



# Application of quantum computing techniques in particle tracking at LHC

DAIYA AKIYAMA<sup>A</sup>, KOKI ARAKAWA<sup>A</sup>, <u>WAI YUEN CHAN<sup>B</sup></u>, SANMAY GANGULY<sup>B</sup> , TOSHIAKI KAJI<sup>B</sup> , JURI MINAMI<sup>A</sup>, RYU SAWADA<sup>B</sup> , JUNICH TANAKA<sup>B</sup> , KOJI TERASHI<sup>B</sup> , KOHEI YORITA<sup>A</sup>

CHEP2023

2023/5/9

WASEDA UNIVERSITY<sup>A</sup>, ICEPP, THE UNIVERSITY OF TOKYO<sup>B</sup>

#### Motivation



- HL-LHC is coming (~2027).
- With larger pile-up ( $\langle \mu \rangle \sim 200$ ) and high readout rate, CPU consumption will dramatically increase.
  - Especially track reconstruction -> New techniques are needed



# Introduction: Quantum Annealing

• Quantum Annealing:

An optimisation process for finding the global minimum of a given function by using quantum fluctuations.

• Quantum Annealer: The machine which is designed to perform the quantum annealing process. e.g. D-Wave computers



• Quantum Annealer can only deal with the problem which can be transform to a "QUBO" or "Ising" function.

#### Quantum Pattern Recognition: Algorithm Overview

 We found the Quantum Annealing could improve the speed of pattern recognition and provide another way to perform the particle tracking. Result published on: <u>arXiv: 1902.08324</u>

potential \_ doublets





- $T_i$  : potential triplet
- $a_i$  : Bias weight which has been set to 0.
- $b_i$ : The coupling strength, depending on the relation between  $T_i \& T_j$



# GNN application in Quantum Pattern Recognition

# Data preparation (I)



 $n_i$ 

 $n_i$ : node *i* 

 $e_{ij}$ : edge for  $n_i$  to  $n_j$ 

 $O(a,b,T) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} a_i T_i + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} b_{ij} T_i T_j$ 



• Graph neural network (GNN) is a suitable choice to deal with it.



- The parameter fit iD parameter is the key for the data e
  - Hits in each Triplet T contained Hit ID.
    These IDs are used to form the doublet list and the hit list.
    - The GNN Target, is given by matching the Hit ID from the Hit list per  $T_i T_j$ 
      - If the Hit ID from a pair of hits  $(n_i, n_j)$  in the is equal to Hit ID in the doublet list: Target (edge score) = 1
      - If it's not, then Target (edge score) = 0
    - We want to train the GNN to predict the correction combination of edge scores.
- We would like to preform a edge classification in order to form the  $T_i T_j$  from raw hits.
  - To do that we need to consider all the combinations of edges scores per graph.

# Nearby Hits Searching (II)

• In order to get all the combinations, we need to search for nearby hits which is close to the original hits in the same detector layer (i.e. same r-coordinate).



- Our dataset have 269550 samples, only 6% of them are Signal samples.
- 40% are used for training; 40% are used for validation; 20% are used for test.



#### Network architecture







- From each layer, the EdgeConv parameters  $e_x$ ,  $e_{en}$  are passing to the next layer.
- Final output, e<sup>N</sup><sub>s</sub> is the edge score coming from the last EdgeConv layer.

#### Loss function and score distribution

- We use Cross Entropy Loss as our Loss function.
- The impact of batch size is studies and batch size = 8 has been used.
- Underfitting observed.







#### Edge score distributions





#Sample = 53910, #Doublet = 323460, batch size = 8, Score distribution All Prediction Predict: FP Predict: TP



- "Predict: TP" : edges have target edge score = 1
- "Predict: FP" : edges have target edge score = 0

104

#### ROC curve





- ROC curves are shown with different batch size.
- Smaller batch size gives higher AUC.
- The best cases here is given by batch size = 8, with AUC = 0.92

#### Score distribution per graph





- Sum of edge scores per graph is shown.
- In target, only score = 0,2,4,6 are allowed since  $e_{ij} = e_{ji}$  is always true.
- The predicted score, on the other hand, have also score = 1,3,5; this is because in some cases, score of  $e_{ij} \neq e_{ji}$ . This is possible as we didn't add  $e_{ij} = e_{ji}$  as one of the input features of our network.
- However, this is a non-physical result. Since the edges,  $e_{ij} = e_{ji}$  have to be always true as this is a physical doublet.

#### **QUBO** comparision



$$O(a,b,T) = \sum_{i}^{N} a_i T_i + \sum_{i}^{N} \sum_{j < i}^{N} b_{ij} T_i T_j$$



- Graphs with scores > 3 are selected
- $-1 \leq b_{ij} \leq -0.2$  is given by the pervious study.
- We are expecting similar distribution to the original QUBO.
- More investigation is needed for the distribution for GNN-generated QUBO in -0.85 to -0.25.



# Application for the ATLAS dataset

# Application for the ATLAS dataset



- We verified if track finding by annealing machines works in a realistic environment with the ATLAS dataset.
- Detector-hit information is taken from the dataset processed by the ATLAS software (<u>https://cds.cern.ch/record/2767187</u>), while the annealing tracking is done by other standalone software.
- This study has been performed independently from the previous GNN study.
- We used Fixstars Amplify Annealing Engine(AE) which was an annealing machine developed by Fixstars.
  - Perform simulated annealing using GPU(NVIDIA A100)
  - 262k bits, fully connected
- This time, <u>we used "doublets"</u> for bits.
  - When two doublets have close curvature in X-Y plane or close angle in R-Z plane, we give them low energy.
  - Doublets and double-pairs were selected before a QUBO building to reduce the size of QUBO.

$$H(a, b, D) = \sum_{i}^{N} a_{i}D_{i} - \sum_{i}^{N} \sum_{j < i}^{N} S_{ij}D_{i}D_{j} - \sum_{i}^{N} \sum_{j < i}^{N} W_{ij}D_{i}D_{j} + \sum_{i}^{N} \sum_{j < i}^{N} \zeta_{ij}D_{i}D_{j}$$

$$\cdot D_{i} : \text{Potential doublet}$$

$$\cdot a_{i} : \text{Bias weight which is depending on } N_{holes} \text{ in a doublet.}$$

$$\cdot S_{ij}, W_{ij} : \text{The coupling strength, depending on the } \Delta\left(\frac{1}{R}\right), \Delta\theta \text{ between } D_{i} \text{ and } D_{j}.$$

$$\cdot \zeta_{ii} : \text{The coupling strength, we give constant } (\zeta_{ii}=5).$$

# Event display



- Reconstructed results with 200 muons/event MC sample generated with the ATLAS software.
  - 0.5 GeV <  $p_T$  < 10 GeV in 1/ $p_T$  flat distribution,  $|\eta| < 1.0$



X[mm]

![](_page_15_Figure_6.jpeg)

• Layout of the ATLAS inner tracker

![](_page_15_Figure_8.jpeg)

Track findings by annealing machines work successfully in a realistic environment.

### Results with real data

- We applied this algorithm to real ATLAS data taken by non-physics random triggers.
- The efficiency is calculated w.r.t. the ATLAS offline tracks. The matching to the offline tracks is performed if reconstructed tracks with annealing machines share more than 50% of hits with the offline tracks.
- The annealing time was compared with MC sample(10 pions/event with pile-up 20).

![](_page_16_Figure_4.jpeg)

- Our algorithm also works successfully with real ATLAS data.
- It is a good starting point to further explore the method.

#### Conclusions

![](_page_17_Picture_1.jpeg)

- 2 type of studies are performed with the annealing tracking algorithm:
  - GNN application in Quantum Pattern Recognition
    - In order to make use of the GNN in the pre-processing stage of this algorithm, we performed an edgeclassification using a bi-directional graph made by simplified sample which only contain 4 hits.
    - The result indicated that it is possible but there are rooms to improve.
  - Application for the ATLAS dataset
    - Another study shows that the algorithm can also deal with real data collected from the ATLAS detector using low pileup (and no pileup) samples, in both MC and data.
    - Result looks promising and further development is under consideration.