



---

# Search for the SM Higgs boson in the $(W/Z)H$ channel with $H \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ using the ATLAS detector at the LHC

---

**Garoé González Parra**

**Ph.D. thesis**

Institut de Física d'Altes Energies  
Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona  
Departament de Física  
Facultat de Ciències

January 2015

*co-Directors:*

**Prof. Mario Martínez Pérez**

Institució Catalana de Recerca i Estudis Avançat  
Institut de Física d'Altes Energies  
Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona

**Dr. Verónica Sorin**

Institut de Física d'Altes Energies





*A child of four would understand this.  
Send someone to fetch a child of four!*

*Un niño de cuatro años podría entenderlo.  
¡Qué me traigan un niño de cuatro años!*

Groucho Marx  
Duck soup 1933



# Contents

|                                                                                    |           |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Introduction</b>                                                                | <b>1</b>  |
| <b>1 Theoretical framework</b>                                                     | <b>3</b>  |
| 1.1 The Standard Model of particle physics . . . . .                               | 3         |
| 1.1.1 Quantum Chromodynamics . . . . .                                             | 5         |
| 1.1.2 Electroweak unification . . . . .                                            | 6         |
| 1.1.3 The Brout-Englert-Higgs mass mechanism . . . . .                             | 7         |
| 1.2 Higgs boson at the LHC . . . . .                                               | 10        |
| 1.2.1 Production modes . . . . .                                                   | 10        |
| 1.2.2 Decay modes . . . . .                                                        | 10        |
| 1.2.3 Higgs boson searches . . . . .                                               | 11        |
| 1.2.4 Results on the Higgs boson search at the LHC . . . . .                       | 12        |
| <b>2 Phenomenology of <math>pp</math> collisions</b>                               | <b>15</b> |
| 2.1 Proton structure . . . . .                                                     | 15        |
| 2.2 The QCD factorization theorem and the $pp$ cross section calculation . . . . . | 16        |
| 2.3 Simulation of $pp$ collisions . . . . .                                        | 17        |
| 2.3.1 Hard process . . . . .                                                       | 18        |
| 2.3.2 Parton shower . . . . .                                                      | 18        |
| 2.3.3 Hadronization . . . . .                                                      | 19        |
| 2.3.4 Underlying event and pile-up . . . . .                                       | 20        |
| 2.4 Monte Carlo generators . . . . .                                               | 21        |
| <b>3 Statistical Model</b>                                                         | <b>23</b> |
| 3.1 Hypothesis testing . . . . .                                                   | 23        |
| 3.2 Likelihood function and profile likelihood ratio . . . . .                     | 24        |
| 3.3 Nuisance parameters . . . . .                                                  | 25        |
| 3.4 Discovery and upper limit . . . . .                                            | 26        |
| 3.4.1 Test statistics $q_0$ and $q_\mu$ . . . . .                                  | 26        |
| 3.4.2 Probabilities $p_0$ and $p_\mu$ . . . . .                                    | 28        |
| 3.4.3 $CL_S$ method . . . . .                                                      | 28        |
| 3.5 Approximate sampling distributions and the Asimov data set                     | 30        |

## CONTENTS

---

|          |                                                                                                                     |           |
|----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| 3.6      | Analysis sensitivity . . . . .                                                                                      | 31        |
| <b>4</b> | <b>The LHC and the ATLAS detector</b>                                                                               | <b>33</b> |
| 4.1      | The LHC . . . . .                                                                                                   | 33        |
| 4.2      | The ATLAS detector . . . . .                                                                                        | 35        |
| 4.2.1    | Coordinate system . . . . .                                                                                         | 35        |
| 4.2.2    | Inner detector . . . . .                                                                                            | 36        |
| 4.2.3    | Calorimeters . . . . .                                                                                              | 38        |
| 4.2.4    | Muon spectrometer . . . . .                                                                                         | 40        |
| 4.2.5    | Minimum Bias Trigger Scintillators . . . . .                                                                        | 41        |
| 4.3      | Luminosity . . . . .                                                                                                | 42        |
| 4.4      | Trigger system . . . . .                                                                                            | 44        |
| 4.5      | ATLAS detector simulation . . . . .                                                                                 | 44        |
| 4.6      | Computing facilities and data storage . . . . .                                                                     | 45        |
| <b>5</b> | <b>Physic objects reconstruction and identification</b>                                                             | <b>47</b> |
| 5.1      | Track and vertex reconstruction . . . . .                                                                           | 47        |
| 5.1.1    | Pile-up vertices correction . . . . .                                                                               | 48        |
| 5.2      | Electrons . . . . .                                                                                                 | 48        |
| 5.3      | Muons . . . . .                                                                                                     | 50        |
| 5.4      | Jets . . . . .                                                                                                      | 51        |
| 5.4.1    | Topological clusters . . . . .                                                                                      | 52        |
| 5.4.2    | Jet algorithm . . . . .                                                                                             | 53        |
| 5.4.3    | Jet energy calibration . . . . .                                                                                    | 54        |
| 5.4.4    | Jet vertex fraction . . . . .                                                                                       | 58        |
| 5.5      | Objects overlap removal . . . . .                                                                                   | 60        |
| 5.6      | b-jets . . . . .                                                                                                    | 60        |
| 5.6.1    | b-tagging algorithm . . . . .                                                                                       | 60        |
| 5.6.2    | b-tagging calibration . . . . .                                                                                     | 61        |
| 5.6.3    | pseudo-continuous b-tagging . . . . .                                                                               | 63        |
| 5.6.4    | b-jet energy and dijet mass resolution . . . . .                                                                    | 64        |
| 5.7      | Missing transverse energy $E_T^{\text{miss}}$ . . . . .                                                             | 65        |
| <b>6</b> | <b>Search for the Standard Model Higgs boson in the VH production channel <math>ZH \rightarrow \nu\nu bb</math></b> | <b>67</b> |
| 6.1      | Data samples and trigger selection . . . . .                                                                        | 68        |
| 6.1.1    | Trigger efficiency . . . . .                                                                                        | 68        |
| 6.2      | Object selection . . . . .                                                                                          | 70        |
| 6.2.1    | Leptons . . . . .                                                                                                   | 70        |
| 6.2.2    | Jets . . . . .                                                                                                      | 70        |
| 6.2.3    | b-jets . . . . .                                                                                                    | 71        |
| 6.2.4    | $E_T^{\text{miss}}$ and track-based missing transverse momenta . . . . .                                            | 72        |
| 6.3      | Event categorization . . . . .                                                                                      | 72        |
| 6.4      | Backgrounds composition . . . . .                                                                                   | 74        |

|          |                                                                                                                                    |            |
|----------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| 6.5      | Kinematic selection . . . . .                                                                                                      | 76         |
| 6.6      | Background Monte Carlo samples . . . . .                                                                                           | 76         |
| 6.7      | Background modeling . . . . .                                                                                                      | 77         |
| 6.7.1    | Vector Boson+jets . . . . .                                                                                                        | 78         |
| 6.7.2    | $t\bar{t}$ . . . . .                                                                                                               | 80         |
| 6.7.3    | Diboson . . . . .                                                                                                                  | 81         |
| 6.8      | Multijet Background . . . . .                                                                                                      | 81         |
| 6.9      | Uncertainties on the modeling of the backgrounds . . . . .                                                                         | 82         |
| 6.9.1    | V+jets modeling systematics . . . . .                                                                                              | 83         |
| 6.9.2    | $t\bar{t}$ and single-top modeling systematics . . . . .                                                                           | 85         |
| 6.9.3    | Diboson modeling systematics . . . . .                                                                                             | 85         |
| 6.10     | Experimental uncertainties . . . . .                                                                                               | 86         |
| 6.11     | VH signal characterization . . . . .                                                                                               | 87         |
| 6.11.1   | Signal Monte Carlo samples and cross section computation . . . . .                                                                 | 88         |
| 6.11.2   | Signal systematics . . . . .                                                                                                       | 88         |
| <b>7</b> | <b>VH search statistical procedure</b>                                                                                             | <b>91</b>  |
| 7.1      | Global fit . . . . .                                                                                                               | 91         |
| 7.1.1    | Treatment of nuisance parameters . . . . .                                                                                         | 92         |
| 7.1.2    | Background normalizations . . . . .                                                                                                | 92         |
| 7.1.3    | Higgs signal extraction from data . . . . .                                                                                        | 94         |
| 7.1.4    | Correlation of nuisance parameters . . . . .                                                                                       | 94         |
| 7.1.5    | Technical implementation . . . . .                                                                                                 | 95         |
| 7.2      | Fit model simplifications . . . . .                                                                                                | 95         |
| 7.2.1    | The $m_{bb}$ discriminant transformation . . . . .                                                                                 | 95         |
| 7.2.2    | Pruning and smoothing of systematic uncertainties . . . . .                                                                        | 96         |
| 7.3      | Results of the global fit . . . . .                                                                                                | 97         |
| 7.4      | Fit cross-checks . . . . .                                                                                                         | 106        |
| <b>8</b> | <b>Results</b>                                                                                                                     | <b>109</b> |
| 8.1      | Diboson results . . . . .                                                                                                          | 109        |
| 8.2      | Dijet mass analysis results . . . . .                                                                                              | 111        |
| 8.3      | Multivariate analysis results . . . . .                                                                                            | 117        |
| 8.4      | Correlation between dijet mass and multivariate based results                                                                      | 120        |
| 8.5      | The 7 TeV analysis results . . . . .                                                                                               | 120        |
| 8.6      | Combination of 7 TeV and 8 TeV results . . . . .                                                                                   | 123        |
|          | <b>Conclusions</b>                                                                                                                 | <b>127</b> |
| <b>A</b> | <b>VH analysis in the production channels <math>WH \rightarrow l\nu b\bar{b}</math> and <math>ZH \rightarrow llb\bar{b}</math></b> | <b>129</b> |
| A.1      | Object and kinematic selection . . . . .                                                                                           | 129        |
| A.2      | Kinematic fit in 2-lepton . . . . .                                                                                                | 131        |

## CONTENTS

---

|          |                                                                             |            |
|----------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| A.3      | Multijet estimation in the $WH \rightarrow l\nu b\bar{b}$ channel . . . . . | 131        |
| A.4      | Multijet estimation in the $ZH \rightarrow llb\bar{b}$ channel . . . . .    | 132        |
| <b>B</b> | <b>Multivariate Analysis Techniques</b>                                     | <b>133</b> |
|          | <b>Bibliography</b>                                                         | <b>137</b> |
|          | <b>Acknowledgement</b>                                                      | <b>143</b> |

# Introduction

The Higgs boson was discovered in 2012 by the ATLAS and CMS experiments at the LHC collider at CERN. After the discovery, the experiments are trying to determine all the properties of this new particle, including a precise measurement of its mass, its quantum numbers and the couplings to the different SM particles. In this context, the search for a Higgs boson decaying into a pair of quarks is a crucial part of the LHC Higgs program and the subject of this thesis.

The  $H \rightarrow b\bar{b}$  decay channel is the most promising one with a branching ratio of about 58 % for a Higgs boson mass of 125 GeV. The search for the inclusive production of the Higgs in this final state is virtually impossible given the huge (many orders of magnitude larger) multijet background with  $b$ -jets in the final state. Therefore, the associate production channel is considered, where the Higgs boson is produced in association with a  $W$  or  $Z$  vector boson in the final state. The use of the  $W$  and  $Z$  leptonic decays makes possible to maintain the SM background to manageable levels.

This thesis describes the analysis of the search for the Higgs boson in the  $(W/Z)H$  channel with  $H \rightarrow b\bar{b}$  using the 7 TeV and 8 TeV proton-proton data collected by the ATLAS experiment at the LHC. Special emphasis is put in the  $ZH$  ( $Z \rightarrow \nu\nu$  and  $H \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ ) channel and the 8 TeV large data sample. The analysis is performed using two different techniques: a cut-and-count method relying on the  $H \rightarrow b\bar{b}$  invariant mass signal, and a multivariate analysis. This thesis puts emphasis on the former.

The document is organized as follows. Chapter 1 introduces the Standard Model and the BHE mechanism for electroweak symmetry breaking, and discusses the Higgs boson production and decay modes. Chapter 2 is devoted to the phenomenology of proton-proton collisions. The statistical framework, tools and methodology used in the analysis are presented in Chapter 3. Details on the LHC accelerator and the ATLAS experiment are provided in Chapter 4, while Chapter 5 describes the reconstruction in the detector of the physics objects used in the analysis. Chapters 6 and 7 detail the Higgs search in the  $VH$  channel using  $20.3 \text{ fb}^{-1}$  of 8 TeV. The final results, including a combination with the 7 TeV results, based on  $4.7 \text{ fb}^{-1}$  of data, are presented in Chapter 8.

## INTRODUCTION

---

The thesis is complemented with two appendices, Appendix A presents the main characteristics of the analysis that targets the vector boson decays  $W \rightarrow l\nu$  and  $Z \rightarrow ll$ , and Appendix B devoted to the multivariate analysis.

The results presented in this thesis led to the following publication by the ATLAS Collaboration:

- *Search for the  $b\bar{b}$  decay of the Standard Model Higgs boson in associated  $(W/Z)H$  production with the ATLAS detector.* ATLAS Collaboration, JHEP (2015) 069.

This paper is based on the work developed during 2011 and 2012 data taking periods, which includes one paper and three collaboration public notes:

- *Search for the Standard Model Higgs boson produced in association with a vector boson and decaying to a b-quark pair with the ATLAS detector.* ATLAS Collaboration, Phys.Lett. B718, 369 (2012).
- *Search for the  $b\bar{b}$  decay of the Standard Model Higgs boson in associated  $W/ZH$  production with the ATLAS detector.* ATLAS Collaboration, ATLAS-CONF-2013-079.
- *Search for the Standard Model Higgs boson produced in association with a vector boson and decaying to bottom quarks with the ATLAS detector.* ATLAS Collaboration, ATLAS-CONF-2012-161.
- *Search for the Standard Model Higgs boson produced in association with a vector boson and decaying to a b-quark pair using up to  $4.7 \text{ fb}^{-1}$  of  $pp$  collision data at  $\sqrt{s} = 7 \text{ TeV}$  with the ATLAS detector at the LHC.* ATLAS Collaboration, ATLAS-CONF-2012-015.

# Chapter 1

## Theoretical framework

The Standard Model (SM) of particle physics [1, 2, 3] is the theory that so far best describes nature at the sub-nuclear level. It uses a set of fundamental particles to describe matter and its interactions. The theory has been broadly tested and it has been confirmed with high precision since it was developed in the sixties and seventies. The last piece missing and predicted by the theory was the Higgs field and the associated Higgs boson, responsible of giving mass to the rest of the particles via the Higgs mechanism. The Higgs boson particle was discovered at CERN in 2012 after decades of searching of it.

This Chapter summarizes the main concepts of the SM and the Higgs mechanism, including the discovery and the latest results on the characterization of the Higgs boson.

### 1.1 The Standard Model of particle physics

The Standard Model divides the elementary particles in “matter” (fermions) and “force mediator” (bosons) particles. It describes the fundamental forces as interactions among particles through the exchange of mediators. These mediators are spin 1 bosons that depending on the force are called photons ( $\gamma$ ), to describe electromagnetic interactions; gluons ( $g$ ), for the strong interactions; and  $W^\pm$ ,  $Z$  bosons for the weak interactions. All fundamental forces described by the SM are presented in Table 1.1.

| Interaction     | Symbol   | Mass      | Electric Charge |
|-----------------|----------|-----------|-----------------|
| Electromagnetic | $\gamma$ | 0         | 0               |
| Strong          | $g$      | 0         | 0               |
| Weak (charged)  | $W^\pm$  | 80.38 GeV | $\pm 1$         |
| Weak (neutral)  | $Z$      | 91.19 GeV | 0               |

Table 1.1: Table of carrier bosons of the fundamental interactions.

Fermions are classified in quarks and leptons and sub-divided in three generation families. Generations of quarks and leptons are copies with the same properties but their masses, having the 1<sup>st</sup> generation the lighter particles and the 3<sup>rd</sup> the heaviest. Each generation of quarks is naturally grouped in pairs:  $(u,d)$ ,  $(c,s)$ ,  $(t,b)$ . These quarks have color and fractional electric charge, thus they interact through all types of forces (electromagnetic, weak and strong). On the other hand, each family of leptons is formed by a negative charged particle and a neutrino. They do not present color charge, therefore they do not interact via strong force. Instead, charged leptons interact via electromagnetic and weak forces, while neutrinos due to their neutral charge and low mass can only be detected via weak force. All leptons, their masses and charges are listed in Table 1.2. Additionally, each quark and lepton has an anti-particle multiplying the presented fermion spectrum by two. The anti-particles are characterized by having the same masses and properties but opposite electric charges and quantum numbers, e.g. an anti-electron, so-called positron, has a charge of +1 and an anti-u has a charge of -2/3 and anti-color. As it is explained in Section 1.1.1, quark and gluons do not appear in nature as single particles but as color-neutral hadronic bound states. These states can be formed by a quark and anti-quark to construct *mesons*, e.g. the pion  $\pi^\pm$ , or three quarks or anti-quarks to construct *baryons*, e.g. the proton or the neutron.

| Generation      | Name              | Symbol     | Mass       | Charge |
|-----------------|-------------------|------------|------------|--------|
| <b>Quarks</b>   |                   |            |            |        |
| 1 <sup>st</sup> | Up                | $u$        | 2.3 MeV    | 2/3    |
|                 | Down              | $d$        | 4.8 MeV    | -1/3   |
| 2 <sup>nd</sup> | Charm             | $c$        | 1.275 GeV  | 2/3    |
|                 | Strange           | $s$        | 95 MeV     | -1/3   |
| 3 <sup>rd</sup> | Top               | $t$        | 173.5 GeV  | 2/3    |
|                 | Bottom            | $b$        | 4.65 GeV   | -1/3   |
| <b>Leptons</b>  |                   |            |            |        |
| 1 <sup>st</sup> | Electron          | $e$        | 0.51 MeV   | -1     |
|                 | Electron neutrino | $\nu_e$    | < 2 eV     | 0      |
| 2 <sup>nd</sup> | Muon              | $\mu$      | 105.66 MeV | -1     |
|                 | Muon neutrino     | $\nu_\mu$  | < 2 eV     | 0      |
| 3 <sup>rd</sup> | Tau               | $\tau$     | 1.77 GeV   | -1     |
|                 | Tau neutrino      | $\nu_\tau$ | < 2 eV     | 0      |

Table 1.2: Table of quark and lepton families with their mass and charge according to the Particle Data Group [4].

The SM is a quantum field theory (QFT) based on the gauge symmetry group  $SU(3)_C \otimes SU(2)_L \otimes U(1)_Y$ . The QFT describes particles as local fields functions of space-time coordinates  $\varphi(x)$ . Then the dynamics of the fields are described constructing a lagrangian density  $\mathcal{L}$ , which is function of the field and its first derivatives  $\partial_\mu \varphi(x)$ :

$$\mathcal{L}(\varphi(x), \partial_\mu \varphi(x)). \quad (1.1)$$

In addition, a gauge theory introduces gauge fields (boson fields) to keep invariant the lagrangian under local transformations. The number of associated boson fields is equal to the number of generators of the symmetry group. In the SM, the gauge symmetry  $SU(3)_C$  determines the strong interaction mediated by gluons, while the  $SU(2)_L \otimes U(1)_Y$  gauge symmetry governs the electroweak interaction mediated by the photons and the  $W^\pm$  and  $Z$  bosons.

The SM is described with a lagrangian density in two terms, one including the strong sector described with the quantum chromodynamics (QCD) theory, and the other the electroweak sector, which unifies electromagnetic and weak interactions:

$$\mathcal{L}_{SM} = \mathcal{L}_{QCD} + \mathcal{L}_{EW}. \quad (1.2)$$

### 1.1.1 Quantum Chromodynamics

The Quantum Chromodynamics theory (QCD) [5, 6, 7] describes the strong interactions between quarks and gluons. Its lagrangian density can be written as

$$\mathcal{L}_{QCD} = \bar{q}_f i \gamma^\mu D_\mu q_f - \frac{1}{4} G_{\mu\nu}^a G_{\mu\nu}^a, \quad (1.3)$$

where

$$D_\mu = \partial_\mu + i g_s T_a G_\mu^a \quad (1.4)$$

is the covariant derivative,  $\gamma^\mu$  are the Dirac matrices,  $T_a$  are the Gell-Mann matrices,  $q_i$  correspond to the quark field of flavor  $i$  and  $g_s^2 \equiv 4\pi\alpha_s$  is the coupling constant that gives the strength of the interaction. The gluon field tensor  $G_{\mu\nu}^a$  is written as

$$G_{\mu\nu}^a = \partial_\mu G_\nu^a - \partial_\nu G_\mu^a - g_s f_{abc} G_\mu^b G_\nu^c, \quad (1.5)$$

where  $G_\mu$  represents the gluon field and  $f_{abc}$  is the structure constant of the  $SU(3)$  group. In the expressions  $a$ ,  $b$  and  $c$  corresponds to the color indices, which run from 1 to 8 and accounts for the different gluon mediators; and the  $f$  index is the quark flavor index which runs from 1 to 6. The QCD is a non-abelian theory, therefore self-interaction between the gluon fields are included. The non-abelian nature arises in the last term of Eq. 1.5 which describes three and four gluon vertices interactions.

The presence of self-gluon interactions in QCD explains the behavior of the coupling strength  $\alpha_s$  as a function of the energy scale (typically, momentum transfer in the process evaluated). Figure 1.1 presents this  $\alpha_s$  dependence. If the strong force is evaluated at very high energies or equivalently, at very short distances, the quarks and gluons interact weakly. This effect is known as asymptotic freedom and explains why quarks and gluons behave as free particles at very short distances. In addition, it allows to apply perturbative theory calculations of QCD. On the other hand, at low energies, or equivalently large distances, the strong interaction coupling diverges causing that gluons and quarks can not be considered free particles. Chapter 2 explains the use of perturbative theory in the calculation of cross sections for hadron-hadron collisions, and the approximations adopted to describe the hadronization process and the formation of jets using non-perturbative QCD models.




Figure 1.1: Strong coupling  $\alpha_s$  as a function of the energy scale  $Q$  [8].

### 1.1.2 Electroweak unification

The electroweak theory [2] describes the weak and the electromagnetic interactions. It unifies the forces in the symmetry group  $SU(2)_L \otimes U(1)_Y$ . When the symmetry is broken the mediators (photon,  $W^\pm$  and  $Z$ ) arise.

The theory defines the fermions as left- and right-handed using the projections on the fermion fields:  $\psi_{L,R} = 1/2(1 \mp \gamma^5)\psi$ . Left-hand fermions are doublets transforming under  $SU(2)_L \otimes U(1)_Y$  and interacting electromagnetically and weakly, while right-hand fermions are singlets transforming only under  $U(1)_Y$  and therefore interacting via neutral currents mediated

by  $Z$  or  $\gamma$ . The fields transform as:

$$\psi_L = \begin{pmatrix} \nu_e \\ e \end{pmatrix}_L, \begin{pmatrix} u \\ d \end{pmatrix}_L, \dots \quad \psi_L \rightarrow \psi'_L = e^{iY\beta(x) + \bar{\sigma}\bar{\alpha}(x)}\psi_L \quad (1.6)$$

$$\psi_R = e_R, u_R, d_R, \dots \quad \psi_R \rightarrow \psi'_R = e^{iY\beta(x)}\psi_R \quad (1.7)$$

where  $\bar{\alpha}(x)$  and  $\beta(x)$  are the local phases,  $\bar{\sigma}$  corresponds to the weak generator (the Pauli matrices) and  $Y$  to the hypercharge, defined as  $Y = 2(Q - I_3)$ , where  $Q$  is the electric charge and  $I_3$  the third component of the isospin.

The boson fields associated to the electroweak symmetries are defined as

$$W_{\mu\nu}^l = \partial_\mu W_\nu^l - \partial_\nu W_\mu^l - g\epsilon_{ljk}W_\mu^jW_\nu^k \quad (1.8)$$

$$B_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu B_\nu - \partial_\nu B_\mu, \quad (1.9)$$

where  $g$  corresponds to the coupling to the electroweak  $W^l$  boson field ( $l = 1, 2, 3$ ).

With the fermions and the boson fields defined, the electroweak lagrangian density can be written as

$$\mathcal{L}_{EW} = \bar{\psi}i\gamma^\mu D_\mu\psi - \frac{1}{4}W_{\mu\nu}^lW_l^{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{4}B_{\mu\nu}B^{\mu\nu}, \quad (1.10)$$

where its covariant derivative is defined as

$$D_\mu = \partial_\mu + i\frac{g}{2}\bar{\sigma}W_\mu^l + i\frac{g'}{2}B_\mu Y. \quad (1.11)$$

The  $g'$  represents the coupling to the boson field  $B$ . By expanding the first term of the lagrangian in Eq. 1.10, the differences between the interactions of the vector bosons with the left- and right-handed fermion become apparent

$$\mathcal{L}_{EW,int} = -\bar{\psi}_L\gamma^\mu\left(\frac{g}{2}\bar{\sigma}W_\mu^l + \frac{g'}{2}B_\mu Y\right)\psi_L - \bar{\psi}_R\gamma^\mu\left(\frac{g'}{2}B_\mu Y\right)\psi_R. \quad (1.12)$$

### 1.1.3 The Brout-Englert-Higgs mass mechanism

The previous formalism predicts the existence of 4 massless mediators to describe the electroweak force ( $W^l$  and  $B$ ). Experiments discovered that  $W^\pm$  and  $Z$  bosons, associated with the weak force are massive [9, 10, 11, 12]. Moreover, fermions are described as massless particles, against observation. Peter Higgs, in parallel with Robert Brout, François Englert and others developed a model for massive weak mediator fields through a spontaneous symmetry breaking (SSB) that preserves gauge invariance. It postulates an additional field, generally called, the Higgs field [13, 14, 15]. As a consequence of the introduction of this field in the theory, masses of the rest of the particles are explained by their interaction with the Higgs field.

The simplest case to describe the field is introducing a complex doublet

$$\phi = \begin{pmatrix} \varphi^+ \\ \varphi^0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \varphi_1 + i\varphi_2 \\ \varphi_3 + i\varphi_4 \end{pmatrix} \quad (1.13)$$

with a particular potential, like

$$V(\phi) = \mu^2 \phi^\dagger \phi + \lambda (\phi^\dagger \phi)^2, \quad (1.14)$$

where  $\mu$  and  $\lambda$  are real constants. When searching for its minimum different choices can be made. The case  $\lambda < 0$  is unphysical, leading to no stable minima, while for  $\lambda > 0$  two possible solutions arise. The first one,  $\mu^2 > 0$  gives a vacuum state  $\phi = 0$  where the symmetry stays unbroken. The second solution,  $\mu^2 < 0$  gives the potential a non-vanishing vacuum expectation value in a set of infinite degenerate states. Figure 1.2 shows the potential as a function of the field  $\phi$  for the two solutions. One of the possible vacuum




Figure 1.2: The potential  $V$  of the scalar field  $\phi$  in the case  $\lambda > 0$  and (left)  $\mu^2 > 0$  or (right)  $\mu^2 < 0$  [16].

states is

$$\phi_0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v \end{pmatrix}, \quad (1.15)$$

where  $v = \sqrt{-\mu^2/\lambda}$  is the vacuum expectation value. If fluctuations that break the symmetry around these ground state are considered, a boson associated with the Higgs field arises

$$\phi_0(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v + h(x) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (1.16)$$

The Higgs boson is chosen to have a hypercharge of  $Y = 1$ . Therefore the vacuum breaks  $SU(2)_L \otimes U(1)_Y$ , but leaves  $U(1)_{EM}$  invariant, leaving only

the photon massless. The contribution to the lagrangian density of the Higgs field is written as

$$\mathcal{L}_H = (D_\mu \phi)^\dagger (D_\mu \phi) - V(\phi^\dagger \phi). \quad (1.17)$$

The interaction between the weak mediators and the Higgs field gives the masses to the  $W^\pm$  and  $Z$  bosons. Combining the Higgs lagrangian density with Eq. 1.16 and 1.11, the electroweak boson fields can be defined as linear combination of the  $W^l$  and  $B$  fields

$$W_\mu^\pm = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(W_\mu^1 \mp iW_\mu^2) \quad (1.18)$$

$$Z_\mu = \frac{g}{\sqrt{g^2 + g'^2}} W_\mu^3 - \frac{g'}{\sqrt{g^2 + g'^2}} B_\mu \quad (1.19)$$

$$A_\mu = \frac{g'}{\sqrt{g^2 + g'^2}} W_\mu^3 + \frac{g}{\sqrt{g^2 + g'^2}} B_\mu, \quad (1.20)$$

where  $A_\mu$  corresponds to the electromagnetic field associated with the photon. The masses associated with the electroweak mediators arise as new terms in the lagrangian once the Higgs field is included giving

$$m_W = \frac{gv}{2} \quad (1.21)$$

$$m_Z = \frac{v}{2} \sqrt{g^2 + g'^2} \quad (1.22)$$

$$m_\gamma = 0. \quad (1.23)$$

$$(1.24)$$

Fermion masses and interaction fermion-Higgs terms will also arise by adding the Higgs field into the lagrangian. These terms are proportional to the Yukawa couplings  $\lambda_f$ , which in the particular case of the electrons is

$$\mathcal{L}_e = \lambda_e (\bar{l}_L \phi e_R + \bar{e}_R \phi^\dagger l_L), \quad (1.25)$$

where  $l_L$  refers only to the first family of left-handed lepton. Using the definition of Higgs field  $\phi$  presented in Eq. 1.16, the lagrangian density takes the form

$$\mathcal{L}_e = -\frac{\lambda_e v}{\sqrt{2}} (\bar{e}_L e_R + \bar{e}_R e_L) - \frac{\lambda_e h}{\sqrt{2}} (\bar{e}_L e_R + \bar{e}_R e_L). \quad (1.26)$$

A general definition of the Yukawa coupling for all fermions is written as

$$\lambda_f = \sqrt{2} \frac{m_f}{v}. \quad (1.27)$$

The Higgs boson mass is related to  $\lambda$  and  $v$  as

$$m_H = \sqrt{2\lambda v^2}. \quad (1.28)$$

## 1.2 Higgs boson at the LHC

This Section describes the production of the Higgs boson at hadron colliders, its different decay modes, and the most relevant results released by the experiments about its discovery and characterization.

### 1.2.1 Production modes

At the collision energies reached by hadron colliders, the dominant Higgs production modes are: the gluon-gluon fusion (ggF), the vector boson fusion (VBF), the associated production with  $W$  or  $Z$  ( $VH$ ) and the production in association with a  $t\bar{t}$  pair ( $t\bar{t}H$ ). Feynman diagrams and cross sections for  $pp$  collision at  $\sqrt{s} = 8$  TeV are presented in Figures 1.3 and 1.4, respectively.




Figure 1.3: Feynman diagrams of the SM Higgs production: a) gluon fusion, b) vector boson fusion, c) vector boson associated and d)  $t\bar{t}$  associated production.

### 1.2.2 Decay modes

The Higgs boson is an unstable particle that has a very short lifetime ( $1.56 \times 10^{-22}$  s). Its main decay modes include decays into pairs of fermions or gauge bosons. Since photons and gluons are massless, they do not couple directly to the Higgs boson. Nevertheless,  $\gamma\gamma$  or  $gg$  final states can be generated via loops involving massive particles. The couplings between the gauge bosons and the Higgs goes like  $M_V^2/v$ , while the couplings to fermions are directly proportional to the masses. Therefore the Higgs boson branching




Figure 1.4: Standard Model Higgs boson production cross sections  $\sqrt{s} = 8 \text{ TeV}$ . The bands indicate the total theoretical uncertainties.

ratio (BR) depends on the masses of the final state or the virtual (if the decay occurs via loops) particles. Figure 1.5 shows the Higgs BR as a function of its mass. At a Higgs mass of  $m_H = 125 \text{ GeV}$  the dominant decays are:  $b\bar{b}$  (58 %),  $WW$  (21 %),  $gg$  (9 %),  $\tau\bar{\tau}$  (6 %),  $c\bar{c}$  (3 %) and  $ZZ$  (3 %). For the high mass range,  $m_H > 140 \text{ GeV}$ , the decays to  $W$  and  $Z$  pairs become dominant.

### 1.2.3 Higgs boson searches

The sensitivities associated with the different Higgs decay modes depend on the understanding and the rate of the backgrounds. Therefore, physics analyses exploit the kinematics and the unique signatures of the various decay channels to efficiently suppress the backgrounds. Although the highest production rate is given by the process  $ggF \rightarrow H \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ , the huge  $b\bar{b}$  background produced at hadron colliders makes essentially impossible the search and study of the Higgs boson via this process. Despite their relative low production rate, the most favorable decay modes to discover the Higgs boson at hadron colliders, due to their low background rate and their high mass resolution, are the resonant channels  $H \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$  and  $H \rightarrow ZZ$ , followed by  $H \rightarrow WW$ .




Figure 1.5: Standard Model Higgs boson decay branching ratios as a function of the boson mass.

#### 1.2.4 Results on the Higgs boson search at the LHC

In July, 2012 CERN announced the discovery of a new particle compatible with the SM Higgs boson. The resonance was observed by both ATLAS [17] and CMS [18] experiments independently. Since then, experiments have been characterizing the new particle by measuring its mass, spin and coupling to other particles.

The resonance of the Higgs boson has been observed in several decay channels. Figure 1.6(a) shows the invariant mass of four leptons ( $m_{4l}$ ) where a resonance from the process  $H \rightarrow ZZ \rightarrow 4l$  is observed. The particle has been also observed decaying into fermions, Figure 1.6(b) presents the Higgs signal from the  $H \rightarrow \tau\tau$  process in the invariant  $\tau\tau$  mass distribution.

The mass of the boson has been measured using the decay channels with better energy resolution:  $\gamma\gamma$  and  $ZZ$ . Figure 1.7 presents the measured cross section (relative to the SM Higgs expectation) versus the Higgs mass. ATLAS obtains a result of  $m_H = 125.36 \pm 0.37(stat) \pm 0.18(syst)$  GeV [19], compatible with the CMS result  $m_H = 125.7 \pm 0.3(stat) \pm 0.3(syst)$  GeV [21]. Using the same decay modes, measurements on the spin and parity of the particle has shown a strong preference for SM Higgs boson expectation values  $J^P = 0^+$  [22].




Figure 1.6: (a) Distributions of the four-lepton ( $m_{4l}$ ) and (b) the  $\tau\bar{\tau}$  ( $m_{\tau\tau}$ ) invariant masses for the selected candidates (filled circles) compared to the expected signal and background contributions (filled histograms) [19, 20].




Figure 1.7: Likelihood contours as a function of the normalized signal yield  $\sigma/\sigma_{SM}$  and  $m_H$  for the  $H \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$  and  $H \rightarrow ZZ \rightarrow 4l$  channels, and their combination [19].



## Chapter 2

# Phenomenology of $pp$ collisions

This Chapter gives a brief overview of the proton structure, the phenomenology of the  $pp$  collisions, and the different steps performed in their simulation. A small description of the main Monte Carlo generator programs, related with this analysis, is also presented.

### 2.1 Proton structure

The proton is not an elementary particle, it is formed by quarks and gluons, usually referred as partons. To describe their density inside the proton, the parton distribution functions (PDFs) are used. These functions describe the probability of finding a parton of type  $i$  carrying a fraction of the proton momentum  $x$

$$\int_0^1 x \sum_i f_i(x) dx = 1, \quad (2.1)$$

where  $f$  corresponds to the PDF and the sum runs over all parton types ( $g, u, \bar{u}, d, \dots$ ). The PDFs can not be calculated analytically using QCD and their estimation rely on experimental data. The data come from a broad type of experiments such as hadron-hadron collisions or deep inelastic scattering, among others.

The PDF evolution with the transferred momentum  $Q^2$  can be predicted in perturbation theory in series of  $\alpha_s$ , known as perturbative QCD (pQCD), using the DGLAP (Dokshitzer-Gribov-Lipatov-Altarelli-Parisi) [23] equation:

$$\frac{df_i(x, Q^2)}{dQ^2} = \sum_j \frac{\alpha_s(Q^2)}{2\pi} \int_x^1 \frac{dz}{z} P_{j \rightarrow i}(z) f(x/z, Q^2), \quad (2.2)$$

where  $P_{j \rightarrow i}$  is the splitting function that gives the probability that a process like  $j \rightarrow i$  takes place. In this process, a parton of type  $j$  radiates a quark

or a gluon and becomes a parton  $i$  carrying a fraction  $z$  of its longitudinal momentum. Figure 2.1 shows some of the PDFs for the different partons as a function of  $x$  for two different values of  $Q^2$ . It is observed that the fraction of  $u$  and  $d$  valence quarks, that form the proton bound state, carry around 0.5 of the proton momentum, while the rest is carried by virtual gluons and, to a lesser extent, by sea quarks from gluon splitting.




Figure 2.1: Proton PDFs and their associated error at transfer momentum  $Q^2 = 10 \text{ GeV}^2$  ( $Q^2 = 10^4 \text{ GeV}^2$ ) on the left (right).

## 2.2 The QCD factorization theorem and the $pp$ cross section calculation

Cross section calculations in hadron-hadron collisions are possible thanks to the QCD factorization theorem. This theorem states that a cross section can be factorized into short- and long-distance effects delimited by a factorization scale  $\mu_F$ . Short-distance effects are calculable in pQCD, while long-distance ones, corresponding to soft and collinear parton emissions, are in the non-perturbative QCD regime. Figure 2.2 illustrates a hadron-hadron collision where the scale  $\mu$  is used to separate these effects.

According to the factorization theorem, the cross section for a proton-




Figure 2.2: Illustrative hadron-hadron interaction where the scale  $\mu$  delimits its hard process.

proton interaction with momenta  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  can be written as

$$\sigma(P_1, P_2) = \sum_{i,j} \int dx_1 dx_2 f_i(x_1, \mu_F^2) f_j(x_2, \mu_F^2) \times \hat{\sigma}_{ij}(p_1, p_2, \alpha(\mu_F^2, \mu_R^2), Q^2/\mu_F^2), \quad (2.3)$$

where the sum runs over all parton types,  $f_i$  are their PDFs and  $\hat{\sigma}_{ij}$  is the parton-level cross section for incoming partons with momenta  $p_1 = x_1 P_1$  and  $p_2 = x_2 P_2$ . The PDFs are function of the  $\mu_F$  such that any parton emitted with smaller transverse momentum than the factorization scale is considered part of the hadron structure, and it is absorbed into the parton distributions. The partonic cross section is calculated at a given order in  $\alpha_s$  which introduces a dependence on a renormalization scale  $\mu_R$ , usually chosen to be equal to  $\mu_F$ .

## 2.3 Simulation of $pp$ collisions

The Monte Carlo (MC) simulation method is applied to describe hadron-hadron collisions. It uses pseudo-random numbers to simulate the full evolution of high energetic particle collisions. Comparisons between the simulated MC and real data events are crucial to understand the physics behind the collisions.

The simulation of a proton-proton collision is performed in steps according to the energy involved in the different processes. It starts simulating a relatively simple interesting sub-process in a collision with a large momentum transfer. This process is known as hard process and is calculated using pQCD. Soft and collinear emissions are added to the resulting partons of the hard process to form a parton shower. When the energy of the partons is small enough, they are recombined into hadrons. The simulation finishes adding the processes involved between the remnants partons from the protons that do not take part in the hard interaction. Figure 2.3 illustrates the full simulation chain.




Figure 2.3: Illustrative representation of the different processes involved in a  $pp$  collision simulation [24].

### 2.3.1 Hard process

As previously mentioned, the event simulation begins with the hard process. Its cross section is calculated integrating the squared matrix element (ME) over the phase space. Eq. 2.3 can be rewritten to express the hard process cross section as

$$\sigma(P_1, P_2) = \sum_{i,j} \int dx_1 dx_2 \int d\Phi f_i(x_1, \mu_F^2) f_j(x_2, \mu_F^2) \times \frac{1}{2x_1 x_2 s} |M_{12}|^2(\Phi, \mu_R, \mu_F). \quad (2.4)$$

The expression includes terms for the parton fluxes in the final state,  $\frac{1}{2x_1 x_2 s}$ , the phase space in the final state  $\Phi$ , and the matrix elements  $M_{12}$ . The  $M_{12}$  can be written as the sum of Feynman diagrams used in the computation:

$$M_{12} = \sum_i F_{12}^{(i)}. \quad (2.5)$$

For a typical process, if only tree-level diagrams without internal loops are used in the ME the cross section is computed at Leading Order (LO). If higher-order diagrams including 1-loop corrections are used, the computation is performed at Next-to-Leading-Order (NLO). Equivalently, the Next-to-Next-to-Leading-Order (NNLO) includes 2-loop diagrams in the ME.

### 2.3.2 Parton shower

The parton shower (PS) consists of successive soft collinear emissions of quarks and gluons out of the partons involved in the hard process. It is used to approximately simulate the higher-orders processes that can not be

described using fixed order in pQCD. It uses two simple phenomenological ideas, the iterative splitting of partons via the processes  $q \rightarrow gq$ ,  $g \rightarrow gg$  and  $g \rightarrow q\bar{q}$  to form multiparton final states, and a proper cancelation of real and virtual divergences, giving physical results. Using both approximations together, a reliable answer to describe the PS is given. Figure 2.4 illustrates how the iterative splitting of the partons forms a parton shower.




Figure 2.4: A cascade of successive splitting of partons [25].

The splitting of partons is performed using the DGLAP splitting functions describe in Section 2.1. It is iteratively applied until the parton energies reach the hadronization scale ( $Q_0 \sim 1$  GeV) where confinement effects and hadronization phenomena dominate.

The virtual corrections are taken into account with the Sudakov factors [26]. These factors are derived from the splitting functions and include the corrections in a probability of the parton to evolve in time without splitting.

Depending if an incoming or an outgoing parton from the hard process initiates the shower, the radiation is classified as initial state radiation (ISR) or final state radiation (FSR), respectively. Algorithms used to generate the showers are the same in both cases but in the case of the ISR they are operated backwards in time. This means that the fraction momentum of the initial parton is increased until it matches the PDFs  $x$  value. One of the limitations of this approach is that potential interference between ISR and FSR are neglected.

### 2.3.3 Hadronization

The hadronization is the process by which, after showering, partons at the  $Q_0 \sim 1$  GeV scale are recombined in colorless hadrons. The parton-hadron duality assumes that no high momentum transfer is needed in the recombination, as it happens close in phase space. Therefore, hadronization does

not change significantly neither the flavor nor the kinematic of the initial partons conserving the event energy flow. The parton-hadron duality is an observed QCD property. Its simulation relies on QCD-inspired phenomenological models where their parameters are tuned using experimental data.

The most used hadronization models are the string and the cluster models (see Figure 2.5). The string model ties a quark with an antiquark (plus a number of intermediate gluons) and it is assumed that a “string” between them produces a linear confinement potential. If the distance between the pair of quarks is so long that the string energy exceeds the mass of a pair of quarks, a color-singlet pair is generated and the string is split into two less energetic strings. The cluster model is based on the pre-confinement of the branching processes. This means that at scales much smaller than the hard process scale, the partons in a shower are clustered in color-singlet groups independently of the nature and scale of the hard process. Therefore final state gluons are forced to split into a quark-antiquark pair. Then neighboring quarks and antiquarks (not from the same gluon) are paired together in color-singlet clusters.




Figure 2.5: Illustrative color flux parton shower graph (a) completed with hadronization from the string model (b) and the cluster model (c) [27].

### 2.3.4 Underlying event and pile-up

The underlying event (UE) refers to the interactions between the proton remnants that do not take part in the hard interaction. They happen at low transferred momentum and involve the flavor- and color-connection with the hard process that cannot be described using perturbation theory. An important contribution to the UE are multiple parton interactions, relatively hard secondary collisions between the incoming hadron remnants. This is simulated using low- $p_T$  minimum bias interactions. The simulation parameters of the UE are tuned with experimental data.

Finally, one has to consider pile-up, due to multiple proton-proton interactions per bunch crossing at the collider. It is reproduced in simulation using minimum bias events as well. These events are then overlaid on top of the hard scattering event.

## 2.4 Monte Carlo generators

Monte Carlo generators are used to perform the simulation chain described in Section 2.3. The following list briefly describes the ones used in this analysis:

- **PYTHIA** is a multi-purpose MC generator that uses ME to compute at LO 2-to- $n$  ( $n \leq 3$ ) parton processes and PS to account for the initial- and final-state radiation. The hadronization step is simulated using the string model. There are two versions of the PYTHIA generator, version 6 [28] written in **Fortran** and version 8 [29] rewritten in **C++**.
- **HERWIG** is a multi-purpose MC generator program that uses ME to compute at LO  $2 \rightarrow 2$  parton processes and simulates also the PS. It uses the cluster model for hadronization and it is usually interfaced with JIMMY [30] to simulate the UE. There are two versions of the program, HERWIG [31] written in **fortran** and HERWIG++ [32] written **C++**.
- **SHERPA** [33] is a multi-purpose MC generator that uses ME to simulate  $2 \rightarrow n$  parton processes at LO. The different jet multiplicities are generated in a single inclusive sample. It is interfaced with PYTHIA to simulate the PS. To cover the whole phase space with a smooth transition from ME to PS, and in order to avoid overlaps, a ME-PS matching is performed with the Catani-Krauss-Kuhn-Webber (CKKW) method [34]. The SHERPA generator uses the cluster model to simulate the hadronization and it has its own UE implementation.
- **POWHEG** [35, 36, 37] is a MC generator that simulate events using ME at NLO in pQCD and usually interfaced with other generators like PYTHIA or HERWIG for modeling the PS, hadronization and UE.
- **ACERMC** [38] is another MC event generator specialized in the simulation of the SM background processes in  $pp$  collisions at the LHC. It uses ME at LO and generally is interfaced with other generators like PYTHIA or HERWIG for the modeling of PS, hadronization and UE.
- **ALPGEN** [39] is a MC generator specialized in  $2 \rightarrow n$  ( $n \leq 9$ ) parton processes computed with ME at LO. The various processes for parton multiplicities are generated in individual samples and then combined

into an inclusive one. It is interfaced either with PYTHIA or HERWIG for the PS development. It also implements a ME-PS matching (MLM matching [40]) to avoid overlaps.

- MC@NLO [41] is specialized MC generator used to simulate ME processes at NLO in pQCD. It is generally interfaced with HERWIG to simulate the PS.

## Chapter 3

# Statistical Model

A key aspect of this analysis is to determine the statistical treatment in order to interpret the results. This Chapter describes the statistical tools and the methodology used in all LHC Higgs searches.

### 3.1 Hypothesis testing

In particle physics, the procedure used to discover or exclude a new physic model is normally done via a statistical test. Two hypotheses, one which describes the known processes and another which, in addition, includes the new phenomena, are tested one against the other. This applies to the Higgs searches as follows:

**$H_0$  or Null Hypothesis** corresponds to the Standard Model without the presences of a Higgs boson. It is often referred to as the background-only (B) hypothesis.

**$H_1$  or Test Hypothesis** corresponds to the Standard Model with the presences of the Higgs boson. For this reason, it is often referred to as the signal+background (S+B) hypothesis.

The compatibility between the observed data and a hypothesis  $H$  is given by a  $p$ -value. The computation of this probability is based on a test statistic. In LHC Higgs searches, the likelihood ratio is the test statistic of choice due to its good properties. It is constructed from the number of signal and background events in the analysis regions. A hypothesis is rejected if the  $p$ -value is observed below an a-priori specified threshold. This leads to the discovery of new particle or the setting of 95 % Confidence-Level (CL) limits to its production rate.

### 3.2 Likelihood function and profile likelihood ratio

This Section is focused on building the likelihood function from the distributions (histograms) provided by an analysis. In this case, each histogram can be represented as  $n = (n_1, \dots, n_N)$ . The expectation value  $E$  of each  $n_i$  can be written as:

$$E[n_i] = \mu s_i + b_i, \quad (3.1)$$

where  $s_i$  and  $b_i$  correspond to the number of signal and background events, respectively, of the  $i$ th bin, and  $\mu$  is the parameter of interest (POI), also known as signal strength. This parameter multiplies the SM Higgs boson cross section times branching ratio value. Therefore, a  $\mu = 0$  is associated with the background-only hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) while a  $\mu = 1$  denotes the presence of a signal, and is associated with signal+background hypothesis ( $H_1$ ). The number of signal and background events expected in bin  $i$  can be expressed as:

$$s_i = s_{tot} \int_{bin\ i} f_s(x; \theta_s) dx, \quad (3.2)$$

$$b_i = b_{tot} \int_{bin\ i} f_b(x; \theta_b) dx. \quad (3.3)$$

The functions  $f_s(x; \theta_s)$  and  $f_b(x; \theta_b)$  are the probability density functions (pdfs) of the discriminant variable  $x$ , while  $\theta_s$  and  $\theta_b$  represent parameters that characterize the shapes of the pdfs. The  $s_{tot}$  and  $b_{tot}$  account for the total number of signal and background events. In the following definitions  $\theta = (\theta_s, \theta_b, b_{tot})$  will be used for simplification to denote all nuisance parameters (NPs). The signal normalization  $s_{tot}$  is a fixed value extracted from the signal model. Section 3.3 presents a detail description of the NPs.

In addition to the measured histogram  $n$ , auxiliary measurements to help constraining the NPs are considered. These measurements can be represented also as histogram bins  $m = (m_1, \dots, m_M)$ , where the expected values  $E$  of  $m_i$  can be written as

$$E[m_i] = u_i(\theta). \quad (3.4)$$

Depending on the characteristics of  $\theta$ , different pdfs can be used to describe them and calculate  $u_i$ .

All this analysis information is gathered in a likelihood function built as the product of Poisson probabilities for all bins:

$$L(\mu, \theta) = \prod_{i=1}^N \frac{(\mu s_i + b_i)^{n_j}}{n_j!} e^{-(\mu s_i + b_i)} \prod_{k=1}^M \frac{u_k^{m_k}}{m_k!} e^{-u_k} \rho(\theta). \quad (3.5)$$

To perform the statistical interpretation, the set of NPs  $\theta$  is profiled, meaning that they are functions of  $\mu$ ,  $\theta(\mu)$ . For some NPs, a “penalty”

term  $\rho(\theta)$  is added such that it decreases as soon as  $\theta$  is shifted away from its nominal value. Two estimators are constructed from the same likelihood in the so-called profile likelihood ratio:

$$\lambda(\mu) = \frac{L(\mu, \hat{\hat{\theta}}(\mu))}{L(\hat{\mu}, \hat{\theta})}. \quad (3.6)$$

The numerator is  $\mu$  dependent, thus  $\hat{\hat{\theta}}(\mu)$  corresponds to the  $\theta$  value that maximizes  $L$  for a specific  $\mu$ , also called conditional maximum-likelihood (ML) estimator of  $\theta$ . Instead, the denominator is not  $\mu$  dependent and it is known as the maximized unconditional likelihood function. There,  $\hat{\mu}$  and  $\hat{\theta}$  represent the best estimators obtained if no condition is required to the  $\mu$  value. The presence of a signal is expected to produce only upward fluctuations of the background. Negative values of  $\mu$  are not taken into account in the statistical interpretation of results by using a modified likelihood ratio:

$$\tilde{\lambda}(\mu) = \begin{cases} \frac{L(\mu, \hat{\hat{\theta}}(\mu))}{L(\hat{\mu}, \hat{\theta})} & \hat{\mu} \geq 0 \\ \frac{L(\mu, \hat{\hat{\theta}}(\mu))}{L(0, \hat{\theta}(0))} & \hat{\mu} < 0. \end{cases} \quad (3.7)$$

### 3.3 Nuisance parameters

The nuisance parameters are any parameter used in the statistical model with the exception of the POI. The parameters account for systematic, statistical and normalization uncertainties on the measurements, with the exception of data statistics, that is the basic Poisson term in the likelihood (Eq. 3.5). To have a factorized form of the likelihood, the  $\theta$  parameters are taken into account as uncorrelated.

From the fitting point of view, the NPs are used to accommodate any possible variation on the signal (Eq. 3.2) and background (Eq. 3.3) expectation pdfs when the function is maximized. In some cases, an extra term is introduced in the likelihood to account for variations of the NPs (Eq. 3.5).

Every NP is described with a pdf  $\rho(\theta)$  and, in general, characterized by its best associated estimate  $\hat{\theta}$  and extra parameters to describe its width or shape. The election of the pdf depends on the characteristics of the NP. The ones used in the analysis are described as follows:

- The flat pdf is used if no constraint exists on a particular parameter. In general no extra term is included in the likelihood, except if physical boundaries on the NP are set. In that case, the pdf is a rectangle whose limits are the ones set. These NPs are often referred to as freely floating parameters.

- The Gaussian pdf is a common choice for shape systematics uncertainties. It describes uncertainties on parameters that can be both positive and negative:

$$\rho(\theta) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} \exp\left(-\frac{(\theta - \hat{\theta})^2}{2\sigma^2}\right), \quad (3.8)$$

This pdf is not suitable for positively defined observables.

- The log-normal pdf is used for parameters bounded to positive values:

$$\rho(\theta) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi \ln(\kappa)}} \exp\left(-\frac{(\ln(\theta/\hat{\theta}))^2}{2(\ln(\kappa))^2}\right) \frac{1}{\theta}. \quad (3.9)$$

The parameter  $\kappa$  characterizes the width of the log-normal distribution which tends to a Gaussian form for small values of  $\kappa$  as shown in Figure 3.1 (left). Typically background normalizations can be constrained using such pdfs.

- The Gamma pdf is applied for describing statistical uncertainties associated with the number of selected Monte Carlo events. The event rate  $n$  in the a certain region is related to the number of events  $N$  in MC using the relation  $n = \alpha \cdot N$ . The gamma distribution, as a function of these variables, is expressed as follow:

$$\rho(n) = \frac{1}{\alpha} \frac{(n/\alpha)^N}{N!} \exp\left(-\frac{n}{\alpha}\right). \quad (3.10)$$

Figure 3.1 (right) presents the gamma distribution for samples with different number of events.

## 3.4 Discovery and upper limit

When searching for a new particle, a discovery is claimed if a large enough incompatibility between data and the null hypothesis is observed. If no deviation is observed, an upper limit on the test hypothesis is extracted. The profile likelihood ratio  $\tilde{\lambda}(\mu)$  (Eq. 3.7) ranges from  $0 < \tilde{\lambda} < 1$  with  $\tilde{\lambda}$  close to 1 implying good agreement between the data and the hypothesized value of  $\mu$ . Although it is more commonly used the form  $-2 \ln \tilde{\lambda}(\mu)$  for reasons explained in the following Sections.

### 3.4.1 Test statistics $q_0$ and $q_\mu$

The procedure to discover a new signal is to reject the background-only hypothesis. The statistic to do so is  $q_\mu$  when  $\mu = 0$  defined as:

$$q_0 = \begin{cases} -2 \ln \tilde{\lambda}(0) & \hat{\mu} \geq 0 \\ 0 & \hat{\mu} < 0. \end{cases} \quad (3.11)$$




Figure 3.1: (Left) Log-normal distributions with  $\kappa = 1.10, 1.20, 1.33$  and  $1.50$ . (Right) Gamma distribution with the number of events in a sample  $B = 100, 25, 9$  and  $4$ . Ref. [42].

An increase of event yields above the expected background translates into an increase of  $\hat{\mu}$ , thus  $\hat{\mu} \geq 0$  means that a new signal could be present. If this is the case, larger  $q_0$  values will correspond to an increase level of incompatibility between data and the background-only hypothesis. Since only upward fluctuations of the background are considered, by construction if  $\hat{\mu} < 0$  then  $q_0 = 0$ , indicating a compatibility with the background-only hypothesis.

If no discovery has been made, one can define upper limit on the signal strength parameter  $\mu$ . The test statistic is defined differently compared to the discovery case:

$$q_\mu = \begin{cases} -2 \ln \tilde{\lambda}(\mu) & \hat{\mu} \leq \mu \\ 0 & \hat{\mu} > \mu \end{cases} = \begin{cases} -2 \ln \frac{L(\mu, \hat{\theta}(\mu))}{L(0, \hat{\theta}(0))} & \hat{\mu} < 0 \\ -2 \ln \frac{L(\mu, \hat{\theta}(\mu))}{L(\hat{\mu}, \hat{\theta})} & 0 \leq \hat{\mu} \leq \mu \\ 0 & \hat{\mu} > \mu. \end{cases} \quad (3.12)$$

In this case,  $q_\mu$  is set to 0 if  $\hat{\mu} > \mu$  because no upper limit could be set if the observed signal strength is larger than the tested one. As for the discovery case, higher values of  $q_\mu$  represent greater incompatibility between the data and the tested value of  $\mu$ .

### 3.4.2 Probabilities $p_0$ and $p_\mu$

The compatibility of data with the background-only hypothesis is given by the  $p$ -value:

$$p_0 = \int_{q_{0,obs}}^{\infty} f(q_0|0, \hat{\theta}(0)) dq_0, \quad (3.13)$$

where  $q_{0,obs}$  is the observed value of the test statistic and  $f(q_0|\mu)$  denotes the  $q_0$  pdf under the assumption of the signal strength  $\mu = 0$  and  $\hat{\theta}(0)$ . In the presence of a signal, the  $p_0$  is generally converted into the corresponding Gaussian significance,  $Z$ , defined as the Gaussian distributed variable with upper-tail probability equal to the  $p_0$  which correspond to  $Z$  standard deviations above its means. That is  $Z = \Phi^{-1}(1 - p_0)$ , where  $\Phi^{-1}$  is the quantile (inverse of the cumulative distribution) of the standard Gaussian. In particle physics, it has been adopted the convention that if the background-only hypothesis is rejected with a  $p_0 = 1.3 \times 10^{-3}$ , equivalent to a significance  $Z = 3$ , an evidence is announced. A discovery is claimed for  $Z = 5$ , corresponding to  $p_0 = 2.9 \times 10^{-7}$ .

If no signal is present in the data, the signal+background hypothesis can be excluded with a certain Confidence-Level, and an upper limits can be set on its cross section. This is done by calculating the probability that the  $q_\mu$  test statistic for a given signal strength  $\mu$  assumes a value equal or higher than the observed value  $q_{\mu,obs}$  using the  $p$ -value expression:

$$p_\mu = \int_{q_{\mu,obs}}^{\infty} f(q_\mu|\mu, \hat{\theta}(\mu)) dq_\mu. \quad (3.14)$$

The upper limit  $\mu_{up}$  at 95 % CL is defined as the highest value of the signal strength  $\mu$  for which the probability  $p_\mu$  is still higher or equal to 5 %.

### 3.4.3 $CL_S$ method

When downward fluctuations on the observed number of background events are produced, upper limits computed using  $p_\mu$  can lead to unphysical exclusion of small  $\mu$  values to which the search is not a priori sensitive. This is overcome in the analysis by using the  $CL_S$  method [43] defined as a ratio of probabilities

$$CL_S = \frac{p_\mu}{1 - p_b} = \frac{p_{s+b}}{1 - p_b}, \quad (3.15)$$

where  $p_{s+b}$  and  $p_b$  quantify the compatibilities between the data and the signal+background and background-only hypotheses, respectively. The  $p_b$  is defined as

$$p_b = 1 - \int_{q_{\mu,obs}}^{\infty} f(q_\mu|0, \hat{\theta}(0)) dq_\mu. \quad (3.16)$$

A downward background fluctuation in data will lead to small values of  $1 - p_b$  increasing the  $CL_S$  upper limit and avoiding the exclusion of too small cross

sections. In LHC Higgs searches  $CL_S$  upper limits at 95 % confidence level are obtained by computing the  $\mu$  for which  $CL_S$  gives 0.05.

Figure 3.2 shows the pdfs for the test statistics  $q^1$ . It also illustrates the computation of the signal+background and the background-only hypotheses probabilities used in the  $CL_S$  method for an observation  $q_{obs}$  obtained from data.




Figure 3.2: The distribution of the statistic  $q$  under the hypotheses signal+background and background-only and  $q_{obs}$  obtained from data. Green and yellow areas correspond to  $p_{s+b}$  and  $p_b$  probabilities defined with Eq. 3.14 and Eq. 3.16 integrals respectively. This illustrative Figure uses the Tevatron Collider test statistic which is defined with a different likelihood ratio. Figure obtained from Ref. [44].

<sup>1</sup>In this case  $q$  represents the Tevatron Collider test statistic which is defined using a different likelihood ratio.

### 3.5 Approximate sampling distributions and the Asimov data set

The computation of a  $p$ -value associated with a hypothesis needs the full distribution of the test statistic as shown in Eq. 3.13 and Eq. 3.14. In particular, when trying to make a discovery, the background only hypothesis needs to be tested using  $f(q_0|0, \hat{\theta}(0))$ . Similarly, when computing an upper limit using the  $CL_S$  method, the  $f(q_\mu|\mu, \hat{\theta}(\mu))$  to describe the  $q_\mu$  distribution is also needed.

The estimation of  $q_\mu$  and  $q_0$  distributions could be done with Monte Carlo methods. These methods are computationally heavy specially when calculating upper limits. As an example, if a discovery with  $p_0 \sim 10^{-7}$  wants to be claimed, an order  $10^8$  pseudo-experiments toys would need to be simulated. For this reason, an approximation [44], valid in the large sample limit, is normally used instead to describe the profile likelihood ratio. If the assumption is that the data are distributed according to a strength parameter  $\mu'$ , one can write using Wald's approximation [45]

$$-2 \ln \tilde{\lambda}(\mu) = \frac{(\mu - \hat{\mu})^2}{\sigma^2} + \mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{N}), \quad (3.17)$$

where  $\hat{\mu}$  follows a Gaussian distribution with a mean  $\mu'$  and standard deviation  $\sigma$ , and  $N$  accounts for the data sample size. The value of  $\sigma$  is estimated from an artificial data set known as 'Asimov data set' [44].

The Asimov data set takes its name after I. Asimov's short story *Franchise*, where one most representative voter was chosen to act as the whole electorate. To construct it, the pseudo-data is forced to be equal to its expectation value  $n_{i,A} = E[n_i] = \mu' s_i(\theta) + b_i(\theta)$  and all NPs are set to the values obtained from the best fit to data.

The test statistics  $q_\mu$  and  $q_0$  can be rewritten using Eq. 3.17 approximating the pdfs  $f(q_\mu)$  and  $f(q_0)$  to  $\chi^2$  distributions [44]. This asymptotic approximation of the profile likelihood ratio works very well and reduces the computational time since calculations are done analytically. An example of distributions obtained with this method is shown in Figure 3.2 where the histograms are from Monte Carlo and the solid curves are the predictions of the asymptotic approximation.

In Ref. [44], approximate equations are derived for the significance and upper limits using the asymptotic approximation. The significance can be written as

$$Z = \sqrt{q_0}, \quad (3.18)$$

and the upper limit on  $\mu$  can be written as

$$\mu_{up} = \hat{\mu} + \sigma \Phi^{-1}(1 - \alpha), \quad (3.19)$$

where  $\sigma$  is the standard deviation on  $\mu$ ,  $\Phi^{-1}$  the inverse of the cumulative distribution of the standard Gaussian, and  $1 - \alpha$  the confident level to be excluded.

### 3.6 Analysis sensitivity

It is useful to know the sensitivity of the analysis, which can be done calculating its expected significance and upper limit. Expected results are estimated in the same way as the observed results by replacing the data set with the Asimov pseudo-data set.

When computing the expected significance, the pseudo-data is usually constructed with a  $\mu' = 1$  to obtain the results simulating the presence of a signal. This pseudo-data are used to calculate the value of the test statistic  $q_{0,A}$  and with Eq. 3.18 obtained the expected significance of the analysis

$$Z_{0,exp} = \sqrt{q_{0,A}}. \quad (3.20)$$

To set expected upper limits, the pseudo-data is usually constructed with a  $\mu' = 0$  to obtain the results simulating the background-only hypothesis. Using Eq. 3.19 the expected upper limit can be computed with the following expression

$$\mu_{up,exp} = \mu' + \sigma \Phi^{-1}(1 - \alpha). \quad (3.21)$$

When presenting expected upper limit results,  $\pm 1\sigma$  and  $\pm 2\sigma$  bands are usually calculated as well. The expression used is

$$band_{N\sigma} = \mu' + \sigma(\Phi^{-1}(1 - \alpha) \pm N), \quad (3.22)$$

where  $N$  correspond to the  $\sigma$  band ( $N = -2, -1, 1, \dots$ ).



## Chapter 4

# The LHC and the ATLAS detector

### 4.1 The LHC

The Large Hadron Collider (LHC) is a particle accelerator placed at CERN (Centre Européen pour la Recherche Nucléaire). The machine lies in a circular tunnel of 27 Km long and an underground depth that can reach 175 m under the Franco-Swiss boarder near Geneva. The LHC has four collision points where experiments are placed to record and analyze the particle collisions. The four main detector experiments are: ATLAS [46], CMS [47], ALICE [48] and LHCb [49]. Figure 4.1 shows the LHC ring with its four main experiments.

Protons are accelerated at the LHC up to energies of 4 TeV but it is designed to reach 7 TeV per proton beam when it will be operating at its full potential. Protons are not individually accelerating but collected in bunches of protons. The acceleration and the configuration of the proton beams is performed in various steps. The process starts extracting the protons from a hydrogen gas and injecting them into the first linear accelerator LINAC2 where they are accelerated up to 50 MeV. Then they enter the Proton Synchrotron Booster (PSB) where their energy is increased up to 1.4 GeV and the bunches are formed. Next step is the Proton Synchrotron (PS) which brings the energy to 25 GeV before passing them to the Super Proton Synchrotron (SPS) where the energy is further increased up to 450 GeV. Finally, the bunches are injected into the LHC and the energy is increased before the collisions start. Figure 4.2 illustrates the CERN accelerator complex and the main experiments.

The LHC is constructed with 1232 15 m-long superconducting dipole magnets which bend the beams to keep them in the ring. Moreover, 392 superconducting quadrupoles 5-7 m long are placed in between dipoles to focus the beams. Additional types of magnets move and squeeze the beams




Figure 4.1: Schematic view of the LHC ring under the Franco-Swiss boarder and its four main experiments: ATLAS, CMS, ALICE and LHCb. CERN label represents the headquarters of the organization located in Meyrin, Geneva.




Figure 4.2: A schematic showing the accelerator complex at CERN.




Figure 4.3: General overview of the ATLAS detector.

at the collisions points. Protons are accelerated at LHC by 16 superconducting radiofrequency cavities, 8 for each beam, placed between the CMS and ALICE collision points. All these superconducting materials operate at a temperature of 1.9 K, maintained with liquid helium.

## 4.2 The ATLAS detector

ATLAS (A Toroidal Lhc ApparatuS) [46] is a general purpose particle detector placed at the LHC. It has a cylindrical shape 44 m long, 25 m of diameter with a weight of approximately 7000 t (Figure 4.3). The detector is formed by several sub-detectors, each one of them with specific characteristics according to its functionality. The sub-detector closest to the interaction point is the inner detector, it tracks down charged particles in a strong magnetic field. Then come the electromagnetic and hadronic calorimeters where photons, electrons and hadrons are absorbed to measure their energy. Finally, the muon spectrometer wraps all previous sub-detectors in order to measure the momentum of the muons that cross the detector. ATLAS has a magnetic system which immerses the inner detector and the muon spectrometer in a 2 T solenoidal and in a 0.5-1 T toroidal magnetic fields, respectively. Figure 4.4 shows a cross sectional of the detector and illustrates how the different particles travel through it.

### 4.2.1 Coordinate system

The ATLAS coordinate system is such that the interaction point is defined as the origin. The beam direction defines the  $z$ -axis and, transverse to it, the  $x$ - $y$  plane. The positive  $z$ -axis is defined by the anti-clockwise beam direction,




Figure 4.4: ATLAS cross sectional schematic showing particles travelling from the interaction point through the various sub-detectors.

the positive  $x$ -axis is defined as pointing from the center of the detector to the center of the LHC ring, and the positive  $y$ -axis points upwards. In addition, to the use of cylindrical coordinates,  $\phi$ ,  $\theta$ , the experiment uses the rapidity, define as

$$y = \frac{1}{2} \ln \left( \frac{E + p_z}{E - p_z} \right). \quad (4.1)$$

The use of the rapidity is motivated by the fact that rapidity difference of two particles in the final state  $\Delta y$  is invariant against longitudinal boosts along the  $z$ -direction. For massless particles, the rapidity is equivalent to the pseudorapidity ( $\eta$ ) define as

$$\eta = -\ln \tan \left( \frac{\theta}{2} \right). \quad (4.2)$$

### 4.2.2 Inner detector

The Inner Detector (ID) [50] is the sub-detector closest to the interaction point. It is contained within a cylinder of 6 m length and 2 m diameter and it is the combination of three sub-detectors which permits to cover the range  $|\eta| \leq 2.5$  (Figure 4.5). Its primary task is the precise reconstruction of the trajectories (tracks) of charged particles produced in the collisions. The ID is immersed in a 2 T axial magnetic field produced by a solenoid. By combining the track and the magnetic field information it is possible




Figure 4.5: ATLAS Inner Detector layout.

to infer the  $p/q$  curvature and the point of closest approach of the particle trajectory to the beam line (the impact parameter) of the charge particles. Its expected momentum and transverse impact parameter resolutions are  $\sigma_{p_T}/p_T = 0.05\% p_T \oplus 1\%$  and  $10 \mu\text{m}$ , respectively. As the density of particles is higher closer to the interaction point, three sub-system with different technologies are used to reduce/avoid overlaps or ambiguities in the track reconstruction:

- The pixel detector: is the closest to the beam line, provides high-precision measurements around the interaction point, and allows secondary vertex identification from particle decays. It is formed by three barrel layers and three forward and backward end-cap disks which sum  $\sim 80.4$  million pixel channels with a size of  $50 \times 140 \mu\text{m}^2$ .
- The Semi Conducting Tracker (SCT): is composed by silicon strip detectors distributed in four cylinders in the barrel region and nine disks in each end-cap region, providing  $\sim 6.3$  millions channels. A strip sensor alone can only provide a position measurement in one direction. Therefore, these sensors are attached back-to-back with a small angle of  $40 \text{ mrad}$  between them to solve any ambiguities and provide a space point.
- Transition Radiation Tracker (TRT): consists of thin drift tubes with a diameter of  $4 \text{ mm}$ . The tubes are distributed parallel to the beam axis in the barrel region and radially in the end-caps disks, giving  $351 \text{ k}$  read-out channels. This design guarantees that particles traversing the TRT will cross 35-40 straws in the region  $|\eta| < 2$ . The TRT provides discrimination between particles and contributes to the electron identification.




Figure 4.6: The ATLAS electromagnetic, hadronic and forward calorimeters layout.

### 4.2.3 Calorimeters

The calorimeters measure the position and energy deposited by electromagnetic (EM) and hadron showers. The methodology of the different technologies is to have alternating layers of absorbing and sampling material. The calorimeters are  $\phi$ -symmetric covering a range up to  $|\eta| < 4.9$ . They are designed to capture the whole shower produced by an incident particle so its total energy can be inferred from the sum of the energy deposited in each sampling layer. The calorimeters also measure any imbalance in the total transverse energy to infer any weakly interacting neutral particle which carries unseen away momentum. Full containment of the showers is also needed to avoid punch-through of particles into the muon system. Figure 4.6 shows a layout of all the calorimeters installed in the ATLAS detector, as described in the following Sections.

#### 4.2.3.1 Electromagnetic calorimeter

ATLAS electromagnetic calorimeter (ECAL) [51] uses lead as absorber and Liquid Argon (LAr) as sampling material. It is designed to measure the position and energy of electrons and photons. High energy electrons that cross the calorimeter volume produce additional photons through the process known as Bremsstrahlung radiation. High energy photons instead, produce electron-positron pairs via pair production. This leads to a cascade which ionizes the LAr. The charge from ionization is collected in the readout electrodes made of copper and kapton. The collected charge is proportional to the deposited energy. The ECAL energy resolution can be parameterized by  $\sigma_E/E = 10\%/\sqrt{E} \oplus 0.7\%$ .




Figure 4.7: Diagrams showing (a) the segmentation in three layers of a electromagnetic calorimeter barrel module. The cell and trigger tower granularity are shown as well as the radiation length of the different layers. (b) Schematic of a module of the hadronic barrel calorimeter TileCal.

The electromagnetic calorimeter is divided into the barrel (EMB), which covers a range up to  $|\eta| < 1.5$ , and the end-caps (EMEC) which covers the range  $1.4 < |\eta| < 3.2$  (Figure 4.6). To increase the coverage to the region  $3.1 < |\eta| < 4.9$ , the first layer of the forward calorimeter (FCal) is optimized to make EM measurements (see Section 4.2.3.3). The EMB and EMEC are segmented in four sections in depth: the presampler and 3 additional layers. The presampler, installed in the region  $|\eta| < 1.8$ , is used to correct for the energy lost in the material before the calorimeter. The first layer contributes to the particle identification and precise position measurement. The second layer is where most of the shower is contained. Finally, the third layer is used to correct for the tail of very highly energetic EM showers. The granularity and the radiation length ( $X_0$ ) of the cells depends on the layer and their  $\eta$  position, having a typical cell size of  $\Delta\eta \times \Delta\phi = 0.025 \times 0.025$  and a radiation length higher than  $22 X_0$ . The fast read-out system installed allows to use ECAL signals to trigger interesting events in the  $|\eta| < 2.5$  range. An illustration of a EM barrel module is shown in Figure 4.7(a).

#### 4.2.3.2 Hadronic calorimeter

The hadronic calorimeter (HCAL) is composed by various technologies. In the central region, the barrel calorimeter is made of scintillating tiles as

active material and lead as absorber. This part is called TileCal calorimeter [52] and covers the region  $|\eta| < 1.7$ . Covering region  $1.5 < |\eta| < 3.2$  there is the hadronic end-cap calorimeter (HEC) [51]. The HEC uses copper as passive material and LAr as active material, chosen for the radiation hardness needed in the very forward region. The HCAL energy resolution can be parameterized by  $\sigma_E/E = 50\%/\sqrt{E} \oplus 3\%$ .

TileCal is divided in a barrel ( $|\eta| < 1$ ) and two extended barrels ( $0.8 < |\eta| < 1.7$ ), and further divided into three layers. In the TileCal, particles interact with the lead tiles provoking the showers that illuminate the scintillating tiles. The light is collected by optic fiber and finally guide to a photomultiplier (see Figure 4.7(b)). Each photomultiplier reads a bunch of fiber corresponding to a cell of  $\Delta\eta \times \Delta\phi = 0.1 \times 0.1$  in the first two layer and  $\Delta\eta \times \Delta\phi = 0.2 \times 0.1$  in the third one. The interaction length ( $\lambda$ ) varies depending on the layer being 1.4, 4.1 and  $1.8\lambda$  in the barrel and 1.5, 2.6,  $3.3\lambda$  in the extended barrel. The granularity in the HEC varies with  $\eta$  ranging between  $\Delta\eta \times \Delta\phi = 0.1 \times 0.1$  and  $0.2 \times 0.2$  and it has a interaction length of about  $10\lambda$ .

#### 4.2.3.3 Forward calorimeter

The Forward Calorimeter (FCal) [51] covers the region  $3.1 < |\eta| < 4.9$ , improving the calorimetry coverage to very forward regions. Each end-cap consists in three modules of about  $10\lambda$ , where LAr is used as active material. The first module is optimized for measure EM measurements using copper as absorber. The other two modules use tungsten as absorber. The FCal energy resolution can be parameterized by  $\sigma_E/E = 100\%/\sqrt{E} \oplus 10\%$ .

#### 4.2.4 Muon spectrometer

The muon spectrometer (MS) is the outermost part of ATLAS. Since muons mostly interact with matter like minimal ionizing particles, they traverse the inner detector and the calorimeters relatively undisturbed and a track is observed in the MS. To resolve the muon momentum with large accuracy, the system is immersed in a magnetic field which is produced by one barrel and two end-caps air-core toroids, providing on average 0.5 T and 1.0 T respectively. The MS provides momentum measurement with a resolution better than 3% over a wide  $p_T$  range and up to 10% for  $p_T \approx 1$  TeV.

Four different gaseous detector technologies are used for high-precision tracking measurements and trigger. Figure 4.8 shows how the technologies are distributed in ATLAS.

- Monitored Drift Tubes (MDT): cover the  $|\eta| < 2.7$  range and provide a precision measurement of the track coordinates.

- Cathode Strip Chambers (CSC): multiwire proportional chambers with cathodes segmented into strips. It provides precision measurements in the forward region  $2.0 < |\eta| < 2.7$ . Since the modules are located closer to the collisions point, they have higher rate capability, and time resolution compared to the MDTs.
- Resistive Plate Chambers (RPC): consist of parallel electrode-plates which cover the barrel region  $|\eta| < 1.05$ . They have a fast time response to be used by the trigger system and enough spacial resolution to deliver extra tracking information.
- Thin-Gap Chambers (TGC): operate on the same principle than the RPC but in the end-cap region  $1.05 < |\eta| < 2.7$ , providing trigger only up to  $|\eta| < 2.4$ . They have a better granularity giving better rate capability.




Figure 4.8: (a) Overview of ATLAS muon spectrometer. (b) Cross-sectional view of the detector showing the distribution of the different technologies used in the MS.

#### 4.2.5 Minimum Bias Trigger Scintillators

The Minimum Bias Trigger Scintillators (MBTS) are segmented scintillator paddles located close to the beam-pipe, which trigger on the energy deposited by charged particles traversing the scintillator. During early running when the luminosity was very low, the random trigger installed was inefficient since the probability of an interaction during a bunch crossing was less than 1 % and MBTS was crucial for recording first physic collision events in ATLAS.

The MBTS detector consists of thirty-two scintillator paddles, each of which is 2 cm thick. The paddles are arranged into two disks and installed




Figure 4.9: Overview and geometry of ATLAS MBTS.

on the inner face of the end-cap calorimeters. Each disk has an inner and outer ring covering  $2.82 < |\eta| < 3.84$  and  $2.09 < |\eta| < 2.82$  respectively. The light emitted by each scintillator is transmitted through a wavelength-shifting optical fiber to a photomultiplier located in the TileCal hadronic calorimeter.

### 4.3 Luminosity

In ATLAS, the luminosity is determined indirectly using several detectors. These detectors measure the  $pp$  interaction rate per bunch crossing  $\mu_{vis}$ , which is related to the luminosity with the expression [53]:

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{\mu_{vis} n_b f_r}{\sigma_{vis}}, \quad (4.3)$$

where  $n_b$  is the number of bunches cross,  $f_r$  is the bunches revolution frequency (11245.5 Hz) and  $\sigma_{vis} = \epsilon \sigma_{ine}$  is the total inelastic  $pp$  cross section within the detector acceptance  $\epsilon$ . The  $n_b$  and  $f_r$  are known machine parameters,  $\mu_{vis}$  is directly measured during collisions thus the only parameter which needs to be calibrated is  $\sigma_{vis}$ . The calibration is performed using scans of the beam-beam separation, known as van der Meer scans [54]. An alternative expression to infer the luminosity from measured accelerator parameters during the scans can be used:

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{n_b f_r n_1 n_2}{2\pi \Sigma_x \Sigma_y}, \quad (4.4)$$

where  $n_1$  and  $n_2$  are the number of protons in the colliding bunches and  $\Sigma_x$  and  $\Sigma_y$  give the extensions of the bunches perpendicular to the beam direction. The scan moves the beams in the horizontal and vertical plane to measure their profiles  $\Sigma_x$  and  $\Sigma_y$ . Simultaneously the  $\mu_{vis}$  is measured and maxima in its profile are associated to zero beam separation. All the information can be combined, using Eq. 4.3 and 4.4, to estimate  $\sigma_{vis}$ :

$$\sigma_{vis} = \frac{\mu_{vis}^{max} 2\pi \Sigma_x \Sigma_y}{n_1 n_2}. \quad (4.5)$$

Instantaneous luminosity is integrated over time to account for the amount of collisions generated. Figure 4.10 presents the integrated luminosity delivered over time, recorded and certified to be good quality data, for  $pp$  collisions at 7 TeV and 8 TeV centre-of-mass energy in 2011 and 2012. The luminosity delivered accounts for collisions from the start of stable beams until the beam is dumped by LHC. The difference with the ATLAS integrated luminosity also accounts for the time to ramp-up HVs. The Data Quality (DQ) information finally decides on the fraction of data good for physics analysis. This leads to a total of  $20.3 \text{ fb}^{-1}$  at 8 TeV and  $4.57 \text{ fb}^{-1}$  at 7 TeV data.




Figure 4.10: Cumulative luminosity versus time delivered to, recorded by ATLAS, and certified to be good quality data during stable beams and for  $pp$  collisions at 7 and 8 TeV centre-of-mass energy in 2011 and 2012.

While operating the ATLAS detector, a unit called lumiblock is introduced to handle event samples for practical matters. It can be considered as a quantum of data which roughly corresponds to  $10 - 150 \text{ nb}^{-1}$ . When the machine runs smoothly, the operation time can be also expressed in number of lumiblocks taken. The correspondence of the lumiblock in seconds vary among the data periods since it depends on the beams configuration and the instantaneous luminosity.

## 4.4 Trigger system

In hadron colliders is impossible to store all the data generated by the huge amount of event collisions produced. At nominal luminosity the event rate reached in ATLAS is 1 GHz ( $10^9$  events/s). Since the detector store rate is orders of magnitude smaller ( $\sim 400$  Hz), a trigger system is needed to quickly decide whether a given event contains an interesting signature and should be stored or not. The trigger system is divided in three levels which progressively filter the events and reduces its rate to a storable level.

The first selection is made by the Level-1 (L1) trigger. The L1 is a hardware based trigger since a very fast response is needed it. It uses the muon detector and the calorimeters to measure signatures of high- $p_T$  muons, energy deposits in the calorimeters and  $E_T^{\text{miss}}$ . The L1 also identifies Regions of Interests (ROI) corresponding to directions in the  $\eta - \phi$  plane, where interesting features in the detector are observed, usually associated with high- $p_T$  objects. The ROI information is stored in front-end pipelines pending for the L1 decision. Considering the pipeline buffer, the expected time to make a decision on the event, also known as latency, is  $2.5 \mu\text{s}$ . The typical L1 input and output rates in 2012 were 20 MHz and 65 kHz, respectively.

Next step in the chain is the Level-2 (L2) trigger, a software base trigger with a longer processing time which allows to increase the complexity of the selection algorithm. This trigger is seeded with the ROI identified by L1. The L2 has a larger latency compare to L1, 100 ms, which makes possible to use data with full granularity and tracking information. The L2 output rate is 6.5 kHz

The final stage of the trigger system is the Event Filter (EF). The 1 s of processing time allowed to the EF makes possible to fully reconstruct the event using algorithms as those for the offline analysis. This reduces the event rate to a storable number of about 400 Hz, which corresponds to about 1 Gb/s data rate.

## 4.5 ATLAS detector simulation

The ATLAS detector simulation [55] models the detector material, its geometry and response to particles crossing based on the GEANT4 [56] program. The read-out electronic signals produced by the interaction with the different subsystems is also simulated. At this point data and simulated events use the same algorithms to reconstruct the physic objects such as electrons, muons or jets. The detector simulation is constantly updated with the information from the real detector conditions, e.g. dead channels or mis-alignments.




Figure 4.11: Diagram of the Worldwide LHC Computing Grid (WLCG) project with the hierarchy and connections of the different Tier sites.

## 4.6 Computing facilities and data storage

Due to the huge amount of data generated by the ATLAS detector, estimated in few Petabyte per year, and the large number of physicists involved in their analysis, a Worldwide LHC Computing Grid (WLCG) [57] was designed. The LCG consists on a pyramid structure with a main computer center at CERN (the Tier-0 site), thirteen large computer centres (Tier-1 sites), and more than 160 Tier-2 and -3 sites in different institutions around the globe. The pyramid is designed to decrease the event size and detail level while increasing analysis specific information every time the datasets are transferred to a next Tier level.



## Chapter 5

# Physic objects reconstruction and identification

This Chapter is focused on the description of the reconstruction and the identification of the physics objects used in the  $VH(H \rightarrow b\bar{b})$  analysis. This includes: the reconstruction and identification of charged particles (tracks); interaction vertices; electrons and muons; and jets and  $b$ -tagged jets. Finally, the reconstruction of the missing transverse momentum is discussed.

### 5.1 Track and vertex reconstruction

In ATLAS, tracks are reconstructed using the hit information generated from charged particles while passing through the inner detector. The reconstruction starts by transforming the hits information from pixel and the SCT into three dimensions space-points. At the same time, the TRT hit information is transformed into drift circles which correspond to the closest distance to a straw wire. Seeds are then built from space-points from the three pixel layers and the first SCT layer. These seeds are then extended in search for more hits through the remaining layers of the SCT. Candidates are then fitted and fakes and ambiguities are removed [58]. The remaining tracks are extended to add the information from the TRT drift circles. This track-finding algorithm is called inside-out tracking. In addition, an outside-in track-finding algorithm is also performed. This second algorithm starts from TRT seeds and extends the tracks back to the inner SCT and pixels layers. It is used to more efficiently reconstruct tracks coming from secondary vertices from long-lived particles.

The detected tracks are used to reconstruct the vertices (from the interaction points) and secondary vertices from particle decays. The procedure to reconstruct primary vertices (PVs) [59] starts by selecting tracks originated in the interaction region. A vertex seed is found based on a global maximum in the  $z$  distribution of the tracks. An algorithm which uses as

input the seed and the tracks around it, computes the vertex position [60]. This algorithm is rerun using as seeds close tracks that could not be associated with the already located vertices. This procedure is repeated until no unassociated tracks are left in the event or no additional vertex can be found. Vertices are required to have at least three associated tracks with  $p_T > 400$  MeV. From all PVs found, the primary interaction in the event is associated with the one with highest sum of the  $p_T^2$  of the associated tracks.

### 5.1.1 Pile-up vertices correction

As mentioned in Section 2.3.4, pile-up is originated from multiple proton-proton interactions which happen in the same bunch crossing. The number of pile-up events turns out to be proportional to the number of reconstructed primary vertices. The effect of the pile-up is simulated adding minimum bias events on top of the hard scattering event. Since the amount of pile-up varies depending on the beam configurations, the generation of the MC simulated samples is first produced using an approximated estimation of the pile-up. A correction is applied afterward by weighting the number of vertices in simulation (Figure 5.1(b)) to match the data profiles (Figure 5.1(a)).




Figure 5.1: (a) Luminosity-weighted distribution of the mean number of interactions per crossing in the  $\sqrt{s} = 8$  TeV data set. Same distribution in arbitrary units is presented in (b) for a typical MC sample.

## 5.2 Electrons

Electrons are reconstructed associating clusters of energy deposited in the electromagnetic (EM) calorimeter to a track. The energy clusters are built using a sliding-window clustering algorithm [61, 62]. First, the  $\eta - \phi$  space of the calorimeter is divided into a grid of  $\Delta\eta \times \Delta\phi$  elements with size  $0.025 \times 0.025$ . Inside each of these grid elements, the energy of all cells in

all longitudinal layers is summed to form a tower of energy. A window of fixed size  $3 \times 5$  is then used to scan across each element of the tower grid. From the scan, clusters with a local maxima above a 2.5 GeV threshold are selected. This limits the rate of fake clusters due to noise. Clusters matched to a well reconstructed ID track associated to a primary vertex are classified as electrons. The cluster energy is rebuilt using a calorimeter area of  $3 \times 7$  and  $5 \times 5$  in the Barrel Electromagnetic Calorimeter (EMB) and End-caps (EMEC), respectively. These areas are optimized for EM showers produced by electrons in the different detector regions, while suppressing the pile-up and noise contributions.

A high energy  $pp$  collision environment is characterized by the high rate of particles generated in each bunch crossing. In order to suppress the background produced by these particles and to make precise measurements, it is usually required for the objects to be isolated. In the case of electrons, track and calorimeter based isolations [63] are applied to suppress the jets of hadrons faking electrons. For isolated electrons, energy associated to the tracks or the calorimeter cells around it should be low compared to the electron energy.

The electron identification criteria relies on a likelihood [63] selection. This likelihood-based identification combines shower-shape information, track quality criteria, the matching quality between the track and its associated energy cluster in the calorimeter, TRT information, and a reconstruction algorithm that helps to identify electrons originated from photon conversions. Identified electrons are classified in three different quality categories: *loose*, *medium* and *tight*. The loose category fulfil a “loose likelihood” identification criteria. Medium electrons add to this criteria a cut on the transverse energy ( $E_T$ ) to select only high energetic electrons. Finally, the “very tight likelihood” criteria, in addition to track and calorimeter isolations, are required for the tight electrons.

### Electron identification efficiency

To measure the identification efficiency of loose, medium and tight electrons the tag-and-probe method [63] is used in both data and MC simulation. The method requires a pure and unbiased sample of electrons, and  $Z \rightarrow ee$  and  $J/\psi \rightarrow ee$  decays are used. One of the two electrons is selected with very tight requirements (“tag”), while the second electron candidate is selected applying rather loose conditions (“probe”). The efficiency  $\epsilon$  is estimated by the fraction of probe electrons passing the tested criteria.

Data-to-MC scale factors (SFs) are applied to the simulated samples to correct for the differences in efficiencies observed in the simulation when compared to data. These corrections are parametrized as a function of  $E_T$  and  $\eta$ . Figure 5.2 shows the electron efficiencies in data and MC samples. The ratio plots correspond to SFs that vary between 0.9 and 1 depending

on the selection quality,  $E_T$ , and  $\eta$  of the electron.




Figure 5.2: Identification efficiency in data and MC as a function of (a)  $E_T$  and (b)  $\eta$  for loose, medium and tight selections. The lower panel shows the data-to-MC efficiency ratios. The uncertainties are statistical (inner error bars) and statistical+systematic (outer error bars). The dashed lines indicate the bins in which the efficiencies are calculated (taken from Ref.[63]).

### 5.3 Muons

Muons are identified and reconstructed [64] using the information from the muon spectrometer (MS), the ID and, to a lesser extent, the calorimeters. The reconstruction depends on the available information from the different detectors, leading to different types of muons:

- Stand-alone (SA) muon: is reconstructed using only the track MS information of muons that went through at least two layers of the chambers. To determine the parameters at the interaction point, the track is extrapolated to the closest point to the beam line taking into account the estimated energy loss in the calorimeters. In general, SA muons are used to extend the acceptance to the range  $2.5 < |\eta| < 2.7$ , where there is no coverage from the ID.
- Combined (CB) muon: is reconstructed by matching SA muon and ID track. Its momentum is defined as a weighted combination of the MS

and the ID  $p_T$  measurements. The reconstruction of combined muons is limited to the ID coverage  $|\eta| < 2.5$ . These are the main type of reconstructed muons.

- Segment-tagged (ST) muon: is reconstructed from an extrapolated ID track to the MS, associating the inner track with at least one track segment reconstructed in a MDT or CSC chamber. ST muons increase the acceptance for low  $p_T$  muons, or muons which fall in regions with reduced MS acceptance.
- Calorimeter-tagged (CaloTag) muon: is reconstructed by associating an ID track with an energy deposit in the calorimeter, compatible with a minimum ionizing particle. Although this type of muon has a low purity, it recovers acceptance in the region  $|\eta| < 0.1$  where there is limited coverage by the muon chambers.

The identification criteria classifies the muons by increasing background rejection in *loose*, *medium* and *tight*. The loose muons gather all types previously presented: SA, CB, ST and CaloTag. They are required to have an isolated track, with the exception of the SA type, where no track information is available. The medium muons are formed by CB and ST muons. They also required track isolation in addition to a cut on the  $E_T$  to select only high energetic muons. Finally, tight muons are identified by tightening the medium isolation requirements.

### Muon identification efficiency

The efficiency in the muon reconstruction and identification [64] is estimated using the same procedure as for the electrons. A tag-and-probe method is used in a pure and unbiased sample of muons both in data and MC simulated events. In this case,  $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ ,  $J/\psi \rightarrow \mu\mu$  and  $\Upsilon \rightarrow \mu\mu$  events are used. As it was the case for electrons, data-to-MC SFs are applied to the MC samples to correct for the differences in efficiencies with respect to data. Figure 5.3 shows the efficiency for the different muons types in MC and data events as a function of  $\eta$ . The corresponding data-to-MC correction is presented in the ratio plot, and varies between 1.02 and 0.98. The combination of all the muon reconstruction types (for CB, ST, and CaloTag muons) give a uniform muon reconstruction efficiency over almost all the detector regions.

## 5.4 Jets

As discussed in Chapter 1, jets are used to identify collimated flows of particles resulting from the fragmentation of partons in the final state. In the analysis, one can distinguish *truth* jets, *track* jets and *calorimeter* jets.




Figure 5.3: Muon reconstruction efficiency as a function of  $\eta$  measured in  $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$  events for muons with  $p_T > 10$  GeV and different muon reconstruction types. CaloTag muons are only shown in the region  $|\eta| < 0.1$ . The error bars on the efficiencies indicate the statistical uncertainty. The panel at the bottom shows the ratio between the measured and predicted efficiencies. The error bars on the ratios are the combination of statistical and systematic uncertainties [64].

Truth jets are defined in MC simulation from stable particles with a lifetime  $\tau > 10^{-11}$  s. Track jets are reconstructed from charged particle tracks associated with a primary vertex. This Section is focused on the reconstruction and calibration of calorimeter jets, built from energy clusters in the calorimeter.

#### 5.4.1 Topological clusters

Particles that interact with the calorimeter deposit their energy in different cells. To reconstruct the particle energies, cells are gathered and their energies summed. This reconstruction is performed using a 3-D topological clustering algorithm [61].

The topological cluster algorithm groups the cells that have significant energies compared to the expected noise. The noise is estimated for every cell and its dominant sources are the read-out electronics and the energy deposited by pile-up interactions. The algorithm starts by selecting seed cells with a high signal-to-noise ratio,  $|E|/\sigma > 4$ . The next step checks the signal to noise ratio in the seed's neighboring cells, if  $|E|/\sigma > 2$  they are added to the cluster seed. This procedure is repeated with their neighboring cells. The cluster stops growing when a neighboring ratio condition is not fulfilled. To finish, all the perimeter cells, regardless their signal-to-noise ratio, are added to the cluster. This ensures that tails of showers are not discarded. An

illustrative diagram of the procedure is presented in Figure 5.4. Overlapping of particle showers are resolved by searching for local maxima inside a cluster and splitting it around those maxima.




Figure 5.4: Illustrative  $\eta - \phi$  grid which represents the three barrel hadronic layers. The picture shows the topo-cluster formation starting from a high signal to noise ratio cell (red), expanding in the 3-dimensional space to the medium significance cell (blue), and closing the topo-cluster by adding all perimeter cells (green).

### 5.4.2 Jet algorithm

In this analysis, the iterative anti- $k_T$  algorithm [65] is used to reconstruct jets in the calorimeter, using topo-clusters as input. The algorithm starts by introducing the “distance”  $d_{ij}$  between two topo-clusters  $i$  and  $j$  and the “distance” between the topo-cluster  $i$  and the beam line  $d_{iB}$ . These variables are defined as

$$d_{ij} = \min \left( \frac{1}{k_{T,i}^2}, \frac{1}{k_{T,j}^2} \right) \frac{\Delta_{ij}^2}{R^2}, \quad (5.1)$$

$$d_{iB} = \frac{1}{k_{T,i}^2},$$

where  $k_T$  is the transverse momentum of the topo-clusters,  $\Delta_{ij}$  is the distance in the rapidity-azimuthal plane and  $R$  is a free parameter associated with the jet size.

The clustering procedure identifies the smallest distance, if it is  $d_{ij}$  it recombines the topo-clusters  $i$  and  $j$  into a new pseudo-cluster. If instead it is  $d_{iB}$ , it calls  $i$  a proto-jet and stop using the cluster in future iterations. The procedure continues until no topo-clusters are left. To select jets associated with hard interactions, a minimum transverse momentum ( $p_T$ ) is required

to the proto-jets. Figure 5.5 illustrates the shape of the jets obtained by running the  $k_T$  algorithm on a set of hard and soft particles. As it is observed, algorithm provides well-defined conical shapes to the jets, allowing a robust pile-up correction.




Figure 5.5: Illustrative plot showing the reconstructed jets using the  $k_T$  algorithm [65].

### 5.4.3 Jet energy calibration

Jets are formed from the calorimetric energy deposits reconstructed at the EM energy scale. This scale properly accounts for the EM components of the jet shower. A calibration, called local cell signal weighting (LCW), is performed to correctly reconstruct the calorimeter response to hadrons. This calibration uses the density of energy and the longitudinal shower depth to classify the topo-cluster as EM or hadronic.

An overview of the ATLAS jet reconstruction and calibration scheme is shown in Figure 5.6. The calibration of jets at the EM or LCW-scale is divided into four steps: energy correction to account for pile-up, position correction, energy and  $\eta$  calibration based on MC simulation and a residual *in-situ* calibration based on MC-data comparisons [66].

#### 5.4.3.1 Jet pile-up correction

The pile-up activity produces an offset in the jet energy measurement. This offset is associated with two effects: the *in-time* and *out-of-time* pile-up. The in-time pile-up effect corresponds to the extra signals measured in the calorimeters due to the additional interactions produced in the same bunch crossing. The out-of-time pile-up instead, is related with further signal modulations produce by the interactions in the surrounding bunch crossings.




Figure 5.6: Overview of the ATLAS jet reconstruction and calibration scheme [66].

Two corrections are applied to mitigate the pile-up effects [67, 68]. The first one estimates the average energy deposited by the pile-up  $\rho$ , and subtracts it depending on the jet shape area  $A$ :

$$p_T^{jet,corr} = p_T^{jet} - \rho \cdot A. \quad (5.2)$$

This correction mitigates the in-time pile-up effects, but  $\rho$  does not properly describe the out-of-time effects, specially in the forward region of the detector. This motivates the introduction of a residual correction that depends on the jet  $p_T$ , the number of vertices in the event  $N_{PV}$  and (since it accounts for out of time pile-up effects) the average number of interactions per bunch crossing  $\langle\mu\rangle$ . Figure 5.7 shows the pile-up effects on the jet reconstructed  $p_T$  before and after applying the corrections.

#### 5.4.3.2 Jet origin correction

Initially, the jet direction is estimated with the energy-weighted position of the topo-cluster cells pointing to the center of the detector. A correction makes the jet to point to the primary vertex without changing its energy. This correction improves the angular resolution and results in a small improvement ( $< 1\%$ ) in the jet  $p_T$  response.

#### 5.4.3.3 Jet energy scale

The jet energy scale (JES) calibration brings the jet energies measured at the detector level back to the particle-level (truth jets) [69]. The aim is to correct for detector effects such as: partially measured energies specially in hadronic showers; energy leakages from showers not contained in the calorimeters or in the jet cones, or energy deposition in non-sensitive regions of the detector.

The calibration is based on MC simulation. It is extracted from matched pairs of isolated jets at calorimeter and truth levels, where the jets are close to each other within a cone of radius 0.3. Isolated jets are defined such that




Figure 5.7: Dependence of the reconstructed jet  $p_T$  on in-time pile-up (a) and out-of-time pile-up (b), at various correction stages: before any correction, after the  $\rho \cdot A$  subtraction, and after the residual correction [68].

there is no additional jet with  $p_T > 7$  GeV within  $\Delta R = 2.5R$ , where  $R$  is the jet algorithm size parameter.

Using these pairs of matched calorimeter-truth jets, the calibration starts by computing the energy response function

$$\mathcal{R}_{EM/LCW} = \frac{E_{EM/LCW}^{jet}}{E_{truth}^{jet}} \quad (5.3)$$

for each pair in the MC sample. Results are binned in the truth jet energy  $E_{truth}^{jet}$  and the calorimeter jet detector pseudorapidity  $\eta_{det}$ , defined as the jet  $\eta$  before the origin correction. Then, a Gaussian fit is performed to estimate the averaged jet response ( $\langle \mathcal{R}_{EM/LCW} \rangle$ ) for each  $(E_{truth}^{jet}, \eta_{det})$  bin. In the same bins, the average jet calorimeter energy ( $\langle E_{EM/LCW}^{jet} \rangle$ ) is also derived as the mean of the  $E_{EM/LCW}^{jet}$  distribution. Figure 5.8 shows the average response of simulated jets formed at the EM scale as a function of  $\eta_{det}$  for various truth-jet energies.

The jet calibration function ( $\mathcal{F}_{calib}$ ) depends on the  $E_{EM/LCW}^{jet}$  and it is obtained from the fit of the  $\langle \mathcal{R}_{EM/LCW} \rangle$  and  $\langle E_{EM/LCW}^{jet} \rangle$  values for each  $E_{truth}^{jet}$  bin. Figure 5.9 presents the average jet energy scale correction ( $1/\mathcal{F}_{calib}$ ) as function of the jet  $p_T$ . The values of the function decrease with  $p_T$ , ranging in the central region of the detector from 2.1 at low  $p_T$  to 1.2 at high  $p_T$ .




Figure 5.8: Average response of simulated jets formed from topo-clusters at the EM scale ( $\langle \mathcal{R}_{EM} \rangle$ ) as a function of the uncorrected jet pseudorapidity  $\eta_{det}$ . The response is shown separately for various truth-jet energies. Also indicated are the different calorimeter regions [69].




Figure 5.9: Average jet energy scale correction ( $1/\mathcal{F}_{calib}$ ) as a function of the calibrated jet transverse momentum for three representative  $\eta_{jet}$ -intervals obtained from the nominal Monte Carlo simulation sample [69].

The final jet energy scale correction that relates the measured calorimeter energy back to the particle-level is defined as

$$E_{EM/LCW+JES}^{jet} = \frac{E_{EM/LCW}^{jet}}{\mathcal{F}_{calib}(E_{EM/LCW}^{jet}, \eta_{det})} \quad (5.4)$$

#### 5.4.3.4 In-situ calibration

After the EM/LCW+JES calibration is applied to the  $p_T$  of the jets, residual differences between data and MC simulation in the jet  $p_T$  need to be addressed. This is important since the MC simulation is used to bring the measurements at the detector level back to the truth particle level. In case of difference, a residual correction is applied to the data such that data come closer to the simulation.

Samples of  $\gamma$ +jet,  $Z$ +jet events are used to compare the performance of the jet calibration in data and simulation where the photon or the  $Z$  boson act as reference. For very high- $p_T$  jets, this is complemented with a multijet sample in which a high- $p_T$  jet recoils a system of low- $p_T$  multijets. In each case, the calibration is applied as a jet-by-jet correction defined as

$$\mathcal{C}_{in-situ}(p_T^{jet}, \eta) = \frac{\langle p_T^{jet}/p_T^{ref} \rangle_{MC}}{\langle p_T^{jet}/p_T^{ref} \rangle_{data}}. \quad (5.5)$$

For the central part of the detector  $|\eta| < 1.2$ , three analyses are performed to estimate the in-situ correction. The analysis where  $Z$  boson is used as the reference objects, allows to calibrate jets with  $15 < p_T < 200$  GeV. Instead, when  $\gamma$ 's are used, the calibration covers the range  $20 < p_T < 800$  GeV. Finally, for jets with  $p_T > 800$  GeV, the calibration is performed using a system of a low- $p_T$  jets recoiling against a high- $p_T$  jet, where the low- $p_T$  jet is calibrated using the  $\gamma$ -jet or  $Z$ -jet in-situ techniques. Figure 5.10 shows the in-situ correction estimated using the three analyses. The correction ranges between -4 % and -2 % as the  $p_T$  increases.

#### 5.4.4 Jet vertex fraction

The jet vertex fraction (JVF) is a variable used to reduce the contribution of jets from pile-up. It is calculated as the sum of the  $p_T$  of tracks matched to the jet that originate from the primary vertex divided by the sum of  $p_T$  of all tracks matched to the jet. The JVF is only required for jets with  $p_T < 50$  GeV and  $|\eta| < 2.4$ , since low  $p_T$  jet measurements are more affected by pile-up. Due to detector acceptance, only jets associated tracks within  $|\eta| < 2.4$  are considered. Figure 5.11 illustrates the JVF distribution for jets produced in a hard-scatter or a pile-up interaction in the simulation.




Figure 5.10: Ratio of the average jet response  $\langle p_T^{jet}/p_T^{ref} \rangle$  measured in data to that measured in MC simulations for jets within  $|\eta| < 1.2$  as a function of the transverse jet momentum  $p_T$ . The data-to-MC jet response ratios are shown separately for the three in-situ techniques used in the combined calibration: direct balance in Z-jet events, photon-jet events, and multijet  $p_T$  balance in inclusive jet events [66].




Figure 5.11: The JVF distribution for simulated jets associated to a hard-scattering or a pile-up interaction.

## 5.5 Objects overlap removal

By construction, leptons and jets are reconstructed independently. As consequence, close objects could lead to a double counting of the energy deposited in the calorimeters. Another consequence of this, is that the same object can be reconstructed by different algorithms, e.g. electrons and jets are both reconstructed as jets by the jet algorithms. Therefore, a hierarchy, presented in Table 5.1, is established to resolve overlaps.

| Case                       | Order | Keep $\mu$        | Keep e        | Keep jet         |
|----------------------------|-------|-------------------|---------------|------------------|
| $\Delta R(jet, e) < 0.4$   | 1     | –                 | Yes           | No               |
| $\Delta R(jet, \mu) < 0.4$ | 2     | $N_{trk} \leq 3$  | –             | $N_{trk} \geq 4$ |
| $\Delta R(\mu, e) < 0.2$   | 3     | if not Calo $\mu$ | if Calo $\mu$ | –                |

Table 5.1: Overlap hierarchy and the order in which the overlap is solved where  $N_{trk}$  corresponds the jet track multiplicity.

## 5.6 b-jets

The bottom quark hadronizes in a  $B$  hadron when produced in a particle collision. These hadrons have a lifetime of the order of  $10^{-12}$  s. At the energies they are normally produced at LHC, they can travel few millimeter before decaying. This relatively long lifetime allows the reconstruction of a displaced secondary vertex which respect to the primary collision point. Algorithms exploit this property to identify the jets generated by  $B$  hadrons, referred as to  $b$ -jets.

### 5.6.1 b-tagging algorithm

The procedure to identify  $b$ -jets is called  $b$ -tagging. In general, a weight that corresponds to the probability for a jet to be generated from a  $b$ -quark is defined. The  $b$ -tagging algorithm used in this analysis is called MV1c [71]. It combines, using a neural network, the information from various algorithms based on the impact parameter of the jet tracks, the presence of a secondary vertex and the topology of *bottom* and *charmed* hadron decays. Figure 5.12 shows a schematic view of a  $B$  hadron decay and highlights some of the variables used by the  $b$ -tagging algorithms.

The output of the MV1c algorithm is a weight ( $w$ ) that ranges between 0 and 1. The closer the associated  $w$  value of a jet is to 1, the more likely to be a  $b$ -jet. The algorithm performance is characterized by the efficiency of tagging a  $b$ -jet ( $\epsilon_b$ ) versus the probability of mis-identifying (mis-tag) a




Figure 5.12: Schematic view of a  $B$  hadron decay resulting in a secondary vertex. The vertex is significantly displaced with respect to the primary vertex. The track impact parameter, which is the distance of closest approach between the extrapolation of the track and the primary vertex, is shown in addition for one of the secondary tracks [70].

jet as  $b$ -jet when it is generated by a  $c$ -quark, a  $\tau$ -jet or a light-flavor parton ( $u$ ,  $d$ ,  $s$  quarks or a gluon).

Analyses normally set a  $w$  threshold value, or working point, that defines if a jet is considered to be a  $b$ -jet. Typically, a working point close to 1 gives high purity  $b$ -jet samples but with a low  $b$ -tagging efficiency, while a working point close to 0 gives low purity  $b$ -jet samples with a high  $b$ -tagging efficiency. Therefore, when choosing the working point a balance between the purity and the efficiency is needed.

### 5.6.2 $b$ -tagging calibration

The MV1c algorithm needs to be calibrated such that efficiencies in simulation mimic the data. In MC generated events, the efficiencies are estimated independently for the different jet flavors. The flavor is determined by searching for different particles within a cone of 0.4 around the jet axis just after the parton in the final state has hadronized. The jets are labeled as  $b$ -jet if a  $B$  hadron is found,  $c$ -jet if a *charmed* hadron and not a  $B$  hadron is found, or  $\tau$ -jet if a  $\tau$  lepton is found. If none of the requirements are fulfilled, the jet is labeled as light-jet.

The following Sections explain the different methods used to estimate the tagging efficiencies of  $b$ -jets [72],  $c$ -jets and light-jets [71], both in data and

simulation. Data-to-MC SFs are estimated as the ratio between data and simulation efficiencies and are applied on MC to account for the differences with data. These SFs are binned in jet  $p_T$  and  $b$ -tagging weight. For light-jets, efficiencies are also binned in  $|\eta|$  since the statistics allows to do so. To some extent, the SFs include effects and physics modeling and therefore, they are only strictly valid for the generator used to derive them. The differences observed when the efficiencies are measured with different MC generators are taken into account by additional MC-to-MC SFs.

#### 5.6.2.1 $b$ -jet efficiency

The  $b$ -jet tagging efficiency  $\epsilon_b$  is estimated in MC and data  $t\bar{t}$  events. To obtain the highest possible  $b$ -jet purity samples, an analysis is performed on  $t\bar{t}$  candidates selected with two opposite charged leptons in the final state (dilepton top channel).

There are several methods to estimate the  $b$ -jet efficiency. In the case of this analysis, where events with two or three jets in the final state are selected, a likelihood fit-based approach is used to easily take into account the correlations between the jet flavors. This method constructs likelihood functions using the probabilities of  $b$ -tagging certain flavor jets given their  $b$ -tagging weights and  $p_T$ . Likelihood is fitted to data and the probability density function of tagging a  $b$ -jet is obtained. Efficiencies are estimated integrating the probability density function over the  $b$ -tagging weight variable.

#### 5.6.2.2 $c$ -jet efficiency

The efficiency with which the  $b$ -tagging algorithm tags  $c$ -jets is referred to as the  $c$ -jet tagging efficiency  $\epsilon_c$ . It is calibrated using a jet sample enriched in  $c$ -jets containing a  $D^{*+}$  meson identified in the  $D^0(\rightarrow K^-\pi^+)\pi^+$  decay mode. The efficiency is measured by comparing the yield of mesons before and after the tagging requirement.

#### 5.6.2.3 light-jet efficiency

The light-jet efficiency  $\epsilon_l$  is defined as the fraction of jets originating from light flavor which are tagged by a  $b$ -tagging algorithm. Light-flavor jets are mis-tagged as  $b$ -jets mainly because of the finite resolution of the inner detector and the presence of tracks from long-lived particles or from the interactions with the dead material in the detector. Prompt tracks which are apparently displaced due to the finite resolution of the tracker, will often appear to originate from a point behind the primary vertex with respect to the jet axis. The negative tag method exploits this feature of the light-jets, by tagging negative impact parameter or decay length. The method translates this negative tag rate into a measurement of the mis-tag rate.

### 5.6.3 pseudo-continuous b-tagging

In this analysis, several working points are used in a procedure known as *pseudo-continuous tagging*. This procedure allows not only to define if a jet is considered a *b*-jet but also further classified them according to its purity. The categories defined are *loose* (with an efficiency of 80 %), *medium* (70 %) and *tight* (50 %). Table 5.2 summarizes the information for the different working points used in the analysis. Figure 5.13 shows an illustrative example of MV1c weight distributions for the different jet flavors and the different analysis working points. The advantages of using a *pseudo-continuous tagging* is that low purity with high statistics, and high purity with low statistics *b*-jet samples can be defined in the same analysis.

| Name             | $w$ value | $\epsilon_b$ (%) | $c$ -jet RF | $\tau$ -jet RF | $l$ -jet RF |
|------------------|-----------|------------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|
| 80 ‘Loose’ or L  | 0.4050    | 79.85            | 3.04        | 6.40           | 29.12       |
| 70 ‘Medium’ or M | 0.7028    | 70.00            | 5.34        | 14.90          | 135.76      |
| 60               | 0.8353    | 59.99            | 10.45       | 33.92          | 453.53      |
| 50 ‘Tight’ or T  | 0.9237    | 49.99            | 26.22       | 120.33         | 1388.28     |

Table 5.2: The MV1c output  $w$  value and the efficiencies associated with the working points estimated from simulated events. RF stands for Rejection Factor which is the reciprocal of the efficiency.




Figure 5.13: Illustrative example of the MV1c weight distributions for different jet flavors in simulation. Dash lines correspond to the analysis working points loose with an efficiency of 80 %, medium with 70 % and tight 50 %.

#### 5.6.4 b-jet energy and dijet mass resolution

As it will be described in Chapter 6, the most powerful variable to search for the process  $VH$  ( $H \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ ) is the reconstructed mass of the two  $b$ -jets. Therefore, and in order to maximize the discriminant power and the discovery potential, a jet-by-jet calibration and two corrections are applied to the dijet invariant mass to improve the jet energy resolution.

The extra jet calibration, known as global sequential calibration (GSC) [69], is applied on top of the LCW+JES one. This calibration parametrized the jet response (Eq. 5.3) as a function of variables ( $x_i$ ) related with the longitudinal and transverse jet energy deposition. For every variable, a multiplicative correction to the jet energy measurement is derived by inverting the calibrated jet response as a function of the variable

$$\mathcal{C}(x) = \frac{\mathcal{R}^{-1}(x)}{\langle \mathcal{R}^{-1}(x) \rangle}, \quad (5.6)$$

where  $\langle \mathcal{R}^{-1}(x) \rangle$  corresponds to the average inverse jet response. This procedure requires that the correction for a given variable  $x_i$  ( $C_i$ ) is calculated using jets to which the correction for the previous variable  $x_{i-1}$  ( $C_{i-1}$ ) has already been applied. The jet  $p_T$  after the correction  $i$  is defined as

$$p_T^i = C_i(x_i) \times p_T^{i-1} = C_i(x_i) \times C_{i-1}(x_{i-1}) \times p_T^{i-2} = \dots \quad (5.7)$$

By applying these corrections to the jet  $p_T$ , the dependencies between the jet response and the variables are removed, translating in a reduction of the spread of the reconstructed jet  $p_T$  without changing its average energy.

The first of the two extra corrections applied to the dijet mass is called muon-in-jet correction. This correction is motivated by the presence of a muon when a  $b$ -quark decays semileptonically and it improves the  $m_{bb}$  resolution by 12 % which respect to the one given by LCW+JES+GSC jets. It adds the energy from the muons reconstructed within jets to the total energy of the jet, after subtracting the muons energy deposit in the calorimeter. Muons are considered for this correction if they have  $p_T > 4$  GeV and are within  $\Delta R < 0.4$  of the  $b$ -tagged jet.

The other correction, called reconstruction correction, is applied to compensate for the bias introduced by the underlying jet  $p_T$  spectrum in the average jet response function. It is derived from simulated  $ZH \rightarrow llb\bar{b}$  events by comparing the truth and the reconstructed jet  $p_T$ . This correction is parametrized as a function of the reconstructed  $p_T$  and it is defined as

$$\mathcal{C}_{p_T-reco}(p_T^{reco}) = \left\langle \frac{p_T^{truth}}{p_T^{reco}} \right\rangle. \quad (5.8)$$

Applying this corrections to GSC calibrated jets, make them vary their  $p_T$  around 5 % for  $p_T > 60$  GeV and increasing up to 15 % for lower energies. This correction adds an extra 2 % improvement to the  $m_{bb}$  resolution.

Figure 5.14 illustrates the impact of the different corrections in the dijet mass resolution for one of the analysis distributions. The dijet mass resolution for the signal is improved by 14 % after all these corrections.




Figure 5.14: Dijet mass distribution for the decay products of a Higgs boson with  $m_H = 125$  GeV in the 2-lepton analysis selection (see Chapter 6). In solid line the distribution using  $b$ -jets with the global sequential calibration (GSC), dash line if jets have also the muon-in-jet correction and dash-dotted line if the resolution correction is also applied.

## 5.7 Missing transverse energy $E_T^{\text{miss}}$

The missing transverse energy  $E_T^{\text{miss}}$  is defined as the momentum imbalance in the plane transverse to the beam axis. The reconstruction of the  $E_T^{\text{miss}}$  [73, 74] uses the energy deposits in the calorimeters and the momentum measured in the muon spectrometer. The calorimeter part is estimated associating the energy cell to a reconstructed and calibrated object in the following order: electrons, photons, hadronically decaying  $\tau$ -leptons and jets. The different calorimeter terms used in the estimation of the  $E_T^{\text{miss}}$  are:

- $E_{x(y)}^{\text{miss,e}}$ : is reconstructed from cells in clusters associated to *medium* electrons with  $p_T > 10$  GeV.
- $E_{x(y)}^{\text{miss},\gamma}$ : corresponds to cluster cells associated to photons passing a *tight* identification criteria and with  $p_T > 10$  GeV [62].
- $E_{x(y)}^{\text{miss},\tau}$ : is reconstructed from cell cluster calibrated at the LCW-scale associated with hadronically decaying  $\tau$ -leptons passing a *tight* identification criteria and with  $p_T > 10$  GeV [75].
- $E_{x(y)}^{\text{miss,jets}}$ : is reconstructed from LCW calibrated cells using the anti- $k_T$  algorithm with an  $R = 0.6$ . Jets are required to have  $p_T > 20$  GeV.

## CHAPTER 5. PHYSIC OBJECTS RECONSTRUCTION AND IDENTIFICATION

---

- $E_{x(y)}^{\text{miss,SoftTerm}}$ : contains the LCW calibrated cluster energies not associated with any object, the contributions from jets with  $7 < p_T < 20$  GeV and reconstructed tracks with  $p_T > 400$  MeV. Track momenta is added to account for low- $p_T$  particles that do not reach the calorimeter or do not have enough energy to seed a topo-cluster.
- $E_{x(y)}^{\text{miss},\mu}$ : corresponds to the  $p_T$  lost by muons in the calorimeter. As will be explained below, this contribution is sometimes not taken into account in favor of precise muon momentum measurements performed with the muon spectrometer.

In the case of the muons, two different procedures are applied to properly deal with its energy deposited in the calorimeter. If the muon is isolated, its momentum is taken from the measurement of the muon spectrometer and the inner detector (see Section 5.3), not considering the energy it deposits in the calorimeter. On the other hand, when the muon is non-isolated the energy it deposits in the calorimeter is considered, and the  $p_T$  measured by the MS is added. Finally, in the region  $2.5 < |\eta| < 2.7$ , where there is no coverage of the ID, the  $p_T$  measured by the MS is used for both isolated and non-isolated muons.

The  $E_T^{\text{miss}}$  is defined as the negative vector sum of the physics objects in the event, thus its x and y components can be expressed as

$$E_{x(y)}^{\text{miss}} = E_{x(y)}^{\text{miss,e}} + E_{x(y)}^{\text{miss},\gamma} + E_{x(y)}^{\text{miss},\tau} + E_{x(y)}^{\text{miss,jets}} + E_{x(y)}^{\text{miss,SoftTerm}} + E_{x(y)}^{\text{miss},\mu}. \quad (5.9)$$

Using its  $x$  and  $y$  components, the  $E_T^{\text{miss}}$  and its azimuthal coordinate ( $\phi^{\text{miss}}$ ) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} E_T^{\text{miss}} &= \sqrt{(E_x^{\text{miss}})^2 + (E_y^{\text{miss}})^2} \\ \phi^{\text{miss}} &= \arctan(E_x^{\text{miss}}, E_y^{\text{miss}}). \end{aligned} \quad (5.10)$$

## Chapter 6

# Search for the Standard Model Higgs boson in the VH production channel $ZH \rightarrow \nu\nu b\bar{b}$

At the LHC, the highest Higgs boson production rate is given by the gluon-gluon fusion initiated process  $ggF \rightarrow H \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ . However, the search and study of the Higgs boson in this process is virtually impossible given the overwhelming background from multijet production. Therefore, the most promising way to study this decay mode is to search for the Higgs production in association with a vector boson  $VH(H \rightarrow b\bar{b})$ .

The search is divided according to the vector boson decay modes in three analysis channels. These channels target the processes  $ZH \rightarrow \nu\nu b\bar{b}$ ,  $WH \rightarrow \nu l b\bar{b}$  and  $ZH \rightarrow ll b\bar{b}$  and present different background compositions. Due to the number of leptons (electrons or muons) in their final states they are referred to as 0-lepton, 1-lepton and 2-lepton channels, respectively. A simultaneous fit to all the channels permits the constrain of the different background processes taking into account properly the correlations.

The  $VH$  search is performed using two independent analysis procedures. The first one selects events by applying cuts on individual kinematic variables and uses the mass of the dijet system of  $b$ -tagged jets as the discriminant variable to search for the Higgs boson. In this document, this procedure is referred to as “dijet mass analysis”. The second relies on multivariate techniques. This procedure uses an algorithm to determine a probability of an event to originate from a signal or background process.

This Chapter is devoted to a detailed description of the 0-lepton dijet mass analysis. As explained, the  $VH$  search is performed combining it with the information from the 1- and 2-leptons channels. The general characteristics of the 1- and 2-leptons analyses are found in Appendix A. Along

with the dijet mass analysis results, this thesis also presents the multivariate results, hence a brief description of this technique is given in Appendix B.

## 6.1 Data samples and trigger selection

The analysis uses all the good data for physics analyses recorded by the ATLAS experiment during Run I. This corresponds to  $4.6 \text{ fb}^{-1}$  and  $20.3 \text{ fb}^{-1}$  at the center-of-mass of  $\sqrt{s} = 7 \text{ TeV}$  and  $\sqrt{s} = 8 \text{ TeV}$ , respectively [76]. Figure 4.10 shows the integrated luminosity as a function of time during the years 2011 and 2012.

This data is selected in the 0-lepton analysis using three different  $E_T^{\text{miss}}$  triggers (see Table 6.1). All of them have a threshold of  $E_T^{\text{miss}} > 80 \text{ GeV}$  in the final level of the trigger chain while having different requirements in the intermediate chain levels L1 and L2 (a detailed description of the Trigger chain is found in Section 4.4). The reason to use three triggers is to maximize the luminosity used in the analysis. There was a brief data taking period where the first bunch crossing of particles could not be used by the  $E_T^{\text{miss}}$  trigger with the loosest requirements (*trigger 1* in Table 6.1). A second trigger (*trigger 2*) was used in this period to minimize the loss of high  $E_T^{\text{miss}}$  data events. This problem was overcome by incorporating a noise suppression tool in the forward region of the calorimeter (*trigger 3*).

|                      | Selection                 | L1 | L2 | EF | Luminosity ( $\text{fb}^{-1}$ ) |
|----------------------|---------------------------|----|----|----|---------------------------------|
| <i>trigger 1</i>     | $E_T^{\text{miss}} < 160$ | 40 | 45 | 80 | 1.92                            |
| <i>trigger 2</i>     | $E_T^{\text{miss}} > 160$ | 50 | 55 | 80 | 2.13                            |
| <i>trigger 3</i> (*) | -                         | 40 | 45 | 80 | 18.13                           |

Table 6.1: The different triggers used in the analysis, the  $E_T^{\text{miss}}$  requirements, the threshold values and associated luminosities. All threshold and selection values are presented in GeV. (\*) Trigger with the noise suppression in the forward region of the calorimeter.

### 6.1.1 Trigger efficiency

To study the efficiency of the  $E_T^{\text{miss}}$  triggers, unbiased samples of  $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$  and  $W \rightarrow \mu\nu$  events are used. Both simulated and data events samples are used to model the so-called turn-on efficiency curve as a function of the offline  $E_T^{\text{miss}}$ . Figure 6.1 shows the *trigger 3* turn-on curves using SHERPA MC and data samples. This trigger is found to be around 80 % efficient at  $E_T^{\text{miss}} = 120 \text{ GeV}$ , becoming fully efficient at  $E_T^{\text{miss}} = 150 \text{ GeV}$ . The analysis uses the trigger down to  $E_T^{\text{miss}} = 100 \text{ GeV}$ , and relies on the determination of the turn-on curves.

## 6.1. DATA SAMPLES AND TRIGGER SELECTION




Figure 6.1: Trigger efficiency turn-on curves estimated using  $W \rightarrow \mu\nu$  and  $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$  (a) SHERPA MC and (b) data samples.

The trigger efficiency curve is slightly different in data and MC simulation. Therefore, a scale factor (SF) correction is applied to the MC samples. This SF is defined as the ratio between both efficiencies,  $Eff^{Data}/Eff^{MC}$ . Figure 6.2 shows the correction results as a function of the  $E_T^{\text{miss}}$  for the *trigger 3*. In the region  $E_T^{\text{miss}} > 100$  GeV, where the trigger is used, the SF ranges between  $\sim 0.94$  and 1.




Figure 6.2: Calculated scale factor for *trigger 3* (technically named EF\_xe80\_tclcw\_loose) from  $W \rightarrow \mu\nu$  and  $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$  samples.

Correlations between the trigger efficiency as a function of the  $E_T^{\text{miss}}$  and other relevant variables for the analysis are studied. An example of these variables are the  $p_T$  of the jets, the  $\Delta\phi$  between jets, or the dijet invariant

mass  $m_{jj}$ . This study shows a dependency on the sum of the  $p_T$  of the jets. As it is explained in Section 6.5, this dependency is solved by removing the kinematic region, potentially affected by this bias.

## 6.2 Object selection

In this Section, the details on the selection of the physic objects, as described in Chapter 5, are given.

### 6.2.1 Leptons

As mention in Chapter 5, leptons (electrons and muons) are classified in the VH analysis in three different categories according to their purity: loose, medium and tight. The 0-lepton analysis applies a lepton veto by requiring no loose leptons in the events. Loose electrons are considered with  $E_T > 7 \text{ GeV}$  and  $|\eta| < 2.5$ . In the case of the muons, there are three types of loose muons defined according to the reconstruction procedure that is used. This allows a uniform muon reconstruction efficiency across rapidity. Type (1) muons are reconstructed in both the inner detector and the muon spectrometer in the region  $|\eta| < 2.7$  and with  $E_T > 7 \text{ GeV}$ . Type (2) corresponds to muons with  $E_T > 20 \text{ GeV}$  detected in the calorimeter with an associated track in the region  $|\eta| < 0.1$ , to compensate the muon spectrometer coverage there. Finally, type (3) are the muons detected by the muon spectrometer, outside the inner detector coverage, in the range  $2.5 < |\eta| < 2.7$  and with  $E_T > 7 \text{ GeV}$ . Type (1) and (2) are required to have a track impact parameter which respect to the primary vertex smaller than 0.1 mm in the transverse plane and 10 mm along the z-axis.

The leptons generated from the vector boson decays are expected to be isolated. Therefore, a track based isolation is required to the leptons. This requirement uses the variable  $iso_{track}$ , defined as the scalar sum of the transverse momenta of the tracks within a cone of radius 0.2 centered on the lepton track over the lepton  $p_T$ . Leptons with an associated track are required to have  $iso_{track} < 0.1$ . Table 6.2 summarizes all lepton requirements.

### 6.2.2 Jets

Jets are reconstructed from 3D topological clusters using the anti- $k_T$  algorithm with a radius parameter  $R = 0.4$ . Detailed explanation of jet reconstruction and calibration procedure is found in Section 5.4.

The analysis uses two orthogonal jet categories, the *central* and the *forward* jets. The criteria to select them is presented in Table 6.3. The *central* jets are reconstructed in the region  $|\eta| < 2.5$  and are required to have a  $p_T > 20 \text{ GeV}$ . The *forward* jets are selected with  $p_T > 30 \text{ GeV}$  in the region

## 6.2. OBJECT SELECTION

| Flavor<br>Type | Electrons | Muons   |         |                 |
|----------------|-----------|---------|---------|-----------------|
|                |           | (1)     | (2)     | (3)             |
| $ \eta $       | $< 2.5$   | $< 2.7$ | $< 0.1$ | in $[2.5, 2.7]$ |
| $E_T$ (GeV)    | $> 7$     | $> 7$   | $> 20$  | $> 7$           |
| $ d_0 $ (mm)   | –         | $< 0.1$ | $< 0.1$ | –               |
| $ z_0 $ (mm)   | –         | $< 10$  | $< 10$  | –               |
| $iso_{track}$  | $< 0.1$   | $< 0.1$ | $< 0.1$ | –               |

Table 6.2: Loose lepton requirements.

$2.5 < |\eta| < 4.5$ . The *central* jets are used to reconstruct potential Higgs candidates and its multiplicity helps in defining the analysis categories. Events with *forward* jets are discarded to reduce the  $t\bar{t}$  background. In order to suppress fake jets coming from pile-up,  $JVF > 0.5$  (Section 5.4.4) is requested for the *central* jets.

| Type        | Central Jet | Forward Jet     |
|-------------|-------------|-----------------|
| $p_T$ (GeV) | $> 20$      | $> 30$          |
| $ \eta $    | $< 2.5$     | in $[2.5, 4.5]$ |
| $ JVF $     | $> 0.5$     | –               |

Table 6.3: Selection used to define the sets of central and forward jets.

### 6.2.3 b-jets

The  $b$ -jets and the algorithm to define them are key parts of the analysis given the Higgs signature. The identification of a jet being generated by a  $b$ -quark is carried out using the  $b$ -tagging algorithm called MV1c. The *pseudo-continuous tagging* used in the analysis allows to classify the  $b$ -jets according to their purity in *loose*, *medium* and *tight*. A detailed description of the  $b$ -jets identification and calibration can be found in Section 5.6.

#### 6.2.3.1 Parametrized b-tagging

The generation of a large sample of MC events with heavy-flavor jets is demanding. In addition, the MV1c  $b$ -jet mis-tag is small and when this algorithm is applied to the light-jet enriched samples, few events fulfil the  $b$ -jet requirements. Therefore, instead of directly tagging the  $c$ - and *light*-labeled jets with the MV1c algorithm, a parametrization of their probability of being mis-tagged as  $b$ -jets is derived as a function of  $p_T$  and  $\eta$ . This probability is then applied as a weight to the events. This procedure, applied

to some light-jet enriched samples to enlarge their statistics after requiring events with  $b$ -jets, is called *parametrized  $b$ -tagging*.

#### 6.2.4 $E_T^{\text{miss}}$ and track-based missing transverse momenta

The missing transverse momentum is measured from the negative vector sum of the following objects: electrons, photons,  $\tau$ 's, jets, muons, and energy in calorimeter clusters which have not been associated with a reconstructed object. The detailed description of its reconstruction can be found in Section 5.7. The  $E_T^{\text{miss}}$  distribution is a very important quantity in the 0-lepton channel since is the one used to estimate the  $Z$  boson transverse momentum  $p_T^Z$ .

A track-based missing transverse momentum ( $p_T^{\text{miss}}$ ) is also calculated based on the vector sum of the transverse momenta of the tracks associated to the primary vertex. The tracks used fulfil the following requirements:  $p_T > 0.5 \text{ GeV}$ ,  $|\eta| < 2.4$ , pixel hits  $> 0$ , SCT hits  $> 5$ ,  $d_0 < 1.5 \text{ mm}$  and  $z_0 \sin \theta < 1.5 \text{ mm}$ . As will be presented in Section 6.5, a cut on this variable is used to suppress the multijet background production.

### 6.3 Event categorization

The composition of backgrounds varies in the different VH channels, being the most important  $W$ +jets,  $Z$ +jets and  $t\bar{t}$ . The goal of the categorization is to classify the events in regions to study and constrain these backgrounds ("control regions") and isolate the highly sensitive  $S/\sqrt{B}$  regions ("signal regions"). As it is presented in this Section, the construction of the control and signal regions translates into a complex event categorization.

The lepton multiplicity defines the three orthogonal analyses that compose the VH search: no leptons that targets the signal  $ZH \rightarrow \nu\nu bb$ , one lepton for  $WH \rightarrow l\nu bb$  and two leptons for  $ZH \rightarrow llbb$ . In addition, central jets are used to select the events compatible with a Higgs decay. According to their jet multiplicities the events are categorized in 2- or 3- jets regions which helps to isolate regions with a large signal to background ratio. Table 6.4 summarizes these requirements.

| Analysis | Leptons  |           |          | Jets    |         |
|----------|----------|-----------|----------|---------|---------|
|          | VH Loose | VH Medium | VH Tight | Central | Forward |
| 0-lepton | 0        | –         | –        |         |         |
| 1-lepton | 0        | 0         | 1        | 2-3     | 0       |
| 2-lepton | 1        | 1         | –        |         |         |

Table 6.4: Lepton and jet selection for the three VH analyses.

### 6.3. EVENT CATEGORIZATION

To construct the control regions, events are also categorized according to their  $b$ -jet multiplicities in 0-, 1- and 2-tag exclusive regions. Table 6.5 shows for the three lepton channels the main background composition of these  $b$ -jet categories. It can be observed that the main backgrounds of 1- and 2-lepton control regions are  $W$ +jets and  $Z$ +jets, respectively. This makes these categories perfect to study and constrain them. Contrarily, the mixture of backgrounds in the 0-lepton channel makes more difficult to obtain such good constrains in its control regions. Therefore, one of the main motivation of using such a complex categorization is that the  $W$ +jets and  $Z$ +jets constrains obtained from 1- and 2-leptons are then applied to the 0-lepton channel. In particular, to constrain its irreducible  $Z \rightarrow \nu\nu$ +jets background.

|       | 0-lepton   | 1-lepton   | 2-lepton  |
|-------|------------|------------|-----------|
| 0-tag | $Z$ +jets  | $W$ +jets  | $Z$ +jets |
|       | $W$ +jets  |            |           |
| 1-tag | $Z$ +jets  | $W$ +jets  | $Z$ +jets |
|       | $W$ +jets  |            |           |
|       | $t\bar{t}$ |            |           |
| 2-tag | $Z$ +jets  | $W$ +jets  | $Z$ +jets |
|       | $W$ +jets  | $t\bar{t}$ |           |
|       | $t\bar{t}$ |            |           |

Table 6.5: Main background composition of the different lepton channels for the different  $b$ -jet multiplicity categories.

The use of the *pseudo-continuous tagging* allows a further selection in the events with two  $b$ -tag jets in three exclusive categories. This selection is motivated by the higher sensitivity of the tighter  $b$ -tag regions. The different 2-tag categories are: two exclusive loose  $b$ -tags, two exclusive medium  $b$ -tags and two tight  $b$ -tags which are expressed as ‘LL’, ‘MM’ and ‘TT’ respectively. Figure 6.3 summarized the different  $b$ -jet categories using a graphical representation.

A final event categorization is done according to different intervals of the transverse momentum of the recoiling vector boson ( $p_T^V$ ), which in the 0-lepton channel corresponds to the  $E_T^{\text{miss}}$ . This is motivated by the higher sensitivity presented at high  $p_T^V$ . The dijet mass 0-lepton uses four  $p_T^V$  bins:  $100 < p_T^V < 120$  GeV,  $120 < p_T^V < 160$  GeV,  $160 < p_T^V < 200$  GeV and  $p_T^V > 200$  GeV.

Summarizing, the 0-lepton dijet analysis is divided according to the jet multiplicity in 2- and 3-jets and to the  $b$ -jet multiplicity in 1- and 2-tag regions (0-tag control regions are used only for background modeling studies). The 2-tag regions are further split depending on the  $b$ -tag efficiency in




Figure 6.3: A graphical representation of the exclusive  $b$ -tagging categories used. 50 %, 70 %, 80 % and 100 % correspond to the different efficiency values.

2-loose, 2-medium and 2-tight. Finally, all the regions are binned in four  $p_T^V$  regions.

## 6.4 Backgrounds composition

Some Standard Model processes can be mis-identified as the Higgs in association with a vector boson representing backgrounds to the analysis. As mentioned before, the main backgrounds present in this analysis are the production of a vector boson in association with jets ( $V$ +jets) and the top pair production ( $t\bar{t}$ ). Other small contributions include, the diboson production ( $WW$ ,  $ZZ$  and  $WZ$ ), single top production, including the three different production modes ( $s$ -channel,  $t$ -channel and  $Wt$ -channel) and the multijet production.

In the case of the  $V$ +jet backgrounds, the events are categorized according to their jet flavors as it is explained in Section 5.6.2 in:  $Vbb$ ,  $Vbc$ ,  $Vbl$ ,  $Vcc$ ,  $Vcl$  and  $Vll$ . The combination of  $Vbb$ ,  $Vbc$ ,  $Vbl$  and  $Vcc$  is denoted as vector boson plus heavy flavors  $V + hf$ .

The background processes composition varies with the  $p_T^V$  region, with the jet multiplicity, and with the  $b$ -tagging category considered. In general, the 2-jet, tight  $b$ -tagging and high  $p_T^V$  categories have higher sensitivity  $S/\sqrt{B}$  compared to 3-jet, loose  $b$ -tagging and low  $p_T^V$  categories. Figure 6.4 shows the  $p_T^V$  and dijet mass distributions for some selected regions or combination of them to illustrate the background composition of the analysis. As anticipated, the main backgrounds are  $Zbb$ ,  $t\bar{t}$  and, less significant  $Wbb$ . The  $Zbb$  contribution arises from  $Z \rightarrow \nu\nu$  events in addition to the extra radiated  $b$ -jets which mimic the signal signature  $ZH \rightarrow \nu\nu bb$ . In the case of the  $Wbb$  in  $W \rightarrow l\nu$ +jets processes, their contribution to the total background is less than the  $Zbb$  one, since the lepton should be first produced outside of the detector acceptance or not identified to mimic the signal sig-

## 6.4. BACKGROUNDS COMPOSITION

nature. The  $t\bar{t}$  contribution arises from the top-quark decays via the process  $t \rightarrow Wb \rightarrow l\nu b$ . When both leptons are not identified, events could mimic the signal as well. The relative  $t\bar{t}$  contribution changes, being larger in the low  $p_T^V$  and in the 3-jet categories.




Figure 6.4: Dijet mass and  $p_T^V$  distributions in data (points with error bars) and simulation (histograms) with Medium (MM) and Tight (TT) categories combined. The  $p_T^V$  distribution for (a) 2-jet region and the dijet mass distribution for the (b) 2-jet region in the  $100 < p_T^V < 120$  GeV interval, the (c) 2-jet region in the three intervals with  $p_T^V > 120$  GeV combined and the (d) 3-jet region in the three intervals with  $p_T^V > 120$  GeV combined.

## 6.5 Kinematic selection

To suppress the backgrounds and increase the sensitivity  $S/\sqrt{B}$  of the analysis, an event kinematic selection is applied. The full list of event selection criteria is given in Table 6.6. Common to all regions is a requirement on the leading jet to have  $p_T^{j_1} > 45$  GeV. Requirements, optimized for each  $p_T^V$  interval, are also applied to the angular separation between the two jets of the dijet system  $\Delta R(jet_1, jet_2)$ . The requirement on the minimum value reduces the background from  $V$ +jet production, while the requirement on the maximum value, which reduces the background from  $t\bar{t}$  production, is tightened with increasing  $p_T^V$  to take advantage of the increasing collimation of the dijet system for the signal. The  $\Delta\phi(V, H)$  variable accounts for the separation between the vector boson and the Higgs candidate (H), the latter reconstructed from vectorial sum of the two leading  $p_T$  jets. As mentioned before, correlation studies between relevant variables and the trigger efficiency show a dependence with the sum of the  $p_T$  of the jets ( $\sum p_T^{j_i}$ ). Therefore, to have a fully efficient trigger,  $\sum p_T^{j_i} > 120(150)$  GeV is required in events with 2-jets (3-jets) and  $p_T^V > 120$  GeV. The rest of the cuts presented in the table are done to suppress the multijet contribution. For events with  $p_T^V > 120$  GeV a  $p_T^{\text{miss}} > 30$  GeV, a  $\Delta\phi(E_T^{\text{miss}}, p_T^{\text{miss}})$  and a  $\Delta\phi(E_T^{\text{miss}}, jets)$  cuts are sufficient to suppress most of it. Instead for  $p_T^V < 120$  GeV regions, multijet events present different kinematics and those cuts suppress the signal. Therefore, the requirements are made on the  $\Delta\phi(jet_1, jet_2)$ , the  $E_T^{\text{miss}}\text{Sig}$ , defined as  $E_T^{\text{miss}}/\sqrt{p_{Tj_1} + p_{Tj_2}}$ , and the output variable of a likelihood-based technique. This technique uses four variables (explained below) to build a multijet background discriminator, giving as output values between 0 and 1, where multijets events are expected to give values close to 0. The variables used to build this likelihood are  $\Delta\phi(jet_1, jet_2)$ ,  $\Delta\phi(V, H)$ , the  $p_T$  of the sum of the two leading jets,  $p_T^{j_1+j_2}$ , and the ratio of this variable and the scalar sum  $p_T$  of the jets,  $p_T^{j_1+j_2}/(p_T^{j_1} + p_T^{j_2})$ .

## 6.6 Background Monte Carlo samples

Background event samples are generated using MC techniques, as explained in Chapter 2, where detailed information of the simulation of the events and the programs used is presented. A complete list of the generators utilized in the different processes can be found in Table 6.7. As an exception, multijet samples are generated using data-driven techniques as will be explained in Section 6.8.

To simulate all  $W$ +jets and  $Z$ +jets at Leading-Order (LO) in QCD, the SHERPA generator with CT10 parton distribution functions (PDFs) [77] is used. The other main background,  $t\bar{t}$ , is generated using POWHEG with

| Variable                             | Dijet Mass Analysis |         |           |       |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------|---------|-----------|-------|
| $p_T^V$ (GeV)                        | 100-120             | 120-160 | 160-200   | > 200 |
| $\Delta R(jet_1, jet_2)$             | 0.7-3.0             | 0.7-2.3 | 0.7-1.8   | < 1.4 |
| $\Delta\phi(V, H)$                   | >2.2                |         | > 2.8     |       |
| $\sum p_T^{j_i} N_{jet} = 2$         |                     |         | > 120     |       |
| $\sum p_T^{j_i} N_{jet} = 3$         |                     |         | > 150     |       |
| $p_T^{miss}$ (GeV)                   |                     |         | > 30      |       |
| $\Delta\phi(E_T^{miss}, p_T^{miss})$ |                     |         | < $\pi/2$ |       |
| $\Delta\phi(E_T^{miss}, jets)$       |                     |         | > 1.5     |       |
| $\Delta\phi(jet_1, jet_2)$           | <2.7                |         |           |       |
| $E_T^{miss} \text{Sig}$              | >7.0                |         |           |       |
| Likelihood                           | >0.5                |         |           |       |
| $p_T^{j_1}$ (GeV)                    |                     |         | > 45      |       |

Table 6.6: Event kinematic selection applied in the 0-lepton analysis.

CT10 PDFs, interfaced with PYTHIA6 with CTEQ6L1 PDFs [78] and the Perugia2011C tune [79, 80]. The tune indicates the parametrization used in the simulation of the parton shower, the hadronization and the underlying event. Theoretical cross sections at Next-to-Next-to-Leading-Order (NNLO) for both  $V$ +jets [81] and  $t\bar{t}$  [82] are used to initially normalize the samples and to optimize the selection, although most of the final normalizations are then constrained from data in the analysis.

The single-top-quark background is formed by the  $s$ -channel and  $t$ -channel exchange processes and  $Wt$  production. The  $s$ -channel and  $Wt$  processes are simulated using POWHEG, while  $t$ -channel uses ACERMC and all are interfaced with PYTHIA6 with CTEQ6L1 PDFs and the Perugia2011C tune. Diboson processes are generated using POWHEG with CT10 PDFs and are interfaced with PYTHIA8 with the AU2 tune [79, 80]. The single-top-quark and diboson cross sections used to normalize the samples are taken from Ref. [83, 84, 85] and Ref. [86], respectively.

## 6.7 Background modeling

This Section presents the background modeling studies performed in order to validate the different MC simulations of the main background processes. Corrections to improve the description of data distributions are extracted when is needed. Modeling uncertainties associated to each background process are presented in Section 6.9.

| Process                     | Generator      |
|-----------------------------|----------------|
| Vector boson + jets         |                |
| $Z \rightarrow \nu\nu$      | SHERPA         |
| $W \rightarrow l\nu$        | SHERPA         |
| $Z/\gamma^* \rightarrow ll$ | SHERPA         |
| Top-quark                   |                |
| $t\bar{t}$                  | POWHEG+PYTHIA  |
| s-channel                   | POWHEG+PYTHIA  |
| Wt-channel                  | POWHEG+PYTHIA  |
| t-channel                   | ACERMC+PYTHIA  |
| Di-boson                    |                |
| $WW$                        | POWHEG+PYTHIA8 |
| $WZ$                        | POWHEG+PYTHIA8 |
| $ZZ$                        | POWHEG+PYTHIA8 |

Table 6.7: Monte Carlo generators used to simulate the most relevant background processes in the analysis.

### 6.7.1 Vector Boson+jets

The modeling studies of the  $W$ +jets and  $Z$ +jets backgrounds are performed using 1- and 2-lepton control regions, respectively. As explained before, these regions allow more precise constrain of these backgrounds than the one given by the 0-lepton.

**$W$ +jets:** Several studies show a mis-modeling of the  $W$  boson  $p_T$  ( $p_T^W$ ) in the SHERPA MC with respect to data for  $W$ +jets as can be seen in Figure 6.5(a). It is found that this mis-modeling is strongly correlated with the  $\Delta\phi(jet_1, jet_2)$  distribution (Figure 6.6). Its origin is related with the usage of a LO order generator and a parton shower that gives a poor description of the kinematics in events with multiple jets in their final states. The solution applied to solve the mis-modeling is a re-weighting correction. This is extracted from a parameterized fit to the ratio of data to MC in the  $\Delta\phi(jet_1, jet_2)$  distribution in 0-tag events. The kinematics of the events are different depending on the jet multiplicity and the  $p_T^V$ , thus four different re-weighting functions are derived for 2- and 3-jet, and for  $p_T^W > 120$  GeV and  $p_T^W < 120$  GeV regions. The contribution of heavy components in the regions used to extract the correction is negligible, therefore the re-weighting is only applied to  $Wl$  and  $Wcl$  components in the MCs in all regions and channels. This correction typically ranges between 0.9 and 1.1, depending on the  $\Delta\phi(jet_1, jet_2)$  value. Figure 6.5 shows the  $p_T^W$  distribution before and after applying the correction. The impact of the re-weighting in the 2-jet category is to increase the  $p_T^W$  normalization by 7% in the  $p_T^W < 120$  GeV

## 6.7. BACKGROUND MODELING

regions and reduce it by 5.8 % for  $p_T^W > 120$  GeV. In the 3-jet category, the corresponding increase and decrease are 5.8 % and 2 %, respectively.




Figure 6.5:  $p_T^W$  distribution for the 2-jet 0-tag control region of the 1-lepton, (a) before and (b) after the  $\Delta\phi(jet_1, jet_2)$  re-weighting.




Figure 6.6:  $\Delta\phi(jet_1, jet_2)$  distribution for the 2-jet 0-tag control region of the 1-lepton with all  $p_T^W$  regions combined, (a) before and (b) after re-weighting.

**Z+jets:** A mis-modeling is also observed in the  $Z$  boson  $p_T$  ( $p_T^Z$ ) distributions. The origin is the same as in the  $p_T^W$ , but the  $\Delta\phi(jet_1, jet_2)$  correction is not enough to mitigate it and, on top of it, an extra correction is

applied to the  $p_T^Z$  distributions. As in the previous case, the  $\Delta\phi(jet_1, jet_2)$  correction is derived from 0-tag 2-lepton distributions and applied to  $Zl$  events. The second correction is applied to  $Zc$  and  $Zb$  events and it is derived from the  $p_T^Z$  2-tag 2-lepton distribution. In this case, the 100–150 GeV dijet mass interval is excluded to avoid any bias in the region where the Higgs signal is expected.

In order to construct the  $Vl$  and  $Vc$  backgrounds with  $b$ -jets out of the inclusive sample, the *parametrized  $b$ -tagging* is applied (see Section 6.2.3.1). The strong dependence in  $Vcc$  events between the tagging efficiency and the  $\Delta R$  (the angular separation between the tagged jet and the closest other jet) produces a mis-modeling in the  $\Delta R$  distribution once the *parametrized  $b$ -tagging* is used. A correction on the  $\Delta R < 1$  is applied to  $Vcc$  events to mitigate it.

### 6.7.2 $t\bar{t}$

The  $t\bar{t}$  background is a process extensively studied in ATLAS. Some of these studies have shown a disagreement which is consistent with the top  $p_T$  being too hard in simulation [87]. The disagreement arises from the difficulties to simulate the kinematics of  $t\bar{t}$  events with additional jets in their final state, specially the high jet  $p_T$  spectrum. Analysis results present the same trend as the one shown by the ATLAS 7 TeV unfolded measurement in Figure 6.7. Therefore the distribution is used to derive a re-weighting correction that is applied to the average top  $p_T$  distributions. The correction applied corresponds to the ratio between POWHEG+HERWIG and data which corrects the top  $p_T$  distribution by few percent.




Figure 6.7: The ATLAS 7 TeV  $t\bar{t}$   $p_T^{top}$  unfolded result taken from Ref. [88] used to re-weight the  $p_T^{top}$  distribution in the analysis.

### 6.7.3 Diboson

The diboson background includes the processes which originate two vector bosons in their final state ( $WW$ ,  $WZ$  and  $ZZ$ ). From these processes the one which most contributes to the 0-lepton background is the  $ZZ \rightarrow \nu\nu b\bar{b}$ . The cross section of  $V(Z \rightarrow b\bar{b})$  is about 5 times the Higgs one, making the diboson background a perfect candidate to validate the analysis against a known process. In order to construct the  $WW$  background with  $b$ -jets out of the inclusive sample, the *parametrized  $b$ -tagging* is applied.

## 6.8 Multijet Background

The multijet background (MJ) mostly arises from pure QCD processes. Most of the 0-lepton MJ contribution comes from ‘fake’  $E_T^{\text{miss}}$  measurement provoked by large fluctuations in the jet energy measurement in the calorimeters. Although, the probability of this to happen is low, the huge cross sections of the processes produces a sizable amount of events passing the selection. Simulating the events is not practical thus a data-driven ABCD method is used to estimate the contribution in the different analysis regions.

The ABCD method divides the data in four orthogonal regions, the signal region used in the analysis and three where the MJ is the dominant background. Cuts in  $\Delta\phi(E_T^{\text{miss}}, p_T^{\text{miss}})$  and  $\min[\Delta\phi(E_T^{\text{miss}}, jet)]$  distributions are used to define the regions. As an exception, in the  $100 < p_T^V < 120$  GeV regions the  $\min[\Delta\phi(E_T^{\text{miss}}, jet)]$  distribution is substituted for the Likelihood variable used to suppress the MJ describe in Section 6.5. Correlations of these variables have been probed to be weak. Kinematics of events with no ‘fake’  $E_T^{\text{miss}}$  are expected to have the directions of  $E_T^{\text{miss}}$  and  $p_T^{\text{miss}}$  similar. On the other hand, events with ‘fake’  $E_T^{\text{miss}}$  are expected to have the direction of the  $E_T^{\text{miss}}$  closer to the direction of the badly measured jet. Therefore, the regions are defined as follows:

- A:  $\min[\Delta\phi(E_T^{\text{miss}}, jet)] > 1.5$ ,  $\Delta\phi(E_T^{\text{miss}}, p_T^{\text{miss}}) < \pi/2$
- B:  $\min[\Delta\phi(E_T^{\text{miss}}, jet)] < 0.4$ ,  $\Delta\phi(E_T^{\text{miss}}, p_T^{\text{miss}}) < \pi/2$
- C:  $\min[\Delta\phi(E_T^{\text{miss}}, jet)] > 1.5$ ,  $\Delta\phi(E_T^{\text{miss}}, p_T^{\text{miss}}) > \pi/2$
- D:  $\min[\Delta\phi(E_T^{\text{miss}}, jet)] < 0.4$ ,  $\Delta\phi(E_T^{\text{miss}}, p_T^{\text{miss}}) > \pi/2$

The contribution of MJ events in the signal region A is then computed using the relation expressed in Eq. 6.1 which assumes that the fraction of events between region A and C is conserved in B and D. The number of events suffers from low statistics in all regions after the 2-tag requirement. To increase them and allow a robust estimation, the  $b$ -tagging requirements

are dropped from B, C and D, as well as the  $\Delta R$  cuts (see Section 6.5) from B and D regions. To properly estimate the multijet contribution, the effect of the  $b$ -tagging requirement is recovered by applying a normalization factor  $R$ . This factor is defined as the ratio of events before and after requiring 2-tag in the region D.

$$N_{MJ}(A) = N(C) \times \frac{N(B)}{N(D)} \times R \quad (6.1)$$

The ABCD method estimates a MJ contribution that ranges between 0.5 % and 2 % of the total background depending on the analysis region. By varying the cuts to define the regions and the normalization factor  $R$  a systematic uncertainty of 100 % is assigned to the estimation.

## 6.9 Uncertainties on the modeling of the backgrounds

This Section presents all the systematics uncertainties related with the modeling of the background processes. These uncertainties are associated with both the corrections applied to some processes described in Section 6.7, and the choice of the MC generators. Uncertainties quoted in this Section correspond to the  $1\sigma$  prior assigned before the fit to the data.

The different studies to estimate the uncertainties are performed when possible in data control regions where the relative contribution of the process under study is large. This is the case for  $Z$ +jets,  $W$ +light jets and  $t\bar{t}$  backgrounds. When no control regions with enough purity of the process under study are found, uncertainty estimations are performed using different MC generator programs. This is the case for single top,  $W$ +heavy jets and diboson processes.

The uncertainty associated with the choice of generator is obtained from differences observed using different PDFs, from variation of the renormalization ( $\mu_R$ ) and factorization ( $\mu_F$ ) scales or from different tunes used to simulate the hard process, the parton shower or the underlying event.

There are several types of systematics. The most generic accounts for possible variations in the overall normalization of a distribution. The uncertainties that accounts for possible migration of events across bins in a distribution are classified as shape uncertainties. This uncertainty is typically estimated for the discriminant variable of the analysis  $m_{bb}$  and some  $p_T^V$  distributions. Finally, an uncertainty accounts for migration of events across analysis categories or  $V$ +jets contributions. E.g. a 3-to-2-jet ratio uncertainty takes into account the possible migration of 3-jet events to the 2-jet region and vice versa. Another example is the uncertainty that accounts for migration of  $Wbl$  events to a  $Wbb$  distribution and vice versa.

## 6.9. UNCERTAINTIES ON THE MODELING OF THE BACKGROUNDS

---

All background modeling systematics that are going to be discussed below are summarized in Table 6.8.

### 6.9.1 V+jets modeling systematics

As previously explained, a  $\Delta\phi(jet_1, jet_2)$  and  $p_T^Z$  corrections are applied to the  $V$ +jets backgrounds. In the case of the  $W$ +jets contributions, the correction is applied only to  $Wl$  and  $Wcl$  components where half of it is assigned as systematic. Although, no correction is applied on  $Wcc$  and  $Wbb$  backgrounds, in order to account for any residual effect, a systematic equal to the full correction to the light components is assigned to these heavy flavor contributions. The  $Z$ +jets contributions are instead re-weighted with two corrections. A systematic uncertainty equal to half of the  $\Delta\phi(jet_1, jet_2)$  correction is applied to  $Zl$  components and equal to the full correction if the components are  $Zc$  or  $Zb$ . To account for the  $p_T^Z$  corrections another set of systematics equal to half of the correction are assigned to  $Zl$  and  $Zc$  or  $Zb$ .

The normalization and the 3-to-2-jet ratio for the  $Wl$  background are taken directly from simulation, both with a 10 % uncertainty. This is based on the agreement observed between data and simulation in the 0-tag regions. Same 10 % systematic is assigned to the 3-to-2-jet ratio in  $Wcl$  background. In the case of  $Zl$ , the normalization and the 3-to-2-jet ratio uncertainties are estimated from data in 0-tag regions, both with an uncertainty of 5 %. The 3-to-2-jet ratios uncertainties for the  $Zcl$ ,  $Zhf$  and  $Whf$  are estimated comparing events generated with SHERPA with samples generated with POWHEG+PYTHIA8, ALPGEN+HERWIG and MC@NLO+HERWIG or ALPGEN. Uncertainties are estimated to be 26 % for  $Zcl$ , 20 % for  $Zhf$  and 10 % for  $Whf$ .

The parton shower and hadronization modeling could have an impact in the relative flavor composition of the samples. Comparison between different generators are also used to estimated the systematic uncertainties associated with the effect. The uncertainties assigned to the  $Whf$  samples are 35 % for  $bl/bb$  and 12 % for each of  $bc/bb$  and  $cc/bb$ . In the case of  $Zhf$  samples the error are 12 % for each of  $bl/bb$ ,  $cc/bb$  and  $bc/bb$ , with  $bl/bb$ .

In  $W$ +jets the shape uncertainties assigned to the  $m_{bb}$  and  $p_T^V$  distributions are estimated by comparison of MC generators. This comparison estimates that the  $m_{bb}$  can increase at 50 GeV up to 23 % and decrease at 200 GeV down to 28 %. This  $m_{bb}$  shape variation impacts the  $p_T^W$  shape and uncertainties are also estimated for this distribution, 9 % increase at  $p_T^W = 50$  GeV and a 23 % decrease at  $p_T^W = 200$  GeV. Also  $m_{bb}$  shape systematics are estimated in  $Z$ +jets by comparing data and simulation. The numbers are 3 % increase at 50 GeV and a decrease of 5 % at 200 GeV.

CHAPTER 6. SEARCH FOR THE STANDARD MODEL HIGGS  
BOSON IN THE VH PRODUCTION CHANNEL  $ZH \rightarrow \nu\nu BB$

---

| $Z$ +jets                            |                                        |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|
| $Zl$ normalization, 3/2-jet ratio    | 5%                                     |
| $Zcl$ 3/2-jet ratio                  | 26%                                    |
| $Z$ +hf 3/2-jet ratio                | 20%                                    |
| $Z$ +hf/ $Zbb$ ratio                 | 12%                                    |
| $\Delta\phi$ , $p_T^V$ , $m_{bb}$    | S                                      |
| $W$ +jets                            |                                        |
| $Wl$ normalization, 3/2-jet ratio    | 10%                                    |
| $Wcl$ , $W$ +hf 3/2-jet ratio        | 10%                                    |
| $Wbl/Wbb$ ratio                      | 35%                                    |
| $Wbc/Wbb$ , $Wcc/Wbb$ ratio          | 12%                                    |
| $\Delta\phi$ , $p_T^V$ , $m_{bb}$    | S                                      |
| $t\bar{t}$                           |                                        |
| 3/2-jet ratio                        | 20%                                    |
| High/low- $p_T^V$ ratio              | 7.5%                                   |
| Top-quark $p_T$ , $m_{bb}$           | S                                      |
| Single top                           |                                        |
| Cross section                        | 4% ( $s$ -, $t$ -channel), 7% ( $Wt$ ) |
| Acceptance (generator)               | 3%–52%                                 |
| $m_{bb}$ , $p_T^{b_2}$               | S                                      |
| Diboson                              |                                        |
| Cross section and acceptance (scale) | 3%–29%                                 |
| Cross section and acceptance (PDF)   | 2%–4%                                  |
| $m_{bb}$                             | S                                      |
| Multijet                             |                                        |
| Normalization                        | 100%                                   |

Table 6.8: Summary of the systematic uncertainties on the background modeling. An “S” symbol is used when shape uncertainties are assessed. The % corresponds to the  $1\sigma$  prior estimated for the systematic as input to the fit.

### 6.9.2 $t\bar{t}$ and single-top modeling systematics

The  $t\bar{t}$  process presents mis-modelings corrected by re-weighting the average top  $p_T$ . Half of this correction is assigned as a systematic uncertainty to  $t\bar{t}$  events.

The  $t\bar{t}$  is normalized from a fit to data, although the 3-to-2-jet ratio is obtained from the MC, and an uncertainty of 20 % is assigned. From comparison of generator predictions, an extra 7.5 % error is also applied to the  $p_T^V > 120$  GeV regions. These comparisons are carried out between the nominal generator POWHEG+PYTHIA with MC@NLO+HERWIG, POWHEG+HERWIG, ACERMC+PYTHIA and ALPGEN+PYTHIA. In general, higher discrepancies are observed with ALPGEN and are those the one used to estimate the systematic uncertainties.

Shape uncertainties on the  $m_{bb}$  distribution are also estimated by comparing the predictions from the MC generators. In the  $t\bar{t}$ , the shape increases  $m_{bb}$  by 3 % at 50 GeV while decreases by 1 % at 200 GeV in the 2-jet regions. In 3-jet events, the result is the same but with opposite signs.

The single top components  $s$ -channel,  $t$ -channel and  $Wt$ -channel are determined with a cross section production uncertainty of 4 %, 4 % and 7 %, respectively [89]. Studies using different event generators show discrepancies in the acceptance of the events. These discrepancies are taken as normalization systematics and they can be as large as 52 % for 2-jet events in the  $t$ -channel, of the order of 5 % for  $Wt$ -channel or 20 % for the  $s$ -channel.

For single top, the  $m_{bb}$  shape systematic is estimated by comparing the predictions from different generators. The only non-negligible contribution arises for  $Wt$ -channel events with  $p_T^V > 120$  GeV. The uncertainty is estimated to increase the rate by 20 % at 50 GeV and decrease it by 40 % at 200 GeV. For 3-jet it was estimated that the corresponding shifts are 25 % and 20 %. Finally, a third uncertainty is needed for the  $p_T$  distribution of the second-leading jet in  $p_T^V < 120$  GeV and 2-jet regions.

### 6.9.3 Diboson modeling systematics

The uncertainties on the cross sections for diboson production ( $WW$ ,  $WZ$  and  $ZZ$ ) are assessed at parton level using MCFM [90] at NLO in QCD. Variations in the scales  $\mu_R$  and  $\mu_F$  by factors of 2 or 0.5 lead to normalization uncertainties which range between 3 and 29 % depending on the process and the analysis region. Another set of normalization systematics which range from 2 to 4 % account for the errors in the PDFs.

Finally, a  $m_{bb}$  shape systematic is assigned comparing the results of the  $Z$  line shape in  $VZ$  production given by the difference between the nominal generator POWHEG+PYTHIA8 and HERWIG. The difference between the shapes is of 20 % for  $m_{bb} = 125$  GeV.

## 6.10 Experimental uncertainties

The relevant experimental systematic uncertainties that are taken into account come from: the luminosity estimation, the trigger selection, the physics object reconstruction, identification, momentum and energy resolution and calibration. From all of them, the ones with higher impact in the analysis are those associated with the  $b$ -tagging efficiency and the jet energy scale (JES), both explained in detail in this Section.

The uncertainty on the  $\sqrt{s} = 8$  TeV luminosity is 2.8 % [53] and it is applied to the simulated signal and backgrounds (except from multijet estimated from data). An additional 4 % error is also applied to these samples to account for the pile-up correction.

Two sources of uncertainty associated with  $E_T^{\text{miss}}$  trigger selection are applied. These uncertainties arise from the method to estimate the trigger efficiency (Section 6.1), one to account for the statistical uncertainty of the method and a second for the differences observed in the two event classes used,  $W \rightarrow \mu\nu$  and  $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ . Their combination gives a relative uncertainty of the order of 3 % of the total background in the  $100 < p_T^V < 120$  GeV region and below 1 % for  $p_T^V > 120$  GeV.

The impact of systematic uncertainties for electron and muon reconstruction, identification and isolation efficiencies are very small, less than 1 %. The uncertainty associated with the lepton veto efficiency applied in the 0-lepton analysis is negligible.

The jet energy scale uncertainty [66] gathers different sources of systematics coming from the jet calibration. These are related with the pile-up dependent corrections, the flavor composition of jets in different event classes and the in-situ corrections. The sources are separated into uncorrelated components. Typically, the systematic uncertainty on the JES ranges from 3 % to 1 % for a 20 GeV and 1 TeV central jet respectively. The calibration of  $b$ -jets is affected by an additional 1-2 %. The jet energy resolution (JER) uncertainty [91] is also considered and its contribution is separated for jets and  $b$ -jets. The systematic uncertainty on the JER ranges from about 10 to 20 %, depending on the  $\eta$  range, for jets with  $p_T = 20$  GeV to less than 5 % for jets with  $p_T > 200$  GeV. To account for the  $m_{bb}$  resolution improvements, explained in Section 5.6.4, a 0.4 % uncertainty is added to the  $b$ -jets JER contribution.

All the uncertainties presented and related with energy and momentum calibration of the physics objects are propagated to the  $E_T^{\text{miss}}$ . Additional uncertainties on  $E_T^{\text{miss}}$  are estimated from the impact of the variations of the scale (8 %) and resolution (2.5 %) of the energy in calorimeter clusters which have not been associated with a reconstructed object.

As explained in Section 6.2.3,  $b$ -tagging efficiencies for  $b$ -,  $c$ - and light-jets are estimated and corrected to match the data estimation. This MC-to-data corrections are close to unity, with uncertainties that range from 2 % to 3 %

over most of the jet  $p_T$  range, reaching 5 % for  $p_T = 20$  GeV and 8 % above 200 GeV. These uncertainties account for the MC modeling of the  $t\bar{t}$  and background processes utilized for the  $b$ -tagging calibration process, together with detector related ones, such as lepton identification efficiencies, JES calibration, etc. They depend on  $p_T$  and the MV1c weight and they are decomposed into uncorrelated components: 10 components to account for  $b$ -jets, 15 for  $c$ -jets and 10 for light-jets. In addition, half of the MC-to-MC SF (see Section 5.6.2) is applied as an uncertainty.

## 6.11 VH signal characterization

The Standard Model  $VH$  production is dominated by the quark-quark-initiated ( $qq$ ) process (see Figure 6.8a). Additionally, a non-negligible contribution arises from higher orders gluon-gluon-initiated ( $gg$ )  $ZH$  processes (see Figure 6.8b). The 0-lepton analysis tries to target  $ZH \rightarrow \nu\nu b\bar{b}$  but




Figure 6.8: Leading Order Feynman diagrams for (a) quark-quark-initiated  $VH$  production and gluon-gluon-initiated  $ZH$  production.

a few percentage of the total signal contribution arises from  $WH \rightarrow \nu l b\bar{b}$  process due to a production of the lepton outside of the detector acceptance or the presence of a lepton not identified. The acceptance times efficiency of the event selection in the 2-tag signal regions is presented in Table 6.9 for a Higgs of 125 GeV. The contribution from Higgs final state decays different than  $b\bar{b}$  is estimated to be less than 1 %.

CHAPTER 6. SEARCH FOR THE STANDARD MODEL HIGGS  
BOSON IN THE VH PRODUCTION CHANNEL  $ZH \rightarrow \nu\nu BB$

| $m_H = 125 \text{ GeV}$ at $\sqrt{s} = 8 \text{ TeV}$ |                |                         |                                |
|-------------------------------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Signal                                                | Generator      | $\sigma \times BR$ (fb) | Acceptance $\cdot\epsilon$ (%) |
| $q\bar{q} \rightarrow WH \rightarrow \nu lbb$         | PYTHIA8        | 131.7 fb                | 0.3                            |
| $q\bar{q} \rightarrow ZH \rightarrow \nu\nu bb$       | PYTHIA8        | 44.2 fb                 | 3.8                            |
| $gg \rightarrow ZH \rightarrow \nu\nu bb$             | POWHEG+PYTHIA8 | 3.8 fb                  | 5.0                            |

Table 6.9: The 0-lepton analysis signal processes, generators used, cross section times branching ratios and acceptances times efficiencies. The acceptance is calculated as the fraction of events remaining in the combined 2-tag signal regions after the full event selection.

### 6.11.1 Signal Monte Carlo samples and cross section computation

The  $q\bar{q}$ -initiated (W/Z)H events are simulated using PYTHIA8 with the CTEQ6L1 PDFs and the AU2 tune for the parton shower, hadronization, and underlying event. While the QED final-state radiation is simulated using the PHOTOS [92] program. In addition,  $gg$ -initiated ZH and crosschecks to  $q\bar{q}$ -initiated processes are simulated using POWHEG and it is computed at NLO using the Multi-scale improved (MiNLO) [93] to generate  $HW/HZ$  + 0- and 1-jet events. In this case the generator uses the CT10 PDFs and is interfaced with PYTHIA8 with the AU2 tune.

Several signal samples with different Higgs boson masses are simulated within the range 100 to 150 GeV in steps of 5 GeV. Cross sections for all signal masses and processes are taken from Ref. [94] and the branching ratios (BR) are calculated with HDECAY [95]. Table 6.9 presents the cross section times BRs for  $m_H = 125 \text{ GeV}$  processes at 8 TeV. The simulated  $W$  and  $Z$  decays include all charged lepton flavors thus the leptonic  $\tau$  decay can also be selected in the analysis. For the Higgs boson, only the  $b\bar{b}$  decay mode is used in the analysis.

Both  $WH$  and  $ZH$   $q\bar{q}$ -initiated production cross sections and associated uncertainties are computed at the NNLO in QCD [96, 97, 98] and with electroweak corrections at NLO [99]. An additional electroweak NLO normalization-preserving correction as a function of the  $p_T^V$  is applied [100] to better model the recoil between the vector boson and the Higgs. Figure 6.9 shows these corrections and the size of the associated uncertainty. The  $gg$ -initiated ZH are calculated at NLO [101] increasing its cross section at LO by 5%.

### 6.11.2 Signal systematics

A complete study of the systematic uncertainties of the Higgs signal has been performed. Table 6.10 summarizes the uncertainties discussed in this




Figure 6.9: Relative NLO electroweak corrections to  $VH$  cross sections and the size of the associated uncertainties is shown as a function of  $p_T^V$ .

Section. As previously explained, uncertainties quoted in this Section correspond to the  $1\sigma$  prior assigned before the fit to the data.

The uncertainties associated with the cross section computation include those related with the scales  $\mu_R$  and  $\mu_F$ , and the PDFs. In the case of  $qq$ -initiated processes, the uncertainties are estimated to be 1 % and 2.4 %, respectively [102]. For the  $gg$ -initiated process, the same errors are estimated to be 50 % and 17 %. The applied uncertainties on the shape of the  $p_T^V$  spectrum associated with the NLO electroweak corrections range approximately from 2 % at low  $p_T^V$  up to 2.5 % at high  $p_T^V$  (see Figure 6.9). The relative uncertainty on the 125 GeV Higgs boson branching ratio to  $b\bar{b}$  is 3.3 % [95].

Several acceptance uncertainties are estimated comparing the total number of events that pass the event selection once the scales or the PDFs are changed. Variations in the scales  $\mu_R$  and  $\mu_F$  by factors of 2 or 0.5 lead to uncertainties of 3.0 %, 3.4 % and 1.5 % for  $qq \rightarrow WH$ ,  $qq \rightarrow ZH$  and  $gg \rightarrow ZH$  respectively, for the 2- and 3-jet categories combined, and of 4.2 %, 3.6 % and 3.3 % for the 3-jet category.

Since the  $p_T^V$  shape distribution is seen to be affected as well by the variation of the scales, a shape uncertainty is estimated. This systematic produces an increase of the  $p_T^V$  of 1 % at 50 GeV and a decrease of 3 % at 200 GeV in the  $qq \rightarrow (W/Z)H$  samples. The same estimations give 2 % and 8 % respectively for the  $gg \rightarrow ZH$  samples. Finally, acceptance uncertainties are derived varying the PDFs ranging from 2 % in the 2-jet  $gg \rightarrow ZH$  to 5 % in the 3-jet  $qq \rightarrow ZH$ .

The results given by the nominal MC generator used, PYTHIA, and HERWIG are compared to estimate the uncertainties on the parton shower modeling. This gives an acceptance error of 8 %, except in the 3-jet and

CHAPTER 6. SEARCH FOR THE STANDARD MODEL HIGGS  
BOSON IN THE VH PRODUCTION CHANNEL  $ZH \rightarrow \nu\nu BB$

---

| Signal uncertainties              |                             |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Cross section (scale)             | 1% ( $qq$ ), 50% ( $gg$ )   |
| Cross section (PDF)               | 2.4% ( $qq$ ), 17% ( $gg$ ) |
| Branching ratio                   | 3.3 %                       |
| Acceptance (scale)                | 1.5%–3.3%                   |
| 3-jet acceptance (scale)          | 3.3%–4.2%                   |
| $p_T^V$ shape (scale)             | S                           |
| Acceptance (PDF)                  | 2%–5%                       |
| $p_T^V$ shape (NLO EW correction) | S                           |
| Acceptance (parton shower)        | 8%–13%                      |

Table 6.10: Summary of the systematic uncertainties on the signal modeling. An “S” symbol is used when shape uncertainties are assessed. The % corresponds to the  $1\sigma$  prior estimated for the systematic as input to the fit.

$p_T^V > 120$  GeV regions, where the error estimated is 13%.

## Chapter 7

# VH search statistical procedure

This Chapter describes the statistical procedure for the  $VH$  search in the di-jet mass analysis. This combines via a complex fit the information provided by the 0-, 1- and 2-leptons channels described in Chapter 6. As a result of the fit, Higgs signal strength ( $\mu$ ), 95 % CL limits on the signal cross section, and  $p_0$  values for the background-only hypothesis are obtained for the  $VH(H \rightarrow b\bar{b})$  process. All statistical tools used in the search are described in Chapter 3.

### 7.1 Global fit

The statistical procedure combines distributions from the three channels (0-, 1- or 2-lepton) in a global fit performed maximizing a likelihood. Two distributions are used to construct the likelihood: the invariant mass of the two  $b$ -jets  $m_{bb}$  and the  $b$ -tagging MV1c discriminant described in Section 5.6.1. As a reminder, the analysis is divided in three channels, up to five  $p_T^V$  intervals, two jet multiplicities (2 and 3-jet), two  $b$ -jet multiplicities (1- and 2-tag) and three  $b$ -tagging categories (LL, MM and TT) (see Section 6.3).

Distributions are chosen according to the analysis region: the MV1c distribution in 1-tag regions and  $m_{bb}$  distribution in the 2-tag one. Table 7.1 presents a summary of the distributions and the analysis regions. As an exception, the 0-lepton channel low  $p_T^V$  interval (100-120GeV) only uses the 2-jet category since bad modeling is found in the 3-jet one. The use of the MV1c distributions is motivated by the high  $c$ -jet rejection provided by the  $b$ -tagging algorithm. This allows a better constrain of  $V+c$ -jets contributions. The MV1c  $p_T^V$  intervals are combined in the ranges with  $p_T^V < 120$  GeV and  $p_T^V > 120$  GeV. In total, 81  $m_{bb}$  distributions and 11 MV1c distributions are used.

| Channel                           |                | 0-lepton | 1-lepton | 2-lepton |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|----------|----------|----------|
| 2-/3-jet<br><br>$p_T^V$ intervals | 1-tag          | $MV1c$   |          |          |
|                                   | LL             | $m_{bb}$ |          |          |
|                                   | MM 2-tag<br>TT |          |          |          |

Table 7.1: The distributions used in each region by the likelihood fit in the dijet mass analysis for the 8 TeV data. Four  $p_T^V$  intervals are used in the 0-lepton and five in 1- and 2-lepton channels. These distributions are input to the fit for the 2-jet and 3-jet categories separately.

### 7.1.1 Treatment of nuisance parameters

The systematics uncertainties on the signal and the background expectations are described by NPs. The analysis divides them in two types: floating parameters and parameters with priors. A floating parameter is generally associated with the cross section and acceptance where absolute ignorance of the rate is assumed and are completely determined from data. Flat pdfs are used to describe them. On the other hand, when a prior is used, it is assumed that there is a reasonable range within which the true value is believed to lie. When one of this NP could affect the normalization of the expected values, it is described with a log-normal prior. If the NP could affect the shape of the  $m_{bb}$  distribution it is describe with a Gaussian prior. The prior is added as a penalty term to the likelihood,  $L(\mu, \theta)$ . This term decreases as soon as  $\theta$  is shifted away from its nominal value.

The fit is expected to accommodate the values and uncertainties of the NP in order to maximize the likelihood function value. Therefore, the NPs could be pulled away from their initial value and their uncertainty could be reduced with respect to its prior uncertainty. The fit could also developed correlations between initially uncorrelated NPs.

Statistical uncertainties in the MC are estimated to vary the expected significance of the analysis less than 1 %. Therefore, to decrease the number of NPs and computational time, these uncertainties are neglected and only the modeling and experimental uncertainties are taken into account. In total, the fit has to handle almost 170 NPs. Table 7.2 brings together all background and signal modeling systematics and their priors previously described in Sections 6.9 and 6.11.2, respectively. In addition, all experimental uncertainties applied to the analysis were presented in Section 6.10.

### 7.1.2 Background normalizations

The analysis is designed with a complex categorization. This provides distributions to the fit with the statistical power to constrain the backgrounds.

| Signal                               |                                        |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|
| Cross section (scale)                | 1% ( $qq$ ), 50% ( $gg$ )              |
| Cross section (PDF)                  | 2.4% ( $qq$ ), 17% ( $gg$ )            |
| Branching ratio                      | 3.3 %                                  |
| Acceptance (scale)                   | 1.5%–3.3%                              |
| 3-jet acceptance (scale)             | 3.3%–4.2%                              |
| $p_T^V$ shape (scale)                | S                                      |
| Acceptance (PDF)                     | 2%–5%                                  |
| $p_T^V$ shape (NLO EW correction)    | S                                      |
| Acceptance (parton shower)           | 8%–13%                                 |
| $Z$ +jets                            |                                        |
| $Zl$ normalization, 3/2-jet ratio    | 5%                                     |
| $Zcl$ 3/2-jet ratio                  | 26%                                    |
| $Z$ +hf 3/2-jet ratio                | 20%                                    |
| $Z$ +hf/ $Zbb$ ratio                 | 12%                                    |
| $\Delta\phi$ , $p_T^V$ , $m_{bb}$    | S                                      |
| $W$ +jets                            |                                        |
| $Wl$ normalization, 3/2-jet ratio    | 10%                                    |
| $Wcl$ , $W$ +hf 3/2-jet ratio        | 10%                                    |
| $Wbl/Wbb$ ratio                      | 35%                                    |
| $Wbc/Wbb$ , $Wcc/Wbb$ ratio          | 12%                                    |
| $\Delta\phi$ , $p_T^V$ , $m_{bb}$    | S                                      |
| $t\bar{t}$                           |                                        |
| 3/2-jet ratio                        | 20%                                    |
| High/low- $p_T^V$ ratio              | 7.5%                                   |
| Top-quark $p_T$ , $m_{bb}$           | S                                      |
| Single top                           |                                        |
| Cross section                        | 4% ( $s$ -, $t$ -channel), 7% ( $Wt$ ) |
| Acceptance (generator)               | 3%–52%                                 |
| $m_{bb}$ , $p_T^{b_2}$               | S                                      |
| Diboson                              |                                        |
| Cross section and acceptance (scale) | 3%–29%                                 |
| Cross section and acceptance (PDF)   | 2%–4%                                  |
| $m_{bb}$                             | S                                      |
| Multijet                             |                                        |
| Normalization                        | 100%                                   |

Table 7.2: Summary of the systematic uncertainties on the signal and background modeling. An “S” symbol is used when shape uncertainties are assessed. The % corresponds to the  $1\sigma$  prior estimated for the systematic as input to the fit.

Sufficient statistical power is obtained to normalize the  $t\bar{t}$ ,  $Wbb$ ,  $Wcl$ ,  $Zbb$  and  $Zcl$  background contributions with floating parameters (see the  $V$ +jets flavor composition explained in Section 6.4). The rest of the contributions ( $Vl$ , single-top and diboson processes) are constrained within their uncertainties using NP with priors.

The normalizations of the  $Wbb$ ,  $Wcl$ ,  $Zbb$  and  $Zcl$  backgrounds are correlated among channels. Therefore, the normalization of a given process is mainly driven by the distributions in the regions with the highest relative contribution of that process. In the case of the  $Wbb$  and  $Zbb$ , these regions are the ones with 2  $b$ -jets (2-tag) in the 1-lepton and 2-lepton channels, respectively. The  $Wcl$  and  $Zcl$  normalizations are mainly driven by 1-tag distributions in the same channels.

The  $t\bar{t}$  process is normalized independently in each lepton channel using distributions with 2 jets. The reason to uncorrelate it among channels is driven by the fact that the 2-jet samples for each channel are very different. The 0-lepton channel is limited to  $p_T^V > 100$  GeV and mostly accepts  $t\bar{t}$  events coming from  $(W \rightarrow l\nu)b$  (fully leptonic) decays with the two leptons undetected and  $(W \rightarrow qq')b$  (semileptonic) decays with a missed lepton (usually a  $\tau$  lepton) and a missed light-quark jet. The 1-lepton channel is populated by fully leptonic decays with one of the leptons undetected and  $t\bar{t}$  events where one of the top quarks decays fully leptonic and the other semileptonically with a missed light-quark jet. Finally, the 2-lepton channel  $t\bar{t}$  contribution is coming from both top quarks decaying fully leptonically.

### 7.1.3 Higgs signal extraction from data

The Higgs signal strength is obtained from a fit to data ( $\hat{\mu}$ ). The  $\hat{\mu}$  is estimated by maximizing the likelihood with respect to all parameters in the fit. Its uncertainty  $\sigma_\mu$  is obtained by varying the function  $2\ln \tilde{\lambda}(\mu)$  by one unit, and the corresponding  $\mu$  values delimit the  $\pm 1\sigma$  range.

### 7.1.4 Correlation of nuisance parameters

The number of NPs is larger than the sources of systematic uncertainties considered. This comes from the fact that the impact of a NP, a-priori correlated, can be different across background processes or regions with very different kinematics. The solution is to uncorrelate the NP to avoid undesirable constraints in our results. The correlations of the different NPs in the analysis have been carefully designed. An example of this is the uncertainty related with the  $\Delta\phi$  correction applied to  $V$ +jets processes (see Section 6.7.1). Since the correction is estimated independently for events with 2- and 3-jets, the associated NP is uncorrelated between 2- and 3-jets distributions, although the source of the uncertainty is the same.

Another uncorrelation of the same systematic source arises from the  $t\bar{t}$

contributions in the 2-tag 3-jet region for the different channels. In the 0- and 1-lepton channels it is likely that a jet from a  $t \rightarrow b(W \rightarrow qq)$  decay is missed while in the 2-lepton channel it is likely that an ISR or FSR jet is selected. Therefore two NPs are used, one correlated among the 0- and 1-lepton analyses and a second one for the 2-lepton.

### 7.1.5 Technical implementation

The statistical fitting machinery is based on the ROOSTATS framework [103, 104] which implements all the statistical procedures: the construction of the likelihood from the bins of the input distributions involving the number of data events and expected signal and background yields; the maximization of the likelihood, by properly treating the background normalization of the different samples and their systematics uncertainties; and the extraction of the signal strength, and computation of the discovery significance or upper limits on  $\mu$ .

## 7.2 Fit model simplifications

The  $VH$  analysis constructs a complex likelihood function that needs to be maximized to search for the Higgs boson. It includes 92  $m_{bb}$  and MV1c nominal distributions. In addition, and in order to account for the systematics uncertainties, most of the 170 NPs are introduced as distributions that contain up-and-down ( $\pm 1\sigma$ ) variations of the nominal. In conclusion, this fit machinery could end up handling around fifteen thousand distributions.

The maximization of this complex likelihood is time and resource consuming, and can lead to instabilities in the results obtained. Therefore, three methods are applied to simplify it without affecting the physics result. The first one reduces the number of bins per  $m_{bb}$  distribution. The second one rejects the systematic uncertainties with a negligible impact on the final results. Finally, large local fluctuations in the distributions used to assess systematics are smoothed out to avoid instabilities.

### 7.2.1 The $m_{bb}$ discriminant transformation

To reduce the number of bins from the  $m_{bb}$  distributions, a procedure to rebin them is performed. The tails of the  $m_{bb}$  distribution present high statistical uncertainties, while giving little information about the background composition or the background shape to the fit. This statistical uncertainties could be reduced by using wider bins, however this reduces the sensitivity in those regions eventually enriched in signal. A feasible solution to reduce the number of bins, increase the sensitivity, and decrease the statistical error in the distribution tails is the use of bins with a variable size.

| Channel  | 2-jet               | 3-jet               |
|----------|---------------------|---------------------|
| 0-lepton | $z_s = 6 \ z_b = 2$ | $z_s = 4 \ z_b = 2$ |
| 1-lepton | $z_s = 6 \ z_b = 2$ | $z_s = 4 \ z_b = 2$ |
| 2-lepton | $z_s = 4 \ z_b = 4$ | $z_s = 2 \ z_b = 2$ |

Table 7.3: Optimized free parameters used in the transformation algorithm of the  $m_{bb}$  distribution.

The procedure to rebin the  $m_{bb}$  distribution with variable bins size starts with fine-binned histograms. Bins are then merged moving from high to low  $m_{bb}$  values using the algorithm

$$Z = z_s \frac{n_s}{N_s} + z_b \frac{n_b}{N_b}, \quad (7.1)$$

where  $N_s$  and  $N_b$  correspond to the total number of signal and background events in the histogram;  $n_s$  and  $n_b$  are the total number of signal and background events in a certain bin interval; and  $z_s$  and  $z_b$  are free parameters of the algorithm. The procedure calculates  $Z$  in a certain interval of bins starting from the high  $m_{bb}$  bins and adding bins until the condition  $Z > 1$  is fulfilled. The interval is then remapped in a new bin and the procedure is repeated without using the remapped bins until no bins are left. The  $z_s$  and  $z_b$  values are used to define the relative signal and background compositions in the remapped bins. The free parameters of the transformation algorithm are optimized for 2- and 3-jet regions and for each lepton channel separately and their values are summarized in Table 7.3. The effect of the transformation on the  $m_{bb}$  distributions can be seen in Figure 7.1 where an example of a 1-lepton region using a fix bin size and the result of the rebin algorithm are shown.

### 7.2.2 Pruning and smoothing of systematic uncertainties

To reduce the number of distributions used to construct the likelihood, systematic uncertainties with a negligible impact on the final results are neglected in the fit. A normalization uncertainty is removed if the variation which respect to the nominal is below 0.5 %, as such small variation is tested to not affect the result. In the case of shape uncertainties, the same criteria is applied if the variation is below 0.5 % in all bins. Shape uncertainties with same-sign variations are also pruned. This is performed to avoid instabilities in the fit and after carefully study the source. Finally, systematics variations which impact the total background prediction by less than 0.5 % in regions where the signal contribution is less than 2 % of the total background are also dropped. This pruning procedure reduces the nominal number of systematic variation distributions by a factor of two.




Figure 7.1: The  $m_{bb}$  distributions for the 1-lepton channel and the 2-jet 2-tag TT category for the  $160 < p_T^V < 200$  GeV region (a) before and (b) after applying the transformation of the histogram bins.

Some MC samples suffer from limited statistics and this can cause large local fluctuations in the distributions of the nominal and/or the systematic variations. In the cases where only the systematic variation is affected, e.g. the JES uncertainties, a smoothing algorithm is applied to the distributions to mitigate the fluctuations. This smoothing algorithm merges bins until the statistical uncertainty in each bin is less than 5 %.

### 7.3 Results of the global fit

This Section presents the 0-lepton MV1c and  $m_{bb}$  distributions obtained from the combined fit of all  $VH$  analysis regions. The fit is performed using all the data recorded at 8 TeV during Run I. The corresponding factors applied to the nominal background normalizations, obtained as explained in Section 7.1.2, are shown in Table 7.4. Figure 7.2 shows the MV1c distributions for the 1-tag region. The 2-jet category is binned in  $p_T^V > 120$  GeV and  $100 < p_T^V < 120$  GeV, while the 3-jet one has a single bin of  $p_T^V > 120$  GeV. Figures 7.3 to 7.9 present the  $m_{bb}$  distributions. They are separated in the  $p_T^V$  bins  $100 < p_T^V < 120$  GeV,  $120 < p_T^V < 160$  GeV,  $160 < p_T^V < 200$  GeV and  $p_T^V > 200$  GeV. Figures alternate the 2- and 3-jet categories besides the bin  $100 < p_T^V < 120$  GeV, where only the 2-jet category is used. Each Figure shows the different  $b$ -tagging categories: (a) the 2-tag 2-loose jets, (b) 2-tag 2-medium jets and (c) 2-tag 2-tight jets. All distributions show a good agreement between data and MC expectation.




Figure 7.2: The output of the MV1c  $b$ -tagging algorithm is shown for the  $b$ -tag jet, where the left bin boundaries denote the operating points (MV1c(b) OP) of the MV1c  $b$ -tagging algorithm as defined in Section 5.6.1, corresponding to  $b$ -tagging efficiencies of 80 %, 70 %, 60 %, 50 %. In (a) 2-jets  $100 < p_T^V < 120$  GeV, in (b) 2-jets  $p_T^V > 120$  GeV and in (c) 3-jets  $p_T^V > 120$  GeV regions. The Higgs boson signal ( $m_H = 125$  GeV) is shown as a filled histogram on top of the fitted backgrounds, as expected from the SM (indicated as  $\mu = 1.0$ ), and, unstacked as an unfilled histogram, scaled by the factor indicated in the legend. The dashed histogram shows the total background as expected from the pre-fit MC simulation. The combined statistical and systematic uncertainty on the sum of the signal and fitted background is indicated by the hatched band. The ratio of the data to the sum of the signal and fitted background is shown in the lower panel.

### 7.3. RESULTS OF THE GLOBAL FIT




Figure 7.3: The  $m_{bb}$  transform distributions for following 2-jet  $100 < p_T^V < 120$  GeV signal regions: (a) 2-tag LL, (b) 2-tag MM and (c) 2-tag TT. The Higgs boson signal ( $m_H = 125$  GeV) is shown as a filled histogram on top of the fitted backgrounds, as expected from the SM (indicated as  $\mu = 1.0$ ), and, unstacked as an unfilled histogram, scaled by the factor indicated in the legend. The dashed histogram shows the total background as expected from the pre-fit MC simulation. The combined statistical and systematic uncertainty on the sum of the signal and fitted background is indicated by the hatched band. The ratio of the data to the sum of the signal and fitted background is shown in the lower panel.




Figure 7.4: The  $m_{bb}$  transform distributions for following 2-jet  $120 < p_T^V < 160$  GeV signal regions: (a) 2-tag LL, (b) 2-tag MM and (c) 2-tag TT. The Higgs boson signal ( $m_H = 125$  GeV) is shown as a filled histogram on top of the fitted backgrounds, as expected from the SM (indicated as  $\mu = 1.0$ ), and, unstacked as an unfilled histogram, scaled by the factor indicated in the legend. The dashed histogram shows the total background as expected from the pre-fit MC simulation. The combined statistical and systematic uncertainty on the sum of the signal and fitted background is indicated by the hatched band. The ratio of the data to the sum of the signal and fitted background is shown in the lower panel.

### 7.3. RESULTS OF THE GLOBAL FIT




Figure 7.5: The  $m_{bb}$  transform distributions for following 3-jet  $120 < p_T^V < 160$  GeV signal regions: (a) 2-tag LL, (b) 2-tag MM and (c) 2-tag TT. The Higgs boson signal ( $m_H = 125$  GeV) is shown as a filled histogram on top of the fitted backgrounds, as expected from the SM (indicated as  $\mu = 1.0$ ), and, unstacked as an unfilled histogram, scaled by the factor indicated in the legend. The dashed histogram shows the total background as expected from the pre-fit MC simulation. The combined statistical and systematic uncertainty on the sum of the signal and fitted background is indicated by the hatched band. The ratio of the data to the sum of the signal and fitted background is shown in the lower panel.




Figure 7.6: The  $m_{bb}$  transform distributions for following 2-jet  $160 < p_T^V < 200$  GeV signal regions: (a) 2-tag LL, (b) 2-tag MM and (c) 2-tag TT. The Higgs boson signal ( $m_H = 125$  GeV) is shown as a filled histogram on top of the fitted backgrounds, as expected from the SM (indicated as  $\mu = 1.0$ ), and, unstacked as an unfilled histogram, scaled by the factor indicated in the legend. The dashed histogram shows the total background as expected from the pre-fit MC simulation. The combined statistical and systematic uncertainty on the sum of the signal and fitted background is indicated by the hatched band. The ratio of the data to the sum of the signal and fitted background is shown in the lower panel.

### 7.3. RESULTS OF THE GLOBAL FIT




Figure 7.7: The  $m_{bb}$  transform distributions for following 3-jet  $160 < p_T^V < 200$  GeV signal regions: (a) 2-tag LL, (b) 2-tag MM and (c) 2-tag TT. The Higgs boson signal ( $m_H = 125$  GeV) is shown as a filled histogram on top of the fitted backgrounds, as expected from the SM (indicated as  $\mu = 1.0$ ), and, unstacked as an unfilled histogram, scaled by the factor indicated in the legend. The dashed histogram shows the total background as expected from the pre-fit MC simulation. The combined statistical and systematic uncertainty on the sum of the signal and fitted background is indicated by the hatched band. The ratio of the data to the sum of the signal and fitted background is shown in the lower panel.




Figure 7.8: The  $m_{bb}$  transform distributions for following 2-jet  $p_T^V > 200$  GeV signal regions: (a) 2-tag LL, (b) 2-tag MM and (c) 2-tag TT. The Higgs boson signal ( $m_H = 125$  GeV) is shown as a filled histogram on top of the fitted backgrounds, as expected from the SM (indicated as  $\mu = 1.0$ ), and, unstacked as an unfilled histogram, scaled by the factor indicated in the legend. The dashed histogram shows the total background as expected from the pre-fit MC simulation. The combined statistical and systematic uncertainty on the sum of the signal and fitted background is indicated by the hatched band. The ratio of the data to the sum of the signal and fitted background is shown in the lower panel.

### 7.3. RESULTS OF THE GLOBAL FIT




Figure 7.9: The  $m_{bb}$  transform distributions for following 3-jet  $p_T^V > 200$  GeV signal regions: (a) 2-tag LL, (b) 2-tag MM and (c) 2-tag TT. The Higgs boson signal ( $m_H = 125$  GeV) is shown as a filled histogram on top of the fitted backgrounds, as expected from the SM (indicated as  $\mu = 1.0$ ), and, unstacked as an unfilled histogram, scaled by the factor indicated in the legend. The dashed histogram shows the total background as expected from the pre-fit MC simulation. The combined statistical and systematic uncertainty on the sum of the signal and fitted background is indicated by the hatched band. The ratio of the data to the sum of the signal and fitted background is shown in the lower panel.

| Process             | Scale Factor    |
|---------------------|-----------------|
| $t\bar{t}$ 0-lepton | $1.37 \pm 0.13$ |
| $t\bar{t}$ 1-lepton | $1.12 \pm 0.08$ |
| $t\bar{t}$ 2-lepton | $1.15 \pm 0.19$ |
| $Wbb$               | $0.88 \pm 0.14$ |
| $Wcl$               | $1.09 \pm 0.10$ |
| $Zbb$               | $1.08 \pm 0.06$ |
| $Zcl$               | $0.87 \pm 0.11$ |

Table 7.4: Factors applied to the nominal normalizations of the  $t\bar{t}$ ,  $Wbb$ ,  $Wcl$ ,  $Zbb$ , and  $Zcl$  backgrounds.

## 7.4 Fit cross-checks

The behaviour of the global fit is evaluated by several checks. First, pseudo-data, derived from the nominal MC expectation, are used to understand possible arising features without introducing any bias from the observation of real data results. Once a robust fit model is constructed, checks are performed in data and results extracted.

One of the performed studies tests how much each NP is pulled away from its initial value, how much its uncertainty is reduced, and which correlations are developed between initially uncorrelated systematic uncertainties. These studies usually result on further uncorrelation of systematic uncertainties by including additional NPs. This prevents to propagate constraints between kinematic regions when they are not well motivated. Examples were previously presented with the studies on the NPs associated with  $\Delta\phi$  correction and the normalization of the 3-jet  $t\bar{t}$  distributions in Section 7.1.4.

Another procedure performed to understand the impact of the NPs is the so-called NP ranking. This procedure identifies the NP with larger impact on the determination of the signal strength  $\mu$ . After the maximum likelihood value is found, each NP is pulled and fixed to the  $\pm 1\sigma$  values while the other parameters are allowed to vary to properly take into account the correlations between systematic uncertainties. Then the magnitude of the shift in the new fitted signal strength  $\hat{\mu}$  is used to rank the impact of the NP in the final results.

Figure 7.10 shows the ranking plot obtained with the dijet mass analysis applied to the 8 TeV data set with the NPs that more impact the  $\hat{\mu}$  value. As expected, most of the normalization NPs related with the backgrounds in the most sensitive regions of the analysis are in the list. These correspond to the 2-lepton  $t\bar{t}$ ,  $Zbb$  and  $Wbb$  normalization NPs, as well as, the NPs associated with the migration of events among  $Zbb$  and  $Zbl$  distributions, or  $Wbb$  and  $Wbl$ . In the top of the list is the NP associated with the  $m_{bb}$  shape of the

$Wbb$  and  $Wcc$  distributions. As expected, among the different experimental uncertainties, the list includes NPs associated with  $b$ -tagging procedure and the  $b$ -jet energy resolution. Theoretical uncertainties associated with the Higgs signal modeling are also present in the list.




Figure 7.10: Impact of systematic uncertainties on the fitted signal strength parameter  $\hat{\mu}$  applied to the 8 TeV data. The systematic uncertainties are listed in decreasing order of their impact on  $\hat{\mu}$  on the y-axis. The boxes show the  $\hat{\mu}$  variations, referring to the top x-axis, when fixing the corresponding individual NP  $\theta$  to its post-fit value  $\hat{\theta}$  modified upwards or downwards by its post-fit uncertainty, and repeating the fit as explained in the text. The hatched and open areas correspond to the upwards and downwards variations, respectively. The black filled circles, referring to the bottom x-axis, show the deviations of the fitted nuisance parameters  $\hat{\theta}$  from their nominal values  $\theta_0$ , expressed in terms of standard deviations with respect to their nominal uncertainties  $\Delta\theta$ . The associated error bars show the post-fit uncertainties of the nuisance parameters, relative to their nominal uncertainties. The red circles with their error bars, also referring to the bottom x-axis, show the fitted values and uncertainties of the normalization parameters that are freely floating in the fit. The normalization parameters have a pre-fit value of one. As explained in Section 6.10, the  $b$ -tagging uncertainties are decomposed into uncorrelated components; the labels 0, 1 and 6 refer to such components.

# Chapter 8

## Results

This Chapter presents the results of the  $VH(H \rightarrow b\bar{b})$  searches using the dijet mass and MVA analyses (see Appendix B). The complex fit procedure is first validated with the search of the diboson process  $VZ$ . As explained in Chapter 7, results are obtained from maximum-likelihood fits to data. The final discriminants used for extracting the results depend on the region, being different in the signal regions with 2-jets tagged as  $b$ -jets (2-tag) or in the control regions with only one  $b$ -tagged jet (1-tag). For the 2-tag regions the transformed  $m_{bb}$  and the multivariate algorithm output distributions are used in the dijet mass and the MVA analyses, respectively. In the 1-tag regions the MV1c distributions are used in both analyses. Although this thesis is focused in the 8 TeV analyses, combined results after adding the 7 TeV dataset are also presented. Section 8.5 briefly discusses the 7 TeV analysis and results.

### 8.1 Diboson results

The diboson process, where a  $Z$  boson decays into a pair of  $b$ -quarks in association with a  $W$  or another  $Z$  boson, has a very similar signature to that of the Higgs in the  $ZH$  channel. The main difference between the diboson and the Higgs events is that the first have a softer  $p_T^{bb}$  spectrum and that its  $m_{bb}$  distribution peaks around the  $Z$  mass. The diboson cross section is five times larger than the SM 125 GeV Higgs boson. This makes the search for the diboson production a perfect test to validate the analysis procedure and to check the fit performance.

The diboson fit, here referred as “ $VZ$  fit”, uses a multiplicative scale factor  $\mu_{VZ}$  to account for the normalization of its contribution with respect to the SM expectation. The small  $WW$  contribution is treated as a background and constrained within its uncertainty. A 125 GeV Higgs boson is also treated as background in this fit. Its cross section is set to the SM prediction value with an uncertainty of 50 %. Figure 8.1 shows the distribution

of  $m_{bb}$  in data after subtraction of all backgrounds except for the diboson processes, as obtained with the Higgs dijet mass analysis for the 8 and 7 TeV datasets (see Section 8.5). The distribution associated with 8 TeV presents good agreement between number of data and expected events where the  $VZ$  process is clearly seen. Instead the 7 TeV shows a deficit of events in data compared to the background expectation, specially in the bin where the Higgs  $m_H = 125$  GeV signal is expected.




Figure 8.1: The distribution of  $m_{bb}$  in data after subtraction of all backgrounds except for the diboson processes, as obtained with the Higgs dijet mass analysis for the (a) 8 TeV and (b) 7 TeV data. The contributions from all lepton channels,  $p_T^V$  intervals, number of jets and 2-tag  $b$ -tagging categories are summed weighted by their respective values of the ratio of expected Higgs boson signal to fitted background. The contribution of the associated  $WH$  and  $ZH$  production of a SM Higgs boson with  $m_H = 125$  GeV is shown as expected for the SM cross section (indicated as  $\mu = 1.0$ ). The size of the combined statistical and systematic uncertainty on the fitted background is indicated by the hatched band.

The diboson signal strength for the dijet mass analysis using only the 8 TeV dataset is  $\mu_{VZ} = 0.79 \pm 0.11(stat.) \pm 0.16(syst.)$ , while the result using the MVA analysis in the same data is  $\mu_{VZ} = 0.77 \pm 0.10(stat.) \pm 0.15(syst.)$ . If only the 7 TeV dataset is used the signal strength obtain is  $\mu_{VZ} = 0.50 \pm 0.30(stat.) \pm 0.38(syst.)$ . It is important to note that the lower value of the 7 TeV compared with the 8 TeV, is the result of the deficit of events previously mentioned.

The MVA analysis discriminates better between processes leading to a very small diboson contribution in the most significant bins of its discriminant variable, making the analysis more sensitive compared with the dijet

## 8.2. DIJET MASS ANALYSIS RESULTS

mass one. Therefore, it is used to combine the result with the 7 TeV dataset giving a diboson signal strengths of  $\mu_{VZ} = 0.74 \pm 0.09(stat.) \pm 0.14(syst.)$ . The observed significance of the  $VZ$  signal is  $4.9\sigma$ , to be compared to an expected significance of  $6.3\sigma$ . Additional measurements where the signal strengths are floated independently for the 7 and 8 TeV datasets and for the three lepton channels are carried out as crosschecks. Figure 8.2 shows the results.




Figure 8.2: The fitted values of the diboson signal strength  $\mu_{VZ}$  for (a) the 7 TeV, 8 TeV and combined datasets, and (b) for the three lepton channels separately and combined, for the combined dataset. The MVA is used for the 8 TeV data. The individual  $\mu_{VZ}$  values for the lepton channels are obtained from a simultaneous fit with the signal strength for each channel floating independently.

As an additional crosscheck, fits are performed with the two signal strengths left freely floating for the  $VZ$  and Higgs processes, in order to check any possible bias. The test uses the same final discriminants as for the Higgs boson analysis search on the 8 TeV dataset. The results of this test do not show any variation in the signal strength compare to the nominal procedure, where the Higgs boson is normalized to its SM cross section value with an uncertainty of 50 %. Correlations between  $\mu_{VZ}$  and  $\mu_{VH}$ , obtained from the correlation matrices given by the fit, are 9 % in the dijet mass analysis and -3 % in the MVA. The reason for the low correlation between the signal strengths is the different shape of the  $p_T^V$  distributions for  $VZ$  and Higgs boson events.

## 8.2 Dijet mass analysis results

Final results using the dijet mass analysis strategy on the 8 TeV data are presented in this Section. A full set of distributions for the 0-lepton  $m_{bb}$  and the MV1c discriminants, with the background normalizations and nuisance

parameters adjusted from a fit to data, were already presented in Section 7.1. Figures 8.3 and 8.4 show a summary of  $m_{bb}$  distributions for the 0-, 1- and 2-lepton channels, where the  $b$ -jet categories with the highest purity, 2-Medium and 2-Tight, as well as, the  $p_T^V$  intervals with higher values are combined. In general, good agreement between data and expected number of events is presented.

The 95 % CL upper limits on the cross section times branching ratio for  $pp \rightarrow (W/Z)(H \rightarrow b\bar{b})$  in the Higgs boson mass range 110–140 GeV is presented in Figure 8.5. The Figure shows how the analysis is most sensitive to the presence of a Higgs signal in the low mass range. The reason is that the branching ratio of the Higgs boson decaying into  $b$ -quarks decreases with its mass. The figure also presents differences in all the mass range between the expected limit in the absence of a signal and the corresponding observed values. This indicates the presence of an excess of events above the expected background. In particular, the observed limit in the absence of signal obtained for  $m_H = 125$  GeV is 2.2 times the SM value, to be compared to an expected limit of 1.02.

The probability  $p_0$  associated with the background-only hypothesis at the Higgs boson mass of 125 GeV is 1.3 %. This corresponds to an excess observed at this mass with a significance of  $2.2\sigma$ , to be compared to an expectation of  $1.9\sigma$ . The  $p_0$  values for the Higgs mass range 110–140 GeV obtained with the 8 TeV dataset is presented in Figure 8.6.

The fitted signal strength value for the dijet mass 8 TeV analysis for a 125 GeV Higgs boson mass is  $\mu = 1.23 \pm 0.44(stat.) \pm 0.41(syst.)$ . Additional measurements are also performed, where the signal strengths are floated independently for the  $WH$  and  $ZH$  production processes or the three lepton channels. Figures 8.7 and 8.8 show the fitted  $\mu$  values for these additional measurements compared to the nominal dijet result. The compatibility between the signal strengths in the  $WH$  and  $ZH$  processes and the three lepton channels with the combined result are at the level of 8 % in both cases. This compatibility is calculated performing a  $\chi^2$  test, where fit results are compared. The high signal strength associated with the 1-lepton, around two times SM expected, is correlated with the large excess of events above the expected background observed in Figure 8.4a at  $m_{bb} = 125$  GeV. Since most of the  $WH$  signal is obtained from the 1-lepton channel, similar values are expected between their associated signal strengths. Instead, the  $ZH$  signal is obtained from 0- and 2-leptons analyses. Non-trivial correlations among these analyses explain the differences between  $ZH$  and 0- and 2-lepton signal strengths which show a compatibility at the level of 15 %.

## 8.2. DIJET MASS ANALYSIS RESULTS




Figure 8.3: The dijet-mass distribution observed in data (points with error bars) and expected (histograms) in the 0-lepton channel with the Medium and Tight  $b$ -tagging categories combined for (a) the 2-jet signal region in the  $100 < p_T^V < 120$  GeV interval, (b) the 2-jet signal regions in the three intervals with  $p_T^V > 120$  GeV combined, and (c) the 3-jet signal regions in the three intervals with  $p_T^V > 120$  GeV combined. The background contributions after the global fit of the dijet-mass analysis are shown as filled histograms. The Higgs boson signal ( $m_H = 125$  GeV) is shown as a filled histogram on top of the fitted backgrounds, as expected from the SM (indicated as  $\mu = 1.0$ ), and, unstacked as an unfilled histogram, scaled by the factor indicated in the legend. The dashed histogram shows the total background as expected from the pre-fit MC simulation. The entries in overflow are included in the last bin. The size of the combined statistical and systematic uncertainty on the sum of the signal and fitted background is indicated by the hatched band. The ratio of the data to the sum of the signal and fitted background is shown in the lower panel.




Figure 8.4: The dijet-mass distribution observed in data (points with error bars) and expected (histograms) with the Medium and Tight  $b$ -tagging categories combined and the three intervals with  $p_T^V > 120$  GeV combined for (a) the 2-jet signal regions of the 1-lepton channel, (b) the 3-jet signal regions of the 1-lepton channel, (c) the 2-jet signal regions of the 2-lepton channel, and (d) the 3-jet signal regions of the 2-lepton channel. The background contributions after the global fit of the dijet-mass analysis are shown as filled histograms. The Higgs boson signal ( $m_H = 125$  GeV) is shown as a filled histogram on top of the fitted backgrounds, as expected from the SM (indicated as  $\mu = 1.0$ ), and, unstacked as an unfilled histogram, scaled by the factor indicated in the legend. The dashed histogram shows the total background as expected from the pre-fit MC simulation. The entries in overflow are included in the last bin. The size of the combined statistical and systematic uncertainty on the sum of the signal and fitted background is indicated by the hatched band. The ratio of the data to the sum of the signal and fitted background is shown in the lower panel.

## 8.2. DIJET MASS ANALYSIS RESULTS




Figure 8.5: Observed (solid) and expected 95 % CL cross section upper limits, normalized to the SM Higgs boson production cross section, as a function of  $m_H$  for all channels using the 8 TeV dijet mass analysis dataset. The expected upper limit is given for the background-only hypothesis (dashed) and with the injection of a SM Higgs boson signal at a mass of 125 GeV (dotted). The dark and light shaded bands represent the  $1\sigma$  and  $2\sigma$  ranges of the expectation in the absence of a signal.




Figure 8.6: Observed (solid) and expected  $p_0$  values as a function of  $m_H$  for all channels using the 8 TeV dijet mass analysis dataset. The expected  $p_0$  values are given for the background-only hypothesis in the presence of a SM Higgs boson: for the dashed curve the Higgs boson mass corresponds to each tested mass point in turn; for the dotted curve the Higgs boson mass is 125 GeV.




Figure 8.7: The fitted values of the Higgs boson signal strength parameter  $\mu$  for  $m_H = 125\text{ GeV}$  for the 0-, 1- and 2-lepton channels and the combination of the three channels with the 8 TeV dataset. The individual  $\mu$  values for the lepton channels are obtained from a simultaneous fit with the signal strength for each of the lepton channels floating independently.




Figure 8.8: The fitted values of the Higgs boson signal strength parameter  $\mu$  for  $m_H = 125\text{ GeV}$  for the  $WH$  and  $ZH$  processes and the combination of the  $WH$  and  $ZH$  processes with 8 TeV dataset. The individual  $\mu$  values for the  $(W/Z)H$  processes are obtained from a simultaneous fit with the signal strength for each of the  $WH$  and  $ZH$  processes floating independently.

### 8.3 Multivariate analysis results

The multivariate analysis (see Appendix B) uses the Boosted Decision Tree algorithm output ( $\text{BDT}_{VH}$ ) as the discriminant in the analysis regions with two  $b$ -jets (2-tag). For the 1-tag control regions, it uses the same MV1c distributions as the dijet mass analysis. Some  $\text{BDT}_{VH}$  distributions for the 0-, 1- and 2-lepton channels are presented in Figures 8.9, 8.10 and 8.11, respectively. The Figures show a combination of regions that include the  $b$ -jet categories with the highest purity (2-Medium and 2-Tight) or a combination of both;  $p_T^V > 120$  GeV and  $p_T^V < 120$  GeV, and events with 2- or 3-jets. Figure 8.9 shows a deficit of events in data compared to the background expectation in the most sensitive bins of the 0-lepton channel. The rest of the distributions present good agreement between number of data and background expected events.




Figure 8.9: The  $\text{BDT}_{VH}$ -discriminant distribution observed in data (points with error bars) and expected (histograms) for the 0-lepton channel combining the 2-tag Medium and Tight  $b$ -tagging categories for  $p_T^V > 120$  GeV for (a) 2-jet events and (b) 3-jet events. The background contributions after the global fit of the MVA are shown as filled histograms. The Higgs boson signal ( $m_H = 125$  GeV) is shown as a filled histogram on top of the fitted backgrounds, as expected from the SM (indicated as  $\mu = 1.0$ ), and, unstacked as an unfilled histogram, scaled by the factor indicated in the legend. The dashed histogram shows the total background as expected from the pre-fit MC simulation. The size of the combined statistical and systematic uncertainty on the sum of the signal and fitted background is indicated by the hatched band. The ratio of the data to the sum of the signal and fitted background is shown in the lower panel.



### 8.3. MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS RESULTS




Figure 8.11: The BDT<sub>VH</sub>-discriminant distribution observed in data (points with error bars) and expected (histograms) for the 2-lepton channel combining the 2-tag Medium and Tight  $b$ -tagging categories for (a) 2-jet events with  $p_T^Z < 120$  GeV, (b) 2-jet events with  $p_T^Z > 120$  GeV, and (c) 3-jet events with  $p_T^Z > 120$  GeV. The background contributions after the global fit of the MVA are shown as filled histograms. The Higgs boson signal ( $m_H = 125$  GeV) is shown as a filled histogram on top of the fitted backgrounds, as expected from the SM (indicated as  $\mu = 1.0$ ), and, unstacked as an unfilled histogram, scaled by the factor indicated in the legend. The dashed histogram shows the total background as expected from the pre-fit MC simulation. The size of the combined statistical and systematic uncertainty on the sum of the signal and fitted background is indicated by the hatched band. The ratio of the data to the sum of the signal and fitted background is shown in the lower panel.

In the multivariate analysis, the observed (expected) 95 % CL upper limits on the cross section times branching ratio is 1.4 (0.8) times the SM expectation. As for the dijet mass analysis, differences between the values indicates an excess of events above the expected background. The observed (expected) significance of the data excess is  $1.7\sigma$  ( $2.5\sigma$ ) with a signal strength of  $\mu = 0.65 \pm 0.32(stat.) \pm 0.26(syst.)$  for the Higgs mass  $m_H = 125$  GeV.

## 8.4 Correlation between dijet mass and multivariate based results

The dijet mass and the multivariate analyses use the same data. Correlation studies between the two analyses are performed to check the consistency of the results. Figure 8.12 shows the correlation of the dijet mass versus the multivariate discriminant for a combination of categories in the 0-lepton channel. As expected, the higher values of the  $BDT_{VH}$  discriminant are obtained around the Higgs mass resonance at 125 GeV. The correlation between the signal strengths obtained from the two analyses is performed using pseudo-data with the method described in Ref.[105]. A large number of pseudo-data is generated using the simulated events with a signal strength equal to the SM value ( $\mu = 1$ ). Pseudo-data samples are created with the number of events and associated statistical errors set such that they represent the integrated luminosity and the associated Poisson fluctuations in the data. Each of the generated samples is analyzed by both the dijet and the MVA analyses. This allows to compared the  $\hat{\mu}$  obtained and to calculate their statistical correlation. The dijet mass and multivariate results are expected to be 67% correlated, and the observed results are found to be statistically consistent at the level of 8%.

## 8.5 The 7 TeV analysis results

For the 7 TeV dataset, only a dijet mass analysis is performed. This dijet analysis is similar but not identical to the one performed for the 8 TeV dataset. The main differences arise from the object identification, reconstruction and calibration, some of them performed independently for the 7 TeV and 8 TeV datasets. As an example, in the 7 TeV analysis the  $b$ -tagging calibration is performed for a single operating point. Another difference is that the 100-120 GeV  $p_T^V$  region is not used in the 0-lepton channel. A detailed description of the analysis can be found in Ref. [106]. Figure 8.13 shows the  $m_{bb}$  distributions for the most sensitive regions in the 0-, 1- and 2-lepton channels. These correspond to regions with 2-jets both  $b$ -tag and  $p_T^V > 120$  GeV. The Figure shows a deficit of events in the  $m_{bb}$  region where the Higgs signal is expected in the case of 0- and 1-lepton channels.




Figure 8.12: Correlations between the dijet mass and the multivariate discriminant ( $BDT_{VH}$ ) in the 2-jet 2-tag category (LL, MM and TT combined) of the 0-lepton channel for  $p_T^V > 120 \text{ GeV}$ : (a) the dijet mass versus the  $BDT_{VH}$  discriminant for the total expected background (shadings indicating the numbers of events) and the data (open boxes with the box size being proportional to the number of events), (b) and (c) show the mean values and RMS of the projections onto the axes of the  $BDT_{VH}$  discriminant and dijet mass, respectively, for the total expected background after the global fit of the MVA and the data.



## 8.6 Combination of 7 TeV and 8 TeV results

The 7 TeV and 8 TeV analyses are considered independent given the differences in the physics objects, event categorization and the estimation of the systematic uncertainties. To provide combine results, a global fit, where the distributions are not aggregate and the NPs are treated as uncorrelated, is performed. The approved ATLAS results for the Higgs searches in the  $VH(H \rightarrow b\bar{b})$  decay mode are obtained from the combination of the 8 TeV MVA and the 7 TeV dijet mass datasets. The MVA is chosen since it has a better expected sensitivity than the dijet mass analysis ( $2.5\sigma$  to be compared with the  $1.9\sigma$  given by the dijet mass).

Figure 8.14 shows the data, background and signal yields, where the final discriminant bins in all signal regions are combined into bins of  $\log(S/B)$ , separately for the 7 TeV and 8 TeV datasets. As previously mentioned, it is observed a deficit of events in the 7 TeV most sensitive bins, while the 8 TeV presents a small excess of events above the expected background.




Figure 8.14: Event yields as a function of  $\log(S/B)$  for data, background and Higgs boson signal with  $m_H = 125$  GeV for the (a) 8 TeV data and (b) 7 TeV data. Final discriminant bins in all signal regions are combined into bins of  $\log(S/B)$ . The signal  $S$  and background  $B$  yields are expected and fitted, respectively. The Higgs boson signal contribution is shown as expected for the SM cross section (indicated as  $\mu = 1.0$ ). The pull of the data with respect to the background-only prediction is also shown with statistical uncertainties only. The full line indicates the pull of the prediction for signal ( $\mu = 1.0$ ) and background with respect to the background-only prediction.

The signal strengths results for  $m_H = 125$  GeV using 7 TeV and 8 TeV data alone, and their combination are shown in Figure 8.15. The signal

strength using all lepton channels and datasets is <sup>1</sup>

$$\mu = 0.51 \pm 0.31(stat.) \pm 0.24(syst.). \quad (8.1)$$

For the 8 TeV dataset alone is  $\mu = 0.65 \pm 0.32(stat.) \pm 0.26(syst.)$ , while for the 7 TeV data alone is  $\mu = -1.6 \pm 1.2(stat.) \pm 0.9(syst.)$ . The 8 TeV analysis presents higher statistics and cross section of the signal processes, therefore it drives the results when the combination is performed.




Figure 8.15: The fitted values of the Higgs boson signal strength parameter  $\mu$  for  $m_H = 125$  GeV for the 7 TeV and 8 TeV datasets independently and combined.

Additional fits where the signal strengths are floated independently for the  $WH$  and  $ZH$  production processes and for the three lepton channels are shown in Figure 8.16 (a) and (b) respectively. The consistency in the results shown by the  $WH$  and  $ZH$  processes and their combination is at a 20 % level. In the case of the three lepton signal strengths, the consistency is at the 72 % for the 7 TeV data and 8 % for the 8 TeV data. The low values shown by the 0-lepton  $\mu$  is also affected by an additional data deficit observed in the most sensitive bins of the BDT discriminant as shown in Figure 8.9. This fact also explains the low  $ZH$   $\mu$  value.

The 95 % CL upper limits on the cross sections times branching ratio for the Higgs boson mass range 110–140 GeV is presented in Figure 8.17. The observed limit for  $m_H = 125$  GeV is 1.2 times the SM value, to be compared with an expected limit, in the absence of signal, of 0.8.

The Figure 8.18 shows the  $p_0$  values in the mass range 110-140 GeV obtained from the combination of the 7 TeV and 8 TeV datasets. The result

<sup>1</sup>Using the analysis results from the Higgs decay modes with the highest sensitivity and energy resolution ( $H \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$  and  $H \rightarrow 4l$ ), the ATLAS Collaboration obtained a value for the Higgs mass of  $m_H = 125.36$  GeV. The signal strength obtained by fitting this mass value is  $\mu = 0.52 \pm 0.32(stat.) \pm 0.24(syst.)$ .

## 8.6. COMBINATION OF 7 TEV AND 8 TEV RESULTS




Figure 8.16: The fitted values of the Higgs boson signal strength parameter  $\mu$  for  $m_H = 125$  GeV using the 7 and 8 TeV datasets: (a) for the  $WH$  and  $ZH$  processes and (b) for the three channels. The result of the final combination is shown in each case. The individual signal strengths for the lepton channels are obtained from a simultaneous (for the  $(W/Z)H$  processes) are obtained from a simultaneous fit with the signal strength for each of the lepton channels (for each of the  $WH$  and  $ZH$  processes) floating independently.

at  $m_H = 125$  GeV corresponds to an observed excess with a significance of  $1.4\sigma$ , to be compared to an expectation of  $2.6\sigma$ .




Figure 8.17: Observed (solid) and expected 95 % CL cross section upper limits, normalized to the SM Higgs boson production cross section, as a function of  $m_H$  for all channels and data-taking periods combined, as obtained using the dijet-mass analysis for the 7 TeV dataset and BDTs trained at each individual mass for the 8 TeV dataset. The expected upper limit is given for the background-only hypothesis (dashed) and with the injection of a SM Higgs boson signal at a mass of 125 GeV (dotted). The dark and light shaded bands represent the  $1\sigma$  and  $2\sigma$  ranges of the expectation in the absence of a signal.




Figure 8.18: Observed (solid) and expected  $p_0$  values as a function of  $m_H$  for all channels and data-taking periods combined, as obtained using the dijet-mass analysis for the 7 TeV dataset and BDTs trained at each individual mass for the 8 TeV dataset. The expected  $p_0$  values are given for the background-only hypothesis in the presence of a SM Higgs boson: for the dashed curve the Higgs boson mass corresponds to each tested mass point in turn; for the dotted curve the Higgs boson mass is 125 GeV.

# Conclusions

This thesis presents the latest ATLAS results on the search for the Standard Model Higgs boson decaying into a pair of  $b$ -quarks. The Higgs boson is searched for in the production channel for which the Higgs is produced in association with a  $W$  or  $Z$  boson in the final state. This includes the leptonic (electron and muon) decay channels for the vector bosons in addition to the channel with  $Z$  decaying into a pair of neutrinos. In particular, this document is mostly focused on the  $ZH(Z \rightarrow \nu\nu$  and  $H \rightarrow b\bar{b})$  channel. The analysis has considered all the proton-proton collision data collected by the ATLAS experiment at  $\sqrt{s} = 7$  TeV and  $\sqrt{s} = 8$  TeV.

Events are characterized according to the vector boson decay, the number of jets and  $b$ -jets in the final state, and the vector boson transverse momentum. This permits a detail study of the main background processes. Two different approaches are considered for the analysis: using the  $m_{bb}$  distribution as main discriminating variable or using a neural-net multivariate technique.

The analysis involves a complex fitting strategy of data and background predictions in control and signal regions that contributes to constrain the background processes, to reduce the systematic uncertainties, and to increase the sensitivity to the Higgs signal. The whole procedure is validated by searching for the known diboson ( $W/Z$ ) $Z$  ( $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ ) process with similar final state. The diboson signal is clearly observed with a significance of  $4.9\sigma$ . Its observed strength (compared to that of the SM) is  $\mu_{VZ} = 0.74 \pm 0.09(stat.) \pm 0.14(syst.)$ , in agreement with the SM prediction.

The measured output distributions of the multivariate algorithm in each event category are compared with the expected signal and background distributions and an excess of events above the expected background is observed at a Higgs mass  $m_H$  of 125 GeV. The observed (expected) significance of this excess is  $1.4\sigma$  ( $2.6\sigma$ ) and the ratio of the measured signal yield to the Standard Model expectation is found to be  $\mu = 0.51 \pm 0.31(stat) \pm 0.24(syst)$ . These results are consistent among channels and in agreement with those obtained with the analysis that uses  $m_{bb}$  distributions as the main discriminating variable. Although an excess is observed, its statistical significance is not large enough to claim neither evidence nor discovery of the process.

The LHC will resume operations in 2015 with an increased centre-of-

## CONCLUSIONS

---

mass energy of 13 TeV. With the new data, the study of the Higgs couplings to quarks will continue as one of the pillars of the physics program in which the  $(WZ)H$  analysis promises to keep playing a central role.

## Appendix A

# VH analysis in the production channels

$$WH \rightarrow l\nu b\bar{b} \text{ and } ZH \rightarrow llb\bar{b}$$

This Appendix presents the main characteristics of the analyses that target the Higgs signatures in the channels  $WH \rightarrow l\nu b\bar{b}$  and  $ZH \rightarrow llb\bar{b}$ . These are not covered in Chapter 6 which is mainly focused on the  $ZH \rightarrow \nu\nu b\bar{b}$ . As a reminder, due to the number of expected leptons (electrons or muons) in their final states, the analysis channels are referred to as 0-lepton, 1-lepton and 2-lepton channel. Common to the three channels is the selection performed to target the Higgs decay into a pair of  $b$ -jets, but the presence of leptons in the events motivates the following:

- The use of lepton triggers.
- A kinematic selection to constrain the mass of the reconstructed  $W$  or  $Z$  boson.
- The full reconstruction of events in the 2-lepton channel, allowing to correct the kinematics in the final state by performing a  $p_T$  balance of the  $Z$ - $H$  system which improves the  $m_{bb}$  resolution.

Multijet background contributions are estimated using data-driven techniques and different methods are carried out by the lepton channels.

### A.1 Object and kinematic selection

The  $VH$  analysis uses three inclusive lepton definition that in increasing order of purity are: *loose*, *medium* and *tight*. Loose leptons are described in detail in Section 6.2.1. Medium electrons are defined with the loose requirements and  $E_T > 25 \text{ GeV}$ , while medium muons correspond to type

APPENDIX A. VH ANALYSIS IN THE PRODUCTION CHANNELS  
 $WH \rightarrow L\nu B\bar{B}$  AND  $ZH \rightarrow LLB\bar{B}$

---

(1) muons with  $E_T > 25$  GeV and  $|\eta| < 2.5$ . In addition, tight electrons and muons are selected with track and calorimeter isolations of  $iso_{track} < 0.04$  and  $iso_{calo} < 0.04$ . In the case of electrons, a veryTight likelihood is also required (see Section 5.2). Table A.1 summarizes all lepton requirements.

| Flavor<br>Type | Electrons    | Muons    |         |                 |
|----------------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------------|
|                |              | (1)      | (2)     | (3)             |
| Loose          |              |          |         |                 |
| <i>quality</i> | Loose LH     |          |         |                 |
| $ \eta $       | $< 2.5$      | $< 2.7$  | $< 0.1$ | in $[2.5, 2.7]$ |
| $E_T$ (GeV)    | $> 7$        | $> 7$    | $> 20$  | $> 7$           |
| $ d_0 $ (mm)   | –            | $< 0.1$  | $< 0.1$ | –               |
| $ z_0 $ (mm)   | –            | $< 10$   | $< 10$  | –               |
| $iso_{track}$  | $< 0.1$      | $< 0.1$  | $< 0.1$ | –               |
| Medium         |              |          |         |                 |
| $E_T$ (GeV)    | $> 25$       | $> 25$   |         | NU              |
| $ \eta $       | –            | $< 2.5$  |         | NU              |
| Tight          |              |          |         |                 |
| <i>quality</i> | VeryTight LH | –        |         |                 |
| $iso_{track}$  | $< 0.04$     | $< 0.04$ |         | NU              |
| $iso_{calo}$   | $< 0.04$     | $< 0.04$ |         | NU              |

Table A.1: Loose medium and tight lepton requirements. NU stands for “Not Used” and LH for Likelihood (see Section 5.2).

Events containing one tight lepton and no additional loose leptons are assigned to the 1-lepton channel. Events containing one medium lepton and one additional loose lepton of the same flavor, and no other loose leptons, are assigned to the 2-lepton channel.

Table A.2 presents the list of event selection criteria. The events in the 1- and 2-lepton channels are categorized in five  $p_T^V$  intervals, with boundaries at 0, 90, 120, 160, and 200 GeV. In addition to the common selection of  $\Delta R$  between the two leading jets, a selection on the mass of the reconstructed  $W$  or  $Z$  boson is applied. In the 1-lepton channel, a requirement is imposed on the transverse mass  $m_T^W$ . This requirement reduces the contamination from the  $t\bar{t}$  background. To reduce the multijet background, additional cuts on the effective mass  $M_{eff}$ , which is the scalar sum  $p_T$  of the signal jets, leptons, and  $E_T^{miss}$  are applied. In the 2-lepton channel, criteria are imposed on the dilepton invariant mass  $m_{ll}$ , which must be consistent with the mass of the  $Z$  boson. A requirement is also imposed on  $E_T^{miss}$ .

## A.2. KINEMATIC FIT IN 2-LEPTON

| Variable                       | Dijet Mass Analysis |         |         |         |       |
|--------------------------------|---------------------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| $p_T^{j_1}$ ( GeV)             | > 45                |         |         |         |       |
| $p_T^V$ (GeV)                  | 0-90                | 90-120  | 120-160 | 160-200 | > 200 |
| $\Delta R(j_{et_1}, j_{et_2})$ | 0.7-3.4             | 0.7-3.0 | 0.7-2.3 | 0.7-1.8 | < 1.4 |
| 1-lepton selection             |                     |         |         |         |       |
| $M_{eff}$ (GeV)                | > 180               |         | –       |         |       |
| $E_T^{\text{miss}}$ (GeV)      | –                   |         | > 20    |         | > 50  |
| $m_T^W$ (GeV)                  | < 120               |         |         |         |       |
| 2-lepton selection             |                     |         |         |         |       |
| $m_{ll}$ (GeV)                 | 83-99               |         |         |         |       |
| $E_T^{\text{miss}}$ (GeV)      | < 60                |         |         |         |       |

Table A.2: Event kinematic selection applied in the 1- and 2-lepton analyses.

## A.2 Kinematic fit in 2-lepton

In the 2-lepton channel, wherein no true  $E_T^{miss}$  is involved, except possibly from semileptonic heavy-flavor decays, the energy calibration of the jets is further improved by a kinematic likelihood fit. This fit includes constraints on the dilepton mass, the transverse components of the  $llb\bar{b}$  system momentum, a prior built from the expected true jet  $p_T$  spectrum in  $ZH$  events and dedicated transfer functions to relate the reconstructed jet transverse momenta to their true value. Figure A.1 shows the  $m_{bb}$  before and after the kinematic likelihood fit performed in simulation for a signal region of the analysis. Overall, the  $m_{bb}$  resolution is improved by 30 % in the 2-lepton channel.

## A.3 Multijet estimation in the $WH \rightarrow l\nu b\bar{b}$ channel

Multijet events mimicking the  $WH \rightarrow l\nu b\bar{b}$  signal topology is a major background of the 1-lepton analysis. As with most backgrounds of this type, the efficiency is small but the production rate is so large that the background cannot be ignored. As in the 0-lepton case, the multijet background is estimated using a data-driven technique.

The method uses data events to estimate the contribution of multijet events which satisfy the 1-lepton selection. The data sample dominated by multijet events is obtained by modifying the nominal selection to use medium, instead of tight, leptons and loosening both the track and calorimeter-based isolation criteria. Multijet distributions are then defined applying the selection cuts on these data events and subtracting the electroweak contribution. The resulting distributions describe the shape of the

## APPENDIX A. VH ANALYSIS IN THE PRODUCTION CHANNELS $WH \rightarrow L\nu B\bar{B}$ AND $ZH \rightarrow LLB\bar{B}$




Figure A.1: Dijet-invariant-mass distribution for the decay products of a Higgs boson with  $m_H = 125$  GeV in the 2-lepton. The distributions are shown using jets after global sequential calibration (GSC, solid), and after adding muons inside jets and applying the kinematic fit (dash-dotted) (see Section 5.6.4).

multijet background. Their normalizations are then obtained from a “multijet fit” to the  $E_T^{\text{miss}}$  distributions in the 2- and 3-jet, 1- and 2-tag (LL, MM and TT combined) categories.

### A.4 Multijet estimation in the $ZH \rightarrow llb\bar{b}$ channel

Multijet events are background to the 2-lepton channel for cases in which the two jets are mistakenly identified as leptons. Photon conversions (detected as electrons) also contribute in the case of electrons. In addition to fake leptons, true leptons from the semi-leptonic decay of heavy flavor hadrons may also contribute. The multijet background is estimated using a data-driven technique. As for the 1-lepton, a data sample dominated by multijet events is obtained by loosening the identification and isolation requirements. The analysis selections are applied to the sample and the resulting data distributions are used to describe the shape of the multijet background in the various analysis regions.

As in the case of the 1-lepton analysis, the normalization is estimated by fitting the di-electron invariant mass  $m_{ee}$  distribution after applying the nominal selection. The fit is performed over the range  $40 < m_{ee} < 150$  GeV, where the  $Z$ +jets and multijet components are free parameters, while the other backgrounds (mostly  $t\bar{t}$ ) are taken from the simulation.

The multijet background in the muon channel is investigated by comparing the data and MC in the  $m_{\mu\mu}$  side-bands and it is found to be negligible.

## Appendix B

# Multivariate Analysis Techniques

This Appendix describes the general concepts of the multivariate analysis (MVA) techniques and their applications in the  $VH$  search. The MVA refers to any data analysis that uses more than one statistical input variable at a time. In particle physics the MVA approach relies on several variables used as input to determine a probability for each event to be originating from a signal or background process. This approach differs from the dijet analysis presented in previous Sections where consecutive cuts are applied on discriminating variables. Boosted Decision Tree (BDT) [107, 108] is the multivariate technique used among all the Toolkit for Multivariate Data Analysis (TMVA) [109].

The BDT algorithm needs to be trained to distinguish signal from background. The selection of variables used in this training can be found in the Table B.1. Variables from the 0-lepton that could need further explanations are:  $V$ , used to represent the vector boson which in the 0-lepton analysis is reconstructed from the  $E_T^{\text{miss}}$ ,  $H$ , which correspond to the Higgs candidate coming from vectorial sum of the two leading  $p_T$  jets and  $M_{eff}$ , which is the scalar sum  $p_T$  of the signal jets, leptons, and  $E_T^{\text{miss}}$  known as effective mass. Notice that in the 0-lepton analysis the  $p_T^V$  and the  $E_T^{\text{miss}}$  correspond to the same variable and  $\Delta\phi(V, H)$  correspond to  $\Delta\phi(E_T^{\text{miss}}, jj)$ . Figure B.1 shows an example of the distributions of signal and background input variables used to train the BDT.

In this analysis the BDT algorithm output ranges from -1 to 1. Background events are expected to give values close -1 while signal events close to 1. Figure B.2 shows an example of a 1-lepton BDT output distribution, where it is clear how the Higgs signal accumulates for BDT values above 0.2.

---

APPENDIX B. MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS TECHNIQUES

---

| Variable                                   | 0-Lepton | 1-Lepton | 2-Lepton |
|--------------------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|
| $p_T^V$                                    |          | ✓        | ✓        |
| $E_T^{\text{miss}}$                        | ✓        | ✓        | ✓        |
| $p_T^{\text{jet}_1}$                       | ✓        | ✓        | ✓        |
| $p_T^{\text{jet}_2}$                       | ✓        | ✓        | ✓        |
| $MV1c(\text{jet}_1)$                       | ✓        | ✓        | ✓        |
| $MV1c(\text{jet}_2)$                       | ✓        | ✓        | ✓        |
| $m_{jj}$                                   | ✓        | ✓        | ✓        |
| $\Delta R(\text{jet}_1, \text{jet}_2)$     | ✓        | ✓        | ✓        |
| $ \Delta\eta(\text{jet}_1, \text{jet}_2) $ | ✓        |          | ✓        |
| $ \Delta\phi(V, H) $                       | ✓        | ✓        | ✓        |
| $ \Delta\eta(V, H) $                       |          |          | ✓        |
| $M_{eff}(M_{eff} \geq 3)$                  | ✓        |          |          |
| $\min \Delta\phi(\ell, \text{jet}) $       |          | ✓        |          |
| $m_T^W$                                    |          | ✓        |          |
| $m_{\ell\ell}$                             |          |          | ✓        |
| Only in 3 Jet Events                       |          |          |          |
| $p_T^{\text{jet}_3}$                       | ✓        | ✓        | ✓        |
| $m_{jjj}$                                  | ✓        | ✓        | ✓        |

---

Table B.1: Input variables used in the MVA analysis in the different lepton channels. Some distributions plots can be found Figure B.1.




Figure B.1: Examples of variables input to the MVA in the 2-jet 2-tag category (LL, MM and TT combined) for  $p_T^V > 120$  GeV: (a) 0-lepton channel, dijet mass; (b) 0-lepton channel,  $E_T^{\text{miss}}$ ; (c) 1-lepton channel,  $\Delta R(b_1, b_2)$ ; (d) 1-lepton channel,  $p_T^b$ ; (e) 2-lepton channel,  $p_T^{b_1}$ ; (f) 2-lepton channel,  $\Delta\eta(V, H)$ .




Figure B.2: The BDT-output distribution for the expected background and signal contributions in the 0-lepton channel and the 2-jet 2-tag MM and TT category for  $p_T^V > 120$  GeV.

# Bibliography

- [1] S. Glashow, Nucl.Phys. **22**, 579 (1961).
- [2] S. Weinberg, Phys.Rev.Lett. **19**, 1264 (1967).
- [3] A. Salam, Rev.Mod.Phys. **52**, 525 (1980).
- [4] Particle Data Group, J. Beringer *et al.*, Phys.Rev. **D86**, 010001 (2012).
- [5] M. Han and Y. Nambu, Phys.Rev. **139**, B1006 (1965).
- [6] M. Gell-Mann, Acta Phys.Austriaca Suppl. **9**, 733 (1972).
- [7] H. Fritzsch, M. Gell-Mann, and H. Leutwyler, Phys.Lett. **B47**, 365 (1973).
- [8] S. Bethke, Prog.Part.Nucl.Phys. **58**, 351 (2007), hep-ex/0606035.
- [9] UA1 Collaboration, G. Arnison *et al.*, Phys.Lett. **B122**, 103 (1983).
- [10] UA2 Collaboration, M. Banner *et al.*, Phys.Lett. **B122**, 476 (1983).
- [11] UA1 Collaboration, G. Arnison *et al.*, Phys.Lett. **B126**, 398 (1983).
- [12] UA2 Collaboration, P. Bagnaia *et al.*, Phys.Lett. **B129**, 130 (1983).
- [13] F. Englert and R. Brout, Phys.Rev.Lett. **13**, 321 (1964).
- [14] P. W. Higgs, Phys.Lett. **12**, 132 (1964).
- [15] P. W. Higgs, Phys.Rev.Lett. **13**, 508 (1964).
- [16] A. Djouadi, Phys.Rept. **457**, 1 (2008), hep-ph/0503172.
- [17] ATLAS Collaboration, G. Aad *et al.*, Phys.Lett. **B716**, 1 (2012), 1207.7214.
- [18] CMS Collaboration, S. Chatrchyan *et al.*, Phys.Lett. **B716**, 30 (2012), 1207.7235.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

---

- [19] ATLAS Collaboration, G. Aad *et al.*, Phys.Rev. **D90**, 052004 (2014), 1406.3827.
- [20] CERN Report No. ATLAS-CONF-2014-061, 2014 (unpublished).
- [21] CMS Collaboration, CERN Report No. CMS-PAS-HIG-13-005, 2013 (unpublished).
- [22] ATLAS Collaboration, G. Aad *et al.*, Phys.Lett. **B726**, 120 (2013), 1307.1432.
- [23] G. Altarelli and G. Parisi, Nucl.Phys. **B126**, 298 (1977).
- [24] M. Dobbs *et al.*, p. 411 (2004), hep-ph/0403045.
- [25] T. Sjostrand, p. 51 (2006), hep-ph/0611247.
- [26] V. Sudakov, Sov.Phys.JETP **3**, 65 (1956).
- [27] M. Mangano and T. Stelzer, Ann.Rev.Nucl.Part.Sci. **55**, 555 (2005).
- [28] T. Sjostrand, S. Mrenna, and P. Z. Skands, JHEP **0605**, 026 (2006), hep-ph/0603175.
- [29] T. Sjostrand, S. Mrenna, and P. Z. Skands, Comput.Phys.Commun. **178**, 852 (2008), 0710.3820.
- [30] J. Butterworth, J. R. Forshaw, and M. Seymour, Z.Phys. **C72**, 637 (1996), hep-ph/9601371.
- [31] G. Corcella *et al.*, JHEP **0101**, 010 (2001), hep-ph/0011363.
- [32] K. Arnold *et al.*, (2012), 1205.4902.
- [33] T. Gleisberg *et al.*, JHEP **0902**, 007 (2009), 0811.4622.
- [34] S. Catani, F. Krauss, R. Kuhn, and B. Webber, JHEP **0111**, 063 (2001), hep-ph/0109231.
- [35] P. Nason, JHEP **0411**, 040 (2004), hep-ph/0409146.
- [36] S. Frixione, P. Nason, and C. Oleari, JHEP **0711**, 070 (2007), 0709.2092.
- [37] S. Alioli, P. Nason, C. Oleari, and E. Re, JHEP **1006**, 043 (2010), 1002.2581.
- [38] B. P. Kersevan and E. Richter-Was, Comput.Phys.Commun. **184**, 919 (2013), hep-ph/0405247.

- [39] M. L. Mangano, M. Moretti, F. Piccinini, R. Pittau, and A. D. Polosa, JHEP **0307**, 001 (2003), hep-ph/0206293.
- [40] M. L. Mangano, M. Moretti, F. Piccinini, and M. Treccani, JHEP **0701**, 013 (2007), hep-ph/0611129.
- [41] S. Frixione and B. R. Webber, (2008), 0812.0770.
- [42] CERN Report No. ATL-PHYS-PUB-2011-011, ATL-COM-PHYS-2011-818, CMS-NOTE-2011-005, 2011 (unpublished).
- [43] A. L. Read, J.Phys. **G28**, 2693 (2002).
- [44] G. Cowan, K. Cranmer, E. Gross, and O. Vitells, Eur.Phys.J. **C71**, 1554 (2011), 1007.1727.
- [45] A. Wald, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society **54**, 426 (1943).
- [46] ATLAS Collaboration, G. Aad *et al.*, JINST **3**, S08003 (2008).
- [47] CMS Collaboration, S. Chatrchyan *et al.*, JINST **3**, S08004 (2008).
- [48] ALICE Collaboration, K. Aamodt *et al.*, JINST **3**, S08002 (2008).
- [49] LHCb Collaboration, J. Alves, A. Augusto *et al.*, JINST **3**, S08005 (2008).
- [50] ATLAS Collaboration, G. Aad *et al.*, Eur.Phys.J. **C70**, 787 (2010), 1004.5293.
- [51] ATLAS Collaboration, G. Aad *et al.*, Eur.Phys.J. **C70**, 723 (2010), 0912.2642.
- [52] ATLAS Collaboration, G. Aad *et al.*, Eur.Phys.J. **C70**, 1193 (2010), 1007.5423.
- [53] ATLAS, G. Aad *et al.*, Eur.Phys.J. **C73**, 2518 (2013), 1302.4393.
- [54] S. van der Meer, (1968).
- [55] ATLAS Collaboration, G. Aad *et al.*, Eur.Phys.J. **C70**, 823 (2010), 1005.4568.
- [56] GEANT4, S. Agostinelli *et al.*, Nucl.Instrum.Meth. **A506**, 250 (2003).
- [57] I. Bird, Annual Review of Nuclear and Particle Science **61**, 99 (2011).
- [58] ATLAS Collaboration, CERN Report No. ATLAS-CONF-2010-072, ATLAS-COM-CONF-2010-073, 2010 (unpublished).

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

---

- [59] ATLAS Collaboration, CERN Report No. ATLAS-CONF-2010-069, 2010 (unpublished).
- [60] R. Fruhwirth, W. Waltenberger, and P. Vanlaer, J.Phys. **G34**, N343 (2007).
- [61] W. Lampl *et al.*, CERN Report No. ATL-LARG-PUB-2008-002. ATL-COM-LARG-2008-003, 2008 (unpublished).
- [62] ATLAS Collaboration, G. Aad *et al.*, Eur.Phys.J. **C74**, 3071 (2014), 1407.5063.
- [63] CERN Report No. ATLAS-CONF-2014-032, 2014 (unpublished).
- [64] ATLAS Collaboration, G. Aad *et al.*, (2014), 1407.3935.
- [65] M. Cacciari, G. P. Salam, and G. Soyez, JHEP **0804**, 063 (2008), arXiv:hep-ex/0802.1189.
- [66] ATLAS Collaboration, G. Aad *et al.*, (2014), 1406.0076.
- [67] M. Cacciari and G. P. Salam, Phys.Lett. **B659**, 119 (2008), arXiv:hep-ex/0707.1378.
- [68] CERN Report No. ATLAS-CONF-2013-083, 2013 (unpublished).
- [69] ATLAS Collaboration, G. Aad *et al.*, Eur.Phys.J. **C73**, 2304 (2013), 1112.6426.
- [70] CERN Report No. ATL-PHYS-PUB-2014-014, 2014 (unpublished).
- [71] CERN Report No. ATLAS-CONF-2014-046, 2014 (unpublished).
- [72] CERN Report No. ATLAS-CONF-2014-004, 2014 (unpublished).
- [73] CERN Report No. ATLAS-CONF-2013-082, 2013 (unpublished).
- [74] ATLAS Collaboration, G. Aad *et al.*, Eur.Phys.J. **C72**, 1844 (2012), 1108.5602.
- [75] CERN Report No. ATLAS-CONF-2013-064, 2013 (unpublished).
- [76] ATLAS Collaboration, G. Aad *et al.*, Eur.Phys.J. **C71**, 1630 (2011), arXiv:hep-ex/1101.2185.
- [77] H.-L. Lai *et al.*, Phys.Rev. **D82**, 074024 (2010), 1007.2241.
- [78] J. Pumplin *et al.*, JHEP **0207**, 012 (2002), hep-ph/0201195.
- [79] ATLAS Collaboration, CERN Report No. ATL-PHYS-PUB-2011-008, 2011 (unpublished).

- [80] ATLAS Collaboration, CERN Report No. ATL-PHYS-PUB-2011-009, 2011 (unpublished).
- [81] K. Melnikov and F. Petriello, Phys.Rev. **D74**, 114017 (2006), hep-ph/0609070.
- [82] M. Czakon, P. Fiedler, and A. Mitov, Phys.Rev.Lett. **110**, 252004 (2013), 1303.6254.
- [83] N. Kidonakis, Phys.Rev. **D83**, 091503 (2011), 1103.2792.
- [84] N. Kidonakis, Phys.Rev. **D81**, 054028 (2010), 1001.5034.
- [85] N. Kidonakis, Phys.Rev. **D82**, 054018 (2010), 1005.4451.
- [86] P. Nason and G. Zanderighi, Eur.Phys.J. **C74**, 2702 (2014), 1311.1365.
- [87] ATLAS Collaboration, G. Aad *et al.*, (2014), hep-ex/1407.0371.
- [88] ATLAS Collaboration, CERN Report No. ATLAS-CONF-2013-099, 2013 (unpublished).
- [89] N. Kidonakis, p. 831 (2012), hep-ph/1205.3453.
- [90] J. M. Campbell and R. Ellis, Nucl.Phys.Proc.Suppl. **205-206**, 10 (2010), 1007.3492.
- [91] ATLAS Collaboration, G. Aad *et al.*, Eur.Phys.J. **C73**, 2306 (2013), 1210.6210.
- [92] P. Golonka and Z. Was, Eur.Phys.J. **C45**, 97 (2006), hep-ph/0506026.
- [93] G. Luisoni, P. Nason, C. Oleari, and F. Tramontano, JHEP **1310**, 083 (2013), 1306.2542.
- [94] LHC Higgs Cross Section Working Group, S. Heinemeyer *et al.*, (2013), 1307.1347.
- [95] A. Djouadi, J. Kalinowski, and M. Spira, Comput.Phys.Commun. **108**, 56 (1998), hep-ph/9704448.
- [96] J. Ohnemus and W. J. Stirling, Phys.Rev. **D47**, 2722 (1993).
- [97] H. Baer, B. Bailey, and J. Owens, Phys.Rev. **D47**, 2730 (1993).
- [98] O. Brein, A. Djouadi, and R. Harlander, Phys.Lett. **B579**, 149 (2004), hep-ph/0307206.
- [99] M. Ciccolini, S. Dittmaier, and M. Kramer, Phys.Rev. **D68**, 073003 (2003), hep-ph/0306234.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

---

- [100] A. Denner, S. Dittmaier, S. Kallweit, and A. Muck, PoS **EPS-HEP2011**, 235 (2011), 1112.5258.
- [101] L. Altenkamp, S. Dittmaier, R. V. Harlander, H. Rzehak, and T. J. Zirke, JHEP **1302**, 078 (2013), 1211.5015.
- [102] LHC Higgs Cross Section Working Group, S. Dittmaier *et al.*, (2011), 1101.0593.
- [103] L. Moneta *et al.*, PoS **ACAT2010**, 057 (2010), 1009.1003.
- [104] W. Verkerke and D. P. Kirkby, eConf **C0303241**, MOLT007 (2003), physics/0306116.
- [105] G. Bohm and G. Zech, *Introduction to statistics and data analysis for physicists* (Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron, Hamburg, 2010).
- [106] CERN Report No. ATLAS-CONF-2013-079, 2013 (unpublished).
- [107] L. Breiman, J. Friedman, R. Olshen, and C. Stone, *Classification and Regression Trees* (Wadsworth and Brooks, Monterey, CA, 1984).
- [108] Y. Freund and R. E. Schapire, Experiments with a new boosting algorithm, in *Proceedings of the Thirteenth International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML 1996)*, edited by L. Saitta, pp. 148–156, Morgan Kaufmann, 1996.
- [109] A. Hocker *et al.*, PoS **ACAT**, 040 (2007), arXiv:physics/0703039.

# Acknowledgement

This thesis has been an incredible journey that would not have been possible without the help and the support of many people.

First, I would like to thank my supervisors Mario Martínez and Verónica Sorin for their scrupulous and professional supervision, and the attention they dedicated to my formation as a physicist. I would also like to thank Mario for being a great team-leader and give me the opportunity to spend at CERN 3 years, allowing me to take part of the discovery of the Higgs boson. Also Verónica for having always the time for having physics and non-physics discussions, and her support specially in the hard moments.

Thanks to the “Institut de Física d’Altes Energies” (IFAE) for their support, in particular to Ilya Korolkov and Jalal Abdallah who supervised my first activities as a physicist for the Tile Calorimeter. Also to Paolo Francavilla who introduced me in the physics analysis world, taught me a lot and share with me many long work days in the office.

The analysis presented in this thesis would not succeed without the people of the HSG5 working group, from which I would like to thank Gabriel Facini, Nicolas Morange and Daniel Büscher.

To my office mates: Volker (por enseñarme los principios básicos de programación “Array kaka, vector mola”), Jordi, Chiara, Valerio, Silvia (to allow me think I was her boss), Arely, Vincent, Francesco and Andrea. También a Roger y Javi Montejo, estos años hemos compartido muchísimo Master, casa, oficina... empezamos y terminamos la aventura juntos.

To the people of Geneva who share with me incredible moments and always made me feel at home: Jose, Dani, Javi Salsaoplayer, Tito, Robiño, Cadi, Ana, Tomish, Brunei, Jabu... To all LeClub and all their fans Ili, Martín, Nani, Irene, Luis, Sara, Chelo, Claire, ... the list is so long and we have spent so many adventures together that I would need a full chapter to thank you.

Agradecer también al “pijo” de Pere, Clara, Pove, Javi Serra, Moli, Anna, Alex y Thibaud por acogerme en Barcelona, por los fast Catan y las risas imprescindibles para desconectar. A la gente de siempre, que pese a

---

Este trabajo se llevó a cabo con el apoyo del Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación, bajo el programa FPI, Ref. BES-2010-038684.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

---

que estos años los he visto menos de lo que me gustaría, siempre están ahí: Pablo, Edu, Javi, Chema, Fede... Y al Equipo por su apoyo para emprender la aventura: Raul, Alberto, Carlos, Nacho y Pilu.

A Celia por enseñarme que la física no lo explica todo y acompañarme y aguantarme en la parte más difícil de la tesis.

Por último quería agradecer a mi familia todo su apoyo y cariño. En especial a mis padres Rosa y Tomás por apoyarme siempre en mis decisiones y estar ahí siempre que los que he necesitado.