

TDR:performance

Technical Design Report of the CEPC Reference Detector

Author: the CEPC study group

Institute:

Date: June 25, 2025

Version: 0.1

Bio: Information

Contents

Chapter 1	Detector and Physics performance	1
1.1	Introduction	1
1.2	Detector Performance	1
1.2.1	Tracking (Chenguang Zhang, Hao Zhu, et al.)	1
1.2.1.1	Tracking efficiency	1
1.2.1.2	Momentum resolution	2
1.2.1.3	Impact parameter resolution	3
1.2.2	Performance of Photon, Electron and Muon (Ligang Xia, Reda, Danning Liu, et al.)	4
1.2.2.1	Identification of Photon, Electron and Muon	4
1.2.2.2	Photon energy resolutions	4
1.2.2.3	Electron momentum resolutions	4
1.2.2.4	Muon momentum resolutions	4
1.2.3	PID for Charged Hadrons (Chenguang Zhang, Xiaotian Ma, et al.)	4
1.2.4	Jets (Kaili Zhang, Xiaotian Ma, Yingqi Hou, Chenguang Zhang, Jiarong Li, et al.)	4
1.2.4.1	Jet Energy Resolution in $Z \rightarrow qq$ vents	7
1.2.4.2	Jet performance in physics events	7
1.2.5	Vertexing (Chenguang Zhang, et al.)	12
1.2.5.1	Vertex Efficiency	12
1.2.5.2	Vertex Resolution	12
1.2.6	Jet Flavor Tagging - traditional way (Chenguang Zhang, et al.)	12
1.2.7	Jet Origin ID (Manqi Ruan, Kaili Zhang, et al.)	12
1.3	Physics Benchmarks	13
1.3.1	Event Generation (Kaili Zhang, Gang Li, et al.)	13
1.3.1.1	Monte Carlo event generators	13
1.3.1.2	Generated signal and background samples	13
1.3.2	Analysis Tools	13
1.3.2.1	Multivariate analysis tools	14
1.3.3	Higgs mass and production cross-section through recoil mass (Mingshui Chen, et al.)	14
1.3.4	Branching ratios of the Higgs boson in hadronics final states (Yanping Huang, et al.)	14
1.3.5	$H \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ (Yaquan Fang, et al.)	14
1.3.6	$H \rightarrow invisible$ (Mingshui Chen, et al.)	14
1.3.7	Weak mixing angle (Zhijun Liang, Bo Liu, et al.)	14
1.3.8	A channel in flavor physics (Shanzhen Chen, et al.)	14
1.3.9	top mass and width (Xiaohu Sun, et al.)	14
1.3.10	W fusion cross section (Hongbo Liao, et al.)	14
1.3.11	Long-lived particles (Liang Li, et al.)	14
1.3.12	smuon (Xuai Zhuang, et al.)	14
1.3.13	Partial decay width of $Z \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$	14
1.3.14	$H \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$	14
1.4	Challenges & Plan	15
1.4.1	Strategy for the measurement of absolute luminosity	15
1.4.2	Plan of the use of resonant depolarization for W/Z mass (Zhe Duan)	15
1.4.3	Methods & Considerations for Calibration, Alignment (Jin Wang)	16
1.4.4	Further technology decisions/detector optimization	16
1.5	Summary	16

Chapter 1 Detector and Physics performance

1.1 Introduction

The overall performance of the CEPC Reference TDR detector is established using a detailed GEANT4 model [ref] and full reconstruction of the simulated events. Using full simulation and a realistic reconstruction ensures that the performance is as realistic as possible and takes into account the detailed knowledge on detector mechanics, dead areas, and non-perfect response.

In this chapter the physics objects performance of the CEPC detector is discussed. Then a series of different physics studies done using full Monte Carlo at different center of mass energies from 91 to 350 GeV are presented. These analyses have not been selected to demonstrate the physics reach at CEPC, but rather to stress the detector and its performance.

Most of the sub-detectors have been implemented with a significant amount of engineering detail such as mechanical support structures, electronics and cabling as well as dead material and cracks. The material budget associated with the support structures and services are based on the best current estimates from the detector R&D groups. **In addition, the material associated with the delivery of power and cooling to the sub-detectors have been implemented in the simulation so as to provide a reasonable description of the mean material budget.** A description of the detector parameters and the reconstruction software can be found in the Software Chapter.

All events are reconstructed based on a sophisticated reconstruction chain, including using a Kalman-filter based track reconstruction and the CyberPFA particle flow algorithm.

1.2 Detector Performance

To evaluate the performance of the CEPC detector concept and the reconstruction software as relevant for the benchmarking analyses, tracking, PID, vertex reconstruction and flavor tagging, and performance of the particle flow algorithms have been studied in detail.

1.2.1 Tracking (Chenguang Zhang, Hao Zhu, et al.)

CEPC ref-TDR tracking is designed around three subsystems capable of standalone tracking: VTX, Silicon Tracker (ITK) and the TPC. These are augmented by one auxiliary tracking system, the OTK, which provide additional high resolution measurement points. The TPC provides full coverage down to $\theta \approx 37^\circ$. Beyond this the number of measurement points decreases. The last measurement point provided by the TPC corresponds to $\theta \approx 10^\circ$. The central inner tracking system, consisting of the six layer VTX and the three layer ITK, provides 9 precise measurements down to $\theta \approx 37^\circ$. The ITK endcap provides up to a maximum of 4 measurement points for tracks at small polar angles. The OTK provide a single high precision measurement point with large lever arm outside of the TPC volume down to a $\theta \approx 8.5^\circ$.

1.2.1.1 Tracking efficiency

With over 200 continuous readout layers, pattern recognition and track reconstruction in a TPC is relatively straightforward, even in an environment with a large number of background hits. In addition, the standalone tracking capability of the VTX+ITK enables the reconstruction of low transverse momentum tracks which do not reach the TPC. ITK endcap coverage enables tracks to be reconstructed to polar angles below $\theta \approx 8.5^\circ$.

Figure 1.1 shows, as a function of momentum and polar angle, the track reconstruction efficiency in simulated (high multiplicity) $ZH \rightarrow 4$ jets at $\sqrt{s} = 240$ GeV. Efficiencies are plotted with respect to MC tracks that stem from a region of 10 cm around the IP with $pt > 100$ MeV and $\cos(\theta) > 0.99$, excluding decays in flight and requiring at least 90% purity. For the combined tracking system, the track reconstruction efficiency is on average 99.7% for tracks with momenta greater than 1 GeV across the entire polar angle range, and it is larger than 99.8% for $\cos(\theta) < 0.95$.




Figure 1.1: Track efficiency for $ZH \rightarrow 4$ jets at 240 GeV plotted against (left) momentum and (right) $\cos(\theta)$.

Fig. 1.2 shows the track efficiency in the low momentum region for $ZH \rightarrow 4$ jets at 240 GeV, as a function of either momentum (left) or transverse momentum (right) and $\cos(\theta)$.




Figure 1.2: Track efficiency in the low momentum region for $ZH \rightarrow 4$ jets at 240 GeV plotted against 2D plane of momentum (left) or transverse momentum (right) vs. $\cos(\theta)$.

The effects of background from beam background events are taken into account by overlaying the corresponding number of events.

1.2.1.2 Momentum resolution

Figure 1.3 left shows track momentum resolutions for different configurations: Vertex+ITK+OTK, TPC, Vertex+ITK+TPC, Vertex+ITK+TPC+OTK.

The momentum resolution with the CEPC ref-detector simulation and full reconstruction is shown in Figure 1.3 right. The study was performed using muons generated at fixed polar angles of $\theta = 10^\circ, 20^\circ, 40^\circ$ and 85° , and the momentum was varied over the range $1 \sim 100$ GeV. For one polar angle, this is compared to the expected parametric form of $\sigma_{1/p_T} = a \oplus b/(p_T \sin\theta)$, with $a = 2 \times 10^{-5} \text{ GeV}^{-1}$ and $b = 1 \times 10^{-3}$. As can be seen, at a polar angle of 85° , the required momentum resolution is attainable over the full momentum range from 1 GeV upwards. This remains true over the full length of the barrel region of the detector, where the TPC in conjunction with the OTK is able to provide the longest possible radial lever arm for the track fit. For high momentum tracks, the asymptotic value of the momentum

• Full simulation





Figure 1.3: (Left) Track resolution for different detector configurations. (Right) Transverse momentum resolution for single muon events as a function of the transverse momentum for different polar angles. The lines show $\sigma_{1/p_T} = 2 \times 10^{-5} \oplus 1 \times 10^{-3}/(p_T \sin\theta)$.

resolution is $\sigma_{1/p_T} = 2 \times 10^{-5} \text{ GeV}^{-1}$. In the very forward region, the momentum resolution is inevitably worse due to the relatively small angle between the B-field and the track momentum.

1.2.1.3 Impact parameter resolution

Figure 1.4 left shows rphi impact parameter resolution as a function of the transverse track momentum. The required performance is achieved down to a track momentum of 1 GeV, whilst it is exceeded for high momentum tracks where the asymptotic resolution is 2 μm . Figure 1.4 right shows rz impact parameter resolution, which is better than $\geq 10 \mu\text{m}$ down to momenta of 3 GeV and reaches an asymptotic value of $\leq 5 \mu\text{m}$ for the whole barrel region. The impact parameter resolution here assumes perfect alignment of the tracking systems.




Figure 1.4: Impact parameter resolution for single muon events as a function of the transverse momentum for different polar angles, d_0 in left and d_z in right.

1.2.2 Performance of Photon, Electron and Muon (Ligang Xia, Reda, Danning Liu, et al.)

The basic object performance (leptons, photons) as a function of energy and polar angle are shown in this section.

1.2.2.1 Identification of Photon, Electron and Muon

Particle identification (particle ID), and in particular lepton identification will be central to many physics studies at the CEPC. Methods for photon and leptons identification using calorimeter shower shapes have been developed. Muons are identified and all of their hits removed before the calorimeter hits are clustered. The track-cluster agreement is optimised using various re-clustering strategies, which are guided by identifying the cluster as belonging to an electromagnetic or a hadronic interaction.

The particle identification has been evaluated on samples of single photons, electrons, muons and pions of 1, 2, 5, 10, 20, 30, 45, 60, 80 GeV, respectively (see Figures 1.5-1.7 below). In these plots, the reconstructed particle is required to have the same type as the generated particle, and for electrons and pions a loose energy cut of five times the resolution of the EM calorimeter above or below the energy of the generated particle is applied. .

The default for neutral particles is the neutron hypothesis, while charged particles are assigned the pion hypothesis by default. The muon identification efficiency is above XX% for values of the polar angle $10^\circ \leq \theta \leq 170^\circ$. The photon identification efficiency is above XX% over the same angular range, except for an inefficiency in the transition region between calorimeter barrel and endcap, which results in a dip in the bin $30^\circ \leq \theta \leq 40^\circ$. That same region results also in a dip of the electron efficiency, which is otherwise over XX% for XX GeV electrons.

The performance of the reconstruction as shown here has not been optimised for particle identification efficiency, but rather for jet energy resolution. We expect that a significant improvement can be achieved - particularly in the transition region between calorimeter barrel and endcap - with dedicated particle identification algorithms that are optimised for performance with the TPC/TOF and Glass Scintillator HCal.

1.2.2.2 Photon energy resolutions

1.2.2.3 Electron momentum resolutions

1.2.2.4 Muon momentum resolutions

1.2.3 PID for Charged Hadrons (Chenguang Zhang, Xiaotian Ma, et al.)

Measuring the energy loss of charged particles in the TPC provides a powerful tool for identifying the type of the particle. In addition, the time of flight measurement from the TOF enhances the identification, in particular for low momentum region around 1 GeV.

Figure 1.8 shows the dE/dx reconstructed from a truncated mean for charged particle tracks in the TPC as a function of the particle momentum, clearly revealing the bands of the most abundant particle types e^\pm , μ^\pm , π^\pm , k^\pm and p^\pm . By fitting Gaussian distributions, with mean $\mu(p)$ and standard deviation $\sigma(p)$, to individual bands in momentum bins one can define a separation power $S_{A,B}$ for distinguishing the two particle types A and B:

$$S_{A,B}(p) = \frac{|\mu_A(p) - \mu_B(p)|}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{2}(\sigma_A^2(p) + \sigma_B^2(p))}} \quad (1.1)$$

Figure 1.9 shows the separation power for π, k and K, p based on the dE/dx measurement in the TPC and the improvement achieved by combining it with the time-of-flight (TOF) measurement.

Figure 1.10 shows the performance of the charged Kaon identification based on dE/dx for TPC and on the combined information from TPC+TOF, as obtained from the Z(qq) events.

1.2.4 Jets (Kaili Zhang, Xiaotian Ma, Yingqi Hou, Chenguang Zhang, Jiarong Li, et al.)

The design of the CEPC detector concept has been optimised for jet energy resolution using the particle flow approach, which requires strong interplay among various sub-detectors and has led to the choice of calorimeters with a high degree



Figure 1.5: Identification efficiency for photons as a function of the angle theta for different energy points: 1, 2, 5, 10, 20, 30, 45, 60, 80 GeV separately.



Figure 1.6: Identification efficiency for electrons as a function of the angle theta for different energy points: 1, 2, 5, 10, 20, 30, 45, 60, 80 GeV separately.

of segmentation and transverse granularity. In addition, sophisticated reconstruction algorithms are necessary to obtain a jet energy resolution that allows to separate W and Z decays. The performance is evaluated with Z and ZH samples.

The ee-kt algorithm (a.k.a. Durham algorithm [2]) is used as the baseline jet clustering algorithm at the CEPC using the FastJet package [1]. “GenJets” are the clustered true-level Monte Carlo particles that were produced from the hadronization of the partons, simulated by Pythia [3], including the subsequent decay products such as photons, leptons,



Figure 1.7: Identification efficiency for muons as a function of the angle theta for different energy points: 1, 2, 5, 10, 20, 30, 45, 60, 80 GeV separately.




Figure 1.8: dE/dx as a function of particle momentum as reconstructed from a full simulation of single particle events (e, μ, π, K and p) in the TPC.

or other lighter hadrons. Neutrinos are excluded in the clustering, while only the decay products of hadrons with $c\tau \geq 1$ cm are included. “RecoJets” are clustered from the reconstructed final-state particles by the ee-kt algorithm in the same




Figure 1.9: Particle separation power (eq. 1.1) for π/K and K/p based on the dE/dx measurement in the TPC (in square) and through TOF (in circle), as well as the combined separation power (in star) where $S_{dE/dx, TOF} = S_{dE/dx} \oplus S_{TOF}$. The curves are shown to guide the eye.

way as the “GenJet”.

1.2.4.1 Jet Energy Resolution in $Z \rightarrow qq$ events

First the jet energy resolution (JER) without the effects from jet finding or background is studied as shown in Fig. 1.11, to distinguish the measurement of the actual JER from other effects like ISR-photons or confusion in jet clustering that occur in more complex, realistic events. This is done with dedicated $Z \rightarrow qq$ events, $q \in [u, d, s]$, where the Z is chosen to have the desired mass of twice the jet energy and decays at rest.

To avoid a bias from possible tails, the rms90 value is computed to describe the energy resolution. It is defined as the standard deviation of the distribution in the smallest range that contains 90% of the events. The jet energy resolution (rms90) is better than X.X% for jets of energy greater than 40 GeV. The resolutions quoted in terms of rms90 should be multiplied by a factor of approximately 1.1 to obtain an equivalent Gaussian analysing power.

Due to the calorimetric coverage in the forward region, the jet energy resolution remains good down to $\theta = XX^\circ$ ($\cos\theta = 0.9XX$) as shown in Fig. 1.11 right.

1.2.4.2 Jet performance in physics events

Then the jet reconstruction performance of several major standard model hadronic processes at the CEPC, including $Z \rightarrow qq$ at Z-pole, $ZH \rightarrow \nu\nu(qq \text{ or } gg)$ or $q\bar{q}(q\bar{q} \text{ or } gg)$ at $\sqrt{s} = 240$ GeV is analyzed.

The GenJet and RecoJet are mapped to each other with the combination that minimizes the sum of angles between the GenJet-RecoJet pairs. For a given pair, the relative difference is then expressed in terms of the jet energy resolution, the jet energy scale (JES), the jet angular resolution (JAR), and the jet angular scale (JAS). The relative energy difference



Figure 1.10: Efficiency-purity curves for charged Kaon identification in the context of the single $Z(qq)$ sample. For the same efficiency, TPC+TOF reaches a XX% higher purity in comparison with TPC only.




Figure 1.11: Fractional jet energy resolution plotted against jet energy (left) and $|\cos\theta|$ (right) where θ_{thrust} is the thrust axis of the event.

is modelled with the double-sided crystal ball (DBC) function. The angular (polar and azimuth angle) differences of the GenJet-RecoJet pairs are modelled with the Gaussian function. The JER/S are extracted from the standard deviation (σ) and mean (\bar{x}) of the DBC fitting to the relative energy difference between RecoJet and GenJet while JAR/S are the σ/\bar{x} of the Gaussian fitting within $\bar{x} \pm 1.5\sigma$ of angular difference. Fig. 1.12 shows the differential jet energy resolution as functions of the $\cos\theta_{Gen}$, azimuth angle and GenJet energy of the above-mentioned physics benchmark processes. The JER is around 4–5% in the barrel region, while JES is controlled within $\pm 1\%$ after the jet energy is calibrated by the ratio of the Z-boson mass affected by double counting to the anticipated Z-boson mass from the ZZ semi-leptonic process. This is the first order method to calibrate the PFA double-counting effect.

Fig. 1.13 left shows a comparison of the distributions of the reconstructed Z mass in Z-pole events simulated with and without background. The effect of the background on the reconstructed mass is partially mitigated by the jet clustering.

The addition of background from $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow$ hadrons events and incoherent pairs results in only a minor change in resolution in these events. The difference can be explained by the additional background energy in the reconstructed jets balancing the small reconstruction bias towards lower energies in events without background.

Fig. 1.13 right shows a neat separation between the W, the Z, and the Higgs bosons with hadronic final states in their reconstructed invariant mass spectrum.




Figure 1.12: Jet energy resolution and scale as functions of (a) and (b) the $\cos\theta_{Gen}$, (c) and (d) the azimuthal angle, and (e) and (f) the GenJet energy for 2- (solid symbols) and 4-jet (open symbols) final states. The errors shown are only statistical. In (a) and (b), the jet energy resolutions grow and jet energy scales decrease because part of jet is out of the fiducial acceptance of the detector.




Figure 1.13: (left) Comparison of the distributions of the reconstructed Z mass in Z-pole with and without background. (right) Reconstructed di-jet mass distribution from WW, ZZ and ZH processes at $\sqrt{s} = 240$ GeV.

1.2.5 Vertexing (Chenguang Zhang, et al.)

One of the most important variables in jet flavour tagging networks is the decay length of the secondary vertices, which requires a precise measurement of the coordinates of secondary vertices.

1.2.5.1 Vertex Efficiency

1.2.5.2 Vertex Resolution

The vertex resolution of the CEPC vertex detector has been assessed in the context of the analysis of the ZH samples. Figure 1.14(left) shows the position of the reconstructed primary vertex in events containing two isolated leptons and two b quarks. The physics interaction has been generated at the position (0, 0, 0), and the beam spot constraint has been turned on for the purpose of this study.

Figure 1.14(right) shows the resolution of the primary vertex position versus the number of tracks originating from the primary interaction. The resolution is better than $X \mu\text{m}$ for low multiplicity events and approaches $Y \mu\text{m}$ for high multiplicity events.




Figure 1.14: Position of the reconstructed primary vertex (left) and resolution of the primary vertex position as a function of the number of tracks originating from that vertex (right).

Figure 1.15 shows the transverse (a) and longitudinal (b) components of the secondary vertices as a function of the distance from the IP.

The overall vertexing performance for the Reference Detector is excellent, as expected already from the single track impact parameter resolutions.

1.2.6 Jet Flavor Tagging - traditional way (Chenguang Zhang, et al.)

Description of Jet Flavor Tagging framework/algorithm.

The ability to tag bottom, charm, and strange decays with high purity is a crucial aspect in the design of the vertex detector. Figure below shows the b-tagging efficiency of a light quark sample (red curve) or a charm quark sample (green curve) or a strange quark sample (yellow curve) versus the b-tagging efficiency of a bottom quark sample. The neural networks have been trained on a sample of di-jets at $\sqrt{s} = 91 \text{ GeV}$ and tested on a statistically independent sample.

1.2.7 Jet Origin ID (Manqi Ruan, Kaili Zhang, et al.)

Description of Jet Origin ID framework/algorithm and performance. [Recommendation from IDRC](#): Ensure that the performance metrics for the crystal ECAL, specifically for boson mass resolution (see Page 20 of “Physics Benchmarks and Global Performance” presentation) and Jet Origin Identification (see Page 9), are simulated in a consistent way.




Figure 1.15: (Left) Resolution of the transverse component of secondary vertices as a function of the distance from the IP and the same for the longitudinal component in (Right)

Additionally, evaluate the impact of the crystal ECAL on PFA and jet flavor tagging capabilities to understand its potential contributions to the overall detector performance.

1.3 Physics Benchmarks

Results of detailed simulation studies of the CEPC detector are discussed in this chapter. The generation of the events and common analysis tools used for the benchmark analyses are described briefly.

The production of events for the benchmarking analyses includes generation of a comprehensive set of Standard Model processes taking into account the CEPC beam spectrum, full Geant4 detector simulation, generation, simulation and mixing of machine-induced background processes with the signal samples and PFA-based reconstruction of the mixed events. Benchmark studies were conducted at a center-of-mass energy of 240 GeV using a dataset of 20 ab-1, at a center-of-mass energy of 91 GeV using a dataset of xx ab-1, and at center-of-mass energy of 350 GeV using a dataset of xx ab-1, separately. In these analyses, the SM Higgs mass was set to 125 GeV and the top quark mass was set to 17X GeV.

1.3.1 Event Generation (Kaili Zhang, Gang Li, et al.)

1.3.1.1 Monte Carlo event generators

The WHIZARD Monte Carlo event generator was used for the generation of all $2 \rightarrow n$ processes, $n = 2 \dots 6$, where n is the number of final state fermions (e , μ , τ , u , d , s , c , b). The Higgs branching ratios listed in [ref] were assumed for the event generation.

1.3.1.2 Generated signal and background samples

1.3.2 Analysis Tools

To reconstruct jets in hadronic final states, the Durham algorithm as implemented from the FastJet [ref] package was used.

1.3.2.1 Multivariate analysis tools

The traditional approach in high energy physics to separate a signal from backgrounds is based on a set of fixed cuts. However, for complex final states and large backgrounds this method is often not optimal. Hence multivariate analysis techniques like artificial neural networks or boosted decision trees (BDTs) are commonly used today. The implementations of these models in the TMVA [ref] software package were used for the benchmark analyses described in the following unless explicitly stated otherwise.

1.3.3 Higgs mass and production cross-section through recoil mass (Mingshui Chen, et al.)

1.3.4 Branching ratios of the Higgs boson in hadronics final states (Yanping Huang, et al.)

1.3.5 $H \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ (Yaquan Fang, et al.)

1.3.6 $H \rightarrow invisible$ (Mingshui Chen, et al.)

1.3.7 Weak mixing angle (Zhijun Liang, Bo Liu, et al.)

1.3.8 A channel in flavor physics (Shanzhen Chen, et al.)

The branching ratio of Z boson decays to a pair of charm and beauty quarks are $\text{BR}(Z \rightarrow c\bar{c}) \simeq 12\%$, $\text{BR}(Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}) \simeq 15\%$ in the SM, respectively, which suggests that the CEPC Z -pole operation mode could also serve as a charm and beauty factory. Given the CEPC's high luminosity, low background, and excellent detector performance, CEPC may significantly enhance the precisions of certain studies in heavy flavour physics.

1.3.9 top mass and width (Xiaohu Sun, et al.)

1.3.10 W fusion cross section (Hongbo Liao, et al.)

1.3.11 Long-lived particles (Liang Li, et al.)

1.3.12 smuon (Xuai Zhuang, et al.)

1.3.13 Partial decay width of $Z \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$

Currently a copy-paste from CDR.

The $\mu^+\mu^-$ channel provides the cleanest leptonic final state of the Z boson. The combination of LEP measurements [109–112] yields a value of $R_l^0 = 20.767 \pm 0.025$, where $R_l^0 = \Gamma(Z \rightarrow hadrons)/\Gamma(Z \rightarrow l^+l^-)$. Major systematic uncertainties includes the uncertainty in the modeling of $Z \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-\gamma$ events (0.01) and the uncertainty due to photon trigger and identification efficiency (0.01).

A precision of 0.002 in R_l^0 can be achieved at the CEPC. The main systematic is expected to be the uncertainty in modeling the $Z \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-\gamma$ events. About 2% of the $Z \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$ sample are classified as $Z \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-\gamma$ events with a photon detected in ECAL. For this class of events, the most critical issue is to reconstruct and identify the low energy photon object with high efficiency. Benefiting from high granularity of the CEPC ECAL ($10 \times 10 \text{ mm}^2$ as shown in Chapter ??), we expect to have close to 100% efficiency for a photon with $E > 5 \text{ GeV}$, as shown in Section 1.2.2.2. Another challenge in this measurement is to reduce the systematic uncertainty due to QED ISR events. Detailed studies of radiative events in Z off-peak runs are expected, especially the Z off-peak runs at $\sqrt{s} = 92.2 \text{ GeV}$. Benefiting from high statistics in Z off-peak runs ($> 1 \text{ ab}^{-1}$), the uncertainty in the modeling $Z \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-\gamma$ events is expected to reduced to 0.002.

1.3.14 $H \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$

Perhaps this channel could be put in backup.

1.4 Challenges & Plan

1.4.1 Strategy for the measurement of absolute luminosity

Comments from IDRC: A clear strategy is also needed for measuring absolute luminosity, crucial for accurate cross-section calculations and with significant applications (e.g., neutrino counting at the Z pole). It's essential to determine if the absolute luminosity measurement will rely solely on Bhabha scattering, the role of the luminometer, and whether the measurement will be complemented by $e^+e^- \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ events.

Recommendation from IDRC: Clearly outline the strategy for measuring absolute luminosity in the Ref-TDR, as this is essential for accurate cross-section measurements.

1.4.2 Plan of the use of resonant depolarization for W/Z mass (Zhe Duan)

Comments from IDRC: Another critical aspect is the use of resonant depolarization to measure the Z and W masses with high precision. These are key observables that need enhanced accuracy to fully leverage precision Higgs measurements (e.g., Higgs couplings).

Recommendation from IDRC: Include at least a brief description in the Ref-TDR regarding plans to use resonant depolarization for high-precision Z and W mass measurements.

Updated on Jan 21, 2025: First draft without figure or citations, to be completed and reviewed later.

The resonant depolarization technique, which employs a pulsed “depolarizer” with frequency-scan capability to induce a narrow artificial spin resonance for beam depolarization, and measured the closed orbit spin tune ν_0 , which is nearly proportional to the beam energy, according to the location of depolarization with the precisely known depolarizer frequency, provides so far the most precise measurements of beam energy. Its implementation at the CEPC would require achieving transverse polarization levels of at least 5% to 10% for both beams. This also requires implementation of laser-Compton polarimeters capable of measuring vertical beam polarization. In addition, keeping track of the evolution of beam energies throughout the physics runs is essential for the precision measurements for W/Z masses, this requires carrying out resonant depolarization measurements frequently, say every 10-15 minutes, and each measurement will depolarize one or two bunches for each particle species.

As detailed in the CEPC Accelerator TDR and reference therein, it is viable to prepare polarized lepton beams from the source, transport them throughout the injector chain and inject into the collider rings, to accommodate the needs of such requirements of beam energy calibration. The idea is to utilize one or two bunches per species, which can be efficiently depolarized, and once depolarized, it can be readily removed and replaced with a new polarized bunch. This process aligns with the capabilities of the injector chain and ensures a streamlined calibration procedure. Figure shows the operation scenario for the resonant depolarization scheme at the Z-energy, similar scheme is also applicable for the W-energy operation.

Note that this approach requires some modification of the whole injector chain of the design outlined in the CEPC TDR, and shall be implemented in an updated design. In addition, preparing highly polarized electron beams from the source is achievable with the status-of-art technology, this approach has the additional potential of realizing longitudinal polarization for colliding beam experiments.

To prepare for the high performance of Compton polarimetry, polarized electron sources as well as resonant depolarization techniques to be used in CEPC, dedicated R&D efforts have been under way in the EDR phase of the CEPC. In particular, a Compton polarimeter is being constructed at BEPCII, reusing the hutch and beamline of a dismantled wiggler, to measure the vertical polarization of the electron beam, due to the self-polarization build-up, in the storage ring. Such a Compton polarimeter, though based on detecting backscattered γ photons, rather than the preferred solution of detecting backscattered electrons as planned for CEPC, would establish the knowhow to operate such delicate instrument, as well as advancing the laser polarization control and pixel detector technologies for Compton polarimetry. The conceptual design of the Compton polarimeter has finalized and modification of the beamline and hutch region has completed, the first beam experiment of the Compton polarimeter is scheduled to start in the first semester of 2025.

Once reliable beam polarization measurements are achieved, demonstration of beam energy calibration with the

resonant depolarization technique is foreseen at BEPCII in the coming 2-3 years. Being a double-ring collider with many bunches similar to CEPC, BEPCII would serve as an ideal test bed for the operation concepts of resonant depolarization for CEPC, for example using dedicated pilot bunches for resonant depolarization and continuous monitoring of the beam energy throughout physics runs.

The knowledge gained through these R&D activities will set a solid foundation for the practical design of Compton polarimetry and preparation for resonant depolarization applications at CEPC.

1.4.3 Methods & Considerations for Calibration, Alignment (Jin Wang)

Recommendation from IDRC: Explain how calibration for each sub-detector will be achieved through physics processes, and document specific calibration methods in the Ref-TDR.

1.4.4 Further technology decisions/detector optimization

Recommendation from IDRC:

(longer term) Outline the primary areas where detector configuration optimizations could be further explored beyond the initial Ref-TDR results, acknowledging the time constraints of the current study.

(longer term) Consider how performance study results could influence technology decisions, especially as they relate to detector component specifications and configurations.

1.5 Summary

A set of benchmarks have been conducted with the Ref detector with full simulation. They illustrate the detector performance for centre-of-mass energies in the range from 91 GeV up to 350 GeV. All results obtained have been summarized in following Table.