Lecture 3: jet substructure

* boosted-objects physics
* grooming and tagging
* calculations for jet substructure



the (ambitious) target of this lecture is to understand this plot

searching for new particles (I)

* Standard analysis: the heavy particle X decays into two partons, reconstructed as two jets



* Look for bumps in the dijet invariant mass distribution



* What about EW-scale particles at the LHC ?

searching for new particles (II)

* LHC energy (10^4 GeV) $\gg$ electro-weak scale (10^2 GeV)
* EW-scale particles (new physics, Z/W/H/top) are abundantly produced with a large boost





source CMS

* their decay-products are then collimated
* if they decay into hadrons, we end up with localised deposition of energy in the hadronic calorimeter: a jet



we want to look inside a jet

we want to look inside a jet


ATLAS
EXPERIMENT
Event: 531676916
2015-08-22 04:2
exploit jets' properties
to distinguish signal
jets from bkgd jets
R
R
h
q
$p_t > 2m/R$
we want to look inside a jet

signal-jet mass

* first jet-observable that comes to mind
* signal jets should have a mass distribution peaked near the resonance



signal-jet mass

* first jet-observable that comes to mind
* signal jets should have a mass distribution peaked near the resonance
* however, that's a simple partonic picture
* perturbative and non-pert. emissions from the qqb pair broadens and shift the peak
* underlying event and pile-up typically enhance the jet mass



QCD-jet mass

* first jet-observable that comes to mind
* background (QCD) jets acquire mass through showering



$$m^2 = 2p_q \cdot p_g \simeq z(1-z)\theta^2 p_T^2$$

HM3.1 g→bb is important for H→bb studies. What's its average mass? (take m_b=0)

QCD-jet mass

* first jet-observable that comes to mind
* background (QCD) jets acquire mass through showering



$$m^2 = 2p_q \cdot p_g \simeq z(1-z)\theta^2 p_T^2$$

$$\langle m^2 \rangle \simeq \frac{\alpha_s}{2\pi} p_T^2 \int_0^{R^2} \frac{d\theta^2}{\theta^2} \int_0^1 dz z(1-z)\theta^2 P_{gq}(z)$$

HM3.1 g→bb is important for H→bb studies. What's its average mass? (take m_b=0)

QCD-jet mass

* first jet-observable that comes to mind
* background (QCD) jets acquire mass through showering



$$m^2 = 2p_q \cdot p_g \simeq z(1-z)\theta^2 p_T^2$$

$$\langle m^2 \rangle \simeq \frac{\alpha_s}{2\pi} p_T^2 \int_0^{R^2} \frac{d\theta^2}{\theta^2} \int_0^1 dz z(1-z)\theta^2 P_{gq}(z)$$

$$= \frac{\alpha_s C_F}{\pi} p_T^2 R^2 \int_0^1 dz z(1-z) \frac{2-2z+z^2}{2z}$$

mass grows with p_T

$$= 3/8$$

HM3.1 g→bb is important for H→bb studies. What's its average mass? (take m_b=0)

homework 5

- Gluon splitting into bottom quarks g→bb is important for H→bb studies. What's its average mass? (take $m_b=0$)

QCD-jet mass: NP effects

- first jet-observable that comes to mind
- background (QCD) jets receive important non-pert contributions



hadronisation and UE



pile-up (data!)

beyond the mass: substructure

* need to go beyond the mass and exploit jet substructure : grooming and tagging:
    * clean the jets up by removing soft radiation
    * identify the features of hard decays and cut on them

beyond the mass: substructure

* need to go beyond the mass and exploit jet substructure : grooming and tagging:
  * clean the jets up by removing soft radiation
  * identify the features of hard decays and cut on them



core-idea for grooming:

beyond the mass: substructure

* need to go beyond the mass and exploit jet substructure : grooming and tagging:
  * clean the jets up by removing soft radiation
  * identify the features of hard decays and cut on them



core-idea for grooming:

* identify the "right" angular scale

beyond the mass: substructure

- need to go beyond the mass and exploit jet substructure : grooming and tagging:
  - clean the jets up by removing soft radiation
  - identify the features of hard decays and cut on them



core-idea for grooming:

- identify the "right" angular scale
- throw away what is soft & large angle
- left with a groomed jet

beyond the mass: substructure

* need to go beyond the mass and exploit jet substructure : **grooming** and **tagging**:

    * clean the jets up by removing soft radiation

    * identify the features of hard decays and cut on them

    core-idea for 2-body tagging:





beyond the mass: substructure

- need to go beyond the mass and exploit jet substructure : grooming and tagging:
  - clean the jets up by removing soft radiation
  - identify the features of hard decays and cut on them

core-idea for 2-body tagging: $\min(z, 1-z) > z_{\text{cut}}$

$$P_{gq} = C_F \frac{1 + (1-z)^2}{z}$$

$P_{h\to q\bar{q}} = 1$

symmetric sharing of the energy





asymmetric sharing of the energy

grooming & tagging landscape



Many available in Fastjet or as Fastjet contribs

relative positions depends on physics context, kinematics, etc.

plot by G. Salam

grooming & tagging landscape



relative positions depends on physics context, kinematics, etc.

plot by G. Salam

BDRS method for H→bb



- undo last stage of C/A clustering.
- if there's symmetric sharing of energy & significant mass drop, then tag the jet.
- otherwise iterate

- resolve the jet on a smaller radius
- keep the 3 hardest subjets



* this study resurrected an "impossible" channel
* still very difficult at the LHC !
* it sparked interest in this field !

Butterworth, Davison, Rubin and Salam (2008)

grooming & tagging landscape



relative positions depends on physics context, kinematics, etc.

plot by G. Salam

recap: the jet mass



$\sigma_{res} = g_0 \exp[g_1(\alpha_s L)/\alpha_s + g_2(\alpha_s L) + \alpha_s g_3(\alpha_s L) + \ldots]$



$$\frac{1}{\sigma}\frac{d\sigma^{\rm LL}}{dm^2} = \frac{1}{\sigma}\frac{d\sigma^{\rm LO}}{dm^2} \times \exp\left[-\int_{m^2}^{p_T^2 R^2} dm'^2 \frac{1}{\sigma}\frac{d\sigma^{\rm LO}}{dm'^2}\right]$$



- all-order leading logs: veto emissions which would give too big a mass
- exponential that gives the no-emission probability
- jet mass distributions exhibits double logs

recap: the jet mass



$$\sigma_{res} = g_0 \exp[g_1(\alpha_s L)/\alpha_s + g_2(\alpha_s L) + \alpha_s g_3(\alpha_s L) + \ldots]$$



* all-order leading logs: veto emissions which would give too big a mass
* exponential that gives the no-emission probability
* jet mass distributions exhibits double logs

and now groomed masses



$\sigma_{res} = g_0 \exp[g_1(\alpha_s L)/\alpha_s + g_2(\alpha_s L) + \alpha_s g_3(\alpha_s L) + \ldots]$



?

* different groomers / taggers appear to behave quite similarly

and now groomed masses



$\sigma_{res} = g_0 \exp[g_1(\alpha_s L)/\alpha_s + g_2(\alpha_s L) + \alpha_s g_3(\alpha_s L) + \ldots]$



??

* but only for a limited kinematic region!
* complicated algorithm with many parameters
* can we compute groomed mass distributions?

trimming as an example

Krohn, Thaler and Wang (2010)



1. take all particles in a jet and re-cluster them with a smaller jet radius $R_{sub} < R$

2. keep all subjets for which $p_t^{subjet} > z_{cut}\, p_t$

3. recombine the subjets to form the trimmed jet

trimming



Soft gluons off a hard parton (a quark for definiteness)



* the action of a groomer is to remove some of the allowed phase space (typically soft and soft-collinear)
* what are the consequences for physical observables, e.g. the jet mass ?

trimmed mass at LL



- one emission sets a **mass m**
- veto emissions that would give too big a mass
- **trimming here has no effect**

$$\Sigma(\rho) \equiv \int^{\rho} d\rho' \frac{1}{\sigma} \frac{d\sigma}{d\rho'}$$

$$\Sigma^{(\rm trim)}(\rho) \simeq \exp\left[-\frac{\alpha_s C_F}{2\pi}\left(-\frac{3}{2}\ln\frac{1}{\rho} + \Theta(\rho - z_{\rm cut})\ln^2\frac{1}{\rho} + \right)\right]$$

trimmed mass at LL



- first transition at $\rho = z_{cut}$
- soft & soft collinear radiation is trimmed away
- only single logs!

$$\Sigma^{(\mathrm{trim})}(\rho) \simeq \exp\left[-\frac{\alpha_s C_F}{2\pi}\left(-\frac{3}{2}\ln\frac{1}{\rho} + \Theta(\rho - z_{\mathrm{cut}})\ln^2\frac{1}{\rho} + \right.\right.$$
$$\left.\left. +\Theta(z_{\mathrm{cut}} - \rho)\left(\ln^2\frac{1}{z_{\mathrm{cut}}} + 2\ln\frac{z_{\mathrm{cut}}}{\rho}\ln\frac{1}{z_{\mathrm{cut}}}\right)\right)\right]$$

trimmed mass at LL



- second transition at $\rho = R_{sub}^2/R^2\, z_{cut}$
- soft & soft-collinear radiation below angular resolution isn't trimmed away
- **back to double logs** (same as plain mass)

$$\Sigma^{(\rm trim)}(\rho) \simeq \exp\left[-\frac{\alpha_s C_F}{2\pi}\left(-\frac{3}{2}\ln\frac{1}{\rho} + \Theta(\rho - z_{\rm cut})\ln^2\frac{1}{\rho} + +\Theta(z_{\rm cut}-\rho)\left(\ln^2\frac{1}{z_{\rm cut}} + 2\ln\frac{z_{\rm cut}}{\rho}\ln\frac{1}{z_{\rm cut}}\right) + \Theta(z_{\rm cut}r^2 - \rho)\ln^2\frac{z_{\rm cut}r^2}{\rho}\right)\right]$$

trimmed mass: MC vs analytics

Modified LL (MLL): LL + hard collinear + running coupling



* trimming is active (and aggressive) for $z_{cut} < \rho < R_{sub}^2/R^2\, z_{cut}$
* not active below because of fixed R_{sub}

pruned mass: MC vs analytics

Ellis, Vermilion, Walsh (2010)

Modified LL (MLL): LL + hard collinear + running coupling



* more complex structure, no simple exponentiation
* single logs for $z_{cut}^2 < \rho < z_{cut}$

mMDT mass: MC vs analytics

Dasgupta, Fregoso, SM, Salam (2013)

Modified LL (MLL): LL + hard collinear + running coupling



- MDT has only single logs at LO
- modified MDT maintains this feature to all orders

homework 6

Show that the leading-order mass distributions for MDT and pruning are single-logarithmic. (This doesn't hold at higher orders!). Use the definition below

1. Undo the last stage of the C/A clustering. Label the two subjets j_1 and j_2 ($m_1 > m_2$)
2. If $m_1 < \mu m$ (mass drop) and the splitting was not too asymmetric, ie

$$\frac{\min(p_{ti}, p_{tj})}{p_{ti} + p_{tj}} > z_{\text{cut}}$$

tag the jet.
3. Otherwise redefine $j = j_1$ and iterate.

1. From an initial jet with mass m define the pruning radius $R_{prune} = m / p_t$
2. Re-cluster the jet, vetoing recombination for which: $d_{ij} > R_{prune}$ and

$$\frac{\min(p_{ti}, p_{tj})}{p_{ti} + p_{tj}} > z_{\text{cut}}$$

[Hint] Consider as in the lecture the emission of a collinear gluon off a quark. Take the small-z_{cut} limit to simplify your expressions.

analytics to check MCs

* so far we have always compared to a single MC simulation
* how solid are MC descriptions ?



* take the spread as the uncertainty ?
* but we can also add the analytic calculation

analytics to check MCs

* so far we have always compared to a single MC simulation
* how solid are MC descriptions ?



* take the spread as the uncertainty ?
* but we can also add the analytic calculation

* problem in the shower: fixed by the Authors in the 6.428pre version

analytic understanding at work: soft drop

Larkoski, SM, Soyez and Thaler (2014)

1. Undo the last stage of the C/A clustering. Label the two subjets j_1 and j_2.

2. If $$\frac{\min(p_{T1}, p_{T2})}{p_{T1} + p_{T2}} > z_{\rm cut} \left(\frac{\Delta R_{12}}{R_0}\right)^{\beta}$$

then deem j to be the soft-drop jet.



3. Otherwise redefine j to be the harder subjet and iterate.

1-prong jets can be either kept (grooming mode) or discarded (tagging mode)

* generalisation of the (modified) Mass Drop procedure
* no mass drop condition (not so important)
* mMDT recovered for β=0
* some inspiration from semi-classical jets

Butterworth, Davison, Rubin and Salam (2008)
Dasgupta, Fregoso, SM and Salam (2013)

Tseng and Evans (2013)

soft drop as a groomer



* useful to consider the soft-gluon phase space
* soft-drop condition becomes

$$z > z_{\text{cut}} \left(\frac{\theta}{R} \right)^{\beta}$$

* soft drop always removes soft radiation entirely (hence the name)
* for β>0 soft-collinear is partially removed

soft drop vs trimming



- trimming had an abrupt change of behavior due to fixed R_{sub}
- in soft-drop angular resolution controlled by the exponent β
- phase-space appears smoother

Soft drop in grooming mode (β>0) works as a dynamical trimmer

soft drop and mMDT



- useful to consider the soft-gluon phase space
- soft-drop condition becomes

$$z > z_{\text{cut}} \left(\frac{\theta}{R}\right)^{\beta}$$

- soft drop always removes soft radiation entirely (hence the name)
- for β=0 soft-collinear is also entirely removed (mMDT limit)

soft drop as a tagger



- useful to consider the soft-gluon phase space
- soft-drop condition becomes

$$z > z_{\rm cut} \left(\frac{\theta}{R}\right)^{\beta}$$

- soft drop always removes soft radiation entirely (hence the name)
- for β<0 some hard-collinear is also partially removed

soft-drop mass at LL



- one emission sets a **mass m**
- veto emissions that would give too big a mass
- **soft drop here has no effect**

$$\Sigma(\rho) \equiv \int^{\rho} d\rho' \frac{1}{\sigma}\frac{d\sigma}{d\rho'}$$

$$\Sigma^{(\mathrm{s.d.})}(\rho) \simeq \exp\left[-\frac{\alpha_s C_F}{2\pi}\left(-\frac{3}{2}\ln\frac{1}{\rho} + \Theta(\rho - z_{\mathrm{cut}})\ln^2\frac{1}{\rho} \qquad \right)\right]$$

soft-drop mass at LL



- only one transition point at $\rho = z_{cut}$
- soft & soft collinear radiation is partially removed
- only single logs for β=0!

$$\Sigma^{(\mathrm{s.d.})}(\rho) \simeq$$

$$\exp\left[-\frac{\alpha_s C_F}{2\pi}\left(-\frac{3}{2}\ln\frac{1}{\rho} + \Theta(\rho - z_{\mathrm{cut}})\ln^2\frac{1}{\rho} + \Theta(z_{\mathrm{cut}} - \rho)\left(\frac{\beta}{2+\beta}\ln^2\frac{1}{\rho} + \frac{2}{2+\beta}\ln^2\frac{1}{z_{\mathrm{cut}}}\right)\right)\right]$$

soft-drop mass: MC vs analytics

Modified LL (MLL): LL + hard collinear + running coupling



$C_1^{(2)} \simeq m^2/p_T^2$



* smooth distributions
* flatness in bkg can be achieved for β=0
* now standard choice for CMS

precision jet substructure



- using SCET, precision pushed to NNLL
- no non-global logs
- no colour correlations

Frye, Larkoski, Schwartz, Yan (2016)

and data!



CMS-PAS-16-010



arXiv:1711.08341

homework 7

* go back to homework 4 and now calculate the contribution to the soft-dropped jet mass from the dipole which is formed by the initial-state partons

summary of lecture 3

* boosted-object physics
* grooming and tagging
* precision substructure physics with soft-drop

more robust

deeper understanding
QCD, calculations, etc.

ideas, phenomenology,
MC simulations, etc.

more efficient

summary of lecture 3

more robust

deeper understanding
QCD, calculations, etc.



ideas, phenomenology,
MC simulations, etc.

more efficient

resources

* G. Salam: "Towards jetography"
* G. Soyez: "Pileup mitigation at the LHC: a theorist's view"
* the BOOST report series
* SM, M. Spannowsky, G. Soyez, in preparation