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LCH: a jet factory

Jets produced in a phase space never probed before, with several TeV transverse momentum

Complex final states containing multiple hadronic jets are produced copiously at LHC and enter in a number of new particle discovery processes

Experimental capabilities to disentangle signal from background are significantly enhanced if the detailed structure of jets can be used as a diagnostics for potential new physics effects, e.g. in decays of highly boosted massive state

The interpretation of experimental data for such multi-particle final states relies both on **perturbative multi-jet calculations** and on realistic event simulation by **parton-shower Monte Carlo generators**.
Outline

• Jet Reconstruction and Calibration in CMS
• Inclusive jet cross section at 8 and 13 TeV *(P. Kokkas talk)*
• Jet charge observables in dijet events at 8 TeV
• Differential jet production cross section as function of jet mass and transverse momentum in dijet events at 13 TeV
• Comparison to Montecarlo event generators at LO and NLO with different PDFs *(E. Eren talk)*
• Conclusions
Jet reconstruction

Particle Flow reconstruction

Jet clustering (anti-$k_T$)

Jet energy fractions

Particle Flow algorithm benefits from sub-detectors with best spatial+energy resolution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detector</th>
<th>$p_T$-resolution</th>
<th>$\eta/\Phi$-segmentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tracker</td>
<td>0.6% (0.2 GeV) – 5% (500 GeV)</td>
<td>0.002 x 0.003 (first pixel layer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECAL</td>
<td>1% (20 GeV) – 0.4% (500 GeV)</td>
<td>0.017 x 0.017 ($</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCAL</td>
<td>30% (30 GeV) – 5% (500 GeV)</td>
<td>0.087 x 0.087 ($</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.175 x 0.175 ($</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Particle Flow and Jet reconstruction

- **Particle Flow Jets (PF Jets):** Combining information from all sub-detectors to reconstruct and identify all stable particles to be clustered in jets \(\rightarrow\) jet substructure

  **PF jets:** up to 5x less sensitive to calorimetry than calo-jets

- **Anti-\(k_T\) clustering algorithm:** input particle flow objects infrared and collinear safe. Used with various values of 
  \[ R = \sqrt{(\Delta y)^2 + (\Delta \phi)^2} \]
Jet energy calibration

Factorized JEC approach in CMS

Pileup increases jet mass and distorts jet substructure observables

**Pile-up corrections** applied:
- charged hadron subtraction (CHS) algorithm charged pileup (60%, decreasing at high $p_T$) removed reconstructing secondary vertices
- neutral pileup component (40%) weighted with pileup probability (PUPPI)

Jet energy corrections with small uncertainties: less than 2% in the region $p_T > 100$ GeV
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Inclusive jets @ 8TeV

- Inclusive jets within $0 < |y| < 4.7$ and $p_T \geq 21 \text{ GeV}

- QCD benchmark
  - used to constrain collinear PDF
  - used to measure $\alpha_s$
  - benchmark for all QCD MC generators at LO and NLO!

- sets the level of experimental uncertainties
  - JES uncert. leads to $\sim 2$-$4\%$ at low, up to $\sim 20\%$ at highest $p_T$
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- CT10 NLO $\times$ NP
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Inclusive cross section @ 13 TeV

- First indication that jet physics is as well understood at 13 TeV as at smaller centre-of-mass energies.
- Double-differential inclusive jet cross section with 71 pb$^{-1}$ data extends to $|y|=4.7$, $p_T=2$ TeV (similar reach as with 20 fb$^{-1}$ of 8 TeV data).
- Jets are reconstructed with the anti-$k_T$ clustering algorithm for two jet sizes: 0.4, 0.7.
- Compared to predictions of pQCD at NLO precision, complemented with EWK and nonperturbative (NP) corrections and NLO + PS.
- Data in good agreement with NLO calculations.

POWHEG+Pythia8 gives a good agreement both for R 0.4 and 0.7.
The jet parton type composition of the selected dijet sample depends on the leading-jet $p_T$

The filled histograms show the contributions from different types of initiating partons, identified by means of a matching algorithm.

The "others" category represents those jets that are initiated by parton types, the up antiquark, the down antiquark, the charm, strange, and bottom quarks and antiquarks, and any unmatched jets.

Data (points) compared to PYTHIA6 simulation
Only statistical uncertainties are shown
Jet charge definition

Estimator for the electric charge of a quark, antiquark or gluon initiating a jet, based on the momentum-weighted sum of the measured electric charges of the jet constituents

Three different charge observables of the leading jet

19.7 fb$^{-1}$ proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV
dijet events with HLT trigger requiring at least one jet with transverse momentum $p_T > 320$ GeV

The sums are over all color-neutral (electrically charged and neutral) particles $i$ in the jet that have $p_T > 1$ GeV. $\Rightarrow$ dependence on # of pileup interactions negligible

The $\kappa$ parameter in the exponent of the particle momenta controls the relative weight given to low and high momentum particles contributing to the jet charge. Three values of $\kappa$ are investigated: 0.3, 0.6, and 1.0
It is important to identify the object initiating a jet by means of the properties of the reconstructed particles that define the jet. The type of partons that initiate jets – quark jets, antiquark jets, or gluon jets – are distinguished at leading order (LO) in QCD.

jet charge data UNCORRECTED distribution compared with multijet predictions from PYTHIA6 and HERWIG++

≈55% of the down quark jets and ≈45% of the gluon jets can be rejected at a selection efficiency of 70% for up quark jets
Jet charge vs leading-jet $p_T$

Estimated uncertainty in the jet energy scale 1–2.5% depending on the jet $p_T$ and $\eta$

Gluon jets dominate the lower part of the $p_T$ spectrum, while up quarks become progressively more relevant at high $p_T$.

Difference between jet charge distributions at the generator level and the reconstructed level in PYTHIA6 increases with decreasing $\kappa$ values, because the definition of jet charge for small values of $\kappa$ gives more weight to low-$p_T$ particles, which have a track reconstruction efficiency of about 90%.

3 definitions of jet charge ➔ sensitive to parton fragmentation
3 choices of $\kappa$ parameter ➔ sensitive to the softer and harder particles in jet
Jet charge ($\kappa = 0.6$) vs NLO predictions

To compare with other measurements or theoretical predictions, the measured jet charge distributions must be unfolded from the resolution at the detector level to the final-state particle level.

**POWHEG + PYTHIA8 ("PH+P8")**

NLO POWHEG with the NLO CT10 PDF set compared with disabled in PYTHIA8:

- initial-state radiation ("No ISR")
- final-state radiation ("No FSR")
- multiple-parton interactions ("No MPI")

**LO POWHEG using LO CTEQ6L1 PDF set ("LO")**

Final state PS makes the dominant effect on the jet charge

Hashed uncertainty bands include both statistical and systematic contributions in data, added in quadrature.
Transverse jet charge ($\kappa = 1, 0.6, 0.3$)

Experimental uncertainties are generally larger for small values of $\kappa$ as well as for $Q_{\kappa T}$ because of the larger weights given to soft particles.

For $Q\kappa$ and $Q\kappa L$ POWHEG + PYTHIA8 and POWHEG + HERWIG++ show similar levels of agreement. For $Q\kappa T$ both generators diverge significantly from data in most of the range.

The two generators differ systematically for the three definitions of jet charge

⇒ this measurement can constrain such modeling predictions
Jet charge ($\kappa=1, 0.6, 0.3$) vs $\alpha_s$ parameter

The same $\alpha_s$ parameter cannot be used for all the jet charge distributions ➔ test aspects of the model that cannot be accommodated by a single parameter.
Differential jet production cross section

as a function of the jet mass and transverse momentum
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pp collisions @ 13 TeV

dijet topology R=0.8 at least two jets, without an explicit third jet veto

$p_T$ asymmetry satisfies $(p_{T1} - p_{T2})/(p_{T1} + p_{T2}) < 0.3$

$\Delta(\phi_1 - \phi_2) > \pi/2$ to reduce the number of jets from detector noise

with and without a jet grooming algorithm \(\Rightarrow\) separates hard and soft portions of the jet

“soft drop” grooming algorithm used

ungroomed jets: all MC event generators predict jet mass spectrum within uncertainties in
the data for intermediate masses of about 10-30% of the jet transverse momentum
Outside of this range, some disagreement is observed.

groomed jets: jet mass peak suppressed and precision in the low and intermediate regions
improved, since portions of the jet from soft radiation that are difficult to model cancelled

Experimental uncertainties: JES, JER, JMS, JMR, pileup
Theoretical uncertainties: physics model (parton shower and tuning) and PDFs
Jet mass

Mass is more sensitive to the internal structure of jets, theoretically described by QCD PS

Predicting jet mass is complicated \( \Rightarrow \) singularities from emissions at very low energies ("soft") or at very small angles ("collinear") compared to the momentum of the original quark or gluon (the "hard" component). At NLL the phase space available to the decay is restricted in the collinear and soft regimes, suppressing the singularities.

\( m/p_T \approx 0.1 \) "Sudakov peak" \( \Rightarrow \) sensitive to soft QCD effects and to pileup

Above \( m/p_T \approx 0.3 \) jet splitting threshold

CMS-PAS-16-010
Normalized double differential cross section

The jet masses after unfolding for all $p_T$ bins for the ungroomed and groomed jet unfolding in both transverse momentum and mass
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Jet mass after unfolding groomed jet

Sudakov peak suppressed and improved precision in $0.1 < m/p_T < 0.3$ region (soft radiation removed)

$m/p_T < 0.1$ disagreement between PYTHIA8 (better prediction) and HERWIG++ as for ungroomed jets

Semi-analytical calculations beyond NLL agree with each other, and predict the data at $m/p_T < 0.3$

where wide jets start to be split into two
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Jet mass after unfolding ungroomed jet

$m/p_T < 0.1$ large variations (> 20%) between the predictions from PYTHIA8 and HERWIG++

$m/p_T > 0.3$ predictions from PYTHIA8 and HERWIG++ agree but overpredict by 20–50%

no significant difference when POWHEG+PYTHIA8 is used compared to PYTHIA8 alone.
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Conclusions

• Entering a new region never reached before: jets with $p_T > 3$ TeV
  ➔ Precision measurements in the medium to high $p_T$ range
• Excellent understanding of jet reconstruction and calibration
• Various jet measurements improve our understanding of QCD
  ➔ Theory comparison in good agreement with measurement in the new phase space
• Comparison with physics modeling to improve BSM searches
  ➔ Semi-analytical calculations beyond next-to-leading logarithmic accuracy of groomed jet mass compared to the data for the first time at a hadron collider

The study of jets and QCD is a key component to extend our understanding of the SM and for searches beyond the SM

Exciting times ahead with improved calculations and more data!!