Towards a public analysis database for LHC new physics searches using MadAnalysis 5

Sabine Kraml LPSC Grenoble

In collaboration with B. Dumont, G. Chalons, S. Kulkarni, D. Sengupta from Grenoble, E. Conte, B. Fuks from Strasbourg, S. Bein from Florida

PASCOS 20

22-27 JUNE • WARSAW, POLAND onal Symposium on Particles, Strings and Cosmology

The need for interpretation studies

- ATLAS and CMS perform searches for new physics in many different channels.
- The collaborations typically interpret their results within constrained models, e.g. the CMSSM, or within topology-based "Simplified Model Spectra" (SMSs).
- However, constrained models and SMSs always have specific assumptions built in (mass ratios, branching fractions, etc).
- SUSY (and BSM in general) has much larger variety of signatures.
- Need to interpret LHC results in the contexts of all kinds of models of new physics; crucial if we are to unravel the correct theory and determine its parameters is community-wide effort !



 Current SUSY limits depend a lot (by 200-600 GeV) on the assumptions on the mass spectrum, and disappear for small mass splittings, m_{LSP}>600 GeV, etc.



 Need to be able to interpret the experimental results in a large variety of scenarios, test all kinds of models, beyond the MSSM and beyond SUSY.
 E.g. could use EW-ino or slepton searches to constrain inert-Higgs dark matter

Interpretation tools

- Several groups have been developing their private codes for recasting BSM searches
- A number of public tools have become available recently
 - CheckMATE confronts simulated events of any model to LHC results; currently has 8 ATLAS and 1 CMS SUSY analyses implemented [Drees et al., 1312.2591]
 - SModelS decomposes the spectrum of any BSM scenario into SMS topologies, and compares it to the cross section upper limits from more than 50 ATLAS and CMS simplified-model results
 [SK et al., 1312.4175]

```
\rightarrow talk by Suchita Kulkarni
```

- Fastlim reconstructs the visible cross sections from pre-calculated efficiency tables and cross section tables for simplified event topologies, currently taking into account 11 ATLAS analyses
 [Papucci et al., 1402.0492]
- XQCAT determines the exclusion confidence level for heavy extra quarks based on efficiency maps, CMS search for top partners plus 2 SUSY searches at 8 TeV.

[Barducci et al., 1405.0737]

Interpretation tools

- Several groups have been developing their private codes for recasting BSM searches
- A number of public tools have become available recently
- Fastsim- CheckMATE confronts simulated events of any model to LHC results; currently has
8 ATLAS and 1 CMS SUSY analyses implemented[Drees et al., 1312.2591]



```
→ talk by Suchita Kulkarni
```

SMS

SMS

 Fastlim reconstructs the visible cross sections from pre-calculated efficiency tables and cross section tables for simplified event topologies, currently taking into account 11 ATLAS analyses
 [Papucci et al., 1402.0492]



- XQCAT determines the exclusion confidence level for heavy extra quarks based on efficiency maps, CMS search for top partners plus 2 SUSY searches at 8 TeV.

[Barducci et al., 1405.0737]

Interpretation tools

- Several groups have been developing their private codes for recasting BSM searches
- A number of public tools have become available recently
- Fastsim- CheckMATE confronts simulated events of any model to LHC results; currently has
8 ATLAS and 1 CMS SUSY analyses implemented[Drees et al., 1312.2591]



```
\rightarrow talk by Suchita Kulkarni
```

SMS

SMS

- Fastlim reconstructs the visible cross sections from pre-calculated efficiency tables and cross section tables for simplified event topologies, currently taking into account 11 ATLAS analyses
 [Papucci et al., 1402.0492]
- SMS
- XQCAT determines the exclusion confidence level for heavy extra quarks based on efficiency maps, CMS search for top partners plus 2 SUSY searches at 8 TeV.

[Barducci et al., 1405.0737]

- These tools are extremely valuable. However, they are maintained by just a handful of people. Staying up to date with new exp. results can be difficult.
- SMS approach particularly useful for vast surveys, but has its limitations

The difficulty of recasting with fastsim

Non-collaboration members do not have access to the experimental data, nor the Monte Carlo (MC) event set simulated with an official collaboration detector simulation.

Therefore, the implementation and validation of ATLAS and CMS analyses for re-interpretation of the experimental results in general contexts is a tedious task, even more so as the information given in the experimental papers is often incomplete. "The community should identify, develop and adopt a common platform to store analysis databases, collecting object definitions, cuts, and all other information, including well-encapsulated functions, necessary to reproduce or use the results of the analyses [...]" "The community should identify, develop and adopt a common platform to store analysis databases, collecting object definitions, cuts, and all other information, including well-encapsulated functions, necessary to reproduce or use the results of the analyses [...]"

> "The tools needed to provide extended experimental information will require some dedicated efforts in terms of resources and manpower, to be supported by both the experimental and the theory communities."

Towards a public analysis database



We think it would be of great value for the whole community to have a database of LHC analyses based on fast simulation.

→ we propose to create such a database using the MadAnalysis 5 framework

Towards a public analysis database

We think it would be of great value for the whole community to have a database of LHC analyses based on fast simulation.

→ we propose to create such a database using the MadAnalysis 5 framework

- Validated analysis codes, easy to check and to use for everybody.
- Can serve for the interpretation of the LHC results in a large variety of models.
- Convenient way of documentation; helps long-term preservation of the analyses performed by ATLAS and CMS.
- Modular approach, easy to extend, everybody who implements and validates an existing ATLAS or CMS analysis can publish it within this framework.
- Provides feedback to the experiments about documentation and use of their results. (The ease with which an experimental analysis can be implemented and validated may actually serve as a useful check for the experimental collaborations for the quality of their documentation.)

What is MadAnalysis 5 ?



E. Conte, B. Fuks, G. Serret, arXiv:1206.1599 E. Conte, B. Fuks, arXiv:1309.7831

- Public framework for analyzing Monte Carlo events
- different levels of sophistication: partonic, hadronic, detector reconstructed
- input formats: StdHep, HepMC, LHE, LHCO, Delphes ROOT files
- user-friendly, flexible and fast
- normal mode: intuitive commands typed in the Python interface human-readable output: HTML and LaTeX
- expert mode: C++/ROOT programming within the SampleAnalyzer framework
- powerful tool, well-suited for phenomenological studies for particle colliders

https://madanalysis.irmp.ucl.ac.be

Recasting LHC analyses with MadAnalysis 5

- MadAnalysis 5 was recently extended to include an efficient treatment of different signal regions in the same analysis
- New optimized handling of cuts and histograms



• Every cut is evaluated only once and applied to all relevant signal regions simultaneously

```
string SRForMet150Cut[] = {
   "Stop->b+chargino,LowDeltaM,MET>150",
   "Stop->b+chargino,HighDeltaM,MET>150",
Manager()->AddCut("MET>150GeV",SRForMet150Cut);
```

E. Conte, B. Dumont, B. Fuks, C. Wymant arXiv:1405.3982



Similar for histograms

Analysis implementation and validation

- I. Read and understand the experimental paper
- 2. Write the C++ analyzer code for MadAnalysis 5
- 3. The difficult part: get missing information from the experimental collaboration. Needed, but not always publicly available, are:
 - efficiencies for trigger, electron, muons, b-tagging, event cleaning, ...
 pT dependence treatment of ISR, jet energy scale
 - exact configuration of MC tools (versions, run card settings)
 - benchmark points: SLHA or LHE files
 - cut flows for the benchmark points
 - expected final number of events in each signal region
- 4. Digitize the histograms from the experimental paper (stupid work; direct numerical form would be highly welcome → HepData, Twiki !)
- 5. Produce your own cut flows and histograms and compare, iterate until reasonable agreement is achieved

Analysis implementation and validation

- I. Read and understand the experimental paper
- 2. Write the C++ analyzer code for MadAnalysis 5
- 3. The difficult part: get missing information from the experimental collaboration. Needed, but not always publicly available, are:
 - efficiencies for trigger, electron, muons, b-tagging, event cleaning, ...
 PT dependence treatment of ISR, jet energy scale
 - exact configuration of MC tools (versions, run card settings)
 - benchmark points: SLHA or LHE files
 - cut flows for the benchmark points
 - expected final number of events in each signal region
- 4. Digitize the histograms from the experimental paper (stupid work; direct numerical form would be highly welcome → HepData, Twiki !)
- 5. Produce your own cut flows and histograms and compare, iterate until reasonable agreement is achieved





Analysis implementation and validation

- I. Read and understand the experimental paper
- 2. Write the C++ analyzer code for MadAnalysis 5
- 3. The difficult part: get missing information from the experimental collaboration. Needed, but not always publicly available, are:
 - efficiencies for trigger, electron, muons, b-tagging, event cleaning, ...
 PT dependence treatment of ISR, jet energy scale
 - exact configuration of MC tools (versions, run card settings)
 - benchmark points: SLHA or LHE files
 - cut flows for the benchmark points
 - expected final number of events in each signal region
- 4. Digitize the histograms from the experimental paper (stupid work; direct numerical form would be highly welcome → HepData, Twiki !)
- 5. Produce your own cut flows and histograms and compare, iterate until reasonable agreement is achieved



-essential

CMS example: SUS-13-011 (leptonic stop search)

- Search for stops in the single lepton final state, 19.5 fb⁻¹ at 8 TeV
- Targets stop \rightarrow t+neutralino and stop \rightarrow b+chargino decays (higgsino scenario)
- Two types of signal regions characterized by stop-LSP mass difference (low ΔM , high ΔM)

	$\tilde{t} \rightarrow t \tilde{\chi}_1^0$		$\tilde{t} \rightarrow b \tilde{\chi}^+$			
		Cut-b	ased		Cut-b	ased
Selection	BDT	Low ΔM	High ΔM	BDT	Low ΔM	High ΔM
Emiss (CaV)	yes	> 150, 200,	> 150, 200,	yes	> 100, 150,	> 100, 150,
$E_{\rm T} = (GeV)$		250, 300	250, 300	_	200, 250	200, 250
M ^W ₁₂ (GeV)	yes		>200	yes		>200
$\min \Delta \phi$	yes	>0.8	>0.8	yes	>0.8	>0.8
Hratio	yes			yes		
Hadronic top χ^2	(on-shell top)	<5	<5	-		
Leading b-tagged jet p_T (GeV)	(off-shell top)			yes		>100
$\Delta R(\ell, \text{leading b-tagged jet})$				yes		
Lepton p_{T} (GeV)				(off shell W)		

C++ code available on CMS Twiki page

- Generally very well documented, all MC tools specified, validation material OK
- Missing pieces: details on benchmark points, exact lepton efficiencies

 \rightarrow provided upon request !

Search for direct top squark pair production in the single lepton final state at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV (SUS-13-011)



Contents:

- Further information
- ↓ Abstract
- Analysis summary
- + Approved tables and plots (click on plot to get larger version)
 - + (pseudo) Feynman diagrams
 - + Results: yields vs. background prediction, kinematical distributions of (near-)final event sample
 - Interpretation: SUSY summary plots
 - Interpretation: limits on SUSY parameters
 - Kinematical quantities used in the event selection
 - ↓ Signal Region definitions
 - Sample BDT outputs at the preselection stage
 - ↓ Control region studies
 - ↓ Systematic uncertainties on the background prediction
 - Additional MT and BDT output distributions
 - Monte Carlo modeling of initial state radiation
 - Signal Regions used for limit extraction
 - Acceptance maps, not in paper
 - Additional plots, not in paper
 - ↓ Code
 - ↓ Electronic material
 - Additional Material to aid the Phenomenology Community with Reinterpretations of these Results

CMS very unbureaucratically provided us LHE files for the benchmark points, efficiencies, and cut flows



The single electron trigger efficiency. Uncertainties are statistical.

p_T range [GeV]	$ \eta < 1.5$	$1.5 < \eta < 2.1$
20 - 22	0.00 ± 0.000	0.00 ± 0.000
22 - 24	0.00 ± 0.000	0.00 ± 0.000
24 - 26	0.00 ± 0.000	0.03 ± 0.001
26 - 28	0.07 ± 0.001	0.22 ± 0.002
28 - 30	0.57 ± 0.001	0.52 ± 0.002
30 - 32	0.85 ± 0.001	0.65 ± 0.002
32 - 34	0.88 ± 0.001	0.70 ± 0.002
34 - 36	0.89 ± 0.000	0.72 ± 0.001
36 - 38	0.91 ± 0.000	0.74 ± 0.001
38 - 40	0.92 ± 0.000	0.75 ± 0.001
40 - 50	0.94 ± 0.000	0.77 ± 0.001
50 - 60	0.95 ± 0.000	0.79 ± 0.001
60 - 80	0.96 ± 0.000	0.79 ± 0.002
80 - 100	0.96 ± 0.001	0.80 ± 0.005
100 - 150	0.97 ± 0.001	0.82 ± 0.006
150 - 200	0.97 ± 0.002	0.83 ± 0.014
>200	0.97 ± 0.003	0.85 ± 0.020



Summary of yields for the $\tilde{t} \to t \tilde{\chi}_1^0$ model with $m_{\tilde{t}} = 650$ GeV and $m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^0} = 50$ GeV. No trigger efficiency or ISR reweighting is applied. In the first block of the table, the first row shows the yield after requiring at least one analysis lepton, at least 4 jets, and MET > 50 GeV. In each subsequent row, the preselection requirements are added one at a time. In the second block of the table the lowmass (LM) signal region yields are indicated. In the third block the high-mass (HM) signal region yields are indicated. The number after LM or HM indicates the MET requirement. The latter results may be compared to the signal yields in Table 4 of http://arxiv.org/pdf/1308.1586.pdf but they are slightly higher (~10-20%) because the trigger and ISR weights are not applied. All uncertainties are statistical only. The bold entry indicates the signal region with the best sensitivity, i.e., the signal region used for limit-setting.

$\ell + \ge 4 \text{ jets} + \text{MET} > 50$	31.6 ± 0.3
+ MET > 100	29.7 ± 0.3
$+ nb \ge 1$	25.2 ± 0.2
+ iso-track veto	21.0 ± 0.2
+ tau-veto	20.6 ± 0.2
$+ \min$ -dphi	17.8 ± 0.2
+ chi2	11.9 ± 0.2
+ MT > 120	9.6 ± 0.1
LM150	9.1 ± 0.1
LM200	8.2 ± 0.1
LM250	7.1 ± 0.1
LM300	5.7 ± 0.1
HM150	5.5 ± 0.1
HM200	5.4 ± 0.1
HM250	4.9 ± 0.1
HM300	$\textbf{4.2}\pm\textbf{0.1}$

Plus several distributions available for validation. Only remaining wish: digitized plots

CMS-SUS-13-011: validation

benchmark point	CMS result	${ m MA5}$ result				
$\tilde{t} \to b \tilde{\chi}_1^{\pm}, \text{low}$	$\tilde{t} \to b \tilde{\chi}_1^{\pm}, \text{low } \Delta M, E_T^{\text{miss}} > 150 \text{ GeV}$					
(250/50/0.5)	157 ± 9.9	141.2				
(250/50/0.75)	399 ± 18	366.8				
$\tilde{t} \to b \tilde{\chi}_1^{\pm}, \text{high}$	$\Delta M, E_T^{\text{miss}} >$	$150 {\rm GeV}$				
(450/50/0.25)	23 ± 2.3	23.4				
$\tilde{t} \to b \tilde{\chi}_1^{\pm}, \text{high}$	$\Delta M, E_T^{\text{miss}} > 1$	$250 {\rm GeV}$				
(600/100/0.5)	6.1 ± 0.5	5.4				
(650/50/0.5)	6.7 ± 0.4	5.8				
(650/50/0.75)	6.3 ± 0.4	5.7				
benchmark point	CMS result	MA5 result				
$\tilde{t} \to t \tilde{\chi}_1^0, \text{low } \Delta M, E_T^{\text{miss}} > 150 \text{ GeV}$						
(250/50)	108 ± 3.7	100.1				
$\tilde{t} \to t \tilde{\chi}_1^0$, high $\Delta M, E_T^{\text{miss}} > 300 \text{ GeV}$						
(650/50)	3.7 ± 0.1	3.6				



 $\tilde{t} \to t \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \text{ model}$

$7 \iota_{\chi_1}$ model	$m_{\tilde{t}_1} = 6$	350 GeV	$m_{\tilde{t}_1} = 250 {\rm GeV}$		
cut	CMS result	MA5 result	CMS result	MA 5 result	
$1\ell + \ge 4$ jets $+ E_T^{\text{miss}} > 50$	31.6 ± 0.3	29.0	8033.0 ± 38.7	7365.0	
$+ E_T^{\text{miss}} > 100 \text{ GeV}$	29.7 ± 0.3	27.3	4059.2 ± 27.5	3787.2	
$+ n_b \ge 1$	25.2 ± 0.2	23.8	3380.1 ± 25.1	3166.0	
+ iso-track veto	21.0 ± 0.2	19.8	2770.0 ± 22.7	2601.4	
+ tau veto	20.6 ± 0.2	19.4	2683.1 ± 22.4	2557.2	
$+ \Delta \phi_{\min} > 0.8$	17.8 ± 0.2	16.7	2019.1 ± 19.4	2021.3	
+ hadronic $\chi^2 < 5$	11.9 ± 0.2	9.8	1375.9 ± 16.0	1092.0	
$+ M_T > 120 \text{ GeV}$	9.6 ± 0.1	7.9	355.1 ± 8.1	261.3	
high $\Delta M, E_T^{\text{miss}} > 300 \text{ GeV}$	4.2 ± 0.1	3.9			
$\log \Delta M, E_T^{\rm miss} > 150 {\rm GeV}$	—	—	124.0 ± 4.8	107.9	

~10-20% agreement, quite good for fastsim



without trigger efficiency or ISR reweighting

ATLAS example: stop/sbottom, 012b+MET

Description	Signal Regions		
Description	SRA	SRB	
Event cleaning	Common to	all SR	
Lepton veto	No e/μ after overlap removal w	ith $p_{\rm T} > 7(6)$ GeV for $e(\mu)$	
$E_{ m T}^{ m miss}$	$> 150 { m ~GeV}$	$> 250 { m ~GeV}$	
Leading jet $p_{\rm T}(j_1)$	$> 130 { m ~GeV}$	$> 150 { m ~GeV}$	
Second jet $p_{\rm T}(j_2)$	> 50 GeV,	$> 30 { m ~GeV}$	
Third jet $p_{\mathrm{T}}(j_3)$	veto if $> 50 \text{ GeV}$	$> 30 { m ~GeV}$	
$\Delta \phi({m p}_{ m T}^{ m miss}, j_1)$	-	> 2.5	
b-tagging	leading 2 jets	2nd- and 3rd-leading jets	
	$(p_{\rm T} > 50 { m ~GeV}, \eta < 2.5)$	$(p_{\rm T}>30~{\rm GeV}, \eta <2.5)$	
	n _{b-jets} =	= 2	
$\Delta \phi_{ m min}$	> 0.4	> 0.4	
$E_{\rm T}^{\rm miss}/m_{\rm eff}(k)$	$E_{\rm T}^{\rm miss}/m_{\rm eff}(2) > 0.25$	$E_{\rm T}^{\rm miss}/m_{\rm eff}(3) > 0.25$	
$m_{ m CT}$	$>$ 150, 200, 250, 300, 350 ${\rm GeV}$	-	
H _{T,3}	-	$< 50 { m ~GeV}$	
m _{bb}	$> 200 { m ~GeV}$	-	

public code available

- Search for stops and sbottoms in the 0 lepton + 2 b-jets final state with large MET
- Two signal regions optimized for high and low ΔM
- Analysis well documented for physics, but not so well for recasting purposes
- Upon request obtained cut flows as well as SLHA files and some missing details on MC settings.
- trigger, b-tagging efficiencies ??

JHEP 1310 (2013) 189

ATLAS example: stop/sbottom, 012b+MET

Description	Signal Regions		
Description	SRA	SRB	
Event cleaning	Common to	all SR	
Lepton veto	No e/μ after overlap removal w	ith $p_{\rm T} > 7(6)$ GeV for $e(\mu)$	
$E_{\mathrm{T}}^{\mathrm{miss}}$	$> 150 { m ~GeV}$	$> 250 { m ~GeV}$	
Leading jet $p_{\rm T}(j_1)$	$> 130 { m ~GeV}$	$> 150 { m ~GeV}$	
Second jet $p_{\rm T}(j_2)$	> 50 GeV,	$> 30 { m ~GeV}$	
Third jet $p_{\mathrm{T}}(j_3)$	veto if $> 50 \text{ GeV}$	> 30 GeV	
$\Delta \phi({m p}_{ m T}^{ m miss}, j_1)$	-	> 2.5	
b-tagging	leading 2 jets	2nd- and 3rd-leading jets	
	$(p_{\rm T} > 50 { m ~GeV}, \eta < 2.5)$	$(p_{\rm T}>30~{\rm GeV}, \eta <2.5)$	
	n _{b-jets} =	= 2	
$\Delta \phi_{ m min}$	> 0.4	> 0.4	
$E_{\mathrm{T}}^{\mathrm{miss}}/m_{\mathrm{eff}}(k)$	$E_{\rm T}^{\rm miss}/m_{\rm eff}(2) > 0.25$	$E_{\rm T}^{\rm miss}/m_{\rm eff}(3) > 0.25$	
$m_{\rm CT}$	$>$ 150, 200, 250, 300, 350 ${\rm GeV}$	-	
H _{T,3}	-	$< 50 { m ~GeV}$	
m _{bb}	$> 200 { m ~GeV}$	-	

public code available

- Search for stops and sbottoms in the 0 lepton + 2 b-jets final state with large MET
- Two signal regions optimized for high and low ΔM
- Analysis well documented for physics, but not so well for recasting purposes
- Upon request obtained cut flows as well as SLHA files and some missing details on MC settings.
- trigger, b-tagging efficiencies ??
- In general, it is difficult for us to get necessary additional information from ATLAS; less fruitful interaction than with CMS.

 \rightarrow We would very much like to improve this.

ATLAS 0 lepton + 2b: validation for SRA



solid: MA5 result dashed: ATLAS result

	$m_{\tilde{b}_1} = 500 \text{ GeV}$		$m_{\tilde{t}_1} = 50$	00 GeV
cut	ATLAS result	MA5 result	ATLAS result	MA5 result
$E_T^{\text{miss}} > 80 \text{ GeV filter}$	1606.0	1628.2	1632.0	1585.2
+ Lepton veto	1505.0	1223.5	1061.0	863.2
$+ E_T^{\text{miss}} > 150 \text{ GeV}$	1323.0	1052.2	859.0	696.3
+ Jet Selection	119.0	142.3	39.0	47.6
$+ M_{bb} > 200 \text{ GeV}$	96.0	116.5	32.0	38.8
$+ M_{CT} > 150 \text{ GeV}$	82.0	97.5	26.8	31.7
$+ M_{CT} > 200 \text{ GeV}$	67.0	80.7	20.2	24.5
$+ M_{CT} > 250 \text{ GeV}$	51.0	60.8	13.2	16.6
$+ M_{CT} > 300 \text{ GeV}$	35.0	42.3	7.7	9.2

good agreement (~20%)

ATLAS 0 lepton + 2b: validation for SRB



solid: MA5 result dashed: ATLAS result

	$(m_{\tilde{b}_1}, m_{\tilde{\chi}^0_1}) = 0$	(350, 320) GeV	$(m_{\tilde{t}_1}, m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^{\pm}}, m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^{0}}) = ($	500, 420, 400) GeV
	$m_{\tilde{b}_1} = 35$	50 GeV	$m_{\tilde{t}_1} = 50$	$00 \mathrm{GeV}$
cut	ATLAS result	MA5 result	ATLAS result	MA5 result
$E_T^{\text{miss}} > 80 \text{ GeV filter}$	6221.0	5963.7	1329.0	1117.9
+ Lepton veto	4069.0	4450.4	669.0	702.9
$+ E_T^{\text{miss}} > 250 \text{ GeV}$	757.0	724.5	93.0	86.8
+ Jet Selection	7.9	7.5	6.2	5.7
$+ H_{T,3} < 50 \text{ GeV}$	5.2	6.6	3.0	4.6

agreement less good than for SRA but still reasonable (30-50%)

ATLAS 0 lepton + 2b: validation for SRB

	$(m_{\tilde{b}_1}, m_{\tilde{\chi}^0_1}) = 0$	(350, 320) GeV	$(m_{\tilde{t}_1}, m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm}, m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^0}) \; = \; ($	500, 420, 400) GeV
	$m_{\tilde{b}_1} = 35$	60 GeV	$m_{\tilde{t}_1} = 50$	00 GeV
cut	ATLAS result	MA5 result	ATLAS result	MA5 result
$E_T^{\text{miss}} > 80 \text{ GeV filter}$	6221.0	5963.7	1329.0	1117.9
+ Lepton veto	4069.0	4450.4	669.0	702.9
$+ E_T^{\text{miss}} > 250 \text{ GeV}$	757.0	724.5	93.0	86.8
+ Jet Selection	7.9	7.5	6.2	5.7
$+ H_{T,3} < 50 \text{ GeV}$	5.2	6.6	3.0	4.6

agreement less good than for SRA but still reasonable (30-50%)

ATLAS 0 lepton + 2b: validation for SRB

agreement less good than for SRA but still reasonable (30-50%)

Welcome to <u>INSPIRE</u>, the High Energy Physics information system. Please direct questions, comments or concerns to <u>feedback@inspirehep.net</u>.

HEP :: HEPNAMES :: INSTITUTIONS :: CONFERENCES :: JOBS :: EXPERIMENTS :: JOURNALS :: HELP

Record created 2014-06-19, last modified 2014-06-24

Wiki

wiki: PhysicsAnalysisDatabase

Start Page Index History
Last modified 2 days ago

MadAnalysis 5 physics analysis database

Available Analyses

!! please properly cite the DOIs of all the re-implementation codes you are using !!

ATLAS analyses, 8 TeV

Analysis	Short Description	Implemented by	Code	Validation note	Status
⇔ATLAS-SUSY-2013-05 (published)	stop/sbottom search: 0 leptons + 2 b-jets	G. Chalons	G→Inspire	PDF	done
⇔ATLAS-SUSY-2013-11 (published)	EWK-inos, 2 leptons + MET	B. Dumont	t.b.a.	PDF	validation in progress

CMS analyses, 8 TeV

Delphes card for these analyses

Analysis	Short Description	Implemented by	Code	Validation note	Status
⇔CMS-SUS-13-011 (published)	stop search in the single lepton mode	B. Dumont, B. Fuks, C. Wymant	⇔Inspire [1]	PDF	done
⇔CMS-SUS-13-012 (published)	gluino/squark search in jet multiplicity and missing energy	S. Bein, D. Sengupta	t.b.a.	PDF	ok, move to v1.1.11
⇔CMS-SUS-13-016 (PAS)	search for gluinos using OS dileptons and b-jets	D. Sengupta, S. Kulkarni	t.b.a.	PDF	done

Conclusions

- We propose to create a public database of LHC analyses for BSM searches using the MadAnalysis 5 framework
- Implemented and validated several cut-based ATLAS and CMS SUSY searches; more in preparation (MVA-based analyses can also be implemented in principle if final MVA is provided)
- C++ analysis codes published via INSPIRE → each implementation obtains a digital objet identifier (DOI) and is individually citable.
- It is important for the legacy of the LHC that its experimental results can be used by the whole HEP community. We hope that our project contributes to this aim. Everybody welcome to contribute his/her recast code!
- However, this can only succeed if more information is provided by the experimental collaborations on their analyses. We plea for a more open communication and exchange of information between EXP and TH/users.
 - \rightarrow Les Houches Recommendations

Thanks to

- ATLAS: Jamie Boyd, Marie-Helene Genest, Monica d'Onofrio
 CMS: Alessandro Gaz, Benjamin Hooberman, Christian Sander, Frank Würthwein for providing additional information beyond the analysis papers/Twiki pages
- Inspire people: Sunje Dallmeier-Tiessen, Salvatore Mele and Laura Rueda Garcia for setting up a system for publishing 'datasets' (incl. computer codes) via Inspire
- The Les Houches Physics at TeV Colliders 2013 workshop where this project originated, and the LabEx Enigmass for various financial support

