

Vision Calorimeter for Anti-neutron Reconstruction: A Baseline

Hongtian Yu^{1*}, Yangu Li^{2,1*}, Mingrui Wu¹, Letian Shen¹,
Yue Liu¹, Yunxuan Song³, Qixiang Ye¹,
Xiaorui Lyu¹, Yajun Mao², Yangheng Zheng¹, Yunfan Liu^{1†}

¹University of Chinese Academy of Sciences ²Peking University

³École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne

{yuhongtian17, wumingrui20, shenletian19, liuyue171}@mailsucas.ac.cn, {yanguli, maoyj}@pku.edu.cn,
yunxuan.song@epfl.ch, {qxye, xiaorui, zhengyh, liuyunfan}@ucas.ac.cn

Abstract

In high-energy physics, anti-neutrons (\bar{n}) are fundamental particles that frequently appear as final-state particles, and the reconstruction of their kinematic properties provides an important probe for understanding the governing principles. However, this confronts significant challenges instrumentally with the electromagnetic calorimeter (EMC), a typical experimental sensor but recovering the information of incident \bar{n} insufficiently. In this study, we introduce Vision Calorimeter (ViC), a baseline method for anti-neutron reconstruction that leverages deep learning detectors to analyze the implicit relationships between EMC responses and incident \bar{n} characteristics. Our motivation lies in that energy distributions of \bar{n} samples deposited in the EMC cell arrays embody rich contextual information. Converted to 2-D images, such contextual energy distributions can be used to predict the status of \bar{n} (*i.e.*, incident position and momentum) through a deep learning detector along with pseudo bounding boxes and a specified training objective. Experimental results demonstrate that ViC substantially outperforms the conventional reconstruction approach, reducing the prediction error of incident position by 42.81% (from 17.31° to 9.90°). More importantly, this study for the first time realizes the measurement of incident \bar{n} momentum, underscoring the potential of deep learning detectors for particle reconstruction. Code is available at <https://github.com/yuhongtian17/ViC>.

Introduction

Particle physics explores the most fundamental building blocks of the natural world and the forces that govern their interactions. A key experimental apparatus in this field is the *collider*, where two particles are accelerated to pseudo-light speeds and collide head-on. These collisions generate a diverse array of particles, which decay over time and are subsequently detected by sensors, *e.g.*, calorimeters (Fabjan and Gianotti 2003), positioned around the collision point, Fig. 1. Among the decayed final-state particles, *photons* and *neutrons* are of particular research interest.

Unfortunately, photons and neutrons interact with the calorimeter through different physical mechanisms (electromagnetic force and strong nuclear force, respectively), making it challenging for one calorimeter to maintain equal

*Equal contribution.

†Corresponding author.




Figure 1: Comparison between the conventional Clustering Algorithm and the proposed Vision Calorimeter (ViC). By utilizing the image representation of EMC responses, ViC significantly reduces the prediction error of incident position by leveraging contextual information through pseudo bounding boxes and achieves incident momentum regression for the first time.

sensitivity to both types of particles. For instance, the third-generation Beijing Spectrometer (BESIII), a leading electron-positron collider operating at the Giga-electron volt (GeV) energy scale (Asner et al. 2009), is equipped with an electromagnetic calorimeter (EMC) designed specifically for measuring the behavior of photons. Although neutrons can also interact with the EMC, their deposited energy is typically lower and more dispersed compared to photons, which poses significant challenges for EMC-based neutron reconstruction. Conventional methods, such as those employing analytical clustering algorithms (He 2011), often find it difficult to reliably sift out neutrons from photons and noise, much less accurately determine their positions and momentum.

Despite the complexities and the current lack of comprehensive understanding of neutron interactions with the EMC, physical principles indicate a potential correlation between EMC responses and the parameters of incident neutrons (Fabjan and Gianotti 2003). Our study seeks to explore and interpret this underlying correlation by leveraging the powerful fitting capabilities of deep learning models. To achieve this, we introduce Vision Calorimeter (ViC), a deep-learning-based reconstruction method designed to establish the mapping between EMC readouts and the physical properties of incident particles. In particular, we focus on **the reconstruction of anti-neutron** (\bar{n}), which exhibit properties analogous to neutrons (n) but deposit greater energy in the EMC, thereby yielding more informative data. Specifically, the reconstruction of \bar{n} includes two tasks: **incident position prediction and incident momentum regression**. Given the grid-like arrangement of segmented calorimeter cells on the EMC surface (as depicted in Fig. 1), we frame \bar{n} reconstruction as a computer vision problem by converting EMC readouts into 2-D images. Concretely, we utilize a visual object detector to predict the incident position, while momentum regression is handled through an additional branch in the header network. To integrate the contextual information of deposited energy and align incident position prediction (point localization) with object detection (box localization), we introduce a pseudo bounding box (BBBox) generation strategy and a custom loss function. Experimental results highlight the superior performance of ViC in \bar{n} reconstruction compared to the conventional method. Additionally, further experiments confirm that ViC can simultaneously reconstruct multiple particle types, including anti-neutron (\bar{n}) and anti-lambda ($\bar{\Lambda}$).

The contributions of this study are summarized as:

- We introduce Vision Calorimeter (ViC), the first end-to-end deep learning baseline for anti-neutron reconstruction using EMC response data.
- Considering the deposited energy information, we propose converting the readouts from the EMC cell arrays to 2-D images, thereby facilitating the application of object detection techniques by representing incident positions as pseudo bounding boxes and enhancing the training objective with relevant physical properties.
- ViC not only outperforms the conventional method in incident position prediction but also enables the measurement of incident momentum for the first time, demonstrating its potential in modeling the extensive data generated by colliders and serving as a new reliable probe in high-energy physics.

Related Work

Conventional Neutron Reconstruction Method Strictly speaking, there does not exist a neutron reconstruction method which uses solely an EMC. Physicists usually adopted a simple analytical clustering algorithm (He 2011) to detect photons according to the deposited energies on the EMC. It is based on a fact that high-energy particles interact with the material of the EMC when passing through it, creating a cascade of secondary particles known as a *shower*

which spreads across neighboring EMC cells. A contiguous group of EMC cells with recorded energies above a certain threshold are clustered as a shower, which is split if its energy distribution has multiple local maximums. The energy of shower is the sum over all its containing EMC cells, and the position is the energy-weighted mean of these cell centers. The particle type is inferred from its shape. This algorithm is specified to reconstruct photons without considering the distinct behaviors of neutrons. For neutron reconstruction, the uncertainty of both position and momentum is quite large.

Machine Learning for Particle Physics Applications of machine learning methods in particle physics have a long history (Bowser-Chao and Dzialo 1993). Commonly used multivariate analysis methods (Hocker et al. 2007) include decision trees, support vector machines, shallow artificial neural networks, etc. The discovery of the famous Higgs boson (Aad et al. 2012; Chatrchyan et al. 2012) benefits from decision trees which classify signal and background collision events. These methods are light-weighted and easy for implementation, but the performances are limited due to their legacy and relatively simple structures. Recently, the representation capacity of deep learning models, *e.g.*, convolutional neural networks (CNNs) (LeCun et al. 1998; He et al. 2016), Transformers (Vaswani et al. 2017; Dosovitskiy et al. 2020), and graph neural networks (GNNs) (Scarselli et al. 2008; Bruna et al. 2014), inspired brave new ideas to reform particle physics experiments, in simulating the detector responses (Hashemi and Krause 2024), reconstructing the generated particles (Duarte and Vlimant 2020), and analyzing the physics objects (Mondal and Mastrolorenzo 2024). Despite of the progress, deep learning methods for the particle reconstruction remains to be elaborated. Existing methods (Qasim et al. 2019) that used step-wised strategy, *e.g.*, clustering-then-classification, are complex yet sub-optimal. Deep GNNs were applied to Large Hadron Collider physics tasks (DeZoort et al. 2023), including the reconstruction of particles from detector readouts and the discrimination of physics signals against background processes (Wang et al. 2023). However, the end-to-end particle reconstruction problem, *i.e.*, position prediction, momentum regression and particle identification in a unified framework, remains open (Kieseler 2020; Qasim et al. 2022).

Visual Object Detector This is trained to determine the position (x, y) and size (w, h) of a given object within an image. Taking advantages of the deep neural networks as backbones, modern detectors were endowed powerful capability to precisely identify and localize objects of interests from complex and noisy backgrounds (Everingham et al. 2010; Lin et al. 2014). Compared with image classifiers, object detectors enjoy two additional advantages: (i) the backbone’s representation capability is decoupled to perform classification and localization tasks at the same time (Girshick et al. 2014; Ren et al. 2015; Lin et al. 2017b), and (ii) the classifier is optimized to handle the background-object unbalance issue (Zhang et al. 2019; Kim and Lee 2020; Zhang et al. 2020). The first advantage endows the capability to perform anti-neutron reconstruction which requires




Figure 2: Pipeline of the Vision Calorimeter (ViC). (a) Modeling the EMC cell arrays with a spherical coordinate system; (b) Representing the deposited energy readout with a 2-D image; (c) Converting each annotated incident position to a pseudo GT BBox; (d) Predicting physical properties of incident particles with a unified deep learning network, including (e) incident position, incident momentum, and the estimated confidence.

to perform incident position prediction and particle classification at the same time. The second advantage facilitates solving the problem of unbalanced signal and background events.

Preliminary: Representing Collision Events

In this study, we focus on reconstructing anti-neutron (\bar{n}) produced in the electron-positron *collision event*, where an electron (e^-) and a positron (e^+) collide at pseudo-light speeds. In practice, electron and positron beams are used to produce a large number of collision events. Particles generated by these collisions decay into other final-state particles, which are detected by sensors (*e.g.*, through the measurement of energy deposited in the EMC cell arrays). In this section, we describe how the readouts from the grid of segmented EMC cells are represented as 2-D images, providing the foundation for solving the \bar{n} reconstruction task with ViC.

Collision Event Data Collection

Through physical experiments, we obtain tremendous amount of electron-positron collision events that produce \bar{n} at BESIII. Each event is recorded by a grid of 6,240 segmented EMC cells, positioned on the barrel and two end-caps of the EMC, Fig. 1. Notably, combined with the screening of inner detectors and standard pre-processing steps in particle physics, it empirically confirms that over 99% observation of collision events by the EMC contain a single particle (Ablikim et al. 2006).

The raw data for a single event includes the polar angle (ϕ), azimuth angle (θ), and energy readout (in GeV) for each activated EMC cell, which is triggered either by the incident \bar{n} or by background noise. For ground-truth labeling, the polar angle ($\phi \in (-\pi, \pi)$), azimuth angle ($\theta \in (0, \pi)$), and momentum magnitude of the incident \bar{n} is derived using the energy-momentum conservation law, Fig. 2 (a).

Representing a Collision Event by Image

Cell Arrays to Pixel Grids As illustrated in Fig. 1, the cell arrays are arranged on the cylindrical surface of the EMC, which comprises a barrel section and two end-cap regions. The barrel section contains 44 circular layers, each consisting of 120 cells, with each cell covering an angular width of 3° . The end-cap regions have 6 layers of cells, with the number of cells per layer being {96, 96, 80, 80, 64, 64}, decreasing from the outermost to the innermost layer.

To ensure that each cell maps to an integer number of pixels, we set the width of the unwrapped image (w_{img}) to 960 pixels, which is the least common multiple of the numbers of cells in the different layers (*i.e.*, 120, 96, 80, 64). Since the azimuth angle ($\theta \in (0, \pi)$) spans half the range of the polar angle ($\phi \in (-\pi, \pi)$), we proportionally set the image height (h_{img}) to 480 pixels, which maintains the proportional relationship between the spherical coordinates and the image coordinates. Therefore, the mapping between image coordinates (x, y) and spherical coordinates (ϕ, θ) is expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{x}{w_{img}} &= \frac{\phi + \pi}{2\pi} \in (0, 1), \\ \frac{y}{h_{img}} &= \frac{\theta}{\pi} \in (0, 1). \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

When unwrapping the EMC surface to a flat image, pixel values for cells from different circular layers may be variant, despite uniform cell sizes within the same layer. Notably, we have also quantified the gaps between the EMC's barrel and end-cap, as well as the gap from the end-cap to the pole, to ensure the accuracy and completeness of the pseudo ground-truth bounding box generation described later. For the detailed relationship between EMC cells and image pixels, please refer to Table 6 in the Appendix.

Deposited Energy to Pixel Intensity The readout of each cell in the array indicates the energy deposited by the incident particle, which is crucial for reconstructing its physical




Figure 3: Histogram of EMC readouts of deposited energy.

properties. As the EMC surface is unwrapped into an image, these readouts are naturally represented as intensity values of the corresponding pixels. As illustrated in Fig. 3, the distribution of deposited energy values is highly imbalanced. To address this, we propose dividing the dynamic range of readouts ($E \in [5 \times 10^{-4}, 2] \approx [10^{-3.3}, 10^{0.3}]$ GeV) into three intervals, *i.e.*, *low energy* (lower than $10^{-2.3}$ GeV), *medium energy* (between $10^{-2.3}$ and $10^{-1.3}$ GeV), and *high energy* (higher than $10^{-1.3}$ GeV), and encode the energy values within these intervals into the B, G, and R “color” channels, respectively.

Borrowing from image histogram equalization (Pizer et al. 1987), we estimate the distribution of deposited energy values (after logarithmic transformation with base 10) within each interval by fitting a probability distribution function. This function maps deposited energy E to RGB values for each interval, which can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{B}{255} &= (\lg E + 3.3)^{0.5} & E \in (-\infty, 10^{-2.3}), \\ \frac{G}{255} &= (\lg E + 2.3)^{0.6} & E \in [10^{-2.3}, 10^{-1.3}), \\ \frac{R}{255} &= \frac{\arctan((\lg E + 1.3) \cdot 2.5)}{\arctan 3} & E \in [10^{-1.3}, +\infty). \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Notably, with only about 1% of the cells activated, most pixels in the image have zero intensity due to the lack of recorded deposited energy, as shown in Fig. 2 (b). This sparsity can lead to overfitting and adversely affect the reconstruction accuracy. To address this, we propose adding Gaussian random noise to the background, with a zero mean and a standard deviation equal to the foreground standard deviation divided by 31.62, corresponding to a signal-to-noise ratio of 30 dB to ensure minimal impact on image quality.

Approach: Anti-neutron Reconstruction by Visual Detection and Regression

Given the image representation of collision events, ViC performs incident position prediction and incident momentum regression within a unified learning framework, Fig. 2. For each image, a pseudo ground-truth bounding box (GT BBox) is generated based on the annotation, which facilitates incident position prediction using an object detection

Table 1: Performance comparison of Clust. Algo. and S.F.S. with different backbone models in incident position prediction.

	Clust. Algo.	S.F.S.	
		ResNet-50	Swin-T
mAB ($^\circ$)	17.31	26.77	15.50

paradigm. To enhance accuracy in center point prediction, we also customize the objective function, leading to significant performance improvements.

Pseudo Bounding Box Generation

The unwrapping operation creates a direct correspondence between the incident position in the EMC’s spherical coordinates and a specific pixel in the image. In this context, a straight-forward solution (referred to as S.F.S.) for regressing the incident position ($\phi_{pred}, \theta_{pred}$) is to predict the associated pixel coordinates (x_{pred}, y_{pred}) on the unwrapped image. Specifically, using a deep neural network as the backbone and a simple FC-Sigmoid layer as the head network, we predict the fractional values (t_1, t_2) as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} t_1 &= \frac{x_{pred}}{w_{img}} = \frac{\phi_{pred} + \pi}{2\pi} \in (0, 1), \\ t_2 &= \frac{y_{pred}}{h_{img}} = \frac{\theta_{pred}}{\pi} \in (0, 1). \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

For the mean Angular Bias (mAB, with detailed calculations provided in the next section) metric reported in Table 1, the state-of-the-art deep learning model, *e.g.*, Swin Transformer (Liu et al. 2021), achieves only a modest improvement of 1.81° over the conventional clustering-based algorithm (He 2011) (referred to as Clust. Algo.).

To improve accuracy, we propose integrating contextual information from the deposited energy. This approach arises from the observation that the incident position is often near clusters of activated cells, consistent with the diffusion pattern of particles through the EMC. Thus, we reformulate the incident position regression as an object detection problem, where the center of the predicted bounding box corresponds to the incident position. This allows us to leverage advanced object detection models to address the challenging task of precise incident particle localization.

However, standard object detectors require ground-truth bounding box (GT BBox) annotations for training, which are unavailable in the incident position localization task due to its point-predicting nature. To address this, we introduce a pseudo BBox generation strategy that converts the inherent pixel-level ground-truth incident position into a BBox representation. We consider the incident position as the center of the pseudo GT BBox and define its spatial extent as **a multiple of the cell size** in the image domain, as illustrated in Fig. 2 (c). Intuitively, a smaller pseudo GT BBox imposes a stricter criterion for minimizing prediction error, but it also limits the contextual information available about the deposited energy. The relationship between these factors is investigated through experiments in the ablation study.

Anti-neutron Reconstruction with ViC

A visual object detector architecture usually includes a backbone for feature representation (He et al. 2016; Liu et al. 2021), a feature pyramid network (FPN) for scale handling (Lin et al. 2017a), and a detection head for localization and regression (He et al. 2017; Lin et al. 2017b). For the detailed structure of visual detector in ViC, please refer to Fig. 10 in the Appendix. Although particle reconstruction leverages training pipelines and objectives from visual detectors (Lin et al. 2014; Girshick 2015; Yu et al. 2016; Lin et al. 2017b), the inherent differences require tailored detection outputs and the development of specialized evaluation metrics.

Incident Position Prediction Based on the predicted BBox, we first extract its center point coordinates (x, y) , and then convert them to (ϕ, θ) according to Eq. 1. As illustrated in Fig. 4 (b), we propose to measure the error as the angle between the ground-truth (ϕ_1, θ_1) and the prediction (ϕ_2, θ_2) in the spherical coordinate system. This error, referred to as the angular bias (denoted as γ), is computed as

$$\vec{v}_i = (\cos \phi_i \sin \theta_i, \sin \phi_i \sin \theta_i, -\cos \theta_i), i \in \{1, 2\},$$

$$\gamma = \arccos(\vec{v}_1 \cdot \vec{v}_2).$$
(4)

For evaluation, we report the mean Angular Bias (mAB) on the entire testing set, and subsets of test samples with predicted confidence above a threshold (the ratio of subset size to entire set size is called *relative efficiency*)¹.

Incident Momentum Regression To ensure that the regressed momentum value (p_{dec}) of incident particles is positive, we follow the standard practice of BBox parameter regression in visual object detection (Girshick et al. 2014). Specifically, the calculation of p_{dec} is performed as

$$p_{dec} = e^{p_{enc} \cdot \sigma_p + \mu_p},$$
(5)

where p_{enc} denotes output of the momentum regression head in ViC, while μ_p and σ_p normalization hyperparameters, with default values 0.0 and 1.0. For evaluation, we use the mean Absolute Error (mAE) $\|p_{pred} - p_{gt}\|_1$, the mean Relative Error (mRE) in percentage $\text{Mean}(\|p_{pred} - p_{gt}\|_1 / p_{gt}) \times 100\%$ and the correlation coefficient (Corr.) between prediction and ground-truth values to assess the performance of incident momentum regression.

Center-oriented Position Regression

The main challenge for incident position through object detection is the prediction accuracy of the bounding box center, rather than its height or width. To address this, and drawing inspiration from DIOU (Zheng et al. 2020; Bochkovskiy, Wang, and Liao 2020) which prioritizes center point accuracy, we propose adding a loss term that specifically minimizes the angular bias γ define in Eq. 4, alongside accurate

¹Since most physical observations rely on statistical strength from collision events, it is a common treatment (Asner et al. 2009) to discard lower-quality events to achieve higher precision.




Figure 4: Illustration of the center-oriented loss (CO Loss). (a) Intersection over Union (IoU) of the GT BBox (red) and the predicted BBox (blue); (b) γ and γ_{mer} in the spherical coordinate system.

bounding box prediction. This approach introduces a center-oriented loss (CO Loss), which can be mathematically formulated as follows,

$$\mathcal{L}_{CO} = 1 - IoU + \alpha \cdot \frac{(\cos \gamma - 1)^2}{(\cos \gamma_{mer} - 1)^2},$$
(6)

where $IoU = S(GT \cap Pred) / S(GT \cup Pred)$ denotes Intersection over Union of the GT BBox and the predicted BBox, and α is the weighting parameter set to 1.0 by default. Particularly, γ and γ_{mer} represent the angular biases corresponding to the center points of the predicted BBox and the ground-truth, as well as the diagonal points of their minimum enclosing rectangle, respectively (please refer to Fig. 4 for a detailed illustration).

Experiment

Experimental Settings

Dataset Information We collect 986,343 electron-positron collision events from experiments carried out on BESIII (Asner et al. 2009), and convert EMC responses of \bar{n} into 2-D images using the previously described method. Each image is annotated with incident position and momentum, providing the basis for all \bar{n} reconstruction experiments in this study. From this dataset, 100,000 samples are randomly selected for testing, with the rest used for training.

Experimental Setup We primarily follow the standard protocol used in MS COCO dataset (Lin et al. 2014), which is commonly adopted in seminal studies on visual object detection (Ren et al. 2015; He et al. 2017; Lin et al. 2017b). To better suit the \bar{n} reconstruction task, we introduce a few modifications: (i) resizing the input image resolution to (960, 480), and (ii) keeping one and only one bounding box with the highest confidence for inference.

We employ the Swin Transformer (tiny level) (Liu et al. 2021) pre-trained on ImageNet (Deng et al. 2009; He, Girshick, and Dollár 2019) as the backbone, and RetinaNet (Lin et al. 2017b) as the detection head. The batch size is set to 64, and the learning rate is 5×10^{-5} . All models are trained for 12 epochs using 4×RTX 4090 GPUs. Unless otherwise




Figure 5: Performance comparison of \bar{n} reconstruction. **Left:** mAB at different relative efficiency levels; **Right:** Average-Standard deviation graph of the predicted momentum value corresponding to the ground-truth.

Table 2: Comparison of quantitative results on \bar{n} reconstruction.

	↓ mAB (°)	↓ mAE (GeV/c)	↓ mRE (%)	↑ Corr.
S.F.S. (Swin-T)	15.50	0.1585	29.57	0.5369
ViC	9.90	0.1287	23.80	0.6929

specified in the ablation study, all experiments utilize pseudo GT BBoxes with a shape of $10 \times$ the size of an EMC cell.

Performance on Anti-neutron Reconstruction

Incident Position Prediction In Fig. 5 (left), we compare the incident position prediction error (mAB) of ViC with that of the conventional method (Clust. Algo.) and the point-wise regression solution (S.F.S.) under relative efficiency settings. ViC substantially outperforms Clust. Algo., reducing the prediction error by 42.81% (17.31° to 9.90°) at 100% relative efficiency, where all predictions are considered in the error calculation. This advantage persists through all relative efficiency levels. Additionally, ViC significantly outperforms S.F.S., highlighting effectiveness of the pseudo bounding box generation strategy proposed for ViC.

Incident Momentum Regression As demonstrated in Fig. 5 (right), ViC achieves a smaller prediction error compared to S.F.S., as indicated by its closer alignment with the ideal output (represented by the red dotted line). Quantitative comparisons reveal that ViC surpasses S.F.S. by enhancing the correlation coefficient (Corr.) by 29.06% (0.5369 to 0.6929), reducing the mean absolute error (mAE) by 18.80% (0.1585 GeV/c to 0.1287 GeV/c), and decreasing the mean relative error (mRE) by 5.77% (29.57% to 23.80%). This clearly demonstrates the effectiveness of framing \bar{n} reconstruction as a visual detection problem by incorporating pseudo BBox into the pipeline. Notably, ViC helps the BE-SIII EMC outperform other calorimeters in particle physics even with more dedicated instrument designs for the measurement task of \bar{n} momentum. The typical mRE for such hadronic calorimeters exceeds 50% in sub-GeV energy regions (Golutvin 2000).




Figure 6: Average-Standard deviation graph of the predicted momentum value corresponding to the ground-truth. **Left:** \bar{n} . **Right:** $\bar{\Lambda}$.

Table 3: Reconstruction performance of \bar{n} and $\bar{\Lambda}$. † indicates that the corresponding correlation value is not an average but is recalculated across all testing samples.

		↓ mAB (°)	↓ mAE (GeV/c)	↓ mRE (%)	↑ Corr.	↑ Acc. (%)
S.F.S.	\bar{n}	16.34	0.1546	28.17	0.5733	95.38
	$\bar{\Lambda}$	20.15	0.1421	36.93	0.5389	54.04
	avg.	18.24	0.1483	32.55	0.6390†	74.71
ViC	\bar{n}	10.16	0.1414	25.52	0.6365	93.14
	$\bar{\Lambda}$	15.10	0.1285	33.60	0.5469	73.82
	avg.	12.63	0.1349	29.56	0.6785†	83.48

Identify and Reconstruct Multiple Particles

Up to this point, we have assumed that the type of incident particles is known in advance (e.g., pure \bar{n}), a condition achievable through physical probing methods. However, in this sub-section, we aim to broaden the application of ViC by extending it to the reconstruction of multiple particle types, *i.e.*, anti-neutron (\bar{n}) and anti-lambda ($\bar{\Lambda}$) particles², to evaluate its ability to simultaneously identify different particles and predict their physical properties.

Specifically, we create a training set comprising 400,000 samples each for \bar{n} and $\bar{\Lambda}$, along with a testing set of 50,000 samples for each particle type. As demonstrated by the results shown in Table 3, ViC identifies \bar{n} and $\bar{\Lambda}$ with accuracy of 93.14% and 73.82%, respectively, and achieves promising reconstruction of both particle types within a unified framework (see Fig. 6 and Fig. 7), without any targeted optimization for $\bar{\Lambda}$. This underscores the potential of ViC to generalize and reconstruct multiple types of particles.

Ablation Study

In this subsection, we explore the impact of various pseudo GT BBox sizes and evaluate the effectiveness of the pro-

²The $\bar{\Lambda}$ particle is short-lived and would eventually decay to an \bar{n} and two photons before reaching the EMC, and may confuse the model for its similar physical and image properties with \bar{n} .




Figure 7: Visualization of the reconstruction results for \bar{n} and $\bar{\Lambda}$. Predictions are in blue while GTs are in red.




Figure 8: The performance of incident position prediction with different pseudo GT BBox sizes. **Left:** mAB at different relative efficiency levels; **Right:** relative efficiency with different angular bias thresholds.

posed CO Loss. Due to space limitations, the comparison of different detectors and backbones is provided in [More Ablation Studies](#). All ablation studies are conducted on incident position prediction with performance evaluated by mAB.

Size of Pseudo GT BBox The size of the generated pseudo GT BBox is critical to the accuracy of particle recon-

Table 4: Performance of incident position prediction with different pseudo GT BBox sizes.

Adaptive Size	5x	10x	15x
mAB ($^\circ$)	10.21	10.01	10.05
Fixed Size	40x40	80x80	120x120
mAB ($^\circ$)	10.27	10.08	10.09

Table 5: Performance of incident position prediction with different training loss functions.

Loss Function	L1-	GIoU-	DIoU-	CO- (ours)
mAB ($^\circ$)	10.01	9.98	9.97	9.90

struction, as it affects the extent of contextual information that is incorporated. We test three pseudo GT BBox sizes: 5x, 10x, and 15x the size of the calorimeter cell at the incident position. As shown in Table 4, the optimal quantitative result is achieved with a 10x size, while Fig. 8 reveals that a smaller size (i.e., 5x) yields lower prediction errors in low relative efficiency scenarios. This suggests that the optimal parameter choice depends on the specific task requirements. In addition to the adaptive design, we also investigate the impact of fixed-size pseudo GT BBoxes, such as 40x40, 80x80, and 120x120, all of which result in lower performance compared to 10x (see Table 4). This drop may result from the loss of positional information in the cell arrays when computing the image representation of EMC readouts. Conversely, adaptive GT BBox sizes capture these information (e.g., flatter BBoxes indicate cells closer to the image edges), which enhances the accuracy of position regression.

Center-oriented Loss Function To evaluate the contribution of the proposed CO Loss \mathcal{L}_{CO} , we compare it with objective functions commonly used in general visual object detection tasks. As shown in Table 5, the performance of using L1 Loss, GIoU Loss (Rezatofighi et al. 2019) and DIoU Loss (Zheng et al. 2020) are fairly similar, while CO Loss outperforms them by a clear margin, indicating the effectiveness of the CO Loss.

Conclusion

We introduce Vision Calorimeter (ViC), an end-to-end deep learning baseline for anti-neutron (\bar{n}) reconstruction using data from the cell arrays of the electromagnetic calorimeter (EMC). Building on the image representation of EMC responses, ViC predicts the position and momentum of incident \bar{n} by harnessing the contextual information embedded in the energy distribution. Experimental results demonstrate the effectiveness of ViC in \bar{n} reconstruction, showing a significant reduction in incident position prediction error compared to the conventional method, while also pioneering the implementation of incident momentum regression. Further investigation highlights ViC's extensibility, suggesting its potential as a reliable probe for reconstructing a broader

range of particle types. We hope ViC can serve as a promising baseline, encouraging further research to comprehensively understand and fully utilize the rich data from high-energy collider experiments.

References

- Aad, G.; et al. 2012. Observation of a new particle in the search for the Standard Model Higgs boson with the ATLAS detector at the LHC. *Phys. Lett. B*, 716: 1–29.
- Abashian, A.; et al. 2002. The Belle Detector. *Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A*, 479: 117–232.
- Ablikim, M.; et al. 2006. Observation of two new N^* peaks in $J/\psi \rightarrow p \pi^- \text{anti-n}$ and $\text{anti-p} \pi^+ n$ decays. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 97: 062001.
- Ablikim, M.; et al. 2010. Design and Construction of the BESIII Detector. *Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A*, 614: 345–399.
- Achasov, M.; et al. 2024. STCF conceptual design report (Volume 1): Physics & detector. *Front. Phys. (Beijing)*, 19(1): 14701.
- Asner, D. M.; et al. 2009. Physics at BES-III. *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A*, 24: 23.
- Bochkovskiy, A.; Wang, C.-Y.; and Liao, H.-Y. M. 2020. Yolov4: Optimal speed and accuracy of object detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.10934*.
- Bowser-Chao, D.; and Dzialo, D. L. 1993. A Comparison of the use of binary decision trees and neural networks in top quark detection. *Phys. Rev. D*, 47: 1900–1905.
- Bruna, J.; Zaremba, W.; Szlam, A.; and LeCun, Y. 2014. Spectral networks and deep locally connected networks on graphs. In *2nd International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2014*.
- Chatrchyan, S.; et al. 2012. Observation of a New Boson at a Mass of 125 GeV with the CMS Experiment at the LHC. *Phys. Lett. B*, 716: 30–61.
- Deng, J.; Dong, W.; Socher, R.; Li, L.-J.; Li, K.; and Fei-Fei, L. 2009. Imagenet: A large-scale hierarchical image database. In *CVPR*, 248–255.
- DeZoort, G.; Battaglia, P. W.; Biscarat, C.; and Vlimant, J.-R. 2023. Graph neural networks at the Large Hadron Collider. *Nature Reviews Physics*, 5(5): 281–303.
- Dosovitskiy, A.; Beyer, L.; Kolesnikov, A.; Weissenborn, D.; Zhai, X.; Unterthiner, T.; Dehghani, M.; Minderer, M.; Heigold, G.; Gelly, S.; et al. 2020. An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.11929*.
- Duan, K.; Bai, S.; Xie, L.; Qi, H.; Huang, Q.; and Tian, Q. 2019. Centernet: Keypoint triplets for object detection. In *ICCV*, 6569–6578.
- Duarte, J.; and Vlimant, J.-R. 2020. Graph Neural Networks for Particle Tracking and Reconstruction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.01249*.
- Everingham, M.; Van Gool, L.; Williams, C. K.; Winn, J.; and Zisserman, A. 2010. The pascal visual object classes (voc) challenge. *International journal of computer vision*, 88: 303–338.
- Fabjan, C. W.; and Gianotti, F. 2003. Calorimetry for particle physics. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 75: 1243–1286.
- Girshick, R. 2015. Fast r-cnn. In *ICCV*, 1440–1448.
- Girshick, R.; Donahue, J.; Darrell, T.; and Malik, J. 2014. Rich feature hierarchies for accurate object detection and semantic segmentation. In *CVPR*, 580–587.
- Golutvin, A. 2000. Review of calorimeters. *Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A*, 453: 192–198.
- Hashemi, B.; and Krause, C. 2024. Deep generative models for detector signature simulation: A taxonomic review. *Rev. Phys.*, 12: 100092.
- He, K.; Girshick, R.; and Dollár, P. 2019. Rethinking imagenet pre-training. In *ICCV*, 4918–4927.
- He, K.; Gkioxari, G.; Dollár, P.; and Girshick, R. 2017. Mask r-cnn. In *ICCV*, 2961–2969.
- He, K.; Zhang, X.; Ren, S.; and Sun, J. 2016. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *CVPR*, 770–778.
- He, M. 2011. Simulation and reconstruction of the BESIII EMC. *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.*, 293: 012025.
- Hocker, A.; et al. 2007. TMVA - Toolkit for Multivariate Data Analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:physics/0703039*.
- Kieseler, J. 2020. Object condensation: one-stage grid-free multi-object reconstruction in physics detectors, graph and image data. *Eur. Phys. J. C*, 80(9): 886.
- Kim, K.; and Lee, H. S. 2020. Probabilistic anchor assignment with iou prediction for object detection. In *ECCV*, 355–371. Springer.
- Law, H.; and Deng, J. 2018. Cornernet: Detecting objects as paired keypoints. In *ECCV*, 734–750.
- LeCun, Y.; Bottou, L.; Bengio, Y.; and Haffner, P. 1998. Gradient-based learning applied to document recognition. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 86(11): 2278–2324.
- Lin, T.-Y.; Dollár, P.; Girshick, R.; He, K.; Hariharan, B.; and Belongie, S. 2017a. Feature pyramid networks for object detection. In *CVPR*, 2117–2125.
- Lin, T.-Y.; Goyal, P.; Girshick, R.; He, K.; and Dollár, P. 2017b. Focal loss for dense object detection. In *ICCV*, 2980–2988.
- Lin, T.-Y.; Maire, M.; Belongie, S.; Hays, J.; Perona, P.; Ramanan, D.; Dollár, P.; and Zitnick, C. L. 2014. Microsoft coco: Common objects in context. In *ECCV*, 740–755.
- Liu, W.; Anguelov, D.; Erhan, D.; Szegedy, C.; Reed, S.; Fu, C.-Y.; and Berg, A. C. 2016. Ssd: Single shot multibox detector. In *ECCV*, 21–37. Springer.
- Liu, Y.; Tian, Y.; Zhao, Y.; Yu, H.; Xie, L.; Wang, Y.; Ye, Q.; and Liu, Y. 2024. VMamba: Visual State Space Model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.10166*.
- Liu, Z.; Lin, Y.; Cao, Y.; Hu, H.; Wei, Y.; Zhang, Z.; Lin, S.; and Guo, B. 2021. Swin transformer: Hierarchical vision transformer using shifted windows. In *ICCV*, 10012–10022.
- Lu, X.; Li, B.; Yue, Y.; Li, Q.; and Yan, J. 2019. Grid r-cnn. In *CVPR*, 7363–7372.
- Mondal, S.; and Mastrolorenzo, L. 2024. Machine Learning in High Energy Physics: A review of heavy-flavor jet tagging at the LHC. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.01071*.

- Navas, S.; et al. 2024. Review of particle physics. *Phys. Rev. D*, 110(3): 030001.
- Pizer, S. M.; Amburn, E. P.; Austin, J. D.; Cromartie, R.; Geselowitz, A.; Greer, T.; ter Haar Romeny, B.; Zimmerman, J. B.; and Zuiderveld, K. 1987. Adaptive histogram equalization and its variations. *Computer vision, graphics, and image processing*, 39(3): 355–368.
- Qasim, S. R.; Chernyavskaya, N.; Kieseler, J.; Long, K.; Viazlo, O.; Pierini, M.; and Nawaz, R. 2022. End-to-end multi-particle reconstruction in high occupancy imaging calorimeters with graph neural networks. *Eur. Phys. J. C*, 82(8): 753.
- Qasim, S. R.; Kieseler, J.; Iiyama, Y.; and Pierini, M. 2019. Learning representations of irregular particle-detector geometry with distance-weighted graph networks. *Eur. Phys. J. C*, 79(7): 608.
- Redmon, J.; Divvala, S.; Girshick, R.; and Farhadi, A. 2016. You only look once: Unified, real-time object detection. In *CVPR*, 779–788.
- Redmon, J.; and Farhadi, A. 2017. YOLO9000: better, faster, stronger. In *CVPR*, 7263–7271.
- Redmon, J.; and Farhadi, A. 2018. Yolov3: An incremental improvement. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.02767*.
- Ren, S.; He, K.; Girshick, R.; and Sun, J. 2015. Faster r-cnn: Towards real-time object detection with region proposal networks. *NeurIPS*, 28.
- Rezatofghi, H.; Tsoi, N.; Gwak, J.; Sadeghian, A.; Reid, I.; and Savarese, S. 2019. Generalized intersection over union: A metric and a loss for bounding box regression. In *CVPR*, 658–666.
- Scarselli, F.; Gori, M.; Tsoi, A. C.; Hagenbuchner, M.; and Monfardini, G. 2008. The graph neural network model. *IEEE transactions on neural networks*, 20(1): 61–80.
- Tian, Z.; Shen, C.; Chen, H.; and He, T. 2019. Fcos: Fully convolutional one-stage object detection. In *ICCV*, 9627–9636.
- Vaswani, A.; Shazeer, N.; Parmar, N.; Uszkoreit, J.; Jones, L.; Gomez, A. N.; Kaiser, Ł.; and Polosukhin, I. 2017. Attention is all you need. *NeurIPS*, 30.
- Wang, H.; Fu, T.; Du, Y.; Gao, W.; Huang, K.; Liu, Z.; Chandak, P.; Liu, S.; Van Katwyk, P.; Deac, A.; et al. 2023. Scientific discovery in the age of artificial intelligence. *Nature*, 620(7972): 47–60.
- Wang, Z.; Liu, Y.; Liu, Y.; Yu, H.; Wang, Y.; Ye, Q.; and Tian, Y. 2024. vHeat: Building Vision Models upon Heat Conduction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.16555*.
- Yu, J.; Jiang, Y.; Wang, Z.; Cao, Z.; and Huang, T. 2016. Unitbox: An advanced object detection network. In *ACM MM*, 516–520.
- Zhang, S.; Chi, C.; Yao, Y.; Lei, Z.; and Li, S. Z. 2020. Bridging the gap between anchor-based and anchor-free detection via adaptive training sample selection. In *CVPR*, 9759–9768.
- Zhang, X.; Wan, F.; Liu, C.; Ji, R.; and Ye, Q. 2019. Freeanchor: Learning to match anchors for visual object detection. *NeurIPS*, 32.
- Zheng, Z.; Wang, P.; Liu, W.; Li, J.; Ye, R.; and Ren, D. 2020. Distance-IoU loss: Faster and better learning for bounding box regression. In *AAAI*, volume 34, 12993–13000.

Appendix

Physics Background

The Goal of Particle Physics Particle physics aims to explore the most fundamental constituents of nature and the forces that govern their interactions, with the ultimate goal of formulating a “theory of everything” by investigating the simplest structures of our material universe. To date, 17 fundamental particles and 4 fundamental forces have been identified, all described within the framework of the *Standard Model* (Navas et al. 2024). While the Standard Model has been remarkably successful in explaining a wide range of experimental observations, it still falls short of the comprehensive “theory of everything” that scientists seek. Paradoxically, its success has created a challenge: the lack of discrepancies between its predictions and experimental results has slowed progress toward a more complete theory. The most promising path to challenge the Standard Model lies in discovering phenomena beyond its scope, which has motivated the development of large-scale particle colliders to create extreme experimental conditions.

In a particle collider, two particles are accelerated to pseudo-light speeds and made to collide head-on. These collisions can generate a diverse array of particles, which decay rapidly and then are detected by sensors surrounding the collision point. The very first step in analyzing the collision data is to *reconstruct* these generated particles, *i.e.*, determining their types, trajectories, positions, and energies (momenta) from the sensor readouts. Enhancing the precision of particle reconstruction is vital for the collider to yield more significant and reliable physics discoveries, motivating us to explore deep learning-based methods to address this challenge.

Detection Principle of the Calorimeter The *calorimeter* is designed to detect electrically neutral particles, such as photons and neutrons (Fabjan and Gianotti 2003). When a high-energy particle passes through the calorimeter material, it initiates a cascade of secondary particles, known as a *shower*. For instance, as shown in Fig. 9, a photon may convert into an electron-positron pair, each carrying a fraction of the photon’s original energy. The electron then propagates through the material, emitting additional photons via the bremsstrahlung process. This cascade repeats itself, leading to a rapid increase in the number of electrons and photons within the calorimeter.

Eventually, these secondary particles are absorbed by the material when their energies become low enough, and the deposited energy is recorded by the electronics of the calorimeter. By segmenting the calorimeter into multiple cells, each with its own readout, the shower’s spread can be tracked both longitudinally within a single cell and laterally into neighboring cells, allowing for the determination of both the incident particle’s position and energy (momentum).

Different Types of Calorimeters Photons and neutrons interact with the building material of calorimeters via distinct mechanisms: photons primarily interact via the electromagnetic interaction, while neutrons engage via the nuclear-




Figure 9: Schematic diagram of the detection principle of the calorimeter.

Table 6: Detailed relationship between EMC cells and image pixels.

layers	cells	w (pixels)	h (pixels)	note
2	-	30	8	empty
2	-	24	8	
3	-	20	7	
2	64	15	6	end-cap
2	80	12	6	
2	96	10	5	
1	-	10	5	empty
5	120	8	5	barrel
4	120	8	6	
5	120	8	7	
16	120	8	8	
5	120	8	7	
4	120	8	6	
5	120	8	5	
1	-	10	5	empty
2	96	10	5	end-cap
2	80	12	6	
2	64	15	6	
3	-	20	7	empty
2	-	24	8	
2	-	30	8	

nuclear interaction. Because one single material cannot be equally sensitive to both types of interactions, separate designs for electromagnetic calorimeters (EMC or ECAL) and hadronic calorimeters (HCAL) are necessary to effectively detect these particles.

In an EMC, neutrons interact with the material at a much lower probability compared to an HCAL, making the EMC relatively “transparent” to neutrons. Consequently, neutron-induced showers are sparser and less centralized than those originating from photons, spreading across a series of adjacent calorimeter cells. Furthermore, the energy deposited by neutron-induced showers is generally much lower than the incident neutron’s original energy.

Considerations in building calorimeters Most existing and planned particle colliders are equipped with the EMC,




Figure 10: The framework of Visual Detection and Regression in ViC.

but only one subset also includes the HCAL. Notably, colliders operating at energy scales of several GeVs typically do not have the HCAL (Abashian et al. 2002; Ablikim et al. 2010; Achasov et al. 2024). While no official documentation explicitly addresses this decision, several plausible hypotheses can be considered.

Firstly, calorimeters are among the most costly detectors in collider experiments due to their considerable weight and the extensive electronics required. Secondly, many physics processes within this energy range do not necessitate direct or precise neutron reconstruction. Lastly, hadronic calorimeters are not particularly efficient at detecting low-energy neutrons, where energy measurement uncertainties can exceed 50% (Golovin 2000). **If neutrons can be effectively reconstructed using only data from the electromagnetic calorimeter, this approach could lead to significant cost savings and open up new physics opportunities, which is one of the main motivations of our study.**

Visual Object Detector

As discussed in the main text, deriving the image representation from EMC readouts involves two primary steps: mapping the segmented EMC cells onto a pixel grid and converting the deposited energy values into corresponding pixel intensities. Table 6 provides a detailed overview of the mapping of segmented EMC cells into a 2-D image, covering the barrel, both end-caps, and the transitional regions connecting these components. Once the image is generated, it is processed by the proposed Vision Calorimeter (ViC), which is primarily designed based on the principles of visual object detection.

In the practice of deep learning, object detectors can be categorized based on their classification standards. For in-

stance, detectors can be classified as either two-stage or one-stage, depending on whether proposals are pre-extracted. In two-stage object detectors, such as Faster R-CNN (Ren et al. 2015) or Mask R-CNN (He et al. 2017), the backbone network (Backbone) and feature pyramid network (FPN) first extract features, and then region proposal network (RPN) identifies numerous region proposals, followed by feature refinement to produce the final detection results. Conversely, one-stage object detectors like RetinaNet (Lin et al. 2017b) and the YOLO series (Redmon et al. 2016; Redmon and Farhadi 2017, 2018) directly process features extracted from Backbone and FPN to generate the final detection outcomes.

Detectors can also be classified as either anchor-based or anchor-free. When working with general image datasets, it has been observed that presetting appropriately sized anchor boxes helps detectors more accurately regress object sizes. This is because anchor boxes provide a reference from prior knowledge about object shapes (Ren et al. 2015; Liu et al. 2016; Redmon and Farhadi 2017). However, some studies suggest that object detectors without anchor boxes can achieve superior performance through key feature extraction (Law and Deng 2018; Duan et al. 2019), raising questions about the necessity of anchor boxes and prompting further analysis (Tian et al. 2019; Zhang et al. 2020).

As illustrated in Fig. 10, ViC closely follows the design principles of RetinaNet (Lin et al. 2017b). After the Backbone generates the feature representation and the FPN manages scale variations, the feature maps are passed to the detection head, where each feature map splits into three branches. One branch regresses the position, another regresses the momentum, and the final branch determines whether the region is foreground or background while estimating confidence levels. During training, losses are cal-

Table 7: Performance comparison on incident position prediction with different object detectors. TS/OS denotes the detector is Two-/One-Stage. AB/AF indicates the detector is anchor-based/free. Pre. means whether pre-training the backbone network on the dataset containing natural images (*i.e.*, ImageNet).

Detector	TS/OS	AB/AF	Pre.	mAB ($^{\circ}$)
Mask RCNN (He et al. 2017)	TS	AB	×	12.18
			√	12.84
Grid RCNN (Lu et al. 2019)	TS	AF	×	11.13
			√	10.54
Retinanet (Lin et al. 2017b)	OS	AB	×	10.66
			√	10.01
ATSS (Zhang et al. 2020)	OS	AF	×	10.31
			√	9.87

Table 8: Performance comparison on incident position prediction with different backbones. AP refers to the box AP (Average Precision) metric defined on MS COCO dataset with Mask RCNN and $1\times$ schedule. Pre. means whether pretraining the backbone network on the vision dataset (*i.e.*, ImageNet).

	Pre.	R50	Swin-T	VMamba-T	vHeat-T
AP (%)	√	38.2	42.7	47.3	45.1
mAB ($^{\circ}$)	×	13.41	10.66	9.59	9.72
mAB ($^{\circ}$)	√	11.97	10.01	9.50	9.54

culated for all predicted bounding boxes; during inference, only the bounding box with the highest confidence is retained as the final output.

More Ablation Studies

In this section, we present additional ablation study results that were omitted from the main text due to space constraints. These results primarily focus on analyzing the impact of different object detectors and backbone models.

Different Object Detectors We selected four representative object detectors for comparison, covering both two-stage and one-stage, as well as anchor-based and anchor-free methods. As shown in see Table 7, one-stage detectors significantly outperform two-stage detectors, likely because the proposal design in two-stage detectors may not align well with the use of a single pseudo GT BBox. Moreover, anchor-free detector slightly outperforms anchor-based ones, as anchors are typically designed to match object shape distributions in general image datasets (Lin et al. 2014; Ren et al. 2015; Liu et al. 2016; Redmon and Farhadi 2017), which differ considerably from the sizes of pseudo GT BBoxes. Additionally, the use of pre-trained models from the vision dataset ImageNet (Deng et al. 2009) provides a substantial performance boost across most detectors for the anti-neutron

detection task, suggesting a promising potential for cross-domain alignment.

Visual Representation Models We select four types of backbones: ResNet (He et al. 2016), Swin Transformer (Liu et al. 2021), VMamba (Liu et al. 2024), and vHeat (Wang et al. 2024), representing CNNs, Transformers, and next-generation high-performance visual representation models, respectively. The models used in our experiments are adjusted to maintain a parameter range between 25M and 30M and FLOPs between 4.1G and 4.9G, ensuring comparable model scales. As shown in Table 8, the performance of these visual representation models on general image datasets (Lin et al. 2014) correlates with their effectiveness in anti-neutron detection tasks. This finding further underscores the value of visual pre-training and suggests potential for models to be developed with closer alignment to particle representation, thereby narrowing the knowledge gap between data from different domains.

More Visualization Results

Fig. 11 and Fig. 12 show more visualization results of particle reconstruction. Some samples exhibit minimal energy deposition near the particle’s incident point or interference from other energy clusters, yet still achieve satisfying results in position and momentum regression. This suggests that ViC has effectively learned a pattern associating EMC responses with incident particle parameters.




Figure 11: Visualization of more reconstruction results for \bar{n} . Predictions are in blue while GTs are in red.




Figure 12: Visualization of more reconstruction results for $\bar{\Lambda}$. Predictions are in blue while GTs are in red.