

 $\mathbf{T} \notin \mathbf{L}$

1) Charge misidentification probability



opposite-charge (OC) or samecharge (SC) events, as in Fig.2. • Poisson probability to observe

• $Z \rightarrow ee$ sample divided into

$$N_{SC}:$$

$$f(N_{SC}^{ij}; \lambda) = \frac{\lambda^{N_{SC}^{ij}} e^{-\lambda}}{N_{SC}^{ij}!}$$

given λ :

$$\lambda = N^{ij}(P_i(1 - P_j) + P_j(1 - P_i))$$

where $N^{ij} = N^{ij}_{SC} + N^{ij}_{OC}$

$$-\log L(\mathbf{P}|N_{\rm SC}, \mathbf{N}) = \sum_{i,j} \log(N^{ij}(P_i(1-P_j) + P_j(1-P_i)))N_{\rm SC}^{ij} - N^{ij}(P_i(1-P_j) + P_j(1-P_i)))N_{\rm SC}^{ij} - N^{ij}(P_i(1-P_j) + P_j(1-P_i))$$



Tight Loose

• Tight: pass more stringent identification and isolation criteria. Used to define analysis regions.

•Loose: pass required to fail tight usually less isolated.

Selection for fake-enriched regions	
Muon channel	Electron channel
Single-muon trigger	Single-electron trigger
<i>b</i> -jet veto	<i>b</i> -jet veto
One muon and one jet	One electron
$p_{\rm T}({\rm jet}) > 35 { m ~GeV}$	Number of tight electrons < 2
$\Delta \phi(\mu, \text{jet}) > 2.7$	<i>m</i> (<i>ee</i>) ∉ [71.2, 111.2] GeV
$E_{\rm T}^{\rm miss} < 40 { m ~GeV}$	$E_{\rm T}^{\rm miss} < 25~{ m GeV}$

Tab.1 : "fake-enriched" control regions used for the measurement of F.

Special treatment fow low statistics:

$$\begin{split} P(0|\lambda) &= 32\% \quad \to \lambda = 1.14 \text{ at } 68\% \text{ CL} \quad \to \quad N_{TL} = N_{LT} = N_{LL} = 0.38 \\ N_e^{\text{fakeup}} &= 2 \times 0.38 \times 0.5 - 0.38 \times 0.5^2 \rightarrow N_e^{\text{fake}} = 0^{+0.285}_{-0.0} & Prevents \text{ from} \\ N_{\mu}^{\text{fakeup}} &= 2 \times 0.38 \times 0.9 - 0.38 \times 0.9^2 \rightarrow N_{\mu}^{\text{fake}} = 0^{+0.376}_{-0.0} & 0 \pm 0 \text{ fake estimate} \\ (Fig. 6(b)). \end{split}$$

3) Systematic uncertainties

• Charge-flip: vary the choice of Z peak range; negligible compared to statistical

2) Fake lepton background

isolation requirement. Fake leptons

in bins of $p_{\rm T}$ and $|\eta|$. $N^{\text{fake}} = \left[F(N_{TL} + N_{LT}) - F^2 N_{LL} \right]_{\text{data}}$ $- \left[F(N_{TL} + N_{LT}) - F^2 N_{LL} \right]_{\text{MC}}^{\text{prompt}}$ Final estimate in all analysis regions.

Fake-factor:

 $F = \frac{N_{\text{pass}}}{N_{\text{fail}}}$

"Side-bands": events containing at least one loose lepton (N_{TL} , N_{LT} and N_{LL}).



• Charge Flip (CF) probability $P(p_T,\eta)=\sigma(p_T)\times f(\eta)$ applied as a 1D×1D parametrization of electron p_T and $|\eta|$ (Fig.3). *Correction-factors* derived as the ratio between data/MC and applied to simulated CF electrons.

uncertainty in data and simulated events

 \rightarrow 10%-20% on CF probabilities

Fake factor:

- \rightarrow alter missing E_T requirement to vary W+jets composition
- \rightarrow change recoiling jet requirements to study fake composition
- \rightarrow d₀/| σ_{d0} | varied up/down by 1 unit
- \rightarrow normalization of simulated samples varied up/down by 10%

 \rightarrow 10% to 20% across $p_{\rm T}$ and $|\eta|$ bins, from 1% to 20% on total background

4) Methods used in new physics searches

Doubly-charged boson Higgs production: 2,3,4 leptons final states, N_{jets}≥0

Search for *heavy leptons in type III See-Saw* models (see Tadej Novak's poster for more details): 2 leptons, 2 jets and missing E_T.



Methods validated across different kinematic regimes and event topologies efficiently applied to more than one new physics search.



Bologna, LHCP 2018