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## Introduction

- Tevatron is closing in on SM Higgs boson
- Extract as much as possible out of dataset
- Cover as many possible production and decay channels as possible (see P. Totaro and K. Petridis talks)
- Use multi-variate analysis methods
- Combine these channels
- Double dataset by combining CDF and D0
- Combination covers $\mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{H}}=100 \mathrm{GeV} / \mathrm{c}^{2}$ to $200 \mathrm{GeV} / \mathrm{c}^{2}$
- "Low mass": all channels, $\mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{H}}<150 \mathrm{GeV} / \mathrm{c}^{2}$
- Last updated summer 2010
- "High mass": primarily $H \rightarrow W W, \mathrm{~m}_{\mathrm{H}}>130 \mathrm{GeV} / \mathrm{c}^{2}$
- New for this conference


## Channels considered: Summer 2010

## CDF

56 mutually exclusive final states

| Channel | Luminosity ( $\mathrm{fb}^{-1}$ ) | $m_{H}$ range $\left(\mathrm{GeV} / c^{2}\right)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| WH $\rightarrow \ell \nu b b$ 2-jet channels $4 \times($ TDT,LDT,ST,LDTX) | 5.7 | 100-150 |
| $W H \rightarrow \ell \nu b \bar{b} 3$-jet channels $2 \times($ TDT,LDT,ST) | 5.6 | 100-150 |
| $Z H \rightarrow \nu \bar{\nu} b \bar{b} \quad$ (TDT,LDT,ST) | 5.7 | 100-150 |
| $Z H \rightarrow \ell^{+} \ell^{-} b \bar{b} \quad 4 \times($ TDT,LDT,ST) | 5.7 | 100-150 |
| $H \rightarrow W^{+} W^{-} \quad 2 \times(0,1$ jets $)+(2+$ jets $)+\left(\right.$ low- $\left.m_{\ell \ell}\right)+\left(e-\tau_{\text {had }}\right)+\left(\mu-\tau_{\text {had }}\right)$ | 5.9 | 110-200 |
| $W H \rightarrow W W^{+} W^{-} \quad$ (same-sign leptons $1+$ jets) + (tri-leptons) | 5.9 | 110-200 |
| $Z H \rightarrow Z W^{+} W^{-} \quad$ (tri-leptons 1 jet) + (tri-leptons $2+$ jets) | 5.9 | 110-200 |
| $H+X \rightarrow \tau^{+} \tau^{-} \quad(1$ jet $)+(2$ jets $)$ | 2.3 | 100-150 |
| $W H+Z H \rightarrow j j b \bar{b} \quad 2 \times($ TDT,LDT $)$ | 4.0 | 100-150 |
| $H \rightarrow \gamma \gamma$ | 5.4 | 100-150 |

## 73 mutually exclusive final states

| Channel | Luminosity $\left(\mathrm{fb}^{-1}\right)$ | $m_{H}$ range $\left(\mathrm{GeV} / \mathrm{c}^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| $W H \rightarrow \ell \nu b b$ (ST,DT,2,3 jet) | 5.3 | $100-150$ |
| $V H \rightarrow \tau^{+} \tau^{-} b \bar{b} / q \bar{q} \tau^{+} \tau^{-}$ | 4.9 | $105-145$ |
| $Z H \rightarrow \nu \bar{\nu} b \bar{b} \quad$ (ST,TLDT) | $5.2-6.4$ | $100-150$ |
| $Z H \rightarrow \ell^{+} \ell^{-} b \bar{b}$ (ST,DT, $\left.e e, \mu \mu, e e_{I C R}, \mu \mu_{t r k}\right)$ | $4.2-6.2$ | $100-150$ |
| $V H \rightarrow \ell^{ \pm} \ell^{ \pm}+X$ | 5.3 | $115-200$ |
| $H \rightarrow W^{+} W^{-} \rightarrow e^{ \pm} \nu e^{\mp} \nu, \mu^{ \pm} \nu \mu^{\mp} \nu$ | 5.4 | $115-200$ |
| $H \rightarrow W^{+} W^{-} \rightarrow e^{ \pm} \nu \mu^{\mp} \nu \quad(0,1,2+$ jet) | 6.7 | $115-200$ |
| $H \rightarrow W^{+} W^{-} \rightarrow \ell \bar{\nu} j j$ | 5.4 | $130-200$ |
| $H \rightarrow \gamma \gamma$ | 4.2 | $100-150$ |
| $t \bar{t} H \rightarrow t \bar{t} b \bar{b} \quad$ (ST,DT,TT,4,5+ jets) | 2.1 | $105-155$ |

## Channels considered: New (high mass)

## CDF

12 mutually exclusive final states

| Channel | Luminosity $\left(\mathrm{fb}^{-1}\right)$ | $m_{H}$ range $\left(\mathrm{GeV} / \mathrm{c}^{2}\right)$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $H \rightarrow W^{+} W^{-}$ | $2 \times(0,1$ jets $)+(2+$ jets $)+\left(\right.$ low- $\left.m_{\ell \ell}\right)+\left(e-\tau_{\text {had }}\right)+\left(\mu-\tau_{\text {had }}\right)$ | 7.1 | $110-200$ |
| $W H \rightarrow W W^{+} W^{-}$ | (same-sign leptons 1+ jets) + (tri-leptons) | 7.1 | $110-200$ |
| $Z H \rightarrow Z W^{+} W^{-}$ | (tri-leptons 1 jet) + (tri-leptons 2+ jets) | 7.1 | $110-200$ |

## D0

35 mutually exclusive final states

| Channel | Luminosity $\left(\mathrm{fb}^{-1}\right)$ | $m_{H}$ range $\left(\mathrm{GeV} / c^{2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| $H \rightarrow W^{+} W^{-} \rightarrow l^{ \pm} \nu l^{\mp} \nu$ | $(0,1,2+$ jet $)$ | 8.1 |
| $H \rightarrow W^{+} W^{-} \rightarrow \mu \nu \tau_{h a d} \nu$ | 7.3 | $115-200$ |
| $H \rightarrow W^{+} W^{-} \rightarrow \ell \bar{\nu} j j$ | 5.4 | $115-200$ |
| $V H \rightarrow \ell^{ \pm} \ell^{ \pm}+X$ | 5.3 | $115-200$ |
| $V H \rightarrow \tau^{+} \tau^{-} b \bar{b} / q \bar{q} \tau^{+} \tau^{-}$ | 5.3 | $115-200$ |
| $H \rightarrow \gamma \gamma$ | 8.2 | $105-200$ |

## Combining

- Perform combination using two techniques
- Require agreement within $5 \%$ at each $\mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{H}}$ and $2 \%$ on average
- Both methods
- Use distribution of final discriminants
- Poisson statistics in all bins
- Systematics as nuisance parameters (133 in all!), determined from fit to data
- Method 1: Bayesian method
- Based on credibility, using flat prior
- Method 2: Modified frequentist method
- Uses CLs method- compare b only and s+b hypotheses
- Based on coverage


## Systematics

- Systematics on signal and background estimates in two categories
- Rate: affects overall normalization (e.g. tag uncertainty)
- Shape: affects distribution (e.g. jet energy scale)
- Correlated between CDF and DO
- Integrated luminosity (4\% correlated, ~6\% total)
- Theoretical cross sections for signal and background (5-20\%)
- Correlated amongst analyses of a single experiment
- b-quark tagging efficiency uncertainty
- Lepton selection efficiency
- Jet energy scale
- QCD ISR/FSR
- Jet/missing Eт modeling
- Background modeling


## Cooperation, not competition

- Prior Run 2 CDF+D0 combinations (e.g. mop performed after analyses complete and approved separately
- Higgs combinations approved in parallel with analyses
- Inputs shared when still "confidential"!
- We hope this spirit continues in the LHC era
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## Low mass result



- Upper limit for $\mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{H}}=115 \mathrm{GeV} / \mathrm{c}^{2}$ of $1.56 \times$ бым @95\% CL
- Tevatron-only exclusion at $95 \%$ CL of $100<\mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{H}}<109 \mathrm{GeV} / \mathrm{c}^{2}$


## Background subtracted data

- Subtract background model that has been fit to data
- Independent of any assumed Higgs cross section
- No excess above background observed
- Proceed to set a limit



## Data distributions

- Rebin histograms of final discriminants for all channels in $\log (\mathrm{S} / \mathrm{B})$




## New Tevatron Higgs Limits

Tevatron Run II Preliminary, $\mathrm{L} \leq 8.2 \mathrm{fb}^{-1}$


- SM Higgs boson excluded at $95 \%$ CL for $158<\mathrm{m}_{\boldsymbol{H}}<173 \mathrm{GeV}$
- Expected exclusion at $95 \% \mathrm{CL}$ for $\mathbf{1 5 3}<\mathbf{m}_{\mathrm{H}}<\mathbf{1 7 9} \mathbf{~ G e V}$
- Compare to summer 2010 expected exclusion of $156<\mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{H}}<173 \mathrm{GeV}$


## Another approach: $C L_{s+b}$



- Roughly comparable to Power constrained $\mathrm{CL}_{\mathrm{s}+\mathrm{b}}$ approach used by ATLAS


## Just how excluded is it?



- SM Higgs of 162 < $\mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{H}}<166 \mathrm{GeV}$ excluded @99.5\% CL


## Conclusion

- Combination of all Tevatron searches has been performed
- Up to $5.9 \mathrm{fb}^{-1}$ of data for $100<\mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{H}}<130 \mathrm{GeV}$
- Up to $8.2 \mathrm{fb}^{-1}$ of data for $130<\mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{H}}<200 \mathrm{GeV}$
- Tevatron results exclude at $95 \%$ CL
- $100<\mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{H}}<109 \mathrm{GeV}$
- $158<\mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{H}}<173 \mathrm{GeV}$
- Expected exclusion of $153<\mathrm{m}_{\boldsymbol{H}}<179 \mathrm{GeV}$
- Up from $156<\mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{H}}<173 \mathrm{GeV}$
- Individual experiment exclusions now from both CDF and DO
- Tevatron exclusion now at $99.5 \%$ CL for some masses
- CDF and DO strategies continue to be to leave the Higgs nowhere to hide
- End of Run 2 (this year) will leave $\sim 10 \mathrm{fb}^{-1}$ of data for each experiment
- As always, more analysis improvements are underway
- Plenty left to do- expect new results soon!


## Backup

## LLR from CLs method



## Data distributions: Iow mass




## Theoretical Issues

- Are we treating cross-section uncertainty due to scale variations ( $\mu_{\mathrm{R}} \& \mu_{\mathrm{F}}$ ) correctly?
- We obtain gluon fusion cross sections from:
D. de Florian, M. Grazzini, Phys. Lett. B674, 291-294 (2009).
[arXiv:0901.2427 [hep-ph]].
C. Anastasiou, R. Boughezal, F. Petriello, JHEP 0904, 003 (2009).
[arXiv:0811.3458 [hep-ph]].
- Use a scale variation factor of 2 from the central value to estimate impact of potential high-order contributions
- Authors confirm high-order effects are small
- Another recent publication argues for even smaller scale uncertainties
V. Ahrens, T. Becher, M. Neubert et al., Eur. Phys. J. C62, 333-353
(2009). |arXiv:0809.4283 [hep-ph]|;
V. Ahrens, T. Becher, M. Neubert et al., [arXiv:1008.3162 [hep-ph]].
- We feel our treatment is adequate, if not conservative, and generally supported by the theoretical community


## Theoretical issues (II)

- Do we need additional uncertainties assigned to our gluon fusion cross section resulting from EFT approach used to integrate loop contributions?
- Such an uncertainty is already included:

```
C. Anastasiou, R. Boughezal, F. Petriello, JHEP 0904, 003 (2009).
[arXiv:0811.3458 [hep-ph]].
```

- Uncertainties on gluon fusion cross sections used in our searches include $\sim 2 \%$ to account for this
- Authors find entirely removing corrections from light quark diagrams changes the total cross section by less than 4\%
- We feel our treatment of EFT effects is sound

