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**Examiner 1 = Internal.**

**Examiner 2 = External.**

Abstract:

* **Examiners: Multiple numbers underlined with comment “#s.f. a bit large” (sig figures).**

Introduction:

* Page 23: ~~While~~ **T**he top quark**’s** ~~has the same properties as the other five quarks, its~~ mass of 173+/-0.4 GeV [21], not only places it near the electroweak …

An Introduction to the Standard Model and Top Quark Physics:

* The Standard Model:
  + **Examiners** (Page 25):What is kB? (Is this a viva question or correction? Added correction in parenthesis).
  + *Fundamental Particles:*
    - **Examiners** (Page 25): “… six leptons, fundamental particles experience the electromagnetic and weak force”. **Neutrinos don’t interact with EM.**
    - Page 26 – The spin-0 Higgs boson accounts for fundamental particles acquiring mass. WHOOPS. **Also picked up by Examiners.**
    - Page 27: Table 2.2 – Gauge Bosons heading -> Bosons.
    - Examiners: (Page 27, Table 2.2) **Weak isospin and colour charge entries for gluons are each other’s respective columns.**
  + *Gauge Symmetries:*
    - **Examiners**: (Page 28) “as U(1) has only one generator, which self-commutes, **and** is zero.” Added “and” would make sense if there was no “as” before U(1). **Confirm before committing**.
  + QED:
    - Page 29: “… Heisenberg's uncertainty principle, it***s* (or *the*)** field experiences random fluctuations.” **(Examiners also picked up on this)**.
    - **Examiner 1**: (Page 29) “reduced”. **is it [measured?** illegible**]? Viva question or correction?**
  + Weak Interactions:
    - **Examiner 1:** (Page 30) **What is chirality?** Explain … chirality/left-handed fermions and T = +/- ½ **Viva question or correction? Only “chirality” is underlined and annotated with “explain” in the text. VIVA QUESTION**
  + Electroweak Unification:
    - **Examiners**: (Page 30) **“… gauge group hypothesises that its …”** – technically a theory cannot hypothesise something. Only a person can … **“… gauge group and describes the two seemingly disparate constituent forces – weak and electromagnetic – as a single …”**
  + Spontaneous Symmetry Breaking:
    - Page 31: “Brout, Engler, Higgs,**[insert space]** Guralnik, Hagen …” (**Examiners also picked up on this**).
    - **Examiners**: (Page 31) Explain: “… infinite number of ground states.”
    - **Rephrase:** (Page 32, Figure 2.1) Infinite minima
    - Page 32: Higgs Mass!
  + QCD:
    - Page 33: “This results in the colour confinement **of partons** [31, 46, 53].”
    - Or *“This results in* ***~~the~~*** *colour confinement[ 31, 46, 53].”*
    - **Examiners**: (Page 33) “decreases with **decreasing** distance (increasing momenta).”
* Top Physics:
  + Page 33: **~~Given that~~** **As** the top quark was more massive than initially assumed **~~however~~**, …
  + **Examiner 2**: (Page 34) “Measurements of the Wtb vertex allow**s** for the …”
  + Top quark pair production:
    - Page 35: Missing second bullet point; **·** Higher centre-of-mass energies results in smaller Bjorken *x*
    - Page 35: Reorder bullet points to emphasise greater importance of the latter point. And add bullet point!
  + Single top quark production:
    - **Examiner 2:** (Page 36) Inked lines between paragraphs two and three. No paragraph break? **Merged paragraphs one and two.**
    - Figure 2.5(a) – bbar is NOT from the sea! Due to charge asymmetric initial state
    - **Examiner 1**: [underlined] (Page 37) “on-shell W boson”. **Viva question**
    - **Examiner 1**: [underlined] (Page 37) “observable” (at the LHC). **Correction? Produced alternative version.**
    - **Examiner 1**: (Page 38) “… destructive interference between the tH and HW vertices” **WHY?** **Viva question or correction? Added clarificatory text.**
  + Single top production in association with a Z boson:
    - Page 38: In contrast, ttZ **[insert space]** has a lower … (**Examiners** also picked up on this).
    - Page 38: “**trilepton**: when the W boson decays into a lepton and neutrino and the Z boson decays into a lepton and anti-lepton **[insert full stop].**”
    - Page 38: **hadronic**: both the W boson and Z boson decay into a quark and anti-quark **[insert full stop].**”
    - **Examiners** (page 39-40): “trilepton final state, **~~as~~** while it has …” **“… the trilepton final state as despite it having a smaller …”**
    - **Examiners** (page 39): Underlined Fig 2.7 “the **~~the~~** non-resonant contribution to the tZq process in the bottom right diagram.”
    - **Examiners**: (page 40): [underlined] “… it is the easiest to distinguish against …”
    - Page 40: “as a result of the **t**Z and tbarZ cross sections increasing with the centre-of-mass energy at a similar rate to ttZ **[insert space]** and …” (**Examiners** also picked up on this).
    - **Examiners** (page 40)**: “**Such an increase in statistics”- colloquial use of the word statistics! **Used better phrasing/English.**
    - Page 40: Errors for Equation 2.16.
  + Beyond the Standard Model Physics:
    - **Examiner 1:** (Page 41) “Explain”[comment in margins next to hierarchy text] why the Higgs vev would be either 0 or ~ order of plank’s constant and why cancellations would need to be fine-tuned. “**Given that the loop corrections for the Higgs mass are quadratically divergent, this would imply that the Higgs vacuum expectation value would be either zero or at the mass scale of any new physics”.**

*LHC and CMS:*

* *LHC:*
  + **Examiner 1** (page 42)**:** “The LHC can also operate in a heavy-ion mode, where lead ions are collided at 2.76TeV per nucleon **which** **is** usually **done** for one month a year.”
  + **Examiner 1** (Page 45): Repeating proton bunches, bunch separation and collision rate. **Just state CoM energy and design luminosity in opening paragraph, and have the further details in the “motivation” section.**
  + **Examiner 1** (Page 45:) Explain the difference between in-time/out-of time PU. How is this possible? **Viva question.**
* CMS:
  + Overview:
    - **Examiner 1** (Page 46): Where is the HO in the diagram? (Fig 3.4). **Most diagrams lack the HO …**
    - **Examiner 1** (Page 47): [underlined] This is due to η ? **Very poor language. Provided clearer definition and justification for both y and eta.**
  + Tracker:
    - **Examiners**: (Page 47): “… a low channel occupancy (<1%)**.**”
    - **Examiner 2** (Page 48): “ROCs” undefined
    - **Examiner 1** (Page 48): How are pixels better than strips for track recon. **Viva question I think**
    - **Examiner 1** (Page 48): Last paragraph of 3.2.2 before 3.2.2.1 needs to be better English! **Added missing text that resulted in the poor language. Still think it can be improved.**
  + Silicon Pixel Tracker:
    - **Examiner 2** (Page 48): “… Tracker Inner Disks (TID**)**, …”
    - **Examiner 1** (Page 48): “… barrel layers at mean radii of 4.4 **cm**, 7.3 **cm**, and 10.2 cm respectively …”
    - **Examiner 1** (Page 48): Nice to have pictures of SPT and SMT.
      * **Chosen two picturesque images for each subsubsection as technical layout is already shown in subsection{tracker}.**

Page 48: Make it clear that the Phase-1 pixel has always been planned

* + Silicon Microstrip Tracker:
    - (Page 49): Correct z0 -> z
  + ECAL:
    - **Examiners** (Page 49): “… scintillation light when the electromagnetic shower de-excites …” phrasing of EM shower and spelling for de-excites. **Rephrased.**
    - (Page 49): “Avalanche photo**~~s~~**diodes … amplify the light and **convert** it into an …”. **Examiners also picked up on these**.
    - (Page 49): more radiation hard vacuum **phototriodes** in the endcap disks.
    - **Examiners** (Page 49): EE resolution to be added to supplement the EB one present. **Resolution is from an EB paper, but measurement is for PbWO4 crystals in general (and cannot find a similar quote for EE).**
  + Muon Chambers:
    - (DTs, Page 53): Correct z0 -> z’s
    - **Examiner 1** (Page 55): *Nice to have performance plots of all detectors*
  + Trigger and Data Acquisition Systems:
    - **Examiners** (Page 56): “…the High Level Trigger (HLT), as it**’s** not feasible …”
    - Level-1 Trigger:
      * **Examiners** (Page 56): “Tracking information is not used in the L-1 Trigger as it was not possible to read … every event”. **Phrasing**.
      * **Page 56: Fix broken reference! Same as previous reference. Also picked up by examiners.**
  + LHC and CMS Performance:
    - * **Examiners** (Page 56): “at  **= 13** TeV”

*TMTT:*

* The HL-LHC:
  + **Examiners** (Page 60): **(HL-LHC)**
  + **Examiners** (Page 61): **(HL-LHC)**
  + **Examiners** (Page 61): **Question:** “As it is not practical to increase the number of proton bunches due to the resultant hear loads induce by electron clouds.
  + **Examiners** (Page 61): “… during Long Shutdown 3 **(LS3)**, which …”
  + **Examiners** (Page 61): “geometrical reduction factor**~~,~~** .”
* The Phase-II Outer Tracker Upgrade:
  + Page 61: “… innermost layers) **[insert space]** and …” **Also picked up by examiners.**
  + Pages 61-62: Capitalised start of bullet points
  + **Examiners** (Page 62): [Question] “… either 25x100um² or 50x50um².” **Why the different sized modules? Viva quesiton**
  + Page 62: As with **~~to~~** the previous pixel detectors, the Inner Tracker is also designed.
  + **Examiner 2** (Page 64): [Question] “The advantages of the tilted geometry …large incident angles … overall costs of the system.”
  + Page 64: Further details on the two pT-modules can be found in **[correct reference ordering]**
  + **Page 64: Fix reference ordering in** Figure 4.2 and end of the paragraph at the top of the page.
  + **Examiners** (Page 64): “… to the **~~FW~~ hardware/firmware** buffers …”
  + **Examiners** (Page 65): “… to the off-detector **~~electrons~~ electronics** …”
* A Time-Multiplexed Track Finder:
  + **Examiner 2** (Page 65): [Question] “Hough Transform” **Asked during viva**
* The Track Finding Architecture:
  + Page 66: “as previously demonstrated by the Phase-I Calorimeter Trigger Upgrade **[fix reference]** …” **Also picked up by examiners.**
* The Track Finding Processor:
  + **Examiners** (Page 67): *“This process also greatly reduces the combinatorics that …”* ***Phrasing***. **A highly parallelised initial coarse track finding that identifies track candidates that are consistent with a track in the \rphi plane, greatly reducing the data volume and combinatorics that have to be considered by the subsequent stages.**
  + Hough Transform:
    - **Examiners** (Page 70): [Question] “By choosing an appropriate value of T … optimal value of T was determined to be 58cm.”
    - **Examiners** (Page 70): [Question] “A detailed description of the firmware implementation of the Hough Transform ….”
  + Kalman Filter:
    - **Examiners** (Page 70): “the presence of **~~these~~ such incorrectly associated** stubs would **~~negatively impact the accuracy of the track parameters fitted to the genuine tracks~~  degrade the resolution of the helix parameters fitted to reconstructed tracks associated with a particle.**”
    - **Examiners** (Page 70): “In addition, **~~over half of the tracks candidates found by the Hough Transform in simulation~~** **simulation studies indicated that approximately half of the track candidates created by the Hough Transform did not ~~correspond to a genuine track~~ have stubs associated to the same particle in at least four tracker layers** (i.e. were fake).”
    - **Examiners** (Page 70): “Therefore, a Kalman Filter was developed to precisely fir the track parameters given its ability to simultaneously **~~filter~~** **remove** **~~out~~ these** **~~incompatible~~** **incorrectly associated** stubs and **~~perform the track fit~~ “fake” tracks while** **obtaining the best possible estimate of the reconstructed track’s helix parameters**.”
    - “While the Kalman Filter is the optimal **~~linear~~** filter **for linear systems** and, **~~in certain circumstances,~~** the optimal **~~non-~~**linear filter **for non-linear systems** , it …”
    - Or: “While the Kalman Filter is the optimal linear filter and**~~, in certain circumstances, the optimal non-linear filter,~~** it …”
    - “Details of the mathematics involved in the Kalman formalism is given …” **Rephrased a little bit to flow better.**
  + Duplicate Removal
    - **Examiner 2** (Page 72): [Underlined text - question?] “green and yellow HT cells” **There are two green and one yellow cell!**
    - **Examiners** (Page 72): “…as the DR algorithm **~~loses a few percent of efficiency~~** **rejects a small number of non-duplicated tracks** due to resolution effects **resulting from the discretised implementation of Hough Transform arrays**, the …”
* Simulation Studies:
  + **Examiners** (Page 72-73): “…events **with an average PU (**<PU>**)**  of 200 **~~events~~** **interactions** …”
  + **Examiners** (Page 73): “It was found that **~~running the~~** **using** **a** SF **stage** before the Kalman Filter **stage** did not improve **~~its~~ the overall** **performance of the system** due to the **~~efficiency~~** **effectiveness** of the Kalman Filter’s filtering.”
    - * Reconstructed Tracks:
        + **Examiners** (Page 74): “… at least four layers**/disks** of the tracker …”
        + **Examiners** (Page 74): “… the following conditions.” definition for track
        + **Examiners** (Page 74): “A track is **~~a~~** defined as …”
  + *Linearised ­χ² Track Fitting Studies*
    - **Examiners** (Page 74): “… a **L**inearised χ² **~~track~~** **F**it **algorithm**.”
    - *General Form of a­ χ² fit:*
      * **Examiner 2**(Page 75): “… si, we initially linearly expand …”, change in voice used and define i.
      * Equation (4.5): missing brackets for delta **(**h) and fi(h**)**.
      * **Add an appendix detailing matrix elements D? Or just see Tracklet DN? See tracklet DN for time being …**
      * **Examiner 2**(Page 76): Viva question re. suitability for implementation on FPGAs
    - *­ χ² Track Fitter Software Implementation:*
      * **Examiner 1** (Page 77): “After this validation process**~~es~~**, ….”
      * **Examiner 2** (Page 77): [Question?] First paragraph of the page re. the “approximated expressions”. Perhaps elaborate clarify? **Viva question, was asked, but rephrased a tad for clarity.**
      * **Examiner 2** (Page 77): Define resolution – add/odd(?) biases.
        + Resolution: (Fitted helix parameter – TP helix parameter)
      * **Examiner 2** (Page 78): [Questions] Figure 4.9: Error Bars? Structure? What about biases?
        + **Q: structure – asked in the viva, clarify in text that worsened performance in the forward regions comes from reduced lever-arm, orientation of modules, and increased material traversed.**
        + **Biases: Only brought up by examiner 2. Unsure what biases would be present in the simulation!**
        + **Error bars issue resolved by running over more events.**
        + **Also changed legend text from “maths” to “implementation”.**
      * **Examiner 1+2** (Page 78): [Question] Figure 4.9: Error Bar circled.
        + **See above.**
      * **Examiner 2** (Page 78): “being incorrectly associated with a matched tracked in the forward regions, as shown in Table 4.1, significantly degrades the resolution obtained.” **? mark in the margins! Discussed as part of the structure corrections mentioned above.**
      * **Examiners** (Page 79): “The reason … were …” **tenses**. **Rephrased.**
      * **Examiner 1** (Pages 79-80): “... fake rate being halved…”, “purity … increasing.”, “… resolutions in the endcaps.”, “…linearised chi2 track fit … discontinued.”, “… higher track finding efficiency with 100.0% purity for matched tracks and z0 and cot(theta) resolutions …” Underlined by Examiner 1 – suspect for questions for viva, but I think these parts can be rephrased into a better form.
        + **Rewritten/rephrased each part, including obvious typos and poor English.**
        + **Worse due to exclusion of higher order terms. Excluded due to additional free parameters making LUTs unfeasibly large.**
      * **Page 80: Resolved large error bars in Fig 4.10 relative pT plots by fixing binning artefacts.**
    - *Tracking at low transverse momenta studies:*
      * **Examiners** (Pages 80-81): “… lower pT threshold of 2 GeV ... performance of the proposed track-finder system was studied.”, “… robustness studies…”, “… demonstrator review.”, “tracking efficiency below 3GeV with the Hough Transform.” Underlined by Examiner 1 – suspect for questions for viva, but I think these parts can be rephrased into a better form.
      * **Examiners** (Page 81): “… threshold of 2GeV**.** The …” missing full stop.
      * **Examiner 2**  (Page 81): “The focusing on recovering tracking efficiency below 3 GeV with the Hough Transform.” Phrasing. **Rephrased**
      * **Examiners** (Page 82): Figure 4.11 caption top/bottom -> left/right.
      * **Examiners** (Page 82): “The impact of multiple scattering on the Kalman Filter …” Underlined by Examiner 1 – suspect for questions for viva, but I think these parts can be rephrased into a better form. **Also expressed 3GeV on Page 82 in terms of 1/GeV as Fig 4.11 plots eff against 1/pT. Also correct Fig4.11 x-axis label from 1/Pt to 1/pT.**
      * **Examiners** (Page 84): Correct z0 -> z.
      * **Examiners** (Page 85): [Question re. Figure 4.14] The clear jump in fraction of duplicate tracks in RH plot. **Added clarifying statement to note that at the time of writing that this feature was not understood.**
      * **Examiners** (Page 85): [Question re. Figure 4.14] “The fraction of genuine tracks with duplicates as a function of 1/pT …” Clarify definition! Especially with respect to LH plot y-axis.
        + **HT result – number of duplicate tracks per TP**
        + **KF result – fraction of tracks which are duplicates**
        + **Remade plots for number of duplicate tracks per TP.**
      * **Examiners** (Page 85): Figure 4.14 caption top/bottom -> left/right.
      * **Examiners** (Page 85): [Question] Last paragraph, related to question re. Figure 4.14.
      * **Examiners** (Page 86): [Question] Figure 4.15 – the first bin (high pT) why no multiple scattering scatter point has better efficiency? **Estimated error is larger than actual due to the density effect reducing the effective stopping power on the charged particle.**
      * **Examiner 1** (Page 86): “… whole chain improves when multiple scattering is accounted for in the Kalman Filter …” Underlined by Examiner 1 – suspect for questions for viva, but I think these parts can be rephrased into a better form. **Rephrased – see above correction.**
      * **Examiners** (Page 87-88): “The **resolutions** of both multiple scattering coefficients are superior across all pT compared to when multiple scattering is not considered at all …” REALLY? Arrow to top left plot of Figure 4.16 for 1/pT resolution – clear that this is worse/similar for this helix parameter. The arrow to the top paragraph of page 88 (re., the worse 1/pT resolution in the range 0.181-0.261 is worse when multiple scattering is considered) has a tick! The latter paragraph is correct! **Rewritten to be consistent and provide better explanation for the observed resolutions.**
      * Page 87: Fix colour of constant k plot points in Figure 4.16.
      * **Examiners** (Page 87): “The **resolutions** …” Double line in margins. New paragraph? Rephrase? **Rewritten – see above correction.**
      * **Examiners** (Page 88): **BOTH EXAMINERS** **Maybe a summary; it just ends.**

*Event Simulation and Object Reconstruction:*

* *Add LOTS of plots showing the efficiency of the various circumstances.* ***Examiners also picked up on this: “maybe include performance plots.”***
* 2nd opening paragraph: The event simulation and **object** reconstruction algorithms
  + Event Simulation:
    - Event Generators:
      * **Examiners** (Page 90): “… with a specialist generator **~~that~~** that models a specific physics object …”
      * **Examiners** (Page 91): “These negatively weighted events are not simply discarded as they are required to correctly simulate the NLO cross section by applying a scale factor, SFNLO”. Underlined this passage with annotation: **“Q!”** Perhaps more detail? **Rephrased this and previous**
      * **Examiners** (Page 91): “It can also **be** used to take the output …”
  + Object Reconstruction:
    - Reorder Muons (5.26) and Electron (5.25) subsubsections? **No.**
    - Particle Flow Algorithm
      * Page 94: granularity detector considered (**HCAL**/ECAL). **Both examiners also picked up on this.**
    - Electrons:
      * **Examiners** (Page 94): “As the magnetic field bends **the** electrons’ trajectories in the φ direction, their **~~is~~** energy across φ, the ECAL crystals are …” Phrasing (wrt underlined part). **Rephrased this**
      * **Examiners** (Page 95): “From this combined set of seeds, electron tracks are iteratively build using a**~~s~~** combinatorial Kalman Filter …”
      * Page 95: “These electron tracks undergo a final fitting by **~~the~~** the GSF to precisely determine the …”
    - Muons:
      * **Examiners** (Page 96): “If at least one **~~one~~** muon segment in the …”
    - Jets:
      * **Examiners** (Page 97): **Define k for sequential combination algorithms.**
      * **Examiner 2** (Page 97): **Question:** underlined section wrt. cone size.
      * Jet Energy Corrections:
        + **Examiners** (Page 98): “The uncertainties associated with these JEC**s** are treated as …” **(small s)**
    - b-tagging:
      * **Examiners** (Page 98): “… by the CMS B-Tag and Vertexing (BTV) Physics Object Group **(POG)**.”
      * **Examiners** (Page 98): “… for the CSVv2 algorithm are given in Table 5.1”
    - *MET:*
      * Push subsection onto new page? **Stylistic change to consider during final building of pdf**
      * **Examiners** (Page 100): **Question:** MET – asked during viva.

Analysis Strategy and Event Selection:

* Signal Region:
  + **Introduce forward referencing to the event selection definitions (P110-112).**
    - **“The selection criteria for the physics objects that are Sections 6.1 and 6.2 are defined in detail in Section 6.6”**
  + **Examiner 2** (Page 102): “This mass window was found to be sufficiently **[MISSING WORD]** account for detector resolution effects.” *﻿***This mass window was chosen as was sufficiently wide to account for detector resolution effects, leading to a high acceptance rate of leptons produced from Z boson decays.**
  + Page 102: “… and as **~~as~~** passing the loose jet identification criteria …” **Both examiners also picked up on this.**
    - What about tight jets? Unclear as no forward referencing – the cut name is PF loose, used as a “tight” jet cut. **Referred to a highly efficient jet ID (and fake rejecting) criteria, described later.**
  + **Examiner 1** (Page 102): “… to the known W boson mass of **~~of~~** 80.4 GeV [21] is considered.”
  + **Examiner 2** (Page 102): “The leading b-jet however, is not … from the W boson decay.” **Repetitive rephrase. Removed repetitive rephrase.**
  + The leading and sub-leading electrons pT > **35** GeV(**15** GeV) respectively and be within eta < **2.40. …** The leading and sub-leading muons pT > **26** GeV(20 GeV) respectively and be within eta < **2.40.**
  + Be clear that I mean +/- 20 GeV and not +/- 10 GeV.
  + Justify the b-jet upper limit
* Control Region:
  + **Examiner 2** (Page 103): “In any high energy particle physics analysis, accurate modelling of the background processes is essential in order to extract the signal yield.” **Not strictly true. For high S/B analyses might not be critical to understand background accurately. ﻿For any high energy particle physics analysis lacking a high signal to background ratio, the accurate modelling of the background processes is essential in order to extract the signal yield and make a precise measurement.**
  + **Examiner 1** (Page 103): “… is essential in order **to** extract the signal yield.”
  + **Examiner 2** (Page 103): “... enriched control regions that are topologically similar and orthogonal …” **What does this mean? Meant that their variable shapes are similar without occupying the same analytical phase space “… background enriched control regions whose kinematic distributions are similar to the signal region's were …” See rewritten section’s 2nd paragraph for full text.**
  + **Examiner 2** (Page 103): “… so that they occupy a topologically similar phase space …” **Repetition. See rewritten section’s 2nd paragraph**
  + **Examiner 1** (Page 103): **Explain control region?? [check modelling] See rewritten section’s 2nd paragraph**
  + Page 104 – remove 6.2’s last sentence. The following subsections are self-explanatory!
  + **Examiner 2** (Page 104):“... this control region’s topology may not be …” **Misuse of the word topology. Really you probably mean kinematic distributions or something similar. Solution: better defined Control Regions in the above text and replaced this problematic phrase with “this control region may not provide a sufficiently similar kinematic phase space to the signal region”.**
  + Background Control Region:
    - **Examiners** (Page 104): **Correct pT thresholds used for this control region. 35 GeV for electrons and 26 GeV for muons.**
* Experimental blinding:
  + **Examiner 1** (Page 104): “Despite even the best intentions, there is the **~~for~~** potential **for** experimental procedure …”
  + **Examiner 1** (Page 104): **Explain BDT? Not defined – defined as MVA.**
  + **Corrected sigma(top) and sigma (W) – were the wrong way around!**
  + **Examiner 2** (Page 104): **Incomplete specification of the optimisation of the chi2 and sigma values. What were the optimisation criteria?**
    - **Specification of sigma values already present in the text!**
    - **For σt = 30 GeV and σW = 8, χ2SR and χ2CR were defined as 5 and 30, respectively. χ2SR corresponds one sigma of the tZq signal contained within χ2CR, andχ2CR as five sigma of the measured σW.**
    - **Added to conclusions also and include future work to include defining the SR and SB on the basis of the expected signal strengths.**
  + Page 105: Stray **)** before “optimised chi2 values.” **Examiners also picked up on this.**
  + Page 106: Figure 6.1 top/bottom -> left/right. **Both examiners also picked up on this.**
  + **Examiner 2** (Page 106): Figure 6.1- **Q: Why circles [?]-like structure visible (and physically motivated). Asked during viva.**
    - **Commented upon the optimisation of the shape of the chi2 variable in Chapter 8 (Conclusions).**
* Trigger Strategy
  + **Both examiners** (Page 106): “… and will likely be limited by **~~statistics~~ event yield**, it is …
  + **Examiner 2** (Page 106): “The logic for this for each of the channels is illustrated in **T**able 6.1.”
  + **Examiner 2** (Page 106): “… maximum possible statistics can be …” **Use “event yield” in lieu of statistics.**
  + Table 6.1 - ensure table logic is clear. **Added final state column.**
  + Table 6.1 - !M and !E for Single Electron and Single Muon.
  + **Examiner 2** (Page 106): “… control region**[missing space]** (see Section 6.2.2.).”
* Event Cleaning:
  + **Both examiners** (Page 107): “… with beam or detector from …” **detector? [Examiner 1] Missing words? [Examiner 2] “… a number of filters are applied to remove events containing beam backgrounds or detector noise from further consideration.”**
  + **Examiner 1** (Page 108): “… at raddi up to 5m”Perhaps “of up to 5cm”? **Yes**
* Physics objects:
  + **Examiner 2** (Page 108): “In order to meet suppress the backgrounds in the for a signal enriched region …” **Poor English – rewritten. “In order select events consistent with the objects expected to be in the final states of the signal enriched region and background enriched control regions described …”**
  + Lepton Selection:
    - **Examiner 2** (Page 108): “… their transverse momenta lies in the …” **Consider use of plural. Should probably be “momentum”.**
    - **Examiner 2** (Page 109): **Annotation for final paragraph prior to Electrons subsubsection.** **Would be worth including indication efficiency and fakes rates here …** 
      * **Electron and muon selection efficiencies quoted in respective subsubsections. No need to repeat.**
      * **And the fake rates are background process dependent!**
    - Electrons:
      * **Examiner 1** (Page 109): Add reference to Chapter 5 for conversion veto. **Examiner 2 adds: how is “photon-electron conversion” defined? Unsure of the need to reference Chapter 5 – surely definition of veto is sufficient. New text: “ - a conversion veto - is applied for all working points. The photon to electron conversion veto tests if a pair of electron tracks originate from a common displaced vertex. Any electron which fails this criteria is rejected.”**
      * **Examiner 2** (Page 110): “The MVA tuned variables include:” **How are the tuned? More detail required. On the basis of delivering a defined acceptance efficiency whilst maximising training sample (Z+ jets) fake rejection. Proposed text: “﻿The values of the latter were set by the MVA determining the optimum values for a given selection efficiency, using simulated Z+jets and \ttbar+jets events as the signal and background processes respectively.”**
      * Page 110: Full 5x5σiηiη – add a brief summary. **Examiners also picked up on this.**
        + **Describes the lateral extension of the shower along the η direction: i.e. the RMS along the η direction inside the 5x5 iη tower.**
      * **Examiner 2** (Page 110): “… these variables are given in **T**able 6.3.”
    - Muons:
      * “muons must have eta <= **2.40** to ensure that a muon is fully within the …” **Both examiners also picked up on this!**
      * **Examiner 2** (Page 111): **Better style to avoid forward references [re. muon isolation], since this follows immediately it is probably okay … Rephrased a tad to improve the English in this paragraph.**
    - Jet Requirements:
      * **Both examiners** (Page 113): Energy fractions are wrong. Correct! **Checked CMS twiki page – they are correct! (**[**https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/CMS/JetID13TeVRun2016**](https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/CMS/JetID13TeVRun2016)**)**
    - b-tagging Requirements:
      * **Examiner 2** (Page 113): ): “… defined in **T**able 5.1 in Section ...”
      * **Examiner 2** (Page 113): “… as large statistics as possible ...” **Use “a sample” instead.**
* Background Processes:
  + Z+Jets and W+jets backgrounds: Rephrase title: **Vector Boson in association with multijet backgrounds. Examiner 1 picked up on lower case jets for “W+jets”. New title avoids this mistake!**
    - **Examiner 2** (Page 114): “QCD multijet events …” **Use of QCD redundant as all jets are QCD processes. Remove QCD …**
  + Top Physics backgrounds:
    - **Examiner 2** (Page 114): “… only ttbarZ**[missing space]** where …” **Check fix compiles okay.**
    - **Examiner 2** (Page 114): “…ttbarH**[missing space]** and tHq…” **Check fix compiles okay.**

*Background Estimation:*

* Data and Simulation Samples:
  + **Examiner 2** (Page 116): Include reference for CUETP8M2T4 et al tunes.
  + **Examiner 1** (Page 116): “… start of the most **luminous** runs …” Could use “data taking” … **“… most luminous data taking runs …”**
  + **Examiner 2** (Page 116): “… underlying **event tune** was used by PYTHIA …” Suspect they want an explanation as to what a “tune” is.
    - **Introduced underlying event concept and the need for tunes in 5.1**
  + **Examiners** (Page 116): **isr -> ISR** and **fsr -> FSR**
  + Table 7.2 resize
* Simulation Corrections:
  + **Examiner 2** (Page 119): “… effects observed in data corrective scale … ” **Grammar**.
    - **Fixed.**
    - **“As s**imulation is unable to fully recreate all the effects observed in data, corrective scale factors are used to reweight MC samples on a per event basis to account for **mismodelled variables. ﻿**These scale factors were used to correct simulation for any modelling discrepancies in the lepton identification, isolation and reconstruction efficiencies, lepton and jet energy scales and resolutions, b-tagging efficiencies, the poor modelling of pileup in simulation, and the **resolutions of the detectors”.**
  + Miscalibrated Tracker APV **Chips** (7.2.1 title)
    - Split up first sentence into two.
    - Paragraphs 2+3 can be one paragraph
  + Lepton Efficiency
    - **Examiner 1** (Page 119): “plots for the performance” [ID/iso/reco for centrally derived corrections?]
      * **Confirm if these are wanted? Surely only ones I made myself for the trigger?**
      * **Electrons: CMS DP -2017/004 (for 2016 performance).**
      * **Muons: no public 2016 plots, only 2015 plots (CMS MUO-16-001).**
    - **Examiner 1** (Page 120): “[NXTriggers+lepton triggers] -> εtrigger ≥ 0?”
      * **Viva question not a correction? Was discussed in the viva.**
    - **Examiner 1** (Page 120): 2nd paragraph, beginning “As the trigger requirements …” More detail, add reference, include plots.
      * **Reference already provided for, additional detail and plots (as functions of lepton pT) added. Further plots (for eta dependence given in Appendices)**
    - **Examiner 2** (Page 120): 2nd paragraph, beginning “As the trigger requirements …” **Question: What about other control region? Z+jets?**
      * **The SF concerns all final states with the relevant two leptons. i.e. the lepton ID/iso and trigger requirements for the signal and all control regions were the same. Rewritten to be clearer.**
      * **“﻿A constant scale factor was found to be sufficient to account for the differences ﻿in the trigger efficiency between data and simulation for the $ee$, $\mu\mu$ and $e \mu$ final states considered.”**
  + Rochester Corrections: *“*These corrections are tuned in the second step using the Mµ***Mµ*** peak for…” **Both examiners also picked up on this**
  + B-tagging Efficiency:
    - **Examiner 1** (Page 121): There’s a mark without a clear purpose – perhaps a clarification as to what the author meant to be asked during viva or to be clarified in the thesis text?
      * **Suspect viva question, added clarifying text.**
      * **“… and having events with potentially undefined variables such as the top mass (i.e. the top mass cannot be defined in an event with zero b-tagged jets).**
    - **Examiner 2** (Page 121): Underlined last two lines with **Q** next to them. **Viva question.**
* *Signal Region Background Estimation:*
  + **Both examiners** (Page 122): Correct Figure B.1 to Figure 7.1! Check and confirm. If it is the Appendix figure, why there and reference/highlight in appendix properly.
    - **Same \ref used for 7.1 and B.1 and LaTeX chose B.1! Fixed for all cases.**
  + **Examiners** (Page 122): Figure 7.1 - **Should NPLs be on the plot?**
    - **Yes. The text referring to NPLs though was poorly worded – was referring to non-Z decay sources.**
    - “…reduced the **~~non-prompt lepton~~** contributions **from processes lacking a leptonic Z boson decay**, completely removing the W+jets process.”
  + **Examiner 2** (Page 122): Figure B.1/Figure 7.1 **LH plot, jet and b-tag cuts point on Data/MC plot has annotation: “Looks significant?” Viva question – discussed in viva.**
  + **Both examiners** (Page 123): Table 7.4 – “**non-prompt leptons** **(NPLs)**” in figure caption & errors on data entries in the table are “not needed”.
    - ***Examiner 2 adds: Align columns on decimal points!***
  + **Examiner 1** (Page 124): Figure 7.2 **Only stat not system[amtic errors]**
    - **General question/comment/observation. Clarified in viva.**
  + **Examiner 2** (Page 124): Figures 7.2 + 7.3: **Q wrt. data/MC plot structure. Viva question – discussed in viva.**
* Data-driven Background Estimation:
  + Non-Prompt Leptons:
    - **Examiners** (Page 125): “… and same **~~charge~~ sign** SUSY searches …”
    - **Examiners** (Page 126): Table 7.5 – SF and errors for 0.0 entries.
  + Z+jets Background:
    - **Examiner 1** (Page 130): Add **LO** and **NLO** and subheadings on plots (Figs 7.5-7.7) to make things clearer.
      * **Included in legend**
    - **Examiners** (Page 128-129): Table 7.6 + 7.7 - errors on data entries are not needed.
  + ttbar Background:
    - **Both examiners** (Page 132): Figure B.29 should be 7.8 like comment on page 122.
      * **See above.**
    - **Examiner 2** (Page 132): “From **T**able 7.8 …”
    - **Examiners** (Page 133): Table 7.8 - errors on data entries are not needed.
    - **Updated plots so that the pT cuts are pT > 35 and pT >26 for electrons and muons respectively.**
* *Systematic Uncertainties:*
  + **Examiner 2** (Page 135): First paragraph is bracketed with **Q** annotated. **Presume viva question.**
  + Experimental Uncertainties:
    - Parton Density Functions:
      * **Examiner 2** (Page 136): At end of subsection **“αS?”**
        + **Added extra text re. the uncert of αS used for the PDFs.**
    - Non-prompt Lepton Contributions:
      * **Examiner 2** (Page 136): **Add reference**
    - Lepton Efficiencies:
      * **Both examiners** (Page 137): “When comparing the trigger efficiencies in simulation between the **~~for the~~** and Z+jets samples …”
      * **Examiner 1** (Page 137): Star by Eqn 7.3.
        + **Viva question.**
      * **Expanded on ttbar and Z+jets bit with reference to eta trigger efficiency plots in the appendices. Not included in main body due to spacing and those plots don’t add any new information.**
      * **Corrected typo for ee Z+jets stat uncert value.**
      * **Removed emu Z+jets entry due to lack of stats and usefulness given that Z doesn’t decay into emu.**
  + *Theoretical**Uncertainties:*
    - *Cross section normalisation:*
      * **Examiner 2** (Page 138): Add reference for 30% normalisation uncertainty recommended by CMS.
      * **Both examiners** (Page 138): “… it is now CMS policy to assume an uncertainty of 10%.” Justify your analysis. Add reference.
        + **Chase up with Jo et al.**
        + **Awaiting feedback for top contacts.**
  + Pre-fit Impact of the Systematic Uncertainties:
    - **Examiner 2** (Page 140): Table 7.11 – **Too concise**. **I**
      * **New less concise table title.**
      * **Fixed normalisation uncertainties.**
* Multivariate Analysis Techniques:
  + Boosted Decision Trees:
    - **Examiner 1** (Page 143): “and which hyperparameters, the set of options …” ? above underlined hyperparameters. **If the “?” if examiner wants definition, it is immediately afterwards!**
    - **Examiner 2** (Page 144): **Define discriminating power! ç definition in 7.6.1’s bullet point list.**
  + BDT Optimisation and Evaluation:
    - BDT Hyperparameter Optimisation:
      * **Examiner 1**(Page 152): At bottom of page/last paragraph “small differences lead to big differences.” **Added a remark to this effect.**
      * **Examiner 2** (Page 152): Table 7.20 – Minimum child weight RH column – 1 x 10-**~~0~~**5
      * **Examiners** (Page 153): Fig 7.20 – define which is ee and µµ. In text and on plots. **Defined in figure caption.**
      * **Both examiners** (Page 155): Correct x –axis range for Fig 7.21-222’s “totHtOverPt” and remove empty plot in Fig. 7.21!
        + **Remade plots at great effort – one week of work!**
    - BDT Evaluation:
      * **Examiner 1** (Page 156): Fig 7.23 {Add if [illegible – material?] about the bins.
        + **Suspect asking how the bin sizes were determined.**
        + **Corin:** “basically everything starts on one big bin, then it it split at the median (unweighted), so on recursively until the error exceeds some value or the number of signal events/background events would go be below some value. so at least background event (after weighting) and no more than 10% statistical error in signal or background”
        + # The recursive binning strategies will stop splitting once these limits: are reached

min\_signal\_events: 0

min\_background\_events: 1

max\_signal\_error: 0.1

max\_background\_error: 0.1

* + - * **~~These output discriminant distributions are used to extract the signal strength and its statistical significance in the following chapter. ﻿~~The output distributions were binned using a recursive binning strategy that ensured that each bin contained at least one background event and that the statistical error did not exceed 10\% for either signal or background. ﻿** **﻿These conditions were applied to ensure that when performing the maximum likelihood fit described in the following chapter, each of the distributions' bins contained sufficient statistics to avoid causing~\cite{combineBinning}:**
        + **﻿statistical fluctuations that would result in an artificial enhancement or suppression of the sensitivity in a given bin;**
        + **﻿excessively large fluctuations in shape-based systematic uncertainties, with respect to the nominal, that would influence the measurement's sensitivity;**
        + **﻿ill-defined ﻿probability density functions, due to bins populated by zero background or signal events, resulting in zero trust of the significance of a data event as it is impossible to determine if the significance is the result of a negligible background or lack of statistics.**
      * Also, how does one work out systematics for MVA?
        + **Question asked during the viva.**

*Results:*

* Statistical Methodology:
  + **Examiner 1** (Page 157): “The Higgs Analysis Combined Limit (combine) tool [179] **~~tool~~**, a framework …”
  + Page 157: **As upper limits were not determined, rephrased 8.1 paragraph accordingly.**
  + **Examiner 1** (Page 158): Star **\*** by Equation 8.4. **Viva question?**
  + Likelihood model:
    - Page 158, swap last two references around.
  + CLS method:
    - **Changed subsection title to “…” to better reflect that limits are not being set, but a measurement and its significance was made.**
    - **Examiner 2** (Page 158): “Citation needed” for CLS method.
    - **Examiner 1** (Page 159): Star **\*** by Equation 8.5. Circle over the offset hat (**^**) over **θµ** in both numerator and denominator.
      * **Fixed offset.**
    - **Examiner 1** (Page 159): Lines next to start of final paragraph and “Asmiov dataset” underlined and annotated “**explain**”.
      * **Part viva question and part further explanation I think?**
      * **Rewritten.**
    - **Examiner 2** (Page 159): (Bottom of the page) “this concerns how to set a limit … but you don’t set a limit! Explain how significances are obtained (briefly).”
      * **Rewritten entire subsection to reflect that limits weren’t set.**
        + **Test statistic and text moved from 8.1.2 to 8.1.1 and rewritten a tad.**
        + **Subsection now discusses on how signal strength measurement is made and significances were obtained.**
* Statistical Analysis Results:
  + **Examiner 1** (Page 160): “At 95% CL” **circled by examiner**. Squiggly line next to paragraph.
    - **Also Examiner 2** (Page 160): “At 95% CL” **circled by examiner**, annotated “**Q**”.
    - **Limits were not set! Thus 95% comment leftover from before unblinding occurred does not make sense. Removed “At 95% CL” from sentence.**
  + Post-fit BDT Discriminant Distributions:
    - **Examiner 2** (Page 161): Figure 8.1 – “under s+b hypothesis?”
      * **Added clarification in Figure caption.**
* Discussion of other searches for tZq at the Large Hadron Collider:
  + ***Examiner 1*** *(Page 163): Figure 8.2* ***“Critical conclusions [discuss in detail]”. Need to discuss the impact of the systematics in detail!***
  + ***Examiner 2*** *(Page 163): Figure 8.2 “****DISCUSS****”*

Conclusion:

* Summary of the tZq analysis:
  + **Examiner 1** (Page 165): Line by side of final paragraph. Underlined “ … understand the larger than expected observed significance …” Comment: **Interpretation of measurement**. **Interpreted as suggested better phrasing.**
    - “Given that these results have not been fully reviewed by the CMS collaboration, further work is required in order to **~~understand the larger than expected observed significance of this~~** **interpret this measurement** and to achieve the standard required for journal publication on behalf of the CMS collaboration.”
  + **Examiner 2** (Page 165): “Any speculation on possible reasons?” [for the differences between expected and observed results] Viva question. Honest answer was “nobody had any idea” - that will be for future work to understand!
* Future Measurements:
  + **Added new text to end of paragraph three re. future work on defining the signal/side-band regions for blinding.**
* Summary of the TMTT track finding processor studies:
  + *“…*the three **proposed** track finding*…”*
  + **Examiner 1** (Page 167): Lines by side of first paragraph and star. “… these candidates and **~~and~~** precisely …”
* Future system development:
  + Rename 9.4: “Future **track finding processor** system development”

Appendices:

* Appendix B:
  + B.1 Signal Region: Get plots onto same page as heading.

Bibliography:

* Fix ordering in text – it starts from the list of tables/plots currently.
* **Examiner 2**: Fix DOI links.
* **Examiner 2**: Fix arxiv links.
* **Examiner 2** (Page 213): Typo for [6] “acclrateurs”
* Fixed various typos in imported bibtex citations.

**TO DO LIST**

* Look up examiners:
  + Dr Jonathan Michael Hays
    - Origins of mass of fundamental particles.
    - Higgs searches
  + Professor Akram Khan
  + Dr Rajagopal Nilavalan
* What did my PhD involve?
  + Professional development
  + tZq
  + TMTT
  + Shifts
  + Outreach
* What does my thesis involve?
  + Succinctly describe analysis:
    - Each stage of the analysis – Z+jets backgrounds, key points!
    - It is compatible with SM (more than SM) and saw signal.
    - Order importance of why search for tZq.
* SM Predictions:
  + Higgs, W, Z bosons, gluons, top and charm quarks and their properties before observation.
* Solar neutrino problem:
  + Large discrepancy between solar neutrino flux prediction and measurement.
  + Different solar models didn’t resolve it: lower neutrino flux required cooler core, but neutrino energy spectrum required hotter core.
  + Neutrino oscillations possible if neutrinos have mass.
  + Super-K 1998 – atmospheric neutrino evidence.
  + SNO 1999 – solar neutrino evidence.
* Describe Yukawa Coupling – coupling between scalar and dirac fields.
  + Historically used to describe the nuclear force between nucleons (fermions) that’s mediated by pions (pseudoscalar mesons).
* Describe asymptotic freedom – unbound at small distance.
  + Strong coupling constant increases with momenta.
* Explain ttH and tW/WH interference:
  + Both tH and WH diagrams produce large contributions.
  + But Feynman diagrams have opposite signs and similar contributions ~igWgmtop
* What is isospin?
  + Quantum number related to strong interactions. Isospin symmetry is a subset of flavour symmetry. QM description is similar to spin, wrt. how it couples. It is a dimensionless quantity that is not related to any actual spin!
  + Third component (conserved one) is the projection for which flavour states are eigenstates.
  + Weak isospin is the gauge symmetry of the weak force that only couples to LH fermions. Isospin in contrast couples to LH and RH particles and is a global symmetry. Weak isospin is understood as the eigenvalue of a charge operator, where the conserved quantity is T3.
* What is chirality?
  + An object has chirality if it cannot be mapped to its mirror image by rotations and translations.
  + Different to helicity, which is the projection of spin vector onto momentum vector.
    - If massless, the two are the same.
    - If massive and non-relativistic, change of reference frame can reverse helicity.
  + Chiral symmetry for vector gauge theories with massless dirac fields = rotating LH/RH components makes no difference.
    - Massive fermions breaks chiral symmetry explicitly.
* Implications of non-unitary CKM matrix!
  + There must be branching to somewhere else!
* Which GR predictions contradict the SM?
  + Cosmological constant -> energy density of the vacuum.
* Hireachy problem(s)?
  + A hierachy problem occurs when the fundamental value of a parameter in theory is vastly different from its measured value. Some renormalisations require delicate cancellations between fundamental quantities and quantum corrections.
  + Weak force 1024 stronger than gravity or rather why is Higgs mass lighter than the plank mass.
    - Solution: SUSY.
  + Cosmological constant is also sensitive to quantum fluctuations.
* Dielectric = an electrical insulator that can be polarized by an applied electric field.
* Describe design choices for CMS
  + Sub-detectors must be accessible in a reasonable time frame to service them without removing cables or services and fast recommissioning.
  + Physics case:
    - Higgs
    - SUSY
    - Massive Vector bosons
    - Extra dimensions
    - SM
  + Detector requirements:
    - Good muon ID
    - Good charged particle momentum resolution and reconstruction efficiency.
    - Good EM energy, diphoton and dilelectron mass resolution.
    - Good MET and dijet resolution.
  + Based around a large superconducting 4T solenoid
    - Precise measurement of muon + charged particle momentum.
    - High B field for compact spectrometer without demands on muon chamber resolution/alignment.
  + How good is the error/B field in the tracker?
    - Δp/p ~ 10% at p=1 TeV/c.
* ATLAS vs CMS:
  + Common to both:
    - Detailed inner tracker information.
    - Both provide hermetic coverage.
    - Calorimetry and muon systems provide triggering information.
    - Good energy and position resolution for calorimeters to resolve jets.
    - Calorimeters contain hadronic events -> low occupancy muon chambers.
  + Differences:
    - Varying granularity of individual detector elements.
    - Outer radius of inner tracker.
    - Strength and shape of B field.
    - Choice of detection medium for calorimetry.
    - Different detector and readout technologies.
    - Strategies for background rejection and trigger strategies.
    - Cost containment and optimisation.
  + Choices stem from magnet choices:
    - dp/p α p/Bl²
    - Either large lever arm – ATLAS.
    - Or powerful B field – CMS.
  + ATLAS:
    - ECAL - liquid argon detector.
    - HCAL – Tile calo
    - Tracker – pixel+strip+gas.
      * All the Silicon (and associated services) in CMS increases MS, conversion, and showering (as if a calo).
      * TRT = 370k drift tubes/straws. Straw layers interleaved with radiators. Straws filled with gas mixture.
  + Performance:
    - CMS Tracker ~x3 better.
    - CMS ECAL ~2-5x better.
    - CMS HCAL ~x2 worse
    - CMS Muon Chambers ~x1.4 worse.
* Why APDs and VPTs for ECAL?
  + APDs are insensitive to shower leakage particles escaping.
    - Photon passes through n and p layers and excites free electrons and holes in the depletion region. Electrons and holes create new ones and so on … avalanche! The reverse bias results in a current flowing proportional to number of incident photons.
  + VPTs more radiation tolerant.
    - Photon hits cathode, emits electron, passes through anode mesh, strikes dynode, secondary electrons collected on anode.
* What is Beta\*?
  + Beta function is cross-section/transverse emittance.
    - Low emittance = particles confined to a small distance with nearly the same momentum.
  + Small is narrow and squeezed beam.
  + Beta\* is Beta at the IP.
* Motivation behind Phase-2 Tracker:
  + Reduce data-rate from 4MHz to 750kHz.
  + Total latency is 12.5us, 3.5us to correlate tracks, 1us buffer plus 3us safety margin. Total track finding/fitting budget is 5us, of which 1us for packaging.
* Describe Hough Transform and Kalman Filter.
  + HT: Feature extraction used for image analysis. Traditionally used to identify lines in an image, but has been extended to arbitrary shapes.
    - Why use r->rT and φ->φT? Stub-line gradient is proportional to rT and so can be positive and negative. Larger range of gradients allows for improved precision wrt. intersection point.
  + KF:
    - State vector = fancy name for variables considered (in this case helix parameters).
    - Ak and Bk are state-transition (propagates helix parameters from one layer to the next) and control-input (not used – ignore external influence) models.
    - Hk is the observation model which maps the true state space into the observed space.
    - Kalman Gain = {0,1}. If K~1, measurement is accurate and est is unstable. If K~0, estimate is stable (small error).
  + R-Z/Seed Filter filter:
    - Removes stubs inconsistent with a straight line in the r-z plane.
    - Sort stubs in layer order.
    - Loop over stubs in HT cell.
    - Select first two stubs and if consistent with z0, loop over other stubs.
  + Cot(theta)? Or tan lambda?
    - Tan lambda is the dip angle. Cot(theta) is the cotangent of the dip angle – i.e. tan lambda=theta.
* Tracklet:
  + Pairs of stubs from neighbouring layers of the tracker are linked to form seeds.
  + Seeds are propagated outwards/inwards.
  + Efficiency is maintained by using seeds from multiple pairs of adjacent layers/disks.
  + Use IP in r-φ as a constraint to calculate helix parameters in r-φ and r-z.
  + Pairs of stubs must have |ρ-1| < 0.0057 cm-1 and |z0| < 15cm.
* Associative Memory:
  + ASIC: Pattern recognition for track finding.
  + FPGA: PCA for fitting:
    - Converts sets of measured variables into a set of values of linearly uncorrelated variables.
    - 1st principle component has largest possible variance.
    - Each successive component has highest possible variance under the constraint that it is orthogonal to preceding components.
* Difference between TMTT and offline KF.
  + TMTT only does it to fit hits assigned to a track.
  + Tracker uses CTF to seed initial candidates (2-3 hits), then a CKF to build a track, then KF passes to clean, and finally selection.
  + ECAL uses KF to build initial candidates (GSF too intensive to use except for refitting track seeds and final fitting).
  + CKF in muon systems.
* Describe van der Meer scans:
  + Beams are swept across each other in the transverse plane. Absolute value of the luminosity can be determined by monitoring the collision rate as a function of the beams’ separation.
    - ; , (for Gaussian beam).
    - Scan in x and y to obtain beam heights.
    - *Does* assume x and y profiles are independent and therefore factorisable.
    - Needs distance calibration.
  + Spatial distributions of interaction vertices can be used to develop an image of the beam and determine their overlap and absolute luminosity can also be done.
* Describe Lund String Model
  + Model of hadronistation. All (except highest energy) gluons are treated as field lines that are attracted to each other, forming a narrow tube of colour field when separated – in contrast to the EM field lines that spread out due to the non-abelian nature of the strong force.
  + One of the parton fragmentation models used. Explains features of hadronization well, including particle jets formed along the original paths of two separating quarks and sprays of hadrons between the jets by the string itself.
  + Herwig uses cluster modelling instead – simpler, but more energy-momentum parameters, unpredictive, and fewer flavour composition parameters that is simpler and less unpredictive than string.
* Why is KF optimal linear filter?
  + Designed to minimise the mean squared error.
  + Thus when noise is Gaussian, gives the best result/exact conditional probability estimate.
  + Mean squared error is used as the conditional probability at every iteration being a Gaussian is propagated as a Gaussian in the next iteration.
* What is the GSF algo?
  + A non-linear generalisation of the KF – distributions of all state vectors are Gaussian mixtures that provide a good approximation of the Bethe-Heitler distribution that models bremsstrahlung energy loss.
* Describe event generation in detail:
* Describe jet reco algorithms:
  + Cone algos – not usually infrared- & collinear-safe (except SIS-cone)
  + Sequential clustering - infrared- & collinear-safe by design.
    - Simple and clean.
    - Find the distance between particles i and j and between i and the beam.
    - Consider all i and j, if the smallest distance is dij, then combine i and j and find the next smallest.
    - If smallest distance is diB, remove particle i and call a jet.
    - Parameter “p” governs relative powers of energy vs geometrical scales to distinguish kT (=1), C/A (=0) and anit-kT (=-1) algos.
    - Anti-kT produces circular cone shaped jets and insensitive to UE & PU.
* Describe renormalisation and factorisation scales:
  + UV divergences: large infinite momenta
    - Renormalisation scales.
  + IR divergences: i) virtual or real particle reaches zero momentum or ii) a massless particle radiates a massless particle.
    - i) cancels out, ii) does not.
    - Cross section is factorised for a given energy scale into hard part and “normalization” from PDFs.
  + Why are both scales set to be the same?
    - Common practice to guess µ =Q.
    - Inclusive DIS usually both are set to be the same.
* Describe matching algorithms (differences between MLM and FxFx):
  + Matching vs merging?
    - Matching is the matching of MEs to PS.
  + Hard scattering is generated by ME generator but PS and hadronization is usually performed by PYTHIA.
  + Two stages need matching in order to create a smooth transition between the too.
  + pT threshold at which ME partons are matched to the PS is known as the ME-PS threshold.
  + For POWHEG:
    - Matching threshold depends on tuned parameter hdamp.
    - Dampens real emissions with a factor of h²/(pT²+h²), with the default value of h = mTop.
  + Madgraph\_aMC@NLO uses MLM and FxFx.
    - FxFx = MLM-like merging of NLO calculations.
    - MLM = runs shower, obtains Sudakov suppression and rejects event if any emission > tcut. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/0706.2569.pdf>
    - MLM works for any shower, with minimal modifications and theoretically not perfectly well-controlled.
      * Generate ME event with phase space cut QME
      * Reweight αS using scales for emission corresponding to event.
      * Shower event with starting scale.
      * Cluster shower emissions to jets using Qjet > QME, with events kept if each jet matches to one parton in the ME event.
* What is a deterministic annealing algorithm?
  + Splits phase space if there are no clusters within a set difference along the direction of the principle axis.
  + Repeat until clustering is complete.
  + 
* Why separate MC samples?
  + Statistics!
* Why does PU need correcting?
  + Minimum bias events rely on the underlying event and MC is generated before data PU profile is known.
* Why different PDF sets?
  + Produced by different collaborations that perform the fits using new data/theoretical predictions.
* How are uncertainties for PDF sets determined?
  + PDFs have a number of free parameters that are experimentally determined.
  + The free parameters are expanded around their best values and orthogonal eigenvector sets of PDFs depending on their linear combinations of the parameters variations are obtained.
  + “Replica” datasets are obtained by allowing the parameters to fluctuate randomly by amounts determined by the size of the data uncertainties.
  + Uncert is then the quadratic sum of the uncerts arising from each eigenvector.
* Define Deep Inelastic Scattering?
  + Inelastic = target absorbs some of the kinetic energy.
  + Deep = high energy of the probe, allowing it to resolve “deep” inside the hadron.
* Concisely explain blinding
* How is hadronic punch-through measured?
  + Punch-through = high energy pions producing energetic secondary particles that escape HCAL+Solenoid confinement.
  + Test beams were used to measure impact and found to be well described by simulation. Appears as random large clusters.
* How much signal/Z+jets/ttbar is discarded?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | tZq | Z+jets (LO) | Z+jets (NLO) | ttbar |
| Lepton cuts | 480.406 | 32,006,730 | 32,483,790 | 249,822 |
| Z mass cuts | 437.17 | 30,244,930 | 30,643,260 | 70,476 |
| Jet cuts | 217.9079 | 119,927.3 | 132694.7 | 12,448.46 |
| b-tag cuts | 140.3915 | 17,204.15 | 19375.24 | 9663.45 |
| W mass cuts | 86.0537 | 8957.48 | 9280.6 | 4942.18 |

* Loss of signal though jet cuts? ~6%
* Is the leading b-jet from the top?
  + 66% of the time (post skimming)
    - Rest are from u/d/s/g
  + When only one b-jet, 100% of the time from a top quark (gen).
  + Better W and top mass from nBjet = 1?
  + Does considering W->bq impact results? ~0.9% for reco signal.
* Is the b-jet from the top decay central? Yes – 94.4% are central



* Boosting vs bagging:
  + Any element has the same probability to appear in a new data set for bagging, while boosting has weighted observations, increasing the probability certain elements will be used more often.
  + Bagging has each model being built independently (simple average), i.e. in parallel. Boosting is sequential.
  + Boosting reduces bias, but is susceptible to overtraining.
* How does XGBoost differ from other gradient boosting algos?
  + Modelling details:
    - More accurate approximations to find the best tree model:
      * Advanced regularisation for Regression Trees to better control over-fitting.
      * Computing second-order gradients of the loss function, which provides more info about gradient direction and how to minimise the loss function.
  + Improved data structures = better processor utilisation = faster
  + Better multicore support = faster
    - The ensemble cannot be parallelised as each tree is dependent on the previous but node building within each depth of the tree can be.
* Describe BDT optimisation:
  + Features/inputs:
    - Recursive feature elimination with default training parameters.
    - Feature with lowest importance removed and BDT retrained.
    - AUROC recorded at each step – used to select top “n” features, which for less then “n” steps, the AUROC has significant decline.
  + Hyperparameters:
    - Create a regression model!
    - Need to define a metric to be minimised … but the function is a black box … so regression used to approximate minima instead by first evaluating the model at random values before using choosing more intelligently.
    - The model is constructed using a Gaussian process and the metric is based on the AUROC that favours consistent performance.
    - Gaussian process is a set of random variables that the vector of the variables are distributed as a Gaussian.
* Maximum Likelihood Fit:
  + Find parameters that maximises the “likelihood” function.
* Poisson statistics:
  + Events occur with a known constant rate and independently of the time since the last event.
  + For large mean/variance ~ approximately normal.
* Correlated and uncorrelated nuisance parameters?
  + Correlated are common to both channels, such as luminosity.
* Log normal and log uniform distributed nuisance parameters:
  + Log normal = random variable whose logarithm follows a normal distribution.
  + Log uniform = random variable whose logarithm follows a uniform distribution.
* Results:
  + Past tZq:
    - 8 TeV: Searched for SM and FCNC tZ(q) production.
      * EFT for FCNC.
      * 2.4(1.8) sigma, SM consistent and FCNC limits x2 better than prior ones.
    - 13 TeV:
      * ATLAS:
        + Lepton pT cuts are flavour blind.
        + mZ = +/- 10 GeV.
        + 2 jets, 1 b-jet
        + Ttbar CR used to estimate the NPL contribution from VV as ttbar SR/CR have similar NPL contributions.
        + Ttbar verification and CRs and diboson VR/SR (MET > 20/60 GeV).
        + Neutral Network (all backgrounds except ttbar due to stats).

Validation region results good for expected/observed.

* + - * + SM consistent result signal strength; 4.2(5.4) sigma.
      * CMS:
        + ttZ and WZ CRs.
        + WZ backgrounds are separated by jet flavour for better modelling of heavy jet backgrounds.
        + Fit to BDT discriminant for signal/ttZ and MET for WZ.
        + BDT also includes variables calculated by the matrix-element-method.
  + Current tZq:
    - 7.2(5.7) and 5.4(6.0) sigma for 2016 and 2017
    - Signal strengths compatible with SM (1.36 and 1.01)
    - Improves on past searches by overcoming limitations caused by NPLs and the uncertainty in their prediction.
    - Uses grad BDTs to identify NPLs; exploits jet closest to the lepton (in terms of ΔR, rel iso, rel iso inside a fixed cone, impact parameters, and kinematics.
      * 85(92)% efficient for electrons(muons).
      * Mis-ID = 1.5%
      * Eff improves by 12(8)% and NPL rejection ~2(8) times better.
      * “Loose” criteria optimised for NPL background prediction.
    - BDTs are used for each SR (jet-binned).
    - Alterative deep NN trained, but gives nearly identical results.