



Pileup suppression in ATLAS: jet-vertex tagging & track-based grooming

Pascal Nef

"Mitigation of pileup effects at the LHC" workshop at CERN

May 16th, 2014

Introduction

- Pileup is one of the main challenges at the LHC
 - Especially for jets: jet resolution, pileup jets, jet shapes and jet mass, ...
 - Major area of research for experimentalist and theorists!
- Talk is organized in two themes: pileup jet suppression & track-based grooming
 - more details in recently approved CONF note: ATLAS-CONF-2014-018





Pileup jet suppression

The need for pileup jet suppression

- Pileup effect on jets are mitigated by applying the jet-area pileup correction
 - Local fluctuations in the event-by-event pileup activity can give rise to pileup jets



- Mean number of jets per event after jetarea based correction
 - increases with $\boldsymbol{\mu}$
 - ATLAS simulation over-predicts
- After suppressing pileup jets using tracking information:
 - <N_j> is flat
 - good agreement between data and MC



Pileup jet suppression with JVF



from JVF to corrJVF

• Correcting JVF (in average) for its pileup dependence:



The charged fraction R_{pT}

R_{pT} is the charged p_T of a jet and defined as:

 $R_{\rm pT} = \frac{\sum_{k} p_{\rm T}^{\rm trk_{k}}({\rm PV}_{0})}{p_{\rm T}^{jet}} \longrightarrow \text{hard-scatter tracks only}$ fully calibrated (pileup corrected) calorimeter p_T

- constructed from pileup corrected / insensitive variables
- excellent discrimination between hard-scatter and pileup jets





the JVT likelihood

- constructing the jet-vertex tagger (JVT) as a 2D likelihood from corrJVF and R_{pT}
 - using a nearest neighbor algorithm to avoid statistical fluctuations



0.02

10

15

20

25

 N_{Vtx}

conditions change!

Efficiency vs. fake-rate curves

- efficiency vs. fake-rate curves (ROC) for JVF and JVT
 - large improvement in pileup jet rejection at fixed efficiency



• performance is worse for light (uds)-quark initiated jets than for b-quark and gluon jets

light quark jets have higher response and radiate less



Data to MC comparison in $Z(\mu\mu)$ +jets

Validate modeling of JVT (and corrJVF and R_{pT}) using Z(μμ)+jets and semileptonic ttbar events
separately in hard-scatter and pileup dominated regions



- Ultimately care about modeling of corrJVF, RpT and JVT for hard-scatter, which is good.
- Rate of pileup jets are too high in simulation, corrJVF, RpT and JVT shapes are reasonably well modeled



JVT efficiency measurement

- JVT efficiency measurement from tag & probe in Z+jets events:
- JVT efficiency measured in the signal region with $|\Delta \varphi(Z, jet)| > 2.8$
- pileup background in the signal region estimated from data using a pileup control region IΔφ(Z, jet)I < 1.2
- dominant systematics:
 - difference in efficiency between Sherpa & Powheg+Pythia (different fragmentation model)

- provide efficiency measurements for:
 - three different operating points
 - vs p_t and vs. η
- scale factors are consistent with unity
 - 1% to 2% uncertainty





Physics application: VBF Higgs

- Application of JVT to a VBF H->4I analysis:
- Typical event selection
 - require two p_T > 30 GeV jets to be separated in η by more than 3 units
- Define the jet-veto efficiency as:
 - fraction of events with no additional (third) jet within the tracker coverage

- Veto efficiency for p_T > 20 GeV jets spoilt by pileup jets
- Flat efficiency is recovered if JVT is used to suppress pileup jets





Pileup jet rates: where do we stand?

• Pileup jet rates as a function of jet p_{T} threshold and η in ATLAS simulation



- This is for an average number of truth interactions of 23 (ranging between 0 and 50)
- Pileup jet rates in the forward region are strongly suppressed w.r.t. the central region:
 - Mainly due to granularity and noise thresholds of the ATLAS calorimeter
- Using JVT the pileup jet rate is suppressed by factor ~ 100 in the central region
 - Forward region now become important
 - As of today: No calorimeter (jet shape) based pileup jet suppression in the forward region in ATLAS

Track-based grooming

Track-based grooming

- Event display of a W' at m=1 TeV, decaying via WZ -> qqqq
 - reconstruct anti- $k_t R=1.0$ jets and their $k_t R=0.3$ subjets
 - ghost associate hard-scatter and pileup tracks to the subjets: calculate corrJVF and related variables





Track-based grooming

- Event display of a W' at m=1 TeV, decaying via WZ -> qqqq
 - reconstruct anti- k_t R=1.0 jets and their k_t R=0.3 subjets
 - ghost associate hard-scatter and pileup tracks to the subjets: calculate corrJVF and related variables



corrJVF-based grooming



truth-level study for corrJVF grooming

- truth-level study at high pileup: this is *not* ATLAS material
 - Z'-> ttbar (all hadronic), $M_{Z'} = 1 \text{ TeV}$
 - looking at leading anti-kt R=1.0 jets, with pileup corrected $p_T > 300 \text{ GeV}$



- in trimming, f_{cut} is defined as p_T^{subjet} (pileup corrected) / p_T^{ungroomed}
- $f_{cut} = 5\%$ is too tight for high N_{Vtx}
 - losing subjets from the hard-scatter



truth-level study for corrJVF grooming

Only small fraction of subjets have corrJVF < 0.6

• it seems it's not very likely to get a pileup subjet within the anti- $k_t R = 1.0$ jet ...



- cutting on corrJVF allows to lower the f_{cut}
 - improvement in mass resolution is marginal at $N_{Vtx} = 100$



Summary



