

¹ Searching for SUSY in all hadronic
² final states with the α_T variable

³ Bryn Mathias
⁴ Imperial College London

⁵ Supervisor: Dr Alex Tapper
⁶

Abstract

1

2

This is a thesis.

DRAFT

Declaration

There are many like it.

Author

Preface

¹

²

Something witty.

DRAFT

Acknowledgements

¹

²

Thanks.

Contents

1	1	Introduction	9
2	2	Theory	10
3	2.1	The Constrained Minimal Super Symmetric Model	10
5	3	The CMS detector	11
6	3.1	The Silicon Tracker	12
7	3.2	The Electromagnetic Calorimeter (ECAL)	13
8	3.3	The Hadronic Calorimeter	15
9	3.4	The The Compact Muon Solenoid (C.M.S) Muon system.	15
10	3.5	The Level One Trigger System	15
11	3.6	The High Level Trigger System	15
12	4	Offline Object Reconstruction and Identification	16
13	4.1	Hadronic Jets	16
14	4.2	Electrons	16
15	4.3	Muons	16
16	4.4	Photons	16
17	5	Level One Calorimeter Trigger	17
18	5.1	Level-1 Trigger Jet Algorithm [28]	18
19	5.2	Level-1 Trigger Performance	20
20	5.3	Level-1 Trigger Pile-up Mitigation	28
21	5.3.1	Effect on trigger efficiency	30
22	5.3.2	Summary	32
23	6	The α_T analysis	34
24	6.1	The Problem	34
25	6.2	The α_T variable	35
26	6.3	Event selection	37

1	6.4	High Level triggers for the α_T analysis	41
2	6.4.1	Trigger efficiency measurement	42
3	6.5	Extension to higher analysis dimensions. B-tagging	47
4	6.6	Electro-Weak background prediction	55
5	6.7	Estimating the residual QCD background component.[4]	61
6	6.8	Systematic uncertainties on the electro-weak background model.	66
7	6.8.1	Motivating the combined systematic on the translation factors	67
8	6.9	Signal Models	68
9	6.9.1	Signal Efficiency	69
10	6.9.2	Uncertainty on Signal Efficiency	70
11	6.9.3	Choice of Parton Density Function (PDF) set at generator level. .	71
12	6.9.4	Effects of Jet Energy Scale Variations on Signal Efficiency	73
13	6.9.5	Systematic Uncertainty on Signal Yield from Cleaning Filters and Object Vetoos.	73
14	6.10	Likelihood model	74
15	6.11	Final Results	78
16	6.11.1	Agreement with the Standard Model	78
17	6.11.2	Interpretation in terms of new physics models.	82
19	7	Conclusion	87
20	Bibliography		88
21	1	Additional information on triggers	91
22	2	Addition information on background estimation methods	95
23	2.1	Determination of k_{QCD}	95
24	3	Closure tests and systematic uncertainties	96
25	3.1	Defining muon samples without an α_T requirement	96
26	3.2	Closure tests for inclusive analysis	97
27	3.3	Closure tests for b-tag analysis	98
28	3.4	Closure tests concerning pile-up	100
29	4	Signal efficiency	101
30	4.1	CMSSM	101
31	4.2	T1	102
32	4.3	T2	103
33	4.4	T2tt	104
34	4.5	T2bb	105
35	4.6	T1tttt	106

1	4.7	T1bbbb	107
2	4.8	Signal contamination for T1tttt	108
3	5	Experimental systematic uncertainties on signal efficiency times acceptance	109
4	5.1	Systematics due to jet energy scale uncertainties	109
5	5.2	Systematics due to the MHT/MET cut	114
6	5.3	Systematics due to the dead ECAL cut	118
7	5.4	Systematics due to the lepton and photon vetoes	119

Chapter 1

¹ Introduction

² **The accelerator and detectors** The Large Hadron Collider (LHC) [10] is a proton-
³ proton collider which is situated in the Large Electron Positron (LEP) tunnel approxi-
⁴ mately 100 m under the franco-swiss border. Design center of mass energy is 14 TeV
⁵ with an instantaneous luminosity of $1 \times 10^{34} \text{ cm}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$. However during 2011 the center of
⁶ mass energy was 7 TeV and the maximum luminosity was $5 \times 10^{33} \text{ cm}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$. To achieve
⁷ this high energy and high beam current the LHC uses superconducting niobium-titanium
⁸ magnets, cooled to a temperature of 1.8 Kelvin, that produce a maximum field strength
⁹ of 8.36 Tesla.

¹⁰ we might well need some more stuff about the LHC its self in here!

¹¹ Situated around the LHC ring are four detectors, two general detectors ATLAS [6]
¹² and CMS (see Chapter 3 for a detailed discussion of the CMS detector) [23][38] which
¹³ are designed to measure the Standard Model (S.M) to high precision and search for new
¹⁴ physics. The LHC beauty experiment [31] is designed to study at previously unattainable
¹⁵ precision the decays of heavy quark flavors, both to measure the S.M couplings and to
¹⁶ search for beyond the S.M (BSM) physical processes. Finally the ALICE [7] experiment
¹⁷ is designed to run when the LHC is running in it's secondary mode where rather than
¹⁸ proton bunches, lead ions are collided, in an effort to study the quark-gluon plasma.

¹⁹ **New physics** Whilst the theory of the S.M and of new physics models will be discussed
²⁰ in chapter 2 it is prudent to discuss the observable features of these models with regard
²¹ to design requirements for the general purpose detectors.

Chapter 2

¹ Theory

² 2.1 The Constrained Minimal Super Symmetric ³ Model

Chapter 3

¹ The CMS detector




Figure 3.1: A perspective view of the C.M.S detector[1].

² The C.M.S detector was designed and built to study proton-proton interactions at
³ the Large Hadron Collider (L.H.C) with the aim of discovering the Higgs boson and
⁴ searching for beyond the standard model physics signals. The detector is constructed
⁵ in a traditional onion layer design with high precision tracking detectors nearest the
⁶ interaction point and high energy resolution calorimetric detectors in the outer layers.

¹ Due to the predicted presence of missing energy \cancel{E}_T in new physics models, energy
² measurement over the full η range is required. As allured to in the name the possibilities
³ of the new physics models containing muons and the clean Higgs decay $H \rightarrow ZZ \rightarrow \mu\mu\mu\mu$,
⁴ the detector was built with accurately reconstructing muons with p_T of 1 TeV, due to
⁵ the prevalence of lepton signals and the ability to distinguish these leptons from the large
⁶ amount of hadronic fragmentation caused by smashing two protons together at a centre
⁷ of mass energy of 14 TeV the C.M.S Electromagnetic calorimeter was also designed to
⁸ have precise energy measurement and fine grain spatial resolution, this design feature
⁹ was also necessitated by the Higgs decay channel $H \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$. The other new feature of
¹⁰ C.M.S is the use silicon detectors through out for particle tracking these give precise
¹¹ track reconstruction abilities and the associated fine grain resolution in both position and
¹² momentum. All the sub-detectors save the muon system are contained within in the barrel
¹³ of a 4 T superconducting solenoid. This magnet provides the particle track bending
¹⁴ required for momentum and lepton charge measurement. In this section the key detector
¹⁵ elements and their design parameters are discussed in Section 4 the construction of offline
¹⁶ physics objects is discussed.

¹⁷ 3.1 The Silicon Tracker




Figure 3.2: The C.M.S tracking system, pixel detectors are situated at the centre of the detector closest to the interaction point, surrounded by layers of silicon strip detectors[1].

¹⁸ The design goal for the C.M.S tracking system was to produce a system that can
¹⁹ precisely and efficiently measure the trajectories of charged particles produced in L.H.C
²⁰ collisions. The tracking system surrounds the collision point and has a length of 5.8 m

and a diameter of 2.5 m. At full the instantaneous L.H.C luminosity of $10^{34} \text{ cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ an average of 1000 charged particles from more than 20 proton-proton interactions will be produced per 25 ns bunch crossing. This imposes the requirements of high granularity so that the individual particles and their trajectories can be distinguished and a fast response so that the hits can be assigned to the correct bunch crossing. The technical implications of these requirements imply both a large amount of on-detector electronics and their associated cooling equipment. This large amount of tracker material increases the multiple scattering, bremsstrahlung, photon conversion and nuclear interactions of the particles which are traversing the tracking system, this in turn limits the position and energy resolution of the calorimeter systems. A compromise between the material budget of the tracking system, the desired features and the requirement for the tracking system to have an expected life time of 10 years in a high radiation environment, this was to construct the tracking system using only solid state silicon detector technology.

The C.M.S tracking system is formed of a pixel detector with three layers situated between 4.4 cm and 10.2 cm of the interaction point and a silicon strip tracker with 10 barrel layers extending outwards to a radius of 1.1 m from the interaction point. The barrel layers of both the pixel and strip detectors are complimented by layers of either pixel or strip disks which extend the acceptance of the tracker to $|\eta| < 2.5$. The resulting structure is that of a detector with 200 m^2 of active silicon which makes the C.M.S tracker the largest detector of it's type ever constructed.

The individual pixels that comprise the pixel detector are $100 \times 150 \mu\text{m}^2$ which corresponds to an occupancy of around 10^{-4} per bunch crossing. The detector cell size for the Microstrip detectors at a radius between 20-55 cm is $10 \text{ cm} \times 180 \mu\text{m}$ which leads to an average occupancy of 2-3%, further out the minimum cell size is increased to $25 \text{ cm} \times 180 \mu\text{m}$ with an occupancy of around 1%. The tracker performance is extensively documented in [24].

3.2 The Electromagnetic Calorimeter (ECAL).

The C.M.S electromagnetic calorimeter is a hermetic homogeneous calorimeter constructed from lead tungstate (PbWO_4) crystals. The ECAL is split into two parts, a barrel covering $|\eta| < 1.479$ read out by avalanche photodiodes and the two end-caps covering $1.479 < |\eta| < 3.0$, read out by vacuum phototriodes.

Lead tungstate crystals were chosen because of their short radiation length $X_0 = 0.89$ cm, fast scintillation and radiation hardness. During the research and development program it was shown that radiation damage does not affect the scintillation method or the uniformity of the emitted light yield along the crystal, it only effects the transparency through the creation of colour centres. This will be monitored throughout the lifetime of the ECAL via a light injection system[33].

The barrel crystals have a front face of 22×22 mm 2 , this corresponds to the Moliere radius of ≈ 22 mm; with a length of 230 mm giving a each crystal length of $25.8X_0$ where X_0 is amount of material required for 68% of an electromagnetically interacting particle's energy to be radiated in the form of bremsstrahlung or pair production whilst traversing that material. They are arranged in 36 super-modules, forming two half barrels. The crystal axes are skewed at 3° with respect to the vertex and each covers 1° in ϕ & η .

The End cap crystals are arranged in two semi-circular ‘Dees’, groups of 5×5 crystals are canter-levered on a aluminium backing plate. The crystals are again skewed with regard to the interaction vertex, however they are arranged in an $x - y$ grid rather than a $\phi - \eta$ grid. The crystal dimensions are different to the barrel, in that the cross section is 28.6×28.6 mm 2 , with a length of 220 mm corresponding to 24.7 radiation lengths.

In addition to the ECAL there is a pre-shower detector situated at $1.653 < |\eta| < 2.6$, this provides identification of elections against minimum ionising particles and improves the position measurement of electrons and photons in the ECAL endcaps.

Figure 3.3 shows the change in response of the ECAL during running, due to the formation of colour centres, this response is measured using laser light at 440 nm and is used to correct the energies recorded in data during each run to form a uniform response.




Figure 3.3: Relative response to laser light (440 nm) measured by the ECAL laser monitoring system, averaged over all crystals in bins of pseudorapidity, for the 2011 and 2012 data taking periods. The response change observed in the ECAL channels is of the order of a few percent in the barrel, while it reaches up to 25% in the most forward endcap regions used for electron and photon reconstruction. The response change is up to 60% in channels closest to the beam pipe. These measurements are used to correct the physics data.

The bottom plot shows the instantaneous LHC luminosity delivered during this time period. [?]

1 3.3 The Hadronic Calorimeter.

2 3.4 The C.M.S Muon system.

3 3.5 The Level One Trigger System.

4 3.6 The High Level Trigger System.

Chapter 4

¹ Offline Object Reconstruction and ² Identification.

³ PUT SOME STUFF IN ABOUT THE CROSS CLEANING

⁴ 4.1 Hadronic Jets.

⁵ AK5 calo jets – explanation of the jet algos. How they are clustered at CMS. No need to
⁶ mention PF? (we don't use it so why bother). Energy resolution, Jet energy corrections,
⁷ ID. 2011 note

⁸ 4.2 Electrons.

⁹ GSF electrons - ID, use tracking. Veto on electrons. 2011 note

¹⁰ 4.3 Muons.

¹¹ GPT muons - exact ID's, reconstruction methods. both veto and used to collect the
¹² control sample. 2011 note

¹³ 4.4 Photons.

Chapter 5

1 Level One Calorimeter Trigger




Figure 5.1: The CMS Level-1 Trigger system.

2 The CMS Level-1 trigger system[16] is a pipelined dead-timeless system based on
3 custom-built electronics. The Level-1 trigger is a combination of several sub systems,
4 which are interconnected as depicted in Figure 5.1.

5 Coarse grain information from the electro-magnetic, hadronic and forward calorimeters
6 is processed by the Regional Calorimeter Trigger (RCT), this is then passed to the Global
7 Calorimeter Trigger (GCT) where the coarse grain information is clustered into physics
8 objects, these objects are then passed to the Global Trigger where the Level-1 accept
9 decision is made. Due to the limited size of the pipe line this Level-1 accept must be
10 issued within 4.0 μ s.

¹ The objects passed from the GCT to the GT include electro-magnetic objects, both
² electrons and photons as due to the lack of tracking information at the Level-1 trigger
³ these objects are indistinguishable, jets and energy sums.

⁴ The RCT generates up to 72 isolated and non-isolated electro-magnetic objects, these
⁵ are sorted by rank, which is equivalent to transverse energy E_T . The four highest ranked
⁶ electro-magnetic objects are then passed via the GCT to the GT at an equivalent data
⁷ rate of 29 Gbs^{-1} per type.

⁸ Hadronic objects undergo two clustering steps. First the transverse energy sums of
⁹ the ECAL and corresponding HCAL towers are calculated, the towers are then summed
¹⁰ in to 4×4 trigger regions, these are passed to the GCT at a data rate of 172.8 Gbs^{-1} .
¹¹ These trigger regions are clustered in to jet candidates by the GCT and ranked. The jets
¹² are then sub-divided in the categories depending on their pseudo-rapidity and the result
¹³ of τ identification.

¹⁴ Energy sums come in two forms, the total transverse energy E_T which is the scalar
¹⁵ sum of all transverse energies and the total jet transverse energy H_T which is calculated
¹⁶ as the scalar sum of all jets above some programmable threshold.

¹⁷ The missing energy equivalents of these E_T and H_T are formed from the negative
¹⁸ vector sum of the objects considered for the transverse sums.

¹⁹ 5.1 Level-1 Trigger Jet Algorithm [28]

²⁰ The CMS detector can be un-rolled in the ϕ direction to form a rectangular grid of the
²¹ 396 calorimeter regions, connected along the ϕ edge. The rectangle is formed from 18
²² ϕ divisions (from $-180^\circ < \phi \leq 180^\circ$) and 22 η divisions (from $-5 < \eta < 5$). Each ϕ
²³ division corresponds to 20° . The η divisions correspond to $\Delta\eta = 0.5$ in the forward
²⁴ calorimeters and to $\Delta\eta \approx 0.348$ in the barrel. A pictorial representation of this can be
²⁵ seen in figure 5.3.

²⁶ A jet candidate is created if the sum of the ECAL and HCAL energies of the central
²⁷ calorimeter region has an energy deposit larger than all of its neighbours, as shown in
²⁸ figure 5.2. The jet is centred at this region where $p_T^{central} > p_T^{surrounding}$ and the transverse
²⁹ energies of the surrounding regions are summed in to the central region. The jet is then
³⁰ classified as a τ jet if $|\eta| < 3.0$ and none of the τ veto bits are set. If any τ vetoes are set
³¹ the jet is classified as a central jet. The jet is classified as forward if $3.0 < |\eta| < 5.0$




Figure 5.2: The 3×3 jet-finder window at Level-1. Each cell represents a trigger tower, which is the sum of the HCAL and ECAL transverse energies. The τ -jet veto patterns are shown to the right.

1 The τ -vetoes are set by the RCT depending on whether or not the energy depositions
 2 in up to four contiguous trigger towers are below a programmable fraction of the regional
 3 E_T as shown in Figure 5.2.

4 It is possible to apply separate jet energy corrections to each of the sub categories of
 5 GCT jets, however at current the same E_T and η dependant corrections are used for all
 6 three jet types.

7 In order to reduce the total data duplicated and shared between the jet finders
 8 the GCT employs a pre-clustering algorithm, which involves 18 jet finders operating
 9 simultaneously over the whole detector. These jet finders then only share information
 10 with neighbouring regions when the clustered jets are found. Figure 5.3 shows the
 11 boundaries between which the jet finders operate, these map naturally on to one RCT
 12 crate per jet finder. A maximum of 3 jets can be found on each of the ϕ strips acted
 13 on by the jet finders, this gives a maximum of 108 jets per event. In order to preserve
 14 continuity across the $\eta = 0$ boundary, the two adjacent trigger regions are shared between
 15 the jet finders.

16 An example of the jet finding is shown in Figure 5.4. The first step is to create a 2×3
 17 mini cluster around any local maxima found in the 12×2 strip. Equality statements
 18 are imposed so that the energy of the central cell is greater than its neighbours in some
 19 directions and greater than or equal to the neighbours other directions to enforce a gap
 20 of at least one trigger region in both η and ϕ between the centres of the clustered jets.




Figure 5.3: The calorimeter map that the 3×3 jet-finder operates over is made up for 396 calorimeter regions, each jet finder is mapped on to an RCT crate which is composed of an 11×2 strip of these regions. RCT crate labels are shown for negative η only.

1 In the second step the jet finder transfers the three largest mini clusters on a given
 2 ϕ strip to the closest ϕ strip on the neighbouring jet finder. These are then compared
 3 against the existing mini clusters in that ϕ strip, those that are adjacent or diagonally
 4 adjacent to a larger mini cluster are removed. The inequality statements are then
 5 reimposed to prevent problems with clusters having the same energies. In the final stages
 6 the mini clusters have their three adjacent regions summed in to produce a 3×3 jet
 7 cluster. Finally the four highest ranked jets are corrected and passed to the GT.

8 5.2 Level-1 Trigger Performance

9 During the start of data taking in 2010, no Jet Energy Corrections (JEC's) were applied
 10 in the Level-1 trigger. This gave a relatively slow turn on in terms of offline hadronic
 11 objects. During the winter shut down of the LHC between the 2010 and 2011 running
 12 periods a set of Level-1 JEC's were developed. These corrections used a piecewise cubic




Figure 5.4: The Level-1 jet clustering method, six cells in η are shown. An example of overlapping jets is shown

1 form for the interpolation function used to correct the jet energy dependant on it's
 2 uncorrected E_T and η values. However as can be seen in Figure 5.5 these corrections
 3 were only applied to jets with a raw energy below 130 GeV, the secondary lobe shows
 4 those objects that do not have their energy corrected.

5 To overcome this a new set of corrections were derived using a well established tool
 6 for producing offline corrections,

7 **REFERENCE TO tapper-001 here**

8 using the same functional form that was derived for correcting particle flow jets.

9 **REFERENCE TO PF HERE**

10 In this section we discuss the performance of both sets of Level-1 JEC's and the
 11 performance of the energy sum triggers H_T , \cancel{H}_T , and \cancel{E}_T , the performance of which are
 12 not effected by the application of jet energy corrections at the Level-1 trigger due to the
 13 quantities being built from the internal GCT jets before they pass though the corrections
 14 look up table. The performance is studied under both low pile up conditions where the
 15 mean peak pile up $\langle PU \rangle$ is 16 primary vertices and under high pile up conditions
 16 where $\langle PU \rangle$ is 36 primary vertices.




Figure 5.5: Correlation between offline corrected jet energy and Level-1 corrected jet energy for matched jets. The discontinuity shows where the Level-1 jet corrections do not alter the raw energy of the jet.

1 To measure the performance of the Level-1 single jet triggers we assume that the
 2 leading offline corrected anti- $k_t(0.5)$ calorimeter jet is the jet that triggered the event.
 3 We then match this offline jet to the closest Level-1 jet in ΔR , where for there to be a
 4 match $\Delta R < 0.5$ is required. For this match central, τ and forward jets are considered.
 5 Events where the recorded Level-1 energy is set to the overflow bit, meaning they have
 6 more than 254 GeV of E_T measured at Level-1 are ignored.

7 To collect an unbiased sample in which to measure the performance, two methods
 8 are used; the first is to require a Minimum Bias trigger, which is triggered by beam
 9 induced activity in the CMS detector. However due to the nature of these collisions the
 10 number of events with high energy interactions is low and the prescale applied to this
 11 trigger further reduces the sample size. However this method does produce the least bias.
 12 The second method is to trigger an object that does not deposit significant energy in the
 13 calorimeter systems, in this case we choose the muon trigger with the lowest un prescaled
 14 p_T threshold. The muon trigger is chosen with some loose isolation requirements to
 15 make sure it does not overlap with a jet, causing a discrepancy in the measure of the
 16 calorimetric energy. The sample has a higher number of events due to the large amount
 17 of bandwidth given to the single object muon triggers in CMS. The use of a muon trigger

- 1 also serves to increase the precision of the measurement of the Level-1 missing energy
 2 trigger as the muons are not seen by the calorimeter system the \cancel{E}_T sample is enriched.




Figure 5.6: Comparison of the performance of L1_SingleJet16, L1_SingleJet36 and L1_SingleJet92, when using the piecewise cubic corrections and using the new correction scheme. The difference in performance of the two is negligible above 36GeV.

3 Figure 5.6 shows the performance of the piecewise cubic corrections (PWC) and the
 4 performance of the new corrections. The data was taken with the PWC enabled in the
 5 GCT hardware. The updated corrections were emulated in the bitwise reproduction
 6 of the GCT. This made an event by event comparison possible. At low E_T the new
 7 corrections turn on before the PWC corrections, if the new corrections were applied on
 8 with no change to the trigger menu, the Level-1 trigger rate would rise. At a threshold of
 9 36 GeV and higher the performance of the two correction schemes is very similar. Due to
 10 the small change in observed performance and the ability to correct raw energies above
 11 130 GeV, the new corrections were deployed online at the start of Run2011B and are
 12 still online at the end of data taking in 2012.

13 The performance of the updated corrections was then measured with data taken with
 14 the corrections applied in the GCT hardware. The reference sample was taken with the
 15 HLT_IsoMu24_v* high level muon trigger. The performance of three example triggers is
 16 shown in Figure 5.7. The data collected and represented in Figure 5.7 has a peak mean pile
 17 up ($\langle PU \rangle$) of 16 interactions, this is higher than the $\langle PU \rangle$ of approximately 8-10




Figure 5.7: Performance measurements of L1_SingleJet16, L1_SingleJet36 and L1_SingleJet92, when using the new correction scheme deployed in the GCT hardware. The performance is slightly worse than that of the emulated triggers due to a change in pile up conditions between the two data taking periods.

1 present in Run2011A, on which the previous comparison was performed. The observed
 2 difference in the performance of the Level-1 single jet triggers as a function of pile up is
 3 a case of concern when data taking is underway at the LHC's design luminosity, where
 4 $\langle PU \rangle$ is >36 at an instantaneous luminosity of $1 \times 10^{34} \text{ cm}^{-27} \text{ s}^{-1}$.

5 The instantaneous luminosity in 2012 was predicted to be $5 \times 10^{33} \text{ cm}^{-27} \text{ s}^{-1}$, with
 6 $\langle PU \rangle \approx 32$. In order to study the effect on the trigger rate and efficiency a high pile
 7 up, low instantaneous luminosity, LHC fill was taken in 2011.

8 The Level-1 single jet performance was studied in this run in terms of two offline
 9 object definitions. The first was the standard anti- $k_t(0.5)$ calorimeter jet reconstruction,
 10 the second was a set of anti- $k_t(0.5)$ calorimeter jets which were corrected for pile up
 11 using the fastjet correction algorithm,

12 cite fast jet

13 which is further detailed in Section 4. The fast-jet corrections remove the energy
 14 deposited by the secondary interactions from the objects which are expected to come
 15 from the primary hard interaction, thus removing energy from the offline jets. The effect

of these pile up corrections on the Level-1 trigger performance is first studied under conditions with $\langle PU \rangle$ of 16, the performance of which has already been measured with respect to non pile up corrected offline objects, as a sanity check. The results are shown in Figure 5.8 , the performance is measured with respect to HLT_IsoMu24_v*, in terms of both pile up corrected and standard offline objects. As expected the performance in the two cases is very similar. The same comparison is shown for H_T in Figure 5.9, where the effect of the fastjet corrections is more pronounced due to the sum over jets. The difference between the turn on points for the two offline quantities is on the order of 10 GeV under low pile up conditions.

Due to the high pile up fill being a specialised fill with low instantaneous luminosity, the high level trigger paths were disabled, instead Level-1 trigger pass though paths were utilised to take the data. The Level-1 single muon pass though trigger is used to collect the reference sample. Otherwise the same analysis method is common between the two data sets. Figure 5.10 shows the difference in turn on for three example Level-1 single jet triggers when using standard calorimeter jets and fastjet corrected calorimeter jets. In the high pile up conditions the switch to offline jets that are corrected for pile up shifts the turn on point to lower values of E_T , the magnitude of this effect reduces as the Level-1 trigger trigger threshold raises. This implies that the same offline performance as seen in the low pile up conditions can be achieved by using the pile up corrected offline objects and raising the Level-1 single jet trigger thresholds.

Figure 5.11 shows the same high pile up comparison, but for the Level-1 H_T triggers. Due to the size of the sample the precision of this measurement is low. However the same trend of a shift to lower H_T values of the turn on point of the Level-1 triggers when using pile up corrected offline objects is observed. This again implies that the Level-1 H_T trigger thresholds can be raised whilst preserving the same offline performance as during the low pile up conditions.




Figure 5.8: Comparison of the performance of L1_SingleJet16, L1_SingleJet36 and L1_SingleJet92 triggers. Where $\langle PU \rangle = 16$. For two offline reconstruction methods, standard anti- $k_t(0.5)$ calorimeter jets and pile up corrected anti- $k_t(0.5)$ calorimeter jets.




Figure 5.9: Comparison of the performance of L1_HTT75, L1_HTT100 and L1_HTT150 triggers. Where $\langle PU \rangle = 16$. For two offline reconstruction methods, standard anti- $k_t(0.5)$ calorimeter jets and pile up corrected anti- $k_t(0.5)$ calorimeter jets.




Figure 5.10: Comparison of the performance of L1_SingleJet16, L1_SingleJet36 and L1_SingleJet92 triggers. Where $\langle PU \rangle = 36$. For two offline reconstruction methods, standard anti- $k_t(0.5)$ calorimeter jets and pile up corrected anti- $k_t(0.5)$ calorimeter jets.




Figure 5.11: Comparison of the performance of L1_HTT75, L1_HTT100 and L1_HTT150 triggers. Where $\langle PU \rangle = 36$. For two offline reconstruction methods, standard anti- $k_t(0.5)$ calorimeter jets and pile up corrected anti- $k_t(0.5)$ calorimeter jets.

5.3 Level-1 Trigger Pile-up Mitigation


Whilst we have seen that the offline performance of the Level-1 hadronic triggers can be maintained when raising the trigger thresholds to deal with increased rate, when switching to pile up corrected offline objects. Figure 5.14 shows the trigger cross section as a function of instantaneous luminosity for the L1_HTT150 trigger, which requires $H_T > 150$ GeV. However beyond a certain point raising thresholds causes a loss of performance. In this section we look at a method to reduce the effects of pile up hadronic Level-1 triggers, by making an addition to the Level-1 jet finding algorithm.

In Section 5.1 the Level-1 jet clustering algorithm was described. The proposed change was to add a requirement that the seeding region has a direct energy threshold, in addition to the equality relations that are set up. The effects of applying a 2 GeV or a 5 GeV threshold are studied. This threshold is on the raw, uncorrected energy of the trigger towers and effects all Level-1 jets. The impact will be seen in the Level-1 jet triggers which use corrected energy and Level-1 H_T and \cancel{H}_T which are formed from uncorrected jets. The aim is to remove the events which are accepted due to pile up, but not to remove physics events.

The triggers most effected by this change are the energy sum triggers as they sum many jets of low threshold, whereas the single object triggers are already cutting on high E_T objects.

Figure 5.12(a) shows the internal GCT uncorrected jet energy spectrum in high pile up conditions, taken with the L1_SingleMu pass though triggers. The three histograms are for; no application of jet seed threshold in black, where there are many low E_T jets; In red a 2 GeV seed requirement is made, the effect is to cut out all jets below 2 GeV and cut out jets with an energy up to approximately 35 GeV of uncorrected energy; The blue histogram shows the jet energy spectrum after applying a 5 GeV seed threshold, the effect is to remove all jets below 5 GeV and to cut out jets with energy up to 55 GeV. Figure 5.12(b) shows the efficiency with respect to the no seed sample for the two test seed thresholds. The removal of jets in the low energy region of the E_T spectrum is where the advantage of applying a seed threshold is seen over simply raising the trigger thresholds, or raising the threshold of jets to be included in the Level-1 H_T or \cancel{H}_T calculation.

To quantify the effects of the addition of the jet seed a low pile up sample, where the effects are expected to be small, is studied in terms of rate reduction and efficiency change. The dedicated high pile up fill is then studied in terms of rate reduction, due to



(a) GCT internal uncorrected jet E_T distributions for the same events with a 0, 2 or 5 GeV seed requirement.
(b) Efficiency of applying a requirement of 2 or 5 GeV with respect to no requirement.

Figure 5.12: Effect of requiring a jet seed threshold on GCT internal jets.

the limited sample size of the high pile up fill the change in efficiency on this sample is not studied. However due to the addition of energy from the secondary pile up interactions the change in efficiency in the low pile up sample is the worse case scenario.

Table 5.1 details the rate reduction with respect to the 0 GeV seed threshold for seed thresholds of 2 GeV and 5 GeV for three example triggers, these are:

- L1_SingleJet50, which requires at least one jet with $E_T > 50$ GeV with in $|\eta| < 3.0$;
- L1_QuadJet38, which requires 4 jets with $E_T > 38$ GeV with in $|\eta| < 3.0$;
- L1_HTT100, which requires that Level-1 $H_T > 100$ GeV.

The rate of L1_SingleJet50 is not effected by the requirement of a 2 GeV seed threshold and is reduced by 15% when a 5 GeV seed requirement is made. The L1_QuadJet38 trigger rate is reduced by the same amount as the single jet trigger, under low pile up conditions for both seed thresholds. L1_HTT100 sees a 2% rate reduction when requiring a 2 GeV seed threshold and a 3% reduction in rate when requiring a 5 GeV seed.

Table 5.2 shows the rate reduction under high pile up conditions with respect to the 0 GeV seed threshold requirement, for the same three example triggers as in the low pile up case. The rate of L1_SingleJet50 is not reduced when making a 2 GeV seed requirement, when making a 5 GeV seed requirement the single jet 50 GeV rate is reduced by 30%. The rate of L1_QuadJet38 is reduced by 30% when requiring a 2 GeV

Table 5.1: Summary of rate reduction during low pile up conditions.

Trigger	% rate reduction with a 2GeV requirement	% rate reduction with a 5GeV requirement
L1_HTT100	$3 \pm 11\%$	$3 \pm 11\%$
L1_QquadJet38	$0 \pm 0\%$	$15 + 6 - 8\%$
L1_Jet50	$0 + 0 - 12\%$	$15 + 9 - 15\%$

Table 5.2: Summary of rate reduction during high pile up conditions.

Trigger	% of rate taken with 2GeV requirement	% of rate taken with 5GeV requirement
L1_HTT100	$40 \pm 5.7\%$	$99 + / - 50\%$
L1_QquadJet38	$30 \pm 20\%$	$40 + 22 - 24\%$
L1_Jet50	$0 + 7 - 0\%$	$30 + 10 - 12\%$

- ¹ seed and by 40% when requiring a 5 GeV seed. The rate of L1_HTT100 is reduced by
² 40% when requiring a 2 GeV seed threshold and when requiring a 5 GeV seed threshold
³ the rate is reduced by $\approx 99\%$, however the statistical error on this prediction is large.

⁴ 5.3.1 Effect on trigger efficiency

- ⁵ Section 5.3 shows that requiring a jet seed threshold substantially reduces the trigger
⁶ acceptance rate at in high pile up conditions.

- ⁷ However the aim of requiring a jet seed is to reduce rate, but not at the cost of physics.
⁸ In this section we look at the effects of requiring a seed threshold, whilst requiring some
⁹ loose, generic offline selection on the hadronic objects.

- ¹⁰ The change in efficiency is measured under low pile up conditions where the least
¹¹ extra energy added to the event. This gives a worse case estimate of the effect of requiring
¹² a jet seed on the offline efficiency.

- ¹³ Each offline reconstructed calorimeter jet must adhere to the following quality criteria:

- ¹⁴ • Pass loose calorimeter ID;

- ¹⁵ • $p_T \geq 30$ GeV;

- 1 • $|\eta| \leq 3.0$;
- 2 • Matched to a Level-1 jet with $\Delta R \leq 0.5$.
- 3 Where loose calorimeter ID is defined as; Electro-Magnetic fraction > 0.01 , fraction of
4 energy in the Hybrid Photo Diodes < 0.98 and the number of n90hits > 1 .




Figure 5.13: Efficiency reductions for various Level-1 algorithms when applying a 2 or 5 GeV seed tower requirement, in low pile up conditions. Figure (a) shows the efficiency reduction for H_T triggers at low pile up in cut steps of 25 GeV. Figure (b) shows the efficiency reduction for jets with $|\eta| < 3$. and $p_T > 50$ GeV. Figure (c) show the efficiency reduction for a quad jet trigger, with jet $|\eta| < 3$. and $p_T > 38$ GeV.

5 **Efficiency of H_T Triggers** Figure 5.13(a) shows the acceptance reduction after
6 applying the two jet seed thresholds. The distribution is the cumulative number of events
7 passing a cut of $L1HT^{cut}$ in bins of 25 GeV. Due to H_T being the scalar sum of the
8 jet p_T 's in the event the value of Level-1 H_T is reduced as jets are removed from the
9 calculation. To preserve efficiency the Level-1 trigger threshold will have to be reduced.
10 When comparing to the high pile up rate reduction in table 5.2 it is shown that the trigger

¹ rate can be reduced by $\approx 20\%$ when requiring a 2 GeV seed threshold and reduced by
² $\geq 99\%$ when requiring a 5 GeV seed threshold, for a trigger threshold of 100 100 GeV.

³ **Efficiency of Jet Triggers** Figure 5.13(b) shows the change in acceptance of jets in
⁴ low pile up conditions when the two seed thresholds are required. The effect is on the
⁵ order of a few percent for each of the thresholds. Requiring a 2 GeV seed reduces the
⁶ efficiency for jets above 50 GeV by $\approx 2.5\%$, whilst requiring a 5GeVseed reduces the
⁷ efficiency of the same jets by $\approx 4\%$.

⁸ **Efficiency of MultiJet Triggers** Figure 5.13(c) shows that the effect of requiring a
⁹ seed threshold of 2 GeV has no effect on the efficiency of the quad jet 38 GeV trigger
¹⁰ and requiring a seed threshold of 5 GeV reduces the efficiency of the quad jet 38 trigger
¹¹ by 8%. The change in rate is dramatic in high pile up conditions where for a 2 GeV seed
¹² threshold the rate is reduced by $\approx 30\%$ and by $\approx 40\%$ when requiring a 5 GeV seed.
¹³ However it is to be noted that the sample where this measurement has been made is of
¹⁴ limited size, inferring a reasonably large statistical uncertainty.

¹⁵ 5.3.2 Summary

¹⁶ The effects of requiring a jet seed have been studied using the Level-1 trigger emulator on
¹⁷ high and low pile-up samples. The studies show that requiring a jet seed of 5GeVgreatly
¹⁸ reduces the rate of the H_T and Multi Jet triggers in high pile up conditions, whilst not
¹⁹ adversely effecting the data taking efficiency of these triggers.

²⁰ The cross section of L1.HTT150 has been measured with and with out the addition
²¹ of a jet seed threshold of 5 GeV as shown in Figure 5.14. Ideally the trigger cross section
²² would be independent of the instantaneous luminosity and pile up, Figure 5.14 shows
²³ that the addition of a 5 GeV seed threshold reduces the dependance on instantaneous
²⁴ luminosity of the trigger cross section.




Figure 5.14: Trigger cross section as a function of number of pile up interactions. Showing that applying a 5 GeV jet seed threshold dramatically reduces the dependance of cross section on the instantaneous luminosity.

Chapter 6

¹ The α_T analysis

² **Declaration** In this chapter we discuss the main analysis performed as the subject
³ of this thesis. For the theoretical motivations of this search please see Chapter 2. The
⁴ analysis is based on the full 2011 data set which is made up of 5 fb^{-1} of 7 TeV data.
⁵ However 11.7 fb^{-1} of the 2012 8 TeV is looked at to measure the performance of the
⁶ upgraded α_T HLT paths.

⁷ 6.1 The Problem

⁸ If Supersymmetry or some other beyond the S.M theory is to provide a yet undiscovered
⁹ dark matter candidate the Lightest SUSY Particle (LSP), it is predicted that this
¹⁰ candidate will interact via the weak nuclear force only. This gives a decay topology
¹¹ involving missing energy in the form of the dark matter particle escaping the detector.
¹² Due to the nature of interactions at the L.H.C, these particles would be produced at the
¹³ end of a decay chain of heavy particles that interact strongly, giving a final topology
¹⁴ involving hadronic objects which are classified as jets for the purpose of analysis and
¹⁵ missing energy. There are several S.M processes that mimic this final state.

¹⁶ By far the largest of these backgrounds comes from QCD multi jet events where
¹⁷ fake missing energy is introduced either from failures in reconstruction, or stochastic
¹⁸ fluctuations in the calorimeter systems.

¹⁹ expand on this - E/\sqrt{E} has non gaussian tails. Figures of jets falling below
threshold, missed jets etc. probably from some jet-met paper.

¹ However due to the theoretical errors on the QCD production cross section predicting
² the number QCD background events from Montecarlo simulation is not possible. A
³ secondary QCD background also exists, where due to the requirement of a jet E_T
⁴ threshold, multiple jets fall under threshold by a few GeV, this causes a balanced event
⁵ to look unbalanced as the jets under threshold are no longer considered. It is these
⁶ sources of QCD background that α_T is designed to remove.

⁷ The second major background comes from S.M electro-weak decays and is irreducible
⁸ as the final states involve real missing energy, from neutrinos. The electro-weak decays
⁹ that form the back ground are $W \rightarrow \tau\nu + \text{Jets}$, where the τ is reconstructed as a jet,
¹⁰ or the lepton fails the identification required for the dedicated lepton vetoes, $Z \rightarrow \nu\bar{\nu}$
¹¹ + Jets is completely irreducible. These are generally di-jet topologies. At higher jet
¹² multiplicities top quark production followed by semi-leptonic top decay accounts of the
¹³ largest background. These backgrounds are predicted using a well understood control
¹⁴ sample this is fully explained in Section 6.6.

¹⁵ The final background source is that introduced by detector failure or electronic noise
¹⁶ induced by the movement of the L.H.C proton beam. Approximately 1% of the ECAL
¹⁷ read out is not available in offline event reconstruction, this provides a source of fake
¹⁸ missing energy.

¹⁹ 6.2 The α_T variable.

²⁰ α_T is inspired by Ref [32] and was expanded to transverse multi jet topologies by members
²¹ of the CMS collaboration in Refs [18, 19]. The purpose is to provide a variable that can
²² be cut on to eliminate QCD from the final selection. To do this the inherent balance of
²³ the QCD system is exploited.

²⁴ For di-jet systems α_T is defined as:

$$\alpha_T = \frac{E_T^{j_2}}{M_T} \quad (6.1)$$

²⁵ where $E_T^{j_2}$ is the transverse energy of least energetic of the two jets and M_T is defined as:

$$M_T = \sqrt{\left(\sum_{i=1}^2 E_T^{j_i}\right)^2 - \left(\sum_{i=1}^2 p_x^{j_i}\right)^2 - \left(\sum_{i=1}^2 p_y^{j_i}\right)^2} \quad (6.2)$$

For a perfectly measured di-jet system with $E_T^{j_1} = E_T^{j_2}$, where the jets are opposite in ϕ $\alpha_T = 0.5$, for events with back to back jets where one is miss-measured $\alpha_T < 0.5$. However the majority of signals predict many jets in the final state. α_T can be generalised to work with n-jets in the flowing way. The variables H_T , \cancel{H}_T and ΔH_T are constructed,

$$H_T = \sum_{i=0}^{n \text{ jets}} E_T^{jet_i}, \quad (6.3)$$

$$\cancel{H}_T = \left| \sum_{i=0}^{n \text{ jets}} \cancel{p}_T^{jet_i} \right|, \quad (6.4)$$

- ¹ for jets above some predefined threshold E_T which is common for all jet based quantities.
- ² The multi jet system is reduced to a pseudo di-jet system by forming two large jets. The
- ³ individual jet E_T 's are summed, with the final configuration being chosen to have the
- ⁴ minimum difference in energy (ΔH_T) between the pseudo jets. This simple clustering
- ⁵ criteria provides the best separation between miss-measured events and those with real
- ⁶ \cancel{E}_T .

α_T is then defined as:

$$\alpha_T = \frac{H_T - \Delta H_T}{2\sqrt{H_T^2 - \cancel{H}_T^2}} \quad (6.5)$$

- ⁷ Figure 6.1 shows the α_T distribution for both data and simulated background samples.
- ⁸ The QCD multi jet background is negligible above an α_T value of 0.55, where as the
- ⁹ standard model processes which involve real \cancel{E}_T exist at all possible values of α_T . Values
- ¹⁰ of α_T in the range $0.5 < \alpha_T < 0.55$ arise in multi jet QCD due to jets falling below
- ¹¹ threshold or large stochastic fluctuations. It is to be noted that the discrepancy between
- ¹² data and simulation for $\alpha_T \leq 0.55$ is due to no trigger emulation being applied to the
- ¹³ simulated background samples.




Figure 6.1: α_T distribution for background and data for the region $H_T > 375$ GeV. Trigger emulation is not applied in the simulated background which leads to the discrepancy in the region $\alpha_T \leq 0.55$. The QCD multi-jet background is reduced to less than one event.

6.3 Event selection

In order to select events for the hadronic signal sample and the muon and photon control samples a common set of section cuts is defined. In this section the objects are defined as are the flow of the analysis cuts and filters.

Preselection of hadronic objects Jets are created by running the anti- $k_t(0.5)$ jet clustering algorithm[13] over the calorimeter towers. More detail of the jet reconstruction at C.M.S is given in Section 4.1. The jets have their raw energies corrected based on their position and momentum to establish a uniform relative response in η and a calibrated absolute response in transverse energy E_T , with an associated uncertainty of between 2% and 4% dependant on E_T and η [14]. Jets considered in the analysis are required to have $E_T > 50$ GeV, the highest E_T jet in the events is required to be within tracker acceptance ($|\eta| < 2.5$) and the sub leading jet is required to have $E_T > 100$ GeV. In the lowest two offline H_T bins the jet thresholds are scaled to preserve the jet multiplicity, for the bin $275 \text{ GeV} < H_T < 325 \text{ GeV}$, the jet threshold is 36.6 GeV and the sub leading

¹ jet threshold is 73.3 GeV. In the bin $325 \text{ GeV} < H_T < 375 \text{ GeV}$, the jet threshold is
² 43.3 GeV and the sub leading jet threshold is 86.6 GeV.

³ The quantities H_T and \cancel{H}_T are then formed from these jets.

⁴ **Elections** Elections are reconstructed as described in Section 4.2. For the purpose
⁵ of the analysis an object is defined as an electron if it has $p_T > 10 \text{ GeV}$, $|\eta| < 2.5$ and
⁶ passes “VBTF” working point 95 quality criteria[20]. Any event containing an identified
⁷ electron is vetoed.

⁸ **Muons** Muon reconstruction at C.M.S is detailed in Section 4.3. Signal events are
⁹ vetoed if they contain a muon with $p_T > 10 \text{ GeV}$ and $|\eta| < 2.5$ that passes the “VBTF”
¹⁰ working point 95 for muons [22]. Two separate muon control samples are defined, one
¹¹ requiring exactly one muon with $p_T > 10 \text{ GeV}$, the second requiring two muons, who’s
¹² invariant mass sums to the Z mass.

¹³ **Photons** Photon reconstruction as C.M.S is detailed in Section 4.4, signal events
¹⁴ are vetoed if they contain a photon with $E_T > 25 \text{ GeV}$, $|\eta| < 2.5$ and that passes ID
¹⁵ requirements[21]. A requirement of exactly one photon with $E_T > 150 \text{ GeV}$ with in $|\eta|$
¹⁶ < 1.45 is made for the photon control sample.

¹⁷ The use of these control samples will be discussed in Section 6.6.

¹⁸ The common selection cuts and filters consist of:

- ¹⁹ • **Good run selection**, All detector subsystems on, C.M.S in “Physics Declared”
²⁰ mode and all physics object groups have certified the runs and luminosity sections.
²¹ This removes any events where the sub-detectors were in an error state or events
²² from before the tracker was switched to high voltage mode.
- ²³ • **P.K.A.M (Previously Known As Monsters) filter**, these events are caused
²⁴ by beam-gas interactions close to C.M.S, which cause a shower of particles to enter
²⁵ the pixel detector along the beam line, resulting in a large proportion of the pixel
²⁶ detector to record hits.
- ²⁷ • **Vertex Selection** requires at least one non-fake vertex with at least four associated
²⁸ tracks, within a cylinder of radius 2 cm and length 48 cm, centred at $Z = 0$ of the
²⁹ C.M.S detector.

- **Hadronic barrel and end-cap noise filter**, this filter removes events where strips of towers in the hadronic calorimeters record energy from electrical noise, mimicking large, unbalanced energy deposits.
- **Vertex $p_T/H_T > 0.1$** , removes events where the sum of the p_T of all tracks from all good vertices is less than 10% of the energy deposited by jets in the calorimeters. This cut is designed to remove events with tracking failure, which would otherwise pass the calorimeter only event quality requirements.
- **Masked ECAL channel filter:** Approximately 1% of the ECAL crystals are masked, or have read out failure. To avoid selecting events with large energy miss measurement, a topological cut was devised. The first step is to calculate $\Delta\phi^*$ for each jet (\vec{j}) in the event, where:

$$\Delta\phi^* = \Delta\phi \left(\vec{E}_T + \vec{j}, \vec{j} \right). \quad (6.6)$$

Which gives a measure of the miss measurement of a jet, if $\Delta\phi^*$ is small, the missing energy points along the jet in the ϕ direction. By selecting the miss measured jet, full position information is preserved. If any jet has $\Delta\phi^* < 0.5$, the number of masked ECAL crystals with in $\Delta R < 0.3$ are summed, if there are more than 10 masked crystals adjacent to the jet, the event is vetoed.

- **$R_{miss} < 1.25$:** The total hadronic energy in an event is required to be greater than 275 GeV which is well above the transverse energy threshold of 50 GeV for each jet. However several jets falling below this threshold can sum to a significant quantity of ignored energy. This is shown in Figure 6.2, here the missing energy calculated from jets in the range $10 \text{ GeV} < E_T < 50 \text{ GeV}$ is shown, whilst requiring that $\cancel{E}_T < 20 \text{ GeV}$. This shows that for a well balanced event the jets below threshold can carry greater than 100 GeV of ignored energy. R_{miss} is defined as $\cancel{H}_T/\cancel{E}_T$ and can be used to single out events where the inclusion of lower momentum jets does significantly improve the balance of the event. Figure 6.3 shows for two H_T regions the R_{miss} distribution after the application of the full cut flow, including α_T , QCD contamination is visible in the signal sample for $R_{miss} > 1.25$.

This cut flow and set of object definitions define the common selection, on top of this an α_T cut is applied, the passing events are then binned in 8 H_T bins, these are 275 GeV - 325 GeV, 325 GeV - 375 GeV, 375 GeV - 475 GeV, 475 GeV - 575 GeV, 575 GeV - 675 GeV, 675 GeV - 775 GeV, 875 GeV - 7 TeV. However the raw number of




Figure 6.2: \cancel{E}_T from jets with $10 \text{ GeV} < E_T < 50 \text{ GeV}$ in events with $H_T > 350 \text{ GeV}$ and $\cancel{E}_T < 20 \text{ GeV}$ in 35 pb^{-1} of data.




Figure 6.3: (a) R_{miss} distribution for events in the $250 \text{ GeV} < H_T < 350 \text{ GeV}$ region, where due to the low H_T requirement QCD contamination is enriched.
(b) R_{miss} distribution for events in the $H_T > 350 \text{ GeV}$ region, QCD contamination occurs at $R_{miss} > 1.25$.

1 events in the signal region is meaningless without an accurate background prediction, as
 2 discussed earlier taking the background estimation from simulation is not viable due to
 3 the requirement of high order theory calculations on the cross sections of S.M processes
 4 involving jets, these have many divergencies due to the nature of QCD. Instead the
 5 simulation is used to form a translation factor between two samples measured in data, a
 6 control sample which closely mimics the S.M processes producing missing energy, but
 7 has a visible muon or photon in the final state. The background estimation methods
 8 are described and the background predictions stated in Section 6.6. The next section
 9 describes the trigger used to collect the data samples

10 6.4 High Level triggers for the α_T analysis

11 The CMS trigger system has been discussed in detail in Section 3.6 and Chapter 5,
 12 however details of analysis specific trigger paths were not discussed. During 2011 the
 13 first α_T specific trigger was designed and deployed online. The trigger was then upgraded
 14 for the higher luminosity and energy conditions of the 2012 data taking period.

15 The trigger takes advantage of cutting on two variables, H_T and α_T at low H_T a high
 16 α_T value cuts the trigger rate, whereas at high H_T where the trigger rate is lower the
 17 α_T requirement can be loosened.

18 Due to the scaling of jet thresholds in the lowest offline H_T bins as detailed in
 19 Section 6.3 using a fixed jet threshold would cause inefficiency in the lowest offline H_T
 20 bins. To overcome this the trigger level α_T calculation is performed iteratively for all
 21 jets above a predefined threshold. This raises the total number of accepted events whilst
 22 adding the benefit of being efficient for any offline jet threshold above the minimum
 23 trigger jet threshold.

24 Due to concerns on the time taken to perform the ΔH_T minimisation at the trigger
 25 and time constraints enforced on trigger menu development, the first implementation
 26 calculates α_T for the first 3 jets. For higher jet multiplicities the variable β_T is calculated.

$$\beta_T = \frac{H_T}{2\sqrt{H_T^2 - \cancel{H}_T^2}} \quad (6.7)$$

this gives us the relation:

$$\alpha_T \leq \beta_T. \quad (6.8)$$

- ¹ The decision flow is shown in Figure 6.4 and explained in detail below.
- ² When a level one accept is issued the trigger bits that fired are checked, if the
 ³ event fires a L1 muon trigger it is passed to the HLT muon triggers where only muon
 ⁴ reconstruction is performed, reducing the reconstruction time. The α_T triggers are seeded
 ⁵ on the lowest threshold unprescaled L1 H_T trigger, during 2011 this was L1_HTT100. Any
 ⁶ events issuing a L1 accept and passing L1_HTT100 undergo calorimeter jet reconstruction,
 ⁷ the reconstruction algorithm is detailed in Section 4.1.
- ⁸ Once the jets have been formed the trigger filter is entered. Initially the first two
 ⁹ jets ranked by E_T , are considered, H_T and α_T are calculated, if both pass the trigger
 ¹⁰ thresholds the event is accepted and the full detector read out is performed. If either H_T
¹¹ or α_T is below threshold, the next jet in E_T order is added, if the jet collection contains
 ¹² more than 3 jets then the β_T approximation is used. All jets in the event are added until
 ¹³ either the event is accepted, or there are no more jets to be added above 40 GeV.
- ¹⁴ The effect of switching to the β_T approximation is to accept events that have missing
 ¹⁵ energy due to miss-measurement, when calculating α_T offline these events have values of
 ¹⁶ $\alpha_T < 0.5$. This introduces an impurity to the trigger and costs rate for events that will
 ¹⁷ not be considered in the offline analysis.

¹⁸ 6.4.1 Trigger efficiency measurement

- ¹⁹ The performance of the α_T trigger suit is measured with respect to a sample collected
 ²⁰ using the muon system. This allows the measurement of efficiency of both the level one
 ²¹ seed trigger and the higher level trigger at the same time as different sub-systems are
 ²² used to collect the reference and the signal triggers. This is due to the exclusive use of
 ²³ calorimeter jets in the α_T trigger, if more complicated reconstruction methods which
 ²⁴ produce an event hypothesis were used, muons would at HLT level only be considered as
 ²⁵ jets. Whereas during calorimeter only reconstruction, muons are not considered and the
 ²⁶ p_T of any muons in an event is viewed as missing energy.

- ²⁷ The selection for the trigger efficiency measurement is the same as listed in Section 6.3
 ²⁸ with the requirement of exactly one well identified muon with $p_T > 45$ GeV, the sum of

1 the E_T in the event and the muon must add to the W mass and finally the muon must
2 be separated by at least 0.5 in ΔR to the closest jet, to avoid the muon energy changing
3 the energy of the jet offline when the cross cleaning is applied.

4 Due to the increase in luminosity over the running period the trigger thresholds were
5 increased, to ensure constant rate though out the year and the trigger version numbers
6 were increased each time the trigger menu was updated. The list of triggers considered
7 and their reference triggers are listed in Tables 6.1 and 6.2.

8 The efficiency of each trigger version is measured in the required H_T bins, the total
9 efficiency for each H_T bin is then calculated by combining the individual efficiencies
10 using a weighted sum based on the fraction of the total luminosity of the sample that
11 each version carries. This accounts for the change in running conditions during the data
12 taking period and the criteria that the trigger suite takes constant rate. The higher
13 trigger versions and thresholds generally represent more integrated luminosity due to the
14 evolution of running conditions with time.

15 The efficiency is measured as a function of the cumulative number of events, ie the
16 efficiency at each point on the x axis is the measured efficiency if a cut were applied
17 offline at that cut value.

18 As an example, the efficiency of each trigger used in the $275 \text{ GeV} < H_T < 325 \text{ GeV}$
19 bin is measured and then combined to give the total efficiency. The cumulative efficiency
20 curves for each trigger seeding the lowest bin is show in Figures 6.5, 6.6 & 6.7. Note that
21 some of the triggers are repeated, due to the reference trigger version incrementing and
22 the signal trigger not.

23 These are then combined to give Figure 6.8 the efficiency at a cut of $\alpha_T > 0.55$
24 is $83.3\% + 0.5\% - 0.6\%$. The loss in efficiency comes from the disparity between the
25 minimum thresholds for jets to enter the H_T and α_T calculations at the HLT and those
26 used in the analysis. The trigger jet E_T threshold is 40 GeV where as the analysis jet
27 E_T threshold in this bin is $36 \cdot 6 \text{ GeV}$. The triggers used to take data at the end of this
28 running period also have an α_T threshold above the analysis cut of $\alpha_T > 0.55$, which
29 again causes an inefficiency. The list of efficiencies for each H_T bin are shown in Table 6.3.
30 The trigger efficiencies are measured to better than one percent and this information
31 is used in the final likelihood model, to correct the expected numbers from simulation
32 when calculating the translation factors.

Offline H_T bin	Signal Trigger	Reference Trigger
$275 \text{ GeV} < H_T < 325 \text{ GeV}$	HLT-HT250_AlphaT0p53_v2	HLT_Mu15_HT200_v2
$275 \text{ GeV} < H_T < 325 \text{ GeV}$	HLT-HT250_AlphaT0p53_v3	HLT_Mu15_HT200_v3
$275 \text{ GeV} < H_T < 325 \text{ GeV}$	HLT-HT250_AlphaT0p53_v4	HLT_Mu15_HT200_v4
$275 \text{ GeV} < H_T < 325 \text{ GeV}$	HLT-HT250_AlphaT0p53_v5	HLT_Mu30_HT200_v1
$275 \text{ GeV} < H_T < 325 \text{ GeV}$	HLT-HT250_AlphaT0p55_v1	HLT_Mu5_HT200_v4
$275 \text{ GeV} < H_T < 325 \text{ GeV}$	HLT-HT250_AlphaT0p55_v2	HLT_Mu40_HT200_v4
$275 \text{ GeV} < H_T < 325 \text{ GeV}$	HLT-HT250_AlphaT0p58_v3	HLT_DoubleMu8_Mass8_HT200_v4
$275 \text{ GeV} < H_T < 325 \text{ GeV}$	HLT-HT250_AlphaT0p58_v3	HLT_DoubleMu8_Mass8_HT200_v5
$275 \text{ GeV} < H_T < 325 \text{ GeV}$	HLT-HT250_AlphaT0p60_v3	HLT_DoubleMu8_Mass8_HT200_v4
$275 \text{ GeV} < H_T < 325 \text{ GeV}$	HLT-HT250_AlphaT0p60_v3	HLT_DoubleMu8_Mass8_HT200_v5
$325 \text{ GeV} < H_T < 375 \text{ GeV}$	HLT-HT300_AlphaT0p52_v1	HLT_Mu5_HT200_v4
$325 \text{ GeV} < H_T < 375 \text{ GeV}$	HLT-HT300_AlphaT0p52_v2	HLT_Mu8_HT200_v4
$325 \text{ GeV} < H_T < 375 \text{ GeV}$	HLT-HT300_AlphaT0p52_v3	HLT_Mu15_HT200_v2
$325 \text{ GeV} < H_T < 375 \text{ GeV}$	HLT-HT300_AlphaT0p53_v3	HLT_Mu15_HT200_v3
$325 \text{ GeV} < H_T < 375 \text{ GeV}$	HLT-HT300_AlphaT0p53_v4	HLT_Mu15_HT200_v4
$325 \text{ GeV} < H_T < 375 \text{ GeV}$	HLT-HT300_AlphaT0p53_v5	HLT_Mu30_HT200_v1
$325 \text{ GeV} < H_T < 375 \text{ GeV}$	HLT-HT300_AlphaT0p53_v6	HLT_Mu40_HT200_v3
$325 \text{ GeV} < H_T < 375 \text{ GeV}$	HLT-HT300_AlphaT0p53_v6	HLT_Mu40_HT200_v4
$325 \text{ GeV} < H_T < 375 \text{ GeV}$	HLT-HT300_AlphaT0p54_v5	HLT_Mu40_HT300_v4
$325 \text{ GeV} < H_T < 375 \text{ GeV}$	HLT-HT300_AlphaT0p54_v5	HLT_Mu40_HT300_v5
$325 \text{ GeV} < H_T < 375 \text{ GeV}$	HLT-HT300_AlphaT0p55_v3	HLT_DoubleMu8_Mass8_HT200_v4
$325 \text{ GeV} < H_T < 375 \text{ GeV}$	HLT-HT300_AlphaT0p55_v3	HLT_DoubleMu8_Mass8_HT200_v5

Table 6.1: List of α_T triggers used in the lowest two offline H_T bins and the triggers used to collect the reference sample.

Offline H_T bin	Signal Trigger	Reference Trigger
$375 \text{ GeV} < H_T < 475 \text{ GeV}$	HLT-HT350_AlphaT0p51_v1	HLT_Mu5_HT200_v4
$375 \text{ GeV} < H_T < 475 \text{ GeV}$	HLT-HT350_AlphaT0p51_v2	HLT_Mu8_HT200_v4
$375 \text{ GeV} < H_T < 475 \text{ GeV}$	HLT-HT350_AlphaT0p51_v3	HLT_Mu15_HT200_v2
$375 \text{ GeV} < H_T < 475 \text{ GeV}$	HLT-HT350_AlphaT0p51_v4	HLT_Mu15_HT200_v3
$375 \text{ GeV} < H_T < 475 \text{ GeV}$	HLT-HT350_AlphaT0p51_v5	HLT_Mu15_HT200_v4
$375 \text{ GeV} < H_T < 475 \text{ GeV}$	HLT-HT350_AlphaT0p52_v1	HLT_Mu30_HT200_v1
$375 \text{ GeV} < H_T < 475 \text{ GeV}$	HLT-HT350_AlphaT0p52_v2	HLT_Mu40_HT200_v3
$375 \text{ GeV} < H_T < 475 \text{ GeV}$	HLT-HT350_AlphaT0p52_v2	HLT_Mu40_HT200_v4
$375 \text{ GeV} < H_T < 475 \text{ GeV}$	HLT-HT350_AlphaT0p53_v10	HLT_Mu40_HT300_v4
$375 \text{ GeV} < H_T < 475 \text{ GeV}$	HLT-HT350_AlphaT0p53_v10	HLT_Mu40_HT300_v5
$475 \text{ GeV} < H_T < 7 \text{ TeV}$	HLT-HT400_AlphaT0p51_v1	HLT_Mu5_HT200_v4
$475 \text{ GeV} < H_T < 7 \text{ TeV}$	HLT-HT400_AlphaT0p51_v2	HLT_Mu8_HT200_v4
$475 \text{ GeV} < H_T < 7 \text{ TeV}$	HLT-HT400_AlphaT0p51_v3	HLT_Mu15_HT200_v2
$475 \text{ GeV} < H_T < 7 \text{ TeV}$	HLT-HT400_AlphaT0p51_v4	HLT_Mu15_HT200_v3
$475 \text{ GeV} < H_T < 7 \text{ TeV}$	HLT-HT400_AlphaT0p51_v5	HLT_Mu15_HT200_v4
$475 \text{ GeV} < H_T < 7 \text{ TeV}$	HLT-HT400_AlphaT0p51_v6	HLT_Mu30_HT200_v1
$475 \text{ GeV} < H_T < 7 \text{ TeV}$	HLT-HT400_AlphaT0p51_v7	HLT_Mu40_HT200_v3
$475 \text{ GeV} < H_T < 7 \text{ TeV}$	HLT-HT400_AlphaT0p51_v7	HLT_Mu40_HT200_v4
$475 \text{ GeV} < H_T < 7 \text{ TeV}$	HLT-HT400_AlphaT0p51_v10	HLT_Mu40_HT300_v4
$475 \text{ GeV} < H_T < 7 \text{ TeV}$	HLT-HT400_AlphaT0p51_v10	HLT_Mu40_HT300_v5
$475 \text{ GeV} < H_T < 7 \text{ TeV}$	HLT-HT400_AlphaT0p52_v5	HLT_Mu40_HT300_v4
$475 \text{ GeV} < H_T < 7 \text{ TeV}$	HLT-HT400_AlphaT0p52_v5	HLT_Mu40_HT300_v5

Table 6.2: List of α_T triggers used in the $H_T > 375 \text{ GeV}$ bins and the triggers used to collect the reference sample.

H_T range (GeV)	Trigger efficiency (%)
275–325	$83.3^{+0.5}_{-0.6}$
325–375	$95.9^{+0.7}_{-0.9}$
375–475	$98.5^{+0.5}_{-0.9}$
475– ∞	$100.0^{+0.0}_{-4.8}$

Table 6.3: Efficiencies of the α_T triggers used in the 7 TeV α_T analysis on 5 fb^{-1} of LHC data.

H_T range	Trigger
275 GeV–325 GeV	HLT-HT250_AlphaT0p55_v*
325 GeV–375 GeV	HLT-HT300_AlphaT0p53_v*
375 GeV–475 GeV	HLT-HT350_AlphaT0p52_v*
475 GeV–8 TeV	HLT-HT400_AlphaT0p51_v*

Table 6.4: Triggers used to seed the analysis H_T bins during 2012 data taking.

The α_T triggers were upgraded for the increased instantaneous luminosity and pile up conditions expected during the 2012 data taking period. The first stage was to implement the full α_T calculation for each addition of a new jet, this change increases the purity of the trigger, meaning that for the same threshold the rate taken is lower than that of the previous algorithm. This allows the thresholds to be kept low, whilst not increasing the overall trigger rate.

The second upgrade was to switch to pile up corrected jets at the HLT, this change keeps the trigger cross section liner as a function of instantaneous luminosity.

The third choice was to design a trigger suite that could run for the entire 2012 data taking period, with out changing the trigger thresholds, this was done to make the measurement of the efficiency simpler.

The trigger thresholds used are presented in Table 6.4, due to the constant thresholds in H_T and α_T though out the run, the versioning of the triggers is excluded from this table. The efficiency of the triggers is measured for 11.7 fb^{-1} of LHC data taken at a centre of mass energy of 8 TeV the efficiencies were measured for the analysis presented at HCP, documented in [5]. A single muon trigger is used to collect the reference sample, the threshold of this trigger was unchanged during the data taking period, the path selected is `HLT_IsoMu24_v*` which requires at least one muon with $p_T > 24 \text{ GeV}$ that is not over lapping with any other object in the detector. The same method is used as for the 2011 trigger efficiency measurement. However the offline jets are corrected for pile up using the fast jet corrections, to stay inline with the HLT object definitions.

Figure 6.9 shows the efficiencies of the four individual triggers that seed the 275 GeV–325 GeV H_T bin for 11.7 fb^{-1} of 8 TeV LHC data, Figure 6.10 shows the combined cumulative efficiency of the 2012 trigger suite.

H_T range (GeV)	Trigger efficiency (%)
275 GeV – 325 GeV	$89.6^{+0.4}_{-0.4}$
325 GeV – 375 GeV	$98.6^{+0.2}_{-0.3}$
375 GeV – 475 GeV	$99.4^{+0.2}_{-0.3}$
475 GeV – 8 TeV	$100.0^{+0.0}_{-0.5}$

Table 6.5: Efficiencies of the α_T triggers at a centre of mass energy of 8 TeV α_T measured in 11.7 fb^{-1} of LHC data.

1 The two trigger suites have very similar offline performance with 100% efficiency
 2 in the analysis bins above 475 GeV and high efficiency in the lower bins. To quantify
 3 the difference in performance between the two algorithms the purity is defined as the
 4 number of events passing the trigger that pass the offline α_T requirement at the same
 5 threshold as the trigger requirement divided by the total number of events accepted by
 6 the trigger. The purity of each trigger algorithm is measured for an example trigger with
 7 a H_T threshold of 350 GeV and an α_T threshold of 0.52. The 2011 trigger which only
 8 performs the full α_T calculation for jet multiplicities of less than four has a purity of
 9 48%, which means a quarter of all rate taken by the trigger is used in the offline analysis.
 10 The 2012 trigger which performs the full α_T calculation for all jet multiplicities has a
 11 purity of 75%. This 25% increase in purity translates in to a 25% rate reduction for the
 12 same trigger threshold when changing to the full α_T calculation for all jet multiplicities,
 13 thus enabling the trigger thresholds to be kept at the same or lower thresholds in the
 14 2012 run as in the 2011 run.

15 6.5 Extension to higher analysis dimensions.

16 B-tagging

17 **Declaration** Whilst it should be noted that the author did not contribute towards
 18 the extension of the analysis to include a dimension based on the measurement of the
 19 number of jets containing b quarks in the final state, the final analysis does include this
 20 extension, hence the b-tagging procedure is explained in sufficient detail as to understand
 21 the process but not to elude to all the nuances of the method in the following section.

22 Jets are tagged as originating from a b decay via the identification of a displaced
 23 vertex as it takes the b a finite amount of time to decay, during this time the quark

which is not produced at rest travels away from the initial interaction point, where upon decaying a secondary decay vertex is created. The algorithm used to classify these jets as containing a b quark is the Combined Secondary Vertex (C.S.V) tagger. The “Medium” working point is used in the analysis, which requires a cut of > 0.679 on the C.S.V value. This results in a gluon/light quark miss tag rate of 1% where “light” quarks are u, d and s types. The efficiency for tagging b quark jets in the range 60 – 70%[15] is achieved, this efficiency depends on the jet p_T . The discriminator is supported by the C.M.S b physics object group[2] and its performance is well understood. The Montecarlo miss tag and identification rates are re-weighted to agree with data observations, thus provide an accurate background prediction for the high multiplicity b-tagged bins which are dominated by the miss tag of light quarks as b quarks.




Figure 6.4: Flow chart representing the steps taken to make a trigger decision using the α_T trigger algorithm.




Figure 6.5: Turn on curves for the individual α_T triggers used to seed the $275 \text{ GeV} < H_T < 325 \text{ GeV}$ bin.




Figure 6.6: Turn on curves for the individual α_T triggers used to seed the 275 GeV < H_T < 325 GeV bin.




Figure 6.7: Turn on curves for the individual α_T triggers used to seed the $275 \text{ GeV} < H_T < 325 \text{ GeV}$ bin.




Figure 6.8: Combined cumulative efficiency for the triggers seeding the $275 \text{ GeV} < H_T < 325 \text{ GeV}$ offline analysis bin.




Figure 6.9: Turn on curves for the individual α_T triggers used to seed the $275 \text{ GeV} < H_T < 325 \text{ GeV}$ bin, during 2012 data taking.




Figure 6.10: Combined cumulative efficiency for the triggers seeding the $275 \text{ GeV} < H_T < 325 \text{ GeV}$ offline bin for 11.7 fb^{-1} of 8 TeV LHC data.

6.6 Electro-Weak background prediction

The requirement of an α_T cut on the signal sample removes multi-jet QCD events where a balanced event is counted as signal due to miss-measurements, the remaining background events in the signal region are due to electro-weak processes which produce real missing energy. Primarily these events are produced from $Z \rightarrow \nu\bar{\nu} + \text{Jets}$, $W \rightarrow \ell\bar{\nu} + \text{Jets}$ and $t\bar{t}$ decay, with smaller contributions from Drell-Yan + Jets, single top production in the s,t and tW channels and from di-boson + Jet events. To predict the number of these events contributing to the number of signal like events three control samples are defined and through the use of a Montecarlo derived transfer factor the control samples are used to predict the number of S.M events expected in the signal region.

Figure 6.11[4] shows the expectation from simulation in all bins of the hadronic signal region, for the different background samples and an example CMSSM reference model RM1.

Explain what RM1 is

The expected composition of the backgrounds in the hadronic signal region, as a percentage of the total S.M background, are summarised in Table 6.6. $Z \rightarrow \nu\nu$ contributes $\approx 43\%$ of the S.M background in the 275 GeV–325 GeV H_T bin, raising to $\approx 53\%$ in the $H_T > 875$ GeV bin. Events entering the signal region due to Z or W decays where the lepton is missed by the lepton vetoes account for $\approx 25\%$ at low H_T and $\approx 13\%$ at high H_T . Events from hadronically decays τ (τ_h) have a low H_T dependance, contributing $\approx 22\%$ of the background at low H_T and $\approx 27\%$ of the background at high H_T . Those events arising from τ particles which decay leptonically (τ_l) and are missed by the lepton vetoes account for $\approx 10\%$ of the S.M background.

To calculate the bin by bin translation factors the signal selection and the individual control selections are applied to the montecarlo simulated background samples. The ratio of the number of accepted events is then taken, the signal yield prediction is computed from applying the control selections to real data and multiplying the event yield by the translation factor. The measurements form all control samples are considered simultaneously in a fit defined in Section 6.10. This method can be extended to high dimensions of analysis bins, for example in [5] a secondary dimension involving the number of B quarks in the event is studied. However the B extension is not detailed in this thesis.




Figure 6.11: Expectation from MC in all bins of the hadronic signal region for the following different background processes: $Z \rightarrow \nu\nu + \text{jets}$, $W + \text{jets}$, $t\bar{t}$, single top + jets, di-boson production ($WW/WZ/ZZ$), and Drell-Yan. The total SM expectation is also shown, along with that for the CMSSM benchmark model RM1.

Table 6.6: Relative background composition as given by MC simulation in all bins of the hadronic signal region (expressed as a percentage of the total SM background).

H_T GeV	N _{events}	$Z \rightarrow \nu\nu + \text{jets}$ (%)	W + jets, $t\bar{t}$, single top, DY and di-boson			
			missed e, μ from W/Z (%)	τ_h (%)	τ_l (%)	τ_h matched to jet (%)
275–325	3938.0	43	24	22	11	7
325–375	1569.9	46	25	22	9	7
375–475	1104.2	48	20	23	10	7
475–575	396.0	48	17	24	11	10
575–675	142.4	51	17	23	10	11
675–775	55.5	44	19	31	7	17
775–875	18.7	55	17	22	4	9
875–∞	13.2	53	13	27	7	19

$$N_{prediction}^{sig}(H_T) = N_{obs}^{control}(H_T) \times \frac{N_{MC}^{sig}(H_T)}{N_{MC}^{control}(H_T)} \quad (6.9)$$

¹ The three control samples used are a $W \rightarrow \mu\nu + \text{Jets}$ sample, a $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu + \text{Jets}$
² sample and a $\gamma + \text{Jets}$ sample.

³ The selection criteria for each of these control samples is kept as similar to the signal
⁴ selection as possible, so as to not introduce systematic errors from incorrect modelling in
⁵ the simulation. The use of the ratio of the number of observed events in the montecarlo
⁶ cancels the systematic effects. A systematic is still assigned to each translation factor to
⁷ account for theoretical uncertainties and acceptance and instrumental effects.

⁸ Additional kinematic cuts are applied in the two muon control samples to enrich
⁹ the $W + \text{Jets } t\bar{t}$ and $Z + \text{Jets}$ components in the control samples. The samples are
¹⁰ defined to maximised efficiency rather than purity, any impurities are accounted for in
¹¹ the transfer factors as the yields from all montecarlo samples are used. This is valid under
¹² the assumption that the S.M electro-weak and Drell-Yan processes are well modelled by
¹³ the simulation. The possibility of SUSY like signal contamination in the control samples
¹⁴ is accounted for in the final likelihood, after measuring the signal acceptance for the
¹⁵ control samples on simulated SUSY events.

¹⁶ The magnitude of the systematic uncertainties on the transfer factors is motivated by
¹⁷ a set of closure tests between the control samples. A transfer factor is produced to predict
¹⁸ each control sample from each of the other control samples. No assumed systematic is
¹⁹ applied in these closure tests, instead the level of agreement with in statistical uncertainty
²⁰ is used to set the scale of the systematic error for each H_T bin.

²¹ **The $\mu + \text{Jets}$ control sample** The $\mu + \text{Jets}$ control sample is designed to mimic
²² the events appearing in the signal region due to $W + \text{Jets}$ and $t\bar{t}$ decays where the
²³ leptons are missed offline, either due to falling out of acceptance or being missed by
²⁴ the reconstruction algorithms. Hadronic tau decays from high p_T W bosons are also
²⁵ predicted from this sample. The additional selection criteria for this sample are designed
²⁶ to select events containing the decay $W \rightarrow \mu\nu + \text{Jets}$ in the same kinematic conditions
²⁷ as those events entering the signal selection. Offline the event level discriminators, H_T
²⁸ and α_T , are calculated using only the hadronic components of the event. In order to
²⁹ select the W exactly one tightly identified, isolated muon with $|\eta| < 2.5$ with $p_T >$
³⁰ 10 GeV is required. The transverse mass of the muon combined with the missing energy
³¹ of the event $M_T(\mu, \cancel{E}_T)$ is required to be larger than 30 GeV, as shown in Figure 6.12 the
³² transverse mass cut removes a large amount of QCD whilst preserving a high efficiency
³³ W selection. Events are vetoed if for any jet $\Delta R(\mu, \text{Jet}) < 0.5$, or if a second muon

- ¹ candidate exists that is either loose, non-isolated or outside of acceptance if the two
² muons have an invariant mass with in ± 25 GeV of the Z mass, to suppress $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$
³ events.




Figure 6.12: Transverse mass between the selected muon and E_T in $W \rightarrow \mu\nu$ events.[3].

- ⁴ **The $\mu\mu + \text{Jets}$ control sample** The $\mu\mu + \text{Jets}$ control sample is used to measure the
⁵ $Z \rightarrow \nu\nu + \text{Jets}$ irreducible background in the signal region. The process $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu + \text{Jets}$ is
⁶ identical kinematically, however the acceptance and the branching ratio are both smaller
⁷ the branching ratio due to the possible decay in to one of three neutrino flavour states
⁸ verses the requirement of a particular lepton flavour, the acceptance difference is due
⁹ to the p_T and identification quality requirements on the muons alter the acceptance
¹⁰ between the two processes. The following selection criteria are applied on top of the
¹¹ common selection: Exactly two tightly identified, isolated muons, with in $|\eta| < 2.5$ with
¹² $p_T > 10$ GeV are required; The invariant mass of the di-muon pair is required to be
¹³ with in ± 25 GeV of the Z mass; Events are vetoed if for any muon and jet combination
¹⁴ $\Delta R(\mu, \text{Jet}) < 0.5$. As in the single muon control sample all event level quantities are
¹⁵ calculated from the hadronic objects alone. This control sample can be used in all of the
¹⁶ offline H_T bins.

- ¹⁷ **The $\gamma + \text{Jets}$ control sample** The $\gamma + \text{Jets}$ control sample can also be used to
¹⁸ measure the $Z \rightarrow \nu\nu + \text{Jets}$ background as the $\gamma + \text{Jets}$ process is kinematically similar

when the $\gamma E_T > \approx 100$ GeV[17, 11], again when calculating the event level quantities only hadronic objects are considered. The photon sample requires the following criteria on top of the common selection requirements: Exactly one photon with $E_T > 150$ GeV to ensure trigger efficiency, $|\eta| < 1.45$. Events are vetoed if for any jet $\Delta R(\gamma, \text{jet}) < 1.0$. Given that due to the trigger requirements the photon E_T is required to be greater than 150 GeV and the photon is treated as missing energy, the $\alpha_T > 0.55$ requirement implies a minimum H_T threshold of ≈ 350 GeV, hence the $\gamma + \text{Jets}$ control sample can only be used in the offline region where $H_T > 375$ GeV.

Table 6.7 gives the hadronic signal yields in each of the offline H_T bins along with the simple background estimate from the single muon plus jets control sample. The full background prediction is given from the results of the simultaneous fit to the separate background estimates.

Table 6.7: Total SM prediction using the $\mu + \text{Jets}$ sample only. These are illustrative only, as the final prediction is provided by the final simultaneous fit.

α_T bin	0.55–∞	0.55–∞	0.55–∞	0.55–∞
H_T bin (GeV)	275–325	325–375	375–475	475–575
Hadronic selection MC	2872.32 ± 64.44	1384.22 ± 51.46	1041.38 ± 12.53	396.13 ± 19.85
$\mu + \text{jets}$ selection MC	1228.90 ± 46.18	670.50 ± 38.74	495.14 ± 7.86	181.65 ± 9.65
Translation factor	2.34 ± 0.10	2.06 ± 0.14	2.10 ± 0.04	2.18 ± 0.16
$\mu + \text{jets}$ selection yield data	1421	645	517	169
Total SM prediction	3321.30 ± 169.97	1331.57 ± 105.45	1087.36 ± 52.50	368.56 ± 39.09
Hadronic yield data	3703	1533	1043	346
α_T bin	0.55–∞	0.55–∞	0.55–∞	0.55–∞
H_T bin (GeV)	575–675	675–775	775–875	875–∞
Hadronic selection MC	142.37 ± 7.61	55.47 ± 3.51	18.68 ± 1.45	13.18 ± 1.15
$\mu + \text{jets}$ selection MC	70.84 ± 4.36	22.64 ± 1.82	7.54 ± 0.80	5.19 ± 0.67
Translation factor	2.01 ± 0.16	2.45 ± 0.25	2.4 ± 0.33	2.54 ± 0.40
$\mu + \text{jets}$ selection yield data	52	18	8	1
Total SM prediction	104.50 ± 16.81	44.09 ± 11.33	19.83 ± 7.41	2.54 ± 3.47
Hadronic yield data	122	44	14	6

Muon control samples with out an α_T cut. The requirement of an α_T value above 0.55 in the previous control samples limits the event yield of each of the montecarlo samples, increasing the statistical error of the prediction. This is especially evident when splitting the analysis in to more dimensions than the H_T binning. The requirement of an

¹ α_T cut on the control samples means that as the muon is not seen by the calorimeter
² systems the signal trigger can also be used to collect the both the single and di muon
³ background samples. The translation factor method can be used to create a prediction
⁴ from any sample to any other sample if and only if the modelling of the event kinematics
⁵ and acceptances of any cuts introduces no large systematic errors. We now show that
⁶ the montecarlo simulation accurately reproduces the kinematics and acceptance of the
⁷ α_T cut when applied to electro-weak background samples, enabling the removal of the
⁸ α_T requirement for the muon control samples.

⁹ The preselection of events in the two muon control samples ensures samples with
¹⁰ negligible QCD contamination, which are enriched with $t\bar{t}$, $W + \text{Jets}$ and $Z + \text{Jet}$ events.
¹¹ This is shown for the $\mu + \text{Jets}$ sample in Figure 6.13 and for the $\mu\mu + \text{Jets}$ sample in
¹² Figure 6.14, in both sets of plots the expected number of QCD events from montecarlo
¹³ simulation is less than one event at any α_T value for 5 fb^{-1} of integrated luminosity. The
¹⁴ requirement of tight isolation on each of the muons is largely responsible for the purity of
¹⁵ the sample, the transverse mass and di-muon mass window cuts ensure the sample is rich
¹⁶ in electro-weak events with visible muons. The agreement between data and montecarlo
¹⁷ in these plots is good and the simulation models the α_T acceptance well, the systematic
¹⁸ assigned to this acceptance is detailed in Section 6.8.

¹⁹ Moving to a selection where there is no required α_T cut means that the α_T trigger
²⁰ suite can not be used to collect the high event yield control samples. Instead a trigger
²¹ requiring H_T and a muon in the final state ($\text{Mu}_H T$) is used, due to the muon trigger
²² threshold the p_T acceptance cut is raised to 45 GeV in these control samples. The H_T
²³ requirement on these triggers raises to 300 GeV so only the offline bins with $H_T >$
²⁴ 375 GeV are able to benefit from the increased background estimation precision, due to
²⁵ the larger size of the predicting sample. The efficiency for triggering on a single muon at
²⁶ 45 GeV is measured to be $91.3 \pm 0.1\%$ though out the data taking period, measured for
²⁷ the $H_T + \text{single muon}$ triggers, the H_T component of the trigger is measured to be 100%
²⁸ efficient though out. In the case of the di-muon sample, as both muons have to be above
²⁹ 45 GeV and either of them could have triggered the event, the efficiency is found to be
³⁰ H_T -dependant in the range of 95-97%.

³¹ The muon control samples in the H_T bins where $H_T < 375$ GeV are collected with
³² the α_T trigger suite and the measured efficiencies are the same as those measured for the
³³ hadronic sample. The details of the triggers used for each of the muon + Jets control
³⁴ samples are listed in Table 6.8.




Figure 6.13: Data-MC comparisons of key variables for the muon control sample, for the region $H_T > 375 \text{ GeV}$ and $\alpha_T > 0.55$. Bands represent the uncertainties due to the limited size of MC samples. No requirement is made on the number of b-tagged jets in an event. *The discrepancy in the α_T distributions for values $\alpha_T > 0.55$ is due to the trigger not being simulated in the MC simulation.*

6.7 Estimating the residual QCD background component.[4]

- ³ The expected QCD contamination in the signal region where $H_T > 275 \text{ GeV}$ and $\alpha_T >$
- ⁴ 0.55 from simulated background samples is negligible, residual events are removed via the
- ⁵ application of the detector failure and $R_{\text{miss}} < 1.25$ filters. However due to the difficulty




Figure 6.14: Data–MC comparisons of key variables for the di-muon control sample, for the region $H_T > 375\text{GeV}$ and $\alpha_T > 0.55$. Bands represent the uncertainties due to the limited size of MC samples. No requirement is made on the number of b-tagged jets in an event. *The discrepancy in the α_T distributions for values $\alpha_T > 0.55$ is due to the trigger not being simulated in the MC simulation.*

- 1 in simulating QCD multi jet events accurately a conservative approach is taken where a
- 2 term is inserted in the likelihood to model any residual QCD contamination.

The term is based on the ratio of the number of events above and below the α_T threshold of 0.55 in the individual H_T bins. The dependance of this ratio is modelled as an exponentially falling quantity:

$$R_{\alpha_T}(H_T) = \mathcal{A}_{n_b} e^{-k_{QCD} H_T} \quad (6.10)$$

Table 6.8: List of triggers used for the larger $\mu + \text{Jets}$ and $\mu\mu + \text{Jets}$ samples.

H_T bin (GeV)	275–325	325–375	375–475	475–575	575–675	675–775	775–875	>875
α_T cut	0.55	0.55	None	None	None	None	None	None
Muon p_T cut	10	10	45	45	45	45	45	45
Trigger	α_T	α_T	Mu_HT	Mu_HT	Mu_HT	Mu_HT	Mu_HT	Mu_HT
Dataset	HT	HT	MuHad	MuHad	MuHad	MuHad	MuHad	MuHad
Thresholds	Table 2	Table 2	Table 3					

¹ Where \mathcal{A}_{nb} is the b-tag bin dependant normalisation factor and k_{QCD} is the b-tag dependant decay constant.

³ The exponential behaviour is due to several features, the first of which is the improvement of the jet energy resolution with H_T due to the larger energies deposited in the calorimeter systems. Secondly for the region $H_T > 375$ GeV the jet multiplicity rises slowly with H_T , which due to the combinatorics used in the α_T calculation, results in a narrower α_T distribution peaked at 0.5. Due to the signal region definition and the exponentially falling nature of the QCD background component is reduced to zero above ≈ 500 GeV, thus the validity of the QCD background model above 575 GeV is not of consequence to the final analysis, however the model chosen is shown to be valid over the whole H_T region of the analysis as shown below.

¹² Maximum likelihood (M.L) values for k_{QCD} and \mathcal{A}_{nb} are found by the final likelihood fit, however k_{QCD} is first constrained by a measurement in a background enriched side band regions where either the α_T cut is relaxed or the R_{miss} cut is inverted. Figure 6.15 depicts the regions where k_{QCD} is measured, the signal region is as described before where $\alpha_T > 0.55$ and $R_{miss} < 1.25$ are required. Region B is defined by the inversion of the α_T cut. Region C is defined by inverting both the α_T requirement and the R_{miss} requirement, this region is further divided in to three slices in α_T of $0.52 < \alpha_T < 0.53$, $0.53 < \alpha_T < 0.54$ and $0.54 < \alpha_T < 0.55$, as the index of C_i rises the expected amount of QCD in that control region increases. Finally region D has only the R_{miss} requirement inverted, region D is not used to constrain k_{QCD} , but instead to check the validity of the exponential model. The fits to the individual side bands are shown in Appendix 2. The best fit value for k_{QCD} of $2.96 \pm 0.64 \times 10^{-2}$ GeV $^{-1}$ obtained from region B is used as the central value of the constraint. The assumption that this method gives an unbiased estimate of k_{QCD} stems from the similarity in event kinematics in the two α_T regions. The best fit values for the three C_i regions are used to estimate the systematic uncertainty on the central value obtained from region B. The fit results show now dependance on the α_T




Figure 6.15: QCD side-band regions, used for determination of k_{QCD} .

1 region used to measure the number of events, supporting the assumption that region B
 2 provides an unbiased estimate of k_{QCD} . The variation of the measured values for each C_i
 3 slice are used to calculate the error on the central value, the weighted mean and standard
 4 deviation of the three slices in α_T are calculated to be $1.13 \pm 0.26 \times 10^{-2} \text{ GeV}^{-1}$, the
 5 relative error on this value is 20% which is then applied to the central value to give an
 6 estimate of the systematic uncertainty.

7 The data side bands are used to provide a constrained value of k_{QCD} as an input to
 8 the final likelihood model which describes the expected number of background events in
 9 bins of H_T and the number of observed jets containing a b quark. The value measured for
 10 k_{QCD} is $2.96 \pm 0.61(\text{stat}) \pm 0.46(\text{sys}) \times 10^{-2} \text{ GeV}^{-1}$. The uncertainty values are used
 11 as penalty timers in the likelihood model which is described in Section 6.10

12 A final check is performed using region D , which requires $\alpha_T > 0.55$ but has no
 13 R_{miss} cut, this introduces QCD background in to the signal region. The likelihood fit
 14 is performed on this background enriched region and no constraint is applied on k_{QCD}
 15 which is then determined by the fit only. The fit is performed over the full H_T range
 16 used in the final analysis. Figure 6.16 shows the resulting fit, the M.L value obtained for
 17 k_{QCD} is $(1.31 \pm 0.09) \times 10^{-2} \text{ GeV}^{-1}$, this value is in excellent agreement with the value
 18 found from the weighed mean of the regions C_i , secondly the fit shows that the choice of
 19 exponential function used in the likelihood model is valid over the entire H_T range. This

Table 6.9: Best fit values for the parameters k as obtained from the regions B , C_1 , C_2 , and C_3 . The latter three measurements are used to calculate a weighted mean (identified as region C). Also quoted is the maximum likelihood value of the parameter k given by the simultaneous fit using the sample defined by region D . Quoted errors are statistical only. From [4].

Side-band region	$k_{QCD} (\times 10^{-2} \text{ GeV}^{-1})$	$p\text{-value}$
B	2.96 ± 0.64	0.24
C_1	1.19 ± 0.45	0.93
C_2	1.47 ± 0.37	0.42
C_3	1.17 ± 0.55	0.98
C (weighted mean)	1.31 ± 0.26	-
D (likelihood fit)	1.31 ± 0.09	0.57

- ¹ supports the assumption that region B provides an unbiased estimate of k_{QCD} in the
² signal region $\alpha_T > 0.55$ and $R_{miss} < 1.25$.




Figure 6.16: Comparison of the observed yields and SM expectations given by the simultaneous fit in bins of H_T for the side-band region D . No requirement on the number of b jets is made. Shown are the observed event yields in data (black dots with error bars representing the statistical uncertainties) and the expectations given by the simultaneous fit for the $Z \rightarrow \nu\nu + \text{jets}$ process (orange dotted-dashed line); the sum of all processes with genuine E_T , which are primarily $t\bar{t}$, $W + \text{jets}$, and $Z \rightarrow \nu\nu + \text{jets}$ (dark blue long-dashed line); and the sum of QCD and all aforementioned SM processes (light blue solid line). [4]

¹ 6.8 Systematic uncertainties on the electro-weak ² background model.

³ As previously discussed in Section 6.6 the final background prediction is given by the
⁴ simultaneous fit to the yields in the signal and control samples and the translation
⁵ factors obtained from MC. The fit has some freedom via the statistical and systematic
⁶ uncertainties measured for each translation factor. This implies that the measurement of
⁷ the systematic uncertainties on the translation factors are vital for the fitting procedure.

⁸ A set of closure tests were performed on data to identify any sources of systematic
⁹ biases introduced by the background prediction method. To do this the individual
¹⁰ background samples are used to predict one another using the same translation factor
¹¹ method as for the prediction of S.M missing energy sources in the hadronic signal regions.
¹² The level of agreement is quantified in terms of the ratio $(N_{obs} - N_{pred}) / N_{pred}$, the
¹³ statistical error from the translation factor, based on the available Montecarlo stats
¹⁴ is combined with the statistical error on the number of events in the predicting sample
¹⁵ to give the error on the closure, hence the deviation of the ratio from zero gives the
¹⁶ level of closure per analysis bin. This gives a measure of any biases introduced by the
¹⁷ background estimation method.

¹⁸ The closure tests between the background samples are designed to test the Montecarlo's
¹⁹ ability to model kinematic effects; such as the α_T acceptance; μ acceptance and γ
²⁰ acceptance, instrumental effects such as; reconstruction efficiencies and the effects of
²¹ pile up on isolation and finally the theoretical precision of the production and decay
²² cross sections and their relative contributions to the S.M background. These individual
²³ components are not separable by the closure tests, which instead gives a total systematic
²⁴ error estimation.

²⁵ As described in Section 6.6 the control samples which do not require an α_T cut use a
²⁶ Mu_{HT} cross object trigger to collect the data events. As shown in Table 3 there was a
²⁷ period of data taking where due to the increased trigger thresholds the Mu_{HT} triggers
²⁸ are unsuitable for use in the region $H_T < 375$ GeV. Thusly in the closure tests between
²⁹ the control samples which use an α_T cut and those that do not the integrated luminosity
³⁰ is limited to 3.9 fb^{-1} . This causes a loss of some statistical power in these cases.

³¹ The individual closure tests and fits to the H_T dependance of the ratio $(N_{obs} - N_{pred}) / N_{pred}$
³² are shown in Appendix 3. The Figures 6 show the closure of the prediction between

¹ $\mu + \text{Jets}(\text{no } \alpha_T) \rightarrow \mu + \text{Jets}(\alpha_T > 0.55)$ and $\mu\mu + \text{Jets}(\text{no } \alpha_T) \rightarrow \mu\mu + \text{Jets}(\alpha_T > 0.55)$
² for two samples, one with no requirement on the number of b tagged jets (n_b), which
³ increases the precision of the measurement, and one requiring $n_b = 1$, the red line is the
⁴ result of a one parameter fit. The level of closure shows that the Montecarlo accurately
⁵ models the α_T acceptance, with no significant bias.

⁶ Figure 7 shows the closure between $\mu + \text{Jets} \rightarrow \mu\mu + \text{Jets}$ and between $\gamma + \text{jets} \rightarrow$
⁷ $\mu\mu + \text{Jets}$ over both the full H_T range using only 3.9 fb^{-1} of integrated luminosity and
⁸ for $H_T > 375 \text{ GeV}$ using the full data set. Again the red lines are the result of fitting
⁹ with a one parameter fit.

¹⁰ Figure 8 tests the closure between samples with differing n_b the three tests are
¹¹ $\mu + \text{Jets}(n_b = 0) \rightarrow \mu + \text{Jets}(n_b = 1, \text{no } \alpha_T)$, $\mu + \text{Jets}(n_b = 1) \rightarrow \mu + \text{Jets}(n_b > 1, \text{no } \alpha_T)$
¹² and $\mu + \text{Jets}(n_b = 0) \rightarrow \mu + \text{Jets}(n_b > 1, \text{no } \alpha_T)$. Figure 9 also tests the closure between
¹³ samples with differing n_b , here the test is between $\mu + \text{Jets}(n_b = 0) \rightarrow \mu\mu + \text{Jets}(n_b = 0)$
¹⁴ and $\mu + \text{Jets}(n_b = 1) \rightarrow \mu\mu + \text{Jets}(n_b = 1)$.

¹⁵ Finally any dependence on pile up is measured by comparing a subset of the individual
¹⁶ closure tests between samples which have pile up subtracted jets and those that do
¹⁷ not. The example closures are $\mu + \text{Jets}(\text{no } \alpha_T) \rightarrow \mu + \text{Jets}(\alpha_T > 0.55)$, $\mu + \text{Jets}(\text{no }$
¹⁸ $\alpha_T) \rightarrow \mu\mu + \text{Jets}(\text{no } \alpha_T)$, and $\mu + \text{Jets}(n_b = 0) \rightarrow \mu + \text{Jets}(n_b = 1, \text{no } \alpha_T)$.

¹⁹ 6.8.1 Motivating the combined systematic on the translation ²⁰ factors

²¹ The closure tests described in the previous section are combined to give a total systematic
²² uncertainty. This uncertainty is binned in to three H_T regions $275 \text{ GeV} \rightarrow 575 \text{ GeV}$,
²³ $575 \text{ GeV} \rightarrow 775 \text{ GeV}$ and 775 GeV+ . In each of these regions all of the individual closure
²⁴ tests are used to calculate a weighted mean and variance. The systematic is defined as 3σ
²⁵ of this variance, which is conservative but necessary to cover any biases. The systematics
²⁶ are treated as fully uncorrelated between the three regions, again this is the conservative
²⁷ approach. Figure 6.17 shows the key example closures, the grey shaded region shows
²⁸ the systematic error. The values obtained for the error are 6%, 20% and 39%, these are
²⁹ rounded to 10%, 20% and 40% and then used in the final background simultaneous fit.




Figure 6.17: A set of closure tests (open symbols) overlaid on top of grey bands that represent the systematic uncertainties used for three H_T regions in the final simultaneous fit. The solid circles and their errors represent the weighted mean and standard deviation for the five closure tests of each individual H_T bin.

6.9 Signal Models

The level of agreement of the analysis with the S.M give a handle on the production cross sections and masses of particles predicted by new physics models. The final results are presented in terms of a specific SuperSymmetry (SUSY) model and a selection of generic final state topologies, known as Simplified Model Spectra (S.M.S).

The SUSY model considered is the Constrained Minimal SuperSymmetric Model (CMSSM) [1] which is described in Section 2.1, the parameters chosen are $\tan \beta = 3$, $\mathcal{A}_0 = 0$, $\mu = 0$ with the exclusion curve presented in the m_0 , $m_{1/2}$ plane. This model combines many production and decay topologies and is common to results shown by previous and contemporary experiments [2].

Reference ATLAS and Tevatron susy results

. The results are also presented in terms of S.M.S [3] models, these are models with single production methods and a specified decay topology. The C.M.S terminology for the production methods are as follows: T1 models are gluino-gluino production, which then decay to four S.M hadronic jets and two neutralinos. T2 models are squark-squark production with decays to two S.M hadronic jets and two neutralinos. These topologies

- ¹ can be further specialised by enforcing the squarks or gluinos to decay to heavy flavour
² S.M quarks, such as t, which promptly decay to jets containing b quarks or direct decays
³ to b quarks. The limits on the S.M.S space are defined in terms of the mass splitting
⁴ between the neutrino and the pair produced SUSY particle defining the model.

5 6.9.1 Signal Efficiency

- ⁶ **CMSSM** The CMSSM signal scan is composed of eight sub-processes which define
⁷ the production and decay topologies. The dominant process varies with $m_0, m_{1/2}$ and
⁸ at next to leading order the cross section for each of these processes varies per point.
⁹ The analysis is run over each sub process in turn with the final efficiency given by the
¹⁰ weighted sum of the subprocess efficiencies. The yield per point is then given by $\epsilon \times \mathcal{L}$
¹¹ for 5 fb^{-1} the total yields are show in the appendix in Figure 11 these yields are for the
¹² sum of the H_T analysis bins.

- ¹³ **Simplified Models** The S.M.S models contain only one production process and a set
¹⁴ decay topology, making the interpretation in these models simpler, however the individual
¹⁵ models are not representative of some complete SUSY model. Instead these models allow
¹⁶ the testing of specific facets of new physics models, with out the ambiguity of the relative
¹⁷ contributions of each sub process at a point which is seen when testing full models. The
¹⁸ efficiency is measured for each of the models, with the yield per point given by $\epsilon \times \sigma \times \mathcal{L}$
¹⁹ where σ is given as a reference cross section only. The efficiencies for which are shown in
²⁰ the appendix, Table 6.10 lists which figure corresponds to which model, it is to be noted
²¹ that the total efficiency summed over H_T bins is shown.

Table 6.10: Production and decay modes for various simplified models.

Model	Production and decay modes	Figure showing efficiency
T1	$\tilde{g}\tilde{g} \rightarrow q\bar{q}\tilde{\chi}^0 q\bar{q}\tilde{\chi}^0$	12
T2	$\tilde{q}\tilde{q} \rightarrow q\tilde{\chi}^0 \bar{q}\tilde{\chi}^0$	13
T2tt	$\tilde{t}\tilde{t} \rightarrow t\tilde{\chi}^0 \bar{t}\tilde{\chi}^0$	14
T2bb	$\tilde{b}\tilde{b} \rightarrow b\tilde{\chi}^0 \bar{b}\tilde{\chi}^0$	15
T1tttt	$\tilde{g}\tilde{g} \rightarrow t\bar{t}\tilde{\chi}^0 t\bar{t}\tilde{\chi}^0$	16
T1bbbb	$\tilde{g}\tilde{g} \rightarrow b\bar{b}\tilde{\chi}^0 b\bar{b}\tilde{\chi}^0$	17

1 Signal Efficiency for the Background Selection If the couplings of the SUSY
 2 particles are analogous to the S.M particles then the final states may involve muons
 3 which in the presence of signal would infer an over estimation of the background from
 4 the control samples. To measure this the background selection is applied to the signal
 5 models and the yields are taken into account in the final limit setting procedure. On
 6 average the background selection’s efficiency on signal is $10\times$ lower than the efficiency in
 7 the hadronic signal region. This is shown for the model T1tttt in Figure 18 where the
 8 most muons of all the signal models are expected in the final state, the contamination in
 9 the n_b bins that drive the limit is on the order of 10 – 20%.

10 6.9.2 Uncertainty on Signal Efficiency

11 The systematic uncertainty on the signal models is due to: Choice of PDF at generator
 12 level, the PDF set used to generate the sample has effects on both the acceptance and the
 13 cross section; The measurement of the integrated luminosity is accounted for in the signal
 14 yield; Due to the signal models being created with C.M.S FastSim[] rather than C.M.S
 15 FullSim[] the acceptance differs between the signal and the background samples; The
 16 error on the jet energy scale is accounted for on the signal yield; Systematic errors from
 17 the cleanings cuts (R_{miss} and ECAL dead regions) and lepton/photon vetoes are also
 18 taken in to account; Finally corrections to the b-tagging efficiency between the FullSim
 19 and the FastSim are applied as well as their errors.

20 Each of these uncertainties is expressed as a percentage change in the efficiency from
 21 the central value given by applying the full analysis to each signal model, the total
 22 systematic is given by summing the components in quadrature. In the following section
 23 the measurements of the error from each of these sources is detailed and summarised per
 24 considered signal model at the end of the section.

The uncertainties for the CMSSM are considered in a band of ± 60 GeV in $m_{1/2}$ around the expected limit to confine the errors to the relevant part of the plane, in the very high $m_0, m_{1/2}$ area the jet energy scale causes large fluctuations due to the small mass splitting between the SUSY particles. For the S.M.S models two regions are defined, one “close” to the diagonal, which has small mass splitting and thus the effects of jet energy scale and PDF acceptance have a large impact on the analysis efficiency. A second “far” region is defined with large mass splitting and thus a small change on the analysis efficiency due to jet energy scale and PDF variations. The near and far regions

are defined by:

$$m_{sq}(m_{gl}) - m_{lsp} > 350 \text{ GeV and } m_{sq}(m_{gl}) > 475 \text{ GeV} \quad (6.11)$$

- ¹ events passing these conditions are classified as being in the “far” region, those failing in
² the “close” region.

³ 6.9.3 Choice of PDF set at generator level.

⁴ The PDF set contains information on the interaction probabilities of the quark and
⁵ gluons in the proton at different energies, the model used in the production of the
⁶ Montecarlo simulation has direct impact on the kinematics of the final states, since
⁷ the PDFs have been measured at lower energies than those found at the L.H.C the
⁸ quark and gluon distributions have been extrapolated from the low energy regime, the
⁹ uncertainty at high energy is thus significant. The uncertainties on acceptance due to the
¹⁰ choice of PDF set used to generate the signal Montecarlo are calculated in line with the
¹¹ PDF4LHC[12] working group recommendations. On the event level the individual weights
¹² are re-calculated by moving between PDF set, the weight is based on the energy at which
¹³ the quarks or gluons interaction and the form given by the PDF. This is done for the
¹⁴ central value of the three considered PDF sets (CTEQ6.1[34], MSTW2008nlo68cl[36]
¹⁵ and NNPDF2.0[37]) and for the variations of each of their errors. The change in analysis
¹⁶ efficiency is measured per H_T bin, Figure 6.18 shows the deviation in efficiency per bin
¹⁷ for three examples points in the CMSSM plane, the error bars represent the Root Mean
¹⁸ Squared (RMS) of the spread of the efficiency inside each PDF set. It is to be noted
¹⁹ that some bins show a large change in efficiency due to the choice of PDF set, however
²⁰ these are low efficiency bins where changes in yield of a few events has a large effect, the
²¹ final result however is driven by the high efficiency bins, hence these large fluctuations
²² can be ignored. The effects on the cross section are studied by re-calculating the Next
²³ to Leading Order (N.L.O) cross sections of each of the sub processes for each choice of
²⁴ PDF set, this is done centrally by C.M.S, these changes in cross section are accounted
²⁵ for in the error band on the expected limit.




Figure 6.18: Figures 6.18(a), 6.18(b) and 6.18(c) show the efficiency per H_T bin for the inclusive selection. The three coloured lines represent the analysis efficiency for a choice of PDF set, the error bars are the RMS of the change in efficiency per PDF set from varying the internal components by 1σ of their error. Figures 6.18(d), 6.18(e) and 6.18(f) show the ratio of the change in efficiency from the default PDF set (CTEQ6.1) for three illustrative points in the $m_0, m_{1/2}$ plane of the CMSSSM. The change in efficiency in the high efficiency bins is on the order of 10% for all points.

¹ 6.9.4 Effects of Jet Energy Scale Variations on Signal ² Efficiency

³ Section 4.1 describes the Jet Energy Corrections (JEC) and their uncertainties, which are
⁴ derived in [], these uncertainties are dependant on the $|\eta|$ and E_T of the jet in question.
⁵ To measure the impact of the individual jet energy uncertainties on signal acceptance
⁶ two additional selections are performed on the signal samples, the first with the energy
⁷ of each jet in the event raised from the central value by 1σ of it's uncertainty, the second
⁸ with the energy decreased by 1σ , the relative change in efficiency with respect to the
⁹ central value is then calculated for signal point. The model dependant systematic is
¹⁰ found from the 68th percentile of the 1D distribution of the absolute change in signal
¹¹ efficiency over each point in the model space. Figure 19 shows the change in efficiency
¹² over the full $m_0, m_{1/2}$ plane for the CMSSM, at high $m_0, m_{1/2}$ the variation is large due
¹³ to the primary production method of SUSY particles being electro-weak production of
¹⁴ charginos in this region. These charginos then decay though a chain to the neutrino and
¹⁵ S.M particles, due to the small mass splitting (compressed spectra) between each of the
¹⁶ charginos the jets produced are only just within E_T acceptance. A small change of the
¹⁷ individual jet E_T 's thus moves many jets in and out of acceptance causing a large change
¹⁸ in analysis efficiency, hence only the region within ± 60 GeV around the expected limit in
¹⁹ $m_{1/2}$ is considered when calculating the systematic for the CMSSM. The points close to
²⁰ the diagonal in the S.M.S models display compressed spectra and so are effected by the
²¹ change in jet energy scale. Figures 20 and 21 show the effects of scaling the jet energies
²² for the considered S.M.S models, Figures 22 and 23 show the 68% coverage of the 1D
²³ distribution of the relative change in efficiency for the near and far regions from which
²⁴ the systematic is taken.

²⁵ 6.9.5 Systematic Uncertainty on Signal Yield from Cleaning ²⁶ Filters and Object Veto.

²⁷ For each of the cleaning cuts, R_{miss} and the `DeadECAL`, the systematic is given as the
²⁸ product of the ratio of normalised yields in the control samples, between data and
²⁹ Montecarlo and the relative change in efficiency due to the cleaning filter for each
³⁰ individual signal model. The background sample is chosen before an α_T cut or any other
³¹ cleaning cuts and is high in real \cancel{E}_T due to the selection of W + Jets and t \bar{t} events,
³² meaning the efficiency of the R_{miss} cut should be high. Figure 24 shows the accuracy of

¹ the R_{miss} modelling, at a cut value of $R_{miss} < 1.25$ the miss modelling is at the level of
² 14%. Figures 25, 26 and 27 show the change in selection efficiency due to the R_{miss} on
³ the signal models.

⁴ As for the R_{miss} cut the background selection is performed on data and Montecarlo and
⁵ the accuracy of modelling the DeadECAL filter is measured, the ratio of the normalised cut
⁶ efficiency on data and simulation shows a miss modelling at the level of 1.8%, this is taken
⁷ as the uncertainty on the Montecarlo model of the detector failures. Figures 29, 30 and 31
⁸ show the relative change in efficiency due to the DeadECAL filter on the considered signal
⁹ models.

¹⁰ Again regions with compressed spectra and many jet topologies are more effected by
¹¹ the cleaning cuts.

¹² Finally the effects of the lepton vetoes on the signal efficiency are studied. A generator
¹³ level filter is first applied removing any events with final state leptons or photons, thus
¹⁴ measuring the effect of hadronic objects faking leptons or photons. The relative change in
¹⁵ efficiency due to the application of the object vetoes is show in Figures 33, 35 and 36, the
¹⁶ inefficiency for each signal model are very small and are used directly as the systematic
¹⁷ error.

¹⁸ 6.10 Likelihood model

Declaration The likelihood model was implemented, developed, commissioned and deployed in anger by Edward Laird and is best described in his thesis[27]. However for completeness the likelihood model is described in this section. The likelihood is used to gauge the agreement between the observed yields in the hadronic signal region and the predicted yields obtained from the control samples. For the hadronic sample the likelihood is as follows, for N bins in H_T , let n_i represent the observed hadronic yield in H_T bin i , the likelihood for observing n_i events is then

$$L_{had} = \prod_i Pois(n_i | b_i + s_i) \quad (6.12)$$

¹⁹ where b_i is the number of expected background events and s_i the expected signal
²⁰ yield, which is dependant on the signal model being considered. Pois refers to the Poisson

- ¹ distribution of these values, b_i is equal to the sum of electro-weak events expected plus
- ² the number of QCD events ($b_i = EWK_i + QCD_i$) expected per bin.

In Section 6.7 it was shown that the QCD contribution can be modelled as an exponentially falling as a function of H_T .

$$R_{\alpha_T}(H_T) = A_{qcd} e^{-k_{QCD} H_T} \quad (6.13)$$

Where A_{QCD} and k_{QCD} have been constrained by measurements in the control regions. QCD_i is then given as:

$$QCD_i = m_i A_{qcd} e^{-k_{QCD} \langle H_T \rangle^i}. \quad (6.14)$$

- ³ Where m_i is the number of events per H_T bin which fail $\alpha_T > 0.55$ and $\langle H_T \rangle^i$ is the
- ⁴ mean H_T of the the bin.

For the electro-weak background two components are considered, f_{Zinv}^i represents the fraction of the total electro-weak background contributed by $Z \rightarrow \nu\nu + \text{Jets}$ events. This is models as a liner component:

$$f_{Zinv}^i = f_{Zinv}^0 + \frac{\langle H_T \rangle^i - \langle H_T \rangle^0}{\langle H_T \rangle^{N-1} - \langle H_T \rangle^0} (f_{Zinv}^{N-1} - f_{Zinv}^i), \quad (6.15)$$

where f_{Zinv}^i and f_{Zinv}^{N-1} are floating parameters who's final values are limited between zero and one. The total number of $Z \rightarrow \nu\nu + \text{Jets}$ events per bin is then given by:

$$Z_{inv}^i = f_{Zinv}^i \times EWK^i \quad (6.16)$$

with the remaining background from other electro-weak processes given by:

$$\not Z = (1 - f_{Zinv}^i) \times EWK^i. \quad (6.17)$$

In each H_T bin i there are three background measurements, n_γ^i , n_μ^i and $n_{\mu\mu}^i$, representing the event counts from the photon, muon and di-muon control samples respectively, each of these yields has a Montecarlo counter-part yield. From the Montecarlo it is also possible to extract MC_{Zinv}^i and $MC_{\not Z}^i$. After defining:

$$r_\gamma^i = \frac{MC_\gamma^i}{MC_{Zinv}^i}, \quad r_{\mu\mu}^i = \frac{MC_{\mu\mu}^i}{MC_{Zinv}^i}, \quad r_\mu^i = \frac{MC_\mu^i}{MC_{\not Z}^i} \quad (6.18)$$

Table 6.11: The systematic parameters used in H_T bins.

H_T bin (i)	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
syst. parameter (j)	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	2

three likelihood functions are defined:

$$L_\gamma = \prod_i Pois \left(n_\gamma^i | \rho_{\gamma Z}^j \cdot r_\gamma^i \cdot Z_{inv}^i \right), \quad (6.19)$$

$$L_{\mu\mu} = \prod_i Pois \left(n_{\mu\mu}^i | \rho_{\mu\mu Z}^j \cdot r_{\mu\mu}^i \cdot Z_{inv}^i \right), \quad (6.20)$$

$$L_\mu = \prod_i Pois \left(n_\mu^i | \rho_{\mu Z}^j \cdot r_\mu^i \cdot Z^i + s_\mu^i \right), \quad (6.21)$$

- 1 Equation (6.19) is used to estimate the M.L values for Z_{inv} which is the expectation of
 2 the number of $Z \rightarrow \nu\nu + \text{Jets}$ events in the hadronic signal region using the observations
 3 n_γ^i in the photon control sample and the ratio r_γ^i , similarly the number of $Z \rightarrow \nu\nu + \text{Jets}$
 4 events expected in the signal region predicted by the $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu + \text{Jets}$ are found using
 5 Equation (6.20). The non $Z \rightarrow \nu\nu$ backgrounds are estimated by the M.L value for
 6 Equation (6.21) in a similar way with the addition of s_μ^i which represents the signal
 7 contamination in the single muon control sample. The measurements and ratios are
 8 considered simultaneously though the relationships defined in

9 read the note here and reference the right equations.

The ratios r_γ^i , $r_{\mu\mu}^i$ and r_μ^i are the inverse of the translation factors given by Equation (6.9). The parameters $\rho_{\gamma Z}$, $\rho_{\mu\mu Z}$ and $\rho_{\mu Z}$ are correction factors that account for the systematic uncertainty on each of the ratios and $\sigma_{\gamma Z}$, $\sigma_{\mu\mu Z}$ and $\sigma_{\mu Z}$ represent the relative systematic uncertainties for the control sample constraints, these are accounted for in:

$$L_{EWK \ syst} = \prod_j Gaus \left(1.0 | \rho_{\mu Z}^j, \sigma_{\mu Z}^j \right) \times Gaus \left(1.0 | \rho_{\mu\mu Z}^j, \sigma_{\mu\mu Z}^j \right) \times Gaus \left(1.0 | \rho_{\gamma Z}^j, \sigma_{\gamma Z}^j \right) \quad (6.22)$$

- 10 Three parameters per control sample are used to cover the eight H_T bins as show in
 11 Table 6.11.

Alternatively the single muon control sample can be used to constrain the total electro-weak background, we can define:

$$r_\mu^{i'} = \frac{MC_\mu^i}{MC_{tot}^i} \quad (6.23)$$

and

$$L'_\mu = \prod_i Pois(n_\mu^i | \rho_{\mu Z} \times r_\mu^{i'} \times EWK^i + s_\mu^i) \quad (6.24)$$

Signal Contamination The cross section for each model is represented by x , l represents the total recorded luminosity considered by the analysis in the signal region. The efficiency is defined as ϵ_{had}^i for the signal region and ϵ_μ^i for the single muon control sample, δ represents the relative uncertainty on signal measured in the previous section, δ is taken to be fully correlated though the H_T bins. ρ_{sig} is the correction factor to the signal yield which accommodates this uncertainty. $\{\cdot\}$ represents an unknown multiplicative factor on the signal cross section, for which an allowed interval is computed. The expected signal yield s^i from Equation (6.12) is defined as:

$$s_{had}^i = \{\rho_{sig} x l \epsilon_{had}^i, \quad (6.25)$$

the signal contamination s_μ^i is given by:

$$s_\mu^i = \{\rho_\mu x l \epsilon_\mu^i. \quad (6.26)$$

The systematic on signal uncertainty is included by in an additional term in the likelihood:

$$L_{sig} = Gaus(1.0 | \rho_{sig}, \delta). \quad (6.27)$$

The total likelihood The total likelihood for a given signal selection $k(H_T, n_b)$ is given by:

$$L^k = L_{had}^k \times L_\mu^k \times L_\gamma^k \times L_{\mu\mu}^k, \quad (6.28)$$

each k has $3 + N$ nuisance parameters; $\mathcal{A}_{QCD}, f_{Zinv}^0, f_{Zinv}^{N-1}, \{EWK^i\}_{i=0}^{N-1}$. The 11 parameters k_{QCD}, ρ_{sig} , and $\rho_{\gamma Z}^k, \rho_{\mu\mu}^k, \rho_\mu^k$ with $j = \{0, 1, 2\}$ are shared between the selections, the

total likelihood is then given as:

$$L = L_{sig} \times L_{EWKsyst} \times \prod_k L_{had}^k \times L_\mu^k \times L_\gamma^k \times L_{\mu\mu}^k. \quad (6.29)$$

6.11 Final Results

- 2 The yields obtained in the hadronic signal regions are tested for their compatibility with
- 3 the background predicted by the likelihood model both in terms of agreement with the
- 4 Standard Model and interpretations in the forms of limits on new physics models.

6.11.1 Agreement with the Standard Model

- 6 To test the level of agreement with the standard model the signal terms are dropped
- 7 from the likelihood, which is then maximised over all parameters using RooFit[29] and
- 8 MINUIT[25]. The individual yields and errors from the fits are shown in Appendix

9 put these tables in teh appendix

- 10 . The total background and data yields and their errors as given by the M.L fit are
- 11 show below in Table 6.12.

Table 6.12: Comparison of the measured yields in the different H_T and b jet multiplicity bins for the hadronic sample with the SM expectations and combined statistical and systematic uncertainties given by the simultaneous fit.

H_T (GeV)	275–325	325–375	375–475	475–575	575–675	675–775	775–875	875– ∞
0 b jets SM	2933^{+56}_{-52}	1139^{+17}_{-40}	783^{+17}_{-27}	261^{+14}_{-8}	$81.5^{+6.5}_{-6.5}$	$34.2^{+4.0}_{-3.8}$	$10.4^{+2.8}_{-1.8}$	$5.3^{+1.7}_{-1.1}$
0 b jets Data	2919	1166	769	255	91	31	10	4
1 b jet SM	630^{+26}_{-25}	271^{+10}_{-16}	202^{+10}_{-6}	$78.0^{+6.9}_{-1.9}$	$24.2^{+2.9}_{-2.0}$	$10.6^{+1.7}_{-1.3}$	$2.9^{+0.9}_{-0.5}$	$2.2^{+0.7}_{-0.4}$
1 b jet Data	614	294	214	71	20	6	4	0
2 b jets SM	162^{+13}_{-12}	$61.8^{+4.8}_{-6.3}$	$58.8^{+4.8}_{-2.6}$	$28.0^{+3.5}_{-1.1}$	$9.0^{+1.4}_{-1.0}$	$7.1^{+1.4}_{-1.0}$	$0.6^{+0.3}_{-0.2}$	$0.9^{+0.4}_{-0.2}$
2 b jets Data	160	68	52	19	11	7	0	2
≥ 3 b jets SM	$10.5^{+3.5}_{-2.2}$	$7.1^{+2.2}_{-1.8}$	$5.8^{+1.4}_{-0.9}$	$3.1^{+1.0}_{-0.7}$	$1.7^{+0.5}_{-0.4}$	$0.7^{+0.5}_{-0.4}$	$0.1^{+0.1}_{-0.1}$	$0.2^{+0.1}_{-0.1}$
≥ 3 b jets Data	10	8	8	1	0	0	0	0

Figures 6.19, 6.20, 6.21 and 6.22 show comparisons of the observed yields and the Standard Model only expectations given by the simultaneous fit for 0, 1, 2, ≥ 3 exclusive b-tag bins. A good agreement with the standard model is observed in all H_T and b-tag categories. Given the lack of a signal like observation limits are set on the production masses and cross sections of beyond the standard model particles.




Figure 6.19: Comparison of the observed yields and SM expectations given by the simultaneous fit in bins of H_T for the (a) hadronic, (b) $\mu +$ Jets, (c) $\mu\mu +$ Jets and (d) $\gamma +$ Jets samples when requiring exactly zero reconstructed b-jets. The observed event yields in data (black dots) and the expectations and their uncertainties, as determined by the simultaneous fit, for all SM processes (light blue solid line with dark blue bands) are shown. For illustrative purposes only, an example signal model is superimposed on the SM expectation (magenta solid line). The expected signal contamination in the control samples is negligible.




Figure 6.20: Comparison of the observed yields and SM expectations given by the simultaneous fit in bins of H_T for the (a) hadronic, (b) $\mu +$ Jets, (c) $\mu\mu +$ Jets and (d) $\gamma +$ Jets samples when requiring exactly one reconstructed b-jet. The observed event yields in data (black dots) and the expectations and their uncertainties, as determined by the simultaneous fit, for all SM processes (light blue solid line with dark blue bands) are shown. For illustrative purposes only, an example signal model is superimposed on the SM expectation (magenta solid line). The expected signal contamination in the control samples is negligible.




Figure 6.21: Comparison of the observed yields and SM expectations given by the simultaneous fit in bins of H_T for the (a) hadronic, (b) $\mu +$ Jets, (c) $\mu\mu +$ Jets and (d) $\gamma +$ Jets samples when requiring exactly two reconstructed b-jets. The observed event yields in data (black dots) and the expectations and their uncertainties, as determined by the simultaneous fit, for all SM processes (light blue solid line with dark blue bands) are shown. For illustrative purposes only, an example signal model is superimposed on the SM expectation (magenta solid line). The expected signal contamination in the control samples is negligible.




Figure 6.22: Comparison of the observed yields and SM expectations given by the simultaneous fit in bins of H_T for the (a) hadronic and (b) $\mu +$ Jets samples when requiring at least three reconstructed b-jets. The observed event yields in data (black dots) and the expectations and their uncertainties, as determined by the simultaneous fit, for all SM processes (light blue solid line with dark blue bands) are shown. For illustrative purposes only, an example signal model is superimposed on the SM expectation (magenta solid line). The expected signal contamination in the $\mu +$ Jets control sample is negligible.

6.11.2 Interpretation in terms of new physics models.

Due to the lack of a signal like observation limits are set on new physics models. The first of these is the CMSSM, at each point in the $m_0, m_{1/2}$ parameter space the SUSY particle spectrum is calculated using `SoftSUSY`[8], the signal events are generated at leading order using `Pythia 6.4`[35], the Next to Leading Order + Next Leading Log (NLO+NNL) process dependant cross sections are calculated using `PROSPINO`[9] using the `CTEQ6`[34] PDF set. The previously measured errors on the background prediction, total collected luminosity and signal yield are included in the calculation of the limit. Although signal contributions from each data observation (hadronic, $\mu +$ Jets, $\mu\mu +$ Jets and $\gamma +$ Jets) are included, the only relevant signal contribution to the CMSSM is from the hadronic signal regions. Figure 6.23 shows the expected limit contour with it's associated $\pm 1\sigma$ error band as well as the observed limit. The limit is calculated using NLO+NNL cross sections using `CLs`[30], the limit presented is for the 95% confidence level. For the choice of $\tan\beta = 10$, $A_0 = 0 \text{ GeV}$, $\mu > 0$ and a top quark mass $m_{top} = 173.2 \text{ GeV}$, squarks with masses below 1.25 TeV are excluded at 95% confidence, gluinos with a mass up to 1.25 TeV are also excluded when $m_0 < 600 \text{ GeV}$. In the region $m_0 > 600 \text{ GeV}$ gluino

- ¹ masses below 700 GeV are excluded as are squarks with masses between 1.25-2.5 TeV,
² m_0 dependant.




Figure 6.23: Exclusion contours at 95% CL in the CMSSM ($m_0, m_{1/2}$) plane ($\tan \beta = 10, A_0 = 0, \mu > 0$) calculated with NLO+NNL SUSY production cross sections and the CL_s method. The solid black line indicates the observed exclusion region. The dotted-dashed black lines represent the observed excluded region when varying the cross section by its theoretical uncertainty. The expected median exclusion region (green dashed line) $\pm 1\sigma$ (green band) are also shown.

³ THe observed yields are also used to set limits on S.M.S models. This allows
⁴ interpretation of the results for defined mass splittings and final states. Each S.M.S
⁵ sample is characterised by the SUSY particle which is pair produced, either a squark or
⁶ a gluino and the LSP mass, the individual points are then defined by the mass difference
⁷ between the pair produced particle and the LSP. The decay topologies are further
⁸ specialised by enforcing the final state quarks to be heavy flavours, either top or bottom
⁹ quarks. The decays of the considered models are summarised in Table 6.13 As before the
¹⁰ experimental uncertainties on the background estimation, collected luminosity, and the
¹¹ model dependant signal uncertainties are accounted for in the calculation of the limit.

¹² In the regions $m_{\tilde{q}(\tilde{g})} - m_{LSP} < 200$ GeV and $m_{\tilde{q}(\tilde{g})} < 350$ GeV any selection efficiency
¹³ is strongly dependant on the presence of initial state radiation which is not well modelled
¹⁴ in the Montecarlo simulation, hence these regions are not considered when setting limits
¹⁵ in the S.M.S models, for the model T1tttt the ignored region is expanded to cover
¹⁶ $m_{\tilde{g}} - m_{LSP} < 400$ GeV.

Figure 6.24 shows the observed limits at 95% confidence level obtained using CL_s as a function of $m_{\tilde{q}(\tilde{g})}$ and m_{LSP} . The solid black lines represent the observed median limit assuming NLO+NNL[9, 26] SUSY cross sections for squark pair production in the limit of de-coupled gluinos and vice versa for the gluino production models. The thin black lines represent the limit when this cross section is varied by $\pm 1\sigma$ of the theoretical uncertainty, the dashed purple lines represent the expected limit and its $\pm 1\sigma$ uncertainty.

The best limits are set on the mass of the pair produced sparticles are at low m_{LSP} due to the large mass splitting between the sparticles and the LSP producing high p_T final state objects. The limits degrade as the decay spectra become compressed, above a certain m_{LSP} no limit is set.

No exclusion on direct stop, stop production (T2tt) is expected assuming the NLO+NNL production cross section for $m_{LSP} > 50$ GeV. Figure 6.25 shows the observed upper limit at 95% confidence level on the cross section as a function of m_{stop} for an LSP with a mass of 50 GeV.

Table 6.13: Production and decay modes for various simplified models.

Model	Production and decay modes	Figure showing limit
T1	$\tilde{g}\tilde{g} \rightarrow q\bar{q}\tilde{\chi}^0 q\bar{q}\tilde{\chi}^0$	6.24(a)
T2	$\tilde{q}\tilde{q} \rightarrow q\tilde{\chi}^0 \bar{q}\tilde{\chi}^0$	6.24(b)
T2tt	$\tilde{t}\tilde{t} \rightarrow t\tilde{\chi}^0 \bar{t}\tilde{\chi}^0$	6.24(c), 6.25
T2bb	$\tilde{b}\tilde{b} \rightarrow b\tilde{\chi}^0 \bar{b}\tilde{\chi}^0$	6.24(d)
T1tttt	$\tilde{g}\tilde{g} \rightarrow t\bar{t}\tilde{\chi}^0 t\bar{t}\tilde{\chi}^0$	6.24(e)
T1bbbb	$\tilde{g}\tilde{g} \rightarrow b\bar{b}\tilde{\chi}^0 b\bar{b}\tilde{\chi}^0$	6.24(f)




Figure 6.24: Upper limit on cross section at 95% CL as a function of $m_{\tilde{q}}$ or $m_{\tilde{g}}$ and m_{LSP} for various simplified models. The solid thick black line indicates the observed exclusion region assuming NLO+NNL SUSY production cross section. The thin black lines represent the observed excluded region when varying the cross section by its theoretical uncertainty. The dashed purple lines indicate the median (thick line) $\pm 1\sigma$ (thin lines) expected exclusion regions.




Figure 6.25: Excluded cross section versus top squark mass for a model in which pair-produced top squarks decay to two top quarks and two neutralinos. The solid blue line indicates the observed cross section upper limit (95% CL) as a function of the top squark mass, $m_{\tilde{t}}$. The dashed orange line and blue band indicate the median expected excluded cross section with experimental uncertainties. The solid black line with grey band indicates the NLO+NNL SUSY top squark pair-production cross section and theoretical uncertainties.

Chapter 7

Conclusion

2

DRAFT

Bibliography

- [1]
- [2] Technical report.
- [3] Updated measurements of the inclusive w and z cross sections at 7 tev. (CMS-AN-10-264), 2010.
- [4] Search for supersymmetry with the α_t variable in the 7 tev dataset of 2011. (CMS-AN-11-517), 2011.
- [5] Search for supersymmetry in final states with missing transverse energy and 0, 1, 2, 3, or at least 4 b-quark jets in 8 tev pp collisions using the variable alphat. (CMS-PAS-SUS-12-028), 2012.
- [6] T Åkesson. The ATLAS experiment at the CERN Large Hadron Collider - CERN Document Server. *Particles*, 1999.
- [7] B Alessandro, F Antinori, J Belikov, and C Blume. ALICE: Physics performance report, volume II. *Journal of Physics G: Nuclear and Particle Physics*, January 2006.
- [8] B C Allanach. SOFTSUSY: a program for calculating supersymmetric spectra. *Comput. Phys. Commun.*, 143:305, 2002.
- [9] W. Beenakker and others. Squark and gluino production at hadron colliders. *Nucl. Phys. B*, 492:51, 1997.
- [10] Michael Benedikt, Paul Collier, V Mertens, John Poole, and Karlheinz Schindl. *LHC Design Report*. CERN, Geneva, 2004.
- [11] Z Bern, G Diana, L J Dixon, F Febres Cordero, S Hoche, and others. Driving Missing Data at Next-to-Leading Order. *arXiv*, D84:114002, 2011.
- [12] Michiel Botje, Jon Butterworth, Amanda Cooper-Sarkar, Albert de Roeck, Joel

- 1 Feltesse, Stefano Forte, Alexander Glazov, Joey Huston, Ronan McNulty, Tor-
2 bjorn Sjostrand, and Robert Thorne. The PDF4LHC Working Group Interim
3 Recommendations. *arXiv.org*, hep-ph, January 2011.
- 4 [13] M Cacciari, G Salam, and G Soyez. The anti-kt jet clustering algorithm. *Journal of*
5 *High Energy* . . . , January 2008.
- 6 [14] Serguei Chatrchyan and others. Determination of Jet Energy Calibration and
7 Transverse Momentum Resolution in CMS. *arXiv*, 6:P11002, 2011.
- 8 [15] CMS Collaboration. CMS b-tagging performance database. Technical report.
- 9 [16] CMS Collaboration. The Trigger and Data Acquisition Project Technical Design
10 Report, Volume 1, The Level-1 Trigger. *CERN/LHCC 2000-038, CMS TDR 6.1*,
11 2000.
- 12 [17] CMS Collaboration. Data-Driven Estimation of the Invisible Z Background to the
13 SUSY MET Plus Jets Search. Technical report, 2008.
- 14 [18] CMS Collaboration. SUSY searches with dijet events. Technical report, 2008.
- 15 [19] CMS Collaboration. Search strategy for exclusive multi-jet events from supersym-
16 metry at CMS. Technical report, 2009.
- 17 [20] CMS Collaboration. Electron reconstruction and identification at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV.
18 Technical report, 2010.
- 19 [21] CMS Collaboration. Isolated Photon Reconstruction and Identification at $\sqrt{s} = 7$
20 TeV. Technical report, 2010.
- 21 [22] CMS Collaboration. Performance of muon identification in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$
22 TeV. Technical report, 2010.
- 23 [23] The CMS Collaboration. CMS - The Compact Muon Solenoid. January 1996.
- 24 [24] The C.M.S Collaboration. Cms tracking performance results from early lhc opera-
25 tion. *Eur. Phys. J. C*, 70(arXiv:1007.1988. CERN-PH-EP-2010-019. CMS-TRK-10-
26 001):1165. 29 p, Jul 2010.
- 27 [25] Frederic James. MINUIT Reference Manual. *CERN Program Library Writeup*,
28 D506.
- 29 [26] M Kr amer, A Kulesza, R van der Leeuw, and others. Supersymmetry production

- 1 cross sections in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV. *arXiv*.
- 2 [27] Edward Matthew Laird. A Search for Squarks and Gluinos with the CMS Detector.
3 2012.
- 4 [28] J Marrouche and others. Commissioning the CMS Global Calorimeter Trigger. *CMS*
5 IN, 2010/029, 2010.
- 6 [29] Belasco Cranmer Moneta and others. The RooStats Project. *Proceedings of Science*,
7 2010.
- 8 [30] K Nakamura. Review of particle physics. *J. Phys. G*, 37:075021, 2010.
- 9 [31] J Rademacker. LHCb: Status and Physics Prospects. *Arxiv preprint hep-ex*, January
10 2005.
- 11 [32] Lisa Randall and David Tucker-Smith. Dijet Searches for Supersymmetry at the
12 LHC. *arXiv*, hep-ph, January 2008.
- 13 [33] WH Smith, Ph Busson, S Dasu, J Hauser, G Heath, J Krolikowski, J Varela,
14 A Taurok, G Wrochna, and P Zotto. Cms physiscs technical design report: The
15 trigger system. 1:1–630, Dec 2000.
- 16 [34] Daniel Stump, Joey Huston, Jon Pumplin, Wu-Ki Tung, H.L. Lai, et al. Inclusive jet
17 production, parton distributions, and the search for new physics. *JHEP*, 0310:046,
18 2003.
- 19 [35] S Mrenna T. Sjöstrand and P Z Skands. PYTHIA 6.4 Physics and Manual. *JHEP*,
20 05:026, 2006.
- 21 [36] R.S. Thorne, A.D. Martin, W.J. Stirling, and G. Watt. Status of MRST/MSTW
22 PDF sets. 2009.
- 23 [37] Maria Ubiali, Richard D. Ball, Luigi Del Debbio, Stefano Forte, Alberto Guffanti,
24 et al. Combined PDF and strong coupling uncertainties at the LHC with NNPDF2.0.
25 2010.
- 26 [38] C Wulz. The CMS experiment at CERN. *cdsweb.cern.ch*.

¹ 1 Additional information on triggers

Table 1: List of HT triggers used.

H_T bin (GeV)	Trigger
$275 < H_T < 325$	HLT-HT250_v*
$325 < H_T < 375$	HLT-HT300_v*
$375 < H_T < 475$	HLT-HT350_v*
$H_T > 475$	HLT-HT400_v*

Table 2: List of α_T triggers used.


$275 < H_T < 325 GeV$	$325 < H_T < 375 GeV$
HLT-HT250_AlphaT0p53_v*	HLT-HT300_AlphaT0p52_v*
HLT-HT250_AlphaT0p55_v*	HLT-HT300_AlphaT0p53_v*
HLT-HT250_AlphaT0p58_v*	HLT-HT300_AlphaT0p54_v*
HLT-HT250_AlphaT0p60_v*	HLT-HT300_AlphaT0p55_v*
$375 < H_T < 475 GeV$	$H_T > 475 GeV$
HLT-HT350_AlphaT0p51_v*	HLT-HT400_AlphaT0p51_v*
HLT-HT350_AlphaT0p52_v*	HLT-HT400_AlphaT0p52_v*
HLT-HT350_AlphaT0p52_v*	
HLT-HT350_AlphaT0p53_v*	

Table 3: List of Mu-HT triggers used.


$H_T > 275 GeV$	$H_T > 375 GeV$
HLT_Mu5-HT200_v*	HLT_Mu5-HT200_v*
HLT_Mu8-HT200_v*	HLT_Mu8-HT200_v*
HLT_Mu15-HT200_v*	HLT_Mu15-HT200_v*
HLT_Mu30-HT200_v*	HLT_Mu30-HT200_v*
HLT_Mu40-HT200_v*	HLT_Mu40-HT200_v*
	HLT_Mu40-HT300_v*

Table 4: List of Photon triggers used.


$H_T > 375 GeV$
HLT_Photon75_CaloIdVL_v*
HLT_Photon75_CaloIdVL_IsoL_v*
HLT_Photon90_CaloIdVL_v*
HLT_Photon90_CaloIdVL_IsoL_v*
HLT_Photon125_v*
HLT_Photon135_v*



(a) Efficiency (%)



(b) Positive error (%)



(c) Negative error (%)

Figure 1: Efficiency and associated errors of the α_T trigger in offline bins of H_T and α_T .




Figure 2: Efficiency turn-on curves for the α_T triggers used to collect events for four different HT regions.




Figure 3: Efficiency turn-on curve for the representative model RM1, with $m_0 = 320 \text{ GeV}$ and $m_{1/2} = 520 \text{ GeV}$, using the α_T trigger with thresholds $H_T > 250 \text{ GeV}$ and $\alpha_T > 0.55$ and an offline signal region defined by $H_T > 275 \text{ GeV}$ and $\alpha_T > 0.55$.




Figure 4: Efficiency turn-on curves for the H_T triggers used to collect events for four different H_T regions.

2 Addition information on background estimation methods

2.1 Determination of k_{QCD}




Figure 5: $R_{\alpha_T}(H_T)$ and exponential fit for various data side-bands. Linear y-axis scale.

3 Closure tests and systematic uncertainties

3.1 Defining muon samples without an α_T requirement




Figure 6: Closure tests that demonstrate the MC modelling of the α_T acceptance. The closure tests are performed for both the inclusive analysis with (a) the $\mu + \text{jets}$ sample and (b) the $\mu\mu + \text{jets}$ control sample. Similar tests are performed for the b-tag analysis using (a) the $\mu + \text{jets}$ sample and a requirement of exactly one b-tag, and (b) the $\mu + \text{jets}$ sample and a requirement of at least two b-tags. The red lines indicate the constant best fit value across all H_T bins.

3.2 Closure tests for inclusive analysis




Figure 7: Closure tests using yields from one control to predict yields in another sample. The two plots on the left show closure tests which use “low stats” muon samples recorded with the HT_AlphaT triggers and defined by offline selection criteria that include an α_T requirement: (a) $\mu + \text{jets} \rightarrow \mu\mu + \text{jets}$ sample and (c) $\gamma + \text{jets} \rightarrow \mu\mu + \text{jets}$ sample. Similarly, the plots on the right show the same closure tests but using “high-stats” muon samples recorded with Mu_HT triggers and defined with no offline α_T requirement. The same tests are performed: (b) $\mu + \text{jets} \rightarrow \mu\mu + \text{jets}$ sample and (d) $\gamma + \text{jets} \rightarrow \mu\mu + \text{jets}$ sample. These closure tests are only possible for the six highest H_T bins due to the trigger conditions. The red lines indicate the constant best fit value across all H_T bins.

3.3 Closure tests for b-tag analysis




Figure 8: Closure tests with the $\mu + \text{jets}$ sample that demonstrate the MC modelling of the b-tagging algorithm and of different sample compositions by for different b-tag multiplicities: (a) 0 b-tags \rightarrow 1 b-tag, (b) 1 b-tags $\rightarrow \geq 2$ b-tags, (c) 0 b-tags $\rightarrow \geq 2$ b-tags.




Figure 9: Closure tests using the $\mu + \text{jets}$ sample to predict the yields in a $\mu\mu + \text{jets}$ sample, for events with (a) exactly 0-b-tags and (b) exactly 1-b-tags.

3.4 Closure tests concerning pile-up




Figure 10: Closure tests using yields from one control to predict yields in another sample. The three plots on the left show closure tests from the inclusive analysis, which uses jets that are not corrected for the effects of pile-up. On the right, the jets in the analysis *are* corrected for pile-up effects by applying the `L10offset` jet energy correction. The three closure tests are: probing the MC modelling of the α_T acceptance with the $\mu + \text{jets}$ sample (a) without and (b) with `L10offset` jet energy corrections; using the $\mu + \text{jets}$ sample to predict yields in the $\mu\mu + \text{jets}$ sample (a) without and (b) with `L10offset` jet energy corrections; and using a 0 b-tagged $\mu + \text{jets}$ sample to predict yields in a 1 b-tagged $\mu + \text{jets}$ sample (a) without and (b) with `L10offset` jet energy corrections. The red lines indicate the constant best fit value across all H_T bins.

4 Signal efficiency

4.1 CMSSM




Figure 11: Signal efficiency in the $(m_0, m_{1/2})$ plane of the CMSSM, of the full hadronic signal selection, integrating over all eight H_T bins and requiring (a) exactly zero, (b) exactly one, (c) exactly two, and (d) at least three b-tags per event.

4.2 T1




Figure 12: Signal efficiency in the $(m_{\text{glino}}, m_{\text{LSP}})$ plane of the T1 simplified model, of the full hadronic signal selection, integrating over all eight H_T bins and requiring (a) exactly zero, (b) exactly one, (c) exactly two, and (d) at least three b-tags per event.

1 4.3 T2




Figure 13: Signal efficiency in the $(m_{\text{sq}}, m_{\text{LSP}})$ plane of the T2 simplified model, of the full hadronic signal selection, integrating over all eight H_T bins and requiring (a) exactly zero, (b) exactly one, (c) exactly two, and (d) at least three b-tags per event.

4.4 T2tt




Figure 14: Signal efficiency in the (m_{sq}, m_{LSP}) plane of the T2tt simplified model, of the full hadronic signal selection, integrating over all eight H_T bins and requiring (a) exactly zero, (b) exactly one, (c) exactly two, and (d) at least three b-tags per event.

4.5 T2bb




Figure 15: Signal efficiency in the (m_{sq}, m_{LSP}) plane of the T2bb simplified model, of the full hadronic signal selection, integrating over all eight H_T bins and requiring (a) exactly zero, (b) exactly one, (c) exactly two, and (d) at least three b-tags per event.

1 4.6 T1tttt




Figure 16: Signal efficiency in the $(m_{\text{glino}}, m_{\text{LSP}})$ plane of the T1tttt simplified model, of the full hadronic signal selection, integrating over all eight H_T bins and requiring (a) exactly zero, (b) exactly one, (c) exactly two, and (d) at least three b-tags per event.

4.7 T1bbbb




Figure 17: Signal efficiency in the $(m_{\text{gl}}, m_{\text{LSP}})$ plane of the T1bbbb simplified model, of the full hadronic signal selection, integrating over all eight H_T bins and requiring (a) exactly zero, (b) exactly one, (c) exactly two, and (d) at least three b-tags per event.

4.8 Signal contamination for T1tttt




Figure 18: Signal efficiency in the planes of simplified model T1tttt, of the (left) hadronic signal sample selection or (right) single muon control sample selection, integrating over all eight H_T bins and requiring (top) exactly one, (middle) exactly two, or (bottom) at least three b-tags per event.

1 5 Experimental systematic uncertainties on signal 2 efficiency times acceptance

3 5.1 Systematics due to jet energy scale uncertainties




Figure 19: The effect of jet energy scale variations on signal efficiency in the CMSSM plane. All plots show the relative change in efficiency. No requirement is made on the number of reconstructed b jets. The red shaded area is bounded by the 68th percentile.




Figure 20: The fractional change in signal efficiency due to systematically increasing all jet energies, for various topologies. No requirement is made on the number of reconstructed b jets.




Figure 21: The fractional change in signal efficiency due to systematically decreasing all jet energies, for various topologies. No requirement is made on the number of reconstructed b jets.




Figure 22: The fractional change in signal efficiency near to the diagonal due to systematically increasing or decreasing all jet energies, for various topologies. No requirement is made on the number of reconstructed b jets.




Figure 23: The fractional change in signal efficiency far from the diagonal due to systematically increasing or decreasing all jet energies, for various topologies. No requirement is made on the number of reconstructed b jets.

5.2 Systematics due to the MHT/MET cut





Figure 24: (a) Comparison of the MHT/MET distributions from data and MC, and (b) the ratio of the distributions, data/MC, as a function of the MHT/MET cut value.



(a) Fraction of expected signal yield rejected. (b) Fraction of expected signal yield rejected in a ± 60 GeV band around the observed limit.

Figure 25: The fraction of expected signal yield that is rejected by the MHT/MET cut in the CMSSM plane. No requirement is made on the number of reconstructed b jets.

Table 5: Conservative estimates of inefficiency (%) for the MHT/MET cut when considering model points in the region near to the diagonal (i.e. small mass splitting and compressed spectra) for various simplified models.

	T1	T2	T2tt	T2bb	T1tttt	T1bbbb
Near	10.9	3.5	20.4	3.9	-	10.8
Far	3.2	0.9	3.1	1.2	32.4	3.7




Figure 26: The fraction of expected signal yield that is rejected by the MHT/MET cleaning cut, for various topologies. No requirement is made on the number of reconstructed b jets.




Figure 27: The fraction of expected signal yield that is rejected by the MHT/MET cleaning cut, near to the diagonal, for various topologies. No requirement is made on the number of reconstructed b jets.




Figure 28: The fraction of expected signal yield that is rejected by the MHT/MET cleaning cut, far from the diagonal, for various topologies. No requirement is made on the number of reconstructed b jets.

¹ 5.3 Systematics due to the dead ECAL cut




Figure 29: The fraction of expected signal yield that is rejected by the dead ECAL cut in the CMSSM plane. No requirement is made on the number of reconstructed b jets.

Table 6: Conservative estimates of inefficiency (%) for the dead ECAL cut when considering model points in the region near to the diagonal (i.e. small mass splitting and compressed spectra) for various simplified models.

	T1	T2	T2tt	T2bb	T1tttt	T1bbbb
Near	13.3	6.4	23.7	7.5	-	16.4
Far	13.6	5.8	9.4	6.2	27.6	13.9

5.4 Systematics due to the lepton and photon vetoes




Figure 30: The fraction of expected signal yield that is rejected by the dead ECAL cleaning cut, for various topologies. No requirement is made on the number of reconstructed b jets.




Figure 31: The fraction of expected signal yield that is rejected by the dead ECAL cleaning cut, near to the diagonal, for various topologies. No requirement is made on the number of reconstructed b jets.





Figure 32: The fraction of expected signal yield that is rejected by the dead ECAL cleaning cut, far from the diagonal, for various topologies. No requirement is made on the number of reconstructed b jets.



(a) Fraction of expected signal yield rejected.


(b) Fraction of expected signal yield rejected in a ± 60 GeV band around the observed limit.

Figure 33: The fraction of expected signal yield that is rejected by the dead ECAL cut in the CMSSM plane. No requirement is made on the number of reconstructed b jets.




Figure 34: The fraction of expected signal yield that is rejected by the lepton and photon vetoes, for various topologies. No requirement is made on the number of reconstructed b jets.




Figure 35: The fraction of expected signal yield that is rejected by the lepton and photon vetoes, near to the diagonal, for various topologies. No requirement is made on the number of reconstructed b jets.




Figure 36: The fraction of expected signal yield that is rejected by the lepton and photon vetoes, far from the diagonal, for various topologies. No requirement is made on the number of reconstructed b jets.