



CEPC

Jets, samples and Wednesday working meeting Kaili Zhang <u>zhangkl@ihep.ac.cn</u>

AFB: Practice on fit cos spectrum





Fitting the costheta distribution

- Set costheta function = [0]*(1 + [1]*x + x*x), where [1] = 8/3 * A_FB
- With MCP, fitted [1] = 0.04463 ± 0.00251, so AFB = 0.01674 ± 0.00094
- Counting AFB = (503202-486798)/(503202+486798) = 0.01657 ± 0.00100
- Compatible within statistical uncertainty
- Present it as an alternative method?
 - Statistical uncertainty of each fit is large (only 1M events), so it's hard to estimate syst. Un.
 compared with the counting method

$$\sigma_F = \int_0^1 \frac{d\sigma}{d\cos\theta} d\cos\theta \quad \sigma_B = \int_{-1}^0 \frac{d\sigma}{d\cos\theta} d\cos\theta \quad (9)$$

and $\cos\theta$ is the angle of the outgoing fermion measured relative to the incident electron direction. The experiments determine A_{FB} from fits to the angular distribution which can be written as

$$\frac{1}{\sigma} \frac{d\sigma}{d\cos\theta} = \frac{3}{8} \left(1 + \cos^2\theta \right) + A_{FB} \cos\theta \qquad (10)$$



Uncertainty consistent with number counting.

For counting experiment: Including energy spread as uncertainty source. 2*10⁻⁵.

Need better understanding of spectrum shape.



@Hancen, Mohan



Fixed the bug in model application and least squares. Now the results consistent.

Error:

Original result (5 imes 10^6 events): $R_b=22.808\pm0.733\%$ $R_c=15.434\pm0.939\%$

Scaled result (10^{11} events): $R_b = 22.808 \pm 0.00518\%$ $R_c = 15.434 \pm 0.00664\%$

Corrected:

Original result **lstsq** (N_h,pro = 5.0e+06): R_b = 0.21891525 ± 0.00125486 R_c = 0.17104597 ± 0.00174900

Original result **solve** (N_h,pro = 5.0e+06): R_b = 0.21939958 R_c = 0.17284379

ROC Curve - b



LCFI Plus: 80% b Eff, 2.23% misID to c; (0.05% for ParT) 50% b Eff 0.11% misID to c; (0.02% for ParT)



Roc curve - c



LCFI Plus: 80% c Eff, 13.58% misID to b; (1% for ParT) 50% c Eff 13.9% misID to b; (0.1% for ParT)



JOI Conclusion

- JOI Performance consistent when:
 - Test event size @bootstrap method
 - Extrapolate to different energy and process
 - Specialized to M10 even tagging:
 - Which M11 can reduce to M2 like b & not b tagging. Still sharp.
 - B tagging WP 95% and bkg 0.01 rejection at ~0.35.



PID Conclusion

- In current lepton ID with chi2 method
 - Lepton eff well with the WP description while the purity too bad.
 - Hardware limitation and high pion ratio
 - Expecting Xgboost method
- With smaller lepton eff, better purity and eff*purity result,

better JOI.

• Also, no lepton WP better than Reco98 WP.





backups

Hqq JOI



0.5936

0.5494

0.4825

Reco70: 0.5510

Reco98: 0.5153

Truth:

Nolep:

NoID:



CEPC TDR Jet Origin ID

CEP

Eff with uncertainty from bootstrap



TruthID

Extrapolate to: E360 n1n1_bb



B tagging eff ~93%

						wwf_l	ParT_Tr	uthID				
	b -	0.801	0.131	0.023	0.020	0.003	0.003	0.001	0.002	0.002	0.001	0.012
	bbar -	0.129	0.803	0.021	0.023	0.002	0.003	0.002	0.001	0.001	0.002	0.012
	c -	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	cbar -	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	s -	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Truth	sbar -	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	u -	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	ubar -	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	d -	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	dbar -	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	g -	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
		N V	bbat	C	char	's F	_{چەم} ر Predicte	ہٰ d	ubar	δ	apar	\$

Extrapolate to: E240 2f qq



				E	E240qc	_ParT_	TruthI)			
b -	0.812	0.125	0.022	0.019	0.004	0.003	0.001	0.002	0.002	0.001	0.009
bbar -	0.123	0.812	0.020	0.023	0.003	0.004	0.002	0.001	0.001	0.002	0.010
C -	0.013	0.012	0.792	0.039	0.028	0.034	0.025	0.007	0.008	0.017	0.025
cbar -	0.013	0.014	0.036	0.797	0.033	0.029	0.006	0.025	0.016	0.008	0.023
S -	0.002	0.001	0.015	0.016	0.557	0.107	0.024	0.086	0.090	0.043	0.058
- Truth Truth	0.001	0.001	0.016	0.016	0.100	0.561	0.093	0.026	0.044	0.086	0.055
u -	0.001	0.001	0.018	0.008	0.047	0.156	0.405	0.042	0.074	0.183	0.065
ubar -	0.002	0.001	0.007	0.018	0.151	0.045	0.046	0.404	0.191	0.072	0.062
d -	0.002	0.001	0.009	0.017	0.164	0.099	0.065	0.199	0.306	0.068	0.070
dbar -	0.001	0.001	0.019	0.009	0.093	0.150	0.215	0.066	0.076	0.304	0.066
g -	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	N N	bbat	C	char	' S	په ^{مر} Predicte	ہٰ d	upar	8	abat	¢,

0.5750 (With no gluon tag)

E91.2 Zpole b/c/u/d/s



No performance downgrading.



0.5938 (With no gluon tag)

10 points-comparision

0.0 0.2

0.1 0.0 -0.1 -0.2

h

Residuals A-Baseline





С

S

u

d

Difference in M11 Matrix



-0.01

-0.02

-0.02

-0.02

0.0

-0.1

-0.2

-0.3

-0.4



E240qq_ParT_TruthID - Baseline Difference

ρ

bbar

cbal

sbar

ubaı

dbar

M11 to M10

Ignore gluon score and gluon category.

0.6202

		·			F	redicted	d					
	Ŷ	bbat	ı د	char	5	spar	۱ ১	ubar	ò	apar	¢	
g -	0.012	0.012	0.028	0.027	0.075	0.075	0.076	0.071	0.067	0.060	0.498	
dbar -	0.001	0.001	0.016	0.009	0.074	0.099	0.233	0.067	0.079	0.334	0.087	
d -	0.001	0.001	0.009	0.016	0.096	0.074	0.072	0.212	0.362	0.071	0.086	
ubar -	0.002	0.001	0.007	0.018	0.115	0.031	0.048	0.422	0.202	0.071	0.084	
u -	0.001	0.002	0.018	0.006	0.029	0.114	0.440	0.044	0.079	0.183	0.085	
Truth spar-	0.001	0.001	0.015	0.016	0.079	0.586	0.087	0.023	0.046	0.076	0.070	
S -	0.002	0.001	0.015	0.017	0.584	0.081	0.023	0.085	0.081	0.042	0.069	
cbar -	0.009	0.009	0.035	0.820	0.024	0.024	0.005	0.023	0.016	0.006	0.030	
c -	0.009	0.009	0.822	0.034	0.024	0.024	0.023	0.005	0.006	0.014	0.030	
bbar -	0.113	0.831	0.016	0.018	0.001	0.002	0.002	0.001	0.001	0.002	0.012	
b -	0.832	0.113	0.019	0.016	0.002	0.001	0.001	0.002	0.001	0.001	0.012	
Hqq_ParT_TruthID												

Tiny difference when M11 to M10 in 10 points plot.

M10

CEPC TDR Jet Origin ID

M10 in E91.2qq and E240qq

	Zqq_ParT_TruthID													
b -	0.831	0.121	0.021	0.014	0.003	0.002	0.002	0.003	0.002	0.001				
bbar -	0.120	0.835	0.013	0.021	0.002	0.003	0.002	0.002	0.001	0.002				
с -	0.010	0.011	0.816	0.040	0.031	0.030	0.030	0.006	0.008	0.018				
cbar -	0.011	0.011	0.039	0.819	0.031	0.031	0.007	0.027	0.018	0.008				
۰ s	0.001	0.000	0.020	0.013	0.634	0.095	0.035	0.083	0.072	0.046				
sbar -	0.002	0.004	0.020	0.019	0.096	0.615	0.083	0.028	0.053	0.080				
u -	0.001	0.001	0.021	0.009	0.041	0.141	0.462	0.050	0.090	0.184				
ubar -	0.002	0.001	0.009	0.022	0.139	0.045	0.057	0.429	0.218	0.079				
d -	0.002	0.001	0.010	0.019	0.118	0.090	0.083	0.234	0.362	0.082				
dbar -	0.001	0.002	0.019	0.008	0.088	0.128	0.254	0.075	0.093	0.332				
	v V	boat	C	char	ہٰ Pred	ہ sp ^{at}	۱ ۵	upar	ò	dbat				

Difference in M10 Matrix

0.06

- 0.04

0.02

0.00

-0.02

-0.04

-0.06

E240qq_ParT_TruthID - Baseline Difference

M11 -> M10 -> M2

• To find the b tagging (b+bbar) WP on score

Working Point	Threshold	TPR	FPR	Bkg Rej
eff_95	0.378	0.95	0.009	106.6
eff_90	0.895	0.9	0.002	445
eff_80	0.99	0.8	0.001	1422.4
eff_70	0.996	0.7	0	2330.8
eff_60	0.997	0.6	0	3510.9
eff_50	0.998	0.5	0	4754.7
bkg_rej_10	0.015	0.987	0.1	10
bkg_rej_100	0.352	0.952	0.01	100
bkg_rej_1000	0.978	0.846	0.001	998.9

Roc curve - gsud

Temporary WP setting

This WP is under H decay hypothesis and assume equal ratio.

For different environment and ratios, WP shall be different.

B tagging can be ~0.3 for both eff and bkg rejection. (Also 0.5 is fine as for maximum likelihood) For $c\g\u\s\d$. May use carefully.

Fpr b, Prefer Eff; For others, prefer purity?

	Threshold	Eff	Bkg Rej	Threshold	Eff	Bkg Rej
В	0.378	0.95	106.6	0.352	0.952	100
С	0.047	0.95	5.7	0.763	0.773	100
G	0.067	0.95	2.8	0.781	0.253	100
S	0.088	0.95	2.3	0.651	0.116	100
U	0.096	0.95	2.3	0.611	0.089	100
D	0.019	0.95	2.2	0.559	0.191	100

PID revisit in ZH: ubar

/hpcfs/cepc/higgsgpu/zhangk1/JOI_Fulltest/99_2_joi_E240_nnHuu.root

Total event:	9332
Total PFO:	293006
PFO per event:	31.4
Charged tracks:	106892
Neutral PFOs:	186114

Per channel eff*purity

2025/4/28

98

90

80

70

Reco ID

- L

60

- I

50

nolep

0.8

25

Muon WP

2025/4/28

Truth vs Reco90 Particle Identification Matrix, Per Event

Truth vs Reco80 Particle Identification Matrix, Per Event

Truth vs Reco70 Particle Identification Matrix, Per Event

Truth vs Reco60 Particle Identification Matrix, Per Event

Truth vs Reco50 Particle Identification Matrix, Per Event

Reco Nolep

Truth vs Reconolep Particle Identification Matrix, Per Event

On ZH jet:

/hpcfs/cepc/higgsgpu/zhangkl/JOI_Fulltest/99*.root
120000 jets
b/c/g/u/d/s

2025/4/28

37

Normalized Truth vs Reco80 PID Matrix - 1.0 0.07 0.09 0.05 0.14 ۵-- 0.8 **∠** - 0.08 0.06 0.07 0.11 - 0.6 Truth ID 0.08 0.03 0.46 0.09 0.35 Ħ - 0.4 υ – 0.06 0.04 0.13 0.17 - 0.2 <u>⊐</u>- 0.07 0.05 0.32 0.02 - 0.0 1 р К π e μ Reco80 ID

2025/4/28

Normalized Truth vs Reconolep PID Matrix

On bb jet:

/hpcfs/cepc/higgsgpu/zhangkl/JOI_Fulltest/99*bb.root
20000 jets

-> Dominant in Hqq environment

With uncertainty

PID Efficiency*Purity 0.15 ±0.26 0.16 ±0.21 0.13 0.10 ±0.12 0.15 0.15 0.14 ۹- م ±0.20 ±0.20 ±0.19 ±0.17 - 0.6 - 0.5 0.49 ±0.28 0.49 ±0.27 0.48 ±0.27 0.44 ±0.25 0.49 ±0.28 0.48 ±0.26 ⊻ -- 0.4 Particle ID π 0.40 ±0.11 0.18 ±0.08 0.42 ±0.11 0.44 ±0.11 0.46 ±0.11 0.49 ±0.11 0.68 ±0.10 - 0.3 $0.11 \\ \pm 0.11$ 0.23 ±0.22 0.19 0.15 0.12 0.11 0.00 ω -- 0.2 ±0.14 ±0.00 ±0.21 ±0.18 ±0.16 - 0.1 0.04 ±0.05 0.03 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.00 ユ -±0.05 ±0.04 ±0.04 ±0.00 ±0.04 ±0.04 - 0.0 98 80 60 90 70 50 nolep Reco ID

PID Efficiency										PID Purity									
۵ -	0.39 ±0.48	0.59 ±0.48	0.61 ±0.47	0.62 ±0.47	0.63 ±0.47	0.65 ±0.47	0.68 ±0.46		- 0.7	۵ -	0.39 ±0.48	0.27 ±0.29	0.25 ±0.27	0.24 ±0.26	0.23 ±0.25	0.20 ±0.22	0.14 ±0.16		- 0.8
⊻ -	0.43 ±0.30	0.68 ±0.28	0.70 ±0.28	0.70 ±0.28	0.71 ±0.27	0.73 ±0.27	0.76 ±0.26		- 0.6 - 0.5	⊻ -	0.78 ±0.34	0.73 ±0.28	0.71 ±0.28	0.69 ±0.28	0.67 ±0.27	0.65 ±0.27	0.58 ±0.26		- 0.6
Particle ID π	0.19 ±0.09	0.42 ±0.11	0.46 ±0.11	0.48 ±0.11	0.50 ±0.11	0.54 ±0.11	0.77 ±0.09		- 0.4	Particle ID π	0.94 ±0.11	0.94 ±0.08	0.92 ±0.08	0.92 ±0.08	0.91 ±0.08	0.90 ±0.08	0.88 ±0.08		- 0.4
0 -	0.76 ±0.35	0.70 ±0.37	0.61 ±0.40	0.57 ±0.40	0.50 ±0.41	0.50 ±0.41	0.00 ±0.00		- 0.3 - 0.2	u -	0.15 ±0.13	0.33 ±0.26	0.32 ±0.27	0.27 ±0.25	0.24 ±0.24	0.21 ±0.22	0.00 ±1.00		- 0.2
<u>л</u> -	0.80 ±0.48	0.60 ±0.58	0.51 ±0.59	0.45 ±0.59	0.39 ±0.58	0.31 ±0.55	0.00 ±0.00		- 0.1	ユ -	0.05 ±0.06	0.05 ±0.07	0.04 ±0.07	0.04 ±0.08	0.04 ±0.08	0.05 ±0.11	0.00 ±1.00		0.0
	98	90	80	70 Reco ID	60	50	nolep		- 0.0		98	90	80	70 Reco ID	60	50	nolep		- 0.0

2025/4/28

42