Diffractive W/Z and central gaps at CDF II

K. Goulianos

6-8 December 2008

MANCHESTER 1824

IP3 University of Durham

The University of Manchester

Forward Physics At The LHC

6-8 Dec 2008

Contents

- Introduction
- Difractive W / Z
- Central Gaps

Run I

Diffractive Structure Function

Breakdown of QCD factorization



$\bar{p}p \rightarrow \bar{p} + \text{dijet} + X$

same suppression
as in soft diffraction
➔ Rapidity gap probability

β ← momentum fraction
of parton in Pomeron

DIFFRACTIVE DIJETS



$$R(x_{Bj}) \equiv \frac{\mathrm{Rate}_{jj}^{SD}(x_{Bj})}{\mathrm{Rate}_{jj}^{ND}(x_{Bj})}$$

$$\Rightarrow \quad \frac{F_{jj}^{SD}(x_{Bj})}{F_{jj}^{ND}(x_{Bj})}$$

Systematic uncertainties due to energy scale and resolution cancel out in the ratio

Diffractive Structure Function: X_{Bj} and Q^2 dependence



Small Q^2 dependence in region $100 < Q^2 < 10{,}000$ GeV^2

⇨ Pomeron evolves as the proton!

Diffractive Structure Function:

t- dependence





Fit dσ/dt to a double exponential:

$$F = 0.9 \cdot e^{b_1 \cdot t} + 0.1 \cdot e^{b_2 \cdot t}$$

- No diffraction dips
- No Q2 dependence in slope from inclusive to Q^2~10^4 GeV^2

Remaining work:
- Obtain slope normalization
- Extend range to |t| ~ 4 GeV^2

Diffractive W/Z production





- Diffractive W production probes the quark content of the Pomeron
  - To leading order, the W is produced by a quark in the Pomeron

- Production by gluons is suppressed by a factor of α_S, and can be distinguished from quark production by an associated jet

Diffractive W/Z - motivation

- In Run I, combining diffractive dijet production with diffractive W production was used to determine the quark/gluon content of the Pomeron ===➔
- In Run II, we aim at determining the diffractive structure function for a more direct comparison with HERA.
- To accomplish this we use:
  - ➢ New forward detectors
  - ➢ New methodology
  - ➢ More data

Phys Rev Lett **78**, 2698 (1997)

Fraction of W events due to SD

R_W=[1.15±0.51(stat)±0.20(syst)]%

for ξ<0.1 integrated over t



8

Diffractive W/Z analysis

Using RPS information:

- No background from gaps due to multiplicity fluctuations
- No gap survival probability problem
- The RPS provides accurate event-by-event ξ measurement
- Determine the full kinematics of diffractive W production by obtaining η_ν using the equation:

$$\xi^{RPS} - \xi^{cal} = \frac{\not{E}_T}{\sqrt{s}} e^{-\eta_\nu}$$

where

$$\xi^{cal} = \sum_{towers} \frac{E_T}{\sqrt{s}} e^{-\eta}$$

This allows determination of:

- W mass
- x_{Bj}
- Diffractive structure function

9

W/Z selection requirements

Standard W/Z selection

$E_T^e (p_T^\mu) > 25$ GeV

$\not{E}_T > 25$ GeV

$40 < M_T^W < 120$ GeV

$|Z_{vtx}| < 60$ cm

$E_T^{e1} (p_T^{\mu 1}) > 25$ GeV

$E_T^{e2} (p_T^{\mu 2}) > 25$ GeV

$66 < M^Z < 116$ GeV

$|Z_{vtx}| < 60$ cm

Diffractive W/Z selection

- RPS trigger counters - MIP
- RPS track - $0.03 < \xi < 0.10$, $|t| < 1$
- W → $50 < M_W(\xi^{RPS}, \xi^{cal}) < 120$
- Z → $\xi^{cal} < 0.1$

Reconstructed Diffractive W-Mass



11

Rejection of Multiple Interactions





Diffractive W/Z results

R^W (0.03 < ξ < 0.10, |t|<1)= [0.97 ± 0.05(stat) ± 0.11(syst)]%

Run I: R^W =1.15±0.55 % for ξ<0.1 ➔ estimate **0.97±0.47 %** in **0.03 < ξ < 0.10 & |t|<1)**

R^Z (0.03 < x < 0.10, |t|<1)= [0.85 ± 0.20(stat) ± 0.11(syst)]%

CDF/DØ Comparison – Run I (ξ < 0.1)

CDF PRL 78, 2698 (1997)	DØ Phys Lett B **574**, 169 (2003)
R^W=[1.15±0.51(stat)±0.20(syst)]%	R^W=[5.1±0.51(stat)±0.20(syst)]%
gap acceptance A^{gap}=0.81	gap acceptance A^{gap}=(0.21±4)%
uncorrected for A^{gap} ➔	uncorrected for A^{gap} ➔
R^W=(0.93±0.44)%	R^W=[0.89+0.19-0.17]%
(A^{gap} calculated from MC)	R^Z=[1.44+0.61-0.52]%

Stay connected for $F^D_{W/Z}$

Exclusive Dijet and Higgs Production

Phys. Rev. D 77, 052004



ExHuME





DPEMC



Underlying Event (UE)



Is it modeled correctly?



The data and POMWIG+Background distributions in the transverse Δϕ-region relative to the di-jet axis agree, indicating that the UE is correctly modeled.

Inclusive DPE ^{W}/LRG$_p$: Data vs. MC

ExHuME ←exclusive MC models→ DPEMC



ExHuME (KMR): gg→gg process
(based on LO pQCD)

DPEMC: exclusive DPE MC
based on Regge theory

Shape of excess of events at high R_{jj}
is well described by both ExHuME & DPEMC – but…

ExHuME vs. DPEMC and vs. data



- Measured x-sections favor ExHuME
- KMR x 1/3 agrees with data
  - ➔ Within theoretical uncertainty of +/- factor of 3
- $\sigma_{jj}^{excl}/\sigma^{incl}$ approx. independent of E_T^{min}

Heavy Flavor suppression vs. Inclusive Signal

HF suppression | HF suppression vs. Incl



Invert HF vertically and compare with 1-MC/DATA

➔ good agreement observed

Exclusive Dijet x-section vs. M_{jj}



line: ExHuME hadron-level exclusive di-jet cross section vs. di-jet mass

points: derived from CDF excl. di-jet x-sections using ExHuME

Stat. and syst. errors are propagated from measured cross section uncertainties using M_{jj} distribution shapes of ExHuME generated data.

Exclusive Dijet x-section vs. M_{jj}



line: ExHuME hadron-level exclusive di-jet cross section vs. di-jet mass

points: derived from CDF excl. di-jet x-sections using ExHuME

Stat. and syst. errors are propagated from measured cross section uncertainties using M_{jj} distribution shapes of ExHuME generated data.

The FP420 Project

- **alignment:** study the use of our alignment method in FP420;
- **backgrounds:** study the backgrounds expected using our CDF experience;
- **physics:** explore physics aspects that may lead to discoveries.

An example of the latter is the measurement of the parton distribution density of the proton in the very low-x region accessible with the forward detectors.



TOTEM/CMS
ATLAS

FP420 project: http://www.fp420.com/
Measure protons at 420 m from the IP during normal high luminosity running to be used in conjunction with CMS and ATLAS
Feasibility study and R&D for Roman Pot detector development

- Physics aim :pp → p+ X + p (Higgs, New physics, QCD studies)
- Status: Completed Jun 2008: arXiv:0806.0302

CENTRAL RAPIDITY GAPS





- Measure ΔY^{gap} width and position to differentiate among models.

$$\Delta y^{gap} = \Delta y^{jet} \Rightarrow \text{BFKL}$$

$$\Delta y^{gap} < \Delta y^{jet} \Rightarrow \text{composite}$$



Low Luminosity Run

➔ January 2006: data with dedicated diffractive triggers 🡐

2002-303 data ~1.5E31



Low Lum ~0.5E30



$$\xi^{cal} = \sum_{towers} \frac{E_T}{\sqrt{s}} e^{-\eta}$$

single diffraction
0.03 < ξ < 0.1

diffractive dijet overlapped with MB soft diffraction

MiniPlug Jets

Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A518 (2004) 42.
Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A496 (2003) 333.



jet cone radius
R = 0.4 (0.7)





MiniPlug Jet Properties

$E_T^{jet1,2} > 2$ GeV, $3.5 < |\eta|^{jet1,2} < 5.1$, $\eta^{jet1} \cdot \eta^{jet2} < 0$



MP Jet Data with TOF Veto



The number of CCAL towers with E^T>200 MeV is suppressed by the TOF veto

CCAL gap





The distribution of Δφ for MP_p•MP_{pbar} jets of E_T>2 GeV with a gap in the central calorimeter (CCAL). The events at low values of Δφ are presumed to be due to an imbalance caused by the E_T of $PCAL_p$ and $PCAL_{\bar{p}}$ towers from the underlying event.

CCAL • PCAL $^p/_{pbar}$ Gap





The distribution of Δφ for MP_p•MP_{pbar} jets of E_T>2 GeV with a gap in the central calorimeter (CCAL) plus a gap in one of the Plug calorimeters PCAL(p) or PCAL(pbar). The events at low values of Δφ are presumed to be due to the imbalance caused by the E_T of PCAL(p) or PCAL(pbar) towers from the underlying event. The agreement between the two distributions indicates that detector and beam conditins effects are similar between positive and negative eta-values.

CCAL• $PCAL_p$ • $PCAL_{pbar}$ Gap





The distribution of Δφ for MP_p•MP_{pbar} jets of E_T>2 GeV with a gap in the central calorimeter (CCAL) plus a gap in both Plug calorimeters - PCAL(p) and PCAL(pbar).

CCAL• $PCAL_p$ • $PCAL_{pbar}$ Gap





The distribution of Δφ for MP_p•MP_{pbar} jets of E_T>2 GeV with a gap in the central calorimeter (CCAL) plus a gap in both Plug calorimeters - PCAL(p) and PCAL(pbar).

Gap fraction in CCAL gap Events



The distribution of the gap fraction $R_{gap}=N_{gap}/N_{all}$ vs $\Delta\eta$ for MinBias ($CLC_p \bullet CLC_{pbar}$) and MiniPlug jet events ($MP_p \bullet MP_{pbar}$) of $E_{T(jet1,2)}>2$ GeV and $E_{T(jet1,2)}> 4$ GeV.

The distributions are similar in shape within the uncertainties.

SUMMARY

- Introduction
  - Diffractive PDF looks like proton PDF
  - Exclusive Dijet production

    seePhys. Rev. D **77**, 052004 (2008
- Diffractive W/Z with RPS data
  - W diffractive fraction in agreement with Run I
  - W and Z diffractive fractions are equal within error
  - Tune in for news on the DSF in W production
- Central rapidity gaps
  - Measured gap fraction dependence on width and η-position of gap for hard / soft triggers at $|\eta|>4$.

    ➔ the distributions shapes are similar

    ➔ the hard scale fractions are suppressed relative to the soft scale fractions by a factor of order 10.

The Roman-Pot Detectors at CDF

Concept of a Roman Pot



Bellows allow detectors to move close to the beam while maintaining vacuum



motor to drive bellows

inside of pot



beampipe

bellows

detector goes inside pot

In the Tevatron Tunnel

CDF had three Roman pots (RP1, RP2, RP3) located 57m downstream of the interaction point along the antiproton beam direction.
They were used to detect antiprotons which underwent a "diffractive" interaction and were scattered in a direction very close to that of the original beam.





Roman-Pot Detector Design – by The Rockefeller University

The three Roman pots each contain detectors consisting of:

- Trigger scintillation counter 2.1x2.1x0.8 cm^3
- 40 X + 40 Y fiber readout channels
  - Each consists of 4 (→ bigger signal) clad scintillating fibers 0.8x0.8 mm^2 (new technology at the time)
  - X,Y each have 2 rows of 20 fibers spaced 1/3 fiber width apart for improved position resolution (three times better than with a single row)



CDF "Tokyo"-Pot Detectors – Built by the University of Tsukuba, Japan





Physics Using the Roman-Pot Detectors

- The Roman-pot detectors are used to study diffractive interactions
- Elastic scattering was measured by CDF in 1988-1989 using Roman pots (not those described here) in both the proton and antiproton direction



Path of the Antiproton through the Tevatron Magnets

- Dipole magnets bend recoil antiprotons which have lost momentum towards the inside of the Tevatron ring, into the Roman pots
- Knowledge of the beam optics, the collision vertex position, and the antiproton track position and angle in the Roman-pot detectors are used to reconstruct the kinematics of the diffractive antiproton



BACKUP

Measurements w/the MiniPlugs

Dynamic Alignment of RPS Detectors

E^T_{jet} Calibration

Measurements ^{w}/the MiniPlugs



MP TOWER STRUCTURE

MULTIPLICITY @ POSITION

ENERGY



Multiplicity of SD and ND events

$$\xi^{CAL} = \frac{\sum_i E_T^i e^{-\eta_i}}{\sqrt{s}}$$

NIM A 430 (1999)

NIM A 496 (2003)

NIM A 518 (2004)





ADC counts in MiniPlug towers in a pbar-p event at 1960 GeV.

- "jet" indicates an energy cluster and may be just a hadron.
- 1000 counts ~ 1 GeV

Dynamic Alignment of RPS Detectors

Method: iteratively adjust the RPS X and Y offsets from the nominal beam axis until a maximum in the b-slope is obtained @ t=0.







±30 μ achieved at CDF in the low luminosity run



Limiting factors

1-statistics
2-beam size
3-beam jitter



@ CDF
w/lowlum data

$\pm 30\ \mu m$

E_T^{jet} Calibration

➔use RPS information to check jet energy corrections⬅



Calibrate E_T^{jet} or ξ, as you wish!


thank you