

# Status of Monte-Carlo event generators

*Stefan Hoeche*  
*SLAC National Accelerator Laboratory*  
*Menlo Park, CA 94025, USA*

## 1 Introduction

Particle physics phenomenology has entered a new era with the recent discovery of an elementary boson at the CERN Large Hadron Collider (LHC). In the following years, it will be important to measure the precise properties of the new particle in order to determine whether it is related to the Higgs boson predicted by the Standard Model. Meanwhile, searches for signals of new physics will continue to be carried out at higher luminosity and energy. The fact that no other distinct signature has been observed so far calls for improved analysis strategies and theoretical tools. Also the discovery of the new boson itself mandates developments in both theory and experiment.

A dominant part in this endeavor is played by general-purpose Monte-Carlo (MC) event generators [1, 2], which are employed by both experimentalists and theorists to obtain particle level predictions for collider experiments. Hundreds of final-state particles are typically produced in LHC collisions, and the reactions involve both large and small momentum transfer. The high-dimensional phase space and the non-abelian, nonlinear nature of Quantum Chromodynamics (QCD) make an exact solution of the problem impossible. Instead, MC event generators resort to factorization, which allows to split events into different stages, ordered descending in invariant momentum transfer. In this picture, a hard interaction, described through fixed-order perturbation theory, is followed by multiple Bremsstrahlung emissions off initial- and final-state particles and, eventually, by the hadronization process. Each step is simulated independently.

Three general-purpose Monte-Carlo event generators are currently available which implement this paradigm: HERWIG [3, 4], Pythia [5, 6] and Sherpa [7, 8]. A comprehensive description of the physics models implemented in these programs can be found in [2].

## 2 Simulation of hard processes

Traditionally, multi-purpose event generators compute hard processes at the lowest order in the perturbative expansion. This approximation leads to serious deficiencies

*Invited to The Physics at LHC - 2012*  
*Vancouver, BC, June 4-9, 2012*

in the description of final states with large jet multiplicity. Tree-level matrix element generators have therefore been constructed, which can cope with arbitrary final-states. The most widely used programs nowadays are ALPGEN [9], AMEGIC [10], Comix [11], CompHEP [12], HELAC [13], MadGraph [14] and O’Mega [15,16]. Parton-level events produced by these tools are processed by general-purpose event generators to implement parton showers and hadronization. Although independent programs in principle, matrix-element generators like the above should thus be viewed as an integral part of the simulation chain in general-purpose programs. Their extension to new physics scenarios is handled by FeynRules [17–19], a Mathematica package, which automatically derives interaction vertices from virtually arbitrary Lagrangians.

Predictions for observables in multi-jet final states involve high powers of the strong coupling, and thus, they have large associated uncertainties. It is therefore desirable to improve the description of high-multiplicity events through next-to-leading order (NLO) calculations. Real and virtual NLO corrections can be combined in an automated way using universal infrared subtraction algorithms [20–24], which are implemented in various tree-level matrix-element generators [25–29]. The computation of many challenging background processes at the LHC was accomplished with the help of these tools. Prominent examples include  $pp \rightarrow W/Z+4$  jets [30,31],  $pp \rightarrow 4$  jets [32] and  $pp \rightarrow t\bar{t}b\bar{b}$  [33].

A variety of processes can now be computed in a fully automated fashion by linking the matrix element generators described above with dedicated programs for one-loop virtual matrix elements through a standardized interface [34]. Computing virtual corrections often poses the greatest challenge, both because of complexity and numerical stability. Tremendous progress was made in this field, leading to new computational algorithms [35–41] based on generalized unitarity [42,43]. Automated calculations of one-loop corrections have since become available in the BlackHat [44], GoSam [45], HelacNLO [46], MadLoop [47], OpenLoops [48] and Rocket [49] programs, as well as several others [50–52]. Additionally, more traditional, Feynman-diagram based techniques have been extended [53,54] and applied for example to the process  $pp \rightarrow W^+W^-b\bar{b}$  [55]. They are also used in the program OpenLoops [48]. Table 1 shows an example of next-to-leading order results for 4 jet production. The calculation was performed with BlackHat and Sherpa, which exemplifies the possible synergy between programs for one-loop calculations and leading order event generators.

### 3 Parton showers

While the production of jets in high-energy collisions is typically described very well by fixed-order calculations, the modeling of inner jet structure in this approach is poor. The composition of jets in terms of several partons should therefore be simu-

no. jets	ATLAS	LO	ME+PS	NLO	NLO+NP
$\geq 2$	$620 \pm 1.3^{+110}_{-66} \pm 24$	$958(1)^{+316}_{-221}$	$559(5)$	$1193(3)^{+130}_{-135}$	$1130(19)^{+124}_{-129}$
$\geq 3$	$43 \pm 0.13^{+12}_{-6.2} \pm 1.7$	$93.4(0.1)^{+50.4}_{-30.3}$	$39.7(0.9)$	$54.5(0.5)^{+2.2}_{-19.9}$	$50.2(2.1)^{+2.0}_{-18.3}$
$\geq 4$	$4.3 \pm 0.04^{+1.4}_{-0.79} \pm 0.24$	$9.98(0.01)^{+7.40}_{-3.95}$	$3.97(0.08)$	$5.54(0.12)^{+0.08}_{-2.44}$	$5.11(0.29)^{+0.08}_{-2.32}$

Table 1: Total cross sections in nb for jet production at the LHC, using the anti- $k_T$  jet algorithm with  $R = 0.4$ . ATLAS results from [56] are compared against LO, ME+PS and NLO theoretical predictions. Numerical integration uncertainties are given in parentheses, the scale dependence is quoted as super- and subscripts. The last column gives NLO results including non-perturbative corrections computed with Sherpa. Uncertainties shown with the ATLAS data are statistical, jet energy scale, and detector unfolding. Table taken from [32].

lated by parton showers, which employ collinear factorization properties of scattering amplitudes to sum leading and certain subleading logarithmic corrections to hard scattering processes. The difference between existing parton-shower implementations in HERWIG [57, 58], Pythia [59] and Sherpa [60, 61] lies in the parametrization of the radiative phase space, the splitting functions which are employed and, in particular, the splitting kinematics.

Sherpa implements a dipole-like parton shower [60, 61], which was formally introduced in [62, 63], and which is based on the Catani-Seymour dipole subtraction method in the large- $N_c$  approximation. The advantage compared to traditional parton showers is an improved description of soft-collinear regions, which arises as a consequence of the dependence of the splitting function on the kinematics of the spectator parton. Similar ideas are implemented in HERWIG [64]. Within Pythia, recent development focused on improved matching to hard processes at next-to-leading order [65] and on incorporating multiple scattering and rescattering effects into parton shower simulations [59, 66]. First attempts have been made in HERWIG to include all possible color correlations into the parton shower [67, 68].

## 4 Matrix-element parton-shower matching

Higher-order tree-level calculations and parton showers, as introduced above, are two essentially complementary approaches to simulating perturbative QCD interactions in general-purpose Monte-Carlo. It is desirable to combine both, in order to obtain the best possible description of jet production and evolution. To this end, two different strategies have been exploited, which are known as matching and merging.

Matching algorithms either aim at replacing parton-shower splitting operators with the ratio of complete higher-order matrix elements divided by the Born, or they provide means to correct for the difference between the two. The main problem to be solved is that parton showers alter the kinematics of partonic final states. If the




Figure 1: Left: Transverse momentum of the Higgs boson in  $h$ +jet events at the LHC (7 TeV). Results from POWHEG simulations with different scale choice are compared against each other and against predictions from HqT [69]. The simulation was performed by combining MadGraph with MCFM and the POWHEG Box. Figure taken from [70]. Right: Di-jet mass in  $W$ +2jet events at the Tevatron (1.96 TeV). Results from aMC@NLO are compared against predictions from ALPGEN and against an NLO calculation. Figure taken from [71].

underlying parton-level calculation is performed at NLO, this implies that the Born contribution times the parton shower leads to spurious terms of order  $\alpha_s$ , which must be subtracted to avoid double counting that would spoil the NLO accuracy. Two universally applicable methods to accomplish this task were suggested in the past, which are dubbed MC@NLO [72, 73] and POWHEG [74, 75]. They are compared in [76]. Both methods were applied to a variety of processes, using the event generation frameworks of HERWIG and Pythia [77–83]. The MC@NLO method has also been automated in the aMC@NLO framework, based on MadLoop and HERWIG [71, 84–87]. In contrast to MC@NLO, the POWHEG technique does not depend on the parton-shower algorithm, hence, independent implementations exist [88–98]. Within Sherpa, the POWHEG method has been automated [99], but due to its limitations it was recently replaced by an automated MC@NLO [100–102]. Figure 4 displays results for Higgs boson plus jet and  $W$  boson plus two jets production, which are some of the most challenging processes recently implemented using matching methods.

## 5 Multi-jet merging

To improve the description of hard QCD radiation by general-purpose event generators, so-called merging algorithms were proposed in the context of the LEP physics program [103–105], and subsequently extended for hadron collisions [105–111]. The

Figure 2: Left: Jade 3→2-jet rate in  $e^+e^- \rightarrow$ hadrons. The renormalization scale dependence of NL<sup>3</sup>-merging with 2 and 3-parton processes described at NLO is shown in the ratio plot. Figure taken from [112]. Right: Jet multiplicity in  $W$ +jets events at the LHC. The renormalization scale dependence of MEPS@NLO merging with up to  $W$ +2 parton processes described at NLO is shown as an orange band. Figure taken from [113].

aim of these techniques is to replace the parton-shower approximation with fixed-order matrix elements for only those partons or parton ensembles, which can be identified with experimentally observed jets. Merging algorithms define an unambiguous way to separate the phase-space of real parton emission into a soft and a hard regime. Soft regions, where higher-order corrections must be resummed, but can be approximated, are filled by the parton shower. Hard regions, where soft and collinear approximations are unsuitable, are filled by fixed-order calculations. Since fixed-order calculations are inclusive, they must be made exclusive using the parton-shower no-branching probability, commonly referred to as the Sudakov factor. In this manner, double-counting of logarithmically enhanced terms is avoided, while sub-leading logarithms and finite corrections are correctly included in the hard domain.

An extension of the original merging approaches, which generically maintains the exact logarithmic accuracy of the parton shower while respecting the phase-space separation cut, was achieved in [114,115]. The new merging methods were subsequently combined with matching for the lowest multiplicity process [116–118] using a strategy which served as the starting point to promote matrix-element parton-shower merging from leading to next-to-leading order. A different approach has been presented in [112], which is based on explicit subtraction of the LO and NLO contributions from the parton shower. The technique introduced in [113,119] is based instead on

an extended modified subtraction similar to MC@NLO, which is implemented using truncated vetoed parton showers in the spirit of [114]. The two existing implementations of a merging method at the NLO in [112] and [113, 119] both indicate a substantial reduction of theoretical uncertainties, as exemplified in Fig. 5.

## 6 Event generator validation and tuning

Monte-Carlo event generators have a variety of free parameters, which can be tuned such that predictions better match experimental data. Many of these parameters are connected to fragmentation models and underlying-event simulation, or more general, to models for non-perturbative QCD effects. The resulting parameter space can be quite large, which makes it impossible to find an optimal solution by hand.

Two new tools have been developed recently, which attack these problems using a generator-independent validation and tuning strategy. Rivet [120], as the successor of HZTool [121], implements analyses from the LEP, Tevatron and LHC experiments in a common framework and allows simultaneous tests of Monte-Carlo output against all available collider data. Professor [122] employs Rivet to semi-automatically find the best point in the parameter space of the event generator. With Rivet, the Tevatron and LHC experiments are given a tool to preserve the full details of their analyses for future exploitation of the data.

## 7 Summary

Modern general-purpose event generators are highly sophisticated tools for LHC phenomenology. They often implement perturbative QCD calculations at next-to-leading order in the strong coupling and they provide parton showers to include resummation effects. Many extensions of event generators exist, allowing them to become a platform for testing new physics models and improved descriptions of perturbative QCD in the same framework. Validation and tuning of event generators has been in the focus of interest during the first years of LHC running and has been simplified by dedicated tools.

## Acknowledgements

We are indebted to the members of the MCnet network for discussions and input. Support from the US Department of Energy (contract DE-AC02-76SF00515), and from the US LHC Theory Initiative (NSF contract PHY-0705682) is gratefully acknowledged.

## References

- [1] B. Webber, “Monte Carlo Simulation of Hard Hadronic Processes,” *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.*, vol. 36, pp. 253–286, 1986.
- [2] A. Buckley *et al.*, “General-purpose event generators for LHC physics,” *Phys. Rept.*, vol. 504, pp. 145–233, 2011.
- [3] G. Corcella *et al.*, “HERWIG 6: an event generator for hadron emission reactions with interfering gluons (including supersymmetric processes),” *JHEP*, vol. 01, p. 010, 2001.
- [4] M. Bähr *et al.*, “Herwig++ Physics and Manual,” *Eur. Phys. J.*, vol. C58, pp. 639–707, 2008.
- [5] T. Sjöstrand, S. Mrenna, and P. Skands, “PYTHIA 6.4 physics and manual,” *JHEP*, vol. 05, p. 026, 2006.
- [6] T. Sjöstrand, S. Mrenna, and P. Skands, “A brief introduction to PYTHIA 8.1,” *Comput. Phys. Commun.*, vol. 178, pp. 852–867, 2008.
- [7] T. Gleisberg, S. Höche, F. Krauss, A. Schälicke, S. Schumann, and J. Winter, “Sherpa 1.α, a proof-of-concept version,” *JHEP*, vol. 02, p. 056, 2004.
- [8] T. Gleisberg, S. Höche, F. Krauss, M. Schönherr, S. Schumann, F. Siegert, and J. Winter, “Event generation with Sherpa 1.1,” *JHEP*, vol. 02, p. 007, 2009.
- [9] M. L. Mangano, M. Moretti, F. Piccinini, R. Pittau, and A. D. Polosa, “ALPGEN, a generator for hard multiparton processes in hadronic collisions,” *JHEP*, vol. 07, p. 001, 2003.
- [10] F. Krauss, R. Kuhn, and G. Soff, “AMEGIC++ 1.0: A Matrix Element Generator In C++,” *JHEP*, vol. 02, p. 044, 2002.
- [11] T. Gleisberg and S. Höche, “Comix, a new matrix element generator,” *JHEP*, vol. 12, p. 039, 2008.
- [12] E. Boos *et al.*, “CompHEP 4.4 - automatic computations from Lagrangians to events,” *Nucl. Instrum. Meth.*, vol. A534, pp. 250–259, 2004.
- [13] P. D. Draggiotis, R. H. P. Kleiss, and C. G. Papadopoulos, “Multi-jet production in hadron collisions,” *Eur. Phys. J.*, vol. C24, pp. 447–458, 2002.
- [14] T. Stelzer and W. F. Long, “Automatic generation of tree level helicity amplitudes,” *Comput. Phys. Commun.*, vol. 81, pp. 357–371, 1994.

- [15] M. Moretti, T. Ohl, and J. Reuter, “O’Mega: An optimizing matrix element generator,” 2001.
- [16] W. Kilian, T. Ohl, and J. Reuter, “WHIZARD: Simulating Multi-Particle Processes at LHC and ILC,” *Eur. Phys. J.*, vol. C71, p. 1742, 2007.
- [17] N. D. Christensen and C. Duhr, “FeynRules - Feynman rules made easy,” *Comput. Phys. Commun.*, vol. 180, pp. 1614–1641, 2009.
- [18] N. D. Christensen, P. de Aquino, C. Degrande, C. Duhr, B. Fuks, M. Herquet, F. Maltoni, and S. Schumann, “A comprehensive approach to new physics simulations,” *Eur. Phys. J.*, vol. C71, p. 1541, 2011.
- [19] J. Alwall, M. Herquet, F. Maltoni, O. Mattelaer, and T. Stelzer, “MadGraph 5 : Going Beyond,” *JHEP*, vol. 06, p. 128, 2011.
- [20] S. Frixione, Z. Kunszt, and A. Signer, “Three-jet cross-sections to next-to-leading order,” *Nucl. Phys.*, vol. B467, pp. 399–442, 1996.
- [21] S. Frixione, “A general approach to jet cross sections in QCD,” *Nucl. Phys.*, vol. B507, pp. 295–314, 1997.
- [22] S. Catani and M. H. Seymour, “A general algorithm for calculating jet cross sections in NLO QCD,” *Nucl. Phys.*, vol. B485, pp. 291–419, 1997.
- [23] S. Catani, S. Dittmaier, M. H. Seymour, and Z. Trocsanyi, “The dipole formalism for next-to-leading order QCD calculations with massive partons,” *Nucl. Phys.*, vol. B627, pp. 189–265, 2002.
- [24] D. A. Kosower, “Antenna factorization of gauge-theory amplitudes,” *Phys. Rev.*, vol. D57, pp. 5410–5416, 1998.
- [25] T. Gleisberg and F. Krauss, “Automating dipole subtraction for QCD NLO calculations,” *Eur. Phys. J.*, vol. C53, pp. 501–523, 2008.
- [26] R. Frederix, T. Gehrmann, and N. Greiner, “Automation of the Dipole Subtraction Method in MadGraph/MadEvent,” *JHEP*, vol. 09, p. 122, 2008.
- [27] R. Frederix, S. Frixione, F. Maltoni, and T. Stelzer, “Automation of next-to-leading order computations in QCD: the FKS subtraction,” *JHEP*, vol. 10, p. 003, 2009.
- [28] R. Frederix, T. Gehrmann, and N. Greiner, “Integrated dipoles with MadDipole in the MadGraph framework,” *JHEP*, vol. 06, p. 086, 2010.

- [29] M. Czakon, C. Papadopoulos, and M. Worek, “Polarizing the dipoles,” *JHEP*, vol. 08, p. 085, 2009.
- [30] C. F. Berger, Z. Bern, L. J. Dixon, F. Febres-Cordero, D. Forde, T. Gleisberg, H. Ita, D. A. Kosower, and D. Maître, “Precise Predictions for  $W + 4$ -Jet Production at the Large Hadron Collider,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 106, p. 092001, 2011.
- [31] H. Ita, Z. Bern, L. J. Dixon, F. Febres-Cordero, D. A. Kosower, and D. Maître, “Precise Predictions for  $Z + 4$  Jets at Hadron Colliders,” *Phys.Rev.*, vol. D85, p. 031501, 2012.
- [32] Z. Bern, G. Diana, L. Dixon, F. Febres Cordero, S. Höche, *et al.*, “Four-Jet Production at the Large Hadron Collider at Next-to-Leading Order in QCD,” *Phys.Rev.Lett.*, vol. 109, p. 042001, 2012.
- [33] G. Bevilacqua, M. Czakon, C. Papadopoulos, R. Pittau, and M. Worek, “Assault on the NLO wishlist:  $pp \rightarrow t\bar{t}b\bar{b}$ ,” *JHEP*, vol. 0909, p. 109, 2009.
- [34] T. Binoth *et al.*, “A proposal for a standard interface between Monte Carlo tools and one-loop programs,” *Comput. Phys. Commun.*, vol. 181, pp. 1612–1622, 2010.
- [35] R. Britto, B. Feng, and P. Mastrolia, “Cut-constructible part of QCD amplitudes,” *Phys. Rev.*, vol. D73, p. 105004, 2006.
- [36] D. Forde, “Direct extraction of one-loop integral coefficients,” *Phys. Rev.*, vol. D75, p. 125019, 2007.
- [37] G. Ossola, C. G. Papadopoulos, and R. Pittau, “Reducing full one-loop amplitudes to scalar integrals at the integrand level,” *Nucl. Phys.*, vol. B763, pp. 147–169, 2007.
- [38] G. Ossola, C. G. Papadopoulos, and R. Pittau, “On the rational terms of the one-loop amplitudes,” *JHEP*, vol. 05, p. 004, 2008.
- [39] R. Ellis, W. Giele, and Z. Kunszt, “A numerical unitarity formalism for evaluating one-loop amplitudes,” *JHEP*, vol. 0803, p. 003, 2008.
- [40] W. T. Giele, Z. Kunszt, and K. Melnikov, “Full one-loop amplitudes from tree amplitudes,” *JHEP*, vol. 04, p. 049, 2008.
- [41] R. Ellis, W. T. Giele, Z. Kunszt, and K. Melnikov, “Masses, fermions and generalized  $D$ -dimensional unitarity,” *Nucl. Phys.*, vol. B822, pp. 270–282, 2009.

- [42] Z. Bern, L. J. Dixon, D. C. Dunbar, and D. A. Kosower, “One loop n point gauge theory amplitudes, unitarity and collinear limits,” *Nucl. Phys.*, vol. B425, pp. 217–260, 1994.
- [43] Z. Bern, L. J. Dixon, D. C. Dunbar, and D. A. Kosower, “Fusing gauge theory tree amplitudes into loop amplitudes,” *Nucl. Phys.*, vol. B435, pp. 59–101, 1995.
- [44] C. F. Berger, Z. Bern, L. J. Dixon, F. Febres-Cordero, D. Forde, H. Ita, D. A. Kosower, and D. Maître, “Automated implementation of on-shell methods for one-loop amplitudes,” *Phys. Rev.*, vol. D78, p. 036003, 2008.
- [45] G. Cullen *et al.*, “Automated One-Loop Calculations with GoSam,” 2011.
- [46] A. van Hameren, C. Papadopoulos, and R. Pittau, “Automated one-loop calculations: A Proof of concept,” *JHEP*, vol. 0909, p. 106, 2009.
- [47] V. Hirschi, R. Frederix, S. Frixione, M. V. Garzelli, F. Maltoni, and R. Pittau, “Automation of one-loop QCD corrections,” *JHEP*, vol. 1105, p. 044, 2011.
- [48] F. Cascioli, P. Maierhofer, and S. Pozzorini, “Scattering Amplitudes with Open Loops,” 2011.
- [49] R. Ellis, K. Melnikov, and G. Zanderighi, “ $W + 3$  jet production at the Tevatron,” *Phys. Rev.*, vol. D80, p. 094002, 2009.
- [50] A. Lazopoulos, “Multi-gluon one-loop amplitudes numerically,” 2008.
- [51] W. Giele, Z. Kunszt, and J.-C. Winter, “Efficient color-dressed calculation of virtual corrections,” *Nucl. Phys.*, vol. B840, pp. 214–270, 2010.
- [52] D. Lopez-Val, D. Goncalves-Netto, K. Mawatari, T. Plehn, and I. Wigmore, “MadGolem: automating NLO calculations for New Physics,” 2012.
- [53] A. Denner and S. Dittmaier, “Reduction schemes for one-loop tensor integrals,” *Nucl. Phys.*, vol. B734, pp. 62–115, 2006.
- [54] T. Binoth, J. P. Guillet, G. Heinrich, E. Pilon, and T. Reiter, “Golem95: A numerical program to calculate one-loop tensor integrals with up to six external legs,” *Comput. Phys. Commun.*, vol. 180, pp. 2317–2330, 2009.
- [55] A. Denner, S. Dittmaier, S. Kallweit, and S. Pozzorini, “NLO QCD corrections to WWbb production at hadron colliders,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 106, p. 052001, 2011.

- [56] G. Aad *et al.*, “Measurement of inclusive jet and dijet production in pp collisions at  $\sqrt{s} = 7$  TeV using the ATLAS detector,” *Phys. Rev.*, vol. D86, p. 014022, 2012.
- [57] S. Gieseke, P. Stephens, and B. Webber, “New formalism for QCD parton showers,” *JHEP*, vol. 12, p. 045, 2003.
- [58] K. Hamilton and P. Richardson, “A simulation of QCD radiation in top quark decays,” *JHEP*, vol. 02, p. 069, 2007.
- [59] T. Sjöstrand and P. Z. Skands, “Transverse-momentum-ordered showers and interleaved multiple interactions,” *Eur. Phys. J.*, vol. C39, pp. 129–154, 2005.
- [60] S. Schumann and F. Krauss, “A parton shower algorithm based on Catani-Seymour dipole factorisation,” *JHEP*, vol. 03, p. 038, 2008.
- [61] S. Höche, S. Schumann, and F. Siegert, “Hard photon production and matrix-element parton-shower merging,” *Phys. Rev.*, vol. D81, p. 034026, 2010.
- [62] Z. Nagy and D. E. Soper, “Matching parton showers to NLO computations,” *JHEP*, vol. 10, p. 024, 2005.
- [63] Z. Nagy and D. E. Soper, “A new parton shower algorithm: Shower evolution, matching at leading and next-to-leading order level,” 2006.
- [64] S. Plätzer and S. Gieseke, “Coherent Parton Showers with Local Recoils,” *JHEP*, vol. 01, p. 024, 2011.
- [65] R. Corke and T. Sjöstrand, “Multiparton interactions and rescattering,” *JHEP*, vol. 01, p. 035, 2009.
- [66] R. Corke and T. Sjöstrand, “Improved Parton Showers at Large Transverse Momenta,” *Eur. Phys. J.*, vol. C69, pp. 1–18, 2010.
- [67] S. Plätzer and M. Sjödhahl, “Subleading  $N_c$  improved Parton Showers,” *JHEP*, vol. 1207, p. 042, 2012.
- [68] S. Plätzer and M. Sjödhahl, “Subleading- $N - c$  improved Parton Showers,” 2012.
- [69] G. Bozzi, S. Catani, D. de Florian, and M. Grazzini, “Transverse-momentum resummation and the spectrum of the Higgs boson at the LHC,” *Nucl. Phys.*, vol. B737, pp. 73–120, 2006.
- [70] J. M. Campbell, R. Ellis, R. Frederix, P. Nason, C. Oleari, and C. Williams, “NLO Higgs boson production plus one and two jets using the POWHEG BOX, MadGraph4 and MCFM,” 2012.

- [71] R. Frederix, S. Frixione, V. Hirschi, F. Maltoni, R. Pittau, *et al.*, “aMC@NLO predictions for Wjj production at the Tevatron,” *JHEP*, vol. 1202, p. 048, 2012.
- [72] S. Frixione and B. R. Webber, “Matching NLO QCD computations and parton shower simulations,” *JHEP*, vol. 06, p. 029, 2002.
- [73] S. Frixione, F. Stoeckli, P. Torrielli, and B. R. Webber, “NLO QCD corrections in Herwig++ with MC@NLO,” *JHEP*, vol. 1101, p. 053, 2011.
- [74] P. Nason, “A new method for combining NLO QCD with shower Monte Carlo algorithms,” *JHEP*, vol. 11, p. 040, 2004.
- [75] S. Frixione, P. Nason, and C. Oleari, “Matching NLO QCD computations with parton shower simulations: the POWHEG method,” *JHEP*, vol. 11, p. 070, 2007.
- [76] P. Nason and B. Webber, “Next-to-Leading-Order Event Generators,” 2012.
- [77] C. Weydert, S. Frixione, M. Herquet, M. Klasen, E. Laenen, T. Plehn, G. Stavenga, and C. D. White, “Charged Higgs boson production in association with a top quark in MC@NLO,” *Eur. Phys. J.*, vol. C67, pp. 617–636, 2010.
- [78] A. Papaefstathiou and O. Latunde-Dada, “NLO production of  $W'$  bosons at hadron colliders using the MC@NLO and POWHEG methods,” *JHEP*, vol. 07, p. 044, 2009.
- [79] K. Hamilton, P. Richardson, and J. Tully, “A positive-weight Next-to-Leading Order Monte Carlo Simulation for Higgs boson production,” *JHEP*, vol. 04, p. 116, 2009.
- [80] L. D’Errico and P. Richardson, “A Positive-Weight Next-to-Leading-Order Monte Carlo Simulation of Deep Inelastic Scattering and Higgs Boson Production via Vector Boson Fusion in Herwig++,” 2011.
- [81] L. D’Errico and P. Richardson, “Next-to-Leading-Order Monte Carlo Simulation of Diphoton Production in Hadronic Collisions,” 2011.
- [82] P. Torrielli and S. Frixione, “Matching NLO QCD computations with PYTHIA using MC@NLO,” *JHEP*, vol. 04, p. 110, 2010.
- [83] M. Klasen, K. Kovarik, P. Nason, and C. Weydert, “Associated production of charged Higgs bosons and top quarks with POWHEG,” 2012.

- [84] R. Frederix, S. Frixione, V. Hirschi, F. Maltoni, R. Pittau, and P. Torrielli, “W and  $Z/\gamma^*$  boson production in association with a bottom-antibottom pair,” *JHEP*, vol. 1109, p. 061, 2011.
- [85] R. Frederix, S. Frixione, V. Hirschi, F. Maltoni, R. Pittau, and P. Torrielli, “Four-lepton production at hadron colliders: aMC@NLO predictions with theoretical uncertainties,” *JHEP*, vol. 1202, p. 099, 2012.
- [86] R. Frederix, S. Frixione, V. Hirschi, F. Maltoni, R. Pittau, *et al.*, “Scalar and pseudoscalar Higgs production in association with a top-antitop pair,” *Phys.Lett.*, vol. B701, pp. 427–433, 2011.
- [87] R. Frederix, E. Re, and P. Torrielli, “Single-top t-channel hadroproduction in the four-flavour scheme with POWHEG and aMC@NLO,” *JHEP*, vol. 1209, p. 130, 2012.
- [88] S. Alioli, P. Nason, C. Oleari, and E. Re, “NLO single-top production matched with shower in POWHEG: s- and t-channel contributions,” *JHEP*, vol. 09, p. 111, 2009.
- [89] P. Nason and C. Oleari, “NLO Higgs boson production via vector-boson fusion matched with shower in POWHEG,” *JHEP*, vol. 02, p. 037, 2010.
- [90] S. Alioli, P. Nason, C. Oleari, and E. Re, “Vector boson plus one jet production in POWHEG,” *JHEP*, vol. 1101, p. 095, 2011.
- [91] S. Alioli, K. Hamilton, P. Nason, C. Oleari, and E. Re, “Jet pair production in POWHEG,” *JHEP*, vol. 1104, p. 081, 2011.
- [92] C. Oleari and L. Reina, “W b bbar production in POWHEG,” *JHEP*, vol. 1108, p. 061, 2011.
- [93] T. Melia, P. Nason, R. Rontsch, and G. Zanderighi, “W+W-, WZ and ZZ production in the POWHEG BOX,” *JHEP*, vol. 1111, p. 078, 2011.
- [94] M. Garzelli, A. Kardos, C. Papadopoulos, and Z. Trocsanyi, “Standard Model Higgs boson production in association with a top anti-top pair at NLO with parton showering,” *Europhys.Lett.*, vol. 96, p. 11001, 2011.
- [95] S. Alioli, S.-O. Moch, and P. Uwer, “Hadronic top-quark pair-production with one jet and parton showering,” *JHEP*, vol. 1201, p. 137, 2012.
- [96] M. Garzelli, A. Kardos, C. Papadopoulos, and Z. Trocsanyi, “Z0 - boson production in association with a top anti-top pair at NLO accuracy with parton shower effects,” *Phys.Rev.*, vol. D85, p. 074022, 2012.

- [97] L. Barze, G. Montagna, P. Nason, O. Nicrosini, and F. Piccinini, “Implementation of electroweak corrections in the POWHEG BOX: single W production,” *JHEP*, vol. 04, p. 037, 2012. 31 pages, 7 figures. Minor corrections, references added and updated. Final version to appear in JHEP.
- [98] C. Bernaciak and D. Wackerroth, “Combining NLO QCD and Electroweak Radiative Corrections to W boson Production at Hadron Colliders in the POWHEG Framework,” 2012.
- [99] S. Höche, F. Krauss, M. Schönherr, and F. Siegert, “Automating the POWHEG method in Sherpa,” *JHEP*, vol. 04, p. 024, 2011.
- [100] S. Höche, F. Krauss, M. Schönherr, and F. Siegert, “A critical appraisal of NLO+PS matching methods,” *JHEP*, vol. 09, p. 049, 2012.
- [101] S. Höche, F. Krauss, M. Schönherr, and F. Siegert, “W+n-jet predictions with MC@NLO in Sherpa,” 2012.
- [102] S. Höche and M. Schönherr, “Uncertainties in NLO + parton shower matched simulations of inclusive jet and dijet production,” 2012.
- [103] J. André and T. Sjöstrand, “Matching of matrix elements and parton showers,” *Phys. Rev.*, vol. D57, pp. 5767–5772, 1998.
- [104] S. Catani, F. Krauss, R. Kuhn, and B. R. Webber, “QCD matrix elements + parton showers,” *JHEP*, vol. 11, p. 063, 2001.
- [105] L. Lönnblad, “Correcting the colour-dipole cascade model with fixed order matrix elements,” *JHEP*, vol. 05, p. 046, 2002.
- [106] M. L. Mangano, M. Moretti, and R. Pittau, “Multijet matrix elements and shower evolution in hadronic collisions:  $Wb\bar{b} + n$ -jets as a case study,” *Nucl. Phys.*, vol. B632, pp. 343–362, 2002.
- [107] F. Krauss, “Matrix elements and parton showers in hadronic interactions,” *JHEP*, vol. 0208, p. 015, 2002.
- [108] N. Lavesson and L. Lönnblad, “Merging parton showers and matrix elements – back to basics,” *JHEP*, vol. 04, p. 085, 2008.
- [109] M. L. Mangano, M. Moretti, F. Piccinini, and M. Treccani, “Matching matrix elements and shower evolution for top-pair production in hadronic collisions,” *JHEP*, vol. 01, p. 013, 2007.

- [110] J. Alwall *et al.*, “Comparative study of various algorithms for the merging of parton showers and matrix elements in hadronic collisions,” *Eur. Phys. J.*, vol. C53, pp. 473–500, 2008.
- [111] L. Lönnblad and S. Prestel, “Matching Tree-Level Matrix Elements with Interleaved Showers,” *JHEP*, vol. 03, p. 019, 2012.
- [112] N. Lavesson and L. Lönnblad, “Extending CKKW-merging to one-loop matrix elements,” *JHEP*, vol. 12, p. 070, 2008.
- [113] S. Höche, F. Krauss, M. Schönherr, and F. Siegert, “QCD matrix elements + parton showers: The NLO case,” 2012.
- [114] S. Höche, F. Krauss, S. Schumann, and F. Siegert, “QCD matrix elements and truncated showers,” *JHEP*, vol. 05, p. 053, 2009.
- [115] K. Hamilton, P. Richardson, and J. Tully, “A modified CKKW matrix element merging approach to angular-ordered parton showers,” *JHEP*, vol. 11, p. 038, 2009.
- [116] K. Hamilton and P. Nason, “Improving NLO-parton shower matched simulations with higher order matrix elements,” *JHEP*, vol. 06, p. 039, 2010.
- [117] S. Höche, F. Krauss, M. Schönherr, and F. Siegert, “NLO matrix elements and truncated showers,” *JHEP*, vol. 08, p. 123, 2011.
- [118] S. Alioli, K. Hamilton, and E. Re, “Practical improvements and merging of POWHEG simulations for vector boson production,” *JHEP*, vol. 1109, p. 104, 2011.
- [119] T. Gehrmann, S. Höche, F. Krauss, M. Schönherr, and F. Siegert, “NLO QCD matrix elements + parton showers in  $e^+e^- \rightarrow \text{hadrons}$ ,” 2012.
- [120] A. Buckley *et al.*, “Rivet user manual,” 2010.
- [121] B. M. Vaughn *et al.*, “HZTool and Rivet: Toolkit and framework for the comparison of simulated final states and data at colliders,” 2006.
- [122] A. Buckley, H. Hoeth, H. Lacker, H. Schulz, and J. E. von Seggern, “Systematic event generator tuning for the LHC,” *Eur. Phys. J.*, vol. C65, pp. 331–357, 2010.