Search for dark matter produced in association with a hadronically decaying vector boson in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV with the ATLAS detector

The ATLAS Collaboration

DOI
10.1016/j.physletb.2016.10.042

Publication date
2016

Document Version
Final published version

Published in
Physics Letters B

License
CC BY

Citation for published version (APA):
Search for dark matter produced in association with a hadronically decaying vector boson in \( pp \) collisions at \( \sqrt{s} = 13 \) TeV with the ATLAS detector

The ATLAS Collaboration

A search is presented for dark matter produced in association with a hadronically decaying W or Z boson using 3.2 fb\(^{-1} \) of \( pp \) collisions at \( \sqrt{s} = 13 \) TeV recorded by the ATLAS detector at the Large Hadron Collider. Events with a hadronic jet compatible with a W or Z boson and with large missing transverse momentum are analysed. The data are consistent with the Standard Model predictions and are interpreted in terms of both an effective field theory and a simplified model containing dark matter.
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of 2.1% in the luminosity is derived following the same methodology as that detailed in Ref. [21].

Three non-exclusive categories of jet candidates are built, each using the anti-$k_T$ clustering algorithm [22]. Two categories use clusters of energy deposits in calorimeter cells seeded by those with energies significantly above the measured noise and cali-

trated at the hadronic energy scale [25]. They are distinguished by their radius parameters; jets with radius parameter of 1.0 (0.4) are referred to as large-$R$ jets (narrow jets). Large and narrow jets can share a fraction of their energy deposits. A third type of jet candidate is reconstructed from inner-detector tracks using the anti-$k_T$ algorithm with $R = 0.2$, referred to as track jets. Large-$R$ jets are trimmed [26] to remove energy deposited by pile-up jets, the underlying event, and soft radiation. In this process, the constituents of large-$R$ jets are reclustered using the $k_T$ algorithm [23,24] with a distance parameter of 0.2, and subjects with transverse momentum $p_T$ less than 5% of the large-$R$ jet $p_T$ are removed. Large-$R$ jets are required to satisfy $p_T > 200$ GeV and $|\eta| < 2.0$. These large-$R$ jets are intended to capture the hadronic products of both quarks from the decay of a $W$ or $Z$ boson, while the narrow jets and track jets are helpful in background suppression. The internal structure of the large-$R$ jet is characterized in terms of two quantities: $D_2$ [27,28], which identifies jets with two distinct concentrations of energy [29,30], and $m_{\text{jet}}$, which is the calculated invariant mass of the jet. Narrow jets are required to satisfy $p_T > 20$ GeV for $|\eta| < 2.5$ or $p_T > 30$ GeV for $2.5 < |\eta| < 4.5$. Track jets are required to satisfy $p_T > 10$ GeV and $|\eta| < 2.5$. For both the large-$R$ and narrow jets, jet momenta are calculated by performing a four-vector sum over these component clusters, treating each topological cluster [25] as an $(E, \vec{p})$ four-vector with zero mass, and are calibrated to the hadronic scale. For narrow jets, the direction of $\vec{p}$ is given by the line joining the reconstructed vertex with the barycentre of the energy cluster. The missing transverse momentum $P^{\text{miss}}_T$ is calculated as the negative of the vector sum of the transverse momenta of reconstructed jets, leptons, and those tracks which are associated with the reconstructed vertex but not with any jet or lepton. A closely related quantity, $E^{\text{miss}}_T$, is calculated in the same way but excluding reconstructed muons. A third variant, $P^{\text{miss}}_{T,\text{had}}$, is the missing transverse momentum measured using inner detector tracks. The magnitudes of the three missing-transverse-momentum variants are denoted by $E^{\text{miss}}_T$, $E^{\text{miss}}_{T,\text{had}}$, and $P^{\text{miss}}_T$ respectively. Electrons, muons, jets, and $P^{\text{miss}}_T$ are reconstructed as described in Refs. [25, 31–33], respectively.

Candidate signal events are selected by an inclusive $E^{\text{miss}}_T$ trigger that is more than 99% efficient for events with $E^{\text{miss}}_T > 200$ GeV. Events triggered by detector noise and non-collision backgrounds are rejected as described in Ref. [34]. In addition, events are required to satisfy the requirements of $E^{\text{miss}}_T > 250$ GeV, no reconstructed electrons or muons, and at least one large-$R$ jet with $p_T > 200$ GeV, $|\eta| < 2.0$, $m_{\text{jet}}$ and $D_2$ consistent with a $W$ or $Z$ boson decay as in Ref. [35]. To further suppress back-
grounds from multijet and $t\bar{t}$ production, events are required to satisfy $P^{\text{miss}}_T > 30$ GeV, a minimum azimuthal angular distance, $\Delta \phi$, of 0.6 between the $E^{\text{miss}}_T$ and the nearest narrow jet, and $\Delta \phi(P^{\text{miss}}_T, P^{\text{miss}}_T) < \pi/2$. Within a fiducial volume defined at parton level by similar selection requirements (except those on $D_2$ and $P^{\text{miss}}_T$), the reconstruction efficiency for the signal models described above varies from 38% to 49%.

The dominant source of background events is $Z \rightarrow \nu\bar{\nu}$ production in association with jets. A secondary contribution comes from the production of jets in association with a leptonically decaying $W$ or $Z$ boson in which the charged leptons are not identified or the $\tau$ leptons decay hadronically. The third major background contribution comes from top-quark pair production. The kinematic distributions of these three largest backgrounds are estimated using simulated event samples but the normalization is determined using control regions where the dark-matter signal is expected to be negligible. Each control region requires $E^{\text{miss}}_T > 200$ GeV and $P^{\text{miss}}_T > 30$ GeV as well as one large-$R$ jet satisfying the substructure requirement on $D_2$ as applied in the signal region. The $Z$ boson control region requires exactly two muons with dimuon invariant mass $66 < m_{\mu\mu} < 116$ GeV. The $W$ boson (top quark) control region requires exactly one muon, and zero (at least one) $b$-tagged track jet not associated with the large-$R$ jet. Validation of the reconstruction of hadronic $W$ boson decays with large-$R$ jets is performed in the top-quark control region, as shown in Fig. 2, which also presents the distribution of the $D_2$ substructure variable. Other sources of background are diboson production and single-top-quark production. The contribution to the signal region from multijet production is negligible.

Samples of simulated $W +$ jets and $Z +$ jets events are generated using SHERPA 2.1.1 [36]. Matrix elements are calculated for up to two partons at next-to-leading order (NLO) and four partons at leading order (LO) using the Comix [37] and Open-Loops [38] matrix element generators and merged with the SHERPA parton shower [39] using the ME+PS@NLO prescription [40].

The CT10 [41] PDF set is used in conjunction with dedicated parton shower tuning developed by the SHERPA authors. The $W/Z$ production rates are normalized to a next-to-next-to-leading order (NNLO) calculation [42]. The production of $t\bar{t}$ and single-top processes, including $s$-channel, $t$-channel and $Wt$ production is modelled with the POWHEG-Box v2 generator [43–45] interfaced to PyTHIA6.428 [46]. In these generators the CT10 and CTEQ6L1 [47] PDF sets are used, respectively. Top-quark pair production is normalized to NNLO with next-to-next-to-leading-logarithm corrections [48] in QCD while single-top processes are normalized at NLO [49,50] in QCD. The diboson ($WW$, $WZ$, $ZZ$) processes are simulated using SHERPA 2.1.1 with the CT10 PDF and normalized at NLO [51,52] in QCD. The multijet process is described using samples simulated with PyTHIA8.186 [53] and the NNPDF23LO [54] PDF at leading order in QCD; these multijet samples were used to develop the background estimation strategy but not for the final background prediction.
Fig. 2. Pane (a) Distribution of $m_{\text{jet}}$ in the data and for the predicted background in the top-quark control region. Pane (b) Distribution of jet substructure variable $D_2$ in the data and for the predicted background in events satisfying all signal region requirements other than those on $D_2$. Also shown is the distribution for the simplified model with a vector-boson mediator, scaled by a factor of $10^4$ for given values of $m_\chi$ and $m_{\text{med}}$, the mediator mass. (For interpretation of the references to color in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)

Fig. 3. The $E_{\text{T miss}}$ distribution of the events in the control regions after the profile-likelihood fit to the data under the background-only hypothesis. Pane (a) shows the $t\bar{t}$ control region, pane (b) shows the $Z$ + jets control region, and pane (c) shows the $W$ + jets control region. The total background prediction before the fit is shown as a dashed line. The inset at the bottom of each plot shows the ratio of the data to the total post-fit background. The hatched bands represent the total uncertainty in the background. (For interpretation of the references to color in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)
Samples of simulated $W' \chi \bar{\chi}$ and $Z' \chi \bar{\chi}$ events are generated using MadGraph5_AMC@NLO [55], and the underlying event and parton showering are simulated with Pythia8.186 [53]. Two theoretical models are used as benchmarks: a seven-dimensional $VV \chi \chi$ EFT [19] model ($V$ meaning $W$ or $Z$) and a vector-mediated simplified model [56]. The strength of the EFT interaction is controlled by a mass scale, $M_\chi$, and the strength of the simplified model interaction is controlled by the product of the couplings of the mediator to the SM and the dark matter (DM) particles, $g_{3\text{DM}}$. The EFT model samples were generated with $M_\chi = 3000$ GeV, and the simplified model samples were generated with couplings $g_{3\text{SM}} = 0.25$ and $g_{3\text{DM}} = 1$. The samples were generated as a function of dark-matter particle mass $m_\chi$ for the EFT model and in a grid of mediator mass $m_{\text{med}}$ and $m_\chi$ for the simplified model.

Major sources of systematic uncertainty are uncertainties in the modelling of large-$R$ jet observables, which have a 5–13% impact on the expected background and signal yields, and the energy scale of the narrow jets, which contribute a 1–5% uncertainty to the expected yields. Other sources of uncertainty include theoretical uncertainties in the simulated event samples used to model the background processes (1–10%), parton distribution functions (10–15%), and lepton reconstruction and identification efficiencies (up to 2%).

A profile-likelihood fit [57] to the $E_{T}^{\text{miss}}$ ($E_{T}^{\text{miss}, \text{med}}$) distribution in the signal region (control regions) is used to constrain the $W$ boson, $Z$ boson, and $t\bar{t}$ backgrounds and extract the signal strength, $\mu$, for each model as an overall normalization factor for the signal prediction. Besides the signal strength, three overall normalization factors for the $W$ boson, $Z$ boson, and $t\bar{t}$ backgrounds are parameters in the fit. The diboson and single-top backgrounds are estimated from simulation, and the multijet background is negligible. The likelihood function is defined as the product of Poisson distributions over all bins in $E_{T}^{\text{miss}}$ and $E_{T}^{\text{miss}, \text{med}}$, and the likelihood is simultaneously maximized over the signal and control regions.

Variations of the expected signal and background to allow for their systematic uncertainties are described with nuisance parameters constrained by Gaussian probability distribution functions, and correlations across signal and background processes and regions are taken into account.

A background-only ($\mu = 0$) fit, shows no deviation from SM predictions, and Figs. 3 and 4 show kinematic distributions after the profile-likelihood fit. The floating background-normalization parameters are consistent with unity within one standard deviation. Tables 1 and 2 show the expected event yields after applying the signal selection and the background normalization scale factors, respectively. The values in these tables are estimated for the background-only hypothesis.

Upper limits at 95% confidence level (C.L.) on $\mu$ are calculated using the $C_L$ method [58]. For the $VV \chi \chi$ EFT model, these limits are translated into constraints on the mass scale, $M_\chi$. Fig. 5(a) shows the limit on the mass scale, $M_\chi$, in the EFT model, as a function of $m_\chi$. Fig. 5(b) shows the limits on the signal strength, $\mu$, for a vector-mediated simplified model generated with couplings $g_{3\text{SM}} = 0.25$ and $g_{3\text{DM}} = 1$ in the plane of $m_\chi$ and $m_{\text{med}}$.

In conclusion, this Letter reports ATLAS limits on dark-matter production in events with a hadronically decaying $W$ or $Z$ boson and large missing transverse momentum. These limits from $3.2 \, \text{fb}^{-1}$ of 13 TeV $pp$ collisions at the LHC improve on earlier ATLAS results. No statistically significant excess is observed over the Standard Model prediction.

Acknowledgements

We thank CERN for the very successful operation of the LHC, as well as the support staff from our institutions without whom ATLAS could not be operated efficiently.

We acknowledge the support of ANPCyT, Argentina; YerPhI, Armenia; ARC, Australia; BMVFW and FWF, Austria; ANAS, Azerbaijan; SSTC, Belarus; CNPq and FAPESP, Brazil; NSERC, NRC and CFI, Canada; CERN; CONICYT, Chile; CAS, MOST and NSFC, China; COLCIENCIAS, Colombia; MSMT CR, MPO CR and VSC CR, Czech Republic; DNRF and DNSRC, Denmark; IN2P3-CNRS, CEA-DSM/IRFU, France; GNSF, Georgia; BMBF, HGF, and MPG, Germany; SNSF, Greece; RGC, Hong Kong SAR, China; ISF, I-CORE and Benoziyo Center, Israel; INFN, Italy; MEXT and JSPS, Japan; CNRSR, Morocco; FOM and NWO, Netherlands; RCN, Norway; MINISW and NCN, Poland; FCT, Portugal; MINEFA, Romania; MES of Russia and NRC KI, Russian Federation; JINR; MESTD, Serbia; MSSR, Slovakia; ARRS and MIZŠ, Slovenia; DST/NRF, South Africa; MINECO, Spain; SRC and Wallenberg Foundation, Sweden; SERI, SNSF and Cantons
of Bern and Geneva, Switzerland; MOST, Taiwan; TAEK, Turkey; STFC, United Kingdom; DOE and NSF, United States of America. In addition, individual groups and members have received support from BCKDF, the Canada Council, CANARIE, CRC, Compute Canada, FQRNT, and the Ontario Innovation Trust, Canada; EPLANET, ERC, FP7, Horizon 2020 and Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions, European Union; Investissements d’Avenir Labex and Idex, ANR, Région Auvergne and Fondation Partager le Savoir, France; DFG and AvH Foundation, Germany; Herakleitos, Thales and Aristeia programmes co-financed by EU-ESF and the Greek NSRF; BSF, GIF and Minerva, Israel; BRF, Norway; Generalitat de Catalunya, Generalitat Valenciana, Spain; the Royal Society and Leverhulme Trust, United Kingdom.

The crucial computing support from all WLCG partners is acknowledged gratefully, in particular from CERN, the ATLAS Tier-1 facilities at TRIUMF (Canada), NDGF (Denmark, Norway, Sweden), CC-IN2P3 (France), KIT/GridKA (Germany), INFN-CNAF (Italy), NL-T1 (Netherlands), PIC (Spain), ASGC (Taiwan), RAL (UK) and BNL (USA), the Tier-2 facilities worldwide and large non-WLCG resource providers. Major contributors of computing resources are listed in Ref. [59].

References

The ATLAS Collaboration

The ATLAS Collaboration / Physics Letters B 763 (2016) 251–268
Institut für Astr- und Teilchenphysik, Leopold-Franzens-Universität, Innsbruck, Austria
63 Department of Physics, Innsbruck, Austria
64 University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA, United States
65 Department of Physics and Astronomy, Iowa State University, Ames, IA, United States
66 Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, JINR Dubna, Dubna, Russia
67 KER, High Energy Accelerator Research Organization, Tsukuba, Japan
68 Graduate School of Science, Kobe University, Kobe, Japan
69 Faculty of Science, Kyoto University, Koto, Japan
70 Kyoto University of Education, Kyoto, Japan
71 Department of Physics, Kyushu University, Fukuoka, Japan
72 Instituto de Fisica La Plata, Universidad Nacional de La Plata and CONICET, La Plata, Argentina
73 Physics Department, Lancaster University, Lancaster, United Kingdom
74 INFN Sezione di Lecce; (b) Dipartimento di Matematica e Fisica, Università del Salento, Lecce, Italy
75 Oliver Lodge Laboratory, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, United Kingdom
76 Department of Physics, Joseph Stefan Institute and University of Ljubljana, Ljubljana, Slovenia
77 School of Physics and Astronomy, Queen Mary University of London, London, United Kingdom
78 Department of Physics, Royal Holloway University of London, Surrey, United Kingdom
79 Department of Physics and Astronomy, University College London, London, United Kingdom
80 Louisiana Tech University, Ruston, LA, United States
81 Laboratoire de Physique Nucléaire et de Hautes Energies, UPMC and Université Paris-Diderot and CNRS/IN2P3, Paris, France
82 P.F. Něvského Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, Russia
83 Institute for Theoretical and Experimental Physics (ITEP), Moscow, Russia
84 National Research Nuclear University MEPhI, Moscow, Russia
85 D.V. Skobeltsyn Institute of Nuclear Physics, M.V. Lomonosov Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia
86 Dipartimento di Fisica, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, München, Germany
87 Max-Planck-Institut für Physik (Werner-Heisenberg-Institut), München, Germany
88 Nagasaki Institute of Applied Science, Nagasaki, Japan
89 Graduate School of Science and Kobayashi-Maskawa Institute, Nagoya University, Nagoya, Japan
90 INFN Sezione di Napoli; (b) Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Napoli, Napoli, Italy
91 Department of Physics and Astronomy, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, United States
92 Institute for Mathematics, Astrophysics and Particle Physics, Radboud University Nijmegen/Nikhef, Nijmegen, Netherlands
93 Nikhef National Institute for Subatomic Physics and University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, Netherlands
94 Department of Physics, Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, IL, United States
95 Budker Institute of Nuclear Physics, SB RAS, Novosibirsk, Russia
96 Department of Physics, New York University, New York, NY, United States
97 Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, United States
98 Faculty of Science, Okayama University, Okayama, Japan
99 Homer L. Dodge Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK, United States
100 Department of Physics, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, OK, United States
101 Palacky University, Olomouc, Czech Republic
102 Center for High Energy Physics, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR, United States
103 LAI, Univ. Paris-Sud, CNRS/IN2P3, Université Paris-Saclay, Orsay, France
104 Graduate School of Science, Osaka University, Osaka, Japan
105 Department of Physics, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway
106 Department of Physics, Oxford University, Oxford, United Kingdom
107 INFN Sezione di Pavia; (b) Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Pavia, Pavia, Italy
108 Department of Physics, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, United States
109 National Research Centre “Kurchatov Institute” B.P. Konstantinov Petersburg Nuclear Physics Institute, St. Petersburg, Russia
110 INFN Sezione di Pisa; (b) Dipartimento di Fisica E. Fermi, Università di Pisa, Pisa, Italy
111 Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA, United States
112 Laboratório de Instrumentação e Física Experimental de Partículas - LIP, Lisboa; (b) Faculdade de Ciências, Universidade de Lisboa, Lisboa, Portugal
113 Department of Physics, University of Coimbra, Coimbra; (b) Centro de Física Nuclear da Universidade de Lisboa, Lisboa, Portugal
114 Department of Physics, Universidade do Minho, Braga; (b) Departamento de Física Teórica y del Cosmos y CAFPE, Universidad de Granada, Granada (Spain); (b) Dep Fisica and CENITEC - Facultad de Ciencias y Tecnología, Universidad Nova de Lisboa, Caparica, Portugal
115 Institute of Physics, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, Prague, Czech Republic
116 Czech Technical University in Prague, Prague, Czech Republic
117 Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, Charles University in Prague, Prague, Czech Republic
118 State Research Center Institute for High Energy Physics (Protvino), NRC KI, Russia
119 Particle Physics Department, Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Didcot, United Kingdom
120 INFN Sezione di Roma; (b) Dipartimento di Fisica, Sapienza Università di Roma, Roma, Italy
121 INFN Sezione di Roma Tor Vergata; (b) Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Roma Tor Vergata, Roma, Italy
122 INFN Sezione di Roma Tre; (b) Dipartimento di Matematica e Fisica, Università Roma Tre, Roma, Italy
123 Faculté des Sciences Ain Chock, Université Scientifique et Technique El-Hassen II, Casablanca; (b) Centre National de l’Energie des Sciences Techniques Nucléaires, Rabat; (b) Faculté des Sciences Semlalia, Université Cadi Ayyad, LHEA-Marrakech; (b) Faculté des Sciences, Université Mohammed Premier and LPTPM, Oujda; (b) Faculté des sciences, Université Mohammed V, Rabat, Morocco
124 DSM/IRFU (Institut de Recherches sur les Lois Fondamentales de l’Univers), CEA Saclay (Commissariat à l’Energie Atomique et aux Energies Alternatives), Gif-sur-Yvette, France
Also at School of Physics, Shandong University, Shandong, China.
Also at Department of Physics, California State University, Sacramento, CA, United States.
Also at Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology State University, Dolgoprudny, Russia.
Also at Section de Physique, Université de Genève, Geneva, Switzerland.
Also at Eotvos Lorand University, Budapest, Hungary.
Also at Departments of Physics & Astronomy and Chemistry, Stony Brook University, Stony Brook, NY, United States.
Also at International School for Advanced Studies (SISSA), Trieste, Italy.
Also at Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC, United States.
Also at Institut de Física d’Altes Energies (IFAE), The Barcelona Institute of Science and Technology, Barcelona, Spain.
Also at School of Physics and Engineering, Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou, China.
Also at Institute for Nuclear Research and Nuclear Energy (INRNE) of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Sofia, Bulgaria.
Also at Faculty of Physics, M.V. Lomonosov Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia.
Also at Institute of Physics, Academia Sinica, Taipei, Taiwan.
Also at National Research Nuclear University MEPhI, Moscow, Russia.
Also at Department of Physics, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, United States.
Also at Institute for Particle and Nuclear Physics, Wigner Research Centre for Physics, Budapest, Hungary.
Also at Flensburg University of Applied Sciences, Flensburg, Germany.
Also at University of Malaya, Department of Physics, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.
Also at CPPM, Aix-Marseille Université and CNRS/IN2P3, Marseille, France.
Also affiliated with PKU-CHEP.
* Deceased.