau \tau)$  can be

<sub>1521</sub> calculated from the statistics result and previous selection efficiency to be  $6.19 \pm 0.27$ , as

well as the expected accuracy to be 4.29%.

**Table 7.4:** Cut Flow of MC sample for  $\nu\nu$ H $\rightarrow$   $\tau\tau$  selection on signal and inclusive SM backgrounds

	$ u \nu H \tau \tau$	$ u \nu H $ inclusive bkg	ZZ	WW	singleW	single Z	2f
total generated	15497	231670	5711445	44180832	17361538	7809747	418595861
after preselection	9434	214830	1239457	7463105	3327803	956694	12826280
$N_{Trk}(A/B) < 6$ & $N_{Ph}(A/B) < 7$	9260	8858	24760	1354852	17389	676185	1535029
BDT > 0.78	8836	6587	15450	89729	1355	10739	11243
efficiency	57.02%	2.84%	0.27%	0.20%	< 0.01%	0.14%	< 0.01%

# 1523 7.4 Hadronic channel, $Z \rightarrow qq$

The second catalog is the hadronic one, where the  $\tau$  lepton(s) are always observed with jets. For instance, we have:

- $ZH, Z \to qq, H \to \tau\tau$
- $ZZ \to qq\tau\tau$
- $WW \to qql\tau$
- $ZH, Z \to qq, H \to WW \to l\nu\tau\nu$

The most difficult channel is Z decaying to quarks since these quarks cannot be vetoedfrom the invariant mass without jet clustering.

<sup>1532</sup> The preselection applied to choose the qqH events is:

• 
$$E_{visible} > 100 GeV$$

- 1534  $N_{charge} > 8$
- 1535  $P_t < 93 GeV$
- $M_{Mis} < 120 GeV$

Since the background is still too large, a second preselection is applied to choose the qqH $\rightarrow \tau \tau$  events is:

- $115GeV < E_{visible} < 245GeV$
- $M_{Mis} > 2GeV$

<sup>1541</sup> The distribution of these variables for preselection is shown in Figure 7.11.

Since the qqH process is more complex than  $\mu\mu$ H and  $\nu\nu$ H, the preselection is not that powerful as the previous ones. Keeping the preselection efficiency high leads to nearly half of ZZ and WW semi-leptonic decay remaining. That's a huge number of events to study, therefore the backgrounds are not analyzed in the whole sample but on smaller statistics (10k per sub channel) and scaled to 5 ab<sup>-1</sup>.

After the preselection, the tagging method is no longer for di- $\tau$  but to tag the  $\tau$  jets in the whole space in an event. The steps are:

• Find tracks with energy higher than a defined  $E_{min}$  as the seed



**Figure 7.10:** Distribution of total visible energy  $E_{visible}$ , number of charged particles  $N_{charge}$ , total visible energy  $E_{vis}$ , transverse momentum  $P_T^{tot}$ , and missing mass  $M_{Mis}$  for  $qqH\tau\tau$ , qqH and backgrounds at  $\sqrt{s} = 250$ GeV, the blue/red/black line is for signal (qqH)/background(inclusive). The green arrows indicates the cuts applied in the first preselection and the pink arrows indicate the second preselection.



**Figure 7.11:** Distribution of total visible energy  $E_{visible}$ , number of charged particles  $N_{charge}$ , total visible energy  $E_{vis}$ , transverse momentum  $P_T^{tot}$ , and missing mass  $M_{Mis}$  for qqH $\tau\tau$ , qqH and backgrounds at  $\sqrt{s} = 250$ GeV, with the other cuts applied.

- Collect tracks and photons within an angle ConeA
- Calculate invariant mass with these particles
- Calculate the D0 and Z0 of the leading track
- Calculate the energy in a larger cone ConeB around the seed.

The cut of  $\tau$  tagging is:

- Number of tracks/photons smaller than 6/8
- Energy proportion in the smaller cone larger than  $R_{En}$
- Invariant mass of the  $\tau\tau$  system larger than  $M_{min}$  GeV and smaller than  $M_{max}$  GeV
- Invariant mass of the qq system (the particles except for  $\tau s$ ) smaller than  $M_{qq}$  GeV.

Here the parameters  $E_{min}$ , ConeA, ConeB,  $R_{En}$ ,  $M_{min}$  and  $M_{max}$  are optimized to the value  $\epsilon \cdot p$ , where  $\epsilon$  is the efficiency of finding an opposite charged  $\tau$  pair in  $qq\tau\tau$  events and p is the probability of tagging a opposite charged  $\tau$  pair in the backgrounds. The value of these parameters are:  $E_{min} = 1.5$  GeV, ConeA = 0.15 rad, ConeB = 0.45 rad,  $M_{min} = 0.2$  GeV,  $M_{max} = 2.0$  GeV,  $R_{En} = 0.92$ , the optimized  $\epsilon \cdot p$  is 56%. However, this is a rough optimization without background normalization taken into account.

After these cuts, the remaining  $\tau$ s in an event is collected and the two leading energetic ones with opposite charge are chosen to calculate the invariant mass of the di- $\tau$ , as shown in Figure 7.12. The distribution of each type of background in Figure 7.13 shows that the 2f background is reduced in this step, as well as the events with "fake" taus reconstructed.

The events with at least a pair of  $\tau$ s and the invariant mass in a range of (20, 120 GeV) 1570 are chosen as a Higgs decaying to the  $\tau\tau$  event. The particles except for these have 1571been chosen to form the two leading energetic ones with opposite charge are used to 1572get the invariant mass of the qq system and the cut of  $70 < M_{qq} < 105 GeV$  is chosen as 1573the selection of signal, as shown in Figure 7.14. In Figure 7.15, it is shown that the ZH1574background and WW background can be reduced, where the invariant mass of qq leads 1575to a Higgs mass or it is a flat distribution. The ZZ background is still an important one 1576since the invariant mass of qq is also peaking at Z mass. 1577

The recoil mass of the qq system is used to reduce the ZZ backgrounds, as shown in Figure 7.16 and Figure 7.17, the background  $ZZ \rightarrow qq\tau\tau$  are reduced because the recoil mass of the qq leads to the mass of Z.

The cut chain is summarized in Table 7.5 and the efficiency for the  $\tau$  events tagging is



**Figure 7.12:** Distribution of the invariant mass of the di- $\tau$ ,  $M_{\tau^+\tau^-}$  for qqH $\tau\tau$ , and backgrounds at  $\sqrt{s} = 250$ GeV, the red/black line is for signal  $(qqH\tau\tau)$ /background(inclusive). The arrows indicates the cuts applied.



**Figure 7.13:** Distribution of the invariant mass of the di- $\tau$ ,  $M_{\tau^+\tau^-}$  for qqH $\tau\tau$ , and each backgrounds at  $\sqrt{s} = 250$ GeV.



**Figure 7.14:** Distribution of the invariant mass of the qq,  $M_{qq}$  for  $qqH\tau\tau$  and backgrounds at  $\sqrt{s} = 250$ GeV, the red/black line is for signal  $(qqH\tau\tau)$ /background(inclusive). The arrows indicates the cuts applied.



**Figure 7.15:** Distribution of the invariant mass of the qq,  $M_{qq}$  for  $qqH\tau\tau$  and each backgrounds at  $\sqrt{s} = 250$ GeV after the previous cuts.



**Figure 7.16:** Distribution of the recoil mass of the qq,  $M_{qq}^{recoil}$  for  $qqH\tau\tau$  and backgrounds at  $\sqrt{s} = 250$ GeV, the red/black line is for signal  $(qqH\tau\tau)$ /background(inclusive). The arrows indicates the cuts applied.



**Figure 7.17:** Distribution of the recoil mass of the qq,  $M_{qq}^{recoil}$  for  $qqH\tau\tau$  and each backgrounds at  $\sqrt{s} = 250$ GeV after the previous cuts

<sup>1582</sup> 49.97%. The finding efficiency of each  $\tau$  can be expressed as:  $N_{found}/N_{truth}$ , where  $N_{found}$ <sup>1583</sup> is the number of tagged  $\tau$ 's and the leading track is close to a  $\tau$  decayed track from the <sup>1584</sup> MC information, while  $N_{truth}$  is the number of MC  $\tau$ 's. Here the efficiency in the  $qqH\tau\tau$ <sup>1585</sup> channel is 70.7%. In the similar way the purity defined as  $N_{found}/N_{total}$  where  $N_{total}$  is <sup>1586</sup> the total number of tagged  $\tau$ 's, in the  $qqH\tau\tau$  channel, is 70.1%.

**Table 7.5:** Cut Flow of MC sample for  $qqH \rightarrow \tau\tau$  selection on signal and inclusive SM backgrounds

	qqH au au	<i>qqH</i> inclusive bkg	<i>ZH</i> inclusive bkg	ZZ	WW	singleW	singleZ	2f
total generated (scaled to 5 $ab^{-1}$ )	45597	678158	357249	5711445	44180832	17361538	7809747	418595861
1st preselection	45465	677854	310245	5039286	42425195	1267564	1398362	148401031
2nd preselection	45145	174650	226059	293306	12452091	125735	117306	547402
$N_{\tau^+} > 0, N_{\tau^-} > 0$	24674	7342	33721	93955	723989	33887	54386	103642
$20 GeV < M_{\tau^+ \tau^-} < 120 GeV$	24284	6290	32344	88245	597480	24927	36039	56615
$70GeV < M_{qq}$ <110GeV	22937	2103	4887	65625	21718	738	1893	556
$100 GeV < M_{qq}^{Rec}$ <170 GeV	22703	2045	4524	23789	13154	315	306	193
efficiency	49.97%	0.31%	1.26%	0.41%	0.04%	<0.01%	<0.01%	< 0.01%

From the table, the background of WW and ZZ are more important than the others, this is because of the sub channel of their semi-leptonic decay with q jets and leptons or even  $\tau$ s, which is irreducible. The statistics of signal and the main backgrounds are shown in Figure 7.18. The branching ratio  $Br(H \rightarrow \tau \tau)$  can be calculated from the fit result and provides calculated accuracy to be 1.20%

previous selection efficiency to be  $6.25 \pm 0.04$ , and the expected accuracy to be 1.30%.

# **7.5** Combined Results

<sup>1593</sup> To conclude, the  $\tau$  reconstruction at the CEPC is currently catagorized into leptonic and <sup>1594</sup> hadronic events and reconstructed using different strategies and  $\tau$  finding algorithms. <sup>1595</sup> In the leptonic events, where the  $\tau$  lepton is generated only in association with leptons, <sup>1596</sup> photons or missing energy, the  $\tau$  events identification relies strongly on a successful <sup>1597</sup> reconstruction of the photons and charged hadrons.

<sup>1598</sup> In the hadronic events, it is more difficult to suppress the background, for further study, <sup>1599</sup> the correlation with other channels might be applied.



**Figure 7.18:** Fit of the sum of  $D0^2$  and  $Z0^2$  of the leading tracks of two cones with SM background included

With these channels analyzed and the cross section of Higgs decaying to  $\tau\tau$  can be summarized as in Table 7.6

	BR (H $\rightarrow \tau \tau$ )	$\delta (\sigma \times BR) / (\sigma \times BR)$
$\mu\mu$ H	6.40	2.68%
eeH(extrapolated)	6.37	2.72%
$\nu\nu$ H	6.26	4.38%
qqH	6.23	0.93%
combined	6.28	0.81%

<b>Fable 7.6:</b>	Combined	cross section
-------------------	----------	---------------

In both cases, a precise reconstruction of the impact parameter is essential for the  $\tau$ events identification, as shown in the figures, the statistics can be fitted only if the position resolution is good enough to distinguish the two peaks for  $\tau$ s and backgrounds.

# **7.6 Extrapolating in ILC**

The cross section for three polarization scenarios in ILC at 250GeV is shown in Chapter 2.

<sup>1608</sup> Comparing these cross sections with the cross section at CEPC as shown in previous <sup>1609</sup> section, a simple extrapolation can be done as in Table 7.7. The assumption here is that <sup>1610</sup> the efficiency for each signal and background stays the same for ILC and CEPC.

**Table 7.7:** Extrapolated accuracy  $\delta (\sigma \times BR) / (\sigma \times BR)$  in ILC 250GeV (2000 fb<sup>-1</sup>)

	CEPC	ILC(L)	ILC(R)
Luminosity( $ab^{-1}$ )	5	2	2
Polarization( $e^-, e^+$ )	-	(0.8, -0.3)	(-0.8, 0.3)
Total Higgs	1.06M	0.60M	0.40M
Accuracy(%)	0.81	1.13	1.22

# <sup>1611</sup> 7.7 Discussion

In this chapter, different channels with Higgs decaying into  $\tau\tau$  at CEPC have been studied and the combined accuracy is reaching 1% level. This result is also extrapolated to ILC and also gives the reasonable accuracy.

#### 24.03.2018 CHAPTER 7. MEASUREMENT OF $H \rightarrow \tau \tau$ BRANCHING RATIO

This accuracy has still space to be improved. One choice is to use the collinear approximation to recover the momentum of neutrino(s) from  $\tau$ . This method needs to assume that  $\tau$  decay products almost flight back-to-back. The collinear approximation will help to reconstruct the invariant mass of tau pair system and its comparison to the Higgs mass could be a powerful variable to suppress ZZ/WW backgrounds with  $\tau$  final states.

<sup>1621</sup> Another method is to fully reconstruct hadronically decaying  $\tau$  momenta by making use <sup>1622</sup> of the interaction point position, the impact parameters of the  $\tau$  decay products, and the <sup>1623</sup> transverse momentum of the Z boson recoiling against the  $\tau\tau$  system [67]. Since more <sup>1624</sup> than 60% of  $\tau$ s decays into hadrons, this method will help to improve the performance <sup>1625</sup> of these channels.

Besides, a jet clustering algorithm can be applied in the qqH channel in order to suppress the 2f backgrounds with jets.

<sup>1628</sup> However, this study here is based on a perfect vertex detector, the resolution is not taken

<sup>1629</sup> into account. Since the result was obtained from the impact parameter, the influence of

<sup>1630</sup> the vertex detector design to the performance should be studied in the future.
## <sup>1631</sup> Chapter 8

## **Conclusion**

This thesis covers the aspects of detector optimization, the particle identification, and 1633 tau analysis, in the concept of CEPC, but not limited to CEPC. The requirement on accu-1634 racy to 1% order by the new physics appreciates the future  $e^+e^-$  colliders with a cleaner 1635 environment. In these colliders, the Particle Flow concept becomes a trend for the detec-1636 tor design. The Particle Flow aims at reconstructing all the final state particles, leads to a 1637 higher efficiency and purity on the final physics objects. In order to reconstruct the par-1638 ticles correctly with the most suited sub-detector system, the detector design requires a 1639 precise tracking system and high granularity calorimeter system. While the subdetector 1640prototypes are designed and adjustable, full simulation studies are performed to define 1641 the characteristics and physics capabilities of the final detector. 1642

Taking the Higgs mass resolution of 250 GeV ZH ( $Z \rightarrow \nu \nu$ ,  $H \rightarrow gg$ ) events as the ref-1643 erence to compare the performance, several models with different ECAL layer number, 1644 HCAL layer number, and magnetic field have been studied. The result shows that by 1645degrading the transverse granularity of ECAL by 1/3 ( $\sim 1/2$  budgets for ecal), we lose 1646 6% of resolution. The influence of thickness and cell size of the Si sensors also gives 1647 hints for the engineering. The previous detector design of CEPC takes most of the ILD 1648 detector as the framework, however, the HCAL was designed for higher energy. The re-1649 sult on the HCAL layer numbers and magnetic field provide proves to safely reduce the 1650 number of HCAL to 40 layers and to reduce the magnetic field from 3.5T to 3T, which is 1651 appreciated by the MDI. With this optimization, the CEPC will release a new version of 1652CEPC detector in the CDR on preparing. 1653

The particle identification is essential to the precise Higgs measurements. In the PFA oriented detectors, the segmentation between clusters, detailed energy and spatial information, and track information are provided. Taking full advantage of this information, a dedicated lepton identification algorithm for Higgs factories, LICH, has been developed. For the single particles with energy higher than 2 GeV, LICH reaches an effi-

ciency better than 99.5% in identifying the muons and the electrons, and 98% for pions. 1659The algorithm is also tested in full simulated events, showing that LICH is powerful 1660 in these events to select high energy leptons, In the jet environment, the performance 1661 is limited by the isolation performance and the unbalanced statistics for leptons and 1662 hadrons. Since the particle identification requires high granularity for the segmentation, 1663 the performance of different granular calorimeters has been studied, showing that the 1664 efficiency of finding two leptons decreases by  $1 \sim 2\%$  when the cell size doubles, which 1665 means that the detector needs  $2\sim4\%$  more statistics in the running. Another advantage 1666 of LICH is that the identification condition is adjustable according to the analysis. In 1667 the preparation of CEPC CDR, most of the physics are analyzed with LICH. 1668

The reconstruction of all final state particles in PFA also allows it to reconstruct  $\tau$  events 1669 with higher efficiency. Since the multiplicity of  $\tau$  is much smaller than that of jets, the 1670  $H \rightarrow \tau \tau$  events can easily be recognized in the leptonic channels, where the leptons 1671 decayed from Z can be vetoed by their recoil mass. In hadronic events, the method of 1672defining well-isolated cones with smaller multiplicity is used to choose the  $\tau$  candidates. 1673 The reconstructed  $\tau$  candidates are selected to deduce the information of the di- $\tau$  system 1674 and the qq system. The irreducible backgrounds such as ZZ and ZH with Z decaying 1675to  $\tau\tau$ , are reduced to 1% level. 1676

Thanks to the efficient vertex detector, the starting point of particles can be measured with excellent resolution. Therefore, the impact parameter is used in the tagging of  $\tau$ , as a method to get the statistic of signals and backgrounds. At the center-of-mass energy of 250 GeV and 5000 fb<sup>-1</sup>, the obtained precisions for the production cross section times the branching ratio,  $\Delta(\sigma \times BR)/(\sigma \times BR)$ , is 2.68% for  $\mu\mu H$ , 4.29% for  $\nu\nu H$ , and 1.05% for qqH. After extrapolating the result for  $\mu\mu H$  to eeH, the combined accuracy of the  $H \rightarrow \tau\tau$  is 0.89%, the simple extrapolation to ILC gives an accuracy of 0.84%.

In conclusion, the CEPC detector design is still under optimization, by using the particle flow algorithm. The lepton identification not only provides tools for analysis but also helps to optimize the detector. The  $\tau$  analysis shows that at current detector design, the accuracy can achieve the 1% level or even better, satisfying the requirement of new physics.

## **Bibliography**

[1] Sha Bai, Jie Gao, Yiwei Wang, Qinglei Xiu, Weichao Yao, and Teng Yue. MDI Design in CEPC partial double ring. In *7th International Particle Accelerator Conference (IPAC'16), Busan, Korea, May 8-13, 2016*, pages 3802–3804. JACOW, Geneva, Switzerland, 2016.

- [2] Chris Adolphsen. The International Linear Collider Technical Design Report-Volume 3. II: Accelerator Baseline Design. Technical report, Argonne National Laboratory (ANL), Argonne, IL (United States); Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility (TJNAF), Newport News, VA (United States); Brookhaven National Laboratory (BNL), Upton, NY (United States); SLAC National Accelerator Laboratory (SLAC), Menlo Park, CA (United States); Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory (FNAL), Batavia, IL (United States), 2013.
- [3] Frank Gaede, Ties Behnke, Norman Graf, and Tony Johnson. LCIO-A persistency
   framework for linear collider simulation studies. *arXiv preprint physics/0306114*,
   2003.
- [4] O Wendt, F Gaed, and T Krämer. Marlin: Modular Analysis and Reconstruction for the LINear collider. Technical report, LC-DET-2007-001, 2007.
- [5] Sheldon L Glashow. Partial-symmetries of weak interactions. *Nuclear Physics*, 22 (4):579–588, 1961.
- [6] Steven Weinberg. A model of leptons. *Physical review letters*, 19(21):1264, 1967.
- [7] M Veltman et al. Regularization and renormalization of gauge fields. *Nuclear Physics B*, 44(1):189–213, 1972.
- [8] Harald Fritzsch, Murray Gell-Mann, and Heinrich Leutwyler. Advantages of the color octet gluon picture. *Physics Letters B*, 47(4):365–368, 1973.
- [9] FJ Hasert, S Kabe, W Krenz, J Von Krogh, D Lanske, J Morfin, K Schultze, H Weerts,
   G Bertrand-Coremans, Jean Sacton, et al. Observation of neutrino-like interactions
   without muon or electron in the Gargamelle neutrino experiment. *Nuclear Physics* B, 73(1):1–22, 1974.

1717	[10] Ugo Amaldi, Albrecht Böhm, LS Durkin, Paul Langacker, Alfred K Mann, William J
1718	Marciano, Alberto Sirlin, and HH Williams. Comprehensive analysis of data per-
1719	taining to the weak neutral current and the intermediate-vector-boson masses.
1720	<i>Physical Review D</i> , 36(5):1385, 1987.

[11] Serguei Chatrchyan, Vardan Khachatryan, Albert M Sirunyan, Armen Tumasyan,
 Wolfgang Adam, Ernest Aguilo, T Bergauer, M Dragicevic, J Erö, C Fabjan, et al.
 Observation of a new boson at a mass of 125 GeV with the CMS experiment at the
 LHC. *Physics Letters B*, 716(1):30–61, 2012.

[12] Georges Aad, T Abajyan, B Abbott, J Abdallah, S Abdel Khalek, AA Abdelalim,
 O Abdinov, R Aben, B Abi, M Abolins, et al. Observation of a new particle in the
 search for the Standard Model Higgs boson with the ATLAS detector at the LHC.
 *Physics Letters B*, 716(1):1–29, 2012.

- [13] Hans Peter Nilles. Supersymmetry, supergravity and particle physics. *Physics Reports*, 110(1-2):1–162, 1984.
- <sup>1731</sup> [14] Howard E Haber and Gordon L Kane. The search for supersymmetry: probing <sup>1732</sup> physics beyond the standard model. *Physics Reports*, 117(2-4):75–263, 1985.
- [15] John Ellis, Giovanni Ridolfi, and Fabio Zwirner. Radiative corrections to the masses
   of supersymmetric Higgs bosons. *Physics Letters B*, 257(1-2):83–91, 1991.

[16] Ties Behnke, James E Brau, Brian Foster, Juan Fuster, Mike Harrison, James McE wan Paterson, Michael Peskin, Marcel Stanitzki, Nicholas Walker, and Hitoshi Ya mamoto. The International Linear Collider Technical Design Report-Volume 1: Ex ecutive Summary. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1306.6327*, 2013.

- [17] Abdelhak Djouadi, Joseph Lykken, Klaus Mönig, Yasuhiro Okada, Mark Oreglia,
   and Satoru Yamashita. International Linear Collider reference design report vol ume 2: physics at the ILC. *arXiv preprint arXiv:0709.1893*, 2007.
- [18] CEPC-SPPC study group et al. CEPC-SPPC Preliminary Conceptual Design Report. 1. Physics and Detector. Technical report, IHEP-CEPC-DR-2015-01, 2015.
- Interpretation
   Interpretating and interpretation
   Interpretation
   <l
- [20] Henri Videau. Energy flow or particle flow-the technique of" energy flow" for
   pedestrians. In *International Conference on Linear Colliders-LCWS04*, pages 105–120.
   Ecole Polytechnique Palaiseau, 2004.

 <sup>[21]</sup> C Patrignani, Particle Data Group, et al. Review of particle physics. *Chinese physics* C, 40(10):100001, 2016.

- [22] Andreas Hoecker, Peter Speckmayer, Joerg Stelzer, Jan Therhaag, Eckhard von To erne, Helge Voss, M Backes, T Carli, O Cohen, A Christov, et al. TMVA-Toolkit for
   multivariate data analysis. *arXiv preprint physics/0703039*, 2007.
- [23] G. Alexander et al. A Precise measurement of the tau polarization and its forward - backward asymmetry at LEP. *Z. Phys.*, C72:365–375, 1996. doi: 10.1007/ s002880050257.
- <sup>1757</sup> [24] Gordon L Kane. *Modern elementary particle physics: the fundamental particles and* <sup>1758</sup> *forces.* Addison-Wesley, 1993.
- [25] Michael Edward Peskin. An introduction to quantum field theory. Westview press,
   1760 1995.
- <sup>1761</sup> [26] Howard Georgi. *Lie algebras in particle physics: from isospin to unified theories,* vol-<sup>1762</sup> ume 54. Westview press, 1999.
- [27] François Englert and Robert Brout. Broken symmetry and the mass of gauge vector
   mesons. *Physical Review Letters*, 13(9):321, 1964.
- <sup>1765</sup> [28] Peter W Higgs. Broken symmetries and the masses of gauge bosons. *Physical Review Letters*, 13(16):508, 1964.
- <sup>1767</sup> [29] Lisa Randall and Raman Sundrum. Large mass hierarchy from a small extra di-<sup>1768</sup> mension. *Physical Review Letters*, 83(17):3370, 1999.
- [30] Ali H Chamseddine, Ro Arnowitt, and Pran Nath. Locally supersymmetric grand unification. *Physical Review Letters*, 49(14):970, 1982.
- <sup>1771</sup> [31] Luis Ibáñez. Locally supersymmetric SU (5) grand unification. *Physics Letters B*, 118(1-3):73–78, 1982.
- [32] John Baez and John Huerta. The algebra of grand unified theories. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, 47(3):483–552, 2010.
- [33] Julius Wess and Jonathan Bagger. *Supersymmetry and supergravity*. Princeton university press, 1992.
- [34] C Arzt, MB Einhorn, and J Wudka. Patterns of deviation from the standard model.
   *Nuclear Physics B*, 433(1):41–66, 1995.
- [35] Damien M Pierce, Jonathan A Bagger, Konstantin T Matchev, and Ren-jie Zhang.
   Precision corrections in the minimal supersymmetric standard model. *Nuclear Physics B*, 491(1-2):3–67, 1997.
- <sup>1782</sup> [36] Nima Arkani-Hamed, Savas Dimopoulos, and Gia Dvali. The hierarchy problem and new dimensions at a millimeter. *Physics Letters B*, 429(3-4):263–272, 1998.

1784 1785 1786 1787	[37]	G Apollinari, I Béjar Alonso, Oliver Brüning, M Lamont, and Lucio Rossi. High- Luminosity Large Hadron Collider (HL-LHC): Preliminary Design Report. Tech- nical report, Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory (FNAL), Batavia, IL (United States), 2015.
1788 1789	[38]	Lyn Evans and Shinichiro Michizono. The International Linear Collider Machine Staging Report 2017. 2017.
1790 1791 1792 1793 1794 1795	[39]	Ties Behnke et al. The international linear collider technical design report-volume 4: detectors. Technical report, Argonne National Laboratory (ANL), Argonne, IL (United States); Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL), Richland, WA (United States); SLAC National Accelerator Laboratory (SLAC), Menlo Park, CA (United States); Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory (FNAL), Batavia, IL (United States), 2013.
1796 1797	[40]	CEPC-SPPC Study Group et al. CEPC-SPPC Preliminary Conceptual Design Report, Volume II-Accelerator. <i>IHEP, Beijing, China, Rep. IHEP-AC-2015-01</i> , 2015.
1798 1799	[41]	CEPC-SPPC Study Group et al. Cepc-sppc progress report, accelerator (2015–2016). Technical report, IHEP-CEPC-DR-2017-01, IHEP-CEPC-AC-2017-01, 2017.
1800 1801	[42]	Cai Meng, Jingru Zhang, Dou Wang, Xiaoping Li, Guoxi Pei, Shilun Pei, and Yun- long Chi. CEPC Linac Design and Beam Dynamics. 2017.
1802 1803 1804 1805	[43]	Dou Wang, Jie Gao, Feng Su, Yuan Zhang, Jiyuan Zhai, Yiwei Wang, Sha Bai, Huip- ing Geng, Tianjian Bian, Xiaohao Cui, et al. CEPC partial double ring scheme and crab-waist parameters. In <i>The Future of High Energy Physics: Some Aspects</i> , pages 179–188. World Scientific, 2017.
1806 1807	[44]	Jean-Claude Brient and Henri Videau. The calorimetry at the future e+ e-linear collider. <i>arXiv preprint hep-ex/</i> 0202004, 2002.
1808 1809 1810	[45]	MA Thomson. Particle flow calorimetry and the PandoraPFA algorithm. <i>Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section A: Accelerators, Spectrometers, Detectors and Associated Equipment</i> , 611(1):25–40, 2009.
1811 1812	[46]	Florian Beaudette. The CMS Particle Flow Algorithm. <i>arXiv preprint arXiv:1401.8155</i> , 2014.
1813 1814	[47]	Collaboration ATLAS. Letter of Intent for the Phase-II Upgrade of the ATLAS Experiment. Technical report, 2012.
1815 1816	[48]	Daniel Jeans, Marcel Reinhard, and Jean-Claude Brient. GAmma Reconstruction at a LInear Collider. 2013.
1817 1818	[49]	Manqi Ruan. Arbor, a new approach of the Particle Flow Algorithm. <i>arXiv preprint arXiv:1403.4784</i> , 2014.

1819 1820 1821 1822	[50]	Damir Buskulic, D Casper, I De Bonis, D Decamp, P Ghez, C Goy, J-P Lees, M-N Minard, P Odier, B Pietrzyk, et al. Performance of the ALEPH detector at LEP. <i>Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section A: Accelerators, Spectrometers, Detectors and Associated Equipment</i> , 360(3):481–506, 1995.
1823 1824	[51]	P Moras de Freitas et al. MOKKA: A detailed Geant4 simulation for the Interna- tional Linear Collider detectors, 2003.
1825 1826 1827 1828	[52]	Sea Agostinelli, John Allison, K al Amako, J Apostolakis, H Araujo, P Arce, M Asai, D Axen, S Banerjee, G Barrand, et al. GEANT4—a simulation toolkit. <i>Nuclear instruments and methods in physics research section A: Accelerators, Spectrometers, Detectors and Associated Equipment</i> , 506(3):250–303, 2003.
1829 1830 1831 1832	[53]	Zhenxing Chen, Ying Yang, Manqi Ruan, Dayong Wang, Gang Li, Shan Jin, and Yong Ban. Study of Higgsstrahlung Cross Section and Higgs Mass Measurement Precisions with ZH ( $Z \rightarrow \mu_+\mu^-$ ) events at CEPC. <i>arXiv preprint arXiv:1601.05352</i> , 2016.
1833 1834 1835	[54]	Manqi Ruan, Daniel Jeans, Vincent Boudry, Jean-Claude Brient, and Henri Videau. Fractal Dimension of Particle Showers Measured in a Highly Granular Calorimeter. <i>Physical review letters</i> , 112(1):012001, 2014.
1836 1837	[55]	Aleph Collaboration et al. Measurement of the Tau Polarisation at LEP. <i>arXiv preprint hep-ex/0104038</i> , 2001.
1838 1839	[56]	Eric Braaten, Stephan Narison, and A Pich. QCD analysis of the tau hadronic width. <i>Nuclear Physics B</i> , 373(3):581–612, 1992.
1840	[57]	Antonio Pich. Precision tau physics. Progress in Particle and Nuclear Physics.
1841 1842	[58]	CLEO collaboration et al. Experimental tests of lepton universality in {tau} decay. <i>Physical Review, D</i> , 55(5), 1997.
1843 1844	[59]	DP Roy. The hadronic tau decay signature of a heavy charged Higgs boson at LHC. <i>Physics Letters B</i> , 459(4):607–614, 1999.
1845 1846 1847	[60]	Matthew J Dolan, Christoph Englert, and Michael Spannowsky. Higgs self- coupling measurements at the LHC. <i>Journal of High Energy Physics</i> , 2012(10):112, 2012.
1848 1849	[61]	Seong-Youl Choi and Manuel Drees. Signals for CP violation in scalar tau pair production at muon colliders. <i>Physical review letters</i> , 81(25):5509, 1998.
1850 1851	[62]	Nathan Isgur and Mark B Wise. Weak decays of heavy mesons in the static quark approximation. <i>Physics Letters B</i> , 232(1):113–117, 1989.

1852	[63]	Serguei Chatrchyan, V Khachatryan, AM Sirunyan, A Tumasyan, W Adam,
1853		T Bergauer, M Dragicevic, J Eroe, C Fabjan, M Friedl, et al. Search for neutral
1854		Higgs bosons decaying to tau pairs in pp collisions at. <i>Physics Letters B</i> , 713(2):
1855		68–90, 2012.
1856	[64]	Georges Aad, Brad Abbott, Jalal Abdallah, S Abdel Khalek, O Abdinov, Rosemarie
1857		Aben, Babak Abi, Maris Abolins, OS AbouZeid, Halina Abramowicz, et al. Evi-
1858		dence for the Higgs-boson Yukawa coupling to tau leptons with the ATLAS detec-
1859		tor. Journal of high energy physics, 2015(4):117, 2015.
1860	[65]	Trong Hieu Tran, Vladislav Balagura, Vincent Boudry, J-C Brient, and Henri
1861		Videau. Reconstruction and classification of tau lepton decays with ILD. The Euro-
1862		pean Physical Journal C, 76(8):468, 2016.
1863	[66]	Wolfgang Kilian, Thorsten Ohl, and Jürgen Reuter. Whizard—simulating multi-
1864		particle processes at lhc and ilc. <i>The European Physical Journal C</i> , 71(9):1742, 2011.
1865	[67]	Daniel Jeans. Tau lepton reconstruction at collider experiments using impact pa-
1866	r 1	rameters. Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section A: Accelerators.
1967		Snectrometers Detectors and Associated Fauinment 810:51-58 2016
1001		opeenomenero, Derectoro unu 1000eureu Lympheni, 010.01 00, 2010.

## 1868 Acknowledgement

Firstly, I would like to thank my two supervisors, Vincent and Manqi, for your supports
during my PhD study and research. Your guidance helped me in the research and also
while writing this thesis. Your patience and advices encouraged me to finish my thesis.

I would also like to thank Mark Thomson and Luca for accepting the roles of the reporter
 as well as Florian, especially Zhiqing Zhang, for presiding over my thesis jury.

And thank you, Jean-Claude, for accepting me to do this thesis at the LLR, and for your ideas and guidances. I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Henri Videau, you are really helpful to me, you always answer my stupid question, correct my error, I would not have my thesis without you.

<sup>1878</sup> My thanks also goes to my fellow labmates in LLR, Vladik, Hieu, Yacine, Kostia, and so <sup>1879</sup> on, all of you have helped me during this three years, or since even earlier.

I would also like to take this opportunity to express my gratitude to my family: my
 parents and my sister. It is your supports that guaranteed my study in France and kept
 me away from the worries.

Thanks to my neighbors in Building 76, especially K & S, for feeding me with delicious soups, as well as the others, thank you for all the fun we have had and for providing me miraculous life in the campus. To my friends at IHEP, thank you for welcoming me and helped me adapting the life in Beijing.



Titre : Reconstruction des objets leptoniques dans future e+e- usine de Higgs

Mots clés : Higgs, canaux tau, calorimétrie

18

**Résumé :** Depuis la découverte du boson de Higgs en 2012 par les expériences du Large Hadron Collider (LHC), la mesure précise est devenue le défi dans les expériences de physique des hautes énergies. De nombreuses usines de Higgs électron-positon avec une précision améliorée sur les mesures de largeur totale de Higgs ont été proposées, y compris le collisionneur linéaire international (ILC) et le collisionneur à électrons positrons circulaires (CEPC). Afin d'atteindre la précision à des niveaux de pourcentage ou de sous-pourcentage, l'utilisation de l'algorithme de flux de particules (PFA) est devenue le paradigme de la conception de détecteurs pour la frontière à haute énergie. L'idée clé est de reconstruire chaque particule d'état finale dans les sous-détecteurs les plus adaptés, et de reconstruire tous les objets physiques au-dessus des particules d'état finales. Les détecteurs orientés à PFA ont une grande efficacité dans la reconstruction d'objets physiques tels que les leptons, les jets et l'énergie manquante.

Dans cette thèse, une identification par lepton basée sur PFA (Lepton Identification pour calorimètre à haute granularité) a été développée pour des détecteurs utilisant des calorimètres à haute granula-

rité. Utilisation de la géométrie du détecteur conceptuel pour le CEPC, et les échantillons de particules chargées uniques d'énergie supérieure à 2 GeV, LICH identifie les électrons ou les muons avec des rendements supérieurs à 99,5% et contrôle le taux de désinscription du hadron aux muons ou aux électrons 1% ou 0.5 %. Réduisant la granularité du calorimètre de 1 ou 2 ordres de grandeur, la performance d'identification du lepton est stable pour les particules avec E > 2 GeV Appliquée à des événements eeH ou  $\mu\mu H$ simulés à  $\sqrt{s} = 250$  GeV, la performance d'identification du lepton est cohérente avec le cas d'une seule particule: l'efficacité d'identifier tous les leptons de haute énergie dans un événement est de 95,5 ~ 98,5 %.

Les produits  $\tau$ -decay dans les collisionneurs de haute énergie sont étroitement collimatés et ont une faible multiplicité, fournissant d'excellentes signatures à sonder. Dans cette thèse, les canaux H  $\rightarrow \tau \tau$  sont analysés dans différents modes de désintégration Z avec le contexte SM pris en compte. La précision finale combinée de  $\sigma \times Br(H \rightarrow \tau \tau)$  devrait être de 0.89 %.

Title : Reconstruction of leptonic physics objects at future e+e- Higgs factory

Keywords : Higgs, tau channel, calorimetry

Abstract : Since the discovery of the Higgs boson in 2012 by the experiments at the Large Hadron Collider (LHC), precise measurement of Higgs boson has become the challenge in high energy physics experiments. Many electron-positron Higgs factories with improved accuracy on the Higgs total width measurements have been proposed, including the International Linear Collider (ILC), the Circular Electron Positron Collider (CEPC), the Future Circular Collider  $e^+e^-$  (FCCee). In order to achieve the precision estimated to percent or sub-percent levels, the use of Particle Flow Algorithm (PFA) has become the paradigm of detector design for the high energy frontier. The key idea is to reconstruct every final state particle in the most suited sub-detectors, and reconstruct all the physics objects on top of the final state particles. The PFA oriented detectors have high efficiency in reconstructing physics objects such as leptons, jets, and missing energy.

In this thesis, a PFA based lepton identification (Lepton Identification for Calorimeter with High granularity (LICH) has been developed for detectors with high granularity calorimeters. Using the conceptual detector geometry for the CEPC, and samples of single charged particles with energy larger than 2 GeV, LICH identifies electrons or muons with efficiencies higher than 99.5% and controls the mis-identification rate of hadron to muons or electrons to better than 1% or 0.5% respectively. Reducing the calorimeter granularity by 1 or 2 orders of magnitude, the lepton identification performance is stable for particles with E > 2 GeV. Applied to fully simulated eeH or  $\mu\mu$  H events at  $\sqrt{s} = 250$ GeV, the lepton identification performance is consistent with the single particle case: the efficiency of identifying all the high energy leptons in an event ranges between 95.5% and 98.5%.

The  $\tau$ -decay products have low multiplicity and in high energy colliders are tightly collimated and have low multiplicity, providing excellent signatures to probe. In this thesis, the H $\rightarrow \tau \tau$  channel is analyzed in different Z decay modes with SM background taken into account. The combined final accuracy of  $\sigma \times Br(H \rightarrow \tau \tau)$  is expected to be 0.89%.