Factorisation in charm and jet processes in diffractive DIS and γp

A. Bonato

on the behalf of the H1 and ZEUS Collaborations

Diffraction 2008

La Londe-les-Maures , 13/09/2008

Outline

- Introduction

- Testing QCD factorisation in diffraction at HERA:

  - Open charm

  - Dijets

    - studies on the E_T dependence of the Gap Survival Probability (**GSP**)

- Conclusions

$ep \longrightarrow epX$ kinematics

DIS

Diffractive DIS

$$z_{IP} \cong \beta = \frac{Q^2}{2(P-P')\cdot q}$$

(~ Bjorken-x)

Q^2

x_{Bj}

$$x_{IP} = \frac{(P-P')\cdot q}{P\cdot q}$$

x_{IP} = fraction 4-mom lost by P

$e'(k')$

$e(k)$

$p(P)$

p remnant

$t = (P-P')^2$

$M^2_{P'} \simeq M^2_P$

$$\frac{d\sigma^D}{d\beta \, dQ^2 \, dx_{IP} \, dM_{P'} \, dt} = \frac{2\pi\alpha}{xQ^4}\left[y_+ F^D_2(x_{IP}, M_{P'}, t; \beta, Q^2) + y^2 F^D_L(x_{IP}, M_{P'}, t; \beta, Q^2)\right]$$

HERA

27.5 GeV $e^{+/-}$

820 / 920 GeV p

**$\sqrt{s}$ = 308 / 318 GeV**

~ **0.75 fb^{-1} delivered !**

~ 15 pb^{-1} with p @ 460 GeV

~ 10 pb^{-1} with p @ 575 GeV

Significant improvement of our knowledge of QCD ! (α_S, F_2, F_L...)

Diffraction at HERA

Proton Spectrometer:

- ZEUS: LPS ; H1: FPS, VFPS
- Direct tag of scattered p
- Rich of informations (e.g., t)
- Low acceptance: statistically limited

Large Rapidity Gap:

- Exchange of colourless IP: lack of particle flow in p direction
- High statistics
- Loss of information about scattered p
- Contribution from p dissociation

M_X method:

- Different dependence on Mx of the DDIS and DIS cross section Diffraction at low M_X
- High statistics
- No info on p, p dissociation still a problem

QCD factorisation in diffraction

QCD Factorisation theorem

proven for DIS by J.Collins, *Phys.Rev. D57, 3051(1998)*

$$\sigma^D(\gamma * p \rightarrow Xp) \simeq \sum_{i=q,g} \hat{\sigma} \otimes f_i^D(t, x_{IP}, \beta, Q^2)$$

Hard subprocess ME

pQCD calculable

Diffractive PDFs

defined as the std PDFs + diffractive requirement

DPDFs extracted via DGLAP fit from inclusive DDIS

Direct sensitivity (good precision) to quark singlet, fits generally in agreement.

Larger uncertainties on the gluon density, especially at high β. Predictions guaranteed only up to β~0.8

H1 2006 DPDF Fit A
(exp. error)
(exp.+theor. error)

H1 2006 DPDF Fit B
(exp.+theor. error)

Use DPDFs extracted from inclusive DDIS for calculating NLO predictions to semi-inclusive final states.

Using open charm and dijets:

- Direct sensitivity to gluons (main content of diffractive exchange)
- Hard scale in the process (use of pQCD, QCD-factorisation theorem)

X_γ = fraction of momentum of γ in the hard process.

Direct γ: all momentum contributes , i.e. $x_\gamma \simeq 1$

Resolved γ: parton carrying a fraction of momentum of γ interacts with the IP, i.e. $x_\gamma < 1$

DIS dominated by direct γ

Z_{IP} = fraction of momentum of IP in the hard process.

Replaces β in dijets/open charm case.

Variable sensitive to the DPDFs !

D* in DDIS

NLO describes data.

Very large theoretical uncertainties.

Different measurements in good agreement.

Dijets in DDIS

Z_{IP} is the most sensitive variable to the DPDFs.

Both H1 and ZEUS in agreement with NLO calculations. Best agreement obtained with H1-fitB and MRW2006 fit.

Message from H1 and ZEUS: Factorisation holds in DDIS !

H1-Jets fit to DPDFs

Inclusive diffractive DIS has not direct sensitivity to gluon content of diffractive exchange.

Jet production mechanism has it: **extending precision and range of validity of gluonic densities by including DDIS jets in the fit to DPDFs.**

As expected, large differences in gluon densities at high β.

JHEP 0710:042,2007

Factorisation breaking in diffractive $p\bar{p}$ collisions


Diffractive dijet measurement by CDF. Comparison with NLO prediction using as input dPDFs extracted at HERA .
Significant overestimation by NLO of the data.
The HERA DPDFs cannot be used directly at TeVatron.

Secondary interactions between spectator partons spoil the LRG, no diffractive tag anymore.
Models are able to describe the suppression observed at TeVatron (Kaidalov, Khoze, Martin, Ryskin...).

Test of factorisation in diffractive γp

At HERA we have something similar to a hadron:

photoproduction (γP) photon ($Q^2 \sim 0$).

Low Q^2 γ fluctuates in $q\bar{q}$ pairs and behave ~ vector meson

HERA   Tevatron

secondary interactions by additional spectators?

Direct γ^* (small γ^*) couples directly to parton (DIS and part of γp).

QCD factorisation is expected to hold.

Resolved γ^* (large γ^*) behaves like a hadron (other part of γp).

QCD factorisation is expected to break

$e(k)$ $e(k')$ γ q $\bar{q}$ g $\mathbb{P}$ $p(P)$ $p(P')$ (a)

$e(k)$ $e(k')$ γ q q g g $\mathbb{P}$ $p(P)$ $p(P')$ (b)

Soft Rescattering

D* in Diffractive γp

Satisfactory agreement DATA vs NLO.

Data compatible with factorisation within uncertainties.

But:

- Small hadron-like contribution in NLO. ⟶
- Large theoretical uncertainties.

Testing factorisation breaking for the resolved γ from these data is difficult.

Dijets in Diffractive γp

H1 Diffractive Dijet Photoproduction

- H1 Data
- correlated uncertainty
- H1 2006 Fit B DPDF
- FR NLO$\times(1+\delta_{had})$
- FR NLO

x_γ = fraction of initial γ mom taken by the dijets

$x_\gamma \sim 1$ direct enhanced

$x_\gamma \ll 1$ resolved enhanced

H1: suppression ~ 0.5

ZEUS: weak (if any) suppression

Both : no dependence of GSP on x_γ

- ZEUS data 77pb^{-1}
- ZEUS LPS
- H1 2006 A, AFG (x 0.87)
- H1 2006 A, GRV (x 0.87)
- H1 2006 B, GRV (x 0.87)

E_T dependence ?

Investigating the differences between H1 and ZEUS results.

H1: $E_{T,j1} > 5$ GeV, $E_{T,j2} > 4$ GeV, $0.3 < y < 0.65$

ZEUS: $E_{T,j1} > 7.5$ GeV, $E_{T,j2} > 6.5$ GeV, $0.2 < y < 0.85$

Can it be due to different kinematic regions ?

H1 and ZEUS observe that the data have a harder E_T slope than NLO

Double Ratio $= \dfrac{(\text{DATA / NLO})_{\gamma P}}{(\text{DATA / NLO})_{DIS}}$

Several uncertainties cancel out!

Powerful tool for spotting trends and features.

No evident W dependence.

Evidence for a dependence on E_T !!!

New H1 study of dijets in γp

Based on 1999/2000 data, **luminosity x3** respect to old analysis with 1997 data
Photoproduction tagged directly, diffraction tagged with the **LRG method**.

Two different kinematic regions:

Low E$_T$ scenario	**High E$_T$ scenario**
(cross check to old H1 analysis)	(similar to ZEUS kinematic region)

Low E$_T$ scenario

$E_T^{jet1} > 5$ GeV

$E_T^{jet2} > 4$ GeV

$-1 < \eta^{(jet\ 1\ and\ 2)} < 2$

$x_{IP} < 0.03$

as previous H1 analysis
$\begin{cases} 0.3 < y_e < 0.65 \\ Q^2 < 0.01\ GeV^2 \end{cases}$

$\begin{cases} |t| < 1\ GeV^2 \\ M_Y < 1.6\ GeV \end{cases}$

High E$_T$ scenario

$E_T^{jet1} > 7.5$ GeV

$E_T^{jet2} > 6.5$ GeV

$-1.5 < \eta^{(jet\ 1\ and\ 2)} < 1.5$

$x_{IP} < 0.025$

different from ZEUS
$\begin{cases} 0.3 < y_e < 0.65 \ldots {}_{0.2 < y_{JB} < 0.85} \\ \qquad\qquad\qquad \textbf{ZEUS} \\ Q^2 < 0.01\ GeV^2 \ldots {}_{Q^2 < 1\ GeV^2} \\ |t| < 1\ GeV^2 \\ M_Y < 1.6\ GeV \end{cases}$

# Low E$_T$ scenario

E$_{T,j1}$ > 5 GeV, E$_{T,j2}$>4 GeV

Measurement compared to two independent NLO calculations: Frixione-Ridolfi and Klasen-Kramer.

No x$_\gamma$ dependence of Gap Survival Probability.

$E_{T,j1} > 5$ GeV, $E_{T,j2} > 4$ GeV

Another hint of an E_T spectrum
harder in data than in MC.

Integrated Survival Probabilities
0.43 – 0.65 (depending on the DPDFs used, always
compatible one with each other within unc.)

$$ISP\,^{FR}_{fitB} = 0.54 \pm 0.01\,(stat.) \pm 0.10\,(syst.)\,^{+0.14}_{-0.13}\,(scale)$$

$$ISP\,^{KK}_{fitB} = 0.51 \pm 0.01\,(stat.) \pm 0.10\,(syst.)$$

$$ISP\,^{FR}_{fitA} = 0.43 \pm 0.01\,(stat.) \pm 0.10\,(syst.)$$

$$ISP\,^{FR}_{fitJets} = 0.65 \pm 0.01\,(stat.) \pm 0.11\,(syst.)$$

H1 PRELIMINARY

H1 HERA 99-00 e+ Data · correlated uncertainty

H1 2006 Fit B DPDF · NLO-FR × (1+δ_hadr.) · NLO-KK × (1+δ_hadr.)

E_T^{jet1} > 5 GeV
E_T^{jet2} > 4 GeV
NLO × 0.53

H1 PRELIMINARY

H1 HERA 99-00 e+ Data / NLO-FR × (1+δ_hadr.)

H1 2006 Fit B · H1 2006 Fit A · H1 2007 Fit Jets

High E$_T$ Scenario

H1 PRELIMINARY

E$_{T,j1}$ > 7.5 GeV, E$_{T,j2}$ > 6.5 GeV

Higher E$_T$ cut selects more direct-like events (appearance of a peak at high x$_\gamma$).

No x$_\gamma$ dependence of the suppression. ISP slightly higher than in low E$_T$.

$$ISP\,_{fitB}^{FR} = 0.61 \pm 0.03(stat.) \pm 0.13(syst.)\,^{+0.16}_{-0.14}$$
$$ISP\,_{fitB}^{KK} = 0.62 \pm 0.03(stat.) \pm 0.14(syst.)$$
$$ISP\,_{fitA}^{FR} = 0.44 \pm 0.02(stat.) \pm 0.16(syst.)$$
$$ISP\,_{fitJets}^{FR} = 0.79 \pm 0.04(stat.) \pm 0.09(syst.)$$

H1 PRELIMINARY

$E_{T,j1} > 7.5$ GeV, $E_{T,j2} > 6.5$ GeV

No independent test of an E_T dependence, but values move in the direction of ZEUS results.

Summary

✳ **DDIS data from HERA confirm validity of QCD factorisation in diffraction.** Dijets in γp: results from H1 and ZEUS in tension?

✳ New H1 analysis on dijets in diffractive γp. Confirms previous H1 results, Gap Survival Probability ~ 0.5

✳ If kinematical range similar to ZEUS: increased compatibility between the two (GSP~0.6).

  ➨ Hints of a dependence on E_T of the GSP.

  ➨ Confirmation that no x_γ dependence of the GSP is observed.

  ➨ Main limitation: systematics, theoretical predictions in particular.

✳ **Important for LHC predictions**: CEP of SM-Higgs, SUSY, dijets...

Backup slides

QCD factorisation in diffraction

**Hard subprocess**

ME pQCD
calculable

Diffractive PDFs
defined as the std
PDFs + diffractive
requirement

DPDFs extracted via DGLAP fit from inclusive DDIS

Direct sensitivity (good precision) to quark singlet, fits
generally in agreement.

Larger uncertainties on the gluon density, especially at
high β. Predictions guaranteed only up to $\beta \sim 0.8$

Low E$_T$ scenario

H1 PRELIMINARY

H1 HERA 99-00 e+ Data / NLO-FR × (1+δ$_{hadr.}$)

H1 PRELIMINARY

H1 HERA 99-00 e+ Data / NLO-FR × (1+δ$_{hadr.}$)

Measurement compared to two independent NLO calculations: Frixione-Ridolfi and Klasen-Kramer.

No x$_\gamma$ dependence of rapidity gap survival probability.

Another hint of an E$_T$ spectrum harder in data than in MC.

Integrated Survival Probabilities 0.43 – 0.65 (depending on the DPDFs used, always compatible one with each other within theor. unc.)

High E_T Scenario

Higher E_T cut selects more direct-like events (appearance of a peak at high x_γ).

No x_γ dependence of the suppression. ISP slightly higher than in low E_T.

No independent test of an E_T dependence, but values more similar to ZEUS respect previous cases