



**1 A search for flavour changing neutral currents  
2 involving a top quark and a Z boson, using the  
3 data collected by the CMS collaboration at a  
4 centre-of-mass energy of 13 TeV**

**5 Isis Van Parijs**

**6 Proefschrift ingediend met het oog op het behalen van de academische graad  
7 Doctor in de Wetenschappen.**

Published in    Faculteit Wetenschappen & Bio-ingenieurswetenschappen  
                    Vrije Universiteit Brussel  
At                 10 November 2017.

**8**

Responsible Contact:    Isis Van Parijs  
                                    Institute for High Energy Physics  
Promotor:                  Prof. Jorgen D'Hondt

9      First Referee:                            Prof. Dr. J. D'Hondt  
            Date of Hand-in:                        10 November 2017  
            Date of Defense:                        10 December 2017

# Contents

---

11	<b>1 Theoretical basis</b>	1
12	1.1 Elementary particles and forces . . . . .	1
13	1.2 Standard Model Lagrangian, connecting fields with particles . . . . .	3
14	1.3 Flavours in the SM . . . . .	5
15	1.4 The top quark in the SM . . . . .	6
16	1.5 Effective field theories . . . . .	11
17	1.6 Motivation for new physics . . . . .	14
18	1.7 An effective approach beyond the SM: FCNC involving a top quark . . . . .	15
19	1.8 Experimental constraints on top-FCNC . . . . .	18
20	<b>2 Experimental set-up</b>	23
21	2.1 The Large Hadron Collider . . . . .	23
22	2.2 The Compact Muon Solenoid . . . . .	27
23	2.2.1 CMS coordinate system . . . . .	27
24	2.2.2 Towards the heart of CMS . . . . .	28
25	2.2.3 Data acquisition . . . . .	37
26	2.2.4 Phase 1 upgrades . . . . .	37
27	2.2.5 CMS computing model . . . . .	39
28	<b>3 Analysis techniques</b>	41
29	3.1 Hadron collisions at high energies . . . . .	41
30	3.2 Event generation . . . . .	44
31	3.2.1 Fundamentals of simulating a proton collision . . . . .	44
32	3.2.2 Programs for event generation . . . . .	44
33	3.2.3 Generating FCNC top-Z interactions . . . . .	46
34	3.2.4 Generating SM background events . . . . .	48
35	3.3 Multivariate analysis techniques: Boosted Decision Trees . . . . .	50
36	3.4 Statistical methodology . . . . .	52
37	<b>4 Event reconstruction and identification</b>	55
38	4.1 Object Reconstruction . . . . .	55
39	4.1.1 Charged particle tracks . . . . .	57
40	4.1.2 Following the Muon's Footsteps . . . . .	57
41	4.1.3 The path of the Electron . . . . .	57

42	4.1.4 Primary Vertex Reconstruction . . . . .	58
43	4.1.5 Calorimeter clusters . . . . .	58
44	4.2 Particle flow identification . . . . .	59
45	4.3 Pileup mitigation and luminosity measurement . . . . .	59
46	4.4 Physics object reconstruction and identification . . . . .	60
47	4.4.1 Muons . . . . .	60
48	4.4.2 Electrons . . . . .	62
49	4.4.3 Jets . . . . .	63
50	4.4.4 Jets from b fragmentation . . . . .	66
51	4.4.5 Missing transverse energy . . . . .	69
52	4.5 Summary of corrections . . . . .	69
53	<b>5 Event selection and categorisation</b>	<b>71</b>
54	5.1 Baseline event selection and filters . . . . .	71
55	5.1.1 Event cleaning . . . . .	74
56	5.1.2 Estimation of the trigger efficiency . . . . .	76
57	5.1.3 Corrections . . . . .	77
58	5.1.4 Reconstruction of kinematic variables . . . . .	81
59	5.2 Analysis Strategy . . . . .	82
60	5.3 Data driven NPL background simulation . . . . .	83
61	5.4 Regions and channels . . . . .	85
62	5.4.1 WZCR . . . . .	86
63	5.4.2 TTCR and STCR . . . . .	87
64	5.4.3 TTSR and STSR . . . . .	87
65	<b>6 The search for FCNC involving a top quark and a Z boson</b>	<b>89</b>
66	6.1 Construction of template distributions . . . . .	89
67	6.1.1 Distributions of the BDT variables . . . . .	90
68	6.1.2 BDTs . . . . .	90
69	6.1.3 Transverse mass in WZCR . . . . .	90
70	6.2 Systematic uncertainties . . . . .	91
71	6.3 Limit setting procedure . . . . .	92
72	6.4 Result and discussion . . . . .	93
73	6.4.1 Resulting limits on tZu . . . . .	93
74	6.4.2 Resulting limits on tZc . . . . .	93
75	6.4.3 Resulting limits where both couplings are non-vanishing . . . . .	93
76	6.4.4 Post fit distributions . . . . .	93
77	6.4.5 Nuisance parameters . . . . .	93
78	<b>7 Denouement of the top-Z FCNC hunt at 13 TeV</b>	<b>97</b>
79	<b>Appendices</b>	<b>97</b>
80	<b>A Trigger scale factors</b>	<b>99</b>
81	<b>B Dilepton controlplots</b>	<b>111</b>

## CONTENTS

v

82	<b>C Statistical independent regions</b>	<b>113■</b>
83	<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>115■</b>



# Theoretical basis

# 1

---

85 The Standard Model (SM) [1] is a name given in the 1970s to a theory describing the fun-  
 86 damental particles and their interactions. This quantum field theory describes the particles  
 87 and their interactions as fields and has successfully incorporated three of the four fundamental  
 88 forces in the universe. In [Section 1.1](#), the particle content of the SM is summarised, while  
 89 [Section 1.2](#) describes the SM Lagrangian and its symmetries. In [Section 1.3](#), the flavour content  
 90 of the SM is highlighted, and [Section 1.4](#) focusses on the top quark in the SM.

91 The successful theory of the SM has some shortcomings which are discussed in [Section 1.6](#)  
 92 and lead to searches for a more general theory. One of such is using an effective field theory  
 93 (EFT) approach [2] to search for new physics in a model independent way. In [Section 1.7](#) an  
 94 EFT model focussing on flavour changing neutral currents (FCNC) involving a top quark is  
 95 presented. Its current experimental constraints are given in [Section 1.8](#).

## 96 1.1 Elementary particles and forces

97 The interactions in nature can be described by four forces, the strong force, the electromagnetic  
 98 (EM) force, the weak force and the gravitational force. These interactions happen via particles  
 99 with an integer spin known as bosons. The strong interaction is mediated by eight gluons  $g$ ,  
 100 while the electromagnetic force is mediated by photons  $\gamma$ , and the weak force by Z and  $W^\pm$   
 101 bosons. In [Table 1.1](#), the forces and their characteristics are shown. The gravitational force is  
 102 the only force not included in the SM and can be neglected for energies lower than the Planck  
 scale ( $1.22 \times 10^{19}$  GeV).

**Table 1.1:** The four forces of nature and their characteristics.

	Range	Mediator
Strong force	$10^{-15}$ m	8 gluons
Electromagnetic force	$\infty$	photon
Weak force	$10^{-18}$ m	$W^\pm$ , Z bosons
Gravitational force	$\infty$	unknown

104 The fermions are the particles that make up the visible matter in the universe. They carry  
 105 half integer spin and can be subdivided into leptons and quarks, where leptons do not interact  
 106 strongly. Each fermion has a corresponding anti-fermion which has the same mass and is  
 107 oppositely charged. The electron  $e$  is the first elementary particle discovered [3] and belongs  
 108 to the first generation of leptons together with the electron neutrino  $\nu_e$ . The second generation  
 109 comprises the muon  $\mu$  and muon neutrino  $\nu_\mu$ , whereas the third generation consists of the tau  
 110  $\tau$  and tau neutrino  $\nu_\tau$ . The neutrinos are neutral particles, while the other leptons have charge  
 111  $\pm q_e$  with  $q_e$  representing the elementary charge of  $1.602 \times 10^{-19}$  C. The masses of charged  
 112 leptons differ by four orders of magnitude between the first and third generations. In the SM  
 113 the neutrinos are assumed to be massless, nonetheless it is experimentally established that  
 114 neutrinos do have a tiny non-zero mass [4, 5]. In Table 1.2, the leptons and their properties in  
 the SM are summarised.

**Table 1.2:** The properties of the leptons in the three generations of the SM [6], where  $q_e$  represents the elementary charge.

	Generation	Particle	Mass	Charge
First		$e^-$	0.511 MeV	$-q_e$
		$\nu_e$	$\approx 0$	0
Second		$\mu^-$	106 MeV	$-q_e$
		$\nu_\mu$	$\approx 0$	0
Third		$\tau^-$	1 777 MeV	$-q_e$
		$\nu_\tau$	$\approx 0$	0

115

116 The quarks can also be divided into three generations. Unlike the leptons, they carry  
 117 colour charge and can interact via the strong interaction. The top quark, discovered in 1995  
 118 at the Tevatron [7, 8], is the heaviest SM particle with a mass<sup>1</sup> measured to be  $173.34 \pm$   
 119  $0.27(\text{stat}) \pm 0.71(\text{syst})$  GeV [9]. The quarks and their properties are summarised in Table 1.3.  
 120 In nature, only colour neutral objects can exist. This has as consequence that quarks are bound  
 121 through gluons into mesons (quark+anti-quark) and baryons (three quarks). These mesons  
 122 and baryons are mostly short-lived and unstable particles that rapidly decay through  $W^\pm$  and  $Z$   
 123 bosons. The only known stable baryon is the proton, made up of two up quarks and one down  
 124 quark.

125 The scalar boson, commonly known as the Higgs boson, is the last piece of the SM discovered  
 126 in 2012 [10, 11]. It is responsible for the masses of the  $W^\pm$  and Zboson, and that of the fermions.

---

<sup>1</sup>In this thesis all masses and energies are expressed in natural units, where the speed of light and  $\hbar$  are taken to be equal to one.

**Table 1.3:** The properties of the quarks in the three generations of the SM [6], where  $q_e$  represents the elementary charge.

	Generation	Particle	Mass	Charge
First	up u	$2.2^{+0.6}_{-0.4}$ MeV	$\frac{2}{3} q_e$	
	down d	$4.7^{+0.5}_{-0.4}$ MeV	$\frac{-1}{3} q_e$	
Second	charm c	$1.28 \pm 0.03$ GeV	$\frac{2}{3} q_e$	
	strange s	$96^{+8}_{-4}$ MeV	$\frac{-1}{3} q_e$	
Third	top t	$173.1 \pm 0.6$ GeV	$\frac{2}{3} q_e$	
	bottom b	$4.18^{+0.04}_{-0.03}$ GeV	$\frac{-1}{3} q_e$	

## 127 1.2 Standard Model Lagrangian, connecting fields with particles

128 The SM is a quantum field theory and thus describes the dynamics and kinematics of particles  
 129 and forces by a Lagrangian  $\mathcal{L}$ . The theory is based on the  $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$  gauge  
 130 symmetry, where  $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$  describes the electroweak interaction and  $SU(3)_C$  the strong  
 131 interaction. The indices refer to colour C, the left chiral nature of the  $SU(2)_L$  coupling L, and the  
 132 weak hypercharge Y. Its Lagrangian is constructed such that symmetries representing physics  
 133 conservation laws such as conservation of energy, momentum and angular momentum are  
 134 contained. The symmetries under local gauge transformations are sustained by demanding  
 135 gauge invariance<sup>2</sup>.

The  $U(1)_Y$  group has one generator Y with an associated gauge field  $B_\mu$ . The three gauge fields  $W_\mu^1$ ,  $W_\mu^2$ , and  $W_\mu^3$ , are associated to  $SU(2)_L$  with three generators that can be written as half of the Pauli matrices:

$$T_1 = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad T_2 = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{and} \quad T_3 = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (1.1)$$

The generators  $T^a$  satisfy the Lie algebra:

$$[T_a, T_b] = i\epsilon_{abc} T^c \text{ and } [T_a, Y] = 0, \quad (1.2)$$

136 where  $\epsilon_{abc}$  is an antisymmetric tensor. The gauge fields of  $SU(2)_L$  only couple to left-handed  
 137 fermions as required by the observed parity violating nature of the weak force. The  $SU(3)_C$   
 138 group represents quantum chromodynamics (QCD). It has eight generators corresponding to  
 139 eight gluon fields  $G_\mu^{1\dots 8}$ . Unlike  $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ ,  $SU(3)_C$  is not chiral.

Under  $SU(3)_C$  quarks are colour triplets while leptons are colour singlets. This implies that the quarks carry a colour index ranging between one and three, whereas leptons do not take part in strong interactions. Based on the chirality, the quarks and leptons are organized in doublets or singlets. Each generation  $i$  of fermions consists of left-handed doublets and right-handed

---

<sup>2</sup>Different field configurations of unobservable fields can result in identical quantities. Transformations between such configurations are called gauge transformation and the absence of change in the measurable quantities is a characteristic called gauge invariance.

singlets:

$$l_{L,i} = \begin{pmatrix} e_{L,i} \\ \nu_{L,i} \end{pmatrix}, e_{R,i}, q_{L,i} = \begin{pmatrix} u_{L,i} \\ d_{L,i} \end{pmatrix}, u_{R,i}, \text{ and } d_{R,i} \quad (1.3)$$

The SM Lagrangian can be decomposed as a sum of four terms

$$\mathcal{L}_{SM} = \mathcal{L}_{gauge} + \mathcal{L}_f + \mathcal{L}_{Yuk} + \mathcal{L}_\phi, \quad (1.4)$$

140 that are related to the gauge, fermion, Yukawa and scalar sectors. The gauge Lagrangian  
 141 regroups the gauge fields of all three symmetry groups, and the fermionic part consists of kinetic  
 142 energy terms for quarks and leptons. The interaction between fermions and the scalar doublet  
 143  $\phi$  gives rise to fermion masses and is described by the Yukawa Lagrangian. The scalar part of  
 144 the Lagrangian is composed of a kinematic and potential component related to the scalar boson.

For the electroweak theory, two coupling constants are introduced, namely  $g'$  for  $U(1)_Y$  and  $g$  for  $SU(2)_L$ . The physically observable gauge bosons of this theory are the photon field  $A_\mu$ , the Z boson field  $Z_\mu^0$ , and the W boson fields  $W_\mu^\pm$ . These are a superposition of the four gauge fields of  $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ :

$$\begin{aligned} A_\mu &= \sin \theta_W W_\mu^3 + \cos \theta_W B_\mu, \\ Z_\mu^0 &= \cos \theta_W W_\mu^3 - \sin \theta_W B_\mu, \text{ and} \\ W_\mu^\pm &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} (W_\mu^1 \mp i W_\mu^2), \end{aligned} \quad (1.5)$$

145 where  $\theta_W$  represents the weak mixing angle defined as  $\tan \theta_W = \frac{g'}{g}$ .

146 The coupling constant representing the strength of the QCD interactions is denoted as  $g_s$ . In  
 147 QCD there is asymptotic freedom whereby the strong coupling constant becomes weaker as the  
 148 energy with which the interaction between strongly interacting particles is probed increases,  
 149 and stronger as the distance between the particles increases. A consequence of this is known as  
 150 colour confinement, the quarks and gluons can not exist on their own and are not observed  
 151 individually. They are bound in colour neutral states called hadrons, this process is known as  
 152 hadronisation.

### 153 Electroweak symmetry breaking

154 In  $\mathcal{L}_{gauge}$  and  $\mathcal{L}_f$  are no mass terms for fermions present because only singlets under  $SU(3)_C \times$   
 155  $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$  can acquire a mass with an interaction of the type  $m^2 \phi^\dagger \phi$  without breaking  
 156 the gauge invariance. In order to accommodate mass terms for fermions and gauge fields,  
 157 electroweak symmetry breaking, leading to  $\mathcal{L}_\phi$  is introduced.

The scalar doublet is introduced in the SM as

$$\phi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} \varphi_1 + i\varphi_2 \\ \varphi_3 + i\varphi_4 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (1.6)$$

Its field potential is of the form

$$V(\phi) = \mu^2 \phi^\dagger \phi + \lambda (\phi^\dagger \phi)^2, \quad (1.7)$$

with  $\mu^2 < 0$  and  $\lambda$  a positive integer. This choice of parameters gives the potential a "Mexican hat" shape. It has an infinite set of minima (ground states) and by expanding the field around an arbitrary choice of ground state, the electroweak symmetry is broken (EW):

$$\phi = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \frac{v}{\sqrt{2}} \end{pmatrix} + \hat{\phi}, \quad (1.8)$$

where  $v$  is the vacuum expectation value (vev), measured to be around 245 GeV and corresponds to  $\sqrt{\frac{-\mu}{\lambda}}$ . The scalar doublet's four degrees of freedom are reduced to three degrees of freedom that couple to the gauge fields and fix the  $W^+$ ,  $W^-$  and Zbosons. The remaining fourth degree of freedom has given rise to a physically observable particle, called the Brout-Englert-Higgs (BEH) boson. This spontaneous symmetry breaking leaves the gauge invariance intact and gives masses to the  $W^\pm$  and Zbosons as:

$$m_W = \frac{1}{2} v |g| \quad \text{and} \quad m_Z = \frac{1}{2} v \sqrt{g'^2 + g^2}. \quad (1.9)$$

<sup>158</sup> The Brout-Englert-Higgs field couples universally to fermions with a strength proportional to their masses, and to gauge bosons with a strength proportional to the square of their masses.

### 160 1.3 Flavours in the SM

Flavour changing charged currents are introduced in 1963 by Nicola Cabibbo [12]. Via interactions with a W boson the flavour of the quarks is changed. At the time of the postulation only up, down, and strange quarks were known and the charged weak current was described as a coupling between the up quark and  $d_{\text{weak}}$ , where  $d_{\text{weak}}$  is a linear combination of the down and strange quarks,  $d_{\text{weak}} = \cos\theta_c d + \sin\theta_c s$ . This linear combination is a direct consequence of the chosen rotation

$$\begin{pmatrix} d_{\text{weak}} \\ s_{\text{weak}} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos\theta_c & \sin\theta_c \\ -\sin\theta_c & \cos\theta_c \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} d \\ s \end{pmatrix} = \mathcal{R} \begin{pmatrix} d \\ s \end{pmatrix}, \quad (1.10)$$

where the rotation angle  $\theta_c$  is known as the Cabibbo angle. This provides a definition for the charged weak current between u and d quarks,

$$J_\mu = \bar{u} \gamma_\mu (1 + \gamma_5) d_{\text{weak}}. \quad (1.11)$$

A consequence of Cabibbo's approach is that the  $s_{\text{weak}}$  is left uncoupled, leading to Glashow, Iliopoulos and Maiani (GIM) [13–15] to require the existence of a fourth quark with charge  $\frac{2}{3}q_e$ . This quark, known as the charm quark, couples to  $s_{\text{weak}}$  and a new definition of the charged weak current is modified to

$$J_\mu = (\bar{u} \quad \bar{c}) \gamma_\mu (1 + \gamma_5) \mathcal{R} \begin{pmatrix} d \\ s \end{pmatrix} = \bar{U} \gamma_\mu (1 + \gamma_5) \mathcal{R} D. \quad (1.12)$$

The neutral weak current is defined as

$$J_3 = \bar{U} \gamma_\mu (1 + \gamma_5) [\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{R}^\dagger] D, \quad (1.13)$$

161 and is diagonal in flavour space. This has as consequence that no flavour changing neutral  
162 currents occur at tree-level interactions [1].

Kobayashi and Maskawa generalised the Cabibbo rotation matrix to accommodate a third generation of quarks. The result is a  $3 \times 3$  unitary matrix known as the CKM matrix, responsible for the mixing of weak interaction states of down-type quarks:

$$\begin{pmatrix} d_{\text{weak}} \\ s_{\text{weak}} \\ b_{\text{weak}} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} V_{ud} & V_{us} & V_{ub} \\ V_{cd} & V_{cs} & V_{cb} \\ V_{td} & V_{ts} & V_{tb} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} d \\ s \\ b \end{pmatrix} = \mathcal{V}_{\text{CKM}} \begin{pmatrix} d \\ s \\ b \end{pmatrix}, \quad (1.14)$$

where  $\mathcal{V}_{\text{CKM}}$  is unitary ( $\mathcal{V}_{\text{CKM}}^\dagger \mathcal{V}_{\text{CKM}} = \mathbb{1}$ ). A general  $3 \times 3$  unitary matrix depends on three real angles and six phases. For the CKM matrix, the freedom to redefine the phases of the quark eigenstates can remove five of the phases, leaving a single physical phase known as the Kobayashi-Maskawa phase. This phase is responsible for the charge parity violation in the SM [16]. Each element  $V_{ij}$  of  $\mathcal{V}_{\text{CKM}}$  represents the transition probability of a quark  $i$  going to a quark  $j$ , and is experimentally determined to be [6]

$$\mathcal{V}_{\text{CKM}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.97425 \pm 0.00022 & 0.2253 \pm 0.0008 & (4.13 \pm 0.49) \times 10^{-3} \\ 0.225 \pm 0.008 & 0.986 \pm 0.016 & (41.1 \pm 1.3) \times 10^{-3} \\ (8.4 \pm 0.6) \times 10^{-3} & (40.0 \pm 2.7) \times 10^{-3} & 1.021 \pm 0.032 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (1.15)$$

163 From [Equation 1.15](#) follows that top quarks predominantly decay via charged weak currents  
164 to bottom quarks, with a probability consistent with unity. In the SM, FCNC can only occur via  
165 higher loop interactions which are highly suppressed. The expected transition probabilities for  
166 a top quark decaying via a FCNC interaction in the SM are given in [Table 1.4](#), where it is clear  
167 that the FCNC top quark interactions of the SM is still beyond the reach of the sensitivity of current experiments.

**Table 1.4:** The predicted branching ratios  $\mathcal{B}$  for FCNC decays involving the top quark in the SM [17].

Process	$\mathcal{B}$ in the SM	Process	$\mathcal{B}$ in the SM
$t \rightarrow uZ$	$8 \times 10^{-17}$	$t \rightarrow cZ$	$1 \times 10^{-14}$
$t \rightarrow u\gamma$	$4 \times 10^{-16}$	$t \rightarrow c\gamma$	$5 \times 10^{-14}$
$t \rightarrow ug$	$4 \times 10^{-14}$	$t \rightarrow cg$	$5 \times 10^{-12}$
$t \rightarrow uH$	$2 \times 10^{-17}$	$t \rightarrow cH$	$3 \times 10^{-15}$

168

## 169 1.4 The top quark in the SM

Discovered in 1995 by the CDF and D0 collaborations at the Tevatron with proton-antiproton data [18, 19], the top quark plays an important role in studying high energy physics. Its Yukawa

interaction is given by

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{top-Yukawa}} = -\frac{\lambda_t \nu}{\sqrt{2}} \bar{t}_L t_R - \frac{\lambda_t}{\sqrt{2}} H \bar{t}_L t_R + \text{h.c.}, \quad (1.16)$$

yielding a Yukawa coupling of [6]

$$\lambda_t = \frac{\sqrt{2} m_t}{\nu} = 0.991 \pm 0.003. \quad (1.17)$$

170 This Yukawa coupling is very large compared to the other Yukawa couplings in the SM ( $\mathcal{O}(10^{-2})$ ),  
 171 leading to the belief that the top quark may have an important role in understanding the  
 172 mechanism of electroweak symmetry breaking. On top of this, the very short lifetime of the top  
 173 quark makes it an excellent candidate to study the properties of a bare quark. Its high mass,  
 174 almost 40 times higher than the mass of the closest fermion in mass, leads to a large coupling  
 175 with the Higgs boson and makes the top quark an interesting candidate to investigate how  
 176 particles acquire mass.


177 The CKM matrix element  $V_{tb}$ , given in [Equation 1.15](#), is experimentally found to be much  
 178 larger than  $V_{ts}$ ,  $V_{td}$ , and close to unity. The top quark decays through electroweak interactions  
 179 since the W boson mass is smaller than the top quark mass and the W boson can be on shell. A  
 180 consequence of this is that the top quark has a very short lifetime of only  $1/\Gamma_t \approx 5 \cdot 10^{-25}$  s [6]  
 181 leading to the fact that the formation of bound states involving top quarks are not allowed.  
 182 This lifetime is even shorter than the typical hadronisation timescale of  $1/\Lambda_{\text{QCD}} \approx 10^{-23}$  s,  
 183 prohibiting gluons to radiate from the top quark and keeping its spin coherent. Since the  
 184 electroweak interactions have a vector-axial vector (V-A) coupling structure<sup>3</sup>, the top quark  
 185 spin orientation can be derived from the angular distributions of its decay products. This makes  
 186 it possible to study the polarisation of top quarks from the angular distributions in various  
 187 processes.

188 The massiveness of the top quark leads to the fact that a large amount of energy is needed to  
 189 create one. This is only the case for high energy collisions such as those happening in the Earth's  
 190 upper atmosphere when cosmic rays collide with particles in air, or by particle accelerators.  
 191 The production of top quarks happens in two ways: single via the electroweak interaction or in  
 192 pairs via the strong interaction. At hadron colliders, the dominant production mechanism is top  
 193 quark production via gluon ( $gg \rightarrow t\bar{t}$ ) or quark fusion ( $q\bar{q} \rightarrow t\bar{t}$ ). In [Figure 1.1](#), the different top  
 194 quark pair production mechanisms are shown. The production channel of gluon fusion is the  
 195 main contributor to the top quark pair cross section at the LHC compared to quark fusion at the  
 196 Tevatron. The  $gg \rightarrow t\bar{t}$  process contributes 80-90% to the total top quark pair cross section in  
 197 the LHC centre-of-mass energy regime of 7-14 TeV [6]. In [Table 1.5](#) the predicted top quark  
 198 pair production cross sections are given for the LHC and the Tevatron, while in [Figure 1.2](#), a  
 199 summary plot of the LHC and Tevatron top quark pair cross section measurements as a function  
 200 of the centre-of-mass energy can be found.

201 The singly produced top quarks are produced via the electroweak interaction. These production  
 202 mechanisms are subdivided at leading order into three main channels based on the virtuality

---

<sup>3</sup>In the SM a vector - axial vector coupling structure  $(\gamma^\mu - \gamma^\mu \gamma^5)$  is predicted that only permits left-handed fermions or right-handed anti fermions to interact with a spin-1 particle.




**Figure 1.1:** Leading order diagrams of the top quark pair production. Gluon fusion (right and middle) are the dominant processes at the LHC, while quark fusion (left) is the dominant one at the Tevatron.

**Table 1.5:** Predictions on the top quark pair production cross sections at next-to-next-to-leading order with next-to-next-to-leading log soft gluon resummation per centre-of-mass energy [6]. The first uncertainty is from scale dependence, while the second uncertainty originates from parton density functions.


Experiment	Top quark mass	Centre-of-mass energy	Cross section (pb)
Tevatron	$m_t = 173.3$ GeV	$\sqrt{s} = 1.96$ TeV	$\sigma_{\bar{t}t} = 7.16^{+0.11+0.17}_{-0.20-0.12}$
LHC	$m_t = 173.2$ GeV	$\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV	$\sigma_{\bar{t}t} = 173.6^{+4.5+8.9}_{-5.9-8.9}$
LHC	$m_t = 173.2$ GeV	$\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV	$\sigma_{\bar{t}t} = 247.7^{+6.3+11.5}_{-8.5-11.5}$
LHC	$m_t = 173.2$ GeV	$\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV	$\sigma_{\bar{t}t} = 816.0^{+19.4+34.4}_{-28.6-34.4}$

203 ( $Q^2 = -p_\mu p^\mu$ ) of the exchanged W boson. In Figure 1.3, the corresponding Feynman diagrams  
 204 are shown. The single top quark production cross sections, given in Table 1.6, are smaller than  
 205 the top quark pair production cross sections since the electroweak coupling strength is smaller  
 206 than the strong coupling strength. In addition, for the single top quark production, there is the  
 207 need of sea quarks ( $b, \bar{q}$ ) in the initial states for which the parton density functions increase  
 208 less steeply at low momentum fractions compared to the gluon parton density functions.

209 The production via the  $t$ -channel has a virtuality of the W boson  $Q^2 > 0$ , making it space-like.  
 210 It is produced via the scattering of the W boson of a bottom quark coming from a proton  
 211 or from gluon splitting ( $g \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ ). It has the highest single top quark cross section in proton  
 212 collisions and the top quark production is roughly twice as large than the antitop quark. This is  
 213 a consequence of the up-down valence quark composition of the proton. This feature makes the  
 214  $t$ -channel sensitive to the parton density functions of the proton. The  $s$ -channel is the production  
 215 mechanism with the smallest cross section. Here the W boson is time-like ( $Q^2 < 0$ ) which  
 216 requires the W boson to have a large virtuality to produce the heavier top quark. It is produced  
 217 from two quarks belonging to the same isodoublet (e.g.  $u\bar{d}$ ) and subsequently decays to  $t\bar{b}$ .  
 218 This process gets enhanced by many beyond the Standard Model scenarios via the addition of  
 219 new heavy particles such as  $W'$ . The  $tW$ -channel has a top quark produced in association with a  
 220 W boson produced on shell  $Q^2 = -m_W^2$ . This mode is negligible at the Tevatron, but of relevant  
 221 size at the LHC. The  $tW$ -channel is sensitive to new physics affecting the  $Wtb$  vertex. The single  
 222 top quark production cross section measurements by the CMS collaboration can be found in  
 223 Figure 1.4.




**Figure 1.2:** Summary of the LHC and the Tevatron measurements of the top quark pair production cross section as function of the centre-of-mass energy compared with the next-to-next-to-leading order QCD calculation. The theory bands are the uncertainties due to renormalization and factorisation scales, parton density functions and the strong coupling. The mass of the top quark is assumed to be 172.5 GeV. Measurements for the same centre-of-mass energy are slightly off-set for clarity. Figure taken from [20].



**Figure 1.3:** Leading order Feynman diagrams of the electroweak production of single top quarks in the  $s$ -channel (left),  $t$ -channel (middle), and for the  $tW$  associated production. Figure taken from [21].

**Table 1.6:** Predictions on the single top quark production cross sections at next-to-leading order per centre-of-mass energy [6]. The uncertainties from scale dependence and from parton density functions are combined in quadrature or given separately (scale + PDF). For the  $t$ -channel the relative proportions to  $t$  and  $\bar{t}$  are 65% and 35%. For the  $s$ -channel this is respectively 69% and 31%. The  $tW$ -channel has an equal proportion of top and antitop quarks. For Tevatron, the top quark mass is assumed to be 173.3 GeV, while the LHC predictions use  $m_t = 172.5$  GeV [6, 22].

Collider	Centre-of-mass energy	Cross section $\sigma_{t+\bar{t}}$ (pb)		
		$t$ -channel	$s$ -channel	$tW$ -channel
Tevatron	$\sqrt{s} = 1.96$ TeV	$2.06^{+0.13}_{-0.13}$	$1.03^{+0.05}_{-0.05}$	-
LHC	$\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV	$63.89^{+2.91}_{-2.52}$	$4.29^{+0.19}_{-0.17}$	$15.74^{+0.40+1.10}_{-0.40-1.14}$
LHC	$\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV	$84.69^{+3.76}_{-3.23}$	$5.24^{+0.22}_{-0.20}$	$22.37^{+0.60+1.40}_{-0.60-1.40}$
LHC	$\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV	$216.99^{+9.04}_{-7.71}$	$10.32^{+0.40}_{-0.36}$	$71.7^{+1.80+3.40}_{-1.80-3.40}$



**Figure 1.4:** Summary of the measurements of the single top quark production cross section as function of the centre-of-mass energy. Figure taken from [23].

224 **1.5 Effective field theories**

225 Problems can be simplified if one looks at the relevant scale of the process that one want to  
226 investigate, for example the chemical properties of an hydrogen atom can be described without  
227 any knowledge of quark interactions inside the proton. In this case, the proton can be considered  
228 the elementary object (indivisible) due to the fact that the binding energy of the constituents is  
229 much bigger than the energy of the electron in orbit around the proton. Effective field theories  
230 are based on this kind of separation of different energy scales in a system [24]. Effective field  
231 theories can be used for theories where the perturbative expansion cannot be trusted, e.g. QCD  
232 at low energy, or as bottom up approach to look for new physics in a model independent way.  
233 The latter is the way effective field theory will be used throughout this thesis.

The main idea behind effective field theory is easily explained via the example of the Fermi theory. Fermi explained in 1933 [25] the  $\beta$ -decay as a product of currents:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{EFT}}^{\text{Fermi}} = -\frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} J^\mu J_\mu^\dagger, \quad (1.18)$$

where  $G_F$  is the Fermi coupling constant, measured to be  $G_F \approx 1.17 \times 10^{-5} \text{ GeV}^{-2}$ . The current  $J_\mu$  can written as the sum of an hadronic  $J_\mu^h$  and leptonic  $J_\mu^l$  current, where for simplicity only the leptonic current discussed.

$$J_\mu^l = \sum_i \bar{\nu}_i \gamma_\mu (1 - \gamma_5) l. \quad (1.19)$$

234 Historically, charged currents were flavour universal and the later discovered parity violation of  
235 the weak interaction led to the V-A structure. After this, the  $SU(2)_L$  symmetry was postulated  
236 and the existence of neutral currents was predicted. The effective Lagrangian used then (given  
237 in Equation 1.18), could nowadays be build starting from  $SU(2)_L$  symmetries only.

The muon decay can be computed from two different starting points. The effective Fermi Lagrangian provides the decay width of the muon into an electron and two neutrinos

$$\Gamma(\mu \rightarrow e \bar{\nu}_e \nu_\mu) \approx \frac{1}{96\pi^3} \frac{m_\mu^2}{\Lambda_F^4}, \quad (1.20)$$

where  $\Lambda_F$  is the energy scale defined as

$$\frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} = \frac{1}{\Lambda_F^2}. \quad (1.21)$$

From muon decay measurements, the value of  $\Lambda_F$  is determined to be  $\Lambda_F \approx 348 \text{ GeV}$  [24]. From the SM Lagrangian, one could also calculate the muon decay. Considering that the momenta involved are small compared to the W boson mass, the propagator's denominator can be expanded as [1]

$$\frac{1}{p^2 - m_W^2} = -\frac{1}{m_W^2} - \frac{p^2}{m_W^4} + \dots \quad (1.22)$$

Looking at the first term, and identifying

$$\frac{g^2}{8m_W} = \frac{1^2}{\Lambda_F}, \quad (1.23)$$

one sees that this corresponds with [Equation 1.20](#), thus the effective Lagrangian in [Equation 1.18](#) is the first term of the expansion in  $\frac{1}{m_W^2}$  applied on the full Lagrangian.


An effective theory is thus a Taylor expansion in the ratio of two scales and the only remnants of the full theory at low energies are the symmetries and the values of the coupling constants. If the expansion parameter is small, one can truncate the series leading to the Lagrangian containing a finite number of free coefficients, making predictions possible. The error on these predictions is then of the order as the truncated piece.

The SM can be seen as an effective theory applicable up to energies not exceeding a scale  $\Lambda$ . Therefore, remnants should still be valid and the theory above that scale should have a gauge group containing  $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$  and all the SM degrees of freedom, as well as reduce to the SM at lower energies. The general SM Lagrangian becomes then

$$\mathcal{L}_{SM+EFT} = \mathcal{L}_{SM}^{(4)} + \frac{1}{\Lambda} \sum_k C_k^{(5)} Q_k^{(5)} + \frac{1}{\Lambda^2} \sum_k C_k^{(6)} Q_k^{(6)} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\Lambda^3}\right), \quad (1.24)$$

where  $Q_k^{(n)}$  are dimension- $n$  operators (currents) and  $C_k^{(n)}$  the corresponding dimensionless coupling constants, so-called Wilson coefficients. The Wilson coefficients are determined by the underlying high energy theory.

In the Warsaw basis [\[26\]](#), a set of independent operators of dimension 5 and 6 are built out of the SM fields and are consistent with the SM gauge symmetries and is fully derived in Ref. [\[26\]](#). In general the various measurements show a good agreement with the SM predictions and by lack of deviations from the SM, limits on the anomalous couplings can be derived. The estimated coupling strengths per operator contributing to single top quark production obtained from various measurements at the LHC and Tevatron are shown in [Figure 1.5](#) for which the conventions are discussed in Ref. [\[27\]](#). These results are consistent with the SM expectation for which those operators vanish.



**Figure 1.5:** Global fit results of top quark effective field theory to experimental data including all constrained operators at dimension six. For the operators, the Warsaw basis of [26] is used. The bounds are set on the Wilson coefficients of various operators contributing to top quark production and decay in two cases (red) all other coefficients set to zero, or (blue) all other coefficients marginalized over. Figure taken from [28].

## 256 1.6 Motivation for new physics

257 Many high energy experiments confirm the success of the SM. In particular the scalar boson,  
 258 the cornerstone of the SM, has consecrated the theory. Unfortunately there are also strong  
 259 indications that the SM ought to be a lower energy expression of a more global theory. The  
 260 existence of physics beyond the SM (BSM) [29] is strongly motivated. These motivations are  
 261 based on direct evidence from observation such as the existence of neutrino masses, the existence  
 262 of dark matter and dark energy, or the matter-antimatter asymmetry, and also from theoretical  
 263 problems such as the hierarchy problem, the coupling unification or the large numbers of free  
 264 parameters in the SM.

265 In the SM, the neutrinos are assumed to be massless, while experiments with solar, atmospheric,  
 266 reactor and accelerator neutrinos have established that neutrinos can oscillate and change flavour  
 267 during flight [4, 5]. These oscillations are only possible when neutrinos have masses. The  
 268 flavour neutrinos ( $\nu_e$ ,  $\nu_\mu$ ,  $\nu_\tau$ ) are then linear expressions of the fields of at least three mass  
 269 eigenstate neutrinos  $\nu_1$ ,  $\nu_2$ , and  $\nu_3$ .

270 The ordinary or baryonic matter described by the SM describes only 5% of the mass (energy)  
 271 content of the universe. Astrophysical evidence indicated that dark matter is contributing  
 272 to approximately 27% and dark energy to 68% of the content of the universe. From the  
 273 measurements of the temperature and polarizations anisotropies of the cosmic microwave  
 274 background by the Planck experiment [30], the density of cold non baryonic matter is determined.  
 275 Cold dark matter is assumed to be only sensitive to the weak and gravitational force, leading  
 276 to only one possible SM candidate: the neutrino. However, these are too light to account for  
 277 the vast amount of dark matter and other models are needed. Dark energy is assumed to be  
 278 responsible for the acceleration in the expansion of the universe [31].

279 At the Big Bang, matter and antimatter are assumed to be produced in equal quantities.  
 280 However, it is clear that we are surrounded by matter. So where did all the antimatter go?  
 281 In 1967, Sakharov identified three mechanisms that are necessary to obtain a global matter  
 282 antimatter asymmetry [32]. These mechanisms are those of baryon and lepton number violation,  
 283 that at a given moment in time there was a thermal imbalance for the interactions in the universe,  
 284 and there is charge C and charge parity CP violation<sup>4</sup>.

285 The large number of free parameters in the SM comes from the nine fermion masses, three  
 286 CKM mixing angles and one CP violating phase, one EM coupling constant  $g'$ , one weak coupling  
 287 constant  $g$ , one strong coupling constant  $g_s$ , one QCD vacuum angle, one vacuum expectation  
 288 value, and one mass of the scalar boson. This large number of free parameters leads to the  
 289 expectation of a more elegant and profound theory beyond the SM.

290 The hierarchy problem [33] is related to the huge difference in energy between the weak  
 291 scale and the Planck scale. The vev of the Brout-Englert-Higgs field determines the weak scale  
 292 that is approximately 246 GeV. The radiative corrections to the scalar boson squared mass  $m_H^2$ ,  
 293 coming from its self couplings and couplings to fermions and gauge bosons, are quadratically

---

<sup>4</sup>The rate of a process  $i \rightarrow f$  can be different from the CP-conjugate process:  $\tilde{i} \rightarrow \tilde{f}$ . The SM includes sources of CP-violation through the residual phase of the CKM matrix. However, these could not account for the magnitude of the asymmetry observed.

294 proportional to the ultraviolet momentum cut-off  $\Lambda_{\text{UV}}$ . This cut-off is at least equal to the energy  
 295 to which the SM is valid without the need of new physics. For the SM to be valid up to the  
 296 Planck mass, the correction to  $m_H^2$  becomes thirty orders of magnitude larger than  $m_H^2$ . This  
 297 implies that an extraordinary cancellation of terms should happen. This is also known as the  
 298 naturalness problem of the H boson mass.

The correction to the squared mass of the scalar boson coming from a fermion  $f$ , coupling to the scalar field  $\phi$  with a coupling  $\lambda_f$  is given by

$$\Delta m_H^2 = -\frac{|\lambda_f|^2}{8\pi^2} \Lambda_{\text{UV}}^2, \quad (1.25)$$

while the correction to the mass from a scalar particle  $S$  with a mass  $m_S$ , coupling to the scalar field with a Lagrangian term  $-\lambda_S |\phi|^2 |S|^2$  is

$$\Delta m_H^2 = \frac{|\lambda_S|^2}{16\pi^2} \left( \Lambda_{\text{UV}}^2 - 2m_S^2 \ln \left( \frac{\Lambda_{\text{UV}}}{m_S} \right) + \dots \right). \quad (1.26)$$

299 As one can see the correction term to  $m_H^2$  is much larger than  $m_H^2$  itself. By introducing BSM  
 300 physics models that introduce new scalar particles at the TeV scale that couple to the scalar  
 301 boson one can cancel the  $\Lambda_{\text{UV}}^2$  divergence and avoid this fine-tuning.

302 The choice of the  $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$  symmetry group itself as well as the separate  
 303 treatment of the three forces included in the SM raises concern. The intensity of the forces  
 304 show a large disparity around the electroweak scale, but have comparable strengths at higher  
 305 energies. The electromagnetic and weak forces are unified in a electroweak interaction, but the  
 306 strong coupling constant does not encounter the other coupling constants at high energies. In  
 307 order to reach a grand unification, the running of couplings can be modified by the addition of  
 308 new particles in BSM models.

## 309 1.7 An effective approach beyond the SM: FCNC involving a top 310 quark

311 The closeness of the top quark mass to the electroweak scale led physicists to believe that it  
 312 is a sensitive probe for new physics. Studying its properties is therefore an important topic  
 313 of the experimental program at the LHC. Several extensions of the SM enhance the FCNC  
 314 branching ratios and can be probed at the LHC [17], from which some of them are shown in  
 315 Table 1.7. Previous searches have been performed at the Tevatron by the CDF [34] and D0 [35]  
 316 collaborations, and at the LHC by the ATLAS [36–40] and CMS [41–45] collaborations.

317 The impact of BSM models can be written in a model independent way by means of an  
 318 effective field theory valid up to an energy scale  $\Lambda$ . The leading effects are parametrized by a  
 319 set of fully gauge symmetric operators that are added to the SM Lagrangian and can be reduced  
 320 to a minimal set of operators as seen in Equation 1.24. For simplicity, the assumption is made  
 321 that new physics effects are exclusively described by dimension-6 operators, thus neglecting

**Table 1.7:** The predicted branching ratios  $\mathcal{B}$  for FCNC interactions involving the top quark in some BSM models [17]: quark singlet (QS), generic two Higgs doublet model (2HDM) and the minimal supersymmetric extensions to the SM (MSSM);

Process	QS	2HDM	MSSM	Process	QS	2HDM	MSSM
$t \rightarrow uZ$	$\leq 1.1 \times 10^{-4}$	—	$\leq 2 \times 10^{-6}$	$t \rightarrow cZ$	$\leq 1.1 \times 10^{-4}$	$\leq 10^{-7}$	$\leq 2 \times 10^{-6}$
$t \rightarrow u\gamma$	$\leq 7.5 \times 10^{-9}$	—	$\leq 2 \times 10^{-6}$	$t \rightarrow c\gamma$	$\leq 7.5 \times 10^{-9}$	$\leq 10^{-6}$	$\leq 2 \times 10^{-6}$
$t \rightarrow ug$	$\leq 1.5 \times 10^{-7}$	—	$\leq 8 \times 10^{-5}$	$t \rightarrow cg$	$\leq 1.5 \times 10^{-7}$	$\leq 10^{-4}$	$\leq 8 \times 10^{-5}$
$t \rightarrow uH$	$\leq 4.1 \times 10^{-5}$	$\leq 5.5 \times 10^{-6}$	$\leq 10^{-5}$	$t \rightarrow cH$	$\leq 4.1 \times 10^{-5}$	$\leq 10^{-3}$	$\leq 10^{-5}$

322 neutrino physics. In the fully gauge symmetric case, the EFT Lagrangian is then given by

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{SM+EFT}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{SM}} + \sum_i \frac{\bar{c}_i}{\Lambda^2} O_i + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\Lambda^3}\right), \quad (1.27)$$

where the Wilson coefficients  $\bar{c}_i$  depend on the considered theory and on the way that new physics couples to the SM particles. Taking into account that  $\Lambda$  is large, contributions suppressed by powers of  $\Lambda$  greater than two are neglected. Additionally, all four fermion operators are omitted for the rest of this thesis. The Warsaw basis is adopted for the independent effective operators [26], parametrising the new physics effects relevant for the flavour changing neutral current interactions of the top quark as, all flavour indices understood,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\text{EFT}}^t = & \frac{\bar{c}_{uG}}{\Lambda^2} \Phi^\dagger \cdot [\bar{Q}_L \sigma^{\mu\nu} \mathcal{T}_a u_R] G_{\mu\nu}^a + \frac{\bar{c}_{uB}}{\Lambda^2} \Phi^\dagger \cdot [\bar{Q}_L \sigma^{\mu\nu} u_R] B_{\mu\nu} + \frac{2\bar{c}_{uW}}{\Lambda^2} \Phi^\dagger T_i \cdot [\bar{Q}_L \sigma^{\mu\nu} u_R] W_{\mu\nu}^i \\ & + i \frac{\bar{c}_{hu}}{\Lambda^2} \left[ \Phi^\dagger \overleftrightarrow{D}_\mu \Phi \right] [\bar{u}_R \gamma^\mu u_R] + i \frac{\bar{c}_{hq}^{(1)}}{\Lambda^2} \left[ \Phi^\dagger \overleftrightarrow{D}_\mu \Phi \right] [\bar{Q}_L \gamma^\mu Q_L] \\ & + i \frac{4\bar{c}_{HQ}^{(3)}}{\Lambda^2} \left[ \Phi^\dagger T_i \overleftrightarrow{D}_\mu \Phi \right] [\bar{Q}_L \gamma^\mu T^i Q_L] + \frac{\bar{c}_{uh}}{\Lambda^2} \Phi^\dagger \Phi \Phi^\dagger \cdot [\bar{Q}_L u_R] + \text{h.c.}, \end{aligned} \quad (1.28)$$

where the left handed  $SU(2)_L$  doublet of the quark fields is denoted by  $Q_L$ , the up-type right handed fields by  $u_R$ , the down-type right handed fields by  $d_R$ , the  $SU(2)_L$  doublet of the Higgs field by  $\Phi$ , the field strength tensors as

$$\begin{aligned} B_{\mu\nu} &= \partial_\mu B_\nu - \partial_\nu B_\mu, \\ W_{\mu\nu}^k &= \partial_\mu W_\nu^k - \partial_\nu W_\mu^k - g \epsilon_{ij}^k W_\mu^i W_\nu^j, \\ G_{\mu\nu} &= \partial_\mu G_\nu^a - \partial_\nu G_\mu^a + g_s f_{bc}^a G_\mu^b G_\nu^c, \end{aligned} \quad (1.29)$$

denoting the structure constant of the  $SU(3)_C$  group as  $f_{bc}^a$  and the structure constant of the  $SU(2)_L$  group as  $\epsilon_{ij}^k$ . The gauge covariant derivatives are also standard defined as

$$D_\mu \Phi = \partial_\mu \Phi - \frac{1}{2} i g' B_\mu \Phi - i g T_k W_\mu^k \Phi \quad (1.30)$$

with the conventions of Section 1.2. The representation matrices  $T$  of  $SU(2)_L$  are defined in Equation 1.1, while the representation matrices  $\mathcal{T}$  of  $SU(3)_C$  are the Gell-Mann matrices [1].

The hermitian derivative operator is defined as

$$\Phi^\dagger \overleftrightarrow{D} \Phi = \Phi^\dagger D^\mu \Phi - D_\mu \Phi^\dagger \Phi. \quad (1.31)$$

After electroweak symmetry breaking, the operators induce [17, 46] both corrections to the SM couplings and new interactions at tree level such as FCNC interactions. The FCNC interactions of the top quark that are not present in the SM are given by

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{EFT}}^t = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \sum_{q=u,c} \left[ g' \frac{\kappa_{t\gamma q}}{\Lambda} A_{\mu\nu} \bar{t} \sigma^{\mu\nu} (f_{\gamma q}^L P_L + f_{\gamma q}^R P_R) q \right. \quad (1.32)$$

$$+ \frac{g}{2\cos\theta_W} \frac{\kappa_{tZq}}{\Lambda} Z_{\mu\nu} \bar{t} \sigma^{\mu\nu} (f_{Zq}^L P_L + f_{Zq}^R P_R) q \quad (1.33)$$

$$+ \frac{\sqrt{2}g}{4\cos\theta_W} \zeta_{tZq} \bar{t} \gamma^\mu (\tilde{f}_q^L P_L + \tilde{f}_q^R P_R) q Z_\mu \quad (1.34)$$

$$+ g_s \frac{\kappa_{tgq}}{\Lambda} Z_{\mu\nu} \bar{t} \sigma^{\mu\nu} (f_{gq}^L P_L + f_{gq}^R P_R) q G_\mu^a \quad (1.35)$$

$$+ \eta_{Hqt} \bar{t} (\hat{f}_q^L P_L + \hat{f}_q^R P_R) q H + \text{h.c.} \Big], \quad (1.36)$$

where the value of the FCNC couplings at scale  $\Lambda$  are represented by  $\kappa_{tZq}, \kappa_{tgq}, \kappa_{t\gamma q}, \zeta_{tZq}$ , and  $\eta_{Hqt}$ . These are assumed to be real and positive, with the unit of  $\text{GeV}^{-1}$  for  $\kappa_{txq}/\Lambda$  and no unit for  $\zeta_{xqt}$  and  $\eta_{xqt}$ . In the equation  $\sigma^{\mu\nu}$  equals to  $\frac{i}{2} [\gamma^\mu, \gamma^\nu]$ , and the left- and right-handed chirality projector operators are denoted by  $P_L$  and  $P_R$ . The electromagnetic coupling constant is denoted by  $g'$ , the strong interaction coupling is denoted as  $g_s$ , while the electroweak interaction is parametrised by the coupling constant  $g$  and the electroweak mixing angle  $\theta_W$ . The complex chiral parameters are normalized according to  $|f_{xq}^L|^2 + |f_{xq}^R|^2 = 1$ ,  $|\tilde{f}_q^L|^2 + |\tilde{f}_q^R|^2 = 1$ , and  $|\hat{f}_q^L|^2 + |\hat{f}_q^R|^2 = 1$ . In the expression for  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{EFT}}^t$ , the unitary gauge is adopted and the scalar field is expanded around its vacuum expectation value  $v$  with  $H$  being the SM scalar boson. The field strength tensors of the photon  $A_\mu$ , the gluon field  $G_\mu^{a..8}$ , and the Z boson  $Z_\mu^0$  are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\mu\nu} &= \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu, \\ Z_{\mu\nu} &= \partial_\mu Z_\nu - \partial_\nu Z_\mu, \text{ and} \\ G_{\mu\nu} &= \partial_\mu G_\nu^a - \partial_\nu G_\mu^a + g_s f_{bc}^a G_\mu^b G_\nu^c. \end{aligned} \quad (1.37)$$

323 Note that there are two coupling constants arising in  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{EFT}}^t$ , which is a residue of electroweak  
 324 symmetry breaking. The massive Z boson will appear in both the  $Z_\mu^0$  field as well as the covariant  
 325 derivative, leading to an extra Z-vertex.

326 The relations between the Wilson coefficients in (1.28) and the coupling strengths of the  
 327 interactions in Equation 1.36 can be derived. The 14 effective operators are mapped onto 10  
 328 free parameters providing a more minimal parametrisation of the anomalous interactions of the  
 329 top quark.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \kappa_{tqg} f_{gq}^L &= \frac{\nu}{g_s \Lambda} [\bar{c}_{uG}]_{i3}^*, & \kappa_{tqg} f_{gq}^R &= \frac{\nu}{g_s \Lambda} [\bar{c}_{uG}]_{3i}, \\
 \kappa_{t\gamma q} f_{\gamma q}^L &= \frac{\nu}{g' \Lambda} [\cos \theta_W \bar{c}_{uB} - \sin \theta_W \bar{c}_{uW}]_{i3}^*, & \kappa_{t\gamma q} f_{\gamma q}^R &= \frac{\nu}{g' \Lambda} [\sin \theta_W \bar{c}_{uB} - \cos \theta_W \bar{c}_{uW}]_{3i}, \\
 \kappa_{tZq} f_{Zq}^L &= -\frac{2\cos \theta_W \nu}{g \Lambda} [\sin \theta_W \bar{c}_{uB} + \cos \theta_W \bar{c}_{uW}]_{i3}^*, & \kappa_{tZq} f_{Zq}^R &= -\frac{2\cos \theta_W \nu}{g \Lambda} [\cos \theta_W \bar{c}_{uB} + \sin \theta_W \bar{c}_{uW}]_{3i}, \\
 \zeta_{tZq} \tilde{f}_{Zq}^L &= -\frac{2\nu^2}{\Lambda^2} [(\bar{c}_{hq}^{(1)} - \bar{c}_{hq}^{(3)})_{i3} + (\bar{c}_{hq}^{(1)} - \bar{c}_{hq}^{(3)})_{3i}^*], & \zeta_{tZq} \tilde{f}_{Zq}^R &= -\frac{2\nu^2}{\Lambda^2} [(\bar{c}_{hu})_{i3} + (\bar{c}_{hu})_{3i}^*], \\
 \eta_{tHq} \hat{f}_{Hq}^L &= \frac{3\nu^2}{2\Lambda^2} [\bar{c}_{uh}]_{i3}^*, & \eta_{tHq} \hat{f}_{Hq}^R &= \frac{3\nu^2}{2\Lambda^2} [\bar{c}_{uh}]_{3i}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{1.38}$$


## 330 1.8 Experimental constraints on top-FCNC

Experiments commonly put limits on the branching ratios which allow an easier interpretation across different EFT models by use of the branching ratio

$$\mathcal{B}(t \rightarrow qX) = \frac{\delta_{txq}^2 \Gamma_{t \rightarrow qX}}{\Gamma_t}, \tag{1.39}$$

331 where  $\Gamma_{t \rightarrow qX}$  represents the FCNC decay width<sup>5</sup> for a coupling strength  $\delta_{txq}^2 = 1$ , and  $\Gamma_t$  the full  
 332 decay width of the top quark. In the SM, supposing a top quark mass of 172.5 GeV, the full  
 333 width becomes  $\Gamma_t^{\text{SM}} = 1.32$  GeV [47].

334 Searches for top-FCNC usually adopt a search strategy depending on the experimental set-up  
 335 and the FCNC interaction of interest, looking either for FCNC interactions in the production of a  
 336 single top quark or in its decay for top quark pair interactions. In Figure 1.6, these two cases  
 337 are shown for the tZq vertex.



**Figure 1.6:** Feynman diagrams for the processes with a tZq FCNC interaction, where the FCNC interaction is indicated with the shaded dot. (a) Single top quark production through an FCNC interaction. (b) Top quark pair production with an FCNC induced decay.


<sup>5</sup>The decay width of a certain process represents the probability per unit time that a particle will decay. The total decay width, defined as the sum of all possible decay widths of a particle, is inversely proportional to its lifetime.

339 The observation of top-FCNC interactions has yet to come and experiments have so far only  
 340 been able to put upper bounds on the branching ratios. An overview of the best current limits is  
 341 given in [Table 1.8](#). In [Figure 1.7](#) a comparison is shown between the current best limits set by  
 342 ATLAS and CMS with respect to several BSM model benchmark predictions. From there one can  
 343 see that FCNC searches involving a Z or H boson are close to excluding or confirming several  
 344 BSM theories. In [Figure 1.9](#), the searches performed by CMS are summarised. For the tZq  
 345 vertex, the best limit from CMS comes from Ref. [41] where both single top quark and top quark  
 346 pair are studied. The observed (expected) limits 95% CL at 8 TeV for the FCNC tZq interaction  
 347 by CMS are  $\mathcal{B}(t \rightarrow uZ) < 2.2 \times 10^{-4}$ ( $2.7 \times 10^{-4}$ ) and  $\mathcal{B}(t \rightarrow cZ) < 4.9 \times 10^{-4}$ ( $12 \times 10^{-4}$ ). In  
 348 [Figure 1.8](#), the summary of the 95% confidence level observed limits on the branching ratios  
 349 of the top quark decays to a charm or up quark and a neutral boson is given, considering the  
 results from the HERA, the LEP, the Tevatron, and the LHC.


**Table 1.8:** Overview of the most stringent observed and expected experimental limits on top-FCNC branching ratios  $\mathcal{B}$  at 95% confidence level.

Process	Search mode	Observed $\mathcal{B}$	Expected $\mathcal{B}$	Experiment	
$t \rightarrow uZ$	top quark pair decay	$1.7 \times 10^{-4}$	$2.4 \times 10^{-4}$	ATLAS	[40]
$t \rightarrow u\gamma$	single top quark production	$1.3 \times 10^{-4}$	$1.9 \times 10^{-4}$	CMS	[43]
$t \rightarrow ug$	single top quark production	$4.0 \times 10^{-5}$	$3.5 \times 10^{-5}$	ATLAS	[37]
$t \rightarrow uH$	top quark pair decay	$2.4 \times 10^{-3}$	$1.7 \times 10^{-3}$	ATLAS	[39]
$t \rightarrow cZ$	top quark pair decay	$2.3 \times 10^{-4}$	$3.2 \times 10^{-4}$	ATLAS	[40]
$t \rightarrow c\gamma$	single top quark production	$2.0 \times 10^{-3}$	$1.7 \times 10^{-3}$	CMS	[43]
$t \rightarrow cg$	single top quark production	$2.0 \times 10^{-4}$	$1.8 \times 10^{-4}$	ATLAS	[37]
$t \rightarrow cH$	top quark pair decay	$2.2 \times 10^{-3}$	$1.6 \times 10^{-3}$	CMS	[39]


350



**Figure 1.7:** Current best limits set by CMS and ATLAS for top-FCNC interactions. Figure taken from [23]. (TO DO Remake with new atlas results)



**Figure 1.8:** Summary of the current 95% confidence level observed limits on the branching ratios of the top quark decays via flavour changing neutral currents to a charm (left) or up (right) quark and a neutral boson. The coloured lines represent the results from HERA (the most stringent limits between the ones obtained by the H1 and ZEUS collaborations, in brown), LEP (combined ALEPH, DELPHI, L3 and OPAL collaborations result, in green), TEVATRON (the most stringent limits between the ones obtained by the CDF and D0 collaborations, in grey). The yellow area represents the region excluded by the ATLAS and the CMS Collaborations. Figure taken from [20].



**Figure 1.9:** Summary of the FCNC branching ratios from CMS searches at 8 TeV. Figure taken from [23].

# Experimental set-up

# 2

352 A key objective of the Large Hadron Collider (LHC) was the search for the Brout-Englert-Higgs  
 353 boson. The Large Electron Positron (LEP) [48] and Tevatron [49] experiments established  
 354 that the mass of the scalar boson has to be larger than 114 GeV [50, 51], and smaller than  
 355 approximate 1 TeV due to unitarity and perturbativity constraints [52]. On top of this, the  
 356 search for new physics such as supersymmetry or the understanding of dark matter were part  
 357 of the motivation for building the LHC. Since the start of its operation, the LHC is pushing the  
 358 boundaries of the Standard Model, putting the most stringent limits on physics beyond the  
 359 Standard Model as well as precision measurements of the parameters of the Standard Model. A  
 360 milestone of the LHC is the discovery of the scalar boson in 2012 by the two largest experiments  
 361 at the LHC [10, 11].


362 This chapter is dedicated to the experimental set-up of the LHC and the Compact Muon  
 363 Solenoid (CMS) experiment. Section 2.1 describes the LHC and its acceleration process for  
 364 protons to reach their design energies. The CMS experiment and its components are presented  
 365 in Section 2.2. The upgrades performed during the long shutdown in 2013 are discussed  
 366 in Section 2.2.4. The data acquisition of CMS is presented in Section 2.2.3, while the CMS  
 367 computing model is shown in Section 2.2.5.

## 368 2.1 The Large Hadron Collider

369 The LHC has started its era of cutting edge science on 10 September 2008 [53] after approval by  
 370 the European Organisation of Nuclear Research (CERN) in 1995 [54]. Installed in the previous  
 371 LEP tunnel, the LHC consists of a 26.7 km quasi ring, that is installed between 45 and 170 m  
 372 under the French-Swiss border amidst Cessy (France) and Meyrin (Switzerland). Built to study  
 373 rare physics phenomena at high energies, the LHC can accelerate mainly two types of particles,  
 374 protons and lead ions  $Pb^{45+}$ , and provides collisions at four interaction points, where the particle  
 375 bunches are crossing. Experiments for studying the collisions are installed at each interaction  
 376 point.

377 As can be seen in Figure 2.1, the LHC is the last element in a chain that creates, injects and  
 378 accelerates protons. The starting point is the ionisation of hydrogen, creating protons that are  
 379 injected in a linear accelerator (LINAC 2). Here, the protons obtain an energy of 50 MeV. They

380 continue to the Proton Synchrotron Booster (PSB or Booster), where the packs of protons are  
 381 accelerated to 1.4 GeV and each pack is split up in twelve bunches with 25 or 50 ns spacing.  
 382 The Proton Synchrotron (PS) then increases their energy to 25 GeV before the Super Proton  
 383 Synchrotron (SPS) increases the proton energy up to 450 GeV. Each accelerator ring expands in  
 384 radius in order to reduce the energy loss of the protons by synchrotron radiation<sup>1</sup>. Furthermore,  
 385 the magnets responsible for the bending of the proton trajectories have to be strong enough  
 386 to sustain the higher proton energy. Ultimately, the proton bunches are injected into opposite  
 387 directions into the LHC, where they are accelerated to 3.5 TeV (in 2010 and 2011), 4 TeV (in  
 2012 and 2013) or 6.5 TeV (in 2015 and 2016) [55].



**Figure 2.1:** Schematic representation of the accelerator complex at CERN [56]. The LHC (dark blue) is the last element in chain of accelerators. Protons are successively accelerated by LINAC 2, the Booster, the Proton Synchrotron (PS) and the Super Proton Synchrotron (SPS) before entering the LHC.

388


389 In Figure 2.2 the LHC programme is shown. the first data collisions, so-called Run 1 period,  
 390 lasted from 2008 until 16 February 2013 after which the CERN accelerator complex shut down  
 391 for two years of planned maintenance and consolidation during so-called long shutdown 1  
 392 (LS1). On 23 March 2015, the new data taking period known as Run 2 started. With a brief end  
 393 of the year extended technical stop (EYETS). The main activities carried out during the EYETS  
 394 were the maintenance of systems such as the cryogenics, the cooling, electrical systems, etc.;  
 395 the replacement of the magnet, as well as a de-cabling and cabling campaign on the SPS. Run 2  
 396 will last until July 2018 when the long shutdown 2 (LS2) will begin for 2 years. The main goal  
 397 of this shutdown is the LHC injectors upgrade (LUI), but also maintenance and consolidation  
 398 will be performed. Furthermore, preparations for the High Luminosity LHC, which will start in

---

<sup>1</sup>This energy loss is proportional to the fourth power of the proton energy and inversely proportional to the bending radius.

399 2024, will be done. More information about phase 1 upgrades during LS1 and EYETS is given  
 400 in [Section 2.2.4](#).

401 Before the start of the LHC in 2010, the previous energy record was held by the Tevatron collider  
 402 at Fermilab, colliding protons with antiprotons at  $\sqrt{s} = 1.96$  TeV. When completely filled, the  
 LHC nominally contains 2220 bunches in Run 2, compared to 1380 in Run 1 (design: 2200).



**Figure 2.2:** The HL-LHC timeline. Figure taken from [57].

403

404 Inside the LHC ring [58], the protons are accelerated by the means of radio frequency cavities,  
 405 while 1232 dipole magnets of approximately 15 m long, each weighing 35 t ensure the deflection  
 406 of the beams. The two proton beams circulate in opposite direction in separate pipes inside of  
 407 the magnet. Through the use of a strong electric current in the coils of the magnet, magnetic  
 408 fields are generated and cause the protons to bend in the required orbits. In order for the coil  
 409 to become superconducting and able to produce a strong magnetic field of 8.3 T, the magnet  
 410 structure is surrounded by a vessel. This vessel is filled with liquid Helium making it possible  
 411 to cool down the magnet to 1.9 K. In order to get more focussed and stabilised proton beams,  
 412 additional higher-order multipole and corrector magnets are placed along the LHC beam line.

413 The LHC is home to seven experiments, each located at an interaction point:

- 414 • A Toroidal LHC ApparatuS (ATLAS) [59] and the Compact Muon Solenoid (CMS) [60]  
 415 experiments are the two general purpose detectors at the LHC. They both have a hermetic,  
 416 cylindrical structure and were designed to search for new physics phenomena along with  
 417 precision measurements of the Standard Model. The existence of two distinct experiments  
 418 allows cross-confirmation of any discovery.
- 419 • A Large Ion Collider Experiment (ALICE) [61] and the LHC Beauty (LHCb) [62] experi-  
 420 ments are focusing on specific phenomena. ALICE studies strongly interacting matter  
 421 at extreme energy densities where a quark-gluon plasma forms in heavy ion collisions  
 422 (Pb-Pb or p-Pb). LHCb searches for differences between matter and antimatter with the  
 423 focus on b physics.

- The forward LHC (LHCf) [63] and the TOTal cross section, Elastic scattering and diffraction dissociation Measurement (TOTEM) [64] experiments are two smaller experiments that focus on head-on collisions. LHCf consists of two parts placed before and after ATLAS and studies particles created at very small angles. TOTEM is placed in the same cavern as CMS and measures the total proton-proton cross section and studies elastic and diffractive scattering.
- The Monopoles and Exotics Detector At the LHC (MoEDAL) [65] experiment is situated near LHCb and tries to find magnetic monopoles.

For the enhancement of the exploration of rare events and thus enhancing the number of collisions, high beam energies as well as high beam intensities are required. The luminosity [66] is a measurement of the number of collisions that can be produced in a detector per square meter and per second and is the key role player in this enhancement. The LHC collisions create a number of events per second given by

$$N_{\text{event}} = L\sigma_{\text{event}}, \quad (2.1)$$


where  $\sigma_{\text{event}}$  is the cross section of the process of interest and  $L$  the machine instantaneous luminosity. This luminosity depends only on the beam parameters and is for a Gaussian beam expressed as

$$L = \frac{1}{4\pi} N_b n_b f_{\text{rev}} \frac{N_b}{\epsilon_n} \left( 1 + \left( \frac{\theta_c \sigma_z}{2\sigma^*} \right)^2 \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \frac{\gamma_r}{\beta^*}. \quad (2.2)$$

The number of particles per bunch is expressed by  $N_b$ , while  $n_b$  is the number of bunches per beam,  $f_{\text{rev}}$  the revolution frequency,  $\gamma_r$  the relativistic gamma factor,  $\epsilon_n$  the normalized transverse beam emittance - a quality for the confinement of the beam,  $\beta^*$  the beta function at the collision point - a measurement for the width of the beam,  $\theta_c$  the angle between two beams at the interaction point,  $\sigma_z$  the mean length of one bunch, and  $\sigma^*$  the mean height of one bunch. In Equation 2.2, the blue part represents the stream of particles, the red part the brilliance, and the green part the geometric reduction factor due to the crossing angle at the interaction point.

The peak design luminosity for the LHC is  $10^{34} \text{ cm}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1}$ , which leads to about 1 billion proton interactions per second. In 2016, the LHC was around 10% above this design luminosity [67]. The luminosity is not a constant in time since it diminishes due to collisions between the beams, and the interaction of the protons and the particle gas that is trapped in the centre of the vacuum tubes due to the magnetic field. The diffusion of the beam degrades the emittance and therefore also the luminosity. For this reason, the mean lifetime of a beam inside the LHC is around 15 h. The integrated luminosity - the luminosity provided in a certain time range - recorded by CMS and ATLAS over the year 2016 is given in Figure 2.3. In Run 2, the peak luminosity is  $13\text{-}17 \times 10^{33} \text{ cm}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1}$  compared to  $7.7 \times 10^{33} \text{ cm}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1}$  in Run 1. The recorded luminosity is validated for physics analysis keeping  $35.9 \text{ fb}^{-1}$  during 2016 data taking.

Multiple proton-proton interactions can occur during one bunch crossing, referred to as pileup. On average, the number of pileup events is proportional to the luminosity times the total inelastic proton-proton cross section. In 2016, an average of about 27 of pileup interactions has been observed in 13 TeV proton collisions at the interaction point of CMS. For 2012, this number was about 21 pileup interactions for 8 TeV collisions.



**Figure 2.3:** Cumulative off-line luminosity measured versus day delivered by the LHC (blue), and recorded by CMS (orange), and certified as good physics analysis during stable beams (light orange) during stable beams and for proton collisions at 13 TeV centre-of-mass energy in 2016. [68].

## 454 2.2 The Compact Muon Solenoid


455 At one of the collision points of the LHC, the CMS detector [69–71] is placed. Weighing 14 000 t,  
456 this cylindrical detector is about 28.7 m long and 15 m in diameter. It has an onion like structure  
457 of several specialised detectors and contains a superconducting solenoid with a magnetic field of  
458 3.8 T. Living in a hadronic environment, multi-jet processes produced by the strong interaction  
459 are the main source of background for rare physics processes. Therefore, good identification,  
460 momentum resolution, and charge determination of muons, electrons and photons are one of  
461 the main goals of the CMS detector. Additionally, a good charged particle momentum resolution  
462 and reconstruction efficiency in the inner tracker provides identification for jets coming from b  
463 quarks or tau particles. Also the electromagnetic resolution for an efficient photon and lepton  
464 isolation as well as a good hadronic calorimeter for the missing transverse energy<sup>2</sup> were kept  
465 into account while designing CMS. In Figure 2.4, an overview of the CMS detector is shown.

### 466 2.2.1 CMS coordinate system

The coordinate system used by CMS can be found in Figure 2.5. The origin of the right handed orthogonal coordinate system is chosen to be the point of collisions. The x-axis points towards the centre of the LHC ring such that the y-axis points towards the sky, and the z-axis lies tangent to the beam axis. Since the experiment has a cylindrical shape, customary coordinates are used to describe the momentum  $\vec{p}$ : the distance  $p = |\vec{p}|$ , the azimuthal angle<sup>3</sup>  $\phi \in [-\pi, \pi]$ , the

<sup>2</sup>The missing transverse energy comes from an imbalance in the transverse plane. This will be discussed in Chapter 4.

<sup>3</sup>The azimuthal angle is the angle between the x-axis and the projection in the transverse plane of the momentum  $\vec{p}$ , denoted as  $\vec{p}_T$ .



**Figure 2.4:** Mechanical layout of the CMS detector. Figure taken from [72].

pseudo-rapidity<sup>4</sup>  $\eta$  :

$$\eta = -\ln \left( \tan \left( \frac{\theta}{2} \right) \right). \quad (2.3)$$

For the energies considered at the LHC, where  $E \gg m$ , the pseudo-rapidity is a good approximation of the rapidity  $y$

$$y = \frac{1}{2} \ln \left( \frac{E + p_z}{E - p_z} \right), \quad (2.4)$$


467 where the difference of rapidities of two particles is invariant under a Lorentz boost in the  
468 z-direction.

### 469 2.2.2 Towards the heart of CMS

470 The CMS detector can be divided into two parts. A central barrel is placed around the beam  
471 pipe ( $|\eta| < 1.4$ ), and two plugs (endcaps) ensure the hermeticity of the detector. In Figure 2.4  
472 and Figure 2.6 the onion like structure of the CMS detector is visible. The choice of a solenoid  
473 of 12.9 m long and 5.9 m diameter gives the advantage of bending the particle trajectories in the


---

<sup>4</sup>The pseudo rapidity is expressed by the polar angle  $\theta$  between the direction of  $\vec{p}$  and the beam.



**Figure 2.5:** Representation of the coordinate system used by CMS. The point of origin is put at the collision point. The x-axis points towards the centre of the LHC ring such that the z-axis lies tangent to the beam axis.

474 transverse plane. The hadronic calorimeter (Section 2.2.2.3), the electromagnetic calorimeter  
 475 (Section 2.2.2.4) and the tracker (Section 2.2.2.5) are within the solenoid (Section 2.2.2.2),  
 476 while the muon chambers (Section 2.2.2.1) are placed outside the solenoid. The data used for  
 477 the search presented in this thesis is collected after the long shutdown 1. After discussing each  
 478 part of CMS in their Run 1 configuration, Section 2.2.4 elaborates on their different upgrades  
 479 for the data collected in Run 2.




**Figure 2.6:** Schematic view of the CMS detector in the Run 1 configuration. The longitudinal view of one quarter of the detector is given at the top, while the transversal view is shown at the bottom. The muon system barrel elements are denoted as MBZ/N/S, where Z=−2...+2 is the barrel wheel number, N=1...4 the station number and S=1...12 the sector number. Similarly, the steel return yokes are denoted as YBZ/N/S. The solenoid is denoted as CB0, while the hadronic calorimeter is denoted as HE (endcap)/ HB (barrel)/HF (forward) and the electromagnetic calorimeter as EE (endcap)/EB (barrel). The green part represents the tracking system (tracker + pixel). Figure taken from [73].

480 **2.2.2.1 Muon system**

481 The outermost part of CMS consists of the muon system. The magnet return yoke is interleaved  
 482 with gaseous detector chambers for muon identification and momentum measurement. The  
 483 barrel contains muon stations arranged in five separate iron wheels, while in the endcap four  
 484 muon stations are mounted onto three independent iron discs on each side. Each barrel wheel  
 485 has 12 sectors in the azimuthal angle.

486 The muon system is divided into three parts, shown in [Figure 2.7](#). The muon rate and neutron  
 487 induced backgrounds are small and the magnetic field is very low for the barrel, thus CMS can  
 488 use drift tube (DT) chambers. For the endcaps however, the muon and background flux is much  
 489 higher and there is a need to use cathode strip chambers (CSC) which are able to provide a  
 490 faster response, higher granularity and have a better resistance against radiation. In order to  
 491 form a redundant trigger system, resistive plate chambers (RPC) are added. This makes a total  
 of 250 DT, 540 CSC and 610 RPC chambers. In [Figure 2.6](#) the arrangement is shown.



**Figure 2.7:** (Left) Schematic view of one quarter of the CMS muon system in the Run 1 configuration. The cathode strip chambers (CSC) are shown in green, the drift tubes (DT) are shown in yellow, while the resistive plate chambers (RPC) are shown in blue. Figure taken from [73]. (Right) Cathode strip chambers (ME+4/2 chambers on YE+3). Photo taken from [74].

492

493 Providing a measurement for  $|\eta| < 1.2$ , the DT chambers in the barrel are on average  $2 \times 2.5\text{m}^2$   
 494 in size and consist of 12 layers of DT cells<sup>5</sup> arranged in three groups of four. The  $r\phi$  coordinate is  
 495 provided by the two outside groups, while the middle group measures the  $z$  coordinate. For the  
 496 outer muon station, the DT chambers contain only 8 layers of DT cells, providing a muon position  
 497 in the  $r\phi$  plane. There are four CSC stations in each endcap, providing muon measurements for  
 498  $0.9 < |\eta| < 2.4$  (Run 1 configuration). These CSCs are multi-wired proportional chambers that  
 499 consist of 6 anode wire planes crossed by 7 copper strips cathode panels in a gas volume. The  
 500  $r$  coordinate is provided by the copper strips, while the  $\phi$  coordinate comes from the anode  
 501 wires, giving a two dimensional position measurement. There are six layers of RPCs in the

<sup>5</sup>The DT cells are 4 cm wide gas tubes with positively charged stretched wires inside.

502 barrel muon system and one layer into each of the first three stations of the endcap. They are  
 503 made from two high resistive plastic plates with an applied voltage and separated by a gas  
 504 volume. Read-out strips mounted on top of the plastic plates detect the signal generated by a  
 505 muon passing through the gas volume. The RPCs provide a fast response with a time resolution  
 506 of 1 ns and cover a range of  $|\eta| < 1.8$  for the Run 1 configuration.

507 The muon system provides triggering on muons, identifying muons and improves the momen-  
 508 tum measurement and charge determination of high  $p_T$  muons. On top of the muon system,  
 509 a fraction of the muon energy is deposited in the electromagnetic calorimeter, the hadronic  
 510 calorimeter, and outer calorimeter. The high magnetic field enables an efficient first level trigger  
 511 and allows a good momentum resolution of  $\Delta p/p \approx 1\%$  for a  $p_T$  of 100 GeV and  $\approx 10\%$  for a  
 512  $p_T$  of 1 TeV. There is an efficient muon measurement up to  $|\eta| < 2.4$ .

### 513 2.2.2.2 Solenoid

514 Making use of the knowledge of previous experiments like ALEPH and DELPHI at LEP and H1  
 515 at HERA, CMS chose for a large super conducting solenoid with a length of 12.9 m and a  
 516 inner bore of 5.9 m [71]. With 2168 turns, a current of 18.5 kA resulting in a magnetic field of  
 517 3.8 T, and a total energy of 2.7 GJ, a large bending power can be obtained for a modestly-sized  
 518 solenoid. In order to ensure a good momentum resolution in the forward regions, a favourable  
 519 length/radius was necessary. In [Figure 2.8](#), a photo of the CMS solenoid is shown.

520 The solenoid uses a high-purity aluminium stabilised conductor with indirect cooling from  
 521 liquid helium, together with full epoxy impregnation. A four-layer winding is implemented that  
 522 can withstand an outward pressure of 64 atm. The NbTi cable is co-extruded by pure aluminium  
 523 that acts as a thermal stabilizer and has an aluminium alloy for mechanical reinforcement. The  
 524 return of the magnetic field is done by five wheels, noted by YB in [Figure 2.6](#).


### 525 2.2.2.3 Hadronic calorimeter

526 The hadronic calorimeter (HCAL) is dedicated to precisely measure the energy of charged and  
 527 neutral hadrons via a succession of absorbers and scintillators. This makes it crucial for physics  
 528 analyses with hadronic jets or missing transverse energy. The HCAL barrel extends between  
 529  $1.77 < r < 2.95$  m, where  $r$  is the radius in the transverse plane with respect to the beam. Due  
 530 to space limitations, the HCAL needs to be as small as possible and is made from materials  
 531 with short interaction lengths<sup>6</sup>. On top of this, the HCAL should be as hermetic as possible and  
 532 extend to large absolute pseudo rapidities such that it can provide a good measurement of the  
 533 missing transverse energy.

534 The quality of the energy measurements is dependent on the fraction of the hadronic shower  
 535 that can be detected. Therefore, the HCAL barrel (HB) inside the solenoid is reinforced by an  
 536 outer hadronic calorimeter between the solenoid and muon detectors (HO, see [Figure 2.9](#)), using  
 537 the solenoid as extra absorber. This increases the thickness to 12 interaction lengths. The HB


---

<sup>6</sup>Here the interaction length is the nuclear interaction length and this is the length needed for absorbing 36.7% of the relativistic charged particles. For the electromagnetic calorimeter this is defined in radiation length  $X_0$ . The radiation length is the mean distance over which a high energy electron loses all but  $1/e$  of its energy by bremsstrahlung.



**Figure 2.8:** (Left) CMS solenoid during the long shutdown in 2013. (Right) An impression of the solenoid magnet taken from [75].

538 and HO provide measurements for  $|\eta| < 1.3$ , while an endcap on each side (HE,  $1.3 < |\eta| < 3$ )  
 539 and a forward calorimeter (HF,  $3.0 < |\eta| < 5.2$ ) extend the pseudo rapidity range.



**Figure 2.9:** (Left) Longitudinal view of the CMS detector showing the locations of the HB, HE, HO, and HF calorimeters. Figure taken from [60]. (Right) CMS barrel calorimeter. Photo taken from [76].


540 The HB is made of 16 absorber plates where most of them are built from brass and others are  
 541 made from stainless steel and is about five to ten interaction lengths thick. It is divided in  $\eta \times \phi$   
 542 towers and contains 2592 read-out channels. The HO complements the HB and extends the  
 543 reach up to twelve interaction lengths. This subsystem contains 2160 read-out channels. The  
 544 HE is also composed of brass absorber plates and has a thickness corresponding to approximately

ten interaction lengths, with 2592 read-out channels.. The HF experiences intense particle fluxes with an expected energy of 760 GeV deposited on average in a proton interaction at a centre-of-mass of 14 TeV, compared to 100 GeV in the rest of the detector. Therefore, these are Cherenkov light detectors made of radiation hard quartz fibres. The main causes of such large energy events are high energy muons and charged particles from late showering hadrons. During Run 1, it became clear that the glass windows of the photon multiplier tubes (PMTs) had to be replaced which was done during LS1 [77]. The HF represents 1728 read-out channels.

The HCAL and electromagnetic calorimeter combined can measure the hadron energy with a resolution  $\Delta E/E \approx 100\% \sqrt{E[\text{GeV}]} + 5\%$ .

#### 2.2.2.4 Electromagnetic calorimeter

The electromagnetic calorimeter (ECAL) is designed to measure the energy of photons and electrons and covers  $|\eta| < 3$ . It is an hermetic, homogeneous detector and consists of 75 848 lead tungstate ( $\text{PbWO}_4$ ) crystals. These crystals have a fast response time - 80% of the light is emitted within 25 ns- and are radiation hard. The electromagnetic showers produced by passing electrons or photons ionize the crystal atoms which emit a blue-green scintillation light, that is collected by silicon avalanche photodiodes (APDs) in the barrel and vacuum phototriodes (VPTs) in the endcaps. The crystals and the APD response is sensitive to temperature changes and require a stable temperature.



**Figure 2.10:** (Left) Schematic cross section of the electromagnetic calorimeter taken from [60]. (Right top) The ECAL barrel during construction [78]. (Right bottom) One half of an EE [79].

There are three parts: a central barrel (EB), an endcap region (EE) and a preshower (ES) (Figure 2.10). The EB has an inner radius of 129 cm and corresponds to a pseudo rapidity of  $0 < |\eta| < 1.479$ . At a distance of 314 cm from the vertex and covering a pseudo rapidity of  $1.479 < |\eta| < 3.0$ , are the EE. They consist of semi-circular aluminium plates from which structural units of  $5 \times 5$  crystals (super crystals) are supported. The ES is placed in front of

568 the crystal calorimeter over the endcap pseudo rapidity range with two planes of silicon strip  
 569 detectors as active elements.


The electromagnetic shower will typically involve more than one channel. More than 90% of the energy of a 35 GeV electron or photon is contained in a  $5 \times 5$  matrix of crystals. Therefore, a clustering algorithm is performed in order to associate the energy deposits to the particles impinging the calorimeter. The achieved precision [80] for the barrel is  $2 \times 10^{-3}$  rad in  $\phi$  and  $10^{-3}$  in  $\eta$ . For the endcaps this is  $5 \times 10^{-3}$  rad in  $\phi$  and  $2 \times 10^{-3}$  in  $\eta$ . The energy is reconstructed by a supercluster algorithm, taking into account energy radiated via bremsstrahlung or conversion [60]. The energy resolution is given by

$$\frac{\sigma(E)}{E} = \frac{2.8\%}{\sqrt{E}} \oplus \frac{0.128}{E(\text{GeV})} \oplus 0.3\%, \quad (2.5)$$

570 in the absence of a magnetic field, where the contributions come from the stochastic, noise and  
 571 constant terms respectively. The dominating term is the constant term ( $E_{\text{shower}} \approx 100$  GeV)  
 572 and thus the performance is highly dependent on the quality of calibration and monitoring .

### 573 2.2.2.5 Inner tracking system and operations

574 The tracking system (tracker) [81] is the detecting unit closest to the point of interaction.  
 575 Responsible for the reconstruction of trajectories from charged particles with  $|\eta| < 2.5$  that  
 576 are bent by the magnetic field, it provides a measurement of the momentum. The tracker is  
 577 also responsible for the determination of the interaction point or vertex. It should be able to  
 578 provide high granularity as well as fast read-out, and be able to endure high radiation. For  
 579 these reasons, the CMS collaboration choose silicon detector technology.




**Figure 2.11:** Schematic cross section through the CMS tracker. Each line represents a detector module. Double lines indicate back-to-back modules that deliver stereo hits. Figure taken from [60].

580 The tracking system consists of a cylinder of 5.8 m long and 2.5 m in diameter. It is immersed  
 581 in a co-axial magnetic field of 3.8 T provided by the solenoid. As shown in Figure 2.11, the  
 582 tracker is built up from a large silicon strip tracker with a small silicon pixel tracker inside. The

583 inner pixel region ( $4.4 < r < 10.2$  cm), gets the highest flux of particles. Therefore, pixel silicon  
 584 sensors of  $100 \times 150 \mu\text{m}^2$  are used. It consists of three cylindrical barrels that are complemented  
 585 by two discs of pixel modules at each side. The silicon strip tracker ( $20 < r < 116$  cm) has three  
 586 subdivisions. The Tracker Inner Barrel and Discs (TIB, TID, see [Figure 2.13](#)) are composed  
 587 of four barrel layers accompanied by three discs at each end. The outer part of the tracker -  
 588 Tracker Outer Barrel (TOB) - consists of 6 barrel layers. In the outer discs, there are nine discs  
 589 of silicon sensors, referred to as Tracker End Caps (TEC).



**Figure 2.12:** The pixel barrel being re-installed after the Long Shutdown in 2015, around the beam pipe at CMS [82].



**Figure 2.13:** First half of the inner tracker barrel, consisting of three layers of silicon modules [83].

590 The pixel detector, shown in [Figure 2.12](#), has 1440 modules that cover an area of about  $1 \text{ m}^2$   
 591 and have 66 million pixels. It provides a three-dimensional position measurement of the hits  
 592 arising from the interaction from charged particles with the sensors. In transverse coordinate  
 593 ( $r\phi$ ), the hit position resolution is about  $10 \mu\text{m}$ , while  $20\text{-}40 \mu\text{m}$  is obtained in the longitudinal  
 594 coordinate ( $z$ ). The sensor plane position provides the third coordinate. The TIB/TID, shown in  
 595 [Figure 2.13](#), delivers up to four  $r\phi$ -measurements using  $320 \mu\text{m}$  thick silicon micro-strip sensors.  
 596 These sensors are placed with their strips parallel to the beam axis in the barrel and radial  
 597 in the discs. In the TIB, the first two layers have a strip pitch of  $80 \mu\text{m}$ , while the remaining  
 598 two have a strip pitch of  $120 \mu\text{m}$ . This leads to a respective single point resolution of  $23 \mu\text{m}$   
 599 and  $35 \mu\text{m}$ . For the TID, the pitch varies between  $100 \mu\text{m}$  and  $141 \mu\text{m}$ . The TOB provides six  
 600  $r\phi$ -measurements with a single point resolutions of  $53 \mu\text{m}$  in the first four layers, and  $35 \mu\text{m}$  in  
 601 the last two layers. It consists of  $500 \mu\text{m}$  thick microstrip sensors with strip pitches of  $183 \mu\text{m}$   
 602 (first 4 layers) or  $122 \mu\text{m}$  (last two layers). The TEC provides up to 9  $\phi$ -measurements via 9  
 603 discs consisting of up to 7 rings of silicon microstrip sensors of  $97 \mu\text{m}$  to  $184 \mu\text{m}$  average pitch.

604 A second co-ordinate measurement ( $z$  in the barrel,  $r$  on the discs) is provided through the  
 605 use of a second micro strip detector module mounted back-to-back with a stereo angle of 100  
 606 mrad. This is done on the modules in the first two layers and rings of the TIB, TID, and TOB, as  
 607 well as rings 1,2, and 5 of the TECs (blue line in [Figure 2.11](#)). The resolution in the  $z$  direction is  
 608 approximately  $230 \mu\text{m}$  in the TIB and  $530 \mu\text{m}$  in the TOB, and is varying with pitch in the TID  
 609 and TEC. To allow overlay and avoid gaps in acceptance, each module is shifted slightly in  $r$  or  
 610  $z$  with respect to its neighbouring modules within a layer. With this detector layout, at least  
 611 nine points per charged particle trajectory can be measured in an  $|\eta|$  range up to 2.4, where at  
 612 least four of them being two dimensional. The CMS silicon tracker provides 9.3 million readout  
 613 channels and covers an active area of about  $198 \text{ m}^2$ .

614 **2.2.3 Data acquisition**

615 At a design luminosity of  $10^{34} \text{ cm}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1}$ , the proton interaction rate exceeds 1 GHz. Given the  
 616 large size of an event (about 1 MB), the high crossing rate, and that typically tens of collisions  
 617 happen at the same time, it is impossible for the CMS experiment to store all the data generated.  
 618 In order to deal with the large amount of data, a two level trigger system has been put in place.  
 619 The first level (Level-1) is a custom hardware system, while a second high level trigger (HLT) is  
 620 software based running on a large farm of computers.

621 **CMS Level-1 Trigger**

622 The Level-1 Trigger has to be a flexible, maintainable system, capable of adapting to the  
 623 evolving physics programme of CMS [84]. Its output rate is restricted to 100 kHz imposed  
 624 by the CMS readout electronics. It is implemented by custom hardware and selects events  
 625 containing candidate objects - e.g. ionization deposits consistent with a muon, or energy clusters  
 626 corresponding to an electron / photon / tau lepton / missing transverse energy / jet. Collisions  
 627 with large momenta can be selected by using scalar sum of the transverse momenta of the jets.

628 By buffering the raw data from the CMS subdetectors in front-end drivers, the Level-1 Trigger  
 629 has a pipeline memory of 3.2  $\mu\text{s}$  to decide whether to keep an event or reject it. The trigger  
 630 primitives (TP) from the calorimeters and muon detectors are processed in several steps and  
 631 combined into a global trigger. This information is then combined with the input from the other  
 632 subsystems for the HLT. The separate inputs are synchronized to each other and the LHC orbit  
 633 clock and sent to the global trigger module. Here, Level-1 Trigger algorithms are performed  
 634 within 1  $\mu\text{s}$  to decide whether to keep the event.

635 **CMS HLT Trigger**

636 The HLT is an array of commercially available computers with a programmable menu that has  
 637 an output rate of on average 400 Hz for off-line event storage. The data processing is based on  
 638 an HLT path. This is a set of algorithmic steps to reconstruct objects to define selection criteria.  
 639 Here, the information of all subdetectors can be used to perform algorithms on higher level  
 640 reconstructed objects.

641 **2.2.4 Phase 1 upgrades**

642 Before the start of taking collision data for 13 TeV operations on 3 June 2015, CMS had a  
 643 long shutdown (LS1) [85]. During this shutdown, the section of the beryllium beam pipe  
 644 within CMS was replaced by a narrower one. This operation required the pixel detector to be  
 645 removed and reinserted into CMS. During Run 2, higher particle fluxes with respect to Run  
 646 1 are expected. To avoid longterm damage caused by the intense particle flux at the heart of  
 647 CMS, the tracker is been made ready to operate at much lower temperature than during Run 1.  
 648 The electromagnetic calorimeter preshower system was damaged during Run 1, therefore the  
 649 preshower discs were removed, repaired and reinstalled successfully inside CMS in 2014. To  
 650 help the discrimination between interesting low momentum muons coming from collisions and  
 651 muons caused by backgrounds, a fourth triggering and measurement station for muons was  
 652 added in each of the endcaps. Several new detectors were installed into CMS for measuring the  
 653 collision rate within the detector and to monitor beam related backgrounds.

654 During the LS1, the muon system underwent major upgrades [86, 87]. In the fourth station  
 655 of each endcap, the outermost rings of CSC and RPC chambers were completed, providing an  
 656 angular coverage of  $1.2 < |\eta| < 1.8$  for Run 2, increasing the system redundancy, and allowing  
 657 tighter cuts on the trigger quality. In order to reduce the environmental noise, outer yoke discs  
 658 have been placed on both sides for the endcaps. At the innermost rings of the first station,  
 659 the CSCs have been upgraded by refurbishing the readout electronics to make use of the full  
 660 detector granularity instead of groups of three as was the case for Run 1. In Figure 2.7 (right),  
 661 the refurbishing of the CSCs is shown.

662 Since the HF experiences intense particle fluxes, it became clear during Run 1 that the glass  
 663 windows of the PMTs need replacing. For the ECAL in Run 1, the energy reconstruction happened  
 664 via a weighted sum of the digitized samples [88]. For Run 2 however, the reconstruction had to  
 665 be made more resistant for out of time pileup and a multi-fit approach has been set into place.  
 666 In this approach, the pulse shape is modelled as a sum of one in-time pulse plus the out of time  
 667 pulses [80]. The energy resolution is better than 2% in the central barrel region and 2-5 %  
 668 elsewhere.

During the first data taking period of the LHC (2010 to 2013), the tracker operated at +4°C. With the higher LHC beam intensities from 2015 onwards, the tracker needs to be operated at much lower temperatures. The reason for this is that with intense irradiation, the doping concentration changes, the leakage current increases proportional to the fluence and the charge collection efficiency decreases due to charge trapping. Mostly the leakage current ( $I$ ) is affected by the temperature change:

$$I \propto T^2 e^{-\frac{E_g}{2kT}}, \quad (2.6)$$

669 where  $T$  is the operating temperature,  $E_g$  the band gap and  $k$  the Boltzmann constant. There is  
 670 approximately a factor 15 between the leakage currents at room temperatures and at -10 °C.

671 During the LS1, the CMS cooling plant was refurbished [89] and the fluorocarbon cooling  
 672 system overhauled. To help to suppress the humidity inside the tracker, new methods for vapour  
 673 sealing and insulation were applied. Furthermore, several hundred high-precision sensors are  
 674 used to monitor the humidity and temperature. In order to get as dry air as possible, a new  
 675 dry-gas plant provides eight times more dry gas (air or nitrogen) than during the first run, and  
 676 allows regulation of the flow. As a final addition, the cooling bundles outside the tracker are  
 677 equipped with heater wires and temperature sensors in order to maintain safe operations above  
 678 the cavern dew point. For the data taking in 2015-2016, the tracker operated at -15 °C.

679 In Run 2, with the increase in centre of mass energy and a higher luminosity, a larger number  
 680 of simultaneous inelastic collisions per crossing is expected with respect to Run 1. For this, the  
 681 CMS Level-1 has been upgraded [90]. All hardware, software, databases and the timing control  
 682 system have been replaced for Run 2, where the main changes are that the muon system now  
 683 uses the redundancy of the muon detector system earlier to make a high resolution muon trigger.  
 684 Other upgrades are that the calorimeter system isn't bound any more for streaming data and  
 685 the global trigger has more Level-1 Trigger algorithms.

686 After the first half of Run 2, the innermost part of detection in CMS (pixel detector) was  
 687 replaced, enhancing the particle tracking capabilities of CMS. The data used in the framework

688 of this thesis however is from before this upgrade. More information on the Pixel upgrade can  
689 be found in Refs. [91, 92].

690 **2.2.5 CMS computing model**

691 The selected data is stored, processed and dispersed via the Worldwide Large Hadron Collider  
692 Computing Grid (WLCG) [93, 94]. This has a tiered structure that functions as a single, coherent  
693 system.

694 At CERN and the Wigner Research Center for physics, a single Tier-0 is located. The raw data  
695 collected by the experiments is archived here, and a first reconstruction of the data is done.  
696 This data is then already in a file format usable for physics analysis. Furthermore, it is able to  
697 reprocess data when new calibrations become available. The Tier-0 site distributes this data  
698 to a total of 14 Tier-1 centres. They carry out data reprocessing and store real data as well as  
699 simulated data. The Tier-1 further distributes the data to over 150 Tier-2 centres. These make  
700 the data accessible for physics analysis and are also being used for the production of simulated  
701 data. The data is made accessible for physicists around the world. For CMS, the Tier-0 site at  
702 CERN reconstructs the full collision events and the backup of the data is send to seven Tier-1  
703 computer centres: France, Germany, Italy, Spain, Taiwan, UK, and the US. At the Tier-1 sites  
704 the events are again reconstructed using refined calibration constants. The patterns are created  
705 and the more complex events are sent to forty Tier-2 centres for specific analysis task.




Figure 2.14: Worldwide LHC Computing Grid in 2017 [95].

# Analysis techniques

# 3

707 In order to study the collisions coming from high energy experiments, many tools have been  
 708 developed. In [Section 3.1](#), the physics of hadron collision at high energies are presented. These  
 709 insights are used to generate events via Monte Carlo event generators, explained in [Section](#)  
 710 [3.2](#). Machine learning helps to differentiate between signal- and background like events. In  
 711 [Section 3.3](#), the multivariate technique of boosted decision trees is explained. This yields  
 712 powerful discriminants for separating signal and background events and provides distributions  
 713 for template-based maximum likelihood fits. The fitting method used in the search presented  
 714 in this thesis is discussed in [Section 3.4](#).

## 715 3.1 Hadron collisions at high energies

All partons can be approximated as free when there is sufficiently high momentum transfer in hadron collisions. This makes it possible to treat a hadron-hadron scattering as a single parton-parton interaction. The momentum of the parton can then be expressed as a fraction of the hadron momentum


$$\vec{p}_{\text{parton}} = x \vec{p}_{\text{hadron}}, \quad (3.1)$$

where  $x$  is referred to as the Björken scaling variable. The interaction  $p_A p_B \rightarrow X$  can then be factorised in terms of partonic cross sections  $\hat{\sigma}_{ij \rightarrow X}$  [96]

$$\sigma_{p_A p_B \rightarrow X} = \sum_{ij} \iint dx_1 dx_2 f_i^A(x_1, Q^2) f_j^B(x_2, Q^2) d\hat{\sigma}_{ij \rightarrow X}, \quad (3.2)$$


716 where  $i$  and  $j$  are the partons resolved from protons A and B. The parton density functions  
 717 (PDF) are denoted as  $f_i(x_j, Q^2)$ , and  $Q^2$  is the factorisation scale more commonly denoted as  
 718  $\mu_F$ . This factorisation scale represents the energy at which the hadronic interaction can be  
 719 expressed as a product of the partonic cross section and the process independent PDF. In [Figure](#)  
 720 [3.1](#), the kinematic regions in  $x$  and  $\mu_F$  are shown for fixed target and collider experiments.

721 The parton density functions (PDF) [97–99] represent the momentum distribution of the  
 722 proton amongst its partons at an energy scale  $\mu_F$ . These functions are obtained from global  
 723 fits to data since they can not be determined from first principles. From measurements on deep



**Figure 3.1:** Kinematic regions in momentum fraction  $x$  and factorisation scale  $Q^2$  probed by fixed-target and collider experiments. Some of the final states accessible at the LHC are indicated in the appropriate regions, where  $y$  is the rapidity. In this figure, the incoming partons have  $x_{1,2} = (M/14\text{TeV})e^{\pm y}$  with  $Q = M$  where  $M$  is the mass of the state shown in blue in the figure. For example, exclusive  $J/\psi$  and  $\Upsilon$  production at high  $|y|$  at the LHC may probe the gluon PDF down to  $x \sim 10^{-5}$ . Figure taken from [6].

724 inelastic scattering using lepton-proton collision by the HERA collider [100], supplemented  
 725 with proton-antiproton collisions from the Tevatron [101], and proton collision data from the  
 726 ATLAS, CMS and LHCb collaborations at the LHC (Run 1) [102] the PDFs are determined and  
 727 included in global PDF sets known as the PDF4LHC recommendation [99]. Their measurement  
 728 at scale  $\mu_F$  is extrapolated to higher energies by use of the DGLAP equations [103]. Once  
 729 these PDFs are known, the cross section of a certain process can be calculated and used as  
 730 input for the Monte Carlo generators used to make the simulated data samples at the LHC. In  
 731 the framework of this thesis, the NLO PDF4LHC15\_100 set is used. This set is an envelope of  
 732 three sets: CT14, MMHT2014 and NNPDF3.0 [99]. As illustration, the dependency of the PDFs  
 733 on the momentum fraction  $x$  is shown for the NNPDF3.0 set on hadronic scale  $\mu_F^2 = 10\text{GeV}^2$   
 734 and LHC scale  $\mu_F^2 = 10^4\text{GeV}^2$  in Figure 3.2. The gluon density dominated for most values of  
 735 the momentum fraction, implying that it is easier to probe gluons than the quarks. When the  
 736 Björken scale is to one, the parton densities of the valence quarks of the proton, up and down  
 737 quarks, dominate over the gluon density. The sea quarks originating from gluon splitting, the  
 738 charm, anti-up, and anti-down quarks, have lower densities in general for the proton. The  
 739 resolution scale  $Q^2$  is typically taken to be the energy scale of the collision. For the top quark pair  
 740 production a scale of  $Q^2 = (350\text{ GeV})^2$  is chosen, meaning that the centre-of-mass energy of the  
 741 hard interaction is about twice the top quark mass. The uncertainty on the parton distributions  
 742 is evaluated using the Hessian technique [104], where a matrix with a dimension identical to  
 743 the number of free parameters needs to be diagonalised. In the case of PDF4LHC15\_100 set, this  
 744 translates into 100 orthonormal eigenvectors and 200 variations of the PDF parameters in the  
 745 plus and minus direction.



**Figure 3.2:** The momentum fraction  $x$  times the parton distribution functions  $f(x)$ , where  $f = u_v, d_v, \bar{u}, \bar{d}, s, c$ , or  $g$  as a function of the momentum fraction obtained in the NNLO NNPDF3.0 global analysis at factorisation scales  $\mu^2 = 10 \text{ GeV}^2$  (left) and  $\mu^2 = 10^4 \text{ GeV}^2$  (right), with  $\alpha_s(M_Z^2) = 0.118$ . The gluon PDF has been scaled down by a factor of 0.1. Figure taken from [6].

Quantum fluctuations can cause divergences at high energies. This is solved by introducing a renormalization scale  $\mu_R$  to redefine physical quantities, making the theory still able to describe the experimental regime. A consequence of this method is that the coupling constants will run as a function of  $\mu_R$ . Beyond the renormalization scale, the high energy effects such as the loop corrections to propagators (self energy) are absorbed in the physical quantities through a renormalization of the fields. In particular the running behaviour of the strong coupling constant<sup>1</sup>  $\alpha_S$  is found to be

$$\alpha_S = \frac{\alpha_S(\mu_0^2)}{1 + \alpha_S(\mu_0^2) \frac{33-2n_f}{12\pi} \ln\left(\frac{|\mu_R^2|}{\mu_0^2}\right)}, \quad (3.3)$$

with  $n_f$  the number of quarks and  $\mu_0$  the reference scale at which the coupling is known. The current world average of the strong coupling constant at the Z boson mass is  $\alpha_S(\mu_R = m_Z) = 0.1181 \pm 0.0011$  [6]. From Equation 3.3 one can see easily that the coupling strength decreases with increasing renormalization scale, this is known as asymptotic freedom. Additionally, following the behaviour of  $\alpha_S(\mu_R^2)$ , a limit  $\Lambda_{\text{QCD}} \approx 200 \text{ MeV}$  is found for which  $\alpha_S$  becomes larger than one. Under this limit, the perturbative calculations of observables can no longer be done.

<sup>1</sup>The strong coupling constant is defined as  $\alpha_S = \frac{g_S^2}{4\pi}$ .

Cross sections can be written in terms of interacting vertices contributing to the matrix element (ME) originating from elements of a perturbative series [105], allowing them to be expanded as a power series of the coupling constant  $\alpha$

$$\sigma = \sigma_{\text{LO}} \left( 1 + \left( \frac{\alpha}{2\pi} \right) \sigma_1 + \left( \frac{\alpha}{2\pi} \right)^2 \sigma_2 + \dots \right). \quad (3.4)$$

753 Leading order (LO) accuracy contains the minimal amount of vertices in the process, then  
 754 depending on where the series is cut off one speaks of next-to-leading order (NLO), or next-to-  
 755 next-to-leading order (NNLO) accuracy in  $\alpha$ . Predictions including higher order corrections  
 756 tend to be less affected by theoretical uncertainties originating from a variation of the chosen  
 757 renormalization and factorisation scales.

## 758 3.2 Event generation

759 In order to compare reconstructed data with theoretical predictions, collision events are gener-  
 760 ated and passed through a simulation of the CMS detector and an emulation of its readout. For  
 761 the detector simulation, a so-called Full Simulation package [106, 107] based on the Geant4  
 762 toolkit [108] is employed. This allows detailed simulations of the interactions of the particles  
 763 with the detector material.


### 764 3.2.1 Fundamentals of simulating a proton collision

765 The generation of  $\text{pp} \rightarrow \text{X}$  events is subdivided into sequential steps [109–111], as shown in  
 766 Figure 3.3.

767 The interaction of two incoming protons is often soft and elastic leading to events that are not  
 768 interesting in the framework of this thesis. More intriguing are the hard interactions between  
 769 two partons from the incoming protons. The event generation starts from the matrix elements of  
 770 a hard scattering process of interest. The corresponding cross section integral is sampled using  
 771 Monte Carlo techniques and the resulting sample of events reflect the probability distribution  
 772 of a process over its final state phase space. A parton shower (PS) program is then used to  
 773 simulate the hadronisation of final state partons, coming from the sample of events of the hard  
 774 interaction, into hadrons which then decay further. On top of this, radiation of soft gluons or  
 775 quarks from initial or final state partons is simulated. These are respectively referred to as  
 776 initial state radiation (ISR) or final state radiation (FSR). The contributions from soft secondary  
 777 interactions, the so-called underlying event (UE), and colour reconnection effects are also taken  
 778 into account. A brief overview of the employed programs used for the event generation of the  
 779 signal and main background processes used in the search presented in the thesis is given in  
 780 Section 3.2.2.

### 781 3.2.2 Programs for event generation

782 The FEYNRULES package [112] allows for the calculation of the Feynman rules in momentum  
 783 space for any quantum field theory model. By use of a Lagrangian, the set of Feynman rules asso-  
 784 ciated with this Lagrangian is calculated. Via the Universal FeynRules Output (UFO) [113]  
 785 the results are then passed to matrix element generators.



**Figure 3.3:** Sketch of a hadron collision as simulated by a Monte-Carlo event generator. The red blob in the centre represents the hard collision, surrounded by a tree-like structure representing Bremsstrahlung as simulated by parton showers. The purple blob indicates a secondary hard scattering event. Parton-to-hadron transitions are represented by light green blobs, dark green blobs indicate hadron decays, while yellow lines signal soft photon radiation. Figure taken from [111].

786     The MadGraph program [114] is used to interpret the physics model and calculate the cor-  
 787     responding Feynman diagrams and matrix elements. After this, MadEvent [115] is used to  
 788     calculate the corresponding partons. These generated parton configurations are then merged  
 789     with Pythia [116–118] parton showers using the MLM merging scheme [119].

790     The MadGraph5\_aMC@NLO program [120] combines the LO MadGraph [114] and the aMC@NLO  
 791     program into a common framework. This combination supports the generation of samples at  
 792     LO or NLO together with a dedicated matching to parton showers using the MC@NLO [121]  
 793     or FxFx [122] schemes respectively. The FxFx scheme produces a certain fraction of events  
 794     with negative weights originating from the subtraction of amplitudes that contain additional  
 795     emissions from the NLO matrix element to prevent double-counting.

796     The POWHEG box (versions 1 and 2) [123–128] contains predefined implementations of various  
 797     processes at NLO. It applies the POWHEG method for ME- to PS- matching, where the hardest  
 798     radiation generated from the ME has priority over subsequent PS emission to remove the overlap  
 799     with the PS simulation.

800     The JHU generator (version 7.02) [129–132] is used to generate the parton level information  
 801     including full spin and polarization correlations. It is commonly used for studying the spin and  
 802     parity properties of new resonances such as  $ab \rightarrow X \rightarrow VV$ , where  $V = Z, W, \gamma$ .

803     The generation of events from processes involving the production and decay of resonances  
 804   creates a computational heavy load, especially at NLO. The narrow width approximation assumes  
 805   that the resonant particle is on-shell. This factorizes the production and decay amplitude,  
 806   allowing to perform the simulation of the production and decay of heavy resonances like top  
 807   quarks or Higgs bosons to be performed in separate steps. The MadSpin program [133] extends  
 808   this approach and accounts for off-shell effects through a partial reweighting of the events.  
 809   Additionally, spin correlation effects between production and decay products are taken into  
 810   account.

811     The Pythia program (versions 6 and 8) [116–118] generates events of various processes at  
 812   LO. However more commonly it is only used for its PS simulation and is then used after other  
 813   LO and NLO event generators to perform subsequent parton showering, hadronisation, and  
 814   simulation of the underlying event. In this thesis the underlying event tunes [134] are the  
 815   CUETP8M2T4, CUETP8M1 and CUETP8M2.

816     The detector response is simulated via the Geant4 [108] program. This program tracks the  
 817   particles through the detector material via a detailed description of the detector and generates  
 818   several hits throughout several sensitive layers. In addition, the response of the detector  
 819   electronics to these hits are simulated.

### 820   3.2.3 Generating FCNC top-Z interactions

821     The FCNC processes are generated by interfacing the Lagrangian in Equation 1.36 with  
 822   MadGraph5\_aMC@NLO by means of the FeynRules package and its Universal FeynRules  
 NOTE: RH<sub>823</sub>  
 and LH<sub>824</sub>  
 gave the<sub>825</sub>  
 same re-<sub>826</sub>  
 sulting vari-<sub>827</sub>  
 ables and<sub>828</sub>  
 RH is easier<sub>829</sub>  
 to simulate<sub>830</sub>  
 since those<sub>831</sub>  
 are singlets<sub>832</sub>  
 under SU<sub>833</sub>  
 (no doublet<sub>834</sub>  
 with b)<sub>835</sub>

823   Output format. The complex chiral parameters are arbitrary chosen to be  $f_{Xq}^L = 0$  and  $f_{Xq}^R = 1$ .  
 824   The processes are generated with the MadGraph5\_aMC@NLO (version 2.2.2) and showered with  
 825   Pythia (version 8.22). The signal consists of two components: events describing the top quark  
 826   pair production followed by an FCNC decay of one top quark ( $t \rightarrow Zq$ ), and events with the  
 827   FCNC single top quark production ( $Zq \rightarrow t$ ) for which the top quark decays according the to  
 828   SM. The leading order generation of the single top quark FCNC process  $tZ+0,1$  jet including a  
 829   merging technique can not be done since  $tZ+1$  jet also contains contributions from top quark  
 830   pair FCNC where one quark is decaying in  $tZ$ . Therefore, single top quark and top quark pair  
 831   processes are generated independently, where the single top quark process is generated without  
 832   the extra hard jet, and the top quark pair FCNC process is generated with up to two extra jets.

833     The signal rates are estimated by use of the MadGraph5\_aMC@NLO program for estimating the  
 834   partial widths. The anomalous couplings are left free to float for this estimation, and only one  
 835   coupling is allowed to be non-vanishing at a time. The results are presented in Table 3.1.

836     The anomalous single top quark cross sections are calculated by convolution of the hard  
 837   scattering matrix elements with the LO order set of NN23L01 [135] partons densities. The NLO  
 838   effects are modelled by multiplying each LO cross section by a global  $k$ -factor. The LO single top  
 839   quark production cross section and the global  $k$ -factors for the top-Z production are shown in  
 840   Table 3.2. The hard scattering events are then matched to parton showers to Pythia to account  
 841   for the simulation of the QCD environment relevant for hadronic collisions.

**Table 3.1:** Leading order partial widths related to the anomalous decay modes of the top quark, where the new physics scale  $\Lambda$  is given in GeV.

Anomalous coupling	vertex	Partial decay width (GeV)
$\kappa_{tZq}/\Lambda$	tZu	$1.64 \times 10^4 \times (\kappa_{tZu}/\Lambda)^2$
	tZc	$1.64 \times 10^4 \times (\kappa_{tZc}/\Lambda)^2$
$\zeta_{tZq}$	tZu	$1.69 \times 10^{-1} \times (\zeta_{tZu})^2$
	tZc	$1.68 \times 10^{-1} \times (\zeta_{tZc})^2$

**Table 3.2:** Leading order single top quark production cross section at a centre-of-mass of 13 TeV for  $pp \rightarrow tZ$  or  $\bar{t}Z$ , where the new physics scale is given in GeV. The NLO  $k$ -factors [136] are given in the last column.

Anomalous coupling	vertex	Cross section (pb) $pp \rightarrow t + pp \rightarrow \bar{t}$	$\sigma_{pp \rightarrow \bar{t}}/\sigma_{pp \rightarrow t}$	NLO $k$ -factor
$\kappa_{tZq}/\Lambda$	tZu	$1.92 \times 10^7 \times (\kappa_{tZu}/\Lambda)^2$	0.12	1.40
	tZc	$2.65 \times 10^6 \times (\kappa_{tZc}/\Lambda)^2$	0.50	1.40
$\zeta_{tZq}$	tZu	$8.24 \times 10 \times (\zeta_{tZu})^2$	0.14	1.40
	tZc	$1.29 \times 10 \times (\zeta_{tZc})^2$	0.50	1.40

The top quark pair cross sections are derived from the SM  $t\bar{t}$  cross section, calculated with MadGraph5\_aMC@NLO at NLO at a centre-of-mass of 13 TeV ( $\sigma_{t\bar{t}}^{\text{SM,NLO}} = 6.741 \times 10^2 \text{ pb}$ ), and considering the decay  $t\bar{t} \rightarrow (bW^\pm)(X_{qt})$ . The branching ratio  $\mathcal{B}(t \rightarrow bW^\pm)$  is assumed to be equal to one and the FCNC branching ratio is calculated as

$$\mathcal{B}(t \rightarrow qX) = \frac{\Gamma_{t \rightarrow qX}}{\Gamma_t^{\text{SM}} + \Gamma_t^{\text{FCNC}}} \approx \frac{\Gamma_{t \rightarrow qX}}{\Gamma_t^{\text{SM}}}, \quad (3.5)$$

where  $\Gamma_{t \rightarrow qX}$  is given in Table 3.1,  $\Gamma_t^{\text{SM}} = 1.32 \text{ GeV}$  [47], and the assumption  $\Gamma_t^{\text{FCNC}} \ll \Gamma_t^{\text{SM}}$  is made. In Table 3.3 the resulting NLO cross sections for the top-Z FCNC interactions are given.

**Table 3.3:** Next to leading order top quark pair cross section for the top-Z FCNC interactions  $t\bar{t} \rightarrow (bW^\pm)(X_{qt})$  with a full leptonic decay at a centre-of-mass of 13 TeV, where  $\sigma_{pp \rightarrow t\bar{t}}^{\text{SM,NLO}} = 6.741 \times 10^2 \text{ pb}$ ,  $\mathcal{B}(Z \rightarrow \ell\bar{\ell}) = 3.36 \times 3 \times 10^{-2}$ , and  $\mathcal{B}(W \rightarrow \ell\nu) = 10.80 \times 3 \times 10^{-2}$ .

Anomalous coupling	vertex	Process	Cross section (pb)
$\kappa_{tZq}/\Lambda$	tZu	$t\bar{t} \rightarrow (b\ell^+\nu)(\bar{u}\ell^+\ell^-)$	$2.727 \times 10^5 \times (\kappa_{tZu}/\Lambda)^2$
		$t\bar{t} \rightarrow (\bar{b}\ell^-\bar{\nu})(u\ell^+\ell^-)$	$2.727 \times 10^5 \times (\kappa_{tZu}/\Lambda)^2$
	tZc	$t\bar{t} \rightarrow (b\ell^+\nu)(\bar{c}\ell^+\ell^-)$	$2.726 \times 10^5 \times (\kappa_{tZc}/\Lambda)^2$
		$t\bar{t} \rightarrow (\bar{b}\ell^-\bar{\nu})(c\ell^+\ell^-)$	$2.726 \times 10^5 \times (\kappa_{tZc}/\Lambda)^2$
$\zeta_{tZq}$	tZu	$t\bar{t} \rightarrow (b\ell^+\nu)(\bar{u}\ell^+\ell^-)$	$2.807 \times (\zeta_{tZu})^2$
		$t\bar{t} \rightarrow (\bar{b}\ell^-\bar{\nu})(u\ell^+\ell^-)$	$2.807 \times (\zeta_{tZu})^2$
	tZc	$t\bar{t} \rightarrow (b\ell^+\nu)(\bar{c}\ell^+\ell^-)$	$2.807 \times (\zeta_{tZc})^2$
		$t\bar{t} \rightarrow (\bar{b}\ell^-\bar{\nu})(c\ell^+\ell^-)$	$2.807 \times (\zeta_{tZc})^2$


### 3.2.4 Generating SM background events

The SM tZq sample is generated using the MadGraph5\_aMC@NLO generator (version 2.2.2) [137] at leading order accuracy. The t $\bar{t}Z$  and triboson samples were generated using the MadGraph5\_aMC@NLO generator (version 2.2.2), interfaced through the dedicated MC@NLO matching scheme [121]. The WZ+jets and t $\bar{t}W$  samples are produced with up to one additional parton at next-to-leading order accuracy using MadGraph5\_aMC@NLO (version 2.2.2) and using FxFx approach [138] for matching and merging. Other minor background are simulated using different generators. The samples of t $\bar{t}H$ , WW, ZZ, and single top quark production channels are generated with the POWHEG box (versions 1 and 2) [123–128]. The JHU generator [129–132] is used for the tqH sample, while the tWZ sample is generated using MadGraph [114] interfaced with the MLM matching scheme [119]. All events are interfaced to Pythia version 8.22 [118] to simulate parton shower, hadronisation, and underlying event. Additionally, MadSpin is used for the tZq, WZ+jets, t $\bar{t}Z$ , t $\bar{t}W$ , tWZ, and triboson samples.

The complete list of SM samples is given in Table 3.4, along with their cross sections at a centre-of-mass of 13 TeV. The cross sections without a reference are coming from the generator with which the sample has been made, for some of them the uncertainties are provided by the Generator Group [139]. For each MC sample, the integrated luminosity that the sample represents is estimated as the number of simulated events divided by the cross section of the generated process. This luminosity is then matched to integrated luminosity of  $35.9 \text{ fb}^{-1}$  represented by the data used for analysis. For processes generated with MadGraph5\_aMC@NLO, the effective number of simulated events is used, taking into account positive and negative event weights. In Figure 3.4, a summary is given of the SM cross section measurements performed by the CMS collaboration. These cross sections are all in agreement with their SM predictions.

**Table 3.4:** SM MC samples used in this analysis with their corresponding cross section at a centre-of-mass of 13 TeV and MadGraph5\_aMC@NLO correction C when applicable. The generators used for each sample are indicated and the simulation of the parton shower, hadronisation, and underlying event is done by Pythia version 8.22 [118] for all samples.

Process	Generator	Cross section (pb)	C	Ref.
$WZ \rightarrow 3\ell\nu$	MadGraph5_aMC@NLO+MadSpin	5.26	1.61	[139]
$tZq$ with $Z \rightarrow \ell^+\ell^-$	MadGraph5_aMC@NLO+MadSpin	0.0758	3.77	[139]
$tqH$ with $H \rightarrow ZZ \rightarrow \ell^+\ell^-\ell^+\ell^-$	JHU	$8.80 \cdot 10^{-6}$	-	[139]
$t\bar{t}W + \text{jets}$ with $W \rightarrow \ell\nu$	MadGraph5_aMC@NLO+MadSpin	$0.2043 \pm 0.0020$	1.94	[139]
$t\bar{t}Z \rightarrow 2\ell + 2\nu + \text{other}$ , with $m_{\ell\ell} > 10$ GeV	MadGraph5_aMC@NLO+MadSpin	$0.2529 \pm 0.0004$	2.15	[139]
$t\bar{t}H, \text{no } b\bar{b} \text{ decays}$	POWHEG	0.2151	-	[139]
$t\bar{t}H, b\bar{b} \text{ decays}$	POWHEG	0.2934	-	[139]
$WW \rightarrow 2\ell 2\nu$	POWHEG	12.178	-	[140]
$ZZ \rightarrow 4\ell$	POWHEG	0.3366	-	[139]
$WZZ$	MadGraph5_aMC@NLO+ MadSpin	0.05565	1.14	[139]
$ZZZ$	MadGraph5_aMC@NLO	0.01398	1.17	[139]
single top quark $tWZ$ , with $Z_\mu \rightarrow \ell^+\ell^-$	MadGraph5_aMC@NLO(LO)+MadSpin	0.001123	-	[139]
single top quark t-channel $\bar{t}$	POWHEG+MadSpin	$44.33^{+1.76}_{-1.49}$	-	[139]
single top quark t-channel $t$	POWHEG+MadSpin	$26.38^{+1.32}_{-1.18}$	-	[139]
single top quark $t\bar{W}$	POWHEG	$35.85 \pm 0.90 \text{ (scale)} \pm 1.70 \text{ (PDF)}$	-	[139]
single top quark $tW$	POWHEG	$35.85 \pm 0.90 \text{ (scale)} \pm 1.70 \text{ (PDF)}$	-	[139]
$t\bar{t}$	POWHEG	$831.76^{+19.77+35.06}_{-29.20-35.06}$	-	[139]
$Z/\gamma^* + \text{jets}$ , with $m_{\ell\ell} > 50$ GeV	MadGraph5_aMC@NLO	$3 \times (1921.8 \pm 0.6 \pm 33.2)$	1.49	[139]
$Z/\gamma^* + \text{jets}$ , with $10 \text{ GeV} < m_{\ell\ell} < 50 \text{ GeV}$	MadGraph	18610	-	[139]



**Figure 3.4:** Summary of the SM cross section measurements performed by the CMS collaboration. Figure taken from [23]


### 3.3 Multivariate analysis techniques: Boosted Decision Trees

The need of processing large quantities of data and discriminating between events with largely similar experimental signatures makes multivariate analysis (MVA) a largely used method in the physics community. Multivariate classification methods based on machine learning techniques are a fundamental ingredient to most analyses. The advantage of using a MVA classifier is that it can achieve a better discrimination power with respect to a simpler analysis based on individual selection criteria or poorly discriminating variables. A risk of using MVA classifiers is overtraining. This happens when there are too many model parameters of an algorithm adjusted to too few data points. This leads to an increase in the classification performance over the objectively achievable one.

There are many software tools that exist for MVA. In this thesis the Tool for Multivariate Analysis (TMVA) [141] is used. This software is an open source project included into ROOT [142]. By training on events for which the classification is known, a mapping function is determined that describes a classification or an approximation of the underlying behaviour defining the target value (regression). In this thesis boosted decision trees (BDT) are employed for the classification of events as implemented in the TMVA framework [141]. This multivariate technique is based on a set of decision trees where each tree yields a binary output depending on the fact that an event is signal- or background-like. This has as advantage that several discriminating variables can be combined into a powerful one-dimensional discriminant D.

886 The decision tree is constructed by training on a dataset for which the outcome is already  
 887 provided, such as simulation datasets with signal and background processes (supervised learn-  
 888 ing). Different trees can be combined into a forest where the final output is determined by the  
 889 majority vote of all trees, so-called boosting. This stabilises the decision trees against statistical  
 890 fluctuations and makes it possible to keep the decision trees very shallow, making the method  
 891 more robust against overtraining. Examples of such boosting algorithms are Adaptive Boosting  
 892 (AdaBoost) and Gradient Boosting [143]. In this thesis Gradient boost is used with a learning  
 893 rate of 0.2-0.3 and the depth of the tree is set to three. Additionally, the Gradient boost is  
 894 used in combination with bagging, so-called stochastic gradient boosting. Bagging smears the  
 895 statistical fluctuations in the training data and therefore stabilises the response of the classifier  
 896 and increases the performance by eliminating overtraining. More information about stochastic  
 897 gradient boosting can be found in Ref. [144].

898 The discriminating power of a BDT is assessed by analysing the receiver operating characteristic  
 899 (ROC) curve. This curve represents the background rejection over the signal efficiency of the  
 900 remaining sample. The area under the curve (AUC) is compared to random guessing in order  
 901 to identify the best classifier can be identified. When the multivariate discriminator has no  
 902 discriminating power, the resulting AUC will be 0%, while 50% means fully separated event  
 classes. In Figure 3.5 examples of ROC curves are shown.



**Figure 3.5:** Example of ROC curves. In this example, the green method is better than the blue one, which is better than the red one. The dashed line represents a case where there is no separation. Figure taken from [145].

### 3.4 Statistical methodology

The search performed in the framework of this thesis requires the simultaneous analysis of data from different decay channels. The statistical methodology used for this search is developed by the ATLAS and CMS collaborations in the context of the LHC Higgs Combination group [146–149]. The Higgs Combined Tool [150] is a RooStats [151] framework which runs different statistical methods. In this section, only the statistical tools necessary for the performed search are described [152].

The event yields of signal and background processes are denoted as  $s$  and  $b$  respectively. These represent event counts in multiple bins or unbinned probability density functions. By use of simulation, predictions on both signal and background yields are made the multiple uncertainties on these predictions are accounted for by introducing nuisance parameters  $\theta$  such that  $s = s(\theta)$  and  $b = b(\theta)$ .

The Bayesian and modified classical frequentist statistical approaches are used in high energy physics to characterise the absence of a signal. The level of incompatibility of data with a signal hypothesis is quantified in terms of confidence levels (CL). The convention is to require a 95% CL for excluding a signal. In general limits are not set on the signal cross section directly, but are set on the signal strength modifier  $\mu$ . The signal strength modifier is defined such that it equally changes all the cross sections of all production mechanisms of the signal by the same scale.

In this thesis, the modified frequentist approach [153, 154] for confidence levels that adopts the classical frequentist method to allow nuisance parameters, is used. It constructs a likelihood  $\mathcal{L}(\text{data}|\mu, \theta)$  is as

$$\mathcal{L}(\text{data}|\mu, \theta) = \text{Poisson}(\text{data}|\mu s(\theta) + b(\theta)) \text{pdf}(\tilde{\theta}|\theta). \quad (3.6)$$

The probability density function  $\text{pdf}(\tilde{\theta}|\theta)$  describes all sources of uncertainty. In this thesis, all sources of uncertainties are assumed to be either 100% correlated or uncorrelated. Partially correlated uncertainties are broken down to subcomponents that fit those requirements, allowing to include all constraints in the likelihoods in a clean factorised form.

A systematic uncertainty pdf  $\rho(\theta|\tilde{\theta})$  for the nuisance  $\theta$  with nominal value  $\tilde{\theta}$  is used. It reflects the degree of belief of what the true value of the  $\theta$  is. In this thesis, the approach from the Higgs Combined Tool is used where the pdfs  $\rho(\theta|\tilde{\theta})$  are re-interpret as posteriors of real or imaginary measurements  $\tilde{\theta}$

$$\rho(\theta|\tilde{\theta}) \sim \text{pdf}(\tilde{\theta}|\theta) \pi_\theta(\theta), \quad (3.7)$$

where  $\pi_\theta(\theta)$  is the hyper prior for the (imaginary) measurements. The the pdfs used by the Higgs Combine Tool are described in Ref. [149].

The data in Equation 3.6 represents either the actual observation or pseudo-data to construct sampling distributions. For a binned likelihood, the Poisson probabilities to observe  $n_i$  events in bin  $i$  is given as

$$\text{Poisson}(\text{data}|\mu s(\theta) + b(\theta)) = \prod_i \frac{(\mu s_i(\theta) + b_i(\theta))^{n_i}}{n_i!} e^{-\mu s_i(\theta) - b_i(\theta)}. \quad (3.8)$$

At the LHC, the test statistic is defined as

$$q_\mu = -2 \ln \frac{\mathcal{L}(\text{data} | \mu, \hat{\theta}_\mu)}{\mathcal{L}(\text{data} | \hat{\mu}, \hat{\theta}_\mu)}, \quad (3.9)$$

where the likelihood is maximised in the numerator (maximum likelihood estimator, MLE) for a given  $\mu$  and (pseudo) data at  $\hat{\theta}_\mu$ , while  $\hat{\mu}$  combined with  $\hat{\theta}$  defines the point for which the likelihood reaches its global maximum. The estimated signal strength modifier  $\hat{\mu}$  can not become negative since a signal rate is positive defined by physics. Furthermore, an upper constraint on the MLE  $\hat{\mu} \leq \mu$  is imposed.

The signal is excluded at  $1 - \alpha$  confidence level when

$$\text{CLs} = \frac{P(q_\mu \geq q_\mu^{\text{obs}} | \mu s + b)}{P(q_\mu \geq q_\mu^{\text{obs}} | b)} \leq \alpha, \quad (3.10)$$

with  $P(q_\mu \geq q_\mu^{\text{obs}} | \mu s + b)$  the probability to observe a value of the test statistic at least as large as the one observed in data  $q_\mu^{\text{obs}}$ , under the signal plus background ( $s + b$ ) hypothesis, and  $P(q_\mu \geq q_\mu^{\text{obs}} | b)$  for the background only ( $b$ ) hypothesis. These probabilities are defined as

$$p_\mu = P(q_\mu \geq q_\mu^{\text{obs}} | \mu s + b) = \int_{q_\mu^{\text{obs}}}^{\infty} f(q_\mu | \mu, \hat{\theta}_\mu^{\text{obs}}) dq_\mu, \\ 1 - p_b = P(q_\mu \geq q_\mu^{\text{obs}} | b) = \int_{q_{\mu=0}^{\text{obs}}}^{\infty} f(q_\mu | \mu = 0, \hat{\theta}_{\mu=0}^{\text{obs}}) dq_\mu, \quad (3.11)$$

where  $p_\mu$  and  $p_b$  are the p-values associated to the two hypothesis, and  $f(q_\mu | \mu, \hat{\theta}_\mu^{\text{obs}})$  and  $f(q_\mu | \mu = 0, \hat{\theta}_{\mu=0}^{\text{obs}})$  are the probability density functions of the signal plus background and background only hypothesis constructed from toy Monte Carlo pseudo data. These are generated with nuisance parameters fixed to  $\hat{\theta}_{\mu=0}^{\text{obs}}$  (background only) and  $\hat{\theta}_\mu^{\text{obs}}$  (signal plus background). The 95% CL level upper limit on  $\mu$  is achieved by adjusting  $\mu$  until  $\text{CL} = 0.05$ , this is the so-called observe limit. The expected median upper limit and the  $\pm 1\sigma$  and  $\pm 2\sigma$  bands for a hypothesis is generated by a large set of pseudo data and calculate the CLs and the value of  $\mu$  at 95% CL for each of them. A cumulative probability distribution can be build by starting the integration from the side corresponding to low event yields. The median expected value, so-called expected limit at 95% CL, is where the cumulative distribution function crosses the 50% quantile. The  $\pm 1\sigma$  (68%) and  $\pm 2\sigma$  (95%) bands on the expected limit are defined by the crossings of the 16% and 84%, and 2.5% and 97.5% quantiles.

In order to significantly reduce computing time, the Asymptotic CL method is used. This method avoids an ensemble of toy Monte Carlo samples and instead replaces it by one representative dataset, called Asimov dataset. This dataset is constructed such that all observed quantities are set equal to their MLE values ( $\hat{\theta}_{\text{Asimov}} = \theta_0$ ). More information about this procedure can be found in Refs. [147].




# Event reconstruction and identification

# 4

952 The simulated data after the detector simulation described in [Section 3.2](#), has the exact same  
953 format as the real collision data recorded at the CMS experiment. Therefore the same software  
954 can be used for the reconstruction of both simulation and real data. In [Section 4.1](#), the object  
955 reconstruction is explained. After reconstructing the objects, they are connected to physics  
956 objects need to be identified ([Section 4.2](#)) and corrected for pileup ([Section 4.3](#)). The objects  
957 used for physics analysis have extra requirements as shown in [Section 4.4](#). A summary of all  
958 the corrections applied to data and simulation is given in [Section 4.5](#).

## 959 4.1 Object Reconstruction

960 In [Figure 4.1](#), the particle interaction in a transverse slice of the CMS detector is shown. When  
961 a particle enters the detector, it first enters the tracker where charged particle trajectories,  
962 so-called tracks, and origins, so-called vertices, are reconstructed from signals or hits in the  
963 sensitive layers. The magnetic field bends the charged particles making it able to measure the  
964 electric charges and momenta of charged particles. The electron and photons are absorbed in  
965 the ECAL and the corresponding electromagnetic showers are detected as clusters of energy  
966 in adjacent cells. From this, the energy and the direction of the particles can be determined.  
967 The charged and neutral hadrons can also initiate a hadronic shower in the ECAL that is fully  
968 absorbed in the HCAL. The clusters from these showers are also used to estimate the energy  
969 and direction. Muons and neutrino's pass through the calorimeters without little to no energy  
970 loss and the neutrinos even escape the CMS detector undetected while muons produce hits in  
971 the muon detectors.



**Figure 4.1:** Cross-section of the CMS detector with all parts of the detector labelled. This sketch shows the specific particle interactions from a beam interaction region to the muon detector. The muon and charged pion are positively charged, the electron is negatively charged. Figure taken from [155].

972 The particle flow (PF) [155] reconstruction algorithm correlates the tracks and clusters  
 973 from all detector layers with the identification of each final state particle, and combines the  
 974 corresponding measurements to reconstruct the properties. The muon is identified by a track  
 975 in the inner tracker connected to a track in the muon detector as described in Section 4.1.2.  
 976 The electrons are identified by a track and an ECAL cluster, not connected to an HCAL cluster  
 977 as described in Section 4.1.3. The ECAL and HCAL clusters without a track link identify the  
 978 photons and neutral hadrons, while the addition of the tracker determines the energy and  
 979 direction of a charged hadron.

#### 980 4.1.1 Charged particle tracks

981 An iterative tracking algorithm is responsible for the reconstruction of the tracks made by  
 982 charged particles in the inner tracking system. Each iteration consists of four steps [71]: the  
 983 track-seed generation, the pattern recognition algorithm, removal of track-hit ambiguities and  
 984 a final track fit. The pattern recognitions done by use a Kalman filter method [156, 157] which  
 985 into account the magnetic field and multiple scattering effects. All hits that are unambiguously  
 986 associated to the final track are removed from the list of available hits. In order to associate the  
 987 remaining hits, the procedure is repeated with looser track reconstruction criteria. The use of  
 988 the iterative track reconstruction procedure has a high track finding efficiency, where the fake  
 989 track reconstruction rate is negligible.

**NOTE:** Ik kan hier stoppen en 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.3.4.1.4 volledig schrappen (dus enkel primary vertex houden)

#### 990 4.1.2 Following the Muon's Footsteps

991 The muon reconstruction [158] has three subdivisions: local reconstruction, regional reconstruc-  
 992 tion and global reconstruction. The local reconstruction is performed on individual detector  
 993 elements such as strip and pixel hits in the inner tracking system, and muon hits and/or segments  
 994 in the muon chambers. Independent tracks are reconstructed in the inner tracker - called tracker  
 995 tracks - and in the muon system, called standalone muon tracks. Based on these tracks, two  
 996 reconstructions are considered: Global Muon reconstruction and Tracker Muon reconstruction.  
 997 The first is an outside in approach starting from a standalone muon track while the second uses  
 998 an inside-out approach starting from tracker tracks. For low transverse momenta ( $p_T \lesssim 5$  GeV),  
 999 the tracker muon reconstruction is more efficient than the global muon approach. This is due  
 1000 to the fact that tracker muons only require a single muon segment in muon system, while the  
 1001 global muon approach requires typically segments in at least two muon stations. These tracker  
 1002 muons are used for identifying muons from the hadronisation of b or c quarks. The global muon  
 1003 approach typically improves the tracker reconstruction for  $p_T \gtrsim 200$  GeV.

#### 1004 4.1.3 The path of the Electron

1005 Standard tracking algorithms are based on Kalman filtering which assume that the energy loss  
 1006 is Gaussian distributed. Since the electron tracks are increasingly curved in the magnetic field  
 1007 as a function of its flight distance, these standard tracking algorithms are not suitable to fit the  
 1008 electron tracks and different filtering algorithm, the Gaussian sum filter (GSF) [159] is used  
 1009 instead.

1010 In CMS, the electrons are reconstructed in two ways. The older ECAL based tracking is  
 1011 developed to identify high energetic isolated electrons. This tracking algorithm starts from

1012 ECAL clusters with a transverse energy above 4 GeV and extrapolates from these cluster the  
 1013 position of the hits in the tracker. Another, tracker based algorithm uses all the tracks with  
 1014 a  $p_T$  higher than 2 GeV found with iterative tracking as seeds. The electron seeds from the  
 1015 ECAL- and tracker-based procedures are merged into a unique collection and are then refitted  
 1016 by using the summed Gaussian distributions as uncertainty per hit in the track fit. The electron  
 1017 efficiency is measured in 8 TeV proton collision data to be better than 93% for electrons with an  
 1018 ECAL supercluster energy of  $E_T > 20$  GeV [160]. For electrons with an  $E_T > 25$  GeV in 13 TeV  
 1019 proton collision data, the efficiency is about 96%[161].

#### 1020 4.1.4 Primary Vertex Reconstruction

1021 The primary vertex (PV) reconstruction is able to measure the location of all proton interaction  
 1022 vertices in each event consisting of the signal vertex and all vertices from pileup events. First  
 1023 tracks are selected to be consistent with being produced promptly in the primary interaction [81].  
 1024 Then the tracks are grouped according to the  $z$  coordinate of their closest approach to the beam  
 1025 line [162] and a vertex fitting algorithm [163] is performed. The primary vertex is found as the  
 1026 vertex corresponding to the highest sum of squared track transverse momenta and is taken to  
 1027 be the main interaction point. The resolution on the primary vertex is about 14  $\mu\text{m}$  in  $r\phi$  and  
 1028 about 19  $\mu\text{m}$  in the  $z$  direction for primary vertices with the sum of the track  $p_T > 100$  GeV  
 1029 for 2016 data taking.

#### 1030 4.1.5 Calorimeter clusters

1031 The energy and direction of stable neutral particles such as photons and neutral hadron are recon-  
 1032 structed using a cluster algorithm. This algorithm also separates neutral particles from charged  
 1033 hadron energy deposits, and reconstructs and identifies electrons and their bremsstrahlung  
 1034 photons. Furthermore, the cluster algorithm is contributing to the energy measurements of  
 1035 charged hadrons that don't have accurate tracks parameters, e.g. for low quality and high  
 1036 transverse momentum tracks. The clustering is performed separately in each subdetector:  
 1037 ECAL barrel and endcaps, HCAL barrel and endcaps, and the two preshower layers. The HF has  
 1038 no clustering algorithm since the electromagnetic or hadronic components give rise to an HF  
 1039 EM or HF HAD cluster.

1040 The clustering algorithm consist of different steps. First seeds are identified when cells have  
 1041 an energy larger than the seeding threshold and larger than their neighbouring cells. Then  
 1042 topological clusters are made by accumulating cells that share at least a corner with a cell  
 1043 already in the cluster and an energy above a cell threshold set to twice the noise level. The  
 1044 third step is an expectation maximization algorithm that reconstructs the cluster [155] and  
 1045 assumes that the energy deposits are Gaussian distributed. The calorimeter clusters are used  
 1046 for reconstructing photons and neutral hadrons. The clusters that are not in the vicinity of the  
 1047 extrapolated charged tracks identified as neutral hadrons or photons. If the energy deposits are  
 1048 in vicinity of charged tracks, such is the case for charged hadrons, the neutral particle energy  
 1049 deposit is measured as an excess over the charged particle deposit.

## 1050 4.2 Particle flow identification

1051 The several PF elements from the various CMS subdetectors are connected through a link  
 1052 algorithm. This algorithm tests any pair of elements in an event, only considering nearest  
 1053 neighbours in the  $\eta\phi$ -plane. The quality of the link is determined via the distance between the  
 1054 two elements and PF blocks of elements are formed from elements with a direct link or indirect  
 1055 link through common elements. The identification and reconstruction follows a particular order  
 1056 in each PF block. After each identification and reconstruction the corresponding PF elements  
 1057 (tracks and clusters) are removed from the PF block.

1058 The muons are the first to be identified and reconstructed. These are reconstructed if their  
 1059 momenta are compatible with corresponding track only momenta. Then the electron and its  
 1060 corresponding brehmstrahung photons, are identified and reconstructed by using of the GSF  
 1061 tracking. At the same time, the energetic and isolated photons are identified as well. The  
 1062 remaining elements in the PF block are subjected to a cross identification of charged hadrons,  
 1063 neutral hadrons, and photons that arise from parton fragmentation, hadronisation, and decays  
 1064 in jets. The charged hadron candidate is made from the remaining candidates that have a  
 1065 charged particle track associated with them. Then the charged particle energy fraction is  
 1066 subtracted from the calibrated energy of the linked calorimeter clusters and the remaining  
 1067 energy is assigned to the neutral energy. Depending on the excess of neutral energy in the ECAL  
 1068 and HCAL clusters, a photon or a neutral hadron is assigned respectively. The pseudorapidity  
 1069 range of the inner tracker limits the information on the particles charge to  $|\eta| < 2.4$ . Outside  
 1070 this range a simplified identification is done for hadronic and electromagnetic candidates only.

## 1071 4.3 Pileup mitigation and luminosity measurement

For the 8 TeV dataset, an average of about 21 pileup interactions happen per bunch cross section. For the dataset taken at 13 TeV, the number of pileup interactions increases to about 27 interactions per bunch crossing. These interactions are spread around the beam axis around the centre of the CMS coordinate system and follow a normal distribution with a standard deviation of about 5 cm [155]. The number of pileup interactions is estimated from the number of interaction vertices reconstructed from charged particle tracks, or from the instantaneous luminosity of the given bunch crossing with dedicated detectors and the inelastic proton-proton crossing. The luminosity of the CMS interaction point is estimated from measuring certain process rates with luminometers such as the pixel detector, HF calorimeter, and the pixel luminosity telescope [164]. The instantaneous luminosity from recorded process rate  $R$  is then determined as

$$1072 \quad Ldt = \frac{Rdt}{\sigma_{fid}}, \quad (4.1)$$

1072 where  $\sigma_{fid} = \sigma \times A$  corresponds to the fiducial cross section recorded in the luminometer  
 1073 acceptance  $A$  which is determined using van der Meer scans [165]. The overall uncertainty on  
 1074 the luminosity measurement is estimated to be 2.5%.

1075 The luminosity is used to infer to number of pileup interactions in data, which can be used  
 1076 to corrected the predefined pileup interactions in simulation. Then an event weight can be

1077 derived from the ratio of the distributions of pileup interactions in data and simulation. For 13  
 1078 TeV collisions, the inelastic cross section is measured to be  $71.3 \pm 3.5$  mb [166]. However a  
 1079 better agreement in data and simulation for the pileup sensitive variables, such as the number  
 1080 of primary vertices, is found with a lower cross section of 69.2 mb with an uncertainty of 4.6%.

## 1081 4.4 Physics object reconstruction and identification

1082 The particle flow objects are used for building physics objects that are used for analysis. Analyses  
 1083 use jets, muons, electrons, photons, taus and missing transverse momentum  $\vec{p}_T$  with extra,  
 1084 analysis dependent requirements. In the following section, only the physics objects used  
 1085 throughout this thesis are discussed.

### 1086 4.4.1 Muons


1087 The muon candidates used for analysis in this thesis correspond to the tight and loose working  
 1088 point. Detailed reports on the performance can be found in [167].

1089 The tight working point rejects objects wrongly reconstructed as muons from hadron showers  
 1090 that reach the muon system (punch-throughs), by requiring that the global muon fit includes  
 1091 at least one valid hit in the muon chambers for which at least two muon segments in two  
 1092 muon stations are present. Furthermore, the muon tracks should have a global fit yielding a  
 1093 goodness-of-fit of  $\chi^2/\text{ndof} < 10$ . Requiring at least one pixel hit in the muon track suppresses  
 1094 the decay of muons in flight. Also a minimum of five hits in the tracker is required. Cosmic  
 1095 muons and muons originating from pileup interactions are rejected by constricting the distance  
 1096 of the muon with respect to the primary vertex by putting limits on  $d_{x,y} < 2$  mm and  $d_z < 5$   
 1097 mm. Also muons according to the loose muon working point will be used in the thesis. These  
 1098 are either global muons or tracker muons reconstructed from the particle flow muon object. In  
 1099 Table 4.1, the muon requirements for the muons used throughout this thesis are summarised.  
 1100 In Figure 4.2, the muon efficiencies for data and simulation is presented. These efficiencies are  
 1101 estimated from tag-and-probe methods [167]. Overall, the efficiency is about 95-100%, with  
 1102 two drops due to the crack between the wheels of the DT system. The differences between  
 1103 data and simulation are corrected by applying  $p_T$ - and  $\eta$ -dependent scale factors ( $\epsilon_{\text{data}}/\epsilon_{\text{MC}}$ )  
 1104 to simulated events.

In addition to the identification criteria, the muons are required to be spatially isolated from electromagnetic and hadronic activity. The relative lepton isolation is defined as estimating the total transverse energy of the particles emitted around the direction of the lepton by defining a cone of radius  $\Delta R$  in  $\eta\phi$  plane around the lepton direction. Then a summed energy is calculated from the charged hadrons (CH), neutral hadrons (NH), photons ( $\gamma$ ), excluding the lepton itself. This sum is then corrected to remove the energy coming from pileup interactions. The relative isolation for muons  $\mathcal{I}_\mu$  is defined as [155]:


$$\mathcal{I}_\mu = \frac{\sum p_T(\text{CH}) + \max(0., \sum E_T(\text{NH}), \sum E_T(\gamma) - 0.5 \times \sum E_T(\text{CH}))}{p_T(\mu)}, \quad (4.2)$$

1105 where a cone of  $\Delta R = 0.4$  is adopted and the pileup mitigation is based on the  $\Delta\beta$  correction.  
 1106 The  $\Delta\beta$  correction estimates the pileup energy as half of the contribution coming from charged



**Figure 4.2:** Comparison of the muon tight ID (left) and loose ID (right) efficiencies in data and simulation as a function of the pseudorapidity of the muon using the full 2016 dataset. Figure taken from [167].

hadrons. For tight ID muons, this relative isolation should  $\mathcal{I}_\mu < 0.15$ , while for loose muons this should be  $\mathcal{I}_\mu < 0.25$ . In Figure 4.3, the isolation efficiencies as a function of the pseudo rapidities using the tag and probe method are shown for the tight muon working point. The efficiencies are 85-100% and have a decline for low- $p_T$  muons. The differences between data and simulation are accounted for by applying  $\eta$ - and  $p_T$ -dependent scale factors on the simulation.



**Figure 4.3:** Comparison of the muon tight isolation requirement with the muon tight ID efficiencies in data and simulation as a function of the transverse momentum (left) or pseudorapidity (right) of the muon using the full 2016 dataset. Figure taken from [167].

**Table 4.1:** Muon requirements for the tight and loose working points, used throughout this thesis.

Properties	Loose Muons	Tight Muons
Global muon or Tracker Muon	One or the other	Both
Particle Flow muon	Y	Y
$\chi^2/ndof$ of global muon track fit	N/A	< 10
Nb. of hit muon chambers	N/A	> 0
Nb. of muon stations contained in the segment	N/A	> 1
Size of the transverse impact parameter of the track wrt. to the PV	N/A	$d_{xy} < 2 \text{ mm}$
Longitudinal distance wrt. the PV	N/A	$d_z < 5 \text{ mm}$
Nb. of pixel hits	N/A	> 0
Nb. of tracker layers with hits	N/A	> 5
Relative Isolation	<0.25	<0.15

#### 4.4.2 Electrons

The electrons candidates used correspond to the tight and veto working points. The study of the electron reconstruction and identification performance can be found in [161].

Starting from an electron PF candidate with a GSF track that is outside the barrel-endcap transition region ( $1.4443 < |\eta| < 1.5660$ ), several requirements are set. The electron track should not have more than one (two or three) missing hit in the innermost layer for the tight (veto) working point. This dismisses electrons from photon conversions are dismissed. Additionally, a photon conversion veto is applied by testing if a pair of electron tracks is originating from a common displaced vertex. Furthermore, refined cuts are applied on the shower shape variables such as the difference in  $\eta$  or  $\phi$  between the energy weighted supercluster position in the ECAL and the track direction in at the innermost tracker position ( $\Delta\eta_{\text{in}}$ ,  $\Delta\phi_{\text{in}}$ ), and the ECAL crystal based shower covariance in the  $\eta$  direction ( $\sigma_{\eta\eta}$ ). These cuts also include energy related variables such as the absolute difference between the inverse electron energy measured in the ECAL and the inverse momentum measured in the tracker ( $|1/E - 1/p|$ ), and the ratio of the energy measured in the HCAL and ECAL (H/E). Unlike the muon case, the identification criteria also contain requirements on the isolation of the electrons.

Similar to the muons, the electron relative isolation is determined from the sum of the particles in a cone around the electron itself. The cone radius used for electrons is  $\Delta R = 0.3$  and a  $\rho$  correction for pileup mitigation is applied. For this correction, the expected pileup energy inside the isolation cone is estimated from the median density energy per area of pileup contamination ( $\rho$ ), computed event by event, and the effective area ( $A_{\text{eff}}$ ) [155]. This effective area is estimated from simulation and denotes the expected amount of neutral energy from

pileup interactions per  $\rho$  within the isolation cone as a function of the pseudo rapidity of the associated ECAL superclusters. Table 4.2 shows the values used for 13 TeV data. The relative electron isolation  $\mathcal{I}_e$  is calculated as

$$\mathcal{I}_e = \frac{\sum p_T(\text{CH}) + \max(0, \sum E_T(\text{NH}), \sum E_T(\gamma) - \rho \times A_{\text{eff}})}{p_T(e)}. \quad (4.3)$$

**Table 4.2:** The effective areas  $A_{\text{eff}}$  used for the electron relative isolation [168].

$\eta$ region	$A_{\text{eff.}}$
$0 <  \eta  < 0.1752$	0.1703
$1.0 <  \eta  < 0.1479$	0.1715
$1.479 <  \eta  < 2.0$	0.1213
$2.0 <  \eta  < 2.2$	0.1230
$2.2 <  \eta  < 2.3$	0.1635
$2.3 <  \eta  < 2.4$	0.1937
$2.4 <  \eta  < 2.5$	0.2393


1128

1129 The efficiency of electron identification is estimated from  $Z \rightarrow e^- e^+$  events via the tag-and-  
 1130 probe method and is shown in Figure 4.4 for the tight working point. The efficiencies reach  
 1131 95 – 100%. The difference between data and simulation are corrected by dedicated  $p_T$ - and  $\eta$   
 1132 dependent scale factors as well.

1133 **4.4.3 Jets**

1134 Jets are reconstructed from all reconstructed particles without the charged hadrons associated to  
 1135 pileup vertices. The clustering is done via the anti –  $k_T$  algorithm [169] with a radius parameter  
 1136 for the cone size of the resulting jet of  $R = 0.4$ . More information about the jet algorithm  
 1137 performance can be found in Ref. [170].

1138 The jets used for the analysis discussed in this thesis uses the loose identification working  
 1139 point summarised in Table 4.4. The requirements on the jet constituents are based on the  
 1140 assumption that a proper jet originating from the hadronisation of a quark or gluon consists of  
 1141 multiple PF particles and types. Therefore, the jet should consist of more than one constituent  
 1142 and the neutral hadron fraction and neutral EM energy fractions should be less than 99%. For  
 1143 the jets within the tracker acceptance ( $|\eta| < 2.4$ ), at least one constituent has to be a charged  
 1144 hadron resulting in a charged hadron energy fraction above 0%. Additionally the charged  
 1145 EM energy fraction should be less than 99%. On top of these requirements, objects that are  
 1146 labelled as jets and found in vicinity of any isolated lepton,  $\Delta R < 0.3$ , are removed from the jet  
 1147 collection in that event to avoid duplications of objects.



**Figure 4.4:** Electron identification efficiency as function of the electron transverse momentum from the full 2016 dataset. Figure taken from [161].

**Table 4.3:** Electron requirements used in this analysis. The requirements are set in the barrel ( $|\eta_{supercluster}| \leq 1.479$ ) and the endcaps ( $|\eta_{supercluster}| > 1.479$ ).


Properties	$ \eta_{supercluster}  \leq 1.479$		$ \eta_{supercluster}  > 1.479$	
	Veto electron	Tight electron	Veto electron	Tight electron
$\sigma_{\eta\eta}$	< 0.0115	< 0.00998	< 0.037	< 0.0292
$ \Delta\eta_{in} $	< 0.00749	< 0.00308	< 0.00895	< 0.00605
$ \Delta\phi_{in} $	< 0.228	< 0.0816	< 0.213	< 0.0394
H/E	< 0.356	< 0.0414	< 0.211	< 0.0641
relative isolation	< 0.175	< 0.0588	< 0.159	< 0.0571
$ 1/E - 1/p $	$< 0.299 \text{ GeV}^{-1}$	$< 0.0129 \text{ GeV}^{-1}$	$< 0.15 \text{ GeV}^{-1}$	$< 0.0129 \text{ GeV}^{-1}$
expected missing inner hits	$\leq 2$	$\leq 1$	$\leq 3$	$\leq 1$
pass conversion veto	Y	Y	Y	Y

**Table 4.4:** Jet criteria used throughout the thesis. The last three requirements are only for jets within the tracker acceptance.

Properties	Loose Jet ID
Neutral hadron fraction	< 0.99
Neutral EM fraction	< 0.99
Number of constituents	> 1
Charged hadron fraction	> 0
Charged multiplicity	> 0
Charged EM fraction	< 0.99

1148 The energy of the reconstructed jets deviates from the energies of the corresponding jets  
 1149 clustered from the hadronisation products of true partons from simulations due to non linear  
 1150 subdetector response and efficiencies. The jet energy corrections (JEC) calibrate the jets  
 1151 in order to have the correct energy scale and resolution. Jet energy scale corrections (JES)  
 1152 are determined as a function of pseudorapidity and the transverse momentum from data and  
 1153 simulated events by combining several channels and methods. This is extensively described  
 1154 in [171]. These corrections account for the effects of pileup, the uniformity of the detector  
 1155 response, and residual data-simulation jet energy scale differences. Furthermore, the jet energy  
 1156 resolution (JER) is measured in data and simulation as function of pileup, jet size and jet flavour.  
 1157 The performance of the jet energy corrections for the 13 TeV dataset can be found in [172].

1158 The JEC are factorised and subsequently correct for the offset energy due to pileup, the detector  
 1159 response to hadrons, and residual differences between data and simulation as a function of the  
 1160 jet pseudorapidity and transverse momentum. The consecutive steps of JEC are shown in Figure  
 4.5. The off set corrections remove the dependence of the jet energy response of additional pileup



**Figure 4.5:** The sequence of the JEC for data and simulations. The corrections marked with MC are derived from simulation studies, while RC stands for random cone, and MJB for the analysis of multi-jet events. Figure taken from [171].

1161 activity. It is based on the jet area method, which uses the effective area of the jets multiplied  
 1162 by the average density in the event to calculate the offset energy to be subtracted of the  
 1163 jets. The correction factors are derived by comparing the jet response with and without pileup  
 1164

1165 events overlaid. The residual differences between data and detector simulation are determined  
 1166 using the random cone method (RC). For this method, many jets are reconstructed in each  
 1167 event by clustering particles through placing random cones. This provides a mapping of the  
 $\eta\phi$ -space and the average  $p_T$  of those jets gives the average energy offset due to pileup [171].  
 1169 The next level of corrections have as goal to have an uniform energy response independent  
 1170 of the transverse momentum or pseudorapidity of the jet. These corrections are determined  
 1171 from simulated events by matching the reconstructed to true particle jets and comparing there  
 1172 momenta. The residual corrections between data and simulation are determined by comparing  
 1173 the transverse momentum balance in various types of events (multi-jet, Z + jets, and  $\gamma$  + jets),  
 1174 using a reference jet in the barrel region. The jet flavour corrections are optional and not used  
 1175 for this thesis. More information on the jet flavour corrections can be found in [171]. For jets  
 1176 with a transverse momentum above 30 GeV, the uncertainties from the various corrections are  
 1177 3-5% for the 13 TeV dataset [172].

After applying JEC, the transverse momentum resolution of the jet is extracted from data and simulated events. There are two methods used to rescale the reconstructed four momentum chosen based on whether or not the simulated jet can be matched to a true jet in simulation. The factors are defined as

$$c_{\text{matched}} = 1 + \frac{p_T^{\text{reco.}} - p_T^{\text{true}}}{p_T^{\text{reco.}}} (s_{\text{JER}} - 1), \\ c_{\text{unmatched}} = 1 + N(0, \sigma_{\text{JER}}) \sqrt{\max(s_{\text{JER}}^2 - 1, 0)}, \quad (4.4)$$

1178 where  $N(0, \sigma_{\text{JER}})$  denotes a sample value from a normal distribution centred at zero with  
 1179 as standard deviation the relative resolution in simulation  $\sigma_{\text{JER}}$ , and  $s_{\text{JER}}$  the  $\eta$ -dependent  
 1180 resolution scale factors. These scale factors are derived from data from di-jet or  $\gamma$  + jets events  
 1181 and analysing the  $p_T$  balance. The resolution scale factors (data/simulation) are found to be  
 1182 1.1-1.2 except for the transition regions around  $|\eta| = 3$  and  $|\eta| = 1.4$  [172] and given in Table  
 1183 4.5.

#### 1184 4.4.4 Jets from b fragmentation


1185 Jets originating from the hadronisation of bottom quarks can be discriminated from jets from  
 1186 gluons and light-flavour quarks as well as charm quark fragmentation through the use of b-  
 1187 tagging. There are several algorithms developed within CMS to perform b-tagging [173, 174]  
 1188 on jets that fall within the pseudorapidity acceptance of the trackers. These algorithms exploit  
 1189 the properties of the b quark to identify the jets formed by its fragmentation. These hadrons  
 1190 have relative large masses, long lifetimes and daughter particles with hard momentum spectra.  
 1191 Additionally, their semi-leptonic decays can be exploited as well. To use b-jet identification  
 1192 in an analysis, one needs to know its efficiency and misidentification probability. In general  
 1193 these are function of the pseudorapidity and transverse momentum of the considered jet. Their  
 1194 performances are directly measured from data by use of b-jet enriched jet samples (multi-jet or  
 1195 top-quark decays).

1196 This thesis uses b-jets identified by the Combined Secondary Vertex version 2 (CSVv2)  
 1197 algorithm [173]. This algorithm combines secondary vertices together with track based lifetime

**Table 4.5:** Jet energy scale factors in bins of  $\eta$  with uncertainty


$ \eta $	SF	Uncertainty ( $\pm$ )
0-0.5	1.109	0.008
0.5-0.8	1.138	0.013
0.8-1.1	1.114	0.013
1.1-1.3	1.123	0.024
1.3-1.7	1.084	0.011
1.7-1.9	1.082	0.035
1.9-2.1	1.140	0.047
2.1-2.3	1.067	0.053
2.3-2.5	1.177	0.041

information by use of a multivariate technique. The secondary vertex is reconstructed from displaced tracks within a jet, as illustrated in Figure 4.6. The final state b quark is encapsulated in a B meson (e.g.  $B^\pm$ ,  $B_0$ ,  $B_S$ ) after the hadronisation. This B meson has relatively long lifetime and can travel a measurable distance from the primary vertex before decaying. After reconstruction, the secondary vertices are required to be in accordance with the B meson hypothesis bases on the amount of shared tracks with the primary vertex, the invariant vertex mass to reject kaon decays, and the direction of the tracks compared to the jet axis.

**Figure 4.6:** Sketch showing the common principle of the identification of b-jets. Figure taken from [175]

1205 The b-tagging algorithm performances are evaluated taking into account two cases: discrimination  
 1206 of b-tagged jets originating from charm quarks, and discrimination of b-tagged jets  
 1207 against jets coming from gluons or light (u, d, s) quarks. In Figure 4.7, the misidentification  
 1208 probabilities for different b-tagging algorithms within CMS are shown. Based on the misidentification  
 1209 probabilities for a certain threshold on the CSVv2 discriminator, different working points  
 1210 are defined. These are shown in Table 4.6. The analysis presented in this thesis uses the loose  
 working point which has an average efficiency of 81% and a misidentification rate of 10%.

**NOTE:** Find reason why I am not using cMVA, omdat CSVv2 op ttbar events is gemeten en cMVA op multijet?



**Figure 4.7:** Misidentification probabilities of various b-tagging algorithm in simulation. Figure taken from [174].

**Table 4.6:** Working points used for tagging jets as coming from b quarks for the CSVv2 discriminant.

WP	CSVv2 discr cut	b-tag eff.	misid. prob.
Loose (L)	> 0.5426	≈ 81%	≈ 10%
Medium (M)	> 0.8484	≈ 66%	≈ 1%
Tight (T)	> 0.9535	≈ 46%	≈ 0.1%

1211

1212 The efficiency of tagging a jet as coming from a bottom quark in simulation typically deviates  
 1213 somewhat from data. Efficiency scale factors  $\epsilon_b^{\text{data}}/\epsilon_b^{\text{MC}}$  are derived from data to account for  
 1214 those differences. These scale factors are  $\eta$ -,  $p_T$ -, and flavour dependent, where the flavour  
 1215 of the jet is determined from matched generated hadrons. For cut based analyses these scale  
 1216 factors are applied to the b-tagging efficiencies and mistag rates according to the chosen working  
 1217 point [174]. For shape based analysis however, such as the one presented in this thesis, the  
 1218 scale factors are applied on the distribution of the b-tagging discriminator. This is the so-called  
 1219 IterativeFit method [176].

1220 The uncertainties related to the IterativeFit method cover possible shape discrepancies between  
 1221 data and simulation. The uncertainty coming from the purity of the sample is subdivided into  
 1222 two uncorrelated uncertainties based on the purity of the light flavoured (lf) and heavy flavoured  
 1223 (hf) jet contributions in the sample. Furthermore, the jet energy scale results in jets migrating  
 1224 from one  $p_T$  bin to an other, having an influence on bin dependent scale factors. The statistical  
 1225 fluctuations of the limited amount of entries in each bin are also accounted for and have an  
 1226 influence on the scale factor uncertainties. These have four uncorrelated sources: two for heavy  
 1227 flavour and two for light flavour jets. Since the uncertainty on the scale factors for the jets  
 1228 originating from a charm quark (cf) is determined from the uncertainty on the b scale factors  
 1229 resulting in two independent uncertainties [176].

#### 1230 4.4.5 Missing transverse energy

The missing transverse momentum  $\vec{p}_T$  and energy  $E_T^{\text{miss}}$  resulting from particles that do not interact with the detector material, are calculated by balancing the vectorial sum of the transverse momenta of all particles:

$$E_T = |\vec{p}_T|, \quad (4.5)$$

$$\vec{p}_T = - \sum_{i=1}^{N_{\text{particles}}} \vec{p}_{T,i}.$$

1231 The missing transverse energy is influenced by the minimum thresholds in calorimeters, the  
 1232 inefficiencies in the tracker, and the non-linear response of the calorimeter to hadronic particles.  
 1233 The bias is reduced by correcting the transverse momentum of the jets to particle jet  $p_T$  via the  
 1234 JEC and propagating it to the missing transverse momentum. The performance of the missing  
 1235 transverse energy reconstruction can be found in [177].

## 1236 4.5 Summary of corrections

1237 Throughout the chapter several corrections are introduced to improve the agreement between  
 1238 data and simulation. These corrections are sources of systematic uncertainties for the anal-  
 1239 ysis presented in this thesis. Therefore a summary of the corrections and their associated  
 1240 uncertainties is provided.

1241 **Lepton scale factors** The systematic uncertainty on the lepton scale factors consist of three  
 1242 sources: identification, isolation and tracking. The applied scale factors are varied  
 1243 independently within one standard deviation of their measured uncertainties to account  
 1244 for their systematic impact on the measurements.

1245 **Jet energy corrections** The momenta of the reconstructed jets are corrected to match the  
 1246 expected true energy derived from the hadronisation products of partons in simulation.  
 1247 Furthermore, residual corrections and smearing is applied to match the overall energy  
 1248 scale and resolution for simulation and data. These corrections are also propagated to  
 1249 the missing transverse energy. The systematic uncertainties due to these scale factors are  
 1250 estimated by varying them within their uncertainties and repeating the measurements  
 1251 with recalibrated jets and missing transverse energy.

1252 **CSVv2 discriminant shape reweighting** There are three sources of uncertainty contributing  
1253 to the measurement of the scale factors: statistical uncertainties, jet energy scale and  
1254 the purity of the sample. The jet energy scale uncertainty is 100% correlated to the jet  
1255 energy uncertainties and is evaluated simultaneously. The uncertainty coming from the  
1256 purity of the sample is subdivided into two uncorrelated uncertainties based on the purity  
1257 of the light flavoured (lf) and heavy flavoured (hf) jet contributions in the sample. A  
1258 one sigma shift in each of the two purity contributions corresponds to a higher/lower  
1259 contribution in the purity of the considered flavours. The statistical uncertainties has  
1260 four uncorrelated sources, two for heavy flavour and two for light flavour jets. One of  
1261 the uncertainties correspond to the shift consistent with the statistical uncertainties of  
1262 the sample, while the other is propagated in a way that the upper and lower ends of the  
1263 distribution are affected with respect to the centre of the distribution. The uncertainty  
1264 on the charm jet scale factors (cf) is obtained from the uncertainty on the heavy flavour  
1265 scale factors, doubling it in size and constructing two nuisance parameters to control the  
1266 charm flavour scale factors and treating them as independent uncertainties.

1267 **Pileup** Varying the minimum bias cross section, used to calculate the pileup distribution by  
1268  $\pm 4.6\%$ , results in a systematic shift in the pileup distribution. The uncertainty is estimated  
1269 by recalculating the pileup weights to the distributions associated to the minimum bias  
1270 cross sections.

1271 **Luminosity** The luminosity is measured with a global uncertainty of 2.5%, affecting the ex-  
1272 pected number of events.

# Event selection and categorisation

5

1273


1274 A basic event selection is made for selecting signal like events and is discussed in [Section 5.1](#).  
1275 Also the effect corrections applied to simulation and data, summarised in [Section 4.5](#) is shown.  
1276 The analysis strategy is presented in [Section 5.2](#), defining the signal and background regions  
1277 to constrain the huge SM background compared to the expected signal. [Section 5.4](#) discusses  
1278 each region that is entering the analysis. On top of the use of background estimation from  
1279 control regions, backgrounds that have prompt leptons contaminated by real leptons either from  
1280 decays of tau leptons or from hadronized mesons or baryons (collectively commonly referred as  
1281 “non-prompt leptons”) as well as by hadrons or jets misidentified as leptons<sup>1</sup> are evaluated with  
1282 a data-driven method discussed in [Section 5.3](#).

## 1283 5.1 Baseline event selection and filters


1284 In this analysis a search is performed in a final state made up of a Z boson and a top quark,  
1285 associated or not with a jet, in the leptonic decay of the Z boson and the top quark. The leading  
1286 order Feynman diagrams can be seen in [Figure 5.1](#) and [Figure 5.2](#). The signal considers both the  
1287 single top quark FCNC (tZ in the final state) and the top quark pair FCNC (tZq with q = c, u in  
1288 the final state) events. Their final state signatures consist of three leptons, considering electrons  
1289 or muons, and a jet originating from a b quark. For FCNC tZq, there is an additional up or charm  
1290 jet. Leptons from tau decays are not vetoed and are entering the analysis via their leptonic  
1291 decays. Four different lepton channels based on lepton flavour are considered: eee, eeu, eμu,  
1292 and μμu.

1293 The CMS collaboration recorded in the course of 2016 proton at 13 TeV collisions data with  
1294 a total recorded integrated luminosity of  $35.9 \text{ fb}^{-1}$ . The baseline event selection has a goal to  
1295 substantially reject SM background events, whilst maintaining a high signal efficiency. The  
1296 CMS trigger system, described in [Section 2.2.3](#), filters out the main of the collision events from  
1297 uninteresting processes and dedicated trigger paths are defined to single out the events with our  
1298 required detector signature. The trigger paths are chosen based on on-line triggering objects  
1299 with at least one muon (M), at least one electron (E), at least two muons (MM), at least two

<sup>1</sup>These two classes of contamination will be referred to as not prompt-lepton (NPL) samples.



**Figure 5.1:** Single top quark Feynman diagrams at leading order. The vertex labelled  $tZq$  is the sought-for FCNC interaction.



**Figure 5.2:** Top quark pair Feynman diagram at leading order. The vertex labelled  $tZq$  is the sought-for FCNC interaction.

1300 electrons (EE), at least one muon and an electron (ME), at least three muons (MMM), at least  
 1301 three electrons (EEE), at least two muons and one electron (MME), or at least two electrons  
 1302 and one muon (EEM). For the MC simulation a simple *or* of all triggers is taken and the event  
 1303 is considered when it passes one of the trigger paths. For data however, double counting of the  
 1304 same event has to be taken into account and a procedure to avoid double counting has been  
 1305 put into place. It consists of vetoing in a given dataset the events that are already selected in  
 1306 another, as given in Table 5.1.

1307 For the single lepton triggers, at least one electron (muon) with a transverse momentum  
 1308  $p_T$  higher than 32 (24) GeV is required. The dilepton triggers require an electron (muon)  
 1309 with  $p_T > 23$  GeV and a muon (electron) with  $p_T > 8$  GeV, or an electron (muon) with  
 1310  $p_T > 23$  (17) GeV and an electron (muon) with  $p_T > 12$  (8) GeV. Events collected by the  
 1311 trilepton triggers require an electron (muon) with  $p_T > 16$  (12) GeV, a second electron (muon)  
 1312 of  $p_T > 12$  (10) GeV, and a third electron (muon) with  $p_T > 8$  (5) GeV. The mixed trilepton  
 1313 trigger events require two electrons (muons) with  $p_T > 12$  (9) GeV and a third muon (electron)  
 1314 with  $p_T > 8$  (9) GeV. The HLT trigger paths used in data and simulation are summarised in  
 1315 Table 5.2.

1316 In order to ensure a full trigger efficiency, the off-line  $p_T$  thresholds are set higher than the on-

**Table 5.1:** Trigger logic used to select data events in order to avoid double counting.

Dataset	Trigger Logic
e $\mu$	EM    EEM    MME
$\mu\mu$	(MM    MMM) && !( EM    EEM    MME)
ee	(EE    EEE) && !(MM    MMM) && !( EM    EEM    MME)
single $\mu$	M && !(EE    EEE) && !(MM    MMM) && !( EM    EEM    MME)
single e	E && !M && !(EE    EEE) && !(MM    MMM) && !( EM    EEM    MME)

line trigger thresholds. Selected electrons (muons) are required to have  $p_T > 35$  (30) GeV and  $|\eta| < 2.1(2.4)$ . The electrons and muons corresponding to a tight working point, as discussed in Section 4.4.1 (Table 4.1) and Section 4.4.2 (Table 4.3), are used for analysis. Only events with exactly three leptons are being considered. Events with extra leptons according to looser working points are vetoed. The trigger efficiency estimation is described in Section 5.1.2 and is approximately 100%. To ensure that all reconstructed particles considered for the analysis are corresponding to a proton interaction and to remove signals from beam halo particles as well as detector noise,, several filters are used. These are described in Section 5.1.1.

In addition to three leptons, jets and missing transverse energy are expected from the signal signature. The jets are reconstructed using the anti –  $k_T$  algorithm with a distance parameter of 0.4 using the particle flow particles that are not identified as isolated leptons as input. The jet momentum is determined as the vectorial sum of the particles contained in the jet. Additional selection criteria are applied to each event to remove spurious jet-like features originating from isolated noise patterns in certain hadron calorimeter regions. The jet requirements are discussed Section 4.4.3. The jets are calibrated in simulation and in data separately, accounting for deposits from pileup and the non-linear detector response. Calibrated jets with  $p_T > 30$  GeV and  $|\eta| < 2.4$  are selected for the analysis. A selected jet may still overlap with the selected leptons leading to a double-counting of reconstructed objects. To prevent such cases, jets that are found within a cone of  $R = 0.3$  around any of the signal electrons (muons) are removed from the collection of selected jets. The jets originating from b quarks are tagged using the CSVv2 algorithm, which combines the information of displaced tracks with information of secondary vertices associated with the jet using a multivariate technique. The jets are tagged as a jet coming from a b quark (b-tagged) if the CSVv2 discriminator is above a certain threshold. This analysis uses a threshold that results in an average b-tagging efficiency of 81% and a misidentification rate of 10%. More information about b-tagging can be found in Section 4.4.4.

The missing transverse momentum vector  $\vec{p}_T$  is defined as the projection on the plane perpendicular to the beams of the negative vector sum of the momenta of all reconstructed particles in an event. Its magnitude is denoted by  $E_T^{\text{miss}}$  as shown in Section 4.4.5. Its longitudinal component is calculated by limiting the lepton + neutrino to the W boson mass. In case two solutions arise, the mass closest to the known top quark mass is used.

**Table 5.2:** HLT trigger paths used to select data and simulation events.

Trigger path name	Trigger type
HLT_Mu23_TrkIsoVVL_Ele8_CaloIdL_TrackIdL_IsoVL_v	ME
HLT_Mu23_TrkIsoVVL_Ele8_CaloIdL_TrackIdL_IsoVL_DZ_v	ME
HLT_Mu8_TrkIsoVVL_Ele23_CaloIdL_TrackIdL_IsoVL_v	ME
HLT_Mu8_TrkIsoVVL_Ele23_CaloIdL_TrackIdL_IsoVL_DZ_v	ME
HLT_DiMu9_Ele9_CaloIdL_TrackIdL_v	MME
HLT_Mu8_DiEle12_CaloIdL_TrackIdL_v	EEM
HLT_IsoMu24_v	M
HLT_IsoTkMu24_v	M
HLT_Ele32_eta2p1_WPTight_Gsf_v	E
HLT_Mu17_TrkIsoVVL_Mu8_TrkIsoVVL_v	MM
HLT_Mu17_TrkIsoVVL_TkMu8_TrkIsoVVL_v	MM
HLT_Mu17_TrkIsoVVL_Mu8_TrkIsoVVL_DZ_v	MM
HLT_Mu17_TrkIsoVVL_TkMu8_TrkIsoVVL_DZ_v	MM
HLT_TripleMu_12_10_5_v	MMM
HLT_Ele23_Ele12_CaloIdL_TrackIdL_IsoVL_DZ_v	EE
HLT_Ele16_Ele12_Ele8_CaloIdL_TrackIdL_v	EEE


### 1347 5.1.1 Event cleaning

1348 Some events arising from instrumental noise and beam backgrounds might end up in the  
 1349 data [177, 178]. Spurious deposits may appear in the ECAL from non collision origins such as  
 1350 beam halo particles, or from particles hitting the sensors in the ECAL photodetectors. Conjointly,  
 1351 dead ECAL cells can cause artificial missing transverse energy. Also the HCAL can cause spurious  
 1352 energy from particle interactions with the light guides and the photomultiplier tubes of the  
 1353 HF, as well as noisy hybrid photo diodes. In CMS, different algorithms, so-called filters, are  
 1354 developed to identify and suppress these events.

1355 The ECAL electronics noise and spurious signals from particle interactions with photo detectors  
 1356 are mostly removed via topological and timings based selection using ECAL information only.  
 1357 The remaining effects such as anomalously high energy crystals and the lack of information  
 1358 for channels due to inefficiencies in the read out are removed through dedicated events filters.  
 1359 Five ECAL endcap supercrystal have been identified for giving anomalously high energies due  
 1360 to high amplitude pulses in several channels at once, and are masked. Furthermore, the crystal  
 1361 read out from a small amount of ECAL towers is not available. However, their trigger primitive

information is still available making it possible to estimate the magnitude of unmeasured energy and when the value is too large, the event is filtered out.

The machine induced particles, via beam-gas / beam-pipe/... interactions, that are flying with the beam affect the physics analysis. They leave a calorimeter deposit along a line at constant  $\phi$  in the calorimeter, and interactions in the CSCs will often line up with this deposit. This can be seen in Figure 5.3. Therefore, events containing such beam halo particles are removed from the selection with the CSC Beam Halo Filter. This filter uses information related to the geometric quantities, energy deposits, and timing signatures. For 2016, the filter rejects 85% in a halo-enriched sample, whereas the mistag probability determined from simulation if found to be less than 0.01%.



**Figure 5.3:** Event display of a beam halo event with collinear hits in the CSC (black), missing transverse energy of 250 GeV and a jet of 232 GeV. The hadronic deposit is spread in  $\eta$ , but narrow in  $\phi$ . Figure taken from [177].

Furthermore, there is anomalous high missing transverse energy coming from low quality muons that lead to high- $p_T$  tracks, but are considered not good by the particle flow algorithm. These low quality tracks will be mislabelled as charged hadrons and will therefore be used in the calculation of the missing transverse energy. By investigation the purity of the reconstructed tracks and the relative transverse momentum error of the muons, these events can be filtered out.

Supplementary to previous filters, only events with where the first primary vertex is a well reconstructed primary vertex are selected. The reconstructed primary vertex should have at least five degrees of freedom, the longitudinal distance from the beam spot is maximally 24 cm ( $d_z < 24$  cm), and the transversal distance from the beam spot is maximally 2 cm ( $d_{xy} < 2$  cm).

1382 **5.1.2 Estimation of the trigger efficiency**

1383 The trigger efficiency in data is estimated using a data sample collected using unprescaled  $E_T^{\text{miss}}$   
 1384 triggers. These allow events with a missing transverse energy higher than 110 GeV(120 GeV)  
 1385 and that the scalar sum of the transverse momenta of the reconstructed PF jets  $H_T^{\text{trig.}}$  is at least  
 1386 300 GeV (120 GeV), or a calorimeter (PF)  $E_T^{\text{miss}}$  higher than 200 GeV(300 GeV). For an HB-HE  
 1387 cleaned event the PF missing transverse energy threshold is lowered to 170 GeV. These trigger  
 1388 paths are summarised in [Table 5.3](#) and chosen to be completely uncorrelated with the lepton  
 triggers given in [Table 5.2](#).

**Table 5.3:** Unprescaled  $E_T^{\text{miss}}$  HLT trigger paths for estimating the trigger efficiency. An *or* of the triggers  
 is used to select events.

Trigger path	Requirement
HLT_PFHT300_PFMET110_v*	PF $E_T^{\text{miss}} > 110$ GeV, PF $H_T^{\text{trig.}} > 300$ GeV
HLT_MET200_v*	calorimeter $E_T^{\text{miss}} > 200$ GeV
HLT_PFMET300_v*	PF $E_T^{\text{miss}} > 300$ GeV
HLT_PFMET120_PFHT120_IDTight_v*	PF $E_T^{\text{miss}} > 120$ GeV, PF $H_T^{\text{trig.,tightWP}} > 120$ GeV
HLT_PFMET170_HBHECleaned_v*	PF $E_T^{\text{miss}} > 170$ GeV, cleaned for HB/HE anomalous signals

1389

The trigger efficiency is studied on the main background, namely WZ+jets, with all corrections applied. For this study, the events passing a three lepton cut and at least one jet are being used. The corresponding efficiencies are then calculated as

$$\epsilon_{\text{data}} = \frac{\text{Nb. of events passing lepton and MET triggers}}{\text{Nb. of events passing MET triggers}} \quad (5.1)$$

$$\epsilon_{\text{MC}} = \frac{\text{Nb. of events passing lepton triggers}}{\text{Nb. of total events}} \quad (5.2)$$

The resulting efficiencies and scale factors can be found in [Table 5.4](#), where the scale factors are defined as

$$SF = \frac{\epsilon_{\text{data}}}{\epsilon_{\text{MC}}} \quad (5.3)$$


1390 More detailed scale factors and efficiencies can be found in [Appendix A](#).

1391 The trigger efficiencies are also measured in function of the  $p_T$  of the leptons for which the  
 1392 distributions can be found in [Appendix A](#). The resulting scale factors can be found in Figure  
 1393 [Figure 5.4](#). The trigger efficiencies are measured to be nearly 100% for both simulation and  
 1394 data. The results are dominated by statistics and assigning a large uncertainty to the trigger  
 1395 efficiency based on the dataset collected by  $E_T^{\text{miss}}$  triggers would be over conservative. A one  
 1396 percent uncertainty on the trigger selection for the eeμ and μμμ final states, and 5% for the  
 1397 ee e and eeμ final states is assigned instead. No scale factors will be applied on simulation as  
 1398 they are close to unity. Control plots are made in the dilepton region to validate all corrections  
 applied to simulation and can be found in [Appendix B](#).

**NOTE:** 1399  
 Make sure  
 this is the  
 case

**Table 5.4:** Trigger scale factors for each channel, after three lepton + jets cut, in the Z mass window, by counting number of events.

all	$\mu\mu\mu$	$eee$	$ee\mu$	$e\mu\mu$
1.0000	1.0000	0.9541	1.0006	1.0004%




**Figure 5.4:** The trigger scale factors measured as a function of lepton  $p_T$ , using the dataset collected by  $E_T^{\text{miss}}$  triggers and WZ simulation, after a 3 lepton and jets selection, in the Z mass window. All corrections to simulation are applied. Left, upper:  $e\mu\mu$  channel. Right, upper:  $ee\mu$  channel. Left, lower:  $eee$  channel. Right, lower:  $\mu\mu\mu$  channel

### 5.1.3 Corrections

Mismatches between data and simulation are corrected for via the use of scale factors. These are elaborately discussed in Section 4.4. In this section a short overview of the applied corrections is given and their effect on a dilepton selection is shown.

#### Pileup reweighting

In data, the number of interactions per bunch crossing (pileup) is calculated with a minimum bias cross section of 69.2 mb. The number of simulated pileup events is then reweighted to match the expected number of pileup events in data. Pileup reweighting manifests itself as an altered shape of the number of reconstructed primary vertices as can be seen in Figure 5.5.



**Figure 5.5:** The number of primary vertices before (left) and after (right) pileup reweighting. After a dilepton plus jets selection, in the Z mass window.

1409 Note that Figure 5.5 indicates that even after pileup reweighting, the primary vertex multi-  
1410 plicity is not well described by simulation. This is a known effect, and using a minimum bias  
1411 cross section with a slightly lower value is found to better describe the data. However, the b  
1412 tagging scale factors are only provided for the nominal inelastic cross section, and thus this  
1413 value is used.

#### 1414 Lepton scale factors

The efficiency to select leptons is different in simulation ( $\epsilon_{\text{MC}}$ ) compared to the data ( $\epsilon_{\text{data}}$ ). This is corrected for by applying lepton scale factors (SF) to the simulation that are defined as

$$SF = \frac{\epsilon_{\text{data}}}{\epsilon_{\text{MC}}}. \quad (5.4)$$


These scale factors are measured for the identification, isolation, tracking and trigger efficiencies of the objects as a function of  $p_{\text{T}}$  and  $\eta$  (see Section 4.4.1 and Section 4.4.2). Multiplying these scale factors for each lepton provides an overall efficiency:

$$SF_{\text{global}}^{\mu} = \prod_{\text{i}}^{\#\mu} SF_{\text{ID}}^{\mu}(p_{\text{T}}, \eta) SF_{\text{Iso.}}^{\mu}(p_{\text{T}}, \eta) SF_{\text{Trig.}}^{\mu}(p_{\text{T}}, \eta) SF_{\text{track}}^{\mu}(p_{\text{T}}, \eta), \quad (5.5)$$


$$SF_{\text{global}}^e = \prod_{\text{i}}^{\#e} SF_{\text{ID}}^e(p_{\text{T}}, \eta) SF_{\text{Iso.}}^e(p_{\text{T}}, \eta) SF_{\text{Trig.}}^e(p_{\text{T}}, \eta) SF_{\text{track}}^e(p_{\text{T}}, \eta). \quad (5.6)$$

1415 The effect of the scale factors can be found in Figure 5.7 for the electron scaling and Figure 5.6  
1416 for the muons. The trigger efficiencies are estimated in Section 5.1.2.

1417 Additionally, corrections are made for the energy resolution of the leptons. For the electrons,  
1418 energy smearing and regression is applied [179]. The energy regression uses the detector  
1419 information to correct the electron energy in order to have the best energy resolution by  
1420 correcting local energy containment, material effects, etc.. The energy scale and smearing




**Figure 5.6:** The  $p_T$  of the muons before (left) and after (right) muon scale factors. After a dilepton plus jets selection, in the Z mass window. Both after the Rochester correction.



**Figure 5.7:** The  $p_T$  of the electrons before (left) and after (right) electron scale factors. After a dilepton plus jets selection, in the Z mass window. Both after energy scale corrections and smearing.


1421 is done in order to bring the data energy scale to simulation level. It smears the simulation  
 1422 energies to have identical energy resolution in simulation and data. For the muons, the  $p_T$  is  
 1423 corrected using the Rochester method [180, 181]. This correction removes the bias of the muon  
 1424  $p_T$  from any detector misalignment or any possible error of the magnetic field. The effect of  
 1425 the Rochester correction can be found in Figure 5.8.



**Figure 5.8:** The mass of the Z boson consisting of the muons before (left) and after (right) the Rochester correction. After a dilepton plus jets selection, in the Z mass window.

#### 1426 CSVv2 shape correction

1427 In order to make the shape of the CSVv2 b-tagging discriminant in simulation agree with data,  
 1428 jet-by-jet based scale factors are applied. These scale factors are a function of the  $p_T$ ,  $\eta$  and  
 1429 CSVv2 value of the jet as discussed in Section 4.4.4. The effect of these scale factors can be  
 1430 found in Figure 5.9.




**Figure 5.9:** The CSVv2 discriminant of the jets before (left) and after (right) b-tag scale factors. After a dilepton plus jets selection, in the Z mass window.


#### 1431 Jet energy

1432 The jet energy in data and simulation is corrected by the measured energy response of the  
 1433 detector. This provides  $p_T$ - and  $\eta$  dependent scale factors and are directly taken from the  
 1434 frontier condition database as discussed in Section 4.4.3. The effect of the jet energy corrections  
 1435 can be found in Figure 5.10 and Figure 5.11.

**NOTE:** Figure 5.10  
jet plot



**Figure 5.10:** The  $p_T$  of the jets before (left) and after (right) jet energy scale corrections. After a dilepton plus jets selection, in the Z mass window.



**Figure 5.11:** The  $p_T$  of the jets before (left) and after (right) jet energy resolution smearing. After a dilepton plus jets selection, in the Z mass window.

#### 1436 Missing transverse energy

1437 The energy scale and resolution corrections applied to the jets are propagated back to the  
 1438 missing transverse energy (smeared Type I correction) as discussed in [Section 4.4.5](#). This  
 1439 rebalances the transverse net momentum of the event and improves the missing transverse  
 1440 energy resolution itself.

#### 1441 5.1.4 Reconstruction of kinematic variables

1442 The variables used for the training are related to the reconstructed leptons, jets, Z boson and  
 1443 top quark candidates. The Z boson is reconstructed as the sum of the four vectors of the  
 1444 two same flavour leptons of opposite sign giving the closest value to the Z mass. The third  
 1445 remaining lepton is assigned as the lepton coming from the W boson decay. The reconstruction  
 1446 of the SM top quark candidate is more difficult and done by summing the third lepton, the  
 1447 SM b-jet and the neutrino ( $E_T^{\text{miss}}$ ). The SM b jet is assigned to the jet with the highest CSVv2  
 1448 discriminant. The longitudinal momentum of the neutrino is calculated by putting a constraint

1449 on the lepton+neutrino system with the W mass. In case two solutions are found for the  $p_z^\nu$   
 1450 component, the one that gives the reconstructed mass (lepton + neutrino + b jet) to the known  
 1451 top quark mass is used. The FCNC top quark is reconstructed by summing the reconstructed Z  
 1452 boson and the jet giving the mass closest to the top mass, from the jet collection from which the  
 1453 SM b jet is removed.

1454 The reconstructed objects are validated using simulation by matching the reconstructed  
 1455 objects to their generated counterpart by minimizing  $\Delta R$ . The efficiencies derived for the  
 1456 simulated signal samples and the SM tZq background process can be found in [Table 5.5](#) and  
 1457 [Table 5.6](#).

**Table 5.5:** Efficiencies of assigning the correct leptons in the analysis.

	FCNC tZq	FCNC tZ	SM tZq
W lepton	99%	98%	97%
leptons from the Z boson	99%	98%	97%
all leptons in the decay	99%	98%	97%

**Table 5.6:** Efficiencies of assigning the correct jets in the analysis.

	FCNC tZq	FCNC tZ	SM tZq
SM b jet	99%	98%	80%
c jet	71%	N/A	50%
u jet	83%	N/A	54%

## 1458 5.2 Analysis Strategy

1459 The analysis strategy uses five statistically independent regions to extract limits using a likelihood  
 1460 fit of various observables. Two signal regions, the tZ (STSR) and tZq (TTSR) signal regions, are  
 1461 constructed using the jet multiplicity, focussed on each signal signature (see Tab. 5.9). In order  
 1462 to constrain the rate of WZ+jet events as well as that of NPL backgrounds, three control regions  
 1463 are defined. The WZ control region (WZCR) focusses on NPLs originating from  $Z/\gamma^*$  + jets  
 1464 and simultaneously constrains the WZ+jets background rate. The NPL backgrounds coming  
 1465 from a  $t\bar{t}$  process are constrained by two control regions, TTCSR and STCSR, one for each signal  
 1466 region (TTSR and STSR). In the STSR and TTSR multivariate discriminants based on Boosted  
 1467 Decision Trees (BDT) (see [Section 3.3](#)) are used to respectively discriminate FCNC tZ and FCNC  
 1468 tZq from backgrounds. In the WZCR a discriminating variable between the two backgrounds,  
 1469 WZ+jets and NPLs, is used. In TTCSR and STCSR the dominating process is the  $t\bar{t}$  process, and  
 1470 its rate is estimated by subtracting all other background predictions from data. A simultaneous  
 1471 global fit using the Higgs Combined Tool ([Section 3.4](#)) is performed taking into account each  
 1472 region (STSR, TTSR, WZCR, TTCSR and STCSR) for the four different leptonic channels.

<sup>1473</sup> **5.3 Data driven NPL background simulation**

<sup>1474</sup> One of the most important background consist of events with not prompt leptons. These are  
<sup>1475</sup> mostly instrumental background and are therefore very difficult to model. The NPL background  
<sup>1476</sup> is estimated from data for both its shape and its normalisation.

<sup>1477</sup> The NPL background originates from hadronic objects wrongly reconstructed as leptons, real  
<sup>1478</sup> leptons coming from the semi-leptonic decay of a b or c hadron, or real leptons coming from  
<sup>1479</sup> the conversion of photons that pass the identification and isolation requirements. The dominant  
<sup>1480</sup> source of these NPLs depend on the flavour of the lepton and therefore the events with a not  
<sup>1481</sup> prompt muon ( $\text{NP}\mu$ ) are treated differently than those with a not prompt electron ( $\text{NPe}$ ). For  
<sup>1482</sup> muons, the dominant source is the semi-leptonic decay of heavy flavour hadrons, while for  
<sup>1483</sup> electrons, the dominant sources are hadrons and photon conversions.

<sup>1484</sup> The backgrounds causing NPL contributions are mostly  $Z/\gamma^* + \text{jets}$ (Drell–Yan) and  $t\bar{t} + \text{jets}$   
<sup>1485</sup> dilepton processes, and in a smaller amount  $WW$  processes. All of these backgrounds contain  
<sup>1486</sup> two real leptons and one NPL. Due to the fact that the probability for a lepton to be a NPL is  
<sup>1487</sup> small, backgrounds containing two or more NPL s are neglected in thus search. The assumption  
<sup>1488</sup> is made that for  $Z/\gamma^* + \text{jets}$  the two leptons compatible with a  $Z$  boson decay are the real leptons,  
<sup>1489</sup> and the additional lepton is coming from a NPL source, while for  $t\bar{t} + \text{jets}$  the NPL is associated  
<sup>1490</sup> to the  $Z$  boson. This has been validated using Monte Carlo simulation.

<sup>1491</sup> The NPL sample is constructed from data by requiring exactly three leptons, from which two  
<sup>1492</sup> are considered real, isolated leptons and the third lepton is identified as a NPL. This NPL is  
<sup>1493</sup> created by loosening its identification and inverting its isolation criteria. The full requirements  
<sup>1494</sup> on the not prompt leptons are given in [Table 5.7](#) and [Table 5.8](#). For NPe, a large fraction  
<sup>1495</sup> is coming from misidentified photons. These are removed by applying a tighter cut on the  
<sup>1496</sup>  $1/E - 1/p$  variable, and by limiting the isolation values to be smaller than one.

**Table 5.7:** Non prompt electron requirements used in this analysis. The requirements are set in the barrel ( $|\eta_{supercluster}| \leq 1.479$ ) and the end caps ( $|\eta_{supercluster}| > 1.479$ ).

Properties	$ \eta_{supercluster}  \leq 1.479$	$ \eta_{supercluster}  > 1.479$
$\sigma_{\eta\eta}$	< 0.011	< 0.0314
$ \Delta\eta_{in} $	< 0.00477	< 0.00868
$ \Delta\phi_{in} $	< 0.222	< 0.212
H/E	< 0.298	< 0.101
relative isolation	$\geq 0.0588 \ \&\& < 1$	$\geq 0.0571 \ \&\& < 1$
$ 1/E - 1/p $	$< 0.0129 \text{ GeV}^{-1}$	$< 0.0129 \text{ GeV}^{-1}$
expected missing inner hits	$\leq 1$	$\leq 1$
pass conversion veto	Y	Y
$p_T$	$> 35 \text{ GeV}$	$> 35 \text{ GeV}$

**Table 5.8:** Non prompt muon requirements used in the analysis.

Properties	modified Loose Muon WP
Global muon or Tracker Muon	Both
Particle Flow muon	Y
$\chi^2/ndof$ of global muon track fit	N/A
Nb. of hit muon chambers	N/A
Nb. of muon stations contained in the segment	N/A
Size of the transverse impact parameter of the track wrt. PV	N/A
Longitudinal distance wrt. PV	N/A
Nb. of pixel hits	N/A
Nb. of tracker layers with hits	N/A
Relative Isolation	$\geq 0.15$
$p_T$	$> 30 \text{ GeV}$

<sup>1497</sup> **5.4 Regions and channels**

The regions are defined as in Table 5.9 after a common selection of exactly three leptons containing one opposite sign, same flavour pair that is assigned to the Z boson, at least one jet and at the most three jets, the transverse mass of the W boson to be maximal 300 GeV. The transverse mass  $m_T(W)$  is reconstructed using

$$m_T(W) = \sqrt{(p_T(l_W) + p_T(v_W))^2 - (p_x(l_W) + p_x(v_W))^2 - (p_y(l_W) + p_y(v_W))^2} \quad (5.7)$$

**Table 5.9:** The statistically independent regions used in the analysis.


	WZCR	STS R	TTSR	STCR	TTCR
Number of jets	$\geq 1$	1	$\geq 2$	1	$\geq 2$
Number of b jets	0	1	$\geq 1$	1	$\geq 1$
$ m_Z^{\text{reco}} - m_Z  < 7.5 \text{ GeV}$	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
$ m_Z^{\text{reco}} - m_Z  < 30 \text{ GeV}$	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Number of leptons	3	3	3	3	3

<sup>1498</sup> Additional leptons with a looser identification are vetoed in order to reduce the contamination  
<sup>1499</sup> of backgrounds with four or more leptons in the final state, e.g. ZZ, t̄Z, and t̄H. The most  
<sup>1500</sup> important backgrounds are the ones that contain three prompt leptons in the final state. These  
<sup>1501</sup> are mainly WZ+jets, t̄Z and SM tZq. For these backgrounds, the three lepton topology is  
<sup>1502</sup> identical to the FCNC signal: two opposite sign leptons of the same flavour decaying from the Z  
<sup>1503</sup> boson, and a third additional, high  $p_T$  lepton coming from the W boson decay.

<sup>1504</sup> For the FCNC tZ final state, one b jet coming from the SM top decay is expected. For the  
<sup>1505</sup> FCNC tZq, an additional light jet is expected. In the t̄Z final state, two b jets are present in the  
<sup>1506</sup> final state. However, due to inefficiencies of the b-tagging algorithm, one of the two b jets may  
<sup>1507</sup> be identified as a light quark jet, giving the same final state as the FCNC tZq final state. For  
<sup>1508</sup> the WZ+jets final states, one of the b jets produced by gluon splitting can be b-tagged or light  
<sup>1509</sup> flavour jets coming from the WZ+jets production can be mis-tagged as b jets. The SM tZq final  
<sup>1510</sup> state expects the same signal as FCNC tZq.

<sup>1511</sup> The NPL events give a significant background contribution. This background is coming mainly  
<sup>1512</sup> from  $Z/\gamma^* + \text{jets}$  and  $t\bar{t} + \text{jets}$  processes (in a less significant way, also WW and tWZ contributes),  
<sup>1513</sup> which have very high cross sections and causes a large number of NPL background events  
<sup>1514</sup> compared to signal.

<sup>1515</sup> In order to reduce the large uncertainties in backgrounds, five independent regions are used  
<sup>1516</sup> as defined in Table 5.9. In Figure 5.12, the strategy and usage of each region is illustrated.



**Figure 5.12:** The strategy used for this search. The WZCR region is used to estimate the WZ+jets background process as well as the NPL background coming from the  $Z/\gamma^* + \text{jets}$  process. The TTCR and STCR regions are used to estimate the contributions of the NPL background coming from the  $t\bar{t} + \text{jets}$  process.

### 1517 5.4.1 WZCR

1518 The WZCR is constructed by vetoing events with jets tagged as being a b-jet, making it statistically  
 1519 independent from the signal regions where at least one b-tagged jet is required. In this region,  
 1520 a fit is performed on the transverse mass of the W boson, in order to estimate the NPL yield  
 1521 coming from  $Z/\gamma^* + \text{jets}$  and the WZ+jets backgrounds.

A transfer factor is used to account for going from a region without b-tagged jets to a region with exactly or at least one b-tagged jet. For this the probability of tagging at least one jet with the CSVv2 algorithm at the loose working point is used to calculate the expected number of events,  $N_b$ , after b-tagging:

$$N_b = \frac{\sum_{\text{events}} \mathcal{P}_b}{\text{total nb of events}}, \quad (5.8)$$

where  $\mathcal{P}_b$  is the probability that an event survives the b-tagging requirement

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_b &= 1 - P(\text{event doesn't survive b tag}) \\ &= 1 - \left( \prod_b P(\text{b not tagged}) \prod_c P(\text{c not tagged}) \prod_{uds} P(\text{light not tagged}) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (5.9)$$

1522 with the products going over all b-, c-, and light jets. The jet flavour is determined by means of  
 1523 matching the reconstructed jet to the generated quark based on the distance in the  $\eta\phi$  plane.  
 1524 In order to estimate the probability for exactly one b-tagged jet, the expected number of events  
 1525 is corrected by the fraction of events with exactly one jet in the WZCR. The resulting transfer  
 1526 factors are given in [Appendix C](#). The yield of WZ+jets events in the signal region estimated  
 1527 using the above described transfer factor and the yield calculated with simulated events are in  
 1528 agreement.

1529 **5.4.2 TTCR and STCR**


The TTCR and STCR have are constructed with the same selection criteria as TTSR and STSR but are outside the Z mass window (sidebands):

$$7.5 \text{ GeV} < |m_Z^{\text{reco}} - m_Z| < 30 \text{ GeV}. \quad (5.10)$$

where  $m_Z^{\text{reco}}$  is the reconstructed mass of the Z boson in the event, and  $m_Z$  the mass of the Z boson. These regions are dominated by  $t\bar{t}$ +jets (see Appendix C) and are used to estimate the NPL coming from  $t\bar{t}$ +jets in the STSR and TTSR. Since there aren't enough events entering these regions, no shapes are used in the fit. The distribution of the mass of the Z boson is flat for  $t\bar{t}$ +jets events, as shown in Fig. Figure 5.13, and thus the number of expected events,  $N_s$ , in the signal regions estimated from the number of expected events,  $N_c$ , in the control region is obtained as

$$N_s = \frac{15}{60 - 15} N_c. \quad (5.11)$$

1530 The resulting transfer factors are given in Appendix C. The expected yield in the signal region  
1531 estimated from the TTCR (STCR) is in agreement with the yield calculated from simulated events.



**Figure 5.13:** The normalized distribution for  $Z/\gamma^* + \text{jets}$  and  $t\bar{t} + \text{jets}$  events before dividing the events in to regions, after  $|m_Z^{\text{reco}} - m_Z| < 30 \text{ GeV}$ . All leptonic channels combined.

1532

1533 **5.4.3 TTSR and STSR**

1534 The TTSR is defined to target top quark pair FCNC ( $tZq$ ), while the STSR focusses on single top  
1535 quark FCNC ( $tZ$ ). They have NPL contributions coming from  $Z/\gamma^* + \text{jets}$  and  $t\bar{t} + \text{jets}$  events. In  
1536 this region, the data driven NPL template is split into two templates based on the presence of the  
1537 NPL in the Z boson. The NPL associated with W boson is assigned to  $Z/\gamma^* + \text{jets}$  and estimated  
1538 in the WZCR, while the NPL associated with Z boson is assigned to  $t\bar{t} + \text{jets}$  and estimated in  
1539 the TTCR and STCR.



# The search for FCNC involving a top quark and a Z boson

6

1540

## 1541 6.1 Construction of template distributions

1542 There were no selection criteria found to make a clear rejection of the background events without  
1543 sacrificing a significant amount of signal. For this reason, a multivariate approach using Boosted  
1544 Decision Trees that combines several discriminating variables in the TMVA framework is used.  
1545 For the training, the BDTs are trained against all backgrounds, where the NPL background is not  
1546 taken into account. The BDT settings avoid over-training and maintain a good discriminating  
1547 power against all backgrounds. The background and signal yields follow the relative fractions  
1548 predicted by the simulation.

1549 The variables used to construct the BDTs include the angles, distances, masses and transverse  
1550 momenta:

- 1551 1. pseudo rapidity of the SM top: TT+ST tZ<sub>u</sub>, ST tZ<sub>c</sub>
- 1552 2. invariant mass of the W lepton and the SM b jet: TT+ST tZ<sub>u</sub>, TT+ST tZ<sub>c</sub>
- 1553 3.  $\Delta\Phi$  between the W lepton and the SM b jet: TT+ST tZ<sub>u</sub>, ST tZ<sub>c</sub>
- 1554 4. minimal  $\Delta R$  between the W lepton and jets: TT tZ<sub>u</sub>
- 1555 5. invariant mass of the Z boson: TT tZ<sub>u</sub>, TT tZ<sub>c</sub>
- 1556 6.  $\Delta\Phi$  between the W lepton and the Z boson: TT+ST tZ<sub>u</sub>, TT tZ<sub>c</sub>
- 1557 7.  $\Delta R$  between the W lepton and the SM b jet: TT+ST tZ<sub>u</sub>, TT tZ<sub>c</sub>
- 1558 8. number of CSVv2 medium WP b jets: TT tZ<sub>u</sub>, TT tZ<sub>c</sub>
- 1559 9. invariant mass of the FCNC top: TT tZ<sub>u</sub>, TT tZ<sub>c</sub>
- 1560 10.  $\Delta R$  between the Z boson and the FCNC light jet: TT tZ<sub>u</sub>, TT tZ<sub>c</sub>
- 1561 11.  $\Delta R$  between the FCNC light jet and the SM b jet: TT tZ<sub>u</sub>, TT tZ<sub>c</sub>

- 1562 12. charge of the W lepton times the absolute pseudo rapidity of the W lepton: ST tZu  
 1563 13. b discriminant of the highest  $p_T$  jet: ST tZu, ST tZc  
 1564 14. total Ht of the leptons: ST tZu  
 1565 15. the  $p_T$  of the W lepton times its charge: ST tZu  
 1566 16. total invariant mass of the leptons: ST tZc  
 1567 17.  $\Delta R$  between the W lepton and Z boson: TT+ST tZc  
 1568 18. total invariant mass of the event: TT tZc  
 1569 19. b discriminant of the FCNC light jet: TT tZc  
 1570 20.  $\Delta R$  between the SM b jet and Z boson: TT tZc

1571 The pre fit distributions of the variables used for creating the multivariate discriminator are  
 1572 given in [Section 6.1.1](#). The resulting multivariate discriminator are shown in [Section 6.1.2](#).

### 1573 6.1.1 Distributions of the BDT variables

**NOTE:** include distributions of the vars

### 6.1.2 BDTs

**NOTE:** better to do normalised?

**Figure 6.1:** Distributions of the discriminating variable before the fit, all different leptonic channels together. Upper left: TTSR tZu, upper right: TTSR tZc; lower left: STSR tZu, lower right: STSR tZc.

1576

**Figure 6.2:** Distributions of the discriminating variable before the fit,  $\mu\mu\mu$  channel. Upper left: TTSR tZu, upper right: TTSR tZc; lower left: STSR tZu, lower right: STSR tZc.

**Figure 6.3:** Distributions of the discriminating variable before the fit,  $e\mu\mu$  channel. Upper left: TTSR tZu, upper right: TTSR tZc; lower left: STSR tZu, lower right: STSR tZc.

**Figure 6.4:** Distributions of the discriminating variable before the fit,  $ee\mu$  channel. Upper left: TTSR tZu, upper right: TTSR tZc; lower left: STSR tZu, lower right: STSR tZc.

### 1577 6.1.3 Transverse mass in WZCR

1578 The WZCR is used to estimate the contribution from WZ+jets and NPL background. In this  
 1579 region, a fit is performed on the transverse mass distribution of the W boson. The pre-fit  
 1580 templates are given in [Figure 6.6](#).

**Figure 6.5:** Distributions of the discriminating variable before the fit, eee channel. Upper left: TTSR tZu, upper right: TTSR tZc; lower left: STSR tZu, lower right: STSR tZc.

**Figure 6.6:** The transverse mass of the W boson in the WZCR, before the fit. All different leptonic channels together. Left: scaled to the data, right: normalized.

## 1581 6.2 Systematic uncertainties

1582 The systematic uncertainties entering the analysis are coming from different sources. The  
 1583 experimental uncertainties arise from the reconstruction of the objects and are discussed in  
 1584 Section ???. These influence the number of events passing the selection, so-called normalisation  
 1585 uncertainties, or the relative occupancies of the distributions, so-called shape uncertainties. The  
 1586 normalisation uncertainties coming from reconstruction include the uncertainty of 2.5% on  
 1587 the measured integrated luminosity and the efficiency of the trigger logic used for the analysis  
 1588 which has a 1% (5%) uncertainty on the  $\mu\mu\mu$  and  $e\mu\mu$ ( $ee\mu$  and  $eee$ ) channels. The pileup  
 1589 distribution is calculated via the minimum bias cross section which has a 4.6% uncertainty.  
 1590 This uncertainty results in a systematic shift in the pileup distribution and its shape effect is  
 1591 estimated by recalculating the pileup distribution for each variation of the minimum bias cross  
 1592 section. The effect of the systematic upwards and downwards shift on the pileup distribution is  
 1593 demonstrated in Section ???. The shape uncertainties also include the uncertainties coming from  
 1594 the applied lepton scale factors. Their systematic uncertainty originates from three sources:  
 1595 identification, isolation and tracking. The effect of systematic upwards or downwards shift  
 1596 on shapes is demonstrated in Section ?? and Section ???. The uncertainties arising from jet  
 1597 energy corrections require a recalculation of all jet related kinematic observables and its effect  
 1598 is propagated to the missing transverse energy. The resulting effect of the systematic upwards  
 1599 or downwards shift on shapes is demonstrated in Section ?? and Section ???. The reweighting of  
 1600 the CSVv2 discriminant is also a source of uncertainty. There are three sources of uncertainty  
 1601 contributing to the measurement of the b-tag related scale factors: statistical uncertainties, jet  
 1602 energy scale and the purity of the sample. These result in eight uncorrelated contributions for  
 1603 which the effects on the shapes are shown in Section ???.

1604 Since the NPL sample is artificially made from data by inverting the isolation of the third  
 1605 lepton. Its effect has to be estimated. The shape uncertainty one the NPL processes is obtained  
 1606 by varying the isolation inversion with respect to tight working point to the loose working point  
 1607 for electrons and muons at the same time. This found to have negligible effect. The uncertainty  
 1608 on the normalisation of the overall NPL yield is taken as 50% in accordance the the SM tZq  
 1609 search.

**NOTE:** Add source

1610 The uncertainty on the expected yield of the simulated backgrounds is taken to be 30%  
 1611 of the yield such that it covers all uncertainties at next to leading order accuracy. Theory  
 1612 uncertainties originating from the modelling of the main backgrounds are estimated to account  
 1613 for the effect on the shape of the distributions from the choice of parton density funnctions, and  
 1614 renormalization ( $\mu_R$ ) and factorization ( $\mu_F$ ) scales. The effect of the renormalization ( $\mu_R$ ) and  
 1615 factorization ( $\mu_F$ ) scales is estimated by varying each independently and correlated up and  
 1616 down by a factor of two, where the anti-correlated variations are dropped. The envelope of these  
 1617 variations is used as an uncertainty. The uncertainties coming from the parton density functions

1618 used for simulation are estimated using the PDF4LHC recipe [[Ball:2017nwa](#)], which combines  
 1619 the MMHT14, CT14, and NNPDF3.0 PDF sets [[Ball:2017nwa](#)]. The theory uncertainties are  
 1620 considered for the main backgrounds coming from simulation: WZ+jets, ZZ+jets, tt>Z, and tZq.  
 1621 This is found to have a negligible effect.

1622 The way the uncertainties are treated as nuisance parameters is summarized in Table 6.1.

**Table 6.1:** Uncertainties used in this analysis. The column labelled type represents how the uncertainty is treated for the fit.

Source	Systematic input	Type
nonprompt muon norm.	50%	normalisation
nonprompt electron norm.	50%	normalisation
background t <bar>t&gt;Z norm</bar>	30%	normalisation
background WZ norm	30%	normalisation
background tZq norm	30%	normalisation
background ZZ norm	30%	normalisation
background other MC norm	30%	normalisation
trigger	1% (5%)	normalisation
lepton identification	$\pm\sigma(p_T, \eta)$	shape
JES	$\pm\sigma(p_T, \eta)$	shape
JER	$\pm\sigma(p_T, \eta)$	shape
b-tagging	$\pm\sigma(p_T, \eta)$	shape
pileup	$\pm\sigma$ of min. bias cross section	shape
PDF	PDF4LHC recipe	shape (WZ,tZq, ttZ, ZZ)
luminosity	2.5%	normalisation
renorm. and fact. scales	varying indep. and corr.	shape

### 1623 6.3 Limit setting procedure validation

1624 The analysis strategy has been established using a blinded strategy. Through the use of a pseudo  
 1625 dataset, the limit setting procedure has been validated. Signal injection tests for which the  
 1626 signal strength from a pseudo dataset with a pre-set signal strength is estimated are performed  
 and shown in [Figure 6.7](#).

**Figure 6.7:** The obtained signal strength with the Maximum Likelihood method is in agreement with the signal strength used to generate the Asimov data set for the tZu (left) and tZc (right) couplings.

Another validation has been done by performing a Maximum Likelihood fit in the WZCR only, considering all lepton channels. A simultaneous fit of the signal strength of the NPe, NP $\mu$  and the WZ+jets backgrounds is done by using the multi-dimensional fit in Higgs Combine Tool. The resulting signal strengths with their maximum and minimum value in the 68% CL interval according to a one-dimensional chi-square are:

$$\mu_{FakeMu} = 1.825 - 0.807 / + 0.757 \quad (6.1)$$

$$\mu_{FakeEl} = 1.321 - 0.501 / + 0.323 \quad (6.2)$$

$$\mu_{WZ} = 1.235 - 0.301 / + 0.401 \quad (6.3)$$

When applying these signal strengths as scale factors, the data agrees with simulation as can be seen in Fig. 6.9. Furthermore, a goodness of fit test using the saturated model in combine, resulting in a p-value of 0.3 (see Fig. 6.8).

**Figure 6.8:** Goodness of fit testing in the WZCR using the saturated model with 1000 toys.

**Figure 6.9:** The transverse mass of the W boson in the WZCR for the  $\mu\mu\mu$  channel (left, upper),  $e\mu\mu$  channel (right, upper),  $ee\mu$  channel (left, lower), and 3 electrons channel (right, lower).

Using the normalisations obtained by fitting the WZCR only, one can look at the data/MC agreement in the WZCR for all the variables used to create the BDT variables. These show good agreement and is illustrated in Figure ??

## 6.4 Result and discussion

### 6.4.1 Resulting limits on tZu

**Figure 6.10:** Resulting limits considering the tZu coupling on the BR at 95% CL for the different lepton channels:  $\mu\mu\mu$  (left, top),  $e\mu\mu$  (right,top),  $eee$  (left, bottom),  $ee\mu$  (right,bottom). The current observed (expected) best limit of CMS is given in blue.

**Figure 6.11:** Resulting limits considering the tZu coupling on the BR at 95% CL for the different signal regions: TTSR (left) and STSR (right). The current observed (expected) best limit of CMS is given in blue.

### 6.4.2 Resulting limits on tZc

### 6.4.3 Resulting limits where both couplings are non-vanishing

### 6.4.4 Post fit distributions

### 6.4.5 Nuisance parameters

The expected limits at 95% CL on the BR of for tZu and for tZc surpass the expected limits of 0.027% for tZu and 0.118% for tZc from the 8 TeV analysis. The observed limit at 95% CL on

**Table 6.2:** Expected limits on the branching ratios at 95% CL for the tZu coupling [40, 41].

	expected	$+2\sigma$	$+1\sigma$	$-1\sigma$	$-2\sigma$	observed
$\mu\mu\mu$	0.032%	0.074%	0.050%	0.021%	0.014%	0.053%
$e\mu\mu$	0.032%	0.074%	0.050%	0.021%	0.014%	0.064%
$ee\mu$	0.036%	0.084%	0.056%	0.023%	0.016%	0.056%
$eee$	0.050%	0.13%	0.082%	0.031%	0.021%	0.038%
ST only	0.020%	0.049%	0.032%	0.013%	0.0086%	0.025%
TT only	0.025%	0.054%	0.038%	0.025%	0.017%	0.039%
combined	0.015%	0.033%	0.023%	0.0097%	0.0068%	0.024%
8 TeV ( $19.7 \text{ fb}^{-1}$ )	-%	0.027%	0.42%	0.018%	-%	0.022%
13 TeV ATLAS ( $36 \text{ fb}^{-1}$ )	0.024%	-%	0.35%	0.017%	-%	0.017%

**Figure 6.12:** Resulting limits considering the tZu coupling on the BR at 95% CL. The current observed (expected) best limit of CMS is given in blue.**Figure 6.13:** Resulting limits considering the tZu coupling on the coupling at 95% CL for the different lepton channels:  $\mu\mu\mu$  (left, top),  $e\mu\mu$  (right,top),  $eee$  (left, bottom),  $ee\mu$  (right,bottom). The current observed (expected) best limit of CMS is given in blue.

the BR for tZu is and isn't improving the current best limit of 0.022%. For tZc the observed  
 limit 95% CL is and is improving the current best limit of 0.049%. The latest result on 13 TeV  
 from ATLAS [40] set limits at 95% CL of observed (expected) limits of 0.017% (0.024%) for  
 tZu and 0.023% (0.032%) for tZc.

**Figure 6.14:** Resulting limits considering the tZu coupling on the coupling at 95% CL for the different signal regions: TTSR (left) and STSR (right). The current observed (expected) best limit of CMS is given in blue.

**Figure 6.15:** Resulting limits considering the tZu coupling on the coupling at 95% CL. The current observed (expected) best limit of CMS is given in blue.

**Table 6.3:** Expected limits on the branching ratios at 95% CL for the tZc coupling [40, 41].

	expected	+2 $\sigma$	+1 $\sigma$	-1 $\sigma$	-2 $\sigma$	observed
$\mu\mu\mu$	0.070%	0.15%	0.10%	0.046%	0.032%	0.12%
$e\mu\mu$	0.079%	0.18%	0.12%	0.052%	0.036%	0.096%
$ee\mu$	0.089%	0.20%	0.14%	0.058%	0.040%	0.099%
$eee$	0.12%	0.29%	0.19%	0.075%	0.050%	0.095%
ST only	0.10%	0.23%	0.16%	0.066%	0.045%	0.17%
TT only	0.044%	0.094%	0.066%	0.029%	0.020%	0.043%
combined	0.037%	0.081%	0.056%	0.025%	0.017%	0.045%
8 TeV CMS ( $19.7 \text{ fb}^{-1}$ )	0.118%	-%	0.222%	0.071%	-%	0.049%
13 TeV ATLAS ( $36 \text{ fb}^{-1}$ )	0.032%	-%	0.046%	0.022%	-%	0.023%

**Figure 6.16:** Resulting limits considering the tZc coupling on the BR at 95% CL for the different lepton channels:  $\mu\mu\mu$  (left, top),  $e\mu\mu$  (right,top),  $eee$  (left, bottom),  $ee\mu$  (right,bottom). The current observed (expected) best limit is given in blue.

**Figure 6.17:** Resulting limits considering the tZc coupling on the BR at 95% CL for the different signal regions: TTSR (left) and STSR (right). The current observed (expected) best limit is given in blue.

**Figure 6.31:** Exclusion limits at 95% CL on the FCNC couplings as a function of the cross section of the FCNC process, considering only the tZc (right) or tZu (left) coupling. The current observed (expected) best limit for CMS is given in blue.

**Figure 6.19:** Resulting limits considering the tZc coupling on the coupling at 95% CL for the different lepton channels:  $\mu\mu\mu$  (left, top),  $e\mu\mu$  (right,top),  $eee$  (left, bottom),  $ee\mu$  (right,bottom). The current observed (expected) best limit is given in blue.

**Figure 6.20:** Resulting limits considering the tZc coupling on the coupling at 95% CL for the different signal regions: TTSR (left) and STSR (right). The current observed (expected) best limit is given in blue.

**Figure 6.21:** Resulting limits considering the tZc coupling on the coupling at 95% CL. The current observed (expected) best limit is given in blue.

**Figure 6.22:** Resulting limits considering the tZc and tZu couplings on the BR at 95% CL in the 2D plane. The current observed (expected) best limit is given in blue.

**Figure 6.23:** Resulting limits considering the tZc and tZu vertices on the couplings at 95% CL in the 2D plane. The current observed (expected) best limit is given in blue.

**Figure 6.32:** Exclusion regions at 95% CL on the FCNC branching ratios (right) and couplings (left) in the 2D plane of the two variables. The current observed (expected) best limit for CMS is given in blue.

# Denouement of the top-Z FCNC hunt at 13 TeV

1645

7




Figure 7.1:



# Trigger scale factors



1647 The trigger scale factors measured as a function of lepton  $p_T$ , using the dataset collected by  
 1648  $E_T^{\text{miss}}$  triggers and WZ simulation, after a 3 lepton and jets selection, in the Z mass window. All  
 1649 corrections to simulation are applied.

**Table A.1:** Trigger efficiencies on data events selected with  $E_T^{\text{miss}}$  triggers and WZ simulation for all leptonic channels together. The unweighed number of events is quoted. When there are no events passing the cuts, it is indicated with N/A. The uncertainties are statistical uncertainties.

ALL CHANNEL	data		WZ simulations	
	Efficiency	unc.	Efficiency	unc.
3 lep, at least one jet	117/118 = 99.15 %	12.94%	18047/18055 = 99.96%	1.05%
STSR	6/6 = 100.00%	57.74%	1541/1541 = 100.00%	3.60%
TTSR	26/27 = 96.30%	26.46%	1791/1792 = 99.94%	3.34%
WZCR	69/69 = 100.00 %	17.03%	14405/14412=99.95%	1.18%

**Table A.2:** Trigger efficiencies on data events selected with  $E_T^{\text{miss}}$  triggers and WZ simulation for  $\mu\mu\mu$  leptonic channel together. The unweighed number of events is quoted. When there are no events passing the cuts, it is indicated with N/A. The uncertainties are statistical uncertainties.

$\mu\mu\mu$ CHANNEL	data		WZ simulations	
	Efficiency	unc.	Efficiency	unc.
3 lep, at least one jet	40/40 = 100.00 %	22.36 %	7814/7814 = 100.00%	1.60%
STSR	N/A	N/A	687/687 = 100%	5.40%
TTSR	13/13 = 100.00%	39.22%	763/763 = 100.00%	5.12%
WZCR	22/22 = 100.00 %	30.15%	6238/6238=100.00%	1.79%

**Table A.3:** Trigger efficiencies on data events selected with  $E_T^{\text{miss}}$  triggers and WZ simulation for eee leptonic channel together. The unweighted number of events is quoted. When there are no events passing the cuts, it is indicated with N/A. The uncertainties are statistical uncertainties.


eee CHANNEL	data		WZ simulations	
	Efficiency	unc.	Efficiency	unc.
3 lep, at least one jet	20/21 = 95.24%	29.76%	2211/2215 = 99.82 %	3.00%
STS R	4/4 = 100.00%	70.71%	176/176 = 100.00%	10.66%
TTS R	2/3 = 66.67%	60.86%	242/242 = 100.00%	9.09%
WZCR	14/14 = 100.00 %	37.80%	1744/1748=99.77%	3.38%

**Table A.4:** Trigger efficiencies on data events selected with  $E_T^{\text{miss}}$  triggers and WZ simulation for ee $\mu$  leptonic channel together. The unweighted number of events is quoted. When there are no events passing the cuts, it is indicated with N/A. The uncertainties are statistical uncertainties.


ee $\mu$ CHANNEL	data		WZ simulations	
	Efficiency	unc.	Efficiency	unc.
3 lep, at least one jet	32/32 = 100.00 %	25.00 %	3116/3118 = 99.94%	2.53%
STS R	1/1 = 100.00%	141.42%	255/255 = 100%	8.86%
TTS R	9/9 = 100.00%	47.14%	291/291 = 100.00%	8.29%
WZCR	14/14 = 100.00 %	37.80%	2529/2531=99.92%	2.81%

**Table A.5:** Trigger efficiencies on data events selected with  $E_T^{\text{miss}}$  triggers and WZ simulation for e $\mu\mu$  leptonic channel together. The unweighted number of events is quoted. When there are no events passing the cuts, it is indicated with N/A. The uncertainties are statistical uncertainties.


e $\mu\mu$ CHANNEL	data		WZ simulations	
	Efficiency	unc.	Efficiency	unc.
3 lep, at least one jet	25/25 = 100.00%	28.28%	4906/4908 = 99.96 %	2.02%
STS R	1/1 = 100.00%	141.42%	423/423 = 100.00%	6.88%
TTS R	2/2 = 100.00%	100.00%	495/496 = 99.80%	6.34%
WZCR	19/19 = 100.00 %	32.44%	3894/3895 =99.97%	2.27%




**Figure A.1:** The trigger efficiencies measured as a function of lepton  $p_T$ , using the dataset collected by  $E_T^{\text{miss}}$  triggers and WZ simulation, after a 3 lepton and jets selection, in the Z mass window. All corrections to simulation are applied. 1e2μ channel.




**Figure A.2:** The trigger efficiencies measured as a function of lepton  $p_T$ , using the dataset collected by  $E_T^{\text{miss}}$  triggers and WZ simulation, after a 3 lepton and jets selection, in the Z mass window. All corrections to simulation are applied. 2e1μ channel.




**Figure A.3:** The trigger efficiencies measured as a function of lepton  $p_T$ , using the dataset collected by  $E_T^{\text{miss}}$  triggers and WZ simulation, after a 3 lepton and jets selection, in the Z mass window. All corrections to simulation are applied. 3e channel.




**Figure A.4:** The trigger efficiencies measured as a function of lepton  $p_T$ , using the dataset collected by  $E_T^{\text{miss}}$  triggers and WZ simulation, after a 3 lepton and jets selection, in the Z mass window. All corrections to simulation are applied. 3μ channel.




**Figure A.5:** The trigger efficiencies measured as a function of lepton  $p_T$ , using the dataset collected by  $E_T^{\text{miss}}$  triggers and WZ simulation, after a 3 lepton and jets selection, in the Z mass window. All corrections to simulation are applied. All channel.




**Figure A.6:** The trigger scale factors measured as a function of lepton  $p_T$ , using the dataset collected by  $E_T^{\text{miss}}$  triggers and WZ simulation, after a 3 lepton and jets selection, in the Z mass window. All corrections to simulation are applied. 1e2μ channel.




**Figure A.7:** The trigger scale factors measured as a function of lepton  $p_T$ , using the dataset collected by  $E_T^{\text{miss}}$  triggers and WZ simulation, after a 3 lepton and jets selection, in the Z mass window. All corrections to simulation are applied. 2e1μ channel.



**Figure A.8:** The trigger scale factors measured as a function of lepton  $p_T$ , using the dataset collected by  $E_T^{\text{miss}}$  triggers and WZ simulation, after a 3 lepton and jets selection, in the Z mass window. All corrections to simulation are applied. 3e channel.



**Figure A.9:** The trigger scale factors measured as a function of lepton  $p_T$ , using the dataset collected by  $E_T^{\text{miss}}$  triggers and WZ simulation, after a 3 lepton and jets selection, in the Z mass window. All corrections to simulation are applied. 3μ channel.



**Figure A.10:** The trigger scale factors measured as a function of lepton  $p_T$ , using the dataset collected by  $E_T^{\text{miss}}$  triggers and WZ simulation, after a 3 lepton and jets selection, in the Z mass window. All corrections to simulation are applied. All channel.

## Dilepton controlplots

B

---



# **Statistical independent regions**

---

1651

C

	STS R	TTS R	WZCR	TTCR	STCR	$Tr_{WZCR \rightarrow STSR}$	$Tr_{WZCR \rightarrow TTSR}$	$Tr_{TTCR \rightarrow TTSR}$	$Tr_{STCR \rightarrow STSR}$
<b>FCNC tZu</b>	$3.9 \pm 0.0$	$11.2 \pm 0.0$	$7.3 \pm 0.0$	$0.6 \pm 0.0$	$0.3 \pm 0.0$	$0.22 \pm 0.00$	$0.46 \pm 0.00$	—	—
<b>FCNC tZc</b>	$14.1 \pm 0.1$	$30.9 \pm 0.1$	$15.5 \pm 0.1$	$1.7 \pm 0.0$	$1.2 \pm 0.0$	$0.39 \pm 0.01$	$0.76 \pm 0.01$	—	—
<b>DY</b>	$-4.6 \pm 21.7$	$22.3 \pm 14.3$	$136.9 \pm 48.5$	$-14.0 \pm 22.2$	$-15.9 \pm 11.3$	$0.08 \pm 0.09$	$0.10 \pm 0.10$	—	—
<b>ttbar</b>	$13.1 \pm 2.5$	$9.7 \pm 2.1$	$8.5 \pm 1.9$	$22.3 \pm 3.1$	$33.7 \pm 3.8$	$0.54 \pm 0.31$	$0.70 \pm 0.31$	$0.33 \pm 0.00$	$0.33 \pm 0.00$
<b>DD fake</b>	$62.0 \pm 7.9$	$63.0 \pm 7.9$	$204.0 \pm 14.3$	$41.0 \pm 6.4$	$56.0 \pm 7.5$	—	—	—	—
<b>WZ+jets</b>	$60.9 \pm 1.6$	$83.0 \pm 1.7$	$552.7 \pm 4.6$	$11.9 \pm 0.6$	$8.5 \pm 0.6$	$0.10 \pm 0.00$	$0.15 \pm 0.00$	—	—
<b>tZq</b>	$8.0 \pm 0.2$	$16.9 \pm 0.2$	$7.3 \pm 0.2$	$2.2 \pm 0.1$	$1.0 \pm 0.1$	$0.36 \pm 0.02$	$0.67 \pm 0.03$	—	—
<b>ttZ</b>	$3.5 \pm 0.3$	$42.5 \pm 0.9$	$9.6 \pm 0.5$	$6.8 \pm 0.4$	$0.5 \pm 0.1$	$0.14 \pm 0.02$	$0.61 \pm 0.05$	—	—
<b>ZZ</b>	$4.6 \pm 0.1$	$4.8 \pm 0.1$	$46.2 \pm 0.3$	$0.8 \pm 0.0$	$0.6 \pm 0.0$	$0.10 \pm 0.00$	$0.13 \pm 0.00$	—	—
<b>other</b>	$1.2 \pm 0.3$	$5.6 \pm 0.3$	$6.8 \pm 0.5$	$7.5 \pm 0.7$	$2.4 \pm 0.5$	$0.16 \pm 0.03$	$0.30 \pm 0.03$	—	—

Table C.1: Event yields: All channel. The last three columns represent the transfer factors that have to be applied.

## Bibliography

---

- 1653 [1] MICHAEL E PESKIN and DANIEL V SCHROEDER: **An introduction to quantum field**  
 1654 **theory; 1995 ed.** Includes exercises. Boulder, CO: Westview, 1995. URL: <https://cds.cern.ch/record/257493> (see pp. 1, 6, 11, 16).
- 1655  
 1656 [2] C. P. BURGESS: **Introduction to Effective Field Theory**. In: *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.*, **57**: (2007), pp. 329–362. DOI: [10.1146/annurev.nucl.56.080805.140508](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.nucl.56.080805.140508). arXiv: [hep-th/0701053 \[hep-th\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/0701053) (see p. 1).
- 1657  
 1658 [3] NADIA ROBOTTI: **The discovery of the electron: I**. In: *European Journal of Physics*,  
 1659 **18**:3 (1997), p. 133. URL: <http://stacks.iop.org/0143-0807/18/i=3/a=002> (see p. 2).
- 1660  
 1661 [4] Y. FUKUDA et al.: **Evidence for oscillation of atmospheric neutrinos**. In: *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **81**: (1998), pp. 1562–1567. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.81.1562](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.81.1562). arXiv: [hep-ex/9807003 \[hep-ex\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ex/9807003) (see pp. 2, 14).
- 1662  
 1663 [5] Y. ABE et al.: **Indication of Reactor  $\bar{\nu}_e$  Disappearance in the Double Chooz Experiment**. In: *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **108**: (13 Mar. 2012), p. 131801. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.108.131801](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.108.131801) (see pp. 2, 14).
- 1664  
 1665 [6] C. PATRIGNANI et al.: **Review of Particle Physics**. In: *Chin. Phys.*, **C40**:10 (2016),  
 1666 p. 100001. DOI: [10.1088/1674-1137/40/10/100001](https://doi.org/10.1088/1674-1137/40/10/100001) (see pp. 2–3, 6–8, 10, 42–43).
- 1667  
 1668 [7] S. ABACHI et al.: **Observation of the top quark**. In: *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **74**: (1995),  
 1669 pp. 2632–2637. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.74.2632](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.74.2632). arXiv: [hep-ex/9503003 \[hep-ex\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ex/9503003)  
 1670 (see p. 2).
- 1671  
 1672 [8] F. ABE et al.: **Observation of top quark production in  $\bar{p}p$  collisions**. In: *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **74**: (1995), pp. 2626–2631. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.74.2626](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.74.2626). arXiv: [hep-ex/9503002 \[hep-ex\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ex/9503002) (see p. 2).
- 1673  
 1674 [9] **First combination of Tevatron and LHC measurements of the top-quark mass**. In:  
 1675 (2014). arXiv: [1403.4427 \[hep-ex\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1403.4427) (see p. 2).
- 1676  
 1677 [10] SERGUEI CHATRCHYAN et al.: **Observation of a new boson at a mass of 125 GeV**  
 1678 **with the CMS experiment at the LHC**. In: *Phys. Lett.*, **B716**: (2012), pp. 30–61. DOI:  
 1679 [10.1016/j.physletb.2012.08.021](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2012.08.021). arXiv: [1207.7235 \[hep-ex\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1207.7235) (see pp. 2, 23).
- 1680  
 1681 [11] GEORGES AAD et al.: **Observation of a new particle in the search for the Standard**  
 1682 **Model Higgs boson with the ATLAS detector at the LHC**. In: *Phys. Lett.*, **B716**:  
 1683 (2012), pp. 1–29. DOI: [10.1016/j.physletb.2012.08.020](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2012.08.020). arXiv: [1207.7214 \[hep-ex\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1207.7214)  
 (see pp. 2, 23).

- 1684 [12] NICOLA CABIBBO: **Unitary Symmetry and Leptonic Decays**. In: *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **10**:  
 1685 (12 June 1963), pp. 531–533. doi: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.10.531](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.10.531) (see p. 5).
- 1686 [13] S. L. GLASHOW, J. ILOPOULOS, and L. MAIANI: **Weak Interactions with Lepton-Hadron  
 1687 Symmetry**. In: *Phys. Rev. D*, **2**: (7 Oct. 1970), pp. 1285–1292. doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.2.1285](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.2.1285) (see p. 5).
- 1688 [14] B.J. BJØRKEN and S.L. GLASHOW: **Elementary particles and SU(4)**. In: *Physics Letters*,  
 1689 **11**:3 (1964), pp. 255–257. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0031-9163\(64\)90433-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0031-9163(64)90433-0) (see  
 1690 p. 5).
- 1691 [15] LUCIANO MAIANI: **The GIM Mechanism: origin, predictions and recent uses**. In:  
 1692 *Proceedings, 48th Rencontres de Moriond on Electroweak Interactions and Unified Theories:  
 1693 La Thuile, Italy, March 2-9, 2013*. 2013, pp. 3–16. arXiv: [1303.6154 \[hep-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1303.6154). URL:  
 1694 <https://inspirehep.net/record/1225307/files/arXiv:1303.6154.pdf> (see p. 5).
- 1695 [16] PATRICK KOPPENBURG and SEBASTIEN DESCOTES-GENON: **The CKM Parameters**. In:  
 1696 (2017). arXiv: [1702.08834 \[hep-ex\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1702.08834) (see p. 6).
- 1697 [17] J. A. AGUILAR-SAAVEDRA: **Top flavor-changing neutral interactions: Theoretical  
 1698 expectations and experimental detection**. In: *Acta Phys. Polon.*, **B35**: (2004),  
 1700 pp. 2695–2710. arXiv: [hep-ph/0409342 \[hep-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0409342) (see pp. 6, 15–17).
- 1701 [18] S. ABACHI et al.: **Observation of the top quark**. In: *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **74**: (1995),  
 1702 pp. 2632–2637. doi: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.74.2632](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.74.2632). arXiv: [hep-ex/9503003 \[hep-ex\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ex/9503003)  
 1703 (see p. 6).
- 1704 [19] F. ABE et al.: **Observation of top quark production in  $\bar{p}p$  collisions**. In: *Phys. Rev.  
 1705 Lett.*, **74**: (1995), pp. 2626–2631. doi: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.74.2626](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.74.2626). arXiv: [hep-ex/9503002 \[hep-ex\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ex/9503002) (see p. 6).
- 1706 [20] LHCTOP WORKING GROUP: **LHCTopWG Summary plots**. Sept. 2017. URL: <https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/LHCPhysics/LHCTopWGSummaryPlots> (see pp. 9, 21).
- 1707 [21] ANDREA GIAMMANCO and JEANNINE WAGNER-KUHR: **Measurement of the t-channel  
 1708 single Top-quark production rates in pp collisions at 7 TeV**. Sept. 2011. URL: <http://cms.web.cern.ch/news/measurement-t-channel-single-top-quark-production-rates-pp-collisions-7-tev> (see p. 9).
- 1709 [22] LHCTOP WORKING GROUP: **ATLAS-CMS recommended predictions for single top  
 1710 cross sections using the Hathor v2.1 program**. Sept. 2017. URL: [https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/LHCPhysics/SingleTopRefXsec#Predictions\\_at\\_7\\_8\\_13\\_and\\_14\\_TeV](https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/LHCPhysics/SingleTopRefXsec#Predictions_at_7_8_13_and_14_TeV) (see p. 10).
- 1711 [23] CMS COLLABORATION: **Summaries of CMS cross section measurements**. Oct. 2017.  
 1712 URL: <https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/CMSPublic/PhysicsResultsCombined> (see pp. 10, 20, 22, 50).
- 1713 [24] CÉLINE DEGRANDE: **Effective field theories in the Standard Model and beyond**.  
 Thesis. Université Catholique de Louvain, Sept. 2011. URL: <https://cp3.irmp.ucl.ac.be/upload/theses/phd/degrande.pdf> (see p. 11).
- 1714 [25] ENRICO FERMI: **Tentativo di una Teoria Dei Raggi  $\beta$** . In: *Il Nuovo Cimento (1924-1942)*, **11**:1 (Sept. 20, 2008), p. 1. doi: [10.1007/BF02959820](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02959820) (see p. 11).

- 1725 [26] B. GRZADKOWSKI, M. ISKRZYNSKI, M. MISIAK, and J. ROSIEK: **Dimension-Six Terms**  
 1726 **in the Standard Model Lagrangian.** In: *JHEP*, **1010**: (2010), p. 085. doi: [10.1007/JHEP10\(2010\)085](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP10(2010)085). arXiv: [1008.4884 \[hep-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1008.4884) (see pp. 12–13, 16).
- 1728 [27] J.A. AGUILAR SAVVEDRA, C. DEGRANDE, G. DURIEUX, et al.: **Constraining the MSMEFT**  
 1729 **in the top sector at the LHC.** Working document for the TOP LHC WG. June 2017.  
 1730 URL: [http://www.desy.de/~durieux/topbasis/basis\\_note.pdf](http://www.desy.de/~durieux/topbasis/basis_note.pdf) (see p. 12).
- 1731 [28] ANDY BUCKLEY, CHRISTOPH ENGLERT, JAMES FERRANDO, et al.: **Constraining top**  
 1732 **quark effective theory in the LHC Run II era.** In: *JHEP*, **04**: (2016), p. 015. doi:  
 1733 [10.1007/JHEP04\(2016\)015](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP04(2016)015). arXiv: [1512.03360 \[hep-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1512.03360) (see p. 13).
- 1734 [29] YORIKIYO NAGASHIMA: **Beyond the standard model of elementary particle physics.**  
 1735 Weinheim, Germany: Wiley-VCH Verlag, 2014. URL: [http://www-spires.fnal.gov/  
 1736 spires/find/books/www?cl=QC793.2.N34::2014](http://www-spires.fnal.gov/spires/find/books/www?cl=QC793.2.N34::2014) (see p. 14).
- 1737 [30] P. A. R. ADE et al.: **Planck 2015 results. XIII. Cosmological parameters.** In: *Astron.*  
 1738 *Astrophys.*, **594**: (2016), A13. doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/201525830](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201525830). arXiv: [1502.01589  
 1739 \[astro-ph.CO\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1502.01589) (see p. 14).
- 1740 [31] P. J. E. PEEBLES and BHARAT RATRA: **The Cosmological constant and dark energy.**  
 1741 In: *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, **75**: (2003), pp. 559–606. doi: [10.1103/RevModPhys.75.559](https://doi.org/10.1103/RevModPhys.75.559). arXiv:  
 1742 [astro-ph/0207347 \[astro-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/astro-ph/0207347) (see p. 14).
- 1743 [32] A. D. SAKHAROV: **Violation of CP Invariance, c Asymmetry, and Baryon Asym-**  
 1744 **metry of the Universe.** In: *Pisma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.*, **5**: (1967). [*Usp. Fiz.*  
 1745 *Nauk* **161**, 61(1991)], pp. 32–35. doi: [10.1070/PU1991v034n05ABEH002497](https://doi.org/10.1070/PU1991v034n05ABEH002497) (see p. 14).
- 1746 [33] GUSTAVO BURDMAN: **New solutions to the hierarchy problem.** In: *Braz. J. Phys.*, **37**:  
 1747 (2007), pp. 506–513. doi: [10.1590/S0103-97332007000400006](https://doi.org/10.1590/S0103-97332007000400006). arXiv: [hep-ph/0703194  
 1748 \[hep-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0703194) (see p. 14).
- 1749 [34] T. ET AL. AALTONEN: **Search for the Flavor-Changing Neutral-Current Decay  $t \rightarrow Zq$**   
 1750 **in  $p\bar{p}$  Collisions at  $\sqrt{s} = 1.96$  TeV.** In: *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **101**: (19 Nov. 2008),  
 1751 p. 192002. doi: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.101.192002](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.101.192002) (see p. 15).
- 1752 [35] VICTOR MUKHAMEDOVICH ABAZOV et al.: **Search for flavour changing neutral cur-**  
 1753 **rents via quark-gluon couplings in single top quark production using  $2.3 \text{ fb}^{-1}$  of**  
 1754  **$p\bar{p}$  collisions.** In: *Phys. Lett.*, **B693**: (2010), pp. 81–87. doi: [10.1016/j.physletb.2010.08.011](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2010.08.011). arXiv: [1006.3575 \[hep-ex\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1006.3575) (see p. 15).
- 1756 [36] GEORGES AAD et al.: **Search for flavour-changing neutral current top-quark decays**  
 1757 **to  $qZ$  in  $pp$  collision data collected with the ATLAS detector at  $\sqrt{s} = 8$  TeV.** In:  
 1758 *Eur. Phys. J.*, **C76**:1 (2016), p. 12. doi: [10.1140/epjc/s10052-015-3851-5](https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-015-3851-5). arXiv:  
 1759 [1508.05796 \[hep-ex\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1508.05796) (see p. 15).
- 1760 [37] GEORGES AAD et al.: **Search for single top-quark production via flavour-changing**  
 1761 **neutral currents at 8 TeV with the ATLAS detector.** In: *Eur. Phys. J.*, **C76**:2 (2016),  
 1762 p. 55. doi: [10.1140/epjc/s10052-016-3876-4](https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-016-3876-4). arXiv: [1509.00294 \[hep-ex\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1509.00294) (see pp. 15,  
 1763 19).
- 1764 [38] GEORGES AAD et al.: **Search for flavour-changing neutral current top quark decays**  
 1765  **$t \rightarrow Hq$  in  $pp$  collisions at  $\sqrt{s} = 8$  TeV with the ATLAS detector.** In: *JHEP*, **12**:  
 1766 (2015), p. 061. doi: [10.1007/JHEP12\(2015\)061](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP12(2015)061). arXiv: [1509.06047 \[hep-ex\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1509.06047) (see  
 1767 p. 15).

- 1768 [39] MORAD AABOUD et al.: **Search for top quark decays  $t \rightarrow qH$ , with  $H \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ , in**
- 1769  $\sqrt{s} = 13$  TeV  $pp$  collisions using the ATLAS detector. In: (2017). arXiv: [1707.01404](https://arxiv.org/abs/1707.01404) [hep-ex] (see pp. 15, 19).
- 1771 [40] **Search for flavour-changing neutral current top quark decays  $t \rightarrow qZ$  in proton-**
- 1772 **proton collisions at  $\sqrt{s} = 13$  TeV with the ATLAS Detector.** Tech. rep. ATLAS-CONF-
- 1773 2017-070. Geneva: CERN, Sept. 2017. URL: <https://cds.cern.ch/record/2285808>
- 1774 (see pp. 15, 19, 94–95).
- 1775 [41] ALBERT M SIRUNYAN et al.: **Search for associated production of a Z boson with a**
- 1776 **single top quark and for tZ flavour-changing interactions in pp collisions at  $\sqrt{s}$**
- 1777 **= 8 TeV.** In: (2017). arXiv: [1702.01404](https://arxiv.org/abs/1702.01404) [hep-ex] (see pp. 15, 19, 94–95).
- 1778 [42] SERGUEI CHATRCHYAN et al.: **Search for Flavor-Changing Neutral Currents in Top-**
- 1779 **Quark Decays  $t \rightarrow Zq$  in pp Collisions at  $\sqrt{s} = 8$  TeV.** In: *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **112**:17
- 1780 (2014), p. 171802. doi: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.112.171802](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.112.171802). arXiv: [1312.4194](https://arxiv.org/abs/1312.4194) [hep-ex]
- 1781 (see p. 15).
- 1782 [43] VARDAN KHACHATRYAN et al.: **Search for anomalous single top quark production in**
- 1783 **association with a photon in pp collisions at  $\sqrt{s} = 8$  TeV.** In: *JHEP*, **04**: (2016),
- 1784 p. 035. doi: [10.1007/JHEP04\(2016\)035](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP04(2016)035). arXiv: [1511.03951](https://arxiv.org/abs/1511.03951) [hep-ex] (see pp. 15, 19).
- 1785 [44] VARDAN KHACHATRYAN et al.: **Search for top quark decays via Higgs-boson-mediated**
- 1786 **flavor-changing neutral currents in pp collisions at  $\sqrt{s} = 8$  TeV.** In: *JHEP*, **02**:
- 1787 (2017), p. 079. doi: [10.1007/JHEP02\(2017\)079](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP02(2017)079). arXiv: [1610.04857](https://arxiv.org/abs/1610.04857) [hep-ex] (see
- 1788 p. 15).
- 1789 [45] **Search for the flavor-changing interactions of the top quark with the Higgs boson**
- 1790 **in  $H \rightarrow b\bar{b}$  channel at  $\sqrt{s} = 13$  TeV.** Tech. rep. CMS-PAS-TOP-17-003. Geneva:
- 1791 CERN, 2017. URL: <https://cds.cern.ch/record/2284743> (see p. 15).
- 1792 [46] M. BENEKE et al.: **Top quark physics.** In: *1999 CERN Workshop on standard model*
- 1793 *physics (and more) at the LHC, CERN, Geneva, Switzerland, 25–26 May: Proceedings.*
- 1794 2000, pp. 419–529. arXiv: [hep-ph/0003033](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0003033) [hep-ph]. URL: <http://weblib.cern.ch/abstract?CERN-TH-2000-100> (see p. 17).
- 1796 [47] JUN GAO, CHONG SHENG LI, and HUA XING ZHU: **Top Quark Decay at Next-to-Next-**
- 1797 **to Leading Order in QCD.** In: *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **110**:4 (2013), p. 042001. doi:
- 1798 [10.1103/PhysRevLett.110.042001](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.110.042001). arXiv: [1210.2808](https://arxiv.org/abs/1210.2808) [hep-ph] (see pp. 18, 47).
- 1799 [48] STEPHEN MYERS: **The LEP Collider, from design to approval and commissioning.**
- 1800 John Adams' Lecture. Delivered at CERN, 26 Nov 1990. Geneva: CERN, 1991. URL:
- 1801 [http://cds.cern.ch/record/226776](https://cds.cern.ch/record/226776) (see p. 23).
- 1802 [49] STEPHEN HOLMES, RONALD S MOORE, and VLADIMIR SHILTSEV: **Overview of the**
- 1803 **Tevatron collider complex: goals, operations and performance.** In: *Journal of In-*
- 1804 *strumentation*, **6**:08 (2011), T08001. URL: <http://stacks.iop.org/1748-0221/6/i=08/a=T08001> (see p. 23).
- 1806 [50] R. BARATE et al.: **Search for the standard model Higgs boson at LEP.** In: *Phys.*
- 1807 *Lett.*, **B565**: (2003), pp. 61–75. doi: [10.1016/S0370-2693\(03\)00614-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0370-2693(03)00614-2). arXiv: [hep-ex/0306033](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ex/0306033) [hep-ex] (see p. 23).

- 1809 [51] KENNETH HERNER: **Higgs Boson Studies at the Tevatron**. In: *Nucl. Part. Phys. Proc.*,  
1810 273-275: (2016), pp. 852–856. doi: [10.1016/j.nuclphysbps.2015.09.131](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nuclphysbps.2015.09.131) (see p. 23).
- 1811 [52] ABDELHAK DJOUADI: **The Anatomy of electro-weak symmetry breaking. I: The**  
1812 **Higgs boson in the standard model**. In: *Phys. Rept.*, 457: (2008), pp. 1–216. doi:  
1813 [10.1016/j.physrep.2007.10.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physrep.2007.10.004). arXiv: [hep-ph/0503172 \[hep-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0503172) (see p. 23).
- 1814 [53] LYNDON EVANS and PHILIP BRYANT: **LHC Machine**. In: *Journal of Instrumentation*,  
1815 3:08 (2008), S08001. url: <http://stacks.iop.org/1748-0221/3/i=08/a=S08001> (see  
1816 p. 23).
- 1817 [54] THOMAS SVEN PETTERSSON and P LEFÈVRE: **The Large Hadron Collider: conceptual**  
1818 **design**. Tech. rep. CERN-AC-95-05-LHC. Oct. 1995, p. 20 and 22. URL: <https://cds.cern.ch/record/291782> (see p. 23).
- 1820 [55] JORG WENNINGER and EZIO TODESCO: **Large Hadron Collider momentum calibration**  
1821 **and accuracy**. Tech. rep. CERN-ACC-2017-0007. Geneva: CERN, Feb. 2017. URL:  
1822 <https://cds.cern.ch/record/2254678> (see p. 24).
- 1823 [56] CINZIA DE MELIS: **The CERN accelerator complex. Complexe des accélérateurs du**  
1824 **CERN**. In: (July 2016). General Photo. URL: <https://cds.cern.ch/record/2197559>  
1825 (see p. 24).
- 1826 [57] ANTONELLA DEL ROSSO: **HL-LHC updates in Japan. Projet HL-LHC : une réunion**  
1827 **fait le point au Japon**. In: BUL-NA-2014-272. 51/2014 (Dec. 2014), p. 4. URL:  
1828 <https://cds.cern.ch/record/1975962> (see p. 25).
- 1829 [58] OLIVER SIM BRÜNING, PAUL COLLIER, P LEBRUN, et al.: **LHC Design Report**. CERN  
1830 Yellow Reports: Monographs. Geneva: CERN, 2004. URL: [https://cds.cern.ch/](https://cds.cern.ch/record/782076)  
1831 [record/782076](https://cds.cern.ch/record/782076) (see p. 25).
- 1832 [59] G. AAD et al.: **The ATLAS Experiment at the CERN Large Hadron Collider**. In: *JINST*,  
1833 3: (2008), S08003. doi: [10.1088/1748-0221/3/08/S08003](https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/3/08/S08003) (see p. 25).
- 1834 [60] S. CHATRHYAN et al.: **The CMS Experiment at the CERN LHC**. In: *JINST*, 3: (2008),  
1835 S08004. doi: [10.1088/1748-0221/3/08/S08004](https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/3/08/S08004) (see pp. 25, 33–35).
- 1836 [61] K. AAMODT et al.: **The ALICE experiment at the CERN LHC**. In: *JINST*, 3: (2008),  
1837 S08002. doi: [10.1088/1748-0221/3/08/S08002](https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/3/08/S08002) (see p. 25).
- 1838 [62] A. AUGUSTO ALVES JR. et al.: **The LHCb Detector at the LHC**. In: *JINST*, 3: (2008),  
1839 S08005. doi: [10.1088/1748-0221/3/08/S08005](https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/3/08/S08005) (see p. 25).
- 1840 [63] M. BONGI et al.: **Astroparticle physics at LHC: The LHCf experiment ready for data**  
1841 **taking**. In: *Nucl. Instrum. Meth.*, A612: (2010), pp. 451–454. doi: [10.1016/j.nima.2009.08.039](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nima.2009.08.039) (see p. 26).
- 1843 [64] G. ANELLI et al.: **The TOTEM experiment at the CERN Large Hadron Collider**. In:  
1844 *JINST*, 3: (2008), S08007. doi: [10.1088/1748-0221/3/08/S08007](https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/3/08/S08007) (see p. 26).
- 1845 [65] B. ACHARYA et al.: **The Physics Programme Of The MoEDAL Experiment At The LHC**.  
1846 In: *Int. J. Mod. Phys.*, A29: (2014), p. 1430050. doi: [10.1142/S0217751X14300506](https://doi.org/10.1142/S0217751X14300506).  
1847 arXiv: [1405.7662 \[hep-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1405.7662) (see p. 26).
- 1848 [66] BY JAMES GILLIES: **Luminosity? Why don't we just say collision rate?** In: (Mar.  
1849 2011). URL: [http://cds.cern.ch/record/1997001](https://cds.cern.ch/record/1997001) (see p. 26).

- 1850 [67] BY HARRIET JARLETT and HARRIET KIM JARLETT: **LHC pushes limits of performance.**  
 1851 In: (Aug. 2016). URL: <http://cds.cern.ch/record/2212301> (see p. 26).
- 1852 [68] CMS COLLABORATION. Okt 2017. URL: [https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/CMSPublic/LumiPublicResults#Online\\_Luminosity\\_AN2](https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/CMSPublic/LumiPublicResults#Online_Luminosity_AN2) (see p. 27).
- 1854 [69] **Technical proposal.** LHC Tech. Proposal. Cover title : CMS, the Compact Muon  
 1855 Solenoid : technical proposal. Geneva: CERN, 1994. URL: <https://cds.cern.ch/record/290969> (see p. 27).
- 1857 [70] G. L. BAYATIAN et al.: **CMS physics: Technical design report.** In: (2006) (see p. 27).
- 1858 [71] G L BAYATIAN, S CHATRCHYAN, G HMAYAKYAN, et al.: **CMS Physics: Technical Design**  
 1859 **Report Volume 1: Detector Performance and Software.** Technical Design Report  
 1860 CMS. There is an error on cover due to a technical problem for some items. Geneva:  
 1861 CERN, 2006. URL: <https://cds.cern.ch/record/922757> (see pp. 27, 32, 57).
- 1862 [72] CMS COLLABORATION: **Detector Drawings.** CMS Collection. Mar. 2012. URL: <https://cds.cern.ch/record/1433717> (see p. 28).
- 1864 [73] S CHATRCHYAN, V KHACHATRYAN, A M SIRUNYAN, et al.: **Performance of the CMS**  
 1865 **Drift Tube Chambers with Cosmic Rays.** In: *J. Instrum.*, 5:arXiv:0911.4855. CMS-  
 1866 CFT-09-012 (Nov. 2009), T03015. URL: <http://cds.cern.ch/record/1223944> (see  
 1867 pp. 30–31).
- 1868 [74] TOM DODINGTON: **News from the CMS experimental site: 22 November 2013.** Nov.  
 1869 2013. URL: <http://cms.web.cern.ch/news/news-point-5-22-november-2013> (see  
 1870 p. 31).
- 1871 [75] INSTITUTE OF RESEARCH INTO THE FUNDAMENTAL LAWS THE UNIVERSE: **The CMS**  
 1872 **detector superconducting solenoid.** Jan. 2006. URL: [http://irfu.cea.fr/en/Phoebe/Vie\\_des\\_labos/Ast/ast\\_visu.php?id\\_ast=839](http://irfu.cea.fr/en/Phoebe/Vie_des_labos/Ast/ast_visu.php?id_ast=839) (see p. 33).
- 1874 [76] FERGUS WILSON: **Experimental Particle Physics.** Apr. 2012. URL: <http://slideplayer.com/slide/794631/> (see p. 33).
- 1876 [77] EMRAH TIRAS, BURAK BILKI, and YASAR ONEL: **Commissioning of CMS Forward**  
 1877 **Hadron Calorimeters with Upgraded Multi-anode PMTs and μTCA Readout.** In:  
 1878 (2016). arXiv: 1611.05232 [physics.ins-det] (see p. 34).
- 1879 [78] LUCAS TAYLOR: **Experimental Particle Physics.** Nov. 2011. URL: <http://cms.web.cern.ch/news/electromagnetic-calorimeter> (see p. 34).
- 1881 [79] **Proceedings, 34th International Conference on High Energy Physics (ICHEP 2008)**  
 1882 URL: <http://www.slac.stanford.edu/econf/C080730> (see p. 34).
- 1883 [80] L. BRIANZA: **Precision crystal calorimetry in LHC Run II with the CMS ECAL.** In:  
 1884 *Journal of Instrumentation*, 12:01 (2017), p. C01069. URL: <http://stacks.iop.org/1748-0221/12/i=01/a=C01069> (see pp. 35, 38).
- 1886 [81] SERGUEI CHATRCHYAN, KHACHATRYAN, et al.: **Description and performance of track**  
 1887 **and primary-vertex reconstruction with the CMS tracker.** In: *J. Instrum.*, 9:arXiv:1405.6569  
 1888 CERN-PH-EP-2014-070. CMS-TRK-11-001 (May 2014). Comments: Replaced with  
 1889 published version. Added journal reference and DOI, P10009. 80 p. URL: <http://cds.cern.ch/record/1704291> (see pp. 35, 58).

- 1891 [82] BY CHRISTINE SUTTON: **Chronicles of CMS: the saga of LS1**. In: (May 2015). URL:  
1892 <http://cds.cern.ch/record/2024986> (see p. 36).
- 1893 [83] **A beautiful barrel for CMS**. In: (Mar. 2014). URL: <http://cds.cern.ch/record/1998635> (see p. 36).
- 1895 [84] VARDAN KHACHATRYAN et al.: **The CMS trigger system**. In: *JINST*, **12**:01 (2017),  
1896 P01020. DOI: [10.1088/1748-0221/12/01/P01020](https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/12/01/P01020). arXiv: [1609.02366 \[physics.ins-det\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1609.02366) (see p. 37).
- 1898 [85] BY CORINNE PRALAVORIO and CORINNE PRALAVORIO: **Major work to ready the LHC  
1899 experiments for Run 2**. In: (May 2015). URL: <http://cds.cern.ch/record/2024977> (see p. 37).
- 1901 [86] LUIGI GUIDUCCI: **CMS muon system towards LHC Run 2 and beyond**. Tech. rep.  
1902 CMS-CR-2014-333. Geneva: CERN, Oct. 2014. URL: <https://cds.cern.ch/record/1966038> (see p. 38).
- 1904 [87] CARLO BATTILANA: **The CMS muon system status and upgrades for LHC run-2 and  
1905 performance of muon reconstruction with 13 TeV data**. Tech. rep. CMS-CR-2016-  
1906 437. Geneva: CERN, Dec. 2016. URL: <http://cds.cern.ch/record/2239185> (see  
1907 p. 38).
- 1908 [88] SERGUEI CHATRCHYAN et al.: **Energy Calibration and Resolution of the CMS Elec-  
1909 tronagnetic Calorimeter in  $pp$  Collisions at  $\sqrt{s} = 7$  TeV**. In: *JINST*, **8**: (2013).  
1910 [*JINST8,9009(2013)*], P09009. DOI: [10.1088/1748-0221/8/09/P09009](https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/8/09/P09009). arXiv: [1306.2016 \[hep-ex\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1306.2016) (see p. 38).
- 1912 [89] **Cool running for CMS tracker**. In: (Mar. 2014). URL: <http://cds.cern.ch/record/1998606> (see p. 38).
- 1914 [90] L. CADAMURO: **The CMS Level-1 trigger system for LHC Run II**. In: *Journal of  
1915 Instrumentation*, **12**:03 (2017), p. C03021. URL: <http://stacks.iop.org/1748-0221/12/i=03/a=C03021> (see p. 38).
- 1917 [91] DAVID AARON MATZNER DOMINGUEZ, D. ABBANEO, K. ARNDT, et al.: **CMS Technical  
1918 Design Report for the Pixel Detector Upgrade**. In: (2012) (see p. 39).
- 1919 [92] HANNO CHRISTOPHER PERREY: **Plans and Status of the Phase I Upgrade of the  
1920 CMS Pixel Tracker**. Tech. rep. CMS-CR-2014-005. Geneva: CERN, Jan. 2014. URL:  
1921 <http://cds.cern.ch/record/1644757> (see p. 39).
- 1922 [93] CLAUDIO GRANDI, DAVID STICKLAND, LUCAS TAYLOR, ACHILLE PETRILLI, and ALAIN  
1923 HERVÉ: **CMS Computing Model: The "CMS Computing Model RTAG"**. Tech. rep.  
1924 CMS-NOTE-2004-031. CERN-LHCC-2004-035. LHCC-G-083. Geneva: CERN, Dec.  
1925 2004. URL: <http://cds.cern.ch/record/814248> (see p. 39).
- 1926 [94] CHRISTOPH ECK, J KNOBLOCH, LESLIE ROBERTSON, et al.: **LHC computing Grid: Tech-  
1927 nical Design Report. Version 1.06 (20 Jun 2005)**. Technical Design Report LCG.  
1928 Geneva: CERN, 2005. URL: <https://cds.cern.ch/record/840543> (see p. 39).
- 1929 [95] WORLDWIDE LHC COMPUTING GRID: **WorldWide LHC Computing Gird - 2017**. Oct.  
1930 2017. URL: <http://wlcg-public.web.cern.ch> (see p. 40).

- 1931 [96] JOHN C. COLLINS, DAVISON E. SOPER, and GEORGE F. STERMAN: **Factorization of Hard**  
 1932 **Processes in QCD.** In: *Adv. Ser. Direct. High Energy Phys.*, **5**: (1989), pp. 1–91. doi:  
 1933 [10.1142/9789814503266\\_0001](https://doi.org/10.1142/9789814503266_0001). arXiv: [hep-ph/0409313](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0409313) [hep-ph] (see p. 41).
- 1934 [97] RINGAILE PLACAKYTE: **Parton Distribution Functions.** In: *Proceedings, 31st International Conference on Physics in collisions (PIC 2011): Vancouver, Canada, August 28–September 1, 2011.* 2011. arXiv: [1111.5452](https://arxiv.org/abs/1111.5452) [hep-ph]. URL: <https://inspirehep.net/record/954990/files/arXiv:1111.5452.pdf> (see p. 41).
- 1938 [98] RICHARD D. BALL, VALERIO BERTONE, STEFANO CARRAZZA, et al.: **Parton distributions for the LHC run II.** In: *Journal of High Energy Physics*, **2015**:4 (2015), p. 40. doi:  
 1939 [10.1007/JHEP04\(2015\)040](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP04(2015)040) (see p. 41).
- 1941 [99] JON BUTTERWORTH et al.: **PDF4LHC recommendations for LHC Run II.** In: *J. Phys.*,  
 1942 **G43:** (2016), p. 023001. doi: [10.1088/0954-3899/43/2/023001](https://doi.org/10.1088/0954-3899/43/2/023001). arXiv: [1510.03865](https://arxiv.org/abs/1510.03865)  
 1943 [hep-ph] (see pp. 41–42).
- 1944 [100] H. ABRAMOWICZ and A. CALDWELL: **HERA collider physics.** In: *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, **71**:  
 1945 (1999), pp. 1275–1410. doi: [10.1103/RevModPhys.71.1275](https://doi.org/10.1103/RevModPhys.71.1275). arXiv: [hep-ex/9903037](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ex/9903037)  
 1946 [hep-ex] (see p. 42).
- 1947 [101] STEPHEN HOLMES, RONALD S. MOORE, and VLADIMIR SHILTSEV: **Overview of the Tevatron Collider Complex: Goals, Operations and Performance.** In: *JINST*, **6**: (2011),  
 1948 T08001. doi: [10.1088/1748-0221/6/08/T08001](https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/6/08/T08001). arXiv: [1106.0909](https://arxiv.org/abs/1106.0909) [physics.acc-ph]  
 1949 (see p. 42).
- 1951 [102] JUAN ROJO et al.: **The PDF4LHC report on PDFs and LHC data: Results from Run I and preparation for Run II.** In: *J. Phys.*, **G42**: (2015), p. 103103. doi: [10.1088/0954-3899/42/10/103103](https://doi.org/10.1088/0954-3899/42/10/103103). arXiv: [1507.00556](https://arxiv.org/abs/1507.00556) [hep-ph] (see p. 42).
- 1954 [103] ALAN D. MARTIN: **Proton structure, Partons, QCD, DGLAP and beyond.** In: *Acta Phys. Polon.*, **B39**: (2008), pp. 2025–2062. arXiv: [0802.0161](https://arxiv.org/abs/0802.0161) [hep-ph] (see p. 42).
- 1956 [104] J. PUMPLIN, D. STUMP, R. BROCK, et al.: **Uncertainties of predictions from parton distribution functions. 2. The Hessian method.** In: *Phys. Rev.*, **D65**: (2001), p. 014013.  
 1958 doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.65.014013](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.65.014013). arXiv: [hep-ph/0101032](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0101032) [hep-ph] (see p. 42).
- 1959 [105] FRANZ MANDL and GRAHAM G SHAW: **Quantum field theory; 2nd ed.** New York, NY:  
 1960 Wiley, 2010. URL: <https://cds.cern.ch/record/1236742> (see p. 44).
- 1961 [106] S BANERJEE: **CMS Simulation Software.** In: *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*,  
 1962 **396**:2 (2012), p. 022003. URL: <http://stacks.iop.org/1742-6596/396/i=2/a=022003>  
 1963 (see p. 44).
- 1964 [107] M HILDRETH, V N IVANCHENKO, D J LANGE, and M J KORTELAINEN: **CMS Full Simulation for Run-2.** In: *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, **664**:7 (2015), p. 072022.  
 1965 URL: <http://stacks.iop.org/1742-6596/664/i=7/a=072022> (see p. 44).
- 1967 [108] S. AGOSTINELLI, J. ALLISON, K. AMAKO, et al.: **Geant4-a simulation toolkit.** In: *Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section A: Accelerators, Spectrometers, Detectors and Associated Equipment*, **506**:3 (2003), pp. 250–303. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-9002\(03\)01368-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-9002(03)01368-8) (see pp. 44, 46).

- 1971 [109] MICHAEL H. SEYMOUR and MARILYN MARX: **Monte Carlo Event Generators**. In: *Proceedings, 69th Scottish Universities Summer School in Physics : LHC Phenomenology (SUSSP69): St.Andrews, Scotland, August 19-September 1, 2012.* 2013, pp. 287–319. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-319-05362-2\\_8](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-05362-2_8). arXiv: [1304.6677 \[hep-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1304.6677) (see p. 44).
- 1975 [110] TORBJORN SJÖSTRAND: **Monte Carlo Tools**. In: *Proceedings, 65th Scottish Universities Summer School in Physics: LHC Physics (SUSSP65): St. Andrews, UK, August 16-29, 2009.* 2009, pp. 309–339. DOI: [10.1201/b11865-14](https://doi.org/10.1201/b11865-14). arXiv: [0911.5286 \[hep-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/0911.5286) (see p. 44).
- 1979 [111] STEFAN HÖCHE: **Introduction to parton-shower event generators**. In: *Proceedings, Theoretical Advanced Study Institute in Elementary Particle Physics: Journeys Through the Precision Frontier: Amplitudes for Colliders (TASI 2014): Boulder, Colorado, June 2-27, 2014.* 2015, pp. 235–295. DOI: [10.1142/9789814678766\\_0005](https://doi.org/10.1142/9789814678766_0005). arXiv: [1411.4085 \[hep-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1411.4085) (see pp. 44–45).
- 1984 [112] ADAM ALLOUL, NEIL D. CHRISTENSEN, CÉLINE DEGRANDE, CLAUDE DUHR, and BENJAMIN FUKS: **FeynRules 2.0 - A complete toolbox for tree-level phenomenology**. In: *Comput. Phys. Commun.*, **185**: (2014), pp. 2250–2300. DOI: [10.1016/j.cpc.2014.04.012](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpc.2014.04.012). arXiv: [1310.1921 \[hep-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1310.1921) (see p. 44).
- 1988 [113] CELINE DEGRANDE, CLAUDE DUHR, BENJAMIN FUKS, et al.: **UFO - The Universal FeynRules Output**. In: *Comput. Phys. Commun.*, **183**: (2012), pp. 1201–1214. DOI: [10.1016/j.cpc.2012.01.022](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpc.2012.01.022). arXiv: [1108.2040 \[hep-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1108.2040) (see p. 44).
- 1991 [114] JOHAN ALWALL, MICHEL HERQUET, FABIO MALTONI, OLIVIER MATTELAER, and TIM STELZER: **MadGraph 5 : Going Beyond**. In: *JHEP*, **06**: (2011), p. 128. DOI: [10.1007/JHEP06\(2011\)128](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP06(2011)128). arXiv: [1106.0522 \[hep-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1106.0522) (see pp. 45, 48).
- 1994 [115] MICHELANGELO L. MANGANO, MAURO MORETTI, FULVIO PICCININI, and MICHELE TREC-CANI: **Matching matrix elements and shower evolution for top-quark production in hadronic collisions**. In: *JHEP*, **01**: (2007), p. 013. DOI: [10.1088/1126-6708/2007/01/013](https://doi.org/10.1088/1126-6708/2007/01/013). arXiv: [hep-ph/0611129 \[hep-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0611129) (see p. 45).
- 1998 [116] TORBJORN SJOSTRAND, STEFAN ASK, JESPER R. CHRISTIANSEN, et al.: **An introduction to {PYTHIA} 8.2**. In: *Computer Physics Communications*, **191**: (2015), pp. 159–177. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cpc.2015.01.024> (see pp. 45–46).
- 2001 [117] TORBJORN SJOSTRAND, STEPHEN MRENNA, and PETER Z. SKANDS: **PYTHIA 6.4 Physics and Manual**. In: *JHEP*, **0605**: (2006), p. 026. DOI: [10.1088/1126-6708/2006/05/026](https://doi.org/10.1088/1126-6708/2006/05/026). arXiv: [hep-ph/0603175 \[hep-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0603175) (see pp. 45–46).
- 2004 [118] TORBJORN SJOSTRAND, STEFAN ASK, JESPER R. CHRISTIANSEN, et al.: **An Introduction to PYTHIA 8.2**. In: *Comput. Phys. Commun.*, **191**: (2015), pp. 159–177. DOI: [10.1016/j.cpc.2015.01.024](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpc.2015.01.024). arXiv: [1410.3012 \[hep-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1410.3012) (see pp. 45–46, 48–49).
- 2007 [119] JOHAN ALWALL et al.: **Comparative study of various algorithms for the merging of parton showers and matrix elements in hadronic collisions**. In: *Eur. Phys. J.*, **C53**: (2008), pp. 473–500. DOI: [10.1140/epjc/s10052-007-0490-5](https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-007-0490-5). arXiv: [0706.2569 \[hep-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/0706.2569) (see pp. 45, 48).

- 2011 [120] J. ALWALL, R. FREDERIX, S. FRIXIONE, et al.: **The automated computation of tree-level and next-to-leading order differential cross sections, and their matching to parton shower simulations.** In: *JHEP*, **07**: (2014), p. 079. doi: [10.1007/JHEP07\(2014\)079](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP07(2014)079). arXiv: [1405.0301 \[hep-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1405.0301) (see p. 45).
- 2015 [121] STEFANO FRIXIONE and BRYAN R. WEBBER: **Matching NLO QCD computations and parton shower simulations.** In: *JHEP*, **06**: (2002), p. 029. doi: [10.1088/1126-6708/2002/06/029](https://doi.org/10.1088/1126-6708/2002/06/029). arXiv: [hep-ph/0204244 \[hep-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0204244) (see pp. 45, 48).
- 2018 [122] RIKKERT FREDERIX and STEFANO FRIXIONE: **Merging meets matching in MC@NLO.** In: *JHEP*, **12**: (2012), p. 061. doi: [10.1007/JHEP12\(2012\)061](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP12(2012)061). arXiv: [1209.6215 \[hep-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1209.6215) (see p. 45).
- 2021 [123] SIMONE ALIOLI, PAOLO NASON, CARLO OLEARI, and EMANUELE RE: **A general framework for implementing NLO calculations in shower Monte Carlo programs: the POWHEG BOX.** In: *Journal of High Energy Physics*, **2010**:6 (2010), p. 43. doi: [10.1007/JHEP06\(2010\)043](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP06(2010)043) (see pp. 45, 48).
- 2025 [124] SIMONE ALIOLI, PAOLO NASON, CARLO OLEARI, and EMANUELE RE: **NLO single-top production matched with shower in POWHEG: s - and t -channel contributions.** In: *Journal of High Energy Physics*, **2009**:09 (2009), p. 111. URL: <http://stacks.iop.org/1126-6708/2009/i=09/a=111> (see pp. 45, 48).
- 2029 [125] STEFANO FRIXIONE, PAOLO NASON, and CARLO OLEARI: **Matching NLO QCD computations with parton shower simulations: the POWHEG method.** In: *Journal of High Energy Physics*, **2007**:11 (2007), p. 070. URL: <http://stacks.iop.org/1126-6708/2007/i=11/a=070> (see pp. 45, 48).
- 2033 [126] SIMONE ALIOLI, PAOLO NASON, CARLO OLEARI, and EMANUELE RE: **A general framework for implementing NLO calculations in shower Monte Carlo programs: the POWHEG BOX.** In: *JHEP*, **06**: (2010), p. 043. doi: [10.1007/JHEP06\(2010\)043](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP06(2010)043). arXiv: [1002.2581 \[hep-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1002.2581) (see pp. 45, 48).
- 2037 [127] STEFANO FRIXIONE, PAOLO NASON, and CARLO OLEARI: **Matching NLO QCD computations with Parton Shower simulations: the POWHEG method.** In: *JHEP*, **11**: (2007), p. 070. doi: [10.1088/1126-6708/2007/11/070](https://doi.org/10.1088/1126-6708/2007/11/070). arXiv: [0709.2092 \[hep-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/0709.2092) (see pp. 45, 48).
- 2041 [128] PAOLO NASON: **A New method for combining NLO QCD with shower Monte Carlo algorithms.** In: *JHEP*, **11**: (2004), p. 040. doi: [10.1088/1126-6708/2004/11/040](https://doi.org/10.1088/1126-6708/2004/11/040). arXiv: [hep-ph/0409146 \[hep-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0409146) (see pp. 45, 48).
- 2044 [129] ANDREI V. GRITSAN, RAOUL RÖNTSCH, MARKUS SCHULZE, and MENG XIAO: **Constraining anomalous Higgs boson couplings to the heavy flavor fermions using matrix element techniques.** In: *Phys. Rev.*, **D94**:5 (2016), p. 055023. doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.94.055023](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.94.055023). arXiv: [1606.03107 \[hep-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1606.03107) (see pp. 45, 48).
- 2048 [130] IAN ANDERSON et al.: **Constraining anomalous HVV interactions at proton and lepton colliders.** In: *Phys. Rev.*, **D89**:3 (2014), p. 035007. doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.89.035007](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.89.035007). arXiv: [1309.4819 \[hep-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1309.4819) (see pp. 45, 48).
- 2051 [131] SARA BOLOGNESI, YANYAN GAO, ANDREI V. GRITSAN, et al.: **On the spin and parity of a single-produced resonance at the LHC.** In: *Phys. Rev.*, **D86**: (2012), p. 095031. doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.86.095031](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.86.095031). arXiv: [1208.4018 \[hep-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1208.4018) (see pp. 45, 48).

- 2054 [132] YANYAN GAO, ANDREI V. GRITSAN, ZIJIN GUO, et al.: **Spin determination of single-produced resonances at hadron colliders.** In: *Phys. Rev.*, **D81**: (2010), p. 075022.  
 2055 DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.81.075022](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.81.075022). arXiv: [1001.3396 \[hep-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1001.3396) (see pp. 45, 48).
- 2056
- 2057 [133] PIERRE ARTOISENET, RIKKERT FREDERIX, OLIVIER MATTELAER, and ROBBERT RIETKERK: **Automatic spin-entangled decays of heavy resonances in Monte Carlo simulations.** In: *JHEP*, **03**: (2013), p. 015. DOI: [10.1007/JHEP03\(2013\)015](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP03(2013)015). arXiv: [1212.3460 \[hep-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1212.3460) (see p. 46).
- 2058
- 2059
- 2060
- 2061 [134] V. KHACHATRYAN and ETAL: **Event generator tunes obtained from underlying event and multiparton scattering measurements.** In: *The European Physical Journal C*, **76**:3 (Mar. 17, 2016), p. 155. DOI: [10.1140/epjc/s10052-016-3988-x](https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-016-3988-x) (see p. 46).
- 2062
- 2063
- 2064 [135] RICHARD D. BALL et al.: **Parton distributions with LHC data.** In: *Nucl. Phys.*, **B867**: (2013), pp. 244–289. DOI: [10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2012.10.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2012.10.003). arXiv: [1207.1303 \[hep-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1207.1303) (see p. 46).
- 2065
- 2066
- 2067 [136] YUE ZHANG, BO HUA LI, CHONG SHENG LI, JUN GAO, and HUA XING ZHU: **Next-to-leading order QCD corrections to the top quark associated with  $\gamma$  production via model-independent flavor-changing neutral-current couplings at hadron colliders.** In: *Phys. Rev.*, **D83**: (2011), p. 094003. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.83.094003](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.83.094003). arXiv: [1101.5346 \[hep-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1101.5346) (see p. 47).
- 2068
- 2069
- 2070
- 2071
- 2072 [137] J ALWALL, R FREDERIX, S FRIXIONE, et al.: **The automated computation of tree-level and next-to-leading order differential cross sections, and their matching to parton shower simulations.** In: *JHEP*, **07**:arXiv:1405.0301. CERN-PH-TH-2014-064. CP3-14-18. LPN14-066. MCNET-14-09. ZU-TH 14-14 (May 2014), 079. 158 p. URL: <http://cds.cern.ch/record/1699128> (see p. 48).
- 2073
- 2074
- 2075
- 2076
- 2077 [138] RIKKERT FREDERIX and STEFANO FRIXIONE: **Merging meets matching in MC@NLO.** In: *JHEP*, **12**:arXiv:1209.6215. CERN-PH-TH-2012-247. ZU-TH 21-12 (Sept. 2012). Comments: 40 pages, 14 figures, 061. 40 p. URL: <http://cds.cern.ch/record/1481985> (see p. 48).
- 2078
- 2079
- 2080
- 2081 [139] **CMS Monte Carlo Generator Group** (see pp. 48–49).
- 2082 [140] T. GEHRMANN, M. GRAZZINI, S. KALLWEIT, et al.:  **$W^+W^-$  Production at Hadron Colliders in Next to Next to Leading Order QCD.** In: *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **113**:21 (2014), p. 212001. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.113.212001](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.113.212001). arXiv: [1408.5243 \[hep-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1408.5243) (see p. 49).
- 2083
- 2084
- 2085
- 2086 [141] A. HOECKER, P. SPECKMAYER, J. STELZER, et al.: **TMVA - Toolkit for Multivariate Data Analysis.** In: *ArXiv Physics e-prints*, (Mar. 2007). eprint: [physics/0703039](https://arxiv.org/abs/physics/0703039) (see p. 50).
- 2087
- 2088 [142] R. BRUN and F. RADEMAKERS: **ROOT: An object oriented data analysis framework.** In: *Nucl. Instrum. Meth.*, **A389**: (1997), pp. 81–86. DOI: [10.1016/S0168-9002\(97\)00048-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-9002(97)00048-X) (see p. 50).
- 2089
- 2090
- 2091 [143] A. MAYR, H. BINDER, O. GEFELLER, and M. SCHMID: **The Evolution of Boosting Algorithms - From Machine Learning to Statistical Modelling.** In: *ArXiv e-prints*, (Mar. 2014). arXiv: [1403.1452 \[stat.ME\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1403.1452) (see p. 51).
- 2092
- 2093
- 2094 [144] OLAF BEHNKE, KEVIN KRONINGER, GREGORY SCHOTT, and THOMAS SCHORNER-SADENIUS: **Data Analysis in High Energy Physics: A Practical Guide to Statistical Methods.** 1st. Wiley-VCH, 2013 (see p. 51).
- 2095
- 2096

- 2097 [145] CHRISTIAN BÖSER, SIMON FINK, and STEFFEN RÖCKER: **Introduction to Boosted  
2098 Decision Trees: A multivariate approach to classification problems.** Presented at  
2099 the 'KSETA Doktoranden' workshop, Lauterbad. July 2014. URL: [https://indico.scc.  
2101 kit.edu/indico/event/48/session/4/contribution/35/material/slides/0.pdf](https://indico.scc.<br/>2100 kit.edu/indico/event/48/session/4/contribution/35/material/slides/0.pdf) (see  
p. 51).
- 2102 [146] SERGUEI CHATRCHYAN et al.: **Combined results of searches for the standard model  
2103 Higgs boson in  $pp$  collisions at  $\sqrt{s} = 7$  TeV.** In: *Phys. Lett.*, **B710**: (2012), pp. 26–  
2104 48. DOI: [10.1016/j.physletb.2012.02.064](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2012.02.064). arXiv: [1202.1488 \[hep-ex\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1202.1488) (see p. 52).
- 2105 [147] GLEN COWAN, KYLE CRANMER, EILAM GROSS, and OFER VITELLS: **Asymptotic formulae  
2106 for likelihood-based tests of new physics.** In: *Eur. Phys. J.*, **C71**: (2011). [Erratum:  
2107 *Eur. Phys. J.* C73,2501(2013)], p. 1554. DOI: [10.1140/epjc/s10052-011-1554-0](https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-011-1554-0), [10.1140/epjc/s10052-013-2501-z](https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-013-2501-z). arXiv: [1007.1727 \[physics.data-an\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1007.1727) (see  
2108 pp. 52–53).
- 2109 [148] **Observation of a new boson with a mass near 125 GeV.** Tech. rep. CMS-PAS-HIG-  
2110 12-020. Geneva: CERN, 2012. URL: <https://cds.cern.ch/record/1460438> (see  
2111 p. 52).
- 2112 [149] **Procedure for the LHC Higgs boson search combination in Summer 2011.** Tech.  
2113 rep. CMS-NOTE-2011-005. ATL-PHYS-PUB-2011-11. Geneva: CERN, Aug. 2011. URL:  
2114 [http://cds.cern.ch/record/1379837](https://cds.cern.ch/record/1379837) (see p. 52).
- 2115 [150] HIGGS WORKING GROUP: **Documentation of the RooStats based statistics tools for  
2116 Higgs PAG.** Aug. 2017. URL: [https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/viewauth/CMS/  
2118 SWGuideHiggsAnalysisCombinedLimit](https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/viewauth/CMS/<br/>2117 SWGuideHiggsAnalysisCombinedLimit) (see p. 52).
- 2119 [151] LORENZO MONETA, KEVIN BELASCO, KYLE S. CRANMER, et al.: **The RooStats Project.**  
2120 In: *PoS, ACAT2010*: (2010), p. 057. arXiv: [1009.1003 \[physics.data-an\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1009.1003) (see p. 52).
- 2121 [152] GLEN COWAN, KYLE CRANMER, EILAM GROSS, and OFER VITELLS: **Asymptotic formulae  
2122 for likelihood-based tests of new physics.** In: *The European Physical Journal C*, **71**:2  
2123 (Feb. 2011). DOI: [10.1140/epjc/s10052-011-1554-0](https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-011-1554-0). arXiv: [1007.1727 \[hep-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1007.1727) (see  
2124 p. 52).
- 2125 [153] THOMAS JUNK: **Confidence level computation for combining searches with small  
2126 statistics.** In: *Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section A: Accelerators,  
2127 Spectrometers, Detectors and Associated Equipment*, **434**:2 (1999), pp. 435–443.  
2128 DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-9002\(99\)00498-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-9002(99)00498-2) (see p. 52).
- 2129 [154] AL READ: **Presentation of search results: the CL s technique.** In: *Journal of Physics G: Nuclear  
2130 and Particle Physics*, **28**:10 (2002), p. 2693. URL: [http://stacks.iop.org/0954-3899/28/i=10/a=313](http://stacks.iop.org/0954-<br/>2131 3899/28/i=10/a=313) (see p. 52).
- 2132 [155] A. M. SIRUNYAN et al.: **Particle-flow reconstruction and global event description  
2133 with the CMS detector.** In: *JINST*, **12**: (2017), P10003. DOI: [10.1088/1748-0221/12/10/P10003](https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/12/10/P10003). arXiv: [1706.04965 \[physics.ins-det\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1706.04965) (see pp. 56–60, 62).
- 2134 [156] R. FRÜHWIRTH: **Application of Kalman filtering to track and vertex fitting.** In:  
2135 *Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section A: Accelerators, Spectrometers,  
2136 Detectors and Associated Equipment*, **262**:2 (1987), pp. 444–450. DOI: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0168-9002\(87\)90887-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0168-9002(87)90887-4) (see p. 57).

- 2139 [157] PIERRE BILLOIR: **Progressive track recognition with a Kalman like fitting proce-**  
 2140 **dure.** In: *Comput. Phys. Commun.*, **57**: (1989), pp. 390–394. DOI: [10.1016/0010-4655\(89\)90249-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-4655(89)90249-X) (see p. 57).
- 2142 [158] SERGUEI CHATRCHYAN et al.: **Performance of CMS muon reconstruction in  $pp$  col-**  
 2143 **lision events at  $\sqrt{s} = 7$  TeV.** In: *JINST*, **7**: (2012), P10002. DOI: [10.1088/1748-0221/7/10/P10002](https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/7/10/P10002). arXiv: [1206.4071 \[physics.ins-det\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1206.4071) (see p. 57).
- 2145 [159] W ADAM, R FRÜHWIRTH, A STRANDLIE, and T TODOROV: **Reconstruction of electrons**  
 2146 **with the Gaussian-sum filter in the CMS tracker at the LHC.** In: *Journal of Physics*  
 2147 *G: Nuclear and Particle Physics*, **31**:9 (2005), N9. URL: <http://stacks.iop.org/0954-3899/31/i=9/a=N01> (see p. 57).
- 2149 [160] **Performance of electron reconstruction and selection with the CMS detector in**  
 2150 **proton-proton collisions at  $\sqrt{s} = 8$  TeV.** In: *Journal of Instrumentation*, **10**:06 (2015),  
 2151 P06005. URL: <http://stacks.iop.org/1748-0221/10/i=06/a=P06005> (see p. 58).
- 2152 [161] **Electron and photon performance in CMS with the full 2016 data sample.** In: (Mar.  
 2153 2017). URL: <http://cds.cern.ch/record/2255497> (see pp. 58, 62, 64).
- 2154 [162] K. ROSE: **Deterministic annealing for clustering, compression, classification, re-**  
 2155 **gression, and related optimization problems.** In: *Proceedings of the IEEE*, **86**:11  
 2156 (Nov. 1998), pp. 2210–2239. DOI: [10.1109/5.726788](https://doi.org/10.1109/5.726788) (see p. 58).
- 2157 [163] WOLFGANG WALTENBERGER: **Adaptive Vertex Reconstruction.** Tech. rep. CMS-NOTE-  
 2158 2008-033. Geneva: CERN, July 2008. URL: <https://cds.cern.ch/record/1166320> (see  
 2159 p. 58).
- 2160 [164] ANDREAS KORN Mayer: **The CMS Pixel Luminosity Telescope.** Tech. rep. CMS-CR-  
 2161 2015-121. Geneva: CERN, June 2015. URL: <https://cds.cern.ch/record/2039978> (see  
 2162 p. 59).
- 2163 [165] **CMS Luminosity Measurements for the 2016 Data Taking Period.** Tech. rep. CMS-  
 2164 PAS-LUM-17-001. Geneva: CERN, 2017. URL: <http://cds.cern.ch/record/2257069>  
 2165 (see p. 59).
- 2166 [166] **Measurement of the inelastic proton-proton cross section at  $\sqrt{s} = 13$  TeV.** Tech.  
 2167 rep. CMS-PAS-FSQ-15-005. Geneva: CERN, 2016. URL: <https://cds.cern.ch/record/2145896> (see p. 60).
- 2169 [167] **Muon Identification and Isolation efficiency on full 2016 dataset.** In: (Mar. 2017).  
 2170 URL: <http://cds.cern.ch/record/2257968> (see pp. 60–61).
- 2171 [168] **Effective areas used for Summer16 samples.** May 2017. URL: [https://indico.cern.ch/event/482673/contributions/2187022/%20attachments/1282446/1905912/talk\\_electron\\_ID\\_spring16.pdf](https://indico.cern.ch/event/482673/contributions/2187022/%20attachments/1282446/1905912/talk_electron_ID_spring16.pdf) (see p. 63).
- 2174 [169] MATTEO CACCIARI, GAVIN P. SALAM, and GREGORY SOYEZ: **The Anti-k(t) jet clustering**  
 2175 **algorithm.** In: *JHEP*, **04**: (2008), p. 063. DOI: [10.1088/1126-6708/2008/04/063](https://doi.org/10.1088/1126-6708/2008/04/063). arXiv:  
 2176 [0802.1189 \[hep-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/0802.1189) (see p. 63).
- 2177 [170] **Jet algorithms performance in 13 TeV data.** Tech. rep. CMS-PAS-JME-16-003.  
 2178 Geneva: CERN, 2017. URL: <http://cds.cern.ch/record/2256875> (see p. 63).

- 2179 [171] V. KHACHATRYAN et al.: **Jet energy scale and resolution in the CMS experiment in**  
 2180 **pp collisions at 8 TeV.** In: *Journal of Instrumentation*, **12**:02 (2017), P02014. URL:  
 2181 <http://stacks.iop.org/1748-0221/12/i=02/a=P02014> (see pp. 65–66).
- 2182 [172] **Jet energy scale and resolution performances with 13TeV data.** In: (June 2016).  
 2183 URL: <http://cds.cern.ch/record/2160347> (see pp. 65–66).
- 2184 [173] THE CMS COLLABORATION: **Identification of b-quark jets with the CMS experiment.**  
 2185 In: *Journal of Instrumentation*, **8**:04 (2013), P04013. URL: <http://stacks.iop.org/1748-0221/8/i=04/a=P04013> (see p. 66).
- 2187 [174] **Identification of b quark jets at the CMS Experiment in the LHC Run 2.** Tech. rep.  
 2188 CMS-PAS-BTV-15-001. Geneva: CERN, 2016. URL: <http://cds.cern.ch/record/2138504> (see pp. 66, 68).
- 2190 [175] NAZAR BARTOSIK: **Diagram showing the common principle of identification of jets**  
 2191 **initiated by b-hadron decays.** May 2016. URL: [http://bartosik.pp.ua/hep\\_sketches/btagging](http://bartosik.pp.ua/hep_sketches/btagging) (see p. 67).
- 2193 [176] **Identification of b quark jets at the CMS Experiment in the LHC Run 2.** Tech. rep.  
 2194 CMS-PAS-BTV-16-001. unpublished. Geneva: CERN, 2017 (see pp. 68–69).
- 2195 [177] **Performance of missing energy reconstruction in 13 TeV pp collision data using**  
 2196 **the CMS detector.** Tech. rep. CMS-PAS-JME-16-004. Geneva: CERN, 2016. URL:  
 2197 <http://cds.cern.ch/record/2205284> (see pp. 69, 74–75).
- 2198 [178] JORDAN DAMGOV: **Missing Et Optional Filters Run 2.** Oct. 2017. URL: <https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/viewauth/CMS/MissingETOptionalFiltersRun2> (see p. 74).
- 2200 [179] **EGM corrections for Moriond17.** URL: [https://indico.cern.ch/event/613162/contributions/2472046/attachments/1410308/2156822/EGMSmearerAndRegression\\_PPD\\_022017.pdf](https://indico.cern.ch/event/613162/contributions/2472046/attachments/1410308/2156822/EGMSmearerAndRegression_PPD_022017.pdf) (see p. 78).
- 2203 [180] **Misalignment and Muon Scale corrections.** URL: [https://www-cdf.fnal.gov/~jyhan/cms\\_momscl/rochcor\\_cmsnote.pdf](https://www-cdf.fnal.gov/~jyhan/cms_momscl/rochcor_cmsnote.pdf) (see p. 79).
- 2205 [181] **Rochestor Correction.** Accessed: 2017-05-20. URL: <https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/viewauth/CMS/RochcorMuon> (see p. 79).