Differential cross section measurement of the Higgs boson decaying into two taus at the ATLAS experiment

Antonio De Maria CLHCP 2024

SR



# Higgs boson production modes





 $^*$  predicted cross section for m\_{H}{=}125 GeV at  $\sqrt{s}{=}13$  TeV

A. De Maria

## Higgs boson couplings

 $\bullet\,$  The SM Higgs boson couplings can be summarised in the Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{m_f}{v} f \bar{f} H + \frac{m_H^2}{2v} H^3 + \frac{m_H^2}{8v^2} H^4 + \delta_V V_\mu V^\mu \left(\frac{2m_V^2}{v} H + \frac{m_V^2}{v^2} H^2\right)$$

- Coupling with SM particles proportional to:
  - $m_V^2$  for bosons  $\rightarrow$  main couplings with W and Z
  - $m_F$  for fermions  $\rightarrow$  main couplings with third generation of quark and leptons (b and  $\tau$ )
- Coupling as function of particle mass in good agreement with SM prediction over 3 order of magnitude



#### Higgs boson decay branching ratios





- Larger branching ratio (BR) for  $H \rightarrow b\bar{b}, H \rightarrow WW^*$  and  $H \rightarrow \tau\tau$ , however poor mass resolution and larger background contamination
- *H* → *γγ* and *H* → *ZZ*\*(→ 4*I*) have lower BR, but high mass resolution; can be used for precision measurements
- $H \rightarrow Z\gamma$  and  $H \rightarrow \mu\mu$  becoming accessible thanks to large dataset and the good detector performance

# H ightarrow au au measurements - arxiv-2407.16320



- Considering all main Higgs boson production modes, with dedicated selection to enhance each mode
- Considering all di- $\tau$  final states,  $\tau_{lep}\tau_{lep}/\tau_{lep}\tau_{had}/\tau_{had}\tau_{had}$
- Measure cross section per production mode, cross section in the Simplified Template Cross Section (STXS) framework and differential cross section in VBF phase space
- Results extracted from likelihood fits on the di-τ invariant mass estimated using Missing Mass Calculator (MMC) Link



# Tau Reconstruction/Identification

- Attempt to reconstruct only hadronically decaying taus
- Tau candidates are seeded by anti- $k_t$  LC jets with a distance parameter R = 0.4
- Track selected in the *core*  $(0 < \Delta R < 0.2)$  and *isolation*  $(0.2 < \Delta R < 0.4)$  regions around the tau candidate axis.
- Identification algorithm based on RNN to reject background from q/g jets
  - trained using track and cluster information





# **Background estimation**

- Mostly based on simulation except for misidentified τ, which is data-driven
- Z $\rightarrow \tau \tau$  (70-90%): validated and normalised using *embedded* Z $\rightarrow$  *II* CRs
- Misidentified  $\tau$  (5-20 %): estimated using Matrix Method ( $\tau_{lep}\tau_{lep}$ ) and Fake Factor Method ( $\tau_{lep}\tau_{had}$  and  $\tau_{had}\tau_{had}$ )
- Top ( < 5% but 35-50% in ttH SRs): validated in Top CRs
- Other backgrounds: small, evaluated through simulation







#### Kinematic Embedding (JHEP 08 (2022) 175



- Select  $Z{\rightarrow}$  // + jets events in CRs defined orthogonal to the signal region
- Unfold  $Z \rightarrow II$  events taking into account lepton reconstruction efficiencies
- Mimic Z $\rightarrow \tau \tau$  events through kinematic parameterisation of  $\tau$  decay products



• Procedure validated in different kinematic phase spaces



# Cross section per production mode



- Most precise VBF cross section measurement per-single channel in the ATLAS experiment
- ggH cross section uncertainty limited by syst. uncertainties, mostly from theoretical uncertainty
- ttH and V(had)H cross section measurement limited by statistics





Production mode	ggF	ttH	VBF	VH
Best-fit value	0.94	0.77	0.93	0.91
Total uncertainty	$\pm 0.30$	$\pm 0.97$	$\pm 0.16$	$\pm 0.62$
Statistical uncertainty	±0.15	±0.82	±0.12	±0.52
Total systematic uncertainty	$\pm 0.26$	$\pm 0.51$	$\pm 0.11$	$\pm 0.34$
Samples size	±0.09	±0.32	±0.03	±0.25
Theoretical uncertainty in signal	±0.19	$\pm 0.14$	±0.10	±0.13
Jet and $E_{\rm T}^{\rm miss}$	±0.12	±0.14	±0.03	$\pm 0.11$
Hadronic $\tau$ -lepton decays	$\pm 0.05$	±0.09	$\pm 0.01$	$\pm 0.04$
Misidentified $\tau$ -lepton background	$\pm 0.05$	±0.05	$\pm 0.02$	$\pm 0.11$
Luminosity	$\pm 0.01$	$\pm 0.01$	$\pm 0.01$	$\pm 0.02$
Theoretical uncertainty in top-quark processes	$\pm 0.01$	±0.30	-	$\pm 0.02$
Theoretical uncertainty in Z + jets processes	±0.03	±0.07	-	$\pm 0.02$
Flavour tagging	$\pm 0.02$	±0.05	$\pm 0.01$	$\pm 0.01$
Electrons and muons	$\pm 0.02$	$\pm 0.01$	$\pm 0.01$	$\pm 0.02$

#### A. De Maria

## Simplified template cross section results

- Measurement performed in 18 different kinematic phase spaces
- No significant deviation from SM
- For VBF, first (most precise) measurement for p<sub>T</sub>(H) > (<) 200 GeV and m<sub>jj</sub> > 1.5 TeV
- Found large anti-correlation between VBF and ggH in-VBF phase space cross sections
- ttH measurement used to derive upper limits on STXS ttH bins







#### Differential cross section measurement



- Measurement performed in dedicated fiducial phase space for VBF production, minimising ggH contamination
- Considering several variables for unfolding, like  $p_T(H)$ /leading jet  $p_T$ and  $\Delta \phi_{jj}^{\text{signed}}$  (sensitive to Higgs Charge-Parity (CP) symmetry)





#### Differential cross section Results



Data, total unc

Data stat. unc

MadGraph5+Pythia8

Powheq+Pvthia8

agH+VH+ttH

Powheg+Herwig7

- Per-bin precision typically within 25-50%, limited by statistical uncertainties in most of the bins
- Results compared with predictions from the PoPy8, PoHer7 and MadPy8 generators; found no significant deviations from SM predictions



ل<sup>ofid</sup>/dp<sub>T</sub>(j<sub>0</sub>) [fb/GeV]

0.08

0.07 0.06

0.05

0.04 0.03

0.02

0.01

1.5Ē

ATI AS

√s=13 TeV, 140 fb

A. De Maria

#### **Effective Field Theory interpretation**



- Results from differential analysis are interpreted in the SMEFT formalism
- For VBF, 3 CP-even and 3 CP-odd operators are investigated for the H-V interaction
- Measure the Wilson coefficient (*strength*) for each operator, setting BSM physics scale Λ = 1 TeV

	CP-even			
Operator $O_i^{(d=6)}$	$H^{\dagger}HW^{n}_{\mu u}W^{n\mu u}$	$H^{\dagger}HB_{\mu u}B^{\mu u}$	$H^{\dagger} \tau^n H W^n_{\mu u} B^{\mu u}$	
Wilson coefficient	CHW	CHB	CHWB	
	CP-odd			
Operator $O_i^{(d=6)}$	$H^{\dagger}H\tilde{W}^{n}_{\mu u}W^{n\mu u}$	$H^{\dagger}H\tilde{B}_{\mu u}B^{\mu u}$	$H^{\dagger} \tau^n H \tilde{W}^n_{\mu u} B^{\mu u}$	
Wilson coefficient	$c_{H\tilde{W}}$	$c_{H\tilde{B}}$	$c_{H\tilde{W}B}$	



# **EFT** interpretation results

- Measuring one Wilson coefficient while fixing all others to 0 (1-dim), as well as 2-dim measurements
- Most stringent observed results for 1-dim are  $c_{HW}\epsilon[-1.85, +0.57]$  and  $c_{H\tilde{W}}\epsilon[-0.31, +0.88]$  in the linear scenario
- Tightest constraint to date for  $c_{H\tilde{W}}$
- No evidence of BSM physics





A. De Maria





- $H \rightarrow \tau \tau$  is currently the best decay at LHC to study Higgs-Yukawa coupling
- Considering all main Higgs boson production modes and all di-au final states
- Most precise VBF cross section measurement per-single channel in ATLAS
- cross section measured in 18 different *bins* within the STXS framework
- Performed also differential cross section measurement in VBF with a per-bin precision mostly within 25-50%
- EFT interpretation of the differential results led to tightest constraint to date for  $c_{H\tilde{W}}$  for  $\Lambda=1~\text{TeV}$

# Thanks For Your Attention

# Backup

#### Misidentified au background (JHEP 08 (2022) 175



- Aim to estimate jet mis-identified as  $\tau$ (light leptons) in  $\tau_{lep}\tau_{had}$  and  $\tau_{had}\tau_{had}$  $(\tau_{lep}\tau_{lep})$  final states
- Validated in dedicated CRs and residual mis-modelling assigned as systematic uncertainty





18 / 18