


The ATLASpdf21 fit

Francesco Giuli (on behalf of the ATLAS Collaboration)

LHC EW WG General Meeting



15/02/2022



The ATLASpdf21 fit

2112.11266
(submitted
to EPJC)

- **ATLASpdf21** is a PDF fit to **multiple ATLAS data sets**
- DIS HERA data are the backbone of ATLAS PDF fits – HERA data provide constraints over a very wide range of x and Q^2
- LHC data provide additional constraints at medium and high- x and Q^2
- All the fits performed using [xFitter](#)
- Fit to **NNLO in QCD and NLO in EW** achieved either by direct NNLO grids or by k-factor corrections - current 'state of the art'

Data set	\sqrt{s} [TeV]	Luminosity [fb^{-1}]	Decay channel	Observables entering the fit
Inclusive $W, Z/\gamma^*$ [9]	7	4.6	e, μ combined	$\eta_l (W), y_Z (Z)$
Inclusive Z/γ^* [13]	8	20.2	e, μ combined	$\cos \theta$ in bins of $y_{\ell\ell}, M_{\ell\ell}$
Inclusive W [12]	8	20.2	μ	η_μ
$W^\pm + \text{jets}$ [23]	8	20.2	e	p_T^W
$Z + \text{jets}$ [24]	8	20.2	e	p_T^{jets} in bins of $ y_{\text{jets}} $
$t\bar{t}$ [25, 26]	8	20.2	lepton + jets, dilepton	$m_{t\bar{t}}, p_T^t, y_{t\bar{t}}$
$t\bar{t}$ [15]	13	36	lepton + jets	$m_{t\bar{t}}, p_T^t, y_t, y_{t\bar{t}}$
Inclusive isolated γ [14]	8, 13	20.2, 3.2	-	E_T^γ in bins of η^γ
Inclusive jets [16–18]	7, 8, 13	4.5, 20.2, 3.2	-	p_T in bins of $ y_{\text{jets}} $

Advances wrt previous ATLAS PDF fits

- First ATLAS PDF fit which aim to include **many ATLAS data sets** (in contrast to previous papers where HERA + 1 or 2 other ATLAS data sets were fitted)
- First ATLAS PDF fit which includes **13 TeV data** (only [NNPDF4.0](#) include 13 TeV data, other global fitters do not)
- **Inclusion of scale uncertainties** as additional correlated systematic uncertainties (where relevant e.g. W,Z data at 7 and 8 TeV)
- **Detailed study of the correlation** between the various ATLAS data sets (this is something only experimentalists can do) - gain experience on ATLAS systematic uncertainty treatment to make proposal for use in global fits
- **Extended PDF parametrisation** – 21 free parameters (previous ATLAS PDF fits with 15 or 16 free parameters)
- First ATLAS PDF fit with **enhanced tolerance** (determined following the MSHT dynamic tolerance procedure) – $\mathbf{T} = \sqrt{\Delta\chi^2} = \mathbf{3}$

Fit model

- PDF parametrisation:

$$xf(x) = Ax^B(1-x)^C P(x) = Ax^B(1-x)^C (1 + Dx + Ex^2 + Fx^3)$$

(with an extra negative term for the gluon $-A'_g x^{B'_g} (1-x)^{C'_g}$)

- Constraints for the central fit from sum rules

- At $Q_0^2 = 1.9 \text{ GeV}^2$, we parametrise $xu_V, xd_V, x\bar{u}, x\bar{d}, xs$ and xg

- Central fits with **21 parameters** with $\alpha_S(m_Z) = \mathbf{0.118}$ (previous ATLAS fits with 15 or 16 free parameters)

- $P_g(x) = 1 + D_g(x)$, $P_{uV} = 1 + D_{uV}x + E_{uV}x^2$ and $P_{dV} = 1 + D_{dV}x$

- No constraints on the A and B parameters of the sea quarks, so no constraints on $x\bar{d} - x\bar{u}$ or on $x\bar{s}/(x\bar{d} + x\bar{u})$ as $x \rightarrow 0$ (either shape or normalisation)

- **Model assumptions:**

- heavy quark masses – $m_c = 1.41 \text{ GeV}$ and $m_b = 4.2 \text{ GeV}$
- Q_{min}^2 (10 GeV^2) cut off for inclusion of data in the fit
- Starting scale Q_0^2
- $m_{top} = 173.3 \text{ GeV}$



Correlation between various data sets

- Possible correlation between the ATLAS data sets carefully investigated

Systematic uncertainty	8 TeV W + jets	8 TeV Z + jets	8 TeV $t\bar{t}$ lepton + jets	13 TeV $t\bar{t}$ lepton + jets	8 TeV inclusive jets
Jet flavour response	JetScaleFlav2	Flavor Response	flavres-jes	JET29NP JET Flavour Response	syst JES Flavour Response*
Jet flavour composition	JetScaleFlav1Known	Flavor Comp	flavcomp-jes	JET29NP JET Flavour Composition	syst JES Flavour Comp
Jet punchthrough	JetScalepunchT	Punch Through	punch-jes	-	syst JES PunchThrough MC15
	JetScalePileup2	PU OffsetMu	pileoffmu-jes	-	syst JES Pileup MuOffset
Jet scale	-	PU Rho	pileoffrho-jes	JET29NP JET Pileup RhoTopology	syst JES Pileup Rho topology*
	JetScalePileup1	PU OffsetNPV	pileoffnpv-jes	JET29NP JET Pileup OffsetNPV	syst JES Pileup NPVOffset
	-	PU PtTerm	pileoffpt-jes	JET29NP JET Pileup PtTerm	syst JES Pileup Pt term
Jet JVF selection	JetJVFCut	JVF	jetvxfrac	-	syst JES Zjets JVF
B-tagged jet scale	-	btag-jes	JET29NP JET BJES Response	-	-
Jet resolution	-	jeten-res	JET JER SINGLE NP	-	-
Muon scale	-	-	mup-scale	MUON SCALE	-
Muon resolution	-	-	muonms-res	MUON MS	-
Muon identification	-	-	muid-res	MUON ID	-
Diboson cross section	-	-	dibos-xsec	Diboson xsec	-
Z + jets cross section	-	-	zjet-xsec	Zjets xsec	-
Single- t cross section	-	-	singletop-xsec	st xsec	-





- Entries in the same raw taken 100%-correlated for V +jets and $t\bar{t}$ +jets ($R=0.4$)
- Different degrees of correlation are considered of the inclusive jet data ($R=0.6$), because of the differing choice of the jet radius wrt V +jets and $t\bar{t}$ +jets
- Exact degree of correlation to the inclusive jet data does not change the resulting PDFs

Correlation between various data sets



- The correlations do not give big effects on PDFs - but visible differences in χ^2 e.g. the fit without correlation exhibits a smaller χ^2 by ~ 30 units
- At LHC scales, the central values shift by $> 2\%$ and middling $x \rightarrow$ **important for accuracy of m_W , $\sin^2 \theta_W$ and α_S precision measurements**
- **We have to account for correlations properly**




Impact of the various data sets on PDFs



- Without W/Z data, R_s very poorly determined
- Unsuppressed strange at low- x confirmed
- Without V+jets data, little information on R_s at high- x (increased \bar{d} and decreased \bar{s} at high- x)
- High- x gluon mildly softened when $t\bar{t}$ data added and uncertainties of high- x gluon reduced
- Impact of inclusive jet production (as direct photon) mostly on the high- x gluon



Combining uncertainties

- **Experimental** uncertainties – dominant – also considered **model** and **parametrisation** uncertainties
- Model:
 - Variation of the $Q_{min}^2 = 10 \text{ GeV}^2$ cut
 - Starting scale $Q_0^2 = 1.9 \text{ GeV}^2$
 - Heavy quark masses (including top)
 - Jet radius choice
- Parametrisation: extra F_{uv} and $D_{\bar{d}}$ terms




A less strange result

- **ATLAS R_s** has come **DOWN** from ~ 1.0 to 0.8
- **MSHT, CT and NNPDF R_s** have come **UP** from ~ 0.5 to 0.8 when including W,Z 7 TeV ATLAS data
- Shift from epWZVjet20 to ATLASpdf21 due to a combination of adding W,Z 8 TeV data and our freer low-x parametrisation





Considering an enhanced tolerance

- Considering an enhanced tolerance following the **MSHT dynamic tolerance procedure**
- We decided to use $T = \sqrt{\Delta\chi^2} = 3$
- ATLAS uncertainties expected to be larger at high- x because global PDF fits include fixed target and Tevatron data (both DIS and DY)







gluon PDF

 u_v PDF

strange PDF



Comparison to global PDF sets





- The addition of ATLAS data has resulted in the d_V PDF moving away from the HERAPDF towards the global fits
- **Lower χ^2 for these data than the global fitters**

PDF (free pars)	χ^2/NDP
ATLASpdf21 (21)	2010/1641
CT18 (29)	2135/1641
CT18A (29)	2133/1641
MSHT20 (52)	2218/1641
HERAPDF2.0 (14)	2262/1641
NNPDF3.1	2109/1641

Comparison to global PDF sets





- Nice agreement between all the various PDF sets for \bar{u}
- The \bar{d} also moves towards the global fits, being much harder than that of the HERAPDF at high- x





PDF (free pars)	χ^2/NDP
ATLASpdf21 (21)	2010/1641
CT18 (29)	2135/1641
CT18A (29)	2133/1641
MSHT20 (52)	2218/1641
HERAPDF2.0 (14)	2262/1641
NNPDF3.1	2109/1641

Comparison to global PDF sets



- xg is more similar to HERAPDF and NNPDF
- Note that ABMP uses a different value of $\alpha_s(m_Z)$
- xS agrees with MSHT20 and CT18A nicely



PDF (free pars)	χ^2/NDP
ATLASpdf21 (21)	2010/1641
CT18 (29)	2135/1641
CT18A (29)	2133/1641
MSHT20 (52)	2218/1641
HERAPDF2.0 (14)	2262/1641
NNPDF3.1	2109/1641

Conclusions & outlook

- This fit demonstrates that it is possible to fit, simultaneously, and with small uncertainties, **a very wide portfolio or ATLAS data from different years**, and across the whole spectrum of QCD processes
- Making **proper use of the detailed correlated uncertainties** as recommended by ATLAS is **essential** in order to beat down these uncertainties and achieve the precision demanded by the experimental uncertainties
- This is **very important for any fits for instance for α_S** , since they can be very sensitive to small changes
- **Use of NNLO theory is essential**, as the ever shrinking experimental uncertainties continue to challenge those from the theoretical predictions
- We still have data available for analysis, and soon the start LHC Run 3 will allow us to push down the experimental uncertainties yet further, over even more of the LHC phase space
- Stay tuned!

Backup Slides



Theory framework

- All the fits performed using [xFitter](#)
- Results checked with an independent fitting code
- LHC cross sections from fastNLO and APPLgrid

Data set	NLO QCD code	LO EW code	NNLO QCD code	NLO EW code
Inclusive $W, Z/\gamma^*$ [9]	MCFM	MCFM	DYNNLO 1.5, FEWZ 3.1.b2	DYNNLO 1.5, FEWZ 3.1.b2
Inclusive Z/γ^* [13]	MCFM	MCFM	NNLOJET	NNLOJET
Inclusive W [12]	MG5_AMC@NLO 2.6.4	MG5_AMC@NLO 2.6.4	DYNNLO 1.5	DYNNLO 1.5
W^\pm + jets [24]	N _{jetti}	N _{jetti}	N _{jetti}	SHERPA
Z + jets [25]	Ref. [51]	Ref. [51]	Ref. [51]	SHERPA
$t\bar{t}$ (lepton + jets) [26]	-	Ref. [52]	Ref. [52]	Ref. [55]
$t\bar{t}$ (dilepton) [27]	MCFM	MCFM	Ref. [28]	Ref. [55]
$t\bar{t}$ [15]	-	Ref. [52]	Ref. [52]	Ref. [55]
Inclusive isolated γ [14]	MCFM	MCFM	Ref. [57]	Ref. [58]
Inclusive jets [16–18]	NLOJET++	NLOJET++	NNLOJET	Ref. [63]

- For 7,8 TeV W, Z data scale uncertainties are applied as additional correlated systematic uncertainties (comparable with experimental systematics)
- We evaluated the impact of scale uncertainties for the other data sets and it is found to be negligible

Results

Total χ^2/NDF	2010/1620
HERA χ^2/NDP	1112/1016
HERA correlated term	50
ATLAS W, Z 7 TeV χ^2/NDP	68/55
ATLAS Z/γ^* 8 TeV χ^2/NDP	208/184
ATLAS W 8 TeV χ^2/NDP	31/22
ATLAS W and Z/γ^* 7 and 8 TeV correlated term	71 = (38 + 33)
ATLAS direct γ 13/8 TeV χ^2/NDP	27/47
ATLAS direct γ 13/8 TeV correlated term	6
ATLAS V +jets 8 TeV χ^2/NDP	105/93
ATLAS $t\bar{t}$ 8 TeV χ^2/NDP	13/20
ATLAS $t\bar{t}$ 13 TeV χ^2/NDP	25/29
ATLAS inclusive jets 8 TeV χ^2/NDF	207/171
ATLAS V +jets 8 TeV and $t\bar{t}$ + jets 8,13 TeV and $R = 0.6$ inclusive jets 8 TeV correlated term	87 = (16 + 9 + 21 + 41)

➤ This is a **better fit than that achieved by global fits to these data**

The χ^2 formula



$$\chi^2 = \sum_{ik} \left(D_i - T_i \left(1 - \sum_j \gamma_{ij} b_j \right) \right) C_{stat,ik}^{-1}(D_i, D_k) \left(D_k - T_k \left(1 - \sum_j \gamma_{kj} b_j \right) \right) \quad \text{partial}$$

$$+ \sum_i \log \frac{\delta_{i,uncor}^2 T_i^2 + \delta_{i,stat}^2 D_i T_i}{\delta_{i,uncor}^2 D_i^2 + \delta_{i,stat}^2 D_i^2} \quad \text{log penalty term}$$

$$+ \sum_j b_j^2 \quad \text{correlated term}$$

- D_i represents the measured data and T_i represents the corresponding data predictions
- $\delta_{i,uncor}$ and $\delta_{i,stat}$ are the uncorrelated systematics and statistical uncertainties on D_i
- Correlated systematics, described by γ_{ij} , are accounted for using the nuisance parameters b_j
- $C_{stat,ik}$ is the statistical (plus uncorrelated) covariance matrix
- The log penalty term is a small bias correction term



Correlation between various data sets



- The correlations do not give big effects on PDFs - always compatible within just experimental uncertainties evaluated with $\Delta\chi^2 = 1$ at 68% C.L.
- But visible differences in χ^2 e.g. the fit without correlation exhibits a smaller χ^2 by ~ 30 units
- So we have to **account for correlations properly**



Impact of the various data sets on PDFs

- We first removed all the **inclusive W,Z data**
- Ratio of strange to light sea quarks very poorly determined (left plot)
- We retain the precise W,Z 7 TeV data and remove the W,Z 8 TeV data
- We see that whereas the W,Z 7 TeV serve to fix the low-x sea quarks, the 8 TeV data still has something to add (right plot)






Impact of the various data sets on PDFs

- We first removed all the **inclusive W,Z data**
- The fit without W,Z data can constraints valence and gluon PDF but input of these data results in substantial decrease of uncertainties





Impact of the various data sets on PDFs

- We removed all the **8 TeV V+jets data**
- As for the [ATLASepWZVjets20](#) fit we see that the effect of these data (blue to red) is to harden the high- x \bar{d} and soften the high- x \bar{s}
- Without them we cannot really determine the ratio of strange to light quarks at high- x





Impact of the various data sets on PDFs

- We removed all the **$t\bar{t}$ data** from the fit
- These data marginally soften the high x gluon (blue to red) and **reduce its uncertainties at high- x** - 8 TeV has the bigger effect (backup)
- Milder impact wrt what was found for the [ATLASepWZtop18](#) fit (but here we have many other data sets added)





Impact of the various data sets on PDFs

- We removed all the **$t\bar{t}$ data** from the fit
- Removing the 8 and 13 TeV $t\bar{t}$ data separately makes it clear that the **8 TeV has the bigger effect**
- 8 TeV looked to have more impact when combined with only a few data sets but not so much after many other data sets are added





Impact of the various data sets on PDFs

- We removed all the **13/8 TeV photon ratio data**
- This results in a marginal softening of the high- x gluon (blue to red) but no decrease in uncertainty
- We removed the **8 TeV inclusive jet data**
- This results in a marginal shape change of the gluon PDF (blue to red) and **very substantial decrease in its high- x uncertainty**





Scale uncertainties



- The differences in magnitude of the PDF uncertainties are very small
- The differences between the PDF shapes are not large, but they can be important if $O(1\%)$ is sought on PDFs
- The case where scale uncertainties are included but not correlated between 7 and 8 TeV W, Z data sets is also shown – smaller effect

Correlation between various data sets



- The major effect of the correlations come from the correlations between V +jets and $t\bar{t}$ +jets
- The exact degree of correlation to the inclusive data does not change the resulting PDFs significantly
- The choice of correlating all the inclusive jet systematics is also not important


Parametrisation uncertainties

- PDF parametrisation:

$$xf(x) = Ax^B(1-x)^C P(x) = Ax^B(1-x)^C (1 + Dx + Ex^2 + Fx^3)$$

(with an extra negative term for the gluon $-A'_g x^{B'_g} (1-x)^{C'_g}$)

- **Parametrisation uncertainties:** grey parameters in the equation above



- Adding extra parameters produces modest shape changes wrt uncertainties




- These are included in the PDF uncertainty evaluation as an envelope of variations from the central fit

- **Check made using Chebyshev polynomials** – no improvement in χ^2 and PDFs compatible within uncertainties with the ordinary polynomial fit

Model uncertainties

- We vary the input settings for the fit
- Impact on the gluon PDF in ratio below
- The variation of the starting scale Q_0^2 is the most significant
- We chose $R = 0.6$ since this is theoretically preferred – difference wrt $R = 0.4$ **ADDED as an additional uncertainty**



Central χ^2/NDF	2010/1620
Model variations	
$Q_{\min}^2 = 12.5 \text{ GeV}^2$	1947/1571
$Q_{\min}^2 = 7.5 \text{ GeV}^2$	2076/1660
$m_c = 1.45 \text{ GeV}$ (sym)	2025/1620
$Q_0^2 = 1.6 \text{ GeV}^2$ (sym)	2018/1620
$m_b = 4.3 \text{ GeV}$	2016/1620
$m_b = 4.1 \text{ GeV}$	2014/1620
$m_t = 175.0 \text{ GeV}$	2063/1620
$m_t = 172.5 \text{ GeV}$	2018/1620
$R = 0.4$	2080/1620
Parameter variations	
$F_{u,v}, D_{\bar{d}}$	2007/1620



Talking about inclusive jets








- Different model to treat correlated systematics:
 - keeping them fully correlated
 - decorrelating the Jets Flavour Response (FR) between rapidity bins
 - Two decorrelation scenarios as recommended in the [8 TeV jet paper](#)
- This affects the χ^2 but has little effect on the PDFs

jets 8 TeV R=0.6	Fully Correlated	FR Decorrelated	Decorrelation Scenario 1	Decorrelation Scenario 2
χ^2/NDP	289/171	227/171	250/171	248/171




Combining uncertainties


- Model and parametrisation added in quadrature and combined to the experimental uncertainties



T = 1 vs T = 3




Focus on the very high-x region



- Discrepancies appear, but they are not so severe for $T=3$
- Discrepancies most evident in the sea sector (even between CT18A and MSHT)







High- Q^2 data

- Subtle effects of BSM physics may be present in the high-scale data → if these data are included in a PDF fit, the estimate of backgrounds in searches could be distorted
- Check if the PDFs differ when we cut out possible hidden new physics
- Data with $Q^2 > (500 \text{ GeV})^2$ removed (mainly jet data)









- PDF shapes and uncertainties not strongly affected









Description of Tevatron/fixed-target data






Description of W,Z 7 TeV data




Description of W,Z 8 TeV data







Description of V+jets data










Description of top data





Description of photon data



Description of inclusive jet data




Description of CDF data



Data set	χ^2/ndf
Z	30.46/28
W	35.24/13

- Other PDFs e.g. MSHT20 and NNPDF3.1 also have a less good description of the W-electron asymmetry (e.g. 34/12)
- The ATLAS fit provides a fair description, $\chi^2/\text{NDF} = 126/92$, of Tevatron data, which mostly influence the high-x valence quarks


Description of W,Z 5.02 TeV data



- The data have not been included because there is no information on full correlated systematics
- They are well described, apart from a single data point

Data set	χ^2/ndf
Z	22.11/5
W^+	11.18/11
W^-	11.65/11













Description of A_{FB} 7 TeV data



- A_{FB} data is sensitive to $\sin^2 \theta_W$ - a lot more data from the 8 TeV Z3D analysis
- These were not included in the fit both because of this sensitivity and because these asymmetry data cover kinematic regions which are not fully predicted at NNLO
- They are well described as far as one can tell within the current theoretical limitations

Data set	χ^2/ndf
ee CC	18.95/17
ee CF	21.10/17
$\mu\mu$	3.81/17



Description of Z3D asymmetry 8 TeV data



$\chi^2 / \text{ndf} = 294 / 188$

The asymmetry of antimatter in the proton

- Paper published on [Nature](#)
- It shows $\bar{d}(x)/\bar{u}(x)$ compared to various predictions
- **CT18** describes E906 for $x > 0.2$ within its error band but older variants follow E866 more closely



- MHST20 closer to CTEQ6m
- **ATLASpdf21** closer to SeaQuest
- It seems that because we did not try to fit high- x data perfectly, our PDFs are free enough to accommodate SeaQuest