

Produzione di bottom fra passato e futuro

Matteo Cacciari

LPTHE

Université Pierre et Marie Curie (Paris 6)

A success story (and, along the way, some good lessons)
and a look into the future

What shall we mean by “success”?

Take massive Next-to-Leading Order perturbative QCD (+ NLL resummation, where needed) as a reference, and ask for its ability to:

- predict total cross section (provided they can really be measured)
- describe differential distributions with the addition of a minimal, self-consistent, and possibly universal set of non-perturbative inputs

A successful comparison will be an agreement between possibly real measurements (i.e. little or no extrapolations/deconvolutions) and QCD predictions, within both experimental and theoretical uncertainties (ren./fact. scales, quark masses, strong coupling, PDFs and FFs,)




1. Il passato

Bottom: What success?!?

$$\gamma\gamma \rightarrow b\bar{b}$$

$$\gamma p \rightarrow b\bar{b}$$

$$p\bar{p} \rightarrow BX$$



For bottom production discrepancies of 'a factor of three' or so are typically quoted in $\gamma\gamma$, γp and pp collisions

Let's look at the history of bottom hadroproduction in detail

NB: see also the talk that M.L. Mangano gave at Fermilab in January, <http://cern.ch/~mlm/talks/Bcrosssection.pdf>


Bottom production in $p\bar{p}$ collisions

UA1 1988-1991


PL B213 (1988) 405

PL B256 (1991) 121

UA1/QCD ~ 1



NB. UA1 also published data for physical particles, B mesons and muons. At that time, they could however not easily be compared to theoretical predictions



CDF 1992

PRL 68 (1992) 3403

$$\sigma(p\bar{p} \rightarrow B^- X; p_T > 9.0 \text{ GeV}/c, |y| < 1.0)$$

$$= 2.8 \pm 0.9(\text{stat}) \pm 1.1(\text{syst}) \mu\text{b}.$$

$$\sigma(pp \rightarrow bX; p_T > 11.5 \text{ GeV}, |y| < 1):$$

$$\text{CDF} = 6.1 \pm 1.9 \pm 2.4 \mu\text{b}$$

$$\text{theory} = 1.1 \pm 0.5 \mu\text{b}$$


tion. Our measurement is approximately 1.6 standard deviations above the theoretical calculation.

The 'usual' plot enters the stage....


CDF 1993

PRL 71 (1993) 500, PRL 71 (1993) 2396

agreement within the experimental errors. This result supports the conclusion of previous CDF analyses that the next-to-leading order QCD calculation tends to underestimate the inclusive b -quark cross section.



Deconvoluted!



DO finds however no excess at this stage: consistent with QCD, barely consistent with CDF

“Real” observables are also measured:

CDF 1995

PRL 75 (1995) 1451

B mesons, NOT deconvoluted
to b quark level

However, how is the theoretical
predictions for B mesons calculated?





Fig. 2. To determine the level of agreement between the data and the theoretical prediction, the predicted cross section is fitted to the measurements, holding the shape constant and varying the magnitude. The fit yields an overall scale factor of $1.9 \pm 0.2 \pm 0.2$, with a confidence level of 20%. In conclusion, we find that the shape of the B meson differential cross section presented here is adequately described by next-to-leading order QCD, while the absolute rate is at the limits of that predicted by typical variations in the theoretical parameters. It will be interesting

The possible 'disagreement' between
data and theory is quantified for
the first time

DO 1995-1996



PRL 74 (1995) 3548
PL B370 (1996) 239



Preliminary

Final

The final DO data become more CDF-like.



However, they are still compatible with QCD:

Conclusions

Our measurement indicates that, within theoretical uncertainties, the NLO QCD description [1] of heavy flavor production in $p\bar{p}$ at $\sqrt{s} = 1.8 \text{ TeV}$ is adequate for the kinematic range $|y^b| < 1.0$ and $p_T^b > 6 \text{ GeV}/c$.


A few years later, the data (or the attitude?) change....

Despite the conclusions of the previous paper ("adequate description"), the previously measured b cross section is now considered "systematically larger" in the Introduction:

DO 1999-2000

PL B487 (2000) 264

Measurements of the b quark production cross section and $b\bar{b}$ correlations in $p\bar{p}$ collisions provide an important test of perturbative quantum chromodynamics (QCD) at next-to-leading order (NLO). The measured b quark production cross section at $\sqrt{s} = 1.8$ TeV [1-4] is systematically larger than the central values of the NLO QCD predictions [5,6].



This, of course, helps accepting the conclusion that the new data show now a considerable excess:

Conclusions

as described above and is dominated by the variation of the scales. The ratio of the data to the central NLO QCD prediction is approximately three over the entire p_T^{\min} range covered.



approximately three over

CDF 1998-2002

PRL 85 (2002) 5068

Last CDF Run I result:
B mesons, superseding 1995 result

Data/Theory ratio




CDF: data/theory ~ 3

ainties. The differential cross section is measured to be 2.9 ± 0.2 (stat \oplus syst $_{p_T}$) ± 0.4 (syst $_{f_c}$) times higher than the NLO QCD predictions with agreement in shape. The first

However, once more, the theoretical uncertainty is not included in the error on the ratio


BTW: being the data points a ratio, shouldn't this band better be around 1 and not 0 !?!

By the years 2001–2002, lots of discrepant data.
Proposed explanations range from the semi-conventional...



H. Jung, CASCADE, [Phys. Rev. D65 (2002) 034015]
MC implementation of small- x dynamics, following CCFM
Main criticism: lack of control of NLO effects

....to the very exotic ones:



Berger, Harris, Kaplan, Sullivan, Tait, Wagner
PRL 86 (2001) 4231

Standard model (MSSM) [3]. We postulate the existence of a relatively light gluino \tilde{g} (mass $\approx 12\text{--}16$ GeV) that decays into a bottom quark and a light bottom squark \tilde{b} (mass $\approx 2\text{--}5.5$ GeV). The \tilde{g} and the \tilde{b} are the spin-1/2 and spin-0 supersymmetric partners of the gluon (g) and bottom quark (b). In our scenario the \tilde{b} is either long-lived or decays hadronically. We obtain good agreement with hadron collider rates of bottom-quark production. Several

NB. Model apparently excluded by e^+e^- data, see P. Janot, hep-ph/0403157

2. Il presente

Theoretical ingredients of a VCE (Very Conventional Explanation)

The prediction for the distribution of a 'real particle' (J/ψ or muon) can be obtained by convoluting:

- 1) the NLO (+ NLL = FONLL) calculation for b quarks
- 2) the fragmentation of the b quark into a B meson, $f(b \rightarrow B)$
- 3) the decay of the B meson into the J/ψ or the muon

$$\frac{d\sigma(b \rightarrow B \rightarrow J/\psi)}{dp_T} = \frac{d\sigma(b)}{d\hat{p}_T} \otimes f(b \rightarrow B) \otimes g(B \rightarrow J/\psi)$$

For $f(b \rightarrow B)$ the Peterson, Schlatter, Schmitt, Zerwas form with $\epsilon_b = 0.006$ is used in most experimental papers, following a determination by Chrin made in 1987 (sic) using charm data, $\epsilon_b = m_c^2/m_b^2 \epsilon_c$ rescaling, and LO Montecarlo calculations

Not being the b quark a physical particle, $f(b \rightarrow B)$ cannot be a physical observable: its details depend on the perturbative calculation it is interfaced with. A single fragmentation function cannot do for all calculations

Around 1997 [MC, M. Greco, PRD 55 (1997) 7134, M.L. Mangano, lectures on HQ production, hep-ph/9711337] we started arguing that systematics related to fragmentation risked being underestimated, and called for a **stricter consistency between HQ FF determination from e+e- data and their use elsewhere:**

For one thing, ϵ_b fitted within a NLO description is smaller than the usual 0.006 value. Hence, a harder Peterson will give a larger cross section in the $p_T > m_b$ region

It was also noted that, due to the steeply falling spectrum of the partonic cross section, the transverse momentum distribution in hadronic collisions is sensitive to large moments of the FF, while it is the second moment, $\langle z \rangle$, which is mainly determined from e+e- data


$$\text{Assuming } \frac{d\sigma}{d\hat{p}_T} \sim \frac{1}{\hat{p}_T^N} \quad \text{we get} \quad \frac{d\sigma}{dp_T} \sim \int \frac{dz}{z} \left(\frac{z}{\hat{p}_T}\right)^N f(z) = f_N \frac{d\sigma}{d\hat{p}_T}$$

In proton-(anti)proton collisions N is of order 5 for $p_T \sim 10\text{--}20$ GeV. Therefore, **a proper extraction of moments around this one from e+e- collisions is more important than a good description of the spectrum**


B fragmentation at LEP

x_E space

Moments space



$$\langle x_E^{N-1} \rangle = \int_0^1 x_E^{N-1} f(x_E) dx_E$$




We don't fit this.....

...but rather this.

From the year ~ 2000 accurate enough data on B fragmentation were finally available from LEP, allowing good fits up to $N=10$ or so.

NB. NLL resummed pQCD calculation needed [B. Mele and P. Nason, Nucl. Phys. B361 (1991) 626]



Note that Peterson with $\epsilon_b = 0.006$ underestimates the moments around $N=5$. Its use WITH THIS PARAMETER will consequently underestimate the B cross section




With these ingredients, a much better description of the B meson CDF data can be given:

Data/Theory = 1.7 ± 0.5 (expt.) ± 0.5 (th.)



i.e. no significant discrepancy



A few months ago, CDF published the first preliminary bottom results from Run II data (CDF Note 6285): differential p_T distribution and total x-sect



es of b-hadron Transverse Momentum Distributions



Simulation of B hadron momentum distribution as a function of the J/ψ momentum

Ingredients of the theoretical prediction


Perturbative items:

- NLO massive calculations
 - NLL resummations
- } FONLL (for LEP + Tevatron)
- Inputs: bottom mass (4.5 - 5 GeV) and α_s ($\Lambda = 0.226$ GeV)
- Uncertainties: ren/fact scale variations

Non-perturbative items:

- gluon and light quarks PDFs
 - b quark to B meson fragmentation
- Input: NLL fit to LEP data (only some moments are important)
- B meson to J/ψ decay spectrum
- Inputs: BR from PDG (1.15 ± 0.06 %)
- Spectrum from CLEO or BABAR
- (detailed knowledge irrelevant due to boost)
- B meson mass (5.3 GeV)

2003: CDF Run II preliminary data at 1.96 TeV



MC, Frixione, Mangano, Nason, Ridolfi, hep-ph/0312132
 JHEP 0407 (2004) 033

$$\sigma(pp \rightarrow H_b \rightarrow \psi; P_{T\psi} > 1.25, |y| < 0.6)$$

$$\sigma_{J/\psi}^{\text{CDF}} = 19.9^{+3.8}_{-3.2 \text{ stat+syst}} \text{ nb}$$

$$\sigma_{J/\psi}^{\text{FONLL}} = 19.0^{+8.4}_{-6.0} \text{ nb}$$

$$\sigma(pp \rightarrow H_b X; P_T > 0, |y| < 0.6) \times B(H_b \rightarrow \psi)$$

$$\sigma_{H_b}^{\text{CDF}} = 24.5^{+4.7}_{-3.9 \text{ stat+syst}} \text{ nb}$$

$$\sigma_{H_b}^{\text{FONLL}} = 22.9^{+9.5}_{-6.8} \text{ nb}$$

$$\sigma(pp \rightarrow bX; P_T > 0, |y| < 1)$$

$$\sigma_b^{\text{CDF}}(|y| < 1) = 29.4^{+6.2}_{-5.4 \text{ stat+syst}} \mu\text{b}$$

$$\sigma_b^{\text{NLO}}(|y| < 1) = 23.6^{+11.9}_{-7.6} \mu\text{b}$$

Theory-Data agreement now almost embarrassing. Fully compatible within errors.

Central values move slightly apart as we go to more 'artificial' cross sections.
 Indication of uncertainties and systematics related to deconvolution procedures.

So, what happened?

How did we go from 'factor of three' excesses to full agreement?

A combination of various factors:


- the real distance between data and theory was actually never this large, once ALL uncertainties were taken into account. Plotting $1-\sigma$ errors only and discussing central value ratios forgetting errors altogether might have lead to a distorted perception of reality
- both the data and the theory have moved, often legitimately within the uncertainties (which might have been larger than previously thought)
- new measurements without corrections to unphysical particles (ZEUS, CDF) may have minimized the risk of biasing the data. Whatever the reason, they are now in good agreement (yes, ZEUS too)
- new experimental input (and better use of some of them, e.g. bottom FF) allowed producing more reliable theoretical predictions

Examples ->



Data

If the input from PDFs and the measurements and extraction of HQ FFs pushed the theory up, the data 'helped' coming down a little:

Compare Run II data to Run I ones:
should be 10% higher, they are
instead about 25% lower





This is the main reason why the same calculation which predicted a CENTRAL VALUE a factor of 1.7 lower than the CENTRAL VALUE of the data, is now in perfect agreement with Run II data



A further 15-20% is given by updates in the PDFs (CTEQ5M1 \rightarrow CTEQ6M)

What about old UA1 data?

...everything OK




OLD UA1 data and MODERN theory appear in good agreement both at the HADRON and at the QUARK level

NB. Uncertainty bands are only an indication, $\pm 25\%$

3. Il futuro

Higgs production with bottom quarks


One way:




Keep the b massive and use the gg process for all three studies. The b mass acts as an infrared cutoff and there are no divergences. This is the **4 Flavour Scheme (4FS)**

or the other:


The "leading-order process" depends on how INCLUSIVE is the measurement to be performed:



FULLY INCLUSIVE



1 b at high p_T



2 b 's at high p_T

In so doing the large logs $\alpha_S \ln\left(\frac{m_h^2}{m_b^2}\right)$ are resummed into the b distribution function $b(x, m_h^2)$. This is the **5 flavour scheme**.

No further phenomenological input in a b -quark PDF, it just a different way of framing the NLO (and higher order) calculations

Bonus: resummation to all orders of large logs


Testing resummed bottom production calculations at large scales means therefore testing the techniques for calculating the bottom PDF

The bottom quark can enter, in the form of a PDF, a number of interesting processes:

Process	Interest	Accuracy
single-top t-channel	SM, top EW couplings and polarization, V_{tb} . Anomalous couplings.	NLO
single-top + W		NLO
Wbj	SM, bkg to single top	(NLO)
gamma+b	SM, SUSY bkg, b-pdf	NLO
Z+b		NLO
inclusive h,A	SUSY discovery/ measurements at large $\tan(\beta)$	NNLO
h,A+b		NLO
$H^+ + t$	SUSY discovery, couplings	NLO

pp \rightarrow Z

Besides entering NNLO calculations for Higgs production, b-quark PDF also make up 5% of the total Z production at LHC. If we aim at a 1% accurate hadronic physics, we must make sure we control the b PDF at the 20% level




Can we measure the b-pdf directly?

Proposals:

1. Use HERA “inclusive” b measurements
2. Use Tevatron and/or LHC data for Z+b (and gamma+b?)

HERA

Bottom production in DIS




$$pp \rightarrow Z + HQ$$


Leading order:

Tevatron
LHC


Plenty of HQ measurements at HERA. Goal: accuracy of results, no extrapolations to total cross sections. Perhaps at HERA2?



Next-to-leading order (Campbell, Ellis, F.M., Willenbrock, 2003):



Tevatron




--> ren/fact scale dependence

Not really possible to 'falsify' the NLO prediction (or, rather test FONLL) until $p_T > 200-300$ GeV


How likely is it we'll be able to measure b production up there?

LHC



How far will LHC measure bottom production?

VERY rough estimate:



Neglected a thousand factors:

- actual luminosities
- triggers
- tagging methods
- acceptance
- experimentalists
-

In the end, the situation might very well be a lot better (or worse). Much will depend on the real interest in going far in the measurement

Conclusions

- NLO (+NLL) QCD does a good job in predicting real and unbiased bottom hadroproduction data.

Part of the success is due to the possibility of controlling, from the theory side, the whole chain from parton to hadron, carefully matching perturbative and non-perturbative contributions.

Experiments should avoid publishing only deconvoluted/extrapolated quantities, which might include strong biases from MonteCarlo:

“Thou shalt not publish only results for unphysical objects”

- New physics is not needed to explain most of the recent bottom production data, but there is still some room for it within the uncertainties
- Higher order calculations (when?) or further resummations should not change the picture, but may help in reducing the theoretical uncertainties (e.g. small- x effects for total b cross section at the Tevatron)
- Good LHC data at large p_T will be vital to test the resummation techniques and validate, for instance, the use of heavy quark PDF's