Search for dark matter mediator

using a **Trigger-Object Level Analysis**

with the ATLAS detector

by

Claire Antel

(Kirchhoff Institute for Physics, Heidelberg)

BEYOND STANDARD MODEL



on behalf of the ATLAS collaboration DM@LHC, Heidelberg

5th April 2018





Kirchhoff-Institut für Physik

Introduction: Dijet searches through the ages



DM@LHC, Heidelberg, 5th April 2018

Introduction: Dijet Search in a simplified DM Model

- **Dijet resonance searches** have been conducted in the QCD rich environments of hadron colliders for the past 4 decades.
- Motivation: What can be produced from quarks...

• ... can also decay back to quarks.



Introduction: Dijet Search in a simplified DM Model



 Non-detection of a resonance at the mjj mass: limits on mediator couplings to quarks for mediator mass in range.



Coupling-mass mapping of dijet peak searches, Bogdan A. Dobrescu and Felix Yu Phys. Rev. D 88, 035021 – Published 26 August 2013; Erratum <u>Phys. Rev. D 90, 079901 (2014)</u>

DM@LHC, Heidelberg, 5th April 2018

Triggering at the LHC

Ideal Detector





Triggering at the LHC



- Trigger reality:
 - higher instantaneous luminosity; increased trigger rates.
 - raise trigger thresholds as data processing limits reached.





Claire Antel (KIP, Heidelberg) 6

Physics (Jet) Data Recording at the LHC



DM@LHC, Heidelberg, 5th April 2018

Physics (Jet) Data Recording at the LHC



DM@LHC, Heidelberg, 5th April 2018

Physics (Jet) Data Recording at the LHC

TLA ~2 x normal ATLAS Trigger Operation physics data taking rate 11.2% HLT Stream Rates (incl. overlap) 23.1% pp Data June 2017, $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV Single Jet physics 16.1% Main Physics (full EB) **Trigger rate** rates B-physics and LS (full EB) Express (full EB) 4.1% Other Physics (full EB) Trigger Level Analysis (partial EB) outing event size ~ Detector Calibration (partial EB) Detector Monitoring (partial EB) ain physics event size 42.8% **TLA!** 6.4% ATLAS Trigger Operation HLT Output Bandwidth 9.4% threshold Recorded data: pp Data June 2017, √s = 13 TeV High-Level Trigger physics Main Physics (full EB) Jets 7.3% B-physics and LS (full EB) Express (full EB) Other Physics (full EB) bandwidth 220 Trigger Level Analysis (partial EB) Detector Calibration (partial EB) 74.7% Trigger requireme 1 L1 Jet above threshold

DM@LHC, Heidelberg, 5th April 2018

Trigger-Object Level Analysis (TLA)

Analysis Components



Trigger-Object Level Analysis (TLA)





(see back-up for full calibration chain)

Challenge: no tracking information -> dedicated calibration.



DM@LHC, Heidelberg, 5th April 2018

Trigger Jet Calibration

- Challenge: no tracking information -> dedicated calibration.
- Successfully achieved a **similar precision** for trigger jets compared to offline jets.



• Trigger-to-offline jet energy ratio within 0.05%.

Data-Driven Background Estimation

SWiFT - Sliding Window Fit

(more detailed description of SWIFT Phys. Rev. D 96, 052004 (2017))



• A fit of the mjj spectrum performed within a 'sliding window': window width is fixed.

DM@LHC, Heidelberg, 5th April 2018

Data-Driven Background Estimation

SWiFT - Sliding Window Fit

(more detailed description of SWIFT Phys. Rev. D 96, 052004 (2017))



• A fit of the mjj spectrum performed within a 'sliding window': window width is fixed.

DM@LHC, Heidelberg, 5th April 2018

Bump Search

• Is there an excess over background estimate?



- most discrepant region 887-1007 GeV with global significance of 0.16 σ .
- Thus, no significant excess observed.

Summary Plot

dijet search overview @ ATLAS+ CMS: Sarah Malik's talk on Tuesday



- Numerous other analyses developed to tackle trigger limitation:
 - dijet + ISR, boosted dijet + ISR: low mass reach
- TLA's forte: <u>statistically powerful</u> -> limit setting to lowest coupling.

In Summary

- The ATLAS Trigger-Object Level Analysis is a low-mass dijet search, which
 - Tackles trigger limitations by taking on calibration challenges.
 - Unprecedented statistical precision: high sensitivity to fluctuations. May soon face underlying QCD complexities?



- 2016 13 TeV 29.3/fb results:
 - No excess found
 - Limits set for masses 450-1800 GeV on
 - Quark couplings in an axial-vector Z' mediator model.
 - $\sigma \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}.\mathcal{R}.$ for Gaussian signals of various widths.
- Closing gaps in mediator mass quark coupling landscape.



Back-up Slides

DM@LHC, Heidelberg, 5th April 2018

Trigger-Object Level Analysis (TLA)

Analysis Framework

- Analysis objects from **Datascouting stream**.
- A **dijet search** for a new Dark Matter mediator particle.
- Event selection:

2 jets, pT > 85 GeV

 $|\eta_j| < 2.8$

signal region (1)

L1 Jet Trigger: **J75**

leading jet $p_T > 185 \text{ GeV}$

|y*| < 0.3 *

400 GeV < m_{jj} < 2080 GeV $\mathcal{L} = 3.6 f b^{-1}$

signal region (2)

L1 Jet Trigger: **J100** leading jet $p_T > 220$ GeV |y *| < 0.6 * $531 \text{ GeV} < m_{jj} < 2080 \text{ GeV}$ $\mathcal{L} = 29.3 f b^{-1} * y * = \frac{(y_1 - y_2)}{2}$

Claire Antel (KIP, Heidelberg) 20

 $\mathcal{J}2$

 m_{jj}

All Single Jet "Offline" data versus TLA recorded data



DM@LHC, Heidelberg, 5th April 2018

Trigger Jet Calibration

 dedicated jet calibration as don't have full detector information - mainly no tracking information.



• Final calibration:

- Trigger-to-offline jet energy ratio within 0.05%.
- Min. 3.5% (max. 4.5%) jet energy scale uncertainty for |eta|<0.8 (1.0<|eta|<1.5) jets.

Correction Factors: Trigger->Offline Jets

confection ractoral rudder - onnine acta



Trigger Jet Calibration

Need to watch out for localized fluctuations!

.. as can be induced by bumps in the calibration:



- The **residual in-situ calibration** initially not sufficiently smooth.
 - replaced a spline-based combination method (dashed line, used offline) with a polynomial fit method (solid line) to smoothen calibration factors.

JES uncertainties for Trigger Jets



Data-Driven Background Estimation: more detail

SWiFT - Sliding Window Fit

- A fit of the mjj spectrum performed within a 'sliding window': window width is fixed.
- background estimates in all windows collated.
- starting at widest window width, find
 2 good fit functions*:

1) bg estimate, 2) systematic uncertainty

• good fit:

$$\chi^2$$
 p-value > 0.05



* final selected function for signal region (2): $f(x) = p_1(1-x)^{p_2}x^{p_3+p_4lnx+p_5lnx^2}$ (see back-up for all considered functions)

DM@LHC, Heidelberg, 5th April 2018

Functional Forms

Laucacional Lovano

- considered functional forms for background estimation in SWIFT:
 - 5-param function: $f(x) = p_1(1-x)^{p_2}x^{p_3+p_4lnx+p_5lnx^2}$
 - 4-param function: $f(x) = p_1(1-x)^{p_2} x^{p_3+p_4 lnx}$
 - 4-param "UA2" function: $f(x) = \frac{p_1}{x^{p_2}}e^{-p_3x-p_4x^2}$

leptophobic axial-vector Z' simplified Dark Matter model*

• No significant excess found. How far can we exclude our Z' model?



New coupling limits down to as low as ~0.04.

*D. Abercrombie et al., Dark matter benchmark models for early LHC Run-2 searches: Report of the ATLAS/CMS Dark Matter Forum, 2015, arXiv: 1507.00966 [hep-ex]

DM@LHC, Heidelberg, 5th April 2018

Limit Setting

Limits on Gaussian Signals

Entres of anazolan olduno



Mass Resolution for Trigger Jets

LIGOD MODOLACION LOL LUBDOL DOC



DM@LHC, Heidelberg, 5th April 2018

Summary Plot: DM mass - mediator mass plane



Not updated for latest TLA and Dijet+ISR results.

Summary Plot: DM mass - mediator mass plane



• Not updated for latest TLA and Dijet+ISR results.