Why do we need a collider after the LHC and how should it look like?

J. List (DESY) December 6, 2019







CLUSTER OF EXCELLENCE QUANTUM UNIVERSE

Planning the future

- 1. What will be the open physics questions after HL-LHC? => physics studies & gloabl fits in close collaboration with theorists
- 2. What are realistic requirements on the next collider after HL-LHC? => optimize physics program of a realistic accelerator in close collaboration with accelerator physicists
- 3. What are the requirements on the detectors at such a collider? => study the impact of the detector performance on physics observables
- 4. How can such detectors be built? => construction and test beam operation of prototypes







Contacts for further information

- General, tracking detectors: <u>Ties.Behnke@desy.de</u>
- HCAL: <u>Katja.Krueger@desy.de</u>
- Software, Deep Learning: <u>Frank.Gaede@desy.de</u>
- Group home page flc.desy.de
- Thesis offers (examples!) https://flc.desy.de/education/thesistopics/index_eng.html

General, Physics Analyses, Detector Optimisation: <u>Jenny.List@desy.de</u>





Impact of (no) BSM Assumption





Role of Triple Gauge Coupling Measurements





Role of Luminosity, Energy & Polarisation





Energy, Luminosity and Electrical Power







The ILD Detector Concept





The Particle Flow Concept



Colours are according to **RECONSTRUCTION!** 1000 500 //mm -500 -1000 -500 1000 2000 1500 2500 x/mm





























How does precision on BR(H-> $\mu\mu$) depend on momentum resolution?





How well can be separate WW->4jets from ZZ->4jets ?





How well can be separate WW->4jets from ZZ->4jets ?





Can we improve H->bb reconstruction?

- Decay chain reconstruction:
 - e.g. with semi-leptonic
 b->clv decay
 - Know decay chain
 => can recover neutrino
 momentum
 - huge improvement potential on H->bb mass reconstruction!

	C
	+
	Ľ
	Ĺ





Particle ID => track fit with correct mass



Clear improvement on track fit with correct mass hypothesis

eg pull on impact parameter for **correct** and **wrong** mass hypothesis





Particle ID : specvific energy loss (dE/dx) in TPC





Time-of-Flight measurement => your thesis? :-)

Bachelor Thesis S. Dharani (U Leipzig & DESY-FLC, 2018): "Particle Identication using Time of Flight in the International Large Detector ILD"

- Assume 10, 50, 100 ps single hit resolution in ECal •
- Extrapolate track into ECal, combine time of 10 closest hits => "adhoc" procedure, not optimized!







"When" to measure for best time resolution?

- "Before" shower: only MIP signal resolution not optimal?
- "Early" in shower: several MIPs /hit and/or several hits / initial particle — better ?
- "Later" in shower: shower propagation itself adds uncertainty to estimate of particle arrival time — worse again ?
- => What is "early"/"late" quantitatively ? Is there an optimum?



- As extension of QU Project on construction of LGAD layer for pixel telescope (E.Garutti, I.M.Gregor)
- Combine LGAD sensor with Calice ECal absorber stack (available at DESY)
- Measure resolution on arrival time behind different amounts of tungsten!
- **DESY Testbeam: electrons!** => test with electromagnetic showers => compare to simulation
- Hadrons (CERN) beyond scope of this project, could possibly be follow-up









Hadronic Calorimeter in the Testbeam





Hadronic Calorimeter Layer in the Lab





TPC & Silicon Tracker in the Testbeam

