Stop pair production at the LHC with aMC@NLO Validation figures

C. Degrande, B. Fuks, V. Hirschi, J. Proudom & H.S. Shao

November 3, 2014



Figure 1: Global event variables: the missing transverse energy distribution (left) and the hadronic activity (right).

1 Simulation setup

Parton-level events have been simulated with the MADGRAPH5_aMC@NLO program [1], using the UFO module [2] generated by making use of FEYNRULES [3] and NLOCT [4]. Hard scattering elements have been generated from the interactions embedded in the Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L}_3 = D_\mu \sigma_3^\dagger D^\mu \sigma_3 - m_3^2 \sigma_3^\dagger \sigma_3 + \frac{i}{2} \bar{\chi} \partial \!\!\!/ \chi - \frac{1}{2} m_\chi \bar{\chi} \chi + \left[\sigma_3 \bar{t} \big(\tilde{g}_L P_L + \tilde{g}_R P_R \big) \chi + \text{h.c.} \right] \,,$$

as indicated in Ref. [5] where more information can be found. We recall that this Lagrangian describes the dynamics of a stop field σ_3 of mass m_3 that is allowed to decay into a Majorana gauge-singlet fermion χ (of mass m_{χ}) and a top quark t. The numerical results presented in this document are based on benchmark scenarios where the $\tilde{g}_{L,R}$ parameters are fixed to values typical of supersymmetric models featuring a bino-like neutralino and a maximally-mixing top squark,

$$\tilde{g}_L = 0.25$$
 and $\tilde{g}_R = 0.06$.

We consider three benchmark points for which the stop and neutralino masses are fixed to $(m_3, m_{\chi}) = (500, 50)$ GeV, (1000, 50) GeV and (500, 200) GeV, respectively. For each scenario, we have generated 10^6 events at the leading order accuracy and the same number at the next-to-leading order one.

The decay of the stop has been performed by using the MADSPIN [6] package, and parton-level events generated in this way have then be showered and hadronized as implemented in the PYTHIA 8.1 program [7]. Hadronized events have then been processed with an anti- k_T algorithm with a radius parameter set to R = 0.4 [8], as implemented in the FASTJET program [9].

From all the reconstructed jets, only those with a transverse-momentum $p_T > 20$ GeV and a pseudrapidity $|\eta| < 2.5$ have been retained. In our analysis, we have also only considered leptons with $p_T > 10$ GeV and $|\eta| < 2.5$. Moreover, we have removed all leptons lying at an angular distance $\Delta R < 0.4$ of any selected jet. All the differential distributions presented here have been generated with MADANALYSIS 5 [10], the normalization being fixed to an integrated luminosity of 100 fb⁻¹. In each figure, we indicate both the leading-order and next-to-leading results, as well as their ratio called K-factor (which is differential here).

2 Global event variables

We present in Figure 1 the missing energy distribution (left) and the total transverse hadronic activity (right) that are calculated as

where the sum are performed over all the event particles.

3 Zero lepton analysis

From the inclusively generated event sample, we select events which do not feature any final state electron or muon. We present in Figure 2 various distributions illustrating the properties of the two leading jets.

4 Single lepton analysis

From the inclusively generated event sample, we select events which feature exactly one final state electron or muon. We present in Figure 3 and Figure 4 various distributions illustrating the properties of the lepton and of the leading jets.

5 Dilepton analysis

From the inclusively generated event sample, we select events which feature exactly two final state electrons or muons. We present in Figure 5, Figure 6 and Figure 7 various distributions illustrating the properties of the leptons and of the two leading jets.



Figure 2: Zero lepton signal region: jet properties.



Figure 3: Single lepton signal region: lepton and jet properties.



Figure 4: Single lepton signal region: lepton and jet properties (continued).



Figure 5: Dilepton signal region: lepton properties.



Figure 6: Dilepton signal region: jet properties.



Figure 7: Dilepton signal region: jet and lepton properties (continued).

References

- J. Alwall, R. Frederix, S. Frixione, V. Hirschi, F. Maltoni, et al., The automated computation of tree-level and next-to-leading order differential cross sections, and their matching to parton shower simulations, JHEP 1407 (2014) 079, [arXiv:1405.0301].
- [2] C. Degrande, C. Duhr, B. Fuks, D. Grellscheid, O. Mattelaer, et al., UFO The Universal FeynRules Output, Comput. Phys. Commun. 183 (2012) 1201–1214, [arXiv:1108.2040].
- [3] A. Alloul, N. D. Christensen, C. Degrande, C. Duhr, and B. Fuks, FeynRules 2.0 A complete toolbox for tree-level phenomenology, Comput. Phys. Commun. 185 (2014) 2250-2300, [arXiv:1310.1921].
- [4] C. Degrande, Automatic evaluation of UV and R2 terms for beyond the Standard Model Lagrangians: a proof-of-principle, arXiv:1406.3030.
- [5] C. Degrande, B. Fuks, V. Hirschi, J. Proudom, and H.-S. Shao, Automated next-to-leading order predictions for colored scalar production at the LHC, to appear.
- [6] P. Artoisenet, R. Frederix, O. Mattelaer, and R. Rietkerk, Automatic spin-entangled decays of heavy resonances in Monte Carlo simulations, JHEP 1303 (2013) 015, [arXiv:1212.3460].
- T. Sjostrand, S. Mrenna, and P. Z. Skands, A Brief Introduction to PYTHIA 8.1, Comput. Phys. Commun. 178 (2008) 852–867, [arXiv:0710.3820].
- [8] M. Cacciari, G. P. Salam, and G. Soyez, The Anti-k(t) Jet Clustering Algorithm, JHEP 0804 (2008) 063.
- [9] M. Cacciari, G. P. Salam, and G. Soyez, FastJet User Manual, Eur. Phys. J. C72 (2012) 1896.
- [10] E. Conte, B. Fuks, and G. Serret, MadAnalysis 5, A User-Friendly Framework for Collider Phenomenology, Comput. Phys. Commun. 184 (2013) 222-256, [arXiv:1206.1599].