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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 …
* **~~While the top quark has the same properties as the other five quarks,~~**
  + **WHAT?**
  + **The top quark’s mass of 173.0 +/- 0.4 GeV …**

An Introduction to the Standard Model and Top Quark Physics:

* The Standard Model:
  + QED: “… Heisenberg's uncertainty principle, it***s* (or *the*)** field experiences random fluctuations.”
  + Page 27: Table 2.2 – Gauge Bosons heading -> Bosons.
  + Higgs: “Brout, Engler, Higgs,**[insert space]** Guralnik, Hagen …”
  + **Rephrase:** *Infinite minima*
  + Page 32: Higgs Mass!
* Top Physics:
  + *Page 33: Last sentence rephrase.*
  + Page 35: Reorder bullet points to emphasise greater importance of the latter point.
  + **~~Given that~~** **As** the top quark was more massive than initially assumed **~~however~~**, …
  + Top quark pair production:
    - Missing second bullet point: **·** Higher centre-of-mass energies results in smaller Bjorken *x*
  + Single top production:
    - Figure 2.5(a) – bbar is NOT from the sea! Due to charge asymmetric initial state
  + Single top production in association with a Z boson:
    - In contrast, ttZ **[insert space]** has a lower …
    - **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].**
    - **hadronic**: both the W boson and Z boson decay into a quark and anti-quark **[insert full stop].**
    - 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 …
* *LHC and CMS:*
  + *LHC:*
    - *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.*
  + *CMS:*
    - *Silicon Microstrip Tracker (page 49): WHY smaller pitch?*
    - Silicon Microstrip Tracker (page 49): Correct z0 -> z
    - ECAL: (page 49) :more radiation hard vacuum **phototriodes** in the endcap disks
    - *Make it clear that the Phase-1 pixel has always been planned*
    - Muon Chambers, DTs (page 53): Correct z0 -> z’s
    - Level-1 Trigger: **Fix broken reference! Same as previous reference.**
* *TMTT:*
  + *The Phase-II Outer Tracker Upgrade:*
    - … innermost layers) **[insert space]** and …
    - Capitalised start of bullet points
    - *Further details on the two pT-modules can be found in* ***[correct reference ordering]***
    - *As with* ***~~to~~*** *the previous pixel detectors, the Inner Tracker is also designed (page 62).*
    - *Fix reference on page 66.*
    - ***Fix reference ordering in*** *Figure 4.2*
  + *The Track Finding Architecture:*
    - “as previously demonstrated by the Phase-I Calorimeter Trigger Upgrade **[fix reference]** …”
    - *“Details of the mathematics involved in the Kalman formalism is given …”* ***Think that this paragraph can be rephrased to flow better.***
* *Event Simulation and Object Reconstruction:*
  + 2nd opening paragraph: The event simulation and **object** reconstruction algorithms
    - *Object Reconstruction:*
      * *Particle Flow Algorithm*
        + Page 94: granularity detector considered (**HCAL**/ECAL).
      * *Push MET subsection onto new page?*
* *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***
    - Page 102: “and as ***~~as~~*** passing the loose jet identification criteria “
      * What about tight jets? Unclear as no forward referencing – the cut name is PF loose, used as a “tight” jet cut.
    - 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
  + *Experimental blinding:*
    - Stray **)** before “optimised chi2 values.”
    - Figure 6.1 top/bottom -> left/right.
  + *Trigger Strategy*
    - *Table 6.1 - ensure table logic is clear.*
    - Table 6.1 - !M and !E for Single Electron and Single Muon.
  + *Physics objects:*
    - *Lepton Selection:*
      * *Electrons:*
        + *Full 5x5σiηiη – add a brief summary.*

*Describes the lateral extension of the shower along the η direction: i.e. the RMS along the η direction inside the 5x5 iη tower.*

* + - * *Muons:*
        + *“muons must have eta <=* ***2.40*** *to ensure that a muon is fully within the …”*
  + *Background Processes:* 
    - Z+Jets and W+jets backgrounds: Rephrase title: **Vector Boson in association with multijet backgrounds**
* *Background Estimation:*
  + *Data and Simulation Samples:*
    - *Table 7.2 resize*
  + *Simulation Corrections:*
    - *APV: Split up first sentence into two.*
    - *APV: paragraphs 2+3 can be one paragraph*
  + *Data-driven Background Estimation:*
    - *ttbar Background:*
* *Results:*
  + *DATA IS OF GOOD QUALITY - NOT EXPECTING RESULTS TO CHANGE*
* *Conclusion:*
  + *Summary of the TMTT track finding processor studies:*
    - *“…the three* ***proposed*** *track finding…”*
  + *Rename 9.4: “Future* ***track finding processor*** *system development”*
* *References:*
  + *149 – needs making clearer*
  + 161 – T. A. Collaboration -> Atlas collaboration

**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
* 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.
* 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.
* Describe Hough Transform and Kalman Filter.
  + 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 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.
* Explain ttH and tW/WH interference:
* 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!
  + 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.
* Implications of non-unitary CKM matrix!
  + There must be branching to somewhere else!
* 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.
  + 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?
  + For which circumstances is it the optimal non-linear filter?
* 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 cicular 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):
  + 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, the threshold depends on tuned parameter hdamp.
  + 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.
    - 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.
* 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.
* 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.
  + 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



* Describe BDT hyperparameters
* Describe BDT optimisation