

# ***Long-lived Particles:*** some experimental perspective

- 1) Experimental challenges
- 2) Ways to present results
  - efficiencies
  - fastsim?
  - RECAST

***This is a workshop, we are here to discuss!***


**Gavin Hesketh, UCL**

**Based on LLP Whitepaper Chapter 5 draft**

## **Reinterpretation and Recommendations for the Presentation of Search Results**

Juliette Alimena    Will Buttinger    Giovanna Cottin    Yanou Cui  
Nishita Desai    Jared Evans    Jan Heisig    Gavin Hesketh    Sabine Kraml  
Andre Lessa    Zhen Liu    David Morse    Brian Shuve

October 15, 2017



**For details of experimental results, see:**


Carlos Sierra, Albert de Dorck, Karri di Petrillo

<https://indico.cern.ch/event/649760/timetable/>


**Experimentally, long-lived particles are an interesting challenge**

- use all parts of the detector
  - ...in ways they were not necessarily designed to be used!
- requires different triggers, reconstruction, background estimates
  - ...depending on where the signal may appear

for  $c\tau = 5$  cm,  $\langle\beta\gamma\rangle \sim 30$



for  $c\tau = 50$  cm,  $\langle\beta\gamma\rangle \sim 30$



images from Heather Russell




image from Heather Russell



### ***Charged LLPs, decaying outside detector:***

- signature similar to muons

Can use  $dE/dx$  in muon system (ATLAS)

or silicon (ATLAS & CMS)

or **Cherenkov radiation** in RICH (LHCb)



### ***Neutral LLPs, decaying outside the detector:***

- MET! Similar to dark matter searches

### ***Charged LLPs, decaying inside detector:***

- disappearing or kinked track
- requires dedicated tracking



### **In both cases, triggering is the challenge:**

- need additional activity in the event
- mono-X style searches.

### ***LLPs decaying to leptons in the tracker:***


displaces vertices or kinked tracks

- CMS can identify large IP muons by default
- retracking + Ecal/MS at ATLAS



### ***Decays outside the tracker:***

- stand-alone muons, possibly + calo



***Signatures can be resolved or boosted***



→ “lepton jets”

***Triggering again an issue:***


- IP requirements generally stricter in the trigger
- specialised triggers needed if decay outside tracker

**LLPs decaying to hadrons:**

- signature could be displaced multi-track vertex
  - + resolved jets (CMS, LHCb), or single boosted jet (ATLAS)
- a jet with no tracks & low EMF
  - ATLAS can trigger on this signature
- multi-track vertex in the muon system

**Emerging jets**

- multiple displaced vertices

**(very) late decays in the calorimeter**



- ATLAS and CMS look for jets in empty bunch crossings (neither beam in the detector)

## *LLPs also come with a different mix of backgrounds*


- beam-induced background
- cosmics
- displaced vertices from material interaction
- etc...

## *Can lead to non-trivial event selection*

→ and efficiencies that are not so trivial to parametrise



*From limits...*



*...to reinterpretation:*

- 1) the event selection defining the signal region
- 2) the event yield in the SR
- 3) the background yields in the SR (+uncertainties)
- 4) the signal yield in the SR, for which you need a model of the detector...
  - a parameterisation of the efficiency (in terms of..?)
  - fast-sim (possible for LLPs?)
  - full sim (see RECAST)

Provided by experiments

To discuss!


**Searches usually focus on a particular signature, in a specific part of the detector**

- displaced muon tracks, displaced vertex in tracker, jet with no tracks, ...etc

**Changing the model can completely change the analysis!**

- different lifetime, decay model → different experimental signature

**So how to enable reinterpretation?**




### *Provide efficiencies for a simplified model*

Model may depend on the analysis

- eg decay mode of  $\chi$

Limits **& efficiencies** as a function of

- mass & lifetime of LLP




### *Provides a single calibration point for reinterpretation*

- using the efficiencies, anyone can run the same model, and get the same limits
- within the limits of the parametrisation...

### *Reinterpreting the same model is not very interesting...*

### *Fairly high-level efficiencies*

- may not capture dependencies of efficiencies
- hard/impossible to interpolate between different models
- ... and between analyses



## Provide efficiencies for multiple simplified models?

- allows testing of interpolation
- and confidence in extrapolation

Production \ Decay	$\gamma\gamma(+\text{inv.})$	$\gamma + \text{inv.}$	$jj(+\text{inv.})$	$jj\ell$	$\ell^+\ell^- (+\text{inv.})$	$\ell_\alpha^+ \ell_{\beta \neq \alpha}^- (+\text{inv.})$
DPP: sneutrino pair		SUSY	SUSY	SUSY	SUSY	SUSY
HP: squark pair, $\tilde{q} \rightarrow jX$ or gluino pair $\tilde{g} \rightarrow jjX$		SUSY	SUSY	SUSY	SUSY	SUSY
HP: slepton pair, $\tilde{\ell} \rightarrow \ell X$ or chargino pair, $\tilde{\chi} \rightarrow WX$		SUSY	SUSY	SUSY	SUSY	SUSY
HIG: $h \rightarrow XX$ or $\rightarrow XX + \text{inv.}$	Higgs, DM*		Higgs, DM*		Higgs, DM*	
HIG: $h \rightarrow X + \text{inv.}$	DM*		DM*		DM*	
ZP: $Z(Z') \rightarrow XX$ or $\rightarrow XX + \text{inv.}$	$Z', \text{DM}^*$		$Z', \text{DM}^*$		$Z', \text{DM}^*$	
ZP: $Z(Z') \rightarrow X + \text{inv.}$	DM		DM		DM	
CC: $W(W') \rightarrow \ell X$			RH $\nu^*$	RH $\nu$	RH $\nu^*$	RH $\nu^*$

Production \ Decay	$\ell + \text{inv.}$	$jj(+\text{inv.})$	$jj\ell$	$\ell\gamma$
DPP: chargino pair or slepton pair	SUSY	SUSY	SUSY	
HP: $\tilde{q} \rightarrow jX$	SUSY	SUSY	SUSY	
ZP: $Z' \rightarrow XX$	$Z', \text{DM}^*$	$Z', \text{DM}^*$	$Z'$	
CC: $W' \rightarrow X + \text{inv.}$	DM*	DM*		

Production \ Decay	$j + \text{inv.}$	$jj(+\text{inv.})$	$j\ell$	$j\gamma$
DPP: squark pair or gluino pair	SUSY	SUSY	SUSY	

**Problem:** generating samples,

calculating & parametrising efficiencies on many models not simple...

## Simplified models and reinterpretation quite closely connected

More discussion on simplified models to follow in Jared's talk

## Next step:

- rather than the efficiency to select a given model...

...provide efficiencies to select the experimental objects

**Example 1:** CMS displaced electron + muon search



- search for top squark pair production, decay to lepton+b-jet (only leptons used)
- squark  $c\tau$  in range 1mm  $\rightarrow$  1m

Provided electron and muon efficiencies vs  $d_0$  or  $p_T$

arXiv:1409.4789 (8 TeV)

CMS-PS-EXO-16-022 (13 TeV)

Cut Summary of CMS displaced $e\mu$	
<b>Preselection</b>	
1 OS $e^\pm\mu^\mp$ pair	
$d_\ell > 100\ \mu\text{m}$	
$p_{T,\ell} > 25\ \text{GeV}$ , $ \eta_\ell  < 2.5$	
Reject $1.44 <  \eta_e  < 1.56$	
$I_{\Delta R < 0.3}^{\text{calo},e} < 0.10$ , $I_{\Delta R < 0.4}^{\text{calo},\mu} < 0.12$	
$\Delta R_{\ell j} > 0.5 \forall$ jets with $p_T > 10\ \text{GeV}$	
$\Delta R_{e\mu} > 0.5$	
$v_{T,\bar{\ell}} < 4\ \text{cm}$ , $v_{Z,\bar{\ell}} < 30\ \text{cm}$	
Veto additional leptons	

**Closure test vs full analysis**

for various mass / lifetime benchmarks

- closure at  $\sim 20\%$  level





## ATLAS search for displaced vertex or displaced lepton pair

- RPV or GGM (l+jets, dilepton+MET, jets+MET, ...)

arXiv:1504.05162



For efficiencies, displaced vertex is a much more complex object!



<b>DV jets</b>	4 or 5 or 6 jets with $ \eta  < 2.8$ and $p_T > 90, 65, 55 \text{ GeV}$ , each.
<b>DV reconstruction*</b>	DV made from tracks with $p_T > 1 \text{ GeV}$ , $ \eta  < 2.5$ and $ d_0  > 2 \text{ mm}$ , vertices within 1 mm are merged. Note: a tracking efficiency needed here; we assume a functional form given by equation 1.
<b>DV fiducial</b>	DV within $4 \text{ mm} < r_{DV} < 300 \text{ mm}$ and $ z_{DV}  < 300 \text{ mm}$ .
<b>DV material*</b>	No DV in regions near beampipe or within pixel layers: Discard tracks with $r_{DV}/\text{mm} \in \{[25, 38], [45, 60], [85, 95], [120, 130]\}$ .
$N_{\text{trk}}$	DV track multiplicity $\geq 5$ .
$m_{DV}$	DV mass $> 10 \text{ GeV}$ .

## Reinterpretation (arXiv 1606.03099) with some success

arXiv:1504.05162



**Needed to implement an approximate tracking efficiency:**

$$\varepsilon_{\text{trk}} = 0.5 \times \left( 1 - \exp\left(\frac{-p_T}{4.0 \text{ GeV}}\right) \right) \times \exp\left(\frac{-z_{\text{DV}}}{270 \text{ mm}}\right) \times \max\left(-0.0022 \times \frac{r_{\text{DV}}}{1 \text{ mm}} + 0.8, 0\right)$$

**Vertex efficiency provided for one benchmark model (D.V. + muon)**



- did not extrapolate very well to other benchmark models in paper.
- DV+MET, dilepton

***A vertex efficiency may not be enough:***

It “would be useful if ATLAS could provide three-dimensional interpolated efficiencies for tracks for different types of particles, possibly with an additional efficiency factor for the vertex depending upon the numbers and types of particles coming from it”



## A vertex efficiency may not be enough:

It “would be useful if ATLAS could provide three-dimensional interpolated efficiencies for tracks for different types of particles, possibly with an additional efficiency factor for the vertex depending upon the numbers and types of particles coming from it”



Since Monday:  
arXiv:1710.04901

$(m_{\tilde{g}} [\text{GeV}], m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^0} [\text{GeV}], \tau [\text{ns}])$	(1400, 100, 1)	(2000, 100, 1)	(2000, 1800, 1)	(1400, 100, 0.1)
Initial Events	827	32	32	827
Trigger-based data reduction	826	32	27	827
Event cleaning	826	32	27	827
Good Runs List	826	32	27	827
Primary vertex	826	32	27	827
NCB veto	823	32	26	824
$E_T^{\text{miss}}$ trigger	791	31	24	803
$E_T^{\text{miss}}$ filter	760	31	17	717
Offline $E_T^{\text{miss}}$	671	29	7	641
DV fiducial acceptance	620	28	6	625
DV fit quality	615	27	6	621
DV displacement	613	27	6	608
Material veto	493	22	5	544
Disabled module veto	480	22	5	541
DV track multiplicity	331	15	3	455
DV mass	305	14	2	442




*As provided efficiencies become more general...*

*Is fast sim for LLPs possible?*



eg a particle decaying to electron (+ MET) looks very different if the decay is in  
the tracker... the hadronic calorimeter... the muon system...

- will need input from many analyses
- and be used with caution...



***It would also be very interesting to reinterpret prompt searches for LLPs***

- prompt searches have implicit constraints on lifetime
- only really possible to reinterpret by rerunning the prompt analysis?
- done by the prompt analysers, ...or with RECAST ?



## CMS displaced di-lepton search (13 TeV)

- top squark pairs  $\rightarrow$  lepton pair (+2 b-jets)



## compared to search for (prompt) scalar leptoquarks

- leptoquark pairs  $\rightarrow$  2 muons + 2 jets

## Running LLP signal sample through prompt search

- $\rightarrow$  prompt search sets tighter limits for  $c\tau < \sim 3\text{mm}$

CMS-PAS-EXO-16-022  
CMS-PAS-EXO-16-007



**Some benchmark models could be run through any prompt analysis...**

- otherwise, getting relevant prompt analyses in RECAST may be the best option

***LLP searches tend to focus on experimental signatures rather than specific models***

- and reinterpretation is central to this idea

***Experiments recognise the importance, and want to provide useful information***

- already very active on reinterpretation, simplified models, ...
- material for reinterpretation should be published & put on HEPData
  - though not generally provided for preliminary results

***LLP searches are a special case ...***

- very different experimental signatures, more challenging to parametrise
  - ...but of course people will do it anyway!

***In the white-paper, collect experience trying to reinterpret:***

- Displaced leptons, jets, vertices, lepton-jets
- Disappearing tracks, Heavy Stable Charged Particles, Non-pointing Photons
- Prompt searches to set limits on LLPs
- Developing fast-sim
  - discussion on white-paper chapter tomorrow (in Trieste)

## ***What should the experiments provide?***

### ***This is probably a trade-off between what people want and what is realistic***

- ideally, efficiency maps for LLPs, vs mass/lifetime/decay mode of LLP
  - ie something approaching a fastsim for LLPs ...is not realistic in all cases
- how is the provided information used, and what precision is needed?
- this conversation needs to happen as early as possible...

### ***Simplified models are closely related***

- efficiencies for a single model, as a function of mass/lifetime (which model?)
  - with cutflows / yields for a couple of benchmark reference points?
- efficiencies for a handful of models would allow easier interpolation
- comparing several models may motivate a new analysis, trigger, ....

### ***In some cases, the object-based efficiencies are probably more useful***

- eg the ATLAS displaced vertex provides a vertex efficiency vs mass, #tracks
- again, efficiencies for some simplified models/benchmarks needed?

### ***Reinterpreting prompt searches for LLPs:***

- benchmark simplified models to be tested with any relevant prompt searches?
- priority list of prompt searches to include in RECAST?



