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Abstract: Several high energy $e^+e^-$ colliders are proposed as Higgs factories by the international high energy physics community. One of the most important goals of these projects is to study the Higgs properties, such as its couplings, mass, width, and production rate, with unprecedented precision. Precision studies of the Higgs boson should be the priority and drive the design and optimization of detectors. A global analysis approach based on the multinomial distribution and Machine Learning techniques is proposed to realize an “end-to-end” analysis and to enhance the precision of all accessible decay branching fractions of the Higgs significantly. A proof-of-principle Monte Carlo simulation study is performed to show the feasibility. This approach shows that the statistical uncertainties of all branching fractions are proportional to a single parameter, which can be used as a metric to optimize the detector design, reconstruction algorithms, and data analyses. In the Higgs factories, the global analysis approach is valuable both to the Higgs measurements and detector R & D, because it has the potential for superior precision and makes detector optimization single-purpose.
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1 Introduction

The historic observation of the Higgs boson in 2012 at the Large Hadron Collider (LHC) [1, 2] declared the discovery of the last missing piece of the most fundamental building blocks in the Standard Model (SM). Although the SM has been remarkably successful in describing experimental phenomena, a precision Higgs physics program would be critically important given that the SM does not predict the parameters in the Higgs potential, nor does it involve particle candidates for dark matter. The precision determination of the Higgs couplings to SM particles, gauge bosons and leptons/quarks, are the agents probing the Higgs mechanism for generating SM particle masses [3]. In particular, potential observable deviations of the Higgs couplings from the SM expectations would indicate new physics [4]. Therefore, the Higgs discovery marks the beginning of a new era of theoretical and experimental explorations. Various $e^+e^-$ colliders as Higgs factories were proposed by the high energy physics community, such as ILC [5], CLIC [6], FCC-ee [7], and CEPC [8, 9].

The most important advantages of a Higgs factory are that the center of mass (CM) energy is precisely defined and that they could perform absolute measurements to the Higgs boson. Neglecting the $Z$ fusion production, in an $e^+e^- \rightarrow ZH$ event, where the $Z$ decays to a pair of visible fermions ($Z \rightarrow e^+e^-, \mu^+\mu^-, \tau^+\tau^-$, or $q\bar{q}$), the Higgs boson can be identified with the kinematics of these fermion pairs independent of its decays. The production cross-section and most of the decay branching fractions of the Higgs could be measured model-independently by the counting method. For example, the CEPC can measure the cross-section of $e^+e^- \rightarrow ZH$, 
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\[\sigma(ZH), \text{ at } 240\text{GeV}, \text{ to a precision of } 0.5\% \text{ and the branching fractions to a few percent, respectively, by combining the four } Z \text{ decay modes } [9, 10].\]

The physics goal of a Higgs factory must be accomplished by optimizing the detector design and making use of the latest developments in data science. Recently, various Machine Learning (ML) techniques have already shown very promising performances in the data analysis of high energy physics because of their strong inductive biases [11], in particular for jet studies. For instance, jets are treated as images [12–17] or as sequences [18–21], trees [22, 23], graphs [24], or sets [25, 26] of particles, and ML techniques, most notably deep neural networks (DNNs), are used to build new jet tagging algorithms automatically from (labeled) simulated samples and even data [27–30]. While the above ML techniques are used at jet-level for case studies, they naturally can apply for the event level in \(e^+e^-\) collision, which has much simpler topology and pile-up free.

In this article, an ML global analysis approach of the Higgs couplings at \(e^+e^-\) colliders is proposed to aid in the design and optimization of the detector for the Higgs factory (and \(W, Z\), and top as well). This approach is efficient and balanced because it can measure almost all the Higgs decays modes simultaneously with the combined information on all sub-detectors through state-of-the-art ML techniques. The approach also is a "one-shop" analysis to extract all Higgs couplings taking into account the correlations and commonalities of the same detector for the experiment. In all, it will be proved that the experiment optimized through this ML global analysis technique could have the potential for superior precision.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. The mathematical basis of the global analysis approach is introduced in Sec. 2, followed by the implementation of this approach with a toy Monte Carlo (MC) simulation and ML approach as a proof-of-principle in Sec. 3. Finally, a summary and some discussion are presented.

2 ML global analysis

The global analysis was proposed to enhance the precision of a set of branching fractions of the same resonance significantly, by taking all the cross-talks among all processes into account and benefiting from the statistical character of the multinomial distribution. It was first used to measure \(\tau\) decay branching fractions by the ALEPH collaboration [31] and an excellent demonstration can be found in [32] by the BESIII collaboration. Usually, only one signal and its backgrounds are studied in a branching fraction measurement, which is a typical classification problem of signal and background processes. Take measuring the Higgs branching fractions as an example, two types of backgrounds must be studied if all decay modes are measured simultaneously. One is the background from other SM processes, the other is the contamination among all the decay modes of the Higgs (cross talks).

2.1 Mathematical basis of the global analysis

The idea of the global analysis is going to be illustrated with an example. For the sake of simplicity, let’s take a typical process, \(e^+e^- \rightarrow ZH \rightarrow e^+e^-H\), and leave out its SM
backgrounds for future study. Here we introduce some notations: \( N_e \) is the total number of \( e^+e^- \rightarrow Z(e^+e^-)H \) events; \( \mathcal{L} \) is the integrated luminosity; \( B_Z^e \) is the branching fraction of \( Z \) to electron-positron pair decay; \( B_i \) represents the \( i \)th branching fraction of the Higgs; \( N_i \) the number of generated events in the \( i \)th decay mode; \( n_i \) the number of observed candidate events of the \( i \)th decay mode, which could contain cross talks from other decay modes; \( \epsilon_{ij} \) the probability of a generated mode \( j \) is reconstructed as mode \( i \). With these notations, the following relations are established,

\[
N_e = \sigma(ZH)\mathcal{L}B_Z^e ,
\]

\[
N_i = N_e B_i ,
\]

\[
n_i = \sum_j \epsilon_{ij} N_j ,
\]

and

\[
\sum_i N_i = N_e \quad \text{or} \quad \sum_i B_i = 1 .
\]

Eq. 2.4 always holds by definition. If all the branching fractions of an SM Higgs are measured simultaneously (neglecting the tiny branching fraction of \( H \rightarrow e^+e^- \) and combining \( H \rightarrow uds \) pairs into \( gg \) temporarily), \( N_i \)s satisfy the multinomial distribution. It should be noted that the efficiency matrix \( (\epsilon_{ij}) \) can be determined without dependence on the \( B_i \)s, and the elements can be corrected using data for many effects such as particle identification (PID) efficiency, tracking efficiency, and lepton isolation requirement efficiency.

It is more compact and convenient to use linear algebra. Therefore, \( \mathbf{N} = (N_1, N_2, \ldots)^T \), \( \mathbf{n} = (n_1, n_2, \ldots)^T \), and \( \mathbf{E} = (\epsilon_{ij}) \). Now the Eq. 2.3 is expressed as,

\[
\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{E}\mathbf{N} .
\]

The covariance matrices of \( \Sigma^n \), \( \Sigma^N \), and \( \Sigma^B \) are calculated in multinomial distribution. First, \( \Sigma^N \) reads

\[
\Sigma^N = N_e^e \begin{pmatrix}
B_1(1 - B_1) & -B_1B_2 & \ldots & -B_1B_m \\
-B_2B_1 & B_2(1 - B_2) & \ldots & -B_2B_m \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
-B_mB_1 & -B_mB_2 & \ldots & B_m(1 - B_m)
\end{pmatrix} ,
\]
where $m$ is the total number of the Higgs decay modes to be studied. Then it is straightforward that the covariance matrices of $N$ and $n$ are connected by their Jacobian matrix, $J_{nN} = E = (\epsilon_{ij})$,

$$\Sigma^n \equiv (\epsilon^n_{ij}) = E \Sigma^N E^T,$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.6)

or equivalently,

$$\Sigma^N = E^{-1} \Sigma^n (E^T)^{-1}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.7)

The most important aspect of Eq. 2.6 is that the statistical uncertainties of $n_i$s are calculated with $N_i$s instead of with $n_i$s directly. As a consequence, the statistical uncertainties get significantly smaller, because they are calculated according to the multinomial distribution instead of a Poisson. Another important influence is that the uncertainties calculated with $N_i$s are expected to be insensitive to the background because $N_i$, the generated number, doesn’t depend on background contamination.

$$\Sigma^B = J_{BN} E^{-1} \Sigma^n (E^T)^{-1} J^T_{BN} \propto \frac{1}{(N^e_t)^2 |E|^2},$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.8)

where $J_{BN}$ is the Jacobian matrix connecting Bs and Ns and easily obtained with error propagation. In the simplest case of $m = 2$, it reads,

$$J_{BN} = \frac{1}{N^e_t} \begin{pmatrix} B_2 & -B_1 \\ -B_2 & B_1 \end{pmatrix}. \hspace{1cm} (2.9)$$

Equation 2.8 has several useful and interesting features. The first is that all branching fractions are anti-correlated, in particular, they are 100% anti-correlated if there are only two decay modes. This anti-correlation is because of the nature of multinomial distribution. The second is that the covariance is proportional to $1/[(N^e_t)^2 |E|^2]$, which shows that better precision could be reached when statistics are larger and/or the determinant of $E$ becomes larger, i.e, $E$ is approaching an identity matrix of 100% detection efficiency and zero misidentification.

### 2.2 Combination of multiple tagging modes

The total number of the Higgs events can be determined by the visible decay products of the $Z$ at an $e^+e^-$ collider, such as the electron-positron pair in the process $e^+e^- \rightarrow e^+e^- H$. It not only makes the model-independent study of the Higgs workable but also provides an extra constraint on the total number and improves the precision.

To make use of the advantages of multinomial distribution and the constraint, the following $\chi^2$ is constructed,

$$\chi^2_{ee} = \sum_i \frac{(\sum_k \epsilon_{ik} N_k - n_i)^2}{c_{ii}} + \frac{(\sum_k N_k - N^e_t)^2}{\sigma^2_{N_i}}, \hspace{1cm} (2.10)$$
where the subscript $ee$ represents that the Higgs is tagged by electron-positron pair. If 9 Higgs decay modes are studied, namely $H \rightarrow c\bar{c}$, $b\bar{b}$, $\mu^+\mu^-$, $\tau^+\tau^-$, $gg$, $\gamma\gamma$, $ZZ$, $W^+W^-$, and $\gamma Z$, Eq. 2.10 contains 10 unknowns, 9 $B$s and one cross-section, $\sigma(ZH)$. We should note that there are only 8 $B$s are independent when the constraint applies.

If more tagging modes from $Z$ decays come in, such as $e^+e^- \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-H$, $\tau^+\tau^-H$, and $q\bar{q}H$, the sum of the $\chi^2$s is going to be used to combine them.

$$\chi^2 = \chi^2_{ee} + \chi^2_{\mu\mu} + \chi^2_{\tau\tau} + \chi^2_{q\bar{q}},$$

where the four $Z$ decay branching fractions are fixed to the world averages [33] and the total number of unknowns does not change. A useful feature is that there are still only 10 free parameters when additional tagging modes are included, so the precision of those parameters could be improved further because more information is combined.

The key technical ingredients of the global analysis are determining of the efficiency matrices and minimizing the $\chi^2$. Minimization problem can be realized with some mature and widely used software [34]. The first is going to be accomplished with the ML technique elegantly, which is going to be presented in the next section.

## 3 Determination of $B$s with machine learning

In this section, the connection between the efficiency matrix and the confusion matrix of ML will be established. Then the global analysis will achieve the $B$s and their statistical uncertainties with the ML techniques.

### 3.1 The efficiency matrix and confusion matrix

In data analysis, event selection is a classification problem. In the Higgs decays at $e^+e^-$ colliders, there are 9 accessible decay modes and 2 types of backgrounds. The first type of background is the other SM processes, which usually can be subtracted using the fit method and is going to be left out in this proof-of-principle study. And the other type is the cross-talks among all 9 decay modes and described by the off-diagonal elements of the efficiency matrices, which can be seen if Eq. 2.3 is written explicitly in the matrix,

$$
\begin{pmatrix}
    n_1 \\
    n_2 \\
    \vdots \\
    n_9
\end{pmatrix}
= 
\begin{pmatrix}
    \epsilon_{11} & \epsilon_{12} & \cdots & \epsilon_{19} \\
    \epsilon_{21} & \epsilon_{22} & \cdots & \epsilon_{29} \\
    \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
    \epsilon_{91} & \epsilon_{92} & \cdots & \epsilon_{99}
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
    N_1 \\
    N_2 \\
    \vdots \\
    N_9
\end{pmatrix}.
$$

An implementation of an ML model usually has two stages: training and test(application). During the training stage, ML models learn knowledge on the training data set and are validated by independent validation data sets at the same time. Each entry of both two data sets contains some features and a label showing which category it belongs to. After the
training finished successfully, the model applies to a new data set (test set). Each data entry is assigned some scores to predict its category quantitatively.

The performance of a classification model can be characterized by various metrics. An important one is the confusion matrix, which not only describes the performance of a classification model but also the key ingredient of the global analysis. Each row of a confusion matrix represents the instances in an actual class while each column represents the instances in a predicted class, or vice versa. By definition, a normalized confusion matrix $C$ is such that the element, $C_{i,j}$, is equal to the probability of observations known to be in group $i$ and predicted to be in group $j$. The diagonal elements of the confusion matrix represent the probabilities of which the prediction is equal to its label, while off-diagonal elements are those which are mislabeled by the classifier. The higher the diagonal values of the confusion matrix, the better, which means improved accuracy. Based on the definition of the confusion matrix and Eq.2.3, it can be concluded that the confusion matrix here is equivalent to the efficiency matrix in this study. So $E$ or $(\epsilon_{ij})$ will represent the two matrices in the following.

Eq. 2.8 points the direction to improve the precision of the $B$s. From the fact that the covariance matrix of $B$ is proportional to $1/(N^2|E|^2)$, there are two ways to improve precision. One is increasing the total number of signals generated in collisions, and the other is maximizing the determinant, $|E|$. Since the $N$ is decided by luminosity and operation time of accelerators, which usually are limited by the technologies and operating cost. It is more practical to make $|E|$ larger. It is worth noting that $|E|$ could be factorized as the performance of a detector, reconstruction software, and analysis techniques, as well as the level of backgrounds of both the SM processes and the colliding environments. All these are essential for the design and optimization of an experiment and have to be considered.

### 3.2 ParticleFlow Network and “end-to-end” analysis

In [25] the authors applied the Deep Sets concept [35] to the jet tagging problem. They propose two elegant model architectures, named EnergyFlow Network (EFN) and ParticleFlow Network (PFN), with provable physics properties, such as infrared and colinear safety. In these two architectures, the features of each particle are encoded into a latent space of $\Phi$ [35] and the category, $F$, is extracted from the summed representation in that latent space. Both $\Phi$ and $F$ are approximated by neural networks. The key mathematical fact is that a generic function of a set of particles can be decomposed into an arbitrarily good approximation according to the Deep Set Theorem [35]. The performance of these models in classification problems is comparable with other more complicated models. The authors also tried to interpret and visualize what the model has learned [25].

As suggested by the authors [25] and according to the performances of EFN and PFN, we choose the PFN to realize an “end-to-end” analysis. It contains some distinct features in contrast to conventional data analysis. First, the ML approach is used to study many physics processes at the same time and globally. There are already 9 branching fractions to be measured simultaneously, and the number of classes will be greater than 9 if the SM backgrounds are included. In addition, the term “end-to-end” means that all the particle level
information, such as four momenta, PID, and impact parameters of charged particles, is used as input directly, and the network calculates the scores of each event. In this case, the analysis no longer needs some dedicated and complicated reconstruction tools, such as lepton/photon isolation, jet-clustering, and $\tau$ finder, and so on.

### 3.3 Determination of the efficiency matrices

In this sub-section, the PFN architecture applies to calculate the efficiency matrices. The details of the ML model setup, data sets, and classification results are also presented.

**ML model setup**  For the model used to determine the confusion matrices, kinematic information of energy, polar and azimuthal angles are always given for each particle. We should note that energies and polar angles are used instead of the transverse momenta and rapidities, respectively, in this study, since the model is going to be utilized for $e^+e^-$-collider experiments. All features are pre-processed: the energies are divided by the scalar $\sum E$ and the polar and azimuthal angles are centered based on the polar and azimuthal angles of the event. The inputs also include the PID and impact parameters of charged particles.

The PFN model architecture is designed to parameterize the functions $\Phi$ and $F$ in a sufficiently general way, several dense neural network layers are used as universal approximators. For $\Phi$, three dense layers are employed with 100, 100, and $l$ nodes, respectively, where $l$ is the latent dimension that takes 256 after comparing the performances of 128 and 256. For $F$, we use the same configuration as the original paper, which has three dense layers, each with 100 nodes. Each dense layer uses the ReLU activation function and He-uniform parameter initialization [39]. A nine-unit layer with a SoftMax activation function is the output layer.

**Data samples**  In this study, there are 4 production modes of the Higgs boson at 240 GeV to be analyzed, i.e., $e^+e^\rightarrow e^+e^-H$, $\mu^+\mu^-H$, $\tau^+\tau^-H$, and $q\bar{q}H$. And in each production mode, the same 9 decay modes are measured, which are $H\rightarrow c\bar{c}$, $b\bar{b}$, $\mu^+\mu^-$, $\tau^+\tau^-$, $gg$, $\gamma\gamma$, $ZZ$, $W^+W^-$, and $\gamma Z$, respectively. So there are 36 processes in total. For each process, 400,000 events are generated with the WHIZARD 1.9.5 [36] and fed to Pythia [37] for hadronization. Then they are simulated by smearing to model detector responses. All particles are smeared according to the performance of the baseline detector in the CEPC CDR [9], besides the impact parameters and PID are taken directly from the truth of generation. While this simple simulation is a bit too ideal, it is sufficient for a proof-of-principle study.

**Training and evaluation**  During model training, the common properties of the neural network include categorical cross-entropy loss function, the Adam optimization algorithm [38], batch size of 1000, and a learning rate of 0.001. 400,000 events are used for each production mode, and the total number of events of 9 decays is 3,600,000. The full data set is split into training, validation, and test samples according to fractions of 8:1:1. The monitoring of loss and accuracy on training and validation samples shows that the models converge well and there is no obvious over-training after the models are trained for 100 epochs, see Figure 1 as an example.
The outputs of the classifier, which are from a nine-unit layer with a SoftMax activation function, are visualized in various ways. The SoftMax is essential because it helps to produce scores comprising 9 probabilities proportional to the exponential of the input information for each event, which is input for a cut-based data analysis. Figure 2 presents the 9 scores for each category. Taking the bottom left panel as an example, these events are of $H \rightarrow ZZ$, and the curves in different colors represent the probability distributions assuming them to be $H \rightarrow ZZ$. The blue curve peaks when the score approaches 1, which means the classifier can identify $H \rightarrow ZZ$ signals. There are two small peaks in the blue and brown curves around 0.8, which shows that $H \rightarrow ZZ$ and $H \rightarrow \gamma Z$ can contaminate each other because of the similarity of their cascade decays. From Figure 2, it can be seen that high-dimensional data is difficult to visualize intuitively. A better way is that data in lower dimensions are plotted to show the inherent structures. To aid visualization of the structure of 9 outputs, the t-SNE[40] method is used. Figure 3 shows the distribution of the two largest components after the dimensionality
reduction, where 1-9 represents the 9 decay modes of the Higgs boson from $c\bar{c}$ to $\gamma Z$ in the same order as the above, respectively. The patterns in Figure 3 are consistent with those in Figure 2 but much clearer. It can be seen that $\mu^+\mu^-$ (3), $\gamma\gamma$ (6), $\tau^+\tau^-$ (4) and $\gamma Z$ (9) modes are almost isolated clusters and background free. The clusters of the others can also be seen and the overlaps are also significant.

![Figure 2](image-url): The distributions of 9 outputs for each true category, taking $e^+e^-H$ as an example. Each score is calculated by assuming that the event belongs to that category.

Some standard quantities can measure the performances of classifiers. For instance, accuracy (ACC) measures the fraction of correctly classified observations, ROC curve (Receiver Operating Characteristic curve) visualizes the True Positive Rate (TPR) versus the False Positive Rate (FPR), and AUC (Area Under the Curve) is the area under the ROC curve. If we have a better classification for each threshold value, the area grows, and a perfect classification leads to an AUC of 1.0. The average ACC and AUC for all 36 processes in the 4 tagging modes are summarized in Table 1. Several conclusions can be drawn from the table. First, the average accuracy of each tagging mode reaches about 87%, which is good and adequate for further analysis. The decays of $H \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$, $\tau^+\tau^-$, and $\gamma\gamma$ have the best accuracy and largest AUCs as expected. Last but not least, the accuracy of $H \rightarrow ZZ$ or $W^+W^-$ is not good as the others, which leaves room for further improvement.

Finally, the confusion matrices are used to evaluate the performance of the ML model and
Figure 3: The classification performance on the test set is visualized with $t$-SNE, where the two largest components are used, taking 10,000 events of $e^+e^- \rightarrow e^+e^-H$ for illustration.

to be used as an important gradient for the global analysis. Confusion matrices are calculated by comparing the prediction of the model and the true labels. Figure 4 shows the confusion matrices of the four classifiers, respectively. In terms of the confusion matrix, the accuracy appears as the diagonal elements of the corresponding confusion matrices, and the off-diagonal ones represent misclassification rates. So confusion matrices contain the complete information of both the correct and incorrect classifications, which could help to unfold the generated numbers of signals, $N_i$. 
Decay Mode | $e^+e^-H$ | $\mu^+\mu^-H$ | $\tau^+\tau^-H$ | $qqH$
---|---|---|---|---
$H \to c\bar{c}$ | 0.880 0.991 | 0.882 0.991 | 0.857 0.987 | 0.755 0.966
$H \to b\bar{b}$ | 0.908 0.994 | 0.893 0.994 | 0.877 0.991 | 0.733 0.972
$H \to \mu^+\mu^-$ | 0.997 1.000 | 0.986 1.000 | 0.981 1.000 | 0.983 1.000
$H \to \tau^+\tau^-$ | 0.993 0.999 | 0.985 0.999 | 0.985 0.999 | 0.982 0.999
$H \to gg$ | 0.810 0.985 | 0.830 0.986 | 0.816 0.982 | 0.736 0.954
$H \to \gamma\gamma$ | 0.997 1.000 | 0.999 1.000 | 1.000 1.000 | 0.997 1.000
$H \to ZZ$ | 0.650 0.958 | 0.667 0.960 | 0.585 0.947 | 0.535 0.926
$H \to W^+W^-$ | 0.806 0.981 | 0.801 0.981 | 0.771 0.974 | 0.632 0.952
$H \to \gamma Z$ | 0.921 0.996 | 0.936 0.996 | 0.910 0.993 | 0.896 0.993

Table 1: Accuracy (left) and AUCs (right) of four classifiers.

Figure 4: Confusion matrices of (a): $e^+e^- \to e^+e^-H$, (b): $e^+e^- \to \mu^+\mu^-H$, (c): $e^+e^- \to \tau^+\tau^-H$, and (d): $e^+e^- \to qqH$, respectively.
3.4 The Higgs decay branching fractions

To show the advantages of the global analysis approach over the conventional ones, a toy MC study is carried out using the efficiency matrices from above. Toy MC is used for both the global analysis (abbreviated as Glo.Ana. in the following) and individual analysis (Ind.Ana.), where the individual one means that only one signal and its background are studied and the global one utilizes procedures introduced in section 2.

In the simulation, we implement Poisson samplings to generate the total number of tagged events $N_t$ for each tagging mode, and then the numbers of generated events of the 9 decay modes, $N_i$s, are sampled according to multinomial distribution and the SM Higgs decay branching fractions. The number of observed events of each decay mode, $n_i$, can be easily calculated according to Eq. 2.5, which includes the contamination from other decay modes. The total integrated luminosity is set as 5.6 ab$^{-1}$ and the cross-sections of 4 production processes are 7.04 fb ($e^+e^- \rightarrow e^+e^-H$), 6.77 fb ($e^+e^- \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-H$), 6.75 fb ($e^+e^- \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-H$), and 136.81 fb ($e^+e^- \rightarrow q\bar{q}H$), respectively, which are consistent with CEPC CDR [9]. The total number of the Higgs events is about 881,000. So far, the simulation processes discussed above are the same for both individual and global analysis.

In individual analysis, we assume that the background contamination can be modeled by the MC perfectly and subtracted. Therefore, the signal yield, $n^{sig}_i$, is determined unbiasedly. But its statistical uncertainty becomes larger because it includes fluctuations of both the signal itself and its backgrounds. With the $n^{sig}_i$, the branching fraction of the $i$th decay mode is calculated by

$$B_i = \frac{n^{sig}_i}{\epsilon_i N_t}.$$  \hfill (3.2)

As for the global analysis, all 9 Higgs decay branching fractions and $\sigma(ZH)$ are obtained simultaneously by minimizing the $\chi^2$ defined in Eq. 2.10 and Eq. 2.11. In Eq. 2.11, all 4 tagging modes of $Z$ are combined naturally to further improve the precision. To make it clear, all parameters are listed: the $\sigma(ZH)$, 4 branching fractions of $Z$ decays, and 9 branching fractions of Higgs decays. It should be noted that there are only 9 free parameters, because that the 4 $Z$ branching fractions are fixed to the world averages [33] and a unitary constraint applies to all the Higgs decay branching fractions during fitting. Therefore, in the minimization, only 10 parameters are dealt with as fitting parameters and 9 of them are free.

To evaluate the statistical uncertainties of all 10 parameters, the MC experiment described above is repeated 10,000 times. Thus the distributions of calculated branching fractions are to follow Gaussian distribution, and their standard deviations represent statistical uncertainties. The MC sampling method used is a popular approach to perform error propagation, which is straightforward and fast, in particular when more sources of uncertainties are considered and even when some of them are correlated.

As the most important results of this study, all relative statistical uncertainties of the 9 branching fractions obtained with the toy MC experiments are presented in Figure 5 and Table 2. Those in [9] are also shown in the table as references. To explicitly demonstrate
the improvement power (IP) of global analysis, the ratios of the statistical uncertainties of Ind.Ana. over those of Glo.Ana. are also listed in Tab. 2. The global analysis approach can enhance precision by a factor of 2 compared with the Ind.Ana on average. It is essential to be aware that the SM background is left out for both analyses. Therefore, the relative changes, the IP, can represent the superior precision of the Glo.Ana. But to be honest, the Glo.Ana results should not be compared with those in CEPC CDR directly before the SM background is taken into account.

![Relative uncertainties of the Higgs decay branching fractions.](image)

**Figure 5**: Relative uncertainties of the Higgs decay branching fractions. Blue and red bars show the results from individual and the global analysis, respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decay Mode</th>
<th>Ind.Ana.</th>
<th>Glo.Ana.</th>
<th>IP</th>
<th>CEPC CDR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$H \to c \bar{c}$</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>0.65%</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H \to b \bar{b}$</td>
<td>0.19%</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H \to \mu^+ \mu^-$</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H \to \tau^+ \tau^-$</td>
<td>0.61%</td>
<td>0.41%</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H \to gg$</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H \to \gamma \gamma$</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H \to ZZ$</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0.65%</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H \to W^+W^-$</td>
<td>0.37%</td>
<td>0.21%</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H \to \gamma Z$</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2**: Relative uncertainties of Higgs decay branching fractions. The improvement powers are listed in the fourth column and results from CEPC CDR in the fifth column for reference.

We make some attempts to understand the improvements brought by the global analysis
approach. It can be explained from the following aspects. First, the global analysis makes use of the full covariance of all counts, which means more information is used to determine the measurands. And second, it deploys the law of multinomial distribution to calculate the statistical uncertainties, which could be significantly smaller than those of individual analysis. The reasons are not only because the statistical uncertainties are calculated according to multinomial distribution but also because they are calculated with \( N_i \) directly instead of \( n_i^{\text{sig}} \), and then transformed into the ones of observations. Last, the global analysis introduces a unitary constraint of the total branching fractions. In conclusion, the global analysis approach benefits from using more information of data and knowledge of statistics and prior to physics, which can improve precision significantly.

For the sake of in-depth understanding of the IPs of some specific decay modes, some attempts are tried to factorize the contributions to the IPs. Regarding larger decay branching fractions like \( H \to b\bar{b} \), it is less affected by cross talks because of its distinguishing features for identification. As a result, the contribution to IP mainly comes from the law of multinomial distribution. In contrast, the \( H \to \gamma Z \) has a much smaller branching fraction and is more easily contaminated by others. In the global analysis, the effect of contamination can be significantly reduced using the full efficiency matrix, which makes the IP of \( H \to \gamma Z \) the largest. As for decay modes with small branching fractions and less affected by cross talks, such as \( H \to \gamma \gamma, H \to \mu^+ \mu^- \), an \( \tau^+ \tau^- \), improvements brought by the global analysis approach are limited and that leads to relatively small IPs. The reason is two-fold. On one hand, a small \( B_s \) cannot help to get smaller statistical uncertainties according to multinomial distribution. On the other hand, the background is already rather low and the full efficiency matrix doesn’t help much.

It should be noted that the SM background was left out in this proof-of-principle study. But simple estimation shows that the ML global analysis can still achieve superior precision with the SM background. First, a significant improvement is observed for the fair comparison because neither the Glo.Ana nor the Ind.Ana takes the SM background into account. Second, if we compare the second and the fifth columns in Tab 2, the results of \([9, 10]\) are rough 2 times worse. There are two reasons. One is the SM background, the other is due to realistic detector simulation. At a Higgs factory of a rather clean collision environment, the typical signal-to-background ratio is at about \( O(1) \) in the statistical inference stage \([9, 10]\). The last and most important, Eq. 2.6 already shows that the uncertainties calculated with the generated numbers of events are insensitive to backgrounds. As a whole, we can safely conclude that the SM background cannot change trends dramatically and that the ML global analysis could keep its advantages when the SM background appears.

4 Summary and discussion

In this paper, we presented an ML global analysis approach to aid the detector optimization and enhance the precision of all decay branching fractions of the Higgs at electron-positron colliders. It deploys multinomial distribution, “end-to-end” ML techniques, and full efficiency
matrices to maximize the usage of the data information and physics priori for superior precision. The study based fast simulation shows that the precision can be enhanced by a factor of 2 on average compared with conventional analysis methods. This approach is an efficient and balanced “one-shop” analysis method, which can measure all Higgs couplings using all detector information and taking all the commonalities and correlations into account. For the analyses of tens or hundreds of channels, they can be repeated using this technique in a few days if all data samples are ready. In contrast, the time could be considerably longer using the conventional analysis method.

The Equation 2.8 provides a unique metric and makes detector optimization single-purpose. For a specific Higgs factory experiment, the total integrated luminosity is limited due to cost. Therefore, the total number of Higgs events is also limited. According to Eq. 2.8, the only realistic way to enhance precision is to maximize the determinant of the efficiency matrix. As an important consequence, only one parameter needs to be optimized in this case. For comparison, conventional detector optimization has to choose a bunch of benchmark channels. The optimization based on these benchmarks, of course, is multi-purpose. People have to perform lots of data analyses and balance the importance among them. A single-purpose optimization is favored at the experiment R & D stage, which is beneficial for fast iterations. As we’d like to see, the optimization problem is successfully simplified into tuning the detector design, the reconstruction algorithms, and data analysis techniques to maximize $|E|$.

Besides the superior precision and single-purpose characters of the ML global analysis, there is another advantage in terms of prioritizing software development and detector optimization. The global analysis approach utilizes state-of-the-art ML technology for an “end-to-end” analysis, which can make use of the particle level information for classification problems directly. Therefore, it doesn’t depend on the complicated reconstruction algorithms, such as lepton and photon isolation, τ-finder, and jet-clustering, which can make it possible to start physics study and detector optimization before all those software tools are ready.

To be frank, this work is only a proof-of-principle study. There are various possibilities to enhance and validate it. One is to enhance the performance by taking the sequential decays of $W$ and $Z$ bosons into account, which can adopt more information and improve the precision. Another possibility is to try some other ML techniques, such as ParticleNet [26], which explicitly exploits the local spatial structure of particle clouds and is expected to perform better in an economical way of less trainable parameters. In addition, another endeavor with more physical significance is incorporating some physics processes beyond the SM in the analysis, such as the invisible and semi-invisible decays of the Higgs boson, which can enhance the sensitivity of an experiment to new physics. To validate the global approach, it needs to be implemented with a full set of 36 Higgs signals and the SM background processes with realistic simulation. The systematic uncertainty is another important issue for measurements and there are already many studies on the topic in the ML applications for high energy data analyses [41–43]. So systematic uncertainty will also be taken into account in future studies.
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