



BEIHANG UNIVERSITY  
UNIVERSITÉ LIBRE DE BRUXELLES

---

# Search for new physics in dilepton final states at the CMS experiment

---

Wenxing Fang

Thesis submitted for the degree of

**Doctor of Philosophy**

Bruxelles, 15 April 2019



**Defense date:**

- Private: 23th May at Beihang University, Beijing (China)
- Public: 19th June at Université Libre de Bruxelles, Brussels (Belgium)

**Doctoral jury:**

- Prof. Barbara CLERBAUX (Université Libre de Bruxelles, Belgium), co-promoter
- Prof. Chengping SHEN (Fudan University, China), co-promoter
- Prof. Laura Lopez Honorez (Université Libre de Bruxelles, Belgium)
- Prof. Li YUAN (Beihang University, China)
- Prof. Yajun MAO (Peking University, China)
- Prof. Andrea Giammanco (UCL, Belgium)
- Dr. Reza Goldouzian (University of Notre Dame, UAS)

**Internal Chinese readers:**

- Prof. Yujie ZHANG (Beihang University, China)
- Prof. Huaxing CHEN (Beihang University, China)
- Prof. Yong BAN (Peking University, China)
- Prof. Mingshui CHEN (IHEP, China)
- Prof. Chunxu YU (Nankai University, China)



---

## 摘要

该论文介绍了利用双电子末态寻找新的重共振态和在顶夸克产生过程寻找新物理的研究。论文的第一章介绍了粒子物理中的标准模型。紧接着在第二章介绍了一些与研究相关的超标准模型。在第三章介绍了欧洲大型强子对撞机（LHC）和紧凑缪子线圈探测器（CMS）。在随后的一章介绍了 CMS 中粒子的重建技术和过程。最后给出这两个研究的具体介绍。

第一个研究是在双电子末态寻找重的共振态。这个新的共振态是许多超标准模型所预言的，例如大统一理论（GUT）和额外维理论。如果存在这种共振态，那么我们将会双电子不变质量谱中观察到一个新的质量峰。该研究利用了 CMS 在 2016 年采集到的  $35.9 \text{ fb}^{-1}$  和在 2017 年采集到的  $41.4 \text{ fb}^{-1}$  的数据。采用了优化的事例选择条件以增加其对信号事例选择效率。该分析的主要本底来自 Drell-Yan 过程，该过程利用蒙特卡洛样本（MC）来模拟。对于次要的顶夸克对和类顶夸克对过程，该分析也采用 MC 来模拟，同时利用数据来对 MC 进行检查。对于喷注（jet）误判为电子的本底，该分析利用 data-driven 的方法来估计该本底的贡献。在观察研究了最终的双电子不变质量谱后发现数据的分布与标准模型的预期相符合，并没有看到新物理存在的迹象。因此，在研究的最后给出了相关的新共振态产生截面乘以衰变分支比的上限和对应的新共振态的质量下限。

第二个研究是利用双电子和双缪子末态在顶夸克产生过程中寻找新物理。由于顶夸克是基本粒子中最重的粒子，其与 Higgs 粒子和 W 玻色子有很强的耦合。因此，顶夸克在许多新物理模型中占有重要地位。该研究利用了 CMS 在 2016 年采集到的  $35.9 \text{ fb}^{-1}$  的数据。所研究的过程包括顶夸克对（ $t\bar{t}$ ）产生过程和单个顶夸克伴随一个 W 玻色子产生过程（ $tW$ ）。同时，由于  $t\bar{t}$  和  $tW$  过程很接近，该研究利用了多变量分析的方法去区分  $t\bar{t}$  和  $tW$  过程。由于最终的数据分布和标准模型预期的分布一致，因此并没有发现新物理。最终该研究利用有效场理论给出了对可能存在的新耦合的强度的限制。

**关键词:** 新物理，双电子，双缪子，重共振态，顶夸克，CMS实验，有效场理论，多变量分析



---

## Résumé

Cette thèse décrit la recherche de nouvelles résonances massives qui se désintègrent en une paires d' électrons et la recherche de nouvelle physique dans le secteur des quarks top. Le modèle standard des particules élémentaires est présenté dans le premier chapitre. Ensuite, nous décrivons une sélection de théories au-delà du modèle standard prédisant l'existence de nouvelles résonances massives, ainsi qu'une introduction à la théorie effective des champs utilisée pour la recherche de nouvelles physiques dans le secteur des quark top. Après cela, le collisionneur LHC (Large Hadron Collider) et le détecteur CMS (Compact Muon Solenoid) sont introduits, et les techniques utilisées afin de reconstruire les particules produit dans les collisions sont discutées ensuite. Finalement, deux analyses séparées sont présentées.

La première est la recherche de nouvelles résonances massives dans l'état final diélectron. Certaines théories au-delà du modèle standard prédisent l'existence de nouvelles résonances massives pouvant se désintégrer en paires d' électrons, telles que les théories de grande unification et les théories qui introduisent des dimensions spatiales supplémentaires. L'observation d'un excès local d' événements dans le spectre de masse invariante diélectron serait la preuve de l'existence d'une nouvelle résonance massive. Les données utilisées proviennent de l'expérience CMS, et correspondent à  $35.9 \text{ fb}^{-1}$  collectés en 2016 et  $41.4 \text{ fb}^{-1}$  en 2017. La sélection d'événements est optimisée pour les électrons de haute énergie et pour éviter de perdre des événements de signal potentiels. Le processus principal est le processus Drell-Yan et il est estimé à partir de simulations. Les processus  $t\bar{t}$  et  $t\bar{t}$ -like sont aussi important, et sont également estimés à partir de simulations. La simulation de ce bruit de fond est validée par une méthode d' analyse de données. Le dernier bruit de fond, à savoir les processus de chromodynamique quantique, est déterminé à partir des données. Après inspection du spectre de masse invariante diélectron, aucun excès significatif par rapport au bruit de fond du modèle standard n'est observé, et une limite supérieure à 95% de niveau de confiance est posée sur le rapport entre d' une part le produit de la section efficace de production d'une nouvelle résonance par son rapport de branchement en diélectron, et d' autre part ce même produit mesuré au pic du boson Z.

La deuxième analyse est la recherche de nouvelle physique dans le secteur des quarks top avec les états finaux diélectron et dimuon en utilisant les données collectées par l'expérience CMS en 2016 avec  $35.9 \text{ fb}^{-1}$ . En raison de sa masse élevée et de sa masse proche de l' énergie de brisure de la symétrie électrofaible, le quark top devrait jouer un rôle important dans plusieurs scénarios de nouvelle physique. Nous recherchons cette nouvelle physique dans la production de paires de quarks top et dans la production d' un seul quark top associé à un boson, et une analyse multivariée est utilisée pour séparer ces deux processus. Aucun écart significatif par rapport aux prédictions du modèle standard n'est observé. Les résultats sont interprétés dans le cadre d'une théorie effective des champs et les contraintes sur les couplages effectifs correspondants sont définies à un niveau de confiance de 95%.

**Mots clés:** nouvelle physique, diélectron, dimuon, résonances massives, quark top, Expérience CMS, théorie effective des champs, analyse multivariée.





---

## Abstract

This thesis describes searches for new heavy resonances that decay into dielectron final state and searches for new physics in the top quark sector. The standard model of elementary particle is introduced in the first chapter. After that, a selection of theories beyond the standard model that predict the existence of new massive resonances are described together with an introduction to the effective field theory that is used to search for new physics in top quark sector. Then, the Large Hadron Collider (LHC) and the Compact Muon Solenoid (CMS) detector are introduced, and the techniques used in order to reconstruct the particles produced in the collisions are discussed afterwards. Finally, two separate analyses are presented.

The first one is searching for new heavy resonances using dielectron final state. As some beyond Standard Model theories predict the existence of new heavy resonances that can decay into dielectron pair, such as the grand unified theories and theories that introduce extra space-like dimensions. An observation of a local “bump” in the dielectron invariant mass spectrum will be an evidence for the existence of a new heavy resonance. The data used is from CMS experiment collected in 2016 with  $35.9 \text{ fb}^{-1}$  and in 2017 with  $41.4 \text{ fb}^{-1}$ . The event selection is optimized in order to be highly efficiency for high energy electron and avoid losing potential signal events. The leading background is the Drell-Yan process and it is estimated from simulation. The sub-leading background is from  $t\bar{t}$  and  $t\bar{t}$ -like processes and it is estimated from simulation also. A data-driven method is used to validate the simulation of sub-leading background. The last background from quantum chromodynamics processes is determined by data-driven approach. After having inspected the final dielectron invariant mass spectrum, no significant excess over the standard model background is observed, and upper limit at 95% confidence level is set on the ratio of production cross-section times branching ratio of a new resonance to the one at the Z boson peak.

The second analysis is the search for new physics in the top quark sector with dielectron and dimuon final states using data collected by the CMS experiment in 2016 with  $35.9 \text{ fb}^{-1}$ . Because of its high mass and close to electroweak symmetry breaking scale, the top quark is expected to play an important role in several new physics scenarios. The new physics in top quark pair production and in single top quark production in association with a W boson are investigated and a dedicated multivariate analysis is used to separate these two processes. No significant deviation from the standard model expectation is observed. Results are interpreted in the framework of an effective field theory and constraints on the relevant effective couplings are set at 95% confidence level.

**Key words:** new physics, dielectron, dimuon, heavy resonances, top quark, CMS experiment, effective field theory, multivariate analysis.



---

## Acknowledgements

This thesis would have not been possible without the contributions of many people who helped me during the five years of my doctoral studies.

Firstly, I would like to greatly thank Chengping Shen who is my PhD supervisor at Beihang University and supervised the work presented here. We met each other in 2014 for the first time, he was very friendly and enthusiastic. He inspired my interest in particle physics and opened the door to do a PhD thesis. He gave me great guidance, great support, and countless advices during my PhD study in Beihang University. It is him who encouraged and supported me to be a joint PhD between Beihang University and Université Libre de Bruxelles (ULB). Besides, he provided me great help and suggestions when I was searching for a job after my PhD.

Secondly, I would give great thanks to Barbara Clerbaux who is my PhD supervisor at ULB and supervised the work presented here. She is very kind, thoughtful, and supportive. She is expert in CMS and she gave me countless guidance during my PhD study in CMS. When I had some questions, she always can provide me very nice explanations and answers. It is she who leaded me to the world of searching for new physics in CMS. She also cared about my living at Brussels and provided me help without hesitation when I needed.

Then, I want to thank the people with whom I worked in searching for new physics. I want to thank Reza Goldouzian who helped me a lot both in theoretical and experimental parts of my research. Besides, I want to thank Sam Harper for the time he devoted to me in discussions and explanations. I learnt many things in these occasions. A special acknowledgement goes to Xuyang Gao who is one of my best partner of my research, we worked together efficiently and pleasantly. In addition, a great thank goes to Aidan Randle-Conde who helped me a lot at the beginning of my  $Z'$  search study. I would like thank to Laurent Thomas from whom I took over the high  $P_T$  electron selection efficiency study in  $Z'$  searching. I want to thank Giuseppe Fasanella who did a very nice work in the  $Z'$  search team, he is friendly and provided me a very nice Latex template for my PhD thesis.

Moreover, I want to thank the people in IIHE. Firstly, I would like to thank Laurent Favart who is director of IIHE from ULB, we met each other at first time in Beihang University in 2014. He is gentle and friendly as well as taking care of my living in ULB. Secondly, I would thank Pascal Vanlaer who is enthusiastic, easy going and willing to help when I had some questions, he gave me useful comments on my  $V_{tx}$  phenomenological study. Then, I want to thank Audrey Terrier who is the secretary at IIHE. She is very kind and helped a lot in my accommodation and living at ULB. Finally, I would like thank to IIHE IT team who works very hard in maintaining and upgrading the IIHE computer cluster which is easy to use and has very high computing efficiency.

A special thank goes to my office mates, Amandeep and Diego, we get along very well and I wish them all the best for their future.

Last but not least, I would like to thank my family for the great support and understanding during my PhD study.

Although it is impossible to name everyone here, I would like to thank all of you who helped me.



# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Searching for High Mass Resonances in Dielectron Final State</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Data and MC samples . . . . .	1
1.2	Trigger . . . . .	2
1.2.1	Method for Measuring Trigger Efficiencies in Data . . . . .	4
1.2.2	Primary Signal Trigger: L1 Efficiency . . . . .	5
1.2.3	Primary Signal Trigger: HLT Efficiency . . . . .	6
1.2.4	Other Trigger Efficiencies . . . . .	6
1.3	Object and Event Selection . . . . .	8
1.4	Mass Resolution and Scale . . . . .	10
1.5	HEEP ID Efficiency and Scale Factor . . . . .	18
1.5.1	Tag and probe method . . . . .	18
1.5.2	HEEP ID efficiencies and scale factors . . . . .	30
1.6	Standard Model Backgrounds . . . . .	38
1.6.1	SM Drell-Yan background . . . . .	38
1.6.2	$t\bar{t}$ and $t\bar{t}$ -like backgrounds . . . . .	43
1.6.3	Jet background . . . . .	45
1.7	Invariant Mass Spectra . . . . .	50
1.7.1	Complementary plot . . . . .	56
1.8	Statistical Interpretation . . . . .	59
1.8.1	Upper limits . . . . .	63
1.9	Summary . . . . .	66
	<b>Appendices</b>	<b>66</b>



# List of Figures

1.1	Pile up distributions for data and MC samples in 2016 (left) and in 2017 (right) . . . . .	2
1.2	The efficiency for an electron passing HEEP to pass the lowest unscaled L1 SingleEG seed versus supercluster $E_T$ and $\eta$ in barrel (left) and in endcap (right) for 2016 [12]. . . . .	5
1.3	The efficiency for an electron passing HEEP to pass the lowest unscaled L1 SingleEG seed versus supercluster $E_T$ and $\eta$ in barrel and endcap for 2017 [13]. . . . .	6
1.4	The efficiency for electron in the barrel (left) and endcap (right) passing HEEP to pass an online supercluster $E_T > 33$ GeV cut for 2016 [12]. . . .	6
1.5	The efficiency for electron in the barrel (left) and endcap (right) passing HEEP to pass an online supercluster $E_T > 33$ GeV cut for 2017 [13]. . . .	7
1.6	The efficiency for electron in the barrel and endcaps passing HEEP to pass the CaloIdL+MW ID requirement(left) and CaloIdL+GsfTrkIdVL ID requirement (right) for 2016 [12]. . . . .	7
1.7	The efficiency for electron in the barrel and endcaps passing HEEP to pass the CaloIdL+MW ID requirement for 2017 [13]. . . . .	7
1.8	The efficiency for an electron passing HEEP to pass the HLT_Ele27_eta2p1_WPTight trigger for 2016 [12]. . . . .	8
1.9	The efficiency for an electron passing HEEP to pass the HLT_Ele35_WPTight for $E_T$ less than 40 GeV (left) and $E_T$ more than 40 GeV (right) for 2017 [13]. . . . .	8
1.10	Definition of the regions used to compute the ECAL (left) and HCAL (right) isolation. . . . .	10
1.11	The distributions of dielectron invariant masses at the Z peak in data (top) and MC (bottom) for the BB (left) and BE (right) regions in 2016 [12]. . .	11
1.12	The distributions of dielectron invariant masses at the Z peak in data (top) and MC (bottom) for the BB (left) and BE (right) regions in 2017. . . . .	12
1.13	The mean (left) and sigma (right) values of dCB as the function of $E_T$ (top) and energy (bottom) of leading electron for barrel-barrel channel. . . . .	13
1.14	The mean (left) and sigma (right) values of dCB as the function of $E_T$ (top) and energy (bottom) of endcap electron for barrel-endcap channel. . . . .	14
1.15	The mean (left) and sigma (right) values of dCB as the function of $\eta$ of second electron (the first electron is asked to have $ \eta  < 0.5$ ) for barrel-barrel (top) and barrel-endcap (bottom) channels. . . . .	15
1.16	The mass resolutions ( $\sigma_{fit}$ ) as a function of generated Z boson mass for BB (left) and BE (right) regions in 2016 (top) [12] and 2017 (bottom). . . . .	16
1.17	The mass scales as a function of generated Z boson mass for BB (left) and BE (right) regions in 2016 (top) [12] and 2017 (bottom). . . . .	17

1.18	Invariant mass distributions of tag and probe for probe in the barrel (left) and endcap (right) where all the probes are included (top), only passing probes are included (middle), and only failed probes are included (bottom) for 2016. . . . .	20
1.19	$E_T$ of probe in the barrel (left) and endcap (right) where all the probes are included (top), only passing probes are included (middle), and only failed probes are included (bottom) for 2016. . . . .	21
1.20	$\eta$ of probe where all the probes are included (top left), only passing probes are included (top right), and only failed probes are included (bottom) for 2016. . . . .	22
1.21	$\phi$ of probe in the barrel (left) and endcap (right) where all the probes are included (top), only passing probes are included (middle), and only failed probes are included (bottom) for 2016. . . . .	23
1.22	Number of primary vertex of tag and probe pair event in the barrel (left) and endcap (right) where all the probes are included (top), only passing probes are included (middle), and only failed probes are included (bottom) for 2016. . . . .	24
1.23	Invariant mass of tag and probe distributions for probe in the barrel (left) and endcap (right) where all the probes are included (top), only passing probes are included (middle), and only failed probes are included (bottom) for 2017. . . . .	25
1.24	$E_T$ of probe in the barrel (left) and endcap (right) where all the probes are included (top), only passing probes are included (middle), and only failed probes are included (bottom) for 2017. . . . .	26
1.25	$\eta$ of probe where all the probes are included (top left), only passing probes are included (top right), and only failed probes are included (bottom) for 2017. . . . .	27
1.26	$\phi$ of probe in the barrel (left) and endcap (right) where all the probes are included (top), only passing probes are included (middle), and only failed probes are included (bottom) for 2017. . . . .	28
1.27	Number of primary vertex of tag and probe pair event in the barrel (left) and endcap (right) where all the probes are included (top), only passing probes are included (middle), and only failed probes are included (bottom) for 2017. . . . .	29
1.28	The HEEP efficiencies in data and MC, as well as the scale factors when the probe is in the barrel (top) and endcap (bottom) where the non-DY processes are included (left) and subtracted (right) as functions of probe $E_T$ in 2016. . . . .	30
1.29	The HEEP efficiencies in data and MC, as well as the scale factors where the non-DY processes are included (left) and subtracted (right) as functions of probe $\eta$ in 2016. . . . .	31
1.30	The HEEP efficiencies in data and MC, as well as the scale factors when the probe is in the barrel (top) and endcap (bottom) where the non-DY processes are included (left) and subtracted (right) as functions of probe $\phi$ in 2016. . . . .	31
1.31	The HEEP efficiencies in data and MC, as well as the scale factors when the probe is in the barrel (top) and endcap (bottom) where the non-DY processes are included (left) and subtracted (right) as functions of the number of primary vertices, $n_{Vtx}$ in 2016. . . . .	32



1.32	The HEEP efficiencies in data and MC, as well as the scale factors when the probe is in the barrel (top) and endcap (bottom) where the non-DY processes are included (left) and subtracted (right) as functions of probe $E_T$ in 2017. . . . .	33
1.33	The HEEP efficiencies in data and MC, as well as the scale factors where the non-DY processes are included (left) and subtracted (right) as functions of probe $\eta$ in 2017. . . . .	34
1.34	The HEEP efficiencies in data and MC, as well as the scale factors when the probe is in the barrel (top) and endcap (bottom) where the non-DY processes are included (left) and subtracted (right) as functions of probe $\phi$ in 2017. . . . .	34
1.35	The HEEP efficiencies in data and MC, as well as the scale factors when the probe is in the barrel (top) and endcap (bottom) where the non-DY processes are included (left) and subtracted (right) as functions of the number of primary vertices, $n_{Vtx}$ in 2017. . . . .	35
1.36	HEEP ID efficiency in data after non-DY contributions are subtracted for different runs for barrel and endcap in 2017. . . . .	37
1.37	Data - MC agreement in the Z peak region with the MC normalized to the luminosity of data for the barrel-barrel (left) and barrel-endcap (right) regions. The trigger turn on curve, gsf reconstruction and HEEP ID scale factor are applied for MC in 2016 (top) [12] and 2017 (bottom) [13]. . . . .	40
1.38	The ratio of the $Z/\gamma^* \rightarrow e^+e^-$ cross-section as predicted by FEWZ 3.1.b2 using the LUXqed_plus_PDF4LHC15_nnlo_100 PDF set and that predicted by POWHEG at NLO using the NNPDF3.0 PDF set in various mass bins. The cross-sections are normalized to each other in the 60 to 120 GeV bin [12]. . . . .	41
1.39	The PDF uncertainties on the DY cross section relative to the Z peak region as a function of mass. . . . .	42
1.40	Invariant mass spectra of the $e\mu$ events in data and MC for 2016 (left) [12] and 2017 (right) [13]. . . . .	43
1.41	The measured HEEP ID fake rate vs $E_T$ for the barrel region (top left), the endcap low $ \eta $ region (top right) and the endcap high $ \eta $ region (bottom) in 2016 [12]. . . . .	48
1.42	The measured HEEP ID fake rate vs $E_T$ for the barrel region (top left), the endcap low $ \eta $ region (top right) and the endcap high $ \eta $ region (bottom) in 2017 [13]. . . . .	48
1.43	The dielectron mass spectra (left) and the cumulated distributions (right) for both electrons in the endcaps in 2016 (top) and 2017 (bottom). . . . .	49
1.44	The observed dielectron mass spectrum (left) and the integral of the measured dielectron mass spectrum (right) for barrel-barrel (top), barrel-endcap (middle) and sum of the barrel-barrel and the barrel-endcap (bottom) together with the predicted standard model backgrounds in 2016. . . . .	51
1.45	The observed dielectron mass spectrum (left) and the integral of the measured dielectron mass spectrum (right) for barrel-barrel (top), barrel-endcap (middle) and sum of the barrel-barrel and the barrel-endcap (bottom) together with the predicted standard model backgrounds in 2017. . . . .	52
1.46	The ratio of observed dielectron mass spectrum in signal region for barrel-barrel (top left), barrel-endcap (top right) and sum of the barrel-barrel and the barrel-endcap together (bottom) in 2016. . . . .	53

1.47	The ratio of observed dielectron mass spectrum in signal region for barrel-barrel (top left), barrel-endcap (top right) and sum of the barrel-barrel and the barrel-endcap together (bottom) in 2017. . . . .	53
1.48	The distributions of invariant mass of two electrons in barrel-barrel, barrel-endcap and barrel-barrel + barrel-endcap (first row), $E_T$ , $\eta$ and $\phi$ of leading electron (second row) and $E_T$ , $\eta$ and $\phi$ of sub-leading electron (third row), $\Delta R$ , $\Delta\phi$ between two electrons and $p_T$ of Z (fourth row) in 2016. . .	57
1.49	The distributions of invariant mass of two electrons in barrel-barrel, barrel-endcap and barrel-barrel + barrel-endcap (first row), $E_T$ , $\eta$ and $\phi$ of leading electron (second row) and $E_T$ , $\eta$ and $\phi$ of sub-leading electron (third row), $\Delta R$ , $\Delta\phi$ between two electrons and $p_T$ of Z (fourth row) in 2017. . .	58
1.50	The total SM background together with the fitted functional form used to enter it into the limit setting tools for the barrel-barrel (left) and barrel-endcap (right) channels in 2016 (top) and 2017 (bottom). . . . .	60
1.51	The acceptance times efficiency for a spin-1 or spin-2 particle to be selected by the analysis in the barrel-barrel region (left) and barrel-endcap region (right) together with the fitted functional form used to enter it into the limit setting tools in 2016 (top) [12] and 2017 (bottom) [CMS-AN-18-021]. $E_T$ independent effects which will cancel in the ratio to the acceptance times efficiency at the Z peak are not included. These are primarily the data/MC efficiency scale factor and the trigger ID efficiency. . . . .	62
1.52	The 95% CL upper limits on $R_\sigma$ for a spin 1 resonance with a width equal to 0.6% of the resonance mass for 2016 (left) [25] and 2017 (right) [26]. The shaded bands correspond to the 68% and 95% quantities for the expected limits. Theoretical predictions for the spin 1 $Z'_{\text{SSM}}$ and $Z'_\psi$ resonances are also shown. . . . .	63
1.53	The 95% CL upper limits on $R_\sigma$ for a spin 1 resonance with a width equal to 0.6% of the resonance mass for the dielectron (using 2016 and 2017 data) and dimuon (using 2016 data) final states combined. The shaded bands correspond to the 68% and 95% quantities for the expected limits. Theoretical predictions for the spin 1 $Z'_{\text{SSM}}$ and $Z'_\psi$ resonances are also shown [26]. . . . .	64
1.54	The 95% CL upper limits on $R_\sigma$ for a spin 1 resonance with a width equal to 0.6%, 3%, 5%, and 10% of the resonance mass in 2016 [25]. . . . .	64
1.55	The 95% CL upper limits on $R_\sigma$ for a spin 2 resonance for the dielectron (left) and its combination with dimuon (right) final states in 2016. The shaded bands correspond to the 68% and 95% quantities for the expected limits. Theoretical predictions for the spin 2 resonances with width equal to 0.01, 0.36, and 1.42 GeV corresponding to coupling parameters $k/\bar{M}_{Pl}$ of 0.01, 0.005, and 0.10 are shown for comparison [25]. . . . .	65

# List of Tables

1.1	The various datasets using in the analysis and their integrated luminosities. X = DoubleEG is for the main analysis, X = SingleElectron is for the trigger and electron selection efficiency, X = SinglePhoton is for the fake electron study and X = SingleMuon is for the $e\mu$ study. . . . .	2
1.2	MC samples used in the main analysis. . . . .	3
1.3	The definitions of HEEP selection cuts [14]. . . . .	9
1.4	The results of scale shift $\frac{\Delta M}{M}$ between data and MC, as well as the $\sigma_{extra}$ parameters per category. . . . .	13
1.5	MC samples used in the HEEP efficiency and scale factor studies . . . . .	18
1.6	The HEEP efficiencies in data and MC, as well as the scale factors when the probe is in the barrel and endcap for non-DY processes included and subtracted. . . . .	36
1.7	Measurements of the DY cross section in the range of $60 < M_{ee} < 120$ GeV. The scale factors for HEEP ID efficiency between data and MC are taken from Table 1.6. It should be noticed that the scale factors in Table 1.6 are for individual electrons, while here they are for electron pairs. For 2017, the gsf electron reconstruction efficiency scale factor between data and MC is already included in MC acc $\times$ eff [12, 13]. . . . .	38
1.8	The PDF uncertainties on the DY cross section relative to the Z boson peak region (60-120 GeV) as a function of mass [12]. . . . .	39
1.9	The selection requirements for the starting point of the fake rate calculation. . . . .	46
1.10	The functional approximation of the measured fake rate for HEEP electrons in the barrel and endcap vs $E_T$ [12, 13]. . . . .	46
1.11	Predicted SM background and observed data yields as a function of dielectron invariant mass for Barrel-Barrel, Barrel-Endcap and Barrel-Barrel plus Barrel-Endcap regions. The uncertainty contains statistic uncertainty and systematic uncertainty. . . . .	54
1.12	The relative effect of each systematic uncertainty as a function of dielectron invariant mass. . . . .	55
1.13	The input parameters to the limit setting code. The MC efficiencies do not have the data/MC scale factor applied or any $E_T$ independent efficiency like HLT identification efficiency although $E_T$ dependent effects like L1 and HLT turn on are included [12, 13]. . . . .	63
1.14	The observed and expected 95% CL lower limits on the masses of spin 1 $Z'_\psi$ and $Z'_{SSM}$ bosons, assuming a signal width of 0.6% (3%) of the resonance mass for $Z'_\psi$ ( $Z'_{SSM}$ ) [25, 26]. . . . .	65
1.15	The observed and expected 95% CL lower limits on the masses of spin 2 resonance with width equal to 0.01, 0.36, and 1.42 GeV corresponding to coupling parameters $k/\overline{M}_{Pl}$ of 0.01, 0.005, and 0.10 [25]. . . . .	65



# Appendices



# Bibliography

- [1] Paolo Nason. “A new method for combining NLO QCD with shower Monte Carlo algorithms”. In: *JHEP* 11 (2004), p. 040. DOI: 10.1088/1126-6708/2004/11/040. arXiv:0409146.
- [2] Stefano Frixione, Paolo Nason, and Carlo Oleari. “Matching NLO QCD computations with Parton Shower simulations: the POWHEG method”. In: *JHEP* 0711 (2007), p. 070. DOI: 10.1088/1126-6708/2007/11/070. arXiv:0709.2092 [hep-ph].
- [3] Simone Alioli et al. “A general framework for implementing NLO calculations in shower Monte Carlo programs: the POWHEG BOX”. In: *JHEP* 06 (2010), p. 043. DOI: 10.1007/JHEP06(2010)043. arXiv:1002.2581 [hep-ph].
- [4] Simone Alioli et al. “NLO vector-boson production matched with shower in POWHEG”. In: *JHEP* 07 (2008), p. 060. DOI: 10.1088/1126-6708/2008/07/060. arXiv:0805.4802 [hep-ph].
- [5] Stefano Frixione, Paolo Nason, and Giovanni Ridolfi. “A positive-weight next-to-leading-order Monte Carlo for heavy flavour hadroproduction”. In: *JHEP* 09 (2007), p. 126. DOI: 10.1088/1126-6708/2007/09/126. arXiv:0707.3088 [hep-ph].
- [6] Emanuele Re. “Single-top Wt-channel production matched with parton showers using the POWHEG method”. In: *Eur. Phys. J. C* 71 (2011), p. 1547. DOI: 10.1140/epjc/s10052-011-1547-z. arXiv:1009.2450 [hep-ph].
- [7] J. Alwall et al. “The automated computation of tree-level and next-to-leading order differential cross sections and their matching to parton shower simulations”. In: *JHEP* 07 (2014), p. 079. DOI: 10.1007/JHEP07(2014)079. arXiv:1405.0301 [hep-ph].
- [8] Torbjörn Sjöstrand et al. “An Introduction to PYTHIA 8.2”. In: *Comput. Phys. Commun.* 191 (2015), p. 159. DOI: 10.1016/j.cpc.2015.01.024. arXiv:1410.3012 [hep-ph].
- [9] S. Agostinelli et al. “GEANT4: a simulation toolkit”. In: *Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A* 506 (2003), p. 250. DOI: 10.1016/S0168-9002(03)01368-8.
- [10] W Adam et al. “Reconstruction of electrons with the Gaussian-sum filter in the CMS tracker at the LHC”. In: *Journal of Physics G: Nuclear and Particle Physics* 31.9 (2005), N9. URL: <http://stacks.iop.org/0954-3899/31/i=9/a=N01>.
- [11] The CMS Collaboration. “Generic Tag and Probe Tool for Measuring Efficiency at CMS with Early Data”. In: *CMS Notes* CMS AN-2009-111 (2009).
- [12] B. Clerbaux et al. “Search for high mass dielectron resonances with the full 2016 data”. In: *CMS Notes* CMS AN-2016-404 (2017).
- [13] B. Clerbaux et al. “Search for high-mass resonances in the di-electron final state with 2017 data”. In: *CMS Notes* CMS AN-2018-021 (2018).
- [14] “.HEEP ID”. In: *Twiki* <https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/CMS/HEEPElectronIdentificationRun2?rev=r23> ().
- [15] B. Clerbaux et al. “Dielectron resonance search in Run 2 at  $\sqrt{s} = 13$  TeV pp collisions”. In: *CMS Notes* CMS AN-2015-222 (2015).
- [16] B. Clerbaux, W. Fang, and R. Goldouzian. *HEEP selection efficiency scale factor study for CMS with the full 2016 data sample*. CMS Note 2017/077. CERN, 2017.
- [17] B. Clerbaux, W. Fang, and R. Goldouzian. *HEEP selection efficiency scale factor study for CMS with the full 2017 data sample*. CMS Note 2018/143. CERN, 2018.
- [18] D. Bourilkov and G. Daskalakis. *PDF Uncertainties for  $Z'$  searches at 13 TeV with Electron Pair or Muon Pair Final States*. CMS Note 2016/053. CERN, 2016.

- 
- [19] Abbiendi et al. “Search for High-Mass Resonances Decaying to Muon Pairs in pp Collisions at  $\sqrt{s} = 13$  TeV with the full 2016 data set of  $37 \text{ fb}^{-1}$  and combination with 2015 result”. In: *CMS Notes* CMS-AN-2016-391 (2016).
  - [20] S. Folgueras, N. Neumeister, and J.-F. Schulte. *Statistical Analysis for a Search for a Narrow Resonance*. CMS Note 2016/307. CERN, 2016.
  - [21] S. Schmitz et al. “Statistical Inference in a Search for a Narrow Resonance”. In: *CMS Notes* CMS-AN-2012-185 (2012).
  - [22] V. Giakoumopoulou et al. “Z’ stats meeting”. In: *CMS Indico Pages* (2015). URL: <https://indico.cern.ch/event/387187/>.
  - [23] Nicholas Metropolis et al. “Equation of State Calculations by Fast Computing Machines”. In: *The Journal of Chemical Physics* 21.6 (1953), pp. 1087–1092. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1063/1.1699114>. URL: <http://scitation.aip.org/content/aip/journal/jcp/21/6/10.1063/1.1699114>.
  - [24] W. K. Hastings. “Monte Carlo sampling methods using Markov chains and their applications”. In: *Biometrika* 57.1 (1970), pp. 97–109. DOI: [10.1093/biomet/57.1.97](https://doi.org/10.1093/biomet/57.1.97). eprint: <http://biomet.oxfordjournals.org/content/57/1/97.full.pdf+html>. URL: <http://biomet.oxfordjournals.org/content/57/1/97.abstract>.
  - [25] The CMS Collaboration. “Search for high-mass resonances in dilepton final states in proton-proton collisions at  $\text{fb}^{-1}$  TeV”. In: *Journal of High Energy Physics* 2018.6 (2018), p. 120. ISSN: 1029-8479. DOI: [10.1007/JHEP06\(2018\)120](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP06(2018)120). URL: [https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP06\(2018\)120](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP06(2018)120).
  - [26] The CMS Collaboration. “Search for high mass resonances in dielectron final state”. In: *CMS Physics Analysis Summaries* CMS-PAS-EXO-18-006 (2018).
  - [27] The CMS Collaboration. “Search for high-mass resonances in dilepton final states in proton-proton collisions at  $\text{fb}^{-1}$  TeV”. In: *CMS Physics Analysis Summaries* CMS-PAS-EXO-16-047 (2016).
  - [28] The ATLAS Collaboration. “Search for new high-mass phenomena in the dilepton final state using proton-proton collisions  $\sqrt{s} = 13$  TeV with the ATLAS detector”. In: *ATLAS Conference Notes* ATLAS-CONF-2017-027 (2017).
  - [29] Georges Aad et al. “Search for high-mass dilepton resonances using  $139 \text{ fb}^{-1}$  of  $pp$  collision data collected at  $\sqrt{s} = 13$  TeV with the ATLAS detector”. In: (2019). arXiv:1903.06248 [hep-ex].