

LHC Run-2 and Future Prospects

J. T. Boyd

CERN, Geneva, Switzerland

Abstract

The lecture discusses both the current status of the LHC collider as well as its future running scenarios. In addition a selection of the latest physics results from ATLAS/CMS and LHCb is presented.

Keywords

LHC Run-2; EPSHEP2019.

1 The LHC Collider

The LHC is the highest energy particle collider in the world, situated in the 27 km long, former LEP tunnel at CERN. It is an extremely sophisticated machine, using super conducting 8T dipole magnets to steer the high-energy proton beams. The magnets are cooled to an operating temperature of 1.9K using super-fluid liquid helium. Given the extreme energy of the beams, the LHC needs a complex machine protection system, relying on a large number of beam instrumentation devices to monitor the beam position and beam losses.

The two key parameters for a collider are the collision energy, and the luminosity L which is a measure of the number of collisions. The number of events for a specific process (N) is given by $N = \sigma \times L$, where σ is the production cross-section for that process and L is the integrated luminosity.

The luminosity at a collider is given by the formula: $L = n_b N_1 N_2 F / 4\pi\epsilon\beta^*$ and can be increased by increasing the number of protons per bunch (N_1, N_2), the number of colliding bunches (n_b), or reducing the transverse size of the beam at the collision point which can be done by using a lower emittance (ϵ) beam, or by squeezing the beam more with the focussing magnets (reducing β^*). The crossing-angle between the beams, needed to avoid parasitic collisions due to the short distance between bunches, reduces the luminosity, and is encapsulated in the geometric factor F in the equation.

The main machine parameters for the LHC are shown in Table 1, for the design, Run-1, Run-2, as well as the expectation for Run-3 and the High Luminosity upgrade (HL-LHC). It can be seen that all of the design parameters have been exceeded, except the collision energy, and the number of colliding bunches. The LHC experts have continually improved the running scenario to increase the luminosity, and during Run-2 the design luminosity of $10^{34} \text{ cm}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1}$, was achieved and surpassed by a factor of two at the end of Run-2. As well as improving the instantaneous luminosity, the availability of the machine was dramatically improved during Run-2 which led to a large dataset for physics; in 2016,2017,2018 running, the machine was providing physics collisions during 50% of the allocated physics time, which is very impressive for a super conducting collider. An important parameter for the LHC experiments is the pileup, which is determined by the luminosity per bunch, and is a measure of the number of inelastic pp interactions that occur per bunch crossing. Higher pileup gives more luminosity (for a fixed number of bunches) but makes physics analysis more difficult due to the signals in the detector from the additional interactions.

The HL-LHC will operate from 2026 with the goal of delivering 3000 fb^{-1} in the following ten years (an increase of a factor of ten compared to the expected dataset at that time). In order to achieve this the injector needs to be upgraded to provide higher intensity beam, the focussing magnets will be replaced to be able to squeeze the beam more, and various components will be upgraded to be able to cope with the increased radiation and stored energy. The pileup in ATLAS and CMS will increase significantly (to 150 interactions per bunch crossing) and the detectors will need large upgrades to be

able to make physics measurements at this large pileup, as well as to be able to cope with the associated radiation.

Parameter	Design	Run-1	Run-2	Run-3	HL-LHC
Energy [TeV]	14	7/8	13	14	14
Bunch spacing [ns]	25	50	25	25	25
Bunch Intensity [10^{11} ppb]	1.15	1.6	1.2	up to 1.8	2.2
Number of bunches	2800	1400	2500	2800	2800
Emittance [μm]	3.5	2.2	2.2	2.5	2.5
β^* [cm]	55	80	30 \rightarrow 25	30 \rightarrow 25	down to 15
Crossing angle [μrad]	285	-	300 \rightarrow 260	300 \rightarrow 260	TBD
Peak Luminosity [10^{34} $\text{cm}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1}$]	1.0	0.8	2.0	2.0	5.0
Peak pileup	25	45	60	55	150

Table 1: Summary of main accelerator parameters for the LHC, showing the design values, and those used during Run-1 and Run-2, as well as the expected parameters for Run-3 and the HL-LHC.

2 Run-2 physics highlights and future prospects

2.1 The LHC detectors

ATLAS and CMS are the general-purpose detectors at the LHC with the same physics goals. There are significant differences in the detector designs, but despite these they have very similar physics performance.

The main differences in the detectors relate to the magnet design, ATLAS utilizes a 2 T solenoid to provide the magnetic field to bend charged particles in the central detector region, with three toroidal magnets (one barrel toroid and two endcaps) to bend muons in the muon spectrometer. CMS uses a single large solenoid with field of 3.8 T for both of these roles. Following on from this the ATLAS calorimeters are placed outside the thin solenoid, whereas in CMS the calorimeters are inside the solenoid.

2.2 The Run-2 dataset

During Run-2 ATLAS and CMS collected $\approx 140 \text{ fb}^{-1}$ of data for physics analysis. The cost of this large dataset was the significantly larger pileup compared to the design value of 25, as can be seen in Figure 1, and it has been one of the main challenges for the experiments to be able to efficiently trigger, reconstruct the data, and carry out physics analyses with the Run-2 pileup. The experiments have put a huge effort into updating the trigger and reconstruction algorithms to improve the performance at high pileup. Figure 1 shows examples of the achieved pileup robustness in terms of reconstructed particles both for efficiency and resolution.




Fig. 1: (left) The Run-2 pileup distribution. An example of the pileup robustness of (middle) the reconstructed muon efficiency and (right) the electron energy scale.

2.3 Higgs physics

The main modes for Higgs production at the LHC are (in order of decreasing cross-section): gluon-fusion (ggF), Vector-Boson fusion (VBF), production in association with a vector boson (VH) and production in association with a pair of top-quarks (ttH). In VBF production the scattered quarks are likely to form forward jets on the two sides of the detector, which can be used to tag such events. The main decay modes for the Higgs boson are shown in Table 2. Experimentally the modes with the best mass resolution are important, as this allows to separate the signal from the background in a much more reliable way. The $H \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ and $H \rightarrow ZZ^* \rightarrow 4\ell$ ($\ell = e/\mu$) both have excellent mass resolution of $\approx 1\text{-}2\%$, and these were the modes used for the Higgs discovery in 2012, despite the fact they have very low branching fractions (BF). Figure 2 shows the mass distributions for these two channels for the full Run-2 dataset. For $H \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ the signal to background (S/B) is low, but the total number of selected Higgs events is a few thousand, whereas for $H \rightarrow 4\ell$ the S/B is high, but the total number of signal events is an order of magnitude less.

Poor mass resolution channels		Good mass resolution channels	
Decay Mode	BF (%)	Decay Mode	BF (%)
$H \rightarrow b\bar{b}$	58.2	$H \rightarrow ZZ^*$	2.6 (0.012 e, μ)
$H \rightarrow WW^*$	21.4 (1.1 e, μ)	$H \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$	0.23
$H \rightarrow gg$	8.2	$H \rightarrow Z\gamma$	0.15 (0.008 e, μ)
$H \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-$	6.3	$H \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$	0.02
$H \rightarrow c\bar{c}$	2.9		

Table 2: Summary of Higgs decay modes (BFs and resolutions) for the 125 GeV mass SM Higgs boson. For the good mass resolution channels involving a Z-boson, the resolution is only good for leptonic decays of the Z.




Fig. 2: Reconstructed Higgs candidate mass distributions in the $H \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ (left) and $H \rightarrow 4\ell$ (right) channels.

Table 3 shows the status of the main Higgs production and decay modes, in terms of the significance of the measured signal. It shows that all of the main production and decay modes have been established, although many of these were only observed in the last year.

The Higgs coupling to fermions was established with the observation of the $H \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-$ decay. The analysis selects events with two τ s (either can decay hadronically or leptonically), and uses selections targeting either VBF Higgs production or high- p_T ggF Higgs production to reduce the backgrounds. The main background is $Z \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-$ which has the same final state, with $\approx 1000\times$ higher cross-section and with a similar di- τ mass (the mass resolution is not sufficient to be able to resolve the two processes). Figure 3 shows the di- τ mass distribution from the Run-2 CMS analysis [1] where a tiny signal can be

	$\gamma\gamma$	ZZ^*	WW^*	$b\bar{b}$	$c\bar{c}$	$\tau^+\tau^-$	$\mu^+\mu^-$	Combined
ggF	Obs.	Obs.	Obs.	-	-	UL	UL	Obs.
VBF	UL	UL	UL	UL	-	Evid.	UL	Obs.
VH	UL	UL	UL	Obs.	UL	-	-	Obs.
ttH	Evid.	UL	Evid.	UL	-	Evid.	-	Obs.
Combined	Obs.	Obs.	Obs.	Obs.	UL	Obs.	UL	-

Table 3: Status of the measured significance for the main Higgs production and decay modes. Here Obs./Evid. means the significance is at the level of an observation/evidence, UL stands for 'Upper Limit' and '-' implies this mode has not been studied.

seen on top of the large $Z \rightarrow \tau\tau$ background. The analysis measured the $H \rightarrow \tau\tau$ rate to be compatible with the SM expectation with a precision of $\approx 30\%$, corresponding to a 5.9σ observation of the process. Searches for $H \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$ have found no evidence of a signal (as expected in the SM for the current dataset), which when combined with the $H \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-$ result, demonstrates the Higgs couplings do not obey lepton flavour conservation.

The Higgs coupling to quarks was established with the observation of $H \rightarrow b\bar{b}$. Although this has the largest Higgs decay BF, it is experimentally challenging due to the large background from QCD $b\bar{b}$ production, and the poor di- b -jet mass resolution. In order to reduce the background and to trigger on the events, the analysis targets VH production where V is a Z or W boson decaying leptonically, so the final state can have 0-leptons (but large missing transverse momentum (MET) from the $Z \rightarrow \nu\bar{\nu}$ decay), 1-lepton, or 2-leptons, and selects two b -jets with a mass close to the Higgs mass. As seen in Figure 3, which shows the ATLAS analysis [2], the VZ , $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ decay acts as an important validation of the analysis. This has the same final state, with a similar rate. The figure shows that VZ is observed with the expected rate (grey), and the $H \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ signal can be seen as a high mass shoulder on the Z peak. The analysis finds the expected SM rate with a precision of $\approx 30\%$.

The Higgs is too light to decay to top quarks, so the top-Higgs (tH) coupling can only be directly probed through ttH production. In the SM ggF production is dominated by a top-quark in the ggF loop, and so the tH coupling can also be extracted indirectly from ggF production rates. The direct and indirect measurement of the coupling then allow to constrain possible new-particles that could enter the ggF loop. Within the current precision the direct and indirect measurements of the coupling are compatible.

With the increased luminosity at the HL-LHC the Higgs physics goals are:

- Improve the precision on the Higgs couplings to the few-% level (where they can be sensitive to BSM effects);
- Establish the coupling to 2nd generation fermions through the $H \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$ and $H \rightarrow c\bar{c}$ decays;
- Improve the constraints on forbidden Higgs decays such as $H \rightarrow$ invisible and lepton-flavour violating Higgs decays;
- Make more precise differential measurements of Higgs production, in more extreme regions of phase-space) which can be sensitive to New Physics;
- Observe the very rare di-Higgs production process.

Studying di-Higgs production is needed to understand the Higgs self-coupling, and to probe the Higgs potential term of the SM Lagrangian. However, it is doubtful that this will be possible at the HL-LHC. Current projections [3] [4] suggest that evidence for di-Higgs production can be achieved by combining the ATLAS and CMS HL-LHC results.




Fig. 3: (left) The di-tau mass distribution from the CMS $H \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-$ analysis; (right) The di- b -jet mass distribution from the ATLAS $H \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ analysis.

2.4 Searches for Physics beyond the Standard Model

One of the primary goals of the LHC is to search for the direct production of Beyond the Standard Model (BSM) physics. ATLAS and CMS have carried out a huge number of searches, but to date no significant excess of events over the SM expectation has been observed. A few example searches are discussed below.

A search for a new Gauge boson (Z') that is similar to the SM Z boson but with much higher mass, looks for an excess of events in the di-lepton mass spectra at high mass. Figure 4 shows the di-electron and di-muon mass distributions from the ATLAS search [5]. No significant deviation from the expected background (dominated by SM Drell-Yan production) is observed. Examples signals are shown in the figures, which show that the mass resolution is significantly better at high mass for electrons than for muons, as the energy resolution improves for calorimeters, but deteriorates for tracking detectors, at higher energy. The main experimental challenge for this search is to have good efficiency and resolution for very high transverse momentum leptons (up to 2 TeV).

At the other end of the spectrum is a search for Higgsino production where very low-momentum leptons are expected. The ATLAS search [6] uses leptons with p_T down to 3 GeV (muons) and 4.5 GeV (electrons) in order to improve the sensitivity, and allows to exclude Higgsinos with masses up to 150 GeV for certain mass splittings.

Searching for Dark Matter (DM) production in LHC collisions can be done by taking advantage of initial-state-radiation which can be used to tag events where DM particles are pair produced through an s -channel mediator particle but escape the detector without interacting with it. This can lead to a detector signature of a high- p_T jet + MET. Figure 5 shows the MET spectrum for such events from the CMS search [7], also showing the expected background, dominated by $Z \rightarrow \nu\bar{\nu}$ + jets ($\approx 60\%$) and $W \rightarrow \ell\nu$ + jets (where the lepton is not reconstructed) ($\approx 30\%$). The signal has a slightly harder MET-spectra than the background, but is much smaller than the background, meaning the background needs to be controlled at the few-% level to allow to have sensitivity. The background is estimated from data control regions with $Z \rightarrow \ell^+\ell^-$ + jets, $W \rightarrow \ell\nu$ + jets and γ + jets but accurate theoretical predictions are needed on the ratio of Z + jets/ γ + jets and Z + jets/ W + jets; in order to achieve the needed precision NNLO electroweak corrections need to be taken into account.

As well as searching for the DM particle, we can also search for the mediator which can be




Fig. 4: The di-electron and di-muon mass distributions from the ATLAS Z' search.




Fig. 5: (left) The MET spectrum in the DM search; (middle) The di-jet mass spectra in the mediator search; (right) The exclusion limit in the search for the mediator showing results for both the high mass search, and the low mass search which uses the *Data Scouting* technique.

produced in the LHC collisions but decay back to the SM (for example to two quarks) this could show up as a resonance in the di-jet mass spectra. Figure 5 shows the di-jet mass distribution for such a CMS search [8], showing a smoothly falling distribution with no sign of a resonance in the range 1 TeV \rightarrow 8 TeV in di-jet mass. The 1 TeV lower limit in the probed mass range, comes from the trigger thresholds applied to the jets used in the search. Going to lower p_T -jets would increase the trigger rate leading to a too high bandwidth when reading out the detector. In order to search for possible resonances at lower mass a new technique called *Data Scouting* or *Trigger Level Analysis* was developed, in which just the trigger level jets are written out for certain triggers. These trigger level jets are much smaller than the full event data (less than 5% of the size), and can therefore be read out at a much higher rate without hitting bandwidth limitations. Thus lower thresholds can be applied. This technique allows to set limits on di-jet mass resonances down to lower masses as can be seen in Figure 5 (CMS analysis [8]).

2.5 Precise Standard Model Measurements

The LHC experiments carry out a large number of precise measurements of SM processes, measuring cross-sections, masses and other SM parameters. Cross-section measurements are normalized by the luminosity, which is measured by dedicated luminosity detectors in the experiments that are calibrated by dedicated van-der-Meer scans which are typically carried out each year. The precision of the luminosity measurements in ATLAS/CMS for the Run-2 dataset is an impressive $\approx 2.5\%$, which is far better than had thought to be possible before LHC running.

An example of a very precise cross-section measurement is the W and Z inclusive production cross-section measurement from ATLAS [9] with the 2011 7 TeV dataset. The precision is limited by systematic uncertainties, and the total experimental uncertainty is $\approx 0.5\%$ dominated by uncertainties related to the lepton reconstruction, the background (for the W) and theoretical modeling uncertainties (for the Z). The luminosity uncertainty is 1.8%, but this cancels in ratios such as $\sigma(W \rightarrow e\nu)/\sigma(W \rightarrow \mu\nu)$ or $\sigma(W)/\sigma(Z)$ allowing very precise tests of lepton flavour conservation, and parton distribution functions (PDFs).

The measurement of the W -boson mass by ATLAS [10] with a precision of 19 MeV represents one of the most precise measurements at the LHC, and has a precision equal to the best single-experiment measurement. The W mass is a fundamental parameter of the SM, and has important sensitivity in the electroweak fit. The ATLAS analysis measures the mass using a template fits to the transverse mass (formed from the lepton and the reconstructed hadronic recoil), and to the lepton transverse momentum. A very precise knowledge of experimental effects related to lepton reconstruction and the hadronic recoil reconstruction is needed, where the later deteriorates significantly with pileup. The current measurement utilizes the 2011 7 TeV data set which has an average pileup of around 9. Theoretical uncertainties also play an important role, in particular related to the modelling of the W -boson p_T which is derived from the measured Z -boson p_T spectra, as well as from PDF uncertainties. Utilizing low-pileup data taken in 2017 and 2018 at 13 TeV there is the prospect of improving the precision of the measurement to the 10-15 MeV level.

Measurements of the top-quark mass are carried out in a number of different channels. A recent example from CMS [11] utilizes the lepton+jets final state to measure the mass using a kinematic fit (including the W -mass constraint on the hadronic W decay) to improve the resolution and to reduce the fraction of incorrect assignments of jets to the two top-quarks. The dominant systematic uncertainty is related to the jet energy scale which is constrained in the fit. The final result of $172.25 \pm 0.08(\text{stat.}) \pm 0.62(\text{syst.})$ GeV is the most precise single measurement to date.

2.6 Flavour Physics

The $B_S \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$ rare decay is theoretically clean, and has a large sensitivity to many new physics models (for example MSSM scenarios with large $\tan \beta$). Because of this there is a long history of searches for this decay starting over 30 years ago. Sensitivity to the SM branching ratio of $(3.3 \pm 0.3) \times 10^{-9}$ was reached with a combination between LHCb and CMS [12]. Despite a much smaller dataset, LHCb has the best sensitivity due to the excellent track resolution, as well as an optimized trigger for low p_T physics; CMS has better sensitivity than ATLAS due to the higher magnetic field in the inner tracker which gives a better mass resolution. Current measurements from all three experiments are consistent with the SM estimate with an uncertainty of between 20 - 30 %.

LHCb searches for lepton flavour violation in B meson decays by measuring the ratio $R_{K^{(*)}} \equiv \text{BF}(B \rightarrow K^{(*)}\mu^+\mu^-)/\text{BF}(B \rightarrow K^{(*)}e^+e^-)$. In the SM this is precisely predicted and is close to unity, modulo phase-space effects. An experimental complication is that due to bremsstrahlung the mass resolution is much worse in the di-electron channel than the di-muon channel (as can be seen in Figure 6), but this is corrected for by normalizing by the measured ratio $\text{BF}(B \rightarrow K^{(*)}J/\psi(\mu^+\mu^-)) / \text{BF}(B \rightarrow K^{(*)}J/\psi(e^+e^-))$. For R_K , the reconstructed B meson mass distribution is shown in Figure 6

in both the $\mu^+\mu^-$ and e^+e^- channels. The measured values from the LHCb measurements [13] [14] are shown in Table 4, and for R_{K^*} in Figure 6, and show that the three measurements are between 2 and 2.5 σ lower than the SM prediction. This is currently one of the most intriguing anomalies observed at the LHC, with many theoretical models proposed to explain the results. More data and measurements from Belle-2 should shed further light onto the situation.




Fig. 6: (left/middle) The reconstructed B meson mass in the R_K analysis for the $\mu^+\mu^- / e^+e^-$ channels; (right) The measured R_{K^*} values in two bins of q^2 (the di-lepton mass) compared with various theoretical predictions.

Measurement	Dataset	Measured Value	Compatibility with SM
R_K	Run 1 + Run 2	$0.85^{+0.06}_{-0.05} \pm 0.015$	2.5σ
R_{K^*} low- q^2	Run 1	$0.66^{+0.11}_{-0.07} \pm 0.03$	2.2σ
R_{K^*} high- q^2	Run 1	$0.69^{+0.11}_{-0.07} \pm 0.05$	2.4σ

Table 4: LHCb results on lepton flavour violation measurements R_K and R_{K^*} , where the latter is measured in two regions of q^2 (the di-lepton mass).

3 Summary

The LHC machine and the experiments performed extremely well in Run-2. A large and high-quality dataset was produced by the experiments leading to a huge number of physics results. A leading challenge for the experiments was the high pileup in the data, but they have coped very well with this situation.

The large dataset has allowed a more and more precise probing of the Higgs boson, where all major production modes, and decay channels accessible at the LHC have been established. A huge number of direct searches for BSM physics have been carried out, with no significant excess of events over the SM prediction observed, such that increasingly stringent exclusion limits have been set on BSM model parameters. In addition, the experiments have been able to make very precise measurements of cross-sections and SM parameters, as well as measuring extremely rare processes, but again no discrepancy with the SM expectations have been observed. An intriguing set of results from lepton-flavour violation measurements by LHCb show a 2 - 2.5 standard deviation discrepancy with the SM in a few channels and q^2 -bins.

The increased dataset that will be produced with Run-3, and then with the HL-LHC, along with the upgraded detector functionality, and innovations in triggering, reconstruction and physics analysis will allow to probe further the SM in the coming years.

References

- [1] A. M. Sirunyan *et al.* [CMS Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **779** (2018) 283 doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2018.02.004 [arXiv:1708.00373 [hep-ex]].

- [2] M. Aaboud *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **786** (2018) 59 doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2018.09.013 [arXiv:1808.08238 [hep-ex]].
- [3] CMS Collaboration CMS-PAS-FTR-18-011, <https://cds.cern.ch/record/2647699>
- [4] ATLAS Collaboration, ATL-PHYS-PUB-2018-054, <http://cdsweb.cern.ch/record/2652762>
- [5] G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **796** (2019) 68 doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2019.07.016 [arXiv:1903.06248 [hep-ex]].
- [6] G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], arXiv:1911.12606 [hep-ex].
- [7] A. M. Sirunyan *et al.* [CMS Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **97** (2018) no.9, 092005 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.97.092005 [arXiv:1712.02345 [hep-ex]].
- [8] A. M. Sirunyan *et al.* [CMS Collaboration], JHEP **1808** (2018) 130 doi:10.1007/JHEP08(2018)130 [arXiv:1806.00843 [hep-ex]].
- [9] M. Aaboud *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], Eur. Phys. J. C **77** (2017) no.6, 367 doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-017-4911-9 [arXiv:1612.03016 [hep-ex]].
- [10] M. Aaboud *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], Eur. Phys. J. C **78** (2018) no.2, 110 Erratum: [Eur. Phys. J. C **78** (2018) no.11, 898] doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-018-6354-3, 10.1140/epjc/s10052-017-5475-4 [arXiv:1701.07240 [hep-ex]].
- [11] A. M. Sirunyan *et al.* [CMS Collaboration], Eur. Phys. J. C **78** (2018) no.11, 891 doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-018-6332-9 [arXiv:1805.01428 [hep-ex]].
- [12] V. Khachatryan *et al.* [CMS and LHCb Collaborations], Nature **522** (2015) 68 doi:10.1038/nature14474 [arXiv:1411.4413 [hep-ex]].
- [13] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb Collaboration], JHEP **1708** (2017) 055 doi:10.1007/JHEP08(2017)055 [arXiv:1705.05802 [hep-ex]].
- [14] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **122** (2019) no.19, 191801 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.122.191801 [arXiv:1903.09252 [hep-ex]].