IDEA vs. CLD Detector Card Comparison – Prelim. Results w/ LLPs from exotic Higgs decays

Mark Larson, Louise Skinnari

Northeastern University

Based on work by Magdalena Vande Voorde, Giulia Ripellino, Axel Gallén, Rebeca Gonzalez Suarez, link to recent talk

LLPs at the FCC-ee

- **Long-lived particles (LLPs):**
  - Particles w/ decay length resolvable in detector, achieved by small couplings, often leave **displaced signatures**
  - Motivated by numerous open questions, BSM theories
- Experimental challenges of LLP searches:
  - Detectors, triggers, offline reconstruction and subsequent searches are generally designed for **prompt** decays
- Advantages of FCC-ee LLP searches:
  - Clean experimental signatures
  - Few trigger limitations and high luminosity
- Initial studies have motivated further studies:
  - Heavy Neutral Leptons (HNLs)
  - Axion-like Particles (ALPs)
  - **Scalar LLPs from exotic Higgs decays**



arXiv: 1810.1260



J. Alimena

Long-lived scalars from exotic Higgs decays

- Consider a SM + scalar model (arXiv:1312.4992, arXiv:1412.0018)
- Scalar acts as portal between SM and dark sector (e.g., Dark Matter)
- Higgs and scalar coupled by $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$, Higgs and scalar mix with angle $\mathbf{sin}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$

$$\Gamma\left(s \to X_{\mathrm{SM}} X_{\mathrm{SM}}\right) = \sin^2\theta\,\Gamma\left(h(m_s) \to X_{\mathrm{SM}} X_{\mathrm{SM}}\right)$$

- → scalar inherits coupling to SM particles from mixing, so for sufficiently small mixing will be **long-lived**

$$\mathcal{L}_{SM} \ni \underbrace{\frac{1}{2}\mu_S^2 S^2 - \frac{1}{4!}\lambda_s S^4}_{\text{scalar potential}} - \underbrace{\frac{1}{2}\kappa S^2|H|^2}_{\text{portal term}} + \underbrace{\mu^2|H|^2 - \lambda|H|^4}_{\text{Higgs potential}}$$



Production at FCC-ee

- Targeting **240 GeV, *Zh* production** stage of FCC-ee w/ signal process:

$$e^+e^- \rightarrow Z\,h \text{ with } Z \rightarrow e^+e^- \text{ or } \mu^+\mu^- \text{ and } h \rightarrow ss \rightarrow b\bar{b}b\bar{b}$$

- This provides following experimental signatures:
  - **Reconstructed Z boson** from e^+e^- or $\mu^+\mu^-$ pairs
  - **Displaced vertices** from b pairs from long-lived scalar decay





M. Vande Voorde et al.

Signal Generation and Selection

- Generated new CLD samples with CLD-like Delphes Card (IDEA card w/ tracker geometry replaced by CLD tracker geometry), IDEA samples (from previous analysis) used Winter2023 IDEA Delphes card
  - Using MadGraph v3.5.3 (3.4.2 for IDEA samples) + Pythia8 + Delphes
  - 6 separate samples generated based on varied scalar mass, mixing angle

Mass of Scalar m_S [GeV]	Mixing angle $\sin\theta$	Mean proper lifetime $c\tau$ [mm]
20	1×10^{-5}	3.4
20	1×10^{-6}	341.7
20	1×10^{-7}	34167.0
60	1×10^{-5}	0.9
60	1×10^{-6}	87.7
60	1×10^{-7}	8769.1

- Event selection (from previous analysis):
  - Note: DV cut rejects all background events from WW, ZZ, ZH processes

	Selection
Pre-selection	≥ 2 oppositely charged electrons or muons
Z boson tag	$70 < m_{ll} < 110$ GeV
Multiplicity of DVs	n_DVs ≥ 2

	WW	ZZ	ZH
Before selection	1.0	1.0	1.0
Pre-selection	0.131	0.026	0.059
$70 < m_{ll} < 110$ GeV	0.006	0.086	0.047
n_DVs ≥ 2	0.0	0.0	0.0

IDEA, CLD Differences



CLD/ILD'

- Well established design
  - ILC -> CLIC detector -> CLD
- Full Si vtx + tracker, study TPC option viability
- CALICE-like calorimetry;
- Large coil, muon system
- Engineering still needed for operation with continuous beam (no power pulsing)
  - Cooling of Si-sensors & calorimeters
- Possible detector optimizations
  - σ_p/p, σ_E/E
  - PID ($\mathcal{O}$(10 ps) timing and/or RICH)?

IDEA

- A bit less established design
  - But still ~15y history
- Si vtx detector; ultra light drift chamber with powerful PID; compact, light coil;
- Monolithic dual readout calorimeter;
  - Possibly augmented by crystal ECAL
- Muon system
- Very active community
  - Prototype designs, test beam campaigns, …

Detector summary talk

IDEA, CLD Tracking Differences





IDEA Drift Tube Geometry



CLD Tracker Geometry

Preliminary IDEA vs. CLD Results

- Applying cuts yielded following efficiencies for IDEA and CLD samples:

IDEA:

(from previous analysis by Magda Vande Voorde, et al.)

Signal Cut flow efficiencies:

	20 GeV, 1e-5	20 GeV, 1e-6	20 GeV, 1e-7
Before Selection	1.0	1.0	1.0
Pre-selection	0.957	0.950	0.949
$70 < m_{ll} < 110$ GeV	0.888	0.888	0.900
$N_{DVs} \geq 2$	0.091	0.672	0.014
	60 GeV, 1e-5	60 GeV, 1e-6	60 GeV, 1e-7
Before Selection	1.0	1.0	1.0
Pre-selection	0.957	0.957	0.951
$70 < m_{ll} < 110$ GeV	0.894	0.895	0.896
$N_{DVs} \geq 2$	0.0002	0.672	0.398

Events selected:

m_s, sin θ	n_DVs ≥ 2
20 GeV, 1e-5	5.0 ± 0.166
20 GeV, 1e-6	37.1 ± 0.453
20 GeV, 1e-7	0.8 ± 0.067
60 GeV, 1e-5	0.0033 ± 0.0023
60 GeV, 1e-6	10.96 ± 0.167
60 GeV, 1e-7	6.49 ± 0.103

Sensitive (> 3 events)

Sensitive, but significant decline

Not sensitive (< 3 events)

Note: given 1.46×10^6 Zh events

CLD:

Signal Cut flow efficiencies:

	20 GeV, 1e-5	20 GeV, 1e-6	20 GeV, 1e-7
Before Selection	1.0	1.0	1.0
Pre-selection	0.955	0.952	0.952
$70 < m_{ll} < 110$ GeV	0.891	0.896	0.903
$N_{DVs} \geq 2$	0.092	0.109	0.002
	60 GeV, 1e-5	60 GeV, 1e-6	60 GeV, 1e-7
Before Selection	1.0	1.0	1.0
Pre-selection	0.958	0.958	0.952
$70 < m_{ll} < 110$ GeV	0.895	0.897	0.899
$N_{DVs} \geq 2$	0.0002	0.654	0.0502

Events selected:

$m_s, sin\theta$	$n_{\rm DVs} \geq 2$	Mean proper lifetime $c\tau$ [mm]
20 GeV, 1e-5	5.10 ± 0.167	3.4
20 GeV, 1e-6	6.02 ± 0.182	341.7
20 GeV, 1e-7	0.11 ± 0.025	34167.0
60 GeV, 1e-5	0.003 ± 0.0023	0.9
60 GeV, 1e-6	10.67 ± 0.132	87.7
60 GeV, 1e-7	0.819 ± 0.036	8769.1

Tracking Performance: IDEA vs. CLD

Longer decay length CLD sample saw reduction in # reco. tracks,
shorter decay length CLD sample saw similar # reco. tracks



$m_s = 20\ GeV, \sin(\theta) = 1e-6, c\tau = 341.7\ mm$ sample saw significant decline in sensitivity



$m_s = 20\ GeV, \sin(\theta) = 1e-5, c\tau = 3.4\ mm$ sample saw similar sensitivity

Tracker Hits:

$m_s = 20\ GeV, \sin(\theta) = 1e-6, c\tau = 341.7\ mm$ sample

IDEA:



CLD:



Summary and Future Work

- Have generated preliminary results comparing sensitivity to LLPs using IDEA, CLD tracker geometries
- Initial results indicate similar performance for low displacements, while signal points with larger displacement show significant difference in reconstructed tracks and hence sensitivity
- **Detector Comparison:**
  - Further studies of LLPs tracking and vertexing with IDEA, CLD cards
  - Use full simulation to compare IDEA, CLD cards
- **Extending original analysis:**
  - Incorporate hadronic decay modes of Z boson to increase statistics
  - Apply Machine Learning techniques to improve signal sensitivity and background rejection

Questions I have:

- Problematic Events in Sample Generation:
  - Ran into some events causing crashes when running DELPHES (notably didn't crash w/ CLD card), different event # than Magda's samples
  - How to identify which events are problematic?
- Adding tracker hits per track / other track quality variables:
  - Is any of this information currently available in the analysis framework?
- Backgrounds:
  - Do we want to do a comparison of the cuts' effectiveness on a CLD-card generated background sample?
  - Are there Winter2023 IDEA WW, ZZ, ZH backgrounds available?
- IDEA FullSim availability:
  - When will this be available / do we want to compare using the FullSim detector cards?

Backup

Tracking Performance: IDEA vs. CLD

- $m_s = 60\ GeV, \sin(\theta) = 1e-7, c\tau = 8769.1\ mm$ sample saw significant decline in sensitivity
- Supports evidence for poor CLD tracking performance with longer decay lengths