

# Top Quark Modeling and Generators in CMS

EFE YAZGAN ON BEHALF OF THE CMS COLLABORATION

*Chinese Academy of Sciences  
Institute of High Energy Physics, Beijing, CHINA*

Recent top quark event modeling studies done using LHC proton-proton collision data collected with the CMS detector at centre of mass energies of 8 and 13 TeV and state-of-the-art theoretical predictions are summarized. A new factorized approach for parton shower uncertainties is presented. A top quark specific PYTHIA8 CMS tune, along with tunes using new color reconnection models, is discussed. The possibility of having a consistent choice of parton distribution function in the matrix element and the parton shower is demonstrated with tunes constructed with leading, next-to-leading, and next-to-next-to-leading order versions of NNPDF3.1 set compared to minimum bias and underlying event data.

PRESENTED AT

9<sup>th</sup> International Workshop on Top Quark Physics  
Braga, Portugal, September 17–22, 2017

# 1 Introduction

Top quark measurements provide important tests of QCD and of the consistency of the standard model (SM). Better understanding of perturbative and non-perturbative effects is required to obtain the highest possible precision in the measurement of top quark properties, in particular, the top quark mass, and its interpretation. Differential measurements done with well-defined top-quark objects are also important to improve the accuracy of predictions in different phase space regions in searches for beyond the SM effects. The uncertainties in the measurements and the predictions need to be at a level where deviations from the predictions from the Monte Carlo (MC) codes or deviations due to new physics effects may become visible. State-of-the-art next-to-leading order (NLO) matrix element (ME) event generators interfaced to more recent parton shower (PS) codes used in LHC Run 2 may provide better modeling and eventually reduce the major theoretical uncertainties. In this note, a selection of recent top quark event modeling studies from the CMS[1] Collaboration are discussed.

## 2 Particle Level Top Quark

Simulations at NLO take the finite width of the top quark into account to model the off-shell production of top quarks and their interference with the backgrounds. In these calculations the concept of top quark as a particle is not well-defined and has strong dependence on the choice of the MC generator. One can only use the kinematics of the final-state particles for unambiguous comparisons to theory predictions. A particle-level top quark (so-called pseudo-top quark) can be constructed from the final-state objects after hadronization. Using particle-level top quarks yields smaller uncertainties from non-perturbative effects and from acceptance corrections thanks to the similar phase definitions at the particle and detector levels, thereby reducing the MC dependence. The details of particle-level top quark definitions and their adoption in the RIVET [2] framework in the official CMS reconstruction code are discussed in [3] as a fundamental aspect for current and future measurements of differential production cross sections in both top quark pair ( $t\bar{t}$ ) and single-top quark production.

## 3 Factorized PS and Hadronization Uncertainties

The top quark is a colored particle that decays into another colored particle, the b-quark, and most of the times accompanied by extra jets. The predictions are reliable only after the ME is interfaced to the parton shower. In the simulation of top quark events, ambiguities arise from the shower scales, ME-PS matching, soft non-perturbative QCD effects, color reconnection, fragmentation, flavour response and hadronization, and semileptonic B hadron branching fraction. For most measure-

ments, experimental collaborations usually compare predictions from two different PS codes, e.g. PYTHIA vs HERWIG++. However, in experiments jet energy corrections and b-tagging scale factors are typically derived based on a single PS code. Therefore, comparing two PS codes requires ad-hoc corrections. In some cases, even after corrections large discrepancies remain leading to overestimated or not-so-well understood PS uncertainties. To get better insights in the PS uncertainties, CMS adopted a new method to calculate PS uncertainties through variations in a single parton shower simulation (PYTHIA8). These variations cover uncertainties in the modeling of perturbative and non-perturbative QCD effects in a parton shower MC. The individual uncertainty sources, their corresponding parameters/quantities, and variations are shown in Table 1. Information on the possibility to determine the uncertainties using event weights is also provided.

Table 1: Factorized PS and hadronization uncertainties. The uncertainty source, the corresponding quantities, variations and corresponding references are displayed. Information on the possibility to determine the uncertainties using event weights is also provided.

Source	Handle	Weights	Variation	Note/Ref.
Showers scales	ISR/FSR	No	0.5-2.0	[1,2] /-
ME-PS matching	hdamp	No	$1.58_{-0.59}^{+0.66} m_t$	-/[6]
Soft QCD	UE parameters	No	up/down	[3]/[6]
Color reconnection (Odd clusters)	MPI based, gluon move QCD-inspired	No	compare models	[4]/-
Fragmentation	momentum transfer from b-quark to B-hadron $x_b = p_T(B)/p_T(b\text{-jet})$	Yes	Vary $x_b$ parameter within uncertainties from LEP/SLD fits	[5]/[4]
Flavor response/ hadronization	Pythia vs Herwig	No	vary JES for each flavour for light, g, c, b	-/-
Decay tables	B semi-leptonic BR	Yes	+0.77%/-0.45%	[6]/-

[1] Since PYTHIA8.230, it is possible to calculate shower scales with event weights.

[2] FSR variations scaled down by  $\sqrt{2}$  based on LEP data.

[3] Multiparton Interactions (MPI) or Color Reconnection (CR) strength do not affect resonance decays.

[4] CR affects resonance decays.

[5] Re-weight  $x_b$ .

[6] Re-weight the fraction of semi-leptonic b jets by the PDG values (scale  $\Lambda_b$  to match PDG value).

## 4 A Top Quark Specific Event Tune

The predictions of the NLO ME generators + PYTHIA CUETP8M1tune (based on the Monash tune [7]) overshoot the CMS data for large jet multiplicities, while all other

distributions are modelled well (except the transverse momentum ( $p_T$ ) of the top quark) [6]. An accurate description of this observable is important in many searches for new physics phenomena and in measurements of the Higgs boson properties. To improve the description of high jet multiplicities in  $t\bar{t}$  events, the parameters that are most sensitive to jet kinematics in  $t\bar{t}$  events are selected and optimized. The strong coupling parameter at  $m_Z$  for initial-state radiation in the PS,  $\alpha_s^{ISR}$ , and the  $h_{damp}$  parameter that controls the jet matching in the POWHEG v2+PYTHIA8 [8, 9, 10] setup are tuned using Run 1 data on jet activity in  $t\bar{t}$  events. The Monash tune for  $\alpha_s^{ISR}$  adopts the  $\alpha_s^{FSR}$  value ( $=0.1365$ ) tuned to LEP event shapes. This is found to be the leading cause of overproduction of jets. Using the jet multiplicity and leading additional jet  $p_T$  distributions in the dilepton final state measured at  $\sqrt{s} = 8$  TeV [11], we tuned the  $\alpha_s^{ISR}$  and  $h_{damp}$  parameters. In the fit, all other tune parameters are kept fixed to the ones in the CUETP8M1tune. It is observed that  $\alpha_s^{ISR}$  impacts mostly  $N_{jets} > 3$ , while  $h_{damp}$  affects the ratio of 2-to-3-jet events and the leading additional jet  $p_T$ . This is in agreement with the fact that the leading additional jet, in the POWHEG v2+PYTHIA8 configuration, stems from the real radiation calculated by the POWHEG v2 generator. The tuning procedure yields  $h_{damp} = 1.581_{-0.585}^{+0.658} \times m_t$  and  $\alpha_s^{ISR} = 0.1108_{-0.0142}^{+0.0145}$ . The tuned  $\alpha_s^{ISR}$  value agrees with the PDG value of  $\alpha_s(M_Z) = 0.1181 \pm 0.0011$  [12] well within uncertainties.

The probability for parton emission is mainly constrained by the jet activity and the interplay between the hard and soft parts of the parton emissions. However, it does not strongly constrain the global production of hadrons, i.e. the underlying event (UE). Therefore,  $\alpha_s^{ISR}$  constrained by  $t\bar{t}$  jet kinematics can be used as a fixed input parameter in the UE tune. See ref. [6] for the details of the CUETP8M2T4 tune derived fixing  $\alpha_s^{ISR}$  to 0.1108. It is found that both POWHEG v2+PYTHIA8 and MG5\_aMC@NLO + PYTHIA8 with FxFx merging [13] with tune CUETP8M2T4 describe the top quark data well (except for the top quark  $p_T$  distribution, irrespective of the tune). It is also observed that the global event variables  $H_T$  or  $S_T$  are not considerably affected by the value of  $\alpha_s^{ISR}$ . The comparison of different  $t\bar{t}$  differential cross section predictions using POWHEG v2+PYTHIA8 with the CUETP8M2T4 tune to the corresponding measurements at  $\sqrt{s} = 13$  TeV yield an overall p-value of  $< 0.01$  when theory uncertainties are ignored. The p-value improves to 0.91 when theory uncertainties are included [15].

The CUETP8M2T4 tune is also used in a recent top quark mass measurement [16], and the resulting top quark mass value is found to be consistent with the Run 1 results, based on a different MC generator and tune. In addition, event tunes with alternative color-reconnection models (referred to in the previous section) are derived based on the CUETP8M2T4 event tune. The top quark mass measured in bins of different kinematic variables with these different color-reconnection models show that there is no indication of a kinematic bias and that there is no significant sensitivity to tunes with different color-reconnection models.

## 5 Consistency of ME and PS Codes

PDFs and  $\alpha_s$  values are used in MC generators in several parts such as the hard partonic ME, in the computation of the ISR, as an input to the PS model, and to the MPI models. The  $\alpha_s$  values are typically different at LO and NLO. Traditionally, the order of the PDF is matched to the perturbative order of the ME calculation. Using the same PDF set and the  $\alpha_s$  value in the ME calculations and in the simulation of the various components of the PS is advocated in [17], in particular, when the PS simulation is matched to higher-order matrix elements. Different strategies are adopted; CMS and ATLAS tunes are traditionally based on LO PDFs, PYTHIA8 tunes are mostly based on LO PDFs, new SHERPA tunes are based on NNLO PDFs, and HERWIG7 provided tunes based on NLO PDFs. We tested the effect of using different PDF orders of NNPDF sets in PYTHIA8 among other parameter variations. The CP1 and CP2 tunes use NNPDF3.1 LO ( $\alpha_s = 0.130$ ), CP3 tune uses NNPDF3.1 NLO ( $\alpha_s = 0.118$ ), and CP4 and CP5 uses NNPDF3.1 NNLO ( $\alpha_s = 0.118$ ). The predictions from these tunes are compared to data as shown in Figure 1. It is observed that UE and minimum bias data are described at the same level by tunes with LO, NLO, and NNLO NNPDF3.1 sets.




Figure 1: Predictions from tunes with NNPDF3.1 LO ( $\alpha_s = 0.130$ ), NLO ( $\alpha_s = 0.118$ ), and NNLO ( $\alpha_s = 0.118$ ) tunes compared to CMS minimum bias (left) and ATLAS UE (right) data [18].

## References

- [1] CMS Collaboration, JINST **3**, S08004 (2008).
- [2] A. Buckley et al., <https://rivet.hepforge.org/>.
- [3] CMS Collaboration, [CERN-CMS-NOTE-2017-004](#) (2017).
- [4] CMS Collaboration, [CMS-PAS-TOP-16-022](#) (2017).
- [5] CMS Collaboration, EPJ-C, **76**, 155 (2016).
- [6] CMS Collaboration, [CMS-PAS-TOP-16-021](#) (2016).
- [7] P. Skands, S. Carrazza, and J. Rojo, EPJ-C, **74**, 3024 (2014).
- [8] P. Nason, JHEP, **11** (2004) 040.
- [9] S. Frixione, P. Nason, and C. Oleari, JHEP, **11**, 070 (2007).
- [10] S. Alioli, P. Nason, C. Oleari, and E. Re, JHEP, **06**, 043 (2010).
- [11] CMS Collaboration, EPJ-C, **76**, 379 (2016).
- [12] C. Patrignani et al. (Particle Data Group), Chin. Phys. C, **40**, 100001 (2016).
- [13] R. Frederix, and S. Frixione, JHEP, **12**, 061 (2012).
- [14] J. Alwall, et al., EPJ-C, **53**, 473 (2008).
- [15] CMS Collaboration, [CMS-PAS-TOP-16-14](#) (2017).
- [16] CMS Collaboration, [CMS-PAS-TOP-17-007](#) (2017).
- [17] B. Cooper, J. Katzy, M. L. Mangano, A. Messina, L. Mijavic, and P. Skands, EPJ-C, **72**, 2078 (2012).
- [18] E. Yazgan, [PDF4LHC meeting](#), 6 September 2017.