### From Inclusive to Differential: Precision Measurements of $t\bar{t}W$ Production at 13 TeV with the ATLAS detector

#### **Nihal Brahimi**

#### On behalf of the ATLAS collaboration IRN TERASCALE @ IPHC Strasbourg







## $t\bar{t}W$ process: Rare, Complex and Relevant

- $t\bar{t}W$  is a **rare and challenging** process to model theoretically
  - ➡ significant higher order QCD and EWK corrections, off-shell effects, spin correlations





ATL-PHYS-PUB-2024-011

## $t\bar{t}W$ process: Rare, Complex and Relevant

- $t\bar{t}W$  is an irreducible background to many SM and BSM searches including  $t\bar{t}H$  and  $t\bar{t}t\bar{t} \rightarrow limiting$  factor to their sensitivity
- $t\bar{t}W$  mismodeling observed by ATLAS and CMS  $\rightarrow$  measurements consistently yield 20-50% higher cross-section than prediction •Inclusive and differential cross-section measurements of  $t\bar{t}W$  are a key input to improve its modelling



ATL-CONF-2019-045

JHEP07(2023)219

JHEP 05 (2024) 131

#### Full Run 2 ttW analysis: measurement strategy JHEP 05 (2024) 131

- $t\bar{t}W$  production cross-section measured in multilepton final states
  - → 1 Same-Sign (SS) lepton pair or 3L (e/ $\mu$ )
  - → N<sub>jets</sub> ≥ 2, N<sub>b-jets</sub> ≥ 1(60%) or ≥ 2(77%)
  - → 3L: events w/ OSSF and 3L invariant mass in Z peak excluded

#### • Inclusive measurement:

- → Signal Regions split based on N<sub>jets</sub>,N<sub>b-jets</sub> and lepton charge
- ➡ SS further split by lepton flavour
- ➡ 48 (SS) + 8 (3L) signal regions
- Measured parameters:
  - $\clubsuit$  Inclusive and fiducial  $t\bar{t}W$  cross-sections
  - $\Rightarrow t\bar{t}W^+$  and  $t\bar{t}W^-$  cross-sections and their ratio (R)
  - ➡ Relative Charge asymmetry

#### • Differential measurement:

➡ Signal Regions split by lepton charge: SS (++/- -), 3L (+/-)

#### • Measured distributions:

- ➡ Absolute and normalised cross-sections at particle level
- ➡ Relative Charge asymmetry at particle level
- 8 observables sensitive to modelling differences:

→ N<sub>jets</sub>, H<sup>jet</sup><sub>T</sub>, H<sup>lep</sup><sub>T</sub>, 
$$\Delta R_{\ell b,lead}$$
, M <sub>$\ell b,lead$</sub> , M <sub>$\ell \ell,SS$</sub> ,  $|\Delta \phi_{\ell \ell,SS}|$   
and  $|\Delta \eta_{\ell \ell,SS}|$ 

- Main backgrounds:
  - → Irreducible:  $t\bar{t}Z$ , diboson
  - ➡ Reducible: fake/non-prompt leptons from tt decays, charge misID electrons

## Irreducible backgrounds: $t \bar{t} Z$ and diboson

• Dedicated  $t\bar{t}Z$  and VV control regions w/ different jet multiplicities and w/ same flavour dilepton pair invariant mass near the Z peak

 $\lambda_{t\bar{t}Z} = 1.16 \pm 0.15$ 

➡ Normalisation extracted from fit to data (with signal extraction)

 $\lambda_{\rm VV} = 0.87 \pm 0.33$ 



Control regions for:	Diboson	$t\bar{t}Z$
Lepton requirement		$3\ell$
Lepton definition		(L,M,M)
Lepton $p_{\rm T}$ [GeV]		(10,  20,  20)
$m^{ m SF}_{\ell^+\ell^-}~[{ m GeV}]$		> 12
$ m^{ m SF}_{\ell^+\ell^-} - m_Z ~[{ m GeV}]$		< 10
$ m_{3\ell} - m_Z   [\text{GeV}]$		> 10
$m_{ m T}(\ell_0, E_{ m T}^{ m miss}) \; [{ m GeV}]$		—
$N_{ m jets}$	2  or  3	$\geq 4$
$N_{b ext{-jets}}$	$1  b^{60\%}$	$\geq 1 \; b^{60\%} \; { m or} \geq 2 \; b^{77\%}$
Region split		
Region naming	$3\ell VV$	$3\ell$ ttZ

#### **Reducible background: Template Method**

- 6 Control Regions enriched in **HF non-prompt leptons (e**,  $\mu$ )
  - $\rightarrow$  defined using exclusive BDT-based isolation working points  $M_{ex}$
- 2 Control Regions enriched in electrons from conversions:
  - Material conversions
  - ➡ Internal (virtual photons) conversions
- Non-prompt lepton templates shapes taken from simulation
  - ➡ normalisation free-floated in the signal extraction fit

Electron Charge mis-ID background is estimated using data-driven method
 negligible for muons





#### **Reducible background: Template Method**



$\lambda_e^{had}$	$\lambda_{\mu}^{had}$	$\lambda_e^{MatC}$	$\lambda_e^{IntC}$	
$0.83 \pm 0.31$	$1.01 \pm 0.21$	$1.15 \pm 0.31$	$1.07 \pm 0.24$	

![](_page_6_Figure_3.jpeg)

7

## Inclusive $t\bar{t}W$ cross-section measurement

• Simultaneous profile likelihood fit to data using event yields in 56 SR and 10 CR with 6 free parameters (backgrounds normalisation)

![](_page_7_Figure_2.jpeg)

 $\sigma(t\bar{t}W) = 880 \pm 50$  (stat.)  $\pm 70$  (syst.) fb

**9% relative uncertainty** 

## Inclusive $t\bar{t}W$ cross-section measurement

• Simultaneous profile likelihood fit to data using event yields in 56 SR and 10 CR with 6 free parameters (backgrounds normalisation)

![](_page_8_Figure_2.jpeg)

- Consistent at 1.4 $\sigma$  with latest SM NNLO theory calculation 745 ± 50 (scale) ± 13 (2-loop approx.) ± 19(PDF,  $\alpha_s$ ) fb
- •Leading sources of systematic uncertainties:
  - $\Rightarrow$  tt W modeling (generator, parton shower)
  - →  $t\bar{t}H$ ,  $t\bar{t}t\bar{t}$  background normalisation
  - ➡ b-tagging
  - Non-prompt isolation BDT calibration

# $t\bar{t}W$ Ratio and Asymmetry measurements

- $\bullet\ t\bar{t}W^+$  and  $t\bar{t}W^-$  production rates and their ratio measured inclusively
- Relative charge asymmetry  $A_C^{rel}$  also measured
- Both measurements consistent with MC predictions

![](_page_9_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_9_Figure_5.jpeg)

 $A_C^{rel}$ (Sherpa 2.2.10) =  $0.322 \pm 0.003$  (scale)  $\pm 0.007$ (PDF)

## ttW differential measurements

- First time differential measurements carried out for  $t\bar{t}W$  process at the LHC
- Fiducial phase space definition follows closely the detector level selection using quasi-stable objects (mean lifetime > 30 ps)
- Unfolding performed using a profile likelihood approach
  - ➡ same background model and CR from inclusive fit included
  - ➡ Tikhonov regularisation applied with optimised strength for each observable/fiducial volume
  - ➡ Dedicated binning scheme optimisation, closure and stress tests carried out
  - ➡ signal extracted for each particle-level bin by a fit to the detector level events in several SR

![](_page_10_Figure_8.jpeg)

 $\mathcal{L}(\sigma,\vec{\theta},\vec{\lambda}) = \prod_{i} P\left(N_{i}|L_{\text{int}}\sum_{j} \mathcal{R}_{ij}(\vec{\theta})\sigma_{j}(\vec{\theta}) + B_{i}(\vec{\theta},\vec{\lambda})\right) \times \prod_{k} G(\theta_{k}) \times \prod_{l} R(\sigma_{l},\tau_{l}),$ 

## ttW differential measurements

- First time differential measurements carried out for  $t \overline{t} W$  process at the LHC
- Fiducial phase space definition follows closely the detector level selection using quasi-stable objects (mean lifetime > 30 ps)
- Unfolding performed using a profile likelihood approach
  - ➡ same background model and CR from inclusive fit included
  - → Tikhonov regularisation applied with optimised strength for each observable/fiducial volume
  - ➡ Dedicated binning scheme optimisation, closure and stress tests carried out
  - ➡ signal extracted for each particle-level bin by a fit to the detector level events in several SR

![](_page_11_Figure_8.jpeg)

![](_page_11_Figure_9.jpeg)

12

 $\mathcal{L}(\sigma,\vec{\theta},\vec{\lambda}) = \prod_{i} P\left(N_{i}|L_{\text{int}}\sum_{j} \mathcal{R}_{ij}(\vec{\theta})\sigma_{j}(\vec{\theta}) + B_{i}(\vec{\theta},\vec{\lambda})\right) \times \prod_{k} G(\theta_{k}) \times \prod_{l} R(\sigma_{l},\tau_{l}),$ 

# ttW differential measurements: cross-section vs Niets

![](_page_12_Figure_1.jpeg)

- Unfolded cross-sections compared to several theoretical predictions (accounting for higher order QCD and EWK corrections)
  - ➡ absolute cross-sections higher than predictions (consistent with inclusive measurements)
- Good agreement with all MC setups for  $N_{jets}$  with p-values ~ 17%-96%

## $t\bar{t}W$ differential measurements: cross-section vs $H_{\tau}^{lep}$

![](_page_13_Figure_1.jpeg)

- Good agreement with all MC setups with p-values ~ 50%-90%
- Comparison to calculation including off-shell effects (Eur. Phys. J. C 81 (2021) 675) in 3L channel for a subset of observables
  - ➡ slightly higher cross-sections than other predictions

### $t\bar{t}W$ differential measurements: compatibility with predictions

#### $\chi^2$ and p-values for unfolded normalised cross-section distributions in the 2ISS region

Observable	NDF	Sherpa 2.2.10		MG5aMC+Py8 FxFx		MG5aMC+Py8 Incl.		Powheg+Py8		Powheg+H7	
		$\chi^2$	p-value	$\chi^2$	p-value	$\chi^2$	p-value	$\chi^2$	p-value	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i> -value
$N_{ m jets}$	5	6.5	0.26	7.8	0.17	6.9	0.23	7.2	0.21	6.8	0.24
$H_{ m T}^{ m jet}$	5	2.0	0.85	2.3	0.81	1.9	0.86	2.5	0.78	2.7	0.75
$H_{ m T}^{ m lep}$	7	6.1	0.53	6.3	0.51	5.9	0.55	5.9	0.56	5.9	0.55
$\Delta R_{\ell b,\mathrm{lead}}$	7	6.8	0.45	7.2	0.41	7.2	0.41	7.2	0.40	7.1	0.41
$ \Delta \phi_{\ell\ell,{ m SS}} $	7	1.7	0.97	1.7	0.98	1.9	0.96	1.8	0.97	1.9	0.97
$ \Delta\eta_{\ell\ell, m SS} $	6	7.0	0.32	8.1	0.23	12.1	0.06	10.2	0.12	10.1	0.12

- Overall good agreement with MC predictions for unfolded cross-sections
  - → mild tensions in some observables e.g  $|\Delta \eta_{\ell\ell,SS}|$

![](_page_14_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_14_Figure_6.jpeg)

## ttW differential measurements: A<sup>rel</sup>

Total unc.

Powheg+Py8

AMC@NLO+Py8 (FxFx)

 $\mathsf{A}_{\mathrm{C}}^{\mathrm{rel}}$ 

1.5

0.5

-0.5

0.5

-0.50.5

-0.5

0.5

-0.5

2

3

5

2ISS

6

2

3

4

31

Particle-Level N<sub>iete</sub>

5

Pred. - Data

Data, stat. unc.

aMC@NLO+Py8 (Incl.)

Sherpa

Powheg+Hw7

 $A_{\rm C}^{\rm rel}$ 

1.5

0.5

-0.5

0.5

-0.5

0.5

-0.5Ē

0.5

-0.5F

Data

Pred.

Data, stat. unc.

Powheg+Py8

aMC@NLO+Py8 (FxFx)

Sherpa

Total unc.

----- Off-Shell

![](_page_15_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_15_Figure_2.jpeg)

- ➡ Many systematic uncertainties cancel out
- Some tension between data and MC predictions
  - ➡ Not statistically significant

➡ Good p-values obtained

$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	4				
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		Observable	NDF	Sherpa 2.2.10	
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$				$\chi^2$	<i>p</i> -value
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		$N_{ m jets}$	4	4.3	0.37
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		$H_{\mathrm{T}}^{\mathrm{jet}}$	5	4.1	0.53
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	-000000000	$H_{ m T}^{ m lep}$	6	3.6	0.73
$\sum_{i=1}^{2} \sum_{j=1}^{2} \sum_{i=1}^{2} \sum_{j=1}^{2} \sum_{i$	40 70 85 100 115 130 150 180 40 115 145 170 200 245	$\Delta R_{\ell b,  \mathrm{lead}}$	6	3.3	0.77
Particle-Level H <sub>T</sub> [GeV] $ \Delta \varphi_{\ell\ell}, SS $   0   1.2   0.30	Particle-Level $H_T^{lep}$ [GeV]	$ \Delta \phi_{\ell\ell,\mathrm{SS}} $	6	7.2	0.30
$ \Delta\eta_{\ell\ell,{ m SS}} $ 6 4.9 0.56		$ \Delta\eta_{\ell\ell, m SS} $	6	4.9	0.56

## Summary

- Largest ever dataset available allowing to evolve from inclusive to first time differential  $t\bar{t}W$  measurements
  - $\Rightarrow$  overview of the ATLAS inclusive and differential t $\bar{t}W$  production cross-sections measurements given
- Inclusive cross-section found to be ~ 20% higher than state-of-the-art predictions despite including higher order QCD/EWK effects
  - ⇒ compatible at the level of 1.4 $\sigma$  with NNLO prediction of 745 ± 50 (scale) ± 13 (2-loop approx.) ± 19(PDF,  $\alpha_s$ ) fb
- Normalised differential distributions are consistent with predictions within uncertainties -> dominated by statistical component
  - → some observables exhibit mild tensions in parts of the distributions but not significant at current accuracy of the measurements
- These measurements are a key input to improve the modelling of this process
  - ➡ HEPdata entry (bootstrap replicas, HISTFactory workspaces for inclusive and differential fits)
- With Run 3 and beyond an unprecedented amount of data awaits!
  - $\Rightarrow$  would enhance significantly the precision of  $t\bar{t}W$  measurements...stay tuned!

![](_page_16_Picture_11.jpeg)

![](_page_16_Figure_12.jpeg)

17

### Backup

#### **Definition of unfolded observables**

Variable	Definition
$N_{ m jets}$	Number of selected jets with $p_{\rm T}>25{\rm GeV}$ and $ \eta <2.5$
$H_{ m T}^{ m jet}$	Scalar sum of the transverse momenta of selected jets with $p_{\rm T}>25{\rm GeV}$ and $ \eta <2.5$
$H_{\mathrm{T}}^{\mathrm{lep}}$	Scalar sum of the transverse momenta of selected leptons
$\Delta R_{\ell b,  \mathrm{lead}}$	Angular separation between the leading lepton and the leading $b$ -tagged jet
$ \Delta \phi_{\ell\ell,{ m SS}} $	Absolute azimuthal separation between the two leptons of the same-sign pair
$ \Delta\eta_{\ell\ell,{ m SS}} $	Absolute pseudorapidity separation between the two leptons of the same-sign pair
Variable	e Definition
$M_{\ell b, \text{ lead}}$	Invariant mass of the leading lepton and the leading <i>b</i> -tagged jet
$M_{\ell\ell,\rm SS}$	Invariant mass of the two leptons of the same-sign pair

#### **Tikhonov regularisation parameter**

Observable	$2\ell SS++$	$3\ell +$	$2\ell SS$	$3\ell-$
$N_{ m jets}$	0.7	0.3	0.4	0.2
$H_{\mathrm{T}}^{\mathrm{jet}}$	0.6	0.3	0.4	0.2
$H_{\mathrm{T}}^{\mathrm{lep}}$	0.5	0.1	0.2	0.1
$\Delta R_{\ell b,\mathrm{lead}}$	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.3
$ \Delta \phi_{\ell\ell,{ m SS}} $	0.1	0	0	0
$ \Delta\eta_{\ell\ell,{ m SS}} $	0.1	0.1	0.1	0

$$\rho = \left\langle \sqrt{1 - \left(V_{ii}V_{ii}^{-1}\right)^{-1}} \right\rangle_{i \in 1, \dots, N_{\text{bins}}}$$

- **Tikhonov** regularisation is implemented through the R term in the PLU which constrains the discrete second derivative of the particle level bin normalisation factor to be close to zero
- Optimisation based on bootstrapping to estimate the value of the parameter that minimises the global correlation coefficient of the unfolded covariance matrix

#### **Examples of stress/closure tests**

- Building an Asimov dataset with changed normalisation in certain regions or applying linear slopes in the particle level distributions which are then retrieved by the PLU
- Stress test evaluating the bias in the unfolding using an alternative signal model
- Stress test evaluating the sensitivity to the limited number of simulated events by splitting the signal sample into 2 parts of equal size (for unfolding and as Asimov dataset)
- Data-driven stress test to evaluate the bias in the unfolded observed data (unfolding without regularisation to build pseudo Asimov dataset using a second order polynomial fitting)