

# List of Figures

1.1	Pictorial representation of the standard model. . . . .	4
1.2	QED interaction vertex. . . . .	7
1.3	QCD interaction vertices: coupling of gluon-gluon (self interaction) (left) and quark-gluon (right). . . . .	8
1.4	Pictorial representation of quark confinement. . . . .	9
1.5	Weak interaction vertices: charged current (left) and neutral current (right) interactions. . . . .	11
1.6	Measured production cross sections for various production processes at the CMS detector at different center-of-mass energies [20]. . . . .	14
1.7	Summary of $\sigma_{\text{eff}}$ measurements as a function of collision energy [31]. . . . .	18
1.8	Production cross sections for diboson processes in proton (anti- )proton collisions as a function of collider center-of-mass energy. The dotted curves correspond to single-parton scattering (SPS) processes, while the solid curves represent the DPS processes [21]. . . . .	20
1.9	Thesis organization. . . . .	21
2.1	The CERN accelerator complex and various experiments. . . . .	30
2.2	Mean number of interactions per bunch crossing observed at the CMS detector during the pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV run in the year 2012 [10].	33

---

2.3	Cumulative luminosity recorded at the CMS detector during pp collisions at various center-of-mass energies. The integrated luminosity at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV is multiplied by a factor of 50 for the sake of easy comparison [10]. . . . .	35
2.4	Layout of the CMS detector demonstrating its layered structure and various subdetector modules. . . . .	36
2.5	Transverse slice of the CMS detector showing various particle trajectories. The charged particles (solid lines) follow a curved trajectories and are measured in the silicon tracker. The energy of electromagnetically interacting particles (e.g. electrons (red line) or photons (dashed blue line)) is measured in the electromagnetic calorimeter. Strongly interacting particles (e.g. pions (green line) or neutrons (dashed green line)) pass through the electromagnetic calorimeter and have their energies registered in the hadron calorimeter. Finally $p_T$ of muons (light blue line) is measured in the muon chambers. . . . .	37
2.6	Schematic cross section through the CMS tracker with each line representing a detector module. Double lines indicate back-to-back detector modules. . . . .	40
2.7	Layout diagram of the the pixel detector of the CMS tracking system.	41
2.8	Geometrical outline of the CMS ECAL illustrating the arrangement of $\text{PbWO}_4$ crystals inside the barrel and endcap regions, with the preshower detector in front of the endcap (top) while a longitudinal section of one quadrant is shown at the bottom. . . . .	44
2.9	Longitudinal overview of the CMS HCAL detector. . . . .	46
2.10	Energy resolution of the ECAL (top) and the HCAL (bottom). . . . .	48
2.11	Illustrative overview of the CMS muon detector system. . . . .	50

2.12	$p_T$ resolution of muons as a function of their $p_T$ for the muon system, the inner tracker, and the combination of both in the region with $ \eta  < 0.8$ (left) and $1.2 <  \eta  < 2.4$ (right). . . . .	51
2.13	Layouts of the CMS trigger (left) and DAQ system (right). . . . .	52
2.14	Sketch of a typical pp collision at the LHC. . . . .	54
3.1	One quarter of the CMS muon system with different layers of RPCs. . . . .	69
3.2	Simulated RPC L1 trigger efficiency as a function of $\eta$ corresponding to different number of RPC layers. . . . .	70
3.3	Schematic layout of CMS RE4 disk, with new RPCs and contributions from different contributing assembly sites. . . . .	71
3.4	Schematic diagram of a RPC. . . . .	72
3.5	Layout of the endcap RPC station. . . . .	76
3.6	Schematic diagram of the double-gap RPC used in the CMS muon detector system. . . . .	76
3.7	Schema of the CMS endcap RPC. . . . .	79
3.8	RPC laboratory at Department of Physics, Panjab University Chandigarh. . . . .	80
3.9	Observed variation in over-pressure versus time for a bakelite Bottom gas gap under the gas leak test at an over-pressure of 20 mbar. . . . .	82
3.10	Observed fluctuations in over-pressure for a gas gap undergoing the spacer test, here each spike corresponds to the location of a button spacer inside the gas gap. . . . .	83
3.11	Dark current for a gas gap during the HV scan and long term monitoring test. . . . .	83
3.12	Sequential procedure followed for the assembly of CMS RPC. . . . .	85
3.13	Base panel of HCP covered with mylar and Cu-Faraday cage. . . . .	86

3.14	Cu-readout panel placed over the Bottom gas gap. . . . .	86
3.15	Gas pipes attached to the gas gaps and coaxial cables soldered to the readout strips. . . . .	87
3.16	Final packing of the RPC with top panel of HCP including the front- end electronics and the Cu-cooling system. . . . .	87
3.17	Strip profile from readout channels of the RPC. . . . .	88
3.18	Cluster size distributions for three different type of gas gaps (indicated using different colors) as a function of applied HV. . . . .	88
3.19	Configuration of the coincidence unit used to perform efficiency mea- surements of RPCs. . . . .	88
3.20	Variation of efficiency as a function of effective high voltage for the CMS RPC assembled at Panjab University. A nice plateau region with efficiency greater than 95% is observed at the operating voltage of RPC ( $\approx 9.5$ kV). . . . .	89
3.21	Cross-sectional view of the various RPC stations in the forward and backward regions of the CMS detector. The black points show the position of the reconstructed hits in the middle of the signal electrodes (strips). The results are based on the analysis of the collision data at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV at a magnetic field of 3.8 T. The empty spots correspond to the inactive signal electrodes. . . . .	91
3.22	Intrinsic noise rate for the RPCs. . . . .	92
3.23	History of fraction of inoperative RPC readout channels during the year 2015. The blue line represents the number of inactive or dead channels, while the masked channels are shown using a green line. . .	93
3.24	Mean of the WP distributions for the RPCs in the barrel and endcap regions during the period 2011–2015. The error bars on the points correspond to statistical fluctuations. . . . .	94

3.25	Cluster size distribution for the RPCs in the barrel (top) and endcap (bottom) regions. . . . .	95
3.26	Mean cluster size for the newly installed RPCs in Disk $\pm$ 4 in the year 2015. . . . .	95
3.27	Hit rate (Hz/cm <sup>2</sup> ) for various RPC detector units at an average instantaneous luminosity of $4.5 \times 10^{33}$ cm <sup>-2</sup> s <sup>-1</sup> for the barrel region during the year 2015. The grey colored boxes represent the detector units switched off. The color pallet on the right end of the plot illustrates the background rates increasing while moving from violet color towards the red color. The x-axis corresponds to the sector numbers in a wheel and the y-axis corresponds to different $\eta$ partitions of the chamber. . . . .	96
3.28	Hit rate (Hz/cm <sup>2</sup> ) for various RPC detector units at an average instantaneous luminosity of $4.5 \times 10^{33}$ cm <sup>-2</sup> s <sup>-1</sup> for the endcap regions. The grey colored boxes represent the detector units switched off. . . .	97
3.29	Variation of average RPC hit rate versus instantaneous luminosity of pp collisions at the LHC. The red (black) markers represent the hit rate measured in the barrel (endcap) region. The green markers indicate the overall hit rate evaluated for the entire RPC system. . . .	98
3.30	Overall detection efficiency for the RPCs in the barrel (top) and endcap (bottom) regions. . . . .	99
3.31	History of detection efficiency for the RPCs in Disk $\pm$ 4 during the LHC data taking in 2015. . . . .	100
4.1	Visualization of an event in the CMS detector. . . . .	106
4.2	Flowchart of event reconstruction algorithms. . . . .	107

4.3	Magnified view of the CMS event display, showing 29 distinct vertices reconstructed corresponding to 29 distinct collisions within a single bunch crossing at the LHC. . . . .	110
4.4	Underlying concept of PF event reconstruction algorithm. . . . .	112
5.1	Leading order Feynman diagrams corresponding to the production of a same-sign W boson pair via DPS (left) and SPS (right) processes. . . . .	128
5.2	Generator level distributions for the scalar sum of the $p_T$ of electron and muon (left) coming from the decay of two W bosons and azimuthal angular separation between them (right), for the DPS and SPS production processes. . . . .	130
5.3	Feynman diagrams for the production of $t\bar{t}$ pairs via quark annihilation (top panel) and gluon fusion (bottom panel) processes. . . . .	131
5.4	Decay scheme of a top quark. . . . .	131
5.5	Feynman diagrams illustrating the single top quark production. . . . .	132
5.6	Feynman diagram for the W+jets production process. . . . .	133
5.7	Feynman diagrams for the DY production process. . . . .	133
5.8	Tree level diagrams for various diboson production processes. . . . .	134
5.9	Analysis strategy used for the DPS studies via same-sign WW events with $e\mu$ final state. . . . .	135
5.10	Number of vertices distribution for the events passing same-sign WW selection criteria for the $e\mu$ final state. Various background processes and signal are shown using different colors in the stacked histogram. The data points are shown using black markers. The bottom panel shows the ratio of data to MC events, with associated statistical uncertainty. The hatched bands in both the panels represent the quadrature sum of statistical and systematic uncertainties. . . . .	140

- 
- 5.11 Muon (top) and electron (bottom) misidentification rate as a function of their  $p_T$  and the effect of EWK subtraction on them. . . . . 146
- 5.12 Muon misidentification rate (with statistical uncertainty only), as a function of its  $p_T$  and  $\eta$  after the EWK subtraction. . . . . 147
- 5.13 Electron misidentification rate (with statistical uncertainty only), as a function of its  $p_T$  and  $\eta$  after the EWK subtraction. . . . . 147
- 5.14 Muon prompt ratio as a function of its  $p_T$  and  $\eta$ . Only statistical uncertainty on these numbers is given here. . . . . 147
- 5.15 Electron prompt ratio as a function of its  $p_T$  and  $\eta$ . Only statistical uncertainty on these numbers is given here. . . . . 148
- 5.16 Comparison of muon (top) and electron (bottom) misidentification rates as a function of their  $p_T$ , under two different misidentified lepton enriched regions. . . . . 151
- 5.17 Distribution of  $m_T$  and  $m_{ll}$  in the DY control region. . . . . 155
- 5.18 Distribution of  $p_T$  of the leading and subleading leptons (top row),  $p_T^{\text{miss}}$  (bottom left), and  $p_T$  of the dilepton system (bottom right), after the same-sign dilepton pre-selection. The simulated events are normalized to their theoretical cross section and the integrated luminosity of the dataset. The bottom plots in all the cases show the ratio of data to the sum of all signal and background contributions. The hatched bands around the ratio plot and the stacked histogram include statistical and systematic uncertainties added in quadrature. . 157

5.19 Distributions for the angular observables:  $\Delta\phi(\vec{p}_{T1}, \vec{p}_{T2})$  (top left),  $\Delta\phi(\vec{p}_{T1}, \vec{p}_{T2}, \vec{p}_T^{\text{miss}})$  (top right),  $\Delta\phi(\vec{p}_{T2}, \vec{p}_T^{\text{miss}})$  (bottom left), and  $\Delta\eta(l_1, l_2)$  (bottom right) at the level of same-sign WW selection criteria. The bottom plots in all the cases show the ratio of data to the sum of all signal and background contributions. The hatched bands around the ratio plot and the stacked histogram include statistical and systematic uncertainties added in quadrature. . . . . 158

5.20 Background rejection vs. signal efficiency for the BDT discriminant. Different curves represent different set of input variables used for the BDT training. . . . . 160

5.21 Linear correlation coefficients of the initial set input variables used to train BDTs for the signal (left) and background (right) samples. . . . 161

5.22 Distributions of the input variables for the signal (blue) and background (red) used for BDT training and testing. . . . . 163

5.23 BDT classifier response for the signal (blue) and background (red) training and testing samples. . . . . 164

5.24 Distribution of the BDT discriminant for the data and simulations at the level of same-sign WW selection criteria. The simulated events are normalized to their theoretical cross section and the integrated luminosity of the dataset. The bottom plot shows the ratio of data to the sum of all signal and background contributions. The hatched bands around the ratio plot and the stacked histogram include statistical and systematic uncertainties added in quadrature. . . . . 165

6.1 Isolation variable spectra for the muons in different phase space regions. 179



- 6.2 The distributions of the observables sensitive to DPS in the dimuon channel:  $p_{T_1}$  (top left),  $p_{T_2}$  (top right),  $p_T^{\text{miss}}$  (bottom left), and  $\Delta\phi(\vec{p}_{T_1}, \vec{p}_T^{\text{miss}})$  (bottom right). The data are represented using the black dots and the shaded histograms represent the predicted signal and background processes normalized according to the theoretical cross sections and the luminosity. For each individual distribution, the ratio of the number of events observed in the data to that predicted by the simulation, along with the associated statistical uncertainty is also shown. The hatched bands in all cases represent the sum of the systematic and statistical uncertainties on the simulation, added in quadrature. . . . . 181
- 6.3 DPS sensitive observables in the dimuon channel:  $\Delta\phi(\vec{p}_{T_2}, \vec{p}_T^{\text{miss}})$  (top left),  $\Delta\phi(\vec{p}_{T_1}, \vec{p}_{T_2})$  (top right),  $m_T(\mu_1, \vec{p}_T^{\text{miss}})$  (bottom left), and  $m_T(\mu_2, \vec{p}_T^{\text{miss}})$  (bottom right). The data are represented using the black dots and the shaded histograms represent the predicted signal and background processes normalized according to the theoretical cross sections and the luminosity. For each individual distribution, the ratio of the number of events observed in the data to that predicted by the simulation, along with the associated statistical uncertainty is also shown. The hatched bands in all cases represent the sum of the systematic and statistical uncertainties on the simulation, added in quadrature. . . . . 182

- 
- 6.4 The distribution of the dimuon transverse mass,  $m_T(\mu_1, \mu_2)$ , for the dimuon channel. The data are represented by the black dots and the shaded histograms represent the predicted signal and background processes normalized according to the theoretical cross sections and the luminosity. The bottom panel shows the ratio of data to MC events, with associated statistical uncertainty. The hatched bands in both the panels represent the quadrature sum of statistical and systematic uncertainties. . . . . 183
- 6.5 Normalized distributions of the variables used for the BDT-based analysis for the training signal and background samples. . . . . 184
- 6.6 BDT response for the training and testing samples. . . . . 185
- 6.7 Distribution of the BDT discriminant for the dimuon channel. The data are represented by the black dots and the shaded histograms represent the predicted signal and background processes normalized according to the theoretical cross sections and the luminosity. For each individual distribution, the ratio of the number of events observed in data to that predicted by the simulation, along with the associated statistical uncertainty is also shown. The hatched bands in all cases represent the sum of the systematic and statistical uncertainties on the simulation, added in quadrature. . . . . 185
- 6.8 Distribution of the BDT discriminant, for the dimuon channel (top) and for the electron-muon channel (bottom). The data are represented by the black dots and the shaded histograms represent the pre-fit signal and post-fit background processes. The hatched band represents the post-fit uncertainty, which includes both the statistical and systematic components. . . . . 189

---

6.9	Expected and observed 95% CL upper limit on $\sigma_{W^\pm W^\pm}^{\text{DPS}}$ for the dimuon and electron-muon final states, along with their combination. The predicted values of $\sigma_{W^\pm W^\pm}^{\text{DPS}}$ from PYTHIA8 and the factorization approach are also shown. . . . .	190
6.10	Measured values of $\sigma_{\text{eff}}$ at different center-of-mass energies using different DPS processes. Different markers represent results taken from mentioned references. . . . .	191
7.1	95% CL limit on the $\sigma_{W^\pm W^\pm}^{\text{DPS}}$ for the dimuon and electron-muon final states along with their combination. . . . .	199
7.2	Measurement of $\sigma_{\text{eff}}$ at different center-of-mass energies using different DPS processes. Different markers represent results taken from mentioned references. . . . .	200