

# Update in VBF Higgs CP test in $H \rightarrow \gamma \gamma$ channel

#### FANGYI GUO, IHEP CAS

fangyi.guo@cern.ch



Institute of High Energy Physics Chinese Academy of Sciences

#### Previous review

In last report, we considered a 6-dimension EFT for VBF Higgs CPV.

$$\begin{split} \mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}} &= \mathcal{L}_{\text{SM}} + \frac{f_{\bar{B}B}}{\Lambda^2} O_{\bar{B}B} + \frac{f_{\bar{W}W}}{\Lambda^2} O_{\bar{W}W} + \frac{f_{\bar{B}}}{\Lambda^2} O_{\bar{B}} \\ &= \mathcal{L}_{\text{SM}} + \tilde{g}_{HAA} H \tilde{A}_{\mu\nu} A^{\mu\nu} + \tilde{g}_{HAZ} H \tilde{A}_{\mu\nu} Z^{\mu\nu} + \tilde{g}_{HZZ} H \tilde{Z}_{\mu\nu} Z^{\mu\nu} + \tilde{g}_{HWW} H \tilde{W}^+_{\mu\nu} W^{-\mu\nu} \\ \text{And use } \tilde{d} \sim f(\tilde{g}) \text{ to represent the CP violation in matrix element:} \\ \mathcal{M} &= \mathcal{M}_{\text{SM}} + \tilde{d} \cdot \mathcal{M}_{\text{CP-odd}} \\ &|\mathcal{M}|^2 = |\mathcal{M}_{\text{SM}}|^2 + \tilde{d} \cdot 2 \Re (\mathcal{M}^*_{\text{SM}} \mathcal{M}_{\text{CP-odd}}) + \tilde{d}^2 \cdot |\mathcal{M}_{\text{CP-odd}}|^2 \,. \end{split}$$



### MC sample

Signal sample:

- SM VBF  $H \rightarrow \gamma \gamma$ : ATLAS official mc16, 13TeV PowhegPythia8EvtGen, NNPDF30, DxAOD file.
- BSM CP-mixing VBF: matrix element reweighting method to SM VBF sample.

Background sample:

- SM ggF  $H \rightarrow \gamma \gamma$ : ATLAS official h024 mc16a+d, PowhegPy8 NNLOPs ggH125, MxAOD file.
- SM di-photon: ATLAS h024 mc16a+d, Sherpa 2DP20 myy\_100\_160, MxAOD file.

15+16+17 sideband data as data-MC comparison.

# Validation of weight method

Use truth information in VBF sample to calculate a weight by HAWK

• 
$$w \equiv \frac{|\mathcal{M}_{CPV}|^2}{|\mathcal{M}_{SM}|^2} = 1 + w_1 \tilde{d} + w_2 \tilde{d}^2$$
.

- Input: incoming & outgoing VBF quarks flavor, Bjorken x, all 4-momentum of initial & final state particles.
- Output:  $w_1$  and  $w_2$ .

Validation: generate 2 Madgraph\_aMC@NLO sample

- 1) SM VBF: p p > h j j \$\$ w+ w- z a QCD=0, default pars + reweight to  $\tilde{d} = 0.1$
- 2) CP-mixing VBF: same syntax but changed the coupling pars to  $\tilde{d}=0.1$

MG5\_aMC@NLO parameters numerical values,  $\tilde{d} = \tilde{d}_B = 0.1$   $c_{\alpha} = 0.6$   $K_{SM} = 1.\bar{6}$   $k_{AWW} = -2.03$   $k_{AZZ} = -2.03$   $k_{A\gamma\gamma} = -155.97$  $k_{AZ\gamma} = 0$ 

# Validation of weight method



Left: my result, blue is re-weight, red is generated. Right: result cited from H->tautau supporting note.

The HAWK package has no problem, and I used correctly in my work.

#### Event selection

Event selection for MC samples:

- Pre-sel: No Dalitz, PassIsolation, PassPID, passTriggerMatch,  $m_{\gamma\gamma} \in [105,160]$  GeV (exclude [120, 130]GeV for sideband data)
- At least 2 photon + 2 jets
- $\frac{P_T}{m_{\gamma\gamma}} > 0.35(0.25)$
- $m_{ii} > 400 GeV$
- $\circ \ \left| \Delta \eta_{jj} \right| > 2$
- $\circ \ |\eta^{Zepp}| < 5$

		SM VBF	ggF	MC bkg	Sideband data
	Sum of weight	1506191	804823820	28449980	
	pre-sel	152.93	642.611	160058.7	164046
	rel.pT	152.93	642.611	160058.7	164046
	Mass window	152.93	642.611	160058.7	164046
	m_jj<400	84.4765	74.2101	15018	16947
	deltaEta_jj>2	83.8883	70.6592	12727.97	11361
	Zepp<5	83.849	70.3787	12604.75	11262
	VBF cat.	72.9534	51.8225	7654.16	7025

### Data-MC comparison

Background composition estimation:

• Purity 2x2DSB. Calculate  $\gamma\gamma$ ,  $\gamma j$ ,  $j\gamma$ , jj event number and fraction

2015+2016 data, 36ifb:

Consistency check with sum over the bins: Ngg = 247648 Ngj = 32505 Njg = 11423 Njj = 5505 Purity = 0.833604

2017 data, 44ifb:

Consistency check with sum over the bins: Ngg = 233833 Ngj = 29814 Njg = 9626 Njj = 5003 Purity = 0.840292 Inclusive, no specific category. Ref from Run2 80ifb: 75.6% for yy Ref from Run2 36ifb: baseline 78.7% for yy for 4 VBF cat. 80%~84%

#### Data-MC comparison



2019/12/2

#### Data-MC comparison





# Fitting with sideband data

- a) Fit model with individual MC template to get PDF
- b) Fix  $N_{ggF}$  to  $N_{ggF}^{SM}$ , fit 1-D  $m_{\gamma\gamma}$  distribution to get  $\hat{\mu}_{VBF}$ ,  $\hat{N}_{bkg}$ .
- c) Construct 2-D model with:  $PDF_{total}(m_{\gamma\gamma}, 00)$   $= \hat{\mu}_{VBF} \times N_{VBF}^{SM} \times f_{sig}(m_{\gamma\gamma}) \times g_{VBF}(00) + N_{ggF}^{SM} \times f_{sig}(m_{\gamma\gamma}) \times g_{ggF}(00)$  $+ \hat{N}_{bkg} \times f_{sig}(m_{\gamma\gamma}) \times g_{ggF}(00)$
- d) Calculate Negative Log Likelihood(NLL) and  $\Delta NLL \equiv NLL NLL_{min}$  with  $PDF_{total}(m_{\gamma\gamma}, OO)$  and SM Asimov data for each d.

The approximate central confidence interval at 68%(95%) CL could be determined from  $\Delta NLL$  curve.

#### Fitting with sideband data



Left: Best fit signal strength  $\mu$  and  $\mu^{fit}/\mu^{exp}$ . Right:  $\Delta NLL$  for different  $\tilde{d}$ 

# Conclusion

Statistic only expected CP mixing parameter interval:

- 68% CL: [-0.08, 0.07]
- 95% CL: [-0.12, 0.12]

Facing problem: Data and MC don't match in jet performance.

- Can I use Run2 HGam MVA categories?(HjjHigh\_tight, etc. they are trained with jet-relative vars.)
- Is only using sideband data for background correct?

Next step:

• read 140ifb full Run2 data, consider systematic uncertainty.

# Back up

# Fit model

Signal: Double-side Crystal Ball

Background: exponential PDF.

Use Asimov data to decrease statistical fluctuation.



### Fit model

#### Optimal Observable: Double-side Crystal Ball



# $m_{\gamma\gamma}$ and OO correlation

