Physics at Hadron Colliders

Part 2



Standard Model Physics

Test of Quantum Chromodynamics
- Jet production
- W/Z production
- Production of Top quarks

Precision measurements
- W mass
- Top-quark mass

QCD processes at hadron colliders





- Hard scattering processes are dominated by QCD jet production

- Originating from quark-quark, quark-gluon and gluon-gluon scattering

- Due to fragmentation of quarks and gluons in final state hadrons
  → Jets with large transverse momentum P_T in the detector

- Cross sections can be calculated in QCD (perturbation theory)

Comparison between experimental data and theoretical predictions constitutes an important test of the theory.

Deviations? → Problem in the experiment ?
Problem in the theory (QCD) ?
New Physics, e.g. quark substructure ?

A two jet event at the Tevatron (CDF)



CDF (ϕ-r view)

Dijet Mass = 1364 GeV/c^2



E_T = 666 GeV
η = 0.43

E_T = 633 GeV
η = -0.19

A two jet event in the DØ experiment





M_{jj} = 838 GeV/c^2

$p_T(1)$ = 432 GeV/c

$p_T(2)$ = 396 GeV/c

Test of QCD Jet production



Data from the DØ experiment (Run II)

Inclusive Jet spectrum as a function of Jet-P_T

very good agreement over many orders of magnitude !

within the large theoretical and experimental uncertainties

Similar data from the CDF experiment





contributions of the various sub-processes to the inclusive jet cross section

Data corresponding to ~1 fb^{-1}
Double differential distributions in P_T and η

Main experimental systematic uncertainty: Jet Energy Scale

- A Jet is NOT a well defined object (fragmentation, detector response)

  - one needs an algorithm to define a jet, to measure its energy
  (e.g., a cone around a local energy maximum in the calorimeter, cone size adapted such that a large fraction of jet energy is collected,
  typical values: $\Delta R = \sqrt{\Delta\Phi^2 + \Delta\eta^2} = 0.7$



- Cone energy ≠ parton energy

Main corrections:

- In general, calorimeters show different response to electrons/photons and hadrons (see lectures on detector physics)
- Subtraction of offset energy not originating from the hard scattering
  (inside the same collision or pile-up contributions, use minimum bias data to extract this)
- Correction for jet energy out of cone
  (corrected with jet data + Monte Carlo simulations)

Main experimental systematic uncertainty: Jet Energy Scale



Jet response correction in DØ:

- measure response of particles making up the jet
- use photon + jet data - calibrate jets against the better calibrated photon energy



Comparison with Theory

– Fully corrected inclusive jet cross section





Systematic uncertainties: - jet energy scale (red band)
- parton density functions
- theory: renormalization scale

Di-jet angular distributions:

- reduced sensitivity to Jet energy scale
- sensitive to higher order QCD corrections







Good agreement with
Next-to-leading order QCD-predictions

Test of W and Z production

Number of detected W-bosons:





Drell-Yan production process (leading order)

Tevatron: expected rates for 2 fb^{-1}: 3 Mio $W \to \ell \nu$ events

LHC: expected rates for 10 fb^{-1}: 60 Mio $W \to \ell \nu$ events

How do W and Z events look like ?

As explained, leptons, photons and missing transverse energy are key signatures at hadron colliders

→ Search for leptonic decays: $W \rightarrow \ell\, \nu$ (large $P_T(\ell)$, large P_T^{miss})

$Z \rightarrow \ell\, \ell$





A bit of history: one of the first W events seen; UA2 experiment

W/Z discovery by the UA1 and UA2 experiments at CERN (1983/84)

Today's W / Z → eν / ee signals

CDF $W \rightarrow e\nu$





missing transverse momentum P_T^{miss} (GeV/c)

Trigger:

- **Electron candidate > 20 GeV/c**

Electrons

- **Isolated el.magn. cluster in the calorimeter**
- **P_T > 25 GeV/c**
- **Shower shape consistent with expectation for electrons**
- **Matched with tracks**

Z → ee

- **70 GeV/c² < m_{ee} < 110 GeV/c²**

W → eν

- **Missing transverse momentum > 25 GeV/c**

Z→ ℓℓ cross sections





Good agreement with
NNLO QCD calculations
C.R.Hamberg et al, Nucl. Phys. B359 (1991) 343.

Precision is limited by systematic effects (uncertainties on luminosity, parton densities,...)

W → ℓν Cross Section





$$M_W^T = \sqrt{2 \cdot P_T^l \cdot P_T^\nu \cdot \left(1 - \cos \Delta\phi^{l,\nu}\right)}$$

Note: the longitudinal component of the neutrino cannot be measured
→ only transverse mass can be reconstructed

Good agreement with NNLO QCD calculations

C.R.Hamberg et al, Nucl. Phys. B359 (1991) 343.

Precision is limited by systematic effects (uncertainties on luminosity, parton densities,...)

Comparison between measured W/Z cross sections and theoretical prediction (QCD)







C. R. Hamberg, W.L. van Neerven and T. Matsuura, Nucl. Phys. B359 (1991) 343

QCD Test in W/Z + jet production







Compare # of W/Z + n jet events
(data versus QCD Monte Carlo Models
-SHERPA, ALPGEN-)

Top Quark Physics





- Discovered by CDF and DØ collaborations at the Tevatron in 1995
- Run I top physics results are consistent with the Standard Model

  (Errors dominated by statistics)
- Run II top physics program will take full advantage of higher statistics
  - Better precision
  - Search for deviations from Standard Model expectations

Why is Top-Quark so important ?



- The top quark may serve as a window to ***New Physics*** related to the electroweak symmetry breaking;
  Why is its Yukawa coupling ~ 1 ??

$$M_t = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \lambda_t v$$

$$\Rightarrow \lambda_t = \frac{M_t}{173.9\ \mathrm{GeV}/c^2}$$

- We still know little about the properties of the top quark:
  mass, spin, charge, lifetime, decay properties (rare decays), gauge couplings, Yukawa coupling,…

Top Quark Production

Pair production: qq and gg-fusion



Electroweak production of single top-quarks (Drell-Yan and Wg-fusion)



	Run I 1.8 TeV	Run II 1.96 TeV	LHC 14 TeV
qq gg	90% 10%	85% 15%	5% 95%
σ (pb)	5 pb	7 pb	600 pb

	Run I 1.8 TeV	Run II 1.96 TeV	LHC 14 TeV
σ (qq) (pb)	0.7	0.9	10
σ (gW) (pb)	1.7	2.4	250
σ (gb) (pb)	0.07	0.1	60

Top Quark Decays

BR ($t \rightarrow Wb$) ~ 100%



Both W's decay via $W \rightarrow \ell\nu$ (ℓ=e or μ; 5%)

dilepton channel

One W decays via $W \rightarrow \ell\nu$ (ℓ=e or μ; 30%)

lepton + jet channel

Both W's decay via $W \rightarrow qq$ (44%)

all hadronic, not very useful

Important experimental signatures: :
- Lepton(s)
- Missing transverse momentum
- b-jet(s)

DØ top candidate event with two leptons



$p_T(e) = 20.3$ GeV/c^2
$p_T(\mu) = 58.1$ GeV/c^2
$E_T^j = 141.0, 55.2$ GeV
$\not{E}_T = 91$ GeV

tt cross section (dilepton)

2 high-p_T isolated leptons

Large missing E_T , ≥ 2 jets







A CDF Lepton + Jet event







$p_T(\mu)$ = 54.4 GeV

E_T^j = 96.7, 65,8, 54.8, 33.8 GeV

Missing E_T= 40.2 GeV

$t\bar{t}$ cross section (lepton + jets)
(topology, no b-jet identification)

1 high-p_T isolated lepton

Large missing E_T $\geq$ 3 jets





H_T = scalar sum of all high P_T objects (jets, leptons, E_T^{miss})

Before b-tagging: background from W+jet events clearly dominates

Tagging of b-quarks

Soft lepton tagging



- $b \to \ell \nu c$ (BR ~ 20%)
- $b \to c \to \ell \nu s$ (BR ~ 20%)

Search for non-isolated soft lepton in a jet

Silicon Vertex tag



B mesons travel ~ 3 mm before decaying:

– Search for secondary vertex

Silicon detectors



Run II: silicon detectors cover a large region of acceptance





μ + jets double-tagged event

B tagging established in both experiments!

Important for the top physics measurements



$t\bar{t}$ cross section (lepton + jets)   (including b-tagging)

1 high-p_T isolated lepton,   at least one b-tagged jet

Large missing E_T



Excess above the W+ jet background in events with high jet multiplicity

$t\bar{t}$ cross section (lepton + jets)   (including double b-tag)

1 high-p_T isolated lepton   +   Two b-tagged jet

Large missing E_T



Very clean top sample

$t\bar{t}$ cross section summary (preliminary)



QCD prediction:

- Cacciari et al., hep-ph/0303085
- Kidonakis et al., hep-ph/0303086

Good agreement among various exp. measurements and with QCD prediction (similar results for DØ)

Precision measurements of m_W and m_{top}

Motivation:

W mass and top quark mass are fundamental parameters of the Standard Model;
The standard theory provides well defined relations between m_W, m_{top} and m_H

Electromagnetic constant
measured in atomic transitions,
e^+e^- machines, etc.

$$m_W = \left(\frac{\pi \alpha_{EM}}{\sqrt{2}\, G_F} \right)^{1/2} \frac{1}{\sin \theta_W \sqrt{1-\Delta r}}$$

Fermi constant
measured in muon
decay

weak mixing angle
measured at
LEP/SLC

radiative corrections
$\Delta r \sim f\,(m_{top}^2, \log m_H)$
$\Delta r \approx 3\%$



G_F, α_{EM}, $\sin \theta_W$

are known with high precision

Precise measurements of the W mass and the top-quark mass constrain the Higgs-boson mass
(and/or the theory,
radiative corrections)

The W-mass measurement

$$m_W = \left(\frac{\pi\,\alpha_{EM}}{\sqrt{2}\,G_F}\right)^{1/2} \frac{1}{\sin\theta_W\,\sqrt{1-\Delta r}}$$



4·10⁻⁴

m_W (from LEP2 + Tevatron) = 80.410 ± 0.032 GeV

m_{top} (from Tevatron) = 172.5 ± 2.3 GeV

1.4%



light Higgs boson is favoured by present measurements

Ultimate test of the Standard Model: comparison between the direct Higgs boson mass (from observation, hopefully) and predictions from rad. corrections….

Technique used for W-mass measurement at hadron colliders:







Observables: $P_T(e)$, $P_T(had)$

$\Rightarrow$ $P_T(\nu)$ = - ($P_T(e)$ + $P_T(had)$)

$$\Rightarrow \quad M_W^T = \sqrt{2 \cdot P_T^l \cdot P_T^\nu \cdot \left(1 - \cos \Delta\phi^{l,\nu}\right)}$$

long. component cannot be measured

In general the transverse mass M_T is used for the determination of the W-mass (smallest systematic uncertainty).

Shape of the transverse mass distribution is sensitive to m_W, the measured distribution is fitted with Monte Carlo predictions, where m_W is a parameter



Main uncertainties:

result from the capability of the Monte Carlo prediction to reproduce real life:

- detector performance
  (energy resolution, energy scale, ...)
- physics: production model
  $p_T(W)$, Γ_W, ...
- backgrounds

Dominant error (today at theTevatron, and most likely also at the LHC) :
Knowledge of lepton energy scale of the detector !

Calibration of the detector energy scale:

Example : EM calorimeter



- if $E_{measured}$ = 100.000 GeV for all calorimeter cells

  $\rightarrow$ calorimeter is perfectly calibrated

- to measure m_W to ~ 20 MeV, need to know energy scale to 0.02%,

  i.e. if $E_{electron}$ = 100 GeV then 99.98 GeV < $E_{measured}$ < 100.02 GeV

$\Rightarrow$ one of most serious experimental challenges !!

Calibration strategy:

- detectors equipped with calibration systems which inject known pulses:



→ check that all cells give same response: if not → correct

- calorimeter modules calibrated with test beams of known energy
  → set the energy scale

- inside LHC detectors: calorimeter sits behind Inner Detector
  → electrons lose energy in material of Inner Detector
  → need a final calibration " *in situ* " by using physics samples:

e.g. $Z \rightarrow e^+ e^-$ decays   1/s at low luminosity
constrain $m_{ee} = m_Z$

known to ≈ 10^{-5} from LEP

What precision can be reached in Run II and at the LHC ?

Int. Luminosity	0.08 fb^{-1}	2 fb^{-1}	10 fb^{-1}
Stat. error	**96 MeV**	**19 MeV**	**2 MeV**
Energy scale, lepton res.	57 MeV	20 MeV	16 MeV
Monte Carlo model (P_T^W, structure functions, photon-radiation….)	30 MeV	20 MeV	17 MeV
Background	11 MeV	2 MeV	1 MeV
Tot. Syst. error	**66 MeV**	**28 MeV**	**24 MeV**
Total error	**116 MeV**	**34 MeV**	**25 MeV**

- Total error per lepton species and per experiment at the **LHC** is estimated to be **± 25 MeV**
  at the **Tevatron** **± 34 MeV**
- Main uncertainty: lepton energy scale (goal is an uncertainty of ± 0.02 %)
- Many systematic uncertainties can be controlled in situ, using the $Z \rightarrow \ell\ell$ sample ($P_T(W)$, recoil model, resolution)

Combining both experiments (ATLAS + CMS, 10 fb^{-1}), both lepton species and assuming a scale uncertainty of ± 0.02% **⇒ Δm_W ~ ± 15 MeV**

Tevatron: 2 fb^{-1}: **Δm_W ~ ± 30 MeV**

Signature of Z and W decays





What precision can be reached in Run II and at the LHC ?

Int. Luminosity	0.08 fb^{-1}	2 fb^{-1}	10 fb^{-1}
Stat. error	**96 MeV**	**19 MeV**	**2 MeV**
Energy scale, lepton res.	57 MeV	20 MeV	16 MeV
Monte Carlo model (P_T^W, structure functions, photon-radiation….)	30 MeV	20 MeV	17 MeV
Background	11 MeV	2 MeV	1 MeV
Tot. Syst. error	**66 MeV**	**28 MeV**	**24 MeV**
Total error	**116 MeV**	**34 MeV**	**25 MeV**

- Total error per lepton species and per experiment at the **LHC** is estimated to be **± 25 MeV**
  at the **Tevatron** **± 34 MeV**
- Main uncertainty: lepton energy scale (goal is an uncertainty of ± 0.02 %)
- Many systematic uncertainties can be controlled in situ, using the $Z \rightarrow \ell\ell$ sample ($P_T(W)$, recoil model, resolution)

Combining both experiments (ATLAS + CMS, 10 fb^{-1}), both lepton species and assuming a scale uncertainty of ± 0.02% **⇒ Δm_W ~ ± 15 MeV**

Tevatron: 2 fb^{-1}: **Δm_W ~ ± 30 MeV**

Top mass measurements

- Top mass calculation:
  - Kinematic fit under (tt) hypothesis
  - compute likelihood for observed events as a function of the top quark mass
    Maximum likelihood → m_{top}



Most precise single measurements:

m_{top} = 173.4 ±3.5 (stat+JES) ± 1.3 (syst) GeV/c² (CDF)

m_{top} = 170.6 ±4.4 (stat+JES) ± 1.4 (syst) GeV/c² (DØ)



- Reduce JES systematic by using in-situ hadronic W mass in tt events

(simultaneous determination of m_t and JES from reconstructed m_t and M_W templates)

Future Prospects for the top quark mass measurement





1. Channel dependence ? still statistically consistent results;
   full hadronic channel is difficult

2. Expected Tevatron precision (full data set): ± 1.5 GeV/c^2

3. Expected LHC precision for 10 fb^{-1}: < ~ 1 GeV/c^2
   (Combination of several methods, maybe somewhat conservative)

Summary of the 2. Lecture

- **Hadron Colliders Tevatron and LHC play an important role in future tests of the Standard Model**

- **Predictions of Quantum Chromodynamics can be tested in**
  - **High P_T jet production**
  - **W/Z production**
  - **Top quark production**
  - **…….**

- **In addition, precise measurements of Standard Model parameters can be carried out.**

Examples: **W mass can be measured to ~15 MeV**
Top-quark mass to ~ 1 GeV

→ Higgs mass constrained indirectly to ~ 25%