





# Recent results on Standard Model physics from CMS

Nataša Raičević on behalf of the CMS Collaboration

University of Montenegro, Faculty of Science and Mathematics



12<sup>th</sup> International Congress of the BPU Bucharest, Romania, July 8–12, 2025

# High precission measurements of the Standard Model

- □ High-precision measurements of the Standard Model are one of the cornerstones of modern particle physics
- Search for new physics via deviations
- > Test the internal consistency of the Standard Model
- Improve and constrain Standard Model parameters
- Set limits on new physics scales
- Provide essential inputs for other experiments
- This talk focuses on recent CMS measurements in:
- QCD at the highest energies
- Electroweak phyiscs through multiboson production

Production of vector bosons (covered by I. Bubanja)





+ Describing and modeling the evolution of parton showers in the initial and final state

- + Describing hadronisation and fragmentation processes
- + MPI, Beam remnants and the UE

Extracted  $\alpha_s$  - PDG

#### PRD 110 (2024) 030001

#### NLO



# $\alpha_{\rm s}$ determined from several CMS measurements

#### **NNLO** BP 2008-16 FO Boito 2018 FO τ decays Boito 2021 FO & $low Q^2$ PDG 2022 tau Ayala 2023 Mateu 2018 Peset 2018 $Q\overline{Q}$ Narison 2018 (cc) bound Narison 2018 (bb) states BM19 (cc) BM20 (bb) BBG06 **JR14** ABMP16 PDF fits NNPDF31 CT18 MSHT20 HERAPDF20jets ALEPH (j&s) OPAL (j&s) e+e-JADE (j&s) jets Dissertori (3j) & JADE (3j) shapes Verbytskyi (2j) Kardos (EEC) Klijnsma (*t*t̄) CMS (tt) H1 (jets)\* hadron d'Enterria (W/Z) collider HERA (jets) CMS (incl. jets)\* ATLAS ([A]TEEC) Gfitter 2018 HEPfit 2022 electroweak PDG 2022 EW FLAG 2021 lattice 0.115 0.110 0.120 0.125 0.130 $\alpha_{s}(m_{7}^{2})$

#### August 2023

 $\alpha_{s}$  from the simultenious fit with PDFs – NNLO QCD analysis

## **CMS-PAS-SMP-24-007** (Submitted to PLB)

□ From inclusive jet production in proton-proton collisions at centre-of-mass energies of 2.76, 7, 8, and 13 TeV





- Data from multiple center-of-mass energies improves precision by significantly reducing the fit uncertainty
- The dominant contribution to the uncertainty arises from missing higher order corrections
- > The running of  $\alpha_s$  as a function of the energy scale demonstrated at NNLO up to 1.6 TeV 4

PDFs from the simultenious fit with  $\alpha_s$ 

CMS-PAS-SMP-24-007 (Submitted to PLB)



- Improvement in the uncertainties of all PDFs is observed by inclusion of CMS jet measurements in the QCD analysis.
- The inclusion of all available CMS inclusive jet measurements at different Vs provides significant constraints on the valence d distribution



➢ By adding the CMS jet data → the valence PDF, in particular the d valence distribution, is observed to shift with respect to HERAPDF20 towards the results of the global PDFs

The uncertainties are given at 68% CL

Event Shape (ES) variables from jets at 13 TeV

CMS-PAS-SMP-22-004 (Public since April 2025)

- □ ESV using charged particles inside jets in proton-proton collisions 138 pb<sup>-1</sup>
- Sensitive to the perturbative part of hadron collisions as well as to the energy flow in the final state of a high energy collision event
- Minimize impact of systematic uncertainties
- Measured variables designed to have higher values for multijet, spherical events and lower values for back-to-back two-jet events
- $\succ$  Complement of transverse thrust,  $\tau_{\perp}$  more dependent on the initial hard scattering
- > Third-jet resolution parameter, Y<sub>23</sub> sensitive to the clustering and substructure of the jets
- $\blacktriangleright$  Jet Broadening,  $B_T \equiv B_U + B_L$
- depend more on the subsequent nonperturbative part of QCD, i.e., the evolution of the partons into the final state particles
- $\blacktriangleright$  Jet masses,  $\rho_{Tot} \equiv \rho_U + \rho_L$

□ This is the first CMS study that uses charged particles inside jets to evaluate ESV

- □ For each variable, detector effects are corrected using a two-dimensional unfolding in which the average  $p_T$  of the leading and the second leading jets in events,  $H_{T,2} = \frac{1}{2}(p_{T,11} + p_{T,12})$ , and variables are unfolded simultaneously
- $\Box$   $\tau_{\perp}$  and  $\rho_{Tot}^{T}$  use the momenta of the particles in the transverse plane ( $p_{T}$ ) and  $\rho_{Tot}$ ,  $B_{T}$ , and  $Y_{23}$  use the complete momentum information



General trend:

➤ the predictions of PYTHIA 8 and HERWIG 7, show good agreement with data for τ<sub>⊥</sub> and ρ<sup>T</sup><sub>Tot</sub>, but overestimate multijet events for ρ<sub>Tot</sub>, B<sub>T</sub>, and Y<sub>23</sub>.

 $\rightarrow$  Indicates that the modelling of fragmentation and hadronization needs to be examined

- ➤ MG5+PYTHIA 8 underestimates multijet spherical events except for Y<sub>23</sub>
  - $\rightarrow$  Possible issues in the combination of ME calculations with the PS

□ There is room for improvement in QCD modelling and the understanding of energy flow

ES in minimum bias events at 13 TeV

### CMS-PAS-SMP-23-008

- D Minimum bias data (~1 inelastic proton-proton collision per bunch crossing) integrated luminosity of 64 μb<sup>-1</sup>
- □ Many new measurements highlight the need for additional experimental input to soft and nonperturbative QCD
- The kinematics of reconstructed tracks were used to unfold the distributions to the level of stable charged particles



- 8 variables measured: charged particle multiplicity and invariant mass, isotropy, broadening, thrust and sphericity (also in the transverse plane)
- The difference between data and MC observed for all the variables
- General trend:

Isotropy underestimated and anisotropy overestimated in the models – observed also in the transverse plane

→ Mismodeling not coming only from the poorly modelled longitudinal components

> Is poor modeling of event shapes coming from the distribution of the number of charged particles ?



Sphericity  $S \sim 1 \rightarrow$  isotropic

- □ Isotropy underestimated in different charged-particle multiplicity bins
- → The poor modeling of event shapes is likely not primarily due to the distribution of the number of charged particles

# Electroweak multiboson interactions predicted in the SM



 $\Box$  Anomalous neutral triple/quatric gauge couplings  $\rightarrow$  allowed in the presence of new physics

□ Several of such heavy bosons produced together is a rare process

- $\rightarrow$  Multiboson production process great tool to:
- Test and study the SM expectations
- Study electroweak sector where one could search for a new physics impacting EWSB











The BSM s-channel Zyy production due to the presence of aNTGCs





- The measured cross section is compatible with the theoretical predictions in QCD
- The study of the photon pT spectrum yields the most stringent limits on the aNTGC





**CMS-PAS-SMP-24-002** (Public since March 2025)



#### LO SM Feynman diagrams



Photon ID and luminosity are the leading uncertainties in the measurement

Channel	$\sigma \times BR(Z\gamma \rightarrow l^+l^-\gamma) \pm \text{th.} \pm \text{syst.} \pm \text{stat.} \text{ (pb)}$
predicted $Z\gamma$ ( $\mu\mu$ )	$0.961 \pm 0.004 \pm 0.028 \pm 0.019$
predicted $Z\gamma$ (ee)	$0.961 \pm 0.004 \pm 0.037 \pm 0.021$
predicted $Z\gamma$ (combined)	$1.922 \pm 0.006 \pm 0.056 \pm 0.033$
observed $Z\gamma$ ( $\mu\mu$ )	$0.928 \pm 0.004 \pm 0.027 \pm 0.018$
observed $Z\gamma$ (ee)	$0.975 \pm 0.003 \pm 0.038 \pm 0.021$
observed $Z\gamma$ (combined)	$1.896 \pm 0.006 \pm 0.054 \pm 0.033$

 $\rightarrow$  Good agreement with NLO predictions from MadGraph

# First ZZ $\gamma$ measurement with full RUN 2 data

TEST

**CMS-PAS-SMP-24-014** 



- The signal region is affected by two types of reducible BGs:
- nonprompt leptons/photons estimated from data
- Significance in the inclusive measurement: observed 5.1 (expected 4.1) SD
- To distinguished from FSR, requiring inv. mass of the 2l + γ system to be above 100 GeV
- nonprompt photons (estimated from simulation)



 $\bar{q}$   $\gamma$  anomalous Quatric Gauge Couplings (aQGC)

 $\sim \sim \sim$ 

- Fit to the invariant mass of the
   4 leptons + γ system
- 98 % of the total uncertainty due to statistical uncertainty
- Significance: observed 3.0 (expected 3.7) SD

$$egin{aligned} &\sigma_{
m fid}({
m pp}
ightarrow{
m ZZ}\gamma
ightarrow4\ell\gamma) \ &\left[5.6^{+3.4}_{-2.8}
ight] imes~10^{-2}\,{
m fb} \end{aligned}$$

# Vector boson scattering in the semileptonic final state at 13 TeV

CMS-PAS-SMP-22-011 (Public since March 2025)



- ➢ Full RUN 2 − 138 fb<sup>-1</sup>
- Semi-leptonic final state from ZV (V = W, Z) production  $\rightarrow l^+ l^- (Z) q \overline{q'}(V)$
- The cross section measured in a fiducial region of a large invariant mass and pseudorapidity gap between the two forward jets.
- The DNN is trained to enhance the separation of the VBS EW signal from background processes dominated by Drell-Yan and single top (data driven estimations) control regions (CRs)
- > Events are categorized into two topologies to capture decays of the V boson: **boosted** and **resolved**.
  - The boosted category → at least one AK8 jet with a mass compatible with a W or Z boson.
     V decay products are highly collimated and reconstructed as a single jet
  - The resolved category → no AK8 jets must be present, at least two additional AK4 jets are required
     → Invariant mass of the jets compatible with the W or Z boson mass



- > The uncertainty dominated by statistics
- > Signal strength of EW ZVjj production:  $\mu_{EW} = \sigma_{obs} / \sigma_{SM} = 0.63^{+0.53}_{-0.51}$
- > Observed (expected) significance  $1.3\sigma$  ( $1.8\sigma$ )
- ➤ The ZV combined with WV semi-leptonic events → constraints on coefficients of new operators from an EFT sensitive to an anomalous electroweak production of WW, WZ, and ZZ boson pairs in association with two jets

Anomalous quartic gauge couplings are induced by 20 dimension-8 operators (backup slides)

# Combination of VBS diboson measurements at 13 TeV



- <u>CMS-PAS-SMP-24-013</u> (Public since April 2025)
- The most comprehensive statistical combination of vector boson scattering (VBS) processes to date, integrating results from different CMS analyses

SMP-19-012 (WZ, SS WW) SMP-20-001 (4l+2j evidence) SMP-20-013 (WZ, WW evidence) SMP-21-001 (OS WW observation) SMP-22-008 (SS WW with τ) SMP-22-011 (ZV semi leptonic)

- CMS Preliminary 138 fb<sup>-1</sup> (13 TeV) ± 1 SD (syst) ±1 SD (stat⊕syst) Observed Tot. Stat. Syst. ± 1 SD (stat) - ± 2 SD (stat⊕syst) Expected  $1.04^{+0.14}_{-0.14} \begin{pmatrix} +0.09\\ -0.09 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} +0.11\\ -0.10 \end{pmatrix}$ µ ssww  $1.09^{+0.21}_{-0.18} \begin{pmatrix} +0.14 \\ -0.14 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} +0.15 \\ -0.12 \end{pmatrix}$ μ<sub>osww</sub>  $1.19^{+0.28}_{-0.23} \begin{pmatrix} +0.20\\ -0.19 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} +0.20\\ -0.14 \end{pmatrix}$  $\mu_{WZ}$  $1.15^{+0.44}_{-0.37} \begin{pmatrix} +0.37 \\ -0.34 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} +0.23 \\ -0.16 \end{pmatrix}$  $\mu_{ZZ}$  $1.11^{+0.17}_{-0.15}$   $\begin{pmatrix} +0.11 \\ -0.10 \end{pmatrix}$   $\begin{pmatrix} +0.13 \\ -0.11 \end{pmatrix}$ μ w⁺w'  $0.84^{+0.27}_{-0.24} \left( \begin{smallmatrix} +0.21 \\ -0.20 \end{smallmatrix} \right) \left( \begin{smallmatrix} +0.17 \\ -0.14 \end{smallmatrix} \right)$ ŴV  $1.08^{+0.20}_{-0.19} \begin{pmatrix} +0.14 \\ -0.14 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} +0.14 \\ -0.13 \end{pmatrix}$ μ w⁺w  $1.15^{+0.32}_{-0.27} \begin{pmatrix} +0.25\\ -0.23 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} +0.20\\ -0.14 \end{pmatrix}$ μ w⁺z  $1.30^{+0.47}_{-0.40}$  $\begin{pmatrix} +0.40 \\ -0.36 \end{pmatrix}$  $\begin{pmatrix} +0.25 \\ -0.17 \end{pmatrix}$  $\mathfrak{l}^{\mu}_{WZ}$  $1.16^{+0.44}_{-0.38}$   $\begin{pmatrix} +0.37\\ -0.34 \end{pmatrix}$   $\begin{pmatrix} +0.23\\ -0.17 \end{pmatrix}$  $\mu_{ZZ}$ 2.5 3 3.5 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 0 0.5 1.5 2 Parameter estimate Significance
- The results are in agreement with the Standard Model, within the uncertainty limits;
- ➢ 5-10% improvement on signal strength results

# Measurement of WWZ and ZH cross sections at 13 and 13.6 TeV

**CMS-PAS-SMP-24-015** (Submitted to PRL)





Nonresonant WWZ production

ZH production (H  $\rightarrow$  W<sup>+</sup>W<sup>-</sup>)

- ➢ For the first time, the two processes measured separately in a simultaneous fit 200 fb<sup>-1</sup>: RUN 2 + RUN 3 (2022-2023)
   → The most precise WWZ measurement to date
- $\rightarrow$  The first measurement of tri-bosons at 13.6 TeV

- A boosted decision tree (BDT) multiclassifier is trained on signal and background MC events in order to better distinguish signal processes from background processes, and to distinguish the two signal processes from each other (backup slides)
- ightarrow The multiclassifier based on 27 event kinematic properties
- □ Signal regions (SRs) are then constructed by binning in the three BDT scores

Dedicated control regions (CRs) used for estimation of the leading background contributions: ZZ, ttZ, and tWZ production.

#### □ SRs and CRs are based on flavor of the charged leptons from W bosons



The yields for signal (WWZ and ZH) and background are extracted from a simultaneous extended maximum likelihood fit to 34 bins
18

## CMS

138 fb⁻¹ (13 TeV) ∺●∺	62 fb⁻¹ (13.6 TeV) ∺▲∺	200 fb <sup>-1</sup> (13+13.6 TeV) ∺ <b>≖</b> ∺
	SM	μ stat. syst.
Nonresonant WWZ	<b>⊢</b> •1	$0.52 \pm 0.45 \pm 0.12$
	H + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +	$1.91 \pm 1.03 \pm 0.20$
	<b>⊢</b> _∎	$0.87 \pm 0.44 \pm 0.11$
	F	$1.01 \pm 0.56 \pm 0.11$
$ZH(H \rightarrow WW)$	F	$1.57 \pm 1.00 \pm 0.21$
	<b>⊢</b>	$1.20 \pm 0.50 \pm 0.11$
	⊢●┤	$0.75 \pm 0.30 \pm 0.09$
Inclusive	<b>⊬</b> ∎	$1.74 \pm 0.63 \pm 0.19$
	⊢∎⊣	$1.03 \pm 0.29 \pm 0.09$
4 -2	0 2 Sig	inal strength: $\mu = \sigma_{obs}^{6} / \sigma_{SM}$

- the statistical uncertainties are much larger than the systematic ones
- systematics dominated by the BG normalization and electron ID efficiency
- the most precise measurement of WWZ production process

Era	Total	WWZ	ZH
Run 2	2.9 (4.4)	1.3 (3.1)	2.0 (2.6)
Run 3	3.8 (2.5)	2.5 (1.3)	2.5 (1.7)
Total	4.5 (5.0)	2.4 (3.3)	3.1 (3.1)

the first evidence for triboson production at center-of-mass energy of 13.6 TeV

# Summary and outlook

- CMS provides input for many aspects of understanding QCD and phenomenology
- Relaiable probes for both soft and hard phenomena across a wide range of energy scales
- Still, quite some room for better understanding and uncertainty reduction expected from the Run3
- Electroweak processes of multiboson production measured by CMS show no significant deviations from the SM, but many areas remain to be explore
- An increase of the statistics should provide more precise and new measueremnets
- Further combinations within the electroweak sector are expected to improve measurements and set tighter limits
- Application of SMEFT



# Thank you very much for your attention

PDFs from the simultenious fit with  $\alpha_s$ 



**CMS-PAS-SMP-24-007** (Submitted to PLB)



Complement of transverse thrust: the complement of transverse thrust  $(\tau_{\perp})$  is defined as  $\tau_{\perp} \equiv 1 - T_{\perp}$ , where the event thrust observable in the transverse plane is defined as  $T_{\perp} \equiv \max_{\overrightarrow{n}_{T}} \frac{\sum_{i} |\overrightarrow{p}_{T,i} \cdot \overrightarrow{n}_{T}|}{\sum_{i} p_{T,i}}$ 

□ Third-jet resolution parameter: defined as

$$Y_{23} = \frac{\max(p_{\mathrm{T},3}^2, [\min(p_{\mathrm{T},i}, p_{\mathrm{T},j})^2 (\Delta R_{i,j})^2 / R^2])}{P_{12}^2}$$

where i, j run over all final-state inputs and  $(\Delta R_{i,j})^2 = (\eta_i - \eta_j)^2 + (\varphi_i - \varphi_j)^2$ 

□ Jet broadening: in a single event one can divide the central region into two hemispheres. All particles in the upper part (U) have  $\vec{p}_T \cdot \vec{n}_T > 0$ and in the lower part (L),  $\vec{p}_T \cdot \vec{n}_T < 0$ . The pseudorapidities and the azimuthal angles of the axes for the upper and lower event regions are defined by

$$\eta_X \equiv \frac{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}_X} p_{\mathrm{T},i} \eta_i}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}_v} p_{\mathrm{T},i}}, \ \phi_X \equiv \frac{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}_X} p_{\mathrm{T},i} \phi_i}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}_v} p_{\mathrm{T},i}},$$

where X refers to the upper (U) or lower (L) side. The jet broadening variable in each region is defined as

$$B_X \equiv \frac{1}{2 P_{\rm T}} \sum_{i \in C_X} p_{{\rm T},i} \sqrt{(\eta_i - \eta_X)^2 + (\phi_i - \phi_X)^2}$$

□ Jet masses: the normalized squared invariant mass of the jets in the upper and lower regions of the event is defined by  $\rho_X \equiv \frac{M_X^2}{P^2}$  where MX is the invariant mass of the constituents of the jets in the region X, and P is the scalar sum of the momenta of all constituents in both sides



# CMS-PAS-SMP-22-004 (Public since April 2025)



ES in minimum bias events

#### **CMS-PAS-SMP-23-008**

Sphericity: a measure of how isotropically the momenta p are distributed in an event. The tensor S is first defined with components

$$S^{lphaeta} = rac{\sum_i p^lpha_i p^eta_i}{\sum_i |ec{p}_i|^2},$$

in which  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta \in \{x, y, z\}$  refer to Cartesian coordinates, and i is the index for the 2 final-state charged particles that passed the selections based on the detector acceptance. The sphericity is constructed from the two smallest eigenvalues  $\lambda_2$  and  $\lambda_3$ : S = 3/2 ( $\lambda_2 + \lambda_3$ ).

Broadening: a measure of the fraction of energy that is perpendicular to the thrust axis. The thrust axis defines the left L and right R hemispheres of the event. The left and right broadening are defined as

$$\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{L}} = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} rac{|ec{p}_i imes ec{n}|}{2\sum_j |ec{p}_j|}, \ \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{R}} = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} rac{|ec{p}_i imes ec{n}|}{2\sum_j |ec{p}_j|}.$$

The total broadening is the sum of the left and the righ one.

□ Isotropy: a measure of how isotropically energy is distributed in an event. It is defined as the energy mover's distance (EMD) from the spatial distribution of the tracks to a uniform radiation pattern. This variable also explores the efficacy of the isotropy to distinguish the isotropic events from the jet-like ones characterized by the majority of the transverse momentum being clustered along a few axes. For this measurement the spherical geometry was used, with the distance measure  $d_{ij} = 2(1 - \cos \theta_{ij})$  where  $\theta_{ij}$  is the angle between the particles.

# EFT results from VBS

#### **CMS-PAS-SMP-22-011**

Observed and expected 95% CL intervals on the parameters on the parameters of the quartic operators in WV and ZV channels. The last two columns show the observed and expected limits for the combination of the WV and ZV channels.

	Observed (WV)	Expected (WV)	Observed (ZV)	Expected (ZV)	Observed	Expected
	$(\text{TeV}^{-4})$	$(\text{TeV}^{-4})$	$(\text{TeV}^{-4})$	$(\text{TeV}^{-4})$	$(\text{TeV}^{-4})$	$(\text{TeV}^{-4})$
$f_{\rm S0}/\Lambda^4$	[-3.01, 3.1]	[-4.7, 4.77]	[-9.76, 9.89]	[-13.9, 14.0]	[-2.86, 2.96]	[-4.68, 4.75]
$f_{\mathrm{S1}}/\Lambda^4$	[-4.27, 4.32]	[-6.56, 6.6]	[-10.2, 10.3]	[-13.9, 13.9]	[-3.97, 4.02]	[-6.45, 6.49]
$f_{\mathrm{S2}}/\Lambda^4$	[-4.42, 4.48]	[-6.81, 6.86]	[-9.75, 9.89]	[-13.9, 14.0]	[-4.04, 4.11]	[-6.68, 6.73]
$f_{\rm M0}/\Lambda^4$	[-0.568, 0.567]	[-0.844, 0.843]	[-1.38, 1.38]	[-1.74, 1.74]	[-0.539, 0.534]	[-0.828, 0.827]
$f_{ m M1}/\Lambda^4$	[-1.71, 1.75]	[-2.6, 2.63]	[-3.97, 4.00]	[-5.28, 5.29]	[-1.59, 1.62]	[-2.55, 2.58]
$f_{\rm M2}/\Lambda^4$	[-0.746, 0.747]	[-1.11, 1.11]	[-1.86, 1.86]	[-2.37, 2.37]	[-0.703, 0.703]	[-1.1, 1.1]
$f_{\rm M3}/\Lambda^4$	[-2.81, 2.81]	[-4.2, 4.2]	[-5.60, 5.59]	[-7.47 <i>,</i> 7.47]	[-2.55, 2.55]	[-4.08, 4.07]
$f_{\rm M4}/\Lambda^4$	[-1.74, 1.73]	[-2.6, 2.59]	[-2.70, 2.70]	[-3.61, 3.61]	[-1.48, 1.48]	[-2.42, 2.41]
$f_{\rm M5}/\Lambda^4$	[-2.53, 2.51]	[-3.77, 3.76]	[-3.80, 3.81]	[-5.21, 5.23]	[-2.14, 2.13]	[-3.5, 3.5]
$f_{\rm M7}/\Lambda^4$	[-2.86, 2.82]	[-4.35, 4.32]	[-6.09, 6.07]	[-8.26, 8.24]	[-2.63, 2.58]	[-4.24, 4.2]
$f_{\rm T0}/\Lambda^4$	[-0.096, 0.083]	[-0.14, 0.128]	[-0.26, 0.25]	[-0.33, 0.32]	[-0.0921, 0.0785]	[-0.138, 0.127]
$f_{\mathrm{T1}}/\Lambda^4$	[-0.0933, 0.1]	[-0.142, 0.149]	[-0.22, 0.24]	[-0.30, 0.31]	[-0.0863, 0.0943]	[-0.14, 0.147]
$f_{\rm T2}/\Lambda^4$	[-0.225, 0.225]	[-0.336, 0.335]	[-0.56, 0.60]	[-0.74, 0.76]	[-0.21, 0.214]	[-0.331, 0.332]
$f_{\rm T3}/\Lambda^4$	[-0.206, 0.206]	[-0.311, 0.31]	[-0.48, 0.51]	[-0.64, 0.66]	[-0.191, 0.194]	[-0.305, 0.305]
$f_{\mathrm{T4}}/\Lambda^4$	[-1.09, 1.02]	[-1.58, 1.53]	[-1.44, 1.37]	[-1.84, 1.77]	[-0.895, 0.828]	[-1.4, 1.35]
$f_{\mathrm{T5}}/\Lambda^4$	[-0.287, 0.257]	[-0.391, 0.383]	[-0.59, 0.57]	[-0.76, 0.73]	[-0.265, 0.237]	[-0.382, 0.373]
$f_{\rm T6}/\Lambda^4$	[-0.656, 0.627]	[-0.976, 0.954]	[-0.73, 0.71]	[-0.94, 0.92]	[-0.5, 0.478]	[-0.794, 0.775]
$f_{\mathrm{T7}}/\Lambda^4$	[-0.936, 0.899]	[-1.39, 1.36]	[-1.78, 1.67]	[-2.26, 2.16]	[-0.85, 0.8]	[-1.34, 1.29]
$f_{\rm T8}/\Lambda^4$	—	_	[-0.53, 0.53]	[-0.67, 0.67]	[-0.53, 0.53]	[-0.67, 0.67]
$f_{\mathrm{T9}}/\Lambda^4$	_	_	[-1.17, 1.16]	[-1.47, 1.45]	[-1.17, 1.16]	[-1.47, 1.45]



## Separation of signal from background in the measurement of WWZ and ZH at 13 and 13.6 TeV



#### CMS-PAS-SMP-24-015

Machine learning technique called a boosted decision tree (BDT) to further separate the signal from the remaining backgrounds. The BDT is trained on simulated data to learn to distinguish WWZ collision events from background events. The BDT is also trained to distinguish between the two different types of signal processes.

Ternary plot showing how the BDT achieves separation between signals and backgrounds. The location of each point on the ternary plot is determined by the output scores of the BDT (which indicate how background-like, how WWZ-like, and how ZH-like each event is evaluated to be). The green points indicate simulated background processes, the blue points correspond to simulated WWZ production with an intermediate Higgs boson (i.e., ZH), and the red points indicate simulated WWZ production without an intermediate Higgs boson. The black points correspond to real data events.

