Search for pair-produced heavy quarks decaying to $Wq$ in the two-lepton channel at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV with the ATLAS detector
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A search is presented for heavy-quark pair production ($Q\bar{Q}$) under the decay hypothesis $Q\bar{Q} \rightarrow W^+qW^-\bar{q}$ with $q = d, s, b$ for up-type $Q$ or $q = u, c$ for down-type $Q$. The search is performed with 1.04 fb$^{-1}$ of integrated luminosity from $pp$ collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV collected by the ATLAS detector at the CERN LHC. Dilepton final states are selected, requiring large missing transverse momentum and at least two jets. Mass reconstruction of heavy-quark candidates is performed by assuming that the $W$ boson decay products are nearly collinear. The data are in agreement with standard model expectations; a heavy quark with mass less than 350 GeV is excluded at 95% confidence level.
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The addition of one or more heavy quarks is a natural extension to the standard model, capable of providing an additional source of CP violation in $B_i$ decays and accommodating a heavy Higgs boson [1,2]. Searches for heavy quarks with the Collider Detector at Fermilab (CDF) constrain the mass of heavy quarks ($Q$) that decay as $Q \rightarrow Wq$, where $q = d, s, b$ for up-type $Q$ or $q = u, c$ for down-type $Q$, to be $m_Q > 340$ GeV [3]. More specific searches have also constrained the mass of up-type heavy quarks ($t'$) that decay as $t' \rightarrow Wb$ to be $m_{t'} > 358$ GeV [3] and the mass of down-type heavy quarks ($b'$) decaying via $b' \rightarrow Wt$ to be $m_{b'} > 372$ GeV [4]. The D0 experiment at Fermilab has set a mass limit of $m_Q > 285$ GeV [5] on heavy quarks that decay as $Q \rightarrow Wq$. All previous searches used the “lepton + jets” channel, where only one of the produced $W$ bosons decays hadronically.

In this article, a search is presented for pair production of a heavy quark ($Q\bar{Q}$) in data corresponding to an integrated luminosity of 1.04 fb$^{-1}$ from proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV collected by the ATLAS experiment. The heavy quark is assumed to decay via $Q \rightarrow Wq$ where $q = d, s, b$ for up-type $Q$ or $q = u, c$ for down-type $Q$. This search does not include states with $q = t$, i.e. $d' \rightarrow Wt$ decays are assumed not to happen. The search is performed in the dilepton channel, where both $W$ bosons decay leptonically. Fourth-generation up-type quarks ($t'$) decaying through weak charged currents ($t' \rightarrow Wb, t' \rightarrow Ws,$ and $t' \rightarrow Wd$) are used as a benchmark.

Three complementary searches for fourth-generation quarks were performed with the ATLAS detector using 1.04 fb$^{-1}$ of 2011 data. These searches all implement $b$-quark identification algorithms and are thus targeted towards more specific heavy-quark decay modes. The channels considered are $t't' \rightarrow W^+W^-bb$ in the lepton plus jets channel (setting a limit $m_{t'} > 404$ GeV [6]), $b'b' \rightarrow W^+W^-\bar{t}\bar{t} \rightarrow W^+W^-W^+W^-bb$ in the lepton plus jets channel ($m_{b'} > 480$ GeV [7]), and $b'b' \rightarrow W^+W^-\bar{t}\bar{t} \rightarrow W^+W^-W^+W^-bb$ with two same sign leptons in the final state ($m_{b'} > 450$ GeV [8]).

The dileptonic final state arises in a way similar to that of pair-produced top quarks: $Q\bar{Q} \rightarrow \ell^+\nu\ell^-\bar{\nu}\bar{q}\bar{q}$, where $\ell$ is either $e$ or $\mu$. Leptonically decaying intermediary $\tau$ leptons are able to contribute to this final state if additional neutrinos are considered. The signature is at least two jets, two oppositely charged leptons, and missing transverse momentum ($E_{T}^{\text{miss}}$) from undetected neutrinos. Top quark pair production is the dominant source of background. To distinguish a potential heavy-quark signal, heavy-quark mass reconstruction is performed by taking advantage of the larger boost each $W$ boson receives from the decay of a heavy quark compared to the decay of a top quark. This large boost makes each undetected neutrino approximately collinear with an observed charged lepton.

The following sections contain descriptions of the ATLAS detector (Sec. I), simulated samples (Sec. II), object reconstruction (Sec. III), baseline event selection (Sec. IV), data-driven background estimates (Sec. V), mass reconstruction strategy (Sec. VI), validation of background modeling (Sec. VII), final event selection (Sec. VIII), binned maximum-likelihood ratio fit using the reconstructed mass (Sec. IX and X), and final results (Sec. XI).

I. THE ATLAS DETECTOR

The ATLAS detector [9] is a multipurpose particle detector with precision trackers, calorimeters, and muon spectrometers. The momenta of charged particles with
pseudorapidity $|\eta| < 2.5$\footnote{ATLAS uses a right-handed coordinate system with its origin at the nominal interaction point (IP) in the center of the detector and the $z$ axis along the beam pipe. The $x$ axis points from the IP to the center of the Large Hadron Collider (LHC) ring and the $y$ axis points upward. Cylindrical coordinates $(r, \phi)$ are used in the transverse plane, $\phi$ being the azimuthal angle around the beam pipe. The pseudorapidity is defined in terms of the polar angle $\theta$ as $\eta = -\ln \tan(\theta/2)$.} are measured by the inner detector (ID), which is a combination of silicon pixels, silicon microstrips, and a straw-tube tracker. The ID operates in a uniform 2 T axial magnetic field produced by a superconducting solenoid. The pixel detector measurements enable precise determination of production vertices.

Electromagnetic (EM) calorimetry for electron and photon reconstruction is provided by a high-granularity, three layer liquid argon (LAr) sampling calorimeter with lead absorbers in the region $|\eta| < 3.2$. A presampler is used to correct for energy lost by electrons and photons in material in front of the calorimeter for $|\eta| < 1.8$. Hadronic calorimetry for $|\eta| < 1.7$ is provided by a scintillating tile sampling calorimeter with steel absorbers, and for $1.5 < |\eta| < 3.2$ it is provided by a LAr sampling calorimeter with copper-plate absorbers.

Muons are detected with a multisystem muon spectrometer (MS). Precision measurements in the $\eta$ coordinate are provided by monitored drift tubes for $|\eta| < 2.7$. These are supplemented by cathode-strip chambers measuring both the $\eta$ and azimuth ($\phi$) coordinates for $2.0 < |\eta| < 2.7$. Fast measurements required for initiating trigger logic are provided by resistive-plate chambers for $|\eta| < 1.05$ and then by thin-gap chambers for $1.05 < |\eta| < 2.4$. The muon detectors operate in a nonuniform toroidal magnetic field generated by a superconducting air-core magnet system.

The ATLAS detector uses a three-level trigger system to select events for offline analysis. For this search, events are required to have at least one lepton satisfying trigger requirements. Electron trigger candidates must have transverse energy $E_T > 20$ GeV, must satisfy shower-shape requirements [10], and must have an ID track matched to the EM shower. Muon trigger candidates must have transverse momentum $p_T > 18$ GeV and matching tracks in the ID and MS.

II. SIMULATED SIGNAL AND BACKGROUND SAMPLES

Simulated samples are used to evaluate the contributions from the $Q\bar{Q}$ signal (assuming an up-type heavy quark) and most background processes. Unless otherwise noted, all events are showered and hadronized with HERWIG v6.5 [11,12], using JIMMY [13] for the underlying event model. After event generation, all samples are processed with the GEANT4-based [14] simulation of the ATLAS detector [15] and subject to the same reconstruction algorithms as the data.

The CERN LHC instantaneous luminosity varied during data-taking from about $2 \times 10^{32}$ cm$^{-2}$s$^{-1}$ to $1 \times 10^{33}$ cm$^{-2}$s$^{-1}$ [16,17]. At maximum luminosity numerous proton-proton ($pp$) interactions were superimposed in each bunch crossing. This pileup background produces additional activity in the detector, affecting variables such as jet reconstruction and isolation energies. Monte Carlo (MC) events simulate the pileup background by adding minimum bias events on top of the hard scatter. The MC events are later reweighted such that the simulated instantaneous luminosity distribution matches that in data.

A. Heavy-quark pair production

Production and decay of heavy-quark pairs ($Q\bar{Q}$) is modeled with the leading-order (LO) generator PYTHIA 6.421 [18] using MRST 2007 LO* [19] parton distribution functions (PDFs). The production cross section is calculated using HATHOR [20] with approximate next-to-next-to-leading-order (NNLO) QCD calculations with CTEQ6.6 PDFs [21] for several heavy-quark masses ($m_Q$). In addition, scale uncertainties are evaluated in the range $m_Q/2$ to $2 \times m_Q$ and PDF uncertainties are calculated from the CTEQ6.6 error eigenvectors. The cross sections and uncertainties for each heavy-quark mass considered in this analysis are shown in Table I. Samples are generated with either $t' \rightarrow Wb$, $t' \rightarrow Ws$, or $t' \rightarrow Wd$ final states; final results are verified with all three decay modes.

B. Top quark pair production

The background due to $t\bar{t}$ production is modeled using the next-to-leading-order (NLO) generator MC@NLO v3.41 [22] with an assumed top quark mass of 172.5 GeV and the NLO PDF set CTEQ6.6. The cross section for $t\bar{t}$ production is normalized to the value obtained from an approximate NNLO calculation [20].

C. Z boson, diboson, and single-top quark production

The background from $Z/\gamma^* \rightarrow$ boson production in association with jets is modeled with the LO generator ALPGEN

### Table I. NNLO cross-sections, scale uncertainties, and PDF uncertainties

| $m_Q$ (GeV) | $\sigma_{Q\bar{Q}}$ (pb) | Scale $\Delta$ (pb) | PDF $\Delta$ (pb) |
|------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 300        | 8.0             | +0.2            | +1.0            |
| 350        | 3.2             | +0.1            | +0.4            |
| 400        | 1.4             | +0.1            | +0.2            |
| 450        | 0.68            | +0.02           | +0.11           |
| 500        | 0.34            | +0.01           | +0.06           |

The background from $Z/\gamma^*$ boson production in association with jets is modeled with the LO generator ALPGEN
The LO PDF set CTEQ6.1 [21] is used to generate $Z/\gamma'$ + jets events with dilepton invariant mass $m_{\ell\ell} > 10$ GeV. For WW, WZ, and ZZ production, events are generated with the LO generator HERWIG v6.5 and the LO PDF set CTEQ6.1. For the small background from single-top production, MC@NLO is used with the NLO PDF set CTEQ6.6, invoking the diagram removal scheme [24,25] to remove overlaps between the single-top and $t\bar{t}$ final states. The cross sections for $t\bar{t}$ samples are determined using NLO calculations with MC@NLO. The cross sections for diboson samples are determined using NLO calculations with MC@NLO. The cross sections for single-top samples are normalized to an approximate NNLO prediction [28,29].

### III. OBJECT SELECTION

Electrons are found by a calorimeter-seeded reconstruction algorithm and must have a track that matches an energy deposit in the calorimeter. They are required to satisfy $E_{\text{cluster}}/\cosh(\eta_{\text{track}}) > 25$ GeV, where $E_{\text{cluster}}$ is the energy deposited in the calorimeter cluster and $\eta_{\text{track}}$ is the pseudorapidity of the matching track. Electrons are required to be in a pseudorapidity range $|\eta_{\text{cluster}}| < 2.47$, excluding the transition region $1.37 < |\eta_{\text{cluster}}| < 1.52$ between the EM calorimeter barrel and endcap. They must also satisfy a calorimeter isolation $I_{\text{cal}} < 3.5$ GeV requirement in $\Delta R < 0.2$, where $\Delta R = \sqrt{(\Delta \eta)^2 + (\Delta \phi)^2}$. Calorimeter isolation is defined as the energy reconstructed within a cone of a certain radius around the lepton that is not associated with that lepton, and it is represented by $I_{\text{cal}}$. The calorimeter shower shape is required to closely resemble what is expected for electrons [10].

Jets are reconstructed from topological clusters of energy deposits in the calorimeter [30] using the anti-$k_t$ algorithm with distance parameter $R = 0.4$ [31,32]. These jets are calibrated to the hadronic energy scale using a correction factor obtained from simulation that depends on $p_T$ and $\eta$ [33]. They are required to satisfy $p_T > 25$ GeV and $|\eta| < 2.5$. Jets that fall within $\Delta R < 0.2$ of accepted electrons are rejected.

Muons are found by requiring that a track reconstructed in the MS has a matching track in the ID. A loose cosmic ray rejection is applied by removing all muon pairs that are back-to-back azimuthally ($\Delta \phi(\mu, \mu') > 3.1$) and whose transverse impact parameter with respect to the beam line is greater than 0.5 mm. Muon candidates must satisfy $p_T > 20$ GeV and $|\eta| < 2.5$. The muon must be isolated, satisfying calorimeter isolation $I_{\text{cal}} < 4$ GeV in $\Delta R < 0.3$ and tracking isolation $I_{\text{trk}} < 4$ GeV in $\Delta R < 0.3$. Tracking isolation is defined as the sum of track momenta within a cone of a certain radius around the lepton vertex, and it is represented by $I_{\text{trk}}$. The muon must also not fall within $\Delta R < 0.4$ of any jet with $p_T > 20$ GeV.

The $E_T^{\text{miss}}$ is constructed from the vector sum of calorimeter topological cluster energies projected onto the transverse plane [34]. Calorimeter deposits not associated with a jet are calibrated at the EM energy scale. Deposits associated with selected jets contribute at the corrected hadronic energy scale. Muon transverse momenta are included after correcting for muon energy losses in the calorimeters.

### IV. BASELINE EVENT SELECTION

The $Q\bar{Q}$ pair decay yields two charged leptons, two jets, and $E_T^{\text{miss}}$ from the undetected neutrinos. An initial dilepton selection is applied to validate the modeling of the $Z/\gamma'$ boson production background as well as the identification of leptons, reconstruction of jets, and measurement of $E_T^{\text{miss}}$.

The initial dilepton selection [35,36] first requires that an event contains a high-quality reconstructed primary vertex. The event must also have exactly two leptons ($e$ or $\mu$) with opposite charges, at least one of which must be associated with the object that triggered the event. The two leptons must not share a track in the ID. At this stage, the data sample is dominated by $Z/\gamma' \rightarrow \ell\ell$ decays (the Drell-Yan process), although the contribution from $t\bar{t}$ production is evident at large jet multiplicity, as can be seen in Figs. 1 and 2. These figures show good agreement between the data and background expectation.

To reduce the background from $Z/\gamma' \rightarrow \ell\ell$ decays, the baseline selection requires:

(i) all events must have at least two jets, each with $p_T > 25$ GeV and $|\eta| < 2.5$;

(ii) same-flavor events ($ee$ and $\mu\mu$) must satisfy a missing transverse momentum requirement, $E_T^{\text{miss}} > 60$ GeV;

(iii) the dilepton invariant mass of same-flavor events ($ee$ and $\mu\mu$) must be greater than 15 GeV and must fall outside a window around the $Z$ boson mass, defined as 81 GeV $< m_{\ell\ell} < 101$ GeV;

(iv) in different-flavor events ($e\mu$), $H_T$, defined as the scalar sum of $E_T$ from every lepton and jet passing the object selection criteria, must exceed 130 GeV. The $H_T$ requirement reduces the $Z/\gamma' \rightarrow \tau\tau$ background, where an $E_T^{\text{miss}}$ requirement is insufficient due to the presence of neutrinos.

### V. DATA-DRIVEN ESTIMATES

#### A. Drell-Yan events

The total number of Drell-Yan $ee$ and $\mu\mu$ events remaining after the baseline selection has been applied is estimated with a data-driven technique that extrapolates from a control region (CR) [37]. Events in the CR have dilepton invariant mass in the range 81–101 GeV with at least two jets and $E_T^{\text{miss}} > 30$ GeV. The number of data
events in the control region, data (CR), and MC $Z/\gamma^* + \text{jets}$ events in the control region, MC$_\text{DY}$ (CR), are used to scale the prediction of $Z/\gamma^* + \text{jets}$ events in the signal region, MC$_\text{DY}$. Non-$Z/\gamma^*$ background processes in the control region, MC$_\text{other}$ (CR), are subtracted from the data using MC predictions. The estimated number of $Z/\gamma^* + \text{jets}$ events in the signal region, $N_{\text{DY}}$, in the $ee$ and $\mu\mu$ channels is calculated with Eq. (1):

$$N_{\text{DY}} = \frac{(\text{Data(CR)} - \text{MC}_{\text{other(CR)}})}{\text{MC}_{\text{DY}}(\text{CR})} \text{MC}_{\text{DY}}. \quad (1)$$

FIG. 1 (color online). Jet multiplicity after initial dilepton selection in (a) $ee$, (b) $\mu\mu$, and (c) $e\mu$ channels. The shaded region indicates the magnitude of cross-section and luminosity uncertainties. Samples are stacked in the same order as they are presented in the legend, from left to right; the first entry in the legend is at the bottom of the stack. The data-driven Drell-Yan estimate defined in Sec. VA has not been applied here.

FIG. 2 (color online). Dilepton mass after initial dilepton selection in (a) $ee$, (b) $\mu\mu$, and (c) $e\mu$ channels. The shaded region indicates the magnitude of cross-section and luminosity uncertainties. The last bin contains overflow events, and the first bin contains underflow events. Samples are stacked in the same order as they are presented in the legend, from left to right; the first entry in the legend is at the bottom of the stack. The data-driven Drell-Yan estimate defined in Sec. VA has not been applied here.
**B. Fake lepton events**

A small fraction of the background consists of events in which a jet or a nonprompt lepton is misidentified as a prompt lepton from W boson decay. Prompt leptons and misidentified nonprompt leptons are referred to as real and fake leptons, respectively. Fake muons are predominantly produced from semileptonic b or c quark decays in which the muon passes the isolation requirements despite being produced in association with a jet. There are three principal mechanisms for producing fake electrons: heavy-flavor produced in association with a jet. There are three principal

The muon passes the isolation requirements despite being defined in Sec.III.

A large fraction of events with fake leptons is W boson production with associated jets, including lepton plus jets decays of top quark pairs.

A matrix method [36] is used to estimate the fraction of the sample that comes from fake lepton events. A looser lepton selection is defined, and the number of observed dilepton events with two tight leptons ($N_{TT}$), one loose and one tight lepton ($N_{TL}$, $N_{LT}$), or two loose leptons ($N_{LL}$) is counted. The leptons are ordered by $p_T$ such that the leading lepton in $N_{TL}$ is tight and the leading lepton in $N_{LT}$ is loose. Tight leptons pass the selection criteria defined in Sec. III. Loose electrons need to pass the same selections as the electrons defined in Sec. III except for looser shower-shape and calorimeter isolation requirements [10]. Loose muons only need to satisfy $p_T > 20$ GeV, $|\eta| < 2.5$ and the muon-jet overlap requirements defined in Sec. III.

The probabilities for real and fake leptons that pass the loose identification criteria to also pass the tight criteria are defined as $r_\ell$ and $f_\ell$, respectively. These two probabilities are measured separately for $\ell = e$ and $\ell = \mu$. Using $r_\ell$ and $f_\ell$, linear expressions are obtained for the observed yields as a function of the number of events with zero, one, and two real leptons together with two, one, and zero fake leptons ($N_{FF}$, $N_{RF}$ and $N_{FR}$, $N_{RR}$; in $N_{RF}$ the real lepton has greater $p_T$ than the fake lepton, and vice versa for $N_{FR}$):

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
N_{TT} \\
N_{TL} \\
N_{LT} \\
N_{LL}
\end{bmatrix} = M
\begin{bmatrix}
N_{RR} \\
N_{RF} \\
N_{FR} \\
N_{FF}
\end{bmatrix},
$$

(2)

where $M$ is a $4 \times 4$ matrix containing terms proportional to $r_\ell$ and $f_\ell$. The matrix is inverted in order to extract the real and fake content of the observed dilepton event sample. The method explicitly accounts for the presence of events with two fake leptons.

The probability ($r_\ell$) for a real loose lepton to pass the tight criteria is measured in $Z \rightarrow \ell\ell$ events in data with a tag-and-probe method. The probability for a fake loose electron to satisfy the tight requirements ($f_\ell$) is measured by requiring exactly one loose electron in an event with $E_T^{miss} < 10$ GeV. The probability for a fake loose muon to satisfy the tight requirements ($f_\mu$) is measured in a control region obtained by requiring exactly one loose muon with $|\Delta \phi(\mu, E_T^{miss})| < 0.5$. The baseline selection requirements from Sec. IV are not applied when checking these control regions.

**VI. MASS RECONSTRUCTION**

After the baseline selection has been applied, mass reconstruction of heavy-quark candidates is performed in order to discriminate the heavy-quark decays from the dominant $t\bar{t}$ background. Direct reconstruction is not possible, as two neutrinos escape the detector. However, a unique feature of the heavy quark is the large momentum of the daughter W boson, which makes its decay products approximately collinear in the detector as seen in Fig. 3.

Both neutrino momentum vectors are reconstructed by assuming that the neutrinos are the sole contributors to $E_T^{miss}$ and that they are approximately collinear with the leptons. The optimal values of each $|\Delta \eta(n, \ell)|$ and each $|\Delta \phi(n, \ell)|$ are fit by minimizing the mass difference between the two reconstructed heavy quarks using MINUIT [38]. The fitted direction of each neutrino is constrained to be within $\Delta R < 2.5$ of the direction taken by the neutrino’s leptonic partner from the W boson decay, and all jet combinations are considered during each step of the mass difference minimization. A solution of the minimization procedure is penalized if the scalar sum of neutrino momenta exceeds the scalar sum of lepton momenta by at least 30%. The square of the difference between each reconstructed W boson mass and 80.4 GeV is added to the square of the heavy-quark mass difference in the minimized function; the preferred solutions produce W bosons with reconstructed masses that are close to the W boson mass. The full minimization function is $f_{\text{min}} = (m_Q - m_Q) + (m_W^{(80.4\text{GeV})})^2 + (m_W^{(80.4\text{GeV})})^2$.

**FIG. 3.** True $p_T$ of parent W boson versus true $\Delta R$ between its daughter lepton and neutrino. The scale, shown on the right, indicates the number of generated MC events.
The two reconstructed mass values tend to be more correlated for signal than background, as shown in Fig. 4. This is because the collinear approximation does not work well for single-top, diboson, Drell-Yan, and fake lepton events. An event is only kept if the two values of reconstructed mass are within 25 GeV of each other. The selection efficiency for this requirement is greater than 99% for $t\bar{t}$, and only 75–90% for other backgrounds.

The final reconstructed mass ($m_{\text{Collinear}}$) is taken to be the average of the two reconstructed masses in the event. Distributions of $m_{\text{Collinear}}$ for various simulated $Q\bar{Q}$ samples and the $t\bar{t}$ background are shown in Fig. 5.

The expected background yields and number of observed events after the baseline selection are given in Table II. Distributions of $H_T$ and $m_{\text{Collinear}}$ are shown in Fig. 6.

![FIG. 4. Correlation between reconstructed masses for $Q\bar{Q}$ pairs produced with $m_Q = 350$ GeV and for background samples. The fitting method selects solutions with correlated mass values; however, this correlation is smaller for background events. Events within $|m_{\text{Collinear}_1} - m_{\text{Collinear}_2}| < 25$ GeV are kept; this region is found between the two lines in the figure.](image1)

![FIG. 5 (color online). $m_{\text{Collinear}}$ for simulated heavy-quark pairs produced with masses of 350 GeV, 400 GeV, and 450 GeV and for top quark pairs. Each histogram is normalized to unit area. The distributions have long tails that are produced by wrong jet assignment in events where at least one of the correct jets fails selection requirements.](image2)

![FIG. 6 (color online). Expected and observed distributions of (a) $H_T$ and (b) $m_{\text{Collinear}}$ for the sum of $ee$, $\mu\mu$, and $e\mu$ channels after the baseline selection. The last bin contains overflow events. Samples are stacked in the same order as they are presented in the legend, from left to right; the first entry in the legend is at the bottom of the stack. The signal has been amplified to 20 times the expected rate.](image3)
VII. BACKGROUND VALIDATION

Event samples with the baseline selection and low $H_T$, low lepton $p_T$, low jet $p_T$, or low $E_T^{\text{miss}}$ are examined to validate the modeling of the background (Fig. 7). These conditions cause the distributions to be depleted of signal. In each case, the data is described well by the background model, within uncertainties.

VIII. FINAL EVENT SELECTION

The baseline selection provides excellent discrimination against $Z/\gamma^*$ production and other backgrounds, but additional selection requirements are necessary to suppress the dominant $t\bar{t}$ background. A triangular selection in $H_T + E_T^{\text{miss}}$ versus $m_{\text{Collinear}}$, $H_T + E_T^{\text{miss}} > X - 0.4 \times m_{\text{Collinear}}$ with $X$ dependent on the assumed signal mass, is applied. Mass-dependent requirements on $E_T^{\text{miss}}$ and leading jet $p_T$ are imposed as well. These selection requirements are optimized in MC simulation by seeking a point of maximum significance, $S/\sqrt{S+B}$, while simultaneously varying all of the selection requirement parameters. Distributions of $H_T + E_T^{\text{miss}}$ versus $m_{\text{Collinear}}$ for background and signal are shown in Fig. 8. Tables III and IV list the full set of optimized selection requirements at each mass point. Table V lists the expected backgrounds, expected signal, and observed data for each mass point after this final selection. Figure 9 shows the distributions in $m_{\text{Collinear}}$ for two signal samples after the final selection.

IX. SYSTEMATIC UNCERTAINTIES

The major sources of systematic uncertainty are due to modeling of the signal and most sources of background. The uncertainties due to simulation of the lepton trigger, reconstruction, and selection efficiencies are assessed using leptons from $Z \to ee$ and $Z \to \mu\mu$ in data [36]. MC events are corrected for differences in data and simulation. The statistical and systematic uncertainties in these corrections are included in the uncertainties on the acceptance values. Uncertainties in the modeling of the lepton energy scale and resolution are studied using reconstructed $Z$ boson mass distributions. The jet energy scale (JES) and its uncertainty are derived by combining information from test-beam data, LHC collision data, and simulation [33]. The JES uncertainty varies as a function of jet $p_T$ and $\eta$ and also accounts for the presence of nearby jets and event pileup. There is additional uncertainty associated with jets originating from $b$ quarks in simulation. Smaller uncertainties are associated with the jet energy resolution and jet finding efficiency.

Uncertainties related to the $E_T^{\text{miss}}$ arise due to uncertainties associated with low momenta jets, event pileup, and calorimeter energy not associated with reconstructed leptons or jets [34]. There is also some uncertainty in estimating the effect of a readout problem affecting a subset of the LAr calorimeter channels in a part of the data set.
TABLE III. List of $H_T + E_T^{\text{miss}}$ versus $m_{\text{Collinear}}$ requirements for each $m_Q$.

| $m_Q$ (GeV) | $H_T + E_T^{\text{miss}}$ (GeV) | Triangle requirement (GeV) |
|------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 300        | $H_T + E_T^{\text{miss}} > 610$ | $0.4 \times m_{\text{Collinear}}$ |
| 350        | $H_T + E_T^{\text{miss}} > 700$ | $0.4 \times m_{\text{Collinear}}$ |
| 400        | $H_T + E_T^{\text{miss}} > 790$ | $0.4 \times m_{\text{Collinear}}$ |
| 450        | $H_T + E_T^{\text{miss}} > 880$ | $0.4 \times m_{\text{Collinear}}$ |
| 500        | $H_T + E_T^{\text{miss}} > 970$ | $0.4 \times m_{\text{Collinear}}$ |

FIG. 8. $H_T + E_T^{\text{miss}}$ versus $m_{\text{Collinear}}$ for (a) background and (b) $m_Q = 350$ GeV signal events for the sum of $ee$, $\mu\mu$, and $e\mu$ channels. The scale, on the right indicates the number of reconstructed MC events per bin passing the baseline selection and weighted to $\int L dt = 1.04$ fb$^{-1}$. The shaded region is removed by the triangular selection requirement shown in Table III.

The use of simulated samples to calculate the signal and background acceptances gives rise to systematic uncertainties from the generator choice, the amount of initial and final state radiation (ISR/FSR), and from the PDF choice. The uncertainty due to the choice of generator for $t\bar{t}$ events is evaluated by comparing the predictions of MC@NLO with those of POWHEG [39] interfaced to either HERWIG or PYTHIA. The uncertainty due to ISR/FSR is evaluated by studies using the ACERMC [40] generator interfaced to PYTHIA, varying the parameters controlling ISR and FSR in a range consistent with experimental data [41]. For $Z/\gamma^* + \text{jets}$ events, the generator uncertainty is evaluated by comparing the predictions of ALPGEN with the PDF set CTEQ6.1 and SHERPA [42] with the PDF set CTEQ6.6. Finally, the uncertainty in the PDFs used to generate signal, $t\bar{t}$, and single-top events is evaluated using the procedure adopted in a measurement of the $t\bar{t}$ cross section [36].

The integrated luminosity measurement carries a 3.7% uncertainty [16,17]. Each sample also has an uncertainty associated with its theoretical cross section or with its data-driven rate. For $t\bar{t}$ [20], single-top [28,29], and $Z/\gamma^* \rightarrow \tau\tau$ [43] the rate uncertainty is estimated from theoretical calculations. $Z/\gamma^* \rightarrow ee$, $Z/\gamma^* \rightarrow \mu\mu$, and fake lepton event rate uncertainties are evaluated with the data-driven fitting described in Sec. V. The cross section uncertainty for each signal point comes from HATHOR NNLO calculations and can be found in Table I. The background normalization uncertainties are listed in Table VI.

The effects of the systematic uncertainties on the overall background yield are summarized in Table VII for the cuts used for $m_Q = 350$ GeV.

X. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A binned maximum-likelihood ratio technique is used to fit distributions of $m_{\text{Collinear}}$ to the observed data in order to measure the most likely $Q\bar{Q}$ production cross section.
FIG. 9 (color online). Distributions of \( m_{\text{Collinear}} \) for the sum of ee, \( \mu\mu \), and \( e\mu \) channels after applying the final selection for (a) \( m_0 = 350 \) GeV and (b) \( m_0 = 400 \) GeV. The last bin contains overflow events. The uncertainty bands include all statistical and systematic background uncertainties. The signal samples are normalized using the cross sections in Table I. Samples are stacked in the same order as they are presented in the legend, from left to right; the first entry in the legend is at the bottom of the stack.

\( \sigma(pp \rightarrow QQ) \). In the fitting technique, all events with \( m_{\text{Collinear}} > 760 \) GeV are considered to belong in the same bin. A shape fit is performed on background and signal simultaneously; this allows the background normalization to float, but maintains the bin-to-bin relationships that define the background and signal shapes in \( m_{\text{Collinear}} \).

This fitting procedure allows for the possibility of an underestimated or overestimated background in the signal region. To take into account systematic uncertainties, the signal and background shapes are smoothly deformed in generated samples of pseudodata by random variations consistent with these uncertainties as shown in Tables VI and VII; these fluctuations are not constrained by the data. Most of the systematic uncertainties are assumed to be correlated between signal and background; the uncertainties due to cross section or data-driven estimates, Drell-Yan modeling, \( t\bar{t} \) modeling, and \( t\bar{t} \) generation are uncorrelated between signal and background.

A small excess is observed over the background expectation for each hypothetical \( Q \) mass.

Since the statistical interpretation uses the full shape of the signal and background distributions, the results in Table V do not entirely determine the results; only a signal-like excess would weaken the observed limits. The excess shape in the \( m_{\text{Collinear}} \) distribution is not particularly signal-like and the data are found to be in better agreement with the background-only than the signal + background hypothesis.

Statistical interpretation of the fitted cross section \( \sigma \) is made using the CLs technique [44,45]. This technique performs fits in pseudodata generated from the background model and varying levels of injected signal to measure the ability of the fit to distinguish between the background-only and background-plus-signal hypotheses. In the case that the data are in better agreement with the background-only hypothesis, 95% C.L. upper limits on the signal cross section \( \sigma^{95} \) are derived. The limit \( \sigma^{95} \) is chosen so that

### TABLE VI. Overall normalization uncertainties for each background, which are either due to cross section uncertainties or uncertainties related to data-driven methods.

| Background     | \(+1\sigma\) Unc. | \(-1\sigma\) Unc. |
|----------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| \( t\bar{t} \) | 7%                | 10%               |
| Single-top     | 7%                | 7%                |
| \( Z/\gamma^* \to ee \) | 60%             | 30%               |
| \( Z/\gamma^* \to \mu\mu \) | 40%             | 30%               |
| \( Z/\gamma^* \to \tau\tau \) | 40%             | 40%               |
| WW, WZ, ZZ     | 5%                | 5%                |
| Fake leptons   | 50%               | 50%               |

### TABLE VII. The effects of the \( \pm 1\sigma \) systematic uncertainties on the overall background yield.

| Source                              | \(+1\sigma\) Unc. | \(-1\sigma\) Unc. |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Lepton trigger                      | 1%                | 1%                |
| Lepton ID and reconstruction        | 2%                | <1%               |
| Jet reconstruction                  | 3%                | 3%                |
| Jet energy resolution               | 2%                | 2%                |
| Jet energy scale                    | 13%               | 11%               |
| \( \mu \) momentum resolution      | 2%                | 2%                |
| \( \mu \) momentum scale           | 1%                | 2%                |
| \( e \) energy resolution           | 1%                | 1%                |
| \( e \) energy scale                | <1%               | <1%               |
| \( e \) isolation pileup term       | 1%                | 1%                |
| \( e \) isolation \( p_T \) term    | <1%               | <1%               |
| Emiss uncertainties                 | 1%                | <1%               |
| LAr readout problem                 | 2%                | 2%                |
| ISR/FSR: \( t\bar{t} \)            | 8%                | 5%                |
| MC generator: \( t\bar{t} \)       | 1%                | <1%               |
| MC fragmentation/model: \( t\bar{t} \) | 1%             | 1%                |
| Drell-Yan model                     | 7%                | 7%                |
This search allows $q = d, s, b$ for up-type $Q$ final states or $q = u, c$ for down-type $Q$ final states. The analyzed data correspond to an integrated luminosity of 1.04 fb$^{-1}$ collected by the ATLAS detector in $pp$ collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV. To enhance the sensitivity to a new quark, mass reconstruction is performed by exploiting the boost received by the heavy-quark decay products. The reconstructed mass is used for binned maximum-likelihood ratio fitting.

The data are found to be in agreement with the expectation from the standard model. A lower limit is set on the mass $m_Q > 350$ GeV at 95% confidence level. This limit assumes $\text{BR}(Q \rightarrow Wq) = 100\%$ and is applicable to many exotic models \cite{46,47}, including up-type fourth-generation quarks $t'$, down-type fourth-generation quarks $b'$, and quarks with exotic charges (such as $\sim 4/3$) decaying to light quarks.
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FIG. 10 (color online). Observed and median expected 95% C.L. cross section upper limits on $Q\bar{Q}$ production, compared to the theoretical prediction. The limit was calculated for five signal masses, and a linear interpolation has been made between mass points. Limits were calculated for simulated samples of $Q \rightarrow Wb$, $Q \rightarrow Ws$, and $Q \rightarrow Wd$, but the results were approximately the same for all samples. The results from $Q \rightarrow Wu$ and $Q \rightarrow Wc$ were assumed to be analogous for $Q \rightarrow Ws$ and $Q \rightarrow Wd$, respectively.

$$\frac{p_s}{1 - p_0} < 0.05$$

where $p_s$ is the fraction of fits in pseudodata with injected signal $\sigma^{95}$ that give a result as seen in the data, and $p_0$ is the corresponding fraction from pseudodata drawn from the background hypothesis. Thus the performance of the fitting technique in ensembles of pseudodata is naturally accounted for. Figure 10 shows the observed and expected limits on the production cross section $\sigma(pp \rightarrow Q\bar{Q})$.

The upper limit on the production cross section is converted into a lower limit on $m_Q$ by finding the point of intersection with the theoretical prediction as a function of $m_Q$. This analysis finds a lower limit of $m_Q > 350$ GeV at 95% C.L. whereas a limit of $m_Q > 335$ GeV was expected. This limit assumes that the branching ratio (BR) of $Q \rightarrow Wq$ is 100%. Limits were calculated for simulated samples of $Q \rightarrow Wb$, $Q \rightarrow Ws$, and $Q \rightarrow Wd$, but the results were approximately the same for all samples. The results from $Q \rightarrow Wu$ and $Q \rightarrow Wc$ were assumed to be analogous for $Q \rightarrow Ws$ and $Q \rightarrow Wd$, respectively.

**XI. CONCLUSIONS**

This article presents a search for pair production of heavy quarks decaying to $Wq$ in the dilepton channel at the CERN LHC. This search allows $q = d, s, b$ for up-type $Q$ final states or $q = u, c$ for down-type $Q$ final states. The
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