

# The W-boson mass and the strong interaction

Maarten Boonekamp

CEA/IRFU and Guest Scientist at Helmholtz Institut, Mainz

#### Tests of the electroweak theory



#### Tests of the electroweak theory



### Electroweak predictions in leading order

- The electroweak gauge sector of the SM is constrained by three precisely known parameters :
  - The electromagnetic coupling constant :
  - The muon decay constant :
  - The Z boson mass :

- **α** = 1/137035999206(11)
- **G**<sub>µ</sub> = 1.1663787(6) GeV<sup>-2</sup>

• The W boson mass is given by

$$m_W^2 = \frac{m_Z^2}{2} \left( 1 + \sqrt{1 - 4 \frac{\pi \alpha}{\sqrt{2} G_\mu m_Z^2}} \right)$$

#### Quantum corrections : $m_W$

• Higher-order corrections, predominantly the boson self-energies, modify the leading-order relations to

$$m_{W}^{2} = \frac{m_{Z}^{2}}{2} \left( 1 + \sqrt{1 - 4 \frac{\pi \alpha}{\sqrt{2} G_{\mu} m_{Z}^{2}}} \frac{1}{1 - \Delta r} \right)$$

$$\sim (r_{t}, q\bar{q}) \sim (tb, H, ...) \sim W$$

$$\Delta r = \Delta \alpha - \tan^{2} \theta_{W} \Delta \rho = \sim 0.059 - \frac{3 G_{\mu} m_{W}^{2}}{8 \sqrt{2} \pi^{2}} \left[ \frac{m_{up}^{2}}{m_{W}^{2}} \cot^{2} \theta_{W} - \left( \ln \frac{m_{H}^{2}}{m_{W}^{2}}, \frac{5}{6} \right) + ... \right]$$

$$\Rightarrow \alpha(0) \sim 1/137... \Rightarrow \alpha(m_{Z}) \sim 1/128.9$$

#### Quantum corrections : mw



#### Quantum corrections : m<sub>w</sub> m<sub>w</sub> [GeV] 81 80.8 80.6 predicted 80.4 80.2 Measured value? 80 me 79.8 79.6 $\Delta \mathbf{r} = \mathbf{0}$ $\Delta \mathbf{r} = \Delta \alpha$ Œ 79.4 $\Delta \mathbf{r} = \Delta \alpha - \tan^2 \theta_w \Delta \rho(\mathbf{m}_{top}^2, ...)$ (m<sub>H</sub>=125 GeV) 79.2 100 120 160 180 200 220 240 140 Nowadays: m<sub>top</sub> [GeV]

- Inputs :  $\delta m_{top} \sim 0.7 \text{ GeV}$   $\delta m_H < 0.2 \text{ GeV}$
- Output : m<sub>w</sub> = 80.356 +/- 0.008 GeV



- Incomplete kinematics (missing neutrino!)
  - $\rightarrow$  no invariant mass
  - $\rightarrow\,$  rely on measured quantities, and exploit momentum conservation in the transverse plane
- Event representation :
- Main signature : single electron or muon  $\vec{p}_T^{\ l}$
- Recoil : sum of "everything else" reconstructed in the calorimeters; a measure of p<sub>T</sub><sup>w,z</sup>

$$\vec{u}_{\mathrm{T}} = \sum_{i} \vec{E}_{\mathrm{T},i}$$



 $p_T^{\tilde{l}}$ 



• The process at leading order, no width :



$$\hat{\sigma}_{u\bar{d}\to\ell^+\nu} = \frac{1}{3} \frac{|V_{ud}|^2}{3\pi} \left(\frac{G_F m_W^2}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2 \delta(m^2 - m_W^2)$$

Unpolarized differential cross section (spin 1) :

$$\frac{d\hat{\sigma}_{u\bar{d}\to\ell^+\nu}}{d\cos\theta} \propto 1 + \cos^2\theta \qquad \rightarrow \qquad \frac{d\hat{\sigma}_{u\bar{d}\to\ell^+\nu}}{dp_{\rm T}^\ell} \propto \frac{\left(1 - \frac{2p_{\rm T}^\ell}{m_W^2}\right)}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{4p_{\rm T}^\ell}{m_W^2}}} \qquad \qquad \rightarrow \qquad \text{the "Jacobian peak"}$$

• The process at leading order, no width :



• Natural width :



• Radiation in the initial state (QCD)

 $\rightarrow\,$  non trivial transverse momentum distribution



Radiation in the final state (QED)

 $\rightarrow$  decays leptons lose a fraction of their energy

![](_page_13_Figure_3.jpeg)

- Summary of physics effects
  - $\rightarrow$  all carry uncertainties to be quantified!

![](_page_14_Figure_3.jpeg)

- Detector effects, also with uncertainties :
  - Lepton calibration and resolution; Missing  $E_T$  resolution ~ 5 15 GeV
  - Efficiencies and acceptance ~15% (with non-trivial kinematic dependence!)

![](_page_15_Figure_4.jpeg)

• Mass measurement : produce models ("templates") of the final state distributions for different mass hypotheses; compare to data

![](_page_16_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_17_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Figure_2.jpeg)

- The valence and sea distributions
  - Determine the W-boson rapidity distribution  $\rightarrow$  acceptance & fiducial distributions
  - The valence distributions polarize the W decay, with corresponding uncertainties.
  - For W<sup>+</sup> :

![](_page_20_Figure_6.jpeg)

- The valence and sea distributions
  - Determine the W-boson rapidity distribution  $\rightarrow$  acceptance & fiducial distributions
  - The valence distributions polarize the W decay, with corresponding uncertainties.
  - For W<sup>+</sup> :

![](_page_21_Figure_6.jpeg)

- The valence and sea distributions
  - Determine the W-boson rapidity distribution  $\rightarrow$  acceptance & fiducial distributions
  - The valence distributions polarize the W decay, with corresponding uncertainties:

![](_page_22_Figure_5.jpeg)

#### Constraining PDFs: W charge asymmetry

• vs rapidity: 
$$A(y) \approx \frac{u_V - d_V}{u_V + d_V + 2 r_s c}$$
  $(r_s \approx \bar{s}/\bar{d} \text{ and assuming } \bar{u} \approx \bar{d} \text{ and } s \approx \bar{s}).$ 

• Experiments only access  $\eta_{lep}$ : effect blurred by V-A. Still very discriminating information: probes a mixture of  $u_V/d_V$  and second generation quark PDFs

![](_page_23_Figure_3.jpeg)

#### Implications: Valence distributions

- Strategy (largely common to ATLAS and CMS): use HERA data by necessity; ad only collider data
  - · Avoid data subject to larger theoretical uncertainty
- Impact of asymmetry measurement: most significant improvement in  $d_V$ 
  - $d_V$  has more freedom as  $u_V$  is better constrained by HERA data

![](_page_24_Figure_5.jpeg)

Phys. Rev. Lett. 109 (2012) 111806

- Transverse momentum distribution
  - Initial state radiation involves large corrections, and is in part non-perturbative. W events are only partly measured (neutrino!)
  - Approach : adjust model parameters using Z events, which are close to W's and can be measured precisely; extrapolate to W production

![](_page_25_Figure_4.jpeg)

- Transverse momentum distribution
  - Z-based model tuning +  $Z \rightarrow W$  extrapolation uncertainties
  - Problem : measurements are inclusive in initial parton configurations.
     Heavy-flavour contributions "kick" the p<sub>T</sub> distribution, and are different in W and Z

![](_page_26_Figure_4.jpeg)

- Transverse momentum distribution
  - Comparison between selected theoretical predictions:

![](_page_27_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_27_Figure_4.jpeg)

#### After all is said and done...

• CDF, D0

![](_page_28_Figure_2.jpeg)

#### After all is said and done...

• ATLAS

![](_page_29_Figure_2.jpeg)

#### After all is said and done...

![](_page_30_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### **Experimental situation**

![](_page_31_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### **Experimental situation**

- Last measurements:
  - ATLAS 2017

 $m_w = 80370 \pm 7 \text{ (stat.)} \pm 11 \text{ (exp.)} \pm 10 \text{ (theory)} \pm 9 \text{ (PDF)}$ 

- LHCb 2021  $m_w = 80354 \pm 23 \text{ (stat.)} \pm 10 \text{ (exp.)} \pm 17 \text{ (theory)} \pm 9 \text{ (PDF)}$ 

- CDF 2022  $M_w = 80433 \pm 6.4$  (stat.)  $\pm 4.5$  (exp.)  $\pm 3.5$  (theory)  $\pm 3.9$  (PDF)

### Conclusions

- The W boson mass is arguably the most difficult measurement in HEP
  - Partial event reconstruction, incomplete kinematics
  - Calibrations
  - Physics modelling
  - Precision goal
  - $\rightarrow$  so mistakes can be made..
- The limit of these measurements is the limit of our understanding of QCD.
- Ultimate goals of ATLAS, CMS, LHCb ~10 MeV each, with different experimental conditions and methods