


1 Muon tagging using a Match- χ^2 based Soft Muon
2 Tagger in top quark analyses using data from the
3 **ATLAS detector**

4 Jacobo Ezequiel Blanco

5 Department of Physics
6 Royal Holloway, University of London



7 A thesis submitted to the University of London for the
8 Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

9 April 21, 2014

DECLARATION

10

11

12 I confirm that the work presented in this thesis is my own. Where information has been
13 derived from other sources, I confirm that this has been indicated in the document.

14 Jacobo Ezequiel Blanco

Abstract

16 This is an abstract

Contents

19	1 Introduction and motivation	9
20	2 The Standard Model of Particle Physics	10
21	2.1 Quantum Electrodynamics	13
22	2.2 Quantum Chromodynamics	13
23	2.3 Weak Interactions	15
24	2.3.1 Electroweak Unification and the Higgs mechanism	18
25	3 Top-quark physics	19
26	3.1 Top quark production	19
27	3.2 Top quark decay modes	19
28	4 The LHC and the ATLAS Detector	20
29	4.1 The Large Hadron Collider	20
30	4.2 The ATLAS detector	20
31	5 Identifying b-jet, and the Match χ^2 based Soft Muon Tagger	21
32	5.1 b -jet tagging methodology	21
33	5.2 The Match- χ^2 Soft Muon Tagger	21
34	6 Calibration of the Soft Muon Tagger for 2012 ATLAS Data	22
35	6.0.1 Software, Collision Data and Simulated samples	23
36	6.1 Tag and Probe Selection	24
37	6.1.1 Trigger requirements	25
38	6.1.2 Selection Cuts	25

39	6.2	Invariant mass fitting	27
40	6.2.1	Uncertainty Measurement	29
41	6.3	Efficiencies	31
42	6.3.1	Isolation dependence	31
43	6.3.2	2011 Calibration	33
44	6.3.3	Efficiency Binning	33
45	6.3.4	Results	33
46	7	Measurement of the $t\bar{t}$ cross-section in the single-lepton channel using	
47		SMT	46
48	7.1	Data and Monte Carlo samples	46
49	7.2	Object selection and event selection	46
50	7.3	Re-weighting of the b-quark to muon transition BR	46
51	7.4	Data-driven background selection	46
52	7.5	Systematics uncertainties	46
53	7.6	Results and conclusion	46
54	8	Muon Tagging in a boosted $t\bar{t}$ environment	47
55	8.1	Boosted event topology	48
56	8.2	Samples and muon selection	49
57	8.3	Signal muon selection	50
58	8.3.1	Muon selection	50
59	8.4	Efficiency definition	53
60	8.5	Results	56
61	8.5.1	Background	57
62	8.6	B-tagging potential in boosted events	58
63	9	Conclusions	60
64		Appendices	61
65	A	List of triggers used in calibration	62
66	B	List of combined muon performance (MCP) cuts	65

67 List of Figures

68	2.1	The interaction vertex described by QED. One can obtain all possible	
69		vertex shapes by rotating this basic vertex and assigning the appropriate	
70		electric charge and making sure to conserve lepton number across the vertex.	13
71	2.2	Feynman diagrams of the process $e^+e^- \rightarrow e^+e^-$ allowed in QED. Note	
72		that these are the simplest diagrams, also known as tree level diagrams,	
73		and additional vertices can be added to produce higher-order diagrams of	
74		the same process.	14
75	2.3	Diagrams of the fundamental interaction vertices described by quantum	
76		chromodynamics.	15
77	2.4	The neutral current and charged current vertices allowed via the weak	
78		force. Where f can be an e , μ or τ and ν_ℓ is the corresponding lepton	
79		neutrino of the same flavour. One can obtain all possible interaction	
80		vertices by rotating these basic vertices and assigning the appropriate	
81		electric charge and making sure to conserve lepton flavour across the vertex.	16
82	2.5	Neutral current weak scattering vertex	16
83	6.1	The distribution of $\chi^2_{\text{match}}/N_{\text{dof}}$ for all muon probes for ATLAS collision	
84		data and prompt J/ψ Monte Carlo simulation.	28
85	6.2	A diagram of the various components of the fit procedure. The composite	
86		fit is shown along with the corresponding implied signal and background.	
87		The two variations of the background shape are also shown.	29

88	6.3	Invariant mass distributions of tag and probe pairs at a) probe level and	
89		at b) muon probe level in collision data. Note the various components of	
90		the fit as well as the variations on the background fits and the 3σ and 5σ	
91		integration windows used for systematics. Note the fit parameters and	
92		their respective uncertainties	32
93	6.4	χ^2_{DoF} efficiencies and scale factor with respect to $\sum E_T$	34
94	6.5	χ^2_{DoF} efficiencies and scale factor with respect to $\sum p_T$	35
95	6.6	χ^2_{DoF} efficiencies and scale factor with respect various isolation variables. .	36
96	6.7	χ^2_{match} efficiencies and scale factor with respect to the (a) ϕ and (b) η . .	38
97	6.8	χ^2_{match} efficiencies and scale factor with respect to the transverse momen-	
98		tum of the muon probe	39
99	6.9	χ^2_{match} efficiencies and scale factors in the crack region of the detector for	
100		side (a) A and (b) C	40
101	6.10	χ^2_{match} efficiencies and scale factors in the barrel region of the detector for	
102		side (a) A and (b) C	41
103	6.11	χ^2_{match} efficiencies and scale factors in the transition region of the detector	
104		for side (a) A and (b) C	42
105	6.12	χ^2_{match} efficiencies and scale factors in the endcap region of the detector	
106		for side (a) A and (b) C	43
107	6.13	χ^2_{match} efficiencies and scale factors in the forward region of the detector	
108		for side (a) A and (b) C	44
109	6.14	χ^2_{match} efficiencies and scale factor with respect to impact parameter d_0	
110		for muon probes with p_T in the range (a) 4-6 GeV, (b) 6-8 GeV and (c)	
111		8-10 GeV. The measurement was carried out only on Period B of 2012	
112		ATLAS collision data.	45
113	8.1	This figure shows a simple diagram for the possible configuration of final-	
114		state objects in a (a) boosted and (b) non-boosted events. Note that in	
115		both cases a muon is embedded within the b -jet	49
116	8.2	The angular separation (ΔR) between the truth W muon and the corre-	
117		sponding b -quark for all examined Z' mass points.	50

118	8.3	The transverse momentum of the top/anti-top quarks in the event for all	
119		examined Z' mass points.	51
120	8.4	The angular separation (ΔR) between the b and \bar{b} in the event for all	
121		examined Z' mass points.	52
122	8.5	This figure shows the distribution of (a) transverse momentum and (b)	
123		pseudo-rapidity of muons which pass the SMT selection, the (c) angular	
124		separation between those muons and the nearest jet in th event and (d)	
125		the χ^2_{match} used in the selection for all tested Z' mass points.	53
126	8.6	This figure shows the (a) transverse momentum and (b) pseudo-rapidity of	
127		muons which pass the MI10 selection, the (c) angular separation between	
128		those muons and the nearest jet in th event and (d) the cone size used in	
129		the selection for all tested Z' mass points.	54
130	8.7	Structure of the efficiency measurement.	55
131	8.8	Efficiency of mini-isolation ($k_T = 10$) and χ^2_{match} muon tagger as a function	
132		of the angular separation between the reconstructed muon and the nearest	
133		reconstructed jet. Note the dip in the mini-isolation efficiency at low ΔR .	
134		In the nominal analysis an overlap removal between the jet and the muon	
135		is applied.	57
136	8.9	Efficiency of mini-isolation ($k_T = 10$) and χ^2_{match} muon tagger as a function	
137		of the transverse momentum of the muon.	58

List of Tables

139	2.1	A summary of all elementary particles described by the SM [8]. Note the	
140		various groupings and divisions including by spin, generation and parti-	
141		cle type. Within the fermion sector the quarks are shown in yellow and	
142		the leptons are shown in green. These are grouped into three different	
143		generations traditionally denoted by roman numerals. The force medi-	
144		ators known as gauge bosons are shown in blue and finally the recently	
145		discovered Higgs boson with a spin of zero.	12
146	2.2	A summary of the four fundamental forces ordered by relative strength.	
147		These are approximate relative strengths for the purpose of demonstrating	
148		the hierarchy of forces as a function of their strength. A more accurate	
149		determination of the interaction strength depends on the details of the	
150		interaction itself. Note however the order-of-magnitude differences in the	
151		relative strengths of these forces. Note that the graviton is the theoretical	
152		boson responsible for mediating gravitational interactions, it is not part	
153		of the SM.	12
154	6.1	Pseudorapidity regions of the ATLAS detector	33
155	6.2	Data/MC Scale Factors for 2012 Data in all five regions of the detector	
156		as a function of p_T . The uncertainties include systematic and statistical	
157		components as described in Section 6.2.1	37
158	8.1	Muon reconstruction selection used by Mini-Isolation and by Muon Tagging	52

159	8.2	Efficiency of selecting a muon by using the χ^2_{match} tagger against mini-	
160		isolation. Note that ‘MI10 + Overlap’ is the efficiency of applying both	
161		the mini-isolation cut and overlap removal.	57
162	8.3	Fake rate of χ^2_{match} tagger, mini-isolation and mini-isolation including	
163		overlap removal as measured using all Z' mass points.	58
164	8.4	caption	59

165 Chapter 1

166 Introduction and motivation

167 This part will include an overview summary of the body of work presented in the thesis
168 including a scientific motivation for the use of the soft muon tagger as a method for b-jet
169 tagging and muon tagging.

Chapter 2

The Standard Model of Particle Physics

Particle physics is the study of the most fundamental constituents of matter and their interactions. The best current description of these interactions is known as The Standard Model of Particle Physics (SM); a group of theories that cover all currently known particles and their interactions. The SM was developed through-out the latter half of the 20th century and has seen tremendous success in predicting the behaviour of our universe at the most fundamental level. The SM has stood the test of time and rigorous examination by numerous experiments. The last piece to be confirmed was the existence of the Higgs boson, which in turn points to the existence of the so-called Higgs field. Evidence of the elusive Higgs were observed by the ATLAS and CMS experiments at CERN [5,9].

The SM describes the nature of the interactions of the fundamental constituents of our universe in terms of the three different fundamental forces: strong, weak and electromagnetic each described by a specific theory. Note that the most familiar of the forces, gravity, is not included in this list. The SM does not incorporate a description of gravity, however the development of such description is the subject of much interest for those creating theories that go Beyond the SM (BSM).

The SM classifies particles into several categories depending on their properties and allowed interactions. Particles which have a half-integer spins (e.g. $\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}, \dots$) are known

191 as fermions, and particles with integer spins (e.g. 0, 1,...) are known as bosons. A
 192 summary of all elementary particles described by The SM can be found in Table 2.1.

193 Fermions can be divided into two subgroups: quarks, which can interact via the
 194 strong, weak and electromagnetic forces and leptons which can only interact by the weak
 195 and electromagnetic forces. Each group contains six particles which are categorized into
 196 three distinct generations.

197 Additionally each fermion has a set of so-called quantum numbers which dictate the
 198 type of interactions that can occur. For example each lepton has a lepton number associ-
 199 ated with it, electrons have an electron lepton number (L_e) of +1, while the positron has
 200 $L_e = -1$. Muons and taus have their own respective lepton number (L_μ and L_τ). Each
 201 neutrino has lepton number $L_f = 1$ and their anti-matter counterpart have $L_f = -1$.
 202 Each of these lepton numbers is conserved separately across interaction vertices. An
 203 example of this is discussed later.

204 Another example of a quantum number is baryon number (B), each quark has $B = \frac{1}{3}$
 205 and anti-quarks have $B = -\frac{1}{3}$.

206 For every matter fermion (f) there is an equivalent antimatter partner (\bar{f}) which
 207 possesses the same characteristics as its matter companion but is opposite in electric
 208 charge. Thus 12 matter particles are combined with 12 antimatter partners for a total
 209 of 24 elementary particles which form all material in the universe.

210 The interaction between fermions occur via the exchange of spin one particles known
 211 as bosons. Each force is mediated by one or more bosons (Table 2.2). The strong force
 212 is mediated by a set of massless bosons known as the gluons. The weak force is mediated
 213 by a neutral massive boson known as the Z boson and a pair of charged massive bosons
 214 known as the W bosons. Finally, the electromagnetic force is mediated by a massless
 215 boson known as the photon. Note that each boson has an antimatter partner however
 216 some are indistinguishable from their matter partner. A summary of their properties is
 217 shown in Table 2.1.

		Fermions ($s = \frac{1}{2}$)			Bosons ($s = 0$)	Higgs ($s = 1$)
		I	II	III		
Quarks		$+\frac{2}{3}$ 2.3 MeV u Up	$+\frac{2}{3}$ 1.275 GeV c Charm	$+\frac{2}{3}$ 173.07 GeV t Top	0 0 MeV γ Photon (EM)	0 126.07 GeV H^0 Higgs boson
		$-\frac{1}{3}$ 4.8 MeV d Down	$-\frac{1}{3}$ 95 MeV s Strange	$-\frac{1}{3}$ 4.18 GeV b Bottom	± 1 80.4 GeV W^\pm W boson (Weak)	
Leptons		-1 0.511 MeV e Electron	-1 105.7 MeV μ Muon	-1 1.777 GeV τ Tau	0 91.2 GeV Z Z boson (Weak)	
		0 < 2.2 eV ν_e Electron Neutrino	0 < 0.17 MeV ν_μ Muon Neutrino	0 15.5 MeV ν_τ Tau Neutrino	0 0 MeV g Gluon (Strong)	q mass symbol name (force)

Table 2.1: A summary of all elementary particles described by the SM [8]. Note the various groupings and divisions including by spin, generation and particle type. Within the fermion sector the quarks are shown in yellow and the leptons are shown in green. These are grouped into three different generations traditionally denoted by roman numerals. The force mediators known as gauge bosons are shown in blue and finally the recently discovered Higgs boson with a spin of zero.

Name	Relative Strength	Boson
Strong	10^{38}	Gluons
Electromagnetic	10^{36}	Photon
Weak	10^{25}	W^\pm and Z^0
Gravity	1	Graviton*

Table 2.2: A summary of the four fundamental forces ordered by relative strength. These are approximate relative strengths for the purpose of demonstrating the hierarchy of forces as a function of their strength. A more accurate determination of the interaction strength depends on the details of the interaction itself. Note however the order-of-magnitude differences in the relative strengths of these forces. Note that the graviton is the theoretical boson responsible for mediating gravitational interactions, it is not part of the SM.




Figure 2.1: The interaction vertex described by QED. One can obtain all possible vertex shapes by rotating this basic vertex and assigning the appropriate electric charge and making sure to conserve lepton number across the vertex.


2.1 Quantum Electrodynamics

The interaction of particles via the electromagnetic force is described by Quantum Electrodynamics or QED. These interactions are mediated by the massless neutral boson known as the photon and the strength of the interaction is characterized by the fine-structure constant α . All electrically charged fermions are allowed to interact, since the photon itself is not charged, no self-interaction is allowed within QED. Figure 2.1 shows the single vertex described by QED, where two fermions interact via a photon. Note that the electric charge is conserved across the vertex, so for example $\gamma \rightarrow e^+e^+$ is not allowed within QED.

By combining different forms of this vertex one can build every possible QED interaction. For example an e^+e^- pair can annihilate to create energy in the form of a photon as shown in Fig. 2.2a and then subsequently decay into an additional e^+e^- pair. Electrons can scatter by emitting a photon which is then absorbed by a positron as shown in Fig. 2.2b this process is known as Bhabha scattering.

2.2 Quantum Chromodynamics

Interactions via the strong force are described in the theory of Quantum Chromodynamics or QCD. These interactions are mediated by a set of massless neutral bosons known as gluons. QCD introduces the concept of colour, which similarly to electrical charge, determines the possible interactions that can occur via the strong force. Colour can take three states: red (antired), blue (antiblue), green (antigreen). For example both quarks and gluons possess colour and as a result gluons, unlike photons, can self-interact (Fig-



(a) Electron-Positron pair annihilation mediated by a photon.

(b) Electron-Positron pair scattering via the emission of a photon.

Figure 2.2: Feynman diagrams of the process $e^+e^- \rightarrow e^+e^-$ allowed in QED. Note that these are the simplest diagrams, also known as tree level diagrams, and additional vertices can be added to produce higher-order diagrams of the same process.

ure 2.3)). As with electrical charge, colour-charge must also be conserved. Thus in the scattering process $q \rightarrow q + g$ shown in Figure 2.3a the flavour of the quark may not change but the colour-charge does and the gluon carries away the difference in colour. There are eight different gluons that can participate in QCD interactions each with a different colour-charge combination. Note that there is a ninth combination ($R\bar{R} + G\bar{G} + B\bar{B}$) which is overall colorless so it cannot take part in interactions.

In an analogous fashion to screening which occurs with electric charges, quark-antiquark pairs act like dipoles which screen the true colour charge of the central quark. However since gluons also carry colour, they cause the opposite effect (anti-screening) to amplify and change the observed colour of the quark. Which effect wins out depends on the number of colours in the theory and the number of quark flavours. As it is with three colour states and six different quark flavours, anti-screening is the overall dominant effect. As a result the colour potential decreases with distance and quarks experience very little potential when very near to each other. This effect is known as asymptotic freedom and results in quarks only existing within colorless bound states known as hadrons.

Hadrons can be divided into two categories: mesons, which contain a quark and an antiquark ($q\bar{q}$); and baryons which are made of three quarks (or antiquarks) each with a different (anti)colour-charge to result in a colourless composite particle. Common examples of baryons are protons (uud) and neutrons (udd) which are the building blocks of atomic nuclei. While $\pi^0(u\bar{u}/d\bar{d})$ is a commonly produced meson in hadron colliders.




Figure 2.3: Diagrams of the fundamental interaction vertices described by quantum chromodynamics.

259 Note that due to the quark configuration, baryons have baryon number $B=+1$ while
 260 mesons have $B=0$.

261 2.3 Weak Interactions

262 The final type of interaction involves the so-called weak force. The weak force is respon-
 263 sible for β^- decay ($n \rightarrow p + e^- + \bar{\nu}_e$) and β^+ decay. Interactions via the weak force
 264 are mediated by a single neutral massive boson and two charged massive bosons. Since
 265 the bosons responsible for weak interactions are massive, the range of interaction is very
 266 short, unlike electromagnetic interactions via a massless photon.

267 All fermions can take part in interactions via the weak force. Let us consider weak
 268 interactions involving only leptons. The weak neutral vertex is very similar to the
 269 basic vertex seen in QED (2.1) A valid interactions via the weak force is then formed
 270 by combining these simple vertices (Figure 2.4) while taking care to conserve electric
 271 charge and lepton flavour. An example of a leptonic weak interaction is muon decay
 272 ($\mu \rightarrow \nu_\mu W^- \rightarrow \nu_\mu e^- \bar{\nu}_e$) shown in Figure 2.5.

273 Let us consider weak interactions involving quarks. The neutral vertex is similar to
 274 that of the leptonic version, a quark can emit a Z boson or a Z boson can decay forming
 275 a quark-antiquark pair. The charged current then changes the flavour of an up-type
 276 quark into a down-type quark (or vice-versa) with a W boson of the appropriate charge
 277 (Figure 2.4c). It is possible for a weak interaction to change the flavour of a quark across
 278 families. A well known example of such an interaction is Kaon decay ($K^+ \rightarrow \mu^+ \nu_\mu$). In
 279 order to account for this interaction and preserve the universality of weak interactions,
 280 Nicola Cabibbo postulated [4] that the states that the states that couple to the charged




Figure 2.4: The neutral current and charged current vertices allowed via the weak force. Where f can be an e , μ or τ and ν_ℓ is the corresponding lepton neutrino of the same flavour. One can obtain all possible interaction vertices by rotating these basic vertices and assigning the appropriate electric charge and making sure to conserve lepton flavour across the vertex.




Figure 2.5: Neutral current weak scattering vertex

current are really a mixture of 'rotated' quark states:

$$\begin{pmatrix} u \\ d' \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} c \\ s' \end{pmatrix} \quad (2.1)$$

where

$$d' = d \cos \theta_c + s \sin \theta_c \quad (2.2a)$$

$$s' = -d \sin \theta_c + s \cos \theta_c \quad (2.2b)$$

This introduces an arbitrary parameter into the theory known as the quark mixing angle or the Cabibbo angle, named after Nicola Cabibbo who developed the phenomenon of quark mixing. The introduction of quark mixing has the effect of attenuating the interaction strength at vertices involving multiple quark generations. Interactions which cross one generation are said to be Cabibbo Suppressed while those that cross two generations are Doubly Cabibbo suppressed.

290 Taking into account the three quark generations, quark mixing can be expressed
 291 in matrix notation as shown in Equation 2.3. This unitary matrix is known as the
 292 Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa Matrix (CKM Matrix) after Cabibbo which initially pos-
 293 tulated quark mixing and Makoto Kobayashi and Toshihide Maskawa who later added
 294 an additional generation, containing the top and bottom quarks, to the matrix [10].

$$\begin{pmatrix} d' \\ s' \\ b' \end{pmatrix} = V_{CKM} \begin{pmatrix} d \\ s \\ b \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} V_{ud} & V_{us} & V_{ub} \\ V_{cd} & V_{cs} & V_{cb} \\ V_{td} & V_{ts} & V_{tb} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} d \\ s \\ b \end{pmatrix} \quad (2.3)$$

295 Several parameterizations of the CKM matrix exist, the “standard” parametrization
 296 uses angles θ_{12} , θ_{23} , θ_{13} and a phase δ_{13} :

$$V_{CKM} = \begin{pmatrix} c_{12}c_{13} & s_{12}c_{13} & s_{13}\exp(-i\delta) \\ -s_{12}c_{23} - c_{12}s_{23}s_{13}\exp(i\delta) & c_{12}c_{23} - s_{12}s_{23}s_{13}\exp(i\delta) & s_{23}c_{13} \\ s_{12}s_{23} - c_{12}c_{23}s_{13}\exp(i\delta) & -c_{12}s_{23} - s_{12}c_{23}s_{13}\exp(i\delta) & c_{23}c_{13} \end{pmatrix} \quad (2.4)$$

297 where $c_{ij} = \cos \theta_{ij}$ and $s_{ij} = \sin \theta_{ij}$ for $i=1,2,3$. This parametrization has the advan-
 298 tage that each angle θ_{ij} relates to a specific transition from one generation to the other.
 299 If $\theta_{13} = \theta_{23} = 0$ the third generation is not coupled to the other two and the matrix
 300 reduces to the original matrix postulated by Cabibbo. Note that θ_{12} is the Cabibbo
 301 angle, θ_c , described earlier.

302 Another parameterization due to Wolfenstein [11] expresses all elements in terms of
 303 the Cabibbo angle by defining $\lambda \equiv s_{12} = \sin \theta_{12}$ and then expressing the other elements
 304 in terms of powers of λ :

$$V_{CKM} \approx \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \lambda^2/2 & \lambda & A\lambda^3(\rho - i\eta) \\ -\lambda & 1 - \lambda^2/2 & A\lambda^2 \\ A\lambda^3(1 - \rho - i\eta) & -A\lambda^2 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (2.5)$$

305 where A , ρ and η are all real numbers intended to express the order of magnitude
 306 differences between s_{12} and the other elements in the matrix.

307 The elements of the CKM matrix have been measured and the latest accepted re-
 308 sults are summarized in 2.7 [8]. The interaction strength is then proportional to $|V_{ij}|^2$.
 309 Including all three generations the sum of all possible transitions from a given quark, q ,

is unity:

$$\sum |V_{qi}|^2 = 1 \quad (2.6)$$

Note that the term V_{tb} is approximately unity and by far dominates over the other V_{tj} terms. This means that the top-quark transitions almost exclusively into a b -quark ($t \rightarrow Wb$) with transitions $t \rightarrow Ws$ and $t \rightarrow Wd$ being exceedingly rare. The soft muon tagger which is the focus of this thesis relies on weak semileptonic decays of b -quarks. From 2.7 one can see that the transition $b \rightarrow c$ dominates over $b \rightarrow u$.

$$V_{CKM} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.97427 \pm 0.00015 & 0.22534 \pm 0.00065 & 0.00351^{+0.00015}_{-0.00014} \\ 0.22520 \pm 0.00065 & 0.97344 \pm 0.00016 & 0.0412^{+0.0011}_{-0.0005} \\ 0.00867^{+0.00029}_{-0.00031} & 0.0404^{+0.0011}_{-0.0005} & 0.999146^{+0.000021}_{-0.000046} \end{pmatrix} \quad (2.7)$$

An additional unique feature of weak interactions is that the charge conjugation-parity (CP) symmetry is violated. The operator C denotes the change of a particle by its antiparticle partner and P denotes a reversal of helicity (the projection of spin onto the momentum of a particle). A clear violation of C and P was observed in the radioactive decay of Cobalt-60, where the resulting electrons were preferentially emitted in the opposite direction of the nuclear spin of the Cobalt. Thus weak currents only couple to left-handed neutrinos (or right-handed antineutrinos) this is then a violation of parity. Additionally charge symmetry is also violated since a left-handed neutrino is preferentially picked over a left-handed antineutrino. Finally in 1964 CP violation was observed in the decay of neutral kaon.

Thus the probability of $\bar{a} \rightarrow \bar{b}$ is not equal to that of $a \rightarrow b$. The existence of CP violation has interesting consequences for the formation of the early universe. The preferential production of matter over antimatter in CP violating interactions would shift the balance in favour of matter resulting in a universe similar to our own.

2.3.1 Electroweak Unification and the Higgs mechanism

331 **Chapter 3**

332 **Top-quark physics**

333 Since this thesis will focus mostly on top quark physics a strong emphasis is put on the
334 description of processes involving this quark

335 **3.1 Top quark production**

336 **3.2 Top quark decay modes**

337 Chapter 4

338 The LHC and the ATLAS 339 Detector

340 This section will include a description of the Large Hadron Collider and the ATLAS
341 detector technology with particular emphasis on those aspects that allow for precision
342 measurement of muons and top quark physics studies.

343 4.1 The Large Hadron Collider

344 4.2 The ATLAS detector

345 Chapter 5

346 Identifying b -jet, and the Match 347 χ^2 based Soft Muon Tagger

348 This section will include a description of several current methodologies for b -jet tagging
349 and a detailed description of the Match- χ^2 Soft Muon Tagger.

350 5.1 b -jet tagging methodology

351 5.2 The Match- χ^2 Soft Muon Tagger

352

Chapter 6

353

Calibration of the Soft Muon

354

Tagger for 2012 ATLAS Data

355

High-energy physics relies heavily on the use of simulated data to inform the development

356

of analysis techniques. It is thus paramount that the simulation reflect nature as closely

357

as possible. However the simulation does not accurately predict conditions within the

358

detector and the effects on the muon reconstruction and the quality of the fit between the

359

inner detector tracks and muon spectrometer tracks which is represented in the χ^2_{match} .

360

Instead the difference between simulation and data is quantified and taken into account.

361

This process is known as calibration. In the case of the muon reconstruction method

362

and the χ^2_{match} tagger it is important that the difference in efficiency between MC and

363

data be accounted for. This is done by constructing a scale factor, defined in this case

364

by:

$$\kappa_{\chi^2_{\text{match}}} = \frac{\epsilon_{\chi^2_{\text{match}}}^{\text{Data}}}{\epsilon_{\chi^2_{\text{match}}}^{\text{MC}}} \quad (6.1)$$

365

One of the advantages of using the χ^2_{match} tagger over other forms of tagging is that

366

the presence of a jet is not required to measure the χ^2_{match} of a muon. This means that

367

the calibration can be performed on a isolated muons such as those from $J/\psi \rightarrow \mu\mu$ or

368

$Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ using the so called tag and probe method. This calibration relies on muons with

369

low p_T from J/ψ decays. As the χ^2_{match} is a characteristic of combined and therefore

370 reconstructed muons,

371 The tag and probe method used in this calibration is defined as follows. One recon-
 372 structed combined muon is designated as the Tag, this muon must pass a stringent set
 373 of cuts implying that this is indeed a muon from a J/ψ . The second muon which is des-
 374 ignated as the Probe is constructed from an inner detector (ID) only. To ensure that the
 375 Probe is the second muon from the J/ψ decay, the invariant mass of the combined tag
 376 and probe system is required to be within a mass window centered around the true J/ψ
 377 mass. The complete selection used in the calibration is detailed in Section 6.1. These
 378 Probes are then used to measure the reconstruction efficiency and the χ^2_{match} tagger
 379 efficiency as described in Sections 6.2 and 6.3.

380 The tag and probe method used here is based on a previous calibration of the χ^2_{match}
 381 tagger performed on 2011 ATLAS collision data outlined in This analysis differs from
 382 the 2011 calibration in several ways these will be highlighted and explained.

383 6.0.1 Software, Collision Data and Simulated samples

384 The tag and probe method used here was implemented using the ROOT analysis frame-
 385 work.

386 The calibration was performed on a dataset made of those luminosity blocks selected
 387 by the recommended standard Good Runs List (GRL) which corresponds to all pp col-
 388 lision periods in 2012. The GRL selects only those luminosity blocks where detector
 389 conditions are appropriate for physics data-taking. This includes all relevant detector
 390 components being operational and that stable beam conditions have been achieved. The
 391 datasets are part of the 2013 summer reprocessing (processing tag p1328) corresponding
 392 to data taken in periods A through to L, excluding periods F and J.

393 The efficiency scale factor is measured against a sample containing almost 10 million
 394 $J/\psi \rightarrow \mu\mu$ events. At event generation filters are applied so the sample only contains
 395 events where both muons have a transverse momentum of at least 4 GeV and they
 396 must lie within the pseudo-rapidity range $|\eta| < 2.5$. This selection matches the object
 397 selection used by most analyses as recommended by the Muon Combined Performance
 398 (MCP) group.

6.1 Tag and Probe Selection

A tag and probe method was chosen to measure the efficiency of muon reconstruction and the χ^2_{match} tagger. The tag and probe method allows for the measurement of the performance of selection criteria or algorithms by exploiting well known decays. By creating a sample of objects, in this case muons, on which to apply the aforementioned selection criteria, it is possible to study these algorithms.

The muon reconstruction algorithm examines various Inner Detector (ID) tracks and Muon Spectrometer (MS) tracks and makes a determination as to whether said track is produced by muon or not. To measure the performance of the muon reconstruction algorithm a sample of ID tracks which originate from the J/ψ decay and are thus very likely to be a real muon is constructed. This is done in the following way:

First, require the presence of a combined **STACO** muon which passes a very stringent selection. This strongly implies that this is a real muon and thus is labelled as the Tag. Additionally a very loose selection is applied to all ID tracks. These are known as candidate Probes. Pairs of tag and probes are then formed by requiring that the combined invariant mass lie within a J/ψ mass window and the pair pass additional pairing cuts. This then implies that the Probe is likely the other muon from the J/ψ decay and as such is a suitable test-bed to measure the performance of the muon reconstruction algorithm. Note that all selection criteria are detailed and explained in Section 6.1.2

After selecting a sample of probes the performance of the algorithm is estimated by measuring the proportion of probe candidates which are selected by the algorithm. In other words the performance is estimated by counting the number of muons which are reconstructed given that the ID track is very likely to be a real muon. Probes which are reconstructed into combined **STACO** muons are labelled as muon probes. The performance of the χ^2_{match} tagger is estimated in a similar manner, by measuring the proportion of combined muon probes which pass the SMT selection.

6.1.1 Trigger requirements

In order for an event to be included in the analysis it must pass at least one of the trigger chains listed in Appendix A. For the sake of brevity only the primary trigger (EF_mu6_Trk_Jpsi_loose) which contributes the majority of events is described here.

As stated in the trigger name this is an Event Filter trigger which requires the presence of a muon with a momentum of at least 6 GeV and an ID track whos combined invariant mass lies within a J/ψ mass window of $2.6 \text{ GeV} < m_{\text{inv}} < 3.6 \text{ GeV}$. This loose mass window contains the entirety of the J/ψ peak in all examined p_T and η ranges as well as additional side bands to allow for background removal. Note the omission of double muon triggers to avoid introducing a bias by specifically selecting events with two good muons.

Also note that while all triggers are operational in all periods, most are heavily prescaled and the prescale is period dependent. This does not have a first-order effect on the measurement since only ratios are compared between collision data and MC.

6.1.2 Selection Cuts

The selection criteria for tags, probes, muon probes and SMT muons are listed and detailed below. Note that all cuts are applied on the kinematic properties measured in the ID due to its improved resolution unless it is not possible as in the case of the χ^2_{DoF} which is a combined MS and ID property. Also note that all objects must pass a selection criteria collectively refered to as MCP cuts. These are tracking quality cuts which require a certain number of detector elements be active to ensure good tracking. These cuts are listed in

The muon tag selection criteria are defined in the list below:

- MCP cuts
- STACO collection
- Combined muon
- $p_T > 4 \text{ GeV}$
- $|\eta| < 2.5$

- 454 • $|d_0| < 0.3$ mm and $|z_0| < 1.5$ mm
- 455 • $|d_0/\sigma_{d_0}| < 3$ and $|z_0/\sigma_{z_0}| < 3$
- 456 • Fired at least one of the relevant triggers (see Appendix A)

457 Included are cuts on the muon impact parameter (IP) d_0 and z_0 . These are defined
 458 as the distance of closest approach of the ID track to the primary interaction vertex in
 459 the transverse and longitudinal planes, respectively. Additionally cuts on the absolute
 460 values of IP significances are also implemented. The significance of the impact parameter
 461 is defined as d_0/σ_{d_0} where σ_{IP} is the standard deviation of the impact parameter. These
 462 cuts are designed to ensure that the muon selected originates near the primary vertex
 463 and thus from a prompt J/ψ from the primary collision. Note that non-prompt J/ψ can
 464 be produced in the decay of b hadrons. Finally note that the tag muon must match the
 465 trigger object which selected this event.

466 The probe selection is a subset of the tag selection and only requires an ID track
 467 with $|\eta| < 2.5$ and $p_T < 4$ GeV. The pairing cuts are shown below:

- 468 • $2 \text{ GeV} \leq m_{\text{inv}} \leq 4 \text{ GeV}$
- 469 • Probe charge is opposite the tag charge
- 470 • $0.4 < \Delta R(\text{tag}, \text{probe}) < 3.5$
- 471 • $\Delta z_0(\text{tag}, \text{probe}) < 0.2$ mm

472 The probe and the tag are required to be fairly well separated to avoid the momentum
 473 of the tag from entering the isolation cone of the probe. In the 2011 calibration analysis
 474 the track of the tag and the probe are refit to a common vertex and the quality of
 475 the refit, expressed by the χ^2 is a part of the pairing criteria. This criteria is present
 476 to reduce the effects of pile-up on the measurement, by ensuring both objects have a
 477 common origin. Since the data format used for this analysis is a derived form of that
 478 used in 2011 it is not possible to perform such a refit. Instead the difference between
 479 the z_0 of the tag and the probe is used.

480 The **STACO** reconstruction efficiency is not measured by applying the algorithm on
 481 the probe collection but rather a probe is said to be a muon probe if it matches a com-
 482 bined muon from the **STACO** collection. This is done by requiring the angular separation
 483 between the probe and the **STACO** muon be less than 0.001. Probes which are matched
 484 become the numerator of the reconstruction efficiency and the denominator is defined
 485 as the number of probes:

$$\epsilon = \frac{N_{\text{muon probe}}}{N_{\text{probe}}}$$

486 A muon probe is said to be an SMT muon if it passes the following selection, which
 487 matches the muon cuts defined in Chapter 5. Note in particular the main component
 488 of the soft muon tagger, the cut on $\chi^2_{\text{match}}/N_{\text{dof}} < 3.2$, the distribution of the χ^2_{DoF} is
 489 shown in Fig. 6.1

- 490 • $|d_0| < 3 \text{ mm}$
- 491 • $|z_0 \sin(\theta)| < 3$
- 492 • $\chi^2_{\text{match}}/N_{\text{dof}} < 3.2$

493 Those muon probes which pass the SMT selection are the numerator of the SMT
 494 efficiency and the denominator is defined as the number of muon probes:

$$\epsilon = \frac{N_{\text{SMT}}}{N_{\text{muon probe}}}$$

495 6.2 Invariant mass fitting

496 The pairing criteria are very effective at selecting J/ψ events, however non- J/ψ back-
 497 ground events are also pass the selection. These include combinatorial background
 498 where the wrong tag and probe pair is constructed and Drell-Yan which appears as a
 499 continuum below the J/ψ peak.

500 The number of probes is extracted from a fit to the invariant mass of the dimuon
 501 system using a composite function to accomodate for the background and the gaussian-
 502 like J/ψ peak.




Figure 6.1: The distribution of $\chi^2_{\text{match}}/N_{\text{dof}}$ for all muon probes for ATLAS collision data and prompt J/ψ Monte Carlo simulation.

503 The invariant mass peak of the J/ψ is modelled by a gaussian distribution while the
 504 background distribution is modelled by a quadratic. The invariant mass distribution is
 505 fit by a sum of the two functions.

506 To avoid the first-order effects of signal mis-modelling from the fit of the J/ψ peak,
 507 the yield is obtained from the integral of the measured invariant mass distribution sub-
 508 tracting the background contribution from the integral of the fit to the background.
 509 The integration is performed in a window with a width based on the width of the fitted
 510 J/ψ peak. The integration window marked in Fig. 6.2 corresponds to three times the
 511 width of the peak or simply 3σ . Additionally note the composite fit line as well as the
 512 background-only distribution and the implied signal gaussian peak.




Figure 6.2: A diagram of the various components of the fit procedure. The composite fit is shown along with the corresponding implied signal and background. The two variations of the background shape are also shown.

513 6.2.1 Uncertainty Measurement

514 The uncertainty on the efficiency is made of three components. First, the statistical
 515 uncertainty on the efficiency is estimated as a Binomial error:

$$\delta\epsilon = \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon \times (1 - \epsilon)}{N}} \quad (6.2)$$

Where ϵ is the measured efficiency and N is, in this case the denominator of the efficiency measured.

Secondly, an uncertainty is associated with the fit to the background. This is done by taking the largest upward and downward fluctuations of the background by the uncertainty on the fit parameters of the background, and obtaining the maximum upward and downward effects on the efficiency. After the fit of the composite function is carried out, a downward variation of the background is defined as:

$$f(x) = a_{\min}x^2 + b_{\max}x + c_{\min}, \text{ where } p_{\max/\min} = p_{\text{central}} \pm \sigma_p \quad (6.3)$$

Here the maximum and minimum of a parameter is obtained by varying the central value by the uncertainty obtained from the fit. The upward variation of the background fit is thus the opposite, defined as:

$$f(x) = a_{\max}x^2 + b_{\min}x + c_{\max} \quad (6.4)$$

These background variation then result in the maximum deviation from the nominal integral. Again Fig. 6.2 shows these two variations¹. The uncertainty on the efficiency is then determined by obtaining the maximum efficiency in both directions. If the nominal efficiency is defined as:

$$\epsilon_{\text{nominal}} = \frac{N_{\text{numerator}}}{N_{\text{denominator}}} \quad (6.5)$$

Then the variations are defined as follows:

$$\epsilon_{\text{up}} = \frac{N_{\text{numerator}}^{\text{down}}}{N_{\text{denominator}}^{\text{nominal}}}, \quad \epsilon_{\text{down}} = \frac{N_{\text{numerator}}^{\text{nominal}}}{N_{\text{denominator}}^{\text{up}}} \quad (6.6)$$

Finally the uncertainty on the background is given by adding the differences between ϵ_{up} and ϵ_{down} and the nominal efficiency, in quadrature:

¹The variation shown in the diagram is very exaggerated and meant for illustration purposes

$$\sigma_{\text{bkg}} = \sqrt{|\epsilon_{\text{up}} - \epsilon|^2 + |\epsilon_{\text{down}} - \epsilon|^2} \quad (6.7)$$

533 The final component of the uncertainty is constructed by varying the integration
 534 window. The nominal value is defined as 3σ away from the center of the fitted gaussian,
 535 where again σ is the FWHM of the same fitted gaussian. An uncertainty is constructed
 536 by measuring the efficiency with a wide integration window corresponding to 5σ . The
 537 integration window uncertainty is defined as:

$$\sigma_{\text{window}} = |\epsilon_{5\sigma} - \epsilon_{3\sigma}| \quad (6.8)$$

538 Finally, the total uncertainty on the efficiency is given by the sum in quadrature of
 539 the all uncertainty components. The uncertainty on the efficiency is then carried over
 540 to the scale factor determination.


541 An example of the fitting procedure applied is shown in Fig. 6.3 for both tag and
 542 probes at probe level and at muon probe level. Note that as expected the muon probe
 543 contains far less background.

544 6.3 Efficiencies


545 The efficiency is monitored as a function of a variety of kinematic variables, including
 546 isolation variables, transverse momentum and angular position of the probe.

547 6.3.1 Isolation dependence

548 The muons from J/ψ used in this calibration are produced in isolation, there is very little
 549 energetic activity surrounding them in the detector. In contrast muons from semileptonic
 550 decay of b -quarks in $t\bar{t}$ events are produced amongst the numerous components of the
 551 b -jets. Thus it is important to ensure that the performance of the χ^2_{match} tagger is not
 552 affected by the isolation of the muon for a calibration on J/ψ events to be applicable.
 553 In this calibration as, in the 2011 analysis nine isolation variables are considered. The
 554 so-called etcone20, 30 and 40 correspond to the transverse energy surrounding the muon
 555 in a cone of size $\Delta R = 0.2, 0.3, 0.4$ respectively. Additionally ptcone20, 30 and 40



(a) Probe level



(b) Muon probe level

Figure 6.3: Invariant mass distributions of tag and probe pairs at a) probe level and at b) muon probe level in collision data. Note the various components of the fit as well as the variations on the background fits and the 3σ and 5σ integration windows used for systematics. Note the fit parameters and their respective uncertainties

and nucone20, 30, 40 correspond to the sum of transverse momentum and the number of tracks surrounding the muon, respectively. All nine isolation variables exclude the muon itself in a cone of size 0.1 and include various corrections for known energy losses, momentum leakages between adjacent clusters in the detector and the effects of pile-up.

As in the 2011 analysis there appears to be no dependence of the scale factor on any of the isolation variables examined as can be seen from Figures 6.4, 6.5 and 6.6.

The dependence on each isolation variable is measured in a range dictated by the available statistics. Given the isolated nature of muons in J/ψ events limits the number of muons available at higher pt/et/nucone values.

6.3.2 2011 Calibration

6.3.3 Efficiency Binning




The efficiencies are measured with respect to pseudorapidity and across the $|\eta|$ range of the ATLAS detector in regions defined in Table 6.1. Note that the η regions are labeled as A and C to denote the positive and negative η sections of the detector. The binning in other variables is determined by the amount of statistics available to allow for the fitting procedure to produce good and stable results. The binning in p_T was chosen as: 4-5, 5-6, 6-7, 7-8, 8-10, 10-12, 12-14, 14-16 and 16-20 GeV.




Table 6.1: Pseudorapidity regions of the ATLAS detector




$ \eta $ range	Name
$0.0 < \eta < 0.1$	Crack
$0.1 < \eta < 1.1$	Barrel
$1.1 < \eta < 1.3$	Transition
$1.3 < \eta < 2.0$	Endcap
$2.0 < \eta < 2.5$	Forward

6.3.4 Results

The efficiency is presented as a function of η , ϕ and p_T . Figure 6.7 shows the χ^2_{match} efficiency with respect to the spatial variables of the probe. Note that as with the 2011 analysis the efficiency exhibits no dependence on ϕ and an asymmetric dependence on η particularly in the Forward regions of the detector. Note that as expected there is a

(a) $\sum E_T$ in cone $\Delta R = 0.2$ (b) $\sum E_T$ in cone $\Delta R = 0.3$ (c) $\sum E_T$ in cone $\Delta R = 0.4$ Figure 6.4: χ^2_{DoF} efficiencies and scale factor with respect to $\sum E_T$.

(a) $\sum p_T$ in cone $\Delta R = 0.2$ (b) $\sum p_T$ in cone $\Delta R = 0.3$ (c) $\sum p_T$ in cone $\Delta R = 0.4$ Figure 6.5: χ^2_{Dof} efficiencies and scale factor with respect to $\sum p_T$.

(a) N_{trk} in cone $\Delta R = 0.2$ (b) N_{trk} in cone $\Delta R = 0.3$ (c) N_{trk} in cone $\Delta R = 0.4$ Figure 6.6: χ^2_{DoF} efficiencies and scale factor with respect various isolation variables.

strong dependence on the transverse momentum of the muon probe as shown in Fig.6.8.
 As in the 2011 analysis it was decided to bin the scale factor as a function of η and p_T .
 The scale factors and efficiencies are presented in the next pages. The scale factors and
 their uncertainties are summarized in Table

Table 6.2: Data/MC Scale Factors for 2012 Data in all five regions of the detector as a function of p_T . The uncertainties include systematic and statistical components as described in Section 6.2.1

Side A (Positive η)					
p_T range	Crack A	Barrel A	Transition A	Endcap A	Forward A
4-5 GeV	1.051 ± 0.016	1.053 ± 0.005	1.046 ± 0.019	1.061 ± 0.011	1.090 ± 0.018
5-6 GeV	1.050 ± 0.007	1.058 ± 0.004	1.057 ± 0.019	1.062 ± 0.011	1.103 ± 0.020
6-7 GeV	1.068 ± 0.008	1.065 ± 0.003	1.070 ± 0.015	1.065 ± 0.008	1.134 ± 0.019
7-8 GeV	1.061 ± 0.018	1.063 ± 0.006	1.064 ± 0.017	1.061 ± 0.010	1.140 ± 0.024
8-10 GeV	1.061 ± 0.014	1.063 ± 0.007	1.068 ± 0.016	1.052 ± 0.014	1.167 ± 0.023
10-12 GeV	1.060 ± 0.042	1.070 ± 0.006	1.064 ± 0.026	1.058 ± 0.016	1.175 ± 0.038
12-14 GeV	1.061 ± 0.050	1.064 ± 0.010	1.067 ± 0.037	1.057 ± 0.021	1.190 ± 0.057
14-16 GeV	1.062 ± 0.087	1.068 ± 0.015	1.078 ± 0.054	1.067 ± 0.031	1.218 ± 0.064
16-20 GeV	1.062 ± 0.087	1.068 ± 0.015	1.078 ± 0.054	1.067 ± 0.031	1.218 ± 0.064



(a) For the positive η regions

Side C (Negative η)					
p_T range	Crack	Barrel	Transition	Endcap	Forward
4-5 GeV	1.044 ± 0.016	1.055 ± 0.005	1.054 ± 0.017	1.056 ± 0.009	1.068 ± 0.018
5-6 GeV	1.069 ± 0.013	1.057 ± 0.004	1.050 ± 0.016	1.062 ± 0.010	1.084 ± 0.020
6-7 GeV	1.080 ± 0.016	1.068 ± 0.004	1.065 ± 0.008	1.066 ± 0.008	1.089 ± 0.018
7-8 GeV	1.064 ± 0.021	1.068 ± 0.004	1.063 ± 0.016	1.066 ± 0.010	1.095 ± 0.022
8-10 GeV	1.071 ± 0.015	1.067 ± 0.005	1.045 ± 0.015	1.061 ± 0.009	1.107 ± 0.022
10-12 GeV	1.084 ± 0.030	1.073 ± 0.007	1.085 ± 0.022	1.061 ± 0.015	1.113 ± 0.036
12-14 GeV	1.098 ± 0.067	1.069 ± 0.010	1.059 ± 0.031	1.040 ± 0.024	1.108 ± 0.055
14-16 GeV	1.063 ± 0.101	1.073 ± 0.015	1.076 ± 0.046	1.061 ± 0.030	1.099 ± 0.057
16-20 GeV	1.073 ± 0.149	1.088 ± 0.006	1.099 ± 0.028	1.054 ± 0.012	1.117 ± 0.043

(b) For the negative η region

Dependence on d_0

The dependence on the impact parameter d_0 was examined and no direct dependence is observed. From Fig. 6.14 the scale factor shows no structure with respect to d_0 when binned in p_T . Since the scale factors are already binned in η and p_T the correlation of d_0 and p_T is already taken into account.

(a) χ^2_{match} efficiency and scale factor as a function ϕ of the probe muon(b) χ^2_{match} efficiency and scale factor as a function η of the probe muonFigure 6.7: χ^2_{match} efficiencies and scale factor with respect to the (a) ϕ and (b) η






Figure 6.8: χ^2_{match} efficiencies and scale factor with respect to the transverse momentum of the muon probe




(a) Crack A Region




(b) Crack C Region

Figure 6.9: χ^2_{match} efficiencies and scale factors in the crack region of the detector for side (a) A and (b) C




(a) Barrel A Region




(b) Barrel C Region

Figure 6.10: χ^2_{match} efficiencies and scale factors in the barrel region of the detector for side (a) A and (b) C




(a) Transition A Region




(b) Transition C Region

Figure 6.11: χ^2_{match} efficiencies and scale factors in the transition region of the detector for side (a) A and (b) C




(a) Endcap A Region




(b) Endcap C Region

Figure 6.12: χ^2_{match} efficiencies and scale factors in the endcap region of the detector for side (a) A and (b) C



(a) Forward A Region



(b) Forward C Region

Figure 6.13: χ^2_{match} efficiencies and scale factors in the forward region of the detector for side (a) A and (b) C




(a) $4 \text{ GeV} < p_T < 6 \text{ GeV}$ (b) $6 \text{ GeV} < p_T < 8 \text{ GeV}$ (c) $8 \text{ GeV} < p_T < 10 \text{ GeV}$

Figure 6.14: χ^2_{match} efficiencies and scale factor with respect to impact parameter d_0 for muon probes with p_T in the range (a) 4-6 GeV, (b) 6-8 GeV and (c) 8-10 GeV. The measurement was carried out only on Period B of 2012 ATLAS collision data.

587 Chapter 7

588 Measurement of the $t\bar{t}$ 589 cross-section in the single-lepton 590 channel using SMT

591 This section will discuss the measurement of the $t\bar{t}$ cross-section in the single-lepton
592 channel with an emphasis on the electron multijet background estimation conducted.

593 7.1 Data and Monte Carlo samples

594 This section will

595 7.2 Object selection and event selection

596 7.3 Re-weighting of the b-quark to muon transition BR

597 7.4 Data-driven background selection

598 7.5 Systematics uncertainties

599 7.6 Results and conclusion

Chapter 8

Muon Tagging in a boosted $t\bar{t}$ environment

The large center-of-mass energies at which collisions occur at the LHC allows for the production of very high mass particles. Several Beyond the SM (BSM) theories predict the existence of high mass particles which decay primarily top quark pairs. An example of hypothetical model which predict high mass $t\bar{t}$ resonances is the topcolor assisted technicolor model (TC2), which predicts the existence of a leptophobic Z' boson. The resultant top quark pair provides a well understood probe to search for such hypothetical particles.

The Z' could potentially have a mass on the order of several TeV. As a result their decay product would be produced in the detector with very large momentum. These top quarks are said to be boosted. In terms of the subsequent top decay, the resultant bottom quark and W boson are expected to emerge in a collimated cone. The events thus appear as two large back-to-back jets. If the W decays leptonically, the W lepton is expected to lie very close to or within the b -jet. If the W decays hadronically all three jets will appear to merge into a single 'fat' jet.

In this chapter the results of a feasibility study conducted to determine the viability of using the χ^2_{match} tagger to tag W muons from boosted top-quark decays is presented and discussed. Note that this is in contrast to the cross-section analysis detailed in a previous chapter where the muon tagged came from the semileptonic decay of b -quarks.

621 The boost is expected to be related to the mass of the Z' produced, so a higher mass Z'
 622 would decay into more collimated jets. The environment that results is thus very similar
 623 to that of a semileptonic b -decay, a muon buried inside of a b -jet.

624 No evidence for such a resonance has been observed and limits have been placed on
 625 the production rate of these resonance for various benchmark models. A leptophobic
 626 topcolor Z' of mass less than 1.74 TeV has been excluded using 4.7 fb^{-1} of pp collision
 627 data collected by ATLAS with a center-of-mass energy $\sqrt{s} = 7 \text{ TeV}$ [3]. Additionally a
 628 more recent analysis using 14.3 fb^{-1} of $\sqrt{s} = 8 \text{ TeV}$ data collected at ATLAS excluded
 629 a Z' with a mass less than 1.8 TeV at 95% confidence level [1]. The analysis detailed
 630 here is based on the 7 TeV analysis. Similar analyses performed with data collected by
 631 CMS have excluded Z' candidates for similar benchmark models [2, 6, 7].

632 The performance of SMT is compared to the contemporary method for selecting
 633 muons known as mini-isolation. In addition a short performance study to determine the
 634 viability of using SMT to tag b -jets in boosted top events is also presented. Firstly, a
 635 short examination of the topology of a boosted event is presented.

636 8.1 Boosted event topology

637 In order to perform an effective feasibility study, it is important to understand the
 638 signature left by boosted events in the detector. There are certain expectations regarding
 639 the momentum distribution of the various product particles from the decay of the top
 640 as well as their angular separation. As with the cross-section analysis presented in
 641 Chapter 7, this study focuses on the semileptonic decays of top quark pairs

642 It is expected for events where the momentum of the top quarks higher to exhibit
 643 stronger collimation between the W muon and the b -quark. This results in a situation
 644 very similar to that exploited for muon tagging in Section 7 where a muon from the
 645 semileptonic decay of a b -quark emerges from within the b -jet. Fig. 8.1 illustrates the
 646 similarity of both scenarios. It is thus possible to use the χ_{match}^2 -tagger¹ to tag W muons
 647 in boosted events. As the tagger is designed to work in energetically "busy" sectors of
 648 the detector, it is ideally suited to probe highly boosted events where the decay products

¹As signal muons are very hard, the tagger is now referred to as the χ_{match}^2 tagger not soft muon tagger to reflect this difference




Figure 8.1: This figure shows a simple diagram for the possible configuration of final-state objects in a (a) boosted and (b) non-boosted events. Note that in both cases a muon is embedded within the b -jet

are collimated.

As can be seen from Fig. 8.2 the increase in boost does result in the W muon and b -quark emerging closer. Note that the fraction of events below the SMT requirement of $\Delta R(\mu, jet) < 0.5$ increases with increased top-quark p_T . Additionally Fig. 8.3 shows that the top p_T distribution peaks at just below half of the mass of the Z' boson, thus the large portion of the candidate muons in the sample will pass the aforementioned separation requirement. The decay products of the top quark appear to emerge primarily back to back as seen in Fig. 8.4.

8.2 Samples and muon selection

This measurement is based on simulated data generated for a Z' with a mass of 1.0, 1.3, 1.6, 2.0, 2.5 and 3.0 TeV. All Monte Carlo (MC) samples were generated using PYTHIA with CTEQ6LI PDFs. The width of the generated Z' is 3% of the mass.




Figure 8.2: The angular separation (ΔR) between the truth W muon and the corresponding b -quark for all examined Z' mass points.

8.3 Signal muon selection

8.3.1 Muon selection

The nominal muon object selection includes an isolation requirement, which normally removes events where the signal lepton is found in a region of the calorimeter with large amounts of activity. Cutting on the amount of energy deposited in the calorimeter around the lepton is an example of one such requirement. Such a cut forms part of the object selection used in the top cross-section measurement described in Part 6.

However, as described a priori, boosted top events result in large collimated jets which include the products of the two top quarks. Thus the signal lepton can emerge within the cone of the reconstructed jet from the b -quark.

Note that the muon is not required to be isolated, instead the muon is tagged by the χ^2_{match} tagger. Selecting isolated muons would reduce significantly the number of muons available for tagging. Additionally, as explained a priori, events which exhibit stronger




Figure 8.3: The transverse momentum of the top/anti-top quarks in the event for all examined Z' mass points.

674 collimation are more likely to emerge from particles with higher masses. By requesting
 675 the muons be isolated, the ability to probe those higher mass events is diminished.

676 Another candidate to replace the traditional isolation selection is the so-called mini-
 677 isolation. This variable takes into account the strong collimation of the top products
 678 with increasing boost. Mini-isolation is defined as the sum of the measured transverse
 679 momenta of all tracks in a cone of size $\Delta R = k_T/p_T^\ell$ around the lepton, where
 680 k_T is an adjustable scale and p_T^ℓ is the momentum of the lepton in question. This is
 681 known as the absolute mini-isolation. This study uses the relative mini-isolation where
 682 the absolute value is scaled by the momentum of the lepton (MI/p_T^ℓ).

683 In this analysis the performance of the χ_{match}^2 tagger is measured against mini-
 684 isolation using a $k_T = 10$ and a lepton is deemed isolated if the p_T in the MI cone
 685 is less than 5% that of the lepton. The Muon Tagger operates with the same selection
 686 as used in Part 6, the cuts are $|z_0| < 3.0$ mm, $|d_0| < 3.0$ mm and finally $\chi_{\text{DoF}}^2 < 3.2$.

687 Thus two separate selections are applied, one for mini-isolation and one for SMT.




Figure 8.4: The angular separation (ΔR) between the b and \bar{b} in the event for all examined Z' mass points.

688 Note that both methodologies have different muon reconstruction criteria, these are
 689 detailed in Table 8.1.

Table 8.1: Muon reconstruction selection used by Mini-Isolation and by Muon Tagging

Mini-Isolation	Muon-Tagging
MCP Cuts	
$p_T > 20$ GeV	
$ \eta < 2.5$	
MUID	STACO
$z_0 < 3.0$ mm	Is Combined Muon
IsEM Tight	

690 The performance of both methodologies are then compared by measuring their effi-
 691 ciency.




Figure 8.5: This figure shows the distribution of (a) transverse momentum and (b) pseudo-rapidity of muons which pass the SMT selection, the (c) angular separation between those muons and the nearest jet in the event and (d) the χ^2_{match} used in the selection for all tested Z' mass points.

8.4 Efficiency definition

The efficiency measurement was designed to provide an accurate representation of the performance of the soft muon tagger and a valid comparison with mini-isolation. Additional sources of inefficiency such as muon reconstruction are separated out into an additional efficiency which is also quoted. See Fig. 8.7 for a summary of the efficiency measurement.

Firstly, events where a W decays into a muon are selected, this becomes the pool of events from which the efficiency is measured. The selections then diverge and the two sets of reconstruction cuts described in Table 8.1 are applied independently. The efficiency of each sets of reconstruction cuts are measured as:

$$\epsilon_{\text{reco}} = \frac{\text{Muons which pass selection}}{\text{All reconstructed muons}}$$




Figure 8.6: This figure shows the (a) transverse momentum and (b) pseudo-rapidity of muons which pass the MI10 selection, the (c) angular separation between those muons and the nearest jet in the event and (d) the cone size used in the selection for all tested Z' mass points.

These good reconstructed muons are then truth-matched to the truth μ from the W if the angular separation (ΔR) between them is less than 0.01. This has an efficiency associated with it, defined as:

$$\epsilon_{\text{match}} = \frac{\text{Muons matched to truth } W \text{ muon}}{\text{Muons which pass selection}}$$

Note that at each stage the denominator is the numerator of the previous efficiency. This allows for a combination of all the efficiencies to obtain an inclusive measure which can be used to approximate the number of W muons which would be selected from collision data assuming that the simulation describes the data well.

Next the muons are required to be within $\Delta R < 0.5$ from a jet. The Muon Tagger requires that jets be near a muon, in addition the impetus behind the analysis is to probe highly boosted events exploiting the capabilities of χ^2_{match} tagging. This selection ensures that the muons available for χ^2_{match} tagging are indeed close to a jet. This selection also




Figure 8.7: Structure of the efficiency measurement.

713 has an efficiency associated with it defined as:

$$\epsilon_{\text{non-iso}} = \frac{\text{Muons with } \Delta R(\mu, \text{jet}) < 0.5}{\text{Muons matched to truth } W \text{ muon}}$$

714 The final step is the application of both the mini-isolation selection and the muon
 715 tagging selection discussed a priori. These selections are associated with the final and
 716 most interesting sets of efficiencies, defined as:

$$\epsilon_{\text{MT/MI10}} = \frac{\text{Muons which pass MT/MI10 selection}}{\text{Muons with } \Delta R(\mu, \text{jet}) < 0.5}$$

717 Please note that the denominator in every efficiency is a subset of the previous
 718 denominator. In other words each selection is applied in sequence and the efficiencies
 719 are calculated out of the remaining muons which passed the previous selection criteria.

720 Note that in the nominal analysis described in [3] muons which are within ΔR of
 721 0.1 of the jet would be removed. The impetus behind the analysis is to exploit the
 722 χ^2_{match} tagger to accept additional events where the signal muon emerges very close to
 723 the jet axis, thus overlap removal is not part of the χ^2_{match} tagging selection. In order
 724 to provide an accurate performance comparison between the χ^2_{match} tagger and mini-
 725 isolation, the overlap removal is applied only for the mini-isolation selection at the end
 726 of the chain. The additional acceptance gained by using χ^2_{match} tagger is compared to
 727 the mini-isolation selection with overlap included:

$$\epsilon = \frac{\text{Muons that pass } \chi^2_{\text{match}} \text{ tagger} - \text{MI muons } \Delta R < 0.1}{\text{Total } W \mu} \quad (8.1)$$

728 8.5 Results

729 Mini-isolation is a very efficient method for selecting muons. Table 8.2 shows the effi-
 730 ciency for the χ^2_{match} tagger, mini-isolation and mini-isolation including overlap removal.
 731 Across the used mass range, the efficiency of selection remains above 80% and in fact
 732 increases with a increased Z' mass. When the Z' has a mass of 3 TeV the efficiency of
 733 selection with mini-isolation is 92.5% with no overlap removal. In contrast the efficiency
 734 of the χ^2_{match} tagger is more consistent across the used mass range and higher than mini-
 735 isolation for a given mass. For a Z' with a mass of 3 TeV the measured efficiency of
 736 the χ^2_{match} tagger is 96.2%. When applying the overlap removal the efficiency of mini-
 737 isolation falls to 85.0%. As can be seen from Fig. 8.8 the efficiency of mini-isolation
 738 dips for muons which are close to a jet however this occurs below the threshold of the
 739 overlap removal. Finally the additional acceptance gained as defined in 8.1 is 4.03%.
 740 The additional acceptance gained in all mass points is also included in Table 8.2.

Z' Mass [TeV]	χ^2_{match}	MI10	MI10 + Overlap
1.0	94.9%	83.1%	67.0%
1.3	95.8%	89.0%	79.2%
1.6	95.9%	90.4%	81.9%
2.0	96.0%	92.4%	85.7%
2.5	95.8%	92.8%	85.1%
3.0	96.2%	92.5%	85.0%

Table 8.2: Efficiency of selecting a muon by using the χ^2_{match} tagger against mini-isolation. Note that ‘MI10 + Overlap’ is the efficiency of applying both the mini-isolation cut and overlap removal.




Figure 8.8: Efficiency of mini-isolation ($k_T = 10$) and χ^2_{match} muon tagger as a function of the angular separation between the reconstructed muon and the nearest reconstructed jet. Note the dip in the mini-isolation efficiency at low ΔR . In the nominal analysis an overlap removal between the jet and the muon is applied.

8.5.1 Background

A preliminary examination of the amount of background was performed. This was done on the same sample of events but instead of selecting semileptonic events, the all-hadronic events are used as background. While these events do not perfectly mimic the true background, namely $b\bar{b}$, the lack of any real signal muons can provide a suitable preliminary substitute.

The lack of an isolation requirement is expected to result in a substantial increase in the amount of background selected. Additionally the semileptonic b -decays in $b\bar{b}$ would result in muons that the χ^2_{match} tagger will select. The analysis chain described in Section 8.4 is repeated on the same sample used a priori however the truth level selection of events with a W muon is reversed, thus at truth level both W bosons decay




Figure 8.9: Efficiency of mini-isolation ($k_T = 10$) and χ^2_{match} muon tagger as a function of the transverse momentum of the muon.

752 hadronically.

753 The results of this selection are presented in Table 8.3. As expected mini-isolation re-
 754 moves a substantial amount of background while maintaining very high signal efficiency.
 755 In comparison, removing the isolation requirement greatly increases the background ac-
 756 ceptance when using the χ^2_{match} tagger. A full treatment of the background would be
 757 required to account for the background present.

758 The increase in signal acceptance does not make this methodology sufficiently ad-
 759 vantageous particularly when considering the increase in fake rate. An examination of
 760 the b -tagging potential of the χ^2_{match} tagger is presented in the next section.

Table 8.3: Fake rate of χ^2_{match} tagger, mini-isolation and mini-isolation including overlap removal as measured using all Z' mass points.

Z' Mass [TeV]	χ^2_{match}	MI10	MI10 + Overlap
1.0	92.8%	4.10%	2.39%
1.3	92.4%	4.77%	3.66%
1.6	91.8%	5.46%	4.55%
2.0	91.1%	7.07%	6.09%
2.5	90.0%	6.40%	5.57%
3.0	90.1%	6.59%	5.68%

761 8.6 B-tagging potential in boosted events

Table 8.4: caption

Z' Mass [TeV]	Good Muons	Matched Muons	$\Delta R(\mu, jet) < 0.5$	χ^2_{match} -tagged
1.0	16382	9807 (59.8%)	8722 (88.9%)	8237 (94.4%)
1.3	21099	13344 (63.2%)	12083 (90.6%)	11402 (94.4%)
1.6	19947	13012 (65.2%)	11929 (91.7%)	11240 (94.2%)
2.0	23391	15235 (65.1%)	14177 (93.1%)	13276 (93.6%)
2.5	5152	3347 (64.9%)	3137 (93.7%)	2922 (93.1%)
3.0	21766	13835 (63.5%)	13032 (94.2%)	12145 (93.2%)

⁷⁶² Chapter 9

⁷⁶³ Conclusions

Appendices

765 Appendix A

766 List of triggers used in calibration

767 The calibration analysis makes use of an OR of the triggers listed below. The triggers fire
768 based on a set of criteria summarized in the trigger name following the ATLAS trigger
769 naming convention. The list includes generic single low- p_T muon triggers such as EF_mu6
770 and EF_mu15, single high- p_T muons & jets triggers such as EF_mu24_j65_a4tchad and
771 the specialized J/ψ trigger EF_mu6_Trk_Jpsi_loose.

- 772 • EF_mu24_j65_a4tchad_EFxe40_tclcw
- 773 • EF_mu4T_j65_a4tchad_xe60_tclcw_loose
- 774 • EF_mu24_j65_a4tchad
- 775 • EF_mu18_tight_e7_medium1
- 776 • EF_mu4T_j65_a4tchad_xe70_tclcw_veryloose
- 777 • EF_mu24_j65_a4tchad_EFxe60_tclcw
- 778 • EF_mu24_tight_b35_mediumEF_j35_a4tchad
- 779 • EF_mu20i_tight_g5_loose_TauMass
- 780 • EF_mu6_Trk_Jpsi_loose
- 781 • EF_mu24i_tight
- 782 • EF_mu24i_tight_MuonEF

- 783 • EF_mu24i_tight_MG
- 784 • EF_mu24i_tight_l2muonSA
- 785 • EF_mu24_tight_3j35_a4tchad
- 786 • EF_mu24_g20vh_loose
- 787 • EF_mu40_MSonly_barrel_tight
- 788 • EF_mu50_MSonly_barrel_tight
- 789 • EF_mu24_tight_EFxe40
- 790 • EF_mu24_tight_L2StarB
- 791 • EF_mu18_medium
- 792 • EF_mu24_medium
- 793 • EF_mu24_tight
- 794 • EF_mu24_tight_MuonEF
- 795 • EF_mu24_tight_MG
- 796 • EF_mu24_tight_L2StarC
- 797 • EF_mu36_tight
- 798 • EF_mu40_tight
- 799 • EF_mu20it_tight
- 800 • EF_mu24_g20vh_medium
- 801 • EF_mu18_2g10_medium
- 802 • EF_mu24_muCombTag_NoEF_tight
- 803 • EF_mu10i_loose_g12Tvh_medium
- 804 • EF_mu10i_loose_g12Tvh_medium_TauMass

- 805 • EF_mu18_2g10_loose
- 806 • EF_mu10i_g10_medium_TauMass
- 807 • EF_mu20i_tight_g5_medium_TauMass
- 808 • EF_mu24_tight_3j45_a4tchad
- 809 • EF_mu24_tight_4j45_a4tchad
- 810 • EF_mu24_tight_4j35_a4tchad
- 811 • EF_mu4T
- 812 • EF_mu6
- 813 • EF_mu15
- 814 • EF_mu40_slow_tight
- 815 • EF_mu60_slow_tight1
- 816 • EF_mu22_IDTrkNoCut_tight
- 817 • EF_mu8_4j45_a4tchad_L2FS
- 818 • EF_mu6_Trk_Jpsi_loose_L2StarB
- 819 • EF_mu6_Trk_Jpsi_loose_L2StarA
- 820 • EF_mu24_j65_a4tchad_EFxe40wMu_tclcw
- 821 • EF_mu24_j65_a4tchad_EFxe60wMu_tclcw
- 822 • EF_mu6T_2b55_medium_2j55_a4tchad_L1J20_matched
- 823 • EF_mu24i_tight_muFast
- 824 • EF_mu4T_L2StarB
- 825 • EF_mu6_L2StarB
- 826 • EF_mu15_vbf_L1TAU8_MU10

827 **Appendix B**

828 **List of combined muon**

829 **performance (MCP) cuts**

Bibliography

- [1] A search for $t\bar{t}$ resonances in the lepton plus jets final state with ATLAS using 14 fb¹ of pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV. Technical Report ATLAS-CONF-2013-052, CERN, Geneva, May 2013. Not published in the proceedings.
- [2] Search for $t\bar{t}$ resonances in semileptonic final state. Technical Report CMS-PAS-B2G-12-006, CERN, Geneva, 2013.
- [3] Georges Aad et al. Search for $t\bar{t}$ resonances in the lepton plus jets final state with ATLAS using 4.7 fb⁻¹ of pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV. *Phys.Rev.*, D88(1):012004, 2013.
- [4] Nicola Cabibbo. Unitary symmetry and leptonic decays. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 10:531–533, Jun 1963.
- [5] Serguei Chatrchyan et al. Observation of a new boson at a mass of 125 GeV with the CMS experiment at the LHC. *Phys.Lett.*, B716:30–61, 2012.
- [6] Serguei Chatrchyan et al. Search for anomalous $t\bar{t}$ production in the highly-boosted all-hadronic final state. *JHEP*, 1209:029, 2012.
- [7] Serguei Chatrchyan et al. Search for Z' resonances decaying to $t\bar{t}$ in dilepton+jets final states in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV. *Phys.Rev.*, D87:072002, 2013.
- [8] J. Beringer et al. (Particle Data Group). The Review of Particle Physics. *Physical Review D*, 86:010001+, 2012.
- [9] et. al. G. Aad. Observation of a new particle in the search for the standard model higgs boson with the {ATLAS} detector at the {LHC}. *Physics Letters B*, 716(1):1 – 29, 2012.

- 852 [10] Makoto Kobayashi and Toshihide Maskawa. Cp-violation in the renormalizable
853 theory of weak interaction. *Progress of Theoretical Physics*, 49(2):652–657, 1973.
- 854 [11] Lincoln Wolfenstein. Parametrization of the kobayashi-maskawa matrix. *Phys. Rev.*
855 *Lett.*, 51:1945–1947, Nov 1983.