

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 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

With the discovery of the Higgs boson with mass 125 GeV at the LHC in 2012, the Compact Muon Solenoid (CMS) experimental physics program has evolved to include the precise characterization of the Standard Model 125 GeV Higgs boson and searches for evidence of additional Higgs particles in an extended Higgs sector. 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 similar search in a different final state 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.

⁴³

Acknowledgements

⁴⁴ Placeholder acknowledgements.

⁴⁶ Contents

⁴⁷	Abstract	iii
⁴⁸	Acknowledgements	iv
⁴⁹	List of Tables	xi
⁵⁰	List of Figures	xv
⁵¹	1 Introduction	1
⁵²	1.1 History of the Standard Model	1
⁵³	1.2 The Standard Model as a gauge theory	3
⁵⁴	1.3 The Higgs mechanism	6
⁵⁵	1.4 Two-Higgs Doublet Models	8
⁵⁶	1.5 Two Real Singlet Model	11
⁵⁷	2 The Large Hadron Collider and the CMS Experiment	15
⁵⁸	2.1 The Large Hadron Collider	16
⁵⁹	2.2 Luminosity and pile-up	17
⁶⁰	2.3 The High-Luminosity LHC	20
⁶¹	2.4 The CMS detector	21
⁶²	2.5 Sub-detectors of CMS and data processing	23
⁶³	2.5.1 Inner tracking system	23
⁶⁴	2.5.2 ECAL	24
⁶⁵	2.5.3 HCAL	25

66	2.5.4 Muon detectors	27
67	2.5.5 The Level-1 Trigger	28
68	2.5.6 The High-Level Trigger	32
69	2.5.7 Particle reconstruction	33
70	2.5.8 Data storage and computational infrastructure	34
71	3 The Phase-2 Upgrade of CMS	35
72	3.1 The High-Luminosity LHC	35
73	3.2 The Phase-2 Level-1 Trigger	36
74	3.3 Standalone barrel calorimeter electron/photon reconstruction	39
75	3.3.1 Electron/photon standalone barrel procedure	39
76	3.3.2 Electron/photon standalone barrel results	44
77	4 Datasets and Monte Carlo samples	48
78	4.1 Datasets used	48
79	4.2 Monte Carlo samples	49
80	4.3 Embedded samples	50
81	5 Object reconstruction and corrections applied	53
82	5.1 Object reconstruction	54
83	5.1.1 Taus	54
84	5.1.2 Muons	57
85	5.1.3 Electrons	58
86	5.1.4 Jets	60
87	5.1.5 B-flavored jets	61
88	5.2 Reconstruction of the di-tau mass	62
89	5.2.1 Original SVFit “standalone”: maximum likelihood	63
90	5.2.2 “Classic SVFit” with matrix element	64
91	5.2.3 FastMTT: optimized SVFit	64

92	5.3 Corrections applied to simulation	65
93	5.3.1 Tau energy scale	66
94	5.3.2 Muon energy scale	67
95	5.3.3 Electron energy scale	67
96	5.3.4 τ_h identification efficiency	67
97	5.3.5 Trigger efficiencies definition	68
98	5.3.6 Tau trigger efficiencies	69
99	5.3.7 Single muon trigger efficiencies	70
100	5.3.8 Single electron trigger efficiencies	71
101	5.3.9 $e\mu$ cross-trigger efficiencies	72
102	5.3.10 Electrons and muons faking τ_h : energy scales	73
103	5.3.11 Electrons and muons faking τ_h : misidentification efficiencies .	74
104	5.3.12 Electron ID and tracking efficiency	75
105	5.3.13 Muon ID, isolation, and tracking efficiencies	75
106	5.3.14 Recoil corrections	77
107	5.3.15 Drell-Yan corrections	78
108	5.3.16 Pile-up reweighing	78
109	5.3.17 Pre-firing corrections	79
110	5.3.18 Top p_T spectrum reweighing	79
111	5.3.19 B-tagging efficiency	79
112	5.3.20 Jet energy resolution and jet energy smearing	80
113	6 Event selection	81
114	6.1 General procedure for all channels	81
115	6.2 Event selection in the $\mu\tau_h$ channel	83
116	6.3 Event selection in the $e\tau_h$ channel	85
117	6.4 Event selection in the $e\mu$ channel	87
118	6.5 Extra lepton vetoes in all channels	88

¹¹⁹	7 Background estimation	91
¹²⁰	7.1 Z+jets	91
¹²¹	7.2 W+jets	92
¹²²	7.3 $t\bar{t}$ + jets	92
¹²³	7.4 Single top	93
¹²⁴	7.5 Diboson	93
¹²⁵	7.6 Standard Model Higgs	93
¹²⁶	7.7 Jet faking τ_h	94
¹²⁷	7.8 QCD multijet background	95
¹²⁸	8 Systematic uncertainties	97
¹²⁹	8.1 Uncertainties in the lepton energy scales	98
¹³⁰	8.2 Uncertainties from other lepton corrections	99
¹³¹	8.3 Uncertainties from jet energy scale and resolution	100
¹³²	8.4 Uncertainties from b-tagging scale factors	101
¹³³	8.5 Uncertainties from MET	101
¹³⁴	8.6 Uncertainties associated with samples used	102
¹³⁵	8.7 Other uncertainties	103
¹³⁶	8.8 Pulls and impacts	103
¹³⁷	9 Event categorization and signal extraction	105
¹³⁸	9.1 B-tag jet multiplicity	105
¹³⁹	9.2 DNN-based event categorization	106
¹⁴⁰	9.3 Methodology for signal extraction	110
¹⁴¹	9.3.1 Model building and parameter estimation	110
¹⁴²	9.3.2 Hypothesis testing	111
¹⁴³	9.3.3 Confidence intervals	113
¹⁴⁴	9.3.4 Profile likelihood ratio	115

¹⁴⁵	9.3.5 Modified frequentist method: CL_S	116
¹⁴⁶	10 Results	117
¹⁴⁷	10.1 Results from $bb\tau\tau$	117
¹⁴⁸	10.2 Combination with $bb\mu\mu$ final state	119
¹⁴⁹	11 Asymmetric exotic Higgs decays	130
¹⁵⁰	11.1 Signal masses	130
¹⁵¹	11.2 Cascade scenario signal studies	131
¹⁵²	11.3 Control plots for $\mu\tau_h$ channel	133
¹⁵³	12 Conclusion and outlook	141
¹⁵⁴	A Samples used	143

¹⁵⁵ List of Tables

¹⁵⁶	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.	52
¹⁶⁰	5.1	Energy scales applied to genuine hadronic tau decays τ_h by data-taking year/era and decay mode, along with systematic errors.	66
¹⁶¹	5.2	Energy scales and systematic errors applied to genuine muons.	67
¹⁶²	5.3	Energy scales and systematic errors applied to electrons in embedded samples by data-taking year/era.	67
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	68
¹⁶⁵	5.5	Energy scales and up/down systematic uncertainties applied to electrons misidentified as hadronic taus.	73
¹⁶⁶	5.6	Tau mis-identification efficiencies (in %) for the DeepTau Tight and Very Loose (VLoose) working points vs. muons in 2018.	74
¹⁶⁹	5.7	Tau mis-identification efficiencies (in %) for the DeepTau Tight and Very Loose (VLoose) working points vs. electrons in 2018.	74
¹⁷⁰			
¹⁷¹			
¹⁷²			

173	6.1	Trigger thresholds used for the leptons in the $bb\mu\mu$ analysis and the 174 $bb\tau\tau$ analysis (the focus of this work). The thresholds for the three $bb\tau\tau$ 175 channels ($e\mu$, $e\tau_h$, and $\mu\tau_h$) are listed separately, with some channels 176 and years taking the logical OR of two triggers with different thresholds.	83
177	6.2	Summary of requirements applied to the leptons in the $bb\mu\mu$ analysis 178 and the $bb\tau\tau$ analysis (the focus of this work). $\Delta R = \sqrt{(\Delta\eta)^2 + (\Delta\phi)^2}$ 179 is a measure of spatial separation. Relative isolation is defined in 180 Eqn. 5.2Muonsequation.5.1.2 and Section 5.1.2Muonssubsection.5.1.2. 181 The b-tag jets are required to pass the listed DeepFlavour working 182 points (WP), which are described in Section 5.1.5B-flavored jetssub- 183 section.5.1.5. In the $bb\tau\tau$ analysis, the required $ \eta $ of the hadronic 184 taus are listed for the single and cross triggers respectively. The $bb\mu\mu$ 185 analysis requires two b-tag jets in all events, while the $bb\tau\tau$ analysis 186 only requires one.	84
187	6.3	High-Level Trigger (HLT) paths used to select data and simulation 188 events in 2016 for the three $\tau\tau$ channels.	88
189	6.4	High-Level Trigger (HLT) paths used to select data and simulation 190 events in 2017 for the three $\tau\tau$ channels.	89
191	6.5	High-Level Trigger (HLT) paths used to select data and simulation 192 events in 2018 for the three $\tau\tau$ channels. In 2018 a HLT trigger path 193 using the hadron plus strips (HPS) tau reconstruction algorithm be- 194 came available.	90
195	9.1	Event categorization based on DNN scores for events with exactly 1 196 b-tag jet (1bNN), for the three $\tau\tau$ channels and three eras.	109
197	9.2	Event categorization based on DNN scores for events with 2 b-tag jets 198 (2bNN), for the three $\tau\tau$ channels and three eras.	109

199	A.1 Datasets used in the $h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow bb\tau\tau$ analysis for the 2016 era.	144
200	A.2 Datasets used in the $h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow bb\tau\tau$ analysis for the 2017 era.	145
201	A.3 Datasets used in the $h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow bb\tau\tau$ analysis for the 2018 eras.	145
202	A.4 Embedded samples used in the analysis for the 2016 era.	145
203	A.5 Embedded samples used in the analysis for the 2017 era.	146
204	A.6 Embedded samples used in the analysis for the 2018 era.	146
205	A.7 Background MC samples used in the analysis for the 2016 era. Samples marked with a \dagger are generated with the powhegV2-madspin-pythia8 tag.	147
206		
207	A.8 Background MC samples used in the analysis for the 2017 era. All samples use powheg, except the DYJets and WJets samples, which use madgraphMLM. Samples marked with a \dagger , \ddagger , or $\ddagger\dagger$ were produced with Powheg2 and Pythia8, and Madspin, JHUGenV714, or jhugen724 respectively.	148
208		
209		
210		
211		
212	A.9 Background Monte Carlo samples used in the analysis for the 2018 era. All samples listed are generated for 13 TeV collisions and use pythia8. All samples use powheg, except the DYJets and WJets samples, which use madgraphMLM. Samples marked with a \dagger , \ddagger , or $\ddagger\dagger$, were pro- duced with Powheg and Pythia8, and Madspin, JHUGenV714, and Jhugen724 respectively.	149
213		
214		
215		
216		
217		
218	A.10 Signal samples used in the analysis for the 2016 era. All belong to the RunIISummer16MiniAODv3 campaign and are produced with Mad- graph and Pythia8. The second column is the number of events after the generator-level filter is applied, and the third column is the filter efficiency (percentage of all events that pass the generator-level filter).	150
219		
220		
221		
222		

223 A.11 Signal samples used in the analysis for the 2017 era. All belong to
224 the RunIIFall17MiniAODv2 campaign and are produced with Mad-
225 graph and Pythia8. The second column is the number of events after
226 the generator-level filter is applied, and the third column is the filter
227 efficiency (percentage of all events that pass the generator-level filter). 150

228 A.12 Signal samples used in the analysis for the 2018 era. All belong to
229 the RunIIAutumn18MiniAOD campaign and are produced with Mad-
230 graph and Pythia8. The second column is the number of events after
231 the generator-level filter is applied, and the third column is the filter
232 efficiency (percentage of all events that pass the generator-level filter). 151

²³³ List of Figures

²³⁴ 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.	3
²³⁹ 1.2	An illustration of the Higgs potential.	8
²⁴⁰ 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).	11
²⁴¹ 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. . . .	14
²⁴³ 2.1	Aerial view of the Large Hadron Collider (LHC).	18
²⁴⁴ 2.2	Distribution of the mean number of inelastic collisions per bunch cross- ing (pile-up) in data, for proton-proton collisions in 2016-2018 . . .	20
²⁴⁵ 2.3	Sketch of particle trajectories of muons, electrons, charged and neutral hadrons, and photons in a transverse cross-section of the CMS detector.	22
²⁴⁶ 2.4	Cross section of the current Phase-1 CMS tracker.	24
²⁴⁷ 2.5	Longitudinal view of the CMS detector showing the hadron calorimeter barrel (HB), endcap (HE), outer (HO), and forward (HF) calorimeters.	26

253	2.6	Layout of the CMS barrel muon drift tube (DT) chambers in one of the five wheels.	28
254	2.7	Dataflow for the Phase-1 Level-1 Trigger.	29
255	2.8	Schematic of the calorimeter trigger after Long Shutdown 2. The Layer-1 calorimeter trigger is implemented in CTP7 cards, which send time-multiplexed outputs to the Layer-2 MP7 cards. The Layer-2 cards handle the data in a round-robin style and the outputs are de- multiplexed, producing one output data stream to the Global Trigger.	31
256			
257			
258			
259			
260			
261	3.1	Functional diagram of the CMS L1 Phase-2 upgraded trigger design. .	37
262	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.	40
263			
264			
265	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.	41
266			
267			
268			
269			
270			
271	3.4	Schematic of two example RCT cards in the negative eta (<i>top left</i>) and positive eta (<i>bottom left</i>) regions of the ECAL barrel. Each RCT card is divided into six regions: five regions are of size 3×4 towers in $\eta \times \phi$ (<i>top right</i>), and a sixth smaller overlap region of size 2×4 towers (<i>bottom right</i>). Each tower is 5×5 ($\eta \times \phi$) in crystals.	42
272			
273			
274			
275			

297	3.7	Efficiencies of the current and previous emulators of the standalone barrel e/γ algorithm for the Phase-2 Level-1 Trigger, evaluated in a simulated sample containing electrons, as a function of the electron’s generator-level transverse momentum p_T . The standalone working point (WP) is defined as the logical OR of the isolation flag and shower shape flag. The efficiencies with and without requiring the standalone WP, are shown for the current emulator (labeled “Phase 2”, <i>black, red</i>) and the previous emulator (labeled “TDR”, <i>dark blue, grey</i>).	45
305	3.8	Rates in kHz of the current Phase-2 and previous (“TDR”) emulators of the standalone barrel e/γ algorithm for the Phase-2 Level-1 Trigger, evaluated on a minimum bias (MinBias) sample with 200 pile-up (PU), measured as a function of the minimum energy (E_T) required of the reconstructed e/γ object in each event. The standalone working point (standalone WP) is defined to be the logical OR of the isolation flag and the shower shape flag. The rates with and without requiring the standalone WP, are shown for the current emulator (labeled “Phase 2”, <i>black, red</i>) and the previous emulator (labeled “TDR”, <i>dark blue,</i> <i>grey</i>).	47
315	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.	49
318	4.2	Schematic view of the four main steps of the embedding technique for τ leptons.	51
320	5.1	Distributions of $m_{\tau\tau}$ reconstructed by the classic SVFit algorithm, and masses of visible tau decay products (before SVFit).	65
322	5.2	Electron/photon energy scale factors and uncertainties for 2018. . . .	68

323	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.	70
324		
325	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 326 muon in the isolated single muon trigger with threshold $p_T > 24$ GeV 327 in the data-taking year 2018, as functions of the muon p_T (<i>left</i>) and 328 muon $ \eta $ (<i>right</i>).	71
329		
330	5.5 Trigger efficiencies in data and the data/MC ratio for the electron in 331 the single electron trigger with threshold $p_T > 32$ GeV in the data- 332 taking year 2018, as functions of the electron p_T (<i>left</i>) and electron $ \eta $ 333 (<i>right</i>).	72
334		
335	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 336 electron and 23 GeV for the muon, with the data-taking years 2016 337 through 2018 overlaid.	73
338		
339	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- 340 cation (<i>left</i>) and for the Gaussian-sum filter (GSF) tracking (<i>right</i>). .	75
341		
342	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.	76
343		
344	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>).	77
345		
346	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.	78
347		
	7.1 Leading-order Feynman diagrams of Higgs production.	94

348	8.1 Top sixty pulls and impacts for the combination of all channels and	
349	years.	104
350	9.1 Schematic of the Neyman construction for confidence intervals.	114
351	10.1 Postfit final observed and expected $m_{\tau\tau}$ distributions in the $\mu\tau_h$ chan-	
352	nel, for the 1 b-tag jet and 2 b-tag jet signal and control regions.	121
353	10.2 Postfit final observed and expected $m_{\tau\tau}$ distributions in the $e\tau_h$ chan-	
354	nel, for the 1 b-tag jet and 2 b-tag jet signal and control regions.	122
355	10.3 Postfit final observed and expected $m_{\tau\tau}$ distributions in the $e\mu$ channel.	123
356	10.4 Observed 95% CL exclusion limits (<i>black, solid lines</i>) and expected 95%	
357	CL and 68% CL limits (<i>shaded yellow and green</i>) on the branching	
358	fraction $B(h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow bb\tau\tau)$ in percentages, assuming the Standard	
359	Model production for the 125 GeV Higgs (h). Limits are shown for the	
360	$\mu\tau_h$ channel (<i>top left</i>), the $e\tau_h$ channel (<i>top right</i>), and the $e\mu$ channel	
361	(<i>bottom left</i>), and lastly the combination of all three channels (<i>bottom</i>	
362	<i>right</i>) The dataset corresponds to 138 fb^{-1} of data collected in the	
363	years 2016-2018 at a center-of-mass energy 13 TeV.	124
364	10.5 Observed 95% CL upper limits on $B(h \rightarrow aa)$ in %, for the $bb\tau\tau$ final	
365	state (<i>left</i>) and $bb\mu\mu$ final state (<i>right</i>) using the full Run 2 integrated	
366	luminosity of 138 fb^{-1} in 2HDM+S type I (<i>blue</i>), type II with $\tan\beta =$	
367	2.0 (<i>orange dashed</i>), type III with $\tan\beta = 2.0$ (<i>dotted green</i>), and type	
368	IV with $\tan\beta = 0.6$ (<i>red dashed</i>).	125

369	10.6 Observed 95% CL upper limits on the branching fraction of the 125 GeV	
370	Higgs boson to two pseudoscalars, $B(h \rightarrow aa)$, in percentages, as a	
371	function of the pseudoscalar mass m_a , in 2HDM+S type I (<i>blue</i>), type	
372	II with $\tan\beta = 2.0$ (<i>orange dashed</i>), type III with $\tan\beta = 2.0$ (<i>dotted</i>	
373	<i>green</i>), and type IV with $\tan\beta = 0.6$ (<i>red dashed</i>), for the combination	
374	of $bb\mu\mu$ and $bb\tau\tau$ channels using the full Run 2 integrated luminosity	
375	of 138 fb^{-1}	126
376	10.7 Observed 95% CL upper limits on $\mathcal{B}(h \rightarrow aa)$ in %, for the combination	
377	of $bb\mu\mu$ and $bb\tau\tau$ channels using the full Run 2 integrated luminosity	
378	of 138 fb^{-1} for Type II (<i>left</i>), Type III (<i>middle</i>), and Type IV (<i>right</i>)	
379	2HDM+S in the $\tan\beta$ vs. m_a phase space.	127
380	10.8 Summary plot of current observed and expected 95% CL limits on the	
381	branching ratio of the 125 GeV Higgs boson to two pseudoscalars, nor-	
382	malized to the Standard Model Higgs production cross-section, $\frac{\sigma(h)}{\sigma_{\text{SM}}} \times$	
383	$B(h \rightarrow aa)$, in the 2HDM+S type I scenario, obtained at CMS with	
384	data collected at 13 TeV.	127
385	10.9 Summary plot of current observed and expected 95% CL limits on the	
386	branching ratio of the 125 GeV Higgs boson to two pseudoscalars, nor-	
387	malized to the Standard Model Higgs production cross-section, $\frac{\sigma(h)}{\sigma_{\text{SM}}} \times$	
388	$B(h \rightarrow aa)$, in the 2HDM+S type II scenario with $\tan\beta = 2.0$, ob-	
389	tained at CMS with data collected at 13 TeV.	128
390	10.10 Summary plot of current observed and expected 95% CL limits on the	
391	branching ratio of the 125 GeV Higgs boson to two pseudoscalars, nor-	
392	malized to the Standard Model Higgs production cross-section, $\frac{\sigma(h)}{\sigma_{\text{SM}}} \times$	
393	$B(h \rightarrow aa)$, in the 2HDM+S type III scenario with $\tan\beta = 2.0$, ob-	
394	tained at CMS with data collected at 13 TeV.	129

395	11.1 Generator-level b-flavor jet transverse momenta p_T , for $h \rightarrow a_1 a_2$ cas-	
396	cade scenario in the $4b2\tau$ final state, for mass hypotheses $(m_{a_1}, m_{a_2}) =$	
397	$(100, 15)$ GeV (<i>left</i>) and $(40, 20)$ GeV (<i>right</i>). In each plot the generator-	
398	level p_T of the leading (<i>black</i>), sub-leading (<i>red</i>), third (<i>blue</i>), and	
399	fourth (<i>light green</i>) are overlaid.	132
400	11.2 Distributions (arbitrary units) of transverse momentum p_T resolution	
401	and ΔR between the two closest generator-level b jets, treated as one	
402	object, and the nearest reconstructed AK4 jet, for two different $h \rightarrow$	
403	$a_1 a_2$ mass hypotheses $(m_{a_1}, m_{a_2}) = (100, 15)$ GeV (<i>top left, top right</i>)	
404	and $(40, 20)$ GeV (<i>bottom left, bottom right</i>) in the ggH production of	
405	the 125 GeV h . In the $(40, 20)$ GeV mass point, the longer p_T resolution	
406	tail (<i>bottom left</i>) indicates that the reconstructed jet underestimates	
407	the generator b-flavor jets' energy, and the significant fraction of events	
408	with larger ΔR values (<i>bottom right</i>) indicate worse matching.	133
409	11.3 Kinematic properties of the leading muon in the $\mu\tau_h$ channel using 2018	
410	samples: transverse momentum p_T (<i>top</i>), η (<i>middle</i>), and ϕ (<i>bottom</i>).	
411	The errors shown in the figures include statistical errors and only sev-	
412	eral of the full set of systematic errors (only those associated with the	
413	lepton energy scales and τ_h identification efficiency).	135
414	11.4 Kinematic properties of the leading hadronic tau (τ_h) in the $\mu\tau_h$ channel	
415	using 2018 samples: transverse momentum p_T (<i>top</i>), η (<i>middle</i>), and ϕ	
416	(<i>bottom</i>). The errors shown in the figures include statistical errors and	
417	only several of the full set of systematic errors (only those associated	
418	with the lepton energy scales and τ_h identification efficiency).	136

419	11.5 The visible di-tau mass m_{vis} (<i>top</i>) and visible di-tau transverse momen-	
420	tum $p_{T,\text{vis}}$ (<i>bottom</i>), computed from the sum of the visible 4-momenta	
421	of the muon and τ_h in the $\mu\tau_h$ channel using 2018 samples. The er-	
422	rors shown in the figures include statistical errors and only several of	
423	the full set of systematic errors (only those associated with the lepton	
424	energy scales and τ_h identification efficiency).	137
425	11.6 Kinematic properties of the leading b-tag jet in the $\mu\tau_h$ final state	
426	using 2018 samples: transverse momentum p_T (<i>top</i>), η (<i>middle</i>), ϕ	
427	(<i>bottom</i>). The errors shown in the figures include statistical errors and	
428	only several of the full set of systematic errors (only those associated	
429	with the lepton energy scales and τ_h identification efficiency).	138
430	11.7 Kinematic properties of the sub-leading b-tag jet in the $\mu\tau_h$ final state	
431	using 2018 samples: transverse momentum p_T (<i>top</i>), η (<i>middle</i>), ϕ	
432	(<i>bottom</i>). The errors shown in the figures include statistical errors and	
433	only several of the full set of systematic errors (only those associated	
434	with the lepton energy scales and τ_h identification efficiency).	139
435	11.8 Missing transverse energy magnitude (<i>top</i>) and azimuthal direction	
436	(<i>bottom</i>) in the $\mu\tau_h$ final state using 2018 samples. The errors shown	
437	in the figures include statistical errors and only several of the full set of	
438	systematic errors (only those associated with the lepton energy scales	
439	and τ_h identification efficiency).	140

⁴⁴⁰ Chapter 1

⁴⁴¹ Introduction

⁴⁴² The Standard Model is the current prevailing theoretical framework that encompasses
⁴⁴³ all known elementary particles to date and describes their interactions, yet falls short
⁴⁴⁴ of describing open problems in physics. Here, we describe the history of the Standard
⁴⁴⁵ Model and its particle content (Section 1.1), and provide a mathematical motivation of
⁴⁴⁶ the SM as a gauge theory (Section 1.2). We introduce the Higgs mechanism (Section
⁴⁴⁷ 1.3), and outline two groups of theoretical extensions to the Standard Model that
⁴⁴⁸ feature extended Higgs sectors (Sections 1.4 and 1.5).

⁴⁴⁹ 1.1 History of the Standard Model

⁴⁵⁰ The building blocks of our modern-day understanding of particle physics were estab-
⁴⁵¹ lished over the course of many decades by experimental discoveries and theoretical
⁴⁵² advances, culminating in the development of a theoretical framework known as the
⁴⁵³ Standard Model (SM). In the 1880s, the electron was the first subatomic particle to
⁴⁵⁴ be identified, through measurements of particles produced by ionizing gas. By the
⁴⁵⁵ 1930s, atoms were known to consist mostly of empty space, with protons and neutrons
⁴⁵⁶ concentrated at the center and orbited by electrons. Spurred by advances in parti-
⁴⁵⁷ cle accelerator technology, the experimental discoveries of the positron, the muon,

and the pion, painted an increasingly complicated picture of particle physics that could not be described solely with atomic physics [1]. Quantum field theory (QFT) began to be developed in the early 20th century as an extension of the conceptual framework of quantum mechanics to electromagnetic fields [2]. In 1927, Dirac coined the name quantum electrodynamics (QED), which was the first part of QFT that was developed. QED quantized the electromagnetic field and supplied a relativistic theory of the electron, and could be applied to concrete physical processes such as the scattering of high-frequency photons by free electrons (Compton scattering), and the production of electron-positron pairs by photons [2]. In the 1940s the QED-only picture was challenged by the realization that the four-fermion theory of weak interactions had infinities at higher orders of perturbation theory which could not be removed via the technique of renormalization [3], i.e. shifting divergences into parts of the theory that do not influence empirical measurements [2].

In the 1950s and 1960s, QFT was extended to describe not only the electromagnetic force, but also the strong and weak force, with the final picture forming the Standard Model. This took place in the development and maturation of three principles: the quark model, the idea of gauge (or local) symmetry, and spontaneously broken symmetry [3]. In the fully fledged QFT, Lagrangians had to be formed that contained new classes of quantum fields, or particles [2].

The particle content of the Standard Model is summarized in Fig. 1.1. Particles are grouped into fermions, which comprise all known matter, and bosons, which mediate the interactions between particles. Fermions consist of quarks and leptons, and are grouped into three generations. For example, the electron belongs to the first generation of leptons. The second and third generation counterparts of the electron are the muon and the tau lepton, and are over 200 and 30,000 times heavier than the electron respectively. The quarks are also organized into three generations (top and bottom quarks, charm and strange quarks, and up and down quarks), and

485 carry fractional electric charge. Bosons are force carriers; the interaction of fermions
 486 with bosons corresponds to fundamental forces. The Standard Model describes the
 487 electromagnetic force, the strong nuclear force, and the weak nuclear force. Through
 488 the strong force, quarks can form composite particles known as hadrons. Familiar
 489 examples of hadrons are the protons and neutrons in the nucleus of an atom.




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.

490 1.2 The Standard Model as a gauge theory

491 In this section we lay the theoretical foundations of the Standard Model as a gauge
 492 theory, starting from the principle of gauge invariance (gauge symmetry), with local
 493 gauge symmetries giving rise to interactions between particles.

494 Gauge theories of elementary particle interactions originate from a freedom of
 495 choice in the mathematical description of particle fields which has no effect on the
 496 particles' physical states [4]. The existence and form of the particles' interactions,

497 can be deduced from the existence of physically indeterminate, gaugable quantities.

498 An example of this gauge invariance in classical physics is the electromagnetic
499 interaction, where the fundamental field is the four-vector potential A^μ [4]. The
500 physical electromagnetic fields and Maxwell's equations arise from the elements of
501 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
502 transformation of the form

$$A_\mu \rightarrow A_\mu + \partial_\mu \alpha \quad (1.1)$$

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

506 One important consequence of gauge symmetry comes from the application of
507 Noether's theorem, which states that for every global transformation under which the
508 Lagrangian density is invariant, there exists a conserved quantity. If $\mathcal{L}(\Psi(x), \partial_\mu \Psi(x))$
509 is invariant under the transformation of the wave function $\Psi(x) \rightarrow \Psi'(x)$, where
510 $\Psi'(x) = \Psi(x) + \delta\Psi(x)$, then there exists a conserved current

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

511 In classical mechanics, the conservation of linear momentum, angular momentum,
512 and energy follows from translational invariance, rotational variance, and invariance
513 under translations in time [4]. Likewise, charge conservation can be shown to arise
514 from the invariance of the Dirac Lagrangian density $\mathcal{L}_{\text{Dirac}} = \bar{\Psi}(i\gamma^\mu \partial_\mu - m)\Psi$ under the
515 particle wavefunction's phase transformation, $\Psi'(x) = \exp(i\epsilon\chi)\Psi(x)$. Thus Noether's
516 theorem establishes a correspondence between a gauge symmetry and a conserved
517 internal property (e.g. charge or momentum).

518 Interactions between particles arise if we modify the wave function with a phase

519 transformation $\Psi'(x) = \exp(ie\chi)\Psi(x)$, and allow the phase χ to be a function of
520 spacetime [4]. A wave function of the form

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

521 can be verified to *not* be a solution to the Dirac equation for free particles: $(i\gamma^\mu\partial_\mu -$
522 $m)\Psi(x) = 0$. This necessitates a modified Dirac equation, where the derivative takes
523 into account that the vector field $V(x)$ needs to be compared at two displaced space-
524 time points in a curvilinear coordinate system:

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

525 We define a covariant derivative,

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

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

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

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

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

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

532 One must define a derivative of the form

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

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

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

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

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

540 • 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-
541 potentials. $\tau/2$ are the Pauli matrices, generators of the $SU(2)$ transformation.

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

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

546 1.3 The Higgs mechanism

547 To introduce mass into the theory, i.e. to change the propagation of the gauge par-
548 ticles and all the fermions, the physical vacuum cannot have all the symmetries of
549 the Standard Model Lagrangian [4]. The symmetries of the physical vacuum must
550 be spontaneously broken, without affecting gauge invariance in the Lagrangian. The

551 Higgs mechanism proposes the existence of a scalar field, or fields, with nonzero vac-
 552 um expectation values, which reduce the gauge symmetries of the physical vacuum
 553 from $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ down to $SU(3)_C \times U(1)_{EM}$.

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

562 The minimal choice of Higgs field comes from the breaking of $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$
 563 down to $U(1)_{EM}$. The smallest $SU(2)$ multiplet is the doublet. The existence of three
 564 massive electroweak bosons leads the Higgs sector to have at least three degrees of
 565 freedom. The minimal single-doublet complex scalar Higgs field is

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

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

568 The minimal self-interacting Higgs potential that is invariant under $SU(2)_L \times$
 569 $U(1)_Y$ is given by

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

570 where λ is the coupling strength of the four-point Higgs interaction. The potential

571 energy is minimized at

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

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




Figure 1.2: An illustration of the Higgs potential [5]. Choosing any of the points at the bottom of the potential breaks spontaneously the rotational $U(1)$ symmetry.

574 The excitations of the Higgs field with respect to the minimum Φ_{\min} are parame-
575 terized by

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

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

580 1.4 Two-Higgs Doublet Models

581 One of the simplest possible extensions to the Standard Model is adding a doublet
582 to the minimal Higgs sector of the Standard Model, which is a $SU(2)_L$ doublet H

583 with hypercharge $Y = +\frac{1}{2}$, denoted here as $H \sim 2_{+1/2}$. These extensions are found
 584 in several theories such as supersymmetry. A general 2HDM can be extended with a
 585 light scalar (2HDM+S) to obtain a rich set of exotic Higgs decays [6].

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 [6].
 Expanding about the minima yields two complex and four real degrees of freedom:

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

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

586 The charged scalar and pseudoscalar mass matrices are diagonalized by a rotation
 587 angle β , defined as $\tan \beta = v_2/v_1$. One charged (complex) field and one neutral
 588 pseudoscalar combination of $H_{1,2,I}^0$ are eaten by the SM gauge bosons after electroweak
 589 symmetry breaking [6]. The other complex field yields two charged mass eigenstates
 590 H^\pm , which are assumed to be heavy. The remaining three degrees of freedom yield
 591 one neutral pseudoscalar mass eigenstate

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

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

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

593 We assume that the 2HDM is near or in the decoupling limit: $\alpha \rightarrow \pi/2 - \beta$, where the
 594 lightest state in the 2HDM is h , which we identify as the 125 GeV Higgs particle [6]. In
 595 this limit, the fermion couplings of h become identical to the Standard Model Higgs,

596 while the gauge boson couplings are very close to Standard Model-like for $\tan \beta \gtrsim 5$.
597 All of the properties of h can be determined by just two parameters: $\tan \beta$ and α ,
598 and the fermion couplings to the two Higgs doublets.

599 2HDM can be extended by a scalar singlet (2HDM+S) [6]:

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

600 If this singlet only couples to the Higgs doublets $H_{1,2}$ and has no direct Yukawa
601 couplings, all of its couplings to SM fermions result from mixing with $H_{1,2}$. Under
602 these simple assumptions, exotic Higgs decays $h \rightarrow ss \rightarrow X\bar{X}Y\bar{Y}$ or $h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow$
603 $X\bar{X}Y\bar{Y}$, and $h \rightarrow aZ \rightarrow X\bar{X}Y\bar{Y}$ are permitted, where $s(a)$ is a (pseudo)scalar mass
604 eigenstate mostly composed of $S_R(S_I)$, and X, Y are Standard Model fermions or
605 gauge bosons. There are two pseudoscalars in the 2HDM+S, and the mostly singlet-
606 like pseudoscalar can be chosen to be the one lighter than the SM-like Higgs. For
607 $m_a < m_h - m_Z \sim 35$ GeV, the exotic Higgs decay $h \rightarrow Za$ is possible, and for
608 $m_a < m_h/2 \approx 63$ GeV, the exotic Higgs decay $h \rightarrow aa$ is possible.

609 In 2HDM, and by extension 2HDM+S, there are four types of fermion couplings
610 commonly discussed in the literature that forbid flavor-changing neutral currents at
611 tree level [6]. These are referred to as Type I (all fermions couple to H_2), Type II
612 (MSSM-like, d_R and e_R couple to H_1 , u_R to H_2), Type III (lepton-specific, leptons
613 and quarks couple to H_1 and H_2 respectively) and Type IV (flipped, with u_R , e_R
614 coupling to H_2 and d_R to H_1). The exact branching ratios of the pseudoscalars to
615 Standard Model particles vary depending on the 2HDM+S model and the value of
616 $\tan \beta$ (e.g. Fig. 1.3).




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 [6], 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.

1.5 Two Real Singlet Model

The two real singlet model (TRSM) adds two real singlet degrees of freedom to the Standard Model. These are written as two real singlet fields S and X . Depending on the vacuum expectation values acquired by the scalars, different phases of the model can be realized [7]. To reduce the number of free parameters, two discrete \mathbb{Z}_2 symmetries are introduced. The fields are decomposed as

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

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

627 The mass eigenstates $h_{1,2,3}$ are related to the fields $\phi_{h,S,X}$ through a 3×3 orthogonal
628 mixing matrix denoted R . The mass eigenstates are assumed to be ordered $M_1 \leq$
629 $M_2 \leq M_3$. R is parameterized by the three mixing angles θ_{hS} , θ_{hX} , θ_{SX} . The nine
630 parameters of the scalar potential can be expressed in terms of the three physical
631 Higgs masses, the three mixing angles, and the three vacuum expectation values.

632 After fixing one of the Higgs masses to the mass of the observed Higgs boson, and
633 fixing the Higgs doublet vacuum expectation value to its Standard Model value, there
634 are seven remaining free parameters of the TRSM [7].

635 In one benchmark scenario of TRSM [7], the heaviest scalar state h_3 is identified
636 with the 125 GeV Higgs, h_{125} , and it can decay asymmetrically $h_{125} \rightarrow h_1 h_2$, which
637 we also denote $h \rightarrow a_1 a_2$ to highlight the similarity with the symmetric decay $h \rightarrow aa$
638 typically interpreted in 2HDM+S as discussed. The parameter values in TRSM are
639 chosen such that the couplings of h_3 to Standard Model particles are nearly identical
640 to the Standard Model predictions.

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

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

651 If the $h_2 \rightarrow h_1 h_1$ decay is kinematically closed (i.e. $M_2 < 2M_1$), both scalars decay
652 directly to Standard Model particles, with branching ratios identical to a Standard
653 Model-like Higgs boson, i.e. with the $b\bar{b}b\bar{b}$ final state dominating, as shown in Fig. 1.4

654 (*bottom left*), while at smaller masses, combinations with τ leptons and eventually
655 final states with charm quarks and muons become relevant [7].




Figure 1.4: Benchmark plane BP1 for benchmark scenario 1 from [7], 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.

656 **Chapter 2**

657 **The Large Hadron Collider and the**
658 **CMS Experiment**

659 This chapter introduces the key aspects of the CERN Large Hadron Collider (LHC)
660 and the Compact Muon Solenoid (CMS) experiment where the work for this thesis was
661 conducted. Section 2.1 describes the history of accelerator developments at CERN
662 that led to the construction of the LHC, the current LHC configuration, and the
663 largest experiments located at the LHC. The concepts of beam luminosity and pile-
664 up, which are critical for understanding and measuring high-energy particle collisions,
665 are described in Section 2.2 and discussed in the context of the High-Luminosity
666 LHC (HL-LHC) upgrade in Section 2.3. Lastly, Section 2.4 describes the design
667 and function of CMS and its subdetectors, and terminates in a description of data
668 processing at CMS, beginning from online event filtering in the Level-1 Trigger, to
669 processing in the High-Level Trigger, to offline particle reconstruction, and finally
670 long-term storage and processing of measured events.

671 2.1 The Large Hadron Collider

672 CERN, the European Organization for Nuclear Research, is an international organiza-
673 tion based in Meyrin, Switzerland which operates the world's largest particle physics
674 laboratory, and is the site of the Large Hadron Collider (LHC) [8]. The very first
675 accelerator built at CERN was the 600 MeV Synchrocyclotron (SC), which initially
676 provided beams for CERN's first experiments. The newer and more powerful Proton
677 Synchrotron (PS), which could accelerate particles to an energy of 28 GeV, began
678 operations in 1959 and is still in use today. The first hadron collider at CERN was
679 the Intersecting Storage Rings (ISR), which consisted of two interlaced rings each
680 with a diameter of 300 meters. The ISR collided protons at a center-of-mass energy
681 of 62 GeV and began measuring collisions in 1971. In 1968 CERN began to accel-
682 erate heavy ions in the Super Proton Synchrotron (SPS), which is 7 kilometers in
683 circumference and was the first of CERN's giant underground rings to be built. The
684 SPS became the forefront of CERN's particle physics program in 1976, and in 1981
685 was converted into a proton-antiproton collider. The final and largest underground
686 ring constructed at CERN was the Large Electron-Positron (LEP) collider, which
687 was commissioned in July 1989 and hosted 5176 magnets and 128 accelerating cav-
688 ities located around a 27-kilometer circumference. Over 11 years of research, four
689 detectors, ALEPH, DELPHI, L3, and OPAL measured the collisions, with collision
690 energies reaching up to 209 GeV in the year 2000. In November 2000, LEP was closed
691 down to make way for the construction of the LHC in the same tunnel.

692 In its current configuration, the LHC accelerator complex at CERN is a succession
693 of machines that accelerate particles in stages until they reach their final energy of 6.5
694 TeV per beam [9] [10]. In Linear Accelerator 4 (Linac4), negative hydrogen ions (hy-
695 drogen atoms with an additional electron) are accelerated to 160 MeV, and stripped
696 of their two electrons, leaving only protons, before entering the Proton Synchrotron
697 Booster (PSB). These protons are accelerated to 2 GeV, then to 26 GeV in the Proton

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

705 The beams of particles in the LHC are made to collide at a center-of-mass en-
706 ergy of up to 13.6 TeV, at four positions at particle detector experiments located
707 around the ring: ATLAS, CMS, ALICE, and LHCb. An aerial view of the four ma-
708 jor experiments' locations is shown in Fig. 2.1 [11]. ATLAS and CMS are the two
709 general-purpose detectors with broad physics programmes spanning Standard Model
710 measurements and searches for signatures of new physics [12] [13]. The two experi-
711 ments use different technical solutions and different magnet system designs. ALICE
712 is a general-purpose detector dedicated to measuring LHC heavy-ion collisions, and
713 is designed to address the physics of strongly interacting matter, and the properties
714 of quark-gluon plasma [14]. The LHCb experiment specializes in investigating CP vi-
715 olation through measuring the differences in matter and antimatter, by using a series
716 of subdetectors to detect mainly forward particles close to the beam direction [15].

717 **2.2 Luminosity and pile-up**

718 In order to search for rare processes, such as those resulting from a Higgs, W, or Z
719 boson, a large number of parton interactions per second are required at the LHC.
720 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) [11].

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 [16] [17]:

- 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,

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

737 Peak luminosity at interaction points 1 and 5 reach values of $\sim 1.0 \times 10^{34} \text{ cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$,
 738 with peak luminosity per bunch crossing reaching $\sim 3.56 \times 10^{30} \text{ cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ [18].

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

744 The interaction vertex corresponding to the hard scattering of the protons is called
 745 the primary interaction vertex, or primary vertex (PV). The LHC's nominal beam
 746 luminosities are sufficiently large for multiple proton-proton collisions to occur in the
 747 same time window in which proton bunches collide [19]. To measure a proton-proton
 748 collision, the primary vertices must be separated from overlapping collisions, called
 749 "pile-up" collisions.

750 The pile-up is defined as the average number of pp collisions per bunch crossing,
 751 and can be estimated from the inelastic pp cross-section of $\sigma_{\text{inel}} = 68.6$ millibarns at
 752 a center-of-mass energy of $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV [20]:

$$\text{Pile-up} = \frac{\mathcal{L} \times \sigma_{\text{inel}}}{n_b \cdot f} \sim 22 \quad (2.3)$$

753 A distribution of pile-up in the data-taking years 2016-2018 is shown in Fig. 2.2.




Figure 2.2: Distribution of the mean number of inelastic collisions per bunch crossing (pile-up) in data [19], 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, pile-up will reach unprecedented levels of up to 200 per bunch crossing [21].

These multiple collisions will lead to higher occupancies in the detector, and particles originating from the pile-up interactions can be confused with those originating from the primary vertex. Thus, higher luminosities create more intense pile-up conditions, posing a greater challenge to detector performance and particle reconstruction and identification.

2.3 The High-Luminosity LHC

The High-Luminosity LHC (HL-LHC) is a major upgrade of the LHC scheduled to take place in the late 2020s, that will increase the instantaneous luminosity by a factor of five beyond the original design value, and the integrated luminosity by a factor of ten [21]. This will be accomplished through accelerator technological advances: for instance, reduction of the interaction point β^* from 0.55 m down to 0.15

765 m by installation of new final-focusing magnets, and improvements in the geometric
766 luminosity loss factor $F \approx 1$ through the installation of crab cavities that optimize
767 the orientation of colliding bunches. A further discussion of the HL-LHC upgrades
768 for the CMS detector follows in Chapter 3.

769 2.4 The CMS detector

770 We give a brief overview of the Compact Muon Solenoid (CMS) experiment here
771 and discuss each of the subdetectors in more detail in the following sections. The
772 CMS experiment was conceived to study proton-proton and lead-lead collisions at a
773 center-of-mass energy of 14 TeV (5.5 TeV nucleon-nucleon) and at luminosities up
774 to $10^{34} \text{ cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ ($10^{27} \text{ cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$) [22] [23]. Starting from the beam interaction region
775 at the center of the CMS detector, particles first pass through a silicon pixel and
776 strip tracker, in which charged-particle trajectories (tracks) and origins (vertices)
777 are reconstructed from signals (hits) in the sensitive layers. The tracker, electro-
778 magnetic calorimeter (ECAL), and hadronic calorimeter (HCAL) are immersed in a
779 high-magnetic-field superconducting solenoid that bends the trajectories of charged
780 particles. After passing through the tracker, electrons and photons are then absorbed
781 in the electromagnetic calorimeter (ECAL) comprised of lead-tungstate scintillating-
782 crystals. The corresponding electromagnetic showers are detected as clusters of energy
783 recording in neighboring cells, from which the direction and energy of the particles can
784 be determined. Charged and neutral hadrons may initiate a hadronic shower in the
785 ECAL as well, which is then fully absorbed in the hadron calorimeter (HCAL). The
786 resulting clusters are used to estimate their direction and energies. Muons and neu-
787 trinos pass through the calorimeters with little to no interactions. Neutrinos escape
788 undetected; muons produce hits in additional gas-ionization chamber muon detectors
789 housed in the iron yoke of the flux-return. A sketch of example particle interactions

in a transverse slice of the CMS detector is shown in Fig. 2.3. The collision data is recorded with the use of the Level-1 (L1) trigger (discussed in greater detail in 2.5.5), the High-Level Trigger (HLT), and data acquisition systems ensuring high efficiency 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 [23].

CMS uses a right-handed coordinate system [22]. 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} .

804 2.5 Sub-detectors of CMS and data processing

805 This section details the sub-detectors of CMS that operate to identify and precisely
806 measure muons, electrons, photons, and jets over a large energy range. The sections
807 are ordered starting from the innermost sub-detectors closest to the beam interaction
808 area: the tracker, the electromagnetic and hadronic calorimeters, and the muon de-
809 tectors. The two-stage trigger system is described, starting with the hardware-based
810 Level-1 Trigger and followed by the software-based High-Level Trigger. Lastly, parti-
811 cle reconstruction and data storage and computational infrastructure are discussed.

812 2.5.1 Inner tracking system

813 The CMS Tracker performs robust tracking and detailed vertex reconstruction in the
814 4 T magnetic field of the superconducting solenoidal magnet. The primary sensors
815 used in the tracker are p^+ on n -bulk devices, which allow high voltage operation and
816 are radiation-resistant [24] [25]. The active envelope of the CMS Tracker extends
817 to a radius of 115 cm, over a length of approximately 270 cm on each side of the
818 interaction point [24]. Charged particles in the region $|\eta| \lesssim 1.6$ benefit from the full
819 momentum measurement precision. In this region, a charged particle with p_T of 1000
820 GeV has a sagitta of $\sim 195 \mu\text{m}$. The Tracker acceptance extends further to $|\eta| = 2.5$,
821 with a reduced radius of approximately 50 cm.

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

826 A schematic view of the current Phase-1 CMS tracker [26], including the pixel
827 detector, is shown in Fig. 2.4. The Phase-1 pixel detector consists of three barrel
828 layers (BPIX) at radii of 4.4 cm, 7.3 cm, and 10.2 cm, and two forward/backward disks

829 (FPIX) at longitudinal positions of ± 34.5 cm and ± 46.5 cm, and extending in radius
 830 from about 6 cm to 15 cm. These pixelated detectors produce 3D measurements along
 831 the paths of charged particles with single hit resolutions between 10-20 μm .




Figure 2.4: Cross section of the current Phase-1 CMS tracker [26]. Each line represents a detector module. Double lines indicate back-to-back modules which deliver two-dimensional (stereo) hits in the strip tracker.

832 After the pixel and on their way out of the tracker, particles pass through the
 833 silicon strip tracker which reaches out to a radius of 130 cm (Fig. 2.4). The sensor el-
 834 ements in the strip tracker are single-sided p -on- n type silicon micro-strip sensors [22].
 835 The silicon strip detector consists of four inner barrel (TIB) layers assembled in shells,
 836 with two inner endcaps (TID), each composed of three small discs. The outer barrel
 837 (TOB) consists of six concentric layers. Two endcaps (TEC) close off the tracker on
 838 either end.

839 2.5.2 ECAL

840 The electromagnetic calorimeter (ECAL) of CMS measures electromagnetic energy
 841 deposits with high granularity. One of the driving criteria in the design was the capa-
 842 bility of detecting the Standard Model Higgs boson decay to two photons (in fact, the
 843 channel in which the 125 GeV Higgs boson was discovered at CMS). ECAL is a her-
 844 metic homogeneous calorimeter comprised of 61,200 lead tungstate (PbWO_4) crystals

845 mounted in the central barrel, with 7,324 crystals in each of the two endcaps [22]. A
846 preshower detector is located in front of the endcap crystals. Avalanche photodiodes
847 (APDs) are used as photodetectors in the barrel and vacuum phototriodes (VPTs) in
848 the endcaps.

849 The design of the ECAL is driven by the behavior of high-energy electrons, which
850 predominantly lose energy in matter via bremsstrahlung, and high-energy photons
851 by e^+e^- pair production. The characteristic amount of matter traversed for these
852 interactions is the radiation length X^0 , usually measured in units of $\text{g} \cdot \text{cm}^{-2}$. The
853 radiation length is also the mean distance over which a high-energy electron loses all
854 but $1/e$ of its energy via bremsstrahlung [27]. Thus high granularity in η and ϕ , and
855 the length of the ECAL crystals, is designed to capture the shower of e/γ produced
856 by electrons and photons.

857 The barrel part of the ECAL (EB) covers the pseudorapidity range $|\eta| < 1.479$ [22].
858 The barrel granularity is 360-fold in ϕ and (2×85) -fold in η . The crystal cross-section
859 corresponds to approximately 0.0174×0.0174 in $\eta - \phi$ or $22 \times 22 \text{ mm}^2$ at the front
860 face of the crystal, and $26 \times 26 \text{ mm}^2$ at the rear face. The crystal length is 230 mm,
861 corresponding to $25.8 X_0$.

862 The ECAL read-out acquires the signals of the photodetectors [22]. At each bunch
863 crossing, digital sums representing the energy deposit in a trigger tower, comprising
864 5×5 crystals in $\eta \times \phi$, are generated and sent to the Level-1 trigger system (detailed
865 in Section 2.5.5).

866 2.5.3 HCAL

867 The hadronic calorimeter (HCAL) of CMS measures hadronic energy, which is key to
868 characterizing the presence of apparent missing transverse energy which could arise
869 from hadron jets and neutrinos or exotic particles [22]. A schematic of the components
870 of HCAL are shown in Fig. 2.5. The HCAL barrel (HB) and endcaps (HE) are located

outside of the tracker and the ECAL, spanning a radius of 1.77 m (outer extent of
 ECAL) up to 2.95 m (inner extent of the magnet coil). An outer hadron calorimeter
 (HO) is placed outside the solenoid to complement the barrel calorimeter. Beyond
 $|\eta| = 3$, the forward hadron calorimeter (HF) at 11.2 m from the interaction point
 extend the pseudorapidity coverage to $|\eta| = 5.2$.




Figure 2.5: Longitudinal view of the CMS detector showing the hadron calorimeter barrel (HB), endcap (HE), outer (HO), and forward (HF) calorimeters from [22].

The HB is a sampling calorimeter covering the pseudorapidity range $|\eta| < 1.3$ [22]. It consists of 36 identical azimuthal wedges which form two half-barrels (HB+ and HB-), with a segmentation of $(\Delta\eta, \Delta\phi) = (0.087, 0.087)$. The HE covers pseudorapidity $1.3 < |\eta| < 3$. The HB and endcap HE calorimeters are sampling calorimeters which use brass as the absorber and plastic scintillator as the active material. Light from the plastic scintillator is wavelength-shifted and captured in optic fibers which are read out by front-end electronics [28].

The HF is a Cherenkov calorimeter based on a steel absorber and quartz fibers which run longitudinally through the absorber and collect Cherenkov light, primarily from the electromagnetic component of showers developed in the calorimeter [28]. Photomultiplier tubes are used to collect light from the quartz fibers. The HF is designed to survive in the harsh radiation conditions and high particle flux of the

forward region. On average, 760 GeV per proton-proton interaction is deposited into the two forward calorimeters, compared to only 100 GeV for the rest of the detector [22]. Furthermore, this energy has a pronounced maximum at the highest rapidities.

2.5.4 Muon detectors

The CMS muon system is designed to have the capability of reconstructing the momentum and charge of muons over the kinematic range of the LHC, since muons are a powerful handle on signatures of interesting processes over the high background rate of the LHC [22]. For instance, the decay of the Standard Model Higgs boson into ZZ , which in turn decay to 4 leptons, can be reconstructed with high 4-particle mass resolution if all the leptons are muons, since muons are less affected than electrons by radiative losses in the tracker material.

The muon system consists of a cylindrical barrel section and two planar endcap regions [22]. The barrel muon detector consists of drift tube (DT) chambers covering the pseudorapidity region $|\eta| < 1.2$ (Fig. 2.6). The DTs can be used as tracking detectors due to the barrel region's characteristic low neutron-induced backgrounds, low muon rate, and relatively uniform 4T magnetic field contained in the steel yoke.

In the two endcap regions, the muon rates and background levels are high and the magnetic field is large and non-uniform [22]. Here, the muon system uses cathode strip chambers (CSCs) to identify muons between $0.9 < |\eta| < 2.4$. The cathode strips of each chamber run radially outwards and provide a precision measurement in the $r - \phi$ bending plane. The anode wires run approximately perpendicular to the strips and are read out in order to measure η and the beam-crossing time of a muon.

In addition to the DT and CSC, a dedicated trigger system consisting of resistive plate chambers (RPCs) in the barrel and endcap regions provides a fast, independent, and highly-segmented trigger with a sharp p_T threshold over a large portion of the




Figure 2.6: Layout of the CMS barrel muon drift tube (DT) chambers in one of the five wheels from [22]. 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).

914 pseudorapidity range ($|\eta| < 1.6$) of the muon system [22]. RPCs have good time
 915 resolution but coarser position resolution compared to the DTs or CSCs. The RPCs
 916 also play a role in resolving ambiguities in reconstructing tracks from multiple hits in
 917 a chamber.

918 2.5.5 The Level-1 Trigger

919 The design performance of the LHC corresponds to an instantaneous luminosity of
 920 $10^{34} \text{ cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ with a 25 ns bunch crossing rate, giving an average pile-up (number of
 921 simultaneous events) of 25 per bunch crossing [29]. However, during Run 2, in 2017
 922 and 2018 the LHC was able to surpass this goal with a mean number of 32 inter-

actions per bunch crossing, and reaching over 50 interactions in short periods (Fig. 2.2). The large number of events from inelastic collisions (minimum bias events) per bunch crossing, combined with the small cross-sections of possible physics discovery signatures, necessitates a sophisticated event selection system for filtering this large event rate, as it is impossible to save all events. This data filtering system is implemented by CMS in two stages. The first stage is the Level-1 (L1) Trigger, which is deployed in custom electronic hardware systems and is responsible for reducing the event rate to around 100 kHz. The second stage is the High-Level Trigger (HLT) which is described in Section 2.5.6. This section describes the Phase-1 configuration of the Level-1 Trigger.

The L1 Trigger data flow of Phase-1 is shown in Fig. 2.7 [29], with organization into the L1 calorimeter trigger, the L1 muon trigger, and the L1 Global Trigger (GT).




Figure 2.7: Dataflow for the Phase-1 Level-1 Trigger [29], 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.

The L1 calorimeter trigger begins with trigger tower energy sums formed by the

936 ECAL, HCAL, and HF Trigger Primitive Generator (TPG) circuits from the individual calorimeter cell energies. In the original configuration, the ECAL energies
937 were accompanied by a bit indicating the transverse extent of the electromagnetic
938 energy deposits, and the HCAL energies were accompanied by a bit indicating the
939 presence of minimum ionizing energy [30]. During Long Shutdowns 1 and 2 (LS1
940 and LS2), HF was upgraded to provide finer granularity information to the trigger,
941 and the HCAL barrel and endcap front-end electronics were upgraded to provide
942 high-precision timing information and depth segmentation information.

944 In the original design of the L1 calorimeter trigger, the trigger primitives are
945 processed by the Regional Calorimeter Trigger (RCT) which finds isolated and non-
946 isolated electron/photon candidates [29]. At this stage, electron/photon candidates
947 are treated together since they cannot be definitively distinguished at this stage due
948 to a lack of tracking information in the L1 trigger. The Global Calorimeter Trigger
949 (GCT) sorts further the candidate electrons/photons, finds jets (classified as central,
950 forward, and tau) using the E_T sums and performs calibration of the clustered jet
951 energies, and calculates global quantities such as missing E_T . It sends the top four
952 candidates of each type to the Global Trigger [29].

953 During LS2 and before Run-2, the legacy calorimeter trigger was upgraded to be
954 more flexible, maintainable, and performant [31] [32] [33]. These upgrades included
955 the replacement of legacy VME-based electronics with the MicroTCA (μ TCA) mod-
956 ern telecommunication standard, and system-wide usage of the latest generation of
957 FPGAs, Xilinx Virtex 7. Parallel copper links were replaced in almost all cases with
958 serial optical links, allowing link speeds to increase from 1 Gb/s to 10 Gb/s [31]. A
959 schematic of the current calorimeter trigger is shown in Fig. 2.8. The calorimeter
960 Layer-1 is implemented in 18 Calorimeter Trigger Processor (CTP7) boards, with
961 each card spanning 4 out of 72 towers in ϕ and all of η . Tower-level operations are
962 performed in Layer-1, such as the sum of ECAL and HCAL energies, energy calibra-

963 tion, and the computation of the ratio of HCAL to ECAL energies. The Layer-1 cards
 964 each transmit 48 output links at 10 Gb/s to the nine Layer-2 Master Processor cards
 965 (MP7) cards, which host calorimeter algorithms that find particle candidates and
 966 compute global energy sums. Each MP7 takes 72 input links and has access to the
 967 whole event at trigger tower granularity, such that the algorithms are fully pipelined
 968 and start processing as soon as the minimum amount of data is received. The trigger
 969 candidates are sent to a demultiplexer board (Demux), also a MP7, which formats
 970 the data for the upgraded Global Trigger, also called the microGT (μ GT).




Figure 2.8: Schematic of the calorimeter trigger after Long Shutdown 2 [31]. The Layer-1 calorimeter trigger is implemented in CTP7 cards, which send time-multiplexed outputs to the Layer-2 MP7 cards. The Layer-2 cards handle the data in a round-robin style and the outputs are de-multiplexed, producing one output data stream to the Global Trigger.

971 Each of the L1 muon triggers has its own trigger logic [30]. The RPC strips are
 972 connected to a Pattern Comparator Trigger (PACT), which forms trigger segments
 973 that are used to build tracks and calculate p_T . The RPC logic also provides some
 974 hit data to the CSC trigger system to resolve ambiguities caused by two muons in

975 the same CSC. The CSCs form local charged tracks (LCTs) from the cathode strips,
976 which are combined with the anode wire information. LCTs are combined into full
977 muon tracks and assigned p_T values.

978 The Global Muon Trigger (GMT) sorts the RPC, DT, and CSC muon tracks,
979 converts these tracks to the same η , ϕ , and p_T scale, and validates the muon sign [30].
980 It improves the trigger efficiency by merging muon candidates that were detected
981 in two complementary sub-systems (i.e. DT+RPC, or CSC+RPC). The GMT also
982 contains logic to correlate the found muon tracks with an $\eta-\phi$ grid of quiet calorimeter
983 towers to determine if the muons are isolated, as well as logic to remove duplicate
984 candidates originating in the overlap regions from both DT and CSC systems. The
985 final collection of muons is sorted based on their initial quality, correlation, and p_T ,
986 and the top four muons are sent to the Global Trigger [30].

987 The Global Trigger (GT) receives information from the Demux and GMT, and
988 makes the Level-1 Accept (L1A) decision to either discard or accept the bunch cross-
989 ing [30]. This is accomplished by sorting ranked trigger objects that are accompanied
990 by positional information in η and ϕ , permitting the trigger to apply criteria with
991 thresholds that can vary based on the location of the trigger objects, and/or to re-
992 quire trigger objects to be close to or opposite from each other. The GT L1A decision
993 arrives at the detector front end with a $3.8\ \mu\text{s}$ latency after the interaction at a rate
994 which is required to be less than 100 kHz, and triggers a full readout of the detector
995 for further processing.

996 2.5.6 The High-Level Trigger

997 The HLT is implemented in software running on a large computer farm of fast com-
998 mercial processors [34] [35]. The algorithms in HLT have access to full data from
999 all CMS sub-detectors, including the tracker, with full granularity and resolution.
1000 The HLT reconstruction software is similar to what is used offline for full CMS data

analysis. As a result, the HLT can calculate quantities with a resolution comparable to the final detector resolution, compared to the L1 Trigger. The HLT performs more computationally-intensive algorithms, such as combining tau-jet candidates in the calorimeter with high- p_T stubs in the tracker, to form a hadronic tau trigger. The maximum HLT input rate from the L1 Trigger is 100 kHz, and the HLT output rate is approximately 100 Hz.

The HLT contains trigger paths, each corresponding to a dedicated trigger [36]. A path consists of several steps implemented as software modules. Each HLT trigger path must be seeded by one or more L1 trigger bits: the first module always looks for a L1 seed, consisting of L1 bit(s) and L1 object(s). Each module performs a well-defined task such as unpacking (raw to digitized quantities), reconstruction of physics objects (electrons, muons, jet, missing transverse energy, etc.), making intermediate decisions that trigger more detailed reconstruction modules, and calculating the final decision for the trigger path. If an intermediate filter decision is negative, the rest of the path is not executed, and the trigger rejects the event.

2.5.7 Particle reconstruction

To build a description of the physics objects present in the particle collision, the basic elements from the detector layers (tracks and clusters of energy) are correlated to identify each particle in the final state. Measurements from different sub-detectors are combined to reconstruct the particle properties. This approach is called particle-flow (PF) reconstruction [23]. Key to the success of the PF reconstruction is the fine spatial granularity of the detector layers. Coarse-grained detectors can cause the signals from different particles to merge, especially within jets. However, if the subdetectors are sufficiently segmented to separate individual particles, it becomes possible to produce a global event description that identifies all physics objects with high efficiencies and resolution.

1027 2.5.8 Data storage and computational infrastructure

1028 The LHC generates over 15 petabytes (15 million gigabytes) of data every year, neces-
1029 sitating a flexible computing system that can be accessed by researchers working at
1030 the four main LHC experiments: ALICE, ATLAS, CMS, and LHCb. The Worldwide
1031 LHC Computing Grid (WLCG) [37] is a global collaboration of computer centers that
1032 links thousands of computers and storage systems in over 170 centers across 41 coun-
1033 tries. These centers are arranged in “tiers”, and provide near real-time access to users
1034 processing, analyzing, and storing LHC data. One of the final stages of data analy-
1035 sis at LHC experiments is large-scale data processing taking place over distributing
1036 computing, for instance, with the use of Condor [38], a distributed, scalable, flexible
1037 batch processing system which accepts a computing job, allocates a resource to it,
1038 executes it, and returns the result back to a user transparently.

1039 **Chapter 3**

1040 **The Phase-2 Upgrade of CMS**

1041 This chapter gives an overview of the High-Luminosity LHC upgrade of the LHC in
1042 Section 3.1, and the upgrades for the Phase-2 CMS Level-1 (L1) Trigger in Section
1043 3.2. One of the major upgrades is the new availability of calorimeter crystal-level
1044 information to the L1 calorimeter trigger, compared to the current trigger which only
1045 has access to tower-level information (a tower being 5 by 5 in crystals). To capitalize
1046 on the increased spatial granularity of this information, an upgraded algorithm is
1047 presented which reconstructs and identifies electron and photon candidates in the
1048 Layer-1 Calorimeter Trigger. A description of the algorithm and a validation of its
1049 performance in Phase-2 conditions is given in Section 3.3.

1050 **3.1 The High-Luminosity LHC**

1051 In order to sustain and extend the LHC’s physics discovery program and maintain
1052 operability for a decade or more, the LHC is undergoing a major upgrade to the High-
1053 Luminosity LHC (HL-LHC). In its final configuration, the HL-LHC will deliver a peak
1054 luminosity of $7.5 \times 10^{34} \text{ cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$, potentially leading to total integrated luminosity
1055 of 4000 fb^{-1} after ten years of operations, scheduled to begin in 2027 [39]. This
1056 integrated luminosity is about ten times the predicted luminosity reach of the LHC

in its initial configuration. To enable the CMS experiment to continue operations and data-taking and to maximize the discovery potential of the unprecedented amount of data, the CMS detector is undergoing Phase-2 upgrades in order to perform high-precision measurements and searches for physics beyond the Standard Model in the intense running conditions of the HL-LHC.

3.2 The Phase-2 Level-1 Trigger

To achieve the goals of the HL-LHC program and to ensure the collection of information-rich datasets in the HL-LHC, the Phase-2 upgrade of the CMS Level-1 Trigger [39] must be upgraded in conjunction with the CMS sub-detectors and their readouts, to maintain physics selectivity. The HL-LHC will produce an intense hadronic environment corresponding to 200 simultaneous collisions per beam crossing, necessitating comprehensive upgrades of the trigger system outlined below.

In order to cope with the increased pile-up and high occupancies of the HL-LHC, the latency of the L1 trigger system (time available to produce a L1 Accept signal) will be increased significantly from $3.8 \mu\text{s}$ to $12.5 \mu\text{s}$, with an increased maximum output bandwidth of 750 kHz [39]. With the increased latency, in addition to information from calorimeters and muon detectors (as in the Phase-1 system), information from the new tracker and high-granularity endcap calorimeter can also be included at L1 for the first time. This is illustrated in the functional diagram of the architecture of the Phase-2 trigger system in Fig. 3.1.

The key feature of the Phase-2 L1 Trigger is the introduction of a correlator layer, where algorithms produce higher-level trigger objects by combining information from sub-detectors, with a selectivity approaching that of offline reconstruction in the HLT [39]. Four independent data processing paths (grouped together in Fig. 3.1) are implemented: tracking, calorimetry, muon systems, and particle-flow techniques:




Figure 3.1: Functional diagram of the CMS L1 Phase-2 upgraded trigger design [39], 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.

- **Calorimeter Trigger path:** (red, Fig. 3.1) A barrel calorimeter trigger (BCT) and the HGCAL backend are used to process crystal-level information from the calorimeters to produce high-resolution clusters and identification variables used for later processing. Outputs from the BCT, HGCAL, and the HF are sent to a global calorimeter trigger (GCT), where calorimeter-only objects such as e/γ candidates, hadronically decaying tau lepton candidates, jets, and energy sums are built.
- **Track Trigger path:** (green, Fig. 3.1) Tracks from the Outer Tracker are reconstructed in the track finder (TF) processors as part of the detector backend. A global track trigger (GTT) will reconstruct the primary vertices of the event, along with tracker-only based objects, such as jets and missing transverse momentum.

- **Muon Trigger path:** (*blue*, Fig. 3.1) Trigger primitives are processed by muon track finder algorithms, again separated into the barrel (barrel muon track finder, BMTF), overlap (overlap muon track finder, OMTF), and endcap (endcap muon track finder, EMTF). Standalone muons and stubs containing information such as position, bend angle, and timing, as well as L1 tracks, are sent to the global muon trigger (GMT).
- **Particle-Flow Trigger path:** (*yellow*, Fig. 3.1) The correlator trigger (CT) aims to approach the performance of offline Particle Flow, and is implemented in two layers. “Layer-1” produces the particle-flow candidates from matching calorimeter clusters and tracks. “Layer 2” builds and sorts final trigger objects and applies additional identification and isolation criteria.

The outputs from the above trigger paths are combined in the Global Trigger (GT) (*purple*, Fig. 3.1), which calculates the final trigger decision (Level-1 Accept), transmitting it to the Trigger Control and Distribution System (TCDS), which distributes it to the detector backend systems, initiating the readout to the DAQ. The GT also provides the interface to external triggers (*grey*, Fig. 3.1), such as triggers for the precision proton spectrometer (PPS), beam position and timing monitors (BPTX), and luminosity and beam monitoring (BRIL) detectors [39]. The design of the Phase-2 Level-1 Trigger allows for future inclusion of triggering information, for instance information about minimum ionizing particles (MIPs) from the MIP Timing Detector (MTD) [40].

1115 3.3 Standalone barrel calorimeter electron/photon 1116 reconstruction

1117 The reconstruction and identification of electrons and photons (e/γ) begin with the
1118 trigger primitives of the barrel ECAL and HCAL detectors and endcap HGCAL
1119 calorimeters, covering the pseudorapidity region $|\eta| < 3$. The barrel and endcap re-
1120 gions of the detector are intrinsically different enough to warrant different approaches
1121 to e/γ reconstruction. This work presents a firmware-based emulator for the stan-
1122 dalone e/γ reconstruction in the barrel calorimeter (Fig. 3.2). “Standalone” refers
1123 to the fact that the tracker information is not used in this particular reconstruction
1124 chain. This firmware-based emulator is based on the parallelized, computational logic
1125 that will be deployed in the firmware of the Phase-2 Level-1 trigger. The emulator
1126 uses fixed-precision integers to represent all values, such as in the computation of clus-
1127 ter energies, and closely mimics the firmware logic which uses arrays and performs
1128 computations in flattened loops. It represents an improved, more realistic under-
1129 standing of the trigger, compared to the previous emulator which used idealized logic
1130 such as vector operations, and floats to represent all values [39].

1131 3.3.1 Electron/photon standalone barrel procedure

1132 In Phase-2, the upgrade of both on-detector and off-detector electronics of the barrel
1133 calorimeters’ trigger primitive generator (TPG) will enable the streaming of single
1134 crystal data from the on-detector to the backend electronics. Currently in Phase-1,
1135 the ECAL and HCAL TPGs are restricted to providing lower-granularity information
1136 of trigger tower sums of 5×5 crystals to the Level-1 Trigger [39]. A schematic of the
1137 geometry of the ECAL barrel in the Phase-2 Regional Calorimeter Trigger (RCT) is
1138 shown in Fig. 3.3. The barrel is spanned by 36 RCT cards, each spanning 17×4
1139 towers in $\eta \times \phi$. Each RCT card is subdivided into five “regions” as shown in Fig.




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 [39], 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.

1140 3.4. After initial clustering and processing, the outputs of the RCT card are sent to
 1141 the Global Calorimeter (GCT) trigger, which is processed in three cards as shown in
 1142 Fig. 3.5. The reconstruction algorithm is detailed below.

1143 The standalone barrel algorithm for reconstructing and identifying electrons and
 1144 photons in the Phase-2 Level-1 Trigger takes as input the digitized response of each
 1145 crystal of the barrel ECAL, with a granularity 0.0175×0.0175 in $\eta \times \phi$, which is 25
 1146 times higher than the input to the Phase-1 trigger, which consisted of trigger towers
 1147 with a granularity of 0.0875×0.0875 . In HCAL the tower size of 0.0875×0.0875
 1148 is unchanged. The trigger algorithm is designed to closely reproduce the algorithm
 1149 used in the offline reconstruction, with limitations and simplifications due to trigger
 1150 latency.

1151 In the RCT, an initial requirement of $p_T > 0.5$ GeV is imposed on the input




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.

trigger primitives (i.e. energies from the ECAL crystals and HCAL towers) to reject contribution from pile-up. In one of the regions inside a RCT card (Fig. 3.4), the crystal containing the highest energy deposit is identified as the seed crystal, as shown in Fig. 3.6. The energy in the crystals in a window of size 3×5 in $\eta \times \phi$ around the seed cluster is added into a cluster. The energy is considered “clustered”. The process is repeated with the remaining “unclustered” energy, until up to four clusters are produced in the region.

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

- Shower shape: The energy deposit sums around the seed crystal are computed in windows of size 2×5 and 5×5 (Fig. 3.6, *dashed lines*), with true e/γ clusters




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


1163 tending to produce showers that deposit most of their energy in a 2×5 region.

- 1164 • Bremsstrahlung recovery: e/γ tend to spread in the ϕ direction due to charged
1165 particles being bent by the magnetic field of the CMS solenoid. If sufficient
1166 energy comparable to the core 3×5 cluster is found in the adjacent 3×5
1167 windows (Fig. 3.6, *shaded yellow*), the energy is added to the core cluster and
1168 no longer considered unclustered energy.

1169 After parallel processing in the regions, the clusters in a RCT card are stitched
1170 together if they are located directly along the borders of a region (Fig. 3.3). The
1171 remaining unclustered ECAL energy is summed into ECAL towers.

1172 From each RCT card, the twelve highest-energy clusters, as well as any remaining
1173 unclustered energy, are sent to the GCT. Since each GCT card has information from
1174 sixteen RCT cards (Fig. 3.5), final stitching across the boundaries of the RCT cards
1175 is performed. One more identification algorithm is performed at this stage:

GCT/“Layer 2”

 : one GCT card

 : area that is unique to the GCT card




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 GCT cards (*purple borders*). Each card in the GCT processes the equivalent of sixteen RCT cards, with the center twelve RCT cards being unique to that GCT card (*shaded pink*), and the remaining four RCT cards overlapping with one other GCT card.

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

Flags that provide discrimination power between genuine e/γ and background, are computed using the relative isolation and shower shape quantities. The standalone working point (WP) is defined as the logical OR of the relative isolation and shower shape flags.

The information of the clusters in the event, including their energies, crystal-level position, the relative isolation flag, the shower shape flag, the standalone WP, and the ratio of the HCAL over ECAL energies, are sent in 64 bits to the Correlator Trigger and the Global Trigger. The towers in the event are computed as the sum of all unclustered energy in the ECAL with the corresponding HCAL energy at each

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 (3×4 towers) in $\eta \times \phi$. 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*). The presence of energy lost to bremsstrahlung radiation is checked in the adjacent 3×5 windows in the ϕ direction (*shaded light yellow*). The ratio of the total energies in windows of size 2×5 and 5×5 in crystals (*dashed dark blue and dark red*) around the seed crystal, is computed and compared to the core cluster energy to obtain shower shape flags. Lastly, the isolation, defined as the sum of the energy in a large window of size 7×7 in towers (not shown in figure) is computed, and compared to the core cluster energy to obtain isolation flags.

¹¹⁹⁰ tower location, and their energies are sent to the Correlator Trigger.

¹¹⁹¹ 3.3.2 Electron/photon standalone barrel results

¹¹⁹² The performance of the current emulator of the standalone barrel e/γ algorithm in
¹¹⁹³ Phase-2 conditions is quantified in efficiencies and rates. Efficiency is the fraction of
¹¹⁹⁴ true electrons that the algorithm can reconstruct and identify, and is evaluated in
¹¹⁹⁵ a Monte Carlo simulated sample containing electrons with transverse momentum p_T
¹¹⁹⁶ ranging from 1 to 100 GeV. The efficiencies of the current and previous emulators as

1197 a function of the electron generator-level p_T are shown in Fig. 3.7.

1198 The rates are the event rates that this reconstruction and identification algorithm
1199 would obtain if it were deployed in a trigger, assuming that proton-proton collisions
1200 are occurring at the 40 MHz event rate of the HL-LHC. The rate is reported as a
1201 function of the minimum energy threshold required by the trigger, and is estimated
1202 using a simulated sample of minimum bias events, i.e. generic proton-proton colli-
1203 sions without any specific physics selections. The rates for the current and previous
1204 emulators are shown in Fig. 3.8.




Figure 3.7: Efficiencies of the current and previous emulators of the standalone barrel e/γ algorithm for the Phase-2 Level-1 Trigger, evaluated in a simulated sample containing electrons, as a function of the electron's generator-level transverse momentum p_T . The standalone working point (WP) is defined as the logical OR of the isolation flag and shower shape flag. The efficiencies with and without requiring the standalone WP, are shown for the current emulator (labeled “Phase 2”, *black, red*) and the previous emulator (labeled “TDR”, *dark blue, grey*).

1205 The current emulator is incorporated into the full Phase-2 L1 menu, allowing an
1206 estimate of the rates produced by the standalone e/γ barrel trigger path and all
1207 other algorithms in the L1 Trigger. All rates are estimated with the assumption of
1208 an average pile-up of 200 and event rate of 40 MHz. The standalone working point
1209 single e/γ path with requirements on the e/γ candidate to have $|\eta| < 2.4$, offline p_T
1210 to be greater than 51 GeV, and online p_T to be greater than 41 GeV, is projected to
1211 have a rate of around 23 kHz. The standalone working point double e/γ path with
1212 requirements on the two e/γ candidates to have $|\eta| < 2.4$, offline p_T greater than 37
1213 and 24 GeV, and online p_T greater than 29 and 18 GeV, is projected to give a rate
1214 of around 6 kHz. For both paths, the objects' efficiencies plateau at 99%.




Figure 3.8: Rates in kHz of the current Phase-2 and previous (“TDR”) emulators of the standalone barrel e/γ algorithm for the Phase-2 Level-1 Trigger, evaluated on a minimum bias (MinBias) sample with 200 pile-up (PU), measured as a function of the minimum energy (E_T) required of the reconstructed e/γ object in each event. The standalone working point (standalone WP) is defined to be the logical OR of the isolation flag and the shower shape flag. The rates with and without requiring the standalone WP, are shown for the current emulator (labeled “Phase 2”, *black, red*) and the previous emulator (labeled “TDR”, *dark blue, grey*).

1215 **Chapter 4**

1216 **Datasets and Monte Carlo samples**

1217 This search for the exotic decay of the 125 GeV Higgs boson to two light neutral scalars
1218 decaying to a pair of bottom quarks and a pair of tau leptons ($h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow bb\tau\tau$) is
1219 based on proton-proton collision data at a center-of-mass energy 13 TeV collected
1220 in Run-2 of data-taking, spanning the data-taking years 2016, 2017, and 2018. The
1221 datasets used and the triggers used to collect the data are described in Section 4.1.
1222 Section 4.2 describes the Monte Carlo simulated samples that are used to model the
1223 $h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow bb\tau\tau$ signal and background Standard Model processes. Lastly, in order
1224 to obtain a better description of Standard Model backgrounds that contain two tau
1225 leptons, a data-Monte Carlo hybrid technique is used to generate embedded samples
1226 which model processes with genuine $\tau\tau$ in the final state, as detailed in Section 4.3.
1227 All samples are listed in Appendix A.

1228 **4.1 Datasets used**

1229 The $h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow bb\tau\tau$ analysis [41] is based on proton-proton collision data at a center-
1230 of-mass energy of 13 TeV collected in full Run-2 (2016-18) with the CMS detector.
1231 The data analyzed corresponds to a total integrated luminosity of 138 fb^{-1} (36.33 fb^{-1}
1232 for 2016, 41.53 fb^{-1} for 2017, and 59.74 fb^{-1} for 2018) [42] [43] [44]. The cumulative

1233 delivered and recorded luminosity versus time for 2015-2018 is shown in Fig. 4.1.




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 [45].

1234 Data collected with the single muon trigger is used for the $\mu\tau_h$ channel. For the
1235 $e\tau_h$ channel, data collected with the single electron trigger is used; and for the $e\mu$
1236 channel, data collected with the electron + muon trigger is used. A more in-depth
1237 discussion of the triggers used follows in a later section. The datasets are listed in
1238 Appendix A in Tables A.1, A.2, and A.3.

1239 4.2 Monte Carlo samples

1240 Modeling and computing observables originating from arbitrary physics processes at
1241 the tree level and at next-to-leading order (NLO) is performed by Monte Carlo (MC)
1242 event generators, such as Powheg and MadGraph5_amCNLO [46] [47]. The informa-
1243 tion generated, e.g. the computation of the differential cross sections and kinematics
1244 of the final state particles, is saved in a compressed file and used to generate MC sam-
1245 ples that are used in physics analyses. The samples are digitized using GEANT4 [48],
1246 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 MC background samples used in this analysis for 2016-2018 are listed in Appendix A in Tables A.7, A.8, and A.9.

The Monte Carlo samples for modeling the signal ($h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow 2b2\tau$) are generated at tree-level, for mass hypotheses of the a ranging from $m_a = 12$ GeV to 60 GeV. The MC signal samples used in this analysis for 2016-2018 are listed in Appendix A in Tables A.10, A.11 and A.12.

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 $\tau\tau$ [49]. 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) [50] [51].

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 [49]. The simulation must be tuned extensively to accurately model aspects of the data, such as time-dependent pile-up profiles, the production of additional jets, e.g. in multijet and vector boson fusion topologies, the number of reconstructed primary interaction vertices, and the missing transverse momentum p_T^{miss} . Since all events with genuine $\tau\tau$ are estimated with samples made with the embedded technique (referred to as embedded samples from here on), events in Monte Carlo simulation with genuine $\tau\tau$

1272 are not used, in order to avoid double-counting.

1273 Fig. 4.2 shows a schematic of how embedded samples are produced. Data events
1274 containing $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ decays are selected. In these events, all energy deposits of the
1275 recorded muons are removed, and are replaced with simulated tau leptons with the
1276 same kinematic properties as the removed muons. This results in a hybrid data format
1277 containing information from both observed and simulated events, as illustrated in Fig.
1278 4.2 [49]. The embedded samples used for the years 2016-2018 are listed in Appendix
1279 A in Tables A.4, A.5, and A.6.




Figure 4.2: Schematic view of the four main steps of the embedding technique for τ leptons, as described in Section 4.3 [49]. 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).

1280 In the selection step of the embedded technique, events are selected with at least
1281 one of a set of di-muon trigger paths, which require $p_T > 17(8)$ GeV for the leading
1282 (sub-leading) muons, and a minimum requirement between 3.8 and 8.0 GeV on the

invariant di-muon mass $m_{\mu\mu}$ [49]. 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 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 [49]. $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ 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.

Fraction (%)			
Process	Inclusive	$m_{\mu\mu} > 70$ 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 [49], before additional cuts (i.e. inclusive, *column 2*), and after adding a requirement on the di-muon mass $m_{\mu\mu} > 70$ GeV (*column 3*), or a requirement on the number of b-tag jets in the event (*column 4*).

1298 **Chapter 5**

1299 **Object reconstruction and**
1300 **corrections applied**

1301 In the data processing workflow, data events and simulated events are analyzed to
1302 reconstruct physics objects of interest, and algorithms for distinguishing genuine par-
1303 ticle candidates from background, are employed. Section 5.1 describes the physical
1304 properties of the most important objects in the $h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow bb\tau\tau$ analysis: taus,
1305 muons, electrons, jets, and jets originating from b-quarks (b-flavor jets), as well as
1306 their reconstruction and identification in CMS. In this analysis, the full energy and
1307 momentum of the two tau leptons ($m_{\tau\tau}$) are estimated from the measured (i.e. vis-
1308 ible) components of the tau leptons using the SVFit/FastMTT algorithm, which is
1309 described in Section 5.2. Corrections are applied to the simulated samples at the ob-
1310 ject level and the event level to account for known discrepancies between simulations
1311 and the data that the simulations are intended to model. These corrections are listed
1312 and detailed in Section 5.3.

₁₃₁₃ **5.1 Object reconstruction**

₁₃₁₄ **5.1.1 Taus**

₁₃₁₅ The tau (τ) is the heaviest known lepton. With a rest mass of 1776.86 MeV, it can
₁₃₁₆ decay to not only electrons and muons, but also hadrons. In two thirds of the cases, τ
₁₃₁₇ leptons decay hadronically, typically into one or three charged mesons (predominantly
₁₃₁₈ π^+ , π^-), often accompanied by neutral pions (that decay $\pi^0 \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$), and a ν_τ . These
₁₃₁₉ hadronic decays are denoted τ_h . In the remaining cases, the tau decays to the lighter
₁₃₂₀ leptons (electron or muon), termed leptonic decays. The mean lifetime of the τ is
₁₃₂₁ $\tau = 290 \times 10^{-15}$ seconds, corresponding to $c\tau = 87.03 \mu\text{m}$, which is short enough that
₁₃₂₂ taus decay in the CMS detector before reaching the detector elements, but also long
₁₃₂₃ enough that some decay length variables can help with hadronic tau identification.
₁₃₂₄ The tau's largest decay branching ratios (proportional to probability of decay) are
₁₃₂₅ listed below [27]:

- ₁₃₂₆ • 17.8% decay to $e^- \bar{\nu}_e \nu_\tau$
- ₁₃₂₇ • 17.4% decay to $\mu^- \bar{\nu}_\mu \nu_\tau$
- ₁₃₂₈ • 25.5% decay to $\pi^- \pi^0 \nu_\tau$ (ρ^- resonance at 770 MeV)
- ₁₃₂₉ • 10.8% decay to $\pi^- \nu_\tau$
- ₁₃₃₀ • 9.3% decay to $\pi^- \pi^0 \pi^0 \nu_\tau$ (a_1^- resonance at 1200 MeV)
- ₁₃₃₁ • 9.0% decay to $\pi^- \pi^- \pi^+ \nu_\tau$ (a_1^- resonance at 1200 MeV)

₁₃₃₂ In all cases, at least one neutrino is produced. The neutrinos escape undetected
₁₃₃₃ from the CMS detector, resulting in missing transverse energy. Charged hadrons leave
₁₃₃₄ tracks in the tracking detector before being absorbed in the hadronic calorimeter; in
₁₃₃₅ CMS tau reconstruction terminology, they are often called “prongs”, i.e. the dominant

1336 τ_h decay modes are termed “1 prong” (π^\pm), “1 prong + π^0 (s)”, and “3-prong”. Neutral
1337 pions decay to two photons which lose their energy in the electromagnetic calorimeter.
1338 Taus that decay to electrons and muons, are typically triggered on and reconstructed
1339 as electrons and muons respectively.

1340 **Hadron plus strips (HPS) reconstruction of τ_h**

1341 At CMS, hadronically decaying tau leptons are reconstructed with the hadron plus
1342 strips (HPS) algorithm [52] [53]. The HPS algorithm capitalizes on photon conversions
1343 in the CMS tracker material, which originate from the neutral pion (π^0) decaying
1344 to two photons. The bending of electron/positron tracks due to the CMS solenoid
1345 magnetic field leads to a spread of the neutral pions’ calorimeter signatures in the ϕ
1346 direction. This motivates the reconstruction of photons in “strips”: objects that are
1347 built out of PF photons and electrons. The strip reconstruction starts with centering
1348 a strip on the most energetic electromagnetic particle in a PF jet. Among other
1349 electromagnetic particles located in a window of size $\Delta\eta = 0.05$ and $\Delta\phi = 0.20$
1350 around the strip center, the most energetic one is associated with the strip and its
1351 momentum is added to the strip momentum. This is repeated iteratively until no
1352 further particles can be associated. Lastly, strips satisfying a requirement of $p_T^{\text{strip}} > 1$
1353 GeV are combined with charged hadrons to reconstruct individual τ_h decay modes,
1354 where h stands for both π and K :

- 1355 • *Single hadron:* $h^- \nu_\tau$ and $h^- \pi^0 \nu_\tau$ decay modes, in which the neutral pions have
1356 too little energy to be reconstructed as strips.
- 1357 • *One hadron + one strip:* $h^- \pi^0 \nu_\tau$ decay modes, where the photons from the π^0
1358 decay are close together in the calorimeter.
- 1359 • *One hadron + two strips:* $h^- \pi^0 \nu_\tau$ decay modes, where the photons from the π^0
1360 decay are well separated.

- 1361 • *Three hadrons:* $h^- h^+ h^- \nu_\tau$ decay modes. The three charged hadrons are re-
1362 quired to originate from the same secondary vertex.

1363 The $h^- \pi^0 \pi^0 \nu_\tau$ and $h^- h^+ h^- \pi^0 \nu_\tau$ decay modes do not have their own treatment, and
1364 are reconstructed with the above topologies.

1365 In the HPS algorithm, the direction of the reconstructed tau momentum \vec{p}^{τ_h}
1366 is required to fall within a distance of $\Delta R = 0.1$ from the original PF jet. All
1367 charged hadrons and strips are required to be contained within a cone of size $\Delta R =$
1368 $(2.8 \text{ GeV})/p_T^{\tau_h}$, from the τ_h as reconstructed by the HPS.

1369 All charged hadrons are assumed to be pions, and they are required to be consis-
1370 tent with the masses of the intermediate meson resonances (if applicable), with the
1371 following allowed windows for candidates: 50-200 MeV for π^0 , 0.3-1.3 GeV for ρ , and
1372 0.8-1.5 GeV for a_1 . If the τ_h decay is compatible with more than one hypothesis, the
1373 one giving the highest $p_T^{\tau_h}$ is chosen. Lastly, an isolation requirement is applied: aside
1374 from the τ_h decay products, no charged hadrons or photons can be present within
1375 an isolation cone of size $\Delta R = 0.5$ around the direction of the τ_h . The outputs of
1376 the HPS algorithm are the reconstructed decay mode and the visible four-momentum
1377 (i.e. the four-momenta of all decay products excluding the neutrinos).

1378 **DeepTau for identifying τ_h**

1379 The identification of τ_h candidates in CMS has historically been divided into separate
1380 discriminators against jets, electrons, and muons. Discriminators versus jets and
1381 electrons use information from derived quantities, such as the p_T sum of particles
1382 near the τ_h axis. Building on the previous multivariate analysis (MVA) classifier [54]
1383 based on a boosted decision tree (BDT), DeepTau is a more recent classifier based on a
1384 deep neural network (DNN) that simultaneously discriminates against jets, electrons,
1385 and muons. The DNN uses a combination of high-level inputs, similar to previous
1386 algorithms, and also uses convolutional layers in η - ϕ space to process information

1387 from all reconstructed particles near the τ_h axis. Convolutional layers are based on
1388 the principle that an image can be processed independently of its position.

1389 The final DeepTau discriminators against jets, muons, and electrons are given by

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

1390 where y_τ (y_α) are estimates of the probabilities for the τ_h candidate to come from
1391 a genuine τ_h (jet, μ , e). Working points for each discriminator with different τ_h
1392 identification efficiencies are defined for D_e , D_μ , and D_{jet} , for usage in physics analyses
1393 and derivation of data-to-simulation corrections [55].

1394 5.1.2 Muons

1395 Muons are the next lightest lepton after taus, with a mass of 105.66 MeV and a mean
1396 lifetime of $\tau = 2.20 \times 10^{-6}$ seconds, or $c\tau = 658.64$ meters. At CMS, muons are
1397 identified with requirements on the quality of the track reconstruction and on the
1398 number of measurements in the tracker and the muon systems [56]. In the standard
1399 CMS reconstruction, tracks are first reconstructed independently in the inner tracker
1400 (tracker track) and in the muon system (standalone-muon track). Next, these tracks
1401 are processed in two different methods.

1402 The first is Global Muon reconstruction (outside-in) [56], which fits combined hits
1403 from the tracker track and standalone-muon track, using the Kalman-filter technique.
1404 At large transverse momenta, $p_T \gtrsim 200$ GeV, the global-muon fit can improve the
1405 momentum resolution compared to the tracker-only fit.

1406 The second is Tracker Muon reconstruction (inside-out) [56], which starts with
1407 tracker tracks with $p_T > 0.5$ GeV and total momentum $p_T > 2.5$ GeV. These tracks
1408 are extrapolated outwards to the muon system and matched to detector segments
1409 there, taking into account the magnetic field, expected energy losses, and multiple

1410 Coulomb scattering in the detector material. Tracker Muon reconstruction is more
1411 efficient than the Global Muon reconstruction at low momenta, $p \lesssim 5$ GeV, because
1412 it only requires a single muon segment in the muon system, whereas Global Muon
1413 reconstruction typically requires segments in at least two muon stations.

1414 To further suppress fake muons from decay in flight, isolation cuts are used. A
1415 relative isolation variable is defined to quantify the energy flow of particles near the
1416 muon trajectory. A relative isolation is defined similarly for muons and electrons:

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

1417 where $\sum_{\text{charged}} p_T$ is the scalar sum of the p_T of the charged particles originating from
1418 the primary vertex and located in a cone of size $\Delta R = \sqrt{(\Delta\eta)^2 + (\Delta\phi)^2} = 0.4(0.3)$
1419 centered on the direction of the muon (electron). The sum $\sum_{\text{neutral}} p_T$ is the equivalent
1420 for neutral particles. The sum $\sum_{\text{charged, PU}} p_T$ is the scalar sum of the p_T of the
1421 charged hadrons in the cone originating from pile-up vertices. The factor 1/2 comes
1422 from simulation estimations, which find that the ratio of neutral to charged hadron
1423 production in the hadronization process of inelastic pp collisions is 1/2. Thus the
1424 subtracted term is intended to subtract contribution from pile-up, from the neutral
1425 particle contribution to the isolation sum. Finally, this is divided by the lepton
1426 transverse momentum, p_T^ℓ .

1427 5.1.3 Electrons

1428 Electrons are the lightest lepton with a mass of 0.511 MeV. At CMS, electrons are
1429 reconstructed by associating a track reconstructed in the silicon tracking detector
1430 with a cluster of energy in the ECAL. Performance is maximized via a combination
1431 of a stand-alone approach and the complementary global particle-flow approach [57].

1432 In the stand-alone approach, the electron energy, which is typically spread over

1433 several crystals of the ECAL, is clustered with the “hybrid” algorithm in the barrel
1434 and the “multi- 5×5 ” in the endcaps [57]. The hybrid algorithm collects energy in
1435 a small window in η and an extended window in ϕ . It identifies a seed crystal, and
1436 adds arrays of 5×1 crystals in $\eta \times \phi$ in a range of $N = 17$ crystals in both directions
1437 of ϕ , if their energies exceed a minimum threshold, thus forming a supercluster (SC).
1438 In the endcap, crystals are not arranged in an $\eta \times \phi$ geometry; instead clusters are
1439 built around seed crystals in clusters of 5×5 crystals that can partly overlap. Nearby
1440 clusters are grouped into a supercluster, and energy is recovered from associated
1441 deposits in the preshower.

1442 In the PF reconstruction [57], PF clusters are reconstructed by aggregating around
1443 a seed all contiguous crystals with energies two standard deviations above the elec-
1444 tronic noise observed at the beginning of a data-taking run. The energy of a given
1445 crystal can be shared among two or more clusters.

1446 The electron track reconstruction is performed in two ways [57]: the ECAL-based
1447 seeding, which begins with the SC energy and positioning, and the tracker-based
1448 seeding (part of the PF reconstruction algorithm), which uses tracks reconstructed
1449 from the general algorithm for charged particles, extrapolated towards the ECAL and
1450 matched to an SC. Kalman filter (KF) tracks with a small number of hits or that are
1451 not well-fitted, are re-fitted with a dedicated Gaussian sum Filter (GSF).

1452 A global identification variable [57] is defined using a multivariate analysis (MVA)
1453 technique that combines information on track observables (kinematics, quality of the
1454 KF track and GSF track), the electron PF cluster observables (shape and pattern),
1455 and the association between the two (geometric and kinematic observables). For
1456 electrons seeded only through the tracker-based approach, a weak selection is applied
1457 on this MVA variable. For electrons seeded through both approaches, a logical OR is
1458 taken.

1459 Electron isolation, i.e. the presence of energy deposits near the electron trajectory,

1460 is a separate key handle in rejecting significant background. Compared to isolated
 1461 electrons, electrons from misidentified jets or genuine electrons within a jet resulting
 1462 from semileptonic decays of b or c quarks tend to have significant energy deposits
 1463 near the primary trajectory [57]. Offline analyses benefit from the PF technique
 1464 for defining isolation, which sums the PF candidates reconstructed located within a
 1465 specified isolation cone around the electron candidate, as in Eqn. 5.2.

1466 5.1.4 Jets

1467 The vast majority of processes of interest at the LHC contain quarks or gluons in
 1468 the final state, but these particles cannot be observed directly. In a process called
 1469 hadronization, they fragment into spatially-grouped collections of particles called jets,
 1470 which can be detected in the tracking and calorimeter systems. Hadronization and
 1471 the subsequent decays of unstable hadrons can produce hundreds of nearby particles
 1472 in the CMS detector. Jets are reconstructed by the PF algorithm (PF jets), or from
 1473 the sum of the ECAL and HCAL energies deposited in the calorimeter towers (Calo
 1474 jets). In PF jets, typically used in offline analyses, jets are built using the anti- k_T
 1475 (AK) clustering algorithm [58]. The anti- k_T algorithm iterates over particle pairs and
 1476 finds the two that are closest in a distance measure d , and determines whether to
 1477 combine them:

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

1478 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-
 1479 ity, and azimuthal angle of particle i . The power -2 means that higher-momentum
 1480 particles are clustered first, leading to jets that tend to be centered on the hardest
 1481 (highest p_T) particle.

1482 There are several methods to remove contributions of pile-up collisions from jet

1483 clustering [59]:

- 1484 • Charged hadron subtraction (CHS), which removes all charged hadron candi-
1485 dates associated with a track that is not associated with the primary vertex.
- 1486 • PileUp Per Particle Identification (PUPPI), which weighs input particles based
1487 on their likelihood of arising from pile-up. QCD particles tend to have a collinear
1488 structure, compared to soft diffuse radiation coming from pile-up. The local
1489 shape for charged pile-up, used as a proxy for all pile-up particles, is used on an
1490 event-by-event basis to calculate a weight for each particle. PUPPI is deployed
1491 in Run-2 and is more performant than CHS in high pile-up scenarios.

1492 **5.1.5 B-flavored jets**

1493 Jets that arise from bottom-quark hadronization (b-flavor jets) have overwhelming
1494 background from processes involving jets from gluons (g) and light-flavor quarks (u, d,
1495 s), and from c-quark fragmentation. The ability to identify b-flavor jets, or b-tagging,
1496 exploits the b hadrons' relatively large masses, long lifetimes, and daughter particles
1497 with hard momentum spectra [58].

1498 The impact parameter (IP) of a track is the 3-dimensional distance between the
1499 track and the primary vertex (PV) at the point of closest approach. The IP is positive
1500 if the track originates from the decay of particles travelling along the jet axis. The
1501 resolution of the IP depends on the p_T and η of the track, motivating the use of the
1502 impact parameter significance S_{IP} (ratio of the IP to its estimated uncertainty) as an
1503 observable [58].

1504 Because of their large, but finite, lifetimes, b hadrons tend to travel a short dis-
1505 tance before decaying at a secondary vertex (SV), which can be measured and recon-
1506 structed separately from the primary vertex due to the excellent position resolution
1507 of the pixel detector [58]. Previous b-tagging algorithms (e.g. CSV, cMVAv2, and

1508 DeepCSV) have capitalized on variables such as the presence of a SV, the flight
1509 distance and direction (computed from the vector between the PV and the SV), and
1510 kinematics of the system of associated secondary tracks (e.g. track multiplicity, mass,
1511 and energy).

1512 The DeepJet (formerly known as DeepFlavour) algorithm [60] is a deep-neural-
1513 network multi-classification algorithm, which uses 16 properties of up to 25 charged
1514 and 6 properties of 25 neutral particle-flow jet constituents, as well as 17 properties
1515 from up to 4 secondary vertices associate with the jet. Compared to the previous clas-
1516 sifying algorithm DeepCSV, DeepJet has been demonstrated to have higher efficiency
1517 with lower misidentification probability in Phase-1 data [61].

1518 5.2 Reconstruction of the di-tau mass

1519 The final signal extraction is done to the total di-tau ($\tau\tau$) mass, which is estimated
1520 from the visible $\tau\tau$ mass using the FastMTT algorithm [62]. FastMTT is based on the
1521 SVFit algorithm, originally developed for the Standard Model $H \rightarrow \tau\tau$ analysis [63].
1522 Both the SVFit algorithms, and the FastMTT algorithm, are described below, to give
1523 a complete picture of how the algorithms attempt to reconstruct the true invariant
1524 mass of a Higgs or Z boson decay.

1525 To specify a hadronic τ decay, six parameters are needed [63]: the polar and
1526 azimuthal angles of the visible decay product system in the τ rest frame, the three
1527 boost parameters from the τ rest frame to the laboratory frame, and the invariant
1528 mass m_{vis} of the visible decay products. For a leptonic τ decay, two neutrinos are
1529 produced, and a seventh parameter, the invariant mass of the two-neutrino system, is
1530 necessary. The unknown parameters are constrained by four observables that are the
1531 components of the four-momentum of the system formed by the visible decay products
1532 of the τ lepton, measured in the laboratory frame. The remaining unconstrained

1533 parameters for hadronic and leptonic τ decays are thus:

1534 • The fraction of the τ energy in the laboratory frame carried by the visible decay
1535 products,

1536 • ϕ , the azimuthal angle of the τ direction in the laboratory frame,

1537 • $m_{\nu\nu}$, the invariant mass of the two-neutrino system in leptonic τ decays (for
1538 hadronic τ decays, $m_{\nu\nu}$ is set to 0).

1539 E_x^{miss} and E_y^{miss} , the x and y components of the missing transverse energy E_T^{miss}
1540 provide two further constraints.

1541 5.2.1 Original SVFit ‘‘standalone’’: maximum likelihood

1542 In one of the original versions of SVFit, called ‘‘standalone’’ SVFit [63], a maximum
1543 likelihood fit method is used to reconstruct the mass $m_{\tau\tau}$ by combining the measured
1544 observables E_x^{miss} and E_y^{miss} with a likelihood model that includes terms for the τ
1545 decay kinematics and the E_T^{miss} resolution [63]. The likelihood function $f(\vec{z}, \vec{y}, \vec{a}_1 \vec{a}_2)$
1546 of the parameters $\vec{z} = (E_x^{\text{miss}}, E_y^{\text{miss}})$ in an event is constructed, where the remaining
1547 parameters are the kinematics of the two τ decays, denoted $\vec{a}_1 = (x_1, \phi_1, m_{\nu\nu,1})$ and
1548 $\vec{a}_2 = (x_2, \phi_2, m_{\nu\nu,2})$, and the four-momenta of the visible decay products with the
1549 measured values $\vec{y} = (p_1^{\text{vis}}, p_2^{\text{vis}})$.

1550 The likelihood f is the product of three likelihood functions. The first two likeli-
1551 hood functions model the decay parameters \vec{a}_1 and \vec{a}_2 of the two τ leptons. For lep-
1552 tonic decays, the likelihood function is modeled using matrix elements for τ decays,
1553 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
1554 hadronic τ decays, a model based on the two-body phase space is used and integrated
1555 over $m_{\text{vis}}^2/m_{\tau\tau}^2 \leq x \leq 1$. The third likelihood function quantifies the compatibility of
1556 a τ decay hypothesis with the reconstructed \vec{E}_T^{miss} in an event, assuming the neutrini-
1557 nos are the only source of missing transverse energy. The expected \vec{E}_T^{miss} resolution

1558 is represented by a covariant matrix, estimated on an event-by-event basis using a
1559 significance algorithm [64].

1560 5.2.2 “Classic SVFit” with matrix element

1561 Classic SVFit is an improved algorithm of the original “standalone” SVFit using the
1562 formalism of the matrix element (ME) method [62]. In the ME method, an estimate
1563 for the unknown model parameter Θ (here, the mass $m_{\tau\tau}$) is obtained by maximizing
1564 the probability density \mathcal{P} . The key ingredients of the probability density are the
1565 squared modulus of the matrix element $|\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{p}, \Theta)|^2$ and the transfer function $W(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{p})$
1566 (probability density to observe the measured observables \mathbf{y} given the phase space
1567 point \mathbf{p}). The best estimate $m_{\tau\tau}$ is obtained by computing the probability density \mathcal{P}
1568 for a range of mass hypotheses and finding the value of $m_{\tau\tau}$ that maximizes \mathcal{P} .

1569 Distributions illustrating the performance of the classic matrix element SVFit
1570 algorithm are shown in Fig. 5.1 from [62], showing the di-tau mass after and before
1571 application of SVFit to recover energy lost to neutrinos. The SVFit algorithm is
1572 found to improve the sensitivity of the Standard Model $H \rightarrow \tau\tau$ analysis performed
1573 by CMS by about 30%, compared to performing the same analysis using only the
1574 visible mass m_{vis} .

1575 5.2.3 FastMTT: optimized SVFit

1576 FastMTT [65] is a further simplification to the matrix element method of Classic
1577 SVFit which has comparable performance but is about 100 times faster. FastMTT
1578 drops the matrix element component of the computation without significant impact
1579 on the final mass resolution, and simplifies the computation of the transfer functions.
1580 The opening angle of the τ decay products with respect to the initial τ momenta ap-
1581 proaches 0 for τ with high $\gamma = E_\tau/m_\tau$, with typical τ decays from the Z boson decays
1582 already satisfying this condition. In this collinear approximation, the dimensionality




Figure 5.1: Distributions from [62], 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 $\tau\tau \rightarrow \mu\tau_h$.

1583 of the transfer function can be reduced in the computation of FastMTT, while still
1584 yielding similar results to Classic SVFit [65].

1585 5.3 Corrections applied to simulation

1586 Corrections are applied to simulated samples to account for known effects in the event
1587 modeling and reconstruction and data-taking, and are intended to bring simulations
1588 in closer agreement with data. Corrections fall into two broad categories: *energy*
1589 *scale corrections* applied to physics objects, and *event-level corrections*. Energy scale
1590 corrections are multiplicative factors applied to the energy and transverse momentum
1591 p_T of simulated objects (e.g. leptons or jets), and bring the average reconstructed
1592 energies of simulated particles into better agreement with those of objects recon-
1593 structed from data. Event-level corrections are applied as a per-event multiplicative
1594 weight, and account for effects such as differences in object identification efficiencies
1595 and trigger efficiencies between data and simulated samples, mis-modeling in simu-

1596 lations of the underlying physics process, or changing detector operating conditions
 1597 during data-taking. Event-level corrections change the shapes of the distributions of
 1598 all the physical observables.

1599 Uncertainties in scale factors and corrections are also sources of systematic errors
 1600 in the analysis, detailed in Chapter 8. Systematic uncertainties in the tau, muon, and
 1601 electron energy scales can shift the p_T of the leptons up or down, which can change
 1602 whether events pass or fail the offline p_T thresholds for the trigger paths described in
 1603 the previous section, i.e. change the number of events in the signal region.

1604 **5.3.1 Tau energy scale**

1605 An energy scale is applied to the transverse momentum p_T and mass of the hadronic
 1606 tau τ_h in the $\mu\tau_h$ and $e\tau_h$ channels, to correct for a deviation of the average recon-
 1607 structed τ_h energy from the generator-level energy of the visible τ_h decay products.
 1608 These correction factors are derived centrally [54], by fitting to events in $e\tau_h$ and $\mu\tau_h$
 1609 final states in Z/γ^* events separately for the h^\pm , $h^\pm\pi^0$, and $h^\pm h^\mp h^\pm$ decays. The
 1610 values used are shown in Table 5.1.

1611 When applying the energy scale to the τ_h , the 4-momentum of the missing trans-
 1612 verse energy (MET) is adjusted such that the total 4-momenta of the τ_h and the MET
 1613 remains unchanged [66].

Tau energy scale factor				
Decay mode	2018	2017	2016 pre-VFP	2016 post-VFP
1-prong	0.991 ± 0.008	0.986 ± 0.009	0.987 ± 0.01	0.993 ± 0.009
1-prong + π^0	1.004 ± 0.006	0.999 ± 0.006	0.998 ± 0.006	0.991 ± 0.007
3-prong	0.998 ± 0.007	0.999 ± 0.007	0.984 ± 0.008	1.001 ± 0.007
3-prong + π^0	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.

₁₆₁₄ **5.3.2 Muon energy scale**

₁₆₁₅ An energy scale is applied to the p_T and mass of genuine muons from τ decays in the
₁₆₁₆ $e\mu$ and $\mu\tau_h$ channels [67]. The applied values are the same for MC and embedded
₁₆₁₇ samples and are shown in Table 5.2. Following the SM $H \rightarrow \tau\tau$ analysis, Rochester
₁₆₁₈ corrections are not applied, and instead prescriptions from [68] 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 [69] [68].

₁₆₁₉ **5.3.3 Electron energy scale**

₁₆₂₀ Corrections to the electron energy scale are applied to genuine e from τ decays, and
₁₆₂₁ are binned in two dimensions by electron p_T and η for barrel vs. endcap [70]. The
₁₆₂₂ scale factors are binned in p_T and η for MC samples: e.g. values for 2018 are shown
₁₆₂₃ in Fig. 5.2 from [71]. For embedded samples the electron energy scale is taken as
₁₆₂₄ only binned in η (Table 5.3).

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 [72] [73] [74].

₁₆₂₅ **5.3.4 τ_h identification efficiency**

₁₆₂₆ The τ_h identification efficiency can differ in data and MC [66]. Recommended correc-
₁₆₂₇ tions are provided by the Tau POG, and we use the medium DeepTau vs. jet working




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 [71].

1628 point values. The identification efficiency is measured in $Z \rightarrow \tau\tau$ events in the $\mu\tau_h$
 1629 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 [66].

1630 5.3.5 Trigger efficiencies definition

1631 Scale factors are applied to correct for differences in trigger efficiencies between MC
 1632 and embedded vs. data, with values taken from tools provided by the Standard Model
 1633 $H \rightarrow \tau\tau$ working group which uses the same trigger paths [69]. In the following

1634 sections we review relevant trigger efficiencies in data, which form the basis of the
1635 trigger efficiency corrections applied to MC and embedded.

1636 **5.3.6 Tau trigger efficiencies**

1637 The efficiencies in data of the single- τ_h leg in $\mu\tau_h$, $e\tau_h$, and di- τ_h triggers are computed
1638 centrally using a Tag and Probe (TnP) method [75] which is outlined here. In this
1639 method, $Z \rightarrow \tau\tau \rightarrow \mu\tau_h$ are selected in data and a Drell-Yan simulated sample
1640 ($Z \rightarrow \ell\ell, \ell = e, \mu, \tau_h$) with high purity. Cuts are applied to reject events not in this
1641 final state, e.g. suppressing $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ by vetoing events with a single loose ID muon.
1642 An isolated muon candidate (the tag) with online $p_T > 27$ GeV and $|\eta| < 2.1$ is
1643 identified and matched to an offline μ . An offline τ_h candidate (the probe) is selected,
1644 which is separated from the tag μ , and has $p_T > 20$ GeV and $|\eta| < 2.1$. The probe
1645 τ_h must pass anti-muon and anti-electron discriminators to avoid fakes from muons
1646 and electrons, and must pass the medium MVA tau isolation to suppress fakes from
1647 QCD jets. The trigger efficiency in the TnP method is calculated as

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

1648 The efficiencies for the hadronic tau legs in the relevant channels of this analysis
1649 ($\mu\tau_h$ and $e\tau_h$) as a function of the offline tau p_T and η , are shown for data taken in
1650 2016, 2017, and 2018 in Figures 5.3a and 5.3b [75] [76]. In both figures, the different
1651 HLT thresholds and differences in the L1 seed result in higher efficiencies in 2016 and
1652 differences in shapes of the 2016 efficiencies compared to 2017 and 2018. The low
1653 pile-up in 2016 also leads to higher efficiencies in that year.





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 [76]. HLT p_T thresholds and L1 seeds are indicated in the legends.

1654 5.3.7 Single muon trigger efficiencies

1655 The efficiencies for the single isolated muon trigger with $p_T > 24 \text{ GeV}$ used in this
 1656 analysis, are shown for the data-taking year 2018 in Fig. 5.4a as a function of the
 1657 muon p_T and as a function of the muon $|\eta|$ in Fig. 5.4b from [77]. The data is split
 1658 with respect to a HLT muon reconstruction update that was deployed on 15/05/2018.
 1659 A small asymmetry in efficiencies between negative and positive η in Fig. 5.4b is due
 1660 to disabled muon chambers (CSCs). The efficiencies shown are estimated using a Tag
 1661 and Probe method using $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ events, with the tag being an offline muon with
 1662 $p_T > 29 \text{ GeV}$ and $|\eta| < 2.4$ passing a tight ID criteria, and the probe is an online (L1)
 1663 trigger object with $\Delta R < 0.3$ and passing tight ID and Particle Flow based isolation
 1664 requirements with $p_T > 26 \text{ GeV}$.



(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 [77].

1665 5.3.8 Single electron trigger efficiencies

1666 The efficiencies in data, and the ratio between data and MC, of the single electron
 1667 HLT trigger with p_T threshold 32 GeV used in this analysis are shown for 2018,
 1668 as a function of the electron p_T in Fig. 5.5a and of the electron $|\eta|$ in Fig. 5.5b,
 1669 from [78]. In the Tag and Probe method used for the 2018 dataset, the tag is an
 1670 offline reconstructed electron with $|\eta| \leq 2.1$ and not in the barrel and endcap overlap
 1671 region, with $p_T > 35$ GeV with tight isolation and shower shape requirements, firing
 1672 the tag trigger. The probe is an offline reconstructed electron with $|\eta| \leq 2.5$ with
 1673 $E_T^{\text{ECAL}} > 5$ GeV with no extra identification criteria [78].

1674 The disagreement between data and MC, particularly at low transverse momentum,
 1675 is in part due to detector effects that are difficult to simulate, such as crys-
 1676 tal transparency losses in the ECAL and the evolution of dead regions in the pixel
 1677 tracker [78].



(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) [78]. 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 the barrel and endcap parts of the ECAL.

1678 5.3.9 $e\mu$ cross-trigger efficiencies

1679 The efficiencies of the electron and muons for the cross-trigger with leading muon
 1680 used in the $e\mu$ channel are shown for data in 2016, 2017, and 2018 in Figures 5.6a and
 1681 5.6b [79]. These efficiencies were measured centrally using a Tag and Probe in events
 1682 with Z to dileptons with the same flavor and opposite charge, where the tags are an
 1683 isolated muon or electron, and the probe (offline) candidate is required to satisfy the
 1684 same lepton selection as that of the tag candidate, be matched within $\Delta R < 0.1$ with
 1685 a corresponding online trigger object, and also to pass the cross-trigger. The trigger
 1686 efficiency is then:

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




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*) [79].

1687 5.3.10 Electrons and muons faking τ_h : energy scales

1688 Energy scales for electrons misidentified as hadronic tau decays (e faking τ_h) are
 1689 provided by the Tau POG, and were measured in the $e\tau_h$ channel with the visible
 1690 invariant mass of the electron and hadronic tau system [69]. This energy scale is
 1691 applied for τ_h with $p_T > 20$ GeV regardless of which DeepTau vs. electron working
 1692 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
1-prong	1.01362 (+0.00474, -0.00904)
1-prong + π^0	1.01945 (+0.01598, -0.01226)
3-prong	0.96903 (+0.0125, -0.03404)
3-prong + π^0	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 [69].

1693 No nominal energy scale is applied for muons mis-reconstructed as τ_h , and the
 1694 uncertainty is treated as $\pm 1\%$ and uncorrelated in the reconstructed decay mode [69].

1695 **5.3.11 Electrons and muons faking τ_h : misidentification effi-**
 1696 **ciencies**

1697 Corrections on identification efficiencies are applied to genuine electrons and muons
 1698 misidentified as τ to account for differences in data and MC.

1699 The specific values depend on the vs. electron and vs. muon discriminator working
 1700 points used. For misidentified $\mu \rightarrow \tau_h$, the scale factors are split into different $|\eta|$
 1701 regions, determined by the CMS muon and tracker detector geometries, as shown in
 1702 Table 5.6 for 2018 [66].

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

Table 5.6: Tau mis-identification efficiencies (in %) for the DeepTau Tight and Very Loose (VLoose) working points vs. muons in 2018, binned in the muon $|\eta|$ [66].

1703 For misidentified $e \rightarrow \tau_h$, the scale factors are split into barrel and endcap regions,
 1704 dictated by the ECAL detector geometry, as shown in Table 5.7 for 2018.

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

Table 5.7: Tau mis-identification efficiencies (in %) for the DeepTau Tight and Very Loose (VLoose) working points vs. electrons in 2018, binned in the electron $|\eta|$ [66].

1705 5.3.12 Electron ID and tracking efficiency

1706 Scale factors are applied to MC to correct for differences between MC and data in
 1707 the performance of electron identification (ID) and tracking.

1708 Electron and photon identification, as discussed earlier, use variables with good
 1709 signal vs. background discrimination power such as lateral shower shape and ratio
 1710 of energy deposited in the HCAL to energy deposited in the ECAL at the position
 1711 of the electron. The cut-based electron identification efficiencies in data and ratio of
 1712 efficiencies in data to MC are shown in Fig. 5.7a for the multivariate analysis (MVA)
 1713 identification working point.

1714 The tracking efficiencies in data and the data/MC ratio are shown in Fig. 5.7b
 1715 for the Gaussian-sum filter (GSF) tracking [80].




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*) [80]. Error bars represent statistical and systematic uncertainties.

1716 5.3.13 Muon ID, isolation, and tracking efficiencies

1717 Scale factors are applied to MC to correct for differences between MC and data in
 1718 the performance of muon identification, isolation, and tracking, as detailed below.

1719 The efficiencies for muon identification measured in 2015 data and MC simulation
 1720 are shown in Figures 5.8a and 5.8b for the loose ID and tight ID respectively [81]. The
 1721 loose ID is chosen such that efficiency exceeds 99% over the full η range, and the data
 1722 and simulation agree to within 1%. The tight ID is chosen such that efficiency varies
 1723 between 95% and 99% as a function of η , and the data and simulation agree to within
 1724 1-3%. The muon identification working point used in this analysis is the medium ID,
 1725 which has an efficiency of 98% for all η and an agreement within 1-2% [81].





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 [81].

1726 The efficiencies in data for the muon isolation, as measured in Level-3 muons
 1727 (muons in one of the final stages of reconstruction in the HLT), as a function of the
 1728 muon p_T and $|\eta|$ are shown in Figures 5.9a and 5.9b [81]. The HLT muon reconstruc-
 1729 tion consists of two steps: Level-2 (L2), where the muon is reconstructed in the muon
 1730 subdetectors only, and Level-3 (L3) which is a global fit of tracker and muon hits (i.e.
 1731 the global muon reconstruction as described in Section 5.1.2) [82].

1732 The muon tracking efficiencies as a function of $|\eta|$ for standalone muons (i.e. tracks
 1733 from only the muon system, i.e. DT, CSC, and RPC, as discussed in Section 5.1.2),
 1734 are shown for data and simulated Drell-Yan samples in Fig. 5.10 [83].



(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) [81].

1735 5.3.14 Recoil corrections

1736 In proton-proton collisions, W and Z bosons are predominantly produced through
1737 quark-antiquark annihilation. Higher-order processes can induce radiated quarks or
1738 gluons that recoil against the boson, imparting a non-zero transverse momentum to
1739 the boson [84]. Recoil corrections accounting for this effect are applied to samples
1740 with W+jets, Z+jets, and Higgs bosons [69]. The corrections are performed on the
1741 vectorial difference between the measured missing transverse momentum and the total
1742 transverse momentum of neutrinos originating from the decay of the W, Z, or Higgs
1743 boson. This vector is projected onto the axes parallel and orthogonal to the boson p_T .
1744 This vector, and the resulting correction to use, is measured in $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ events, since
1745 these events have leptonic recoil that do not contain neutrinos, allowing the 4-vector
1746 of the Z boson to be measured precisely. The corrections are binned in generator-level
1747 p_T of the parent boson and also the number of jets in the event.




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*) [83]. 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.

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 [85]. Per-event weights derived by the 2016 data-only version of this analysis [85] 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 Pile-up reweighting

Reweighting is performed to rescale MC events to account for differences between MC and data, in the distribution of the pile-up (number of additional proton-proton interactions per bunch crossing). A tool for calculating the pile-up reweighting for the MC samples used is provided centrally by the Luminosity POG [86].

1759 **5.3.17 Pre-firing corrections**

1760 In 2016 and 2017 data-taking, a gradual timing shift of ECAL was not properly
1761 propagated to L1 trigger primitives (TPs), resulting in a large fraction of high η
1762 TPs being incorrectly associated with the previous bunch crossing. L1 trigger rules
1763 prevent two consecutive bunch crossings from firing, causing events to be rejected if
1764 significant ECAL energy was deposited in $2.0 < |\eta| < 3.0$. To account for this issue,
1765 MC simulations for 2016 and 2017 are corrected using an event-dependent weight.
1766 Embedded samples are not corrected [51].

1767 **5.3.18 Top p_T spectrum reweighing**

1768 In Run-1 and Run-2 it was observed that the p_T spectra of top quarks in $t\bar{t}$ data were
1769 significantly softer than those predicted by MC simulations [87]. Possible sources
1770 of this discrepancy are higher order QCD and/or electroweak corrections, and non-
1771 resonant production of $t\bar{t}$ -like final states. To account for this, corrections derived
1772 from Run-2 data by the Top Physics Analysis Group (PAG) are applied to the p_T
1773 of the top and anti-top quarks in MC simulations, computed as a function of their
1774 generator-level p_T [87].

1775 **5.3.19 B-tagging efficiency**

1776 In order to predict correct b-tagging discriminant distributions and event yields in
1777 data, the weight of selected MC events is reweighed according to recommendations by
1778 the BTV POG [88]. The reweighing depends on the jet p_T , η , and the b-tagging dis-
1779 criminant. In this method, there is no migration of events from one b-tag multiplicity
1780 bin to another.

5.3.20 Jet energy resolution and jet energy smearing

Calibration of jet energies, i.e. ensuring that the energy and momentum of the reconstructed jet matches that of the quark/gluon-initiated jet, is a challenging task due to time-dependent changes in the detector response and calibration and high pile-up [89] [90]. Jet calibration is done via jet energy corrections (JECs) applied to the p_T of jets in MC samples, accounting successively for the effects of pile-up, uniformity of the detector response, and residual data-simulation jet energy scale differences [91]. Typical jet energy resolutions reported at $\sqrt{s} = 8 \text{ TeV}$ in the central rapidities are 15-20% at 30 GeV and about 10% at 100 GeV [89]. Jet energy corrections are also propagated to the missing transverse energy.

Measurements show that the jet energy resolution (JER) in data is worse than in simulation, and so the jets in MC need to be smeared to describe the data. JER corrections are applied after JEC on MC simulations, and adjust the width of the p_T distribution based on pile-up, jet size, and jet flavor [92]. Tools for applying JEC and JER are provided centrally by the JER Corrections group.

1796 **Chapter 6**

1797 **Event selection**

1798 This chapter describes how events in data and simulated samples are selected in the
1799 search for $h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow bb\tau\tau$. The event selection is motivated by optimization checks
1800 aimed at maximizing the final expected limit, and is also based on recommendations
1801 from CMS Physics Objects Groups. As described in the previous chapter, the tau
1802 lepton can decay to electrons (e), muons (μ), or hadronic states (τ_h). As a result,
1803 several different final states of the $\tau\tau$ system are possible, and are here referred to
1804 as “channels” since they are mutually exclusive. The three $\tau\tau$ final states studied in
1805 this analysis are muon and hadronic tau ($\mu\tau_h$), electron and hadronic tau ($e\tau_h$), and
1806 electron and muon ($e\mu$). The procedure for dividing events into these three channels
1807 begins with checking the High-Level Trigger paths passed by the events as detailed
1808 in Section 6.1. Events are further accepted or rejected based on criteria applied to
1809 the leptons in the event. These event selections are described for the $\mu\tau_h$ channel in
1810 Section 6.2, the $e\tau_h$ channel in Section 6.3, and the $e\mu$ channel in Section 6.4.

1811 **6.1 General procedure for all channels**

1812 For the search for $h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow bb\tau\tau$, three final states of the $\tau\tau$ system are considered:
1813 $\mu\tau_h$, $e\tau_h$, and $e\mu$. The $\tau_h\tau_h$ final state is not considered because signal events in the

1814 $\tau_h\tau_h$ channel would typically produce hadronic taus with momenta below data-taking
1815 trigger thresholds. In all three final states, events are required to have at least one
1816 b-tag jet passing the medium working point of the DeepFlavour tagger, with $p_T > 20$
1817 GeV, and $|\eta| < 2.4$. A second b-tag jet is not required because such a requirement
1818 would reduce signal acceptance by 80% compared to only requiring one b-tag jet.

1819 Events in MC samples are sorted into one of the three $\tau\tau$ channels if they pass the
1820 following trigger requirements and requirements on the offline reconstructed objects
1821 in the event, first checking the HLT paths for the $\mu\tau_h$ channel, then $e\tau_h$, and finally $e\mu$.
1822 The two leading leptons (e.g. muon and hadronic tau for the $\mu\tau_h$ channel) that were
1823 determined to have originated from the $\tau\tau$ decay, are called the $\tau\tau$ “legs”. For events
1824 in data and embedded samples, the HLT path requirements for the corresponding
1825 channel are checked.

1826 After sorting events by HLT paths and identifying the leading tau legs in the offline
1827 reconstructed objects, the p_T of the offline objects is checked against the online trigger
1828 thresholds. Trigger matching is also performed, which checks the correspondence
1829 between each offline reconstructed object used in the analysis (e.g. a muon), and a
1830 trigger object in the HLT (e.g. a HLT muon). An offline object is considered to be
1831 matched, if it corresponds to a trigger object of the same object type, with $\Delta R < 0.5$.
1832 This matched trigger object is also required to pass the filter(s) of the HLT trigger.
1833 The trigger thresholds used for the $bb\mu\mu$ final state and the $bb\tau\tau$ final state (the focus
1834 of this work) are summarized in Tables 6.1.

1835 After checking the HLT paths and trigger objects in each channel, events are
1836 subject to further selection to ensure that they contain leptons and b-tag jet(s) of in-
1837 terest. These requirements are summarized in Table 6.2, and detailed in the following
1838 sections.

Year	Single/dilepton trigger p_T	$bb\mu\mu$	$bb\tau\tau$					
		μ	$e\mu$		$e\tau_h$		$\mu\tau_h$	
			e	μ	e	τ_h	μ	τ_h
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	–	27
	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	–	27
	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.

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

In all three years, a single muon trigger is used if the muon has sufficiently high p_T , otherwise a dilepton $\mu\tau_h$ cross-trigger is used (Tables 6.3, 6.4, and 6.5). For data taken in 2017-2018 (2016), the logical OR of the single muon triggers with online p_T thresholds 24 and 27 (23) GeV is used, with the corresponding offline muon required to have with p_T 1 GeV above the online threshold. For data taken in 2017-2018 (2016), a dilepton $\mu + \tau_h$ cross-trigger with p_T thresholds of 20 (19) and 27 (20) GeV for the muon and tau respectively, is used. The τ_h is required to have $|\eta| < 2.3$ if the single trigger is fired, $|\eta| < 2.1$.

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

The muon is required to pass the medium identification (ID) working point [93], which is defined by the Muon POG as a loose muon (i.e. a Particle Flow muon that is either a global or a tracker muon - see Section 5.1.2) with additional requirements on

All years (2016, 2017, 2018) and eras				
Kinematic variable	$bb\mu\mu$		$bb\tau\tau$	
	μ	$e\mu$	$e\tau_h$	$\mu\tau_h$
ΔR between leptons	>0.4	>0.3	>0.4	>0.4
$ \eta $ of electron	-	<2.4	<2.1	-
$ \eta $ of muon	<2.4	<2.4	-	<2.1
$ \eta $ of hadronic tau	-	-	<2.3/< 2.1	<2.3/< 2.1
Relative isolation of electron	-	<0.10	-	<0.15
Relative isolation of muon	<0.25	<0.15	-	<0.15
Leading b-tag jet p_T	>15 GeV		>20 GeV	
Leading b-tag jet $ \eta $	<2.4		<2.4	
Leading b-tag jet WP	Tight		Medium	
Sub-leading b-tag jet p_T	>15 GeV		-	
Sub-leading b-tag jet $ \eta $	<2.4		-	
Sub-leading b-tag jet WP	Loose		-	
ΔR between jet(s) and leptons	>0.4		>0.5	

Table 6.2: Summary of requirements applied to the leptons in the $bb\mu\mu$ analysis and the $bb\tau\tau$ analysis (the focus of this work). $\Delta R = \sqrt{(\Delta\eta)^2 + (\Delta\phi)^2}$ is a measure of spatial separation. Relative isolation is defined in Eqn. 5.2 and Section 5.1.2. The b-tag jets are required to pass the listed DeepFlavour working points (WP), which are described in Section 5.1.5. In the $bb\tau\tau$ analysis, the required $|\eta|$ of the hadronic taus are listed for the single and cross triggers respectively. The $bb\mu\mu$ analysis requires two b-tag jets in all events, while the $bb\tau\tau$ analysis only requires one.

1855 track quality and muon quality. These identification criteria are designed to be highly
1856 efficient for prompt muons and for muons from heavy quark decays. In addition to the
1857 ID, for prompt muons it is recommended to apply cuts on the impact parameter [93]:
1858 we apply $|\Delta(z)| < 0.2$ and $|\Delta(xy)| < 0.045$. A cut is applied on the muon relative
1859 isolation (defined in Section 5.1.2), to be less than 0.15 in a cone size of $\Delta R = 0.4$,
1860 which corresponds to the Tight Particle Flow isolation requirement [93].

1861 The τ_h is required to pass a cut on its impact parameter of $|\Delta(z)| < 0.2$. The τ_h
1862 is also required to pass the VLoose (Very Loose) DeepTau working point vs. elec-
1863 tron, the Tight DeepTau working point vs. muons, and the VVVLoose and Medium
1864 DeepTau working point vs. jets. Events with taus reconstructed in two of the decay
1865 modes (labeled 5 and 6) are rejected, since these decay modes are meant to recover
1866 3-prong taus, but are only recommended for use in analyses where the benefits in final
1867 significance outweigh the resulting increase in background [66]. Decays reconstructed
1868 with 2 prongs are not considered as they are only recommended for taus with a very
1869 high transverse momentum, where the prongs may overlap.

1870 For the estimation of the background from jets faking τ_h , which is described in Sec-
1871 tion 7.7, anti-isolated events are selected, by requiring events to pass all the selections
1872 described above, except failing the Medium DeepTau working point vs. jets.

1873 6.3 Event selection in the $e\tau_h$ channel

1874 The HLT trigger paths for the $e\tau_h$ channel are summarized in Tables 6.3, 6.4, and
1875 6.5. Similarly to the $\mu\tau_h$ channel, a single electron trigger is used if the electron has
1876 sufficiently high p_T in 2018 and 2017. For data taken in 2018 (2017), the OR of the
1877 single electron triggers with online p_T thresholds at 32 and 35 (27 and 32) GeV are
1878 used, with the corresponding offline electrons required to have p_T greater than 33
1879 (28) GeV. A $e + \tau_h$ cross-trigger is used for electrons with lower offline p_T between

1880 25 and 33 GeV (25 and 28 GeV). For the 2016 dataset, there is no cross trigger but
1881 only a single electron trigger with online p_T threshold at 25 GeV, which is used if the
1882 offline electron has p_T greater than 26 GeV.

1883 The electron and τ_h are required to have opposite charges and be separated by
1884 $\Delta R > 0.4$. The electron is required to be within $|\eta| < 2.3$ when no cross trigger is
1885 used, and $|\eta| < 2.1$ when the cross trigger is fired. The τ_h is required to have $|\eta| < 2.3$
1886 if no cross trigger is fired, and have $|\eta| < 2.1$ if the cross trigger is fired.

1887 The electron is required to have a relative isolation (same definition as in Section
1888 5.1.2) of less than 0.1 in a cone size of $\Delta R = 0.3$, which is the standard recommended
1889 cone size giving minimal pile-up dependence and reduced probability of other objects
1890 overlapping with the cone. The isolation quantity used includes an “effective area”
1891 (EA) correction to remove the effect of pile-up in the barrel and endcap parts of the
1892 detector [94]. The electron is also required to pass cuts on its impact parameter of
1893 $|\Delta(z)| < 0.2$ and $|\Delta(xy)| < 0.045$. It is also required to pass the non-isolated MVA
1894 working point corresponding to 90% efficiency. The electron’s number of missing hits,
1895 which are gaps in its trajectory through the inner tracker [94], must be less than or
1896 equal to 1. The electron must pass a conversion veto, which rejects electrons coming
1897 from photon conversions in the tracker, which should instead be reconstructed as part
1898 of the photon [94].

1899 The impact parameter cut for the τ_h is $|\Delta(z)| < 0.2$. In contrast to the $\mu\tau_h$ event
1900 selection, the vs. electron and vs. muon DeepTau working points are flipped, to
1901 reject muons faking the τ_h leg. The τ_h is required to pass the Tight DeepTau working
1902 point vs. electrons, the VLoose DeepTau working point vs. muons, and the Medium
1903 DeepTau working point vs. jets.

1904 As in the $\mu\tau_h$ channel, for the estimation of the background from jets faking τ_h ,
1905 which is described in Section 7.7, anti-isolated events are selected by requiring events
1906 to pass all the selections described above, except failing the Medium DeepTau working

1907 point vs. jets.

1908 6.4 Event selection in the $e\mu$ channel

1909 The HLT trigger paths for the $e\mu$ channel are summarized in Tables 6.3, 6.4, and
1910 6.5. Events are selected with the logical OR of two $e + \mu$ cross triggers, where either
1911 the electron or muon can have larger p_T : (1) leading electron, where the electron has
1912 online $p_T > 23$ GeV and the muon has online $p_T > 8$ GeV, or (2) leading muon,
1913 where the electron has online $p_T > 12$ GeV and the muon has online $p_T > 23$ GeV.

1914 The leading and sub-leading leptons are required to have an offline p_T greater
1915 than 1 GeV above the online threshold (i.e. $p_T > 24$ GeV). If the sub-leading lepton
1916 is the electron, the offline p_T threshold is 1 GeV above the online threshold ($p_T > 13$
1917 GeV), but if it is a muon, the offline p_T threshold is required to be at least 5 GeV
1918 greater than the online threshold (i.e. $p_T > 13$ GeV). This is because of poor data
1919 and simulation agreement for low- p_T muons with p_T between 9 GeV and 13 GeV, and
1920 the higher probability of mis-identifying jets as muons at lower p_T . With no effect on
1921 the expected limits, the offline p_T threshold for muons is raised to 13 GeV instead of
1922 9 GeV, even though it may lead to a loss in signal acceptance. Both the electron and
1923 muon are required to have $|\eta| < 2.4$.

1924 The electron and muon are required to have opposite charges and be separated
1925 by $\Delta R > 0.3$ (note the decreased separation requirement compared to the other
1926 two channels). The electron is required to pass the non-isolated MVA identification
1927 working point corresponding to 90% efficiency, and to have a relative isolation less
1928 than 0.1 for a cone size of $\Delta R = 0.3$ with the EA pile-up subtraction correction.
1929 The electron must have one or fewer missing hits and pass the conversion veto (both
1930 described previously in Section 6.3).

1931 The muon is required to pass the medium identification working point (described

1932 earlier in 6.2), and to have a relative isolation less than 0.15 for a cone size of $\Delta R =$
1933 0.4. The muon impact parameter is required to have $|\Delta(z)| > 0.2$ and $|\Delta(xy)| < 0.045$.

1934 For the QCD multijet background estimation described in Section 7.8, the same-
1935 sign region is selected by requiring all the above selections, except the legs are required
1936 to have the same electric charge rather than opposite.

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

1937 6.5 Extra lepton vetoes in all channels

1938 Events containing a third lepton (electron or muon) that is neither of the leading $\tau\tau$
1939 legs are rejected, and events with di-muons and di-electrons are vetoed, with criteria
1940 taken from the Standard Model $H \rightarrow \tau\tau$ working group [69]. These vetoes on extra
1941 leptons also ensure orthogonality of events to analyses such as the $bb\mu\mu$ final state,
1942 whose results are combined with this $bb\tau\tau$ final state as described in Section 10.2.

1943 The event is vetoed if a third electron is found with the following properties:
1944 $p_T > 10$ GeV, $|\eta| < 2.5$, impact parameter $|\Delta(z)| < 0.2$ and $|\Delta(xy)| < 0.045$, passing

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

1945 non-isolation MVA identification with 90% efficiency, conversion veto, ≤ 1 missing
 1946 hits, and relative isolation < 0.3 with cone size $\Delta R = 0.3$. The event is also vetoed if
 1947 a third muon is found with the following properties: $p_T > 10$ GeV, $|\eta| < 2.4$, impact
 1948 parameter $|\Delta(z)| < 0.2$ and $|\Delta(xy)| < 0.045$, medium ID, and isolation < 0.3 with
 1949 cone size $\Delta R = 0.4$.

1950 A di-muon veto is applied, which rejects events containing a pair of muons with
 1951 opposite charges and separation of $\Delta R > 0.15$, that both pass the following selections:
 1952 $p_T > 15$ GeV, $|\eta| < 2.4$, flag for global muons, flag for tracker muon, flag for Particle
 1953 Flow muon, $|\Delta(z)| < 0.2$, $|\Delta(xy)| < 0.045$, and isolation < 0.3 with cone size $\Delta R =$
 1954 0.4. A similar di-electron veto is applied to reject events containing a pair of electrons
 1955 with opposite charges and separation of $\Delta R > 0.15$, that both pass the following
 1956 selections: $p_T > 15$ GeV, $|\eta| < 2.5$, a dedicated electron ID (cut-based) for vetoing
 1957 third leptons, $|\Delta(z)| < 0.2$, $|\Delta(xy)| < 0.045$, with pile-up corrected relative isolation
 1958 < 0.3 with cone size $\Delta R = 0.3$.

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 6.5: 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.

¹⁹⁵⁹ Chapter 7

¹⁹⁶⁰ Background estimation

¹⁹⁶¹ This section describes methods used to estimate backgrounds from Standard Model
¹⁹⁶² processes in the search for $h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow bb\tau\tau$. The background contributions directly
¹⁹⁶³ taken from MC are described in Sections 7.1 to 7.6. Section 7.7 describes the data-
¹⁹⁶⁴ driven method for estimating backgrounds from jets faking hadronic tau decays (jet
¹⁹⁶⁵ $\rightarrow \tau_h$), which is used in the $\mu\tau_h$ and $e\tau_h$ channels. Section 7.8 describes the data-driven
¹⁹⁶⁶ method for estimating background from quantum chromodynamic (QCD) processes
¹⁹⁶⁷ in the $e\mu$ channel.

¹⁹⁶⁸ 7.1 Z+jets

¹⁹⁶⁹ A major source of background for $\tau\tau$ analyses is the Drell-Yan (DY) process (Z+jets).
¹⁹⁷⁰ The Z boson decays to $\tau\tau/\mu\mu/ee$ with equal probability of 3.4% each, with the domi-
¹⁹⁷¹ nant decay modes being to hadrons (around 70%) and neutrinos (invisible) (20%) [27].

¹⁹⁷² The Drell-Yan contribution with genuine taus, $Z \rightarrow \tau\tau$, is estimated using embed-
¹⁹⁷³ ded samples, described in Section 4.3. To avoid double-counting between embedded
¹⁹⁷⁴ and MC samples, in all MC samples, events with legs that originated from genuine τ
¹⁹⁷⁵ are discarded.

¹⁹⁷⁶ The other decays of the Z, $Z \rightarrow ee$ and $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$, are estimated from MC simulation,

and are hereafter referred to as simply the Drell-Yan background. These MC samples are generated to leading order (LO) with different numbers of jets (jet multiplicity) in the matrix element: Z+1 jet, Z+2 jets, Z+3 jets, Z+4 jets, and inclusive Z+jets. The cross-sections of the samples with ≥ 1 jets are normalized to next-to-NLO (NNLO) in QCD. For the inclusive Drell-Yan sample, two samples are used with different thresholds for the di-lepton invariant mass ($m_{\ell\ell}$) at the generator level: one with $m_{\ell\ell} > 50$ GeV and the other with $10 < m_{\ell\ell} < 50$.

7.2 W+jets

The dominant W boson decay modes are to hadrons (67.4%), $e + \nu_e$ (10.7%), $\mu + \nu_\mu$ (10.6%), and $\tau + \nu_\tau$ (11.4%) [27]. The W+jets background is estimated from MC simulation. Similarly to the Z+jets, the W+jets samples are generated with different jet multiplicities in the matrix element. LO samples are used for greater statistics and are normalized to NNLO cross-sections.

7.3 $t\bar{t}$ + jets

In hadron collisions, top quarks are produced singly with the weak interaction, or in pairs via the strong interaction, with interference between these leading-order processes possible in higher orders of the perturbation theory. The top quark is the heaviest fermion in the Standard Model and has a short lifetime ($\sim 10^{-25}$ s), decaying without hadronization into a bottom quark and a W boson [27], with the decay modes of the W boson as listed in the previous section. With two top quarks, the final states of the two resulting W bosons can be described as fully leptonic, semileptonic, and fully hadronic. These three final states are modeled separately with MC simulation in 2018 and 2017, while for 2016 the sample used is inclusive.

2000 7.4 Single top

2001 There are three main production modes of the single top in pp collisions [95]: the
2002 exchange of a virtual W boson (t channel), the production and decay of a virtual W
2003 boson (s channel), and the associated production of a top quark and W boson (tW ,
2004 or W-associated) channel. As the s channel process is rare and only 3% of the total
2005 production, the dominant production mode of the t -channel and the tW production
2006 are considered and modeled with MC.

2007 7.5 Diboson

2008 In pp collisions, the production of dibosons (pairs of electroweak gauge bosons, i.e.
2009 WW, WZ, and ZZ) is dominated by quark-antiquark annihilation, with a small con-
2010 tribution from gluon-gluon interactions [96]. MC is used to model the pair production
2011 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 quarks
2012 and ℓ being leptons).

2013 7.6 Standard Model Higgs

2014 MC is used to simulate backgrounds from major production modes of the Standard
2015 Model 125 GeV Higgs boson: gluon-gluon fusion (ggH), vector boson fusion (VBF),
2016 associated production with a W or Z (WH, ZH), and associated production with a
2017 top pair (ttH) (see Fig. 7.1 for leading-order diagrams). For these production modes,
2018 samples with the Higgs decaying to $\tau\tau$ or to WW are used. Samples made with
2019 higher-order diagrams for WH and ZH that include the production of a jet, with the
2020 Higgs decaying to WW, are also used.




Figure 7.1: Leading-order Feynman diagrams of Higgs production from [97], 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).

2021 7.7 Jet faking τ_h

2022 Events with a jet mis-reconstructed as the hadronic tau leg τ_h are a major source of
 2023 background in the $\mu\tau_h$ and $e\tau_h$ channels. The main processes contributing to jet $\rightarrow \tau_h$
 2024 events are QCD multijet, W+jets, and $t\bar{t}$ production. These events are estimated
 2025 using a data-driven method adapted from past analyses [51] [85]. This background
 2026 includes contributions from W+jets, QCD multijets, and $t\bar{t}$ +jets. To estimate this
 2027 background, a sideband region is constructed, where events are required to pass all
 2028 baseline $\mu\tau_h/e\tau_h$ selection criteria, but fail the τ_h isolation criteria. The events in this
 2029 sideband region are reweighed with a factor $f/(1 - f)$, where f is the probability
 2030 for a jet to be misidentified as a τ_h . The jet $\rightarrow \tau_h$ background is the anti-isolated,
 2031 reweighed MC and embedded events subtracted from the anti-isolated, reweighted
 2032 data events.

2033 The fake factor is measured in $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu + \text{jets}$ events in data in the $\mu\mu\tau_h$ final
 2034 state, as any reconstructed τ_h in these events must originate from a jet. The two
 2035 muons are required to be isolated (< 0.15), have opposite electric charges, and have

2036 an invariant mass between 76 and 106 GeV (close to the Z mass). These events are
2037 selected with a double muon trigger, with the leading muon having offline $p_T > 20$
2038 GeV and the subleading muon $p_T > 10$ GeV. Simulated diboson (ZZ and WZ) events
2039 are subtracted to avoid contamination from events with real τ_h . The denominator of
2040 the fake rate corresponds to fake taus passing the VVVLoose working point of the
2041 discriminator vs. jets, while the numerator corresponds to those passing the Medium
2042 working point, i.e. $f = N_{\text{jet passing tight}} / N_{\text{jet passing loose}}$.

2043 f is measured as a function of the τ_h transverse momentum and is 8% - 10% in
2044 each of the data-taking years. f is derived separately for the $\mu\tau_h$ and $e\tau_h$ channels
2045 because the channels use different anti-lepton identification working points.

2046 7.8 QCD multijet background

2047 In the $e\mu$ channel, the rate of events with jets faking electrons or muons originating
2048 from QCD multijet processes, is estimated from data events with the same baseline
2049 selection as in the signal region, except with same-signed (SS) charged $e + \mu$, ensuring
2050 orthogonality with the signal region which requires opposite-sign (OS) $e\mu$ pairs. All
2051 same-sign MC events (both events with real and fake $e + \mu$) are subtracted from
2052 same-sign data events to remove contamination from other backgrounds. i.e. QCD_{SS}
2053 = $\text{Data}_{\text{SS}} - \text{MC}_{\text{SS}}$.

2054 Three scale factors are applied to the QCD_{SS} events to compute the QCD multijet
2055 background [85] [41]:

- 2056 • *OS-to-SS scale factor*: This scales the SS QCD to the OS region, and is mea-
2057 sured from an orthogonal region with an isolated electron and an anti-isolated
2058 muon. Only the muon is chosen to be anti-isolated because this scale factor was
2059 observed to depend more strongly on electron isolation than on muon isolation.
2060 This scale factor is treated as a function of the ΔR separation of the trajectories

2061 of the electron and muon, and is measured separately for events with 0 jets, 1,
2062 jet, and greater than 1 jet.

- 2063 • *2D closure correction for the lepton p_T :* This factor accounts for subleading
2064 dependencies of the first scale factor on the p_T of the two leptons. A 2D weight
2065 is derived in a similar fashion, as a ratio of QCD_{OS} events to QCD_{SS} events,
2066 but parameterized by both electron and muon p_T , where the SS events have the
2067 previous scale factor applied.
- 2068 • *Isolation correction for the muon:* The third and final factor is an isolation
2069 correction, which is a bias correction to account for the fact that the fake factor
2070 was determined for less-isolated muons. This factor is obtained as the ratio of
2071 the OS-to-SS scale factors measured in two other control regions: (1) events
2072 where the electron is anti-isolated ($0.15 < \text{iso} < 0.5$) and the muon is isolated,
2073 and (2) events where both leptons are anti-isolated.

2074

Chapter 8

2075

Systematic uncertainties

2076 Uncertainties in the measurement of a physical observable can be statistical or sys-
2077 tematic in nature. Statistical uncertainties originate from limitations on the number
2078 of events and experiments that can be performed. Systematic uncertainties arise
2079 from the dependence of the physical observable on quantities whose exact values are
2080 unknown and which can only be modeled imperfectly.

2081 The handling of systematic uncertainties is separated into normalization uncer-
2082 tainties (those that affect the total yield of a variable’s distribution) and shape un-
2083 certainties (those that shift the distribution of events). Normalization uncertainties
2084 are expressed as multiplicative factors, while shape uncertainties are represented as
2085 up and down shifts of a variable’s distribution.

2086 Up/down shifts of shape uncertainties can change the number of background
2087 events in a distribution. For instance, hadronic taus receive corrections from the
2088 nominal tau energy scale, with the nominal, up, and down energy scales provided
2089 centrally by CMS. For the $\mu\tau_h$ channel, an event could have a τ_h with p_T just below
2090 the offline threshold of 20 GeV (for instance, 19.5 GeV), so in the nominal distribution
2091 of $m_{\tau\tau}$ (or any other variable for this channel), the event is excluded. However, when
2092 we build our distributions with the tau energy scale “up” shift, the energy of this τ_h

2093 may be scaled up to, say, 20.5 GeV, and now the event passes the offline p_T threshold
2094 for the single muon trigger, leading to the event’s inclusion in the distributions made
2095 with the tau energy scale “up” shift.

2096 In evaluating the up and down shifts of a specific source of uncertainty, all other
2097 corrections and scale factors are held at their nominal values, and the full chain of
2098 object and event selection and event categorization is performed to obtain the observ-
2099 able distributions. Any “downstream” variables that depend on the shifted variable,
2100 e.g. the invariant di-tau mass $m_{\tau\tau}$, must be computed for the nominal case, and then
2101 re-computed separately for each up and down shift of the tau leg’s energy scale. The
2102 objective of this process is to quantify the effect of a single source of uncertainty on
2103 the resulting observable distributions. Each scale factor and correction described in
2104 Section 5.3 has an associated uncertainty. The binning of the uncertainties follows
2105 that of the nominal scale factor value.

2106 Sections 8.1 to 8.5 describe uncertainties associated with physics objects, and
2107 Sections 8.6 and 8.7 describe uncertainties associated with sample-level effects. The
2108 pulls and impacts for the top sixty most important systematics are shown in Section
2109 8.8.

2110 8.1 Uncertainties in the lepton energy scales

2111 The uncertainties in the tau energy scales [66] are binned by the tau decay mode and
2112 are taken as shape uncertainties treated as uncorrelated across the tau decay modes
2113 and years. Same as with the application of the nominal scale factor, when applying
2114 the up or down shifts, the missing transverse energy (p_T^{miss}) of the event is adjusted
2115 so that the 4-vector sum of the tau p_T^{miss} is unchanged.

2116 The uncertainties in the muon energy scale [67] are 0.4% for $|\eta| < 1.2$, 0.9% for
2117 $1.2 < |\eta| < 2.1$, and 2.7% for $2.1 < |\eta| < 2.4$, and are treated as shape uncertainties,

2118 fully uncorrelated between embedded and MC samples.

2119 The uncertainties in the electron energy scale [70] in MC are binned in the electron
2120 $|\eta|$ and p_T , and are shown in Fig. 5.2. The uncertainties range from 0.5% to 2.2% in
2121 the barrel, and 0.3% to 4.1% in the endcap, across the p_T range. The uncertainties
2122 for the embedded sample are binned only in $|\eta|$ and are on the order of 0.5% and
2123 1.25% for the barrel and endcap [74].

2124 There are also uncertainties in the energy scales for electrons and muons misiden-
2125 tified as τ_h . The uncertainty for muons misidentified as τ_h is 1% [66]. For electrons
2126 misidentified as τ_h , the uncertainty is binned in barrel/endcap η and by 1-prong and
2127 1-prong + π_0 decays. The probability for e/μ faking a 3-prong decay mode is much
2128 lower.

2129 8.2 Uncertainties from other lepton corrections

2130 Uncertainties associated with the τ_h identification efficiencies are treated as shapes,
2131 uncorrelated across the seven p_T bins and years. The shape uncertainties in the em-
2132 bedded samples are taken as 50% correlated with those of the MC samples. The
2133 uncertainties on electron and muon identification efficiencies are taken as normaliza-
2134 tion uncertainties of 2% each, with a 50% correlation between embedded and MC
2135 samples.

2136 In the $e\tau_h$ channel, there is an additional uncertainty for the vs. jet discrimination
2137 efficiency [66], because the analysis uses a looser anti-lepton working point (VLoose
2138 WP) than the working points used in the measurement of the efficiency (namely,
2139 VLoose WP vs e, and Tight WP vs mu). For nominal $\tau_h p_T < 100$ GeV, an additional
2140 uncertainty of 3% (5%) is used in MC (embedded), and for high p_T an uncertainty of
2141 15% is used for both.

2142 The uncertainties in trigger efficiencies are taken as shapes [66]. In the $e\tau_h$ and $\mu\tau_h$

2143 channels, there are uncertainties for the single and cross lepton triggers, and in the
2144 $e\mu$ channel there is one uncertainty each for the two $e + \mu$ triggers, and one combined
2145 uncertainty since their trigger phase spaces are not mutually exclusive.

2146 8.3 Uncertainties from jet energy scale and resolution

2147

2148 The jet energy scale uncertainties are taken as shape uncertainties: there are eleven
2149 in total, with seven correlated across years (labeled “Year” below) and the remainder
2150 uncorrelated across years. They affect the b-tag jet p_T and mass, and hence the
2151 missing transverse energy p_T^{miss} . The shifts are propagated through the b-tagging
2152 scale factor calculation and b-tag jet counting.

2153 The uncertainties in the jet energy correction and resolution [89] [98] are as follows:

- 2154 • *Absolute, AbsoluteYear*: flat absolute scale uncertainties.
- 2155 • *BBEC1, BBEC1Year*: for sub-detector regions, with barrel “BB” in $|\eta| < 1.3$
2156 and endcap region 1 “EC1”: $1.3 < |\eta| < 2.5$.
- 2157 • *EC2, EC2 year*: for sub-detector regions, with endcap region 2 “EC2” in $2.5 <$
2158 $|\eta| < 3.0$.
- 2159 • *HF, HF year*: for sub-detector regions, with hadron forward “HF” in $|\eta| > 3$.
- 2160 • *FlavorQCD*: for uncertainty in jet flavor (uds/c/b-quark and gluon) estimates
2161 based on comparing Pythia and Herwig (different MC generator) predictions.
- 2162 • *RelativeBal*: account for a difference between log-linear fits of the two methods
2163 used to study the jet energy response: MPF (missing transverse momentum
2164 projection fraction) and p_T balance.

2165 • *RelativeSample*: account for η -dependent uncertainty due to a difference be-
2166 tween relative residuals, observed with dijet and Z+jets in Run D of 2018 data.

2167 • *JetResolution*: uncertainty in the jet energy resolution.

2168 8.4 Uncertainties from b-tagging scale factors

2169 The b-tagging scale factor has its own set of associated uncertainties (not to be
2170 confused with shifts in the b-tagging scale factor due to the propagation of the jet
2171 energy scale uncertainties described in the previous section 8.3). They are:

- 2172 • *hf*: contamination from heavy flavor (b+c) jets in the light flavor region.
- 2173 • *hfstats1, hfstats2*: linear and quadratic statistical fluctuations from b-flavor jets.
- 2174 • *lf*: contamination from light flavor (udsg+c jets) in the heavy flavor region.
- 2175 • *lfstats1, lfstats2*: linear and quadratic statistical fluctuations from udsg jets.
- 2176 • *cferr, cferr2*: uncertainty for charm jets.

2177 The variations for “lf, hf, hfstats1/2, lfstats1/2” are applied to both b and udsg jets.

2178 For c-flavor jets, only “cferr1/2” is applied.

2179 8.5 Uncertainties from MET

2180 Samples where recoil corrections were applied (Z+jets, W+jets, and Standard Model
2181 Higgs, as described in Section 5.3) have uncertainties from the response and resolution
2182 of the hadronic recoil against the leptonic system. These are each binned in jet
2183 multiplicity.

2184 8.6 Uncertainties associated with samples used

2185 Normalization uncertainties related to the samples used are:

2186 • *Cross-section uncertainties*: $\sigma(t\bar{t})$: 4.2%, $\sigma(\text{diboson})$: 5%, $\sigma(\text{single top})$: 5%,
2187 $\sigma(\text{ggH})$: 3.2%, $\sigma(\text{qqH})$: 2.1%, $\sigma(\text{WH})$: 1.9%, $\sigma(\text{ZH})$: 1.3%, $\sigma(\text{ttH})$: 3.6%

2188 • *Uncertainties in QCD renormalization scale*: QCD scale(qqH): +0.43%-0.33%,
2189 QCD scale(WH): +0.5%-0.7%, QCD scale(ttH): +5.8%-9.2%

2190 • *Branching ratio uncertainties*: $\text{BR}(\text{H} \rightarrow \tau\tau)$: 1.8%, and $\text{BR}(\text{H} \rightarrow \text{WW})$: 1.5%.

2191 • *Normalization uncertainties*: 2% for Drell-Yan, 4% for embedded, 20% pre-fit
2192 for the QCD multijet background in the $e\mu$ channel, 20% pre-fit for the jet
2193 faking background.

2194 The $t\bar{t}$ process has additional acceptance uncertainties from QCD scale variation
2195 and parton shower uncertainties [99]. Parton shower uncertainties originate from
2196 the modeling of perturbative and non-perturbative QCD effects handled in parton
2197 shower MC generators. The scale variations are determined from the envelope of the
2198 6 provided shapes due to variations in the factorization scale, renormalization scale,
2199 and their combined variation [99].

2200 The uncertainty in the Z p_T reweighting in Drell-Yan samples is taken as a shape
2201 uncertainty and the up and down values are 0.9 and 1.1 times the nominal reweighting.
2202 This 10% uncertainty is sufficient to cover uncertainties in the weights derived from
2203 the discrepancies between LO simulations and data in the di-muon mass in $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$
2204 events.

2205 The weight applied to anti-isolated events in the $\mu\tau_h$ and $e\tau_h$ channels to estimate
2206 the background from jets faking τ_h , has shape uncertainties covering uncertainties in
2207 the derivation of the weight. There are six shape uncertainties corresponding to the
2208 binning of the fake rate in the τ_h transverse momentum. For the weight applied to

2209 scale up anti-isolated events in cross-trigger regions, 20% of the nominal weight is
2210 taken as a shape uncertainty.

2211 8.7 Other uncertainties

2212 A 3.6% yield uncertainty in the signal is used to cover uncertainties in the parton
2213 distribution functions (PDFs), knowledge of the α_s (fine structure constant), and
2214 QCD scale. The size of these uncertainties was estimated by a different analysis
2215 searching for two light scalars decaying to four muons, which compared the PDFs
2216 from different model libraries using recommendations from the PDF4LHC Working
2217 Group [100] [101].

2218 Uncertainties in the luminosity measurements can originate from uncertainties in
2219 the luminosity calibration in the van de Meer scan procedure and from detector opera-
2220 tions [44]. Some effects are fully uncorrelated (e.g. if the systematic error is limited by
2221 the statistical uncertainty in the calibration scans taken independently in each year),
2222 and some are correlated, for example in the 2017 and 2018 measurements which used
2223 a method with the same systematic bias. The luminosity normalization uncertainties
2224 are applied to all MC samples, divided into those uncorrelated across years (0.26%
2225 for 2016, 0.60% for 2017, and 0.65% for 2018), one correlated between 2017 and 2018
2226 (0.27%), and one correlated between all three years (1.30%) [42] [43] [44] [86].

2227 8.8 Pulls and impacts

2228 The top impacts and pulls computed for the combination of all channels and years are
2229 shown in Fig. 8.1. The top impacts are related to uncertainty in the signal sample and
2230 cross-section of the $t\bar{t}$ cross-section, and also the yields of the jet faking τ_h background,
2231 which is a major background in all channels and expected to be constrained due to
2232 the yield uncertainty which is taken to be 20% pre-fit.




Figure 8.1: Top sixty pulls and impacts for the combination of all channels and years [102].

2233 **Chapter 9**

2234 **Event categorization and signal
extraction**
2235

2236 Measured events are divided into categories, based on cuts on values of observables
2237 in the event, or some derived quantity based on the observables in the event. The
2238 objective of event categorization is to divide events into signal regions, where the
2239 signal is enhanced and the background is suppressed, and control regions, which are
2240 signal-poor and used to check that the background estimation methods employed in
2241 the analysis in fact accurately model the data. In this analysis, events in each di-tau
2242 channel ($\mu\tau_h$, $e\tau_h$, and $e\mu$) are selected to contain one or more b-tag jets reconstructed
2243 in the event as described in Section 9.1. Events are further divided into signal and
2244 control regions using a deep learning-based approach described in Section 9.2. The
2245 signal is extracted from the di-tau mass distribution in the signal region using the
2246 statistical procedure described in Section 9.3.

2247 **9.1 B-tag jet multiplicity**

2248 Compared to the previous CMS $h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow bb\tau\tau$ analysis which used 2016 data corre-
2249 sponding to an integrated luminosity of 35.9 fb^{-1} [85], this analysis is performed on

the full Run-2 dataset corresponding to an integrated luminosity of 138 fb^{-1} . The increased statistics enable the separation of events into events with exactly 1 b-tag jet and events with greater than 1 b-tag jet, which was not possible in the previous analysis. Further event categorization is performed with deep neural networks (DNNs) described below. The DNNs are used only for separating events into signal and control regions in the 1 b-tag and 2 b-tag jets scenarios, and the final results are extracted from the di-tau mass.

9.2 DNN-based event categorization

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

The input variables capture the key differences between the signal and the background:

- Transverse momentum p_T of the electron and muon in the $e\tau_h$ and $\mu\tau_h$ channels, where the signal tends to have a softer p_T spectrum (lower energy) than the background.
- p_T of the b-tag jet(s). The signal sample b-tag jet(s) tend to have softer p_T .
- Invariant masses of the various objects ($\tau\tau$ legs and the b-tag jet(s)), which tend to be smaller for the signal samples.

- 2275 • The angular separation ΔR between pairs of the objects, where signal samples
 2276 peak at smaller ΔR values.
- 2277 • The transverse mass between the missing transverse energy p_T^{miss} and each of
 2278 the four objects [85], defined as

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

2279 where p_T^ℓ is the transverse momentum of the object ℓ , and $\Delta\phi$ is the difference
 2280 in azimuthal angle between the object and the p_T^{miss} . Events from $t\bar{t}$ +jets and
 2281 jets faking τ_h backgrounds have larger p_T^{miss} resulting in larger transverse mass
 2282 values compared to the signal, which tends to have smaller p_T^{miss} that is also
 2283 more aligned with the lepton legs.

- 2284 • The variable D_ζ [85], defined as

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

2285 where the ζ axis is the bisector of the transverse directions of the visible τ decay
 2286 products. p_ζ is the component of the p_T^{miss} along the ζ axis, and p_ζ^{vis} is the sum
 2287 of the components of the lepton p_T along the same axis. This variable captures
 2288 the fact that in signal the p_T^{miss} is small and approximately aligned with the $\tau\tau$.
 2289 In contrast, the $Z \rightarrow \tau\tau$ background tends towards large D_ζ values because the
 2290 p_T^{miss} is collinear to the $\tau\tau$, and the $t\bar{t}$ +jets events tend to have small D_ζ due to
 2291 a large p_T^{miss} not aligned with the $\tau\tau$.

- 2292 • For events with 2 b-tag jets, one additional variable is defined to capture the
 2293 difference in the invariant mass of the bb and the $\tau\tau$:

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

2294 This variable peaks at zero for the $h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow 2b2\tau$ signal.

2295 The DNN model consists of an input layer, two fully-connected hidden layers,
2296 and one output layer, which has only one output for this binary classification of
2297 signal versus background. Two hidden layers were used, as one hidden layer led
2298 to undertraining, and three hidden layers led to overtraining. One dropout layer
2299 was inserted after each of the two hidden layers, which set zero weights at nodes
2300 chosen at a random rate (the dropout rate) during training to reduce overfitting. The
2301 output node uses a sigmoid activation function to produce a probability-like output
2302 $0 < y < 1$, where background samples were assigned a score of 0 and signal samples
2303 were assigned a score of 1. The training datasets were shuffled and divided into
2304 training, validation, and test sets, with an equal number of signal and background
2305 events in each set. Models were trained on the training set, and the performance on
2306 the training set was compared to the performance on the validation set in order to
2307 guide the tuning of hyperparameters in the DNN models (e.g. the number of nodes
2308 in the hidden layers and the dropout rate). The test set was used only to perform an
2309 unbiased evaluation of the final training.

2310 Events in the data, Monte Carlo, and embedded samples are evaluated with the six
2311 trained DNNs and assigned a raw score between 0 and 1 (background-like and signal-
2312 like respectively). In order to flatten the distribution of the score and define score
2313 thresholds for categorizing events, the raw output scores are transformed with the
2314 function $\tilde{p}(n) = \text{arctanh}(p \times \tanh(n))/n$ where n is a positive integer. The thresholds
2315 of the DNN score used for signal/control region definition are determined using scans
2316 that optimize the signal 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.

	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.

2317 9.3 Methodology for signal extraction

2318 After events are divided into categories, the data is compared to the expected back-
2319 grounds in the signal region categories. Here, we describe the fundamental concepts
2320 behind hypothesis testing in high-energy physics, as well as how exclusion limits
2321 can be set on parameters whose true values we cannot measure, culminating in the
2322 modified frequentist method CL_S which is used to perform signal extraction in this
2323 analysis.

2324 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 [103]. 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

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

2325 read “ f of x given α ”, is referred to as a probability model or model. The parameters α
2326 typically represent parameters of the theory or an unknown property of the detector’s
2327 response. The parameters are not frequentist in nature, unlike x . Out of all the
2328 parameters, typically only a few are of interest, and are called the parameters of
2329 interest (POI), labeled μ here. The remaining are referred to as nuisance parameters
2330 (NP) [103] and are labeled $\boldsymbol{\theta}$.

2331 $f(x)$ is the probability density for the observable in one event and we wish to

2332 describe the probability density for a dataset with many events, $\mathcal{D} = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$,
 2333 called the total probability model \mathbf{f} . For instance, if we also have a prediction for
 2334 the total number of events expected, called ν , we also account for the overall Poisson
 2335 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 [103]. The likelihood function is not a probability density for α
 and is not normalized to unity:

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

2336 i.e. the likelihood function is the value of f as a function of α given a fixed value of
 2337 x .

2338 To estimate the parameter α we use an estimator, which is a function of the
 2339 data. Take for example the measurement of data distributed according to a Gaussian
 2340 probability density $f(x|\mu, \sigma) = \text{Gauss}(x|\mu, \sigma)$. One possible estimator of the mean μ ,
 2341 is the mean of the measured data points $\bar{x} = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i/n$ [103].

2342 A commonly used estimator in physics is the maximum likelihood estimator
 2343 (MLE), defined as the value $\hat{\alpha}$ which maximizes the likelihood function $L(\alpha)$. This
 2344 value, labeled $\hat{\alpha}$, also maximizes $\ln L(\alpha)$ and minimizes $-\ln L(\alpha)$. By convention the
 2345 $-\ln L(\alpha)$ is minimized, in a process called “fitting”, and the maximum likelihood
 2346 estimate is called the “best fit value”.

2347 9.3.2 Hypothesis testing

2348 In this section we next introduce concepts related to hypothesis testing such as the
 2349 test statistic constructed from the ratio of likelihood functions.

2350 The objective of a likelihood analysis is to distinguish different models repre-
 2351 senting the various hypotheses, and determine the one that best explains the ex-
 2352 perimental outcome. In a search for new physics, a signal is additive on top of the
 2353 background. The background-only hypothesis is the null hypothesis, and the signal-
 2354 plus-background hypothesis is the alternative.

2355 As a simple example, take the p -value test, for an experiment where we count
 2356 events in the signal region, n_{SR} , and expect ν_B background events and ν_S events from
 2357 the signal [103]. Then

- 2358 1. The null hypothesis (H_0), i.e. the background-only hypothesis in this experi-
 2359 ment, with the probability modeled by $\text{Poisson}(n_{SR}|\nu_B)$.
- 2360 2. The alternate hypothesis (H_1), i.e. signal-plus-background hypothesis, with the
 2361 probability modeled by $\text{Poisson}(n_{SR}|(\nu_B + \nu_S))$.

2362 The compatibility of the observed data ν_{SR}^0 and the null hypothesis, is quantified as
 2363 the probability that the background-only hypothesis would produce at least as many
 2364 events as was observed. This probability is the p -value:

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

2365 If the p -value is very small, we might reject the null hypothesis. The p -value is not the
 2366 probability of the null hypothesis given the data; rather, it expresses the probability
 2367 that data with a certain property was obtained, assuming the null hypothesis [103].

2368 The p -value is an example of a test statistic T , which maps the data to a single
 2369 real number. The Neyman-Pearson lemma states that out of the infinite possibilities
 2370 of choices of test statistic, the uniformly most powerful test statistic is the likelihood
 2371 ratio T_{NP} [103]:

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

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:

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

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

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

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

9.3.3 Confidence intervals

In an example of the measurement of the Standard Model Higgs boson, $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\text{POI}} = (\sigma/\sigma_{SM}, M_H)$, with σ/σ_{SM} is the ratio of the production cross-section for Higgs with respect to its value in the SM, and M_H is the unknown mass of the Higgs, values of these parameters outside specific bounds are said to be “excluded at the 95% confidence level”. These allowed regions are called confidence levels or confidence regions, and the parameter values outside of them are considered excluded [103]. A 95% confidence interval does not mean that there is a 95% chance that the true value of the parameter is inside the interval. Rather, a 95% confidence interval covers the

2386 true value 95% of the time (even though we do not know the true value).

2387 To construct a confidence interval for a parameter α , the Neyman Construction
2388 is used to invert a series of hypothesis tests; i.e. for each possible value of α , the null
2389 hypothesis is treated as α , and we perform a hypothesis test based on a test statistic.
2390 To construct a 95% confidence interval, we construct a series of hypothesis tests with
2391 size of 5%. The confidence interval $I(\mathcal{D})$ is constructed by taking the set of parameter
2392 values α where the null hypothesis is accepted:

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

2393 where $T(\mathcal{D})$ is the test statistic, and the last α (not bolded) and the subscript k_α
2394 refer to the size of the test. A schematic of the Neyman construction is shown in Fig.
2395 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 [103]. 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 $[\theta_1, \theta_2]$ [103].

2396 9.3.4 Profile likelihood ratio

2397 In this section we describe a frequentist statistical procedure based on the profile
 2398 likelihood ratio test statistic, which is implemented using asymptotic distributions.

2399 With a multi-parameter likelihood function $L(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$, the maximum likelihood of
 2400 one specific parameter α_p with other parameters $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_o$ fixed, is called the conditional
 2401 maximum likelihood estimate and is denoted $\hat{\alpha}_p(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_0)$. The process of choosing specific
 2402 values of the nuisance parameters for a given value of μ , $\mathcal{D}_{\text{simulated}}$, and value of global
 2403 observables \mathcal{G} is called profiling. From the full list of parameters $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$, we denote the
 2404 parameter of interest μ , and the nuisance parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}$.

2405 We construct the profile likelihood ratio,

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

2406 which depends explicitly on the parameter of interest μ , implicitly on the data \mathcal{D}_{sim}
 2407 and global observables \mathcal{G} , and is independent of the nuisance parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, which
 2408 have been eliminated in profiling [103].

2409 The main conceptual reason for constructing the test statistic from the profile
 2410 likelihood ratio is that asymptotically (i.e. for measurements with many events) the
 2411 distribution of the profile likelihood ratio $\lambda(\mu = \mu_{\text{true}})$ is independent of the values of
 2412 the nuisance parameters [103].

2413 The following p -value is used to quantify the consistency with the hypothesis of a
 2414 signal strength of μ :

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

2415 9.3.5 Modified frequentist method: CL_S

2416 In the modified frequentist method called CL_S , to test a hypothesis with signal, we
 2417 define p'_μ as a ratio of p -values [103]:

$$2418 p'_\mu = \frac{p_\mu}{1 - p_b} \quad (9.13)$$

2418 where p_b is the p -value derived under the background-only hypothesis:

$$2419 p_b = 1 - p_0 \equiv 1 - \int_{\tilde{q}_{\mu,\text{obs}}}^{\infty} f(\tilde{q}_\mu | 0, \hat{\theta}(\mu = 0, \text{obs})) d\tilde{q}_\mu. \quad (9.14)$$

2419 The CL_S upper limit on μ , denoted μ_{up} , is obtained by solving for $p'_{\mu_{up}} = 5\%$.
 2420 If testing the compatibility of the data with the background-only hypothesis, we
 2421 consider the p_b value defined above and conventionally convert it into the quantile
 2422 or “sigma” of a unit Gaussian. z standard deviations (e.g. $z = 5$ in “ 5σ ”) means
 2423 that the probability of falling above these standard deviations, equals p_b (e.g. 3σ
 2424 corresponds to $p_b = 2.7 \times 10^{-3}$ or 95.43%, and 5σ corresponds to $p_b = 5.7 \times 10^{-7}$ or
 2425 99.999943%).

2426 **Chapter 10**

2427 **Results**

2428 In this chapter, Section 10.1 presents the results from the $h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow bb\tau\tau$ analysis
2429 performed on 137 fb^{-1} of data from the full CMS Run-2 dataset in the years 2016 to
2430 2018, with interpretations provided for different 2HDM+S scenarios. This analysis
2431 was combined with a different search in the $h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow bb\mu\mu$ final state, which was
2432 also performed on the full Run-2 dataset. The combination procedure and results
2433 from the combined analyses ($h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow bb\ell\ell$, with $\ell = \mu, \tau$) are detailed in Sect^{pm}
2434 10.2. The combined analysis places some of the most stringent limits to date at CMS
2435 for 2HDM+S scenarios in the light scalar mass range $m_a = 12 \text{ GeV}$ to 60 GeV .

2436 **10.1 Results from $bb\tau\tau$**

2437 In each of the three $\tau\tau$ channels studied ($\mu\tau_h$, $e\tau_h$, and $e\mu$), events are divided based
2438 on whether they contain exactly 1 or 2 b-tag jets, and further divided into signal
2439 and control regions (SRs and CRs) using the DNN categorization score as described
2440 in Section 9.2. The control regions demonstrate good agreement between observed
2441 events in data, and the sum of the contributions from expected backgrounds that
2442 are modeled in simulated and embedded samples. The signal regions are defined to
2443 be sensitive to the $h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow bb\tau\tau$ signal. The postfit final observed and expected

2444 distributions of the di-tau invariant mass $m_{\tau\tau}$ reconstructed with SVFit (described
2445 in Section 5.2) are shown in Fig. 10.1 for the $\mu\tau_h$ channel, Fig. 10.2 for the $e\tau_h$
2446 channel, and Fig. 10.3 for the $e\mu$ channel. In all figures, the hypothesized yield for
2447 the $h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow bb\tau\tau$ signal is shown for the pseudoscalar mass $m_a = 35$ GeV and
2448 assuming a branching fraction $B(h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow bb\tau\tau) = 10\%$.

2449 The 95% CL expected and observed exclusion limits on the signal strength of the
2450 branching fraction $B(h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow bb\tau\tau)$ as a function of the pseudoscalar mass m_a
2451 ranging from 12 GeV to 60 GeV, are shown for the three $\tau\tau$ channels and all three
2452 channels combined in Fig. 10.4. The limits are shown as percentages and normalized
2453 to the production cross-section of the Standard Model Higgs boson. No excess of
2454 events above the Standard Model expectations is observed. In the limits for the three
2455 $\tau\tau$ channels combined, expected (observed) limits range from 1.4 to 5.6% (1.7 to
2456 7.6%) for pseudoscalar masses between 12 and 60 GeV.

2457 The $e\mu$ channel is the only channel that has signal sensitivity to the $m_a = 12$
2458 GeV pseudoscalar mass hypothesis, because the minimum required spatial separation
2459 $\Delta R = \sqrt{(\Delta\eta)^2 + (\Delta\phi)^2}$ between the two τ legs is smaller than the other two channels
2460 ($\Delta R < 0.3$ for $e\mu$, compared to $\Delta R < 0.4$ for the other two channels). This decreased
2461 ΔR requirement results in better signal acceptance for low mass signals for the $e\mu$
2462 channel. The $\mu\tau_h$ and $e\tau_h$ channels are most sensitive to the intermediate mass points
2463 studied, since the analysis targets a resolved signature: at low mass points, the tau
2464 legs are boosted, and at high mass points, the $m_{\tau\tau}$ distributions in signal have larger
2465 overlap with background distributions. In the combination of the three $\tau\tau$ channels,
2466 the limit for $m_a = 12$ GeV comes only from the $e\mu$ channel, and the best sensitivity
2467 is attained at intermediate mass points around $m_a = 20$ GeV to 45 GeV.

2468 To set limits on the branching fraction of the 125 GeV Higgs to the two pseu-
2469 doscalars, $B(h \rightarrow aa)$, we interpret the results in four types of 2HDM+S, which were
2470 introduced in Section 1.4. In 2HDM+S, the theorized branching fraction of the pseu-

2471 doscalars depends on the 2HDM+S model type, the pseudoscalar mass m_a , and the
2472 ratio of the two Higgs doublets' vacuum expectation values $\tan \beta$. In Type I models,
2473 the branching fraction is independent of $\tan \beta$, while in Types II, III, and IV, it is
2474 a function of m_a and $\tan \beta$. Limits for the $bb\tau\tau$ final state as a function of m_a for
2475 2HDM+S Type I (valid for all $\tan \beta$ values), Type II with $\tan \beta = 2.0$, Type III with
2476 $\tan \beta = 2.0$, and Type IV with $\tan \beta = 0.6$ are overlaid and shown in Fig. 10.5a.

2477 10.2 Combination with $bb\mu\mu$ final state

2478 Results from this analysis for the $h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow bb\tau\tau$ final state are combined with the
2479 analysis for the $h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow bb\mu\mu$ final state [104]. While the predicted branching ratio
2480 for $aa \rightarrow bb\mu\mu$ is comparatively small, the $bb\mu\mu$ final state has competitive results
2481 due to the excellent di-muon resolution measured by CMS. The $bb\mu\mu$ analysis uses
2482 an unbinned fit to the data using the di-muon mass $m_{\mu\mu}$ distribution. Details can be
2483 found in [104].

2484 Combining the results is possible since the $bb\tau\tau$ analysis explicitly rejects events
2485 with extra leptons, so there is no overlap between the events studied in the $bb\tau\tau$
2486 analysis and the $bb\mu\mu$ analysis. In the statistical combination, several systematic
2487 uncertainties are treated as correlated: the integrated luminosity normalization, the
2488 b-tagging scale factor, the scale factors related to muon reconstruction, identifica-
2489 tion, and trigger efficiencies, the inefficiency in the ECAL trigger readout, and the
2490 theoretical uncertainties related to signal modeling.

2491 Since the results in both final states are statistically limited, the combination ben-
2492 efits from the additional data. For $m_a = 35$ GeV, all systematic uncertainties amount
2493 to around 6% of the total uncertainty, with the dominant systematic uncertainties
2494 coming from jet energy systematics in the $bb\mu\mu$ final state, theoretical uncertainties
2495 in the signal, and uncertainties in the QCD multijet backgrounds in the $e\mu$ channel

2496 of the $bb\tau\tau$ final state.

2497 The mass distributions of the di-muon and di-tau objects ($m_{\mu\mu}$ and $m_{\tau\tau}$) are
2498 compared to the data in a combined maximum likelihood fit to derive upper limits
2499 on $B(h \rightarrow aa)$. The observed limits at 95% CL on $B(h \rightarrow aa)$ for different 2HDM+S
2500 scenarios, are shown for the search for $h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow bb\mu\mu$ in Fig. 10.5b, and the
2501 combined analyses $h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow bb\ell\ell$ in Fig. 10.6.

2502 Exclusion limits in a two-dimensional plane as a function of $\tan\beta$ and m_a are
2503 set for 2HDM+S Types II, III, and IV in Fig. 10.7. The most stringent constraints
2504 are observed for 2HDM+S type III because of large branching fractions predicted in
2505 theory, with predicted branching fractions between 0.47 and 0.42 for $\tan\beta = 2.0$ and
2506 values of m_a between 15 and 60 GeV, compared to the observed 95% CL upper limits
2507 which are between 0.08 and 0.03. For 2HDM+S type IV, the predicted branching
2508 fractions from theory are between 0.26 and 0.20 for $\tan\beta = 0.6$ for values of m_a
2509 between 15 and 60 GeV, and the 95% CL observed upper limits are between 0.12 and
2510 0.05.

2511 The combined results from $h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow bb\ell\ell$ are compared with CMS results in
2512 other final states as a function of the pseudoscalar mass m_a : for 2HDM+S type I in
2513 Fig. 10.8, type II with $\tan\beta = 2.0$ in Fig. 10.9, and type III with $\tan\beta = 2.0$ in Fig.
2514 10.10. In other scenarios, e.g. type III with $\tan\beta = 5.0$, more stringent limits are set
2515 by analyses in other final states, $\mu\mu\tau\tau$ in this case. Other summary plots for other
2516 model types and $\tan\beta$ values can be found at [105].




Figure 10.1: Postfit final $m_{\tau\tau}$ observed and expected distributions, and the observed/expected ratios, in the $\mu\tau_h$ channel [102]. 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 $h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow bb\tau\tau$ 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 [102]. 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 $t\bar{t}+j$ (*purple*). For illustrative purposes, the beyond-Standard Model signal yield from $h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow bb\tau\tau$ 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 [102]. 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. For illustrative purposes, the beyond-Standard Model signal yield from $h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow bb\tau\tau$ 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*) [102]. 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 $m_a = 12 \text{ GeV}$. 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) [102]. 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} [102].




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 [102].




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 [105]. 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, $\frac{\sigma(h)}{\sigma_{SM}} \times B(h \rightarrow aa)$, in the 2HDM+S type II scenario with $\tan \beta = 2.0$, obtained at CMS with data collected at 13 TeV [105]. 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 [105]. 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).

2517 **Chapter 11**

2518 **Asymmetric exotic Higgs decays**

2519 This chapter presents progress towards a search for exotic Higgs decays to two light
2520 scalars with unequal mass ($h \rightarrow a_1 a_2$) to final states with bottom quarks and τ leptons,
2521 which has interpretations in Two Real Singlet Models (TRSMs) described in
2522 Section 1.5. Compared to the symmetric decay scenario $h \rightarrow aa$, which has been studied
2523 in multiple final states at CMS with stringent limits set on the various 2HDM+S
2524 scenarios, this asymmetric decay scenario has not been directly searched for at the
2525 CMS experiment. Section 11.1 lists the mass hypotheses of the new particles a_1 and
2526 a_2 considered in this search. Section 11.2 describes the studies performed on the simulated
2527 signal samples to determine which channels are viable for the analysis. Section
2528 11.3 shows the control plots produced using the framework for this analysis.

2529 **11.1 Signal masses**

2530 As discussed in Section 1.5, $h \rightarrow a_1 a_2$ can result in a “cascade” decay if one of the
2531 scalars, a_2 is sufficiently heavy ($m_{a_2} > 2m_{a_1}$). The “non-cascade” case is where the
2532 light scalars decay directly to Standard Model particles.

2533 The mass hypotheses (mass points) (m_{a_1}, m_{a_2}) studied here are:

- 2534 • *Cascade mass points:* (15, 30), (15, 40), (15, 50), (15, 60), (15, 70), (15, 80),
2535 (15, 90), (15, 100), (15, 110), (20, 40), (20, 50), (20, 60), (20, 70), (20, 80), (20,
2536 90), (20, 100), (30, 60), (30, 70), (30, 80), and (30, 90) GeV

- 2537 • *Non-cascade mass points:* (15, 20), (15, 30), (20, 30), (20, 40), (30, 40), (30,
2538 50), (30, 60), (40, 50), (40, 60), (40, 70), (40, 80), (50, 60), and (50, 70) GeV

2539 Samples were produced using the MadGraph5_aMCatNLO event generator, for each
2540 signal mass point in the gluon-gluon fusion (ggF) and vector boson fusion (VBF)
2541 production modes of the 125 GeV Higgs boson. In the sample generation, the decays
2542 of a to Standard Model particles were specified to be decays to bottom quarks or τ
2543 leptons.

2544 11.2 Cascade scenario signal studies

2545 Generator-level studies of the $h \rightarrow a_1 a_2$ cascade decay were performed to determine
2546 the viability of the $4b2\tau$ and/or $2b4\tau$ channels.

2547 Cross-sections and branching fractions of the $4b2\tau$ and $2b4\tau$ final states were
2548 compared using cross-section predictions provided by the authors of [7]. For an
2549 example mass point $m_{a_2} = 80$ GeV, $m_{a_1} = 30$ GeV, the branching fractions to
2550 $4b2\tau$ is ten times larger than $2b4\tau$: $B(h \rightarrow a_1 a_2 \rightarrow 3a_1 \rightarrow 4b2\tau) = 0.00857$, vs.
2551 $B(h \rightarrow a_1 a_2 \rightarrow 3a_1 \rightarrow 2b4\tau) = 0.00068$. The $4b2\tau$ final state is chosen for this
2552 analysis.

2553 In general the four b-flavor jets have low p_T at generator level, as illustrated for
2554 example mass points (100, 15) GeV and (40, 20) GeV in Fig. 11.1. The p_T distribution
2555 of the sub-leading jet peaks at an energy below 20 GeV, with the third and fourth
2556 jets tending to have even softer energies.

2557 An event category with three or more b-tag jets was determined to be infeasible
2558 due to low statistics in this category, due to the difficulties in reconstructing the third

2559 and fourth b-flavor jets which have very low transverse momenta p_T . Event categories
 2560 with exactly 1 b-tag jet and ≥ 2 b-tag jets are 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.

2561 In the $4b2\tau$ final state, the possibility of the leading and sub-leading b-tag jets
 2562 being sufficiently close in ΔR to require boosted jet reconstruction techniques was
 2563 explored. In the $4b2\tau$ case, the two b-flavor-jets in the generated event that were
 2564 spatially closest in ΔR were considered as one object. This two b-flavor jet object was
 2565 spatially matched in ΔR to the jets reconstructed with the standard AK4 algorithm
 2566 which uses a cone size of $\Delta R = 0.4$. The quality of the p_T resolution (computed as
 2567 $(p_{T,\text{reconstructed}} - p_{T,\text{gen}})/p_{T,\text{gen}}$) and closeness in distance ΔR of the reconstructed jet
 2568 to the nearest generator-level jets, was seen to depend on the absolute and relative
 2569 masses of the light scalars. The best (worst) performance occurred in samples with
 2570 large (small) mass differences between the heavier scalar a_2 and the lighter scalar a_1 ,
 2571 as illustrated for the mass hypotheses (m_{a_1}, m_{a_2}) (100, 15) GeV and (40, 20) GeV in
 2572 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 Control plots for $\mu\tau_h$ channel

2573 The $\tau\tau$ states for the $h \rightarrow a_1 a_2$ to $4b2\tau$ analysis are similar to those in the $h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow$
 2574 $bb\tau\tau$ analysis. For the $\mu\tau_h$ channel, histograms of the key kinematic variables are
 2575 made for data and the sum of the expected backgrounds, which are estimated from
 2576 Monte Carlo samples, embedded samples, and the data-driven method for estimating
 2577 jets faking τ_h as described in Chapter 7. Nominal values of the scale factors and event
 2578 reweighting are applied, as described in Chapter 5.3. The errors shown in the figures
 2579 include statistical errors and several of the full set of systematic errors (only those
 2580 associated with the lepton energy scales and τ_h identification efficiency, described in
 2581

2582 Sections 5.3.1, 5.3.2, and 5.3.4).

2583 The p_T , η , and ϕ of the leading muon and hadronic tau τ_h , and the di-tau visible
2584 mass m_{vis} and momentum $p_{T,\text{vis}}$, are shown in Figures 11.3, 11.4, and 11.5. The p_T ,
2585 η , and ϕ of the leading and sub-leading b-tag jets, and the missing transverse energy
2586 magnitude and azimuthal direction, are shown in Figures 11.6, 11.7, and 11.8.




Figure 11.3: Kinematic properties of the leading muon in the $\mu\tau_h$ channel using 2018 samples: transverse momentum p_T (top), η (middle), and ϕ (bottom). The errors shown in the figures 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 hadronic tau (τ_h) in the $\mu\tau_h$ channel using 2018 samples: transverse momentum p_T (top), η (middle), and ϕ (bottom). The errors shown in the figures 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 11.5: The visible di-tau mass m_{vis} (*top*) and visible di-tau transverse momentum $p_{T,\text{vis}}$ (*bottom*), computed from the sum of the visible 4-momenta of the muon and τ_h in the $\mu\tau_h$ channel using 2018 samples. The errors shown in the figures 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 11.6: Kinematic properties of the leading b-tag jet in the $\mu\tau_h$ final state using 2018 samples: transverse momentum p_T (top), η (middle), ϕ (bottom). The errors shown in the figures 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 11.7: Kinematic properties of the sub-leading b-tag jet in the $\mu\tau_h$ final state using 2018 samples: transverse momentum p_T (top), η (middle), ϕ (bottom). The errors shown in the figures 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 11.8: Missing transverse energy magnitude (*top*) and azimuthal direction (*bottom*) in the $\mu\tau_h$ final state using 2018 samples. The errors shown in the figures 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).

2587

Chapter 12

2588

Conclusion and outlook

2589 This thesis presents a direct search at the CMS experiment for exotic decays of the
2590 Higgs boson with mass 125 GeV in data collected in the years 2016-2018 in proton-
2591 proton collisions at center-of-mass energy 13 TeV, to two light neutral scalar particles
2592 that decay to two bottom quarks and two tau leptons ($h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow bb\tau\tau$). The results
2593 are combined with another search that was performed in the $h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow bb\mu\mu$ final
2594 state, giving the most stringent limits to date for theories with Two Higgs Doublet
2595 Models extended with a singlet scalar (2HDM+S), for pseudoscalar masses m_a ranging
2596 from 15 GeV to 60 GeV, in a number of 2HDM+S scenarios such as type II and III
2597 with $\tan\beta = 2.0$.

2598 As the rich physics program of CMS has set stringent limits on the exotic decay
2599 $h \rightarrow aa$, we turn our attention to direct searches for decays to light neutral scalars
2600 with potentially unequal mass, $h \rightarrow a_1a_2$, which has not been performed at CMS
2601 to date. Preliminary studies on $h \rightarrow a_1a_2$ signals in the Two Real Singlet Model
2602 (TRSM) are shown, and work is ongoing to develop the analysis for $h \rightarrow a_1a_2$ in final
2603 states with bottom quarks and tau leptons.

2604 To ensure the continued performance of the CMS detector and to enhance its
2605 data-taking capabilities in the intense pile-up conditions of the Phase-2 upgrade of

2606 the High-Luminosity LHC, upgrades of the Level-1 Trigger are paramount for filtering
2607 the increased data rate of the HL-LHC. This thesis also presents work on the stan-
2608 dalone barrel calorimeter algorithm for reconstructing and identifying electron and
2609 photon candidates, using high granularity crystal-level information from the ECAL
2610 subdetector. For Phase-2, the increase in the granularity of information sent from
2611 the electromagnetic calorimeter to the Level-1 trigger, from energy sums over towers
2612 (which are 5×5 in crystals) to crystal-level information, allows for the implementation
2613 of a more sophisticated clustering algorithm that can exploit the fact that genuine
2614 electrons and photons tend to leave energies concentrated a 3×5 window in crystals,
2615 and use shape and isolation information to distinguish genuine electrons and photons
2616 from noise. Electrons and photons are key to characterizing Standard Model pro-
2617 cesses and performing searches for new physics, and this represents one of the many
2618 upgrades of the CMS detector in preparation for Phase-2. With the ongoing Run-3
2619 data collecting period, and wealth of ongoing and scheduled upgrades, there remains
2620 an abundance of directions for detector development and physics at CMS heading
2621 into Phase-2 of the LHC.

²⁶²² Appendix A

²⁶²³ Samples used

²⁶²⁴ The datasets used in the MiniAOD-based framework for the $h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow bb\tau\tau$ analysis
²⁶²⁵ are listed in this appendix. The NanoAOD-based framework uses the NanoAOD ver-
²⁶²⁶ sions of these datasets. The data used for the years 2016-2018 are listed in Tables A.1,
²⁶²⁷ A.2, and A.3 respectively. The embedded samples used for the years 2016-2018 are
²⁶²⁸ listed in Tables A.4, A.5, and A.6 respectively. The Monte Carlo simulated samples
²⁶²⁹ used to estimate backgrounds for the years 2016-2018 are listed in Tables A.7, A.8,
²⁶³⁰ and A.9 respectively.

²⁶³¹ The $h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow bb\tau\tau$ signal samples are generated for 11 pseudoscalar masses
²⁶³² between 12 GeV and 60 GeV for gluon fusion (ggF) and vector boson fusion (VBF)
²⁶³³ Higgs production. The 2016-2018 signal samples are listed in Tables A.10, A.11 and
²⁶³⁴ A.12 respectively. A filter is applied at the generator level for each $\tau\tau$ final state:

- ²⁶³⁵ • ee final state: $p_T(e_1) > 22$ GeV, $p_T(e_2) > 10$ GeV, $|\eta(e_1)| < 2.6$, and $|\eta(e_2)| <$
²⁶³⁶ 2.6.
- ²⁶³⁷ • $e\tau_h$ final state: $p_T(e) > 22$ GeV, $p_T(\tau_h) > 16$ GeV, $|\eta(e)| < 2.6$, and $|\eta(\tau_h)| < 2.7$.
- ²⁶³⁸ • $e\mu$ final state: $p_T(e) > 11$ GeV, $p_T(\mu) > 7$ GeV, $|\eta(e)| < 2.6$, and $|\eta(\mu)| < 2.5$.
- ²⁶³⁹ • $\tau_h\tau_h$ final state: $p_T(\tau_{h1}) > 28$ GeV, $p_T(\tau_{h2}) > 28$ GeV, $|\eta(\tau_{h1})| < 2.5$, and

2640 $|\eta(\tau_{h2})| < 2.5$.

2641 • $\mu\tau_h$ final state: $p_T(\mu) > 19 \text{ GeV}$, $p_T(\tau_h) > 16 \text{ GeV}$, $|\eta(\mu)| < 2.5$, and $|\eta(\tau_h)| <$
 2642 2.7 .

2643 • $\mu\mu$ final state: $p_T(\mu_1) > 17 \text{ GeV}$, $p_T(\mu_2) > 8 \text{ GeV}$, $|\eta(\mu_1)| < 2.5$, and $|\eta(\mu_2)| <$
 2644 2.5 .

2645 The tables also show for each sample the filter efficiencies, which is the percentage
 2646 of events that pass the above filters, and the number of events that were generated
 2647 after applying the filters.

Channel	Datasets (2016)	Run range
$e\mu$	/MuonEG/Run2016B-17Jul2018_ver1-v1/MINIAOD	272760-273017
	/MuonEG/Run2016B-17Jul2018_ver2-v1/MINIAOD	273150-275376
	/MuonEG/Run2016C-17Jul2018-v1/MINIAOD	275656-276283
	/MuonEG/Run2016D-17Jul2018-v1/MINIAOD	276315-276811
	/MuonEG/Run2016E-17Jul2018-v2/MINIAOD	276831-277420
	/MuonEG/Run2016F-17Jul2018-v1/MINIAOD	277932-278808
	/MuonEG/Run2016G-17Jul2018-v1/MINIAOD	278820-280385
	/MuonEG/Run2016H-17Jul2018-v1/MINIAOD	281613-284044
$e\tau_h$	/SingleElectron/Run2016B-17Jul2018_ver1-v1/MINIAOD	272760-273017
	/SingleElectron/Run2016B-17Jul2018_ver2-v1/MINIAOD	273150-275376
	/SingleElectron/Run2016C-17Jul2018-v1/MINIAOD	275656-276283
	/SingleElectron/Run2016D-17Jul2018-v1/MINIAOD	276315-276811
	/SingleElectron/Run2016E-17Jul2018-v1/MINIAOD	276831-277420
	/SingleElectron/Run2016F-17Jul2018-v1/MINIAOD	277932-278808
	/SingleElectron/Run2016G-17Jul2018-v1/MINIAOD	278820-280385
	/SingleElectron/Run2016H-17Jul2018-v1/MINIAOD	281613-284044
$\mu\tau_h$	/SingleMuon/Run2016B-17Jul2018_ver1-v1/MINIAOD	272760-273017
	/SingleMuon/Run2016B-17Jul2018_ver2-v1/MINIAOD	273150-275376
	/SingleMuon/Run2016C-17Jul2018-v1/MINIAOD	275656-276283
	/SingleMuon/Run2016D-17Jul2018-v1/MINIAOD	276315-276811
	/SingleMuon/Run2016E-17Jul2018-v1/MINIAOD	276831-277420
	/SingleMuon/Run2016F-17Jul2018-v1/MINIAOD	277932-278808
	/SingleMuon/Run2016G-17Jul2018-v1/MINIAOD	278820-280385
	/SingleMuon/Run2016H-17Jul2018-v1/MINIAOD	281613-284044

Table A.1: Datasets used in the $h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow bb\tau\tau$ analysis for the 2016 era.

Channel	Datasets (2017)	Run range
$e\mu$	/MuonEG/Run2017B-31Mar2018-v1/MINIAOD	297047-299329
	/MuonEG/Run2017C-31Mar2018-v1/MINIAOD	299368-302029
	/MuonEG/Run2017D-31Mar2018-v1/MINIAOD	302031-302663
	/MuonEG/Run2017E-31Mar2018-v1/MINIAOD	303824-304797
	/MuonEG/Run2017F-31Mar2018-v1/MINIAOD	305040-306460
$e\tau_h$	/SingleElectron/Run2017B-31Mar2018-v1/MINIAOD	297047-299329
	/SingleElectron/Run2017C-31Mar2018-v1/MINIAOD	299368-302029
	/SingleElectron/Run2017D-31Mar2018-v1/MINIAOD	302031-302663
	/SingleElectron/Run2017E-31Mar2018-v1/MINIAOD	303824-304797
	/SingleElectron/Run2017F-31Mar2018-v1/MINIAOD	305040-306460
$\mu\tau_h$	/SingleMuon/Run2017B-31Mar2018-v1/MINIAOD	297047-299329
	/SingleMuon/Run2017C-31Mar2018-v1/MINIAOD	299368-302029
	/SingleMuon/Run2017D-31Mar2018-v1/MINIAOD	302031-302663
	/SingleMuon/Run2017E-31Mar2018-v1/MINIAOD	303824-304797
	/SingleMuon/Run2017F-31Mar2018-v1/MINIAOD	305040-306460

Table A.2: Datasets used in the $h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow bb\tau\tau$ analysis for the 2017 era.

Channel	Datasets (2018)	Run range
$e\mu$	/MuonEG/Run2018A-17Sep2018-v1/MINIAOD	315257-316995
	/MuonEG/Run2018B-17Sep2018-v1/MINIAOD	317080-319310
	/MuonEG/Run2018C-17Sep2018-v1/MINIAOD	319337-320065
	/MuonEG/Run2018D-PromptReco-v2/MINIAOD	320500-325175
$e\tau_h$	/EGamma/Run2018A-17Sep2018-v2/MINIAOD	315257-316995
	/EGamma/Run2018B-17Sep2018-v1/MINIAOD	317080-319310
	/EGamma/Run2018C-17Sep2018-v1/MINIAOD	319337-320065
	/EGamma/Run2018D-PromptReco-v2/MINIAOD	320497-325175
$\mu\tau_h$	/SingleMuon/Run2018A-17Sep2018-v2/MINIAOD	315257-316995
	/SingleMuon/Run2018B-17Sep2018-v1/MINIAOD	317080-319310
	/SingleMuon/Run2018C-17Sep2018-v1/MINIAOD	319337-320065
	/SingleMuon/Run2018D-PromptReco-v2/MINIAOD	320500-325175

Table A.3: Datasets used in the $h \rightarrow aa \rightarrow bb\tau\tau$ analysis for the 2018 eras.

Channel	Embedded samples (2016)
$e\mu$	/EmbeddingRun2016B/ElMuFinalState-inputDoubleMu_94X_Legacy_miniAOD-v5
	/EmbeddingRun2016C/ElMuFinalState-inputDoubleMu_94X_Legacy_miniAOD-v5
	/EmbeddingRun2016D/ElMuFinalState-inputDoubleMu_94X_Legacy_miniAOD-v5
	/EmbeddingRun2016E/ElMuFinalState-inputDoubleMu_94X_Legacy_miniAOD-v5
	/EmbeddingRun2016F/ElMuFinalState-inputDoubleMu_94X_Legacy_miniAOD-v5
	/EmbeddingRun2016G/ElMuFinalState-inputDoubleMu_94X_Legacy_miniAOD-v5
	/EmbeddingRun2016H/ElMuFinalState-inputDoubleMu_94X_Legacy_miniAOD-v5
$e\tau_h$	/EmbeddingRun2016B/ElTauFinalState-inputDoubleMu_94X_Legacy_miniAOD-v5
	/EmbeddingRun2016C/ElTauFinalState-inputDoubleMu_94X_Legacy_miniAOD-v5
	/EmbeddingRun2016D/ElTauFinalState-inputDoubleMu_94X_Legacy_miniAOD-v5
	/EmbeddingRun2016E/ElTauFinalState-inputDoubleMu_94X_Legacy_miniAOD-v5
	/EmbeddingRun2016F/ElTauFinalState-inputDoubleMu_94X_Legacy_miniAOD-v5
	/EmbeddingRun2016G/ElTauFinalState-inputDoubleMu_94X_Legacy_miniAOD-v5
	/EmbeddingRun2016H/ElTauFinalState-inputDoubleMu_94X_Legacy_miniAOD-v5
$\mu\tau_h$	/EmbeddingRun2016B/MuTauFinalState-inputDoubleMu_94X_Legacy_miniAOD-v5
	/EmbeddingRun2016C/MuTauFinalState-inputDoubleMu_94X_Legacy_miniAOD-v5
	/EmbeddingRun2016D/MuTauFinalState-inputDoubleMu_94X_Legacy_miniAOD-v5
	/EmbeddingRun2016E/MuTauFinalState-inputDoubleMu_94X_Legacy_miniAOD-v5
	/EmbeddingRun2016F/MuTauFinalState-inputDoubleMu_94X_Legacy_miniAOD-v5
	/EmbeddingRun2016G/MuTauFinalState-inputDoubleMu_94X_Legacy_miniAOD-v5
	/EmbeddingRun2016H/MuTauFinalState-inputDoubleMu_94X_Legacy_miniAOD-v5

Table A.4: Embedded samples used in the analysis for the 2016 era.

Channel	Embedded samples (2017)
$e\mu$	/EmbeddingRun2017B/ElMuFinalState-inputDoubleMu_94X_miniAOD-v2 /EmbeddingRun2017C/ElMuFinalState-inputDoubleMu_94X_miniAOD-v2 /EmbeddingRun2017D/ElMuFinalState-inputDoubleMu_94X_miniAOD-v2 /EmbeddingRun2017E/ElMuFinalState-inputDoubleMu_94X_miniAOD-v2 /EmbeddingRun2017F/ElMuFinalState-inputDoubleMu_94X_miniAOD-v2
$e\tau_h$	/EmbeddingRun2017B/ElTauFinalState-inputDoubleMu_94X_miniAOD-v2 /EmbeddingRun2017C/ElTauFinalState-inputDoubleMu_94X_miniAOD-v2 /EmbeddingRun2017D/ElTauFinalState-inputDoubleMu_94X_miniAOD-v2 /EmbeddingRun2017E/ElTauFinalState-inputDoubleMu_94X_miniAOD-v2 /EmbeddingRun2017F/ElTauFinalState-inputDoubleMu_94X_miniAOD-v2
$\mu\tau_h$	/EmbeddingRun2017B/MuTauFinalState-inputDoubleMu_94X_miniAOD-v2 /EmbeddingRun2017C/MuTauFinalState-inputDoubleMu_94X_miniAOD-v2 /EmbeddingRun2017D/MuTauFinalState-inputDoubleMu_94X_miniAOD-v2 /EmbeddingRun2017E/MuTauFinalState-inputDoubleMu_94X_miniAOD-v2 /EmbeddingRun2017F/MuTauFinalState-inputDoubleMu_94X_miniAOD-v2

Table A.5: Embedded samples used in the analysis for the 2017 era.

Channel	Embedded samples (2018)
$e\mu$	/EmbeddingRun2018A/ElMuFinalState-inputDoubleMu_102X_miniAOD-v1 /EmbeddingRun2018B/ElMuFinalState-inputDoubleMu_102X_miniAOD-v1 /EmbeddingRun2018C/ElMuFinalState-inputDoubleMu_102X_miniAOD-v1 /EmbeddingRun2018D/ElMuFinalState-inputDoubleMu_102X_miniAOD-v1
$e\tau_h$	/EmbeddingRun2018A/ElTauFinalState-inputDoubleMu_102X_miniAOD-v1 /EmbeddingRun2018B/ElTauFinalState-inputDoubleMu_102X_miniAOD-v1 /EmbeddingRun2018C/ElTauFinalState-inputDoubleMu_102X_miniAOD-v1 /EmbeddingRun2018D/ElTauFinalState-inputDoubleMu_102X_miniAOD-v1
$\mu\tau_h$	/EmbeddingRun2018A/MuTauFinalState-inputDoubleMu_102X_miniAOD-v1 /EmbeddingRun2018B/MuTauFinalState-inputDoubleMu_102X_miniAOD-v1 /EmbeddingRun2018C/MuTauFinalState-inputDoubleMu_102X_miniAOD-v1 /EmbeddingRun2018D/MuTauFinalState-inputDoubleMu_102X_miniAOD-v1

Table A.6: Embedded samples used in the analysis for the 2018 era.

Process	Simulated background samples (2016)	Cross section (pb)
DY	/DY1JetsToLL_M-50_TuneCUETP8M1	1012.5 (LO)
	/DY2JetsToLL_M-50_TuneCUETP8M1	332.8 (LO)
	/DY3JetsToLL_M-50_TuneCUETP8M1	101.8 (LO)
	/DY4JetsToLL_M-50_TuneCUETP8M1	54.8 (LO)
	/DYJetsToLL_M-50_TuneCUETP8M1	4963.0 (LO)
	/DY1JetsToLL_M-10to50_TuneCUETP8M1	730.3 (LO)
	/DY2JetsToLL_M-10to50_TuneCUETP8M1	387.4 (LO)
	/DY3JetsToLL_M-10to50_TuneCUETP8M1	95.0 (LO)
	/DY4JetsToLL_M-10to50_TuneCUETP8M1	36.7 (LO)
	/DYJetsToLL_M-10to50_TuneCUETP8M1	16290.0 (LO)
Top	/TTTo2L2Nu_TuneCP5_PSweights	88.29
	/TTToHadronic_TuneCP5_PSweights	377.96
	/TTToSemiLeptonic_TuneCP5_PSweights	365.35
	/ST_t-channel_antitop_4f_inclusiveDecays [†]	26.23
	/ST_t-channel_top_4f_inclusiveDecays [†]	44.07
	/ST_tW_antitop_5f_inclusiveDecays_TuneCUETP8M1	35.6
	/ST_tW_top_5f_inclusiveDecays_TuneCUETP8M1	35.6
VV	/VVTTo2L2Nu_13TeV_amcatnloFXFX_madspin_pythia8	13.84
	/WZTo2L2Q_13TeV_amcatnloFXFX_madspin_pythia8	5.52
	/WZTo3LNu_TuneCUETP8M1_13TeV-amcatnloFXFX-pythia8	4.43
	/ZZTo2L2Q_13TeV_amcatnloFXFX_madspin_pythia8	3.38
	/ZZTo4L_13TeV-amcatnloFXFX-pythia8	1.212
W	/W1JetsToLNu_TuneCUETP8M1	8104.0 (LO)
	/W2JetsToLNu_TuneCUETP8M1	2793.0 (LO)
	/W3JetsToLNu_TuneCUETP8M1	992.5 (LO)
	/W4JetsToLNu_TuneCUETP8M1	544.3 (LO)
	/WJetsToLNu_TuneCUETP8M1	52940.0 (LO)
H	/GluGluHToTauTau_M125	48.58*0.0627
	/GluGluHToWWTo2L2Nu_M125	48.58*0.2137*0.3258*0.3258
	/GluGluZH_HToWW_M125	0.1227*0.2137
	/HWminusJ_HToWW_M125	0.5328*0.2137
	/HWplusJ_HToWW_M125	0.840*0.2137
	/HZJ_HToWW_M125	0.7612*0.2137
	/VBFHToTauTau_M125	3.782*0.0627
	/VBFHToWWTo2L2Nu_M125	3.782*0.2137*0.3258*0.3258
	/WminusHToTauTau_M125	0.5328*0.0627
	/WplusHToTauTau_M125	0.840*0.0627
	/ZHToTauTau_M125	0.7612*0.0627
	/ggZH_HToTauTau_ZToLL_M125	0.1227*0.0627*3*0.033658
	/ggZH_HToTauTau_ZToNuNu_M125	0.1227*0.0627*0.2000
	/ggZH_HToTauTau_ZToQQ_M125	0.1227*0.0627*0.6991
	/ttHToNonbb_M125_TuneCUETP8M2_ttHtranche3	0.5071*(1-0.5824)
	/ttHTobb_M125_TuneCP5	0.5071*0.5824

Table A.7: Background MC samples used in the analysis for the 2016 era. Samples marked with a [†] are generated with the powhegV2-madspin-pythia8 tag.

Process	Simulated background samples (2017)	Cross section (pb)
DY	DY1JetsToLL_M-50_TuneCP5	877.8 (LO)
	DY2JetsToLL_M-50_TuneCP5	304.4 (LO)
	DY3JetsToLL_M-50_TuneCP5	111.5 (LO)
	DY4JetsToLL_M-50_TuneCP5	44.0 (LO)
	DYJetsToLL_M-50_TuneCP5	5343.0 (LO)
	DYJetsToLL_M-10to50_TuneCP5	15810.0 (LO)
Top	TTTo2L2Nu_TuneCP5	88.29
	TTToHadronic_TuneCP5	377.96
	TTToSemileptonic_TuneCP5	365.35
	ST_t-channel_antitop_4f_inclusiveDecays_TuneCP5 [†]	80.94
	ST_t-channel_top_4f_inclusiveDecays_TuneCP5 [†]	136.02
	ST_tW_antitop_5f_inclusiveDecays_TuneCP5	35.85
	ST_tW_top_5f_inclusiveDecays_TuneCP5	35.85
VV	VVTo2L2Nu_13TeV_amcatnloFXFX_madspin_pythia8	13.84
	WZTo2L2Q_13TeV_amcatnloFXFX_madspin_pythia8	5.52
	WZTo3LNu_TuneCP5_13TeV-amcatnloFXFX-pythia8	4.43
	ZZTo2L2Q_13TeV_amcatnloFXFX_madspin_pythia8	3.38
	ZZTo4L_TuneCP5_13TeV-amcatnloFXFX-pythia8	1.212
W	W1JetsToLNu_TuneCP5	8104.0 (LO)
	W2JetsToLNu_TuneCP5	2793.0 (LO)
	W3JetsToLNu_TuneCP5	992.5 (LO)
	W4JetsToLNu_TuneCP5	544.3 (LO)
	WJetsToLNu_TuneCP5	52940.0 (LO)
H	GluGluHToTauTau_M125	48.58*0.0627
	GluGluHToWWTo2L2Nu_M125 ^{††}	48.58*0.2137*0.3258*0.3258
	GluGluZH_HToWW_M125	0.1227*0.2137
	HWminusJ_HToWW_M125	0.5328*0.2137
	HWplusJ_HToWW_M125	0.840*0.2137
	HZJ_HToWW_M125 ^{††}	0.7612*0.2137
	VBFHToTauTau_M125	3.782*0.0627
	VBFHToWWTo2L2Nu_M125 ^{††}	3.782*0.2137*0.3258*0.3258
	WminusHToTauTau_M125	0.5328*0.0627
	WplusHToTauTau_M125	0.840*0.0627
	ZHToTauTau_M125	0.7612*0.0627
	ggZH_HToTauTau_ZToLL_M125	0.1227*0.0627*3*0.033658
	ggZH_HToTauTau_ZToNuNu_M125	0.1227*0.0627*0.2000
	ggZH_HToTauTau_ZToQQ_M125	0.1227*0.0627*0.6991
	ttHToNonbb_M125_TuneCP5	0.5071*(1-0.5824)
	ttHTobb_M125_TuneCP5	0.5071*0.5824

Table A.8: Background MC samples used in the analysis for the 2017 era. All samples use powheg, except the DYJets and WJets samples, which use madgraphMLM. Samples marked with a [†], ^{††}, or ^{†††} were produced with Powheg2 and Pythia8, and Madspin, JHUGenV714, or jhugen724 respectively.

Process	Simulated background samples (2018)	Cross section (pb)
DY	DY1JetsToLL_M-50_TuneCP5	877.8 (LO)
	DY2JetsToLL_M-50_TuneCP5	304.4 (LO)
	DY3JetsToLL_M-50_TuneCP5	111.5 (LO)
	DY4JetsToLL_M-50_TuneCP5	44.0 (LO)
	DYJetsToLL_M-50_TuneCP5	5343.0 (LO)
	DYJetsToLL_M-10to50_TuneCP5	15810.0 (LO)
Top	TTTo2L2Nu_TuneCP5	88.29
	TTToHadronic_TuneCP5	377.96
	TTToSemiLeptonic_TuneCP5	365.35
	ST_t-channel_antitop_4f_InclusiveDecays_TuneCP5 [†]	80.94
	ST_t-channel_top_5f_TuneCP5 [†]	136.02
	ST_tW_antitop_5f_inclusiveDecays_TuneCP5	35.85
VV	ST_tW_top_5f_inclusiveDecays	35.85
	VVTo2L2Nu_13TeV_amcatnloFXFX_madspin	13.84
	WZTo2L2Q_13TeV_amcatnloFXFX_madspin	5.52
	WZTo3LNu_TuneCP5_13TeV-amcatnloFXFX-pythia8	4.43
	ZZTo2L2Q_13TeV_amcatnloFXFX_madspin	3.38
W	ZZTo4L_TuneCP5_13TeV-amcatnloFXFX-pythia8	1.212
	W1JetsToLNu_TuneCP5	8104.0 (LO)
	W2JetsToLNu_TuneCP5	2793.0 (LO)
	W3JetsToLNu_TuneCP5	992.5 (LO)
	W4JetsToLNu_TuneCP5	544.3 (LO)
H	WJetsToLNu_TuneCP5	52940.0 (LO)
	GluGluHToTauTau_M125	48.58*0.0627
	GluGluHToWWTo2L2Nu_M125 ^{††}	48.58*0.2137*0.3258*0.3258
	GluGluZH_HToWW_M125	0.1227*0.2137
	HWminusJ_HToWW_M125 ^{†††}	0.5328*0.2137
	HWplusJ_HToWW_M125 ^{†††}	0.840*0.2137
	HZJ_HToWW_M125 ^{††}	0.7612*0.2137
	VBFHToTauTau_M125	3.782*0.0627
	VBFHToWWTo2L2Nu_M125 ^{†††}	3.782*0.2137*0.3258*0.3258
	WminusHToTauTau_M125	0.5328*0.0627
	WplusHToTauTau_M125	0.840*0.0627
	ZHToTauTau_M125	0.7612*0.0627
	ggZH_HToTauTau_ZToLL_M125	0.1227*0.0627*3*0.033658
	ggZH_HToTauTau_ZToNuNu_M125	0.1227*0.0627*0.2000
	ggZH_HToTauTau_ZToQQ_M125	0.1227*0.0627*0.6991
	ttHTobb_M125_TuneCP5	0.5071*(1-0.5824)
	ttHTobb_M125_TuneCP5	0.5071*0.5824

Table A.9: Background Monte Carlo samples used in the analysis for the 2018 era. All samples listed are generated for 13 TeV collisions and use pythia8. All samples use powheg, except the DYJets and WJets samples, which use madgraphMLM. Samples marked with a [†], ^{††}, or ^{†††}, were produced with Powheg and Pythia8, and Madspin, JHUGenV714, and Jhugen724 respectively.

Signal samples (2016)	# events	Filter eff.
/SUSYGluGluToHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-12_FilterTauTauTrigger	0.4M	3.81%
/SUSYGluGluToHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-15_FilterTauTauTrigger	0.4M	3.54%
/SUSYGluGluToHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-20_FilterTauTauTrigger	1M	3.37
/SUSYGluGluToHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-25_FilterTauTauTrigger	0.2M	3.56%
/SUSYGluGluToHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-30_FilterTauTauTrigger	0.2M	3.16%
/SUSYGluGluToHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-35_FilterTauTauTrigger	0.2M	3.30%
/SUSYGluGluToHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-40_FilterTauTauTrigger	1M	3.30%
/SUSYGluGluToHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-45_FilterTauTauTrigger	0.2M	3.23%
/SUSYGluGluToHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-50_FilterTauTauTrigger	0.2M	3.42%
/SUSYGluGluToHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-55_FilterTauTauTrigger	0.2M	3.65%
/SUSYGluGluToHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-60_FilterTauTauTrigger	1M	3.73
/SUSYVBFHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-12_FilterTauTauTrigger	0.2M	7.94%
/SUSYVBFHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-15_FilterTauTauTrigger	0.2M	7.38%
/SUSYVBFHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-20_FilterTauTauTrigger	0.2M	7.27%
/SUSYVBFHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-25_FilterTauTauTrigger	0.2M	7.21%
/SUSYVBFHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-30_FilterTauTauTrigger	0.2M	6.87%
/SUSYVBFHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-35_FilterTauTauTrigger	0.2M	6.80%
/SUSYVBFHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-40_FilterTauTauTrigger	0.2M	6.78%
/SUSYVBFHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-45_FilterTauTauTrigger	0.2M	6.56%
/SUSYVBFHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-50_FilterTauTauTrigger	0.2M	6.40%
/SUSYVBFHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-55_FilterTauTauTrigger	0.2M	6.54%
/SUSYVBFHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-60_FilterTauTauTrigger	0.2M	6.55%

Table A.10: Signal samples used in the analysis for the 2016 era. All belong to the RunIISummer16MiniAODv3 campaign and are produced with Madgraph and Pythia8. The second column is the number of events after the generator-level filter is applied, and the third column is the filter efficiency (percentage of all events that pass the generator-level filter).

Signal samples (2017)	# events	Filter eff.
/SUSYGluGluToHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-12_FilterTauTauTrigger	0.4M	3.78%
/SUSYGluGluToHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-15_FilterTauTauTrigger	0.4M	3.55%
/SUSYGluGluToHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-20_FilterTauTauTrigger	1M	3.40%
/SUSYGluGluToHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-25_FilterTauTauTrigger	0.2M	3.32%
/SUSYGluGluToHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-30_FilterTauTauTrigger	0.2M	3.36%
/SUSYGluGluToHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-35_FilterTauTauTrigger	0.2M	3.27%
/SUSYGluGluToHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-40_FilterTauTauTrigger	1M	3.03%
/SUSYGluGluToHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-45_FilterTauTauTrigger	0.2M	3.03%
/SUSYGluGluToHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-50_FilterTauTauTrigger	0.2M	3.31%
/SUSYGluGluToHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-55_FilterTauTauTrigger	0.2M	3.56%
/SUSYGluGluToHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-60_FilterTauTauTrigger	1M	3.95%
/SUSYVBFHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-12_FilterTauTauTrigger	0.2M	7.73%
/SUSYVBFHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-15_FilterTauTauTrigger	0.2M	7.35%
/SUSYVBFHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-20_FilterTauTauTrigger	0.2M	7.33%
/SUSYVBFHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-25_FilterTauTauTrigger	0.2M	7.23%
/SUSYVBFHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-30_FilterTauTauTrigger	0.2M	6.84%
/SUSYVBFHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-35_FilterTauTauTrigger	0.2M	6.97%
/SUSYVBFHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-40_FilterTauTauTrigger	0.2M	6.17%
/SUSYVBFHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-45_FilterTauTauTrigger	0.2M	6.67%
/SUSYVBFHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-50_FilterTauTauTrigger	0.2M	6.61%
/SUSYVBFHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-55_FilterTauTauTrigger	0.2M	6.51%
/SUSYVBFHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-60_FilterTauTauTrigger	0.2M	6.71%

Table A.11: Signal samples used in the analysis for the 2017 era. All belong to the RunIIFall17MiniAODv2 campaign and are produced with Madgraph and Pythia8. The second column is the number of events after the generator-level filter is applied, and the third column is the filter efficiency (percentage of all events that pass the generator-level filter).

Signal samples (2018)	# events	Filter eff.
/SUSYGluGluToHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-12_FilterTauTauTrigger	0.4M	3.78%
/SUSYGluGluToHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-15_FilterTauTauTrigger	0.4M	3.49%
/SUSYGluGluToHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-20_FilterTauTauTrigger	1M	3.36%
/SUSYGluGluToHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-25_FilterTauTauTrigger	0.2M	3.46%
/SUSYGluGluToHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-30_FilterTauTauTrigger	0.2M	3.18%
/SUSYGluGluToHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-35_FilterTauTauTrigger	0.2M	3.28%
/SUSYGluGluToHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-40_FilterTauTauTrigger	1M	3.10%
/SUSYGluGluToHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-45_FilterTauTauTrigger	0.2M	3.21%
/SUSYGluGluToHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-50_FilterTauTauTrigger	0.2M	3.14%
/SUSYGluGluToHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-55_FilterTauTauTrigger	0.2M	3.56%
/SUSYGluGluToHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-60_FilterTauTauTrigger	1M	3.38%
/SUSYVBFHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-12_FilterTauTauTrigger	0.2M	7.78%
/SUSYVBFHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-15_FilterTauTauTrigger	0.2M	7.52%
/SUSYVBFHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-20_FilterTauTauTrigger	0.2M	6.87%
/SUSYVBFHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-25_FilterTauTauTrigger	0.2M	7.21%
/SUSYVBFHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-30_FilterTauTauTrigger	0.2M	6.51%
/SUSYVBFHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-35_FilterTauTauTrigger	0.2M	6.95%
/SUSYVBFHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-40_FilterTauTauTrigger	0.2M	6.81%
/SUSYVBFHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-45_FilterTauTauTrigger	0.2M	6.62%
/SUSYVBFHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-50_FilterTauTauTrigger	0.2M	6.56%
/SUSYVBFHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-55_FilterTauTauTrigger	0.2M	6.64%
/SUSYVBFHToAA_AToBB_AToTauTau_M-60_FilterTauTauTrigger	0.2M	6.75%

Table A.12: Signal samples used in the analysis for the 2018 era. All belong to the RunIIIAutumn18MiniAOD campaign and are produced with Madgraph and Pythia8. The second column is the number of events after the generator-level filter is applied, and the third column is the filter efficiency (percentage of all events that pass the generator-level filter).

²⁶⁴⁸ Bibliography

- ²⁶⁴⁹ [1] Paul H. Frampton. Journeys Beyond the Standard Model. 54(1):52–
²⁶⁵⁰ 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.
- ²⁶⁵³ [2] Meinard Kuhlmann. Quantum Field Theory. In Edward N. Zalta and Uri Nodelman, editors, *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Metaphysics Research
²⁶⁵⁴ Lab, Stanford University, Summer 2023 edition, 2023.
- ²⁶⁵⁵ [3] Steven Weinberg. The Making of the Standard Model. *Eur. Phys. J. C*, 34:
²⁶⁵⁶ 5–13, 2004. URL <https://cds.cern.ch/record/799984>.
- ²⁶⁵⁸ [4] Christopher G. Tully. *Elementary Particle Physics in a Nutshell*. Princeton
²⁶⁵⁹ University Press, Princeton, 2012. ISBN 9781400839353. doi: doi:10.1515/
²⁶⁶⁰ 9781400839353. URL <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400839353>.
- ²⁶⁶¹ [5] John Ellis. Higgs Physics. In *2013 European School of High-Energy Physics*,
²⁶⁶² pages 117–168, 2015. doi: 10.5170/CERN-2015-004.117.
- ²⁶⁶³ [6] David Curtin, Rouven Essig, Stefania Gori, and Others. Exotic decays of the 125
²⁶⁶⁴ GeV Higgs boson. *Phys. Rev. D*, 90:075004, Oct 2014. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevD.
²⁶⁶⁵ 90.075004. URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.90.075004>.
- ²⁶⁶⁶ [7] 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.
- [8] CERN. The history of CERN, 2024. URL <https://timeline.web.cern.ch/timeline-header/89>.
- [9] R. Schmidt. Accelerator physics and technology of the LHC. In *ROXIE: Routine for the Optimizazation of Magnet X-Sections, Inverse Field Calculation and Coil End Design*, pages 7–17, 1998.
- [10] 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.
- [11] Antonella Del Rosso. Aerial view of the LHC and the four major experiments. 2017. URL <https://cds.cern.ch/record/2253966>. General Photo.
- [12] ATLAS Collaboration. ATLAS: Detector and physics performance technical design report. Volume 1. 5 1999.
- [13] CMS Collaboration. CMS Physics: Technical Design Report Volume 1: Detector Performance and Software. 2006.
- [14] L Musa. Conceptual Design Report for the Upgrade of the ALICE ITS. Technical report, CERN, Geneva, 2012. URL <https://cds.cern.ch/record/1431539>.
- [15] S. Amato et al. LHCb technical proposal: A Large Hadron Collider Beauty Experiment for Precision Measurements of CP Violation and Rare Decays. 2 1998.
- [16] Werner Herr and B Muratori. Concept of luminosity. 2006. doi: 10.5170/CERN-2006-002.361. URL <https://cds.cern.ch/record/941318>.

- 2691 [17] Olivier S. Brning and Frank Zimmerman. Parameter space for the LHC lu-
2692 minosity upgrade. ISBN 978-3-95450-115-1. URL <https://accelconf.web.cern.ch/IPAC2012/papers/moppc005.pdf>.
- 2693
2694 [18] LHC Design Report Vol.1: The LHC Main Ring. 6 2004. doi: 10.5170/
2695 CERN-2004-003-V-1.
- 2696 [19] CMS Collaboration. Pileup mitigation at CMS in 13 TeV data. *JINST*, 15(09):
2697 P09018, 2020. doi: 10.1088/1748-0221/15/09/P09018.
- 2698 [20] CMS Collaboration. Measurement of the inelastic proton-proton cross section
2699 at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV. *JHEP*, 07:161, 2018. doi: 10.1007/JHEP07(2018)161.
- 2700 [21] CMS Collaboration. High-Luminosity Large Hadron Collider (HL-LHC): Tech-
2701 nical design report. 10/2020, 12 2020. doi: 10.23731/CYRM-2020-0010.
- 2702 [22] CMS Collaboration. The CMS Experiment at the CERN LHC. *JINST*, 3:
2703 S08004, 2008. doi: 10.1088/1748-0221/3/08/S08004.
- 2704 [23] CMS Collaboration. Particle-flow reconstruction and global event description
2705 with the CMS detector. *JINST*, 12(10):P10003, 2017. doi: 10.1088/1748-0221/
2706 12/10/P10003.
- 2707 [24] V Karimki, M Mannelli, P Siegrist, H Breuker, A Caner, R Castaldi, K Freuden-
2708 reich, G Hall, R Horisberger, M Huhtinen, and A Cattai. *The CMS tracker sys-
2709 tem project: Technical Design Report*. Technical design report. CMS. CERN,
2710 Geneva, 1997. URL <https://cds.cern.ch/record/368412>.
- 2711 [25] The Phase-2 Upgrade of the CMS Tracker. Technical report, CERN, Geneva,
2712 2017. URL <https://cds.cern.ch/record/2272264>.
- 2713 [26] CMS Collaboration. CMS Technical Design Report for the Pixel Detector Up-
2714 grade. 9 2012. doi: 10.2172/1151650.

- 2715 [27] R. L. Workman and Others. Review of particle physics. 2022:083C01. doi:
2716 10.1093/ptep/ptac097.
- 2717 [28] CMS Technical Design Report for the Phase 1 Upgrade of the Hadron Calorime-
2718 ter. 9 2012. doi: 10.2172/1151651.
- 2719 [29] CMS Technical Design Report for the Level-1 Trigger Upgrade. 6 2013.
- 2720 [30] S. Dasu et al. CMS. The TriDAS project. Technical design report, vol. 1: The
2721 trigger systems. 12 2000.
- 2722 [31] Alex Tapper. The CMS Level-1 Trigger for LHC Run II. *PoS*, ICHEP2016:242,
2723 2016. doi: 10.22323/1.282.0242.
- 2724 [32] A. Zabi, F. Beaudette, L. Cadamuro, O. Davignon, T. Romantreau, T. Strebler,
2725 M. Cepeda, J.B. Sauvan, N. Wardle, R. Aggleton, F. Ball, J. Brooke, D. New-
2726 bold, S. Paramesvaran, D. Smith, J. Taylor, C. Foudas, M. Baber, A. Bun-
2727 dock, S. Breeze, M. Citron, A. Elwood, G. Hall, G. Iles, C. Laner, B. Pen-
2728 ning, A. Rose, A. Shtipliyski, A. Tapper, I. Ojalvo, T. Durkin, K. Harder,
2729 S. Harper, C. Shepherd-Themistocleous, A. Thea, T. Williams, S. Dasu,
2730 L. Dodd, R. Forbes, T. Gorski, P. Klabbers, A. Levine, T. Ruggles, N. Smith,
2731 W. Smith, A. Svetek, J. Tikalsky, and M. Vicente. The cms level-1 calorimeter
2732 trigger for the lhc run ii. *Journal of Instrumentation*, 12(01):C01065, jan 2017.
2733 doi: 10.1088/1748-0221/12/01/C01065. URL <https://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/12/01/C01065>.
- 2735 [33] P. Klabbers et al. CMS level-1 upgrade calorimeter trigger prototype develop-
2736 ment. *JINST*, 8:C02013, 2013. doi: 10.1088/1748-0221/8/02/C02013.
- 2737 [34] CMS Collaboration. The Phase-2 Upgrade of the CMS Data Acquisition and
2738 High Level Trigger. Technical report, CERN, Geneva, 2021. URL [https:](https://)

- 2739 `//cds.cern.ch/record/2759072`. This is the final version of the document,
2740 approved by the LHCC.
- 2741 [35] C. Foudas. The CMS Level-1 Trigger at LHC and Super-LHC. In *34th Inter-*
2742 *national Conference on High Energy Physics*, 10 2008.
- 2743 [36] CMS Software Guide. High Level Trigger (TWiki), 2024. URL <https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/CMSPublic/SWGuideHighLevelTrigger>.
- 2744 [37] The Worldwide LHC Computing Grid. 2012. URL <https://cds.cern.ch/record/1997398>.
- 2745 [38] Douglas Thain, Todd Tannenbaum, and Miron Livny. Distributed computing
2746 in practice: the Condor experience. *Concurrency and Computation: Practice*
2747 *and Experience*, 17(2-4):323–356, 2005. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/cpe.938>.
2748 URL <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/cpe.938>.
- 2749 [39] Alexandre Zabi, Jeffrey Wayne Berryhill, Emmanuelle Perez, and Alexander D.
2750 Tapper. The Phase-2 Upgrade of the CMS Level-1 Trigger. 2020.
- 2751 [40] Technical proposal for a MIP timing detector in the CMS experiment Phase 2
2752 upgrade. Technical report, CERN, Geneva, 2017. URL <https://cds.cern.ch/record/2296612>.
- 2753 [41] CMS Collaboration. Search for exotic decays of the Higgs boson to a pair of
2754 pseudoscalars in the $\mu\mu bb$ and $\tau\tau bb$ final states. *European Physical Journal C*,
2755 2 2024.
- 2756 [42] CMS Collaboration. CMS luminosity measurement for the 2016 data-taking
2757 period. CMS Physics Analysis Summary CMS-PAS-LUM-17-001, 2017. URL
2758 <https://cds.cern.ch/record/2257069>.

- 2762 [43] CMS Collaboration. CMS luminosity measurement for the 2017 data-taking
2763 period at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV. CMS Physics Analysis Summary CMS-PAS-LUM-17-
2764 004, 2018. URL <https://cds.cern.ch/record/2621960>.
- 2765 [44] CMS Collaboration. CMS luminosity measurement for the 2018 data-taking
2766 period at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV. CMS Physics Analysis Summary CMS-PAS-LUM-18-
2767 002, 2019. URL <https://cds.cern.ch/record/2676164>.
- 2768 [45] CMS LUMI Group. CMS Luminosity Public Results (TWiki), 2024. URL
2769 <https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/CMSPublic/LumiPublicResults>.
- 2770 [46] J. Alwall, R. Frederix, S. Frixione, et al. The automated computation of tree-
2771 level and next-to-leading order differential cross sections, and their matching
2772 to parton shower simulations. *Journal of High Energy Physics*, 2014(7), July
2773 2014. 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).
- 2774
- 2775 [47] R. Frederix, S. Frixione, V. Hirschi, et al. The automation of next-to-leading
2776 order electroweak calculations. *Journal of High Energy Physics*, 2018(7), July
2777 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).
- 2778
- 2779 [48] S. Agostinelli, J. Allison, K. Amako, et al. Geant4 - a simulation toolkit. 506(3):
2780 250–303. ISSN 0168-9002. doi: 10.1016/S0168-9002(03)01368-8. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0168900203013688>.
- 2781
- 2782 [49] CMS Collaboration. An embedding technique to determine $\tau\tau$ backgrounds
2783 in proton-proton collision data. *JINST*, 14(06):P06032, 2019. doi: 10.1088/
2784 1748-0221/14/06/P06032.
- 2785 [50] CMS Collaboration. Search for neutral MSSM Higgs bosons decaying to a pair

- 2786 of tau leptons in pp collisions. *JHEP*, 10:160, 2014. doi: 10.1007/JHEP10(2014)
2787 160.
- 2788 [51] CMS Collaboration. Measurements of Higgs boson production in the decay
2789 channel with a pair of τ leptons in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV.
2790 *Eur. Phys. J. C*, 83(7):562, 2023. doi: 10.1140/epjc/s10052-023-11452-8.
- 2791 [52] CMS Collaboration. Reconstruction and identification of tau lepton decays to
2792 hadrons and tau neutrinos at CMS. *Journal of Instrumentation*, 11(01):P01019–
2793 P01019, January 2016. ISSN 1748-0221. doi: 10.1088/1748-0221/11/01/p01019.
2794 URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/11/01/P01019>.
- 2795 [53] CMS Collaboration. Performance of τ -lepton reconstruction and identification
2796 in CMS. *Journal of Instrumentation*, 7(01):P01001, jan 2012. doi: 10.1088/
2797 1748-0221/7/01/P01001. URL <https://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/7/01/P01001>.
- 2798 [54] CMS Collaboration. Performance of reconstruction and identification of τ lep-
2799 tons decaying to hadrons and ν_τ in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV. *JINST*, 13
2800 (10):P10005, 2018. doi: 10.1088/1748-0221/13/10/P10005.
- 2801 [55] CMS Collaboration. Identification of hadronic tau lepton decays using a deep
2802 neural network. *JINST*, 17:P07023, 2022. doi: 10.1088/1748-0221/17/07/
2803 P07023.
- 2804 [56] CMS Collaboration. Performance of CMS muon reconstruction in pp collision
2805 events at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV. *Journal of Instrumentation*, 7(10):P10002–P10002,
2806 October 2012. ISSN 1748-0221. doi: 10.1088/1748-0221/7/10/p10002. URL
2807 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/7/10/P10002>.
- 2808 [57] CMS Collaboration. Performance of electron reconstruction and selection with
2809 the CMS detector in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV. *Journal of Instru-*

- 2811 *mentation*, 10(06):P06005, 2015. doi: 10.1088/1748-0221/10/06/P06005. URL
2812 <https://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/10/06/P06005>.
- 2813 [58] CMS Collaboration. Identification of b-quark jets with the CMS experiment.
2814 *Journal of Instrumentation*, 8(04):P04013–P04013, April 2013. ISSN 1748-
2815 0221. doi: 10.1088/1748-0221/8/04/p04013. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/8/04/P04013>.
2816
- 2817 [59] CMS Collaboration. Pileup Removal Algorithms. Technical report, CERN,
2818 Geneva, 2014. URL <https://cds.cern.ch/record/1751454>.
- 2819 [60] CMS Collaboration. CMS Phase 1 heavy flavour identification performance and
2820 developments. 2017. URL <https://cds.cern.ch/record/2263802>.
- 2821 [61] CMS Collaboration. Performance of the DeepJet b tagging algorithm using
2822 41.9 fb^{-1} of data from proton-proton collisions at 13 TeV with Phase 1 CMS
2823 detector. 2018. URL <https://cds.cern.ch/record/2646773>.
- 2824 [62] Lorenzo Bianchini, John Conway, Evan Klose Friis, and Christian Veelken. Re-
2825 construction of the Higgs mass in $H \rightarrow \tau\tau$ Events by Dynamical Likelihood
2826 techniques. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 513(2):022035, jun 2014.
2827 doi: 10.1088/1742-6596/513/2/022035. URL <https://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/513/2/022035>.
2828
- 2829 [63] CMS Collaboration. Evidence for the 125 GeV Higgs boson decaying to a pair
2830 of τ leptons. *JHEP*, 05:104, 2014. doi: 10.1007/JHEP05(2014)104.
- 2831 [64] CMS Collaboration. Missing transverse energy performance of the CMS detec-
2832 tor. *JINST*, 6:P09001, 2011. doi: 10.1088/1748-0221/6/09/P09001.
- 2833 [65] Artur Kalinowski. CMS AN-19-032 (internal): Reconstruction of a τ pair in-
2834 variant mass with a simplified likelihood scan, 2019.

- 2835 [66] CMS TAU POG. Tau Physics Object Group: Tau ID Recommendation
2836 For Run 2, 2024. URL <https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/CMS/TauIDRecommendationForRun2>.
- 2838 [67] CMS MUO POG. Muon Physics Object Group: Recommendations, 2024. URL
2839 <https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/CMS/MuonPOG>.
- 2840 [68] CMS MUO POG. Muon Physics Object Group: Reference guidelines and results
2841 for muon momentum scale and resolution in Run II, 2024. URL <https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/CMS/MuonReferenceScaleResolRun2>.
- 2843 [69] CMS HTT working group. Higgs To Tau Tau Working TWiki for the full Run-
2844 2 legacy analysis, 2024. URL <https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/CMS/HiggsToTauTauWorkingLegacyRun2>.
- 2846 [70] CMS ELE POG. Electron Physics Object Group: Recommendations
2847 , 2024. URL <https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/CMS/EgammaRunIIRecommendations>.
- 2849 [71] CMS ELE POG. Electron Physics Object Group: Recommendations for
2850 2016 to 2018 UL, 2024. URL <https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/CMS/EgammaUL2016To2018>.
- 2852 [72] CMS TAU Embedding Group. Tau embedded samples using 2016
2853 data, 2024. URL <https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/CMS/TauTauEmbeddingSamples2016Legacy>.
- 2855 [73] CMS TAU Embedding Group. Tau embedded samples using 2017
2856 data, 2024. URL <https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/viewauth/CMS/TauTauEmbeddingSamples2017>.

- 2858 [74] CMS TAU Embedding Group. Tau embedded samples using 2018
2859 data, 2024. URL <https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/viewauth/CMS/>
2860 [TauTauEmbeddingSamples2018](#).
- 2861 [75] Tau Lepton Run 2 Trigger Performance. 2019. URL <https://cds.cern.ch/record/2678958>.
- 2863 [76] CMS Taus High Level Trigger Studies. Tau Lepton Run 2 Trigger Performance
2864 (CMS DP-2019/012), 2024. URL <https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/CMSPublic/HLTauAllRun2>.
- 2866 [77] Muon HLT Performance with 2018 Data. 2018. URL <https://cds.cern.ch/record/2627469>.
- 2868 [78] Single and Double Electron Trigger Efficiencies using the full Run 2 dataset.
2869 2020. URL <https://cds.cern.ch/record/2888577>.
- 2870 [79] Run II Trigger Performance For $e\mu$ Triggers. 2019. URL <https://cds.cern.ch/record/2687013>.
- 2872 [80] Performance of electron and photon reconstruction in Run 2 with the CMS
2873 experiment. 2020. URL <https://cds.cern.ch/record/2725004>.
- 2874 [81] CMS Collaboration. Performance of the CMS muon detector and muon recon-
2875 struction with proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV. *JINST*, 13(06):P06015,
2876 2018. doi: 10.1088/1748-0221/13/06/P06015.
- 2877 [82] Piet Verwilligen. Muons in the cms high level trigger system. *Nuclear
2878 and Particle Physics Proceedings*, 273-275:2509–2511, 2016. ISSN 2405-6014.
2879 doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nuclphysbps.2015.09.441>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S240560141500930X>. 37th Inter-
2880 national Conference on High Energy Physics (ICHEP).

- 2882 [83] Muon tracking performance in the CMS Run-2 Legacy data using the tag-and-
2883 probe technique. 2020. URL <https://cds.cern.ch/record/2724492>.
- 2884 [84] V.M. Abazov, B. Abbott, M. Abolins, et al. A novel method for modeling
2885 the recoil in W boson events at hadron colliders. *Nuclear Instruments and*
2886 *Methods in Physics Research Section A: Accelerators, Spectrometers, Detectors*
2887 *and Associated 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>.
- 2890 [85] CMS Collaboration. Search for an exotic decay of the Higgs boson to a pair of
2891 light pseudoscalars in the final state with two b quarks and two τ leptons in
2892 proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV. *Phys. Lett. B*, 785:462, 2018. doi:
2893 [10.1016/j.physletb.2018.08.057](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2018.08.057).
- 2894 [86] CMS LUMI POG. Luminosity Physics Object Group: Recommendations, 2024.
2895 URL <https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/CMS/TWikiLUM>.
- 2896 [87] The modeling of the top quark p_T (TWiki), 2024. URL <https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/CMS/TopPtReweighting>.
- 2897 [88] CMS BTV group. Methods to apply b-tagging efficiency scale factors (TWiki), 2024. URL <https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/CMS/BTagShapeCalibration>.
- 2898 [89] CMS Collaboration. Jet energy scale and resolution in the CMS experiment in
2899 pp collisions at 8 TeV. *JINST*, 12(02):P02014, 2017. doi: [10.1088/1748-0221/12/02/P02014](https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/12/02/P02014).
- 2900 [90] Garvita Agarwal. Jet Energy Scale and Resolution Measurements in CMS. *PoS*,
2901 ICHEP2022:652, 2022. doi: [10.22323/1.414.0652](https://doi.org/10.22323/1.414.0652).

- 2906 [91] CMS JERC group. Jet Energy Corrections (TWiki), 2024. URL <https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/CMS/JECDataMC>.
- 2907
- 2908 [92] CMS JERC group. Jet Energy Resolution (TWiki), 2024. URL <https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/CMS/JetResolution>.
- 2909
- 2910 [93] CMS MUO POG. Muon Physics Object Group: Baseline muon selec-
- 2911 tions for Run-II, 2024. URL <https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/CMS/SWGuideMuonIdRun2>.
- 2912
- 2913 [94] CMS ELE POG. Electron Identification Based on Simple Cuts, 2024. URL <https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/CMSPublic/EgammaPublicData>.
- 2914
- 2915 [95] Jose Enrique Palencia Cortezon. Single top quark production at CMS. Technical
- 2916 report, CERN, Geneva, 2018. URL <https://cds.cern.ch/record/2640578>.
- 2917 [96] CMS Collaboration. Measurements of the electroweak diboson production cross
- 2918 sections in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 5.02$ TeV using leptonic decays.
- 2919 *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 127(19):191801, 2021. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.127.191801.
- 2920 [97] CMS Collaboration. A portrait of the Higgs boson by the CMS experiment
- 2921 ten years after the discovery. *Nature*, 607(7917):60–68, 2022. doi: 10.1038/s41586-022-04892-x.
- 2922
- 2923 [98] CMS JERC group. Jet energy scale uncertainty sources (TWiki), 2024. URL <https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/CMS/JECUncertaintySources>.
- 2924
- 2925 [99] TOP Systematic Uncertainties (Run 2) (TWiki), 2024. URL <https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/viewauth/CMS/TopSystematics>.
- 2926
- 2927 [100] Search for a non-standard-model Higgs boson decaying to a pair of new light
- 2928 bosons in four-muon final states. Technical report, CERN, Geneva, 2013. URL <https://cds.cern.ch/record/1563546>.
- 2929

- 2930 [101] Michiel Botje et al. The PDF4LHC Working Group Interim Recommendations.
2931 1 2011.
- 2932 [102] Cécile Caillol, Pallabi Das, Sridhara Dasu, Pieter Everaerts, Stephanie Kwan,
2933 Isobel Ojalvo, and Ho-Fung Tsoi. CMS AN-20-213 (internal): Search for an
2934 exotic decay of the 125 GeV Higgs boson to light pseudoscalars, with a pair of
2935 b jets and a pair of tau leptons in the final state, 2020.
- 2936 [103] Kyle Cranmer. Practical Statistics for the LHC. In *2011 European School of*
2937 *High-Energy Physics*, pages 267–308, 2014. doi: 10.5170/CERN-2014-003.267.
- 2938 [104] Elham Khazaie, Maryam Zeinali, Hamed Bakhshiansohi, and Abideh Jafari.
2939 CMS AN-21-058 (internal): Search for exotic decays of the Higgs boson to a
2940 pair of new light bosons with two muons and two b jets in the final states at
2941 $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV, 2021.
- 2942 [105] CMS Higgs Physics Analysis Group. Summary of 2HDM+S searches at 13 TeV
2943 (Run 2), 2024. URL <https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/CMSPublic/Summary2HDMRun2>.