

News on the W Boson Mass from the ATLAS Experiment

Matthias Schott on behalf of the ATLAS Collaboration

Prof. Dr. Matthias Schott

The Global Electroweak Fit



 Knowing four parameters of the electroweak sector (α_{em}, G_F, m_Z, sin²θ_W) as well as m_H and m_{top}, allows to predict m_W within the SM

Δmw=7 MeV



Test prediction of m_W at the experiment

 New particles in the loops would change the SM prediction of m_w





The ATLAS History of the W Boson Mass





Analysis Strategy

 Study leptonic W Boson decays: use the dependence of the leptonic transverse momentum (p_T) and the transverse mass (m_T) to determine m_W



- Revisit 2016 measurement with advanced physics model and profile likelihood fitting
 - Advantage: Reduce systematic uncertainties during the fit
 - Disadvantage: Computational expensive, challenging to investigate systematics

Signal Selection and Measurement Regions

- Lepton selections
 - Muons : |η| < 2.4; isolated
 - Electrons : 0<|η|<1.2 or
 1.8<|η|<2.4; isolated
- Kinematic requirements
 - p_T >30GeV p_T^{miss} >30GeV
 - m_T >60GeV u_T <30GeV</p>
- Measurement categories
 - Electron/muon channel, p_T, m_T-Fits,
 3/4 rapidity regions, W boson charge
- Muon Channel: 7.8 M events
 Electron Channel: 5.9 M events

Calibration

- Detector calibration unchanged compared to legacy measurement
- Muon momentum and electron energy response calibrated using Z boson events
- Lepton efficiencies calibrated using Tagand-Probe method
- Hadronic recoil response calibration based on the hadronic recoil in Z boson events



Physics Modeling

- Baseline: Pythia AZ tune (based on Z boson)
 - Z Boson Data, Parton Shower Variations
 - $Z \rightarrow W$: factorization scale variations (light- and heavy-quarks), heavy quark masses
- New Verifications:
 - AZ tune describes hadronic recoil spectrum of W's in low-pileup data at 5 TeV within experimental uncertainties
 - DYTurbo (resumed calculation) also agrees with AZ Tune. See Talk of S. Camarda
- Treatment of angular coefficients unchanged
 - NNLO prediction + Uncertainties from Z boson measurements
- Parton Distribution Functions
 - Study full set of available PDF Sets at NNLO: CT10, CT14, CT18, MMHT2014, MSHT20, NNPDF3.1, NNPDF4.0
 - New Baseline CT18



Analysis Improvements



- Multijet Background Estimation
 - Systematic shape variations using PCA
 - New transfer function from CR to SR
 - Reduction of 2 MeV uncertainty
- EW unc. are evaluated at detector level
 - increase of 1-2 MeV uncertainty
- Recovering data in the electron channel
 - Increase statistics by 1.5%
- Add Γ_W as NP parameter
- Improving random generator setup for the electron energy calibration
 - Minor effect on mw
- Overall +2 MeV shift on m_W in p_T and +6 MeV shift in m_T channel
 - Driven by MJ background improvements

Details on the Fit-Setup

- Several 1000 NP need to be reduced
- Principle Component Analysis yields
 - 214 NP for pT
 - 223 NP for mT
 - Difference in final rel. unc. <0.1%
- Main Statistical Framework: TRExFitter
 - 12 Templates around m_W=80399 MeV
 - Morphing tested to 0.1 MeV precision
- Normalisation of the different templates is left free in the fit
 - A global normalisation factor is applied to all signal samples
 - Model independent approach (Crosssection depends on Γ_w)



Closure and Consistency Tests

• Step 0: Reproduce the legacy results

- Test PLH fit results with statistical uncertainties only
- Step 1-3: Test consistency of m_W for different setups
 - different fitting-ranges
 - positive and negative leptons
 - different regions of eta
- Step 4: Compare p_T and m_T based fits
 - correlation of p_T and m_T estimated using toy-variations of all systematics
 - Correlation: 0.6
- Good closure observed in all tests



What do we expect?

- PLH fit will move the central value
 How much?
- MC Toy study of systematic variations
 - ±16 MeV (1σ) for p_T
 - ±23 MeV (1σ) for m_T



Prof. Dr. M. Schott (Johannes Gutenberg University, Mainz)



Post-Fit Distributions



- Post-fit distributions show very good agreement with data
- Improvement compared to PLH fit when using statistical uncertainties only

Discussion of Pulls



- The pulls of NP behave as expected
- NP with largest impact on mw:
 - PDF Eigenvector 1 of CT18
 - Extrapolation of muon momentum scale in the forward region



Prof. Dr. M. Schott (Johannes Gutenberg University, Mainz)

Study of Parton Distribution Functions



- Profiling moves central values of all PDF sets closer together
- Normalization of NNPDF4.0 not consistent with 1
- CT18 PDF Set as new baseline
 - yields most conservative uncertainties
 - CT18 PDF uncertainties cover the central values of CT10, CT14, MMHT2014 and MSHT20

Final Results and its Interpretation



New ATLAS W mass measurements yields a value of

 $m_W = 80360 \pm 5_{(stat.)} \pm 15_{(syst.)} = 80360 \pm 16 \text{ MeV}$

- We are even more Standard Model like as we have been previously
 - Reminder: Legacy Measurement of 2017 $m_W = 80370 \pm 19 \text{ MeV}$



JOHANNES GUTENBERG UNIVERSITÄT MAINZ

Summary

- First W boson mass measurement using a PLH approach yields a value of
 m_W = 80360±16 MeV
- Improvement by 15% in precision
 Shift by -10 MeV to previous result
- More preliminary information under
 https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/
 - AtlasPublic/ StandardModelPublicResults

Prof. Dr. Matthias Schott

Where do we gain? Comparison of CT10 and CT18

Profiling helps to reduce essentially all systematics

Obs.	Mean	Elec.	PDF	Muon	EW	PS &	Bkg.	Γ_W	MC stat.	Lumi	Recoil	Total	Data	Total
	[MeV]	Unc.	Unc.	Unc.	Unc.	A_i Unc.	Unc.	Unc.	Unc.	Unc.	Unc.	sys.	stat.	Unc.
p_{T}^{ℓ}	80360.1	8.0	7.7	7.0	6.0	4.7	2.4	2.0	1.9	1.2	0.6	15.5	4.9	16.3
m _T	80382.2	9.2	14.6	9.8	5.9	10.3	6.0	7.0	2.4	1.8	11.7	24.4	6.7	25.3
Improvements			≅ 15% ≅ 30%			≅ 40% ≅ 10%								≅15%

- Overview of the fit results in all categories CT18 PDF set shows good agreement.
 - Also shown is the result when using all categories simultaneously.



Impact of Parton Distribution Functions







PDF-Set	p_{T}^{ℓ} [MeV]	<i>m</i> _T [MeV]	combined [MeV]
CT10	$80355.6^{+15.8}_{-15.7}$	$80378.1^{+24.4}_{-24.8}$	$80355.8^{+15.7}_{-15.7}$
CT14	$80358.0^{+16.3}_{-16.3}$	$80388.8^{+25.2}_{-25.5}$	$80358.4^{+16.3}_{-16.3}$
CT18	$80360.1^{+16.3}_{-16.3}$	$80382.2^{+25.3}_{-25.3}$	$80360.4^{+16.3}_{-16.3}$
MMHT2014	$80360.3^{+15.9}_{-15.9}$	$80386.2^{+23.9}_{-24.4}$	$80361.0^{+15.9}_{-15.9}$
MSHT20	$80358.9^{+13.0}_{-16.3}$	$80379.4^{+24.6}_{-25.1}$	$80356.3^{+14.6}_{-14.6}$
NNPDF3.1	$80344.7^{+15.6}_{-15.5}$	$80354.3^{+23.6}_{-23.7}$	$80345.0^{+15.5}_{-15.5}$
NNPDF4.0	$80342.2^{+15.3}_{-15.3}$	$80354.3^{+22.3}_{-22.4}$	80342.9 ^{+15.3} _{-15.3}