



Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory

FERMILAB-Conf-96/352-E

CDF

**Inclusive Jet Production at $\sqrt{s} = 630$ GeV
and a Test of Scaling at CDF**

**Anwar Ahmad Bhatti
For the CDF Collaboration**

*Department of Physics, The Rockefeller University
1230 York Avenue, New York, New York 10021*

*Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory
P.O. Box 500, Batavia, Illinois 60510*

October 1996

Published Proceedings of 1996 Annual Divisional Meeting (DPF 96) of the Division of Particles and Fields of the American Physical Society, Minneapolis, Minnesota, August 10-15, 1996.



Disclaimer

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

Distribution

Approved for public release: further dissemination unlimited.

INCLUSIVE JET PRODUCTION AT $\sqrt{s} = 630$ GEV AND A TEST OF SCALING AT CDF

ANWAR AHMAD BHATTI^a

*Department of Physics, The Rockefeller University, 1230 York Avenue New York
NY 10021, USA*

A preliminary measurement of the inclusive jet cross section at $\sqrt{s} = 630$ GeV is presented. The data are compared with NLO QCD predictions. The ratio of scaled inclusive jet cross section at $\sqrt{s} = 1800$ and $\sqrt{s} = 630$ is presented and compared with previous CDF results and QCD predictions.

1 Introduction

The hypothesis of "scaling" predicts that the dimensionless jet cross section ($E_T^4 \frac{d^3\sigma}{dp^3}$), where E_T is the transverse energy of the jet, is independent of \sqrt{s} , the center of mass energy of the $\bar{p}p$ interaction. However, the QCD leads to scaling violation through running of strong coupling constant (α_s) and evolution of parton distribution functions. By taking the ratio of the dimensionless cross sections measured at two different beam energies many of the theoretical and experimental systematic uncertainties cancel¹, making it a more precise test of QCD than the individual inclusive jet cross sections.

The CDF collaboration tested the scaling hypothesis using 7.5 nb^{-1} of data at $\sqrt{s} = 546$ and 3.9 pb^{-1} of data at $\sqrt{s} = 1800$ collected during 1989¹. These data were inconsistent with the scaling hypothesis at the 95% C.L. and consistent with NLO QCD predictions at the $1.5\text{-}2.2\sigma$ level; the data favored a level of the ratio that was lower than the predictions.

In this paper, we present the one-jet inclusive cross section measured at $\sqrt{s} = 630$ GeV and compare it with NLO QCD predictions. The ratio of dimensionless cross sections at $\sqrt{s} = 630$ GeV and $\sqrt{s} = 1800$ is also presented.

2 Jet Identification and Data Set

This analysis is based on 600 nb^{-1} of data taken at $\sqrt{s} = 630$ GeV in Dec. 1995. The data were collected using triggers with E_T thresholds of 5 GeV and 15 GeV. The 5 GeV data were prescaled by 150 and were used for 20-30 GeV E_T range. In addition a large sample of minimum bias events was collected and was used to study the trigger efficiency and the calorimeter energy scale.

^aRepresenting CDF collaboration




Figure 1: (a) Inclusive jet cross section at $s^{1/2}=630$ GeV compared with NLO QCD predictions (b) Inclusive jet cross section at $s^{1/2}=630$ GeV compared with NLO QCD using CTEQ3M PDF's. Also shown is the inclusive jet cross section at $s^{1/2}=1800$ GeV for $E_T < 200$ GeV compared to the corresponding NLO prediction.

The CDF detector has been described in the detail elsewhere². Cosmic rays and accelerator loss backgrounds were removed with cuts on event energy timing and on missing E_T significance ($E_T/\sqrt{\sum E_T}$) as described in reference³. All the events with a jet of $E_T > 80$ GeV, passing event requirement cuts, were scanned and no background was found. Finally in order to ensure a good E_T measurement, we require the jets to have $0.1 < |\eta| < 0.7$. The jet energy scale correction and unsmearing procedure is same as the one used to inclusive jet analysis at $\sqrt{s} = 1800$ GeV⁴.

Jets were reconstructed using a cone algorithm⁵ with radius $R \equiv (\Delta\eta^2 + \Delta\phi^2)^{1/2} = 0.7$. The QCD calculation used a similar algorithm⁶. The ambient energy from fragmentation of partons not associated with the hard scattering is subtracted. This ambient energy was measured using the minimum bias events collected at $\sqrt{s} = 630$ GeV and the same techniques as were used for the $\sqrt{s} = 1800$ GeV data⁴. No correction is applied for the energy falling outside the cone because this effect is supposed to be modelled by the NLO QCD calculations.




Figure 2: (a) Inclusive jet cross section at $s^{1/2}=630$ GeV compared with NLO QCD predictions (b) the ratio of dimensionless cross sections

3 Comparison with QCD

Fig.1(a) shows the corrected cross section compared to NLO QCD⁶ using CTEQ3M⁷ PDF's with the renormalisation/factorisation scale $\mu = E_T/2$. The comparison is shown on a linear scale in Fig.1(b). The data are below the QCD predictions for $E_T < 80$ GeV. For $E_T > 80$, the data is in reasonable agreement with QCD within the large statistical errors. For $E_T < 60$, the CDF data has different slope than QCD predictions. The CDF data⁴ at $\sqrt{s} = 1800$ GeV shows good agreement with the corresponding theory prediction for $35 < E_T < 200$ GeV. Detector effects such as energy loss or energy mis-calibration would be function of E_T and thus would affect the two \sqrt{s} samples at same E_T value. We are currently working on evaluating the systematic uncertainties for the $\sqrt{s} = 630$ GeV sample. The systematic uncertainties for the $\sqrt{s} = 1800$ GeV sample are discussed in Ref.⁴.

In Fig.2(a), the CDF data is compared with inclusive jet data from UA2 collaboration⁸. Statistical and P_T dependent systematic uncertainties are shown on the UA2 points while only statistical uncertainties are shown on the CDF data. In the region of overlap ($E_T > 45$ GeV), two data sets appear to agree in shape although there is a difference in normalisation. However, this difference is within the relative normalisation uncertainty of the two samples.

Fig.2(b) shows the ratio of the dimensionless cross sections at $\sqrt{s}=630$ GeV and $\sqrt{s}=1800$ GeV (\bullet) and the previous CDF result¹ (Δ) as a function

of $x_T = 2E_T/\sqrt{s}$. The systematic uncertainties for the 546/1800 measurement are shown as the shaded band. The systematic uncertainties for the 630/1800 measurement are expected to be similar and are still under study. The two results are clearly consistent. Both measurements are lower than the QCD predictions at low x_T using either CTEQ3M or MRSA⁹. Evaluation of the significance of the disagreement must wait for the complete determination of the experimental systematic uncertainties.

4 Conclusions

We have presented a preliminary measurement of the inclusive jet cross section at $\sqrt{s} = 630$ GeV over the E_T range 20-140 GeV. The data are consistent with previous the CDF measurement and with UA2 results in region of overlap ($E_T > 45$ GeV). Evaluation of the systematic uncertainties is underway, but they are expected similar to the previous CDF result. The preliminary measurement at $\sqrt{s} = 630$ GeV shows a deviation from the QCD predictions at low E_T which is not observed in $\sqrt{s} = 1800$ GeV data.

References

1. CDF Collaboration, F. Abe *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70** 1376 (1993).
2. CDF Collaboration, F. Abe *et al.*, Nucl. Instrum. Methods **A271**, 387 (1988).
3. CDF Collaboration, F. Abe *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **62** 613 (1989).
4. CDF Collaboration, F. Abe *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77** 438 (1996).
5. CDF Collaboration, F. Abe *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D45** 1448 (1992).
6. S. Ellis, Z. Kunszt, and D. Soper, Phys. Rev. Lett. **64** 2121(1990). See also F. Aversa, P. Chiappetta, M. Greco, P. Guillet, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65**, 401 (1990); W. T. Giele, E.W.N. Glover and D.A. Kosower, Nucl. Phys. **B403** 633 (1993), and references therein.
7. Lia, H.L. *et al.*, CTEQ Collaboration, Phys. Rev. **D51** (1995) 4763-4782, hep-ph/9410404
8. UA2 Collaboration, J. Alitti *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B257**, 232(1991).
9. A.D. Martin, R.G. Roberts and W.J. Stirling, Phys. Rev. **D50** 6734 (1994).