Scalar Search and Study in Belgium $\label{eq:VBF} \mathsf{VBF}\ \mathsf{H} \to \mathsf{b}\bar{\mathsf{b}}$

P. Azzurri, J. Bernardini, D. Caiulo, P. Spagnolo, C. Vernieri INFN and Scuola Normale, Pisa

<u>S. Alderweireldt</u>, S. Bansal, T.Cornelis, X. Janssen, J. Lauwers, N. van Remortel *University of Antwerp*

S. de Visscher, K. Kousouris *CERN*

January 23-24th, 2014 - IIHE, Brussels, Belgium







Outline



One of the second se

- overview
- ARC/CWR comments

8 Round two analysis

- parked data
- new elements

Summary and Outlook



Introduction

Introduction





- \blacktriangleright Properties of the VBF H \rightarrow bb channel:
 - cross section significantly larger than for VH or ttH production
 - very large QCD background
 - trigger challenges
- 4-jet signal topology:



- Search strategy:
 - topological trigger on the signal main properties (jets with large Δη, two b-jets, etc.)
 - use multivariate methods to exploit maximally the (significant) differences between signal and QCD (maintain the orthogonality to the mbb)
 - perform a fit of the m_{bb} spectrum

Nominal analysis



- ▶ Nominal analysis performed on full 2012 dataset (1)
 - ▶ Several dedicated triggers (L1 + HLT, different jet-p_T thresholds) were used
 - Event interpretation is based on requiring 4-jet events with a good primary vertex and additional pile-up and jet IDs
 - Event reconstruction uses particle-flow algorithms and R=0.5 anti-k_T jet clustering, and identification criteria are applied to the jets (against fake jets and pile-up contamination)
 - B-jet identification is done using the CSV b-tagger, both at trigger level and offline





- Nominal analysis performed on full 2012 dataset (2)
 - Several dedicated triggers (L1 + HLT, different jet-p_T thresholds) were used
 - Event interpretation is based on requiring 4-jet events with a good primary vertex and additional pile-up and jet IDs
 - Event reconstruction uses particle-flow algorithms and R=0.5 anti-k_T jet clustering, and identification criteria are applied to the jets (against fake jets and pile-up contamination)
 - B-jet identification is done using the CSV b-tagger, both at trigger level and offline
 - The event selection is improved using quark-gluon discrimination (to determine if the final state light quarks originate from light quark hadronization (signal) or gluons (bkg)) and looking at additional hadronic activity between the VBF tagging jets (qq̄) (other than that of the central H decay products (bb̄))





4 / 13

- Nominal analysis performed on full 2012 dataset (3)
 - B-jet identification is done using the CSV b-tagger, both at trigger level and offline
 - The event selection is improved using quark-gluon discrimination (to determine if the final state light quarks originate from light quark hadronization (signal) or gluons (bkg)) and looking at additional hadronic activity between the VBF tagging jets (qq) (other than that of the central H decay products (bb))
 - The bb mass resolution is improved by applying jet energy corrections on top of the CMS standard ones (determined using regression techniques similar to those used in the VH H → bb analysis)
 - The offline event selection uses cuts based on the trigger logic, with an extra $\Delta \phi_{b\bar{b}} < 2$ cut to exclude QCD events with back-to-back $b\bar{b}$ pairs





- Multivariate techniques (ANN) are employed to maximally separate signal and background
- Since the final search uses a data-driven fit of the m_{bb} spectrum, only variables orthogonal to m_{bb} are used in the construction of the multivariate discriminant
- The events are split up into five categories, based on the ANN reponse (1); the search is then conducted in the highest four
- A fit of the m_{bb} spectrum (2) is performed in each category, using a 3 and 4-part background model (QCD: Bernstein, Z/W,T: crystal ball, from simulation, (signal))
- Systematic uncertainties are attributed to trigger efficiencies, elements affecting the signal acceptance, elements affecting the Z-template and uncertainties on the integrated luminosity and the process cross sections
- Limits are computed with the asymptotic CLs method



🔊 🖾 🖓 🖉





- Bias studied in CAT4 only
- ► Fit function: 5th order Bernstein polynomial
- Alternative models: exp. power law, tanh and modified Gaussian
- Fit range 70-250 GeV
- ightarrow bias \sim 10% and < 30% in CAT4

$$\frac{\left[\mathcal{N}_{\mathsf{QCD}} \cdot \mathcal{B}_{\mathsf{QCD}}\left(\mathsf{m}_{\mathsf{b}\overline{\mathsf{b}}}\right) + \mathcal{N}_{\mathsf{Z}} \cdot \mathcal{Z}\left(\mathsf{m}_{\mathsf{b}\overline{\mathsf{b}}}\right) + \mathcal{N}_{\mathsf{top}} \cdot \mathcal{T}\left(\mathsf{m}_{\mathsf{b}\overline{\mathsf{b}}}\right)}{\left(\mathcal{N}_{\mathsf{sig}} \cdot \mathcal{CB}\left(\mathsf{m}_{\mathsf{b}\overline{\mathsf{b}}}\right) + \left(1 - \mathcal{N}_{\mathsf{sig}}\right) \cdot \mathcal{B}_{\mathsf{3}}\left(\mathsf{m}_{\mathsf{b}\overline{\mathsf{b}}}\right)}\right)}$$





- Bias studied in CAT4 only
 - \rightarrow extended to all categories
- Fit function: 5th order Bernstein polynomial
- Alternative models: exp. power law, tanh and modified Gaussian
- ► Fit range 70-250 GeV

$$\frac{\mathcal{N}_{\mathsf{QCD}} \cdot \mathcal{B}_{\mathsf{QCD}}\left(\mathsf{m}_{\mathsf{b}\overline{\mathsf{b}}}\right) + \mathcal{N}_{\mathsf{Z}} \cdot \mathcal{Z}\left(\mathsf{m}_{\mathsf{b}\overline{\mathsf{b}}}\right) + \mathcal{N}_{\mathsf{top}} \cdot \mathcal{T}\left(\mathsf{m}_{\mathsf{b}\overline{\mathsf{b}}}\right)}{\left(\mathcal{N}_{\mathsf{sig}} \cdot \mathcal{CB}\left(\mathsf{m}_{\mathsf{b}\overline{\mathsf{b}}}\right) + \left(1 - \mathcal{N}_{\mathsf{sig}}\right) \cdot \mathcal{B}_{\mathsf{3}}\left(\mathsf{m}_{\mathsf{b}\overline{\mathsf{b}}}\right)\right)}$$



- Bias studied in CAT4 only
 - \rightarrow extended to all categories
- Fit function: 5th order Bernstein polynomial
 - \rightarrow bias is problematic especially in CAT1
 - ightarrow increasing the order to 6 yields acceptable results
- Alternative models: exp. power law, tanh and modified Gaussian
- Fit range 70-250 GeV

$$\frac{\mathcal{N}_{\mathsf{QCD}} \cdot \mathcal{B}_{\mathsf{QCD}}\left(\mathsf{m}_{\mathsf{b}\overline{\mathsf{b}}}\right) + \mathcal{N}_{\mathsf{Z}} \cdot \mathcal{Z}\left(\mathsf{m}_{\mathsf{b}\overline{\mathsf{b}}}\right) + \mathcal{N}_{\mathsf{top}} \cdot \mathcal{T}\left(\mathsf{m}_{\mathsf{b}\overline{\mathsf{b}}}\right)}{\left(\mathcal{N}_{\mathsf{sig}} \cdot \mathcal{CB}\left(\mathsf{m}_{\mathsf{b}\overline{\mathsf{b}}}\right) + \left(1 - \mathcal{N}_{\mathsf{sig}}\right) \cdot \mathcal{B}_{\mathsf{3}}\left(\mathsf{m}_{\mathsf{b}\overline{\mathsf{b}}}\right)\right)}$$



- Bias studied in CAT4 only
 - \rightarrow extended to all categories
- Fit function: 5th order Bernstein polynomial
 - \rightarrow bias is problematic especially in CAT1
 - ightarrow increasing the order to 6 yields acceptable results
- Alternative models: exp. power law, tanh and modified Gaussian
 - \rightarrow functions extended with additional parameter
- Fit range 70-250 GeV

$$\frac{\left(\mathcal{N}_{\mathsf{QCD}} \cdot \mathcal{B}_{\mathsf{QCD}}\left(\mathsf{m}_{\mathsf{b}\overline{\mathsf{b}}}\right) + \mathcal{N}_{\mathsf{Z}} \cdot \mathcal{Z}\left(\mathsf{m}_{\mathsf{b}\overline{\mathsf{b}}}\right) + \mathcal{N}_{\mathsf{top}} \cdot \mathcal{T}\left(\mathsf{m}_{\mathsf{b}\overline{\mathsf{b}}}\right)}{\left(\mathcal{N}_{\mathsf{sig}} \cdot \mathcal{CB}\left(\mathsf{m}_{\mathsf{b}\overline{\mathsf{b}}}\right) + \left(1 - \mathcal{N}_{\mathsf{sig}}\right) \cdot \mathcal{B}_{\mathsf{3}}\left(\mathsf{m}_{\mathsf{b}\overline{\mathsf{b}}}\right)}\right)}$$



- Bias studied in CAT4 only
 - \rightarrow extended to all categories
- Fit function: 5th order Bernstein polynomial
 - \rightarrow bias is problematic especially in CAT1
 - ightarrow increasing the order to 6 yields acceptable results
- Alternative models: exp. power law, tanh and modified Gaussian
 - \rightarrow functions extended with additional parameter
- Fit range 70-250 GeV
 - ightarrow range optimized to 90-255 GeV

$$\frac{\left(\mathcal{N}_{\mathsf{QCD}} \cdot \mathcal{B}_{\mathsf{QCD}}\left(\mathsf{m}_{\mathsf{b}\overline{\mathsf{b}}}\right) + \mathcal{N}_{\mathsf{Z}} \cdot \mathcal{Z}\left(\mathsf{m}_{\mathsf{b}\overline{\mathsf{b}}}\right) + \mathcal{N}_{\mathsf{top}} \cdot \mathcal{T}\left(\mathsf{m}_{\mathsf{b}\overline{\mathsf{b}}}\right)}{\left(\mathcal{N}_{\mathsf{sig}} \cdot \mathcal{CB}\left(\mathsf{m}_{\mathsf{b}\overline{\mathsf{b}}}\right) + \left(1 - \mathcal{N}_{\mathsf{sig}}\right) \cdot \mathcal{B}_{\mathsf{3}}\left(\mathsf{m}_{\mathsf{b}\overline{\mathsf{b}}}\right)\right)}$$



Extension of the m_{bb} fit bias studies

- Bias studied in CAT4 only ►
 - \rightarrow extended to all categories
- Fit function: 5th order Bernstein polynomial
 - \rightarrow bias is problematic especially in CAT1
 - \rightarrow increasing the order to 6 yields acceptable results
- Alternative models: exp. power law, tanh and modified Gaussian
 - \rightarrow functions extended with additional parameter
- Fit range 70-250 GeV ►
 - \rightarrow range optimized to 90-255 GeV

 \rightarrow bias < 20% in all CATs and new study with revised pT cuts and lower turnons ongoing



$$\frac{\mathcal{N}_{\text{QCD}} \cdot \mathcal{B}_{\text{QCD}}\left(\boldsymbol{m}_{b\overline{b}}\right) + \mathcal{N}_{Z} \cdot \mathcal{Z}\left(\boldsymbol{m}_{b\overline{b}}\right) + \mathcal{N}_{\text{top}} \cdot \mathcal{T}\left(\boldsymbol{m}_{b\overline{b}}\right)}{\left(\mathcal{N}_{\text{sig}} \cdot \mathcal{CB}\left(\boldsymbol{m}_{b\overline{b}}\right) + \left(1 - \mathcal{N}_{\text{sig}}\right) \cdot \mathcal{B}_{3}\left(\boldsymbol{m}_{b\overline{b}}\right)\right)}$$

S. Alderweireldt (UA)

VBF H $\rightarrow b\bar{b}$





► Bug fix for setup of background model in *combine* (ref: H working meeting 29 Nov '13)

 \rightarrow insert 3 separate bkg sources instead of 1, and leave combine to build the extended PDF

Data/MC discrepancies in the ANN tail (ref: H working meeting 29 Nov '13)

- Severation of the second secon
- Bug fix for setup of background model in combine (ref: H working meeting 29 Nov '13)
 - ightarrow insert 3 separate bkg sources instead of 1, and leave combine to build the extended PDF
- ► Data/MC discrepancies in the ANN tail (ref: H working meeting 29 Nov '13)
 - Not attributable to low stats in 100-250 QCD slice
 - Not attributable to variable correlations
 - Studied extra ttbar control region (QCD free): ANN proves reliable
 - \rightarrow final treatment: systematic uncertainty anti-correlating the signal yields in CAT3 & 4



Round two analysis

Round two analysis: parked data



- Data streams
 - 2012A: No VBFParked
 - 2012B: /VBF1Parked/Run2012B-22Jan2013-v1/AOD
 - 2012C: /VBF1Parked/Run2012C-22Jan2013-v1/AOD
 - 2012D: /VBF1Parked/Run2012D-22Jan2013-v1/AOD
- Included triggers:
 - HLT_DiJet35_MJJ650_AllJets_DEta3p5_VBF (L1: L1_HTT150, L1_HTT175, L1_HTT200, L1_ETM40)
 - HLT_DiJet35_MJJ700_AllJets_DEta3p5_VBF (L1: L1_HTT175, L1_HTT200, L1_ETM40)
 - HLT_DiJet35_MJJ750_AllJets_DEta3p5_VBF (L1: L1_HTT175, L1_HTT200, L1_ETM40)
- Offline preselection studied following the trigger logic:
 - $\Delta \eta_{q\bar{q}} > 3.5$
 - $\blacktriangleright \ m_{q\bar{q}} > 600$
 - ▶ jetPt[1] > 35 GeV
 - $\Delta \phi_{b\bar{b}} < 2.0$
- Parked data amounts to 18.2 fb⁻¹
- Possible reference triggers for efficiency study
 - HLT_DiPFJetAve40
 - HLT_DiPFJetAve80



 $VBF \; H \to b\bar{b}$

Round two analysis: new elements (1)







B-jet discrimination \sim b-tag likelihood (1)

- Nominal analysis event interpretation:
 - select 4 leading jets in p_T
 - order in CSV b-tag:
 - 2 leading ones (b-jets)
 - 2 trailing ones (q-jets)
 - problem: sometimes the b-tag ordering is incorrect
- Round two analysis event interpretation:
 - select 4 leading jets in p_T
 - \blacktriangleright order in CSV b-tag and η
 - build a b-likelihood BDT based on btagldx, etaldx, btag and eta
 - order in b-likelihood: again 2 leading (=b) and 2 trailing (=q)

Improvement:

- coherently use b-tag and eta ordering of the candidates
- ▶ regain some in-peak contribution to $m_{b\bar{b}}$, other than from the regression
- increased significance

Round two analysis: new elements (1)

🚿 🖾 🗗 fwo

B-jet discrimination \sim b-tag likelihood (2)

▶ BDT training on VBF@125 sample, separately in nominal and parked data phase space



(1) result with CSV for nominal phase space



(2) result with CSV for parked data phase space

Round two analysis: new elements (1)

🚿 🖾 🗗 fwo

B-jet discrimination \sim b-tag likelihood (2)

BDT training on VBF@125 sample, separately in nominal and parked data phase space



(1) result with CSV for nominal phase space





(2) result with CSV for parked data phase space





Round two analysis: new elements (2)



Optimization of the b-jet energy regression

- Use case:
 - b-jet resolution is suboptimal when compared to light-quark/gluon-jet resolution
 - use regression techniques to derive a correction factor per b-jet and in one go improve the bb invariant mass resolution
- Recent steps taken:
 - Comparison with the regression from the VH analysis (ref: AN-13-069) \rightarrow VH uses also SoftLepton information
 - Addition of input variables
 - Training optimized according to the two different phase space regions covered by the VBF analysis
- Result: a sizeable improvement in bb invariant mass resolution is achieved
 - around 5-15% when compared to the result using the standard regression
- To do: evaluate the effect on the sensitivity



(1) optimization of the regression in the VBF phase space

 $VBF \; H \, \rightarrow \, b\bar{b}$

Summary & Outlook



- Some extra issues concerning the first full iteration of the analysis as presented in the summer of 2013 were addressed
- \blacktriangleright The parked data, amounting to \sim 18 fb^{-1} is now being studied
- New idea added to the analysis: b-likelihood
- Elements currently being looked at or to follow soon include: (all to be considered in both the nominal and the parked data vbf phase space)
 - optimization of the preselection cuts, following the trigger logic
 - evaluation of the trigger efficiency
 - retraining the categorization
 - redoing the fit of the bb invariant mass spectrum
 - repeating the bias studies