

A unified machine learning approach for reconstructing hadronically decaying tau leptons

Tani, Laurits¹ Seeba, Nalong-Norman¹
 laurits.tani@cern.ch nalong-norman.seeba@cern.ch
 Vanaveski, Hardi¹ Pata, Joosep¹
 hardiveski@gmail.com joosep.pata@cern.ch
 Lange, Torben¹
 torben.lange@cern.ch

¹*National Institute Of Chemical Physics And Biophysics (NICPB), R vala pst. 10, 10143 Tallinn, Estonia*

Abstract

Tau leptons serve as an important tool for studying the production of Higgs and electroweak bosons, both within and beyond the Standard Model of particle physics. Accurate reconstruction and identification of hadronically decaying tau leptons is a crucial task for current and future high energy physics experiments. Given the advances in jet tagging, we demonstrate how tau lepton reconstruction can be decomposed into tau identification, kinematic reconstruction, and decay mode classification in a multi-task machine learning setup. Based on an electron-positron collision dataset with full detector simulation and reconstruction, we show that common jet tagging architectures can be effectively used for these subtasks. We achieve comparable momentum resolutions of 2-3% with all the tested models, while the precision of reconstructing individual decay modes is between 80–95%. This paper also serves as an introduction to a new publicly available **FUTURE** dataset and provides recipes for the development and training of tau reconstruction algorithms, while allowing to study resilience to domain shifts and the use of foundation models for such tasks.

1 Introduction

Tau leptons (τ) serve as an important tool for tests of the Standard Model of particle physics (SM) in the electroweak sector as well as for searches physics beyond the SM (BSM) both at current and future high energy physics experiments.

Due to its relatively high mass, the τ lepton couples strongly to the Higgs boson (H), allowing to test the Higgs boson coupling to third generation fermions [1].

As $H \rightarrow \tau\tau$ decays have a rather clean signature, they allow to investigate also other Higgs boson properties and rare Higgs processes. These include, for example, Higgs boson pair production, directly probing the Higgs boson potential [2], [3], and the Higgs bosons CP properties [4], [5].

Furthermore, studying τ lepton properties — such as its mass, lifetime and branching fractions — allows us to test lepton universality of charged current between different fermion generations, while spin polarization measurements of the τ leptons allows us to probe neutral-current interactions [6], [7].

Next, the τ can also be used to search for lepton flavor violating processes in τ lepton decays [6], [7] as well as in decays of Z bosons [8], [9] and Higgs bosons [10], [11] into a τ lepton and an electron or muon, forbidden in the SM.

Measuring τ lepton properties enables one to test a variety of BSM theories predicting new particles decaying into τ leptons. These theories include models with additional heavy charged and neutral gauge bosons [12]–[14], models of third generation leptoquarks [1], supersymmetric models [15]–[23], and models with an extended Higgs sector [24]–[28].

τ leptons have a very short lifetime of only 2.9×10^{-13} seconds [29], short enough to decay before interacting with the detector material or before undergoing any radiative processes. In about a third of the cases, the τ decays into another, lighter lepton (electron or muon) and a neutrino. As the neutrino does not interact with the detectors used in high energy physics experiments, it can not be reconstructed and thus, leptonically decaying taus (τ_ℓ) leave a signature in the detector that is mostly indistinguishable from an electron or muon, and therefore don't need dedicated reconstruction algorithms.

More interesting for the context of this paper are hadronically decaying taus (τ_h). In two thirds of the cases the τ lepton decays into a neutrino, an odd number of charged (typically pions π^\pm or kaons K^\pm) hadrons (h^\pm) and a number of neutral pions (π^0). The latter particles decay almost instantly into a pair of photons. Most dominant τ_h decay modes feature up to three h^\pm and two or fewer π^0 . An overview of the relative branching fractions for the different τ_h decays is given in Fig. 1.

Correctly reconstructing the τ_h and identifying it from other particle signatures represents a significant combinatorial problem, that eluded a fully machine learning based solution for many years. Instead, it relied on a combination of more classical algorithms, such as the hadron-plus-strips (HPS) [30], [31] for reconstruction, and machine learning-based methods for the τ_h identification. As a system of multiple final state particles, τ_h decays are on first glance especially difficult to differentiate from jets produced by other high energy processes such as the hadronization of a gluon or a quark. Thus, the problem of identifying a τ_h [30]–[40] lies in the realm of "jet-tagging" which in recent years has been thoroughly explored with machine learning techniques, usually focusing on the differentiation of heavy quarks, such as b- and c-quarks, from lighter (u, d, s) quarks and gluons with examples given in Refs. [41]–[43].

The substantial advances in jet-tagging have been made by exploiting deep learning techniques from other fields, such as the use of transformers, originally developed for language modeling. As seen previously in [44], these techniques




Figure 1: Overview of the branching fraction for various τ decay modes. The numbers are taken from the particle data group [29].

can also be used to effectively identify τ_h , with the two tested architectures, LorentzNet [45] and ParticleTransformer [46], outperforming more typical, heavily optimized approaches such as HPS + DeepTau [38] without any fine-tuning done by domain experts. Here, we show that such models can also be used for reconstructing the properties of the τ_h .

In addition to the correct identification of the τ_h candidates from jets, existing τ_h reconstruction chains found in experiments such as Compact Muon Solenoid (CMS) and A Toroidal LHC Apparatus (ATLAS) aim to determine the exact decay mode of the τ_h decay and to precisely reconstruct the τ_h momentum.

Only the τ_h decay modes with the largest branching ratio (BR) are targeted by the state-of-the-art (SOTA) algorithms. These decay modes include h^\pm ; $h^\pm + \pi^0$; $h^\pm + \geq 2\pi^0$; $h^\pm h^\mp h^\pm$ and $h^\pm h^\mp h^\pm + \geq \pi^0$, with the rest of the τ_h decays being usually classified into the “Rare” or “Other” category. Similarly to electron-positron (e^+e^-) experiments, where the decay modes are usually classified by boosted decision trees (BDTs) [47] or a neural network (NN) [48], the classification in proton-proton (pp) experiments is done either with a combinatorial [31], [49] approach or using BDTs on top of reconstructed τ_h candidates [50]. The classification precision for h^\pm and $h^\pm h^\mp h^\pm$ is $\geq 90\%$ for both pp as well as e^+e^- collider experiments. However, as reconstructing multiple π^0 s in pp collider experiments is a more challenging task, with the precision for such decay modes featuring π^0 s being $< 60\%$ [31], [49]–[51] The corresponding precision for e^+e^- collider experiments is $\geq 85\%$ [47], [48], [52].

In pp experiments, the τ_h kinematic reconstruction is done both in a combinatorial approach [31], [34] and a mixture of combinatorics and boosted regression trees (BRTs) [34], [35], [50], [53]. The performance of such approaches is comparable, achieving an average energy resolution of $\sim 14\%$ [31], [34] for the energies ranging from 30 GeV to 300 GeV, with the resolution degrading at higher energies for up to 20% for higher energies. The energy resolution is better in the core region of the jet, being in the order of 5–7%, while the tail resolution is 18–30% [34], [35], [50], [53]. Despite the τ_h kinematic reconstruction being done for energy, then, similarly to jet reconstruction, we are regressing the p_T of the τ_h .

In addition to the above mentioned tasks of τ_h identification, kinematic regression and its decay mode reconstruction, ML methods have also been studied for various other scenarios in τ physics. These include, for example, mass reconstruction of heavy gauge boson decaying into τ leptons [54] and boosted di- τ system identification [55].

In this work, we aim to expand the applications of deep learning based jet tagging algorithms to the problems of τ_h energy regression and decay mode classification, with the ultimate goal of providing a recipe for a complete τ_h reconstruction in an end-to-end approach with the detector of choice. To further facilitate the development and studies of new τ_h reconstruction algorithms, we also provide a well documented version of our `Fu τ ure` dataset.

The dataset and an overview of its features are given in Sec. 2 with further details along with the dataset itself in Ref. [56]. We formulate τ_h reconstruction as a set of machine learning tasks in Sec. 3 and demonstrate how three different types of models with a varying degree of expressiveness and priors can be employed for the tasks. We study the performance of the models on the tasks in Sec. 4 and give a short summary and outlook to future work in Sec. 5.

2 The Fu τ ure dataset

With this paper, we provide the first version of the `Fu τ ure` dataset. This dataset includes $\sqrt{s} = 380$ GeV e^+/e^- samples with $Z/\gamma^* \rightarrow \tau\tau$, $ZH \rightarrow Z\tau\tau$ and $Z/\gamma^* \rightarrow qq$ processes with approximately 2 million events in each category. For the simulation and reconstruction we used the Compact Linear Collider (CLIC) detector [57] setup. The dataset is updated with respect to [44] with higher statistics, and is now released with documentation for the first time. The generation of the events is described in Sec. 2.1 with an overview and description of the features available in Sec. 2.2. The public dataset along with more technical information can be found in Ref. [56]. For the studies in this paper, only τ_h jets in the $Z/\gamma^* \rightarrow \tau\tau$ and $ZH \rightarrow Z\tau\tau$ datasets were used.

2.1 Monte Carlo samples and event reconstruction

The `Fu τ ure` dataset is generated using Pythia8 [58] with the same generator settings as in Ref. [44], [59]. After generation the events undergo a full de-

detector simulation using Geant4 [60] with the CLIC like detector (CLICdet) (CLIC_o3_v14) [61] setup before being reconstructed using the Marlin reconstruction code [62] and interfaced using the Key4HEP package [63]. The features in our dataset are then extracted using the particle candidates found by processing the reconstructed events with the PandoraPF algorithm [64]–[66].

The CLICdet design has been thoroughly studied over the recent years, and its design is similar to the CLIC Like Detector (CLD), foreseen for the upcoming FCC-ee detector providing a relevant benchmark scenario for physics at future e^+/e^- experiments. Similarly to other contemporary detectors at hadron colliders, the CLICdet detector features a layered design with a high precision tracking system featuring a silicon pixel and tracking detector, a Si-W electromagnetic sampling calorimeter and a steel hadronic sampling calorimeter encased in a 4T solenoid and a dedicated muon system. The expected physics performance with some preliminary studies is discussed in Ref. [67].

A potentially important background for the τ_h reconstruction from the overlay of $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow$ hadrons is currently not included in our simulation. The study and inclusion of this background is left for future iterations of this dataset.

2.2 Input features and validation

The basis of our dataset are particle flow candidates from PandoraPF with four momenta, charge, and candidate labels for electrons (e), muons (μ), photons (γ), charged hadrons (h^\pm), and neutral hadrons (h^0). These candidates are clustered into jets using the generalized k_T algorithm for e^+/e^- collisions (**ee_genkt**) [68] with parameters of $p = -1$, $R = 0.4$, and a minimum $p_T \geq 5$ GeV to serve as the seeds for tau identification. The dataset contains the four momenta of these reconstructed jets, and the four momenta, charge and the particle label of the PandoraPF candidates within them.

As τ -leptons have a small but finite lifetime corresponding to a travel distance of a few mm in the detector, variables sensitive to this special topology such as transverse (d_{xy}) and longitudinal (d_z) impact parameters of the tracks of charged particles have long been used for τ_h identification. Such impact parameters are currently not part of the Key4HEP format and are thus calculated by us. In the context of this work, we use the same linear approximation in this calculation as in Ref. [44], with more details to be found in Ref. [69].

The ground truth is based on stable particles at the generator level, before detector simulation. These particles are clustered into generator-level jets with the same algorithm as used for the clustering of the the reconstructed jets, but without a cut on p_T . The generator-level jets are matched to generator-level τ leptons as well as reconstructed jets using $\Delta R < 0.3$. For each reconstructed jet, we can then define up to three target values related to τ lepton reconstruction:

- a binary flag `isTau` if it was matched to a generator-level hadronically decaying τ lepton (τ_h),
- if matched, the categorical decay mode of the τ_h in terms of the number of charged and neutral hadrons $DM^{\text{true}} \in \{0, 1, \dots, 15\}$,

- if matched, the visible (neutrinoless) and reconstructable transverse momentum $p_T^{\text{vis,true}}$ of the τ_h lepton.

Thus, the dataset consists of reconstructed jets, with a variable number of reconstructed particles per jet, and with up to three target labels for each reconstructed jet. While the models we subsequently study are invariant to particle ordering within the jet, we sort the particles in each jet in p_T descending order in the interest of reusability.

The dataset has been extensively investigated and tested for consistency and can be validated with the provided software found in Ref. [70] and Ref. [56]. As an example, Fig. 2 and Fig. 3 show illustrate the two research problems at hand: the first figure shows the jet substructure for two different τ_h decay modes in the ZH sample — decays into a single charged hadron and three charged hadrons. The second figure shows the truth-level energy of the visible τ_h decay products we regress from the jets.




Figure 2: Average p_T of particle flow candidates per bin in the $\Delta\eta - \Delta\phi$ plane around the jet axis, aggregated for jets in the ZH dataset, matched to a single prong and three-prong, more than one neutral pion τ_h decay modes.

3 Tau reconstruction with ML

Reconstructing hadronically decaying tau leptons using ML can be defined as a multi-task machine learning problem:

$$\Phi(\text{jet features, particle features}) \rightarrow \{\text{isTau}, \text{DM}^{\text{true}}, p_T^{\text{vis,true}}\},$$

where Φ is a trainable model. Note that Φ may consist of a single model, separate models, or even a single backbone model with fine-tuned output layers for each task.

We addressed `isTau` classification in Ref. [44], finding that in this dataset, a transformer-based approach performs well compared to the alternatives for τ_h identification.




Figure 3: Distribution of visible τ component of the τ transverse momentum of the generator/truth-level for jets in the $Z/\gamma^* \rightarrow \tau\tau$ and $ZH \rightarrow Z\tau\tau$ datasets.

In this paper, we address reconstructing the hadronic τ decay modes (DMs), as given in Fig. 1, from a τ_h candidate jet and regressing the visible momentum of the τ_h lepton $p_{\tau}^{\text{vis, true}}$.

We use the ParticleTransformer [71] and LorentzNet [72] architectures as the main models due to their expressiveness on jet tasks. As a cross-check, we also test a simpler algorithm based on deep sets [73]. While expressive, transformer-based models can be resource-intensive and challenging to run in real time on constrained hardware such as field programmable gate arrays (FPGAs), or to introduce physics-informed priors. The LorentzNet architecture allows to establish how much of the performance is based purely on kinematic information, while using a strong inductive bias based on Lorentz symmetry. The DeepSet-based architecture serves as a simple cross-check model, which tests how much the previous, more expressive models add on top of a very simple baseline. Moreover, DeepSet-type models are straightforward to deploy on constrained hardware such as FPGAs, and may represent a practical trade-off where accuracy needs to be balanced with inference throughput and latency [74], [75].

We thus use the `Fu τ ure` dataset to compare three model architectures on two different tasks. We use the same set of input features for all models and tasks, consisting of the particle kinematics p_x, p_y, p_z, E and the additional features:

- particle charge $q \in \{-1, 0, +1\}$,
- particle labels `isChargedHadron`, `isNeutralHadron`, `isPhoton`, `isElectron`, `isMuon` based on particle flow reconstruction,

- $\log p_T$, $\log E$ of the particles,
- $\Delta\eta$, $\Delta\phi$ of the particle with respect to the jet,
- relative $\log p_T/p_T^{\text{jet}}$, $\log E/E_{jet}$ with respect to the jet.

Currently no τ lifetime information was used for the momentum and decay mode reconstruction as their impact on the performance in the current setting will be rather modest. However, the inclusion of these variables will more important in future studies with the inclusion of the $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow$ hadrons overlay background, that similarly to “pileup” from simultaneously occurring collisions at hadron colliders, could contaminate the jets with additional low energy particles spoiling the momentum reconstruction.

We pick the first 16 particles in p_T -descending order from each jet for the subsequent studies for efficient transformer training, which introduces a negligible fraction of data loss. The models we study are invariant to particle ordering in the jet.

For the training we use the $Z/\gamma^* \rightarrow \tau\tau$ sample, while the final result is evaluated on $ZH \rightarrow Z\tau\tau$, never used in training, to ensure the models are able to generalize across datasets.

Similarly to Ref. [76] we use $\log [p_T^{\text{vis,true}}/p_T^{\text{jet}}]$ as the target for momentum reconstruction, since the logarithm of the ratio of the total visible transverse momentum of the τ components compared to the jet p_T is distributed approximately normally. We use the Huber loss [77] for the regression task, as it is less sensitive to outliers than the mean squared error. For the decay mode classification task we one-hot encode DM^{true} and use the standard cross-entropy loss for the multi-classification task.

The trainings are performed over a maximum of 100 epochs with a batch size of 1024 using the AdamW [78] optimizer. We cross-validate the training by redoing the it 3 times on different subsets of the training dataset and using different neural network initializations. Each training runs for approximately 8 hours on a single 8GB Nvidia RTX 2070S GPU. No hypertuning is performed at this stage, as our goal is not to find the most optimal configuration for this specific dataset, but rather to demonstrate generically that such ML algorithms can be used for end-to-end τ_h reconstruction.

The top part of Fig. 4 shows the loss curves for all three algorithms for both tasks. As can be seen, more expressive ParticleTransformer and LorentzNet architectures converge both faster than the simpler DeepSet algorithm and also achieve overall lower ultimate validation losses as shown in the bottom part of the same figure.




Figure 4: Training and validation loss curves for the DeepSet, LorentzNet and ParticleTransformer algorithms in the τ_h momentum regression task (**Top-Left**) and the τ_h decay mode classification task (**Top-Right**). **Bottom**: Comparison of the best achieved validation losses for the three different algorithms in both the τ_h momentum regression and τ_h decay mode classification task.

4 Results

To quantify the performance of the three algorithms in the τ_h momentum regression it is useful to look both at the scale and resolution of the resulting τ_h -momentum distribution. The former is given by the median of the ratio of the predicted and the true visible τ_h -momentum $p_T^{\text{vis,pred}}/p_T^{\text{vis,true}}$. A median of one means that on average momentum is predicted correctly, while values above (below) one mean that the momentum on average is over(under)-predicted. The resolution is given by the width of the $p_T^{\text{vis,pred}}/p_T^{\text{vis,true}}$ distribution. For our results we use the interquartile range (IQR) instead of the standard deviation as a measure for the width as it is less sensitive towards outliers. The IQR

is given by the difference in the position of the 25% and 75% quantile of the distribution, normalized by the 50% quantile, giving the width of the central part of the distribution relative to its median. Fig. 5 shows both the scale as well as the resolution of the regressed p_T distribution as a function of the truth level $\tau_h p_T$ for all three algorithms.




Figure 5: Scale (**Left**) and resolution (**Right**) of the τ_h momentum response distribution given by the mean and the IQR of the $p_T^{\text{vis,pred}}/p_T^{\text{vis,true}}$ distribution. Both scale and response are displayed as a function of the truth level visible τp_T for the $ZH \rightarrow Z\tau\tau$ sample for all three algorithms. As a comparison, the scale and resolution are also shown when using the input jet p_T directly as the tau momentum without applying any regression.

It can be seen that in the bulk of the $\tau_h p_T$ between 15 and 100 GeV all three algorithms predict the scale of the τ_h momentum very well, within 0.5%. This compares to an over-prediction of about 1.5% when using the input jet directly as a τ_h without any further regression. Similarly, all three algorithms achieve a resolution of 2.5% to 3% in the same $\tau_h p_T$ range with the ParticleTransformer giving the best results. This compares to a resolution of about 5% when using the input jet directly as a τ_h . At high τp_T where the number of jets in the $Z \rightarrow \tau\tau$ sample used for training drops, the performance of all three algorithms, but in particular the ParticleTransformer and LorentzNet, is reduced, under-predicting the τ_h momentum by up to a few percent while the resolution worsens.

Quantifying the quality of the τ_h decay mode classification is a more difficult task as the fraction of taus for the different decay modes varies, with the most likely decay into one charged hadron and one neutral pion at about 26% of all tau decays, and decays into three charged hadrons and one neutral pion at only about 5%. On the other hand, depending on the underlying physics analysis, the identification of the right number of charged hadrons, and subsequently the correct charge of the τ_h , might be physically more interesting than the differentiation of decay modes with zero, one or two neutral hadrons. Hence the

overall precision of the decay mode classification might not present the most accurate picture. Instead, in Fig. 6 we show the precision broken down by decay mode for all three algorithms and the confusion matrix of true/predicted decay modes for the ParticleTransformer algorithm in Fig. 7. The latter does not only break down the precision of the algorithm as a function of the decay mode, but also helps us judge the migration of misidentified decay modes to other classes. We have chosen the ParticleTransformer algorithm as it shows the best overall loss as can be seen in Fig. 4.




Figure 6: The precision of τ_h decay mode reconstruction in channels with a varying number of charged and neutral particles in the $ZH \rightarrow Z\tau\tau$ dataset. The “Overall” category represents the general performance of a model across all decay modes weighted by the branching ratio of the given decay mode.




Figure 7: Tau decay mode reconstruction confusion matrix for ParticleTransformer on the $ZH \rightarrow Z\tau\tau$ dataset.

Overall a precision of 80% to 95% is achieved for decay mode classification, with the most difficult decay modes being the ones with a multitude of neutral pions as well as rare decays. In general, the ParticleTransformer algorithm performs the best for these difficult cases with a high number of final state particles. Notably, the performance of the ParticleTransformer algorithm is significantly worse for the overflow category (“Rare”). We hypothesize that the ParticleTransformer approach is affected more significantly than the other networks by the limited training statistics. Nevertheless, given the broadly comparable overall precision of the models on the decay mode reconstruction task, the choice in a particular experiment should be driven by the available computational budget.

5 Summary and Outlook

In this paper we define τ_h reconstruction as a multi-task machine learning problem consisting of binary classification for τ_h identification, momentum regression, and decay mode multi-classification, create a realistic benchmark dataset for this task and compare the performance of several architectures on the reconstruction subtasks. The **Fu τ ure** dataset is available in Ref. [56] and contains samples to test machine learning algorithms for τ_h reconstruction. This paper builds on previous work [44] showing how transformer based architectures can be used to reliably reconstruct and identify hadronic τ decays. Here, we demon-

strate that these architectures also perform well in regressing the τ_h momentum as well as identifying the τ_h decay mode, thus allowing to treat τ_h lepton identification and reconstruction as a single machine learning problem. For the momentum regression a resolution of about 3% with a momentum scale about 0.5%-1% within the true tau momentum could be achieved for the bulk of the τ momentum distribution. Depending on the specific decay mode a precision between 80% and 95% could be achieved for the the classification task, with ParticleTransformer outperforming other architectures for the more difficult decay mode with a higher number of final state particles.

Thus far, we have trained separate models for each subtask from scratch, while recent work in the direction of foundation models has shown promise that using pretrained backbone models with task-specific fine-tuning can reduce the amount of required training samples, as well as the required inference budget [79], [80]. In future work, it may be useful to investigate the dependence of the architectures on available training statistics and sample composition to ensure robustness under domain shift scenarios. This dataset also allows to study the trade-offs between bias and variance in terms of using physics-inspired networks such as LorentzNet on a limited set of input features, vs. using a wide variety of input features in more generic architectures such as ParticleTransformer, to identify the relative feature importances for the subtasks. The dataset and training and validation setup can be generalized in a straightforward way to FCC-ee and other future collider scenarios.

Acknowledgments

This work has been supported by the Estonian Research Council grants PSG864, RVTT3-KBFI and TK202.

Data availability

The dataset used in this paper is made available in Ref. [56]. The software used to produce the results can be found in Ref. [70].

Author contributions (CRediT)

Laurits Tani: Conceptualization, Methodology, Software, Validation, Formal analysis, Investigation, Data Curation, Writing - Original Draft, Writing - Review & Editing, Visualization. **Nalong-Norman Seeba:** Software, Validation, Formal analysis, Investigation, Visualization. **Joosep Pata:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Software, Validation, Formal analysis, Investigation, Data Curation, Writing - Original Draft, Writing - Review & Editing, Visualization, Supervision, Project administration, Funding administration. **Torben Lange:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Formal analysis, Writing - Original

Draft. **Hardi Vanaveski**: Software, Validation, Formal analysis, Investigation, Visualization.

References

- [1] ATLAS Collaboration, “Searches for third-generation scalar lepto-quarks in $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV pp collisions with the ATLAS detector,” *JHEP*, vol. 06, p. 144, 2019. DOI: 10.1007/JHEP06(2019)144. arXiv: 1902.08103 [hep-ex].
- [2] ATLAS Collaboration, “Search for resonant and non-resonant Higgs boson pair production in the $bb\tau^+\tau^-$ decay channel using 13 TeV pp collision data from the ATLAS detector,” *JHEP*, vol. 07, p. 040, 2023. DOI: 10.1007/JHEP07(2023)040. arXiv: 2209.10910 [hep-ex].
- [3] CMS Collaboration, “Search for non-resonant Higgs boson pair production in final state with two bottom quarks and two tau leptons in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV,” *Phys. Lett. B*, vol. 842, p. 137531, 2023. DOI: 10.1016/j.physletb.2022.137531. arXiv: 2206.09401 [hep-ex].
- [4] ATLAS Collaboration, “Measurement of the CP properties of Higgs boson interactions with τ -leptons with the ATLAS detector,” *Eur. Phys. J. C*, vol. 83, no. 7, p. 563, 2023. DOI: 10.1140/epjc/s10052-023-11583-y. arXiv: 2212.05833 [hep-ex].
- [5] A. Tumasyan *et al.*, “Analysis of the CP structure of the Yukawa coupling between the Higgs boson and τ leptons in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV,” *JHEP*, vol. 06, p. 012, 2022. DOI: 10.1007/JHEP06(2022)012. arXiv: 2110.04836 [hep-ex].
- [6] M. Dam, “The τ challenges at FCC-ee,” *Eur. Phys. J. Plus*, vol. 136, no. 9, p. 963, 2021. DOI: 10.1140/epjp/s13360-021-01894-y. arXiv: 2107.12832 [hep-ex].
- [7] A. Pich, “Challenges for tau physics at the TeraZ,” *Eur. Phys. J. Plus*, vol. 136, no. 11, p. 1117, 2021. DOI: 10.1140/epjp/s13360-021-02077-5. arXiv: 2012.07099 [hep-ph].
- [8] M. Dam, “Tau-lepton physics at the FCC-ee circular e^+e^- collider,” *SciPost Phys. Proc.*, vol. 1, p. 041, 2019. DOI: 10.21468/SciPostPhysProc.1.041. arXiv: 1811.09408 [hep-ex].
- [9] ATLAS Collaboration, “A search for lepton-flavor-violating decays of the Z boson into a τ lepton and a light lepton with the ATLAS detector,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 98, p. 092010, 2018. DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevD.98.092010. arXiv: 1804.09568 [hep-ex].
- [10] R. Harnik, J. Kopp, and J. Zupan, “Flavor violating Higgs decays,” *JHEP*, vol. 03, p. 026, 2013. DOI: 10.1007/JHEP03(2013)026. arXiv: 1209.1397 [hep-ph].

- [11] CMS Collaboration, “Search for lepton flavour violating decays of the Higgs boson to $\mu\tau$ and $e\tau$ in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV,” *JHEP*, vol. 06, p. 001, 2018. DOI: 10.1007/JHEP06(2018)001. arXiv: 1712.07173 [hep-ex].
- [12] ATLAS Collaboration, “Search for additional heavy neutral Higgs and gauge bosons in the ditau final state produced in 36 fb^{-1} of pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV with the ATLAS detector,” *JHEP*, vol. 01, p. 055, 2018. DOI: 10.1007/JHEP01(2018)055. arXiv: 1709.07242 [hep-ex].
- [13] ATLAS Collaboration, “Search for high-mass resonances decaying to $e^+\nu$ in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV with the ATLAS detector,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 120, p. 161 802, 2018. DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.120.161802. arXiv: 1801.06992 [hep-ex].
- [14] CMS Collaboration, “Search for new physics in the τ lepton plus missing transverse momentum final state in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV,” *JHEP*, vol. 09, p. 051, 2023. DOI: 10.1007/JHEP09(2023)051. arXiv: 2212.12604 [hep-ex].
- [15] ATLAS Collaboration, “Search for the direct production of charginos and neutralinos in final states with tau leptons in $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV pp collisions with the ATLAS detector,” *Eur. Phys. J. C*, vol. 78, p. 154, 2018. DOI: 10.1140/epjc/s10052-018-5583-9. arXiv: 1708.07875 [hep-ex].
- [16] ATLAS Collaboration, “Search for top squarks decaying to tau sleptons in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV with the ATLAS detector,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 98, p. 032 008, 2018. DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevD.98.032008. arXiv: 1803.10178 [hep-ex].
- [17] ATLAS Collaboration, “Search for squarks and gluinos in final states with hadronically decaying τ leptons, jets, and missing transverse momentum using pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV with the ATLAS detector,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 99, p. 012 009, 2019. DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevD.99.012009. arXiv: 1808.06358 [hep-ex].
- [18] CMS Collaboration, “Search for direct pair production of supersymmetric partners to the τ lepton in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV,” *Eur. Phys. J. C*, vol. 80, p. 189, 2020. DOI: 10.1140/epjc/s10052-020-7739-7. arXiv: 1907.13179 [hep-ex].
- [19] CMS Collaboration, “Search for Supersymmetry with a compressed mass spectrum in events with a soft τ lepton, a highly energetic jet, and large missing transverse momentum in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 124, p. 041 803, 2020. DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.124.041803. arXiv: 1910.01185 [hep-ex].
- [20] ATLAS Collaboration, “Search for direct stau production in events with two hadronic τ leptons in $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV pp collisions with the ATLAS detector,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 101, p. 032 009, 2020. DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevD.101.032009. arXiv: 1911.06660 [hep-ex].

- [21] ATLAS Collaboration, “Search for bottom squark pair production in pp collision events at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV with hadronically decaying τ leptons, b jets and missing transverse momentum using the ATLAS detector,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 104, p. 032014, 2021. DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevD.104.032014. arXiv: 2103.08189 [hep-ex].
- [22] CMS Collaboration, “Search for electroweak production of charginos and neutralinos in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV,” *JHEP*, vol. 04, p. 147, 2022. DOI: 10.1007/JHEP04(2022)147. arXiv: 2106.14246 [hep-ex].
- [23] CMS Collaboration, “Search for top squark pair production in a final state with at least one hadronically decaying tau lepton in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV,” *JHEP*, vol. 07, p. 110, 2023. DOI: 10.1007/JHEP07(2023)110. arXiv: 2304.07174 [hep-ex].
- [24] ATLAS Collaboration, “Search for charged Higgs bosons decaying via $H^\pm \rightarrow \tau^- \nu_\tau$ in the τ +jets and τ +lepton final states with 36 fb^{-1} of pp collision data recorded at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV with the ATLAS experiment,” *JHEP*, vol. 09, p. 139, 2018. DOI: 10.1007/JHEP09(2018)139. arXiv: 1807.07915 [hep-ex].
- [25] CMS Collaboration, “Search for charged Higgs bosons in the $H^\pm \rightarrow \tau^- \nu_\tau$ decay channel in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV,” *JHEP*, vol. 07, p. 142, 2019. DOI: 10.1007/JHEP07(2019)142. arXiv: 1903.04560 [hep-ex].
- [26] ATLAS Collaboration, “Search for heavy Higgs bosons decaying into two tau leptons with the ATLAS detector using pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 125, p. 051801, 2020. DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.125.051801. arXiv: 2002.12223 [hep-ex].
- [27] CMS Collaboration, “Searches for additional Higgs bosons and for vector lepto-quarks in $\tau\tau$ final states in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV,” *JHEP*, vol. 07, p. 073, 2023. DOI: 10.1007/JHEP07(2023)073. arXiv: 2208.02717 [hep-ex].
- [28] CMS Collaboration, “Search for a heavy Higgs boson decaying into two lighter Higgs bosons in the $\tau\tau bb$ final state at 13 TeV,” *JHEP*, vol. 11, p. 057, 2021. DOI: 10.1007/JHEP11(2021)057. arXiv: 2106.10361 [hep-ex].
- [29] R. L. Workman *et al.*, “Review of Particle Physics,” *PTEP*, vol. 2022, p. 083C01, 2022. DOI: 10.1093/ptep/ptac097.
- [30] CMS collaboration, “Performance of τ -lepton reconstruction and identification in cms,” *Journal of Instrumentation*, vol. 7, no. 01, P01001, 2012.
- [31] V. Khachatryan *et al.*, “Reconstruction and identification of τ lepton decays to hadrons and ν_τ at CMS,” *JINST*, vol. 11, no. 01, P01019, 2016. DOI: 10.1088/1748-0221/11/01/P01019. arXiv: 1510.07488 [physics.ins-det].

- [32] L. Russell, “Identification of Hadronic Tau Lepton Decays with Domain Adaptation using Adversarial Machine Learning at CMS,” Presented 28 Jun 2022, M.S. thesis, Imperial Coll., London, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://cds.cern.ch/record/2827366>.
- [33] ATLAS Collaboration, “Reconstruction, Identification, and Calibration of hadronically decaying tau leptons with the ATLAS detector for the LHC Run 3 and reprocessed Run 2 data,” *CERN Document Server*, 2022.
- [34] C. Galloni, “Hadronic tau reconstruction and identification performance in ATLAS and CMS,” *PoS*, vol. LHCP2018, p. 228, 2018. DOI: 10.22323/1.321.0228.
- [35] ATLAS Collaboration, “Measurement of the tau lepton reconstruction and identification performance in the ATLAS experiment using pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV,” *CERN Document Server*, May 2017.
- [36] ATLAS Collaboration, “Identification of hadronic tau lepton decays using neural networks in the ATLAS experiment,” *CERN Document Server*, 2019.
- [37] I. Neutelings, “Hadronic tau reconstruction and identification performance in ATLAS and CMS,” *PoS*, vol. LHCP2020, B. Mansoulie, G. Marchiori, R. Salern, and T. Bos, Eds., p. 045, 2021. DOI: 10.22323/1.382.0045.
- [38] CMS Collaboration, “Identification of hadronic tau lepton decays using a deep neural network,” *JINST*, vol. 17, P07023, 2022. DOI: 10.1088/1748-0221/17/07/P07023. arXiv: 2201.08458 [hep-ex].
- [39] A. Huang, X. Ju, J. Lyons, D. Murnane, M. Pettee, and L. Reed, “Heterogeneous Graph Neural Network for identifying hadronically decayed tau leptons at the High Luminosity LHC,” *JINST*, vol. 18, no. 07, P07001, 2023. DOI: 10.1088/1748-0221/18/07/P07001. arXiv: 2301.00501 [physics.ins-det].
- [40] N. Madysa, “Identification of Hadronic Tau Lepton Decays at the ATLAS Detector Using Artificial Neural Networks,” M.S. thesis, Dresden, Tech. U., Oct. 2015.
- [41] S. Mondal and L. Mastrolorenzo, “Machine Learning in High Energy Physics: A review of heavy-flavor jet tagging at the LHC,” *arXiv*, Apr. 2024. arXiv: 2404.01071 [hep-ex].
- [42] F. A. Dreyer and H. Qu, “Jet tagging in the Lund plane with graph networks,” *JHEP*, vol. 03, p. 052, 2021. DOI: 10.1007/JHEP03(2021)052. arXiv: 2012.08526 [hep-ph].
- [43] T. Cheng, “Recursive Neural Networks in Quark/Gluon Tagging,” *Comput. Softw. Big Sci.*, vol. 2, no. 1, p. 3, 2018. DOI: 10.1007/s41781-018-0007-y. arXiv: 1711.02633 [hep-ph].
- [44] T. Lange, S. Nandan, J. Pata, L. Tani, and C. Veelken, “Tau lepton identification and reconstruction: A new frontier for jet-tagging ML algorithms,” *Comput. Phys. Commun.*, vol. 298, p. 109 095, 2024. DOI: 10.1016/j.cpc.2024.109095. arXiv: 2307.07747 [hep-ex].

- [45] S. Gong, Q. Meng, J. Zhang, *et al.*, “An efficient Lorentz equivariant graph neural network for jet tagging,” *JHEP*, vol. 07, p. 030, 2022. DOI: 10.1007/JHEP07(2022)030. arXiv: 2201.08187 [hep-ph].
- [46] H. Qu, C. Li, and S. Qian, “Particle Transformer for jet tagging,” in *International conference on machine learning*, PMLR, 2022, p. 18281. arXiv: 2202.03772 [hep-ph].
- [47] B. Xu, “Detectors and physics at a future linear collider,” Ph.D. dissertation, University of Cambridge, 2017.
- [48] S. Giagu, L. Torresi, and M. Di Filippo, “Tau lepton identification with graph neural networks at future electron–positron colliders,” *Frontiers in Physics*, vol. 10, p. 909205, 2022.
- [49] Z. Chen, “Tau reconstruction in CMS exploiting machine learning techniques,” Deutsches Elektronen–Synchrotron (DESY), Tech. Rep., 2022.
- [50] ATLAS Collaboration, “Reconstruction of hadronic decay products of tau leptons with the ATLAS experiment,” *Eur. Phys. J. C*, vol. 76, no. 5, p. 295, 2016. DOI: 10.1140/epjc/s10052-016-4110-0. arXiv: 1512.05955 [hep-ex].
- [51] T. A. Saxton, “Computer Vision and Application to the Classification of the Hadronic Decay Modes of the Tau Lepton with the ATLAS detector,” CERN, Geneva, Tech. Rep., 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://cds.cern.ch/record/2634314>.
- [52] T. H. Tran, V. Balagura, V. Boudry, J.-C. Brient, and H. Videau, “Reconstruction and classification of tau lepton decays with ILD,” *Eur. Phys. J. C*, vol. 76, no. 8, p. 468, 2016. DOI: 10.1140/epjc/s10052-016-4315-2. arXiv: 1510.05224 [physics.ins-det].
- [53] M. Hübner, “Measurement of the tau lepton reconstruction and identification performance in the atlas experiment using pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV,” ATL-COM-PHYS-2018-1121, Tech. Rep., 2018.
- [54] M. B. V. Krishnan, A. K. Nayak, and A. K. Radhakrishnan, “Invariant mass reconstruction of heavy gauge bosons decaying to τ leptons using machine learning techniques,” *Eur. Phys. J. C*, vol. 84, no. 3, p. 219, 2024. DOI: 10.1140/epjc/s10052-024-12527-w. arXiv: 2304.01126 [hep-ph].
- [55] N. Tamir, I. Bessudo, B. Chen, H. Raiko, and L. Barak, “Neural networks for boosted di- τ identification,” *JINST*, vol. 19, no. 07, P07004, 2024. DOI: 10.1088/1748-0221/19/07/P07004. arXiv: 2312.08276 [hep-ex].
- [56] L. Tani, J. Pata, N. Seeba, H. Vanaveski, and T. Lange, *Future - dataset for studies, development, and training of algorithms for reconstructing and identifying hadronically decaying tau leptons*. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.12664634>.

- [57] L. Linssen, A. Miyamoto, M. Stanitzki, and H. Weerts, “Physics and detectors at CLIC: CLIC conceptual design report,” L. Linssen, A. Miyamoto, M. Stanitzki, and H. Weerts, Eds., 2012. DOI: 10.5170/CERN-2012-003. arXiv: 1202.5940 [physics.ins-det].
- [58] C. Bierlich, S. Chakraborty, N. Desai, *et al.*, “A comprehensive guide to the physics and usage of PYTHIA 8.3,” *SciPost Phys. Codebases*, p. 8, 2022. DOI: 10.21468/SciPostPhysCodeb.8. [Online]. Available: <https://scipost.org/10.21468/SciPostPhysCodeb.8>.
- [59] Y. Amhis, M. Hartmann, C. Hensens, D. Hill, and O. Sumensari, “Prospects for $B_c^+ \rightarrow \tau^+ \nu_\tau$ at FCC-ee,” *JHEP*, vol. 12, p. 133, 2021. DOI: 10.1007/JHEP12(2021)133. arXiv: 2105.13330 [hep-ex].
- [60] GEANT4 Collaboration, “GEANT4: A simulation toolkit,” *Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A*, vol. 506, p. 250, 2003. DOI: 10.1016/S0168-9002(03)01368-8.
- [61] CLIC Collaboration, “CLICdet: The post-CDR CLIC detector model,” CLICdp Collaboration, CLICdp note, 2017. [Online]. Available: <https://cds.cern.ch/record/2254048>.
- [62] F. Gaede, “Marlin and LCCD: Software tools for the ILC,” *Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A*, vol. 559, J. Blumlein, W. Friebel, T. Naumann, T. Riemann, P. Wegner, and D. Perret-Gallix, Eds., p. 177, 2006. DOI: 10.1016/j.nima.2005.11.138.
- [63] G. Ganis, C. Hensens, and V. Völkl, “Key4hep, a framework for future HEP experiments and its use in FCC,” *Eur. Phys. J. Plus*, vol. 137, p. 149, 2022. DOI: 10.1140/epjp/s13360-021-02213-1. arXiv: 2111.09874 [hep-ex].
- [64] J. S. Marshall and M. A. Thomson, “The Pandora software development kit for particle flow calorimetry,” *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.*, vol. 396, M. Ernst, D. Düllmann, O. Rind, and T. Wong, Eds., p. 022034, 2012. DOI: 10.1088/1742-6596/396/2/022034.
- [65] J. S. Marshall, A. Münnich, and M. A. Thomson, “Performance of particle flow calorimetry at CLIC,” *Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A*, vol. 700, p. 153, 2013. DOI: 10.1016/j.nima.2012.10.038. arXiv: 1209.4039 [physics.ins-det].
- [66] J. S. Marshall and M. A. Thomson, “The Pandora software development kit for pattern recognition,” *Eur. Phys. J. C*, vol. 75, p. 439, 2015. DOI: 10.1140/epjc/s10052-015-3659-3. arXiv: 1506.05348 [physics.data-an].
- [67] H. Abramowicz *et al.*, “Higgs physics at the CLIC electron-positron linear collider,” *Eur. Phys. J. C*, vol. 77, p. 475, 2017. DOI: 10.1140/epjc/s10052-017-4968-5. arXiv: 1608.07538 [hep-ex].
- [68] M. Boronat, J. Fuster, I. Garcia, P. Roloff, R. Simoniello, and M. Vos, “Jet reconstruction at high-energy electron-positron colliders,” *Eur. Phys. J. C*, vol. 78, p. 144, 2018. DOI: 10.1140/epjc/s10052-018-5594-6. arXiv: 1607.05039 [hep-ex].
- [69] J. D. Jackson, *Classical electrodynamics*. John Wiley & Sons, 1999, ISBN: 978-0471309321.

- [70] L. Tani, J. Pata, N. Seeba, H. Vanaveski, and T. Lange, *HEP-KBFI/ml-tau-en-reg: arXiv submission (v1.1)*, version v1.1. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.12684862>.
- [71] H. Qu, C. Li, and S. Qian, “Particle transformer for jet tagging,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*, PMLR, 2022, pp. 18 281–18 292.
- [72] S. Gong, Q. Meng, J. Zhang, *et al.*, “An efficient lorentz equivariant graph neural network for jet tagging,” *Journal of High Energy Physics*, vol. 2022, no. 7, pp. 1–22, 2022.
- [73] M. Zaheer, S. Kottur, S. Ravanbakhsh, B. Poczos, R. R. Salakhutdinov, and A. J. Smola, “Deep sets,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 30, 2017.
- [74] M. Yaary, U. Barron, L. P. Domínguez, *et al.*, “Trees versus Neural Networks for enhancing tau lepton real-time selection in proton-proton collisions,” Jun. 2023. arXiv: 2306.06743 [hep-ex].
- [75] J. Motta, “Development and firmware implementation of a Machine Learning based hadronic Tau lepton Level-1 Trigger algorithm in CMS for the HL-LHC,” *PoS*, vol. EPS-HEP2023, p. 590, 2024. DOI: 10.22323/1.449.0590.
- [76] D. Holmberg, “Jet energy corrections with graph neural network regression,” M.S. thesis, University of Helsinki, 2022.
- [77] P. J. Huber, “Robust Estimation of a Location Parameter,” *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, vol. 35, no. 1, pp. 73–101, 1964. DOI: 10.1214/aoms/1177703732.
- [78] I. Loshchilov and F. Hutter, “Decoupled weight decay regularization,” 2017. arXiv: 1711.05101 [cs.LG].
- [79] V. Mikuni and B. Nachman, “OmniLearn: A Method to Simultaneously Facilitate All Jet Physics Tasks,” Apr. 2024. arXiv: 2404.16091 [hep-ph].
- [80] J. Birk, A. Hallin, and G. Kasieczka, “OmniJet- α : The first cross-task foundation model for particle physics,” Mar. 2024. arXiv: 2403.05618 [hep-ph].