

Multi-jet process generation for LHC

Simon de Visscher, Michel Herquet
Universite catholique de Louvain
Centre for Particle Physics and Phenomenology (CP³)

ATLAS MCG meeting - CERN - 11/02/07

Context

- There could be a need of reference samples available for theorists, phenomenologists and experimentalists.
- Multi-jet process (all SM backgrounds + ...) generation is not an easy task.
- Simulation uncertainties should be under control

We propose MadGraph/MadEvent to be one of the generators in this game!

Outline

- 1 Multi-jet process generation
- 2 Validation of the samples
- 3 Summary

Plan

Multi-jet process generation

1 Multi-jet process generation

Validation of the samples

2 Validation of the samples

Summary

3 Summary

Sensitivity to shower choice

With the generation of multi-jets processes with only PS generators, some choices can affect the physical distributions:

- Choice of showering scheme (Q^2 , P_T^2 , $\sim E^2\theta^2, \dots$)
- Choice of shower scale (wimpy, power, ...)

A global tune of a PS to mimic physical distributions is the opposite methodology for BSM physics discoveries. An elegant solution for the problems evoked is to use a jet-parton matching/merging method.

The example of $\tilde{g}\tilde{g}$ produced "a la pythia"


Simon de Visscher

Publication to come, F.Maltoni, J.Alwall, SDV.

Multi-jet process generation

Validation of the samples

Summary



The remedy

Use one of the available jet-parton matching techniques to manage the problems.

ME

- parton-level description
- valid when partons are hard and well separated
- needed for multi-jets description

PS

- down to hadron-level description
- valid when partons are collinear and/or soft
- needed for realistic studies


Double counting problem:

Need to cut the phase-space into two parts: one accessible by Matrix-Element (high Q^2) and the rest by PS (low Q^2).

What does exist?

There are different combinations of

Matrix-Element Generator + Matching Scheme + PS



In MG/ME: Modified MLM (MLM scheme (M.Mangano) using K_T instead of Cone) and CKKW. MMLM designed by S.Mrenna, implemented by J.Alwall and tested by J.Alwall and SDV


Production "a la pythia"

ME: $\tilde{g}\tilde{g}$

Multi-jet process generation

Validation of the samples

Summary




Production with Matching

ME: $\tilde{g}\tilde{g} + 0, 1, 2$ GeV Cutoff used: 60 GeV

Multi-jet process generation

Validation of the samples

Summary



Plan

Multi-jet process generation

1 Multi-jet process generation

Validation of the samples

2 Validation of the samples

Summary

3 Summary

What do we provide?

Simon de Visscher

Multi-jet process
generation

Validation of the
samples

Summary

- for each process+multiplicity: one single code suitable for grid production:
 - Each sample is weighted differently.
 - Possibility of merging (events removing depending of xsec)
 - matching + shower choice set up to the user
- A set of small ($O(100k)$) samples: matrix-element + MLM matching with Pythia showers . Evaluation of the efficiency of the matching procedure (usefull for large scale productions).
- Those provided sample are **validated**:
at matching point of view, we use a set of control distributions (differential jet rate).

MatchChecker (S de Visscher, P.Demin)

Package usefull to

- to validate a choice of matching parameters (via the control plots)
- to compair matching impact with different choices of
 - matching parameters
 - shower scales
 - shower ordering scheme
 - ME+matching schemes+PS combinations.

Example:

MG-ME+Pythia(MMLM) vs Sherpa(CKKW) vs
ALPGEN+Herwig(MLM)

Those kind of checks/comparisons should be mandatory in order to estimate simulation uncertainties!

How it works?

- Input: STDHEP files
- Ultra-simple to use: fill a card and run `./MatchChecker.sh`
 - Differential jet rates
 - Kinematic plots of X in a "X+n jet" production
 - Kinematic plots of jets (P_T, η) with jet definition up to the user, and with minimal user's P_T cut
 - $H_T(2, \dots)$
 - MET
- A Postscript report is done with everything organised (ToC, possibility of adding banners, sections...)
- Each plot is produced in .eps and C format
- A root file is produced containing all physical histograms for more flexibility

Available soon on the MG wiki



Simon de Visscher

Multi-jet process
generation

Validation of the
samples

Summary

Let's see an example!

Plan

Multi-jet process generation

1 Multi-jet process generation

Validation of the samples

2 Validation of the samples

Summary

3 Summary

To conclude

- The generation with PS generator is not sufficient for reliable production of multi-jet samples
- Jet-parton matching techniques permits to avoid PS problems
- MadGraph/MadEvent is suitable for those productions: small samples and frozen codes will be available
- Productions can be validated/compared with MatchChecker: systematics estimations.



Simon de Visscher

Multi-jet process
generation


Validation of the
samples

Summary

Thank you!

Validation of matching parameters


Validation of matching parameters: use the differential jet rate distributions to control the matching.



- Invariance of the global shape with respect to the choice of the cutoff
- Smooth transition from one region of the phase-space to the other.

Other examples of plots

Comparison of differential jet rates:



In this example, comparison of the DJR ($1 \rightarrow 0$) for the production of $W+0,1,2,3$ jets at different cutoff (15,20 and 30 GeV) and for wimpy and power Q^2 ordered shower schemes.

This is by default in the Report.