Top BSM at DØ

Daniel Wicke
(Bergische Universität Wuppertal)

for the DØ collaboration

Introduction and Outline

We can question the SM-likeness of the top quark in several ways:

a) Is it really (to 100%) the top that we see?

b) Is it decaying (to 100%) as expected in SM?

c) Does it have the expected quantum numbers?

d) Is it produced (to 100%) by SM mechanisms?



This talk covers one analysis for each of these questions.

Is it really the top quark?

Stop Pair Production

Are we really looking at top quarks only?

- An admixture of particles with similar signature might have gone unnoticed
- Stop, $\tilde{t}$, is such a candidate
- Decays: $\tilde{t}_1 \to \tilde{\chi}_1^0 t \to \chi_1^0 bW$
  $\tilde{t}_1 \to \tilde{\chi}_1^+ b \to \chi_1^0 bW$
- Decays similar to top-quarks can dominate over a large range of $\tan\beta$
- Assumptions: $m_{\tilde{t}} \leq m_t$;
  $m_{\chi^\pm}$ and m_{χ^0} close to exp. limits





Signature

Signature of the considered $\tilde{t}\bar{\tilde{t}}$ production is very similar to SM $t\bar{t}$ production

ℓ+jets channel considered

High p_T Lepton, $\not{E}_T$ from χ^0 and ν, jets from 2 b quarks and 2 light quarks

Dataset and Background Description

- Selection as cross-section (Iso. electron or muon, $\not{E}_T$, ≥ 4jets, ≥ 1 b-tag)
- Until now $\sim 0.9\,\text{fb}^{-1}$ analysed
- Background description
  - $t\bar{t}$, and further, minor backgrounds: MC normalised to theroy.
  - W+jets normalisation from data (Matrix Method), kinematics from MC
  - Multijet from data (Matrix Method)
- Signal MC is generated for a variety of Stop/Chargino masses.

Likelihood (I)

To distinguish top pair from stop pair production a likelihood is constructed

Constraint fit to construct add. observables

Constraint Fit

Reconstruct as if top pair event:

- $m_{qq} = M_W$, $m_{\ell\nu} = M_W$, $m_t^{(1)} = m_t^{(2)}$
- Jet-parton assignment by best χ^2
  b-tagged jets assigned to b-quarks only
- Inputs to likelihood:
  - m_t, $\cos\theta^*(b,b)$ $m(b,b)$,
    $\Delta R(W, b_{\text{samechain}})$, $\Delta R(W, b_{\text{otherchain}})$

Plots show m_t for data and simulation



$m_{\tilde{t}} = 175$ GeV, $m_{\chi^\pm} = 135$ GeV

Likelihood (II)

Kinematic variables

- p_t leading b-jet,
  $M_T(W_\ell)$, $K_{T,\mathrm{min}}$, $m(j_3, j_4)$,
  $\Delta R(b\text{-jet}, \text{leading other jet})$,
  $\Delta R(\ell, b)$

Construction

- Signal and bkg. prob. densities $P(x)$ built from expected distributions.
- $\mathcal{L}(x) = \dfrac{P_{\mathrm{sig}}(x)}{P_{\mathrm{sig}}(x) + P_{\mathrm{bkg}}(x)}$

  $\mathcal{L}$ separates stop signal from bkg.
- Choice of input vars optimised per $m_{\tilde{t}}$, $m_{\chi^\pm}$

Data look quite SM like





$m_{\tilde{t}} = 175$ GeV, $m_{\chi^\pm} = 135$ GeV

Results

We set limits on cross-section for various $m_{\tilde{t}}$,$m_{\chi^{\pm}}$:

- Bayesian approach with flat prior in $\sigma_{\tilde{t}\bar{\tilde{t}}}$
- Systematics considered by fluctuating the Poisson parameter of the prob.df
  - $t\bar{t}$ normalisation (incl. m_t dependency), Selection eff, Luminosity, ...



- Simultaneous determination of $\sigma_{\tilde{t}\bar{\tilde{t}}}$ and $\sigma_{t\bar{t}}$ yields very similar results

Cross-check with Ensemble Tests

Observed limits much larger than expected ones

- 500 pseudo results were produced for SM phyiscs
- Distribution of results reveals large tails towards high value limits
- Some percent of ensembles worse that μ+jets channel



Result can be interpreted as SM fluctuation

Is it decaying as expected?

Non-standard decay mode

New particles in the final state alter deduced $\sigma_{t\bar{t}}$ depending on decay channel $C = \ell$+jets, Dilepton

$$\sigma_{t\bar{t}}^{C} = \sigma_{t\bar{t}} \cdot \frac{B^{\mathrm{BSM}}(t\bar{t} \to C)}{B^{\mathrm{SM}}(t\bar{t} \to C)}$$



- Check cross-section ratio $R_\sigma = \dfrac{\sigma_{t\bar{t}}^{\ell+\mathrm{jets}}}{\sigma_{t\bar{t}}^{\mathrm{Dilepton}}}$
- Consider decay $t \to bH^{\pm}$ with $H^{\pm} \to cs$
- i.e. leptophobic charged Higgs



Within MSSM relevant only at low $\tan\beta$

General multi-Higgs-doublet models allow such leptophobic charged Higgs

Determination of Cross Section Ratio

Utilise $\sim 0.9\,\mathrm{fb}^{-1}$ (ℓ+jets) and $\sim 1.0\,\mathrm{fb}^{-1}$ (Dilepton)

Important: treat correlations correctly

- Fully correlated:
  - Lepton and Primary vertex ID
  - Muon trigger
  - JES, JER, JetID
  - Diboson normalisation
- Lumi uncertainty cancels in ratio
- Remaining: uncorrelated



Implemented combined ensemble testing.

- Draw event number according to Poisson statistics
- Vary expectation parameters according to systematics correlated/uncorrelated

Determination of Cross Section Ratio (II)

Proceedure is repeated for many hyothetical values of R.

- Done by changing $\sigma_{t\bar{t}}^{\ell+\mathrm{jets}}$
- 10000 pseudo results per nominal R_σ
- Fitted to have parametric relation between $R_\sigma^{\mathrm{measured}}$ and $R_\sigma^{\mathrm{nominal}}$

Interpreted using Feldman-Cousins approach:

- Find most likely interval of nominal R_σ that may yield observed value.
- Add points according to max. likelihood ratio.
- 68% confidence intervall of $R_\sigma^{\mathrm{nominal}}$:



$$R_\sigma = 1.21 \pm 0.27$$

Top Branching Ratio to $H^{\pm}$

Assuming $H^{\pm} \to cs$ to 100%:

- Dilepton: both tops need to decay through W
- ℓ+jets: only one or both may decay through W

$\Rightarrow$ Ratio: $R_\sigma = 1 + \dfrac{x}{(1-x)B(W \to qq)}$

- Formula is extended to account for leakage between the channels.



$B(t \to bH^{\pm})$ is deduced as R_σ before.

- Pseudo results (ensembles) created with proper systematic variation
- Functional form fitted
- Interpreted using Feldman-Cousins approach.



Top Branching Ratio to $H^{\pm}$

For a 80 GeV charged Higgs decaying only hadronically we find

- Expected limit within SM:
  $B(t \to bH^{\pm}) < 0.25\ (95\%\mathrm{CL})$



$B(t \to bH^{\pm}) = 0.13 \pm 0.12$ $\qquad$ $B(t \to bH^{\pm}) < 0.35\ (95\%\mathrm{CL})$

Does it have the expected quantum numbers?

Top Quarks Electrical Charge

Do objects used to reconstruct tops add up to the expected charge?





Requires reconstruction of:

- W charge $\Longrightarrow$ lepton charge
- b-quark charge $\Longrightarrow$ jet charge (more involved)

Performed in ℓ+jets channel with $370\,\mathrm{pb}^{-1}$

Jet charge

Sum charge of tracks in b-jet

- Errors from in- and out-of-cone tracks
- Statistical method
- Weighting with p_T helps

$$Q_{\text{jet}} := \frac{\sum q_i \cdot p_{Ti}^{0.6}}{\sum p_{Ti}^{0.6}}$$



Calibration

- Using double (vertex) tagged $b\bar{b}$ dijets w/ soft μ ($\Delta\phi \leq 3.0$)
- Soft μ determines b charge, Q_{Jet} calibrated on opposite jet.
- Disentangle b, $\bar{b}$, c, $\bar{c}$ contributions to obtain pure b-jet Q_{Jet} distribution

Top Quark Charge Analysis

- Need to assign b-jet to right top
  Choose best fit to top hypothesis
- Combine lepton and b-jet charge to top charge (leptonic and hadronic side):

$$Q_{\mathrm{lep}} = \left|q_l + q_{b_{\mathrm{l}}}\right|$$
$$Q_{\mathrm{had}} = \left|-q_l + q_{b_{\mathrm{h}}}\right|$$

- Templates generated from standard model MC.
  Exotic case by permuting jet charge.





DØ Result ($370\,\mathrm{pb}^{-1}$)

Unbinned likelihood ratio also accouting for remaining background yields

p-value for $|q_{\mathrm{top}}| = 4e/3$ is 7.8%.
Bayes factor is 4.3.

Is it produced by SM mechanisms only?

Resonant Production of Top Pairs

No resonance production in $t\bar{t}$ expected in SM,
but some models predict bound $t\bar{t}$-states

- new strong gauge force coupling to 3rd generation
- top-color assisted technicolor: Z'

Such a reasonance should create a bump in differential cross-section $\frac{\mathrm{d}\sigma}{\mathrm{d}m_{t\bar{t}}}$

Assume its width is smaller than detector mass resolution



Reconstruction of Invariant Mass of $t\bar{t}$

- Reconstruct $m_{t\bar{t}}$ directly from ℓ, ν and up to 4 leading jets (no constraint fit)
- Neutrino: p_x, p_y components from $\not{E}_T$ and p_z^ν from $M_W^2 = (p^\nu + p^l)^2$
- Selection as cross-section (Iso. electron or muon, $\not{E}_T$, ≥ 3jets, ≥ 1 b-tag)





- Resonant production shows more narrow $M_{t\bar{t}}$ distributions than SM $t\bar{t}$
- With increasing resonance mass SM background becomes less important.

Background Estimation

- $t\bar{t}$, Z+jets, single top quark and diboson: MC normalized to theory.
- W+jets, normalisation from data, shape from Monte Carlo
- Multijet from data only

Top pair invariant mass



3 jet bin



4+ jet bin

Limit calculation

Bayesian statistics is used to determine obtain the results (as for stop)

Systematics (Expected Limits for $0.9\,\mathrm{fb}^{-1}$)

Expected limits are computed by using background prediction as "observation"



Systematics may just scale the background or change the background shape

- JES affects medium M_X
- Luminosity, efficenies, ... scale like bkg shape
- m_t affects low M_X

High M_X stat. dominated

Top Resonance Results ($2.1\,\mathrm{fb}^{-1}$)





- All measured $\sigma_X \cdot B(X \to t\bar{t})$ close to zero (max. deviation $\sim 1\sigma$)
- Thus we set limits on $\sigma_X \cdot B(X \to t\bar{t})$
- Top-color assisted technicolor Z':

Expected Limit $M_{Z'} > 795\,\mathrm{GeV}$
Observed Limit: $M_{Z'} > 760\,\mathrm{GeV}$

Summary

- With increasing Luminosity we get access to more and more BSM phenomena

- DØ has questiond the SM-likeness in various aspects
  - Search for Stop admixture
  - Search for charged Higgs in top decay
  - Check of top electric charge
  - Search for resonant $t\bar{t}$ production









- No deviation from SM was observed, yet.

DØ is working on updates for all these analyses