

# Tau Reconstruction and Identification Performance at ATLAS

Björn Gosdzik

on behalf of the ATLAS Collaboration

Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron, Notkestrasse 85, D-22607 Hamburg, GERMANY

For many signals in the Standard Model including the Higgs boson, and for new physics like Supersymmetry,  $\tau$  leptons represent an important signature. This work shows the performance of the ATLAS  $\tau$  reconstruction and identification algorithms. It will present a set of studies based on data taken in 2010 at a center-of-mass energy of  $\sqrt{s} = 7$  TeV. We measured some of the basic input quantities used for these identification methods from selected reconstructed  $\tau$  candidates and compared the results to the prediction of different Monte Carlo simulation models. For early data taking a cut-based identification method will be used. We also measured the background efficiency for the cut-based  $\tau$  identification.

## 1. Introduction

In the Standard Model, a large number of  $\tau$  leptons is expected from the decay of  $Z$  and  $W$  bosons with  $100 \text{ pb}^{-1}$  of data.  $\tau$  leptons also play an important role in searches for new phenomena like the Standard Model Higgs boson, MSSM Higgs bosons and SUSY with large  $\tan \beta$  since  $\tau$  leptons can differentiate between SUSY models based on polarization information. They have a mass of  $m_\tau = 1.78 \text{ GeV}$  and decay  $\approx 65\%$  of the time hadronically.

$\tau$  leptons in ATLAS typically have a collimated calorimetric cluster, 1 or 3 charged decay products and a displaced secondary vertex in the case of 3-prong decays.

## 2. Reconstruction and Identification




Figure 1: EM radius (left) and track radius (right), see section 3 for definitions [2].

The studies are based on data collected with the ATLAS detector [1] at a center-of-mass energy of  $\sqrt{s} = 7$  TeV and correspond to an integrated luminosity of approximately  $\mathcal{L} = 244 \text{ nb}^{-1}$ . Dedicated cuts on the data, have been applied to select events with back-to-back jets and to enrich the sample with fake  $\tau$  candidates from QCD processes that form the primary background [2] in searches with  $\tau$  lepton final states.

To compare the distribution of the variables used for the  $\tau$  reconstruction and identification we used predictions from QCD jets Monte Carlo (MC) samples, generated with the Pythia DW tune [3]. The reconstruction of hadronically decaying  $\tau$  leptons starts from either calorimeter or track seeds:

- Track-seeded candidates start with a seeding track of  $p_T > 6 \text{ GeV}$ ,  $|\eta| < 2.5$ , and satisfy quality criteria on the impact parameter with respect to the interaction vertex ( $|d_0| < 2 \text{ mm}$  and  $|z_0| \times \sin\theta < 10 \text{ mm}$ ).

- Calorimeter-seeded candidates consist of calorimeter jets reconstructed with the anti-Kt algorithm (using a distance parameter  $D = 0.4$ ) starting from topological clusters with a calibrated  $E_T > 10$  GeV and  $|\eta| < 2.5$ .
- Candidates are labeled double-seeded when a seed track and a seed jet are within a distance of  $\Delta R = \sqrt{(\Delta\eta)^2 + (\Delta\phi)^2} < 0.2$ .

Seven variables are currently used as inputs for the identification algorithms to distinguish  $\tau$  leptons from QCD jets. The variables electromagnetic (EM) radius and track radius are shown in Fig. 1.

### 3. Background Rejection in QCD events




Figure 2: Background efficiency from Data/MC as a function of the reconstructed  $p_T$  of the  $\tau$  candidate (left); signal efficiency from  $Z \rightarrow \tau\tau$  MC as a function of the reconstructed  $p_T$  (right) [2].

To identify  $\tau$  leptons after the reconstruction, three independent identification (ID) algorithms were studied: simple cuts, boosted decision trees (BDT) and a projective likelihood (LL).

The cut-based ID uses three variables:  $R_{EM} = \frac{\sum_i^{\Delta R_i < 0.4} E_{T,i}^{EM} \Delta R_i}{\sum_i^{\Delta R_i < 0.4} E_{T,i}^{EM}}$ ,  $R_{track} = \frac{\sum_i^{\Delta R_i < 0.2} p_{T,i} \Delta R_i}{\sum_i^{\Delta R_i < 0.2} p_{T,i}}$  and  $f_{trk,1} = \frac{p_{T,1}^{track}}{p_{T,vis}^{\tau}}$ . Three selections corresponding to signal efficiencies of 30% (tight), 50% (medium), and 60% (loose) are optimized to maximize the rejection of QCD jets. The background efficiency for all three selections is shown in Table I. The background efficiency  $\varepsilon'_{bkgd}$  requires  $n_{track} = 1$  or  $n_{track} = 3$ . Figure 2 shows the background efficiency from Data/MC and signal efficiency from  $Z \rightarrow \tau\tau$  MC for the cut-based ID. Figure 3 (left) shows the BDT jet score and Fig. 3 (right) the likelihood score. The number of  $\tau$  candidates in the MC samples is normalized to the number of  $\tau$  candidates in the data. Very good agreement between the data and the prediction of QCD MC is observed.

Selection	$\varepsilon_{bkgd}$ (data)	$\varepsilon_{bkgd}$ (MC)	$\varepsilon'_{bkgd}$ (data)	$\varepsilon'_{bkgd}$ (MC)
loose	$(3.2 \pm 0.2) \times 10^{-1}$	$3.4 \times 10^{-1}$	$(9.4 \pm 0.6) \times 10^{-2}$	$10 \times 10^{-2}$
medium	$(9.5 \pm 1.0) \times 10^{-2}$	$9.9 \times 10^{-2}$	$(3.1 \pm 0.4) \times 10^{-2}$	$3.3 \times 10^{-2}$
tight	$(1.6 \pm 0.3) \times 10^{-2}$	$1.9 \times 10^{-2}$	$(5.6 \pm 0.9) \times 10^{-3}$	$6.8 \times 10^{-3}$

Table I: Background efficiencies for loose, medium, and tight selection cuts. The measured background efficiencies in data are compared to the MC DW tune prediction [2].

Two effects contribute to systematic uncertainties:

- **The transverse momentum calibration:** Two calibration schemes have been compared, a global cell energy-density weighting (GCW) and a simple  $p_T$  and  $\eta$  dependent calibration (EM+JES). The ratio of the background efficiency for both calibration schemes as function of  $p_T$  is shown in Fig. 4 (left).




Figure 3: BDT jet score (left) and LL score (right) for  $\tau$  candidates in data and MC samples [2].

- **The pile-up effect:** During the data taking period, the beam intensity has increased significantly. The number of vertices  $n_{vtx}$  is highly correlated with pile-up activity. The background efficiency as function of  $n_{vtx}$  is shown in Fig. 4 (right).




Figure 4: Ratio of background efficiencies using EM+JES and GCW calibration as a function of  $p_T$  (left); background efficiencies as a function of  $n_{vtx}$  (right) [2].

## 4. Conclusion

All variables used in the  $\tau$  ID algorithm are well described by MC predictions and show good separation power between  $\tau$  leptons and fake  $\tau$  candidates from QCD jets. Altogether the commissioning of the tauID was successful.

## Acknowledgments

Work supported by the Helmholtz Young Investigators Group VH-NG-303.

## References

- 1 The ATLAS Collaboration, *The ATLAS Experiment at the CERN Large Hadron Collider*, JINST 3 (2008) S08003.
- 2 The ATLAS Collaboration, *Tau Reconstruction and Identification Performance at ATLAS*, ATLAS-CONF-2010-086.
- 3 TeV4LHC QCD Working Group, *Tevatron-for-LHC Report of the QCD Working Group*, arXiv:hep-ph/0610012v1.