#### The ATLAS Higgs boson discovery from the WW\* perspective

#### corrinne mills, "on behalf of HSG3"

University of Illinois at Chicago Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory

HiggsDiscovery@10 Symposium *University of Birmingham* 30 June 2022



## Where was I on 4 July 2012?

- Not in the main auditorium: the line filled up overnight
- Still working hard the night before, because the ATLAS HWW analysis was not yet approved

SK	Sandra Kortner ad-hoc champagne 14:20	July 4, 2012 at 06:34
	To: Higgs,	
	Resent-From: corrinne mills	
Dear S	Scalar Boson finders,	
we wil in Sall just b	have an *ad-hoc champagne celebration* e Bohr 14:20 today efore the WW approval).	
Best, Eilam	and Sandra	

#### Overview

- In the end, pulled together the analysis in time to be part of the discovery paper
- How did we do it?
  - $\rightarrow$  HWW in a nutshell
  - $\rightarrow$  Ambiguous evidence and the decision to blind
  - $\rightarrow$  Work hard, play hard
  - $\rightarrow$  "Success-oriented schedule"
  - $\rightarrow$  Background reviews and MC bottlenecks
  - $\rightarrow$  Eventual triumph
- This talk is more of a social than scientific history, and very much my personal perspective, focused on the time right around the discovery

All credit for the work achieved goes to my incredible collaborators, all opinions and mistakes are purely my own

#### Why $H \rightarrow WW \rightarrow |v|v$ ?

- The payoff: better signal yield than  $\gamma\gamma$  and ZZ  $\rightarrow$  4l, better S/B than bb
- The price: For  $m_H < 2M_W$ , W off mass shell (no mass resolution), large backgrounds, acceptance shrinks as mH decreases one W is virtual and subleading leptons are lower  $p_T$



#### Analysis binning



# All about the backgrounds

#### "We need a control region we can control"

Non-resonant WW diboson background: high-mll control region



#### 2011 ATLAS HWW



#### Back up to December 2011

• December 2011 CERN Council meeting included  $H \rightarrow ZZ \rightarrow I_VI_V$  and  $H \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$  updated to include all 2011 data

 $\rightarrow$  Note WW relevance even with half the data



#### CMS 2011 results



# ATLAS 2011 results



- Local significance at 126 GeV 3.5σ, but ~1.4% probability (2.2σ) to see such a fluctuation in the background somewhere
- Exciting but ambiguous
- We see  $3\sigma$  fluctuations all the time
  - → 750 GeV diphoton bump, anyone? c. mills (UIC+FNAL)

- Combine data in multiple channels (bosonic only)
  - γγ, WW (lvlv, lvjj), ZZ
    (4l, llvv, lljj))



# Blinding to see clearly

- Full disclosure: I was rooting against the SM Higgs
- The physics message was ambiguous
- I worried that we could continue to see *nothing* in the WW channel and that no one would believe us in the excitement of the discovery rush
- Blind analysis was common on other experiments (notably BaBar), but not common practice at the Tevatron or the LHC
  - → Tended to be reserved for precision measurements, needed a well-defined signal and usually associated with a mass window
- I proposed that we blind the HWW analysis and suggested how we do it.

# Blinding the Analysis

- Design requirements:
  - ightarrow S/B < 2% at all times
  - $\rightarrow$  Leave control regions intact
- Not possible to blind WW analysis for all  $m_{\rm H}$ 
  - $\rightarrow$  Judgement call: what we really care about is the low  $m_H$  signal region
- How to define the signal region?
  - $\rightarrow \varDelta \varphi(II)$  and m(II) cuts
  - → Transverse mass bound corresponding to lower bound for 110 and upper bound for 140 → veto (0.75)(110) < m<sub>T</sub> < (1.0)(140)

Blinded Region 82.5 <  $M_T$  < 140 and  $\Delta \phi(II) < 1.8$ and  $m_{II} < 50$ and 0 jets or 0 b-tags



**Old internal plots for illustration only** 

Legendary **workshop in Ischia, Italy** in March 2012

Review of every aspect of the analysis, lessons learned from 2011

Lots of ... informal discussion

Emerged with a plan



# The Challenge

- Many things had become clear:
  - → Stellar performance of LHC in 2011  $\Rightarrow$  could have 5 fb<sup>-1</sup> by July/ICHEP
  - $\rightarrow$  If the 2011 signals in  $\gamma\gamma$ , ZZ  $\rightarrow$  4I data are both real, we **will** see it in WW.
  - → If the 4I signal is spurious,
    WW will stay consistent
    with BG-only hypothesis
  - → Cost of integrated luminosity is instantaneous luminosity: MET resolution deteriorates

Text reads: "high-pileup data will be challenging to understand... limited time to adapt"



Lead analysis contact Pierre Savard

# The Strategy



photo B. Di Micco

Produced 40-page document detailing selection, optimization, etc, for approval by EdBoard:

Not reviewed, for internal circulation only

Conclusion: critical for WW analysis
 to produce a robust result quickly

- Blind signal data, focus analysis on control regions (CR)
- Pared-down analysis: eµ only to dodge Drell-Yan, tighten lepton isolation to cut W+jets by factor of two





Draft version 0.2

Plans for the Standard Model Higgs boson search in the  $H \rightarrow WW^{(*)} \rightarrow \ell \nu \ell \nu$ decay channel in 2012

#### "Success-oriented schedule"

• We had a number of them. This one also turned out to not be true.

#### **Success-Oriented Schedule**

- June 8 (today): Finalizing event selection (almost...)
  EdBoard meeting: event selections, theory and top backgrounds
- June 15: All critical MC samples available; EdBoard meeting: Z/DY backgrounds, W+jets background
- June 22: Unblinding decision;
  Discussion of data/MC agreements in control regions;
  All pre-unblinding supporting notes and draft CONF note ready
- June 25: follow up Discussion data/MC agreements in signal regions; Statistical interpretations, draft CONF note with unblinding results;
- June 27: CONF note Higgs group approval and collaboration circulation
- June 29/July 2: follow up discussions

courtesy Jianming Qian

- July 4: final signoff

# The reality of MC and data

- Recall the plethora of data and MC required to model all the backgrounds
- MC samples were major bottleneck for HWW
  - $\rightarrow$  Priority behind  $H \rightarrow 4\ell$  -- understandable, but had a cost
  - → My 18 June notes indicate a number of samples "still missing"; tchannel single top "buggy"
- The 2012 data had higher pileup
  - $\rightarrow$  I have a lot of notes about MET
  - $\rightarrow$  Effects on lepton isolation (and therefore fakes), jet counting
- Small surprises in background modeling due to filling in things
  - $\rightarrow$  Nothing major, but costs time
- Pages of control region plots to check

## So many meetings

- Daily meetings of the group during crunch time
- Detailed internal review of each background in mini-workshops
  - → I have notebook entries titled "Top Background Showdown"
- Essentially continuous interaction with the EdBoard
  - $\rightarrow$  4 supporting notes, O(100) pages each IIRC



c. mills (UIC+FNAL)

#### Crunch time

- 26 June: Standing-room-only in Salle Curie for ATLAS weekly
  - $\rightarrow$  First mention of July 31<sup>st</sup> submission of discovery paper in sync with CMS
  - $\rightarrow$  WW has made "heroic" effort, but not to be shown at ICHEP
  - $\rightarrow$  Discussion followed:
    - at ICHEP but not in combination? No.
    - But CMS will have HWW → Fabiola: "Let's not discuss rumors"
    - Fabiola stands firm that we have rules on analysis review that can be bent but not broken, need time to understand "delicate" analysis
    - My notes conclude with "F. answers her phone, which has been ringing on and off for ~30 minutes"
- 27 June: Blinded approval, full conference room in building 6. EVO problems. Daniel F [EdBoard Chair] supports unblinding. Heated technical discussion, followed by **decision to unblind**.
- Later that day: HSG3 daily meeting, "this one different than others". Looking at the unblinded data distributions, signal region shows excess in the right region

## ATLAS July 4th results

 We unblinded before the seminar, but the results were not shown, only γγ and ZZ (for 2012)

 $\rightarrow$  7 TeV combination did include WW, tautau, bb



 $\begin{array}{l} \textbf{Global significance} \\ \textbf{4.1-4.3} \sigma \text{ depending on} \\ mass range considered \end{array}$ 

photo (c) CERN



#### July 2012 HWW Results

A few days (and many meetings later), we released a CONF note on July 18<sup>th</sup>, in time for Higgs Hunting:





Combined 2011+2012  $p_0$ : **3 x 10<sup>-3</sup> (2.8** $\sigma$ ) **observed**, 1 x 10<sup>-2</sup> (2.3 $\sigma$ ) expected (for m<sub>H</sub> = 125 GeV in both cases)

## July 2012 discovery paper

4 July 2012: 5.0σ



# Legacy

- Foundation of suite of measurements
  - $\rightarrow$  Couplings, CP properties...
- Most precise measurement in final Run 1 combination (~20%)
- Increasing sophistication of fit, iterative interaction between analysis design and statistical interpretation
  - $\rightarrow$  More control regions
  - $\rightarrow$  First (?) impact ("tornado") plots
  - → Appreciation of correlation between categories, reduction of impact of uncertainties through anticorrelations
- Formative in careers
  - → Not just in academia: many of the postdocs and students left for careers in industry



# Conclusions

#### • HWW powerful measurement of couplings

→ Enormous challenge in data and MC modeling, each background an analysis in itself

Signal strength (μ)

- → Rigor of statistical treatment
- → Deep understanding of physics objects in changing conditions
- Discovery relied on an incredible team, working cohesively
  - → Foundations built over decades
  - → Privilege to be a part of it



# Backup



#### July 2012 results





#### Transverse mass

- Like invariant mass, but drop missing *p<sub>z</sub>* information
- Canonical example: W decay to one e/μ and one neutrino
- H to WW is a four-body decay



