CLICdp Overview

Overview of physics potential at CLIC



Aharon Levy, Tel Aviv University

on behalf of the **CLICdp collaboration**

CLIC detector and physics (CLICdp)

Australia	Australian Collaboration for Accelerator Science (ACAS), University of Melbourne
Belarus	National Scientific and Educational Centre of Particle and High Energy Physics (NC-PHEP), Belarusian State University, Minsk
Chile	Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Santiago
Czech Republic	Institute of Physics of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, Prague
Denmark	Department of Physics and Astronomy, Aarhus University
France	Laboratoire d'Annecy-le-Vieux de Physique des Particules (LAPP), Annecy
Germany	Max-Plack-Institut für Physik, Munich
Israel	Department of Physics, Faculty of Exact Sciences, Tel Aviv University
Norway	Department of Physics and Technology, University of Bergen
Poland	The Henryk Niewodniczanski Institute of Nuclear Physics, Polish Academy of Sciences, Cracow
Poland	Faculty of Physics and Applied Computer Science, AGH University of Science and Technology, Cracow
Romania	Institute of Space Science, Bucharest-Magurele
Serbia	Vinca Institute for Nuclear Sciences, Belgrade
Spain	Spanish Network for Future Linear Colliders
Switzerland	CERN
United Kingdom	The School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Birmingham
United Kingdom	University of Bristol
United Kingdom	University of Cambridge
United Kingdom	University of Glasgow
United Kingdom	The Department of Physics of the University of Liverpool
United Kingdom	Oxford University
USA	Argonne National Laboratory, High Energy Physics Division
USA	University of Michigan, Physics Department

Light-weight cooperation structure
No engagements, on best-effort basis
With strong collaborative links to ILC

http://clicdp.web.cern.ch/

CLICdp: 23 institutes
Spokesperson: Lucie Linssen, CERN

Focus of CLIC-specific studies on:

- Physics prospects and simulation studies
- Detector optimisation + R&D for CLIC

Outline

- Introduction to the CLIC accelerator
- Overall Physics scope and √s energy staging
- Detector requirements and experimental conditions
- CLIC experiment, sub-detectors and R&D
- Example physics capabilities
  - Higgs
  - Top
  - New Physics
- Summary

ILC and CLIC in just a few words

For details, see talk by **Andrea Latina** (Aug 6, paralll 1, 12:50)
"**CLIC overview and accelerator issues**"

CLIC



Linear e^+e^- colliders
Luminosities: few 10^{34} $cm^{-2}s^{-1}$

- 2-beam acceleration scheme, at room temperature
- Gradient 100 MV/m
- $\sqrt{s}$ up to 3 TeV
- Physics + Detector studies for 350 GeV - 3 TeV

CLIC focus is on energy frontier reach !

ILC



- Superconducting RF cavities
- Gradient 32 MV/m
- $\sqrt{s} \leq 500$ GeV (1 TeV upgrade option)
- Focus on ≤ 500 GeV, physics studies also for 1 TeV

Staged approach, scenario A+B

A



Fig. 3.5: Simplified upgrade scheme for CLIC staging scenario A. The coloured lines indicate the required movement of the modules from one stage to the next.

B



Fig. 3.6: Simplified upgrade scheme for CLIC staging scenario B.

Parameters, scenario B

Table 3.4: Parameters for the CLIC energy stages of scenario B.

Parameter	Symbol	Unit			
Centre-of-mass energy	$\sqrt{s}$	GeV	500	1500	3000
Repetition frequency	f_{rep}	Hz	50	50	50
Number of bunches per train	n_b		312	312	312
Bunch separation	Δ_t	ns	0.5	0.5	0.5
Accelerating gradient	G	MV/m	100	100	100
Total luminosity	$\mathscr{L}$	10^{34} cm^{-2}s^{-1}	1.3	3.7	5.9
Luminosity above 99% of $\sqrt{s}$	$\mathscr{L}_{0.01}$	10^{34} cm^{-2}s^{-1}	0.7	1.4	2
Main tunnel length		km	11.4	27.2	48.3
Charge per bunch	N	10^9	3.7	3.7	3.7
Bunch length	σ_z	µm	44	44	44
IP beam size	σ_x/σ_y	nm	100/2.6	$\approx$ 60/1.5	$\approx$ 40/1
Normalised emittance (end of linac)	$\varepsilon_x/\varepsilon_y$	nm	—	660/20	660/20
Normalised emittance	$\varepsilon_x/\varepsilon_y$	nm	660/25	—	—
Estimated power consumption	P_{wall}	MW	235	364	589

CLIC, possible implementation



Fig. 7.2: CLIC footprints near CERN, showing various implementation stages [5].

CLIC strategy and objectives

2013-18 Development Phase

Develop a Project Plan for a staged implementation in agreement with LHC findings; further technical developments with industry, performance studies for accelerator parts and systems, as well as for detectors.



2018-19 Decisions

On the basis of LHC data and Project Plans (for CLIC and other potential projects), take decisions about next project(s) at the Energy Frontier.

4-5 year Preparation Phase

Finalise implementation parameters, Drive Beam Facility and other system verifications, site authorisation and preparation for industrial procurement.

Prepare detailed Technical Proposals for the detector-systems.



2024-25 Construction Start

Ready for full construction and main tunnel excavation.

Construction Phase

Stage 1 construction of CLIC, in parallel with detector construction.

Preparation for implementation of further stages.



Commissioning

Becoming ready for data-taking as the LHC programme reaches completion.

Physics at CLIC

CLIC: e^+e^- collider, staged approach

- 500 fb^{-1} @ 350 – 375 GeV : precision Higgs and top physics
- 1.5 ab^{-1} @ ~1.5 TeV : precision Higgs, precision SUSY, BSM reach, …
- 2 ab^{-1} @ ~ 3 TeV : Higgs self-coupling, precision SUSY, BSM reach,

Exact energies of TeV stages would depend on LHC results



Example of energy staging

(with an example SUSY model)

sparticles in **SUSY** example scenario
(not excluded by LHC results)

CLIC machine environment

	CLIC at 3 TeV
L ($cm^{-2}s^{-1}$)	5.9×10^{34}
BX separation	0.5 ns
#BX / train	312
Train duration (ns)	156
Rep. rate	50 Hz
Duty cycle	0.00078%
σ_x / σ_y (nm)	≈ 45 / 1
σ_z (μm)	44

Cross sections of interested processes, of the order of ***fb*** ➔need high luminosity

Drives timing requirements for CLIC detector

very small beam size



1 train = 312 bunches, 0.5 ns apart

- not to scale -

On average less than one physics event per bunch train is expected

CLIC machine environment



Beam related background:

- Small beam profile at IP leads very high E-field

$$\delta E \propto \frac{N^2 \gamma_L}{(\sigma_x + \sigma_y)^2 \sigma_z}$$

- **Beamstrahlung**
  - Pair-background
    - High occupancies
  - γγ to hadrons
    - Energy deposits



Beamstrahlung ➔ important energy losses right at the interaction point

E.g. full luminosity at 3 TeV:

5.9×10^{34} cm^{-2}s^{-1}

Of which in the peak (1% most energetic part):

2.0×10^{34} cm^{-2}s^{-1}

Most physics processes are studied well above production threshold => profit from full luminosity



On average, at 3 TeV, there are 3.3 γγ → hadrons events per bunch crossing (BX) with Mγγ > 3 GeV.

CLIC conditions => impact on detector

CLIC conditions => impact on detector technologies:

- **High tracker occupancies => need small cell sizes**
  (beyond what is needed for resolution)
  - Small vertex pixels
  - Large pixels / short strips in the tracker
- **Bkg energy => need high-granularity calorimetry**
- **Bkg suppression => overall need for precise hit timing**
  - ~10 ns hit time-stamping in tracking
  - 1 ns accuracy for calorimeter hits
- **Low duty cycle**
  - Triggerless readout
  - Allows for power pulsing
    - => less mass and high precision in tracking
    - => high density for calorimetry





$e^+e^- \rightarrow H^+H^- \rightarrow t\bar{b}\bar{b}t \rightarrow 8$ jets

CLIC physics aims => detector needs

★ **momentum resolution:**

e.g. Smuon endpoint

Higgs recoil mass, Higgs coupling to muons

$$\sigma_{p_T}/p_T^2 \sim 2\times10^{-5}\,\mathrm{GeV}^{-1}$$



★ **jet energy resolution:**

e.g. W/Z/h di-jet mass separation

$$\frac{\sigma_E}{E} \sim 3.5-5\,\%$$

(for high-E jets)



★ **impact parameter resolution:**

e.g. c/b-tagging, Higgs BR

$$\sigma_{r\phi} = 5 \oplus 15/(p[\mathrm{GeV}]\sin^{\frac{3}{2}}\theta)\,\mu\mathrm{m}$$



★ **angular coverage, very forward electron tagging**

+ requirements from CLIC beam structure and beam-induced background

CLIC detector concept



CLIC vertex detector



Want very precise positioning and timing. Precise positioning, need very low mass, not to loose on multiple scattering. Challenge: have all three; low mass, and timing, and small pixels.

- ~25×25 µm pixel size => ~2 Giga-pixels
- 0.2% X_0 material per layer <= very thin !
  - Very thin materials/sensors
  - Low-power design, power pulsing, air cooling
  - Aim: 50 mW/cm^2
- Time stamping 10 ns
- Radiation level <10^{11} $n_{eq}cm^{-2}year^{-1}$ <= 10^4 lower than LHC



Very active R&D ongoing

CLIC_ILD ↙ and CLIC_SiD ↘ tracker

TPC + silicon tracker in 4 Tesla field





Time Projection Chamber (TPC) with MPGD readout

All-silicon tracker in 5 Tesla field



chip on sensor



Silicon-based tracking studies for new CLIC detector model starting

Calorimetry and PFA

Jet energy resolution and **background rejection** drive the overall detector design

=> => fine-grained calorimetry + Particle Flow Analysis (PFA)

What is PFA?

Typical jet composition:
60% charged particles
30% photons
10% long-lived neutral hadrons





Always use the best info you have:
60% => tracker
30% => ECAL
10% => HCAL

Hardware + software !

CLIC forward calorimetry

2 forward calorimeters: Lumical + Beamcal

- e/γ acceptance to small angles
- Luminosity measurement <= Bhabha !
- Beam feedback

Tungsten thickness 1 X_0, 40 layers
BeamCal sensors GaAs
LumiCal sensors silicon

BeamCal angular coverage 10 - 40 mrad
LumiCal coverage 38 – 110 mrad

doses up to 1 Mgy
neutron fluxes of up to 10^{14} per year





Very compact !
Active layer gap is 0.8 mm
Moliere radius 11 mm



• CLIC physics capabilities

Examples of benchmark studies, Geant4-based full detector simulations with overlay of γγ background. Analyses include SM physics backgrounds.

Higgs physics at CLIC



Dominant processes:



Higgsstrahlung decreases with √s



W(Z) - fusion increases with √s

√s (TeV)	0.35	1.4	3	
Int. Lumi. (fb^{-1})	500	1,500	2,000	~4 years
#ZH evts	68,000	20,000	11,000	Higgsstrahlung
#$H\nu_e\nu_e$ evts	17,000	370,000	830,000	WW fusion
#He^+e^- evts	3,700	37,000	84,000	ZZ fusion

Higgs physics at CLIC



Higgs-Strahlung: $e^+e^- \to ZH$
- Measure H from Z-recoil mass
- Model-independent meas.: m_H, σ
- Yields absolute value of g_{HZZ}

WW fusion: $e^+e^- \to H\nu_e\nu_e$
- Precise cross-section measurements in ττ, μμ, qq, … decay modes
- Profits from higher √s (≳350 GeV)

Radiation off top-quarks: $e^+e^- \to ttH$
- Measure top Yukawa coupling
- Needs √s≳700 GeV

Double-Higgs prod.: $e^+e^- \to HH\nu_e\nu_e$
- Measure tri-linear self coupling
- Needs high √s (≳1.4 TeV)









Higgsstrahlung





model-independent Higgs measurement
(coupling and mass)
yields absolute coupling value g_{HZZ}

Identify Higgs through Z recoil

Z => μμ	~3.5%	very clean	$\Delta\sigma(_{HZ}) = \pm 4.2\%$
Z => ee	~3.5%	very clean	
Z => qq	~70%	model independent ?	$\Delta\sigma(_{HZ}) = \pm 1.8\%$

Work in progress !

$$\Delta\left(\sigma_{HZ}\frac{\Gamma_{vis}}{\Gamma}\right) = \pm\ 1.7\% \quad + \quad \Delta\left(\sigma_{HZ}\frac{\Gamma_{invis}}{\Gamma}\right) = \pm 0.6\,\%$$

$$\Delta g(_{HZZ}) = \pm 0.8\%$$

(See Thomson + Mei, AWLC14@FNAL)

Double Higgs production





- The $HH\nu_e\nu_e$ cross section is sensitive to the Higgs self-coupling, λ, and the quartic g_{HHWW} coupling

- $\sigma(HH\nu_e\nu_e)$ = 0.15 (0.59) fb at 1.4 (3) TeV
  → high energy and luminosity crucial

	1.4 TeV	3 TeV
$\Delta(g_{HHWW})$	7% (preliminary)	3% (preliminary)
$\Delta(\lambda)$	32%	16%
$\Delta(\lambda)$ for $p(e^-)$ = 80%	24%	12%

Work in progress !

Summary of Higgs measurements

Channel	Measurement	Observable	Statistical precision 350 GeV 500 fb^{-1}	1.4 TeV 1.5 ab^{-1}	3.0 TeV 2.0 ab^{-1}
ZH	Recoil mass distribution	m_H	120 MeV	–	–
ZH	$\sigma(HZ) \times BR(H \to \text{invisible})$	Γ_{inv}	0.6%	–	–
ZH	$H \to b\bar{b}$ mass distribution	m_H	tbd	–	–
$H\nu_e\bar{\nu}_e$	$H \to b\bar{b}$ mass distribution	m_H	–	40 MeV*	33 MeV*
ZH	$\sigma(HZ) \times BR(Z \to \ell^+\ell^-)$	g^2_{HZZ}	4.2%	–	–
ZH	$\sigma(HZ) \times BR(Z \to q\bar{q})$	g^2_{HZZ}	1.8%	–	–
ZH	$\sigma(HZ) \times BR(H \to b\bar{b})$	$g^2_{HZZ}g^2_{Hbb}/\Gamma_H$	1%†	–	–
ZH	$\sigma(HZ) \times BR(H \to c\bar{c})$	$g^2_{HZZ}g^2_{Hcc}/\Gamma_H$	5%†	–	–
ZH	$\sigma(HZ) \times BR(H \to gg)$		6%†	–	–
ZH	$\sigma(HZ) \times BR(H \to \tau^+\tau^-)$	$g^2_{HZZ}g^2_{H\tau\tau}/\Gamma_H$	5.7%	–	–
ZH	$\sigma(HZ) \times BR(H \to WW^*)$	$g^2_{HZZ}g^2_{HWW}/\Gamma_H$	2%†	–	–
ZH	$\sigma(HZ) \times BR(H \to ZZ^*)$	$g^2_{HZZ}g^2_{HZZ}/\Gamma_H$	tbd	–	–
$H\nu_e\bar{\nu}_e$	$\sigma(H\nu_e\bar{\nu}_e) \times BR(H \to b\bar{b})$	$g^2_{HWW}g^2_{Hbb}/\Gamma_H$	3%†	0.3%	0.2%
$H\nu_e\bar{\nu}_e$	$\sigma(H\nu_e\bar{\nu}_e) \times BR(H \to c\bar{c})$	$g^2_{HWW}g^2_{Hcc}/\Gamma_H$	–	2.9%	2.7%
$H\nu_e\bar{\nu}_e$	$\sigma(H\nu_e\bar{\nu}_e) \times BR(H \to gg)$		–	1.8%	1.8%
$H\nu_e\bar{\nu}_e$	$\sigma(H\nu_e\bar{\nu}_e) \times BR(H \to \tau^+\tau^-)$	$g^2_{HWW}g^2_{H\tau\tau}/\Gamma_H$	–	3.7%*	tbd
$H\nu_e\bar{\nu}_e$	$\sigma(H\nu_e\bar{\nu}_e) \times BR(H \to \mu^+\mu^-)$	$g^2_{HWW}g^2_{H\mu\mu}/\Gamma_H$	–	38%	16%
$H\nu_e\bar{\nu}_e$	$\sigma(H\nu_e\bar{\nu}_e) \times BR(H \to \gamma\gamma)$		–	15%	tbd
$H\nu_e\bar{\nu}_e$	$\sigma(H\nu_e\bar{\nu}_e) \times BR(H \to Z\gamma)$		–	42%	tbd
$H\nu_e\bar{\nu}_e$	$\sigma(H\nu_e\bar{\nu}_e) \times BR(H \to WW^*)$	g^4_{HWW}/Γ_H	tbd	1.1%*	0.8%*
$H\nu_e\bar{\nu}_e$	$\sigma(H\nu_e\bar{\nu}_e) \times BR(H \to ZZ^*)$	$g^2_{HWW}g^2_{HZZ}/\Gamma_H$	–	3%†	2%†
He^+e^-	$\sigma(He^+e^-) \times BR(H \to b\bar{b})$	$g^2_{HZZ}g^2_{Hbb}/\Gamma_H$	–	1%†	0.7%†
$t\bar{t}H$	$\sigma(t\bar{t}H) \times BR(H \to b\bar{b})$	$g^2_{Htt}g^2_{Hbb}/\Gamma_H$	–	8%	tbd
$HH\nu_e\bar{\nu}_e$	$\sigma(HH\nu_e\bar{\nu}_e)$	g_{HHWW}	–	7%*	3%*
$HH\nu_e\bar{\nu}_e$	$\sigma(HH\nu_e\bar{\nu}_e)$	λ	–	32%	16%
$HH\nu_e\bar{\nu}_e$	with -80% e^- polarization	λ	–	24%	12%

Summary of CLIC Higgs benchmark simulations

http://arxiv.org/abs/1307.5288

Have one channel with absolute number. Insert all in a global combined fit.

Work in progress !

* Preliminary
\+ Estimate

CLIC Higgs global fits

Work in progress !

★ Model-independent global fits

80% electron polarisation assumed above 1 TeV

Parameter	Measurement precision		
	350 GeV 500 fb^{-1}	+ 1.4 TeV +1.5 ab^{-1}	+3.0 TeV +2.0 ab^{-1}
m_H	120 MeV	30 MeV	20 MeV
λ	–	24%	11%
Γ_H [%]	5.0	3.6	3.4
g_{HZZ} [%]	0.8	0.8	0.8
g_{HWW} [%]	1.8	0.9	0.9
g_{Hbb} [%]	2.0	1.0	0.9
g_{Hcc} [%]	3.2	1.4	1.1
g_{Htt} [%]	–	4.1	4.1
$g_{H\tau\tau}$ [%]	3.5	1.6	< 1.5
$g_{H\mu\mu}$ [%]	–	14	5.6
g_{Hgg} [%]	3.6	1.1	1.0
$g_{H\gamma\gamma}$ [%]	–	5.7	< 5.7

★ ~1 % precision on many couplings

- limited by g_{HZZ} precision

★ Constrained "LHC-style" fits

- Assuming no invisible Higgs decays (model-dependent):

$$\kappa_i^2 = \frac{\Gamma_i}{\Gamma_i|_{SM}} \qquad \Gamma_{H,md} = \sum_i \kappa_i^2 \, BR_i$$

Parameter	Measurement precision		
	350 GeV 500 fb^{-1}	+ 1.4 TeV +1.5 ab^{-1}	+3.0 TeV +2.0 ab^{-1}
$\Gamma_{H,model}$ [%]	1.6	0.29	0.22
κ_{HZZ} [%]	0.43	0.31	0.23
κ_{HWW} [%]	1.5	0.15	0.11
κ_{Hbb} [%]	1.7	0.33	0.21
κ_{Htt} [%]	3.1	1.0	0.74
$\kappa_{H\tau\tau}$ [%]	3.4	1.3	< 1.3
κ_{Hgg} [%]	3.6	0.76	0.56
$\kappa_{H\gamma\gamma}$ [%]	–	5.6	< 5.6

★ sub-% precision for most couplings

Top physics at CLIC

Exploration of scope for top physics at CLIC is in an **early stage**:

- Existing studies concentrate on top mass measurements
- Coupling to the Higgs (as part of Higgs studies)

Plans for next studies include:

- Asymmetries to study couplings to γ, Z
- Measurement of couplings to W
- Sensitivity to CP violation
- Flavour-changing top decays
- ….



Results of top benchmark studies





$\sqrt{s}$ (GeV)	Technique	Measured quantity	Integrated luminosity (fb^{-1})	Unit	Generator value	Stat. error	
350	Threshold scan	Mass α_S	10×10	GeV	174 0.118	0.033 0.0009	right
500	Invariant mass	Mass	100	GeV	174	0.080	left plot

Final result is dominated by systematic errors (theor. normalisation, beam-energy systematics, translation of 1S mass to $\overline{MS}$ scheme) => 100 MeV error on top mass

Sensitivity to Higgs partners

Higgs multiplet BSM ➔ searches **accessible up to √s/2**

Example MSSM benchmark study at 3 TeV, 2 ab^{-1}

Multi-jet final states
Full simulation studies with background overlay

$M_1 = 780\ \text{GeV}, M_2 = 940\ \text{GeV}, M_3 = 540\ \text{GeV}$
$A_0 = -750\ \text{GeV}, m_0 = 303\ \text{GeV}, \tan\beta = 24, \mu > 0$
$m_t = 173.3\ \text{GeV}, M_b(M_b) = 4.25\ \text{GeV}, \alpha_S(M_Z) = 0.118$

m_{A^0/H^0} : $\pm 2.8\,\text{GeV}$



$m_{H^\pm}$: $\pm 2.4\,\text{GeV}$



Results of SUSY benchmarks

Table 8: Summary table of the CLIC SUSY benchmark analyses results obtained with full-detector simulations with background overlaid. All studies are performed at a center-of-mass energy of 3 TeV (1.4 TeV) and for an integrated luminosity of 2 ab^{-1} (1.5 ab^{-1}) [21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27].

$\sqrt{s}$ (TeV)	Process	Decay mode	SUSY model	Measured quantity	Generator value (GeV)	Stat. uncertainty
3.0	Sleptons	$\tilde{\mu}_R^+\tilde{\mu}_R^- \to \mu^+\mu^-\tilde{\chi}_1^0\tilde{\chi}_1^0$	II	$\tilde{\ell}$ mass	1010.8	0.6%
				$\tilde{\chi}_1^0$ mass	340.3	1.9%
		$\tilde{e}_R^+\tilde{e}_R^- \to e^+e^-\tilde{\chi}_1^0\tilde{\chi}_1^0$		$\tilde{\ell}$ mass	1010.8	0.3%
				$\tilde{\chi}_1^0$ mass	340.3	1.0%
		$\tilde{\nu}_e\tilde{\nu}_e \to \tilde{\chi}_1^0\tilde{\chi}_1^0 e^+e^-W^+W^-$		$\tilde{\ell}$ mass	1097.2	0.4%
				$\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm$ mass	643.2	0.6%
3.0	Chargino Neutralino	$\tilde{\chi}_1^+\tilde{\chi}_1^- \to \tilde{\chi}_1^0\tilde{\chi}_1^0 W^+W^-$	II	$\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm$ mass	643.2	1.1%
		$\tilde{\chi}_2^0\tilde{\chi}_2^0 \to h/Z^0\, h/Z^0\, \tilde{\chi}_1^0\tilde{\chi}_1^0$		$\tilde{\chi}_2^0$ mass	643.1	1.5%
3.0	Squarks	$\tilde{q}_R\tilde{q}_R \to q\bar{q}\tilde{\chi}_1^0\tilde{\chi}_1^0$	I	$\tilde{q}_R$ mass	1123.7	0.52%
3.0	Heavy Higgs	$H^0A^0 \to b\bar{b}b\bar{b}$	I	H^0/A^0 mass	902.4/902.6	0.3%
		$H^+H^- \to t\bar{b}b\bar{t}$		$H^\pm$ mass	906.3	0.3%
1.4	Sleptons	$\tilde{\mu}_R^+\tilde{\mu}_R^- \to \mu^+\mu^-\tilde{\chi}_1^0\tilde{\chi}_1^0$	III	$\tilde{\ell}$ mass	560.8	0.1%
				$\tilde{\chi}_1^0$ mass	357.8	0.1%
		$\tilde{e}_R^+\tilde{e}_R^- \to e^+e^-\tilde{\chi}_1^0\tilde{\chi}_1^0$		$\tilde{\ell}$ mass	558.1	0.1%
				$\tilde{\chi}_1^0$ mass	357.1	0.1%
		$\tilde{\nu}_e\tilde{\nu}_e \to \tilde{\chi}_1^0\tilde{\chi}_1^0 e^+e^-W^+W^-$		$\tilde{\ell}$ mass	644.3	2.5%
				$\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm$ mass	487.6	2.7%
1.4	Stau	$\tilde{\tau}_1^+\tilde{\tau}_1^- \to \tau^+\tau^-\tilde{\chi}_1^0\tilde{\chi}_1^0$	III	$\tilde{\tau}_1$ mass	517	2.0%
1.4	Chargino Neutralino	$\tilde{\chi}_1^+\tilde{\chi}_1^- \to \tilde{\chi}_1^0\tilde{\chi}_1^0 W^+W^-$	III	$\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm$ mass	487	0.2%
		$\tilde{\chi}_2^0\tilde{\chi}_2^0 \to h/Z^0\, h/Z^0\, \tilde{\chi}_1^0\tilde{\chi}_1^0$		$\tilde{\chi}_2^0$ mass	487	0.1%

Large part of the SUSY spectrum measured at <1% level

CLIC reach for New Physics

CLIC at 3 TeV

New particle	LHC (14 TeV)	HL-LHC	CLIC3	
squarks [TeV]	2.5	3	$\lesssim$1.5	Direct observation
sleptons [TeV]	0.3	-	$\lesssim$1.5	
Z' (SM couplings) [TeV]	5	7	20	Loop / effective operator
2 extra dims M_D [TeV]	9	12	20–30	
TGC (95%) (λ_γ coupling)	0.001	0.0006	0.0001	
μ contact scale [TeV]	15	-	60	
Higgs composite scale [TeV]	5–7	9–12	70	

Table 10: Discovery reach of various theory models for different colliders [5]. LHC at $\sqrt{s}$ = 14 TeV assumes 100 fb^{-1} of integrated luminosity, while HL-LHC is with 1 ab^{-1}, and CLIC3 is $\sqrt{s} = 3$ TeV with up to 2 ab^{-1}. TGC is short for Triple Gauge Coupling, and "μ contact scale" is short for LL μ contact interaction scale Λ with $g = 1$.

A. De Roeck, J. R. Ellis and F. Gianotti, Physics motivations for future CERN accelerators, arXiv:hep-ex/01 12004.

Documentation

CLIC Conceptual Design report (2012)

- **CLIC CDR** (#1), A Multi-TeV Linear Collider based on CLIC Technology, CERN-2012-007, https://edms.cern.ch/document/1234244/
- **CLIC CDR** (#2), Physics and Detectors at CLIC, CERN-2012-003, arXiv:1202.5940
- **CLIC CDR** (#3), The CLIC Programme: towards a staged e^+e^- Linear Collider exploring the Terascale, CERN-2012-005, http://arxiv.org/abs/1209.2543

Recent update on CLIC physics potential (in particular Higgs)

- Physics at the CLIC e+e- Linear Collider, Input to the Snowmass process 2013, http://arxiv.org/abs/1307.5288

Summary

CLIC is currently the only mature option for a multi-TeV e^+e^- collider

Very active R&D projects for accelerator and physics/detector

- Energy staging ➔ optimal physics exploration
  - With possible stages at 350 GeV, 1.4, and 3 TeV
- CLIC @ 350 GeV
  - Precision Higgs and top measurements
- CLIC @ 1.4 and 3 TeV
  - Improved precision of many observables and access to rare Higgs decays
  - Discovery machine for BSM physics at the energy frontier

Thank you !

http://clicdp.web.cern.ch/

SPARE SLIDES

CLIC and FCC


CERN-hosted design studies at the high-energy frontier
2014
FCC
hh ee he
under/for discussion !
Progress tracking:
CERN "MAC" machine advisory committee
+
CERN-based or other European-based follow-up on physics/ detector studies
CDR
PIP
~2018
next European strategy update
(PIP = Project Implementation Plan)

The key results of the CDR studies



Drive beam scheme
- Generation tested, used to accelerate test beam above specifications, deceleration as expected
- Improvements on operation, reliability, losses, more deceleration studies ongoing



Main Linac gradient
- Ongoing test close to or on target (BDR 10^{-7}, 100 MV/m)
- Uncertainty from beam loading under test



Luminosity performance
- Damping ring like an ambitious light source, no show stopper
- Alignment system principle demonstrated
- Stabilisation system developed, benchmarked, better system in pipeline
- Simulations on or close to the target, plus verification studies in FACET and ATF on-going



Implementation
- Consistent three stage implementation scenario defined
- Schedules, cost and power developed and presented
- Site and CE studies documented



CLIC physics accuracy
- Full GEANT 4 simulation and reconstruction with background
- Make full use of timing and fine granularity to reconstruct physics objects with high precision
- High precision e+e- physics potential confirmed

Main activities and goals for 2018



Physics studies related to energy frontier capabilities and potential new physics as it emerges from LHC

Detector R&D compatible with CLIC specifications



A re-baselined staged project plan, cost and power optimisation, increased industrialisation effort for cost-drivers



High Gradient structure development and significantly increased test-capacity for X-band RF-structures



System-test programmes in CTF3, at ATF and FACET, as well as system-tests in collaborative programmes with light-source laboratories



Technical systems developments, related among others to complete modules, alignment/stability, instrumentation and power sources

Staged approach, scenario A+B

A



Fig. 3.5: Simplified upgrade scheme for CLIC staging scenario A. The coloured lines indicate the required movement of the modules from one stage to the next.

B



Fig. 3.6: Simplified upgrade scheme for CLIC staging scenario B.

CLIC layout at 500 GeV

A



Fig. 3.2: Overview of the CLIC layout at $\sqrt{s}$ =500 GeV. (scenario A)

Parameters, scenario A

Table 3.3: Parameters for the CLIC energy stages of scenario A.

Parameter	Symbol	Unit			
Centre-of-mass energy	$\sqrt{s}$	GeV	500	1400	3000
Repetition frequency	f_{rep}	Hz	50	50	50
Number of bunches per train	n_b		354	312	312
Bunch separation	Δ_t	ns	0.5	0.5	0.5
Accelerating gradient	G	MV/m	80	80/100	100
Total luminosity	$\mathscr{L}$	10^{34} cm^{-2}s^{-1}	2.3	3.2	5.9
Luminosity above 99% of $\sqrt{s}$	$\mathscr{L}_{0.01}$	10^{34} cm^{-2}s^{-1}	1.4	1.3	2
Main tunnel length		km	13.2	27.2	48.3
Charge per bunch	N	10^9	6.8	3.7	3.7
Bunch length	σ_z	µm	72	44	44
IP beam size	σ_x/σ_y	nm	200/2.6	$\approx$ 60/1.5	$\approx$ 40/1
Normalised emittance (end of linac)	$\varepsilon_x/\varepsilon_y$	nm	2350/20	660/20	660/20
Normalised emittance (IP)	$\varepsilon_x/\varepsilon_y$	nm	2400/25	—	—
Estimated power consumption	P_{wall}	MW	272	364	589

Parameters, scenario B

Table 3.4: Parameters for the CLIC energy stages of scenario B.

Parameter	Symbol	Unit			
Centre-of-mass energy	$\sqrt{s}$	GeV	500	1500	3000
Repetition frequency	f_{rep}	Hz	50	50	50
Number of bunches per train	n_b		312	312	312
Bunch separation	Δ_t	ns	0.5	0.5	0.5
Accelerating gradient	G	MV/m	100	100	100
Total luminosity	$\mathscr{L}$	10^{34} cm^{-2}s^{-1}	1.3	3.7	5.9
Luminosity above 99% of $\sqrt{s}$	$\mathscr{L}_{0.01}$	10^{34} cm^{-2}s^{-1}	0.7	1.4	2
Main tunnel length		km	11.4	27.2	48.3
Charge per bunch	N	10^9	3.7	3.7	3.7
Bunch length	σ_z	µm	44	44	44
IP beam size	σ_x/σ_y	nm	100/2.6	$\approx$ 60/1.5	$\approx$ 40/1
Normalised emittance (end of linac)	$\varepsilon_x/\varepsilon_y$	nm	—	660/20	660/20
Normalised emittance	$\varepsilon_x/\varepsilon_y$	nm	660/25	—	—
Estimated power consumption	P_{wall}	MW	235	364	589

Integrated luminosity

Possible scenarios “A” and “B”, these are **“just examples”**



Fig. 5.2: Integrated luminosity in the scenarios optimised for luminosity in the first energy stage (left) and optimised for entry costs (right). Years are counted from the start of beam commissioning. These figures include luminosity ramp-up of four years (5%, 25%, 50%, 75%) in the first stage and two years (25%, 50%) in subsequent stages.

Based on 200 days/year at 50% efficiency (accelerator + data taking combined)

=> CLIC can provide an evolving and rich physics program over several decades

CLIC_ILD and CLIC_SiD

Two general-purpose CLIC detector concepts

Based on initial ILC concepts (ILD and SiD)

Optimised and adapted to CLIC conditions

CLIC_ILD

CLIC_SiD



comparison CLIC ⇔ LHC detector

In a nutshell:

CLIC detector:

- **High precision:**
  - Jet energy resolution
    - => fine-grained calorimetry
  - Momentum resolution
  - Impact parameter resolution
- **Overlapping beam-induced background:**
  - High background rates, medium energies
  - High occupancies
  - Cannot use vertex separation
  - Need very precise timing (1ns, 10ns)
- **"No" issue of radiation damage (10^{-4} LHC)**
  - Except small forward calorimeters
- **Beam crossings "sporadic"**
- **No trigger, read-out of full 156 ns train**

LHC detector:

- **Medium-high precision:**
  - Very precise ECAL (CMS)
  - Very precise muon tracking (ATLAS)
- **Overlapping minimum-bias events:**
  - High background rates, high energies
  - High occupancies
  - Can use vertex separation in z
  - Need precise time-stamping (25 ns)
- **Severe challenge of radiation damage**
- **Continuous beam crossings**
- **Trigger has to achieve huge data reduction**

CLIC vertex detector: thin assemblies

Ultimate aim:

- 50 µm sensor on 50 µm ASIC
- Slim-edge sensors
- Through-Silicon Vias (TSV)
  - eliminates need for wire bonds
  - 4-side buttable chip/sensor assemblies
  - large active surfaces => less material



Medipix3RX with TSV
by (CEA-LETI)



50 µm thin sensor on Timpix
tested at test beam !



99.2% eff. at operating threshold

First successful picture
using Medipix3RX with TSV

CLIC vertex R&D: power pulsing



Design for low mass !

- Power pulsing with local energy storage in Si capacitors and voltage regulation with Low-Dropout Regulators (LDO)
- FPGA-controlled current source provides small continuous current

Local material: now 0.1%X_0/layer, can be reduced to 0.04%X_0/layer (Si-capacitor technology)

Analog:

- Voltage drop ~16 mV
- Measured average power dissipation <10 mW/cm^2

Digital

- Voltage drop ~70 mV
- Measured average power dissipation <35 mW/cm^2

Total dissipation <50 mW/cm^2



Vertex det. geometry optimisation



Double-sided layers

Comparison of 5 single-sided layers and 3 double-sided layers



Single-sided layers

- Similar flavour tag performance for two considered layouts
- Increasing the material has a larger impact than the layout







background suppression at CLIC

Triggerless readout of full train



- **Full event reconstruction + PFA analysis with background overlaid**
  - => physics objects with precise p_T and cluster time information
  - Time corrected for shower development and TOF
- **Then apply cluster-based timing cuts**
  - Cuts depend on particle-type, p_T and detector region
  - Allows to protect high-p_T physics objects



+

- **Use well-adapted jet clustering algorithms**
  - Making use of LHC experience (FastJet)

time window / time resolution

The event reconstruction software uses:

Subdetector	Reconstruction window	hit resolution
ECAL	10 ns	1 ns
HCAL Endcaps	10 ns	1 ns
HCAL Barrel	100 ns	1 ns
Silicon Detectors	10 ns	$10/\sqrt{12}$ ns
TPC	entire bunch train	n/a

t_0 physics event (offline)

Translates in precise **timing requirements** of the sub-detectors

combined p_T and timing cuts



$$e^+e^- \rightarrow H^+H^- \rightarrow t\bar{b}\bar{b}t \rightarrow 8\ \text{jets}$$

1.2 TeV background in reconstruction time window

100 GeV background after tight cuts

PFO-based timing cuts

Region	p_t *range*	Time cut
Photons		
central	$0.75\ \text{GeV} \leq p_t < 4.0\ \text{GeV}$	$t < 2.0$ nsec
$(\cos\theta \leq 0.975)$	$0\ \text{GeV} \leq p_t < 0.75\ \text{GeV}$	$t < 1.0$ nsec
forward	$0.75\ \text{GeV} \leq p_t < 4.0\ \text{GeV}$	$t < 2.0$ nsec
$(\cos\theta > 0.975)$	$0\ \text{GeV} \leq p_t < 0.75\ \text{GeV}$	$t < 1.0$ nsec
Neutral hadrons		
central	$0.75\ \text{GeV} \leq p_t < 8.0\ \text{GeV}$	$t < 2.5$ nsec
$(\cos\theta \leq 0.975)$	$0\ \text{GeV} \leq p_t < 0.75\ \text{GeV}$	$t < 1.5$ nsec
forward	$0.75\ \text{GeV} \leq p_t < 8.0\ \text{GeV}$	$t < 2.0$ nsec
$(\cos\theta > 0.975)$	$0\ \text{GeV} \leq p_t < 0.75\ \text{GeV}$	$t < 1.0$ nsec
Charged PFOs		
all	$0.75\ \text{GeV} \leq p_t < 4.0\ \text{GeV}$	$t < 3.0$ nsec
	$0\ \text{GeV} \leq p_t < 0.75\ \text{GeV}$	$t < 1.5$ nsec

gaugino pair production, 3 TeV

Example

SUSY "*model II*": $m(\tilde{\chi}_1^0) = 340\,\text{GeV}$ $m(\tilde{\chi}_2^0), m(\tilde{\chi}_1^+) \approx 643\,\text{GeV}$

Pair production and decay:

$$e^+e^- \to \tilde{\chi}_1^+\tilde{\chi}_1^- \to \tilde{\chi}_1^0\tilde{\chi}_1^0 W^+W^-$$

$$e^+e^- \to \tilde{\chi}_2^0\tilde{\chi}_2^0 \to hh\,\tilde{\chi}_1^0\tilde{\chi}_1^0 \quad 82\,\%$$

$$e^+e^- \to \tilde{\chi}_2^0\tilde{\chi}_2^0 \to Zh\,\tilde{\chi}_1^0\tilde{\chi}_1^0 \quad 17\,\%$$

Separation using di-jet invariant masses (test of PFA)



$m(\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm) : \pm 7\,\text{GeV}$

$m(\tilde{\chi}_2^0) : \pm 10\,\text{GeV}$

use slepton study result

$m(\tilde{\chi}_1^0) : \pm 3\,\text{GeV}$

Indirect Z' search

Indirect Z' search in $e^+e^- \Rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$



Fig. 14: 5σ limit for a $M_{Z'}$ discovery as function of the integrated luminosity for different values of the couplings g'_Y and g'_{BL}. The limits shown are determined from the combined observables σ and A_{FB} at $\sqrt{s} = 3$ TeV and 1.4 TeV.

Higgs compositeness



LHC: WW scattering and strong double Higgs production

LHC: single Higgs processes

CLIC: double Higgs production via vector boson fusion



LHC: direct search WZ =>3 leptons

Allows to probe Higgs compositeness at the 30 TeV scale for 1 ab^{-1} at 3 TeV

(60 TeV scale if combined with single Higgs production)

European Strategy statements
=> high-energy frontier

2006 statement "4":

4. In order to be in the position to push the energy and luminosity frontier even further it is vital to strengthen the advanced accelerator R&D programme; *a coordinated programme should be intensified, to develop the CLIC technology and high performance magnets for future accelerators, and to play a significant role in the study and development of a high-intensity neutrino facility.*

proton-proton
or
electron-positron

at high-energy frontier

2013 statement "d":

d) To stay at the forefront of particle physics, Europe needs to be in a position to propose an ambitious post-LHC accelerator project at CERN by the time of the next Strategy update, when physics results from the LHC running at 14 TeV will be available. *CERN should undertake design studies for accelerator projects in a global context, with emphasis on proton-proton and electron-positron high-energy frontier machines. These design studies should be coupled to a vigorous accelerator R&D programme, including high-field magnets and high-gradient accelerating structures, in collaboration with national institutes, laboratories and universities worldwide.*