

4th Particle Physics Workshop National Center for Physics, Islamabad

Proton Structure and QCD tests at HERA Jan Olsson, DESY Part 1



ep collider HERA at DESY in Hamburg, Germany



$$E_e = 27.6 \text{ GeV}$$

 $E_p = 920 \text{ GeV}$

318 GeV CM energy

corresponds to 54 TeV beam energy for a fixed target!

Asymmetric accelerator, superconducting technology, 6.3 km circumference Operates since 1992, H1 and ZEUS colliding beam experiments, fixed target experiment HERMES



HERA Kinematics

$$Q^2 = -q^2 = -(k - k')^2$$

Boson virtuality, resolution scale



Fractional momentum of struck quark Bjorken scaling variable

Inelasticity

CM energy of the ep system (squared)

Boson-proton CM energy, "hadronic mass"

2 independent variables



High Q^2 , high x

Perturbative QCD Electroweak effects Overlap in x with fixed target experiments

HERA can test QCD over wide range of Q^2 and x

Explore proton structure !







Central, backward and forward tracking Liquid Argon (H1) and Compensating Uranium (ZEUS) calorimeters Vertex detectors Solenoidal and Toroidal fields, Forward and Central Muon detectors Forward detectors: Roman pots, Neutron calorimeters Electron and Photon tagging detectors



HERA Physics

- Neutral and Charged Current DIS
- Proton Structure
- Jet production and QCD studies
- Heavy Quark (c and b) production
- Hadronic Final State
- Spectroscopy
- Photoproduction
 - Photon Structure
- Diffraction
 - Exclusive Final States
 - Leading Baryon production
- Search for exotics, BSM

proton hadrons (jet) quark Virtual y, e^-,e^+ W, Z ZEUS · ZEUS 98-00 Wrong-charge background 0.16 AM (GeV) $e^+p \rightarrow \mu^+X$ Event MILON-3 $P_{\pi}^{\mu} = 28 \, \text{GeV}, P_{\pi}^{\chi} = 67 \, \text{GeV}, P_{\pi}^{\text{miss}} = 43 \, \text{GeV}$

H1

Neutral Current event, medium Q²



Kinematics determined from measured electron, as well as from the hadronic system (energies and angles)

Neutral Current event, medium Q^2



Neutral Current event, high Q²

Candidate from NC sample



Neutral Current event, high Q^2



A new look at the kinematic plane:



Charged Current event



Kinematics here determined from hadronic system alone, using energy and angle

No redundancy

Neutral Current Cross Section

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^2 \sigma_{NC}^{\pm}}{dx \, dQ^2} &= \frac{2\pi\alpha^2}{xQ^4} \left[Y_+ \tilde{F}_2 \ \mp \ Y_- x \tilde{F}_3 \ - \ y^2 \tilde{F}_L \right] & Y_{\pm} \equiv 1 \pm (1-y)^2 \\ \tilde{F}_2 &\equiv F_2 - v_e \frac{\kappa Q^2}{(Q^2 + M_Z^2)} F_2^{\gamma Z} \ + (v_e^2 + a_e^2) \left(\frac{\kappa Q^2}{Q^2 + M_Z^2} \right)^2 F_2^Z \\ x \tilde{F}_3 &\equiv -a_e \frac{\kappa Q^2}{(Q^2 + M_Z^2)} x F_3^{\gamma Z} \ + (2v_e a_e) \left(\frac{\kappa Q^2}{Q^2 + M_Z^2} \right)^2 x F_3^Z \end{aligned} \qquad \begin{aligned} \kappa^{-1} &= 4 \frac{M_W^2}{M_Z^2} (1 - \frac{M_W^2}{M_Z^2}) \\ F_2 &= x \sum_q e_q^2 \{q + \overline{q}\} \\ F_2^{\gamma Z} &= x \sum_q 2e_q v_q \{q + \overline{q}\} \\ F_2^{\gamma Z} &= x \sum_q 2e_q v_q \{q + \overline{q}\} \\ F_2^{\gamma Z} &= x \sum_q (v_q^2 + a_q^2) \{q + \overline{q}\} \end{aligned}$$

 $q - ar{q}$ ==> access to valence quark distributions

$$egin{aligned} xF_3^{\gamma Z} &= 2x\sum_q e_q a_q \{q-\overline{q}\} = 2x\sum_{q=u,d} e_q a_q \ q_v \ xF_3^Z &= 2x\sum_q v_q a_q \{q-\overline{q}\} = 2x\sum_{q=u,d} v_q a_q \ q_v \end{aligned}$$

Charged Current Cross Section

$$\frac{d^{2}\sigma_{CC}^{\pm}}{dx \, dQ^{2}} = \frac{G_{F}^{2}}{2\pi x} \left[\frac{M_{W}^{2}}{Q^{2} + M_{W}^{2}} \right]^{2} \frac{1}{2} (Y_{+}W_{2}^{\pm} \mp Y_{-}xW_{3}^{\pm} - y^{2}W_{L}^{\pm})$$

$$\frac{W_{2}^{+} = x(\overline{U} + D)}{W_{2}^{-} = x(U + \overline{D})} \qquad \begin{array}{c} xU = x(u + c) \\ x\overline{U} = x(\overline{u} + \overline{c}) \\ xW_{3}^{+} = x(D - \overline{U}) \\ xW_{3}^{-} = x(U - \overline{D}) \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} xD = x(d + s) \\ x\overline{D} = x(\overline{d} + \overline{s}) \\ x\overline{D} = x(\overline{d} + \overline{s}) \end{array}$$

For convenience: Reduced cross sections:

$$egin{aligned} & ilde{\sigma}_{NC}(x,Q^2) = rac{1}{Y_+} rac{Q^4 x}{2\pilpha^2} rac{\mathrm{d}^2\sigma_{NC}}{\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}Q^2} = F_2ig(1\!+\!\Delta_{F_2}\!+\!\Delta_{F_3}\!+\!\Delta_{F_L}ig) \ & ilde{\sigma}_{CC}(x,Q^2) = rac{2\pi x}{G_F^2} \left[rac{M_W^2\!+\!Q^2}{M_W^2}
ight]^2 rac{\mathrm{d}^2\sigma_{CC}}{\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}Q^2} & ext{(sometimes also called } \sigma_r ig) \end{aligned}$$

Structure Functions: Cross sections, where the kinematic factors have been divided out

The Neutral Current Cross section



The $x \tilde{F}_3$ Structure Function

The contribution from $x\tilde{F}_3$ can be obtained by subtraction of e⁻p and e⁺p NC cross sections, at highest Q² **

$$x ilde{F}_3 = rac{1}{2Y_-} \left[ilde{\sigma}^-_{NC} - ilde{\sigma}^+_{NC}
ight]$$

Pure Z⁰ exchange neglected^{*} ==> $xF_3^{\gamma Z} \equiv xG_3$

$$\star x ilde{F}_3 \equiv - \, a_e \, rac{\kappa Q^2}{(Q^2 + M_Z^2)} x F_3^{\gamma \, Z} + \, \left(2 v_e a_e
ight) \, \left(rac{\kappa Q^2}{Q^2 + M_Z^2}
ight)^2 x F_3^Z$$



The $x\tilde{F}_3$ Structure Function

The dominant contribution to $x F_3$ comes from the interference term, since the pure Z-exchange term is suppressed by the small v_{e.} The interference term has only little dependence on Q² ==> take average over Q²

The NLO QCD fit describes the data; Valence partons in this region constrained by the NC and CC cross sections, rather than by the e^+ and e^- NC cross section difference.

The $x \tilde{F}_3$ Structure Function

Statistics will be improved with the HERA II data

e+p data sensitive to d-quark, e-p data to u-quark distributions

Both e+p and e-p data needed for flavour separation

NC DIS: Reduced cross section measurements

The larger Q^2 is, the more gluons are seen at low x

Gluons split into $q\bar{q}$ But $F_2 \propto x(q + \bar{q})$ Thus the gluon "drives" the rise of F_2 at low x

> The dotted lines represent the Scaling Violations, given by the increasing gluon density

LO DGLAP, low x:

 $dF_2/d\ln Q^2\sim lpha_s xg(x)$

DGLAP Evolution

$$\frac{\partial q_i(x,Q^2)}{\partial \ln Q^2} = \frac{\alpha_s(Q^2)}{2\pi} \int_x^1 \frac{d\zeta}{\zeta} \left[q_i(\zeta,Q^2) \underbrace{q}_{P_{qq}} + g(\zeta,Q^2) \underbrace{g}_{P_{qg}} + g(\zeta,Q^2) \underbrace{g}_{P_{qg}} \right]$$

$$\frac{\partial g(x,Q^2)}{\partial \ln Q^2} = \frac{\alpha_s(Q^2)}{2\pi} \int_x^1 \frac{d\zeta}{\zeta} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{N_f} q_i(\zeta,Q^2) \underbrace{q}_{P_{gq}} + g(\zeta,Q^2) \underbrace{g}_{P_{qg}} + g(\zeta$$

QCD Splitting functions: With increasing Q^2 , probability increases for a parton to split into new partons with lower x

Parton Distribution (Density) Functions, PDFs

Give the probability to find partons in a hadron, as a function of the fraction x of the proton's momentum, carried by the parton $\frac{1}{2}$

The cross section factorizes into a convolution of parton distributions, and the parton-parton cross section

$$d\sigma \sim \sum_a \int dx_A \; f_{a/A}(x_A,\mu) \; d\hat{\sigma}$$

The parton level cross section, $d\hat{\sigma}$, is calculable in perturbative QCD

The PDFs cannot be calculated in pQCD. They have to measured, i.e. extracted from experimental data, using methods based on pQCD

PDFs depend on the way of extracting them: NLO, NNLO, etc.

http://zebu.uoregon.edu/~soper/soper.html/

QCD analysis of the data: The H1 and ZEUS NLO-QCD fits

Recipee: 1. Measured (reduced) cross sections in bins of Q^2 and x

2. Parameterise PDFs for each parton, as function of x and valid at a starting value of $Q^2 = Q_0^2$

General form:

 $xP(x) = p_1 x^{p_2} (1-x)^{p_3} [1+p_4 x+p_5 x^2+p_6 x^3+p_7 x^4]$

3. Apply DGLAP evolution and fit to the data

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \log \left[Q^2/\mu_F^2\right]} \begin{pmatrix} q^{SI} \\ xg \end{pmatrix} = \frac{\alpha_s(\mu_R^2)}{2\pi} \begin{pmatrix} P_{qq} & P_{qg} \\ P_{gq} & P_{gg} \end{pmatrix} \otimes \begin{pmatrix} q^{SI} \\ xg \end{pmatrix}$$

4. Keep going till the PDF parameterisation is optimal !

H1 and ZEUS use similar strategies, although there are many differences in details. However, the results are very similar, and both fits describe the data very well. QCD analysis of the data: The H1 and ZEUS NLO-QCD fits

Some main differences:

H1 use the Fixed Flavour Number (FFN) scheme, with massless quarks

ZEUS use the RT-VFN (Varied Flavour Number - Roberts, Thorne), for smooth transition in the handling of the heavy quark part above mass threshold

ZEUS make use of all fixed target data (NMC,BCDMS,E665,CCFR,SLAC) H1 use only BCDMS

Different assumptions on the definition of valence and sea quarks, on their detailed parameterisation and on the starting value, Q_0^2

The global fits and their data

QCD analysis of the data: The H1 and ZEUS NLO-QCD fits

Both collaborations performed several fits:

Zeus Fits : ZEUS-Standard Use Zeus NC 96/97 e⁺ BCDMS, NMC, E665 proton data NMC,E665 deuterium data, CCFR xF₃ iron data For high x constraint, better flavour separation

> ZEUS-Only Use only Zeus data NC and CC e⁺ and e⁻ up to 99 The nr. of d.o.f. reduced by fixing parameters Both use TR Variable Flavour Number Scheme

H1 Fits: H1PDF2000 and H1 + BCDMS μp Use only H1 data (all HERA I NC and CC) Massless Fixed Flavour Number Scheme

The Result!

NLO QCD describes data over >4 orders of magnitude in Q^2 and x ! Fit works well even for very low Q^2 and x ! (~1 GeV², ~0.00005)

Now a textbook plot!

the dramatic increase of the gluon density at small x in the proton, is one of the most significant discoveries at HERA!

A quick look back on history

DESY 1968, E_{beam} = 4.9 GeV, fixed target

A quick look back on history

Proton structure at low x finally revealed at HERA

The first HERA data...

And 5 years later

The first HERA data already discriminate among theoretical models!

Jan Olsson, DESY

Physics Nobel Prize 2004

"For the Discovery of Asymptotic Freedom in the Theory of Strong Interactions"

David Gross David Politzer

Frank Wilczek

Frank Wilczek:

"The most dramatic of these (experimental consequences), that protons viewed at ever higher resolution would appear more and more as field energy (soft glue), was only clearly verified at HERA twenty years later"

Parton distributions from the fits:

Comparison of Parton Distributions from the fits

Small differences seen between H1 and ZEUS, outside of the quoted error bands; The CTEQ6 fit falls between H1 and ZEUS

Towards the combined HERA SF data

Aim: average the H1 and ZEUS published SF data in the theory free manner

- service to HEP community
 - unique HERA data set
 - proper treatment of correlations between different data sets
- cross checks of systematics: H1 vs. ZEUS

Theory Workshop 29 September 2005 V.Chekelian, Highlights from HERA

The "low Q^2 " problem

At lowest Q^2 values, errors explode, and the gluon "goes negative"

Possible? The Gluon distribution is not an observable...

The gluon is only indirectly determinable, via the scaling violations in F_2

Need other data, with more direct constraints on the gluon

BGF, Boson Gluon Fusion

BGF: depends on xg(x) and α_s QCDC: depends on q(x) and α_s

QCD-Compton

New constraints on gluon and α_s Extract α_s and xg(x) without strong correlation

Direct process

Resolved process

Use also Photoproduction dijet-events Avoid complications from photon structure, by cut

$$x_{\gamma}^{obs} > 0.75$$

(==> enrich direct photon dijet-events)

Fit calculations made via a grid of interpolation weights, obtained from pQCD calculations

Valence distributions:

More precise than previous ZEUS-O distributions, but not so well constrained as when including fixed-target data

Fit uses only ZEUS data: no fixed-target data problems, like heavy target corrections, isospin symmetry assumptions...

Inclusion of Jet data does not change shape significantly: thus, Jet data and Inclusive data are internally consistent

Jet data bring improvement especially in the region 0.01 < x < 0.4

Further improvement in this region only with the HERA II data: greatly increased statistics in the high Q^2 range

Jet data have been used also by ^{10⁴} ^{10³} ^{10²} ^{10²} ^{10⁴} ^{10⁴} ^{10⁴} ^{10⁴} ^{10⁴} ^{10⁴} ^{10⁴}

Jet data break the correlation between gluon shape and α_s value

Marked improvement in precision

First NLO extraction of α_s using HERA data alone!

Expect error reduction of 0.0005, if using NNLO

ZEUS
$$\alpha_s(M_Z^2) = 0.1183 \pm 0.0028(exp) \pm 0.0008(model)$$

cf. H1 + BCDMS $\alpha_s(M_Z^2) = 0.1150 \pm 0.0017(exp) \stackrel{+0.0009}{_{-0.0005}}(model)$

Both values very close to the fixed values used in ZEUS-S and H1 PDF2000

