Trigger Efficiencies from 2015D

P. Dunne on behalf of the H→invisible analysis group

Introduction

Overview

- 50ns data control plots and trigger efficiencies shown previously
- First golden JSONs from 2015D 25ns data have come out in the last couple of weeks
- Will show updated trigger efficiencies and control plots

Trigger Efficiencies - first iteration

- Measure efficiency as a function of each variable
- Start by cutting on all other variables at trigger threshold value
- Trigger: HLT_DiPFJet40_DEta3p5_MJJ600_PFMETNoMu140
- Made using $\sim$166.37 pb^{-1} of 50ns data
  - 2% of grid jobs failed





Trigger Efficiencies - first iteration

- Same cuts and data as previous page





Tighter MET cut

- MET efficiency above 90% at ∼300 GeV
- Change cuts to:
  - METnoMu> 300 GeV, DiPFJet> 40 GeV, $\Delta\eta_{jj} > 3.5$, M_{jj} >600





Tighter MET cut

- MET efficiency above 90% at ∼300 GeV
- Change cuts to:
  - METnoMu> 300 GeV, DiPFJet> 40 GeV, $\Delta\eta_{jj} > 3.5$, M_{jj} >600



Tighter jpt cut

- Jet p_T efficiency above 90% at ∼80 GeV
- Change cuts to:
  - METnoMu> 300 GeV, DiPFJet> 80 GeV, $\Delta\eta_{jj} > 3.5$, M_{jj} >600





Tighter jpt cut

- MET efficiency above 90% at ∼300 GeV
- Change cuts to:
  - METnoMu> 300 GeV, DiPFJet> 40 GeV, $\Delta\eta_{jj} > 3.5$, M_{jj} >600





Control Plots

- Make control plots with METnoMu> 300 GeV, DiPFJet> 40 GeV, $\Delta\eta_{jj} > 3.5$, M_{jj} >600 plus lepton veto
  - Luminosity labels are incorrect





Control Plots

- Make control plots with METnoMu> 300 GeV, DiPFJet> 40 GeV, $\Delta\eta_{jj} > 3.5$, M_{jj} >600 plus lepton veto
  - Luminosity labels are incorrect





Control Plots

- Make control plots with METnoMu> 300 GeV, DiPFJet> 40 GeV, $\Delta\eta_{jj} > 3.5$, M_{jj} >600 plus lepton veto
  - Luminosity labels are incorrect





Control Plots-munu control region

- Make control plots with METnoMu> 300 GeV, DiPFJet> 40 GeV, $\Delta\eta_{jj} > 3.5$, M_{jj} >600 plus single tight muon
- 26 events in region. Enu region has 3 events, mumu region has 2 events
  - Luminosity labels are incorrect





Gamma control region first look

- Cut based photon ID from EGamma POG implemented
- Make control plots with METnoMu> 300 GeV, DiPFJet> 40 GeV, $\Delta\eta_{jj} > 3.5$, M_{jj} >600 plus single tight photon
- Met obviously needs correcting for photon pt
  - Luminosity labels are incorrect





Summary

- Trigger efficiencies from 25ns data shown
  - MET fully efficient ∼300 GeV
  - Jet pt fully efficient ∼80 GeV
- Control plots don't have much statistics after these cuts
- Another 80pb^{-1} have 99% of jobs finished processing

Backup


CMS

Why Higgs to Invisible?

Experimental motivation

- Current measurements of the 125 GeV Higgs boson are compatible with Standard Model (SM) expectations
  - large uncertainties can still accommodate significant beyond the SM (BSM) properties
- Additional Higgs bosons with exotic decays are not excluded



Theoretical motivation

- Many BSM theories predict Higgs boson decays to invisible final states:
  - e.g. SUSY, extra dimensions, fourth-generation neutrinos
- These final state particles are often dark matter candidates

Monojet+V(had)H-tagged - EXO-12-055, AN-2014/206

Strategy

- Select a high energy jet+MET
- Categorise events as boosted or resolved V-tagged or no V-tag
- Use data driven methods to estimate major backgrounds

Signal extraction and results

- Simultaneous fit to MET in signal and control regions
- 95% CL observed (expected) limit on B(H→inv) 54(62)%



Z(ll)H - HIG-13-030, AN-2013/333

Strategy

- Select two electrons or muons compatible with a Z decay + MET
- Categorise by lepton flavour and presence of a jet
- Use data driven methods to estimate remaining backgrounds

Signal extraction and results

- 2D (1D) fit to m_{ll} and m_T (m_T) in 8 (7) TeV
- 95% CL observed (expected) limit on B(H→inv) 83(86)%



Z(bb)H - HIG-13-030, AN-2013/222

Strategy

- Based on H(bb)Z(inv) analysis:
  - Require two jets consistent with $Z \rightarrow$bb+MET
- Categorise according to MET
- Backgrounds from MC normalised in simultaneous fit to signal and control regions

Signal extraction and results

- Fit to BDT
- 95% CL observed (expected) limit on B(H$\rightarrow$inv) 182(199)%



Likelihood scans

- Likelihood plotted as a function of B(H→inv):
  - for combination (left) and by analysis (right)





Limits - by production mode tag

- VBF tagged is VBF analysis
- VH-tagged is Z(ll)H + Z(bb)H + boosted and resolved from monojet+V(had)H
- ggH-tagged is monojet from monojet+V(had)H



Reminder of Analysis

Overlaps

Overlaps between VBF, Z(ll)H, Z(bb)H

- VBF, Z(ll)H and Z(bb)H analyses are exclusive by design:
  - VBF requires no leptons and high M_{jj}
  - Z(ll)H requires two leptons
  - Z(bb)H requires no leptons and low M_{jj}

Overlaps between monojet+V(had) and other analyses

- Z(bb)H and resolved category of monojet+V(had) have potential overlap
  - Not expected to impact result
  - Completely removing resolved category has no effect on expected limit
- VBF and monojet+V(had)-tagged analyses do have overlap:
  - Veto events from monojet+V(had) analysis with 1st (2nd) jet with p_T >50 (45) GeV, M_{jj} >1200 GeV, $\eta_{j1} \cdot \eta_{j2} < 0$ and $\Delta\eta_{jj} > 3.6$
  - Veto is solely for clean statistical combination not for further separation of production modes

Effect of VBF veto

Events rejected by VBF veto

Sample	Monojet	Boosted	Resolved
VBF	13.2%	11.0%	0.0%
ggH	1.52%	0.0%	0.0%
Data	0.4%	0.2%	0.5%
Expected signal composition	70% ggH, 20% VBF, 6% WH, 3% ZH	47% WH, 25% ggH, 23% ZH, 5% VBF	39% ggH, 32% WH, 18% ZH, 11% VBF

- Explicitly checked overlap after veto in signal and dimuon control regions
- 3 out of 89,304 events found to overlap
  - All in monojet category at low MET
  - All have a 2nd jet rejected by PU ID - thought to be from small input differences
- Full monojet+V(had) analysis is rerun after veto:
  - All results shown are after veto

Correlated Nuisances

Nuisance	Analyses which it affects
Jet energy scale	VBF, Z($\ell\ell$)H(inv)
PDF uncertainties	VBF, Z($b\bar{b}$), Z($\ell\ell$)H(inv), monojet+V(had)
QCD scale	VBF, Z($b\bar{b}$), Z($\ell\ell$)H(inv), monojet+V(had)
Luminosity	VBF, Z($b\bar{b}$)H(inv), Z($\ell\ell$)H(inv), monojet+V(had)
Jet energy resolution	VBF, Z($\ell\ell$)H(inv)
Unclustered energy scale	VBF, Z($b\bar{b}$)H(inv), Z($\ell\ell$)H(inv)
Muon identification efficiency	VBF, Z($\ell\ell$)H(inv), monojet+V(had)
Electron identification efficiency	VBF, Z($\ell\ell$)H(inv)
Diboson cross-section	VBF, monojet+V(had)

- JES/R in Z(bb)H is not correlated with others because it comes from jet energy regression method also used in $H \to b\bar{b}$ analysis
- Monojet+V(had) MET uncertiainties are not correlated with others
  - Monojet+V(had) uses uncorrected pfmet with recoil corrections
  - Other analyses use type 1 corrected pfmet

JES/R Correlation - check jet p_T





VBF leading (left) and subleading (right) jet p_T







JES/R Correlation - check jet η





VBF most central (left) and most forward (right) tag jet η







JES/R Correlation

- Significantly different jet kinematics seen in VBF and monojet+V(had)H
- Jets used in Z(ll)H analysis are low p_T additional jets
  - These are similar to additional jets used for min$\Delta\phi$(j,MET) in VBF
  - Different from high p_T jets in monojet+V(had)H analysis
- We therefore do not correlate JES/R between monojet+V(had)H and these analyses
- We tried a number of scenarios for the correlation model and found that they all gave no change to the expected limit:
  - VBF+Z(ll)H correlated, all correlated, none correlated
  - Expected limit was 30% for all scenarios

Channel	Observed (expected) upper limits on $\frac{\sigma}{\sigma_{SM}}\cdot$B(H$\rightarrow$inv) (%)
VBF	57 (40)
Monojet+V(had)H	54 (62)
Z(ll)H	83 (86)
Z(bb)H	182 (199)
Combined	36 (30)

Pulls

- Usual full table of pulls and post-fit nuisances in AN/2014-206
- Generally distributed around their pre-fit values
  - Apologies for x axis below



VBF Objects

PFMET

- Ignore muons
- Type0+1 corrections
- Smeared PFMET for MC

AK5 PFJets

- L1FastJet+L2+L3(+L2L3Residual) JEC
- "Loose" PF Jet ID
- Cleaned with veto leptons
- "Loose" PU jet ID
- Smeared jet collection for MC (JER is smeared to match data)

Veto leptons

- loose+PFiso muons $p_T > 10$ GeV, $|\eta| < 2.1$
- veto+PFiso electrons $p_T > 10$ GeV, $|\eta| < 2.4$

Tight leptons

- As veto leptons but "tight" ID and $p_T > 20$ GeV

Hadronic taus

- $p_T > 20$ GeV, $|\eta| < 2.3$,$d_Z < 0.2$ cm
- Tight ID, discriminant "byTightCombinedIsolationDelta-BetaCorr3Hits"
- Efficiency $\sim$0.55, fake rate 0.02(barrel),0.03(endcap)