UNIVERSITY OF BIRMINGHAM | SCHOOL OF PHYSICS AND ASTRONOMY

Tracking and Inclusive DIS reconstruction with the ePIC detector at the EIC

S. Maple

What is matter?

- Matter made up of atoms…
- Atoms are made up of protons, neutrons and electrons...
- … and protons are just 2 up quarks and a down quark?





What is matter?

- Matter made up of atoms…
- Atoms are made up of protons, neutrons and electrons...
- … and protons are just 2 up quarks and a down quark?

- **No – they have rich structure and dynamics that are <u>partially</u> understood through years of theoretical and experimental effort!**





What is matter?



- The observed properties of nucleons/nuclei such as **mass** and **spin**, emerge out of a complicated system of quarks and gluons

Some details are missing…

- How do the nucleonic properties such as mass and spin emerge from partons and their underlying interactions?
- How are sea quarks and gluons, and their spins, distributed in position and momentum space inside the nucleon?



$$\Delta\Sigma/2 + \Delta G + \ell_q + \ell_g = \hbar/2$$

Quark spins — Gluon spins — Quark orbital angular momentum — Gluon orbital angular momentum



Filling in the gaps → build an EIC

Electron ring added to existing RHIC complex

- **<u>The Electron Ion Collider (EIC) will be the world's first:</u>**
- High luminosity ep collider: $\mathscr{L}_{max}$ = **10^{34} cm^{-2}s^{-1}**
- Polarised target collider: **~70%** (leptons and light nuclei)
- eA collider: protons/deuterons up to Uranium

<u>and spans large c.o.m. range 28 < √s < 140 GeV for ep</u>





<u>Science goals drive specifications</u>

Deep Inelastic Scattering (DIS)

- **Inclusive DIS** – No constraints on hadronic final state (HFS)
  - Probes longitudinal structure of protons/nuclei
  - **Requires:** large acceptance, high quality eID, high quality reconstruction
- **Semi-Inclusive DIS** – tag 1 or more hadrons in HFS
  - Quark flavour separation, access to transverse structure
  - **Also requires:** PID, heavy flavour from vertexing
- **Exclusive/Diffractive** – all final state particles measured (proton intact)
  - 3D structure of nucleons (tomography)
  - **Requires:** proton tagging at far forward angles, high luminosity

Inclusive



Semi-Inclusive



Exclusive/Diffractive



The ePIC Detector

- Asymmetric, compact central detector (|η|<4)
- Extensive beamline instrumentation
  - Roman pots, Off momentum detectors, Zero Degree Calorimeters
  - Electron tagger, luminosity monitor



Magnet
- New 1.7 T SC solenoid, 2.8 m bore diameter

Tracking
- Si Vertex Tracker MAPS wafer-level stitched sensors (ALICE ITS3)
- Si Tracker MAPS barrel and disks
- Gaseous tracker: MPGDs (μRWELL, MMG) cylindrical and planar

PID
- high performance DIRC (hpDIRC)
- dual RICH (aerogel + gas) (forward)
- proximity focussing RICH (backward)
- ToF using AC-LGAD (barrel+forward)

EM Calorimetry
- imaging EMCal (barrel)
- W-powder/SciFi (forward)
- $PbWO_4$ crystals (backward)

Hadron calorimetry
- FeSc (barrel, re-used from sPHENIX)
- Steel/Scint – W/Scint (backward/forward)



Physics Derived Tracking Requirements

- High precision primary vertexing
- Secondary vertex separation
- Low material budget
- Good momentum resolution
- Low p_T tracking
- Large Acceptance
- Well Integrated

→ **Dedicated physics studies performed to set limits on resolutions (YR 2020)**

Tracking requirements from PWGs						
			Momentum res.	**Material budget**	**Minimum pT**	**Transverse pointing res.**
η						
-3.5 to -3.0			σp/p ~ 0.1%×p ⊕ 0.5%		100-150 MeV/c	
-3.0 to -2.5					100-150 MeV/c	dca(xy) ~ 30/pT µm ⊕ 40 µm
-2.5 to -2.0		Backward Detector			100-150 MeV/c	
-2.0 to -1.5			σp/p ~ 0.05%×p ⊕ 0.5%		100-150 MeV/c	dca(xy) ~ 30/pT µm ⊕ 20 µm
-1.5 to -1.0					100-150 MeV/c	
-1.0 to -0.5						
-0.5 to 0	Central Detector	Barrel	σp/p ~ 0.05%×p ⊕ 0.5%	~5% X0 or less	100-150 MeV/c	dca(xy) ~ 20/pT µm ⊕ 5 µm
0 to 0.5						
0.5 to 1.0						
1.0 to 1.5					100-150 MeV/c	
1.5 to 2.0			σp/p ~ 0.05%×p ⊕ 1%		100-150 MeV/c	dca(xy) ~ 30/pT µm ⊕ 20 µm
2.0 to 2.5		Forward Detector			100-150 MeV/c	
2.5 to 3.0			σp/p ~ 0.1%×p ⊕ 2%		100-150 MeV/c	dca(xy) ~ 30/pT µm ⊕ 40 µm
3.0 to 3.5					100-150 MeV/c	dca(xy) ~ 30/pT µm ⊕ 60 µm

EIC YR Table 11.2

Tracking System

- **Silicon tracker** occupies a volume of **r~43 cm** and **-105 < z < 135 cm**
- **MPGD+AC-LGAD** detectors fill remaining tracking volume: **r~80 cm** and **-120 < z < 174 cm**



SVT

3 Inner Barrel layers
- stitched wafer-scale sensors
- 0.05% X/X_0 per layer (sim)

2 Outer Barrel layers
- stitched but not wafer-scale
- 0.25% + 0.55% X/X_0 (sim)

5 Disks per side
- stitched but not wafer-scale
- 0.25% X/X_0 per disk (sim)

Silicon Sensor Technology - MAPS

- **Monolithic Active Pixel Sensors (MAPS) chosen for the Silicon Vertex Tracker (SVT)**
  - "Monolithic" – Sensor and electronic contained in same silicon substrate
  - Small pixel pitch (< 30μm) → needed for vertexing
  - Low power consumption → low mass
  - Moderate Radiation Hardness

- **ALICE ITS3 project aims at developing an extremely low mass MAPS sensor for HL-LHC**
  - Detector specifications and timeline are very compatible with the EIC

→ Sensor being developed through partnership of ITS3 and ePIC-SVT groups

Table 2.1: ITS3 general parameters.

Beampipe inner/outer radius (mm)		16.0/16.5	
IB Layer parameters	Layer 0	Layer 1	Layer 2
Radial position (mm)	19.0	25.2	31.5
Length (sensitive area) (mm)	260	260	260
Pseudo-rapidity coverage[a]	±2.5	±2.3	±2.0
Active area (cm^2)	305	407	507
Pixel sensors dimensions (mm^2)	266×58.7	266×78.3	266×97.8
Number of pixel sensors / layer		2	
Material budget ($\%X_0$ / layer)		0.07	
Silicon thickness (μm / layer)		≤50	
Pixel size (μm^2)		$O(20 \times 22.5)$	
Power density (mW/cm^2)		40	
NIEL (1 MeV n_{eq} cm^{-2})		10^{13}	
TID (kGray)		10	

[a] The pseudorapidity coverage of the detector layers refers to tracks originating from a collision at the nominal interaction point ($z = 0$).

Stitched MAPS

- **Normal fabrication** – light shone through mask with size ~3x3cm (reticle) to pattern circuits on wafer
  - **Limited to size of mask**

- In **“stitching”** the mask is subdivided and different sections are repeated across the wafer
  - **Can achieve devices larger than the mask → up to wafer-scale**
  - Only need connections at extreme ends





Silicon Tracker Barrel

Layer	Radius (mm)	Length (mm)	Sensors
L0	36	270	4
L1	48	270	4
L2	120	270	8

Layer	Radius (mm)	Length (mm)	X/X0%
L3	270	540	0.25
L4	420	840	0.55

- **Barrel uses stitched MAPS**
  - 65nm CMOS imaging process
  - Low power
  - High precision ~20µm pitch

- **Inner Barrel**
  - Directly use ITS3 wafer-scale sensor

- **Outer Barrel**
  - "Traditional" stave design
  - Use **EIC Large Area Sensor (EIC-LAS)**
    → Stitched but not wafer-scale modification of ITS3 sensor





Silicon Tracker Disks

- **Disks uses stitched MAPS**
  - 65nm CMOS imaging process
  - Low power
  - High precision ~20µm pitch
- **Tiled EIC-LAS**
  - **Front** and **back** of disk

Disk	Technology	z (mm)	r_{in} (mm)	r_{out} (mm)
ED0	MAPS	-250	36.76	230
ED1	MAPS	-450	36.76	430
ED2	MAPS	-650	36.76	430
ED3	MAPS	-850	40.06	430
ED4	MAPS	-1050	46.35	430
Bwd MPGD 1	μRWELL	-1100	46.53	500
Bwd MPGD 2	μRWELL	-1200	46.35	500

Disk	Technology	z (mm)	r_{in} (mm)	r_{out} (mm)
HD0	MAPS	250	36.76	230
HD1	MAPS	450	36.76	430
HD2	MAPS	700	38.42	430
HD3	MAPS	1000	54.43	430
HD4	MAPS	1350	70.14	430
Fwd MPGD 1	μRWELL	1480	70.14	500
Fwd MPGD 2	μRWELL	1610	70.14	500
FTTL	AC-LGAD	1740	80.00	500



Gaseous Tracker Technology - MPGDs

- **Two types of MPGD used: μRWELL and Micromegas**

- **Barrel Micromegas: CyMBaL**
  - Cylindrical Micromegas technology developed for CLAS12 BMT
  - Material ~0.5% X/X_0 in active areas
  - Spatial resolution ~150μm
  - Timing resolution ~10ns

CLAS12 BMT



CyMBaL



Gaseous Tracker Technology - MPGDs

- **Two types of MPGD used: µRWELL and Micromegas**

- **Barrel µRWELL: µRWELL-BOT (Barrel Outer Tracker)**
  - Provides seed point for DIRC
  - Material <2% X/X_0 in active area
  - Spatial Resolution ~150µm
  - Timing resolution ~10ns



- **Endcap µRWELLs: µRWELL-ECT**
  - Comparable to above



A brief history…

Proposal Silicon Vertex Tracker

- From the call for proposals came a new baseline detector:
  - Barrel: **5 Si MAPS layers** with **3.3 < r < 22.68 cm** complemented by **3 μRWELL layers** at **r = 33, 51, 77 cm**
  - Endcaps: **4 Si MAPS Disks in electron going direction** with **-106 < z < -25 cm** and **5 Si MAPS Disks in hadron going direction** with **25 < z < 125 cm**



Tracker from Reference Detector

Talks describing this geometry in more detail can be found here https://indico.bnl.gov/event/15489/

Proposal Silicon Vertex Tracker

→ **Update outer barrel material estimate to include support and services**

→ **PWG momentum resolution requirement no longer met**

→ **Reconfigure barrel layout**





Tracker from Reference Detector

Barrel reconfiguration – Vertex layers

- **Radii of vertex layers determined by**
  - **Size of reticule**
  - **Beampipe bakeout requirements (5mm clearance)**

- Opt for 2 sensors per layer:
  - Would need to modify stitching plan
  - r = 36/42/48 mm



- Alternatively opt for 4 sensors per layer
  - r = 36/48/60 mm

Vertex performance comparisons

- Simulations for 4 vertex configurations:
  - Realistic reticule, 2 half layer:
  - r = 36/42/48 mm
  - Active length = 24cm
  - Realistic reticule, 4 quarter layer:
  - r = 36/48/60 mm
  - Active length = 27cm





Some difference in DCA_T
→ **depends distance between r_1 and r_2**
→ **(r_2 – r_1) is an important parameter**

- Proposal config:
- r = 33/43.5/54 mm
- Proposal config moved at 5 mm from beam pipe
- r = 36/46.5/57 mm

Barrel Reconfiguration

Is the YR mid-rapidity performance recoverable in 1.4T?



Following the previous steps, consider:

- Outer barrel layer at r = 420 mm,
- ~45 degree cone,
- Single sagitta layer with r <= 270 mm, $X/X_0 \sim 0.25\%$
- Outer (third) vertex barrel layer with increased radius to r = 120 mm while preserving its length,

Notes:

The lengths assume reticle lengths of 30 mm.

Services and service routing will need further attention; it is not for today, but I have concerns over the “double-cone” and otherwise consider a single projection angle determined by the DIRC length impractically shallow. Not for today.

Key points:

- Keep first 2 vertex layers at **36,48mm**
- **Drive out radius of 3rd vertex layer to 12cm** to contribute to sagitta measurement
- Drive out Si outer layers from r~20cm to **r=27,42cm for larger lever arm** of high precision, low material MAPS layers

Slide from E. Sichtermann https://indico.bnl.gov/event/16261/

Craterlake Barrel Performance



BARREL	r [mm]	l [mm]	X/X0 %
L0	36	270	0.05
L1	48	270	0.05
L2	**120**	270	**0.05**
L3	**270**	540	**0.25**
L4	**420**	840	0.55
Cyl.Micromegas layer	550	2300	0.5
AC-LGAD layer	640	2400	1.0
μRWELL behind DIRC	**730**	3420	~1.0%

Barrel performance recovered!

Disks Optimisation

- Disks spread over **largest lever arm** available
- # of Disks is **compromise between resolution and redundancy**
- Many studies performed throughout yellow report and call for proposals
- **More disks increase material**, giving **worse resolution**, but **increasing redundancy**
- **Larger lever arm** between 1st and 2nd disk **improves DCA_T resolution**
- <5 disks gives **insufficient η coverage**

Old studies (not ePIC)





Craterlake Disks Performance

- **5 Disks per side**
- Occupy **full available lever arm**
- **Challenging requirements** in backwards region with 1.7T field

DISKS	+z [mm]	-z [mm]	X/X0 %
E/HD0	250	-250	0.24
E/HD1	450	-450	0.24
E/HD2	700	-650	0.24
E/HD3	1000	-900	0.24
E/HD4	**1350**	**-1150**	0.24





Now the current version

Tracking Performance – Momentum Resolution

- Requirements on relative momentum resolution **met in central and most of forward region**
- Backward requirement **still challenging to meet**
  - High resolution electromagnetic calorimetry in this region → may provide better reconstruction

Requirement

η			Momentum res.
-3.5 to -3.0	Central Detector	Backward Detector	σp/p ~ 0.1%×p ⊕ 2%
-3.0 to -2.5			
-2.5 to -2.0			σp/p ~ 0.05%×p ⊕ 1%
-2.0 to -1.5			
-1.5 to -1.0			
-1.0 to -0.5		Barrel	σp/p ~ 0.05%×p ⊕ 0.5%
-0.5 to 0			
0 to 0.5			
0.5 to 1.0			
1.0 to 1.5		Forward Detector	σp/p ~ 0.05%×p ⊕ 1%
1.5 to 2.0			
2.0 to 2.5			
2.5 to 3.0			σp/p ~ 0.1%×p ⊕ 2%
3.0 to 3.5			



Tracking Performance – Transverse Pointing Resolution

- Performance consistent with requirement line for all but largest pseudorapidities
  - Next step for ePIC → Understand how this impacts the physics

<u>**Requirement**</u>

η			Transverse pointing res.
-3.5 to -3.0			
-3.0 to -2.5			dca(xy) ~ 30/pT µm ⊕ 40 µm
-2.5 to -2.0		Backward Detector	
-2.0 to -1.5			dca(xy) ~ 30/pT µm ⊕ 20 µm
-1.5 to -1.0			
-1.0 to -0.5			
-0.5 to 0	Central Detector	Barrel	dca(xy) ~ 20/pT µm ⊕ 5 µm
0 to 0.5			
0.5 to 1.0			
1.0 to 1.5			
1.5 to 2.0			dca(xy) ~ 30/pT µm ⊕ 20 µm
2.0 to 2.5		Forward Detector	
2.5 to 3.0			dca(xy) ~ 30/pT µm ⊕ 40 µm
3.0 to 3.5			dca(xy) ~ 30/pT µm ⊕ 60 µm



Particle Rates

- EIC bunch crossing frequency: **98.5 MHz (roughly every 10ns)**

- Interaction frequency is orders of magnitude lower:
  - **Physics (DIS) events up to 500 kHz**
  - Also background processes: **interactions of beams with residual gas** in the beampipe → Vacuum improves with run time, **beam-gas** rate decreases
  - **Synchrotron radiation** reduced by 5μm gold coating applied to beampipe → negligible impact

Rate (kHz)	5×41	5×100	10×100	10×275	18×275	Vacuum
DIS ep	12.5	129	184	500	83	-
p beam-gas	12.2	22.0	31.9	32.6	22.5	10 000 A h
p beam-gas	131.1	236.4	342.8	350.3	241.8	100 A h
e beam-gas	2181.97	2826.38	3177.25	3177.25	316.94	10 000 A h



Radiation levels

- Example study:
  - Assume 10 years of running at top luminosity
    → 100% run time for 6 months per year running
  - 10 GeV e^- on 275 GeV p DIS events
  - 10 GeV e^- and 275 GeV p beam-gas interactions



Total Dose and Fluence over SVT Envelope

- Total Ionising Dose **below 1Mrad**
  - Maximal in the beampipe
    → **10-100krad or lower in tracking layers**

- **Fluence $\lesssim 5\text{x}10^{13}\ n_{eq}/cm^2$**
  - Also maximal in the beampipe
    → **typically <10^{11}-10^{12} in tracking layers**



Within current ITS3 specifications

Hit Rates in the SVT

- Example study:
  - 10 GeV e^- on 100 GeV p DIS events
  - 10 GeV e^- and 100 GeV p beam-gas interactions
  - SR from 10 GeV e^-

- **Background events dominate hit rates in SVT**
  - 3-5 MHz in IB and disks
  - <1 MHz in OB

- For 2μs frame rate and 20.8x22.8μm^2 pixels → maximum hit occupancy **~10^{-7} per pixel per frame**
  - **Not a challenge for sensor + readout electronics**

	Hits/pixel/frame		Hits/pixel/frame		Hits/pixel/frame
L0	7.00E-08	**ED0**	1.96E-08	**HD0**	2.11E-08
L1	5.65E-08	**ED1**	7.07E-09	**HD1**	7.87E-09
L2	6.56E-09	**ED2**	6.81E-09	**HD2**	7.68E-09
L3	8.85E-10	**ED3**	6.40E-09	**HD3**	6.59E-09
L4	3.80E-10	**ED4**	5.76E-09	**HD4**	5.62E-09





SVT Acceptance at large |η|

- Disk inner openings are **not circular**
  - Constructed from **tiles of rectangular sensors**
    → inner opening is square-ish
  - Beams collide with **25mrad crossing angle**
    → **inner opening shifted** to accommodate
    → Offset is **larger for disks further from the IP**

- Disks provide full acceptance for $\mathbf{r > r_{low}}$
- Partial acceptance for $\mathbf{r_{min} < r < r_{low}}$
- No acceptance for $\mathbf{r < r_{min}}$





SVT Acceptance at large |η|

- Require 3 or more hits to reconstruct a track
  - Simulate single e^- ($\eta<0$) and π^- ($\eta>0$)
  - "Reconstructed" if >2 hits

Only 3 Si disks for |η|>3.3
→ **Efficiency becomes important**
→ **Maximise active area around opening**

$$\text{Acceptance} = \frac{\text{Number of events with 3 or more hits}}{\text{Total number of events}}.$$



Brief Interlude – DIS Kinematics



- In **inclusive scattering** no constraints are placed on the hadronic final state
- Events described using three **related** kinematic variables:

$Q^2 = s \cdot x \cdot y$

"Virtuality"
$Q^2 = -q^2$

Inelasticity

CoM energy

Bjorken x

A good reconstruction of these quantities is essential for EIC physics!

$$Q^2 = -(q \cdot q) \qquad x = \frac{Q^2}{2p \cdot q} \qquad y = \frac{p \cdot q}{p \cdot k}.$$

SVT Acceptance vs x-Q^2

- Inclusive kinematics can be fully calculated from the energy and angle of the scattered electron
  - Generate DIS events (Pythia8 18x275 GeV^2, $1<Q^2<10$ GeV^2)
  - Mapping between electron scattering angle and acceptance vs η
- Evaluate **disk acceptance** in x-Q^2 bins → **see where it impacts measurement plane**





Increasing Realism…

- **Full detector is involved in reconstructing DIS electrons**
- Track reconstruction has to be able to reconstruct the track → **<u>some events lost along the way</u>**
- Typical requirement to find electron is a matched cluster in the electromagnetic calorimeter

- Simulate single electrons in full detector
  - Require: reconstructed track, 1+ ECAL clusters
- Isolines are drawn for y=0.01, 0.99 (blue) and Q^2=0.01, 0.1, 1, 10 GeV^2 (red)
- **Acceptance losses at:**
  - **Low η (edge of disk acceptance)**
  - **Low p/p_T (track reconstruction fails or electron doesn't reach ECAL)**



Summary of Tracking Studies

- **The Tracking System for ePIC is required to be low mass and high precision**
  - Achieved using a hybrid tracking system of MAPS complemented by MPGDs

- **Tracking performance (momentum and pointing resolution) is within reach of Yellow Report targets for most of the range**
  - Dedicated physics studies required to evaluate if these requirements are sufficient

- **The EIC will be subject to beam related backgrounds of Synchrotron Radiation and beam-gas interactions**
  - Average pixel hit rate in the SVT layers: 10^{-7} per pixel per frame → does not pose a challenge for the sensor + readout electronics
  - Radiation load is manageable: Dose ~100krad and Fluence ~10^{12} n_{eq}/cm^2 in tracker

- **Large acceptance for DIS electrons across kinematic plane**

Inclusive DIS at the EIC

- Inclusive DIS provides access to collinear parton density functions
  - Even for unpolarised ep, the EIC will have a huge impact!





HERA data have limited high x sensitivity due to kinematic correlation between x and Q^2 and $1/Q^4$ factor in cross section

8

Inclusive DIS at the EIC

- The EIC provides a unique environment for the study of nucleons/nuclei with an Inclusive Physics programme:
  - **High luminosity ep collider**
  - **Polarised proton/light nucleus collider**
  - **eA collider**

- For **unpolarised** p/A – measure F_2, F_L

$$\sigma_r = F_2(x,Q^2) - \frac{y^2}{Y_+} F_L(x,Q^2)$$

- For **polarised** p/^{3}He – extract g_1

$$\frac{\Delta\sigma}{2} = \frac{1}{2}\left[\frac{d^2\sigma^{\uparrow\downarrow}}{dxdQ^2} - \frac{d^2\sigma^{\uparrow\uparrow}}{dxdQ^2}\right] \simeq \frac{4\pi\alpha^2}{Q^4} y(2-y) g_1(x,Q^2)$$

- **Vary c.o.m. energy/polarisation → measure cross section vs x-Q^2**
- **High precision x-Q^2 reconstruction required!**

Phys. Rev. D **100**, 114027



Aschenauer et al. PRD **96**, 114005 (2017)



Reconstructing Inclusive Kinematics

- Inclusive DIS kinematics can be reconstructed from **two measured quantities** → $\vec{\mathbf{D}} = \{E_e, \theta_e, \delta_h, p_{t,h}\}$
  - Where δ_h is $E - p_z$ sum of all particles in the Hadronic Final State: $\Sigma E_i(1 - \cos\theta_i)$
  - $P_{t,h}$ is the transverse momentum of the HFS
- Resolution of conventional reconstruction methods depend on:
  - Event x-Q^2
  - Detector acceptance and resolution effects
  - Size of radiative processes

Electron method

$$Q^2 = 2E_eE'_e(1 + \cos\theta_e)$$

$$y = 1 - \frac{E'_e}{2E_e}(1 - \cos\theta_e)$$

JB method

$$y = \frac{\delta_h}{2E_e}$$

$$Q^2 = \frac{p_{t,h}^2}{1 - y}$$

Σ method

$$y_\Sigma = \frac{\delta_h}{\delta_h + \delta_e}$$

$$Q^2_\Sigma = \frac{p_{t,e}^2}{1 - y_\Sigma}$$

Double Angle method

$$y_{DA} = \frac{\alpha_h}{\alpha_h + \alpha_e}$$

$$Q^2_{DA} = \frac{4E_e^2}{\alpha_e(\alpha_e + \alpha_h)}$$

$$\alpha_{e/h} = \tan\frac{\theta_{e/h}}{2}$$

Reconstructing Inclusive Kinematics with QED radiation

- Presence of **QED radiation changes event kinematics** → Errors in reconstruction when only using two measured quantities

- **FSR not too problematic**: typically collinear to scattered electron → measured together in ECAL

- **ISR more difficult to account for**: reduces electron beam energy, radiated photon typically disappears down beampipe



Kinematic Reconstruction for EIC – A Brief History



No single method wins everywhere!

- Detailed simulations performed, reconstruction methods chosen to optimise resolutions throughout phase space
  → **Resolution throughout phase space allowing 5 (log) bins per decade in x and Q^2**
- Coverage driven by acceptance:
  - $0.01 < y < 0.95$, $Q^2 > 1$ GeV^2
- Lower y accessible → however it's easier to rely on overlap between data at different √s

What if we use all available information?

- Best reconstruction should be possible using all measured quantities simultaneously
  - Some have proposed using Neural Networks https://arxiv.org/abs/2110.05505
  - Can alternatively perform a **kinematic fit of measured quantities.**

Kinematic Fit (KF) Reconstruction

- Kinematic fit of **all 4** measured quantities:
  - Extract DIS kinematics, and energy of a possible ISR photon: $\vec{\lambda}$ = {x, y, E_γ}

1. Likelihood

$$P(\vec{D}|\vec{\lambda}) \propto \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_E} e^{-\frac{(E_e - E_e^\lambda)^2}{2\sigma_E^2}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_\theta} e^{-\frac{(\theta_e - \theta_e^\lambda)^2}{2\sigma_\theta^2}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_{\delta_h}} e^{-\frac{(\delta_h - \delta_h^\lambda)^2}{2\sigma_{\delta_h}^2}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_{P_{T,h}}} e^{-\frac{(P_{T,h} - P_{T,h}^\lambda)^2}{2\sigma_{P_{T,h}}^2}}$$

2. Prior

$$P_o(\vec{\lambda}) = \frac{1 + (1-y)^2}{x^3 y^2} \frac{[1 + (1 - E_\gamma/A)^2]}{E_\gamma/A}$$

3. Posterior

$$P(\vec{\lambda}|\vec{D}) \propto P(\vec{D}|\vec{\lambda}) P_o(\vec{\lambda}).$$

- **Posterior extracted** using Metropolis-Hastings algorithm:
  - → Fitted values of **x, y, E_γ** taken from global mode of the posterior



Marginalised E_γ posterior distribution for a single DIS event

Smeared EIC pseudodata



- EIC DIS events generated with Djangoh
  - 18x275, Q^2>1 GeV^2
- Smear by estimated resolutions

- $\sigma(\theta_e)$ = 0.1mrad
- $\sigma(E_e)$ / E = 11% /sqrt(E) ⊕ 2%
- $\sigma(\delta_h)$ / δ_h = 25%
- $\sigma(p_{T,h})$ / $p_{T,h}$ = 25%

Smeared EIC pseudodata (No ISR)



- **Smearing resolutions used as input for KF**

$$P(\vec{D}|\vec{\lambda}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_E}\exp -\frac{(E_e - E_e^{\lambda})^2}{2\sigma_E^2} \times \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_\theta}\exp -\frac{(\theta_e - \theta_e^{\lambda})^2}{2\sigma_\theta^2} \times \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_{\delta_h}}\exp -\frac{(\delta_h - \delta_h^{\lambda})^2}{2\sigma_{\delta_h}^2} \times \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_{p_t^h}}\exp -\frac{(p_t^h - p_t^{h\lambda})^2}{2\sigma_{p_t^h}^2}.$$

- **Prior as before:**

$$P_0(\vec{\lambda}) = \frac{1+(1-y)^2}{x^3y^2}\frac{1+(1-E_\gamma/E_0)^2}{E_\gamma/E_0}$$

- **Compare y resolutions**:
  - KF method meets or exceeds conventional

Smeared EIC pseudodata (W/ ISR)



- **Compare true and measured ISR energy distributions**
  - Distribution **well reproduced for higher E_γ**
  - Ratio within **30% for E_γ > 3 GeV**
  - Within **10% for E_γ > 4 GeV**
- **Reasonable energy resolution**



Fully Simulated ePIC pseudodata (No ISR)





$$\sigma_E = 0.055 \cdot p \oplus 0.45 \text{ in GeV}$$

$$\sigma_\theta = 72/p_t \oplus 2.8 \text{ in mrad}$$

$$\sigma_{\delta_h} = 0.25 \cdot \delta_h \text{ in GeV}$$

$$\sigma_{p_t^h} = 0.25 \cdot p_t^h \text{ in GeV.}$$





- Parametrised ePIC full sim resolutions
  - Pythia8 NCDIS
  - Craterlake 23.12.0
  - $Q^2 > 100$ GeV^2
  - Ele from tracking

Fully Simulated ePIC pseudodata (No ISR)



- KF gives **comparable y resolution to electron method** at high y
- **Loses at low y to DA method**

HFS Correlations





- Correlations in HFS variables mostly due to energy fluctuations in calorimeters
  - Introduce extra term that reduces likelihood if p_t is overestimated and δ underestimated or vice versa:

$$P(\vec{D}|\vec{\lambda})_{corr} = P(\vec{D}|\vec{\lambda})_{uncorr} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_{corr}} \cdot \exp - \frac{(c-c^{\lambda})^2}{2\sigma^2_{corr}}$$

$$c = \frac{\delta_{h,reco} - \delta_{h,true}}{\delta_{h,true}} - \frac{p^h_{t,reco} - p^h_{t,true}}{p^h_{t,true}}$$

← Correlation width σ_{corr}~8%

Fully Simulated ePIC pseudodata (No ISR) – HFS Correlation



- **Performance of KF recovered at low y!**
  - Not perfect here → but performance comparable to DA method achieved at low y, while maintaining electron method performance at high y

- **Further improvements in likelihood possible**
  → HFS resolutions and correlation parametrisations

What about ISR?

- **ISR energy can be determined due to energy/momentum conservation**
  - If electron beam is -z and hadron beam is +z then **sum of the E-p_z value of all particles** in the event → $\Sigma_{total} = 2E_{e,beam}$
  - If the energy of the electron beam is reduced by the emission of an ISR photon then

    $E_y = E_{e,beam} - ½\Sigma_{total}$
  - This relation is used implicitly in the Σ-method, where $2E_{e,beam}$ is replaced by $(\delta_e+\delta_h)$

$$y_\Sigma = \frac{\delta_h}{\delta_h + \delta_e}$$

$$Q^2_\Sigma = \frac{p^2_{t,e}}{1 - y_\Sigma}$$

δ_h is **E – p_z** sum of all particles in the HFS
δ_e is **E – p_z** of electron

- The **resolution on reconstructed Σ_{total} is poor** → need to be careful not to attribute to ISR that which could be caused by a resolution effect
  - **Prior for E_y in Kinematic Fit helps avoid this**

Kinematic Fitting at H1

- **Simulations are one thing but…**
  - Need full simulations with ISR?
  - Will method work with real data?

- **Previous ep collider: HERA** (@ DESY)
  - H1 was one of 2 general purpose detectors
- **Perform kinematic fit reconstruction on H1 e^+p 2003/2004 MC+Data**



- Use a standard H1 high Q^2 event selection
  - $E_e > 11$ GeV in LAr Calorimeter
  - $(E-p_z)_{total}$ cuts removed so **still have ISR**
  - For plotting, require $0.01 < y_{e\Sigma} < 0.6$ and $Q^2 > 200$ GeV^2

ISR from Kinematic Fitting at H1

ISR Energy from KF vs True Energy



Estimate from Σ_{total} constraint vs True Energy



Note logarithmic z scale

- E_γ resolution similar for both approaches at high $E_{\gamma,true}$
- KF misses some ISR events but gives clear picture, Σ_{total} approach doesn't miss events but drastically overestimates amount ISR

ISR from Kinematic Fitting at H1



- Amount of ISR predicted by KF matches quite well for $E_{\gamma,true}$ > ~4 GeV
- Σ_{total} constraint approach overestimates until $E_{\gamma,true}$ > ~8 GeV

Comparison to Data

- **Good agreement between number of events predicted by KF for data+MC!**



Why identify ISR?

- ISR lowers the electron beam energy
  - **Scattered electrons in low Q^2 events don't enter main detector**
    → lower energy electrons scattered at larger angles → may be within the detector acceptance
    → kinematic reach extended

#events vs x_{kf}-Q^2_{kf} with data



#events vs x_{true}-Q^2_{true} with Djangoh



Note x-Q^2 binning here is arbitrary (not an official H1 binning)

Summary of Kinematic Reconstruction

- **Wealth of opportunities for inclusive physics at the EIC**

- **Methods using HFS information can improve resolution depending on conditions**
  - Can achieve good resolutions if best method is chosen for each x-Q^2 bin

- **Kinematic fitting method explored:**
  - The DA method may outperform the basic (uncorrelated) KF at low y
  - Extending KF method to account for correlations in the HFS recovers this performance → delivers y resolution comparable to best method for each y bin
  - ISR reconstruction improved on in KF method compared to Σ-like methods
  - KF method works for realistic detector conditions

Summary

- **The EIC will greatly improve our understanding of nucleon/nuclear structure**

- **The EIC Physics Programme sets stringent requirements on the design and performance of the tracking detector**
  - The chosen technologies should be able to deliver the physics, and operate well in the conditions of the EIC

- **Inclusive DIS measurements require an accurate reconstruction of the kinematics**
  - This can be achieved through the optimal use of the measured quantities
  - An event-by-event kinematic fit may provide a single method that gives an optimal reconstruction and extends the accessible phase space

Backup

Smeared EIC pseudodata (W/ ISR)



- Compare resolutions: no ISR to with ISR on
  - “Realistic” Σ_{tot} cut of 31 GeV applied to remove high energy ISR
- Some, but not big, difference between observed resolutions
  - Even for the electron method!

*Note different x scale

H1 Resolution on y

No Correlations



HFS Correlations



*Note different x scale

H1 Resolution on Q^2

No Correlations



HFS Correlations



Minimal difference for Q^2

H1 Resolution on x



H1 ISR reconstruction





H1 Data and MC (ISR On)



- KF reconstruction is applied with a likelihood function constructed from the following resolutions:
  - $\sigma(\theta_e)$ = 4mrad
  - $\sigma(E_e)$ / E = 11% /sqrt(E) ⊕ 1%
  - $\sigma(\delta_h)$ / δ_h = 13.5%
  - $\sigma(p_{T,h})$ / $p_{T,h}$ = 54% /sqrt($p_{T,h}$) ⊕ 4%
- No correlation term included for H1 studies
- Good agreement for pulls from data and Djangoh

$$g = \frac{D_{i,fitted} - D_{i,reco}}{RMS_{MC}}$$

Truth Smearing correlations





Kinematic Reconstruction for EIC – A Brief History

- Assessment of **relative performance of reconstruction methods** for measured phase space in ECCE and ATHENA proposals (2021)