A τ Reconstruction Algorithm for High Energies at CLIC

A. Muennich

CERN

18-22 October International Workshop on Linear Colliders 2010

Why is τ identification important?

- Branching ratio and cross section require identification of lepton flavor.
- For analysis: event topology important
 - \rightarrow need to distinguish lepton from jet
 - identification of exclusive final states
 - suppression of background
- SUSY with high $\tan\beta$ produces many τ s in decay cascade
- Polarization measurements (CP violation)
- o ...

Jet like cone algorithm with some specific requirements according to τ properties:

- Take charged particle with highest energy and test for seed
- 2 Loop charged particles and add the ones inside search cone to seed adjusting cone to new combined momentum
- Associate neutral particles in same manner
- Start from top to find next τ candidate
- **(**) Combine all particles inside au candidate to au
- **(**) Check for split τ candidates
- Reject au based on ID criteria

Reconstruction

- minimum transverse momentum for a particle to be considered
- minimum transverse momentum for seed
- lower and upper limit on impact parameter
- opening angle of search cone

ID

- 0 < number of charged tracks in τ -jet < 4
- number of particles to form $\tau < 10$
- opening angle of isolation cone, relative to search cone
- limit on energy in isolation cone

Data sets without background @ 3TeV:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \bullet & e^+e^- \rightarrow \tilde{\tau}_1^+\tilde{\tau}_1^- \\ \bullet & e^+e^- \rightarrow \chi_1^+\chi_1^- \\ \bullet & e^+e^- \rightarrow H^0A^0 \end{array}$$

Parameter Scan:

- p_T of particle > [0, 1] GeV/c
- p_T of seed > [0, 5, 10] GeV/c
- Impact parameter D0 < [0.3, 0.5, 0.7] mm</p>
- Search cone: [0.03, 0.05, 0.07] rad
- Isolation cone: [0.02, 0.04] rad
- Isolation energy < [3, 5, 10] GeV

Results at Generator Level: Efficiency and Purity



Choice of selection cut is always a trade off between efficiency

Jets from quarks are biggest source of mis-identification!

Results at Generator Level: Mis-Identification due to quarks

 $e^+e^- \to H^0 A^0$



Results at Generator Level: Influence of Background

Process: $e^+e^- \rightarrow W^+W^-$ @ 3TeV

overlayed with different number of bunch crossings (BX) of $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow hh$ background (3 ev/BX).



Effects of Detector Resolution: D0, E and p

- Only impact parameter resolution effects the algorithm.
- The resolution value itself is not that important.
- The efficiency is unaffected.
- The purity drops. It can partly (depending on physics process) be recovered by increasing the cut on the *p_t* of the *τ* seed.



Input Information from ReconstructedParticle

- getMomentum()
- getCharge()
- getEnergy()
- getTracks(): charged particles need to have at least one track which is used to compute the impact parameter for the seed

also B field required

Output

- *τ* as ReconstructedParticle (as seen by the detector, not corrected for missing energy)
- Link back to the ReconstructedParticles that formed the τ.

Summary & Outlook

Summary

- Framework (ILD/SiD) dependence minimal: runs on LCIO ReconstructedParticles.
- Independent of τ decay: works for hadronic and leptonic decays.
- Small drop in efficiency with $\gamma\gamma$ background.

Outlook

So far:

Implemented as MARLIN processor.

Evaluation done at generator level (MCParticles, no full detector simulation).

Next:

Evaluation based on PandoraPFA output once PFA performance is satisfactory at high energies.

BACKUP

Efficiency :
$$E = \frac{Matched}{N_{\tau}}$$

Purity : $P = \frac{Matched}{Reconstructed}$

- N_{τ} : Number of τ s in the MC truth.
- *Missed*: Number of τ s not recognized
- *Reconstructed*: Number of τ s reconstructed.
- Matched: Number of reconstructed *τ*s where at least one of the particles used to form the *τ* links back to a *τ* in the MC truth.
- Fake: Reconstructed Matched
- Clean: Number of reconstructed *τ*s where all the particles used to form the *τ* link back to a *τ* in the MC truth.
- Contaminated: Matched Clean.

Evaluation: Nomenclature



au Decay Channel Dependence

Process	Decay	Eff. [%]	tot. Eff.[%]	Purity [%]
$e^+e^- \rightarrow W^+W^-$	$\tau \rightarrow \mu$	77.1 ± 3.1		
	$\tau \rightarrow e$	81.1 ± 3.0		
	$\tau \rightarrow \pi$	82.9 ± 2.0	80.3 ± 1.3	91.1 ± 1.0
	$\tau \rightarrow \pi \pi \pi$	84.2 ± 3.3		
	$\tau \rightarrow \pi \pi^0$	70.6 ± 4.3		
$e^+e^- \rightarrow tt$	$\tau \rightarrow \mu$	42.9 ± 7.4		
	$\tau \rightarrow e$	52.0 ± 6.8		
	$\tau \rightarrow \pi$	56.0 ± 5.1	49.1 ± 3.1	69.5 ± 3.3
	$\tau \rightarrow \pi \pi \pi$	45.9 ± 7.9		
	$\tau \rightarrow \pi \pi^0$	36.0 ± 9.1		
$\mathrm{e^+e^-} \to \tilde{\tau}_1^+ \tilde{\tau}_1^-$	$\tau \rightarrow \mu$	98.6 ± 0.3		
	$\tau \rightarrow e$	97.5 ± 0.4		
	$\tau \rightarrow \pi$	98.6 ± 0.5	98.2 ± 0.1	100
	$\tau \rightarrow \pi \pi \pi$	98.4 ± 0.4		
	$\tau \rightarrow \pi \pi^0$	98.2 ± 0.4		
$\mathrm{e^+e^-} \rightarrow \chi_1^+\chi_1^-$	$\tau \rightarrow \mu$	97.0 ± 1.2		
	$\tau \rightarrow e$	98.0 ± 1.0		
	$\tau \rightarrow \pi$	99.2 ± 0.4	98.3 ± 0.4	95.0 ± 0.6
	$\tau \rightarrow \pi \pi \pi$	100		
	$\tau \rightarrow \pi \pi^0$	96.3 ± 2.0		
$e^+e^- \to H^0 A^0$	$\tau \rightarrow \mu$	80.2 ± 3.7		
	$\tau \rightarrow e$	80.4 ± 3.8		
	$\tau \rightarrow \pi$	69.2 ± 3.4	75.2 ± 1.8	97.1 ± 0.8
	$\tau \rightarrow \pi \pi \pi$	75.8 ± 5.2		
	$\tau \rightarrow \pi \pi^0$	77.5 ± 5.9		