

¹ SEARCH FOR EXOTIC HIGGS DECAYS TO LIGHT
² NEUTRAL SCALARS IN FINAL STATES WITH
³ BOTTOM QUARKS AND TAU LEPTONS

⁴ KA YU STEPHANIE KWAN

⁵ A DISSERTATION
⁶ PRESENTED TO THE FACULTY
⁷ OF PRINCETON UNIVERSITY
⁸ IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE
⁹ OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

¹⁰ NOT YET RECOMMENDED FOR ACCEPTANCE
¹¹ BY THE DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICS
¹² ADVISER: ISOBEL OJALVO

¹³ MAY 2024

¹⁴

© Copyright by Ka Yu Stephanie Kwan, 2024.

¹⁵

All Rights Reserved

Abstract

Open questions in particle physics may be addressed by the existence of an extended Higgs sector beyond the Standard Model Higgs boson with mass 125 GeV, which was discovered in 2012 at the Large Hadron Collider (LHC) by the CMS and ATLAS experiments. Many properties of a potential extended Higgs sector remain unconstrained by current measurements, making direct searches of exotic Higgs decays a powerful probe of new physics. The decay of the 125 GeV Higgs boson into two light neutral scalar particles ($h \rightarrow aa$) is allowed in extensions of the Standard Model, such as Two Higgs Doublet Models extended with a scalar singlet (2HDM+S). We present a search at CMS for exotic decays of the 125 GeV Higgs boson to two light neutral scalars, which decay to two bottom quarks and two tau leptons ($h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow bb\tau\tau$). This analysis is combined with a different search where the light scalars decay to two bottom quarks and two muons. The results from the $bb\tau\tau$ analysis and the combined analyses are interpreted in 2HDM+S scenarios. In a different extension of the Standard Model, the Two Real Singlet Model (TRSM), the 125 GeV Higgs boson can decay to two light scalars with unequal mass ($h \rightarrow a_1a_2$). This decay has not been searched for to date at CMS. We present ongoing work on a search for $h \rightarrow a_1a_2$, where the a_2 decays into two a_1 , resulting in four bottom quarks and two tau leptons in the final state, in the $\mu\tau_h$ channel of the $\tau\tau$ decay. Such searches for rare processes will directly benefit from the increased datasets that will be generated by the High-Luminosity LHC (HL-LHC), which is scheduled to increase the LHC’s number of simultaneous proton-proton collisions by a factor of five to seven. To contribute to the performance of the CMS Level-1 Trigger in selecting collisions with interesting physics, this thesis presents an upgraded algorithm for reconstructing electrons and photons in the barrel calorimeter, which will use information with higher spatial granularity to distinguish genuine electrons and photons from background.

⁴²

Acknowledgements

⁴³ Placeholder acknowledgements.

⁴⁵ Contents

⁴⁶	Abstract	iii
⁴⁷	Acknowledgements	iv
⁴⁸	List of Tables	xi
⁴⁹	List of Figures	xiii
⁵⁰	1 Introduction	1
⁵¹	1.1 History of the Standard Model	1
⁵²	1.2 The Standard Model as a gauge theory	3
⁵³	1.2.1 Gauge invariance	3
⁵⁴	1.2.2 Local gauge symmetries	4
⁵⁵	1.3 The Higgs Mechanism	6
⁵⁶	1.4 Two-Higgs Doublet Models	8
⁵⁷	1.5 Two Real Singlet Model	11
⁵⁸	2 The Large Hadron Collider and the CMS Experiment	14
⁵⁹	2.1 The Large Hadron Collider	15
⁶⁰	2.2 Luminosity and pileup	16
⁶¹	2.3 The High-Luminosity LHC	19
⁶²	2.4 The CMS Detector	20
⁶³	2.5 Sub-detectors of CMS	21
⁶⁴	2.5.1 Inner tracking system	22

65	2.5.2 ECAL	23
66	2.5.3 HCAL	24
67	2.5.4 Muon detectors	26
68	2.5.5 The Level-1 Trigger	27
69	2.5.6 The High-Level Trigger	30
70	2.5.7 Particle reconstruction	31
71	2.5.8 Data storage and computational infrastructure	31
72	3 The Phase-2 Upgrade of CMS	32
73	3.1 High-Luminosity LHC and CMS	32
74	3.2 The Phase-2 Level-1 Trigger	32
75	3.3 Standalone Barrel Calorimeter electron/photon reconstruction	35
76	3.3.1 Phase-2 geometry of the ECAL Barrel trigger	35
77	3.3.2 Phase-2 electron/photon reconstruction algorithm	36
78	4 Datasets and Monte Carlo samples	45
79	4.1 Datasets used	45
80	4.2 Monte Carlo samples	45
81	4.3 Embedded samples	47
82	5 Object reconstruction and corrections applied	50
83	5.1 Object reconstruction	50
84	5.1.1 Taus	50
85	5.1.2 Muons	54
86	5.1.3 Electrons	55
87	5.1.4 Jets	57
88	5.1.5 B-flavored jets	58
89	5.2 Reconstruction of the $\tau\tau$ mass	59
90	5.2.1 Original SVFit “standalone”: maximum likelihood	60

91	5.2.2 “Classic SVFit” with matrix element	61
92	5.2.3 FastMTT: optimized SVFit	62
93	5.3 Corrections applied to simulation	62
94	5.3.1 Tau energy scale	63
95	5.3.2 Muon energy scale	63
96	5.3.3 Electron energy scale	64
97	5.3.4 τ_h identification efficiency	65
98	5.3.5 Trigger efficiencies	65
99	5.3.6 Tau trigger efficiencies	65
100	5.3.7 Single muon trigger efficiencies	66
101	5.3.8 Single electron trigger efficiencies	67
102	5.3.9 $e\mu$ cross-trigger efficiencies	68
103	5.3.10 Electrons and muons faking τ_h : energy scales	69
104	5.3.11 Electrons and muons faking τ_h : misidentification efficiencies . .	70
105	5.3.12 Electron ID and tracking efficiency	71
106	5.3.13 Muon ID, isolation, and tracking efficiencies	72
107	5.3.14 Recoil corrections	73
108	5.3.15 Drell-Yan corrections	74
109	5.3.16 Pileup reweighing	74
110	5.3.17 Pre-firing corrections	75
111	5.3.18 Top p_T spectrum reweighing	76
112	5.3.19 B-tagging efficiency	76
113	5.3.20 Jet energy resolution and jet energy smearing	76
114	6 Event selection	78
115	6.1 General procedure for all channels	78
116	6.2 Event selection in the $\mu\tau_h$ channel	79
117	6.3 Event selection in the $e\tau_h$ channel	81

118	6.4	Event selection in the $e\mu$ channel	82
119	6.5	Extra lepton vetoes in all channels	83
120	7	Background estimation	87
121	7.1	Z+jets	87
122	7.2	W+jets	88
123	7.3	$t\bar{t}$ + jets	88
124	7.4	Single top	89
125	7.5	Diboson	89
126	7.6	Standard Model Higgs	89
127	7.7	Jet faking τ_h	90
128	7.8	QCD multijet background	91
129	8	Systematic uncertainties	93
130	8.1	Uncertainties associated with physics objects	94
131	8.1.1	Uncertainties in the lepton energy scales	94
132	8.1.2	Uncertainties from other lepton corrections	95
133	8.1.3	Uncertainties from jet energy scale and resolution	95
134	8.1.4	Uncertainties from b-tagging scale factors	96
135	8.1.5	Uncertainties from MET	97
136	8.2	Uncertainties associated with samples used	97
137	8.3	Other uncertainties	98
138	8.4	Pulls and impacts	98
139	9	Event categorization and signal extraction	100
140	9.1	B-tag jet multiplicity	100
141	9.2	DNN-based event categorization	100
142	9.3	Methodology for signal extraction	103
143	9.3.1	Model building and parameter estimation	104

144	9.3.2 Hypothesis testing	106
145	9.3.3 Confidence intervals	107
146	9.3.4 Profile likelihood ratio	109
147	9.3.5 Modified frequentist method: CL_S	110
148	10 Results	111
149	10.1 Results from $bb\tau\tau$	111
150	10.2 Combination with $bb\mu\mu$ final state	113
151	11 Asymmetric exotic Higgs decays	124
152	11.1 Signal masses	124
153	11.2 Cascade scenario signal studies	125
154	11.3 Current control plots for $\mu\tau_h$ channel	127
155	12 Conclusion and outlook	131

¹⁵⁶ List of Tables

¹⁵⁷	4.1	Expected event composition after selecting two muons in the embedded technique, before additional cuts (i.e. inclusive), and after adding a requirement on the di-muon mass $m_{\mu\mu} > 70$ GeV, or a requirement on the number of b-tag jets in the event.	49
¹⁶¹	5.1	Energy scales applied to genuine hadronic tau decays τ_h by data-taking year/era and decay mode, along with systematic errors.	63
¹⁶²	5.2	Energy scales and systematic errors applied to genuine muons.	64
¹⁶³	5.3	Energy scales and systematic errors applied to electrons in embedded samples by data-taking year/era.	65
¹⁶⁴	5.4	Tau ID efficiency for the DeepTau vs. jet medium working point, with central, up, and down values for 2018, binned in the tau p_T	65
¹⁶⁵	5.5	Energy scales and up/down systematic uncertainties applied to electrons misidentified as hadronic taus.	69
¹⁶⁶	5.6	Tau mis-identification efficiency for the DeepTau Tight and Very Loose (VLoose) working points vs. muons in 2018.	71
¹⁶⁷	5.7	Tau mis-identification efficiency for the DeepTau Tight and Very Loose (VLoose) working points vs. electrons in 2018.	71

174	6.1	Trigger thresholds used for the leptons in the $bb\mu\mu$ analysis and the	
175		$bb\tau\tau$ analysis (the focus of this work). The thresholds for the three $bb\tau\tau$	
176		channels ($e\mu$, $e\tau_h$, and $\mu\tau_h$) are listed separately, with some channels	
177		and years taking the logical OR of two triggers with different thresholds.	79
178	6.2	High-Level Trigger (HLT) paths used to select data and simulation	
179		events in 2016 for the three $\tau\tau$ channels.	84
180	6.3	High-Level Trigger (HLT) paths used to select data and simulation	
181		events in 2017 for the three $\tau\tau$ channels.	84
182	6.4	High-Level Trigger (HLT) paths used to select data and simulation	
183		events in 2018 for the three $\tau\tau$ channels. In 2018 a HLT trigger path	
184		using the hadron plus strips (HPS) tau reconstruction algorithm be-	
185		came available.	85
186	9.1	Event categorization based on DNN scores for events with exactly 1	
187		b-tag jet (1bNN), for the three $\tau\tau$ channels and three eras.	103
188	9.2	Event categorization based on DNN scores for events with 2 b-tag jets	
189		(2bNN), for the three $\tau\tau$ channels and three eras.	104

¹⁹⁰ **List of Figures**

¹⁹¹ 1.1	Table of Standard Model particles showing the grouping of the fermions into three generations of matter and the bosons, responsible for carrying the three fundamental forces in the Standard Model. The masses, charges, and spins of the particles are shown. The antimatter counter- parts of the fermions are not shown. The possible interactions between the fermions and gauge bosons are highlighted.	2
¹⁹⁶ 1.2	An illustration of the Higgs potential.	7
¹⁹⁷ 1.3	Branching ratios of a singlet-like pseudoscalar in Type II 2HDM+S for $\tan \beta = 0.5$ (left) and $\tan \beta = 5$ (right).	10
²⁰⁰ 1.4	Benchmark plane BP1 for benchmark scenario 1, for the decay signa- ture $h_{125} \rightarrow h_1 h_2$ with $h_{125} \equiv h_3$, defined in the (M_1, M_2) plane. . . .	13
²⁰² 2.1	Aerial view of the Large Hadron Collider (LHC).	17
²⁰³ 2.2	Distribution of the mean number of inelastic collisions per bunch cross- ing (pileup) in data, for proton-proton collisions in 2016-2018	19
²⁰⁵ 2.3	Sketch of particle trajectories of muons, electrons, charged and neutral hadrons, and photons in a transverse cross-section of the CMS detector.	21
²⁰⁷ 2.4	Cross section of the current Phase-1 CMS tracker.	23
²⁰⁸ 2.5	Longitudinal view of the CMS detector showing the hadron calorimeter barrel (HB), endcap (HE), outer (HO), and forward (HF) calorimeters.	25

210	2.6	Layout of the CMS barrel muon drift tube (DT) chambers in one of the five wheels.	27
211			
212	2.7	Dataflow for the Phase-1 Level-1 Trigger.	28
213			
214	3.1	Functional diagram of the CMS L1 Phase-2 upgraded trigger design. .	33
215	3.2	Summary of the links between the trigger primitives, the trigger ob- jects, the Level-1 algorithms, and the physics channels in the Phase-2 menu.	36
216			
217	3.3	Schematic of the geometry of the Phase-2 ECAL barrel in the Regional Calorimeter Trigger (RCT), showing the division of the barrel region into 36 Regional Calorimeter Trigger (RCT) cards (<i>red</i>). Each card spans 17×4 towers in $\eta \times \phi$ (<i>green</i>), and each tower is 5×5 in single crystals in $\eta \times \phi$. Towers in the overlap region (<i>shaded yellow</i>) are read out to both the barrel and endcap.	39
218			
219	3.4	Schematic of two example RCT cards in the negative eta (<i>top</i>) and positive eta (<i>center</i>) regions of the ECAL barrel. Each RCT card is divided into five regions: four regions are of size 3×4 towers in $\eta \times \phi$ (<i>bottom left</i>), and a fifth smaller overlap region of size 2×4 towers (<i>bottom right</i>). Each tower is 5×5 ($\eta \times \phi$) in crystals.	40
220			
221	3.5	Schematic of the Phase-2 ECAL barrel in the Global Calorimeter Trig- ger (GCT), which will process the outputs of the Regional Calorimeter Trigger (RCT) in three cards (<i>magenta highlights</i>). Each card in the GCT processes the equivalent of sixteen RCT cards, with the center twelve being unique to that GCT card (<i>shaded pink</i>), and the remain- ing four processed in overlap with the other GCT cards.	41
222			
223			
224			
225			
226			
227			
228			
229			
230			
231			
232			
233			

234	3.6 Illustration of an example electron/photon (e/γ) cluster in the Phase-	
235	2 Level-1 Trigger standalone barrel e/γ reconstruction, in a region of	
236	15×20 crystals (3×4 towers). Each small pink square is one crystal,	
237	the highest-granularity ECAL trigger primitives available to the L1	
238	Trigger in Phase-2. The core cluster consists of the energy sum in a	
239	3×5 window of crystals, (<i>shaded light blue</i>) centered around the seed	
240	crystal (<i>red</i>). Bremsstrahlung corrections are checked in the adjacent	
241	3×5 windows in the ϕ direction (<i>shaded light yellow</i>). The relative	
242	energies in windows of size 2×5 and 5×5 in crystals (<i>dashed dark blue</i>	
243	<i>and dark red</i>) are used to compute shower shape variables to identify	
244	true e/γ objects. Lastly, an isolation sum is computed in a window of	
245	size 7×7 in towers (not shown in figure).	42
246	3.7 Efficiency of the standalone barrel e/γ reconstruction, as a function of	
247	the true electron's transverse momentum p_T	43
248	3.8 Rates of the standalone barrel e/γ reconstruction measured as a func-	
249	tion of the minimum energy (E_T) required of the reconstructed e/γ	
250	object in each event.	44
251	4.1 Cumulative delivered and recorded luminosity versus time for 2015-	
252	2018 at CMS, in proton-proton collision data only, at nominal center-	
253	of-mass energy.	46
254	4.2 Schematic view of the four main steps of the embedding technique for	
255	τ leptons.	48
256	5.1 Distributions of $m_{\tau\tau}$ reconstructed by the classic SVFit algorithm, and	
257	masses of visible tau decay products (before SVFit).	61
258	5.2 Electron/photon energy scale factors and uncertainties for 2018. . . .	64

259	5.3	Hadronic tau leg efficiency of the cross-triggers for $\mu\tau_h$ (<i>left</i>) and $e\tau_h$ (<i>right</i>) triggers as a function of offline tau p_T for 2016, 2017, and 2018.	67
260			
261	5.4	Trigger efficiencies in data (<i>top panels</i>) and ratio of efficiencies af- ter/before a HLT muon reconstruction update (<i>bottom panels</i>) for the muon in the isolated single muon trigger with threshold $p_T > 24$ GeV in the data-taking year 2018, as functions of the muon p_T (<i>left</i>) and muon $ \eta $ (<i>right</i>).	68
262			
263			
264			
265			
266	5.5	Trigger efficiencies in data and the data/MC ratio for the electron in the single electron trigger with threshold $p_T > 32$ GeV in the data- taking year 2018, as functions of the electron p_T (<i>left</i>) and electron $ \eta $ (<i>right</i>).	69
267			
268			
269			
270	5.6	Efficiencies of the electron leg vs. p_T (<i>left</i>) and the muon log vs. η (<i>right</i>), for the HLT path with online thresholds of 12 GeV for the electron and 23 GeV for the muon, with the data-taking years 2016 through 2018 overlaid.	70
271			
272			
273			
274	5.7	Efficiencies in data (<i>top panels</i>) and the ratio of efficiencies in data/MC (<i>bottom panels</i>), for the electron multivariate analysis (MVA) identifi- cation (<i>left</i>) and for the Gaussian-sum filter (GSF) tracking (<i>right</i>). . .	72
275			
276			
277	5.8	Muon identification efficiencies in 2015 data and MC as a function of the muon p_T for the loose ID (<i>left</i>) and tight ID (<i>right</i>) working points.	73
278			
279	5.9	Muon isolation efficiencies in Run-2 data as a function of the muon p_T (<i>left</i>) and $ \eta $ (<i>right</i>).	74
280			
281	5.10	Muon tracking efficiencies as a function of $ \eta $ for standalone muons in Run-2 data (<i>black</i>) and Drell-Yan (<i>blue</i>) MC simulation.	75
282			
283	7.1	Leading-order Feynman diagrams of Higgs production.	90
284	8.1	Top sixty impacts for the combination of all channels and years. . . .	99

285	9.1 Schematic of the Neyman construction for confidence intervals.	108
286	10.1 Postfit final observed and expected $m_{\tau\tau}$ distributions in the $\mu\tau_h$ chan-	
287	nel, for the 1 b-tag jet and 2 b-tag jet signal and control regions.	115
288	10.2 Postfit final observed and expected $m_{\tau\tau}$ distributions in the $e\tau_h$ chan-	
289	nel, for the 1 b-tag jet and 2 b-tag jet signal and control regions.	116
290	10.3 Postfit final observed and expected $m_{\tau\tau}$ distributions in the $e\mu$ channel.	117
291	10.4 Observed 95% CL exclusion limits (<i>black, solid lines</i>) and expected 95%	
292	CL and 68% CL limits (<i>shaded yellow and green</i>) on the branching	
293	fraction $B(h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow bb\tau\tau)$ in percentages, assuming the Standard	
294	Model production for the 125 GeV Higgs (h). Limits are shown for the	
295	$\mu\tau_h$ channel (<i>top left</i>), the $e\tau_h$ channel (<i>top right</i>), and the $e\mu$ channel	
296	(<i>bottom left</i>), and lastly the combination of all three channels (<i>bottom</i>	
297	<i>right</i>) The dataset corresponds to 138 fb^{-1} of data collected in the	
298	years 2016-2018 at a center-of-mass energy 13 TeV.	118
299	10.5 Observed 95% CL upper limits on $B(h \rightarrow aa)$ in %, for the $bb\tau\tau$ final	
300	state (<i>left</i>) and $bb\mu\mu$ final state (<i>right</i>) using the full Run 2 integrated	
301	luminosity of 138 fb^{-1} in 2HDM+S type I (<i>blue</i>), type II with $\tan\beta =$	
302	2.0 (<i>orange dashed</i>), type III with $\tan\beta = 2.0$ (<i>dotted green</i>), and type	
303	IV with $\tan\beta = 0.6$ (<i>red dashed</i>). .	119
304	10.6 Observed 95% CL upper limits on the branching fraction of the 125	
305	GeV Higgs boson to two pseudoscalars, $B(h \rightarrow aa)$, in percentages,	
306	as a function of the pseudoscalar mass m_a , in 2HDM+S type I (<i>blue</i>),	
307	type II with $\tan\beta = 2.0$ (<i>orange dashed</i>), type III with $\tan\beta = 2.0$	
308	(<i>dotted green</i>), and type IV with $\tan\beta = 0.6$ (<i>red dashed</i>), for the	
309	combination of $bb\mu\mu$ and $bb\tau\tau$ channels using the full Run 2 integrated	
310	luminosity of 138 fb^{-1} .	120

311	10.7 Observed 95% CL upper limits on $\mathcal{B}(h \rightarrow aa)$ in %, for the combination	
312	of $bb\mu\mu$ and $bb\tau\tau$ channels using the full Run 2 integrated luminosity	
313	of 138 fb^{-1} for Type II (<i>left</i>), Type III (<i>middle</i>), and Type IV (<i>right</i>)	
314	2HDM+S in the $\tan\beta$ vs. m_a phase space.	121
315	10.8 Summary plot of current observed and expected 95% CL limits on the	
316	branching ratio of the 125 GeV Higgs boson to two pseudoscalars, nor-	
317	malized to the Standard Model Higgs production cross-section, $\frac{\sigma(h)}{\sigma_{\text{SM}}} \times$	
318	$B(h \rightarrow aa)$, in the 2HDM+S type I scenario, obtained at CMS with	
319	data collected at 13 TeV.	121
320	10.9 Summary plot of current observed and expected 95% CL limits on the	
321	branching ratio of the 125 GeV Higgs boson to two pseudoscalars, nor-	
322	malized to the Standard Model Higgs production cross-section, $\frac{\sigma(h)}{\sigma_{\text{SM}}} \times$	
323	$B(h \rightarrow aa)$, in the 2HDM+S type II scenario with $\tan\beta = 2.0$, ob-	
324	tained at CMS with data collected at 13 TeV.	122
325	10.10 Summary plot of current observed and expected 95% CL limits on the	
326	branching ratio of the 125 GeV Higgs boson to two pseudoscalars, nor-	
327	malized to the Standard Model Higgs production cross-section, $\frac{\sigma(h)}{\sigma_{\text{SM}}} \times$	
328	$B(h \rightarrow aa)$, in the 2HDM+S type III scenario with $\tan\beta = 2.0$, ob-	
329	tained at CMS with data collected at 13 TeV.	123
330	11.1 Generator-level b-flavor jet transverse momenta p_T , for $h \rightarrow a_1 a_2$ cas-	
331	cade scenario in the $4b2\tau$ final state, for mass hypotheses $(m_{a_1}, m_{a_2}) =$	
332	$(100, 15) \text{ GeV}$ (<i>left</i>) and $(40, 20) \text{ GeV}$ (<i>right</i>). In each plot the generator-	
333	level p_T of the leading (<i>black</i>), sub-leading (<i>red</i>), third (<i>blue</i>), and	
334	fourth (<i>light green</i>) are overlaid.	126

335	11.2 Distributions (arbitrary units) of transverse momentum p_T resolution	
336	and ΔR between the two closest generator-level b jets, treated as one	
337	object, and the nearest reconstructed AK4 jet, for two different $h \rightarrow$	
338	$a_1 a_2$ mass hypotheses $(m_{a_1}, m_{a_2}) = (100, 15)$ GeV (<i>top left, top right</i>)	
339	and $(40, 20)$ GeV (<i>bottom left, bottom right</i>) in the ggH production of	
340	the 125 GeV h . In the $(40, 20)$ GeV mass point, the longer p_T resolution	
341	tail (<i>bottom left</i>) indicates that the reconstructed jet underestimates	
342	the generator b-flavor jets' energy, and the significant fraction of events	
343	with larger ΔR values (<i>bottom right</i>) indicate worse matching.	127
344	11.3 Kinematic properties of the leading muon and τ_h in the $\mu\tau_h$ channel: p_T	
345	(<i>top row</i>), η (<i>second row</i>), and ϕ (<i>third row</i>). The visible 4-momenta	
346	of the muon and τ_h are summed, giving the visible di-tau mass m_{vis}	
347	and transverse momentum $p_{T,\text{vis}}$. The errors shown in the figures only	
348	include statistical errors and only several of the full set of systematic	
349	errors (only those associated with the lepton energy scales and τ_h iden-	
350	tification efficiency).	129
351	11.4 Kinematic properties of the leading and sub-leading b-tag jets in the	
352	$\mu\tau_h$ final state: jet p_T (<i>top row</i>), η (<i>second row</i>), ϕ (<i>third row</i>), as well	
353	as the missing transverse energy magnitude and azimuthal direction	
354	(<i>bottom row</i>). The errors shown in the figures only include statistical	
355	errors and only several of the full set of systematic errors (only those	
356	associated with the lepton energy scales and τ_h identification efficiency).	130

³⁵⁷ Chapter 1

³⁵⁸ Introduction

³⁵⁹ The Standard Model is the current prevailing theoretical framework that encompasses
³⁶⁰ all known elementary particles to date and describes their interactions, yet falls short
³⁶¹ of describing open problems in physics. Here, we introduce the Standard Model (Sec-
³⁶² tion 1.1) and provide a mathematical motivation of the SM a gauge theory (Section
³⁶³ 1.2). We introduce the Higgs mechanism (Section 1.3), and outline two groups of
³⁶⁴ theoretical extensions to the Standard Model that feature extended Higgs sectors
³⁶⁵ (Sections 1.4 and 1.5).

³⁶⁶ 1.1 History of the Standard Model

³⁶⁷ The building blocks of our modern-day understanding of particle physics were estab-
³⁶⁸ lished over the course of decades by experimental discoveries and theoretical advances,
³⁶⁹ culminating in the development of a theoretical framework known as the Standard
³⁷⁰ Model (SM). In the 1880s, the electron was the first subatomic particle to be iden-
³⁷¹ tified, through measurements of particles produced by ionizing gas. By the 1930s,
³⁷² atoms were known to consist mostly of empty space, with protons and neutrons con-
³⁷³ centrated at the center and orbited by electrons. Spurred by advances in particle
³⁷⁴ accelerator technology, the experimental discoveries of the positron, the muon, and

375 the pion, painted an increasingly complicated picture of particle physics that could
376 not be described solely with atomic physics [1].

377 In the absence of a theoretical framework describing these particles, in the 1960s
378 and 1970s physicists and mathematicians developed the Standard Model to describe
379 and encompass these fundamental particles and the forces that govern their interac-
380 tions. The particle content of the Standard Model is shown in Fig. 1.1: they are
381 grouped into fermions, which comprise all known matter, and bosons, which mediate
382 the interactions between particles.




Figure 1.1: Table of Standard Model particles showing the grouping of the fermions into three generations of matter and the bosons, responsible for carrying the three fundamental forces in the Standard Model. The masses, charges, and spins of the particles are shown. The antimatter counterparts of the fermions are not shown. The possible interactions between the fermions and gauge bosons are highlighted.

383 Fermions consist of quarks and leptons, and are grouped into three generations.
384 For example, the electron belongs to the first generation of leptons. The second and
385 third generation counterparts of the electron are the muon and the tau lepton, and
386 are over 200 and 30,000 times heavier than the electron respectively. Bosons are force
387 carriers; the interaction of fermions with bosons corresponds to fundamental forces.
388 The Standard Model describes the electromagnetic force, the strong nuclear force,

389 and the weak nuclear force.

390 1.2 The Standard Model as a gauge theory

391 1.2.1 Gauge invariance

392 Gauge theories of elementary particle interactions originate from a freedom of choice
393 in the mathematical description of particle fields which has no effect on the particles'
394 physical states [2]. The existence and form of the particles' interactions, can be
395 deduced from the existence of physically indeterminate, gaugable quantities.

396 An example of this gauge invariance is classical physics is the electromagnetic
397 interaction, where the fundamental field is the four-vector potential A^μ [2]. The
398 physical electromagnetic fields and Maxwell's equations arise from the elements of
399 the tensor $F_{\mu\nu}(x) = \partial_\mu A_\nu(x) - \partial_\nu A_\mu(x)$. Any two choices of A^μ that are related by a
400 transformation of the form

$$A_\mu \rightarrow A_\mu + \partial_\mu \alpha \tag{1.1}$$

401 for any real, differentiable function $\alpha(x)$, describe the same physical configuration,
402 and has no effect on Maxwell's equations. This "redundancy" in the choice of gauge
403 in Eqn. 1.1 is called a gauge symmetry.

404 One important consequence of gauge symmetry comes from the application of
405 Noether's theorem, which states that for every global transformation under which the
406 Lagrangian density is invariant, there exists a conserved quantity. If $\mathcal{L}(\Psi(x), \partial_\mu \Psi(x))$
407 is invariant under the transformation of the wave function $\Psi(x) \rightarrow \Psi'(x)$, where
408 $\Psi'(x) = \Psi(x) + \delta\Psi(x)$, then there exists a conserved current

$$\partial_\mu \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}(x)}{\partial (\partial_\mu \Psi(x))} \delta\Psi(x) \right) = 0 \tag{1.2}$$

409 In classical mechanics, the conservation of linear momentum, angular momentum,
 410 and energy follows from translational invariance, rotational variance, and invariance
 411 under translations in time [2]. Likewise, charge conservation can be shown to arise
 412 from the invariance of the Dirac Lagrangian density $\mathcal{L}_{\text{Dirac}} = \bar{\Psi}(i\gamma^\mu \partial_\mu - m)\Psi$ under the
 413 particle wavefunction's phase transformation, $\Psi'(x) = \exp(ie\chi)\Psi(x)$. Thus Noether's
 414 theorem establishes a correspondence between a gauge symmetry and a conserved
 415 internal property (e.g. charge or momentum).

416 1.2.2 Local gauge symmetries

417 Interactions between particles arise if we modify the wave function with a phase
 418 transformation $\Psi'(x) = \exp(ie\chi)\Psi(x)$, and allow the phase χ to be a function of
 419 spacetime [2]. A wave function of the form

$$\Psi'(x) = \exp(ie\chi(x))\Psi(x) \quad (1.3)$$

420 can be verified to *not* be a solution to the Dirac equation for free particles: $(i\gamma^\mu \partial_\mu -$
 421 $m)\Psi(x) = 0$. This necessitates a modified Dirac equation, where the derivative takes
 422 into account that the vector field $V(x)$ needs to be compared at two displaced space-
 423 time points in a curvilinear coordinate system:

$$\mathcal{D}_\mu \equiv \lim_{\Delta x^\mu \rightarrow 0} \frac{V_{||}(x + \Delta x) - V(x)}{\Delta x^\mu} \quad (1.4)$$

424 We define a covariant derivative,

$$D_\mu = \partial_\mu + ieA_\mu \quad (1.5)$$

⁴²⁵ where $A_\mu(x)$ is a 4-vector potential. Thus the modified Dirac equation reads:

$$(i\gamma^\mu \mathcal{D}_\mu - m) \Psi(x) = 0 \quad (1.6)$$

⁴²⁶ The simultaneous gauge transformation $A'_\mu(x) = A_\mu(x) - \partial_\mu \chi(x)$ and wavefunction
⁴²⁷ transformation $\Psi'(x) = \exp(ie\chi(x))\Psi(x)$ leaves the covariant-derivative form of the
⁴²⁸ Dirac equation (Eqn 1.1) invariant.

⁴²⁹ The generalization of this result is as follows: if a theory is invariant for unitary
⁴³⁰ transformations U of the particle states according to

$$\Psi' = U\Psi \quad (1.7)$$

⁴³¹ One must define a derivative of the form

$$D^\mu = \partial^\mu + igB^\mu \quad (1.8)$$

⁴³² to keep the theory invariant under Eqn. 1.7. The four-potential B^μ represents the
⁴³³ interacting four-potential which must be added to keep the theory invariant.

⁴³⁴ In the case of the Standard Model, the theory is built around the gauge trans-
⁴³⁵ formations $G = SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$. $SU(3)$ is associated to the strong force
⁴³⁶ (subscripted C); $SU(2)$ is associated to the weak force (subscripted L); and $U(1)$ is
⁴³⁷ hypercharge (subscripted Y). The gauge-covariant derivative is

$$\mathcal{D}_\mu = \partial_\mu - ig'B_\mu \frac{Y}{2} - igW_\mu^\alpha \frac{\tau_a}{2} - ig_s G_\mu^k \frac{\lambda_k}{2} \quad (1.9)$$

⁴³⁸ • In the $U(1)_Y$ term, B_μ is the weak hypercharge field.

⁴³⁹ • In the $SU(2)_L$ term, $W_\mu(x) = (W_\mu^1(x), W_\mu^2(x), W_\mu^3(x))$ are a triplet of four-
⁴⁴⁰ potentials. $\tau/2$ are the Pauli matrices, generators of the $SU(2)$ transformation.

- 441 • In the $SU(3)_C$ term, the gluon (color) field is G_μ . λ_k are the Gell-Man matrices,
442 generators of the $SU(3)$ transformation.

443 The invariance of the Standard Model under $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ requires
444 massless fermions and massless force carriers.

445 1.3 The Higgs Mechanism

446 To introduce mass into the theory, i.e. to change the propagation of the gauge par-
447 ticles and all the fermions, the physical vacuum cannot have all the symmetries of
448 the Standard Model Lagrangian [2]. The symmetries of the physical vacuum must
449 be spontaneously broken, without affecting gauge invariance in the Lagrangian. The
450 Higgs mechanism proposes the existence of a scalar field, or fields, with nonzero vac-
451 uum expectation values, which reduce the gauge symmetries of the physical vacuum
452 from $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ down to $SU(3)_C \times U(1)_{EM}$.

453 The Higgs field interacts with the gauge bosons and fermions throughout space,
454 impeding their free propagation. The resulting broken symmetry correctly predicts
455 the mass ratio of the neutral (Z) and charged (W) massive electroweak bosons, and
456 predicts that at least one physical degree of freedom in the Higgs field is a particle
457 degree of freedom, called the Higgs boson. The location of the minimum of the Higgs
458 potential can be constrained from previously measured Standard Model parameters,
459 but the shape of the mass distribution of the Higgs boson must be experimentally
460 measured.

461 The minimal choice of Higgs field comes from the breaking of $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$
462 down to $U(1)_{EM}$. The smallest $SU(2)$ multiplet is the doublet. The existence of three
463 massive electroweak bosons leads the Higgs sector to have at least three degrees of

⁴⁶⁴ freedom. The minimal single-doublet complex scalar Higgs field is

$$\Phi(x) = \begin{pmatrix} \phi^+(x) \\ \phi^0(x) \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} \phi_1^+(x) + i\phi_2^+(x) \\ \phi_1^0(x) + i\phi_2^0(x) \end{pmatrix} \quad (1.10)$$

⁴⁶⁵ where ϕ_1^+ , ϕ_2^+ , ϕ_1^0 , and ϕ_2^0 are real (four degrees of freedom). By convention, the
⁴⁶⁶ nonzero vacuum expectation value is assigned to ϕ_1^0 .

⁴⁶⁷ The minimal self-interacting Higgs potential that is invariant under $SU(2)_L \times$
⁴⁶⁸ $U(1)_Y$ is given by

$$V(\Phi^\dagger \Phi) = -\mu^2 \Phi^\dagger \Phi + \lambda (\Phi^\dagger \Phi)^2, \quad \mu^2 > 0, \lambda > 0 \quad (1.11)$$

⁴⁶⁹ where λ is the coupling strength of the four-point Higgs interaction. The potential
⁴⁷⁰ energy is minimized at

$$\Phi_{\min} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{where } v = \sqrt{\mu^2/\lambda} \quad (1.12)$$

⁴⁷¹ Choosing a fixed orientation of $\langle \Phi \rangle$ out of a continuous set of possible ground states
⁴⁷² spontaneously breaks the symmetry of the physical vacuum, as illustrated in Fig 1.2.




Figure 1.2: An illustration of the Higgs potential [3]. Choosing any of the points at the bottom of the potential breaks spontaneously the rotational $U(1)$ symmetry.

473 The excitations of the Higgs field with respect to the minimum Φ_{\min} are parameterized by
474

$$\Phi(x) = \exp(i\boldsymbol{\xi}(x) \cdot \boldsymbol{\tau}) \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v + H(x) \end{pmatrix} \quad (1.13)$$

475 Three degrees of freedom are coupled directly to the electroweak gauge bosons; this
476 is often referred to as the gauge bosons “eating” the Goldstone bosons to form the
477 longitudinal polarizations of the massive spin-1 boson states. The $H(x)$ excitation is
478 in the radial direction and corresponds to the free particle state of the Higgs boson.

479 1.4 Two-Higgs Doublet Models

480 One of the simplest possible extensions to the Standard Model is adding a doublet
481 to the minimal Higgs sector of the Standard Model, which is a $SU(2)_L$ doublet H
482 with hypercharge $Y = +\frac{1}{2}$, denoted here as $H \sim 2_{+1/2}$. These extensions are found
483 in several theories such as supersymmetry. A general 2HDM can be extended with a
484 light scalar (2HDM+S) to obtain a rich set of exotic Higgs decays [4].

The charges of the Higgs fields are chosen to be $H_1 \sim 2_{-1/2}$ and $H_2 \sim 2_{+1/2}$, which acquire vacuum expectation values $v_{1,2}$ which are assumed to be real and aligned [4]. Expanding about the minima yields two complex and four real degrees of freedom:

$$H_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} v_1 + H_{1,R}^0 + iH_{1,I}^0 \\ H_{1,R}^- + iH_{1,I}^- \end{pmatrix} \quad (1.14)$$

$$H_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} H_{2,R}^+ + iH_{2,I}^+ \\ v_2 + H_{2,R}^0 + iH_{2,I}^0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (1.15)$$

485 The charged scalar and pseudoscalar mass matrices are diagonalized by a rotation
486 angle β , defined as $\tan \beta = v_2/v_1$. One charged (complex) field and one neutral
487 pseudoscalar combination of $H_{1,2,I}^0$ are eaten by the SM gauge bosons after electroweak

488 symmetry breaking [4]. The other complex field yields two charged mass eigenstates
 489 H^\pm , which are assumed to be heavy. The remaining three degrees of freedom yield
 490 one neutral pseudoscalar mass eigenstate

$$A = H_{1,I}^0 \sin \beta - H_{2,I}^0 \cos \beta \quad (1.16)$$

491 and two neutral scalar mass eigenstates (where $-\pi/2 \leq \alpha \leq \pi/2$)

$$\begin{pmatrix} h \\ H^0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -\sin \alpha & \cos \alpha \\ \cos \alpha & \sin \alpha \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} H_{1,R}^0 \\ H_{2,R}^0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (1.17)$$

492 We assume that the 2HDM is near or in the decoupling limit: $\alpha \rightarrow \pi/2 - \beta$, where
 493 the lightest state in the 2HDM is h , which we identify as the 125 GeV Higgs particle
 494 [4]. In this limit, the fermion couplings of h become identical to the Standard Model
 495 Higgs, while the gauge boson couplings are very close to Standard Model-like for
 496 $\tan \beta \gtrsim 5$. All of the properties of h are determined by just two parameters: $\tan \beta$
 497 and α , and the fermion couplings to the two Higgs doublets.

498 2HDM can be extended by a scalar singlet (2HDM+S) [4]:

$$S = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(S_R + iS_I) \quad (1.18)$$

499 If this singlet only couples to the Higgs doublets $H_{1,2}$ and has no direct Yukawa
 500 couplings, all of its couplings to SM fermions result from mixing with $H_{1,2}$. Under
 501 these simple assumptions, exotic Higgs decays $h \rightarrow ss \rightarrow X\bar{X}Y\bar{Y}$ or $h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow$
 502 $X\bar{X}Y\bar{Y}$, and $h \rightarrow aZ \rightarrow X\bar{X}Y\bar{Y}$ are permitted, where $s(a)$ is a (pseudo)scalar mass
 503 eigenstate mostly composed of $S_R(S_I)$, and X, Y are Standard Model fermions or
 504 gauge bosons. There are two pseudoscalars in the 2HDM+S, and the mostly singlet-
 505 like pseudoscalar can be chosen to be the one lighter than the SM-like Higgs. For

506 $m_a < m_h - m_Z \sim 35$ GeV, the exotic Higgs decay $h \rightarrow Za$ is possible, and for
 507 $m_a < m_h/2 \approx 63$ GeV, the exotic Higgs decay $h \rightarrow aa$ is possible.




FIG. 7 (color online). Branching ratios of a singletlike pseudoscalar in the 2HDM + S for type-II Yukawa couplings. Decays to quarkonia likely invalidate our simple calculations in the shaded regions.

Figure 1.3: Branching ratios of a singlet-like pseudoscalar in Type II 2HDM+S for $\tan\beta = 0.5$ (*left*) and $\tan\beta = 5$ (*right*) from [4], showing the dependence of the branching ratios on $\tan\beta$, as well as the prominence of the branching ratios to bb and $\tau\tau$, the channels searched for in the analysis presented here.

508 In 2HDM, and by extension 2HDM+S, there are four types of fermion couplings
 509 commonly discussed in the literature that forbid flavor-changing neutral currents at
 510 tree level [4]. These are referred to as Type I (all fermions couple to H_2), Type II
 511 (MSSM-like, d_R and e_R couple to H_1 , u_R to H_2), Type III (lepton-specific, leptons
 512 and quarks couple to H_1 and H_2 respectively) and Type IV (flipped, with u_R , e_R
 513 coupling to H_2 and d_R to H_1). The exact branching ratios of the pseudoscalars to
 514 Standard Model particles vary depending on the 2HDM+S model and the value of
 515 $\tan\beta$ (e.g. Fig. 1.3).

516 1.5 Two Real Singlet Model

517 The two real singlet model (TRSM) adds two real singlet degrees of freedom to the
 518 Standard Model. These are written as two real singlet fields S and X . Depending
 519 on the vacuum expectation values acquired by the scalars, different phases of the
 520 model can be realized [5]. To reduce the number of free parameters, two discrete \mathbb{Z}_2
 521 symmetries are introduced. The fields are decomposed as

$$\Phi = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \frac{\phi_h + v}{\sqrt{2}} \end{pmatrix}, S = \frac{\phi_S + v_S}{\sqrt{2}}, X = \frac{\phi_X + v_X}{\sqrt{2}} \quad (1.19)$$

522 To achieve electroweak-breaking symmetry, $v = v_{SM} \sim 246$ GeV is necessary. If
 523 the vacuum expectation values $v_S, v_X \neq 0$ the \mathbb{Z}_2 are spontaneously broken, and the
 524 fields $\phi_{h,S,X}$ mix into three physical scalar states. This is called the broken phase and
 525 leads to the most interesting collider phenomenology.

526 The mass eigenstates $h_{1,2,3}$ are related to the fields $\phi_{h,S,X}$ through a 3×3 orthogonal
 527 mixing matrix denoted R . The mass eigenstates are assumed to be ordered $M_1 \leq$
 528 $M_2 \leq M_3$. R is parameterized by the three mixing angles $\theta_{hS}, \theta_{hX}, \theta_{SX}$. The nine
 529 parameters of the scalar potential can be expressed in terms of the three physical
 530 Higgs masses, the three mixing angles, and the three vacuum expectation values.

531 After fixing one of the Higgs masses to the mass of the observed Higgs boson, and
 532 fixing the Higgs doublet vacuum expectation value to its Standard Model value, there
 533 are seven remaining free parameters of the TRSM [5].

534 In one benchmark scenario of TRSM [5], the heaviest scalar state h_3 is identified
 535 with the 125 GeV Higgs, h_{125} , and it can decay asymmetrically $h_{125} \rightarrow h_1 h_2$, which
 536 we also denote $h \rightarrow a_1 a_2$ to highlight the similarity with the symmetric decay $h \rightarrow aa$
 537 typically interpreted in 2HDM+S as discussed. The parameter values in TRSM are
 538 chosen such that the coupling of h_3 to Standard Model particles are nearly identical
 539 to the Standard Model predictions.

540 In benchmark scenario 1 (benchmark plane 1, or BP1) (Fig. 1.4) [5], the maximal
541 branching ratios for $h_3 \rightarrow h_1 h_2$ reach up to 7 – 8% which translates into a signal
542 rate of around 3 pb. These maximal branching ratios are reached in the intermediate
543 mass state for h_2 , $M_2 \sim 60 – 80$ GeV. For $M_2 < 40$ GeV, although phase space opens
544 up significantly for light decay products, the branching ratio becomes smaller.

545 If the decay channel $h_2 \rightarrow h_1 h_1$ is kinematically open (i.e. $M_2 > 2M_1$), it is the
546 dominant decay mode leading to a significant rate for the $h_1 h_1 h_1$ final state, in a
547 “cascade” decay. In BP1, $BR(h_2 \rightarrow h_1 h_1) \simeq 100\%$ above the red line in Fig. 1.4. If,
548 in addition, $M_1 \gtrsim 10$ GeV, the h_1 decays dominantly to $b\bar{b}$ leading to a sizable rate
549 for the $b\bar{b} b\bar{b} b\bar{b}$ final state as shown in Fig. 1.4 (*bottom right*).

550 If the $h_2 \rightarrow h_1 h_1$ decay is kinematically closed (i.e. $M_2 < 2M_1$), both scalars decay
551 directly to Standard Model particles, with branching ratios identical to a Standard
552 Model-like Higgs boson, i.e. with the $b\bar{b} b\bar{b}$ final state dominating, as shown in Fig. 1.4
553 (*bottom left*), while at smaller masses, combinations with τ leptons and eventually
554 final states with charm quarks and muons become relevant [5].




Figure 1.4: Benchmark plane BP1 for benchmark scenario 1 from [5], for the decay signature $h_{125} \rightarrow h_1 h_2$ with $h_{125} \equiv h_3$, defined in the (M_1, M_2) plane. The color code shows $\text{BR}(h_3 \rightarrow h_1 h_2)$ (*top left*) and the 13 TeV LHC signal rate for $pp \rightarrow h_3 \rightarrow h_1 h_2$ (*top right*). The red line separates the region $M_2 > 2M_1$, where $\text{BR}(h_2 \rightarrow h_1 h_1) \sim 100\%$, from the region $M_2 < 2M_1$, where $\text{BR}(h_2 \rightarrow F_{SM}) \sim 100\%$. The *bottom left* and *right* show the branching ratio of the $h_1 h_2$ into (respectively) $b\bar{b}b\bar{b}$, and through a $h_2 \rightarrow h_1 h_1$ cascade to $b\bar{b}b\bar{b}b\bar{b}$. The hatched region indicates where the decay rate slightly exceeds the 2σ upper limit inferred from the LHC Higgs rate measurements, though the region depends on the parameter choices and experimental searches should cover the whole mass range.

555 **Chapter 2**

556 **The Large Hadron Collider and the**
557 **CMS Experiment**

558 This chapter introduces the key aspects of the CERN Large Hadron Collider (LHC)
559 and the Compact Muon Solenoid (CMS) experiment where the work for this thesis was
560 conducted. Section 2.1 describes the history of accelerator developments at CERN
561 that led to the construction of the LHC, the current LHC configuration, and the
562 largest experiments located at the LHC. The concepts of beam luminosity and pileup,
563 which are critical for understanding and measuring high-energy particle collisions,
564 are described in Section 2.2 and discussed in the context of the High-Luminosity
565 LHC (HL-LHC) upgrade in Section 2.3. Lastly, Section 2.4 describes the design
566 and function of CMS and its subdetectors, and terminates in a description of data
567 processing at CMS, beginning from online event filtering in the Level-1 Trigger, to
568 processing in the High-Level Trigger, to offline particle reconstruction, and finally
569 long-term storage and processing of measured events.

570 2.1 The Large Hadron Collider

571 CERN, the European Organization for Nuclear Research, is an international organiza-
572 tion based in Meyrin, Switzerland which operates the world's largest particle physics
573 laboratory, and is the site of the Large Hadron Collider (LHC) [6]. The very first
574 accelerator built at CERN was the 600 MeV Synchrocyclotron (SC), which initially
575 provided beams for CERN's first experiments. The newer and more powerful Proton
576 Synchrotron (PS), which could accelerate particles to an energy of 28 GeV, began op-
577 erations in 1959 and is still in use today. The first hadron collider at CERN was the
578 Intersecting Storage Rings (ISR), which consisted of two interlaced rings each with a
579 diameter of 200. The ISR collided protons at a center-of-mass energy of 62 GeV and
580 began measuring collisions in 1971. In 1968 CERN began to accelerate heavy ions
581 in the Super Proton Synchrotron (SPS), which is 7 kilometers in circumference and
582 was the first of CERN's giant underground rings to be built. The SPS became the
583 forefront of CERN's particle physics program in 1976, and in 1981 was converted into
584 a proton-antiproton collider. The final and largest underground ring constructed at
585 CERN was the Large Electron-Positron (LEP) collider, which was commissioned in
586 July 1989 and hosted 5176 magnets and 128 accelerating cavities located around a
587 27-kilometer circumference. Over 11 years of research, four detectors, ALEPH, DEL-
588 PHI, L3, and OPAL measured the collisions, with collision energies reaching up to
589 209 GeV in the year 2000. In November 2000, LEP was closed down to make way for
590 the construction of the LHC in the same tunnel.

591 In its current configuration, the LHC accelerator complex at CERN is a succession
592 of machines that accelerate particles in stages until they reach their final energy of
593 6.5 TeV per beam [7] [8]. In Linear accelerator 4 (Linac4), negative hydrogen ions (hy-
594 drogen atoms with an additional electron) are accelerated to 160 MeV, and stripped
595 of their two electrons, leaving only protons, before entering the Proton Synchrotron
596 Booster (PSB). These protons are accelerated to 2 GeV, then to 26 GeV in the Proton

597 Synchrotron (PS), and 450 GeV in the Super Proton Synchrotron (SPS). The protons
598 are transferred to the two beam pipes of the Large Hadron Collider (LHC). The LHC
599 is a 27-kilometer ring of superconducting magnets, inside which one beam circulates
600 clockwise and the other counterclockwise. Each LHC ring takes 4 minutes and 20
601 seconds to fill, and it takes about 20 minutes for the protons to reach their maximum
602 energy. During normal operating conditions, beams circulate for many hours inside
603 the LHC ring.

604 The beams of particles in the LHC are made to collide at a center-of-mass energy
605 of up to 14 TeV, at four positions at particle detector experiments located around
606 the ring: ATLAS, CMS, ALICE, and LHCb. An aerial view of the four major ex-
607 periments' locations is shown in Fig. 2.1 [9]. ATLAS and CMS are the two general-
608 purpose detectors with broad physics programmes spanning Standard Model mea-
609 surements and searches for signatures of new physics [10] [11]. The two experiments
610 use different technical solutions and different magnet system designs. ALICE is a
611 general-purpose detector dedicated to measuring LHC heavy-ion collisions, and is de-
612 signed to address the physics of strongly interacting matter, and the properties of
613 quark-gluon plasma [12]. The LHCb experiment specializes in investigating CP vio-
614 lation through measuring the differences in matter and antimatter, by using a series
615 of subdetectors to detect mainly forward particles close to the beam direction [13].

616 2.2 Luminosity and pileup

617 In order to search for rare processes, such as those resulting from a Higgs, W, or Z
618 boson, a large number of parton interactions per second are required at the LHC.
619 The number of events generated per second by the LHC collisions is given by

$$N_{event} = \mathcal{L} \cdot \sigma_{event} \quad (2.1)$$




Figure 2.1: Aerial view of the Large Hadron Collider (LHC) spanning the border of France and Switzerland, and the four major experiments located around the ring: CMS (Compact Muon Solenoid), LHCb (LHC beauty), ATLAS (A Toroidal LHC Apparatus), and ALICE (A Large Ion Collider Experiment) [9].

where σ_{event} is the cross-section for the event under study, and \mathcal{L} the instantaneous luminosity. The instantaneous luminosity is measured in units of $\text{cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$, and depends only on the beam parameters, and can be written for a Gaussian beam distribution as:

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{N_b^2 n_b f_{rev} \gamma_r}{4\pi \epsilon_n \beta^*} F \quad (2.2)$$

where the parameters are as defined, along with some example typical nominal values in Phase-1 of the LHC [14] [15]:

- N_b is the number of particles per bunch ($N_b \approx 1.15 \times 10^{11}$ protons per bunch)
- n_b is the number of bunches per beam (maximum 2808),
- f_{rev} is the revolution frequency ($\approx 11 \text{ kHz}$),
- γ_r is the relativistic gamma factor,

- ϵ_n is the normalized transverse beam emittance (area in a transverse plane occupied by the beam particles),
- β^* is the beta function at the collision point ($\beta^* = 0.55$ m),
- and F is the geometric luminosity reduction factor due to the crossing angle at the interaction points ($F \approx 0.84$ for Phase-1. Note that complete overlap would give $F = 1$).

Peak luminosity at interaction points 1 and 5 reach values of $\sim 1.0 \times 10^{34} \text{ cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$, with peak luminosity per bunch crossing reaching $\sim 3.56 \times 10^{34} \text{ cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$.

Per Eqn. 2.1, the integrated luminosity over time is proportional to the number of events produced, and the size of LHC datasets is commonly presented in terms of integrated luminosity. Collider operation aims to optimize the integrated luminosity. Thus the exploration of rare events in the LHC collisions requires both high beam energies and high beam intensities.

The LHC’s nominal beam luminosities are sufficiently large for multiple proton-proton collisions to occur in the same time window of 25 nanoseconds in which proton bunches collide [16]. These multiple collisions will lead to particle interactions overlapping in the detector. To measure a proton-proton collision, the single collision must be separated from overlapping collisions, which are called “pileup” collisions. A distribution of pileup in the data-taking years 2016-2018 is shown in Fig. 2.2. The pileup is defined as the average number of pp collisions per bunch crossing.

CMS reports an inelastic pp cross section of $\sigma_{\text{inel}} = 68.6$ millibarns at a center-of-mass energy of $\sqrt{s} = 13 \text{ TeV}$ [17], which can be used to estimate pileup as follows:

$$\text{Pileup} = \frac{\mathcal{L} \times \sigma_{\text{inel}}}{n_b \cdot f} \quad (2.3)$$

With the example values above, pileup can be estimated to be ~ 22 .

653 While useful in the search for rare physics processes, higher luminosities create
 654 more intense pileup conditions, posing a greater challenge to detector performance
 655 and particle reconstruction and identification.




Figure 2.2: Distribution of the mean number of inelastic collisions per bunch crossing (pileup) in data [16], for proton-proton collisions in 2016 (*dotted orange*), 2017 (*dotted light blue*), 2018 (*dotted dark blue*), and integrated over 2016-2018 (*solid grey*). A cross-section of inelastic proton-proton collisions of 69.2 mbarns is assumed. In the running conditions of the High-Luminosity LHC, pileup will reach unprecedented levels of up to 200 per bunch crossing [18].

656 2.3 The High-Luminosity LHC

657 The High-Luminosity LHC (HL-LHC) is a major upgrade of the LHC scheduled
 658 to take place in the late 2020s, that will increase the instantaneous luminosity by
 659 a factor of five beyond the original design value, and the integrated luminosity
 660 by a factor of ten [18]. This will be accomplished through accelerator technological
 661 advances: for instance, reduction of the interaction point β^* from 0.55 m down to 0.15
 662 m by installation of new final-focusing magnets, and improvements in the geometric
 663 luminosity loss factor $F \approx 1$ through the installation of crab cavities that optimize

664 the orientation of colliding bunches. A further discussion of the HL-LHC upgrades
665 for the CMS detector follows in Chapter 3.

666 2.4 The CMS Detector

667 The Compact Muon Solenoid (CMS) experiment was conceived to study proton-
668 proton and lead-lead collisions at a center-of-mass energy of 14 TeV (5.5 TeV nucleon-
669 nucleon) and at luminosities up to $10^{34} \text{ cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ ($10^{27} \text{ cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$) [19] [20]. Starting
670 from the beam interaction region at the center of the CMS detector, particles first
671 pass through a silicon pixel and strip tracker, in which charged-particle trajectories
672 (tracks) and origins (vertices) are reconstructed from signals (hits) in the sensitive
673 layers. The tracker is immersed in a high-magnetic-field superconducting solenoid
674 that bends the trajectories of charged particles, allowing the measurement of their
675 electric charge and momenta. Electrons and photons are then absorbed in an electro-
676 magnetic calorimeter (ECAL) comprised of lead-tungstate scintillating-crystals. The
677 corresponding electromagnetic showers are detected as clusters of energy recording in
678 neighboring cells, from which the direction and energy of the particles can be deter-
679 mined. Charged and neutral hadrons may initiate a hadronic shower in the ECAL
680 as well, which is then fully absorbed in the hadron calorimeter (HCAL). The result-
681 ing clusters are used to estimate their direction and energies. Muons and neutrinos
682 pass through the calorimeters with little to no interactions. Neutrinos escaped un-
683 detected; muons produce hits in additional gas-ionization chamber muon detectors
684 housed in the iron yoke of the flux-return. A sketch of example particle interactions
685 in a transverse slice of the CMS detector is shown in Fig. 2.3. The collision data is
686 recorded with the use of the Level-1 (L1) trigger (discussed in greater detail in 2.5.5),
687 the High-Level Trigger (HLT), and data acquisition systems ensuring high efficiency
688 in selecting physics events of interest.




Figure 2.3: Sketch of particle trajectories of muons, electrons, charged and neutral hadrons, and photons in a transverse cross-section of the CMS detector [20].

CMS uses a right-handed coordinate system [19]. The origin is centered at the nominal collision point inside the experiment. The x axis points towards the center of the LHC, and the y axis points vertically upwards. The z axis points along the beam direction. The azimuthal angle, ϕ , is measured from the x axis in the x - y plane, and the radial coordinate in this plane is denoted by r . The polar angle, θ , is measured from the z axis. The pseudorapidity, η , is defined as $\eta = -\ln \tan(\theta/2)$. The momentum and energy transverse to the beam direction, denoted by p_T and E_T respectively, are computed from the x and y components. The momentum imbalance in the transverse plane is called the missing transverse momentum, and its magnitude is denoted by E_T^{miss} .

2.5 Sub-detectors of CMS

This section details the sub-detectors of CMS that operate to identify and precisely measure muons, electrons, photons, and jets over a large energy range.

702 **2.5.1 Inner tracking system**

703 The CMS Tracker performs robust tracking and detailed vertex reconstruction in the
704 4 T magnetic field of the superconducting solenoidal magnet. The primary sensors
705 used in the tracker are p^+ on n -bulk devices, which allow high voltage operation and
706 are radiation-resistant [21] [22]. The active envelope of the CMS Tracker extends to a
707 radius of 115 cm, over a length of approximately 270 cm on each side of the interaction
708 point [21]. Charged particles in the region $|\eta| \lesssim 1.6$ benefit from the full momentum
709 measurement precision. In this region, a charged particle with p_T of 1000 GeV has a
710 sagitta of $\sim 195 \mu\text{m}$. The Tracker acceptance extends further to $|\eta| = 2.5$, with a
711 reduced radius of approximately 50 cm.

712 The high magnetic field of CMS causes low p_T charged particles to travel in helical
713 trajectories with small radii. The majority of events contain particles with a steeply
714 falling p_T spectrum, resulting in a track density which rapidly decreases at higher
715 radii.

716 A schematic view of the current Phase-1 CMS tracker [23], including the pixel
717 detector, is shown in Fig. 2.4. The Phase-1 pixel detector consists of three barrel
718 layers (BPIX) at radii of 4.4 cm, 7.3 cm, and 10.2 cm, and two forward/backward disks
719 (FPIX) at longitudinal positions of ± 34.5 cm and ± 46.5 cm, and extending in radius
720 from about 6 cm to 15 cm. These pixelated detectors produce 3D measurements along
721 the paths of charged particles with single hit resolutions between 10-20 μm .

722 After the pixel and on their way out of the tracker, particles pass through the
723 silicon strip tracker which reaches out to a radius of 130 cm (Fig. 2.4). The sensor
724 elements in the strip tracker are single-sided p -on- n type silicon micro-strip sensors
725 [19]. The silicon strip detector consists of four inner barrel (TIB) layers assembled
726 in shells, with two inner endcaps (TID), each composed of three small discs. The
727 outer barrel (TOB) consists of six concentric layers. Two endcaps (TEC) close off
728 the tracker on either end.




Figure 2.4: Cross section of the current Phase-1 CMS tracker [23]. Each line represents a detector module. Double lines indicate back-to-back modules which deliver two-dimensional (stereo) hits in the strip tracker.

2.5.2 ECAL

The electromagnetic calorimeter (ECAL) of CMS measures electromagnetic energy deposits with high granularity. One of the driving criteria in the design was the capability of detecting the Standard Model Higgs boson decay to two photons (in fact, the channel in which the 125 GeV Higgs boson was discovered at CMS). ECAL is a hermetic homogeneous calorimeter comprised of 61,200 lead tungstate (PbWO_4) crystals mounted in the central barrel, with 7,324 crystals in each of the two endcaps [19]. A preshower detector is located in front of the endcap crystals. Avalanche photodiodes (APDs) are used as photodetectors in the barrel and vacuum phototriodes (VPTs) in the endcaps.

The design of the ECAL is driven by the behaviour of high-energy electrons, which predominantly lose energy in matter via bremsstrahlung, and high-energy photons by e^+e^- pair production. The characteristic amount of matter traversed for these interactions is the radiation length X^0 , usually measured in units of g cm^{-2} . The radiation length is also the mean distance over which a high-energy electron loses all but $1/e$ of its energy via bremsstrahlung [24]. Thus high granularity in η and ϕ , and the length of the ECAL crystals, is designed to capture the shower of e/γ produced

746 by electrons and photons.

747 The barrel part of the ECAL (EB) covers the pseudorapidity range $|\eta| < 1.479$
748 [19]. The barrel granularity is 360-fold in ϕ and (2×85) -fold in η . The crystal cross-
749 section corresponds to approximately 0.0174×0.0174 in $\eta - \phi$ or 22×22 mm 2 at the
750 front face of the crystal, and 26×26 mm 2 at the rear face. The crystal length is 230
751 mm, corresponding to $25.8 X_0$.

752 The ECAL read-out acquires the signals of the photodetectors [19]. At each bunch
753 crossing, digital sums representing the energy deposit in a trigger tower, comprising
754 5×5 crystals in $\eta \times \phi$, are generated and sent to the Level-1 trigger system (detailed
755 in Section 2.5.5).

756 2.5.3 HCAL

757 The hadronic calorimeter (HCAL) of CMS measures hadronic energy, which is key to
758 characterizing the presence of apparent missing transverse energy which could arise
759 from hadron jets and neutrinos or exotic particles [19]. A schematic of the components
760 of HCAL are shown in Fig. 2.5. The HCAL barrel (HB) and endcaps (HE) are located
761 outside of the tracker and the ECAL, spanning a radius of 1.77 m (outer extent of
762 ECAL) up to 2.95 m (inner extent of the magnet coil). An outer hadron calorimeter
763 (HO) is placed outside the solenoid to complement the barrel calorimeter. Beyond
764 $|\eta| = 3$, the forward hadron calorimeter (HF) at 11.2 m from the interaction point
765 extend the pseudorapidity coverage to $|\eta| = 5.2$.

766 The HB is a sampling calorimeter covering the pseudorapidity range $|\eta| < 1.3$ [19].
767 It consists of 36 identical azimuthal wedges which form two half-barrels (HB+ and HB-
768), with a segmentation of $(\Delta\eta, \Delta\phi) = (0.087, 0.087)$. The HE covers pseudorapidity
769 $1.3 < |\eta| < 3$. The HB and endcap HE calorimeters are sampling calorimeters which
770 use brass as the absorber and plastic scintillator as the active material. Light from
771 the plastic scintillator is wavelength-shifted and captured in optic fibers which are




Figure 2.5: Longitudinal view of the CMS detector showing the hadron calorimeter barrel (HB), endcap (HE), outer (HO), and forward (HF) calorimeters from [19].

772 read out by front-end electronics [25].

773 In the central pseudorapidity region, the combined stopping power of EB plus the
 774 HB is insufficient to contain hadron showers [19]. To ensure adequate sampling depth,
 775 the hadron calorimeter is extended with a tail catcher, the HO. The size and position
 776 of the tiles are designed to roughly map the layers of the HB to make towers with
 777 the same granularity of 0.087×0.087 in η and ϕ . HO uses the same active material
 778 as the HB and HE calorimeters, but uses the steel return yoke and magnet material
 779 of CMS as absorbers [25].

780 The HF is a Cherenkov calorimeter based on a steel absorber and quartz fibers
 781 which run longitudinally through the absorber and collect Cherenkov light, primarily
 782 from the electromagnetic component of showers developed in the calorimeter [25].
 783 Photomultiplier tubes are used to collect light from the quartz fibers. The HF is
 784 designed to survive in the harsh radiation conditions and high particle flux of the
 785 forward region. On average, 760 GeV per proton-proton interaction is deposited into
 786 the two forward calorimeters, compared to only 100 GeV for the rest of the detector
 787 [19]. Furthermore, this energy has a pronounced maximum at the highest rapidities.

788 2.5.4 Muon detectors

789 The CMS muon system is designed to have the capability of reconstructing the mo-
790 mentum and charge of muons over the kinematic range of the LHC, since muons are a
791 powerful handle on signatures of interesting processes over the high background rate
792 of the LHC [19]. For instance, the decay of the Standard Model Higgs boson into
793 ZZ , which in turn decay to 4 leptons, can be reconstructed with high 4-particle mass
794 resolution if all the leptons are muons, since muons are less affected than electrons
795 by radiative losses in the tracker material.

796 The muon system consists of a cylindrical barrel section and two planar endcap
797 regions [19]. The barrel muon detector consists of drift tube (DT) chambers covering
798 the pseudorapidity region $|\eta| < 1.2$ (Fig. 2.6). The DTs can be used as tracking
799 detectors due to the barrel region's characteristic low neutron-induced backgrounds,
800 low muon rate, and relatively uniform 4T magnetic field contained in the steel yoke.

801 In the two endcap regions, the muon rates and background levels are high and the
802 magnetic field is large and non-uniform [19]. Here, the muon system uses cathode
803 strip chambers (CSCs) to identify muons between $0.9 < |\eta| < 2.4$. The cathode strips
804 of each chamber run radially outwards and provide a precision measurement in the
805 $r - \phi$ bending plane. The anode wires run approximately perpendicular to the strips
806 and are read out in order to measure η and the beam-crossing time of a muon.

807 In addition to the DT and CSC, a dedicated trigger system consisting of resistive
808 plate chambers (RPCs) in the barrel and endcap regions provide a fast, independent,
809 and highly-segmented trigger with a sharp p_T threshold over a large portion of the
810 pseudorapidity range ($|\eta| < 1.6$) of the muon system [19]. RPCs have good time
811 resolution but coarser position resolution compared to the DTs or CSCs. The RPCs
812 also play a role in resolving ambiguities in reconstructing tracks from multiple hits in
813 a chamber.




Figure 2.6: Layout of the CMS barrel muon drift tube (DT) chambers in one of the five wheels from [19]. The DTs are organized in 12 sectors of the yoke barrel (YB). In each of the 12 sectors of the yoke, there are 4 muon chambers per wheel (MB1, MB2, MB3, and MB4).

814 2.5.5 The Level-1 Trigger

815 The design performance of the LHC corresponds to an instantaneous luminosity of
 816 $10^{34} \text{ cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ with a 25 ns bunch crossing rate, giving an average pile-up (number
 817 of simultaneous events) of 25 per bunch crossing [26]. The large number of minimum
 818 bias events per bunch crossing, combined with the small cross-sections of possible
 819 physics discovery signatures, necessitates a sophisticated event selection system for
 820 filtering this large event rate, as it is impossible to save all events. This data filtering
 821 system is implemented by CMS in two stages. The first stage is the Level-1 (L1)
 822 Trigger, which is deployed in custom electronic hardware systems and is responsible
 823 for reducing the event rate to around 100 kHz. The second stage is the High-Level

824 Trigger (HLT) which is described in Section 2.5.6. This section describes the Phase-1
825 configuration of the Level-1 Trigger.

826 The L1 Trigger data flow of Phase-1 is shown in Fig. 2.7 [26], with organization
827 into the L1 calorimeter trigger, the L1 muon trigger, and the L1 global trigger.




Figure 2.7: Dataflow for the Phase-1 Level-1 Trigger [26], which is implemented in custom hardware and is responsible for reducing the event rate from the LHC bunch crossing frequency of 400 MHz (bunch crossings every 25 ns) to a maximum rate of 100 kHz. In Phase-1, the Level-1 Trigger has access to information from the calorimeter and muon detectors.

828 The L1 calorimeter trigger begins with trigger tower energy sums formed by the
829 ECAL, HCAL, and HF Trigger Primitive Generator (TPG) circuits from the indi-
830 vidual calorimeter cell energies. In the original configuration, the ECAL energies
831 were accompanied by a bit indicating the transverse extent of the electromagnetic
832 energy deposits, and the HCAL energies were accompanied by a bit indicating the
833 presence of minimum ionizing energy [27]. Between Long Shutdowns 1 and 2 (LS1
834 and LS2), HF was upgraded to provide finer granularity information to the trigger,
835 and the HCAL barrel and endcap front-end electronics were upgraded to provide
836 high-precision timing information and depth segmentation information.

837 In the original design of the L1 calorimeter trigger, the trigger primitives are pro-
838 cessed by the Regional Calorimeter Trigger (RCT, upgraded to Calo Layer 1 after
839 LS2) which finds isolated and non-isolated electron/photon candidates [26]. At this
840 stage, electrons/photons candidates are treated together since they cannot be defini-
841 tively distinguished at this stage due to lack of tracking information in the L1 trigger.
842 The Global Calorimeter Trigger (GCT, upgraded to Calo Layer 2 after LS2) sorts
843 further the candidate electrons/photons, finds jets (classified as central, forward, and
844 tau) using the E_T sums and performs calibration of the clustered jet energies, and
845 calculates global quantities such as missing E_T . It sends the top four candidates of
846 each type to the global trigger (GT) [26].

847 Each of the L1 muon triggers has its own trigger logic [27]. The RPC strips are
848 connected to a Pattern Comparator Trigger (PACT), which forms trigger segments
849 that are used to build tracks and calculate p_T . The RPC logic also provides some
850 hit data to the CSC trigger system to resolve ambiguities caused by two muons in
851 the same CSC. The CSCs form local charged tracks (LCTs) from the cathode strips,
852 which are combined with the anode wire information. LCTs are combined into full
853 muon tracks and assigned p_T values.

854 The Global Muon Trigger (GMT) sorts the RPC, DT, and CSC muon tracks,
855 converts these tracks to the same η , ϕ , and p_T scale, and validates the muon sign [27].
856 It improves the trigger efficiency by merging muon candidates that were detected
857 in two complementary sub-systems (i.e. DT+RPC, or CSC+RPC). The GMT also
858 contains logic to correlate the found muon tracks with an $\eta-\phi$ grid of quiet calorimeter
859 towers to determine if the muons are isolated, as well as logic to remove duplicate
860 candidates originating in the overlap regions from both DT and CSC systems. The
861 final collection of muons are sorted based on their initial quality, correlation, and p_T ,
862 and the top four muons are sent to the Global Trigger [27].

863 Information from the GCT and GT are sent to the Global Trigger (GT), which

864 makes the Level-1 Accept (L1A) decision to either discard or accept the bunch crossing
865 [27]. This is accomplished by sorting ranked trigger objects that are accompanied by
866 positional information in η and ϕ , permitting the trigger to applying criteria with
867 thresholds that can vary based on the location of the trigger objects, and/or to
868 require trigger objects to be close to or opposite from each other. The GT L1A
869 decision arrives at the detector front end with a $3.8\ \mu\text{s}$ latency after the interaction
870 at a rate which is required to be less than 100 kHz, and triggers a full readout of the
871 detector for further processing.

872 **2.5.6 The High-Level Trigger**

873 The HLT is implemented in software running on a large computer farm of fast com-
874 mercial processors [28] [29]. The algorithms in HLT have access to full data from
875 all CMS sub-detectors, including the tracker, with full granularity and resolution.
876 The HLT reconstruction software is similar to what is used offline for full CMS data
877 analysis. As a result, the HLT can calculate quantities with a resolution compara-
878 ble to the final detector resolution, compared to the L1 Trigger. The HLT performs
879 more computationally-intensive algorithms, such as combining tau-jet candidates in
880 the calorimeter with high- p_T stubs in the tracker, to form a hadronic tau trigger. The
881 maximum HLT input rate from the L1 Trigger is 100 kHz, and the HLT output rate
882 is approximately 100 Hz.

883 The HLT contains trigger paths, each corresponding to a dedicated trigger [30].
884 A path consists of several steps implemented as software modules. Each HLT trigger
885 path must be seeded by one or more L1 trigger bits: the first module always looks
886 for a L1 seed, consisting of L1 bit(s) and L1 object(s). Each module performs a well-
887 defined task such as unpacking (raw to digitized quantities), reconstruction of physics
888 objects (electrons, muons, jet, missing transverse energy, etc.), making intermediate
889 decisions that trigger more detailed reconstruction modules, and calculating the final

890 decision for the trigger path. If an intermediate filter decision is negative, the rest of
891 the path is not executed, and the trigger rejects the event.

892 **2.5.7 Particle reconstruction**

893 To build a description of the physics objects present in the particle collision, the
894 basic elements from the detector layers (tracks and clusters of energy) are correlated
895 to identify each particle in the final state. Measurements from different sub-detectors
896 are combined to reconstruct the particle properties. This approach is called particle-
897 flow (PF) reconstruction [20]. Key to the success of the PF reconstruction is the
898 fine spatial granularity of the detector layers. Coarse-grained detectors can cause
899 the signals from different particles to merge, especially within jets. However, if the
900 subdetectors are sufficiently segmented to separate individual particles, it becomes
901 possible to produce a global event description that identifies all physics objects with
902 high efficiencies and resolution.

903 **2.5.8 Data storage and computational infrastructure**

904 The LHC generates over 15 petabytes (15 million gigabytes) of data every year, neces-
905 sitating a flexible computing system that can be accessed by researchers working at
906 the four main LHC experiments: ALICE, ATLAS, CMS, and LHCb. The Worldwide
907 LHC Computing Grid (WLCG) [31] is a global collaboration of computer centers that
908 links thousands of computers and storage systems in over 170 centers across 41 coun-
909 tries. These centers are arranged in “tiers”, and provide near real-time access to users
910 processing, analyzing, and storing LHC data. One of the final stages of data analy-
911 sis at LHC experiments is large-scale data processing taking place over distributing
912 computing, for instance, with the use of Condor [32], a distributed, scalable, flexible
913 batch processing system which accepts a computing job, allocates a resource to it,
914 executes it, and returns the result back to a user transparently.

915 **Chapter 3**

916 **The Phase-2 Upgrade of CMS**

917 **3.1 High-Luminosity LHC and CMS**

918 In order to sustain and extend the LHC’s physics discovery program and maintain
919 operability for a decade or more, the LHC is undergoing a major upgrade to the High-
920 Luminosity LHC (HL-LHC). In its final configuration, the HL-LHC will deliver a peak
921 luminosity of $7.5 \times 10^{34} \text{ cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$, potentially leading to total integrated luminosity
922 of 4000 fb^{-1} after ten years of operations, scheduled to begin in 2027 [33]. This
923 integrated luminosity is about ten times the predicted luminosity reach of the LHC
924 in its initial configuration. To maximize the discovery potential of this unprecedented
925 amount of data, the CMS detector is undergoing Phase-2 upgrades in order to perform
926 high-precision measurements and searches for physics beyond the Standard Model in
927 the intense running conditions of the HL-LHC.

928 **3.2 The Phase-2 Level-1 Trigger**

929 To achieve the goals of the HL-LHC program and to ensure the collection of information-
930 rich datasets in the HL-LHC, the Phase-2 upgrade of the CMS Level-1 Trigger [33]
931 must be upgraded in conjunction with the CMS sub-detectors and their readouts, to

932 maintain physics selectivity. The HL-LHC will produce an intense hadronic environment
 933 corresponding to 200 simultaneous collisions per beam crossing, necessitating
 934 comprehensive upgrades of the trigger system outlined below.

935 To profit from the extended coverage and increased granularity of the upgraded
 936 CMS detector, the latency of the L1 trigger system (time available to produce a L1
 937 Accept signal) will be increased significantly from $3.8 \mu\text{s}$ to $12.5 \mu\text{s}$, with an increased
 938 maximum output bandwidth of 750 kHz [33]. With the increased latency, in addition
 939 to information from calorimeters and muon detectors (as in the Phase-1 system),
 940 information from the new tracker and high-granularity endcap calorimeter can also
 941 be included at L1 for the first time. This is illustrated in the functional diagram of
 942 the architecture of the Phase-2 trigger system in Fig. 3.1.




Figure 3.1: Functional diagram of the CMS L1 Phase-2 upgraded trigger design [33], showing the four trigger paths: calorimeter, muon, track, and Particle Flow. For the first time, tracking information will be available as early as the L1 Trigger.

943 The key feature of the Phase-2 L1 Trigger is the introduction of a correlator layer,

944 where algorithms produce higher-level trigger objects by combining information from
945 sub-detectors, with a selectivity approaching that of offline reconstruction in the
946 HLT [33]. Four independent data processing paths (grouped together in Fig. 3.1) are
947 implemented: tracking, calorimetry, muon systems, and particle-flow techniques:

- 948 • **Calorimeter Trigger path:** (*red*, Fig. 3.1) A barrel calorimeter trigger (BCT)
949 and the HGCAL backend are used to produce high-granularity information from
950 the calorimeters to produce high-resolution clusters and identification variables
951 used for later processing. Outputs from the BCT, HGCAL, and the HF are sent
952 to a global calorimeter trigger (GCT), where calorimeter-only objects such as
953 e/γ candidates, hadronically decaying tau lepton candidates, jets, and energy
954 sums are built.
- 955 • **Track Trigger path:** (*green*, Fig. 3.1) Tracks from the Outer Tracker are
956 reconstructed in the track finder (TF) processors as part of the detector back-
957 end. A global track trigger (GTT) will reconstruct the primary vertices of the
958 event, along with tracker-only based objects, such as jets and missing transverse
959 momentum.
- 960 • **Muon Trigger path:** (*blue*, Fig. 3.1) Trigger primitives are processed by
961 muon track finder algorithms, again separated into the barrel (barrel muon
962 track finder, BMTF), overlap (overlap muon track finder, OMTF), and endcap
963 (endcap muon track finder, EMTF). Standalone muons and stubs containing
964 information such as position, bend angle, and timing, as well as L1 tracks, are
965 sent to the global muon trigger (GMT).
- 966 • **Particle-Flow Trigger path:** (*yellow*, Fig. 3.1) The correlator trigger (CT)
967 aims to approach the performance of offline Particle Flow, and is implemented
968 in two layers. “Layer-1” produces the particle-flow candidates from matching

969 calorimeter clusters and tracks. “Layer 2” builds and sorts final trigger objects
970 and applies additional identification and isolation criteria.

971 The outputs from the above trigger paths are combined in the Global Trigger
972 (GT) (*purple*, Fig. 3.1), which calculates the final trigger decision (Level-1 Accept),
973 transmitting it to the Trigger Control and Distribution System (TCDS), which dis-
974 tributes it to the detector backend systems, initiating the readout to the DAQ. The
975 GT also provides the interface to external triggers (*grey*, Fig. 3.1), such as trig-
976 gers for the precision proton spectrometer (PPS), beam position and timing monitors
977 (BPTX), and luminosity and beam monitoring (BRIL) detectors [33]. The design of
978 the Phase-2 Level-1 Trigger allows for future inclusion of triggering information, for
979 instance information about minimum ionizing particles (MIPs) from the MIP Timing
980 Detector (MTD) [34].

981 **3.3 Standalone Barrel Calorimeter electron/photon 982 reconstruction**

983 The reconstruction and identification of electrons and photons (e/γ) begin with the
984 trigger primitives of the barrel ECAL and HCAL detectors and endcap HGCAL
985 calorimeters, covering the pseudorapidity region $|\eta| < 3$. The barrel and endcap re-
986 gions of the detector are intrinsically different enough to warrant different approaches
987 to e/γ reconstruction. This work focuses on the Standalone Calorimeter e/γ recon-
988 struction taking place in the barrel (Fig. 3.2).

989 **3.3.1 Phase-2 geometry of the ECAL Barrel trigger**

990 In Phase-2, the upgrade of both on-detector and off-detector electronics for the barrel
991 calorimeters trigger primitive generator (TPG) will stream single crystal data from




Figure 3.2: Summary of the links between the trigger primitives (*first column*), the trigger objects (*second column*), the Level-1 algorithms used in the menu (*3rd column*), and the physics channels (*4th column*), from [33], where a full description of the Phase-2 L1 algorithms can be found. This work focuses on developments for the Standalone Calorimeter electron and photon ("EG") reconstruction algorithm.

the on-detector to the backend electronics, in contrast to the lower-granularity output of the Phase-1 ECAL TPG that is restricted to providing trigger tower sums of 5×5 crystals [33]. A schematic representation of the geometry of the ECAL barrel in the Regional Calorimeter Trigger (RCT) is shown in Fig. 3.3. The barrel is spanned by 36 RCT cards, each spanning 17×4 towers in $\eta \times \phi$. Each RCT card is subdivided into five “regions” as shown in Fig. 3.4. After initial clustering and processing, the outputs of the RCT card are sent to the Global Calorimeter (GCT) trigger, which is processed in three cards as shown in Fig. 3.5.

3.3.2 Phase-2 electron/photon reconstruction algorithm

The standalone barrel algorithm for reconstructing and identifying electrons and photons in the Phase-2 Level-1 Trigger takes as input the digitized response of each crystal

1003 of the barrel ECAL, with a granularity 0.0175×0.0175 in $\eta \times \phi$, which is 25 times
1004 higher than the input to the Phase-1 trigger, which consisted of trigger towers with
1005 a granularity of 0.0875×0.0875 . In HCAL the tower size of 0.0875×0.0875 is un-
1006 changed. The trigger algorithm is designed to closely reproduce the algorithm used in
1007 the offline reconstruction, with limitations and simplifications due to trigger latency.

1008 In the RCT, an initial requirement of $p_T > 0.5$ GeV is imposed on the input
1009 trigger primitives (i.e. energies from the ECAL crystals and HCAL towers) to reject
1010 contribution from pileup. In one of the regions inside a RCT card (Fig. 3.4), the
1011 crystal containing the highest energy deposit is identified as the seed crystal, as shown
1012 in Fig. 3.6. The energy in the crystals in a window of size 3×5 in $\eta \times \phi$ around
1013 the seed cluster is added into a cluster. The energy is considered “clustered”. The
1014 process is repeated with the remaining “unclustered” energy, until up to four clusters
1015 are produced in the region.

1016 To improve e/γ identification and to reduce background contributions, identifica-
1017 tion and reconstruction algorithms are implemented at this stage:

- 1018 • Shower shape: The energy deposit sums around the seed crystal is computed in
1019 windows of size 2×5 and 5×5 (Fig. 3.6, *dashed lines*), with true e/γ clusters
1020 tending to produce showers that deposit most of their energy in a 2×5 region.
- 1021 • Bremsstrahlung recovery: e/γ tend to spread in the ϕ direction due to charged
1022 particles being bent by the magnetic field of the CMS solenoid. If sufficient
1023 energy comparable to the core 3×5 cluster is found in the adjacent 3×5
1024 windows (Fig. 3.6, *shaded yellow*), the energy is added to the core cluster and
1025 no longer considered unclustered energy.

1026 After parallel processing in the regions, the clusters in a RCT card are stitched
1027 together if they are located directly along the borders of a region (Fig. 3.3). The
1028 remaining unclustered ECAL energy is summed into ECAL towers.

1029 From each RCT card, the twelve highest-energy clusters, as well as any remaining
1030 unclustered energy, are sent to the GCT. Since each GCT card has information from
1031 sixteen RCT cards (Fig. 3.5), final stitching across the boundaries of the RCT cards
1032 is performed. One more identification algorithm is performed at this stage:

- 1033 • Isolation: One handle to reject backgrounds from e.g. pileup, comes from the
1034 tendency for background to be spread more uniformly across a large area in the
1035 detector, whereas genuine e/γ are expected to produce showers concentrated in
1036 the 3×5 crystal window. The energy sum in a large window of 7×7 in towers
1037 is computed and used to reject background.

1038 The performance of the standalone barrel e/γ algorithm in Phase-2 conditions is
1039 summarized in the efficiency and rates. The efficiencies are measured with a simulated
1040 Monte Carlo sample containing electrons. The rates are measured with a simulated
1041 minimum bias sample intended to closely mimic generic proton-proton collisions in
1042 the CMS detector. The performance of the Phase-2 emulator discussed in this work,
1043 which closely mimics the firmware logic and uses fixed-precision integers, is shown to
1044 be comparable to the previous emulator which used floats and idealized logic.




Figure 3.3: Schematic of the geometry of the Phase-2 ECAL barrel in the Regional Calorimeter Trigger (RCT), showing the division of the barrel region into 36 Regional Calorimeter Trigger (RCT) cards (*red*). Each card spans 17×4 towers in $\eta \times \phi$ (*green*), and each tower is 5×5 in single crystals in $\eta \times \phi$. Towers in the overlap region (*shaded yellow*) are read out to both the barrel and endcap.




Figure 3.4: Schematic of two example RCT cards in the negative eta (*top*) and positive eta (*center*) regions of the ECAL barrel. Each RCT card is divided into five regions: four regions are of size 3×4 towers in $\eta \times \phi$ (*bottom left*), and a fifth smaller overlap region of size 2×4 towers (*bottom right*). Each tower is 5×5 ($\eta \times \phi$) in crystals.




Figure 3.5: Schematic of the Phase-2 ECAL barrel in the Global Calorimeter Trigger (GCT), which will process the outputs of the Regional Calorimeter Trigger (RCT) in three cards (*magenta highlights*). Each card in the GCT processes the equivalent of sixteen RCT cards, with the center twelve being unique to that GCT card (*shaded pink*), and the remaining four processed in overlap with the other GCT cards.

3x4 barrel ECAL region




Figure 3.6: Illustration of an example electron/photon (e/γ) cluster in the Phase-2 Level-1 Trigger standalone barrel e/γ reconstruction, in a region of 15×20 crystals (3 \times 4 towers). Each small pink square is one crystal, the highest-granularity ECAL trigger primitives available to the L1 Trigger in Phase-2. The core cluster consists of the energy sum in a 3×5 window of crystals, (*shaded light blue*) centered around the seed crystal (*red*). Bremsstrahlung corrections are checked in the adjacent 3×5 windows in the ϕ direction (*shaded light yellow*). The relative energies in windows of size 2×5 and 5×5 in crystals (*dashed dark blue and dark red*) are used to compute shower shape variables to identify true e/γ objects. Lastly, an isolation sum is computed in a window of size 7×7 in towers (not shown in figure).




Figure 3.7: Efficiency of the standalone barrel e/γ reconstruction, measured in a simulated sample of electrons, as a function of the true electron’s transverse momentum p_T . The performance of the previous, idealized algorithm as shown in the 2021 Phase-2 TDR [33] with and without the isolation and shower shape discrimination variables (“standalone working point/ WP”) (*dark blue, grey*). The Phase-2 emulator discussed in this work with and without the same working point (*black, red*) is shown to have comparable performance.




Figure 3.8: Rates of the standalone barrel e/γ reconstruction, evaluated on a minimum bias sample, measured as a function of the minimum energy (E_T) required of the reconstructed e/γ object in each event. The performance of the previous, idealized algorithm as shown in the 2021 Phase-2 TDR [33] with and without the isolation and shower shape discrimination variables (“standalone working point/ WP”) (*dark blue, grey*). The Phase-2 emulator discussed in this work with and without the same working point (*black, red*) is shown to have comparable performance.

1045 Chapter 4

1046 Datasets and Monte Carlo samples

1047 4.1 Datasets used

1048 The $h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow 2b2\tau$ analysis (CMS CADI line HIG-22-007) is based on proton-proton
1049 collision data at a center-of-mass energy of 13 TeV collected in full Run-2 (2016-
1050 18) with the CMS detector. The data analyzed corresponds to a total integrated
1051 luminosity of 138 fb^{-1} (36.33 fb^{-1} for 2016, 41.53 fb^{-1} for 2017, and 59.74 fb^{-1} for
1052 2018) [35] [36] [37]. The cumulative delivered and recorded luminosity versus time
1053 for 2015-2018 is shown in Fig. 4.1.

1054 Data collected with the single muon trigger is used for the $\mu\tau_h$ channel. For the
1055 $e\tau_h$ channel, data collected with the single electron trigger is used; and for the $e\mu$
1056 channel, data collected with the electron + muon trigger is used. A more in-depth
1057 discussion of the triggers used follows in a later section.

1058 A full list of samples used can be found in the full documentation [39] [40].

1059 4.2 Monte Carlo samples

1060 Modeling and computing observables originating from arbitrary physics processes at
1061 the tree level and at next-to-leading order (NLO) is performed by Monte Carlo (MC)




Figure 4.1: Cumulative delivered and recorded luminosity versus time for 2015-2018 at CMS, in proton-proton collision data only, at nominal center-of-mass energy [38].

event generators, such as Powheg and MadGraph5_amCNLO [41] [42]. The information generated, e.g. the computation of the differential cross sections and kinematics of the final state particles, is saved in a compressed file and used to generate MC samples that are used in physics analyses. The samples are digitized using GEANT4 [43], a platform used at the LHC and other facilities to comprehensively simulate the passage of particles through matter. The digitized samples are passed through the same detector reconstruction as real data events collected in the detector.

The samples for modeling the signal ($h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow 2b2\tau$ and $h \rightarrow a_1a_2$) in the 2HDM+S and TRSM are generated at tree-level, for a range of masses of the light neutral scalar a . For $h \rightarrow aa$, the mass hypotheses for the a range from $m_a = (12 \text{ GeV}, 62.5 \text{ GeV})$. For $h \rightarrow a_1a_2$, the mass hypotheses for the two light scalars span combinations of m_{a1} , m_{a2} ranging from $(12 \text{ GeV}, 62.5 \text{ GeV})$ for the two scalars.

4.3 Embedded samples

An important background for Higgs boson studies and searches for additional Higgs bosons is the decay of Z bosons into pairs of τ leptons ($Z \rightarrow \tau\tau$). An embedded technique was developed in the context of Standard Model Higgs to $\tau\tau$ measurements, to model $Z \rightarrow \tau\tau$ decays, and was expanded to also model all Standard Model processes that contain $\tau\tau$ [44]. The embedded technique has since been used successfully at CMS for the Standard Model $H \rightarrow \tau\tau$ measurement, as well as searches for minimal supersymmetric extensions to the Standard Model (MSSM) [45] [46].

Fig. 4.2 shows a schematic of how embedded samples are produced. Data events containing $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ decays are selected. In these events, all energy deposits of the recorded muons are removed, and are replaced with simulated tau leptons with the same kinematic properties as the removed muons. This results in a hybrid data format containing information from both observed and simulated events, as illustrated in Fig. 4.2 [44].

In the selection step of the embedded technique, events are selected with at least one of a set of $\mu\mu$ trigger paths, which require $p_T > 17(8)$ GeV for the leading (sub-leading) muons, and a minimum requirement between 3.8 and 8.0 GeV on the invariant di-muon mass $m_{\mu\mu}$ [44]. The offline reconstructed muons must match the objects at trigger level and also have offline $p_T > 17(8)$ GeV. They must have $|\eta| < 2.4$ and be located at a distance $|d_z| < 0.2$ cm to the primary vertex along the beam axis. To form a Z boson candidate, each muon is required to originate from a global muon track. The muon pairs must have opposite charges with an invariant mass of $m_{\mu\mu} > 20$ GeV. If more than two di-muon pairs are found, the pair with the invariant mass closest to the Z boson mass (91.19 GeV) is chosen.

This selection is designed to be tight enough to ensure a high purity of genuine $\mu\mu$ events, and also loose enough to minimize biases of the embedded event samples. Isolation requirements are avoided, since they would introduce a bias towards less




Figure 4.2: Schematic view of the four main steps of the embedding technique for τ leptons, as described in Section 4.3 [44]. A $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ event is selected in data ($Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ selection), all of the energy deposits associated with the muons are removed ($Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ cleaning), and two τ leptons and their decays are simulated in an empty detector ($Z \rightarrow \tau\tau$ simulation). Lastly, all energy deposits of the simulated τ decays are combined with the data event ($Z \rightarrow \tau\tau$ hybrid).

hadronic activity in the vicinities of the embedded leptons that will appear more isolated than expected in data. The selection results in an expected mixture of events summarized in Table 4.1 from [44]. $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ is the dominant process modeled by the embedded technique, with $t\bar{t}$, QCD, and diboson and single top processes becoming more significant when considering events with b-tag jets.

The advantage of the embedded technique is that aspects of the event that are difficult to model and describe are directly taken from data, resulting in a better data description than can be achieved with only the $Z \rightarrow \tau\tau$ simulation [44]. The simulation must be tuned extensively to accurately model aspects of the data, such as time-dependent pileup profiles, the production of additional jets, e.g. in multijet and vector boson fusion topologies, the number of reconstructed primary interaction

Process	Fraction (%)		
	Inclusive	$m_{\mu\mu} > 70 \text{ GeV}$	N(b-tag jets) > 0
$Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$	97.36	99.11	69.25
QCD	0.84	0.10	2.08
$t\bar{t}$	0.78	0.55	25.61
$Z \rightarrow \tau\tau$	0.71	0.05	0.57
Diboson, single t	0.17	0.17	2.35
W+jets	0.08	0.02	0.14

Table 4.1: Expected event composition after selecting two muons in the embedded technique [44], before additional cuts (i.e. inclusive, *column 2*), and after adding a requirement on the di-muon mass $m_{\mu\mu} > 70 \text{ GeV}$ (*column 3*), or a requirement on the number of b-tag jets in the event (*column 4*).

1112 vertices, and the missing transverse momentum p_T^{miss} . Since all events with genuine
 1113 $\tau\tau$ are estimated with samples made with the embedded technique (referred to as
 1114 embedded samples from here on), events in Monte Carlo simulation with genuine $\tau\tau$
 1115 are not used, in order to avoid double-counting.

₁₁₁₆ **Chapter 5**

₁₁₁₇ **Object reconstruction and**
₁₁₁₈ **corrections applied**

₁₁₁₉ In this chapter on object reconstruction and corrections, Section 5.1 reviews the
₁₁₂₀ physical properties of the objects most pertinent to the analyses presented in this
₁₁₂₁ work: taus (τ), muons (μ), electrons (e), and jets, with a focus on jets originating from
₁₁₂₂ b quarks (b-flavor jets), as well as the methodology used to reconstruct the particles
₁₁₂₃ from their characteristic signatures in the CMS detector. Section 5.2 describes the
₁₁₂₄ method used to reconstruct the invariant full $\tau\tau$ mass which is used for the final signal
₁₁₂₅ extraction. Lastly, Section 5.3 describes the corrections applied to the simulated
₁₁₂₆ samples which improve their modeling of data.

₁₁₂₇ **5.1 Object reconstruction**

₁₁₂₈ **5.1.1 Taus**

₁₁₂₉ The tau (τ) is the heaviest known lepton. With a rest mass of 1776.86 MeV, it can
₁₁₃₀ decay to not only electrons and muons, but also hadrons. The mean lifetime of the τ
₁₁₃₁ is $\tau = 290 \times 10^{-15}$ seconds, corresponding to $c\tau = 87.03 \mu\text{m}$, which is short enough

₁₁₃₂ that taus decay in the CMS detector before reaching the detector elements.

₁₁₃₃ In two thirds of the cases, τ leptons decay hadronically, typically into one or three
₁₁₃₄ charged mesons (predominantly π^+ , π^-), often accompanied by neutral pions (that
₁₁₃₅ decay $\pi^0 \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$), and a ν_τ . These hadronic decays are denoted τ_h . In the remainder of
₁₁₃₆ the decays, the tau decays to the lighter leptons (electron or muon), termed leptonic
₁₁₃₇ decays. In all cases, at least one neutrino is produced, resulting in missing transverse
₁₁₃₈ energy in the CMS detector. The tau's largest decay branching ratios (proportional
₁₁₃₉ to probability of decay) are listed below [24]:

₁₁₄₀ • 17.8% decay to $e^- \bar{\nu}_e \nu_\tau$

₁₁₄₁ • 17.4% decay to $\mu^- \bar{\nu}_\mu \nu_\tau$

₁₁₄₂ • 25.5% decay to $\pi^- \pi^0 \nu_\tau$ (ρ^- resonance at 770 MeV)

₁₁₄₃ • 10.8% decay to $\pi^- \nu_\tau$

₁₁₄₄ • 9.3% decay to $\pi^- \pi^0 \pi^0 \nu_\tau$ (a_1^- resonance at 1200 MeV)

₁₁₄₅ • 9.0% decay to $\pi^- \pi^- \pi^+ \nu_\tau$ (a_1^- resonance at 1200 MeV)

₁₁₄₆ The neutrinos escape undetected from the CMS detector and are not considered
₁₁₄₇ in the reconstruction. Charged hadrons leave tracks in the tracking detector before
₁₁₄₈ being absorbed in the hadronic calorimeter; in CMS tau reconstruction terminology,
₁₁₄₉ they are often called “prongs”, i.e. the dominant τ_h decay modes are termed “1 prong”
₁₁₅₀ (π^\pm), “1 prong + $\pi^0(s)$ ”, and “3-prong”. Neutral pions decay to two photons which
₁₁₅₁ lose their energy in the electromagnetic calorimeter. Taus that decay to electrons
₁₁₅₂ and muons, are typically triggered on and reconstructed as electrons and muons
₁₁₅₃ respectively.

1154 **Hadron plus strips (HPS) reconstruction of τ_h**

1155 At CMS, hadronically decaying tau leptons are reconstructed with the hadron plus
1156 strips (HPS) algorithm [47] [48]. The HPS algorithm capitalizes on photon conversions
1157 in the CMS tracker material, which originate from the neutral pion (π^0) decaying
1158 to two photons. The bending of electron/positron tracks due to the CMS solenoid
1159 magnetic field leads to a spread of the neutral pions' calorimeter signatures in the ϕ
1160 direction. This motivates the reconstruction of photons in “strips”: objects that are
1161 built out of PF photons and electrons. The strip reconstruction starts with centering
1162 a strip on the most energetic electromagnetic particle in a PF jet. Among other
1163 electromagnetic particles located in a window of size $\Delta\eta = 0.05$ and $\Delta\phi = 0.20$
1164 around the strip center, the most energetic one is associated with the strip and its
1165 momentum is added to the strip momentum. This is repeated iteratively until no
1166 further particles can be associated. Lastly, strips satisfying a requirement of $p_T^{\text{strip}} > 1$
1167 GeV are combined with charged hadrons to reconstruct individual τ_h decay modes,
1168 where h stands for both π and K :

1169 • *Single hadron:* $h^- \nu_\tau$ and $h^- \pi^0 \nu_\tau$ decay modes, in which the neutral pions have
1170 too little energy to be reconstructed as strips.

1171 • *One hadron + one strip:* $h^- \pi^0 \nu_\tau$ decay modes, where the photons from the π^0
1172 decay are close together in the calorimeter.

1173 • *One hadron + two strips:* $h^- \pi^0 \nu_\tau$ decay modes, where the photons from the π^0
1174 decay are well separated.

1175 • *Three hadrons:* $h^- h^+ h^- \nu_\tau$ decay modes. The three charged hadrons are re-
1176 quired to originate from the same secondary vertex.

1177 The $h^- \pi^0 \pi^0 \nu_\tau$ and $h^- h^+ h^- \pi^0 \nu_\tau$ decay modes do not have their own treatment are
1178 reconstructed with the above topologies.

1179 In the HPS algorithm, the direction of the reconstructed tau momentum \vec{p}^{τ_h}
1180 is required to fall within a distance of $\Delta R = 0.1$ from the original PF jet. All
1181 charged hadrons and strips are required to be contained within a cone of size $\Delta R =$
1182 $(2.8 \text{ GeV})/p_T^{\tau_h}$, from the τ_h as reconstructed by the HPS.

1183 All charged hadrons are assumed to be pions, and they are required to be consis-
1184 tent with the masses of the intermediate meson resonances (if applicable), with the
1185 following allowed windows for candidates: 50-200 MeV for π^0 , 0.3-1.3 GeV for ρ , and
1186 0.8-1.5 GeV for a_1 . If the τ_h decay is compatible with more than one hypothesis, the
1187 one giving the highest $p_T^{\tau_h}$ is chosen. Lastly, an isolation requirement is applied: aside
1188 from the τ_h decay products, no charged hadrons or photons can be present within
1189 an isolation cone of size $\Delta R = 0.5$ around the direction of the τ_h . The outputs of
1190 the HPS algorithm are the reconstructed decay mode and the visible four-momentum
1191 (i.e. the four-momenta of all decay products excluding the neutrinos).

1192 DeepTau for identifying τ_h

1193 The identification of τ_h candidates in CMS has historically been divided into separate
1194 discriminators against jets, electrons, and muons. Discriminators versus jets and
1195 electrons use information from derived quantities, such as the p_T sum of particles
1196 near the τ_h axis. Building on the previous multivariate analysis (MVA) classifier [49]
1197 based on a boosted decision tree (BDT), DeepTau is a more recent classifier based on a
1198 deep neural network (DNN) that simultaneously discriminates against jets, electrons,
1199 and muons. The DNN uses a combination of high-level inputs, similar to previous
1200 algorithms, and also uses convolutional layers in $\eta\text{-}\phi$ space to process information
1201 from all reconstructed particles near the τ_h axis. Convolutional layers are based on
1202 the principle that an image can be processed independently of its position.

1203 The final DeepTau discriminators against jets, muons, and electrons are given by

$$D_\alpha(y) = \frac{y_\tau}{y_\tau + y_\alpha} \quad (5.1)$$

1204 where y_τ (y_α) are estimates of the probabilities for the τ_h candidate to come from
1205 a genuine τ_h (jet, μ , e). Working points for each discriminator with different τ_h
1206 identification efficiencies are defined for D_e , D_μ , and D_{jet} , for usage in physics analyses
1207 and derivation of data-to-simulation corrections [50].

1208 5.1.2 Muons

1209 Muons are the next lightest lepton after taus, with a mass of 105.66 MeV and a
1210 mean lifetime of $\tau = 2.20 \times 10^{-6}$ seconds, or $c\tau = 658.64$ m. At CMS, muons are
1211 identified with requirements on the quality of the track reconstruction and on the
1212 number of measurements in the tracker and the muon systems [51]. In the standard
1213 CMS reconstruction, tracks are first reconstructed independently in the inner tracker
1214 (tracker track) and in the muon system (standalone-muon track). Next, these tracks
1215 are processed in two different methods.

1216 The first is Global Muon reconstruction (outside-in) [51], which fits combined hits
1217 from the tracker track and standalone-muon track, using the Kalman-filter technique.
1218 At large transverse momenta, $p_T \gtrsim 200$ GeV, the global-muon fit can improve the
1219 momentum resolution compared to the tracker-only fit.

1220 The second is Tracker Muon reconstruction (inside-out) [51], which starts with
1221 tracker tracks with $p_T > 0.5$ GeV and total momentum $p_T > 2.5$ GeV. These tracks
1222 are extrapolated outwards to the muon system and matched to detector segments
1223 there, taking into account the magnetic field, expected energy losses, and multiple
1224 Coulomb scattering in the detector material. Tracker Muon reconstruction is more
1225 efficient than the Global Muon reconstruction at low momenta, $p \lesssim 5$ GeV, because

it only requires a single muon segment in the muon system, whereas Global Muon reconstruction typically requires segments in at least two muon stations.

To further suppress fake muons from decay in flight, isolation cuts are used. A relative isolation variable is defined to quantify the energy flow of particles near the muon trajectory. A relative isolation is defined similarly for muons and electrons:

$$I^\ell \equiv \frac{\sum_{\text{charged}} p_T + \max(0, \sum_{\text{neutral}} p_T - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\text{charged, PU}} p_T)}{p_T^\ell} \quad (5.2)$$

where $\sum_{\text{charged}} p_T$ is the scalar sum of the p_T of the charged particles originating from the primary vertex and located in a cone of size $\Delta R = \sqrt{(\Delta\eta)^2 + (\Delta\phi)^2} = 0.4(0.3)$ centered on the direction of the muon (electron). The sum $\sum_{\text{neutral}} p_T$ is the equivalent for neutral particles. The sum $\sum_{\text{charged, PU}} p_T$ is the scalar sum of the p_T of the charged hadrons in the cone originating from pileup vertices. The factor 1/2 comes from simulation estimations, which find that the ratio of neutral to charged hadron production in the hadronization process of inelastic pp collisions is 1/2. Thus the subtracted term is intended to subtract contribution from pileup, from the neutral particle contribution to the isolation sum. Finally, this is divided by the lepton transverse momentum, p_T^ℓ .

5.1.3 Electrons

Electrons are the lightest lepton with a mass of 0.511 MeV. At CMS, electrons are reconstructed by associating a track reconstructed in the silicon tracking detector with a cluster of energy in the ECAL. Performance is maximized via a combination of a stand-alone approach and the complementary global particle-flow approach [52].

In the stand-alone approach, the electron energy, which is typically spread over several crystals of the ECAL, is clustered with the “hybrid” algorithm in the barrel and the “multi- 5×5 ” in the endcaps [52]. The hybrid algorithm collects energy in a

1249 small window in η and an extended window in ϕ . It identifies a seed crystal, and adds
1250 arrays of 5×1 crystals in $\eta \times \phi$ in a range of $N = 17$ crystals in both directions of
1251 ϕ , if their energies exceed a minimum threshold, thus forming a supercluster (SC). In
1252 the endcap, crystals are not arranged in an $\eta \times \phi$ geometry; instead clusters are build
1253 around seed crystals in clusters of 5×5 crystals that can partly overlap. Nearby
1254 clusters are grouped into a supercluster, and energy is recovered from associated
1255 deposits in the preshower.

1256 In the PF reconstruction [52], PF clusters are reconstructed by aggregating around
1257 a seed all contiguous crystals with energies two standard deviations above the elec-
1258 tronic noise observed at the beginning of a data-taking run. The energy of a given
1259 crystal can be shared among two or more clusters.

1260 The electron track reconstruction is performed in two ways [52]: the ECAL-based
1261 seeding, which begins with the SC energy and positioning, and the tracker-based
1262 seeding (part of the PF reconstruction algorithm), which uses tracks reconstructed
1263 from the general algorithm for charged particles, extrapolated towards the ECAL and
1264 matched to an SC. Kalman filter (KF) tracks with a small number of hits or that are
1265 not well-fitted, are re-fitted with a dedicated Gaussian sum Filter (GSF).

1266 A global identification variable [52] is defined using a multivariate analysis (MVA)
1267 technique that combines information on track observables (kinematics, quality of the
1268 KF track and GSF track), the electron PF cluster observables (shape and pattern),
1269 and the association between the two (geometric and kinematic observables). For
1270 electrons seeded only through the tracker-based approach, a weak selection is applied
1271 on this MVA variable. For electrons seeded through both approaches, a logical OR is
1272 taken.

1273 Electron isolation, i.e. the presence of energy deposits near the electron trajectory,
1274 is a separate key handle in rejecting significant background. Compared to isolated
1275 electrons, electrons from misidentified jets or genuine electrons within a jet resulting

1276 from semileptonic decays of b or c quarks tend to have significant energy deposits
1277 near the primary trajectory [52]. Offline analyses benefit from the PF technique
1278 for defining isolation, which sums the PF candidates reconstructed located within a
1279 specified isolation cone around the electron candidate, as in Eqn. 5.2.

1280 5.1.4 Jets

1281 The vast majority of processes of interest at the LHC contains quarks or gluons in
1282 the final state, but these particles cannot be observed directly. In a process called
1283 hadronization, they fragment into spatially-grouped collections of particles called jets,
1284 which can be detected in the tracking and calorimeter systems. Hadronization and
1285 the subsequent decays of unstable hadrons can produce hundreds of nearby particles
1286 in the CMS detector. Jets are reconstructed by the PF algorithm (PF jets), or from
1287 the sum of the ECAL and HCAL energies deposited in the calorimeter towers (Calo
1288 jets). In PF jets, typically used in offline analyses, jets are built using the anti- k_T
1289 (AK) clustering algorithm [53]. The anti- k_T algorithm iterates over particle pairs and
1290 finds the two that are closest in a distance measure d , and determines whether to
1291 combine them:

$$d_{ij} = \min(p_{T,i}^{-2}, p_{T,j}^{-2}) \frac{\Delta_{ij}^2}{R^2}, \text{ combine when } d_{ij} < p_{T,i}^{-2}; \text{ stop when } d_{ij} > p_{T,i}^{-2} \quad (5.3)$$

1292 where $\Delta_{ij}^2 = (\eta_i - \eta_j)^2 + (\phi_i - \phi_j)^2$ and $p_{T,i}$, η_i , ϕ_i are the transverse momentum, rapid-
1293 ity, and azimuthal angle of particle i . The power -2 means that higher-momentum
1294 particles are clustered first, leading to jets that tend to be centered on the hardest
1295 (highest p_T) particle.

1296 There are several methods to remove contributions of pileup collisions from jet
1297 clustering [54]:

- 1298 • Charged hadron subtraction (CHS), which removes all charged hadron candi-

1299 dates associated with a track that is not associated with the primary vertex.

- 1300 • PileUp Per Particle Identification (PUPPI), which weighs input particles based
1301 on their likelihood of arising from pileup. QCD particles tend to have a collinear
1302 structure, compared to soft diffuse radiation coming from pileup. The local
1303 shape for charged pileup, used as a proxy for all pileup particles, is used on an
1304 event-by-event basis to calculate a weight for each particle. PUPPI is deployed
1305 in Run-2 and is more performant than CHS in high pileup scenarios.

1306 **5.1.5 B-flavored jets**

1307 Jets that arise from bottom-quark hadronization (b-flavor jets) have overwhelming
1308 background from processes involving jets from gluons (g) and light-flavor quarks (u, d,
1309 s), and from c-quark fragmentation. The ability to identify b-flavor jets, or b-tagging,
1310 exploits the b hadrons' relatively large masses, long lifetimes, and daughter particles
1311 with hard momentum spectra [53].

1312 The impact parameter (IP) of a track is the 3-dimensional distance between the
1313 track and the primary vertex (PV) at the point of closest approach. The IP is positive
1314 if the track originates from the decay of particles travelling along the jet axis. The
1315 resolution of the IP depends on the p_T and η of the track, motivating the use of the
1316 impact parameter significance S_{IP} (ratio of the IP to its estimated uncertainty) as an
1317 observable [53].

1318 Because of the large but finite lifetimes of the b hadrons, b hadrons tend to
1319 travel a short distance before decaying at a secondary vertex (SV), which can be
1320 measured and reconstructed separately from the primary vertex due to the excellent
1321 position resolution of the pixel detector [53]. Previous b-tagging algorithms (e.g.
1322 CSV, cMVAv2, and DeepCSV) have capitalized on variables such as the presence of
1323 a SV, the flight distance and direction (computed from the vector between the PV
1324 and the SV), and kinematics of the system of associated secondary tracks (e.g. track

1325 multiplicity, mass, and energy).

1326 The DeepJet (formerly known as DeepFlavour) algorithm [55] is a deep-neural-
1327 network multi-classification algorithm, which uses 16 properties of up to 25 charged
1328 and 6 properties of 25 neutral particle-flow jet constituents, as well as 17 properties
1329 from up to 4 secondary vertices associate with the jet. Compared to the previous clas-
1330 sifying algorithm DeepCSV, DeepJet has been demonstrated to have higher efficiency
1331 with lower misidentification probability in Phase-1 data [56].

1332 5.2 Reconstruction of the $\tau\tau$ mass

1333 The final signal extraction is done to the total $\tau\tau$ mass, which is estimated from the
1334 visible $\tau\tau$ mass using the FastMTT algorithm [57]. FastMTT is based on the SVFit
1335 algorithm, originally developed for the Standard Model $H \rightarrow \tau\tau$ analysis [58]. Both
1336 the SVFit algorithms, and the FastMTT algorithm, are described below, to give a
1337 complete picture of how tau decays are parameterized.

1338 To specify a hadronic τ decay, six parameters are needed [58]: the polar and
1339 azimuthal angles of the visible decay product system in the τ rest frame, the three
1340 boost parameters from the τ rest frame to the laboratory frame, and the invariant
1341 mass m_{vis} of the visible decay products. For a leptonic τ decay, two neutrinos are
1342 produced, and a seventh parameter, the invariant mass of the two-neutrino system, is
1343 necessary. The unknown parameters are constrained by four observables that are the
1344 components of the four-momentum of the system formed by the visible decay products
1345 of the τ lepton, measured in the laboratory frame. The remaining unconstrained
1346 parameters for hadronic and leptonic τ decays are thus:

- 1347 • The fraction of the τ energy in the laboratory frame carried by the visible decay
1348 products,
- 1349 • ϕ , the azimuthal angle of the τ direction in the laboratory frame,

- 1350 • $m_{\nu\nu}$, the invariant mass of the two-neutrino system in leptonic τ decays (for
 1351 hadronic τ decays, $m_{\nu\nu}$ is set to 0).

1352 E_x^{miss} and E_y^{miss} , the x and y components of the missing transverse energy \vec{E}_T^{miss}
 1353 provide two further constraints.

1354 5.2.1 Original SVFit “standalone”: maximum likelihood

1355 In one of the original versions of SVFit, called “standalone” SVFit [58], a maximum
 1356 likelihood fit method is used to reconstruct the mass $m_{\tau\tau}$ by combining the measured
 1357 observables E_x^{miss} and E_y^{miss} with a likelihood model that includes terms for the τ
 1358 decay kinematics and the \vec{E}_T^{miss} resolution [58]. The likelihood function $f(\vec{z}, \vec{y}, \vec{a}_1 \vec{a}_2)$
 1359 of the parameters $\vec{z} = (E_x^{\text{miss}}, E_y^{\text{miss}})$ in an event is constructed, where the remaining
 1360 parameters are the kinematics of the two τ decays, denoted $\vec{a}_1 = (x_1, \phi_1, m_{\nu\nu,1})$ and
 1361 $\vec{a}_2 = (x_2, \phi_2, m_{\nu\nu,2})$, and the four-momenta of the visible decay products with the
 1362 measured values $\vec{y} = (p_1^{\text{vis}}, p_2^{\text{vis}})$.

1363 The likelihood f is the product of three likelihood functions. The first two likelihood
 1364 functions model the decay parameters \vec{a}_1 and \vec{a}_2 of the two τ leptons. For leptonic
 1365 decays, the likelihood function is modeled using matrix elements for τ decays,
 1366 and integrated over the allowed phase space $0 \leq x \leq 1$ and $0 \leq m_{\nu\nu} \leq m_\tau \sqrt{1-x}$. For
 1367 hadronic τ decays, a model based on the two-body phase space is used and integrated
 1368 over $m_{\text{vis}}^2/m_{\tau\tau}^2 \leq x \leq 1$. The third likelihood function quantifies the compatibility of
 1369 a τ decay hypothesis with the reconstructed \vec{E}_T^{miss} in an event, assuming the neutrinos
 1370 are the only source of missing transverse energy. The expected \vec{E}_T^{miss} resolution
 1371 is represented by a covariant matrix, estimated on an event-by-event basis using a
 1372 significance algorithm [59].

1373 5.2.2 “Classic SVFit” with matrix element

1374 Classic SVFit is an improved algorithm of the original “standalone” SVFit using the
 1375 formalism of the matrix element (ME) method [57]. In the ME method, an estimate
 1376 for the unknown model parameter Θ (here, the mass $m_{\tau\tau}$) is obtained by maximizing
 1377 the probability density \mathcal{P} . The key ingredients of the probability density are the
 1378 squared modulus of the matrix element $|\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{p}, \Theta)|^2$ and the transfer function $W(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{p})$
 1379 (probability density to observe the measured observables \mathbf{y} given the phase space
 1380 point \mathbf{p}). The best estimate $m_{\tau\tau}$ is obtained by computing the probability density \mathcal{P}
 1381 for a range of mass hypotheses and finding the value of $m_{\tau\tau}$ that maximizes \mathcal{P} .

1382 Distributions illustrating the performance of the classic matrix element SVFit
 1383 algorithm are shown in Fig. 5.1 from [57], showing the di-tau mass after and before
 1384 application of SVFit to recover energy lost to neutrinos. The SVFit algorithm is
 1385 found to improve the sensitivity of the Standard Model $H \rightarrow \tau\tau$ analysis performed
 1386 by CMS by about 30%, compared to performing the same analysis using only the
 1387 visible mass m_{vis} .




Figure 5.1: Distributions from [57], of $m_{\tau\tau}$ after reconstruction with the original SVFit algorithm (*left*), and before SVFit with only the visible tau decay products (*right*), for $H \rightarrow \tau\tau$ signal events of mass $m_H = 125$ GeV (*black line*) and the $Z/\gamma^* \rightarrow \tau\tau$ background (*orange, solid*), in the decay channel $\tau\tau \rightarrow \mu\tau_h$.

1388 5.2.3 FastMTT: optimized SVFit

1389 FastMTT [60] is a further simplification to the matrix element method of Classic
1390 SVFit which has comparable performance but is about 100 times faster. FastMTT
1391 drops the matrix element component of the computation without significant impact
1392 on the final mass resolution, and simplifies the computation of the transfer functions.
1393 The opening angle of the τ decay products with respect to the initial τ momenta ap-
1394 proaches 0 for τ with high $\gamma = E_\tau/m_\tau$, with typical τ decays from the Z boson decays
1395 already satisfying this condition. In this collinear approximation, the dimensionality
1396 of the transfer function can be reduced in the computation of FastMTT, while still
1397 yielding similar results to Classic SVFit [60].

1398 5.3 Corrections applied to simulation

1399 Corrections are applied to simulated samples to account for known effects in the event
1400 modeling and reconstruction and data-taking, and are intended to bring simulations
1401 in closer agreement with data. Corrections fall into two broad categories: *energy*
1402 *scale corrections* applied to physics objects, and *event-level corrections*. Energy scale
1403 corrections are multiplicative factors applied to the energy and transverse momentum
1404 p_T of simulated objects (e.g. leptons or jets), and bring the average reconstructed en-
1405 ergies of simulated particles into better agreement with those of objects reconstructed
1406 from data. Event-level corrections are applied as a per-event multiplicative weight,
1407 and account for effects such as mis-modeling in simulations of the underlying physics
1408 process, or changing detector operating conditions during data-taking. Event-level
1409 corrections change the shapes of the distributions of all the physical observables.

1410 Uncertainties in scale factors and corrections are also sources of systematic errors
1411 in the analysis, detailed in Chapter 8. Systematic uncertainties in the tau, muon, and
1412 electron energy scales can shift the p_T of the leptons up or down, which can change

¹⁴¹³ whether events pass or fail the offline p_T thresholds for the trigger paths described in
¹⁴¹⁴ the previous section, i.e. change the number of events in the signal region.

¹⁴¹⁵ 5.3.1 Tau energy scale

¹⁴¹⁶ An energy scale is applied to the transverse momentum p_T and mass of the hadronic
¹⁴¹⁷ tau τ_h in the $\mu\tau_h$ and $e\tau_h$ channels, to correct for a deviation of the average recon-
¹⁴¹⁸ structed τ_h energy from the generator-level energy of the visible τ_h decay products.
¹⁴¹⁹ These correction factors are derived centrally [49], by fitting to events in $e\tau_h$ and $\mu\tau_h$
¹⁴²⁰ final states in Z/γ^* events separately for the h^\pm , $h^\pm\pi^0$, and $h^\pm h^\mp h^\pm$ decays. The
¹⁴²¹ values used are shown in Table 5.1.

¹⁴²² When applying the energy scale to the τ_h , the 4-momentum of the missing trans-
¹⁴²³ verse energy (MET) is adjusted such that the total 4-momenta of the τ_h and the MET
¹⁴²⁴ remains unchanged [61].

Tau energy scale factor				
Decay mode	2018	2017	2016 pre-VFP	2016 post-VFP
0	0.991 ± 0.008	0.986 ± 0.009	0.987 ± 0.01	0.993 ± 0.009
1	1.004 ± 0.006	0.999 ± 0.006	0.998 ± 0.006	0.991 ± 0.007
10	0.998 ± 0.007	0.999 ± 0.007	0.984 ± 0.008	1.001 ± 0.007
11	1.004 ± 0.009	0.996 ± 0.01	0.999 ± 0.011	0.997 ± 0.016

Table 5.1: Energy scales applied to genuine hadronic tau decays τ_h by data-taking year/era and decay mode, along with systematic errors.

¹⁴²⁵ 5.3.2 Muon energy scale

¹⁴²⁶ An energy scale is applied to the p_T and mass of genuine muons from τ decays in the
¹⁴²⁷ $e\mu$ and $\mu\tau_h$ channels [62]. The applied values are the same for MC and embedded
¹⁴²⁸ samples and are shown in Table 5.2. Following the SM $H \rightarrow \tau\tau$ analysis, Rochester
¹⁴²⁹ corrections are not applied, and instead prescriptions from [63] are followed.

Muon energy scale factor	
Eta range	Value for all years
$ \eta \in [0.0, 1.2)$	1.0 ± 0.004
$ \eta \in [1.2, 2.1)$	1.0 ± 0.009
$ \eta \in [2.1, 2.4)$	1.0 ± 0.027

Table 5.2: Energy scales and systematic errors applied to genuine muons. The values are the same for MC and embedded for all years [64] [63].

1430 5.3.3 Electron energy scale

1431 Corrections to the electron energy scale are applied to genuine e from τ decays, and
 1432 are binned in two dimensions by electron p_T and η for barrel vs. endcap [65]. The
 1433 scale factors are binned in p_T and η for MC samples: e.g. values for 2018 are shown
 1434 in Fig. 5.2 from [66]. For embedded samples the electron energy scale is taken as
 1435 only binned in η (Table 5.3).




Figure 5.2: Electron/photon energy scale factors (*left*) and corresponding uncertainties (*right*) binned in the electron η and p_T , for the data-taking year 2018 [66].

Electron energy scale factor for embedded samples			
Eta range	2018	2017	2016
$ \eta \in [0.0, 1.479)$	0.973 ± 0.005	0.986 ± 0.009	0.9976 ± 0.0050
$ \eta \in [1.479, 2.4)$	0.980 ± 0.0125	0.887 ± 0.0125	0.993 ± 0.0125

Table 5.3: Energy scales and systematic errors applied to electrons in embedded samples, binned in the electron η , by data-taking year [67] [68] [69].

¹⁴³⁶ 5.3.4 τ_h identification efficiency

¹⁴³⁷ The τ_h identification efficiency can differ in data and MC [61]. Recommended correc-
¹⁴³⁸ tions are provided by the Tau POG, and we use the medium DeepTau vs. jet working
¹⁴³⁹ point values. The identification efficiency is measured in $Z \rightarrow \tau\tau$ events in the $\mu\tau_h$
¹⁴⁴⁰ final state, and is binned in p_T due to clear p_T dependence of the DeepTau ID.

Tau ID efficiency for DeepTau Medium vs. jet WP in 2018						
p_T (GeV)	< 20	(20, 25]	(25, 30]	(30, 35]	(35, 40]	(40, 500]
Central value	0	0.945	0.946	0.916	0.921	1.005
Up value	0	1.001	0.981	0.946	0.950	1.035
Down value	0	0.888	0.981	0.883	0.893	0.953

Table 5.4: Tau ID efficiency for the DeepTau vs. jet medium working point, with central, up, and down values for 2018, binned in the tau p_T [61].

¹⁴⁴¹ 5.3.5 Trigger efficiencies

¹⁴⁴² Scale factors are applied to correct for differences in trigger efficiencies between MC
¹⁴⁴³ and embedded vs. data, with values taken from tools provided by the Standard Model
¹⁴⁴⁴ $H \rightarrow \tau\tau$ working group which uses the same trigger paths [64]. In the following
¹⁴⁴⁵ sections we review relevant trigger efficiencies in data, which form the basis of the
¹⁴⁴⁶ trigger efficiency corrections applied to MC and embedded.

¹⁴⁴⁷ 5.3.6 Tau trigger efficiencies

¹⁴⁴⁸ The efficiencies in data of the single- τ_h leg in $\mu\tau_h$, $e\tau_h$, and di- τ_h triggers is computed
¹⁴⁴⁹ centrally per using a Tag and Probe (TnP) method [70] which is outlined here. In

1450 this method, $Z \rightarrow \tau\tau \rightarrow \mu\tau_h$ are selected in data and a Drell-Yan simulated sample
 1451 ($Z \rightarrow \ell\ell, \ell = e, \mu, \tau_h$) with high purity. Cuts are applied to reject events not in this
 1452 final state, e.g. suppressing $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ by vetoing events with a single loose ID muon.
 1453 An isolated muon candidate (the tag) with online $p_T > 27$ GeV and $|\eta| < 2.1$ is
 1454 identified and matched to an offline μ . An offline τ_h candidate (the probe) is selected,
 1455 which is separated from the tag μ , and has $p_T > 20$ GeV and $|\eta| < 2.1$. The probe
 1456 τ_h must pass anti-muon and anti-electron discriminators to avoid fakes from muons
 1457 and electrons, and must pass the medium MVA tau isolation to suppress fakes from
 1458 QCD jets. The trigger efficiency in the TnP method is calculated as

$$\text{Efficiency} = \frac{\text{Number of events passing the TnP selection with fires the HLT path}}{\text{Number of events passing the TnP selection}} \quad (5.4)$$

1459 The efficiencies for the hadronic tau legs in the relevant channels of this analyses
 1460 ($\mu\tau_h$ and $e\tau_h$) as a function of the offline tau p_T and η , are shown for data taken in
 1461 2016, 2017, and 2018 in Figures 5.3a and 5.3b [70] [71]. In both figures, the different
 1462 HLT thresholds and differences in the L1 seed result in higher efficiencies in 2016 and
 1463 differences in shapes of the 2016 efficiencies compared to 2017 and 2018. The low
 1464 pileup in 2016 also leads to higher efficiencies in that year.

1465 5.3.7 Single muon trigger efficiencies

1466 The efficiencies for the single isolated muon trigger with $p_T > 24$ GeV used in this
 1467 analysis, is shown for the data-taking year 2018 in Fig. 5.4a as a function of the muon
 1468 p_T and as a function of the muon $|\eta|$ in Fig. 5.4b from [72]. The data is split with
 1469 respect to a HLT muon reconstruction update that was deployed on 15/05/2018. A
 1470 small asymmetry in efficiencies between negative and positive η in Fig. 5.4b is due to
 1471 disabled muon chambers (CSCs). The efficiencies shown are estimated using a Tag
 1472 and Probe method using $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ events, with the tag being an offline muon with




Figure 5.3: Hadronic tau leg efficiency of the cross-triggers for $\mu\tau_h$ (left) and $e\tau_h$ (right) triggers as a function of offline tau p_T for the years 2016 (red), 2017 (blue) and 2018 (green), from [71]. HLT p_T thresholds and L1 seeds are indicated in the legends.

¹⁴⁷³ $p_T > 29$ GeV and $|\eta| < 2.4$ passing a tight ID criteria, and the probe is an online (L1)
¹⁴⁷⁴ trigger object with $\Delta R < 0.3$ and passing tight ID and Particle Flow based isolation
¹⁴⁷⁵ requirements with $p_T > 26$ GeV.

¹⁴⁷⁶ 5.3.8 Single electron trigger efficiencies

¹⁴⁷⁷ The efficiencies in data, and the ratio between data and MC, of the single electron
¹⁴⁷⁸ HLT trigger with p_T threshold 32 GeV used in this analysis are shown for 2018, as
¹⁴⁷⁹ a function of the electron p_T in Fig. 5.5a and of the electron $|\eta|$ in Fig. 5.5b, from
¹⁴⁸⁰ [73]. In the Tag and Probe method used for the 2018 dataset, the tag is an offline
¹⁴⁸¹ reconstructed electron with $|\eta| \leq 2.1$ and not in the barrel and endcap overlap region,
¹⁴⁸² with $p_T > 35$ GeV with tight isolation and shower shape requirements, firing the tag
¹⁴⁸³ trigger. The probe is an offline reconstructed electron with $|\eta| \leq 2.5$ with $E_T^{\text{ECAL}} > 5$
¹⁴⁸⁴ GeV with no extra identification criteria [73].

¹⁴⁸⁵ The disagreement between data and MC, particularly at low transverse momen-
¹⁴⁸⁶ tum, is in part due to detector effects that are difficult to simulate, such as crystal


(a) Muon efficiency vs p_T for SingleMuon.(b) Muon efficiency vs $|\eta|$ for SingleMuon.


Figure 5.4: Trigger efficiencies in data (*top panels*) and ratio of efficiencies after/before a HLT muon reconstruction update (*bottom panels*) for the muon in the isolated single muon trigger with threshold $p_T > 24$ GeV in the data-taking year 2018, as functions of the muon p_T (*left*) and muon $|\eta|$ (*right*). Only statistical errors are shown [72].

1487 transparency losses in the ECAL and the evolution of dead regions in the pixel tracker
1488 [73].

1489 5.3.9 $e\mu$ cross-trigger efficiencies

1490 The efficiencies of the electron and muons for the cross-trigger with leading muon
1491 used in the $e\mu$ channel are shown for data in 2016, 2017, and 2018 in Figures 5.6a and
1492 5.6b [74]. These efficiencies were measured centrally using a Tag and Probe in events
1493 with Z to dileptons with the same flavor and opposite charge, where the tags are an
1494 isolated muon or electron, and the probe (offline) candidate is required to satisfy the
1495 same lepton selection as that of the tag candidate, be matched within $\Delta R < 0.1$ with
1496 a corresponding online trigger object, and also to pass the cross-trigger. The trigger
1497 efficiency is then:

$$\text{Efficiency} = \frac{\text{Events passing lepton pair selections and probe passing trigger}}{\text{Events passing lepton pair selections}} \quad (5.5)$$



(a) Electron efficiency vs p_T for single electron.

(b) Electron efficiency vs $|\eta|$ for single electron.

Figure 5.5: Trigger efficiencies in data, and the data/MC ratio for the electron in the single electron trigger with threshold $p_T > 32$ GeV in the data-taking year 2018, as functions of the electron p_T (left) and electron $|\eta|$ (right) [73]. In the plot vs. p_T , the region $1.442 \leq |\eta| \leq 1.566$ is not included as it corresponds to the transition between barrel and endcap parts of the ECAL.


1498 5.3.10 Electrons and muons faking τ_h : energy scales

1499 Energy scales for electrons misidentified as hadronic tau decays (e faking τ_h) are
 1500 provided by the Tau POG, and were measured in the $e\tau_h$ channel with the visible
 1501 invariant mass of the electron and hadronic tau system [64]. This energy scale is
 1502 applied for τ_h with $p_T > 20$ GeV regardless of which DeepTau vs. electron working
 1503 point was used. Values for 2018 are shown in Table 5.5.

Electrons faking τ_h energy scale factor in 2018	
Reconstructed decay mode of the fake τ_h	Central value and (up, down) shifts
0	1.01362 (+0.00474, -0.00904)
1	1.01945 (+0.01598, -0.01226)
10	0.96903 (+0.0125, -0.03404)
11	0.985 (+0.04309, -0.05499)

Table 5.5: Energy scales and up/down systematic uncertainties applied to electrons misidentified as hadronic taus for 2018, binned in decay mode of the fake τ_h [64].

1504 No nominal energy scale is applied for muons mis-reconstructed as τ_h , and the



(a) Electron efficiency vs. p_T .

(b) Muon efficiency vs. η .

Figure 5.6: Efficiencies of the electron leg vs. p_T (*left*) and the muon leg vs. η (*right*), for the HLT path with online thresholds of 12 GeV for the electron and 23 GeV for the muon, for the data-taking years 2016 (*black*), 2017 (*red*), and 2018 (*green*) [74].

uncertainty is treated as $\pm 1\%$ and uncorrelated in the reconstructed decay mode
 [64].

5.3.11 Electrons and muons faking τ_h : misidentification efficiencies

Corrections on identification efficiencies are applied to genuine electrons and muons misidentified as τ to account for differences in data and MC.

The specific values depend on the vs. electron and vs. muon discriminator working points used. For misidentified $\mu \rightarrow \tau_h$, the scale factors are split into different $|\eta|$ regions, determined by the CMS muon and tracker detector geometries, as shown in Table 5.6 for 2018 [61].

For misidentified $e \rightarrow \tau_h$, the scale factors are split into barrel and endcap regions, dictated by the ECAL detector geometry, as shown in Table 5.7 for 2018.

Tau ID efficiency for DeepTau vs. muon WPs in 2018		
$ \eta $	Tight working point	VLoose working point
(0.0, 0.2)	0.767 ± 0.127	0.954 ± 0.069
(0.2, 0.6)	1.255 ± 0.258	1.009 ± 0.098
(0.6, 1.0)	0.902 ± 0.203	1.029 ± 0.075
(1.0, 1.45)	0.833 ± 0.415	0.928 ± 0.145
(1.45, 2.0)	4.436 ± 0.814	5.000 ± 0.377
(2.0, 2.53)	1.000 ± 0.000	1.000 ± 0.000

Table 5.6: Tau mis-identification efficiency for the DeepTau Tight and Very Loose (VLoose) working points vs. muons in 2018, binned in the muon $|\eta|$ [61].

Tau ID efficiency for DeepTau vs. electron WPs in 2018		
$ \eta $	Tight working point	VLoose working point
(0.0, 0.73)	1.47 ± 0.27	0.95 ± 0.07
(0.73, 1.509)	1.509 ± 0.0	1.00 ± 0.0
(1.509, 1.929)	1.929 ± 0.2	0.86 ± 0.1
(1.929, 2.683)	2.683 ± 0.9	2.68 ± 0.0

Table 5.7: Tau mis-identification efficiency for the DeepTau Tight and Very Loose (VLoose) working points vs. electrons in 2018, binned in the electron $|\eta|$ [61].

5.3.12 Electron ID and tracking efficiency

1517 Scale factors are applied to MC to correct for differences between MC and data in
 1518 the performance of electron identification (ID) and tracking.

1520 Electron and photon identification, as discussed earlier, use variables with good
 1521 signal vs. background discrimination power such as lateral shower shape and ratio
 1522 of energy deposited in the HCAL to energy deposited in the ECAL at the position
 1523 of the electron. The cut-based electron identification efficiencies in data and ratio of
 1524 efficiencies in data to MC are shown in Fig. 5.7a for the multivariate analysis (MVA)
 1525 identification working point.

1526 The tracking efficiencies in data and the data/MC ratio are shown in Fig. 5.7b
 1527 for the Gaussian-sum filter (GSF) tracking [75].





Figure 5.7: Efficiencies in data (*top panels*) and the ratio of efficiencies in data/MC (*bottom panels*), for the electron multivariate analysis (MVA) identification (*left*) and for the Gaussian-sum filter (GSF) tracking (*right*) [75]. Error bars represent statistical and systematic uncertainties.

1528 5.3.13 Muon ID, isolation, and tracking efficiencies

1529 Scale factors are applied to MC to correct for differences between MC and data in
 1530 the performance of muon identification, isolation, and tracking, as detailed below.

1531 The efficiencies for muon identification measured in 2015 data and MC simulation
 1532 are shown in Figures 5.8a and 5.8b for the loose ID and tight ID respectively [76].
 1533 The loose ID is chosen such that efficiency exceeds 99% over the full η range, and the
 1534 data and simulation agree to within 1%. The tight ID is chosen such that efficiency
 1535 varies between 95% and 99% as a function of η , and the data and simulation agree
 1536 to within 1-3%. The muon identification working point used in this analysis is the
 1537 medium ID, which has an efficiency of 98% for all η and an agreement within 1-2%
 1538 [76].

1539 The efficiencies in data for the muon isolation, as measured in Level-3 muons
 1540 (muons in one of the final stages of reconstruction in the HLT), as a function of the
 1541 muon p_T and $|\eta|$ are shown in Figures 5.9a and 5.9b [76]. The HLT muon reconstruc-
 1542 tion consists of two steps: Level-2 (L2), where the muon is reconstructed in the muon



(a) Muon efficiency isolation vs p_T .

(b) Muon isolation efficiency vs. $|\eta|$.


Figure 5.8: Muon identification efficiencies in 2015 data and MC as a function of the muon p_T for the loose ID (left) and tight ID (right) working points [76].

subdetectors only, and Level-3 (L3) which is a global fit of tracker and muon hits (i.e. the global muon reconstruction as described in Section 5.1.2) [77].

The muon tracking efficiencies as a function of $|\eta|$ for standalone muons (i.e. tracks from only the muon system, i.e. DT, CSC, and RPC, as discussed in Section 5.1.2), is shown for data and simulated Drell-Yan samples in Fig. 5.10 [78].

5.3.14 Recoil corrections

In proton-proton collisions, W and Z bosons are predominantly produced through quark-antiquark annihilation. Higher-order processes can induce radiated quarks or gluons that recoil against the boson, imparting a non-zero transverse momentum to the boson [79]. Recoil corrections accounting for this effect are applied to samples with W+jets, Z+jets, and Higgs bosons [64]. The corrections are performed on the vectorial difference between the measured missing transverse momentum and the total transverse momentum of neutrinos originating from the decay of the W, Z, or Higgs boson. This vector is projected onto the axes parallel and orthogonal to the boson p_T . This vector, and the resulting correction to use, is measured in $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ events,



(a) Muon efficiency isolation vs p_T .

(b) Muon isolation efficiency vs. $|\eta|$.

Figure 5.9: Muon isolation efficiencies in Run-2 data with respect to Level-3 muons (one of the final stages of HLT muon reconstruction) as a function of the muon p_T (*left*) and $|\eta|$ (*right*) [76].

since these events have leptonic recoil that do not contain neutrinos, allowing the 4-vector of the Z boson to be measured precisely. The corrections are binned in generator-level p_T of the parent boson and also the number of jets in the event.

5.3.15 Drell-Yan corrections

The Z boson transverse momentum distribution disagrees between leading-order (LO) simulations and data in a $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ control region with at least one b-tag jet [80]. Per-event weights derived by the 2016 data-only version of this analysis [80] are applied to $Z \rightarrow \tau\tau/\ell\ell$ events, as a function of the generator-level Z boson p_T to provide better matching of MC to data.

5.3.16 Pileup reweighting

Reweighting is performed to rescale MC events to account for differences between MC and data, in the distribution of the pileup (number of additional proton-proton interactions per bunch crossing). A tool for calculating the pileup reweighting for the




Figure 5.10: Muon tracking efficiencies as a function of $|\eta|$ for standalone muons in Run-2 data (*black*) and Drell-Yan MC simulation (*blue*) [78]. All Tracks refers to tracks which exploit the presence of muon candidates in the muon system to seed the track reconstruction in the inner tracker, in contrast to tracks that use tracker-only hits for seeding. Uncertainties shown are statistical.

₁₅₇₁ MC samples used is provided centrally by the Luminosity POG [81].

₁₅₇₂ 5.3.17 Pre-firing corrections

₁₅₇₃ In 2016 and 2017 data-taking, a gradual timing shift of ECAL was not properly
₁₅₇₄ propagated to L1 trigger primitives (TPs), resulting in a large fraction of high η
₁₅₇₅ TPs being incorrectly associated with the previous bunch crossing. L1 trigger rules
₁₅₇₆ prevent two consecutive bunch crossings from firing, causing events to be rejected if
₁₅₇₇ significant ECAL energy was deposited in $2.0 < |\eta| < 3.0$. To account for this issue,
₁₅₇₈ MC simulations for 2016 and 2017 are corrected using an event-dependent weight.
₁₅₇₉ Embedded samples are not corrected [46].

1580 **5.3.18 Top p_T spectrum reweighting**

1581 In Run-1 and Run-2 it was observed that the p_T spectra of top quarks in $t\bar{t}$ data
1582 was significantly softer than those predicted by MC simulations [82]. Possible sources
1583 of this discrepancy are higher order QCD and/or electroweak corrections, and non-
1584 resonant production of $t\bar{t}$ -like final states. To account for this, corrections derived
1585 from Run-2 data by the Top Physics Analysis Group (PAG) are applied to the p_T
1586 of the top and anti-top quarks in MC simulations, computed as a function of their
1587 generator-level p_T [82].

1588 **5.3.19 B-tagging efficiency**

1589 In order to predict correct b-tagging discriminant distributions and event yields in
1590 data, the weight of selected MC events is reweighed according to recommendations by
1591 the BTV POG [83]. The reweighting depends on the jet p_T , η , and the b-tagging dis-
1592 criminant. In this method, there is no migration of events from one b-tag multiplicity
1593 bin to another.

1594 **5.3.20 Jet energy resolution and jet energy smearing**

1595 Calibration of jet energies, i.e. ensuring that the energy and momentum of the recon-
1596 structed jet matches that of the quark/gluon-initiated jet, is a challenging task due
1597 to time-dependent changes in the detector response and calibration and high pileup
1598 [84] [85]. Jet calibration is done via jet energy corrections (JECs) applied to the p_T
1599 of jets in MC samples, accounting successively for the effects of pileup, uniformity of
1600 the detector response, and residual data-simulation jet energy scale differences [86].
1601 Typical jet energy resolutions reported at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV in the central rapidities are
1602 15-20% at 30 GeV and about 10% at 100 GeV [84]. Jet energy corrections are also
1603 propagated to the missing transverse energy.

1604 Measurements show that the jet energy resolution (JER) in data is worse than
1605 in simulation, and so the jets in MC need to be smeared to describe the data. JER
1606 corrections are applied after JEC on MC simulations, and adjust the width of the p_T
1607 distribution based on pileup, jet size, and jet flavor [87]. Tools for applying JEC and
1608 JER are provided centrally by the JER Corrections group.

1609 **Chapter 6**

1610 **Event selection**

1611 **6.1 General procedure for all channels**

1612 For the search for $h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow bb\tau\tau$, three final states of the $\tau\tau$ system are considered:
1613 $\mu\tau_h$, $e\tau_h$, and $e\mu$. The $\tau_h\tau_h$ final state is not considered because signal events in the
1614 $\tau_h\tau_h$ channel would typically produce hadronic taus with momenta below data-taking
1615 trigger thresholds.

1616 In all three final states, events are required to have at least one b-tag jet passing the
1617 medium working point of the DeepFlavour tagger, with $p_T > 20$ GeV, and $|\eta| < 2.4$.
1618 A second b-tag jet is not required because such a requirement would reduce signal
1619 acceptance by 80% compared to only requiring one b-tag jet.

1620 Events in MC samples are sorted into one of the three $\tau\tau$ channels if they pass the
1621 following trigger requirements and requirements on the offline reconstructed objects
1622 in the event, first checking the HLT paths for the $\mu\tau_h$ channel, then $e\tau_h$, and finally
1623 $e\mu$. The two leading leptons (e.g. muon and hadronic tau for the $\mu\tau_h$ channel) that
1624 were determined to have originated from the $\tau\tau$ decay, are called the $\tau\tau$ “legs” and
1625 are respectively subscripted 1 and 2 in this work. For events in data and embedded
1626 samples, the HLT paths requirements for the corresponding channel are checked.

1627 After sorting events by HLT paths and identifying the leading tau legs in the offline
 1628 reconstructed objects, the p_T of the offline objects is checked against the online trigger
 1629 thresholds. Trigger matching is also performed, which checks the correspondence
 1630 between each offline reconstructed object used in the analysis (e.g. a muon), and a
 1631 trigger object in the HLT (e.g. a HLT muon). An offline object is considered to be
 1632 matched, if it corresponds to a trigger object of the same object type, with $\Delta R < 0.5$.
 1633 This matched trigger object is also required to pass the filter(s) of the HLT trigger.
 1634 The trigger thresholds used for the $bb\tau\tau$ final state (the focus of this work) and the
 1635 $bb\mu\mu$ final state are summarized in Table 6.1 and detailed in the following sections.

Year	Single/dilepton trigger p_T	$bb\mu\mu$		$bb\tau\tau$			
		μ	$e\mu$	$e\tau_h$	$\mu\tau_h$	e	μ
2016	Single lepton	24	—	25	—	22	—
	p_T -leading lepton	17	23	23	—	—	20
	p_T -subleading lepton	8	12	8	—	19	—
2017	Single lepton	24	—	27, 32	—	24, 27	—
	p_T -leading lepton	17	23	23	—	30	—
	p_T -subleading lepton	8	12	8	24	—	20
2018	Single lepton	24	—	32, 35	—	24, 27	—
	p_T -leading lepton	17	23	23	—	30	—
	p_T subleading lepton	8	12	8	24	—	20

Table 6.1: Trigger thresholds used for the leptons in the $bb\mu\mu$ analysis and the $bb\tau\tau$ analysis (the focus of this work). The thresholds for the three $bb\tau\tau$ channels ($e\mu$, $e\tau_h$, and $\mu\tau_h$) are listed separately, with some channels and years taking the logical OR of two triggers with different thresholds.

1636 Further cuts are made on the offline objects in each channel to obtain the signal
 1637 region, or other data regions used to perform data-driven background estimations.

1638 6.2 Event selection in the $\mu\tau_h$ channel

1639 In all three years, a single muon trigger is used if the muon has sufficiently high p_T ,
 1640 otherwise a dilepton $\mu\tau_h$ cross-trigger is used (Tables 6.2, 6.3, and 6.4). For data

1641 taken in 2017-2018 (2016), the logical OR of the single muon triggers with online p_T
1642 thresholds 24 and 27 (23) GeV is used, with the corresponding offline muon required
1643 to have with p_T 1 GeV above the online threshold. For data taken in 2017-2018
1644 (2016), a dilepton $\mu + \tau_h$ cross-trigger with p_T thresholds of 20 (19) and 27 (20) GeV
1645 for the muon and tau respectively, is used. The τ_h is required to have $|\eta| < 2.3$ if the
1646 single trigger is fired, $|\eta| < 2.1$.

1647 The muon and τ_h are required to have opposite charge and be separated by $\Delta R >$
1648 0.4. The muon is required to have $|\eta| < 2.4$, and the τ_h is required to have $|\eta| < 2.3$
1649 unless a cross-trigger is required, in which case we require $|\eta| < 2.1$ as discussed
1650 above.

1651 The muon is required to pass the medium identification (ID) working point [88],
1652 which is defined by the Muon POG as a loose muon (i.e. a Particle Flow muon that is
1653 either a global or a tracker muon - see Section 5.1.2) with additional requirements on
1654 track quality and muon quality. This identification criteria is designed to be highly
1655 efficiently for prompt muons and for muons from heavy quark decays. In addition to
1656 the ID, for prompt muons it is recommended to apply cuts on the impact parameter
1657 [88]: we apply $|\Delta(z)| < 0.2$ and $|\Delta(xy)| < 0.045$.

1658 In addition, a cut is applied on the muon relative isolation (defined in Section
1659 5.1.2), to be less than 0.15 in a cone size of $\Delta R = 0.4$, which corresponds to the
1660 Tight Particle Flow isolation requirement [88].

1661 The τ_h is required to pass a cut on its impact parameter of $|\Delta(z)| < 0.2$. The τ_h
1662 is also required to pass the VLoose (Very Loose) DeepTau working point vs. elec-
1663 tron, the Tight DeepTau working point vs. muons, and the VVVLoose and Medium
1664 DeepTau working point vs. jets. Events with taus reconstructed in two of the decay
1665 modes (labeled 5 and 6) are rejected, since these decay modes are meant to recover
1666 3-prong taus, but are only recommended for use in analyses where the benefits in
1667 final significance outweigh the resulting increase in background [61].

1668 For the estimation of the background from jets faking τ_h , which is described in Sec-
1669 tion 7.7, anti-isolated events are selected, by requiring events to pass all the selections
1670 described above, except failing the Medium DeepTau working point vs. jets.

1671 6.3 Event selection in the $e\tau_h$ channel

1672 The HLT trigger paths for the $e\tau_h$ channel are summarized in Tables 6.2, 6.3, and
1673 6.4. Similarly to the $\mu\tau_h$ channel, a single electron trigger is used if the electron has
1674 sufficiently high p_T in 2018 and 2017. For data taken in 2018 (2017), the OR of the
1675 single electron triggers with online p_T thresholds at 32 and 35 (27 and 32) GeV are
1676 used, with the corresponding offline electrons required to have p_T greater than 33
1677 (28) GeV. A $e + \tau_h$ cross-trigger is used for electrons with lower offline p_T between
1678 25 and 33 GeV (25 and 28 GeV). For the 2016 dataset, there is no cross trigger but
1679 only a single electron trigger with online p_T threshold at 25 GeV, which is used if the
1680 offline electron has p_T greater than 26 GeV.

1681 The electron and τ_h are required to have opposite charge and be separated by
1682 $\Delta R > 0.4$. The electron is required to be within $|\eta| < 2.3$ when no cross trigger is
1683 used, and $|\eta| < 2.1$ when the cross trigger is fired. The τ_h is required to have $|\eta| < 2.3$
1684 if no cross trigger is fired, and have $|\eta| < 2.1$ if the cross trigger is fired.

1685 The electron is required to have a relative isolation (same definition as in Section
1686 5.1.2) of less than 0.1 in a cone size of $\Delta R = 0.3$, which is the standard recommended
1687 cone size giving minimal pileup dependence and reduced probability of other objects
1688 overlapping with the cone. The isolation quantity used includes an “effective area”
1689 (EA) correction to remove the effect of pileup in the barrel and endcap parts of the
1690 detector [89].

1691 The electron is also required to pass cuts on its impact parameter of $|\Delta(z)| < 0.2$
1692 and $|\Delta(xy)| < 0.045$. It is also required to pass the non-isolated MVA working point

1693 corresponding to 90% efficiency. The electron's number of missing hits, which are
1694 gaps in its trajectory through the inner tracker [89], must be less than or equal to
1695 1. The electron must pass a conversion veto, which rejects electrons coming from
1696 photon conversions in the tracker, which should instead be reconstructed as part of
1697 the photon [89].

1698 The impact parameter cut for the τ_h is $|\Delta(z)| < 0.2$. In contrast to the $\mu\tau_h$ event
1699 selection, the vs. electron and vs. muon DeepTau working points are flipped, to
1700 reject muons faking the τ_h leg. The τ_h is required to pass the Tight DeepTau working
1701 point vs. electrons, the VLoose DeepTau working point vs. muons, and the Medium
1702 DeepTau working point vs. jets.

1703 As in the $\mu\tau_h$ channel, for the estimation of the background from jets faking τ_h ,
1704 which is described in Section 7.7, anti-isolated events are selected, by requiring events
1705 to pass all the selections described above, except failing the Medium DeepTau working
1706 point vs. jets.

1707 6.4 Event selection in the $e\mu$ channel

1708 The HLT trigger paths for the $e\mu$ channel are summarized in Tables 6.2, 6.3, and
1709 6.4. Events are selected with the logical OR of two $e + \mu$ cross triggers, where either
1710 the electron or muon can have larger p_T : (1) leading electron, where the electron has
1711 online $p_T > 23$ GeV and muon has online $p_T > 8$ GeV, or (2) leading muon, where
1712 electron has online $p_T > 12$ GeV and muon has online $p_T > 23$ GeV.

1713 The leading and sub-leading leptons are required to have an offline p_T greater
1714 than 1 GeV above the online threshold (i.e. $p_T > 24$ GeV). If the sub-leading lepton
1715 is the electron, the offline p_T threshold is 1 GeV above the online threshold ($p_T > 13$
1716 GeV), but if it is a muon, the offline p_T threshold is required to be at least 5 GeV
1717 greater than the online threshold (i.e. $p_T > 13$ GeV). This is because of poor data

1718 and simulation agreement for low- p_T muons with p_T between 9 GeV and 13 GeV, and
1719 the higher probability of mis-identifying jets as muons at lower p_T . With no effect on
1720 the expected limits, the offline p_T threshold for muons is raised to 13 GeV instead of
1721 9 GeV, even though it may lead to loss in signal acceptance. Both the electron and
1722 muon are required to have $|\eta| < 2.4$.

1723 The electron and muon are required to have opposite charge and be separated
1724 by $\Delta R > 0.3$ (note the decreased separation requirement compared to the other
1725 two channels). The electron is required to pass the non-isolated MVA identification
1726 working point corresponding to 90% efficiency, and to have a relative isolation less
1727 than 0.1 for a cone size of $\Delta R = 0.3$ with the EA pileup subtraction correction.
1728 The electron must have one or fewer missing hits and pass the conversion veto (both
1729 described previously in Section 6.3).

1730 The muon is required to pass the medium identification working point (described
1731 earlier in 6.2), and to have a relative isolation less than 0.15 for a cone size of $\Delta R =$
1732 0.4. The muon impact parameter is required to have $|\Delta(z)| > 0.2$ and $|\Delta(xy)| < 0.045$.

1733 For the QCD multijet background estimation described in Section 7.8, the same-
1734 sign region is selected by requiring all the above selections, except the legs are required
1735 to have the same electric charge rather than opposite.

1736 6.5 Extra lepton vetoes in all channels

1737 Events containing a third lepton (electron or muon) that is neither of the leading $\tau\tau$
1738 legs are rejected, and events with di-muons and di-electrons are vetoed, with criteria
1739 taken from the Standard Model $H \rightarrow \tau\tau$ working group [64].

1740 The event is vetoed if a third electron is found with the following properties:
1741 $p_T > 10$ GeV, $|\eta| < 2.5$, impact parameter $|\Delta(z)| < 0.2$ and $|\Delta(xy)| < 0.045$, passing
1742 non-isolation MVA identification with 90% efficiency, conversion veto, ≤ 1 missing

2016 $\mu\tau_h$ trigger paths	
Notes	HLT Path
	HLT_IsoMu22_v
	HLT_IsoMu22_eta2p1_v
	HLT_IsoTkMu22_v
	HLT_IsoTkMu22_eta2p1_v
	HLT_IsoMu19_eta2p1_LooseIsoPFTau20_v
	HLT_IsoMu19_eta2p1_LooseIsoPFTau20_SingleL1_v

2016 $e\tau_h$ trigger paths	
Notes	HLT Path
	HLT_Ele25_eta2p1_WPTight_Gsf_v

2016 $e\mu$ trigger paths	
Notes	HLT Path
runs B-F and MC	HLT_Mu23_TrkIsoVVL_Ele12_CaloIdL_TrackIdL_IsoVL_v
runs B-F and MC	HLT_Mu8_TrkIsoVVL_Ele23_CaloIdL_TrackIdL_IsoVL_v
runs G-H	HLT_Mu23_TrkIsoVVL_Ele12_CaloIdL_TrackIdL_IsoVL_DZ_v
runs G-H	HLT_Mu8_TrkIsoVVL_Ele23_CaloIdL_TrackIdL_IsoVL_DZ_v

Table 6.2: High-Level Trigger (HLT) paths used to select data and simulation events in 2016 for the three $\tau\tau$ channels.

2017 $\mu\tau_h$ trigger paths	
Notes	HLT Path
	HLT_IsoMu24_v
	HLT_IsoMu27_v
	HLT_IsoMu20_eta2p1_LooseChargedIso_PFTau27_eta2p1_CrossL1_v

2017 $e\tau_h$ trigger paths	
Notes	HLT Path
	HLT_Ele32_WPTight_Gsf_v
	HLT_Ele35_WPTight_Gsf_v
	HLT_Ele24_eta2p1_WPTight_Gsf_Loose_ChargedIsoPFTau30_eta2p1_CrossL1_v

2017 $e\mu$ trigger paths	
Notes	HLT Path
	HLT_Mu23_TrkIsoVVL_Ele12_CaloIdL_TrackIdL_IsoVL_DZ_v
	HLT_Mu8_TrkIsoVVL_Ele23_CaloIdL_TrackIdL_IsoVL_DZ_v

Table 6.3: High-Level Trigger (HLT) paths used to select data and simulation events in 2017 for the three $\tau\tau$ channels.

2018 $\mu\tau_h$ trigger paths	
Notes	HLT Path
	HLT_IsoMu24_v
	HLT_IsoMu27_v
only data run < 317509	HLT_IsoMu20_eta2p1_ (contd.)
	LooseChargedIsoPFTauHPS27_eta2p1_CrossL1_v
MC and data run \geq 317509	HLT_IsoMu20_eta2p1_ (contd.)
	LooseChargedIsoPFTauHPS27_eta2p1_TightID_CrossL1_v
2018 $e\tau_h$ trigger paths	
Notes	HLT Path
	HLT_Ele32_WPTight_Gsf_v
	HLT_Ele35_WPTight_Gsf_v
only data run < 317509	HLT_Ele24_eta2p1_WPTight_Gsf_ (contd.)
	LooseChargedIsoPFTauHPS30_eta2p1_CrossL1_v
MC and data run \geq 317509	HLT_Ele24_eta2p1_WPTight_Gsf_ (contd.)
	LooseChargedIsoPFTauHPS30_eta2p1_TightID_CrossL1_v
2018 $e\mu$ trigger paths	
Notes	HLT Path
	HLT_Mu23_TrkIsoVVL_Ele12_CaloIdL_TrackIdL_IsoVL_DZ_v
	HLT_Mu8_TrkIsoVVL_Ele23_CaloIdL_TrackIdL_IsoVL_DZ_v

Table 6.4: High-Level Trigger (HLT) paths used to select data and simulation events in 2018 for the three $\tau\tau$ channels. In 2018 a HLT trigger path using the hadron plus strips (HPS) tau reconstruction algorithm became available.

1743 hits, and relative isolation < 0.3 with cone size $\Delta R = 0.3$. The event is also vetoed if
1744 a third muon is found with the following properties: $p_T > 10$ GeV, $|\eta| < 2.4$, impact
1745 parameter $|\Delta(z)| < 0.2$ and $|\Delta(xy)| < 0.045$, medium ID, and isolation < 0.3 with
1746 cone size $\Delta R = 0.4$.

1747 A di-muon veto is applied, which rejects events containing a pair of muons with
1748 opposite charge and separation of $\Delta R > 0.15$, that both pass the following selections:
1749 $p_T > 15$ GeV, $|\eta| < 2.4$, flag for global muons, flag for tracker muon, flag for Particle
1750 Flow muon, $|\Delta(z)| < 0.2$, $|\Delta(xy)| < 0.045$, and isolation < 0.3 with cone size $\Delta R =$
1751 0.4.

1752 A similar di-electron veto is applied to reject events containing a pair of electrons
1753 with opposite charge and separation of $\Delta R > 0.15$, that both pass the following
1754 selections: $p_T > 15$ GeV, $|\eta| < 2.5$, a dedicated electron ID (cut-based) for vetoing
1755 third leptons, $|\Delta(z)| < 0.2$, $|\Delta(xy)| < 0.045$, with pileup-corrected relative isolation
1756 < 0.3 with cone size $\Delta R = 0.3$.

1757 These vetoes on extra leptons also ensure orthogonality of events to analyses such
1758 as the $bb\mu\mu$ final state, whose results are combined with this $bb\tau\tau$ final state as
1759 described in Section ??.

₁₇₆₀ **Chapter 7**

₁₇₆₁ **Background estimation**

₁₇₆₂ This section describes methods used to estimate sources of background from Standard
₁₇₆₃ Model processes in the search for $h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow bb\tau\tau$. Similar background estimation
₁₇₆₄ methods are being used for the $h \rightarrow a_1a_2$ analysis. The background contributions
₁₇₆₅ directly taken from MC are described first, followed by backgrounds estimated from
₁₇₆₆ data-driven methods to produce sufficient statistics in the signal region.

₁₇₆₇ **7.1 Z+jets**

₁₇₆₈ A major source of background for $\tau\tau$ analyses is the Drell-Yan (DY) process (Z+jets).
₁₇₆₉ The Z boson decays to $\tau\tau/\mu\mu/ee$ with equal probability of 3.4% each, with the dom-
₁₇₇₀ inant decay modes being to hadrons (around 70%) and neutrinos (invisible) (20%)
₁₇₇₁ [24].

₁₇₇₂ The Drell-Yan contribution with genuine taus, $Z \rightarrow \tau\tau$, is estimated using embed-
₁₇₇₃ ded samples, described in Section 4.3. To avoid double-counting between embedded
₁₇₇₄ and MC samples, in all MC samples, events with legs that originated from genuine τ
₁₇₇₅ are discarded.

₁₇₇₆ The other decays of the Z, $Z \rightarrow ee$ and $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$, are estimated from MC simulation,
₁₇₇₇ and are hereafter referred to as simply the Drell-Yan background. These MC samples

1778 are generated to leading order (LO) with different numbers of jets (jet multiplicity) in
1779 the matrix element: Z+1 jet, Z+2jets, Z+3 jets, Z+4 jets, and inclusive Z+jets. The
1780 cross-sections of the samples with ≥ 1 jets are normalized to next-to-NLO (NNLO)
1781 in QCD.

1782 For the inclusive Drell-Yan sample, two samples are used with different thresholds
1783 for the di-lepton invariant mass ($m_{\ell\ell}$) at the generator level: one with $m_{\ell\ell} > 50$ GeV
1784 and the other with $10 < m_{\ell\ell} < 50$.

1785 7.2 W+jets

1786 The dominant W boson decay modes are to hadrons (67.4%), $e + \nu_e$ (10.7%), $\mu + \nu_\mu$
1787 (10.6%), and $\tau + \nu_\tau$ (11.4%) [24]. The W+jets background is estimated from MC
1788 simulation. Similarly to the Z+jets, the W+jets samples are generated with different
1789 jet multiplicities in the matrix element. LO samples are used for greater statistics
1790 and are normalized to NNLO cross sections.

1791 7.3 $t\bar{t}$ + jets

1792 In hadron collisions, top quarks are produced singly with the weak interaction, or in
1793 pairs via the strong interaction, with interference between these leading-order pro-
1794 cesses possible in higher orders of the perturbation theory. The top quark is the
1795 heaviest fermion in the Standard Model and has a short lifetime ($\sim 10^{-25}$ s), decay-
1796 ing without hadronization into a bottom quark and a W boson [24], with the decay
1797 modes of the W boson as listed in the previous section. With two top quarks, the
1798 final states of the two resulting W bosons can be described as fully leptonic, semilep-
1799 tonic, and fully hadronic. These three final states are modeled separately with MC
1800 simulation in 2018 and 2017, while for 2016 the sample used is inclusive.

1801 7.4 Single top

1802 There are three main production modes of the single top in pp collisions [90]: the
1803 exchange of a virtual W boson (t channel), the production and decay of a virtual W
1804 boson (s channel), and the associated production of a top quark and W boson (tW ,
1805 or W-associated) channel. As the s channel process is rare and only 3% of the total
1806 production, the dominant production mode of the t -channel and the tW production
1807 are considered and modeled with MC.

1808 7.5 Diboson

1809 In pp collisions, the production of dibosons (pairs of electroweak gauge bosons, i.e.
1810 WW, WZ, and ZZ) is dominated by quark-antiquark annihilation, with a small con-
1811 tribution from gluon-gluon interaction [91]. MC is used to model the pair production
1812 and decays of VV to $2\ell 2\nu$, WZ to $2q 2\ell$ and $3\ell\nu$, and ZZ to 4ℓ and $2q 2\ell$ (q being
1813 quarks and ℓ being leptons).

1814 7.6 Standard Model Higgs

1815 MC is used to simulate backgrounds from major production modes of the Standard
1816 Model 125 GeV Higgs boson: gluon-gluon fusion (ggH), vector boson fusion (VBF),
1817 associated production with a W or Z (WH, ZH), and associated production with a
1818 top pair (ttH) (see Fig. 7.1 for leading-order diagrams). For these production modes,
1819 samples with the Higgs decaying to $\tau\tau$ or to WW are used. Samples made with
1820 higher-order diagrams for WH and ZH that include the production of a jet, with the
1821 Higgs decaying to WW, are also used.




Figure 7.1: Leading-order Feynman diagrams of Higgs production from [92], in ggH (a) and vector boson fusion (VBF; b), associated production with a W or Z (V) boson (VH; c), associated production with a top or bottom quark pair (ttH or bbH); d, and associated production with a single top quark (tH; e, f).

1822 7.7 Jet faking τ_h

1823 Events with a jet mis-reconstructed as the hadronic tau leg τ_h are a major source of
 1824 background in the $\mu\tau_h$ and $e\tau_h$ channels. The main processes contributing to jet $\rightarrow \tau_h$
 1825 events are QCD multijet, W+jets, and $t\bar{t}$ production. These events are estimated
 1826 using a data-driven method adapted from past analyses [46] [80]. This background
 1827 includes contributions from W+jets, QCD multijets, and $t\bar{t}$ +jets. To estimate this
 1828 background, a sideband region is constructed, where events are required to pass all
 1829 baseline $\mu\tau_h/e\tau_h$ selection criteria, but fail the τ_h isolation criteria. The events in
 1830 this sideband region is reweighed with a factor $f/(1 - f)$, where f is the probability
 1831 for a jet to be misidentified as a τ_h . The jet $\rightarrow \tau_h$ background is the anti-isolated,
 1832 reweighed MC and embedded events subtracted from the anti-isolated, reweighted
 1833 data events.

1834 The fake factor is measured in $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu + \text{jets}$ events in data in the $\mu\mu\tau_h$ final
 1835 state, as any reconstructed τ_h in these events must originate from a jet. The two
 1836 muons are required to be isolated (< 0.15), have opposite electric charge, and have

1837 an invariant mass between 76 and 106 GeV (close to the Z mass). These events are
1838 selected with a double muon trigger, with the leading muon having offline $p_T > 20$
1839 GeV and the subleading muon $p_T > 10$ GeV. Simulated diboson (ZZ and WZ) events
1840 are subtracted to avoid contamination from events with real τ_h . The denominator of
1841 the fake rate corresponds to fake taus passing the VVVLoose working point of the
1842 discriminator vs. jets, while the numerator corresponds to those passing the Medium
1843 working point, i.e. $f = N_{\text{jet passing tight}} / N_{\text{jet passing loose}}$.

1844 f is measured as a function of the τ_h transverse momentum and is 8% - 10% in
1845 each of the data-taking years. f is derived separately for the $\mu\tau_h$ and $e\tau_h$ channels
1846 because the channels use different anti-lepton identification working points.

1847 7.8 QCD multijet background

1848 In the $e\mu$ channel, events with jets faking electrons or muons originating from QCD
1849 multijet, is estimated from data events with the same baseline selection as in the
1850 signal region, except with same-signed (SS) charged $e + \mu$, ensuring orthogonality
1851 with the signal region which requires opposite-sign (OS) $e\mu$ pairs. All same-sign MC
1852 events (both events with real and fake $e + \mu$) are subtracted from same-sign data
1853 events to remove contamination from other backgrounds. i.e. $\text{QCD}_{\text{SS}} = \text{Data}_{\text{SS}} -$
1854 MC_{SS} .

1855 Three scale factors are applied to the QCD_{SS} events to compute the QCD multijet
1856 background [80] [40]:

- 1857 • *OS-to-SS scale factor:* This scales the SS QCD to the OS region, and is mea-
1858 sured from an orthogonal region with an isolated electron and an anti-isolated
1859 muon. Only the muon is chosen to be anti-isolated because this scale factor was
1860 observed to depend more strongly on electron isolation than that of the muon.
1861 This scale factor is treated as a function of the ΔR separation of the trajectories

1862 of the electron and muon, and is measured separately for events with 0 jets, 1,
1863 jet, and greater than 1 jet.

- 1864 • *2D closure correction for the lepton p_T :* This factor accounts for subleading
1865 dependencies of the first scale factor on the p_T of the two leptons. A 2D weight
1866 is derived in a similar fashion, as a ratio of QCD_{OS} events to QCD_{SS} events,
1867 but parameterized by both electron and muon p_T , where the SS events have the
1868 previous scale factor applied.
- 1869 • *Isolation correction for the muon:* The third and final factor is an isolation
1870 correction, which is a bias correction to account for the fact that the fake
1871 factor was determined for less-isolated muons. This factor is obtained as the
1872 ratio of the OS-to-SS scale factors measured in two other control regions: (1)
1873 events where the electron is anti-isolated ($0.15 < \text{iso} < 0.5$) and the muon is
1874 isolated, and (2) events where both leptons are anti-isolated.

1875

Chapter 8

1876

Systematic uncertainties

1877 The handling of systematic uncertainties is separated into normalization uncertainties
1878 (those that affect the total yield of a variables' distribution) and shape uncertainties
1879 (those that shift the distribution of events). Normalization uncertainties are expressed
1880 as multiplicative factors, while shape uncertainties are represented as up and down
1881 shifts of a variable's distribution.

1882 Up/down shifts of shape uncertainties can change the number of background
1883 events in a distribution. For instance, hadronic taus receive corrections from the
1884 nominal tau energy scale, with the nominal, up, and down energy scales provided
1885 centrally by CMS. For the $\mu\tau_h$ channel, an event could have a τ_h with p_T just below
1886 the offline threshold of 20 GeV (for instance, 19.5 GeV), so in the nominal distribution
1887 of $m_{\tau\tau}$ (or any other variable for this channel), the event is excluded. However, when
1888 we build our distributions with the tau energy scale “up” shift, the energy of this τ_h
1889 may be scaled up to, say, 20.5 GeV, and now the event passes the offline p_T threshold
1890 for the single muon trigger, leading to the event's inclusion in the distributions made
1891 with the tau energy scale “up” shift.

1892 In evaluating the up and down shifts of a specific source of uncertainty, all other
1893 corrections and scale factors are held at their nominal values, and the full chain

1894 of object and event selection and event categorization is performed to obtain the
1895 observable distributions. Any “downstream” variables that depend on the shifted
1896 variable, e.g. the invariant di-tau mass $m_{\tau\tau}$, must be computed for the nominal case,
1897 and then re-computed separately for each up and down shift of the tau legs’ energy
1898 scale. The objective of this process is to quantify the effect of a single source of
1899 uncertainty on the resulting observable distributions.

1900 8.1 Uncertainties associated with physics objects

1901 Each scale factor and correction described in Section 5.3 has an associated uncertainty.
1902 The binning of the uncertainties follows that of the nominal scale factor value.

1903 8.1.1 Uncertainties in the lepton energy scales

1904 The uncertainties in the tau energy scales [61] are binned by the tau decay mode and
1905 are taken as shape uncertainties treated as uncorrelated across the tau decay modes
1906 and years. Same as with the application of the nominal scale factor, when applying
1907 the up or down shifts, the missing transverse energy (p_T^{miss}) of the event is adjusted
1908 so that the 4-vector sum of the tau p_T^{miss} is unchanged.

1909 The uncertainties in the muon energy scale [62] are 0.4% for $|\eta| < 1.2$, 0.9% for
1910 $1.2 < |\eta| < 2.1$, and 2.7% for $2.1 < |\eta| < 2.4$, and are treated as shape uncertainties,
1911 fully uncorrelated between embedded and MC samples.

1912 The uncertainties in the electron energy scale [65] in MC are binned in the electron
1913 $|\eta|$ and p_T , and are shown in Fig. 5.2. The uncertainties range from 0.5% to 2.2% in
1914 the barrel, and 0.3% to 4.1% in the endcap, across the p_T range. The uncertainties
1915 for the embedded sample are binned only in $|\eta|$ and are on the order of 0.5% and
1916 1.25% for the barrel and endcap [69].

1917 There are also uncertainties in the energy scales for electrons and muons misiden-

tified as τ_h . The uncertainty for muons misidentified as τ_h is 1% [61]. For electrons misidentified as τ_h , the uncertainty is binned in barrel/endcap η and by 1-prong and 1-prong + π_0 decays. The probability for e/μ faking a 3-prong decay mode is much lower.

8.1.2 Uncertainties from other lepton corrections

Uncertainties associated with the τ_h identification efficiencies are treated as shapes, uncorrelated across the seven p_T bins and years. The shape uncertainties in the embedded samples are taken as 50% correlated with those of the MC samples.

The uncertainties on electron and muon identification efficiencies are taken as normalization uncertainties of 2% each, with a 50% correlation between embedded and MC samples.

In the $e\tau_h$ channel, there is an additional uncertainty for the vs. jet discrimination efficiency [61], because the analysis uses a looser anti-lepton working point (VLoose WP) than the working points used in the measurement of the efficiency (namely, VLoose WP vs e, and Tight WP vs mu). For nominal $\tau_h p_T < 100$ GeV, an additional uncertainty of 3% (5%) is used in MC (embedded), and for high p_T an uncertainty of 15% is used for both.

The uncertainties in trigger efficiencies are taken as shapes [61]. In the $e\tau_h$ and $\mu\tau_h$ channels, there are uncertainties for the single and cross lepton triggers, and in the $e\mu$ channel there is one uncertainty each for the two $e + \mu$ triggers, and one combined uncertainty since their trigger phase spaces are not mutually exclusive.

8.1.3 Uncertainties from jet energy scale and resolution

The jet energy scale uncertainties are taken as shape uncertainties: there are eleven in total, with seven correlated across years (labeled “Year” below) and the remainder uncorrelated across years. They affect the b-tag jet p_T and mass, and hence the

1943 missing transverse energy p_T^{miss} . The shifts are propagated through the b-tagging
1944 scale factor calculation and b-tag jet counting.

1945 The uncertainties in the jet energy correction and resolution [84] [93] are as follows:

1946 • *Absolute, AbsoluteYear*: flat absolute scale uncertainties.

1947 • *BBEC1, BBEC1Year*: for sub-detector regions, with barrel “BB” in $|\eta| < 1.3$
1948 and endcap region 1 “EC1”: $1.3 < |\eta| < 2.5$.

1949 • *EC2, EC2 year*: for sub-detector regions, with endcap region 2 “EC2” in $2.5 <$
1950 $|\eta| < 3.0$.

1951 • *HF, HF year*: for sub-detector regions, with hadron forward “HF” in $|\eta| > 3$.

1952 • *FlavorQCD*: for uncertainty in jet flavor (uds/c/b-quark and gluon) estimates
1953 based on comparing Pythia and Herwig (different MC generator) predictions.

1954 • *RelativeBal*: account for difference between log-linear fits of the two methods
1955 used to study the jet energy response: MPF (missing transverse momentum
1956 projection fraction) and p_T balance.

1957 • *RelativeSample*: account for η -dependent uncertainty due to a difference be-
1958 tween relative residuals, observed with dijet and Z+jets in Run D of 2018 data.

1959 • *JetResolution*: uncertainty in the jet energy resolution.

1960 8.1.4 Uncertainties from b-tagging scale factors

1961 The b-tagging scale factor has its own set of associated uncertainties (not to be
1962 confused with shifts in the b-tagging scale factor due to the propagation of the jet
1963 energy scale uncertainties described in the previous section 8.1.3). They are:

1964 • *hf*: contamination from heavy flavor (b+c) jets in the light flavor region.

1965 • $hfstats1$, $hfstats2$: linear and quadratic statistical fluctuations from b-flavor jets.

1966 • lf : contamination from light flavor (udsg+c jets) in the heavy flavor region.

1967 • $lfstats1$, $lfstats2$: linear and quadratic statistical fluctuations from udsg jets.

1968 • $cferr$, $cferr2$: uncertainty for charm jets.

1969 The variations for “lf, hf, hfstats1/2, lfstats1/2” are applied to both b and udsg jets.

1970 For c-flavor jets, only “cferr1/2” is applied.

1971 8.1.5 Uncertainties from MET

1972 Samples where recoil corrections were applied ($Z+jets$, $W+jets$, and Standard Model
1973 Higgs, as described in Section 5.3) have uncertainties from the response and resolution
1974 of the hadronic recoil against the leptonic system. These are each binned in jet
1975 multiplicity.

1976 8.2 Uncertainties associated with samples used

1977 Normalization uncertainties related to the samples used are:

1978 • *Cross-section uncertainties*: $\sigma(t\bar{t})$: 4.2%, $\sigma(\text{diboson})$: 5%, $\sigma(\text{single top})$: 5%,
1979 $\sigma(\text{ggH})$: 3.2%, $\sigma(\text{qqH})$: 2.1%, $\sigma(\text{WH})$: 1.9%, $\sigma(\text{ZH})$: 1.3%, $\sigma(\text{ttH})$: 3.6%

1980 • *Uncertainties in QCD renormalization scale*: QCD scale(qqH): +0.43%-0.33%,
1981 QCD scale(WH): +0.5%-0.7%, QCD scale(ttH): +5.8%-9.2%

1982 • *Branching ratio uncertainties*: $\text{BR}(\text{H} \rightarrow \tau\tau)$: 1.8%, and $\text{BR}(\text{H} \rightarrow \text{WW})$: 1.5%.

1983 • *Normalization uncertainties*: 2% for Drell-Yan, 4\$ for embedded, 20% pre-fit
1984 for the QCD multijet background in the $e\mu$ channel, 20% pre-fit for the jet
1985 faking background.

1986 The $t\bar{t}$ process has additional acceptance uncertainties from QCD scale variation
1987 and parton shower uncertainties [94]. Parton shower uncertainties originate from
1988 the modeling of perturbative and non-perturbative QCD effects handled in parton
1989 shower MC generators. The scale variations are determined from the envelope of the
1990 6 provided shapes due to variations in the factorization scale, renormalization scale,
1991 and their combined variation [94].

1992 The Z p_T reweighing uncertainty in Drell-Yan samples is taken to be 10% of the
1993 nominal value, taken as a shape uncertainty.

1994 The fake rate uncertainties are taken as shape uncertainties. For the weight ap-
1995 plied to scale up anti-isolated events in cross-trigger regions, 20% of the nominal
1996 weight is taken as a shape uncertainty.

1997 8.3 Other uncertainties

1998 A 3.6% yield uncertainty in the signal is used to cover uncertainties in the parton
1999 distribution functions, α_s (fine structure constant), and QCD scale.

2000 Normalization uncertainties from luminosity are applied to all MC samples, di-
2001 vided into those uncorrelated across years, those correlated between 2017 and 2018,
2002 and one for 2018 [81].

2003 8.4 Pulls and impacts

2004 The top impacts and pulls computed for the combination of all channels and years is
2005 shown in Fig. 8.1. The top impacts are related to uncertainty in the signal sample and
2006 cross-section of the $t\bar{t}$ cross-section, and also the yields of the jet faking τ_h background,
2007 which is a major background in all channels and expected to be constrained due to
2008 the yield uncertainty which is taken to be 20% pre-fit.




Figure 8.1: Top sixty impacts for the combination of all channels and years [39].

2009 Chapter 9

2010 Event categorization and signal 2011 extraction

2012 9.1 B-tag jet multiplicity

2013 The increased statistics of the full Run-2 dataset enables the separation of events into
2014 events with exactly 1 b-tag jet and events with greater than 1 b-tag jet. Further event
2015 categorization is performed with deep neural networks (DNNs) described below. The
2016 DNNs are used only for separating events into signal and control regions in the 1
2017 b-tag and 2 b-tag jets scenarios. The final results are extracted from the statistical
2018 fitting to the mass of the $\tau\tau$, $m_{\tau\tau}$.

2019 9.2 DNN-based event categorization

2020 A brief overview of the DNN-based event categorization is given below with a focus
2021 on the physics aspects, with full details of the machine learning training in [40] and
2022 associated documentation.

2023 **Training samples**

2024 Neural networks for event categorization are trained for each of the $\mu\tau_h$, $e\tau_h$, and $e\mu$
2025 channels, for 1 and 2 b-tag jets, giving $3 \times 2 = 6$ networks in total. In the training,
2026 the signal is taken to be all of the possible pseudoscalar mass m_a hypotheses together.
2027 The backgrounds for each DNN are taken to be a representative combination of the
2028 three major backgrounds: $Z \rightarrow \tau\tau$, $t\bar{t}$ +jets, and fake backgrounds. The proportions of
2029 each background for each channel and b-tag jet multiplicity are taken from the yields
2030 in the $m_{\tau\tau}$ distribution. For instance, in the $\mu\tau_h$ 1 b-tag jet category, the composition
2031 of the background for training is 17.4% from $Z \rightarrow \tau\tau$, 42.4% from $t\bar{t}$ +jets, and 40.2%
2032 fakes.

2033 **Input variables**

2034 The input variables capture the key differences between the signal and the back-
2035 ground:

- 2036 • Transverse momentum p_T of the electron and muon in the $e\tau_h$ and $\mu\tau_h$ channels,
2037 where the signal tends to have a softer p_T spectrum (lower energy) than the
2038 background.
- 2039 • p_T of the b-tag jet(s). The signal sample b-tag jet(s) tend to have softer p_T .
- 2040 • Invariant masses of the various objects ($\tau\tau$ legs and the b-tag jet(s)), which
2041 tend to be smaller for the signal samples.
- 2042 • The angular separation ΔR between pairs of the objects, where signal samples
2043 peak at smaller ΔR values.
- 2044 • The transverse mass between the missing transverse energy p_T^{miss} and each of

the four objects [80], defined as

$$m_T(\ell, p_T^{\text{miss}}) \equiv \sqrt{2p_T^\ell \cdot p_T^{\text{miss}}[1 - \cos(\Delta\phi)]} \quad (9.1)$$

where p_T^ℓ is the transverse momentum of the object ℓ , and $\Delta\phi$ is the difference in azimuthal angle between the object and the p_T^{miss} . Events from $t\bar{t}$ +jets and jets faking τ_h backgrounds have larger p_T^{miss} resulting in larger transverse mass values compared to the signal, which tends to have smaller p_T^{miss} that is also more aligned with the lepton legs.

- The variable D_ζ [80], defined as

$$D_\zeta \equiv p_\zeta - 0.85p_\zeta^{\text{vis}} \quad (9.2)$$

where the ζ axis is the bisector of the transverse directions of the visible τ decay products. p_ζ is the component of the p_T^{miss} along the ζ axis, and p_ζ^{vis} is the sum of the components of the lepton p_T along the same axis. This variable captures the fact that in signal the p_T^{miss} is small and approximately aligned with the $\tau\tau$. In contrast, the $Z \rightarrow \tau\tau$ background tends towards large D_ζ values because the p_T^{miss} is collinear to the $\tau\tau$, and the $t\bar{t}$ +jets events tend to have small D_ζ due to a large p_T^{miss} not aligned with the $\tau\tau$.

- For events with 2 b-tag jets, one additional variable is defined to capture the difference in the invariant mass of the bb and the $\tau\tau$:

$$\Delta m_{a_1} \equiv (m_{bb} - m_{\tau\tau})/m_{\tau\tau} \quad (9.3)$$

This variable peaks at zero for the $h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow 2b2\tau$ signal.

2062 **Categorization using the DNN score**

2063 After training, events in data, MC, and embedded are evaluated with the six DNNs
 2064 and assigned a raw score between 0 and 1 (background-like or signal-like). In order
 2065 to flatten the distribution of the score and define score thresholds for categorizing
 2066 events, the raw output scores are transformed with the function $\tilde{p}(n) = \text{arctanh}(p \times$
 2067 $\tanh(n))/n$ where n is a positive integer. The thresholds of the DNN score used for
 2068 signal/control region definition are determined using scans that optimize the signal
 2069 sensitivity and are shown in Tables 9.1 and 9.2.

1bNN $\tilde{p}(n = 1.5)$				
	SR1	SR2	SR3	CR
$\mu\tau_h$ 2018	> 0.98	$\in [0.95, 0.98]$	$\in [0.90, 0.95]$	< 0.90
$\mu\tau_h$ 2017	> 0.97	$\in [0.94, 0.97]$	$\in [0.90, 0.94]$	< 0.90
$\mu\tau_h$ 2016	> 0.97	$\in [0.94, 0.97]$	$\in [0.89, 0.94]$	< 0.89
1bNN $\tilde{p}(n = 1.5)$				
	SR1	SR2	SR3	CR
$e\tau_h$ 2018	> 0.97	$\in [0.945, 0.97]$	$\in [0.90, 0.945]$	< 0.90
$e\tau_h$ 2017	> 0.985	$\in [0.965, 0.985]$	$\in [0.93, 0.965]$	< 0.93
$e\tau_h$ 2016	> 0.985	$\in [0.965, 0.985]$	$\in [0.93, 0.965]$	< 0.93
1bNN $\tilde{p}(n = 2.5)$				
	SR1	SR2	SR3	CR
$e\mu$ 2018	> 0.99	$\in [0.95, 0.99]$	$\in [0.85, 0.95]$	< 0.85
$e\mu$ 2017	> 0.985	$\in [0.95, 0.985]$	$\in [0.85, 0.95]$	< 0.85
$e\mu$ 2016	> 0.99	$\in [0.95, 0.99]$	$\in [0.85, 0.95]$	< 0.85

Table 9.1: Event categorization based on DNN scores for events with exactly 1 b-tag jet (1bNN), for the three $\tau\tau$ channels and three eras.

2070 **9.3 Methodology for signal extraction**

2071 In this section we outline the statistics terminology and concepts underlying the
 2072 modified frequentist method CL_S used to perform signal extraction.

	2bNN $\tilde{p}(n = 1.5)$		
	SR1	SR2	CR
$\mu\tau_h$ 2018	> 0.99	$\in [0.96, 0.99]$	< 0.96
$\mu\tau_h$ 2017	> 0.98	$\in [0.94, 0.98]$	< 0.94
$\mu\tau_h$ 2016	> 0.97	$\in [0.93, 0.97]$	< 0.93
	2bNN $\tilde{p}(n = 1.5)$		
	SR1	SR2	CR
$e\tau_h$ 2018	> 0.96	NA	< 0.96
$e\tau_h$ 2017	> 0.985	NA	< 0.985
$e\tau_h$ 2016	> 0.96	NA	< 0.96
	2bNN $\tilde{p}(n = 2.5)$		
	SR1	SR2	CR
$e\mu$ 2018	> 0.98	$\in [0.94, 0.98]$	< 0.94
$e\mu$ 2017	> 0.97	$\in [0.93, 0.97]$	< 0.93
$e\mu$ 2016	> 0.98	$\in [0.94, 0.98]$	< 0.94

Table 9.2: Event categorization based on DNN scores for events with 2 b-tag jets (2bNN), for the three $\tau\tau$ channels and three eras.

2073 9.3.1 Model building and parameter estimation

In the frequentist interpretation of probability, an experiment measuring an observable can be repeated, resulting in different values of the observable, e.g. the invariant mass of a candidate Higgs boson in a search for the Higgs [95]. The ensemble of values of the observable x gives rise to the probability density function (PDF) $f(x)$, which has the important property that it is normalized to unity:

$$\int f(x) dx = 1.$$

A parametric family of PDFs

$$f(x|\alpha),$$

2074 read “ f of x given α ”, is referred to as a probability model or model. The parameters α
 2075 typically represent parameters of the theory or an unknown property of the detector’s
 2076 response. The parameters are not frequentist in nature, unlike x . Out of all the

parameters, typically only a few are of interest, and are called the parameters of interest (POI), labeled μ here. The remaining are referred to as nuisance parameters (NP) [95] and are labeled $\boldsymbol{\theta}$.

$f(x)$ is the probability density for the observable in one event and we wish to describe the probability density for a dataset with many events, $\mathcal{D} = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$, called the total probability model \mathbf{f} . For instance, if we also have a prediction for the total number of events expected, called ν , we also account for the overall Poisson probability for observing n events given ν expected:

$$\mathbf{f}(\mathcal{D}|\nu, \alpha) = \text{Poisson}(n|\nu) \prod_{e=1}^n f(x_e|\alpha) \quad (9.4)$$

The likelihood function $L(\alpha)$ is numerically equivalent to $f(x|\alpha)$ for fixed x , or $\mathbf{f}(\mathcal{D}|\alpha)$ with \mathcal{D} fixed [95]. The likelihood function is not a probability density for α and is not normalized to unity:

$$\int L(\alpha) d(\alpha) \neq 1.$$

i.e. the likelihood function is the value of f as a function of α given a fixed value of x .

To estimate the parameter α we use an estimator, which is a function of the data. Take for example the measurement of data distributed according to a Gaussian probability density $f(x|\mu, \sigma) = \text{Gauss}(x|\mu, \sigma)$. One possible estimator of the mean μ , is the mean of the measured data points $\bar{x} = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i/n$ [95].

A commonly used estimator in physics is the maximum likelihood estimator (MLE), defined as the value α which maximizes the likelihood function $L(\alpha)$. This value, labeled $\hat{\alpha}$, also maximizes $\ln L(\alpha)$ and minimizes $-\ln L(\alpha)$. By convention the $-\ln L(\alpha)$ is minimized, in a process called “fitting”, and the maximum likelihood estimate is called the “best fit value”.

2096 9.3.2 Hypothesis testing

2097 In this section we next introduce concepts related to hypothesis testing such as the
2098 test statistic constructed from the ratio of likelihood functions.

2099 The objective of a likelihood analysis is to distinguish different models repre-
2100 senting the various hypotheses, and determine the one that best explains the ex-
2101 perimental outcome. In a search for new physics, a signal is additive on top of the
2102 background. The background-only hypothesis is the null hypothesis, and the signal-
2103 plus-background hypothesis is the alternative.

2104 As a simple example, take the p -value test, for an experiment where we count
2105 events in the signal region, n_{SR} , and expect ν_B background events and ν_S events from
2106 the signal [95]. Then

- 2107 1. The null hypothesis (H_0), i.e. the background-only hypothesis in this experi-
2108 ment, with the probability modeled by $\text{Poisson}(n_{SR}|\nu_B)$.
- 2109 2. The alternate hypothesis (H_1), i.e. signal-plus-background hypothesis, with the
2110 probability modeled by $\text{Poisson}(n_{SR}|(\nu_B + \nu_S))$.

2111 The compatibility of the observed data ν_{SR}^0 and the null hypothesis, is quantified as
2112 the probability that the background-only hypothesis would produce at least as many
2113 events as was observed. This probability is the p -value:

$$p = \sum_{n=n_{SR}^0}^{\infty} \text{Poisson}(n|\nu_B). \quad (9.5)$$

2114 If the p -value is very small, we might reject the null hypothesis. The p -value is not the
2115 probability of the null hypothesis given the data; rather, it expresses the probability
2116 that data with a certain property was obtained, assuming the null hypothesis [95].

2117 The p -value is an example of a test statistic T , which maps the data to a single
2118 real number. The Neyman-Pearson lemma states that out of the infinite possibilities

2119 of choices of test statistic, the uniformly most powerful test statistic is the likelihood
2120 ratio T_{NP} [95]:

$$T_{NP}(\mathcal{D}) = \frac{L(\mathcal{D}|H_1)}{L(\mathcal{D}|H_0)} \quad (9.6)$$

To reiterate, the test statistic T is a real-valued function of the data, implying that a particular probability model $\mathbf{f}(\mathcal{D}|\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ implies a distribution of the test statistic, $f(T|\boldsymbol{\alpha})$, which depends on the value of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$. With this distribution in hand, the p -value can be evaluated in the following equivalent formulations:

$$p(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \int_{T_0}^{\infty} f(T|\boldsymbol{\alpha}) dT \quad (9.7)$$

$$= \int \mathbf{f}(\mathcal{D}|\boldsymbol{\alpha}) \theta(T(\mathcal{D}) - T_0) d\mathcal{D} \quad (9.8)$$

$$= P(T \geq T_0|\boldsymbol{\alpha}) \quad (9.9)$$

2121 where T_0 is the value of T based on the observed data, and $\theta()$ is the Heaviside
2122 function. The size of the test is conventionally chosen to be 10%, 5%, or 1%. As
2123 the p -value depends on $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ (both the POI and NP), the null hypothesis should not be
2124 rejected if the p -value is larger than the size of the test for any value of the nuisance
2125 parameters.

2126 9.3.3 Confidence intervals

2127 In an example of the measurement of the Standard Model Higgs boson, $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\text{POI}} =$
2128 $(\sigma/\sigma_{SM}, M_H)$, with σ/σ_{SM} is the ratio of the production cross-section for Higgs with
2129 respect to its value in the SM, and M_H is the unknown mass of the Higgs, values
2130 of these parameters outside specific bounds are said to be “excluded at the 95%
2131 confidence level”. These allowed regions are called confidence levels or confidence
2132 regions, and the parameter values outside of them are considered excluded [95]. A

2133 95% confidence interval does not mean that there is a 95% chance that the true value
 2134 of the parameter is inside the interval. Rather, a 95% confidence interval covers the
 2135 true value 95% of the time (even though we do not know the true value).

2136 To construct a confidence interval for a parameter α , the Neyman Construction
 2137 is used to invert a series of hypothesis tests; i.e. for each possible value of α , the null
 2138 hypothesis is treated as α , and we perform a hypothesis test based on a test statistic.
 2139 To construct a 95% confidence interval, we construct a series of hypothesis tests with
 2140 size of 5%. The confidence interval $I(\mathcal{D})$ is constructed by taking the set of parameter
 2141 values $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ where the null hypothesis is accepted:

$$I(\mathcal{D}) = \{\boldsymbol{\alpha} | P(T(\mathcal{D}) > k_\alpha | \boldsymbol{\alpha}) < \alpha\}, \quad (9.10)$$

2142 where $T(\mathcal{D})$ is the test statistic, and the last α (not bolded) and the subscript k_α
 2143 refer to the size of the test. A schematic of the Neyman construction is shown in Fig.
 2144 9.1. In a more generalized case, the x -axis is the test statistic T .




Figure 9.1: Schematic of the Neyman construction for confidence intervals [95]. For each value of θ , we find a region in x where $\int f(x|\theta)dx$ satisfies the size of the test (blue). These regions form a confidence belt (green). The intersection of the observation x_0 (red) with the confidence belt defines the confidence interval $[\theta_1, \theta_2]$ [95].

2145 9.3.4 Profile likelihood ratio

2146 In this section we describe a frequentist statistical procedure based on the profile
 2147 likelihood ratio test statistic, which is implemented using asymptotic distributions.

2148 With a multi-parameter likelihood function $L(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$, the maximum likelihood of
 2149 one specific parameter α_p with other parameters $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_o$ fixed, is called the conditional
 2150 maximum likelihood estimate and is denoted $\hat{\alpha}_p(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_0)$. The process of choosing specific
 2151 values of the nuisance parameters for a given value of μ , $\mathcal{D}_{\text{simulated}}$, and value of global
 2152 observables \mathcal{G} is called profiling. From the full list of parameters $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$, we denote the
 2153 parameter of interest μ , and the nuisance parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}$.

2154 We construct the profile likelihood ratio,

$$\lambda(\mu) = \frac{L(\mu, \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mu))}{L(\mu, \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})} \quad (9.11)$$

2155 which depends explicitly on the parameter of interest μ , implicitly on the data \mathcal{D}_{sim}
 2156 and global observables \mathcal{G} , and is independent of the nuisance parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, which
 2157 have been eliminated in profiling [95].

2158 The main conceptual reason for constructing the test statistic from the profile
 2159 likelihood ratio is that asymptotically (i.e. for measurements with many events) the
 2160 distribution of the profile likelihood ratio $\lambda(\mu = \mu_{\text{true}})$ is independent of the values of
 2161 the nuisance parameters [95].

2162 The following p -value is used to quantify the consistency with the hypothesis of a
 2163 signal strength of μ :

$$p_\mu = \int_{\tilde{q}_{\mu, \text{obs}}}^{\infty} f(\tilde{q}_\mu | \mu, \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mu, \text{obs})) d\tilde{q}_\mu \quad (9.12)$$

2164 9.3.5 Modified frequentist method: CL_S

2165 In the modified frequentist method called CL_S , to test a hypothesis with signal, we
2166 define p'_μ as a ratio of p -values [95]:

$$p'_\mu = \frac{p_\mu}{1 - p_b} \quad (9.13)$$

2167 where p_b is the p -value derived under the background-only hypothesis:

$$p_b = 1 - p_0 \equiv 1 - \int_{\tilde{q}_{\mu,\text{obs}}}^{\infty} f(\tilde{q}_\mu | 0, \hat{\theta}(\mu = 0, \text{obs})) d\tilde{q}_\mu. \quad (9.14)$$

2168 The CL_S upper limit on μ , denoted μ_{up} , is obtained by solving for $p'_{\mu_{up}} = 5\%$.
2169 If testing the compatibility of the data with the background-only hypothesis, we
2170 consider the p_b value defined above and conventionally convert it into the quantile
2171 or “sigma” of a unit Gaussian. z standard deviations (e.g. $z = 5$ in “ 5σ ”) means
2172 that the probability of falling above these standard deviations, equals p_b (e.g. 3σ
2173 corresponds to $p_b = 2.7 \times 10^{-3}$ or 95.43%, and 5σ corresponds to $p_b = 5.7 \times 10^{-7}$ or
2174 99.999943%).

2175 **Chapter 10**

2176 **Results**

2177 **10.1 Results from $bb\tau\tau$**

2178 In each of the three $\tau\tau$ channels studied ($\mu\tau_h$, $e\tau_h$, and $e\mu$), events are divided based
2179 on whether they contain exactly 1 or 2 b-tag jets, and further divided into signal
2180 and control regions (SRs and CRs) using the DNN categorization score as described
2181 in Section 9.2. The control regions demonstrate good agreement between observed
2182 events in data, and the sum of the contributions from expected backgrounds that
2183 are modeled in simulated and embedded samples. The signal regions are defined to
2184 be sensitive to the $h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow bb\tau\tau$ signal. The postfit final observed and expected
2185 distributions of the di-tau invariant mass $m_{\tau\tau}$ reconstructed with SVFit (described
2186 in Section 5.2) are shown in Fig. 10.1 for the $\mu\tau_h$ channel, Fig. 10.2 for the $e\tau_h$
2187 channel, and Fig. 10.3 for the $e\mu$ channel. In all figures, the hypothesized yield for
2188 the $h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow bb\tau\tau$ signal is shown for the pseudoscalar mass $m_a = 35$ GeV and
2189 assuming a branching fraction $B(H \rightarrow aa \rightarrow bb\tau\tau) = 10\%$.

2190 The 95% CL expected and observed exclusion limits on the signal strength of the
2191 branching fraction $B(h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow bb\tau\tau)$ as a function of the pseudoscalar mass m_a
2192 ranging from 12 GeV to 60 GeV, are shown for the three $\tau\tau$ channels and all three

2193 channels combined in Fig. 10.4. The limits are shown as percentages and normalized
2194 to the production cross-section of the Standard Model Higgs boson. No excess of
2195 events above the Standard Model expectations is observed. In the limits for the three
2196 $\tau\tau$ channels combined, expected (observed) limits range from 1.4 to 5.6% (1.7 to
2197 7.6%) for pseudoscalar masses between 12 and 60 GeV.

2198 The $e\mu$ channel is the only channel that has signal sensitivity to the $m_a = 12$
2199 GeV pseudoscalar mass hypothesis, because the minimum required spatial separation
2200 $\Delta R = \sqrt{(\Delta\eta)^2 + (\Delta\phi)^2}$ between the two τ legs is smaller than the other two channels
2201 ($\Delta R < 0.3$ for $e\mu$, compared to $\Delta R < 0.4$ for the other two channels). This decreased
2202 ΔR requirement results in better signal acceptance for low mass signals for the $e\mu$
2203 channel. The $\mu\tau_h$ and $e\tau_h$ channels are most sensitive to the intermediate mass points
2204 studied, since the analysis targets a resolved signature: at low mass points, the tau
2205 legs are boosted, and at high mass points, the $m_{\tau\tau}$ distributions in signal have larger
2206 overlap with background distributions. In the combination of the three $\tau\tau$ channels,
2207 the limit for $m_a = 12$ GeV comes only from the $e\mu$ channel, and the best sensitivity
2208 is attained at intermediate mass points around $m_a = 20$ GeV to 45 GeV.

2209 To set limits on the branching fraction of the 125 GeV Higgs to the two pseu-
2210 doscalars, $B(h \rightarrow aa)$, we interpret the results in four types of 2HDM+S, which were
2211 introduced in Section 1.4. In 2HDM+S, the theorized branching fraction of the pseu-
2212 doscalars depends on the 2HDM+S model type, the pseudoscalar mass m_a , and the
2213 ratio of the two Higgs doublets' vacuum expectation values $\tan\beta$. In Type I models,
2214 the branching fraction is independent of $\tan\beta$, while in Types II, III, and IV, it is
2215 a function of m_a and $\tan\beta$. Limits for the $bb\tau\tau$ final state as a function of m_a for
2216 2HDM+S Type I (valid for all $\tan\beta$ values), Type II with $\tan\beta = 2.0$, Type III with
2217 $\tan\beta = 2.0$, and Type IV with $\tan\beta = 0.6$ are overlaid and shown in Fig. 10.5a.

2218 10.2 Combination with $bb\mu\mu$ final state

2219 Results from this analysis for the $h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow bb\tau\tau$ final state are combined with the
2220 analysis for the $h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow bb\mu\mu$ final state [96]. While the predicted branching ratio
2221 for $aa \rightarrow bb\mu\mu$ is comparatively small, the $bb\mu\mu$ final state has competitive results
2222 due to the excellent di-muon resolution measured by CMS. The $bb\mu\mu$ analysis uses
2223 an unbinned fit to the data using the di-muon mass $m_{\mu\mu}$ distribution. Details can be
2224 found in [96].

2225 Combining the results is possible since the $bb\tau\tau$ analysis explicitly rejects events
2226 with extra leptons, so there is no overlap between the events studied in the $bb\tau\tau$
2227 analysis and the $bb\mu\mu$ analysis. In the statistical combination, several systematic
2228 uncertainties are treated as correlated: the integrated luminosity normalization, the
2229 b-tagging scale factor, the scale factors related to muon reconstruction, identifica-
2230 tion, and trigger efficiencies, the inefficiency in the ECAL trigger readout, and the
2231 theoretical uncertainties related to signal modeling.

2232 Since the results in both final states are statistically limited, the combination ben-
2233 efits from the additional data. For $m_a = 35$ GeV, all systematic uncertainties amount
2234 to around 6% of the total uncertainty, with the dominant systematic uncertainties
2235 coming from jet energy systematics in the $bb\mu\mu$ final state, theoretical uncertainties
2236 in the signal, and uncertainties in the QCD multijet backgrounds in the $e\mu$ channel
2237 of the $bb\tau\tau$ final state.

2238 The mass distributions of the di-muon and di-tau objects ($m_{\mu\mu}$ and $m_{\tau\tau}$) are
2239 compared to the data in a combined maximum likelihood fit to derive upper limits
2240 on $B(h \rightarrow aa)$. The observed limits at 95% CL on $B(h \rightarrow aa)$ for different 2HDM+S
2241 scenarios, are shown for the search for $h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow bb\mu\mu$ in Fig. 10.5b, and the
2242 combined analyses $h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow bb\ell\ell$ in Fig. 10.6.

2243 Exclusion limits in a two-dimensional plane as a function of $\tan\beta$ and m_a are
2244 set for 2HDM+S Types II, III, and IV in Fig. 10.7. The most stringent constraints

are observed for 2HDM+S type III because of large branching fractions predicted in theory, with predicted branching fractions between 0.47 and 0.42 for $\tan \beta = 2.0$ and values of m_a between 15 and 60 GeV, compared to the observed 95% CL upper limits which are between 0.08 and 0.03. For 2HDM+S type IV, the predicted branching fractions from theory are between 0.26 and 0.20 for $\tan \beta = 0.6$ for values of m_a between 15 and 60 GeV, and the 95% CL observed upper limits are between 0.12 and 0.05.

The combined results from $h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow bb\ell\ell$ are compared with CMS results in other final states as a function of the pseudoscalar mass m_a : for 2HDM+S type I in Fig. 10.8, type II with $\tan \beta = 2.0$ in Fig. 10.9, and type III with $\tan \beta = 2.0$ in Fig. 10.10. In other scenarios, e.g. type III with $\tan \beta = 5.0$, more stringent limits are set by analyses in other final states, $\mu\mu\tau\tau$ in this case. Other summary plots for other model types and $\tan \beta$ values can be found at [97].




Figure 10.1: Postfit final $m_{\tau\tau}$ observed and expected distributions, and the observed/expected ratios, in the $\mu\tau_h$ channel [39]. Events are divided into the 1 b-tag jet signal regions (SR1, SR2, SR3) (*top row*), 1 b-tag jet control region (*middle row*), 2 b-tag jet signal regions (SR1, SR2) (*middle row*), and lastly the 2 b-tag jet control region (CR) (*bottom*). Statistical and systematic sources of uncertainties in the expected events are added in quadrature and labeled “Bkg. unc” (*shaded gray*). The dominant backgrounds in all categories are jets faking the τ_h leg (*pink*), $Z \rightarrow \tau\tau$ (*orange*), and $t\bar{t}+j$ ets (*purple*). For illustrative purposes, the beyond-Standard Model signal yield from $h \rightarrow aabb\tau\tau$ is shown for the pseudoscalar mass hypothesis $m_a = 35$ GeV, assuming a branching fraction $B(h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow bb\tau\tau) = 10\%$ (*red line*).




Figure 10.2: Postfit final observed and expected $m_{\tau\tau}$ distributions, and the observed/expected ratios, in the $e\tau_h$ channel [39]. Events are divided into the 1 b-tag jet signal regions (SR1, SR2, SR3) (*top row*), the 1 b-tag jet control region (CR) (*bottom row*), and 2 b-tag jet signal region (SR) and control region (CR) (*bottom row*). Statistical and systematic sources of uncertainties in the expected events are added in quadrature and labeled “Bkg. unc” (*shaded gray*). In this channel, the dominant backgrounds are jets faking the τ_h leg (*pink*), $Z \rightarrow \tau\tau$ (*orange*), and $t\bar{t}+{\rm jets}$ (*purple*). For illustrative purposes, the beyond-Standard Model signal yield from $h \rightarrow aabb\tau\tau$ is shown for the pseudoscalar mass hypothesis $m_a = 35$ GeV, assuming a branching fraction $B(h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow bb\tau\tau) = 10\%$ (*red line*).




Figure 10.3: Postfit final observed and expected $m_{\tau\tau}$ distributions, and the observed/expected ratios, in the $e\mu$ channel [39]. Events are divided into the 1 b-tag jet signal regions (SR1, SR2, and SR3) (*top row*), 1 b-tag jet control region (CR) (*middle row*), 2 b-tag jet signal regions (SR1 and SR2) (*middle row*), and 2 b-tag jet control region (CR) (*bottom row*). Statistical and systematic sources of uncertainties in the expected events are added in quadrature and labeled “Bkg. unc” (*shaded gray*). The $t\bar{t}+j$ process (*purple*) is a major background, and in the signal regions the QCD multijet (*pink*) is also a major background. TFor illustrative purposes, the beyond-Standard Model signal yield from $h \rightarrow aabb\tau\tau$ is shown for the pseudoscalar mass hypothesis $m_a = 35$ GeV, assuming a branching fraction $B(h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow bb\tau\tau) = 10\%$ (*red line*).






Figure 10.4: Observed 95% CL exclusion limits (*black, solid lines*) and expected 95% CL and 68% CL limits (*shaded yellow and green*) on the branching fraction $B(h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow bb\tau\tau)$ in percentages, assuming the Standard Model production for the 125 GeV Higgs (h). Limits are shown for the $\mu\tau_h$ channel (*top left*), the $e\tau_h$ channel (*top right*), and the $e\mu$ channel (*bottom left*), and lastly the combination of all three channels (*bottom right*) [39]. The dataset corresponds to 138 fb^{-1} of data collected in the years 2016-2018 at a center-of-mass energy 13 TeV. Only the $e\mu$ channel has sensitivity to the mass hypothesis $m_a = 12$ GeV. The best sensitivity is attained at intermediate mass points.



(a) $bb\tau\tau$ final state.



(b) $bb\mu\mu$ final state.

Figure 10.5: Observed 95% CL upper limits on $B(h \rightarrow aa)$ in %, for the $bb\tau\tau$ final state (*left*) and $bb\mu\mu$ final state (*right*) using the full Run 2 integrated luminosity of 138 fb^{-1} in 2HDM+S type I (blue), type II with $\tan\beta = 2.0$ (orange dashed), type III with $\tan\beta = 2.0$ (dotted green), and type IV with $\tan\beta = 0.6$ (red dashed) [39]. Linear interpolation is used between points in the graphs. The $\tan\beta$ values chosen here correspond to the most stringent limits in each model.




Figure 10.6: Observed 95% CL upper limits on the branching fraction of the 125 GeV Higgs boson to two pseudoscalars, $B(h \rightarrow aa)$, in percentages, as a function of the pseudoscalar mass m_a , in 2HDM+S type I (blue), type II with $\tan\beta = 2.0$ (orange dashed), type III with $\tan\beta = 2.0$ (dotted green), and type IV with $\tan\beta = 0.6$ (red dashed), for the combination of $bb\mu\mu$ and $bb\tau\tau$ channels using the full Run 2 integrated luminosity of 138 fb^{-1} [39].




Figure 10.7: Observed 95% CL upper limits on $\mathcal{B}(h \rightarrow aa)$ in %, for the combination of $bb\mu\mu$ and $bb\tau\tau$ channels using the full Run 2 integrated luminosity of 138 fb^{-1} for Type II (*left*), Type III (*middle*), and Type IV (*right*) 2HDM+S in the $\tan \beta$ vs. m_a phase space. The contours (*dashed black*) correspond to branching fractions of 100% and 16%, where 16% is the combined upper limit on Higgs boson to undetected particle decays from previous Run-2 results. All points inside the contour are allowed within that upper limit. Linear extrapolation has been used between different points on the figures [39].




Figure 10.8: Summary plot of current 95% limits on the branching ratio of the 125 GeV Higgs boson to two pseudoscalars, normalized to the Standard Model Higgs production cross-section, $\frac{\sigma(h)}{\sigma_{\text{SM}}} \times B(h \rightarrow aa)$ in the 2HDM+S type I scenario performed with data collected at 13 TeV [97]. Results from different final states studied at CMS are overlaid on this figure: $\mu\mu\mu\mu$ (blue), $\tau\tau\tau\tau$ (green), boosted $2\mu 2\tau$ (red), resolved $2\mu 2\tau$ (yellow), $bbbb$ (magenta), and the combined result for $\ell\ell bb$ ($\ell = \mu, \tau$) (purple).




Figure 10.9: Summary plot of current observed and expected 95% CL limits on the branching ratio of the 125 GeV Higgs boson to two pseudoscalars, normalized to the Standard Model Higgs production cross-section, $\frac{\sigma(h)}{\sigma_{\text{SM}}} \times B(h \rightarrow aa)$, in the 2HDM+S type II scenario with $\tan \beta = 2.0$, obtained at CMS with data collected at 13 TeV [97]. Results from different final states studied at CMS are overlaid on this figure: $\mu\mu\mu\mu$ (blue), $\tau\tau\tau\tau$ (green), boosted $2\mu 2\tau$ (red), resolved $2\mu 2\tau$ (yellow), $bbbb$ (magenta), and the combined result for $\ell\ell bb$ ($\ell = \mu, \tau$) (purple).




Figure 10.10: Summary plot of current observed and expected 95% CL limits on the branching ratio of the 125 GeV Higgs boson to two pseudoscalars, normalized to the Standard Model Higgs production cross section, $\frac{\sigma(h)}{\sigma_{SM}} \times B(h \rightarrow aa)$ in the 2HDM+S type-III scenario with $\tan \beta = 2.0$, obtained at CMS with data collected at 13 TeV [97]. Results from different final states studied at CMS are overlaid on this figure: $\mu\mu\mu\mu$ (blue), $\tau\tau\tau\tau$ (green), boosted $2\mu 2\tau$ (red), resolved $2\mu 2\tau$ (yellow), $bbbb$ (magenta), and the combined result for $\ell\ell bb$ ($\ell = \mu, \tau$) (purple).

2258 **Chapter 11**

2259 **Asymmetric exotic Higgs decays**

2260 This chapter presents progress towards a search for exotic Higgs decays to two light
2261 scalars with unequal mass ($h \rightarrow a_1 a_2$) final states with bottom quarks and τ leptons,
2262 with plans to interpret the results in the context of Two Real Singlet Models (TRSMs),
2263 described in Section 1.5. Compared to the symmetric decay scenario $h \rightarrow aa$ which
2264 has been studied in multiple final states at CMS with stringent limits set on the
2265 various 2HDM+S scenarios, this asymmetric decay scenario has not been directly
2266 searched for at the CMS experiment. Section 11.1 lists the mass hypotheses of the
2267 new particles a_1 and a_2 that will be studied. Section 11.2 describes the studies on
2268 which channels the analysis will be carried out in. Section 11.3 shows the control
2269 plots produced using the analysis framework that will be used for this analysis.

2270 **11.1 Signal masses**

2271 As discussed in Section 1.5, $h \rightarrow a_1 a_2$ can result in a “cascade” decay if one of the
2272 scalars, a_2 is sufficiently heavy ($m_{a_2} > 2m_{a_1}$). The “non-cascade” case is where the
2273 light scalars decay directly to Standard Model particles.

2274 The mass hypotheses (mass points) (m_{a_1}, m_{a_2}) studied here are:

- *Cascade mass points:* (15, 30), (15, 40), (15, 50), (15, 60), (15, 70), (15, 80), (15, 90), (15, 100), (15, 110), (20, 40), (20, 50), (20, 60), (20, 70), (20, 80), (20, 90), (20, 100), (30, 60), (30, 70), (30, 80), and (30, 90) GeV
- *Non-cascade mass points:* (15, 20), (15, 30), (20, 30), (20, 40), (30, 40), (30, 50), (30, 60), (40, 50), (40, 60), (40, 70), (40, 80), (50, 60), and (50, 70) GeV

Samples were produced using the MadGraph5_aMCatNLO event generator, for each signal mass point in the gluon-gluon fusion (ggF) and vector boson fusion (VBF) production modes of the 125 GeV Higgs boson. In the sample generation, the decays of a to Standard Model particles were specified to be decays to bottom quarks or τ leptons.

11.2 Cascade scenario signal studies

Studies of the signal phenomenology in the cascade scenario were performed to determine the viability of the $4b2\tau$ and/or $2b4\tau$ channels.

Cross sections and branching fractions of the $4b2\tau$ and $2b4\tau$ final states were compared using cross-section predictions provided by the authors of [5]. For an example mass point $m_{a_2} = 80$ GeV, $m_{a_1} = 30$ GeV, the branching fractions to $4b2\tau$ is ten times larger than $2b4\tau$: $B(h \rightarrow a_1 a_2 \rightarrow 3a_1 \rightarrow 4b2\tau) = 0.00857$, vs. $B(h \rightarrow a_1 a_2 \rightarrow 3a_1 \rightarrow 2b4\tau) = 0.00068$. The $4b2\tau$ final state is chosen for this analysis.

In general the four b-flavor jets have low p_T at generator level, as illustrated for example mass points (100, 15) GeV and (40, 20) GeV in Fig. 11.1. The p_T distribution of the sub-leading jet peaks at an energy below 20 GeV, with the third and fourth jets tending to have even softer energies.

An event category with three or more b-tag jets was determined to be infeasible due to low statistics in this category, due to the difficulties in reconstructing the third

2300 and fourth b-flavor jets which have very low transverse momenta p_T . Event categories
 2301 with exactly 1 b-tag jet and ≥ 2 b-tag jets will be used.




Figure 11.1: Generator-level b-flavor jet transverse momenta p_T , for $h \rightarrow a_1 a_2$ cascade scenario in the $4b2\tau$ final state, for mass hypotheses $(m_{a_1}, m_{a_2}) = (100, 15)$ GeV (*left*) and $(40, 20)$ GeV (*right*). In each plot the generator-level p_T of the leading (*black*), sub-leading (*red*), third (*blue*), and fourth (*light green*) are overlaid.

2302 In the $4b2\tau$ final state, the possibility of the leading and sub-leading b-tag jets
 2303 being sufficiently close in ΔR to require boosted jet reconstruction techniques was
 2304 explored. In the $4b2\tau$ case, the two b-flavor-jets in the generated event that were
 2305 spatially closest in ΔR were considered as one object. This two b-flavor jet object was
 2306 spatially matched in ΔR to the jets reconstructed with the standard AK4 algorithm
 2307 which uses a cone size of $\Delta R = 0.4$. The quality of the p_T resolution (computed as
 2308 $(p_{T,\text{reconstructed}} - p_{T,\text{gen}})/p_{T,\text{gen}}$) and closeness in distance ΔR of the reconstructed jet
 2309 to the nearest generator-level jets, was seen to depend on the absolute and relative
 2310 masses of the light scalars. The best (worst) performance occurred in samples with
 2311 large (small) mass differences between the heavier scalar a_2 and the lighter scalar a_1 ,
 2312 as illustrated for the mass hypotheses (m_{a_1}, m_{a_2}) (100, 15) GeV and (40, 20) GeV in
 2313 Fig. 11.2.




Figure 11.2: Distributions (arbitrary units) of transverse momentum p_T resolution and ΔR between the two closest generator-level b jets, treated as one object, and the nearest reconstructed AK4 jet, for two different $h \rightarrow a_1 a_2$ mass hypotheses (m_{a_1}, m_{a_2}) = (100, 15) GeV (top left, top right) and (40, 20) GeV (bottom left, bottom right) in the ggH production of the 125 GeV h . In the (40, 20) GeV mass point, the longer p_T resolution tail (bottom left) indicates that the reconstructed jet underestimates the generator b -flavor jets' energy, and the significant fraction of events with larger ΔR values (bottom right) indicate worse matching.

11.3 Current control plots for $\mu\tau_h$ channel

The $\tau\tau$ states for the $h \rightarrow a_1 a_2$ to $4b2\tau$ analysis will be similar to those studied in $h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow bb\tau\tau$. For the $\mu\tau_h$ channel, histograms of the key kinematic variables are made for data and the sum of the expected backgrounds, which are estimated from Monte Carlo samples, embedded samples, and the data-driven method for estimating jets faking τ_h as described in Chapter 7. Nominal values of the scale factors and event reweighting are applied, as described in Chapter ???. The errors shown in the figures only include statistical errors and only several of the full set of systematic errors (only those associated with the lepton energy scales and τ_h identification efficiency,

2323 described in Sections 5.3.1, 5.3.2, and 5.3.4).

2324 The p_T , η , and ϕ of the leading muon and hadronic tau τ_h , and the di-tau visible
2325 mass m_{vis} and momentum $p_{T,\text{vis}}$, are shown in Fig. 11.3. The p_T , η , and ϕ of the the
2326 leading and sub-leading b-tag jets, and the missing transverse energy magnitude and
2327 azimuthal direction, are shown in Fig. 11.4.




Figure 11.3: Kinematic properties of the leading muon and τ_h in the $\mu\tau_h$ channel: p_T (top row), η (second row), and ϕ (third row). The visible 4-momenta of the muon and τ_h are summed, giving the visible di-tau mass m_{vis} and transverse momentum $p_{T,\text{vis}}$. The errors shown in the figures only include statistical errors and only several of the full set of systematic errors (only those associated with the lepton energy scales and τ_h identification efficiency).




Figure 11.4: Kinematic properties of the leading and sub-leading b-tag jets in the $\mu\tau_h$ final state: jet p_T (*top row*), η (*second row*), ϕ (*third row*), as well as the missing transverse energy magnitude and azimuthal direction (*bottom row*). The errors shown in the figures only include statistical errors and only several of the full set of systematic errors (only those associated with the lepton energy scales and τ_h identification efficiency).

²³²⁸ **Chapter 12**

²³²⁹ **Conclusion and outlook**

²³³⁰ With the discovery of a Higgs boson with mass 125 GeV at the LHC in 2012, the LHC
²³³¹ and CMS physics program has evolved to include the precise characterization of the
²³³² 125 GeV Higgs boson and searching for evidence of additional Higgs particles in an
²³³³ extended Higgs sector. This thesis presents a direct search at CMS for exotic decays
²³³⁴ of the Higgs boson with mass 125 GeV in data collected in the years 2016-2018 in
²³³⁵ proton-proton collisions at center-of-mass energy 13 TeV, to two light neutral scalar
²³³⁶ particles that decay to two bottom quarks and two tau leptons ($h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow bb\tau\tau$). The
²³³⁷ results are combined with another search that was performed in the $h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow bb\mu\mu$
²³³⁸ final state, giving the most stringent limits to date for theories with Two Higgs
²³³⁹ Doublet Models extended with a singlet scalar (2HDM+S), for pseudoscalar masses
²³⁴⁰ m_a ranging from 15 GeV to 60 GeV, in a number of 2HDM+S scenarios such as type
²³⁴¹ II and III with $\tan\beta = 2.0$.

²³⁴² As the rich physics program of CMS has set stringent limits on the exotic decay
²³⁴³ $h \rightarrow aa$, we turn our attention to direct searches for decays to light neutral scalars
²³⁴⁴ with potentially unequal mass, $h \rightarrow a_1a_2$, which has not been performed at CMS
²³⁴⁵ to date. Preliminary studies on $h \rightarrow a_1a_2$ signals in the Two Real Singlet Model
²³⁴⁶ (TRSM) are shown, and work is ongoing to develop the analysis for $h \rightarrow a_1a_2$ in final

2347 states with bottom quarks and tau leptons.

2348 To ensure the continued performance of the CMS detector and to enhance its
2349 data-taking capabilities in the intense pileup conditions of the Phase-2 upgrade of
2350 the High-Luminosity LHC, upgrades of the Level-1 Trigger are paramount for filter-
2351 ing the increased data rate of the HL-LHC. This thesis presents work on the stan-
2352 dalone barrel calorimeter algorithm for reconstructing and identifying electron and
2353 photon candidates, using high granularity crystal-level information from the ECAL
2354 subdetector. For Phase-2, the increase in the granularity of information sent from
2355 the electromagnetic calorimeter to the Level-1 trigger, from energy sums over towers
2356 (which are 5×5 in crystals) to crystal-level information, allows for the implementation
2357 of a more sophisticated clustering algorithm that can exploit the fact that genuine
2358 electrons and photons tend to leave energies concentrated a 3×5 window in crystals,
2359 and use shape and isolation information to distinguish genuine electrons and photons
2360 from noise. Electrons and photons are key to characterizing Standard Model pro-
2361 cesses and performing searches for new physics, and this represents one of the many
2362 upgrades of the CMS detector in preparation for Phase-2. With the ongoing Run-3
2363 data collecting period, and wealth of ongoing and scheduled upgrades, there remains
2364 an abundance of directions for detector development and physics at CMS heading
2365 into Phase-2 of the LHC.

²³⁶⁶ Bibliography

- ²³⁶⁷ [1] Paul H. Frampton. Journeys Beyond the Standard Model. 54(1):52–
²³⁶⁸ 52. ISSN 0031-9228. doi: 10.1063/1.1349615. URL <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.1349615>. eprint: https://pubs.aip.org/physicstoday/article-pdf/54/1/52/11109432/52_1_online.pdf.
- ²³⁶⁹
- ²³⁷⁰
- ²³⁷¹ [2] Christopher G. Tully. *Elementary Particle Physics in a Nutshell*. Princeton
²³⁷² University Press, Princeton, 2012. ISBN 9781400839353. doi: doi:10.1515/
²³⁷³ 9781400839353. URL <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400839353>.
- ²³⁷⁴
- ²³⁷⁵ [3] John Ellis. Higgs Physics. In *2013 European School of High-Energy Physics*,
pages 117–168, 2015. doi: 10.5170/CERN-2015-004.117.
- ²³⁷⁶
- ²³⁷⁷ [4] David Curtin, Rouven Essig, Stefania Gori, and Others. Exotic decays of the 125
GeV Higgs boson. *Phys. Rev. D*, 90:075004, Oct 2014. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevD.
²³⁷⁸ 90.075004. URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.90.075004>.
- ²³⁷⁹
- ²³⁸⁰ [5] Tania Robens, Tim Stefański, and Jonas Wittbrodt. Two-real-scalar-singlet
extension of the SM: LHC phenomenology and benchmark scenarios. *Eur. Phys.
J. C*, 80(2):151, 2020. doi: 10.1140/epjc/s10052-020-7655-x.
- ²³⁸¹
- ²³⁸² [6] CERN. The history of CERN, 2024. URL <https://timeline.web.cern.ch/timeline-header/89>.
- ²³⁸³
- ²³⁸⁴ [7] R. Schmidt. Accelerator physics and technology of the LHC. In *ROXIE: Routine*

2385 *for the Optimizazation of Magnet X-Sections, Inverse Field Calculation and Coil*
2386 *End Design*, pages 7–17, 1998.

2387 [8] J. Vollaire et al. *Linac4 design report*, volume 6/2020 of *CERN Yellow Reports: Monographs*. CERN, Geneva, 9 2020. ISBN 978-92-9083-579-0, 978-92-9083-580-6. doi: 10.23731/CYRM-2020-006.

2390 [9] Antonella Del Rosso. Aerial view of the LHC and the four major experiments.
2391 2017. URL <https://cds.cern.ch/record/2253966>. General Photo.

2392 [10] ATLAS Collaboration. ATLAS: Detector and physics performance technical
2393 design report. Volume 1. 5 1999.

2394 [11] CMS Collaboration. CMS Physics: Technical Design Report Volume 1: Detector
2395 Performance and Software. 2006.

2396 [12] L Musa. Conceptual Design Report for the Upgrade of the ALICE ITS. Technical
2397 report, CERN, Geneva, 2012. URL <https://cds.cern.ch/record/1431539>.

2398 [13] S. Amato et al. LHCb technical proposal: A Large Hadron Collider Beauty
2399 Experiment for Precision Measurements of CP Violation and Rare Decays. 2
2400 1998.

2401 [14] Werner Herr and B Muratori. Concept of luminosity. 2006. doi: 10.5170/
2402 CERN-2006-002.361. URL <https://cds.cern.ch/record/941318>.

2403 [15] Olivier S. Brning and Frank Zimmerman. Parameter space for the LHC lumi-
2404 nosity upgrade. ISBN 978-3-95450-115-1. URL <https://accelconf.web.cern.ch/IPAC2012/papers/moppc005.pdf>.

2406 [16] CMS Collaboration. Pileup mitigation at CMS in 13 TeV data. *JINST*, 15(09):
2407 P09018, 2020. doi: 10.1088/1748-0221/15/09/P09018.

- 2408 [17] CMS Collaboration. Measurement of the inelastic proton-proton cross section at
2409 $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV. *JHEP*, 07:161, 2018. doi: 10.1007/JHEP07(2018)161.
- 2410 [18] CMS Collaboration. High-Luminosity Large Hadron Collider (HL-LHC): Tech-
2411 nical design report. 10/2020, 12 2020. doi: 10.23731/CYRM-2020-0010.
- 2412 [19] CMS Collaboration. The CMS Experiment at the CERN LHC. *JINST*, 3:S08004,
2413 2008. doi: 10.1088/1748-0221/3/08/S08004.
- 2414 [20] CMS Collaboration. Particle-flow reconstruction and global event description
2415 with the CMS detector. *JINST*, 12(10):P10003, 2017. doi: 10.1088/1748-0221/
2416 12/10/P10003.
- 2417 [21] V Karimki, M Mannelli, P Siegrist, H Breuker, A Caner, R Castaldi, K Freuden-
2418 reich, G Hall, R Horisberger, M Huhtinen, and A Cattai. *The CMS tracker*
2419 *system project: Technical Design Report*. Technical design report. CMS. CERN,
2420 Geneva, 1997. URL <https://cds.cern.ch/record/368412>.
- 2421 [22] The Phase-2 Upgrade of the CMS Tracker. Technical report, CERN, Geneva,
2422 2017. URL <https://cds.cern.ch/record/2272264>.
- 2423 [23] CMS Collaboration. CMS Technical Design Report for the Pixel Detector Up-
2424 grade. 9 2012. doi: 10.2172/1151650.
- 2425 [24] R. L. Workman and Others. Review of particle physics. 2022:083C01. doi:
2426 10.1093/ptep/ptac097.
- 2427 [25] CMS Technical Design Report for the Phase 1 Upgrade of the Hadron Calorime-
2428 ter. 9 2012. doi: 10.2172/1151651.
- 2429 [26] CMS Technical Design Report for the Level-1 Trigger Upgrade. 6 2013.
- 2430 [27] S. Dasu et al. CMS. The TriDAS project. Technical design report, vol. 1: The
2431 trigger systems. 12 2000.

- 2432 [28] CMS Collaboration. The Phase-2 Upgrade of the CMS Data Acquisition and
2433 High Level Trigger. Technical report, CERN, Geneva, 2021. URL <https://cds.cern.ch/record/2759072>. This is the final version of the document, approved
2434 by the LHCC.
- 2436 [29] C. Foudas. The CMS Level-1 Trigger at LHC and Super-LHC. In *34th Interna-*
2437 *tional Conference on High Energy Physics*, 10 2008.
- 2438 [30] CMS Software Guide. High Level Trigger (TWiki), 2024. URL <https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/CMSPublic/SWGuideHighLevelTrigger>.
- 2440 [31] The Worldwide LHC Computing Grid. 2012. URL <https://cds.cern.ch/record/1997398>.
- 2442 [32] Douglas Thain, Todd Tannenbaum, and Miron Livny. Distributed computing in
2443 practice: the Condor experience. *Concurrency and Computation: Practice and*
2444 *Experience*, 17(2-4):323–356, 2005. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/cpe.938>. URL
2445 <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/cpe.938>.
- 2446 [33] Alexandre Zabi, Jeffrey Wayne Berryhill, Emmanuelle Perez, and Alexander D.
2447 Tapper. The Phase-2 Upgrade of the CMS Level-1 Trigger. 2020.
- 2448 [34] Technical proposal for a MIP timing detector in the CMS experiment Phase 2
2449 upgrade. Technical report, CERN, Geneva, 2017. URL <https://cds.cern.ch/record/2296612>.
- 2451 [35] CMS Collaboration. CMS luminosity measurement for the 2016 data-taking
2452 period. CMS Physics Analysis Summary CMS-PAS-LUM-17-001, 2017. URL
2453 <https://cds.cern.ch/record/2257069>.
- 2454 [36] CMS Collaboration. CMS luminosity measurement for the 2017 data-taking

- 2455 period at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV. CMS Physics Analysis Summary CMS-PAS-LUM-17-
2456 004, 2018. URL <https://cds.cern.ch/record/2621960>.
- 2457 [37] CMS Collaboration. CMS luminosity measurement for the 2018 data-taking
2458 period at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV. CMS Physics Analysis Summary CMS-PAS-LUM-18-
2459 002, 2019. URL <https://cds.cern.ch/record/2676164>.
- 2460 [38] CMS LUMI Group. CMS Luminosity Public Results (TWiki), 2024. URL <https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/CMSPublic/LumiPublicResults>.
- 2462 [39] Cécile Caillol, Pallabi Das, Sridhara Dasu, Pieter Everaerts, Stephanie Kwan,
2463 Isobel Ojalvo, and Ho-Fung Tsoi. CMS AN-20-213 (internal): Search for an
2464 exotic decay of the 125 GeV Higgs boson to light pseudoscalars, with a pair of b
2465 jets and a pair of tau leptons in the final state, 2020.
- 2466 [40] CMS Collaboration. Search for exotic decays of the Higgs boson to a pair of
2467 pseudoscalars in the $\mu\mu bb$ and $\tau\tau bb$ final states. *European Physical Journal C*,
2468 2 2024.
- 2469 [41] J. Alwall, R. Frederix, S. Frixione, et al. The automated computation of tree-
2470 level and next-to-leading order differential cross sections, and their matching to
2471 parton shower simulations. *Journal of High Energy Physics*, 2014(7), July 2014.
2472 ISSN 1029-8479. doi: 10.1007/jhep07(2014)079. URL [http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/JHEP07\(2014\)079](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/JHEP07(2014)079).
- 2474 [42] R. Frederix, S. Frixione, V. Hirschi, et al. The automation of next-to-leading
2475 order electroweak calculations. *Journal of High Energy Physics*, 2018(7), July
2476 2018. ISSN 1029-8479. doi: 10.1007/jhep07(2018)185. URL [http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/JHEP07\(2018\)185](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/JHEP07(2018)185).
- 2478 [43] S. Agostinelli, J. Allison, K. Amako, et al. Geant4 - a simulation toolkit. 506(3):

- 2479 250–303. ISSN 0168-9002. doi: 10.1016/S0168-9002(03)01368-8. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0168900203013688>.
- 2480
- 2481 [44] CMS Collaboration. An embedding technique to determine $\tau\tau$ backgrounds
2482 in proton-proton collision data. *JINST*, 14(06):P06032, 2019. doi: 10.1088/
2483 1748-0221/14/06/P06032.
- 2484 [45] CMS Collaboration. Search for neutral MSSM Higgs bosons decaying to a pair of
2485 tau leptons in pp collisions. *JHEP*, 10:160, 2014. doi: 10.1007/JHEP10(2014)160.
- 2486 [46] CMS Collaboration. Measurements of Higgs boson production in the decay chan-
2487 nel with a pair of τ leptons in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV. *Eur.*
2488 *Phys. J. C*, 83(7):562, 2023. doi: 10.1140/epjc/s10052-023-11452-8.
- 2489 [47] CMS Collaboration. Reconstruction and identification of tau lepton decays to
2490 hadrons and tau neutrinos at CMS. *Journal of Instrumentation*, 11(01):P01019–
2491 P01019, January 2016. ISSN 1748-0221. doi: 10.1088/1748-0221/11/01/p01019.
2492 URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/11/01/P01019>.
- 2493 [48] CMS Collaboration. Performance of τ -lepton reconstruction and identification
2494 in CMS. *Journal of Instrumentation*, 7(01):P01001, jan 2012. doi: 10.1088/
2495 1748-0221/7/01/P01001. URL <https://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/7/01/P01001>.
- 2496
- 2497 [49] CMS Collaboration. Performance of reconstruction and identification of τ leptons
2498 decaying to hadrons and ν_τ in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV. *JINST*, 13(10):
2499 P10005, 2018. doi: 10.1088/1748-0221/13/10/P10005.
- 2500 [50] CMS Collaboration. Identification of hadronic tau lepton decays using a deep
2501 neural network. *JINST*, 17:P07023, 2022. doi: 10.1088/1748-0221/17/07/
2502 P07023.

- 2503 [51] CMS Collaboration. Performance of CMS muon reconstruction in pp collision
2504 events at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV. *Journal of Instrumentation*, 7(10):P10002–P10002,
2505 October 2012. ISSN 1748-0221. doi: 10.1088/1748-0221/7/10/p10002. URL
2506 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/7/10/P10002>.
- 2507 [52] CMS Collaboration. Performance of electron reconstruction and selection with
2508 the CMS detector in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV. *Journal of Instru-*
2509 *mentation*, 10(06):P06005, 2015. doi: 10.1088/1748-0221/10/06/P06005. URL
2510 <https://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/10/06/P06005>.
- 2511 [53] CMS Collaboration. Identification of b-quark jets with the CMS experiment.
2512 *Journal of Instrumentation*, 8(04):P04013–P04013, April 2013. ISSN 1748-
2513 0221. doi: 10.1088/1748-0221/8/04/p04013. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/8/04/P04013>.
- 2515 [54] CMS Collaboration. Pileup Removal Algorithms. Technical report, CERN,
2516 Geneva, 2014. URL <https://cds.cern.ch/record/1751454>.
- 2517 [55] CMS Collaboration. CMS Phase 1 heavy flavour identification performance and
2518 developments. 2017. URL <https://cds.cern.ch/record/2263802>.
- 2519 [56] CMS Collaboration. Performance of the DeepJet b tagging algorithm using 41.9
2520 fb^{-1} of data from proton-proton collisions at 13 TeV with Phase 1 CMS detector.
2521 2018. URL <https://cds.cern.ch/record/2646773>.
- 2522 [57] Lorenzo Bianchini, John Conway, Evan Klose Friis, and Christian Veelken. Re-
2523 construction of the Higgs mass in $H \rightarrow \tau\tau$ Events by Dynamical Likelihood
2524 techniques. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 513(2):022035, jun 2014.
2525 doi: 10.1088/1742-6596/513/2/022035. URL <https://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/513/2/022035>.

- 2527 [58] CMS Collaboration. Evidence for the 125 GeV Higgs boson decaying to a pair
2528 of τ leptons. *JHEP*, 05:104, 2014. doi: 10.1007/JHEP05(2014)104.
- 2529 [59] CMS Collaboration. Missing transverse energy performance of the CMS detector.
2530 *JINST*, 6:P09001, 2011. doi: 10.1088/1748-0221/6/09/P09001.
- 2531 [60] Artur Kalinowski. CMS AN-19-032 (internal): Reconstruction of a τ pair invariant
2532 mass with a simplified likelihood scan, 2019.
- 2533 [61] CMS TAU POG. Tau Physics Object Group: Tau ID Recommendation For Run 2, 2024. URL <https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/CMS/TauIDRecommendationForRun2>.
- 2536 [62] CMS MUO POG. Muon Physics Object Group: Recommendations, 2024. URL
2537 <https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/CMS/MuonPOG>.
- 2538 [63] CMS MUO POG. Muon Physics Object Group: Reference guidelines and results
2539 for muon momentum scale and resolution in Run II, 2024. URL <https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/CMS/MuonReferenceScaleResolRun2>.
- 2541 [64] CMS HTT working group. Higgs To Tau Tau Working TWiki for the full Run-
2542 2 legacy analysis, 2024. URL <https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/CMS/HiggsToTauTauWorkingLegacyRun2>.
- 2544 [65] CMS ELE POG. Electron Physics Object Group: Recommendations,
2545 2024. URL <https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/CMS/EgammaRunIIRecommendations>.
- 2547 [66] CMS ELE POG. Electron Physics Object Group: Recommendations for
2548 2016 to 2018 UL, 2024. URL <https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/CMS/EgammaUL2016To2018>.

- 2550 [67] CMS TAU Embedding Group. Tau embedded samples using 2016
2551 data, 2024. URL <https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/CMS/TauTauEmbeddingSamples2016Legacy>.
- 2553 [68] CMS TAU Embedding Group. Tau embedded samples using 2017
2554 data, 2024. URL <https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/viewauth/CMS/TauTauEmbeddingSamples2017>.
- 2556 [69] CMS TAU Embedding Group. Tau embedded samples using 2018
2557 data, 2024. URL <https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/viewauth/CMS/TauTauEmbeddingSamples2018>.
- 2559 [70] Tau Lepton Run 2 Trigger Performance. 2019. URL <https://cds.cern.ch/record/2678958>.
- 2561 [71] CMS Taus High Level Trigger Studies. Tau Lepton Run 2 Trigger Performance
2562 (CMS DP-2019/012), 2024. URL <https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/CMSPublic/HLTauAllRun2>.
- 2564 [72] Muon HLT Performance with 2018 Data. 2018. URL <https://cds.cern.ch/record/2627469>.
- 2566 [73] Single and Double Electron Trigger Efficiencies using the full Run 2 dataset.
2567 2020. URL <https://cds.cern.ch/record/2888577>.
- 2568 [74] Run II Trigger Performance For $e\mu$ Triggers. 2019. URL <https://cds.cern.ch/record/2687013>.
- 2570 [75] Performance of electron and photon reconstruction in Run 2 with the CMS ex-
2571 periment. 2020. URL <https://cds.cern.ch/record/2725004>.

- 2572 [76] CMS Collaboration. Performance of the CMS muon detector and muon recon-
2573 struction with proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV. *JINST*, 13(06):P06015,
2574 2018. doi: 10.1088/1748-0221/13/06/P06015.
- 2575 [77] Piet Verwilligen. Muons in the cms high level trigger system. *Nuclear
2576 and Particle Physics Proceedings*, 273-275:2509–2511, 2016. ISSN 2405-6014.
2577 doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nuclphysbps.2015.09.441>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S240560141500930X>. 37th Interna-
2578 tional Conference on High Energy Physics (ICHEP).
2579
- 2580 [78] Muon tracking performance in the CMS Run-2 Legacy data using the tag-and-
2581 probe technique. 2020. URL <https://cds.cern.ch/record/2724492>.
- 2582 [79] V.M. Abazov, B. Abbott, M. Abolins, et al. A novel method for modeling the
2583 recoil in W boson events at hadron colliders. *Nuclear Instruments and Methods
2584 in Physics Research Section A: Accelerators, Spectrometers, Detectors and Asso-
2585 ciated Equipment*, 609(2):250–262, 2009. ISSN 0168-9002. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nima.2009.08.056>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0168900209016623>.
2586
2587
- 2588 [80] CMS Collaboration. Search for an exotic decay of the Higgs boson to a pair
2589 of light pseudoscalars in the final state with two b quarks and two τ leptons in
2590 proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV. *Phys. Lett. B*, 785:462, 2018. doi:
2591 10.1016/j.physletb.2018.08.057.
- 2592 [81] CMS LUMI POG. Luminosity Physics Object Group: Recommendations, 2024.
2593 URL <https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/CMS/TWikiLUM>.
- 2594 [82] The modeling of the top quark p_T (TWiki), 2024. URL <https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/CMS/TopPtReweighting>.
2595

- 2596 [83] CMS BTV group. Methods to apply b-tagging efficiency scale fac-
 2597 tors (TWiki), 2024. URL <https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/CMS/BTagShapeCalibration>.
- 2599 [84] CMS Collaboration. Jet energy scale and resolution in the CMS experiment in
 2600 pp collisions at 8 TeV. *JINST*, 12(02):P02014, 2017. doi: 10.1088/1748-0221/
 2601 12/02/P02014.
- 2602 [85] Garvita Agarwal. Jet Energy Scale and Resolution Measurements in CMS. *PoS*,
 2603 ICHEP2022:652, 2022. doi: 10.22323/1.414.0652.
- 2604 [86] CMS JERC group. Jet Energy Corrections (TWiki), 2024. URL <https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/CMS/JECDataMC>.
- 2606 [87] CMS JERC group. Jet Energy Resolution (TWiki), 2024. URL <https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/CMS/JetResolution>.
- 2608 [88] CMS MUO POG. Muon Physics Object Group: Baseline muon selec-
 2609 tions for Run-II, 2024. URL <https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/CMS/SWGuideMuonIdRun2>.
- 2611 [89] CMS ELE POG. Electron Identification Based on Simple Cuts, 2024. URL
 2612 <https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/CMSPublic/EgammaPublicData>.
- 2613 [90] Jose Enrique Palencia Cortezon. Single top quark production at CMS. Technical
 2614 report, CERN, Geneva, 2018. URL <https://cds.cern.ch/record/2640578>.
- 2615 [91] CMS Collaboration. Measurements of the electroweak diboson production cross
 2616 sections in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 5.02$ TeV using leptonic decays.
 2617 *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 127(19):191801, 2021. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.127.191801.
- 2618 [92] CMS Collaboration. A portrait of the Higgs boson by the CMS experiment

- ten years after the discovery. *Nature*, 607(7917):60–68, 2022. doi: 10.1038/s41586-022-04892-x.
- [93] CMS JERC group. Jet energy scale uncertainty sources (TWiki), 2024. URL <https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/CMS/JECUncertaintySources>.
- [94] TOP Systematic Uncertainties (Run 2) (TWiki), 2024. URL <https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/viewauth/CMS/TopSystematics>.
- [95] Kyle Cranmer. Practical Statistics for the LHC. In *2011 European School of High-Energy Physics*, pages 267–308, 2014. doi: 10.5170/CERN-2014-003.267.
- [96] Elham Khazaie, Maryam Zeinali, Hamed Bakhshiansohi, and Abideh Jafari. CMS AN-21-058 (internal): Search for exotic decays of the Higgs boson to a pair of new light bosons with two muons and two b jets in the final states at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV, 2021.
- [97] CMS Higgs Physics Analysis Group. Summary of 2HDM+S searches at 13 TeV (Run 2), 2024. URL <https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/CMSPublic/Summary2HDMSSRun2>.