LHC searches: what role for QCD?

Gavin Salam

LPTHE, CNRS and UPMC (Univ. Paris 6)

Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, USA
15 October 2008

An often-repeated argument

LHC collides quarks and gluons

Quarks and gluons interact strongly → huge QCD backgrounds

Therefore we will need to rely on our understanding of QCD in order to make discoveries at LHC.

True, false, or only half the story?

LHC collides quarks and gluons

Quarks and gluons interact strongly $\rightarrow$ huge QCD backgrounds

Therefore we will need to rely on our understanding of QCD in order to make discoveries at LHC.

True, false, or only half the story?

It must be true, otherwise why would there be such a large effort devoted to QCD calculations?

▶ Parton shower Monte Carlo Generators   Pythia, Herwig, Sherpa

▶ LO tree-level calculations   Alpgen, Madgraph, Sherpa, ...

▶ NLO calculations $\sim 50 - 100$ people, cf. talk by Zvi Bern

▶ NNLO calculations   Higgs, W/Z, next step jets

▶ All-orders calculations   resummations, SCET

▶ Parton Distribution Functions (PDFs)   CTEQ, MSTW, NNPDF, . . .

Healthy scepticism

[...] unless each of the background components can be separately tested and validated, *it will not be possible to draw conclusions from the mere comparison of data against the theory predictions.*

I am not saying this because I do not believe in the goodness of our predictions. But because claiming that supersymmetry exists is far too important a conclusion to make it follow from the straight comparison against a Monte Carlo.

Mangano, 0809.1567

Try to examine the question of how
much QCD matters, how much it can
help with searches.

mass peak

New resonance (e.g. Z') where you see all decay products and reconstruct an invariant mass

QCD may:

▶ swamp signal

▶ smear signal

leptonic case easy; hadronic case harder

mass edge

New resonance (e.g. R-parity conserving SUSY), where undetected new stable particle escapes detection.

Reconstruct only *part* of an invariant mass → kinematic edge.

QCD may:

▶ swamp signal

▶ smear signal

high–mass excess

$d\sigma/dm$ [log scale]

Signal

QCD prediction

mass

Unreconstructed SUSY cascade. Study *effective* mass (sum of all transverse momenta).

Broad excess at high mass scales.

Knowledge of backgrounds is crucial is declaring discovery.

QCD is *one way* of getting handle on background.

**CONTINUE
HERE**

**START
HERE**

**CONTINUE HERE**

START HERE

CONTINUE HERE   **START HERE**

Before Starting

The most pervasive role of QCD at LHC

Every single paper that comes out from the ATLAS and CMS pp physics programmes will involve the use of one or more QCD-based parton-shower Monte Carlo event generators: Pythia, Herwig or Sherpa.

For simulating physics signals.

For simulating background signals.

For simulating pileup.

As input to simulating detector respone.

Predicting QCD

SUSY example: gluino pair production

Signal

SUSY example: gluino pair production

Signal

# SUSY example: gluino pair production

Signal

Background

SUSY searches: what excesses?

Atlas selection [all hadronic]

- no lepton
- MET > 100 GeV
- $1^{st},2^{nd}$ jet > 100 GeV
- $3^{rd},4^{th}$ jet > 50 GeV
- MET / m_{eff} > 20%

Christian Autermann
SUSY08 16.-21.6.08
4

ATLAS Preliminary

CMS selection [leptonic incl.]
(optimized for 10fb⁻¹, using genetic algorithm)

- 1 muon pT > 30 GeV
- MET > 130 GeV
- $1^{st}, 2^{nd}$ jet > 440 GeV
- 3rd jet > 50 GeV
- $-0.95 < \cos(\text{MET}, 1^{st}\text{jet}) < 0.3$
- $\cos(\text{MET}, 2^{nd}\text{jet}) < 0.85$

Christian Autermann
SUSY08 16.-21.6.08

SUSY searches: what excesses?

Atlas selection [all hadronic]

- no lepton
- MET > 100 GeV
- 1st,2nd jet > 100 GeV
- 3rd,4th jet > 50 GeV
- MET / m_{eff} > 20%

CMS selection [leptonic incl.]
(optimized for 10fb⁻¹, using genetic algorithm)

- 1 muon pT > 30 GeV
- MET > 130 GeV
- 1st, 2nd jet > 440 GeV
- 3rd jet > 50 GeV
- $-0.95 < \cos(MET, 1^{st}jet) < 0.3$
- $\cos(MET, 2^{nd}jet) < 0.85$

SUSY ≃ factor 5−10 excess

$$\alpha_s \simeq 0.1$$

That implies LO QCD should be accurate to within 10%

It isn't

Rules of thumb:

LO good to within factor of 2

NLO good to within scale uncertainty

How accurate is QCD?

$pp \rightarrow H + X \rightarrow WW + X \rightarrow e^+\nu \, e^-\nu + X$

MRST2001 LO, MRST2004 NLO/NNLO
$M_h/2 \leq \mu_R = \mu_F \leq 2 \, M_h$
$M_h = 165$ GeV

Anastasiou, Melnikov & Petriello '04
Anastasiou, Dissertori & Stöckli '07

$\alpha_s \simeq 0.1$

That implies LO QCD should be accurate to within 10%

It isn't

Rules of thumb:

LO good to within factor of 2

NLO good to within scale uncertainty

How accurate is QCD?

$pp \rightarrow H + X \rightarrow WW + X \rightarrow e^+\nu\, e^-\bar{\nu} + X$

Anastasiou, Melnikov & Petriello '04
Anastasiou, Dissertori & Stöckli '07

$\alpha_s \simeq 0.1$

That implies LO QCD should be accurate to within 10%

It isn't

Rules of thumb:

LO good to within factor of 2

NLO good to within scale uncertainty

Theory status

from lectures by F. Maltoni '07

$pp \rightarrow n$ particles

- fully inclusive
- parton-level
- fully exclusive

accuracy [loops]

Two-loop:
. Limited number of $2 \rightarrow 1$ processes
. No general algorithm for divs cancellation
. Completely manual
. No matching known

One-loop:
. Large number of processes known up to $2 \rightarrow 3$
. General algorithms for divergences cancellation
. Not automatic yet (loop calculation)
. Matching with the PS available for several processes (MC@NLO)

tomorrow

Tree-level:
. Any process $2 \rightarrow n$ available
. Many algorithms
. Completely automatized
. Matching with the PS at NLL

wednesday

complexity [n]

Control samples

We don't have NLO for the background (e.g. 4 jets + Z, a $2 \to 5$ process).

Only LO (matched with parton showers). How does one verify it?

Common procedure (roughly):
- Get control sample at low p_t
- SUSY should be small(er) contamination there
- Once validated, trust LO prediction at high-p_t


Federica Legger, SUSY08, Seoul

A conservative QCD theory point of view:

It's hard to be sure: since we can't calculate $Z+4$ jets beyond LO.
> But we would tend to think it is safe, as long as control data
> are within usual factor of two of LO prediction

Illustrate issues with toy example: $Z+$jet production

▶ It's known to NLO   and a candidate for "first" $2 \to 2$ NNLO
> $\sim e^+e^- \to 3$ jets, NNLO: Gehrman et al '08, Weinzierl '08

▶ But let's pretend we only know it to LO, and look at the p_t distribution
  of the hardest jet (no other cuts — keep it simple)

example based on
background work for
Butterworth, Davison,
Rubin & GPS '08

Z + jet cross section (LHC)

stage 1: get control sample

Check LO v. data at low p_t

▶ normalisation off by factor 1.5
(consistent with expectations)

So renormalise LO by K-fact

▶ shape OKish

Don't be too fussy: SUSY

could bias higher p_t

Toy data, control sample

Z + jet cross section (LHC)

LO
toy data
LO x K-fact (1.5)

MCFM 5.2
CTEQ6M
k_t alg., R=0.7
$\mu^2 = m_Z^2 + p_{t,Z}^2$

$p_{t,jet}$ [GeV]

$d\sigma_{Z+jets}/dp_t$ [fb/GeV]

### stage 1: get control sample

Check LO v. data at low p_t

▶ normalisation off by factor 1.5
(consistent with expectations)
So renormalise LO by K-fact

▶ shape OKish
Don't be too fussy: SUSY
could bias higher p_t

Z + jet cross section (LHC)

MCFM 5.2
CTEQ6M
k_t alg., R=0.7
$\mu^2 = m_Z^2 + p_{t,Z}^2$

LO
toy data
LO x K-fact (1.5)

$d\sigma_{Z+jets}/dp_t$ [fb/GeV]

$p_{t,jet}$ [GeV]

### stage 1: get control sample

Check LO v. data at low p_t

► normalisation off by factor 1.5
(consistent with expectations)
   So renormalise LO by K-fact

► shape OKish
   Don't be too fussy: SUSY
   could bias higher p_t

Z + jet cross section (LHC)

stage 2: look at high p_t

▶ good agreement at low p_t, by construction

▶ excess of factor ~ 10 at high p_t

▶ check scale dependence of LO
   [NB: seldom done except
   e.g. Alwall et al. 0706.2569]
   still big excess

Z + jet cross section (LHC)

stage 2: look at high p_t

▶ good agreement at low p_t, by construction

▶ excess of factor ~ 10 at high p_t

▶ check scale dependence of LO
[NB: seldom done except
e.g. Alwall et al. 0706.2569]
still big excess

Toy data, high p_t

Z + jet cross section (LHC)

— LO x K-fact (1.5)
— toy data
— LO scale dep

MCFM 5.2
CTEQ6M
k_t alg., R=0.7
$\mu^2 = \{m_Z^2 + p_{t,Z}^2, \langle p_{t,jets}\rangle^2, H_T^2, M_Z^2/4\}$

$d\sigma_{Z+jets}/dp_t$ [fb/GeV]

$p_{t,jet}$ [GeV]

stage 2: look at high p_t

▶ good agreement at low p_t, by construction

▶ excess of factor ~ 10 at high p_t

▶ check scale dependence of LO
  [NB: seldom done except
 e.g. Alwall et al. 0706.2569]
  still big excess

Is it:

▶ QCD + extra signal?
▶ just QCD? But then where does a K-factor of 10 come from?

Here it's just a toy illustration. In a year or two it may be for real:

▶ Do Nature / Science / PRL accept the paper?

   Discovery of New Physics at the TeV scale
   *We report a 5.7σ excess in MET + jets production that is consistent
   with a signal of new physics …*

▶ Do we proceed immediately with a linear collider?
                          It'll take 10–15 years to build; the sooner we start the better
▶ At what energy?   It would be a shame to be locked in to the wrong energy…

<u>Is it:</u>

▶ QCD + extra signal?

▶ just QCD? But then where does a *K*-factor of 10 come from?

Here it's just a toy illustration. In a year or two it may be for real:

▶ Do Nature / Science / PRL accept the paper?

> **Discovery of New Physics at the TeV scale**
> *We report a* 5.7σ *excess in MET + jets production that is consistent with a signal of new physics . . .*

▶ Do we proceed immediately with a linear collider?

It'll take 10–15 years to build; the sooner we start the better

▶ At what energy?   It would be a shame to be locked in to the wrong energy. . .

Z + jet cross section (LHC)

- LO x K-fact (1.5)
- toy data ⊢––⊣
- LO scale dep

MCFM 5.2
CTEQ6M
k_t alg., R=0.7
$\mu^2 = \{m_Z^2 + p_{t,Z}^2, \langle p_{t,jets}\rangle^2, HT^2, M_Z^2/4\}$

$d\sigma_{Z+jets}/dp_t$ [fb/GeV]

$p_{t,jet}$ [GeV]

Unlike for SUSY multi-jet searches, in the Z+jet case we do have NLO.

Once NLO is included the excess disappears

> The "toy data" were just the upper edge of the NLO band

Hold on a second: how does QCD give a K-factor $\mathcal{O}(5-10)$?

NB: DYRAD, MCFM consistent

Z + jet cross section (LHC)

- LO x K-fact (1.5)
- toy data
- LO scale dep
- NLO

MCFM 5.2
CTEQ6M
k_t alg., R=0.7
$\mu^2 = \{m_Z^2 + p_{t,Z}^2, \langle p_{t,jets}\rangle^2, HT^2, M_Z^2/4\}$

Unlike for SUSY multi-jet searches, in the Z+jet case we do have NLO.

Once NLO is included the excess disappears

> The "toy data" were just the upper edge of the NLO band

*Hold on a second: how does QCD give a K-factor $\mathcal{O}(5-10)$?*
NB: DYRAD, MCFM consistent

Z + jet cross section (LHC)

- LO x K-fact (1.5)
- toy data
- LO scale dep
- NLO

MCFM 5.2
CTEQ6M
k_t alg., R=0.7
$\mu^2 = \{m_Z^2 + p_{t,Z}^2, \langle p_{t,jets}\rangle^2, HT^2, M_Z^2/4\}$

$d\sigma_{Z+jets}/dp_t$ [fb/GeV]

$p_{t,jet}$ [GeV]

Unlike for SUSY multi-jet searches, in the Z+jet case we do have NLO.

Once NLO is included the excess disappears

> The "toy data" were just the upper edge of the NLO band

Hold on a second: how does QCD give a K-factor $\mathcal{O}(5-10)$?
> NB: DYRAD, MCFM consistent

Why the large K-factor?

Leading Order

Next-to-Leading Order


$$\alpha_s \alpha_{EW}$$

$$\alpha_s^2 \alpha_{EW} \ln^2 \frac{p_t}{M_Z}$$

LHC will probe scales well above EW scale, $\sqrt{s} \gg M_Z$.
QCD and EW effects **mix**, EW bosons are **light**.
New logarithms (enhancements) appear.

Why the large K-factor?

Leading Order	**Next-to-Leading Order**

$$\alpha_s \alpha_{EW}$$

$$\alpha_s^2 \alpha_{EW} \ln^2 \frac{p_t}{M_Z}$$

LHC will probe scales well above EW scale, $\sqrt{s} \gg M_Z$.
QCD and EW effects **mix**, EW bosons are **light**.
New logarithms (enhancements) appear.

Why the large K-factor?

| **Leading Order**	**Next-to-Leading Order**

$$\alpha_s \alpha_{EW}$$

$$\alpha_s^2 \alpha_{EW} \ln^2 \frac{p_t}{M_Z}$$

LHC will probe scales well above EW scale, $\sqrt{s} \gg M_Z$.
QCD and EW effects **mix**, EW bosons are **light**.
New logarithms (enhancements) appear.

Z + jet cross section (LHC)

Plot distribution for p_{tZ}.

This selects events in which the Z is the hardest object.

Kills diags with EW double-logs.

NLO is well-behaved.

Where does this leave us?

▶ Excess ≡ New Physics, **iff** you are really, really sure you understand backgrounds;

▶ Control samples may not be good enough cross-check

▶ Plain LO QCD can be misleading, understanding the physics is crucial
> This can be non-trivial even in simplest of cases
> But can help you choose good observables

▶ NLO provides a powerful cross check — and progress is being made in multi-jet case
> BlackHat: Berger et al. '08
> Rocket: Giele & Zanderighi + related collaborations '08

▶ What about MLM, CKKW matching for combining different tree-level contributions?
> Designed to avoid deficiences of Parton Showers
> But does more — a sort of "LO++". Still, not NLO
> Couldn't tell from literature how it would do in this case
> One should double-check it!

Viewing QCD

Consider case of *mass peaks* — but bear in mind that
other kinematic structures are fundamentally related.


$$\sim \frac{d}{dm}$$

Some peaks are easy — QCD not needed

e.g. resonance $\to \ell^+\ell^-$, or big broad resonance to jets

Bhatti et al (for CMS), study of dijet mass resonances (q^*), 0807.4961

Observability may depend on parameters

$d\sigma(pp \to (G \to) t\bar{t})/dm_{t\bar{t}}$ [pb/20 GeV]

LO, CTEQ6L1, LHC

m_1=600 GeV

$\kappa/\overline{M}_{pl}$=0.10
$\kappa/\overline{M}_{pl}$=0.07
$\kappa/\overline{M}_{pl}$=0.04
$\kappa/\overline{M}_{pl}$=0.02
$\kappa/\overline{M}_{pl}$=0.01

$t\bar{t}$ invariant mass [GeV]

RS KK resonances, from Frederix & Maltoni, 0712.2355

Cases where QCD has the most to contribute are those that are borderline

Signal peak may sit on background peak

DO low-mass Higgs-boson search, 0808.1970

As example, a Higgs-boson search illustrates two things:

- Using LHC scale hierarchy $\sqrt{s} \gg M_{EW}$ to our advantage

- Using QCD to help us extract cleaner signals

taken from Butterworth, Davison, Rubin & GPS '08

Low-mass Higgs search @ LHC: complex because dominant decay channel, $H \to bb$, often swamped by backgrounds.

Various production processes

- $gg \to H \, (\to \gamma\gamma)$ feasible
- $WW \to H \to \ldots$ feasible
- $gg \to t\bar{t}H$ v. hard
- $q\bar{q} \to WH, ZH$

small; but gives access to
WH and ZH couplings
Currently considered impossible

WH/ZH search channel @ LHC

▶ Signal is $W \to \ell\nu$, $H \to b\bar{b}$.

Studied e.g. in ATLAS TDR

▶ Backgrounds include $Wb\bar{b}$, $t\bar{t} \to \ell\nu b\bar{b}jj$, ...

Difficulties, e.g.

▶ Poor acceptance ($\sim 12\%$)
        Easily lose 1 of 4 decay products

▶ p_t cuts introduce intrinsic bkgd mass scale;

▶ $gg \to t\bar{t} \to \ell\nu b\bar{b}[jj]$ has similar scale

▶ small S/B

▶ Need exquisite control of bkgd shape

WH/ZH search channel @ LHC

- Signal is $W \to \ell\nu$, $H \to b\bar{b}$.   Studied e.g. in ATLAS TDR
- Backgrounds include $Wb\bar{b}$, $t\bar{t} \to \ell\nu b\bar{b}jj$, . . .

$pp \to WH \to \ell\nu b\bar{b}$ + bkgds

ATLAS TDR

$m_{b\bar{b}}$ (GeV)

Difficulties, e.g.

- Poor acceptance ($\sim 12\%$)
  Easily lose 1 of 4 decay products
- p_t cuts introduce intrinsic bkgd mass scale;
- $gg \to t\bar{t} \to \ell\nu b\bar{b}[jj]$ has similar scale
- small S/B
- Need exquisite control of bkgd shape

WH/ZH search channel @ LHC

▶ Signal is $W \to \ell\nu$, $H \to b\bar{b}$.　　　　Studied e.g. in ATLAS TDR

▶ Backgrounds include $Wb\bar{b}$, $t\bar{t} \to \ell\nu b\bar{b}jj$, ...

Difficulties, e.g.

▶ Poor acceptance ($\sim 12\%$)
　　　　Easily lose 1 of 4 decay products

▶ p_t cuts introduce intrinsic bkgd mass scale;

▶ $gg \to t\bar{t} \to \ell\nu b\bar{b}[jj]$ has similar scale

▶ small S/B

▶ Need exquisite control of bkgd shape

Conclusion (ATLAS TDR):

"The extraction of a signal from $H \to b\bar{b}$ decays in the WH channel will be very difficult at the LHC, even under the most optimistic assumptions [...]"

Study subset of WH/ZH with high p_t

Take advantage of the fact that $\sqrt{s} \gg M_H, m_t, \ldots$

Go to high p_t:

✓ Higgs and W/Z more likely to be central

✓ high-p_t $Z \to \nu\bar{\nu}$ becomes visible

✓ Fairly collimated decays: high-p_t $\ell^{\pm}, \nu, b$

Good detector acceptance

✓ Backgrounds lose cut-induced scale

✓ $t\bar{t}$ kinematics cannot simulate bkgd

Gain clarity and S/B

✗ Cross section will drop dramatically

By a factor of 20 for $p_{tH} > 200$ GeV

Will the benefits outweigh this?

Boosted EW bosons

Hadronically decaying Higgs boson at high p_t = single massive jet?

boosted X → z ... $(1-z)$ → **single jet**

$$R \gtrsim \frac{m}{p_t} \frac{1}{\sqrt{z(1-z)}}$$

discussion of this & related problems: Seymour '93; Butterworth, Cox & Forshaw '02; Butterworth, Ellis & Raklev '07; Skiba & Tucker-Smith '07; Holdom '07; Baur '07; Agashe et al. '07; Lillie, Randall & Wang '07; Contino & Servant '08; Brooijmans '08; Thaler & Wang '08; Kaplan et al '08; Almeida et al '08; [. . .]

What does QCD tell us about how to deal with this?

Hadronically decaying Higgs boson at high p_t = single massive jet?

boosted X $\quad z$ $\quad$ **single jet** $\qquad R \gtrsim \dfrac{m}{p_t} \dfrac{1}{\sqrt{z(1-z)}}$

$(1-z)$

discussion of this & related problems: Seymour '93; Butterworth, Cox & Forshaw '02; Butterworth, Ellis & Raklev '07; Skiba & Tucker-Smith '07; Holdom '07; Baur '07; Agashe et al. '07; Lillie, Randall & Wang '07; Contino & Servant '08; Brooijmans '08; Thaler & Wang '08; Kaplan et al '08; Almeida et al '08; [. . .]

What does QCD tell us about how to deal with this?

QCD principle: soft divergence

Signal

Background

Splitting probability for Higgs:

$$P(z) \propto 1$$

Splitting probability for quark:

$$P(z) \propto \frac{1 + z^2}{1 - z}$$

$1/(1-z)$ divergence enhances background

Remove divergence in bkdg with cut on z
Can choose cut analytically so as to maximise $S/\sqrt{B}$

Originally: ad-hoc cut on (related) k_t-distance
Seymour '93; Butterworth, Cox & Forshaw '02

QCD principle: angular ordering

boosted X

Given a color-singlet $q\bar{q}$ pair of opening angle R_{bb}:

Nearly all the radiation from the pair is contained in two cones of opening angle R_{bb}, one centred on each quark.

Standard result also in QED

Use this to capture just the radiation from the $q\bar{q} \Rightarrow$ good mass resol^n

The Cambridge/Aachen jet alg.

Dokshitzer et al '97
Wengler & Wobisch '98

Work out $\Delta R_{ij}^2 = \Delta y_{ij}^2 + \Delta \phi_{ij}^2$ between all pairs of objects i, j;
Recombine the closest pair;
Repeat until all objects separated by $\Delta R_{ij} > R$.

Provides a "hierarchical" view of the event;
work through it backwards to analyse a jet

Implemented in FastJet
Cacciari, GPS & Soyez, '05-08, http://fastjet.fr/

All MC done with Herwig 6.510 and Jimmy 4.31

Start with high-p_t jet

1. Undo last stage of clustering ($\equiv$ reduce R): $J \rightarrow J_1, J_2$

2. If $\max(m_1, m_2) \lesssim 0.67 m$, call this a **mass drop**   [else goto 1]
   Automatically detects correct $R \sim R_{bb}$ to catch angular-ordered radn.

3. Require $y_{12} = \frac{\min(p_{t1}^2, p_{t2}^2)}{m_{12}^2} \Delta R_{12}^2 \simeq \frac{\min(z_1, z_2)}{\max(z_1, z_2)} > 0.09$ [else goto 1]
   dimensionless rejection of asymmetric QCD branching

4. Require each subjet to have b-tag   [else reject event]
   Correlate flavour & momentum structure

Start with high-p_t jet

1. Undo last stage of clustering ($\equiv$ reduce R): $J \rightarrow J_1, J_2$

2. If $\max(m_1, m_2) \lesssim 0.67m$, call this a **mass drop**   [else goto 1]
   Automatically detects correct $R \sim R_{bb}$ to catch angular-ordered radn.

3. Require $y_{12} = \frac{\min(p_{t1}^2, p_{t2}^2)}{m_{12}^2} \Delta R_{12}^2 \simeq \frac{\min(z_1, z_2)}{\max(z_1, z_2)} > 0.09$ [else goto 1]
   dimensionless rejection of asymmetric QCD branching

4. Require each subjet to have b-tag   [else reject event]
   Correlate flavour & momentum structure

At moderate p_t, R_{bb} is quite large; *UE & pileup degrade mass resolution*

$$\delta M \sim R^4 \Lambda_{UE} \frac{p_t}{M}$$ [Dasgupta, Magnea & GPS '07]

Filter the jet

▶ Reconsider region of interest at smaller $R_{filt} = \min(0.3, R_{b\bar{b}}/2)$

▶ Take **3** hardest subjets $\qquad\qquad b, \bar{b}$ and leading order gluon radiation

#3: jet filtering

At moderate p_t, R_{bb} is quite large; *UE & pileup degrade mass resolution*

$$\delta M \sim R^4 \Lambda_{UE} \frac{p_t}{M} \text{ [Dasgupta, Magnea & GPS '07]}$$

Filter the jet

▶ Reconsider region of interest at smaller $R_{filt} = \min(0.3, R_{b\bar{b}}/2)$

▶ Take **3** hardest subjets b, $\bar{b}$ and leading order gluon radiation

$pp \rightarrow ZH \rightarrow \nu\bar{\nu}b\bar{b}$, @14 TeV, $m_H = 115$ GeV

SIGNAL

Herwig 6.510 + Jimmy 4.31 + FastJet 2.3

all jets, default R = 1.2

Zbb BACKGROUND

Cluster event, C/A, R=1.2

arbitrary norm.

$pp \to ZH \to \nu\bar{\nu}b\bar{b}$, @14 TeV, $m_H = 115$ GeV

SIGNAL

Herwig 6.510 + Jimmy 4.31 + FastJet 2.3

Zbb BACKGROUND

Fill it in, $\to$ show jets more clearly

arbitrary norm.

$pp \rightarrow ZH \rightarrow \nu\bar{\nu}b\bar{b}$, @14 TeV, $m_H = 115$ GeV

Herwig 6.510 + Jimmy 4.31 + FastJet 2.3

Hardest jet, pt=246.211 m=150.465

Consider hardest jet, $m = 150$ GeV

SIGNAL

$200 < p_{tZ} < 250$ GeV

Zbb BACKGROUND

$200 < p_{tZ} < 250$ GeV

arbitrary norm.

$pp \rightarrow ZH \rightarrow \nu\bar{\nu}b\bar{b}$, @14 TeV, $m_H = 115$ GeV

Herwig 6.510 + Jimmy 4.31 + FastJet 2.3

Drop step 1; Delta R = 1.03129; pt1=243.291 m1=139.158; pt2=3.944 m2=5.24475

split: $m = 150$ GeV, $\frac{\max(m_1, m_2)}{m} = 0.92 \rightarrow$ repeat

SIGNAL

$200 < p_{tZ} < 250$ GeV

Zbb BACKGROUND

$200 < p_{tZ} < 250$ GeV

arbitrary norm.

$pp \rightarrow ZH \rightarrow \nu\bar{\nu}b\bar{b}$, @14 TeV, $m_H = 115\,\text{GeV}$

Herwig 6.510 + Jimmy 4.31 + FastJet 2.3

Drop step 2; Delta R = 0.87699; pt1=146.636 m1=52.3423; pt2=102.622 m2=27.7967

split: $m = 139$ GeV, $\frac{\max(m_1, m_2)}{m} = 0.37 \rightarrow$ mass drop

SIGNAL
$200 < p_{tZ} < 250$ GeV

Zbb BACKGROUND
$200 < p_{tZ} < 250$ GeV

arbitrary norm.

$pp \rightarrow ZH \rightarrow \nu\bar{\nu}b\bar{b}$, @14 TeV, $m_H = 115$ GeV

Herwig 6.510 + Jimmy 4.31 + FastJet 2.3

Drop step 2; Delta R = 0.87699; pt1=146.636 m1=52.3423; pt2=102.622 m2=27.7967

SIGNAL

$200 < p_{tZ} < 250$ GeV

Zbb BACKGROUND

$200 < p_{tZ} < 250$ GeV

check: $y_{12} \simeq \frac{p_{t2}}{p_{t1}} \simeq 0.7 \rightarrow$ OK + 2 b-tags (anti-QCD)

arbitrary norm.

$pp \rightarrow ZH \rightarrow \nu\bar{\nu}b\bar{b}$, @14 TeV, $m_H = 115$ GeV

Herwig 6.510 + Jimmy 4.31 + FastJet 2.3

$R_{filt} = 0.3$

SIGNAL
$200 < p_{tZ} < 250$ GeV

Zbb BACKGROUND
$200 < p_{tZ} < 250$ GeV

arbitrary norm.

$pp \rightarrow ZH \rightarrow \nu\bar{\nu}b\bar{b}$, @14 TeV, $m_H = 115$ GeV

Herwig 6.510 + Jimmy 4.31 + FastJet 2.3

SIGNAL

$200 < p_{tZ} < 250$ GeV

Zbb BACKGROUND

$200 < p_{tZ} < 250$ GeV

$R_{filt} = 0.3$: take 3 hardest, **m = 117 GeV**

arbitrary norm.

combine HZ and HW, $p_t > 200$ GeV

Leptonic channel

(a)

$S\sqrt{B} = 2.6$
in 112-128GeV

- $q\bar{q}$
- V+jets
- VV
- V+Higgs

Events / 8GeV / 30fb^{-1}

Mass (GeV)

Common cuts

- ▶ $p_{tV}, p_{tH} > 200$ GeV
- ▶ $|\eta_H| < 2.5$
- ▶ $[p_{t,\ell} > 30$ GeV, $|\eta_\ell| < 2.5]$
- ▶ No extra ℓ, b's with $|\eta| < 2.5$
- ▶ Real/fake b-tag rates: 0.7/0.01
- ▶ $S/\sqrt{B}$ from 16 GeV window

Leptonic channel

$Z \to \mu^+\mu^-, e^+e^-$

- ▶ $80 < m_{\ell^+\ell^-} < 100$ GeV

At 5.9σ for 30 fb^{-1} this looks like a possible new channel for light Higgs discovery. **Deserves serious exp. study!**

combine HZ and HW, $p_t > 200$ GeV

Missing E_T channel

(b)

$S/\sqrt{B} = 4.0$
in 112-128GeV

- q̄q
- V+jets
- VV
- V+Higgs

Events / 8GeV / 30fb^{-1}

Mass (GeV)

Common cuts

- $p_{tV}, p_{tH} > 200$ GeV
- $|\eta_H| < 2.5$
- $[p_{t,\ell} > 30$ GeV, $|\eta_\ell| < 2.5]$
- No extra ℓ, b's with $|\eta| < 2.5$
- Real/fake b-tag rates: 0.7/0.01
- $S/\sqrt{B}$ from 16 GeV window

Missing-E_t channel

$Z \to \nu\bar{\nu}, \ W \to \nu[\ell]$

- $\not{E}_T > 200$ GeV

At 5.9σ for 30 fb^{-1} this looks like a possible new channel for light Higgs discovery. **Deserves serious exp. study!**

combine HZ and HW, $p_t > 200$ GeV

Semi-leptonic channel

(c)

$S\sqrt{B} = 3.8$
in 112-128GeV

Legend: $q\bar{q}$, V+jets, VV, V+Higgs

Events / 8GeV / 30fb^{-1}

Mass (GeV)

Common cuts

- $p_{tV}, p_{tH} > 200$ GeV
- $|\eta_H| < 2.5$
- [$p_{t,\ell} > 30$ GeV, $|\eta_\ell| < 2.5$]
- No extra ℓ, b's with $|\eta| < 2.5$
- Real/fake b-tag rates: 0.7/0.01
- $S/\sqrt{B}$ from 16 GeV window

Semi-leptonic channel

$W \to \nu\ell$

- $\not{E}_T > 30$ GeV (& consistent W.)
- no extra jets $|\eta| < 3$, $p_t > 30$

At 5.9σ for 30 fb^{-1} this looks like a possible new channel for light Higgs discovery. **Deserves serious exp. study!**

combine HZ and HW, $p_t > 200$ GeV

3 channels combined

Common cuts

- $p_{tV}, p_{tH} > 200$ GeV
- $|\eta_H| < 2.5$
- $[p_{t,\ell} > 30$ GeV, $|\eta_\ell| < 2.5]$
- No extra ℓ, b's with $|\eta| < 2.5$
- Real/fake b-tag rates: 0.7/0.01
- $S/\sqrt{B}$ from 16 GeV window

3 channels combined

Note excellent VZ, $Z \to b\bar{b}$
peak for calibration

NB: $q\bar{q}$ is mostly $t\bar{t}$

At 5.9σ for 30 fb^{-1} this looks like a possible new channel for light Higgs discovery. **Deserves serious exp. study!**

Higgs physics means establishing whether it has the expected SM couplings.

Crucial part of that is seeing WH and ZH cleanly and separately from each other.

This channel seems to be the only good way of doing that for a light Higgs.

Alternative *WW* fusion: but mixes with *ZZ* fusion, *gg* fusion

Tagging boosted top-quarks

High-p_t top production often envisaged in New Physics processes.
$\sim$ high-p_t EW boson, but: top has 3-body decay and is coloured.

4 papers on top tagging in '08 (at least). All use the jet mass + something extra.

Questions

▶ What efficiency for tagging top?
▶ What rate of fake tags for normal jets?

<table>
<tr><th colspan="4">Rough results for top quark with $p_t \sim 1$ TeV</th></tr>
<tr><th></th><th>"Extra"</th><th>eff.</th><th>fake</th></tr>
<tr><td>[from T&W]</td><td>just jet mass</td><td>50%</td><td>10%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Broojimans</td><td>3,4 k_t subjets, d_{cut}</td><td>45%</td><td>5%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Thaler & Wang</td><td>2,3 k_t subjets, z_{cut} + various</td><td>40%</td><td>5%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Kaplan et al.</td><td>3,4 C/A subjets, z_{cut} + θ_h</td><td>40%</td><td>1%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Almeida et al.</td><td>predict mass dist^n, use jet-shape</td><td>?</td><td>?</td></tr>
</table>

Using (coloured!) boosted top-quarks

If you want to use the tagged top (e.g. for $t\bar{t}$ invariant mass) QCD tells you:

the jet you use to tag a top quark $\neq$ the jet you use to get its p_t

Within inner cone $\sim \frac{2m_t}{p_t}$ (dead cone) you have the top-quark decay products, but no radiation from top

ideal for reconstructing top mass

Outside dead cone, you have radiation from top quark

essential for top p_t

Cacciari, Rojo, GPS & Soyez '08

Impact of using small cone angle

Use small cone

qq, M = 4000 GeV

Cam/Aachen, R=0.4
$Q^w_{f=0.24}$ = 416.2 GeV

arXiv:0810.1304

Use large cone

qq, M = 4000 GeV

C/A-filt, R=1.2
$Q^w_{f=0.24}$ = 162.5 GeV

arXiv:0810.1304

1/N dn/dbin / 4

dijet mass [GeV]

Figure actually from 0810.1304, for light $q\bar{q}$ resonance — but $t\bar{t}$ will be similar

How you look at your event matters: http://quality.fastjet.fr/

Conclusions

We've seen examples where doing the QCD "right" makes a big difference.

From first part: it's clear that relative $\mathcal{O}\left(\alpha_s\right)$ ("the details") in QCD predictions (NLO) may be more than just a luxury refinement.

Part of the motivation for the large calculational effort in the field

Crucial in building confidence in our understanding of any LHC "excess"

From second part: there's much freedom in how we view events at LHC. QCD can guide us in making good choices, with large gains at hand.

A much smaller field — but several groups making good progress

Crucial in order to maximise LHC's senstivity to new physics

Common theme: LHC, for the first time, will take us well above the EW scale. That can take getting used to.

EXTRAS

Z+ N jet, LHC, pT>30 GeV
Integrated pT rate of N-th jet
solid: Alpgen
dashes: Herwig

Mangano, 0809.1567
Leading jet seems not to be enhanced?
Other "matched" plots do suggest some enhancement.

0-lepton search

- ☐ at least 1 jet with PT>100GeV
- ☐ 0 lepton (e, μ) with PT > 20 GeV
- ☐ MET > 100 GeV
- ☐ MET > 0.2 effective mass
- ☐ Transverse Sphericity ST > 0.2
- ☐ $\Delta\varphi(ET - jet\ i) > 0.2$ ($i = 1, 2, 3$)

- ■ Main backgrounds:
  - ☐ tt
  - ☐ W+jets
  - ☐ Z+jets
  - ☐ QCD

SM	0-l
tt	62%
W	17%
Z	10%
QCD	10%

Another example: b-jet production

Tevatron

LHC

MCFM

MC@NLO

$|y| < 0.7$, $R = 0.7$, $\mu_R = \mu_F = P_t$

$1/2\, P_t < \mu_R = \mu_F < 2\, P_t$

GSP

FEX

FCR

Herwig 6.5

GSP

FEX

p_t [GeV]

K factor

scale dep.

channels

Banfi, GPS & Zanderighi, '07

Impact of *b*-tagging, Higgs mass

Most scenarios above 3σ

For it to be a significant discovery channel requires decent *b*-tagging,
lowish mass Higgs [and good experimental resolution]

In nearly all cases, looks feasible for extracting *WH*, *ZH* couplings

Impact of *b*-tagging, Higgs mass

Most scenarios above 3σ

For it to be a significant discovery channel requires decent *b*-tagging, lowish mass Higgs [and good experimental resolution]

In nearly all cases, looks feasible for extracting *WH*, *ZH* couplings

Rough impact of going to high-p_t

How can we be doing so well despite losing factor 20 in X-sct?

	Signal	Background	
Eliminate $t\bar{t}$, etc.	−	×1/3	[very approx.]
$p_t > 200$ GeV	×1/20	×1/60	[bkgds: $Wb\bar{b}, Zb\bar{b}$]
improved acceptance	×4	×4	
twice better resolution	−	×1/2	
add $Z \to \nu\bar{\nu}$	×1.5	×1.5	
total	×0.3	×0.017	

much better S/B; better $S/\sqrt{B}$

[exact numbers depend on analysis details]

Cross section for signal and the Z+jets background in the leptonic Z channel for $200 < p_{TZ}/\,\mathrm{GeV} < 600$ and $110 < m_J/\,\mathrm{GeV} < 125$, with perfect b-tagging; shown for our jet definition (C/A MD-F), and other standard ones close to their optimal R values.

Jet definition	σ_S/fb	σ_B/fb	$S/\sqrt{B \cdot \mathrm{fb}}$
C/A, $R = 1.2$, MD-F	0.57	0.51	0.80
k_t, $R = 1.0$, y_{cut}	0.19	0.74	0.22
SISCone, $R = 0.8$	0.49	1.33	0.42
anti-k_t, $R = 0.8$	0.22	1.06	0.21

Compare with "standard" algorithms

Check mass spectra in HZ channel, $H \to b\bar{b}$, $Z \to \ell^+\ell^-$

Cambridge/Aachen (C/A) with mass-drop and filtering (MD/F) works best