Report of the QCD Tools W orking G roup

Convenors: Keith Ellis (FNAL), Rick Field (Florida), Stephen M renna (Davis) and G reg Snow (Nebraska)

W orking G roup M em bers: C.Balazs (Hawaii), E.Boos (M oscow), J.Campbell (FNAL), R.Dem ina (Kansas State), J.Huston (M SU), C-Y P.Ngan (M II), A.Petrelli (ANL), I.Puljak (LNPHE), T.Sjostrand (Lund), J. Sm ith (Stony Brook), D.Stuart (FNAL), K.Sum orok (M II)

W e report on the activities of the \QCD Tools for heavy avors and new physics searches" working group of the Run II W orkshop on QCD and W eak Bosons. The contributions cover the topics of improved parton showering and comparisons of M onte Carlo program s and resum m ation calculations, recent developments in PYTHIA, the m ethodology of m easuring backgrounds to new physics searches, variable avor number schemes for heavy quark electro-production, the underlying event in hard scattering processes, and the M onte Carlo M CFM for NLO processes.

1. O verview

The task of the \QCD Tools for heavy avors and new physics searches working group" was to evaluate the status of the tools { invariably computer program s that simulate physics processes at colliders { that are being used to estimate signal and background rates at the Tevatron, and to isolate areas of concem. The contributions presented here cover several topics related to that endeavor. It is hoped that the next period of data-taking at the Tevatron will reveal indirect or direct evidence of physics beyond the Standard M odel. The precise m easurem ent of the W boson mass M $_{\rm W}$ and its correlation with the top quark mass m_t is one example of an indirect probe of the Standard Model. The production of a light Higgs boson in association with a W or Z boson is an obvious example of a direct one. W hile both m easurem ents are related to electrow eak symmetry breaking, it requires a quantitative understanding of perturbative and non{perturbative QCD to interpret data.

Because of the importance of the M $_{W}$ m easurement, and since gauge boson production in association with jets is a serious background in many new physics searches, much e ort was devoted to understanding gauge boson production processes. It is well known that the emission of many soft gluons has a profound e ect on the kinematics of gauge boson production. Two calculational methods have been used to com – pare \theory" with data: (1) analytic resummation of several series of important logarithms, and (2) parton showering based on DGLAP (evolved parton distribution functions. Here, there are reports on our understanding of both, and improvements. Note also that diboson production is often a background too.

In the Standard Model, and its minimal supersymmetric extension, the mechanism that generates m ass for the electroweak gauge bosons also generates ferm ion mass. From an agnostic point of view, the fact that the W and Z bosons and the top quark have roughly sim ilar masses, and these masses are quite disparate from, say, the electron or neutrino masses, is some evidence that heavy avor is related to electroweak symmetry breaking. M any of the search strategies for R un II rely on tagging c and b quarks or leptons. For this reason, there are several contributions regarding issues of determining backgrounds in R un II.

2. Performing parton showering at Next-to-Leading-Order Accuracy

by S.M renna

2.1. Introduction

In the near future, experiments at the Tevatron will search for evidence of physics that supersedes the standard model. Im portant among the tools that will be used in these searches are showering event generators or showering Monte Carlos (SMC's). Among the most versatile and popular of these are the M onte CarlosHERW IG [1], ISAJET [2], and PYTHIA [3]. SM C's are useful because they accurately describe the em ission of multiple soft gluons, which is, in e ect, an all orders problem in QCD. However, they only predict total cross sections to a leading order accuracy, and, thus, can dem onstrate a sizeable dependence on the choice of scale used for the parton distribution functions (PDF's) or coupling constants (particularly s). A lso, in general, they do not translate sm oothly into kinematic con gurations where only one, hard parton is emitted. In distinction to SM C's are certain analytic calculations which account for multiple soft gluon em ission and higher order corrections to the hard scattering. These resum mation calculations, how ever, integrate out the kinem atics of the soft gluons, and, thus, are limited in their predictive power. They

can, for example, describe the kinem atics of a heavy gauge boson produced in hadron collision, but cannot predict the number or distribution of jets that accompany it. However, searches for new physics, either directly or indirectly through measurements of precision electroweak observables, often dem and detailed know ledge of kinem atic distributions and jet activity. Furtherm ore, W + jets (and Z + jets) processes are often backgrounds to SUSY or technicolor signatures, and we dem and a reliable prediction of their properties. Here, we report on recent progress in improving the predictive power of showering M onte Carlos by incorporating the positive features of the analytic resumm ation calculations into the showering algorithms. In the ensuing discussion, we focus on the specic example of W boson production at a hadron collider, when the W decays leptonically. The results apply equally wellto ;Z and Higgs bosons (or any heavy, color(singlet particle) produced in hadron collisions.

2.2. Parton Showers

SM C's are based on the factorization theorem [4], which, roughly, states that physical observables in QCD are the product of short{distance functions and long{distance functions. The short{distance functions are calculable in perturbation theory. The long{ distance functions are t at a scale, but their evolution to any other scale is also calculable in perturbation theory.

A standard application of the factorization theorem is to describe W boson production at a pp collider at a xed order in s. The production cross section is obtained by convoluting the partonic subprocesses evaluated at the scale Q with the PDF's evaluated at Q. The partons involved in the hard collision must be su ciently virtual to be resolved inside the proton, and a natural choice for the scale Q is $Q = M_W$ [5]. However, the valence quarks in the proton have virtualities at a much lower scale Q_0 of the order of 1 GeV. The connection between the partons at the low scale Q_0 and those at the high scale Q is described by the DGLAP evolution equations [6]. The DGLAP equations include the most important kinematic con gurations of the splittings a ! bc, where a; b and c represent di erent types of partons in the hadron (q;q, etc.). Starting from a measurement of the PDF's at a low scale Q_0 , a solution of the DGLAP equations yields the PDF's at the hard scale Q. Equivalently, starting with a parton c involved in a hard collision, it is also possible to determ ine probabilistically which splittings generated c. In the process of evolving parton c back to the valence quarks in the proton, a number of spectator partons (e.g. parton b in the branching a ! bc) are resolved. These partons constitute a shower of soft and/or collinear jets that accompany the W {boson, and in uence its kinem atics.

The shower described above occurs with unit probability and does not change the total cross section for W {boson production calculated at the scale Q [7]. The show ering can be attached to the hard { scattering process based on a probability distribution after the hard scattering has been selected. Once kinem atic cuts are applied, the transverse momentum and rapidity of the W {boson populate regions never accessed by the di erential partonic cross section calculated at a xed order. This is consistent, since the xed{order calculation was inclusive (i.e., pp ! W + X) and was never intended to describe the detailed kinem atics of the W {boson in isolation. The parton show er, in e ect, resolves the structure of the inclusive state of partons denoted as X. In practice, the xed order partonic cross section (without show ering) can still be used to describe properties of the decay leptons as long as the observable is well de ned (e.g., the num ber of leptons with central rapidity and high transverse m om entum, but not the distribution of transverse momentum of theW).

Here, we focus on the case of initial state gluon radiation. M one details can be found in Ref. [8], for example. Showering of the parton b with m om entum fraction x resolved at the scale $Q^2 = e^t$ is driven by a Sudakov form factor exp(S), such as[9]

$$\exp \begin{array}{c} \sum_{t^{0} t^{2} \frac{x}{x^{+}}} dt^{0} dz - \frac{s(z; t^{0})}{2} \hat{P}_{a! bc}(z) \frac{x^{0} f_{a}(x^{0}; t^{0})}{x f_{b}(x; t^{0})}; \\ x^{0} = x = z; \quad (1) \end{array}$$

which is implemented in PYTHIA, and the formally equivalent expression [10]

$$\frac{(t^{0})}{f_{b}(x;t^{0})} \frac{f_{a}(x;t)}{(t)};$$

$$(t^{0}) = \exp \int_{t_{0}}^{Z_{t^{0}}Z_{1}} dt^{0} dz \frac{s(z;t^{0})}{2} \hat{P}_{a!\ bc}(z);$$

which is implemented in HERW IG. In the above expressions, t_0 is a cuto scale for the showering, \hat{P} is a DGLAP splitting function, and f_i is a parton distribution function. The Sudakov form factor presented here is a solution of the DGLAP equation, and gives the probability of evolving from the scale $Q^2 = e^t$ to $Q^{0^2} = e^{t^0}$ with no resolvable branching. The Sudakov form factor contains all the information necessary to reconstruct a shower, since it encodes the change in virtuality of a parton until a resolvable show ering occurs. A parton shower is then an iterative

solution of the equation $r = \exp(S)$, where r is a random number uniform ly distributed in the interval [0;1], until a solution for Q⁰ is found which is below a cuto . For consistency, the cuto should represent the lowest scale of resolvable em ission Q₀. The evolution proceeds backwards from a large, negative scale $\frac{1}{2}p_{1}^{2}j$ to a small, negative cuto scale $\frac{1}{2}p_{1}^{2}j$.

A fier choosing the change in virtuality, a particular backwards branching and the splitting variable z are selected from the probability function based on their relative weights (a sum mation over all possible branchings a ! bc is in plied in these expressions). The details of how a full shower is reconstructed in the PYTHIA M onte Carlo, for example, can be found in Ref. [3]. The structure of the shower can be com plex: the transverse momentum of the W {boson is built up from a whole series of splittings and boosts, and is known only at the end of the shower, after the nal boost.

The SMC formulation outlined above is fairly independent of the hard scattering process considered. Only the initial choice of partons and possibly the high scale di ers. Therefore, this form alism can be applied universally to m any di erent scattering problem s. In e ect, soft and collinear gluons are not sensitive to the speci cs of the hard scattering, only the color charge of the incom ing partons.

2.3. A nalytic R esum m ation

At hadron colliders, the partonic cross sections can receive substantial corrections at higher orders in s. This a ects not only the total production rate, but also the kinematics of the W boson. At leading order $\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ s \end{pmatrix}$, the W {boson has a (Q_T^2) distribution in Q_{T}^{2} . At next{to{leading order, the real em ission of a single gluon generates a contribution to d =dQ $_{T}^{2}$ that behaves as Q $_{T}^{2}$ s (Q $_{T}^{2}$) and Q_{T}^{2} s $(Q_{T}^{2}) \ln (Q^{2}=Q_{T}^{2})$ while the leading order, soft, and virtual corrections are proportional to $(Q_{\rm f})$. At higher orders, the most singular terms follow the pattern of ${}_{s}(Q_{T}^{2})^{n} {}_{m=0}^{P} {}_{n}^{2n-1} \ln^{m}(Q^{2}=Q_{T}^{2}) = {}_{s}^{n} L^{m}$ Vⁿ. The logarithms arise from the incomplete cancellation of the virtual and real QCD corrections, but this cancellation becom es com plete for the integrated spectrum, where the real gluon can become arbitrarily soft and/or collinear to other partons. The pattern of singular terms suggest that perturbation theory should be performed in powers of V^n instead of $\frac{n}{s}$. This reorganization of the perturbative series is called resum m ation.

The rst studies of soft gluon emission resummed the leading logarithms [11, 12], leading to a suppression of the cross section at small Q_T . The suppression underlies the importance of including sub{leading log-

arithm s [13]. The most rigorous approach to the problem of multiple gluon emission is the Collins{ Soper{Stemman (CSS) formalism for transverse momentum resummation [14], which resums all of the important logarithms. This is achieved after a Fourier transformation with respect to Q_T in the variable b, so that the series involving the delta function and terms s V^n simplifies to the form of an exponential. Hence, the soft gluon emission is resummed or exponentiated in this b{space formalism. Despite the successes of the b{space formalism, there are drawbacks: the soft gluon dynamics are integrated out, and the Sudakov form factor is a Fourier transform.

The CSS formalism was used by its authors to predict both the total cross section to NLO and the kinematic distributions of the W {boson to all orders [15] at hadron colliders. A similar treatment was presented using the AEGM formalism [16], that does not involve a Fourier transform, but is evaluated directly in transverse momentum Q_T space. W hen evaluated at NLO, the two formalisms are equivalent to NNNL order in $_{\rm S}$, and agree with the xed order calculation of the total cross section [17]. A more detailed num erical comparison of the two predictions can be found in Ref. [18].

Recently, the AEGM formalism has been reinvestigated, and an approximation to the b{space formalism has been developed in Q_T {space which retains its predictive features [19] (see also the recent eprint [20]). This formulation does have a simple, physical interpretation, and can be used to develop an alternate algorithm for parton showering which includes higher{order corrections to the hard scattering. For this reason, we focus on the Q_T {space form alism. To NNNL accuracy, the Q_T space expression agrees exactly with the b{space expression, and has the form [19]:

$$\frac{d (h_1 h_2 ! V' X)}{dQ^2 dQ_T^2 dy} = \frac{d}{dQ_T^2} \overline{\texttt{M}} (Q_T; Q; x_1; x_2) + Y (Q_T; Q; x_1; x_2): (3)$$

In this expression, Q, Q_T and y describe the kinem atics of the boson V, the function Y is regular as $Q_T ! 0$ and corrects for the soft gluon approximation, and the function \hat{W} has the form :

$$\begin{split} & \ensuremath{\bar{\mathbb{H}}} \ = e^{-S (Q_{\rm T} ; Q_{\rm T})} H (Q ; y) \\ & C \quad f (x_1; Q_{\rm T}) C \quad f (x_2; Q_{\rm T}); \end{split}$$

where

$$S(Q_{T};Q) = \frac{Z_{Q^{2}}}{Q_{T}^{2}} \frac{d^{2}}{2} \ln \frac{Q^{2}}{2} A_{s}() + B_{s}() ; (5)$$

and

$$C_{j1} \quad f_{j=h_{1}} \quad (x_{1};) = \\ Z_{1} \quad \frac{d_{1}}{d_{1}} C_{j1} (\frac{x_{1}}{d_{1}}; Q_{T}) f_{j=h_{1}} (_{1}; Q_{T}): \quad (6)$$

H is a function that describes the hard scattering, and A, B, and C are calculated perturbatively in powers of $_{\rm s}$:

$$(A;B;C) = \frac{X^{A}}{n=0} - \frac{S(C)}{n} + (A;B;C)^{(n)}$$

(the rst non{zero terms in the expansion of A and B are for n = 1). The functions C ⁽ⁿ⁾ are the W ilson coe cients, and are responsible for the change in the total production cross section at higher orders. In fact, (C f) is simply a rede nition of the parton distribution function obtained by convoluting the standard ones with an ultraviolet{safe function.

Ignoring Y and other kinematical dependence, Eq. (3) can be rewritten as:

$$\frac{d (h_1 h_2 ! W X)}{dQ_T^2} = {}_1 \frac{d}{dQ_T^2} e^{S(Q_T;Q)} R^i; (7)$$

where

$$R = \frac{(C \quad f) (x_1; Q_T) (C \quad f) (x_2; Q_T)}{(C \quad f) (x_1; Q) (C \quad f) (x_2; Q)}$$
(8)

and

$$a_{1} = \frac{dx_{1}}{x_{1}} (C \quad f) (x_{1};Q) (C \quad f) (x_{2};Q):$$

The factor $_1$ is the total cross section to a xed order, while the rest of the function yields the probability that the W {boson has a transverse m on entum Q_T .

At leading order, the expression for the production of an on{shellW {boson simplies considerably to:

$$\frac{d (h_1 h_2 ! W X)}{dQ_T^2} = \frac{d}{dQ_T^2} = \frac{d}{dQ_T^2} e^{-S(Q_T;Q_T)} \frac{f(x_1;Q_T)f(x_2;Q_T)}{f(x_1;Q_T)f(x_2;Q_T)} ; (9)$$

$$e^{-Z} \frac{d}{dx_1} f(x_1;Q_T)f(x_2;Q_T); (9)$$

where contains physical constants and we ignore the function Y for now. The expression contains two factors, the total cross section at leading order $_0$, and a cumulative probability function in Q_T^2 that describes the transverse momentum of the W {boson. The term e $^{S=2}f(x;Q_T)=f(x;Q)$ is of the same form as the Sudakov form factor of Eq. (2) and, hence, to that of Eq. (1).

2.4. A modi ed showering algorithm

The primary result of this analysis is to exploit the expression for the di erential cross section, which has the form of a leading order cross section times a backwards evolution, to incorporate NLO corrections to the parton shower. We generalize the function $(t)=f(x;t) = (t;t^0) = (t;t^0)$ of the standard backwards show ering algorithm to \overline{W} (the square root appears because we are considering the evolution of each parton line individually).

To implement this modi cation in a numerical program, like PYTHIA, we need to provide the new, modi ed PDF (mPDF) based on the W ilson coe cients. At leading order, the only W ilson coe cient is C $_{ij}^{(0)} =$ $_{ij}$ (1 z), and we reproduce exactly the standard showering formulation. For W {boson production at NLO, the W ilson coe cients C are:

$$C_{jk}^{(1)} = _{jk} \frac{2}{3}(1 - z) + \frac{1}{3}(^{2} - 8)(1 - z);$$
 (10)

$$C_{jg}^{(1)} = \frac{1}{2}z(1 \ z)$$
: (11)

To NLO, the convolution integrals become:

$$C = f_{i}(x;) = f_{i}(x;) + \frac{s()}{3}(2 = 8) + \frac{s()}{x}\frac{z}{z}\frac{1}{z}\frac{dz}{z}\frac{2}{3}(1 = z)f_{i}(x=z;) + \frac{1}{2}(1 = z)f_{g}(x=z;);$$

and $f_g(x;)$ is unchanged. The rst term gives the contribution of an unevolved parton to the hard scattering, while the other two contain contributions from quarks and gluons with higher momentum fractions that split q! qg and g! qq, respectively.

We are assuming that the Sudakov form factor used in the analytic expressions and in the SMC are equivalent. In fact, the integration over the quark splitting function in (Q) yields an expression similar to the analytic Sudakov:

$$\begin{bmatrix}
 Z & 1 & z_{n} \\
 z_{m} & dz C_{F} & \frac{1+z^{2}}{1-z} & = \\
 C_{F} & \ln \frac{1-z_{n}}{z_{m}} & 3=2(1-2z_{F}) \\
 / A^{(1)} \ln (Q^{2}=Q_{T}^{2}) + B^{(1)}; \quad (13)$$

where $z_m = \frac{Q_T}{(Q + Q_T)}$ is an infrared cuto, terms of order z_m and higher are neglected, and the z dependence of the running coupling has been ignored

[21]. Note that the coe cients A $^{(1)}$ (C $_{\rm F}$) and B $^{(1)}$ ($3{=}2C_{\rm F}$) are universal to qq annihilation into a color singlet object, just as the showering Sudakov form factor only knows about the partons and not the details of the hard scattering. For gg fusion, only the coe cient A $^{(1)}$ (3) is universal. In general, at higher orders, the analytic Sudakov is sensitive to the exact hard scattering process.

W hile the Sudakov form factors are sim ilar, there is no one{to{one correspondence. First, the Q_T {space Sudakov form factor is expressed directly in terms of the Q_T of the heavy boson, while, in the SM C's, the $nalQ_T$ is built up from a series of branchings. Secondly, the integral on the left of Eq. (13) is positive (provided that $z_m < \frac{1}{2}$), while the analytic expression on the right can become negative. This is disturbing, since it means sub-leading logarithms (proportional to B) are dominating leading ones. In the exact SM C Sudakov, the kinematic constraints guarantee that (Q) < 1. In this sense, the Sudakov in the SM C is a more exact in plementation of the analytic one. N onetheless, the agreem ent apparent between the analytic and parton shower expressions is com pelling enough to proceed assuming the two Sudakov form factors are equivalent.

2.5. H ard Em ission Corrections

The SMC and resummation formalisms are optimized to deal with kinematic congurations that have logarithmic enhancements L. For large Q_T ' Q, there are no such enhancements, and a xed order calculation yields the most accurate predictions. The region of medium Q_T , however, is not suited to either particular expansion, in ${}_{\rm s}^{\rm s} L^{\rm m}$ or ${}_{\rm s}^{\rm s}$.

The problem becomes acute for SMC's. In the standard implementation of SMC's, the highest Q_T is set by the maximum virtuality allowed, $Q = M_W$ in our example, so that the region Q_{T} Q is never accessed. However, at Q_T Q, the xed order calculation is preferred and yields a non{zero result, so there is a discontinuity between the two predictions. This behavior does not occur in the analytic resumm ation calculations, because contributions to the cross section that are not logarithm ically enhanced as Q_T ! 0 are added back order{by{order in s. This procedure corrects for the approxim ations made in deriving the exponentiation of soft gluon em ission. The correction is denoted Y . If the coe cients A and B are calculated to high {enough accuracy, one sees a relatively sm ooth transition between Eq. (3) and the NLO prediction at $Q_T = Q$. In the Q_T (space calculation, this m atching between the two calculations at $Q_T = Q$ is guaranteed

at any order. The function Y has the form

$$Y (Q_{T};Q;x_{1};x_{2}) = \frac{Z_{1}}{x_{1}} \frac{d_{1}}{1} \frac{Z_{1}}{x_{2}} \frac{d_{2}}{2} \frac{X^{4}}{x_{n-1}} \frac{s(Q)}{n}$$

$$f_{a}(_{1};Q) R_{ab}^{(n)} (Q_{T};Q;\frac{X_{1}}{1};\frac{X_{2}}{2}) f_{b}(_{2};Q): (14)$$

For W or Z boson production, the a = q;b = q component of R at rest order in s is

$$R_{qq}^{(1)} = C_{F} \frac{(\hat{t} \quad Q^{2})^{2} + (\hat{u} \quad Q^{2})^{2}}{\hat{t}\hat{u}} \quad (\hat{s} + \hat{t} + \hat{u} \quad Q^{2})$$
$$\frac{1}{Q_{T}^{2}} \hat{P}_{q! q}(z_{B}) \quad (1 \quad \underline{x}) \quad (A \ \hat{s} \ B): \quad (15)$$

The invariants \$; t and t are de ned in terms of $z; Q; Q_T$:

$$f = Q^{2} = 1 \qquad 1 = r_{2} \qquad q \qquad \frac{1 + Q_{T}^{2} = Q^{2}}{q};$$

$$q \qquad q \qquad \frac{1 + Q_{T}^{2} = Q^{2}}{1 + Q_{T}^{2} = Q^{2}};$$
(16)

The term in R proportional to the delta function is simply the squared matrix element for the hard emission, while the term s proportional to Q_T^2 are the asymptotic pieces from $\frac{1}{N}$.

W e would like to include sim ilar corrections into the SMC. However, this is not entirely straightforward. Though it is not obvious from Eq. (14), the (a = g;b = q+ permutations) components are negative for $Q_T < Q$, though the sum Y is positive. Retaining negative weights in an intermediate part of the calculation is not a problem in principle. We can articially force the negative weights to be positive, and then include the correct sign of the weight when lling histogram s, for example. However, this would involve som e m odi cation to the PYTHIA code used in this study.

A pragmatic approach is to ignore the negative weights entirely, and multiply the exact W + parton cross sections by a factor so that their sum reproduces the Q $_{\rm T}$ distribution and normalization of the analytic Y piece. For the Tevatron in Run I, we nd that the multiplicative factor $f_{COR} = \frac{1}{2} (Q_T = 50)^2$ $(1 + Q_T = 25)$ reproduces the correct behavior for Q $_{\rm T}$ < 50 G eV . 50 G eV, the uncorrected W + parton cross For Q_T sections are employed. Since the matching between the \resum m ed" and \ xed order" calculations is now occurring at $Q_T = 50 \text{ GeV}$ instead of $Q_T = M_W$, we further lim it the maximum virtuality of showering to 50 GeV. This is in accord with the fact that the \resummed" part of the analytic calculation becomes negative around $Q_T = 50 \text{ GeV}$. This choice does have som e e ect on the overall norm alization of the parton show ering com ponent.

At this point, it is useful to compare the scheme outlined above to other approaches at improving the show ering algorithm . One scheme is based on phase{ space splitting of a NLO matrix element into a piece with LO kinematics and another with exclusive NLO kinematics [23, 24]. The separation depends on an adjustable parameter that splits the phase space. In the approach of Ref. [23], the separation parameter is tuned so that the contribution with LO kinematics vanishes. The resultant show ering of the term with exclusive NLO kinem atics can generate em issions which are harder than the rst \hard" em ission, which is not consistent. M ore seriously, physical observables are sensitive to the exact choice of the separation parameter (see the discussion in Ref. [22] regarding Q_T^{sep}). Furtherm ore, the separation parameterm ust be retuned for di erent processes and di erent colliders. This scheme is quaranteed to give the NLO cross section before cuts, but does not necessarily generate the correct kinem atics.

The other scheme is to modify the showering to reproduce the hard emission limit [25, 26]. While this can be accomplished, it does so at the expense of transferring events from low Q_T to high Q_T . There is no attempt to predict the absolute event rate, but only to generate the correct event shapes. In some implementations, the high scale of the showering is increased to the maximum virtuality allowed by the collider energy. This is contrary to the analytic calculations, where the scale $Q = M_W$, for example, appears naturally (in the choice of constants $C_1;C_2$ and C_3 which eliminate potentially large logarithm s). This scheme will generate the correct hard limit, but will not generate the correct cross section in the soft limit.

2.6. Num erical results

For our num erical results, we predict the Q_T distribution of W and Z bosons produced at the Tevatron in Run I. The modi ed PDF (mPDF) was calculated using CTEQ 4M PDF's. These distributions are in good agreement with analytic calculations, but the shape and overall norm alization cannot be predicted accurately by the standard showering algorithm. Som e of the alternative show ering algorithm s reproduce the shape, but not the overall norm alization. Secondly, we discuss jet properties for the same processes, which are not signi cantly altered from the predictions of the standard showering algorithm. These cannot be predicted by analytic calculations.

In Fig. 1(a), the transverse momentum of the W boson (solid line) as predicted by the algorithm outlined above is shown in comparison to D data[27] (crosses). The theoretical distribution has been

passed through the CMS detector simulation. As in analytic calculations, the position of the peak in the Q_T distribution from parton showering depends on non{perturbative physics [29]. In PYTHIA, this is implemented through a Gaussian smearing of the transverse momentum of the incoming partons. To generate this plot, we have changed the default Gaussian width from .44 GeV to 2.0 GeV, which is more in accord with other analyses. This is the value used in all subsequent results. Because of the necessity of reconstructing the m issing E $_{\rm T}$ in W boson decays to leptons, the smearing of the Q_T distribution is signi cant, and the agreem ent between the prediction and data is not a rigorous test of the modied showering algorithm. Fig. 1(b) shows the comparison of the CDF D rell{Yan data [28] near the Z^{0} peak to the modi ed show ering prediction. W hile there is a problem with the overall norm alization, the shape agreem ent is very good. We note that there is also a problem with the overall normalization of the analytic resum m ation predictions.²

G iven all the e ort necessary to improve the showering, it is reasonable to ask if the sim ilar results would have been obtained by simply renorm alizing the usual predictions to the NLO rate, i.e. using PYTHIA but applying a constant K { factor at the end. In W boson production, the relative size of the Q $_{\rm T}$ distributions vary by as much as 10% in the important regions of small and medium Q_{T} . Of course, the e ect is much larger for the large Q_T region where there is almost no rate from the standard parton showering. If one is worried about precision measurements or is applying kinematic cuts that bias the large Q_{T} region, then standard parton showering can yield m isleading results. In most cases, how ever, it appears to be perfectly reasonable to renorm alize the parton show ering results to the total NLO cross section. We have also checked if our new show ering algorithm has an impact on jet properties. For W and Z boson production, there are only m inor di erences, which is expected since the W ilson coe cients for W and Z boson production are nearly unity. In general, we do not expect any major changes from using the modied PDF's, since the showering depends on the ratio of the modied PDF's evaluated at two dierent scales, which is not as sensitive to the overall norm alization of the PDF.

 $^{^1\,\}rm Special$ thanks go to Cecilia Gerber, for making the code portable, and to M ichaelSeym our for explaining how to properly use it.

²C saba Balazs, private com m unication.



Figure 1. (a) The prediction of the W boson transverse m om entum distribution in Run I at the Tevatron (solid line) compared to the D data. The prediction includes the e ects of the m odi ed parton distribution functions, the correction to the hard scattering process, and a prim ordial k_T of 2.0 G eV; (b) The prediction of the Z boson transverse m om entum distribution in Run I at the Tevatron (solid line) compared to the CDF data. The prediction includes the e ects of the m odi ed parton distribution functions, the correction to the hard scattering process, and a prim ordial k_T of 2.0 G eV; (b) The prediction of the Z boson transverse m om entum distribution in Run I at the Tevatron (solid line) compared to the CDF data. The prediction includes the e ects of the m odi ed parton distribution functions, the correction to the hard scattering process, and a prim ordial k_T of 2.0 G eV.

2.7. Conclusions

We have presented a modi ed, parton showering algorithm that produces the total cross section and the event shapes beyond the leading order. These modi cations are based on the Q_T (space resummation. The parton showering itself is modi ed by using a new PDF (called mPDF) which encodes some information about the hard scattering process. Simultaneously, the explicit, hard emission is included, but only after subtracting out the contribution already generated by the showering: this correction is called Y. The presence of Y yields a smooth transition from the parton showering to single, hard emission. We modi ed the PYTHIA M onte C arbo to account for these corrections, and presented com parisons with R un IW and Z boson data.

The scheme works well for the cases considered in this study, and the correct cross sections, transverse m om entum distributions, and jet properties are generated. We have compared our kinem atic distributions to the case when the results of the standard showering arem ultiplied by a constant K {factor to reproduce the NLO cross section. We nd variations on the order of 10% for sm all and m edium transverse m om entum.

of the leptons [30] for W and Z production, which are resummed di erently. It is straightforward to include such e ects. In the theoretical discussion and num erical results, we have focussed on initial state radiation, but our results should apply equally well for nalstate radiation. The situation is certainly simpler, since nal state radiation does not require detailed know ledge of the fragm entation functions. A lso, the case when color ows from the initial state to the nal state requires study. A resumm ed calculation already exists for the case of deep inelastic scattering [31], and much theoretical progress has been m ade for heavy quark production [32]. We believe that the modied showering scheme outlined in this study generalizes beyond NLO, just as the analytic calculations can be calculated to any given order. For example, we could include hard W + 2 jet corrections [33] to Y. For consistency, however, higher order term s (A and B) may also need to be included in the Sudakov form factor.

There are several e ects which still need study. We

have not included the exact distributions for the decay

The modied PYTHIA subroutines used in this study and an explanation of how to use them are

available at the following URL:

moose.ucdavis.edu/mrenna/shower.html.

A cknow ledgem ents I thank C {P Yuan and T. Sjostrand for many useful discussions and encouragement in completing this work. This work was supported by United States D epartm ent of Energy and the D avis Institute for H igh Energy Physics.

3. R ecent P rogress in PYTHIA

by T.Sjostrand

3.1. Introduction

A general-purpose generator in high-energy physics should address a number of physics aspects, such as:

the matrix elements for a multitude of hard subprocesses of interest,

the convolution with parton distributions to obtain the hard-scattering kinematics and cross sections,

resonance decays that (m ore or less) form part of the hard subprocess (such as W , Z, t or h),

initial and nal-state QCD and QED showers (or, as an alternative, higher-order matrix elements, including a consistent treatment of virtual-correction term s),

multiple parton {parton interactions,

beam remnants,

hadronization,

decay chains of unstable particles, and

general utility and analysis routines (such as jet nding).

However, even if a M onte C arbo includes all the physics we currently know of, there is no guarantee that not some important aspect of the physics is m issing. Certain assumptions and phenomenological models inside the program are not well tested and will not necessarily hold when extrapolated to di errent energy regimes. For example, the strong-interaction dynamics in QCD remains unsolved and thereby unpredictable in an absolute sense.

The PYTHIA 6.1 program was released in March 1997, as a merger of JETSET 7.4, PYTHIA 5.7 [3] and SPYTHIA [34]. It addresses all of the aspects listed above. The current subversion is PYTHIA 6.136, which contains over 50,000 lines of Fortran 77 code. The code, manuals and sam ple main program smay be found at

http://www.thep.lu.se/ torbjorn/Pythia.html.

The two other programs of a similar scope are HERW IG $[1]^3$ and ISAJET $[2]^4$. For parton-level processes, many more programs have been written.

The availability of several generators provides for useful cross-checks and a healthy competition. Since the physics of a complete hadronic event is very complex and only partially understood from rst principles, one should not prematurely converge on one single approach.

3.2. PYTHIA 6.1 M ain News

Relative to previous versions, the main news in PYTHIA 6.1 includes

a renaming of the old JETSET program elements to begin with PY, therefore now standard throughout,

new SUSY processes and improved SUSY simulation relative to SPYTHIA, and new PDG codes for sparticles,

new processes for Higgs (including doubly-charged in left{right sym m etric m odels), technicolor, :::,

several in proved resonance decays, including an alternative H iggs m ass shape,

som e new er parton distributions, such as CTEQ5 [35],

initial-state showers matched to some matrix elements,

new options for nal-state gluon splitting to a pair of c=b quarks and modi ed modeling of initial-state avor excitation,

an energy-dependent $\mathtt{p}_{\mathtt{m}\ in}$ in $\mathtt{m}\ \mathtt{ultiple}$ interactions,

an improved modeling of the hadronization of small-mass strings, of importance especially for c=b, and

a built-in package for one-dimensional histogram s (based on GBOOK).

Some of these topics will be further studied below . O ther improvements, of less relevance for $\overline{p}p$ colliders, include

improved modeling of gluon emission o c=b quarks in $e^{\scriptscriptstyle +}e$,

color rearrangem ent options for $W^+ W$ events,

a Bose-Einstein algorithm expanded with new options,

a new alternative baryon production scheme [36],

QED radiation o an incoming muon,

a new machinery to handle real and virtual photon uxes, cross sections and parton distributions [37], and

new standard interfaces for the matching to external generators of two, four and six ferm ions (and of two quarks plus two gluons) in e^+e .

³http://hepwww.rl.ac.uk/theory/seymour/herwig/

⁴ftp://penguin.phy.bnl.gov/pub/isajet

The current list of over 200 di erent subprocesses coverstopics such as hard and soft QCD, heavy avors, D IS and , electroweak production of $=Z^0$ and W (singly or in pairs), production of a light or a heavy Standard M odel H iggs, or of various H iggs states in supersymmetric (SUSY) or left{right symmetric m odels, SUSY particle production (sfermions, gauginos, etc.), technicolor, new gauge bosons, compositeness, and leptoquarks.

N eedless to say, m ost users will still nd that their particular area of interest is not as well addressed as could be wished. In som e areas, progress will require new ideas, while lack of time and m anpower is the limiting factor in others.

3.3. M atching To M atrix E lem ents

The matrix-element (M E) and parton-shower (PS)approaches to higher-order QCD corrections both have their advantages and disadvantages. The form er o ers a system atic expansion in orders of s, and a powerful machinery to handle multiparton con gurations on the Born level, but loop calculations are tough and lead to messy cancellations at small resolution scales. Resummed matrix elements may circumvent the latter problem for specic quantities, but then do not provide exclusive accompanying events. Parton showers are based on an improved leading-log (almost next-to-leading-log) approximation, and so cannot be accurate for well separated partons, but they o er a simple, process-independent machinery that gives a smooth blending of event classes (by Sudakov form factors) and a natural m atch to hadronization. It is therefore natural to try to com bine these descriptions, so that ME results are recovered for widely separated partons while the PS sets the subjet structure.

For nal-state showers in Z⁰ ! $q\bar{q}$, corrections to the showering were considered quite a while ago [38], e.g. by letting the shower slightly overpopulate the $q\bar{q}g$ phase space and then using a M onte C arlo veto technique to reduce down to the M E level. This approach easily carries over to showers in other color-singlet resonance decays, although the various relevant M E's have not all been im plemented in PYTHIA so far.

A similar technique is now available for the description of initial-state radiation in the production of a single color-singlet resonance, such as $=Z^{0}=W$ [39]. The basic idea is to map the kinematics between the PS and ME descriptions, and to nd a correction factor that can be applied to hard emissions in the shower so as to bring agreement with the matrix-element expression. Some simple algebra shows that, with the PYTHIA shower kinematics de nitions, the two

 $q\overline{q}^0$! gW em ission rates disagree by a factor

$$R_{q\bar{q}^{0}! gW}(s;t) = \frac{(d^{-}=dt)_{ME}}{(d^{-}=dt)_{PS}} = \frac{t^{2} + d^{2} + 2m_{W}^{2} s}{s^{2} + m_{W}^{4}};$$

which is always between 1=2 and 1. The shower can therefore be improved in two ways, relative to the old description. Firstly, the maximum virtuality of emissions is raised from Q_{max}^2 m_W^2 to $Q_{max}^2 = s$, i.e. the shower is allowed to populate the full phase space. Secondly, the emission rate for the nal (which norm ally also is the hardest) q! qg emission on each side is corrected by the factor R (\$;t) above, so as to bring agreement with the matrix-element rate in the hard-emission region. In the backwards evolution shower algorithm [9], this is the rst branching considered.

The other possible O ($_{\rm s})$ graph is qg ! q^W , where the corresponding correction factor is

$$R_{qg! q^{0}W} (s;t) = \frac{(d^{-}=dt)_{ME}}{(d^{-}=dt)_{PS}} = \frac{s^{2} + t^{2} + 2m_{W}^{2}t}{(s - m_{W}^{2})^{2} + m_{W}^{4}};$$

which lies between 1 and 3. A probable reason for the low er show er rate here is that the show er does not explicitly simulate the s-channel graph qg ! q ! q^0W . The g ! $q\bar{q}$ branching therefore has to be preweighted by a factor of 3 in the show er, but otherwise the method works the same as above. O byiously, the show er will mix the two alternative branchings, and the correction factor for a nal branching is based on the current type.

The reweighting procedure prompts some other changes in the shower. In particular, $\hat{u} < 0$ translates into a constraint on the phase space of allowed branchings.

O ur published comparisons with data on the W p_2 spectrum show quite a good agreement with this improved simulation [39]. A worry was that an unexpectedly large primordial k_2 , around 4 GeV, was required to match the data in the low $-p_2$ w region. However, at that time we had not realized that the data were not fully unsmeared. The required primordial k_2 is therefore likely to drop by about a factor of two [40].

It should be noted that also other approaches to the same problem have been studied recently. The HERW IG one requires separate treatments in the hard- and soft-em ission regions [41]. Another, more advanced PYTHIA-based one [42], also addresses the next-to-leading order corrections to the total W cross section, while the one outlined above is entirely based on the leading-order total cross section. There is also the possibility of an extension to Higgs production [43].

Sum marizing, we now start to believe we can handle initial- and nal-state showers, with next-to-leadingorder accuracy, in cases where these can be separated by the production of color singlet resonances even if it should be realized that much work remains to cover the various possible cases. That still does not address the big class of QCD processes where the initialand nal-state radiation does not factorize. Possibly, correction factors to showers could be found also here. A Itematively, it may become necessary to start showers from given parton con gurations of varying multiplicity and with virtual-correction weights, as obtained from higher-order ME calculations. So far, PYTHIA only implements a way to start from a given four-parton topology in e⁺ e annihilation, picking one of the possible preceding shower histories as a way to set constraints for the subsequent shower evolution [44]. This approach obviously needs to be extended in the future, to allow arbitrary parton con gurations. Even m ore delicate will be the consistent treatm ent of virtual corrections [45], where much work remains.

3.4. Charm And Bottom Hadronization

Signi cant asymmetries are observed between the production of D and D mesons in p collisions, with hadrons that share some of the avor content very much favored at large x_F in the fragmentation region [46]. This behavior was qualitatively predicted by PYTHIA; in fact, the predictions were for some what larger e ects than seen in the data. The new data has allowed us to go back and take a critical look at the uncertainties that riddle the heavy- avor description [47]. M any e ects are involved, and we lim it ourselves here to mentioning only one.

A hadronic event can be subdivided into sets of partons that form separate color singlets. These sets are represented by strings, that e.g. stretch from a quark end via a number of interm ediate gluons to an antiquark end. The string has a mass, which can be calculated from the energy-momentum of its partons. Three di erent mass regions for the strings may be distinguished in the process of hadronization.

- Norm al string fragmentation. This is the ideal situation, when each string has a large invariant mass, and the standard iterative fragmentation scheme [48] works well. In practice, this approach can be used for all strings with a mass above a cut-o of a few GeV.
- 2. Cluster decay. If a string is produced with a sm all invariant m ass, then it is possible that only two-body nal states are kinem atically accessible. The traditional iterative Lund scheme is then not applicable. We call such a low m ass string a cluster, and treat it separately. In recent pro-

gram versions, the modeling has been in proved to give a smooth m atch onto the standard string scheme in the high-cluster-m ass lim it.

3. Cluster collapse. This is the extreme case of the above situation, where the string mass is so sm all that the cluster cannot decay into even two hadrons. It is then assumed to collapse directly into a single hadron, which inherits the avor content of the string endpoints. The original continuum of string/cluster masses is replaced by a discrete set of hadron masses. Energy and momentum then cannot be conserved inside the cluster, but must be exchanged with other objects within the local neighborhood. This description has also been im proved.

Because the mass of the charm and bottom partons are not negligible in the fragmentation process, the improved treatment of low-mass systems will have relatively more impact on charm and bottom hadronization. In general, avor asymmetries are predicted to be smaller for bottom than for charm, and smaller at higher energies (except possibly at very large rapidities). Therefore, we do not expect any spectacular e ects at the Tevatron. However, other nontrivial features of fragmentation may persist at higher energies, like a non-negligible system atic shift between the rapidity of a heavy quark parton and that of the hadron produced from it [47]. The possibility of such e ects should be considered whenever trying to relate heavy avor measurements to parton level calculations.

3.5. M ultiple Interactions

B ecause of the composite nature of hadrons, several parton pairs may interact in a typical hadron {hadron collision [49]. Over the years, evidence for this mechanism has accumulated, such as the recent direct observation by CDF [50]. How ever, the occurrence of two hard interactions in one hadronic collision is just the tip of the iceberg. In the PYTHIA model, most interactions are at low erp?, where they are not visible as separate jets but only contribute to the underlying event structure. As such, they are at the origin of a number of key features, like the broad multiplicity distributions, the signi cant forward {backward multiplicity correlations, and the pedestal e ect under jets.

Since the perturbative jet cross section is divergent for $p_2 \ ! \ 0$, it is necessary to regularize it, e.g. by a cut-o at som e $p_{?\,m\,in}$ scale. That such a regularization should occur is clear from the fact that the incom ing hadrons are color singlets | unlike the colored partons assumed in the divergent perturbative calculations | and that therefore the color charges should screen each other in the p_2 ! 0 lim it. A lso other dam ping mechanisms are possible [51]. Fits to data typically give $p_{2 \text{ m in}} = 2 \text{ GeV}$, which then should be interpreted as the inverse of some color screening length in the hadron.

O ne key question is the energy-dependence of $p_{2 \text{ m in}}$; this m ay be relevant e.g. for comparisons of jet rates at di erent Tevatron energies, and even m ore for any extrapolation to LHC energies. The problem actually is m ore pressing now than at the time of our original study [49], since now adays parton distributions are known to be rising m ore steeply at sm all x than the at xf (x) behavior norm ally assumed for sm all Q² before HERA. This translates into a m ore dram atic energy dependence of the multiple-interactions rate for a xed $P_{2 \text{ m in}}$.

The larger number of partons also should increase the amount of screening, as con med by toy simulations [52]. As a simple rst approximation, $p_{?min}$ is assumed to increase in the same way as the total cross section, i.e. with some power 0.08 [53] that, via reggeon phenom enology, should relate to the behavior of parton distributions at small x and Q². Thus the new default in PYTHIA is

:

$$p_{?min} = (1.9 \text{ GeV}) \frac{\text{s}}{1 \text{ TeV}^2}$$

3.6. Interconnection E ects

The widths of the W, Z and t are all of the order of 2 GeV. A Standard M odel Higgs with a mass above 200 GeV, as well as many supersymmetric and other \Beyond the Standard M odel" particles would also have widths in the multi-GeV range. Not far from threshold, the typical decay times = 1= 0:1 fm had 1 fm. Thus hadronic decay systems overlap, between a resonance and the underlying event, or between pairs of resonances, so that the nal state may not contain independent resonance decays.

So far, studies have mainly been performed in the context of W pair production at LEP2. Pragmatically, one may here distinguish three main eras for such interconnection:

- Perturbative: this is suppressed for gluon energies ! > by propagator/tim escale e ects; thus only soft gluons m ay contribute appreciably.
- 2. Non-perturbative in the hadroform ation process: norm ally model-led by a color rearrangem ent between the partons produced in the two resonance decays and in the subsequent parton showers.
- 3. Non-perturbative in the purely hadronic phase: best exemplied by Bose(Einstein e ects.

The above topics are deeply related to the unsolved problem s of strong interactions: con nement dynamics, $1=N_c^2$ e ects, quantum mechanical interferences, etc. Thus they o er an opportunity to study the

dynam ics of unstable particles, and new ways to probe con nem ent dynam ics in space and time [54, 55], but they also risk to limit or even spoil precision m easurem ents.

It is illustrative to consider the impact of interconnection e ects on the W mass measurements at LEP2. Perturbative e ects are not likely to give any signi cant contribution to the systematic error, h m_W i [<] 5 M eV [55]. Color rearrangement is not understood from rst principles, but many models have been proposed to model e ects [55, 56, 57], and a conservative estimate gives h m_W i [<] 40 M eV. For Bose{E instein again there is a wide spread in models, and an even wider one in results, with about the sam e potential systematic error as above [58, 59, 57]. The total QCD interconnection error is thus below m in absolute terms and 0.1% in relative ones, a sm all num ber that becom es of interest only because we aim for high accuracy.

A study of $e^+e^-!$ tt ! bW $+\bar{b}W^-!$ bb $+\bar{b}V^+$, v^0 $-\bar{v}$, near threshold gave a realistic interconnection uncertainty of the top m ass of around 30 M eV, but also showed that slight m istreatment of the combined color and showering structure could blow up this error by a factor of ten [60]. For hadronic top decays, errors could be m uch larger.

The above numbers, when applied to hadronic physics, are maybe not big enough to cause an im-mediate alarm. The addition of a colored underlying event | with a poorly-understood multiple-interaction structure as outlined above | has not at all been considered so far, how ever, and can only make matters worse in hadronic physics than in e⁺ e . This is clearly a topic for the future, where we should be appropriately hum ble about our current understanding, at least when it com es to perform ing precision measurements.

QCD interconnection may also be at the root of a number of other, more spectacular e ects, such as rapidity gaps and the whole Pomeron concept [61], and the unexpectedly large rate of quarkonium production [62].

3.7. The Future: On To C++

F inally, a word about the future. PYTHIA continues to be developed. On the physics side, there is a need to increase the support given to di erent physics scenarios, new and old, and m any areas of the general QCD m achinery for parton showers, underlying events and hadronization require further im provem ents, as we have seen.

On the technical side, the main challenge is a transition from Fortran to C + +, the language of choice for Run II (and LHC). To address this, the PYTH IA 7 project was started in January 1998, with L.Lonnblad

bearing the main responsibility. A similar project, but more ambitious and better funded, is now starting up for HERW IG, with two dedicated postdoc-level positions and a three year time frame.

For PYTHIA, what exists today is a strategy document [63], and code for the event record, the particle ob ject, som e particle data and other data base handling, and the event generation handler structure. All of this is completely new relative to the Fortran version, and is intended to allow for a much more general and exible formulation of the event generation process. The rst piece of physics, the string fragmentation scheme, is being implemented by M. Bertini, and is nearing completion. The subprocess generation method is being worked on for the simple case of e^+e ! Z^0 ! $q\overline{q}$. The hope is to have a \proof of concept" version soon, and some of the current PYTHIA functionality up and running by the end of 2000. It will, however, take much further e ort after that to provide a program that is both more and better than the current PYTHIA 6 version. It is therefore unclearwhetherPYTHIA 7willbeofmuchuseduring Run II, except as a valuable exercise for the future.

4. A Comparison of the Predictions from M onte Carlo Program s and Transverse M om entum R esum m ation

by C.Balazs, J.Huston, I.Puljak, S.M renna

4.1. Introduction

M onte Carlo program s including parton showering, such as PYTHIA [3], HERW IG [1] and ISA JET [2], are comm only used by experim entalists, both as a way of com paring experim ental data to theoretical predictions, and also as a means of simulating experimental signatures in kinematic regimes for which there is no experimental data (such as that appropriate to the LHC). The naloutput of the M onte C arb program s consists of the 4-vectors of a set of stable particles (e.g., e; ; ;); this output can either be com pared to reconstructed experim entalquantities or, when coupled with a simulation of a detector response, can be directly com pared to raw data taken by the experim ent, and/or passed through the sam e reconstruction procedures as the raw data. In this way, the parton show er program s can be more useful to experim entalists than analytic calculations perform ed at high orders in perturbation theory. Indeed, alm ost all of the physics plots in the ATLAS physics TDR [108] involve com parisons to PYTHIA (version 5.7).

Here, we are concerned with the predictions of parton shower M onte Carlo program s and those from certain analytic calculations which resum logarithm s associated with the transverse momentum of partons

initiating the hard scattering. Most analytic calculations of this kind are either based on or originate from the formalism developed by J.Collins, D. Soper, and G. Sterm an (CSS), which we choose as the analytic \benchmark" of this section. Both the parton showering and analytic calculations describe the e ects of multiple soft gluon emission from the incoming partons, which can have a profound e ect on the kinem atics of gauge or Higgs bosons and their decay products produced in hadronic collisions. This may have an impact on the signatures of physics processes at both the trigger and analysis levels, and thus it is important to understand the reliability of such predictions. The best method for testing the reliability is a direct comparison of the predictions to experimental data. If no experimental data is available, then some understanding of the reliability m ay by gained by sim ply com paring the predictions of di erent calculationalm ethods.

4.2. Parton Showering and Resum m ation

Parton showering is the backwards evolution of an initial hard scattering process, involving only a few partons at a high scale Q_{max}^2 re ecting large virtuality, into a complicated, multi-parton con guration at a much lower scale Q $_{\rm m~in}^2$ typical of hadronic binding energies. In practice, one does not calculate the probability of arriving at a speci c multi-parton con guration all at once. Instead, the full shower is constructed in steps, with evolution down in virtuality Q^2 with no parton em ission, followed by parton em ission, and then a further evolution downward with no emission, etc., until the scale $Q_{m in}^2$ is reached. The essential ingredient for this algorithm is the probability of evolving down in scale with no parton emission or at least no resolvable parton emission. This can be derived from the DGLAP equation for the evolution of parton distribution functions. One nds that the probability of no em ission P equals 1 exp(S), where S is the Sudakov form factor, a function of virtuality and the momentum fraction x carried by a parton.

A key ingredient in the parton showering algorithm is the conservation of energy-m om entum at every step in the cascade. The transverse momentum of the nal system partly depends on the opening angle between the mother and daughter partons in each emission. Furtherm ore, after each emission, the entire multiparton system is boosted to the center-ofm ass frame of the two virtual partons, until at the end of the shower one is left with two primordial partons which are on the mass shell and essentially parallel with the incoming hadrons. These boosts also in uence the nal transverse momentum.

Parton show ering resum s primarily the leading log-

arithm s { those resum m ed by the DGLAP equations { which are universal, i.e. process independent, and depend only on the given initial state. In this lies one of the strengths of the parton shower approach, since it can be incorporated into a wide variety of physicalprocesses. An analytic calculation, in com parison, can resum m any other types of potentially large logarithm s, including process dependent ones. For exam ple, the CSS form alism in principle sum sallof the logarithm s with $Q^2 = p_T^2$ in their arguments, where, for the exam ple of H iggs boson production, Q is the four m om entum of the H iggs boson and p_T is its transverse m om entum . A llof the \dangerous logs" are included in the Sudakov exponent, which can be written in in pact parameter (b) space as:

$$S(Q;b) = \frac{Z_{Q^2}}{1=b^2} \frac{d^{-2}}{-2} A(s(-)) \ln \frac{Q^2}{-2} + B(s(-));$$

with the A and B functions being free of large logarithms and calculable in xed{order perturbation theory:

$$A (_{s}()) = \frac{X^{l}}{n=1} - \frac{A^{(n)}}{n} A^{(n)};$$

$$B (_{s}()) = \frac{X^{l}}{n=1} - \frac{B^{(n)}}{n} B^{(n)};$$
(17)

These functions contain an in nite number of coe cients, with the A (n) being universal to a given initial state, while the B⁽ⁿ⁾ are process dependent. In practice, the num ber of tow ers of logarithm sincluded in the Sudakov exponent depends on the level to which a xed order calculation was performed for a given process. For example, if only a next-to-leading order calculation is available, only the coe cients A $^{(1)}$ and B $^{(1)}$ can be included. If a NNLO calculation is available, then A⁽²⁾ and B⁽²⁾ can be extracted and incorporated into a resumm ation calculation, and so on. This is the case, for example, for Z 0 boson production. So far, only the $A^{(1)}$, $A^{(2)}$ and $B^{(1)}$ coe cients are known for Higgs production, but the calculation of B⁽²⁾ is in progress [109]. If we try to interpret parton showering in the sam e language, then we can say that the parton shower Sudakov exponent always contains a term analogous to A⁽¹⁾. It was shown in Reference [110] that a suitable modi cation of the Altarelli-Parisi splitting function, or equivalently the strong coupling constant s, also e ectively approximates the A $^{\rm (2)}$ coe cient. 5

In contrast with parton showering, analytic resum m ation calculations integrate over the kinem atics of the soft gluon emission, with the result that they are limited in their predictive power. While the parton shower maintains an exact treatment of the branching kinematics, the original CSS formalism imposes no kinematic penalty for the emission of the soft gluons, although an approximate treatment of this can be incorporated into a numerical implementation, like ResBos [111]. Neither parton showering nor analytic resummation reproduces kinematic con gurations where one hard parton is emitted at large p_T . In the parton shower, matrix element corrections can be imposed [39, 41], while, in the analytic resummation represented in the analytic resummation calculation, matching is necessary.

W ith the appropriate input from higher order cross sections, a resummation calculation has the corresponding higher order normalization and scale dependence. The normalization and scale dependence for the M onte C arlo, though, remains that of a leading order calculation { though, remains that of a leading order calculation { though see R ef. [42] and the related contribution to these proceedings for an idea of how to include these at NLO. The parton showering occurs with unit probability after the hard scattering, so it does not change the total cross section.⁶

Given the above discussion, one quantity which should be well-described by both calculations is the shape of the transverse momentum (p_T) distribution of the nal state electroweak boson in a subprocess such as $q\bar{q}$! W X, ZX or gg! H X, where most of the p_T is provided by initial state parton showering. The parton showering supplies the same sort of transverse kick as the soft gluon radiation in a resummation calculation. Indeed, very similar Sudakov form factors appear in both approaches, with the caveats about the A ⁽ⁿ⁾ and B ⁽ⁿ⁾ term s mentioned previously.

At a point in its evolution corresponding to a virtuality on the order of a few G eV, the parton shower is stopped and the e ects of gluon emission at softer scales must be parameterized and inserted by hand. Typically, a Gaussian probability distribution function is used to assign an extra $primordial" k_T$ to the prim ordial partons of the shower (the ones which are put on the mass shell at the end of the backwards showering). In PYTHIA, the default is a constant value of k_T . Sim ilarly, there is a som ew hat arbitrary division between perturbative and non-perturbative regions in a resummation calculation. Sometimes the non-perturbative e ects are also parametrized by G aussian distributions in $b \operatorname{or} Q_T$ space. In general, the value for the non-perturbative hk_T i needed in a M onte Carlo program will depend on the particular kinem at-

 $^{^{5}}$ This is rigorously true only for the high parton x or $^{p-}$ region.

 $^{^{6}}$ Technically, one could add the branching for q ! q+ Higgs in the shower, which would have the capability of increasing som e-what the Higgs cross section; however, the main contribution to the higher order K -factor comes from the virtual corrections and the Higgs B rem sstrahlung' contribution is negligible.

ics being investigated. In the case of the resum m ation calculation the non-perturbative physics is determ ined from ts to xed target data and then autom atically evolved to the kinem atic regim e of interest.

A value for the average non-perturbative $k_{\rm T}$ of greater than 1 GeV does not imply that there is an anom abus intrinsic $k_{\rm T}$ associated with the parton size; rather this amount of $hk_{\rm T}$ i needs to be supplied to provide what is missing in the truncated parton shower. If the shower is cut o at a higher virtuality, more of the \non-perturbative" $k_{\rm T}$ will be needed.

4.3. Z^0 Boson P roduction at the Tevatron

The 4-vector of a Z 0 boson, and thus its transverse m om entum, can be measured with great precision in the e⁺ e decay mode. Resolution e ects are relatively m inor and are easily corrected for. Thus, the Z $^{\rm 0}$ p_T distribution is a great testing ground for both the resum m ation and M onte C arlo form alism s for soft gluon em ission. The corrected $p_{\rm T}\,$ distribution for Z 0 bosons in the low p_T region for the CDF experiment⁷ is shown in Figure 2, com pared to both the resum m ed prediction from ResBos, and to two predictions from PYTHIA (version 6.125). One PYTHIA prediction uses the default $(m s)^8$ value of intrinsic k_T of 0.44 GeV and the second a value of 2.15 GeV per incoming parton.⁹ The latter value was found to give the best agreem ent between PYTHIA and the data.¹⁰ All of the predictions use the CTEQ 4M parton distributions [112]. The shift between the two PYTHIA predictions at low p_T is clearly evident. A sm ight have been expected, the high p_T region (above 10 GeV) is una ected by the value of the non-perturbative $k_{\rm T}$. Note the $k_{\rm T}\,$ in parted to the incom ing partons at their lowest virtuality, Q_0 , is greatly reduced in its e ect on the Z 0 p_T distribution. This dilution arises because the center-of-m ass energy of the \prim ordial" partons is typically much larger than that of the original hard scattering. Therefore, the transverse of the boost applied to the Z^0 boson to transform it to the fram e where the \prim ordial" partons have transverse m om entum k_T is sm all.

As an exercise, one can transform the resummation formula in order to bring it to a form where the nonperturbative function acts as a G aussian type sm earing term. Using the Ladinsky-Yuan parameterization [114] of the non-perturbative function in ResB os leads to an rm s value for the e ective $k_{\rm T}\,$ sm earing param – eter, for Z 0 production at the Tevatron, of 2.5 GeV. This is similar to that needed for PYTHIA and HERWIG to describe the Z 0 production data at the Tevatron.

In Figure 2, the normalization of the resummed prediction has been rescaled upwards by 8.4%. The PYTHIA prediction was rescaled by a factor of 1.3-1.4 (remember that this is only a leading order comparison) for the shape comparison.



Figure 2. The Z 0 $p_{\rm T}$ distribution (at low $p_{\rm T}$) from CDF for Run 1 compared to predictions from ResBos and from PYTHIA. The two PYTHIA predictions use the default (rm s) value for the non-perturbative $k_{\rm T}$ (0.44 GeV) and the value that gives the best agreem ent with the shape of the data (2.15 GeV).

As stated previously, the resummed prediction correctly describes the shape of the Z 0 p_T distribution at low p_T , although there is still a noticeable di erence in shape between the M onte C arlo and the resummed prediction. It is interesting to note that if the process dependent coe cients (B $^{(1)}$ and B $^{(2)}$) were not incorporated into the resummation prediction, the result would be an increase in the height of the peak and a decrease in the rate between 10 and 20 GeV, leading to a better agreement with the PYTHIA prediction [115].

The PYTHIA and ResB os predictions both describe the data well over a wider p_T range than shown in the gure. Note especially the agreem ent of PYTHIA with the data at high p_T , m ade possible by explicit m atrix element corrections (from the subprocesses $q\overline{q}$! Z 0g and gq! Z 0q) to the Z 0 production process.^11

 $^{^7{\}rm W}$ e thank W illis Sakum oto for providing the $\,$ gures for Z 0 production as measured by CDF

⁸For a G aussian distribution, $k_{\pi}^{rm s} = 1:13hk_{T}$ i.

 $^{^9\}text{A}$ previous publication [39] indicated the need for a substantially larger non-perturbative $hk_{\rm T}$ i, of the order of 4 GeV for the case of W production at the Tevatron. The data used in the comparison, how ever, were not corrected for resolution sm earing, a fairly large e ect for the case of W ! e production and decay. ^{10}A sim ilar conclusion has been reached for comparisons of the CDF Z 0 $p_{\rm T}$ data with HERW IG . [113]

¹¹Slightly di erent techniques are used for the matrix element

4.4. D iphoton P roduction

M ost of the comparisons between resummation calculations/M onte C arlos and data have been performed for D rell-Y an production, i.e. $q\bar{q}$ initial states. It is also interesting to exam ine diphoton production at the Tevatron, where a large fraction of the contribution at low diphoton mass is due to gg scattering. The prediction for the di-photon k_T distribution at the Tevatron, from PYTHIA (version 6.122), is shown in Figure 3, using the experimental cuts applied in the CDF analysis [116].



Figure 3. A comparison of the PYTHIA predictions for di-photon production at the Tevatron for the two di erent subprocesses, $q\overline{q}$ and gg. The same cuts are applied to PYTHIA as in the CDF di-photon analysis.

It is interesting to note that about half of the di-photon cross section at the Tevatron is due to the qq subprocess, and that the di-photon p_T distribution is noticeably broader for the gg subprocess than the $q\overline{q}$ subprocess. The gg subprocess predictions in ResBos agree well with those from PYTHIA while the $q\bar{q}$ p_T distribution is noticeably broader in ResBos. The latter behavior is due to the presence of the Y piece (xed-order corrections) in ResBos at moderate p_T , and the matching of the $q\overline{q}$ cross section to the xed g at high $p_{\rm f}$. The corresponding matrix order qq ! element correction is not in PYTHIA. It is interesting to note that the PYTHIA and ResBos predictions for gg! agree in the moderate $p_{\rm r}$ region, even though the ResBos prediction has the Y piece present and is matched to the matrix element piece gg ! q at high p_T , while there is no such matrix element correction for PYTHIA. This shows that the Y piece correction is not important for the gg subprocess, which is the same conclusion that was reached in Ref. [117]. This is probably a result of steep decline in the gg parton-parton with increasing partonic center of mass energy, \$. This fallo tends to suppress the size of the Y piece since the production of the di-photon pair at higher p_T requires larger x_1 , x_2 values. In the default CSS formalism, there is no such kinematic penalty in the resummed piece since the soft gluon radiation com es for \free." (Larger x_1 and x_2 values are not required.)

A comparison of the CDF diphoton data to NLO [118] and resummed (ResBos) QCD predictions has been performed, but the analysis is still in progress, so the results are not presented here. The transverse momentum distribution, in particular, is sensitive to the elects of the soft gluon radiation and better agreement can be observed with the ResB os prediction than with the NLO one. A much more precise comparison with the elects of soft gluon radiation will be possible with the 2 fb 1 or greater data sample that is expected for both CDF and D in Run 2.

4.5. Higgs Boson Production

A comparison of the two versions of PYTHIA and of ResBos is shown in Figure 4 for the case of the production of a Higgs boson with mass 100 GeV at the Tevatron with center-of-mass energy of 2.0 TeV. The same qualitative features are observed at the LHC : the new er version of PYTHIA agrees better with ResBos in describing the low p_T shape, and there is a fallo at high p_T unless the hard scale for show ering is increased. The default (rm s) value of the non-perturbative k_T (0.44 GeV) was used for the PYTHIA predictions. Note that the peak of the resum m ed distribution has moved to p_T 7 GeV (compared to about 3 GeV for Z⁰)

corrections by PYTHIA [39] and by HERWIG [41]. In PYTHIA, the parton shower probability distribution is applied over the whole phase space and the exact matrix element corrections are applied only to the branching closest to the hard scatter. In HERWIG, the corrections are generated separately for the regions of phase space unpopulated by HERWIG (the blead zone') and the populated region. In the dead zone, the radiation is generated according to a distribution using the rst order matrix element calculation, while the algorithm for the already populated region applies matrix element corrections whenever a branching is capable of being the hardest so far'.

production at the Tevatron). This is due primarily to the larger color factors associated with initial state gluons ($C_A = 3$) rather than quarks ($C_F = 4=3$).

The new erversion of PYTHIA agrees wellwith ResBos at low to moderate p_T , but falls below the resummed prediction at high p_{T} . This is easily understood: ResBos switches to the NLO Higgs + jet matrix element at high pr while the default PYTHIA can generate the Higgs pr distribution only by initial state gluon radiation, using as default a maximum scale equal to the Higgs boson mass. High p_T Higgs boson production is another example where a 2 ! 1 Monte Carlo calculation with parton showering can not completely reproduce the exact matrix element calculation without the use of matrix element corrections. The high p_T region is better reproduced if the maximum virtuality Q_{max}^2 is set equal to the collider center-of-m ass energy, s, rather than subprocess \$. This is equivalent to applying the parton shower to all of phase space. However, the consequence is that the low p_T region is now depleted of events, since the parton show ering does not change the total production cross section. The appropriate scale to use in PYTHIA (or any M onte Carlo) depends on the p_T range to be probed. If matrix element information is used to constrain the behavior, the correct high p_T cross section can be obtained while still using the lower scale for showering. The incorporation of matrix element corrections to Higgs production (involving the processes gq ! qH ,qq ! gH , gg ! gH) is the next logical project for the M onte C arlo experts, in order to accurately describe the high p_T region.

The older version of PYTHIA produces too many Higgs events at moderate p_T (in comparison to Res-Bos) at both the Tevatron and the LHC. Two changes have been im plem ented in the new erversion. The rst change is that a cut is placed on the combination of z and Q^2 values in a branching: $\hat{u} = Q^2 = z \quad \hat{s}(1 \quad z) < 0$, where \$ refers to the subsystem of the hard scattering plus the shower partons considered to that point. The association with û is relevant if the branching is interpreted in terms of a 2! 2 hard scattering. This requirement is not fulled when the Q^2 value of the space-like em itting parton is little changed and the z value of the branching is close to unity. This a ects mainly the hardest emission (largest Q^2). The net result of this requirem ent is a substantial reduction in the total amount of gluon radiation [119]. Such branchings are kinem atically allowed, but since m atrix elem ent corrections would assume initial state partons to have $Q^2 = 0$, a non-physical \hat{u} results (and thus no possibility to impose matrix element corrections). The correct behavior is beyond the predictive power of leading log M onte Carlos.



Figure 4. A comparison of predictions for the Higgs p_T distribution at the Tevatron from ResB os and from two recent versions of PYTHIA. The ResB os and PYTHIA predictions have been norm alized to the same a area.

In the second change, the parameter for the minimum gluon energy emitted in space-like showers is modi ed by an extra factor roughly corresponding to the 1= factor for the boost to the hard subprocess frame [119]. The e ect of this change is to increase the amount of gluon radiation. Thus, the two e ects are in opposite directions but with the rst e ect being dominant.

This di erence in the p_T distribution between the two versions of PYTHIA could have an impact on the analysis strategies for Higgs searches at the LHC. For example, for the CMS detector, the higher p_T activity associated with Higgs production in version 5.7 would have allowed for a more precise determ ination of the event vertex from which the Higgs (decaying into two photons) originated. Vertex pointing with the photons is not possible in CMS, and the large num ber of interactions occurring with high intensity running will ean a substantial probability that at least one of the interactions will produce jets at low to moderate E_T . [120] In principle, this problem could a ect the

 p_T distribution for all PYTHIA processes. In practice, the e ect has manifested itself only in gg initial states, due to the enhanced branching probability.

As an exercise, an 80 GeV W and an 80 GeV Higgs were generated at the Tevatron using PYTHIA5.7 [121]. A comparison of the distribution of values of \hat{u} and the virtuality Q for the two processes indicates a greater tendency for the Higgs virtuality to be near the maximum value and for there to be a larger num ber of Higgs events with positive \hat{u} (than W events).

4.6. C om parison with HERWIG

The variation between versions 5.7 and 6.1 of PYTHIA gives an indication of the uncertainties due to the types of choices that can be made in M onte Carlos. The requirem ent that û be negative for all branchings is a choice rather than an absolute requirem ent. Perhaps the better agreem ent of version 6.1 with ResBos is an indication that the adoption of the û restrictions was correct. Of course, there may be other changes to PYTHIA which would also lead to better agreem ent with ResBos for this variable.

Since there are a variety of choices that can be m ade in M onte C arlo im plem entations, it is instructive to compare the predictions for the p_T distribution for H iggs boson production from R esB os and PYTHIA with that from HERWIG (version 5.6, also using the CTEQ 4M parton distribution functions). The HERWIG prediction is shown in Figure 5 along with the PYTHIA and R esB os predictions, all norm alized to the R esB os prediction .¹² In all cases, the CTEQ 4M parton distribution was used. The predictions from HERWIG and PYTHIA 6.1 are very sim ilar, with the HERWIG prediction m atching the R esB os shape som ewhat better at low p_T .

4.7. Non-perturbative k_T

A question still remains as to the appropriate value of non-perturbative $k_{\rm T}$ to input in the M onte C arlos to achieve a better agreement in shape, both at the Tevatron and at the LHC. Figure 6 compares the ResB os and PYTHIA predictions for the Higgs boson $p_{\rm T}$ distribution at the Tevatron. The PYTHIA prediction (now version 6.1 alone) is shown with several values of non-perturbative $k_{\rm T}$. Surprisingly, no di erence is observed between the predictions with the di erent values of $k_{\rm T}$, with the peak in PYTHIA always being som ewhat below that of ResB os. This insensitivity can be understood from the plots at the bottom of the two gures which show the sum of the non-perturbative initial state $k_{\rm T}$ ($k_{\rm T\,1} + k_{\rm T\,2}$) at Q $_0$ and at the hard scatter scale Q. M ost of the $k_{\rm T}$ is radiated away,





Figure 5. A comparison of predictions for the Higgs $p_{\rm T}$ distribution at the LHC from ResBos, two recent versions of PYTHIA and HERWIG. The ResBos, PYTHIA and HERWIG predictions have been norm alized to the same area.

LHC. The large gluon radiation probability from a gluon-gluon initial state (and the greater phase space available at the LHC) lead to a stronger degradation of the non-perturbative $k_{\rm T}$ than was observed with Z 0 production at the Tevatron.

4.8. Conclusions

An understanding of the signature for Higgs boson production at either the Tevatron or LHC depends upon the understanding of the details of soft gluon emission from the initial state partons. This soft gluon emission can be modeled either in a Monte Carlo or in a $k_{\rm T}$ resummation program, with various choices possible in both in plementations. A comparison of the two approaches is useful to understand the strengths and weaknesses of each. The data from the Tevatron that either exists now, or will exist in Run 2, will be extrem ely useful to test both approaches.

A cknow ledgem ents

W e would like to thank C laude C harlot, G ennaro C orcella, W illis Sakum oto, Torbjorn Sjostrand and



Figure 6. (top) A comparison of the PYTHIA predictions for the p_T distribution of a 100 G eV Higgs at the Tevatron using the default (rm s) non-perturbative k_T (0.44 G eV) and a larger value (4 G eV), at the initial scale Q_0 and at the hard scatter scale. A lso shown is the ResB os prediction (bottom) The vector sum of the intrinsic k_T ($k_{T\,1} + k_{T\,2}$) for the two initial scale partons at the initial scale Q_0 and at the hard scattering scale for the two values of intrinsic k_T .

Valeria Tano for useful conversations and for providing som e of the plots.

5. M C FM :a parton-level M onte C arlo at N LO A ccuracy

by John Campbell and R.K. Ellis

5.1. Introduction

In Run II, experiments at the Tevatron will be sensitive to processes occurring at the fem tobarn level. O fparticular interest are processes which involve heavy quarks, leptons and m issing energy, since so m any of the signatures for physics beyond the standard m odel produce events containing these features. We have therefore written the program MCFM [123, 79] which calculates the rates for a number of standard m odel

processes. These processes are included beyond the leading order in the strong coupling constant where possible; in QCD this is the rst order in which the norm alization of the cross sections is determ ined. Because the program produces weighted M onte Carlo events, we can implement experimental cuts allowing realistic estimates of event numbers for an ideal detector conquration. MCFM is expected to give more reliable results than parton shower Monte Carlo programs, especially in phase space regions with well separated jets. On the other hand it gives little information about the phase space regions which are dom inated by multiple parton em ission. In addition, because the nal state contains partons rather than hadrons, a full detector simulation cannot be performed directly using the output of M C F M .

The processes already included in MCFM at NLO are as follows (H₁;H₂ = porp),

$H_1 + H_2 !$	W
$H_1 + H_2 !$	Ζ
H ₁ + H ₂ !	W + 1 jet
H ₁ + H ₂ !	Z + 1 jet
H ₁ + H ₂ !	W + H
H ₁ + H ₂ !	Z + H
$H_1 + H_2 !$	W ⁺ W
H ₁ + H ₂ !	W Z
H ₁ + H ₂ !	ZZ
H ₁ + H ₂ !	W + + g (! bb); m assless b-quarks
H ₁ + H ₂ !	Z + g (! bb); m assless b-quarks
H ₁ + H ₂ !	H ! W ⁺ W ;ZZ ortt
H ₁ + H ₂ !	+ + :

The decays of vector bosons and/or H iggs bosons are included. We have also included the leptonic decays of the —lepton. As described below the implementation of NLO corrections requires the calculation of both the amplitude for real radiation and the virtual corrections to the Born level process. We have extensively used the one loop results of Bern, D ixon, K osower et al. [124], [125] to obtain the virtual corrections to above processes.

A future developm ent path for the program would be to include the following processes at NLO:

$$H_1 + H_2 ! W + 2 jets$$

 $H_1 + H_2 ! Z + 2 jets :$

In addition there are an number of processes which we have included only at leading order. This restriction to leading order is both a matter of expediency and because the theoretical fram ework for including radiative corrections to processes involving massive particles is not yet complete.

$$H_1 + H_2 ! t+ t$$

 $H_1 + H_2 ! t+ t+ 1 j = t$
 $H_1 + H_2 ! t+ b$
 $H_1 + H_2 ! t+ b + 1 j = t$
 $H_1 + H_2 ! t+ t+ H$
 $H_1 + H_2 ! t+ t+ Z$

H;Z and top quark decays are included.

5.2. General structure

In order to evaluate the strong radiative corrections to a given process, we have to consider Feynman diagrams describing real radiation, as well as the diagram s involving virtual corrections to the tree level graphs. The corrections due to real radiation are dealt with using a subtraction algorithm [126] as form ulated by Catani and Seymour [127]. This algorithm is based on the fact that the singular parts of the QCD matrix elements for real emission can be singled out in a process-independent manner. By exploiting this observation, one can construct a set of counter-terms that cancel all non-integrable singularities appearing in real matrix elements. The NLO phase space integration can then be performed numerically in four dimensions.

The counter-terms that were subtracted from the real matrix elements have to be added back and integrated analytically over the phase space of the extra emitted parton in n dimensions, leading to poles in = $(n \quad 4)=2$. A fler combining those poles with the ones coming from the virtual graphs, all divergences cancel, so that one can safely perform the limit ! 0 and carry out the remaining phase space integration numerically.

As an example of this procedure we consider the production of an on-shell W boson decaying to a lepton-antilepton pair.

$$q(p_1) + q(p_2) ! W + (p_3) + e^+ (p_4));$$

 $p_1 + p_2 = p_3 + p_4; (p_3 + p_4)^2 = M_W^2 : (18)$

In this case, the W boson rapidity distribution is calculable analytically in O ($_{\rm S}$) [128, 129]. Fig. 7 shows the result calculated in the MS scheme. The virtual corrections to (18) are of the D rell-Yan type



Figure 7. The rapidity distribution for W $^+$ production in pp collisions at $\overline{s} = 2 \text{TeV}$.

and are well known [128]. They are expressible as an overall factor multiplying the lowest order matrix element squared,

$$V = LO = \frac{{}_{S}C_{F}}{2} - \frac{4}{Q^{2}} - \frac{1}{(1-)} - \frac{2}{2} - \frac{3}{2} - 6 + 2$$
(19)

and must be combined with the real radiation contribution. For example, gluon radiation from the qq initial state yields the subprocess

$$q(p_1) + q(p_2) ! W ((p_3) + e^+ (p_4)) + q(p_5);$$

 $p_1 + p_2 = p_3 + p_4 + p_5:$ (20)

To elim inate the singular part of this subprocess, we generate a counter event with the kinematics of the $2 \, ! \, 2 \, \text{process}$ as follows

$$q(x_a p_1) + q(p_2) ! W ((p_3) + e^+ (p_4));$$

 $x_a p_1 + p_2 = p_3 + p_4$ (21)

where a Lorentz transform ation has been perform ed on all j nal state m om enta

$$p_{j} = p_{j}; j = 3;4$$
 (22)

such that p_j ! p_j for p_5 collinear or soft. Thus the energy of the emitted gluon p_5 is absorbed by p_1 , and the momentum components are absorbed by the transformation of the nal state vectors. The phase space has a convolution structure,

$$d^{(3)}(p_{5};p_{4};p_{3};p_{2};p_{1}) = Z_{1}$$

$$dx d^{(2)}(p_{4};p_{3};p_{2};p_{1}) \quad [dp_{8}(p_{1};p_{2};x)]$$

$$0 \quad (23)$$

where

$$[dp_5 (p_1; p_2; x)] = \frac{d^d p_5}{(2)^{d-1}} + (p_5^2) (x) (1 - x) (x - x_a) (24)$$

This phase space may be used to integrate out the dipole term $D^{15;2}$, which is chosen to reproduce the singularities in the real matrix elements as the gluon (5) becomes soft or collinear to the quark (1),

$$D^{15;2} = \frac{4 {}_{\rm s} C_{\rm F}^{2}}{p_{1} {}_{\rm s} p} \frac{2}{1 {}_{\rm x_{\rm a}}} 1 {}_{\rm x}$$
(25)

Perform ing the integration yields,

$$Z_{1} dx D^{15;2} [dp_{5} (p_{1}; p_{2}; x)] = \frac{s^{C} F}{2} \frac{4}{2p_{1}} \frac{2}{p} \frac{1}{(1-)} \frac{1}{p_{qq}} (x) + (1-x) \frac{1}{2} + \frac{3}{2} \frac{2}{6} + 2(1+x^{2}) \frac{\log(1-x)}{1-x} + (26)$$

with the Altarelli-Parisi function $p_{qq}(x)$ given by

$$p_{qq}(x) = \frac{2}{(1 - x)_{+}} - 1 - x + \frac{3}{2} - (1 - x)$$
 (27)

In order to obtain the complete counter-term, one must add the (identical) contribution from the dipole conguration D^{25;1} that accounts for the gluon becoming collinear with the anti-quark. In a more complicated process, we would sum over a larger number of distinct dipole terms involving partons both in the initial and nal states. In this simple case, we ind the total counter-term contribution to the qq cross-section to be

$${}^{CT} = \frac{{}_{s}C_{F}}{2} \quad \frac{4}{Q^{2}} \quad \frac{1}{(1)}$$

$$\frac{2}{p_{qq}}(x) + (1 \quad x) \quad \frac{2}{2} + \frac{3}{3} \quad \frac{2}{3}$$

$$2p_{qq}(x) \log x + 4(1 + x^{2}) \quad \frac{\log(1 \quad x)}{1 \quad x} +$$

where each of these terms leads to a di erent type of contribution in MCFM. The rst term, proportional to $p_{qq}(x)$, is canceled by mass factorization, up to some additional nite (O (0)) pieces. The term smultiplying the delta-function (1 x) manifestly cancel the poles generated by the virtual graphs, given in equation (19), leaving an additional 2 contribution. The remaining terms, which don't have the structure of the virtual contribution, are collected together and added separately in MCFM.



Figure 8. The ratio of the contributions to the rapidity distribution of W $\,^+\,$ production

In Fig. 8 we have plotted the three contributions to the W rapidity calculated using MCFM. The three contributions are a) the contribution of (realcounterterm) [the lower curve], b) the contribution of leading order + virtual + integrated counter-term [the upper-m ost curve] and c) the total contribution. All three terms have been normalized to the O(s)rapidity distribution shown in Fig. 7. We see that (b), the leading order term , com bined with the virtual correction and the results from the counterterm provides the largest contribution to the cross section. The total contribution is a horizontal line at unity, show ing the agreement between MCFM and the analytically calculated result. Only at the boundaries of the phase space at large y can the contribution of the real em ission m inus the counterterm becom e sizeable.

5.3. Examples of M CFM results

We rst detail the input parameters used in our phenom enological estimates. The electroweak theory is specified by four numbers, M $_{\rm W}$; M $_{\rm Z}$; (M $_{\rm Z}$), and G $_{\rm F}$, the values of which are given in Table 1, together with

Table 1 Input param eters

М д; д	91:187:2:49 G eV
M _w ; _w	80:41;2:06 G eV
m _t ; t	175;1:4 G eV
(M _z)	1/128.89
G _F	1:16639 10 ⁵
sin ² w	0.228534483
V _{ud}	0.97500
Vus	0.22220
V _{cd}	0.22220
V _{cs}	0.97500
Higgsmass (GeV)	BR (H ! bb)
100	0:8119
110	0 : 7697
120	0 : 6778
130	0:5254

other necessary constants. O ther derived parameters are e;g_W and sin² _W which, when de ned as below, are e ective parameters including the leading e ects of top quark loops[130]. We use the the rst of the MRS99 parton distributions[131] which has $_{\rm S}$ (M $_{\rm Z}$) = 0.1175.

$$e^{2} = 4 \quad (M_{Z})$$

$$g_{W}^{2} = 4^{p} \overline{2}G_{F} M_{W}^{2}$$

$$sin^{2}_{W} = \frac{e^{2}}{g_{W}^{2}} \quad (28)$$

Table 2 shows the production cross sections for

Table 2

D iboson cross sections (in pb) at the Tevatron and the LHC $\,$

PS	(W ⁺ W)	(W ⁺ Z)	(WZ)	(ZZ)
2 TeV (pp)	12:2	2:	.02	1:75
14 TeV (pp)	103:6	27:2	17:7	16:7

diboson production calculated using MCFM for pp collisions at P = 2 TeV and for pp collisions at P = 14 TeV. The next-to-leading order corrections vary between approximately 30% and 50% of leading order and are alm ost entirely due to the virtual graphs. The numbers here are slightly di erent than the results in [79], because of the di erent choices made both for the input EW parameters and parton distributions as detailed above.

M uch e ort has been devoted to the study of H iggs production at the Tevatron at P = 2 TeV. These studies indicate that, given enough lum inosity, a light H iggs boson can be discovered at the Tevatron using the associated production channels W H and Z H. In this report we present results of an analysis that incorporates as m any of the backgrounds as possible at next-to-leading order for the W H channel. W hilst we use no detector simulation and do not attempt to include non-physics backgrounds, the results presented here can provide a norm alization for m ore detailed studies. This is of importance since m ore detailed studies are often perform ed using shower M onte C arlo program s which can give m isleading results for well separated jets.

In particular, we will consider the light H iggs case (M $_{\rm H}~<~130~{\rm GeV}$) in the channel pp $!~{\rm bb}~{\rm e}^{\rm t}$. In addition to the usual cuts on rapidity and transverse m om entum ,

we also in pose isolation cuts,

$$R_{bb}; R_{eb}; R_{eb} > 0.7;$$
 (30)

as well as a cut on the scattering angle of the bb system [132] (the H iggs scattering angle) in the C ollins-Soper fram e [133],

$$j\cos_{bb}j < 0.8:$$
 (31)

Note that imposing the cut on \cos_{bb} requires knowledge of the longitudinal component of a neutrino momentum. Our results for the signal, backgrounds and signi cance are shown in Table 3, where we use $_{bb} = 0.45$ and integrate the cross-sections over a bb m ass range appropriate for the Higgs mass under consideration,

$$M_{\rm H} = M_{\rm bb} j < \frac{p_{\rm Z}}{2} M_{\rm H}; M = M_{\rm H};$$
 (32)

From this table, one can see that, even with a fairly restrictive set of cuts, the W g process in particular provides a challenging background. This is further emphasized in Figure 9, where the cross-sections for $M_{\rm H} = 110~{\rm GeV}$ are presented in 5 GeV bins across the entire m _{bb} spectrum. The signal, the two largest backgrounds and the sum of all the backgrounds including top quark production are plotted separately, as well as the totals with and without the H iggs signal. The sharp peak of the H iggs signal becomes only a small shoulder in the total distribution.

М_Н [GeV] Scale 100 110 120 130 H (! 8:8 6:4 42 2:5 W bb) т_н + 100 G eV)=2 g (! bb) (m_w 25:7 22:7 18:5 15:5 W W Z (! bb) + 100 G eV)=2 6**:**7 4:3 2:0 1:0 (m w bW +)t(! bW _{lept}) 100 G eV 3:3 3:7 3:9 3:9 t(! bW +)t(! bW _{hadr}) 100 G eV 0:3 0:4 0:5 0:6 t(! (t(! bW)b) 100 G eV 5:1 5:8 6:0 6:0 W q⁰t(! bW +) 100 G eV 0:3 0:4 0:5 0:6 41:4 37:3 31:4 27:6 TotalB S=₿ _ 0:21 0:17 0:13 0:09 1:37 0:75 S= _ 1:05 0:48 В

Table 3 Signal, backgrounds (in fb) and signi cance for the W -channel at p = 2 TeV



Figure 9. Signal and backgrounds for W H. top' represents the sum of all the backgrounds including a top quark.

5.4. Conclusions

We have introduced the program MCFM, which calculates the rates for a number of standard model processes that are particularly relevant in Run II. These calculations are performed in xed-order perturbation theory, mainly at next-to-leading order in the strong coupling, and as such di er from other approaches such as parton shower M onte C arlos. A s illustrations of the use of MCFM, we have presented total diboson cross-sections and a primitive study (lacking detector e ects and non-physics backgrounds) of W H production as a search for a light Higgs. Such calculations for m ore detailed studies in the future. 6. Experim entalhandles on the backgrounds to new physics searches

by Regina Dem ina

6.1. Introduction

Signi cant work has been done in the course of the SUSY/Higgs [64] and Strong Dynamics [65] W orkshops to understand the Tevatron discovery potential for new physics. Several prom ising signatures have been identied and the discovery reach has been estimated. In these studies, it was assumed that the system atic error on the signal and background norm alization is sim ilar in size to the statistical error, which is about 10%. Thus, the system atic error of each individualbackground processmust be kept under 5% . Though it is probably a reasonable assumption, this will not happen autom atically and dedicated studies are needed to achieve this goal. In this paper, we review the most im portant backgrounds to new physics and ways to estimate them in signal-depleted control. sam ples.

6.2. New physics signatures

A spociated vector boson and heavy avor jets production is probably the most promising signature for new physics searches at the Tevatron. Standard M odel (SM) Higgs boson [66], Supersymmetry [67], technicolor and topcolor [68] and even extra-dimension [69] signatures may appear in these channels.

Tables 4 and 5, show examples of new physics processes that can produce W + 2 jet and W + 3 or more jet signatures. From the experimental point of view, a W " is usually a high p_T lepton accompanied by a signi cant missing energy (e.g. CDF Run I cuts are P_T (e;) > 20 GeV/c, E_T > 20 GeV [70]). In that sense, the supersymmetric partner of W { e_1^+ { looks like a W, except its transversem ass will be inconsistent

#	P rocess	M odel	Special features
1	WH;H!bb	SM Higgs	Resonance in M _{bb}
2	_T ! W ⁰ _T ; ⁰ ! bb	Technicolor	Resonance in M $_{\rm W\ bb}$ and M $_{\rm bb}$
3	⁰ _T !W _T ; _T !do	Technicolor	Resonance in M $_{\rm W\ cb}$ and M $_{\rm cb}$
4	$e_1^+ e_2^0; e_1^+ ! ` e_1^0; e_2^0 ! bbe_1^0$	SUSY	M $_{\rm T}$ ('F($_{\rm T}$) inconsistent with W
5	tt;t! bW;t! $e_1^0;e_1$ ce $_1^0$	SUSY	M $_{\rm T}$ ('H $_{\rm T}$) inconsistent with W

Table 4

Potential new physics signatures in the W + 2 jet channel. From the experim ental point of view, a \W " is a high p_T lepton accompanied by signi cant m issing energy (e.g., CDF cuts are p_T (e;) > 20 GeV/c, E_T > 20 GeV). In that sense, e_1^+ books like a \W ."

#	P rocess	M odel	Special features
1	tt;t! bW;t! te1;t! be1	SU SY	M $_{\rm T}$ ('F $_{\rm T}$) inconsistent with W
2	ft;t! be ₁ ⁺	SU SY	M $_{\rm T}$ ('F $_{\rm T}$) inconsistent with W
3	€;t! b`~	SUSY	M $_{\rm T}$ ('F $_{\rm T}$) inconsistent with W
4	gg;g!tĨ	SU SY	M $_{\rm T}$ ('E $_{\rm T}$) inconsistent with W
5	Z ⁰ (V ₈ ; _t)! tt	Topcolor	Resonance in M _{tt}

Table 5

Potential new physics signatures in the W + 3 or m ore jet channel.

with the W hypothesis, but this will become obvious only when signi cant statistics is accumulated. Some m odels predict special features, like resonance behavior in the bb invariant m ass, while others do not.

6.3. Backgrounds to new physics

The W (Z)bb signature was studied in the course of the SUSY/Higgs W orkshop for the Higgs discovery potential estimate [66]. The \mathbb{F}_T + heavy avor (c=b) signature was studied in the CDF stop/sbottom search [71]. We use these analyses as examples in our discussion.



Figure 10. Selection cuts and composition of the W bb sample.

W (Z)bb signature

Selection and sam ple com position

The W bb (Z (!)bb) selection criteria and the resultant sample composition are summarized in Fig.10 (Fig.11). The dom inant contribution to both samples is QCD production of a vector boson accompanied by two b-jets.

#	P rocess	M odel	Special features
1	ZH;H!bb	SM Higgs	Resonance in M _{bb}
2	$_{\rm T}^+$! Z $_{\rm T}^+$; $_{\rm T}^+$! do	Technicolor	Resonance in M $_{\rm Z\ cb}$ and M $_{\rm cb}$
3	$e_1^+ e_2^0; e_1^+ ! cse_1^0; e_2^0 ! * e_1^0$	SU SY	M \cdots inconsistent with Z , extra E($_{\rm T}$
4	$\mathbf{b}\mathbf{\hat{b}}; \mathbf{\check{b}} ! \mathbf{b}\mathbf{e}_1^0; \mathbf{\hat{b}} ! \mathbf{b}\mathbf{e}_2^0; \mathbf{e}_2^0 ! \mathbf{\dot{e}}_1^0$	SU SY	extra ₽́_T

Table 6

Potential new physics signatures in the Z + 2 jet channel. From the experimental point of view, a Z is two high p_T leptons, usually with a Z mass window cut. In that sense, e_2^0 looks like a Z only in some regions of SUSY parameter space.

#	P rocess	M odel	Special features
1	ft;t! ce ₁	SU SY	2 charm jets and $\mathbb{F}_{\mathbb{T}}$
1	$\ddot{\mathbf{b}}; \breve{\mathbf{b}} ! \mathbf{b} \mathbf{e}_1^0$	SUSY	2 bottom jets and $E_{\rm T}$
3	LQ ₂ LQ ₂ ;LQ ₂ ! c	Leptoquarks	2 charm jets and E_{T}
3	LQ ₃ LQ ₃ ;LQ ₃ ! b	Leptoquarks	2 bottom jets and $\mathbb{Z}_{\mathbb{T}}$

Table 7

Potential new physics signatures in the $\mathbb{F}_T + 2$ jet channel. This does not include processes complementary to those in Table 6, where a Z decays to a pair of neutrinos Z ! , thus producing m issing energy.



Figure 11. Selection cuts and composition of the ${\rm E}\!\!\!/_{\rm T}$ bb sample.

QCD W (Z)bbproduction.Experim ental studies of gluon splitting to heavy avor.

D iagram s of QCD associated production of W (Z) and heavy avor jets are presented in Figure 12. The leading contribution is W (Z)+ gluon production with subsequent gluon splitting to a bb or ∞ pair, shown in Figure 12 (a).

Though a next-to-leading-order calculation of the QCD W bb production exists [72], even the authors them selves recommend that it should be tested experimentally. This is a particularly hard task in the

presence of a potential signal contribution. In the case of the H iggs search, an invariant mass of two b-jets could be used as an additional handle, since gluon splitting contributes mainly to the low part of the M _{bb} spectrum, while the H iggs is a resonance at 110-130 G eV $/c^2$. This is not the case for som e other potential signal process, e.g. process 5 in Table 4.

The probability for a gluon to split to two heavy avor jets can be studied experimentally in di erent sam ples. The signal contamination becomes negligible, if the presence of a vector boson is not required.

Three heavy avor production mechanisms can be isolated { direct production, nal state gluon splitting and initial state gluon splitting, also called avor excitation. D iagrams of these processes are presented in Figure 13.

Though direct production is the lowest order process, it is responsible for the production of only 20% of heavy avor jets with energy above 20 GeV; about 35% are produced by avor excitation and 45% by gluon splitting. The relative contribution of di erent processes changes after b-tagging is applied. Tagging is usually more e cient on directly produced jets, which tend to be back-to-back in the azim uthalplane. Heavy avor quarks produced from gluon splitting are not well separated, and are often assigned to the same jet. Thus the relative contribution of gluon splitting to the double-tagged jet sam ple is quite low. F lavor excitation involves an initial state gluon splitting to







Figure 13. Diagram s of QCD heavy avor production.

two heavy avor quarks, one of which undergoes hard scattering. The other quark, being a part of the proton remnant, is often outside the detector acceptance. Thus, the contribution of avor excitation to the double-tagged sample is signi cantly depleted. An analysis of the angular correlation between two heavy avor tagged jets can be used to isolate the gluon-splitting component in heavy avor production, as depicted in Fig. 14.

Dierent methods can be used to tag heavy avor jets.

- 1. Im pact parameter or secondary vertex tagging (JETPROB or SECVTX in CDF jargon) [70] are the ones most commonly used. These samples have relatively high statistics. Using the same tagging method for the background and the signal sample elim inates the system atic uncertainty. The main disadvantage of these methods is the relatively low purity of these samples { contam ination from c-jets and m istags is non-negligible. Usually, to get a stable t, the b=c ratio has to be xed to the one predicted by M onte Carlo, which is not without its own uncertainty.
- 2.0 ne of the heavy avor jets is tagged by the

presence of a high $p_T > 8 \text{ GeV/c}$ lepton { electron or muon { and JETPROB or SECVTX tags another jet [73]. These samples have high statistics as well, but again su er from charm and m istag contam ination. Nonetheless, it is an interesting independent study.

- 3. Both heavy avor jets can be tagged by leptons. In this case it is possible to go low er in lepton mom entum, usually $p_T > 3 \text{ GeV}/\text{c}$ [74]. Com pared to the rst two cases, these studies probe a low er energy region, where the direct production m ednanism dom inates. Thus not much information about gluon splitting probability can be gained.
- 4. Study # 2 can be modi ed to increase the purity by reconstructing exclusive or sem i-exclusive nal states in one of the jets:
 - (a) Reconstructing a decay chain D ! D^{0} ; D^{0} ! Ke() can isolate the charm contribution [75]. The presence of a high p_{T} lepton guarantees that the contribution from b ! c decay is at the order of 10% or lower. Studying the angular correlation between D jet and an in pact parameter tagged jet isolates the gluon splitting to



Figure 14. Distribution between two b-quarks from M onte C arlo events.

charm contribution. This probability can then be applied to study # 2 to extract the probability of gluon splitting to b-quarks.

(b) A similar trick can be used to isolate the b-contribution in the lepton sample. Prom ising decay chains are [76]: B ! `D, D ! D⁰, D⁰ ! K orK3; B ! `D⁺, D⁺ ! K ; B ! `D⁰, D⁰ ! K ; and B ! J= K.

In Table 8, we present the number of events in each of the discussed samples collected in Run I and expected in Run II and associated statistical uncertainty on the gluon splitting probability.

Run I numbers are based on CDF results. In Run II, both CDF and D will have similar tracking and vertexing capabilities, thus these numbers are applicable to both detectors. Statistics in Run II is increased by a factor of 40, where 20 is gained from the lum inosity increase and 2 from increased acceptance of the silicon microvertex detectors. The tagging e ciency increase is not taken into account. With these dedicated studies, the statistical uncertainty on the probability of gluon splitting to heavy avor quarks can be signi cantly reduced in Run II, and will become adequate to the needs of new physics searches.

Top, single top and diboson production

O ther backgrounds to new physics searches are top pair [77], single top [78] and diboson [79] production. The theoretical predictions for these backgrounds are more reliable, because they do not involve gluon radiation and splitting, yet they still have to be tested experimentally. This is more or less a straightforward task for top pair and diboson production, where nal states can be exclusively identified. It is less so for single top production, where the nal state is exactly the same { W bb { as in new physics channels in Table 4. A dditional mass constraints, e.g. on the W bm ass can be used to isolate this process, but it is not at all obvious that adequate uncertainty can be reached for this channel.

M issing energy and heavy avor signatures

Here, we sum marize the selection criteria and com – position of the missing energy and heavy avor sam ple used for top squark searches [71]:



Figure 15. Selection cuts and composition of ${\rm E\!\!\!/}_T\,c$ sample.

M ore than 50% of the background is composed of W (!) + 1 jet events.

W + c production

The leading order production process for W (!)+ 1 jet, where this jet is identi ed as charm, is sg ! W c. The main uncertainty of the production rate for this process comes from the PDF of sea s quarks $f_s(x)$, which is measured by NuTeV [80] in the neutrino scattering process s ! c.

Figure 16 (a) shows the distribution in x of sea s-quarks that contribute to sg ! W c production at the Tevatron after the selection cuts from Figure 15

#	Sample	N(Run I)	(g! QQ)Run I	N (Run II)	(g! QQ)Run II
1	D ouble tagged jets	700	20%	28000	3.2%
2	Muon+JETPROB tag	2620	16%	104800	2.5%
3	c! D ! D ⁰ (! K `)	18000	15%	720000	2.4%
4	B ! D ` ! D ⁰ (! K =K3)`	1700	na.	68000	na.
5	B!D ⁺ (!K)`	1900	na.	76000	n.a.
6	B!D ⁰ (!K)	2700	# 4-# 7	108000	# 4-# 7
7	B ! J= K ^()	1300	23%	52000	3.6%

Table 8

D at a sam ples for heavy avor production study. Numbers in sam ples # 1 and # 2 are double tags, while in sam ples # 3 - # 7 numbers of exclusively reconstructed events are shown, without requiring a tag on the opposite side.



Figure 16. (a) Distribution in x of sea s-quarks that contribute to sg ! W c production at the Tevatron, generated with PYTHIA 6.1+CTEQ4LO. Selection cuts have been applied. (b) Solid lines represent $f_s(x)$ and its uncertainty, as measured by NuTeV. It is compared to GRV94LO (dashed line) and CTEQ4LO (dot-dashed line) strange sea distributions.

have been applied. Figure 16 (b) shows the $f_{\rm s}\left(x\right)$ and its uncertainty measured by NuTeV. As we see, the region of NuTeV sensitivity is relevant for Tevatron studies. The overall uncertainty on $f_{\rm s}\left(x\right)$ is 13.5%. $f_{\rm s}\left(x\right)$ measured by NuTeV is in a good agreement with the results of CCFR [81], which has an uncertainty of 10.5%.

Since these uncertainties are dominated by the experimental statistics, we can hope that the combined result will have an uncertainty near 8.5%. The strange sea parton density function was also measured by the

CHARM II [82] and CDHS [83] experiments. Combination of results of all four experiments is certainly desirable, but non{trivial, since som ewhat dierent techniques where used in each analysis.

In Figure 16(b), $f_s(x)$ measured by NuTeV is compared to the one provided by the GRV 94LO [84] and CTEQ4LO [85] PDF's, which are shown by dashed and dot-dashed lines, respectively. None of the PDF's provide an adequate description of the strange sea data. In the Tevatron search experiments, the systematic uncertainty on the background due to PDF's was typically estimated by switching from one PDF to another. In this case, the system atic uncertainty on the number of W c events that pass our cuts is 36% . If instead of CTEQ 4LO , $f_{\rm s}\left(x\right)$ m easured by NuTeV were used, the number of expected W c events would go down by 30%. This is within the estim ated uncertainty, but clearly the uncertainty has been overestimated. The correct uncertainty to use is 13.5%, or 8.5%, when the results of NuTeV and CCFR will be combined. This is a signi cant reduction compared to 36%, yet it is still not down to the desirable level of 5%. We can probably do better by studying W c production when the W is identied by its decay to a muon or an electron. The expected number of events in the W c;W ! ' ('= e;) channel is about 2800, after applying the cuts listed in Figure 15, which corresponds to the statistical uncertainty for this background of about 2%. The system atic uncertainty on m issing energy and charm identi cation are common to the two channels, and the di erence is in lepton vs. tau identi cation uncertainty, which can be expected to be below 5% with Run II statistics.

QCD background

The next dom inant background in the \mathbb{F}_T c channel is QCD multipet production, where m issing energy comes from jet energy m is measurement. This background is the toughest one to estimate, because it involves

multiple gluon radiation and splitting. Not only the overall rate, but also the angular correlation between jets may not be predicted reliably. To isolate this component, the usual trick is to apply all the signal selection cuts except tagging, subtract other known backgrounds and call the rest \QCD." The tagging probability derived from an independent jet sample is then applied to estimate the QCD contribution to the tagged sample [86]. One obvious drawback is that the heavy avor fraction can change after the cuts are applied. A nother is that the signal contribution is not always negligible even before tagging, and to som e extent, it may be norm alized away.

O ther backgrounds in the \mathbb{Z}_T c channel.

O ther backgrounds in the $E_T c$ channel are top pair production, dibosons, Z + jets and W + jets, where leptons were not identi ed. The discussion of these processes in Section 6.3 applies to the $E_T c$ channel as well.

7. Variable avor number schemes for heavy quark electroproduction

by J.Sm ith

Heavy quark production has been a major topic of investigation at hadron-hadron, electron-proton and electron-positron colliders. Here a review is given of some topics which are of interest primarily for electron-proton colliders. We concentrate on this reaction because a theoretical treatment can be based on the operator product expansion, and also because data are available for deep-inelastic charm production at HERA. How all this relates to Ferm ilab experiments will be discussed at the end.

In QCD perturbation theory, one needs to introduce a renorm alization scale and a mass factorization scale to perform calculations. We choose both equal to 2 , which will be a function of Q^2 and the square of the mass of the charm quark m². At small ², where kinem atic e ects due to quark m asses are im portant, the best way to describe charm quark production is via heavy quark pair production from light quark u;d;s and gluon initial states. The mass m only appears in the heavy quark coe cient functions (or partonic cross sections) like H $_{i;g}^{s;(2)}$ (z;Q²;m²; ²), etc., [87]. Here the superscripts refer to their avor decom position and the order in perturbation theory, while the subscripts refer to the projection i = 2;L and the partonic initial state. The arguments refer to the partonic B jorken variable $z = Q^2 = (s + Q^2)$ and to the fact that these functions depend upon invariants and scales. The renorm alization necessary to calculate these NLO expressions follows the CW Z m ethod [88]. The sym bol

28

H refers to those coe cient functions which are derived from Feynm an diagram s where the virtual photon couples to a heavy quark line. Analytic expressions for these functions are not known, but numerical ts are available in [89]. A symptotic expressions in the lim it $Q^2 m^2$ are available in [90]. These contain terms like $\ln^2 (Q^2 = m^2)$ and $\ln (Q^2 = m^2) \ln (Q^2 = 2)$ multiplied by functions of z; they are manifestly singular in the lim it that m ! 0.

There are other heavy quark coe cient functions such as $L_{i,rg}^{NS;(2)}(z;Q^2;m^2)$, which arise from tree diagram s where the virtual photon attaches to the an initial state light quark line, so the heavy-quark is pair produced via virtual gluons. A nalytic expressions for these functions are known for all z, Q^2 and m^2 , which, in the lim it Q 2 m^2 contain powers of $\ln (Q^2 = m^2)$ multiplied by functions of z. The three-avor light mass MS parton densities can be de ned in terms of matrix elements of operators and are now available in parton density sets. This is a xed order perturbation theory (FOPT) description of heavy quark production with three-avor parton densities. Due to the work in [87], the perturbation series is now known up to second order. In regions of moderate scales and invariants, this NLO description is well de ned and can be combined with a fragmentation function to predict exclusive distributions [91] for the outgoing charm meson, the anti-charm meson and the additional parton. This NLO massive charm approach agrees well with the recent D-m eson inclusive data in [92] and [93]. The charm quark structure functions in this NLO description will be denoted $F_{i;c}^{EXACT}$ (x;Q²;m²;n_f = 3).

A di erent description, which should be more appropriate for large scales where term s in m² are negligible, is to represent charm production by a parton density $f_c(x; 2)$, with a boundary condition that the density vanishes at sm all values of ². A lthough at rst sight these approaches appear to be completely dierent, they are in fact intimately related. It was shown in [94] that the large term s in $\ln (Q^2 = m^2)$ which arise when Q² m^2 , can be resummed to all orders in perturbation theory. In this reference, all the two-loop corrections to the matrix elements of massive quark and massless gluon operators in the operator product expansion were calculated. These contain the same type of logarithms mentioned above multiplied by functions of z (which is the last Feynman integration parameter). A fler operator renormalization and suitable reorganization of convolutions of the operator m atrix elements (OME's) and the coe cient functions, the expressions for the infrared-safe charm quark structure functions $F_{i;c}$ (x;Q²;m²;) take on a simple form . A fter resumm ation, they are convolutions

of light-m ass, four- avor parton coe cient functions, commonly denoted by expressions like $C_{i,rg}^{S;(2)}$ (Q $^{2}=^{2}$) (available in [95], [96]), with four-avor light-parton densities, which also include a charm quark density $f_{c}(x; ^{2})$. Since the corrections to the OME's contain terms in $\ln(Q^2 = m^2)$ and $\ln(m^2 = 2)$ as well as non-logarithm ic terms, it is simplest to work in the \overline{MS} scheme with the scale ² = m² for Q² m² and $^{2} = m^{2} + Q^{2} (1 m^{2} = Q^{2})^{2} = 2$ for $Q^{2} > m^{2}$ and discontinuous matching conditions on the avor densities at $2 = m^2$. Then all the logarithm ic term s vanish at $Q^2 = {}^2 = m^2$ and the non-logarithm ic terms in the OME's are absorbed into the boundary conditions on the charm density, the new four-avor gluon density and the new light-avor u,d,s densities. The latter are convolutions of the previous three-avor densities with the OME's given in the Appendix of [94].

The above considerations lead to a precise description through order $\frac{2}{s}$ of how, in the limit m ! 0, to re-express the $F_{i;c}^{EXACT}$ (x;Q²;m²) written in term s of convolutions of heavy quark coe cient functions with three-avor light parton densities into a description in terms of four-avor light-mass parton coe cient functions convoluted with four-avor parton densities. This procedure leads to the so-called zero-mass variable-avor-number scheme (ZM-VFNS) for $F_{i:c}(x;Q^2;)$ where the m dependent logarithms are absorbed into the new four-avor densities. To im plem ent this scheme, one has to be careful to use inclusive quantities which are collinearly nite in the limit m ! 0 and is an appropriate parameter which enables us to do this. In the expression for $F_{i:c}$ there is a cancellation of terms in $\ln^3 (Q^2 = m^2)$ between the two-loop corrections to the light quark vertex function (the Sudakov form factor) and the convolution of the densities with the soft part of the $L_{2;q}$ -coe cient function. This is the reason for the split of Lig into soft and hard parts, via the introduction of a constant . Details and analytic results for $L_{i;c}^{SOFT}$ and $L_{i;c}^{HARD}$ are available in [97]. All this analysis yielded and used the two-loop matching conditions on variable-avor parton densities across avor thresholds, which are special scales where one makes transitions from say a three-avor massless parton scheme to a four-avormassless parton scheme. The threshold is a choice of which has nothing to do with the actual kinem atical heavy avor pair production threshold at Q^2 (x¹ 1) = 4m². In [94],[98] it was shown that the $F_{i,c}^{EXACT}$ (x;Q²;m²;n_f = 3) tend num erically to the known asymptotic results in $F_{i;c}^{ASYMP}$ (x;Q²;m²;n_f = 3), when Q² m², which also equal the ZM -VFNS results. The last description is good for large (asymptotic) scales and contains a charm density $f_c(x; ^2)$ which satis es a speci c boundary condition at $^2 = m^2$. We denote the charm quark structure functions in this description by $F_{ic}^{PDF}(x;Q^2;n_f = 4)$.

For moderate values of Q^2 , a third approach has been introduced to describe the charm components of $F_i(x;Q^2)$. This is called a variable avor number scheme (VFNS). A rst discussion was given in [99], where a VFNS prescription called ACOT was given in lowest order only. A proof of factorization to all orders was recently given in [100] for the total structure functions $F_i(x;Q^2)$, but the NLO expressions for $F_{i:c}(x;Q^2;m^2)$ in this scheme were not provided. An NLO version of a VFNS scheme has been introduced in [97] and will be called the CSN scheme. A dierent approach, also generalized to all orders, was given in [94], [98], which is called the BM SN scheme. Finally another version of a VFNS was presented in [101], which is called the TR scheme. The di erences between the various schemes can be attributed to two ingredients entering the construction of a VFNS. The rst one is the mass factorization procedure carried out before the large logarithms can be resummed. The second one is the matching condition imposed on the charm quark density, which has to vanish in the threshold region of the production process. AllVFNS approaches require two sets of parton densities. One set contains three-avor num ber densities whereas the second set contains four-avor num ber densities. The sets have to satisfy the \overline{MS} m atching relations derived in [94]. Appropriate four-avor densities have been constructed in [97] starting from the three-avor LO and NLO sets of parton densities recently published in [102].

Since the formulae for the heavy quark structure functions are available in [97], we only mention a few points here. The BM SN scheme avoids the introduction of any new coe cient functions other than those above. Since the asymptotic limits for $Q^2 m^2$ of all the operator matrix elements and coe cient functions are known, we de ne (here Q refers to the heavy charm quark)

$$F_{i;Q}^{BM SN} (x;Q^{2};m^{2}; n_{f} = 4) = F_{i;Q}^{EXACT} (x;Q^{2};m^{2}; n_{f} = 3)$$

$$F_{i;Q}^{ASYMP} (x;Q^{2};m^{2}; n_{f} = 3) + F_{i;Q}^{PDF} (x;Q^{2};m^{2}; n_{f} = 4): (33)$$

The scheme for $F_{i,Q}^{CSN}$ introduces a new heavy quark OME $A_{QQ}^{NS;(1)}(z; {}^2=m^2)$ [103] and coe cient functions H $_{i,Q}^{NS;(1)}(z; Q^2=m^2)$ [104] because it requires an incom - ing heavy quark Q, which did not appear in the NLO



Figure 17. The charm quark structure functions $F_{2;c}^{EXACT}$ ($n_f = 3$) (solid line) $F_{2;c}^{CSN}$ ($n_f = 4$), (dotdashed line) $F_{2;c}^{BMSN}$ ($n_f = 4$), (dashed line) and $F_{2;c}^{PDF}$ ($n_f = 4$), (dotted line) in NNLO for x = 0.005 plotted as functions of Q².

corrections in [87]. The CSN coe cient functions are de ned via the following equations. Up to second order we have

$$C_{i;q;Q}^{C\,S\,N;S\,S\,F\,T;N\,S;(2)} ; \frac{Q^{2}}{m^{2}}; \frac{Q^{2}}{2} = A_{qq;Q}^{N\,S;(2)} \frac{2}{m^{2}} C_{i;q}^{N\,S;(0)}$$

$$_{0;Q} \ln \frac{2}{m^{2}} C_{i;q}^{N\,S;(1)} \frac{Q^{2}}{2} C_{i;q}^{V\,IR\,T;N\,S;(2)} (\frac{Q^{2}}{m^{2}})$$

$$L_{i;q}^{SO\,F\,T;N\,S;(2)} ; \frac{Q^{2}}{m^{2}}; \frac{Q^{2}}{2} ; (34)$$

with the virtual term the second order Sudakov form factor. The other C SN coe cient functions are de ned by equations like (we only give one of the longitudinal term s for illustration)

$$C_{L;g}^{C SN;S;(1)} \frac{Q^{2}}{m^{2}}; \frac{Q^{2}}{2} = H_{L;g}^{S;(1)} \frac{Q^{2}}{m^{2}} A_{Qg}^{S;(1)} (\frac{2}{m^{2}}) C_{L;Q}^{C SN;NS;(0)} \frac{Q^{2}}{m^{2}};$$
(35)

with $C_{L,Q}^{C SN;NS;(0)} = 4m^2 = Q^2$. The CSN and BMSN schemes are designed to have the following two properties. First of all, suppressing unimportant labels,

$$F_{iQ}^{CSN}(n_{f} = 4) = F_{iQ}^{BMSN}(n_{f} = 4)$$

= $F_{iQ}^{EXACT}(n_{f} = 3)$ for Q^{2} m²: (36)

Since $f_Q \pmod{2}^{N N LO} \notin 0$ (see [94]) this condition can be only satis ed when we truncate the perturbation series



Figure 18. The charm quark structure functions $F_{L,c}^{EXACT}$ ($n_f = 3$) (solid line) $F_{L,c}^{CSN}$ ($n_f = 4$), (dot-dashed line) $F_{L,c}^{BMSN}$ ($n_f = 4$), (dashed line) and $F_{L,c}^{PDF}$ ($n_f = 4$), (dotted line) in NNLO for x = 0.005 plotted as functions of Q².

at the sam e order. The second requirem ent is that

$$\lim_{Q^2} F_{iQ}^{BM SN}(n_f = 4) = \lim_{Q^2} F_{iQ}^{CSN}(n_f = 4)$$
$$= \lim_{Q^2} F_{iQ}^{PDF}(n_f = 4): (37)$$

The only di erences between the two schemes arises from terms in m² so they may not be equal just above $Q^2 = m^2$. This turns out to be the case for the longitudinal structure function, which is more sensitive to mass elects.

Figure 17 shows NNLO results for the Q² dependence of $F_{2;c}^{EXACT}$ (n_f = 3), $F_{2;c}^{CSN}$ (n_f = 4), $F_{2;c}^{BMSN}$ (n_f = 4), and $F_{2;c}^{PDF}$ (n_f = 4) at x = 0.005. Note that the results satisfy the requirements in Eqs. (36) and (37). The ZM-VFNS description is poor at small Q². Figure 18 shows the results for $F_{L;c}^{EXACT}$ (n_f = 3), $F_{L;c}^{CSN}$ (n_f = 4), $F_{L;c}^{BMSN}$ (n_f = 4), and $F_{L;c}^{PDF}$ (n_f = 4), the results for $F_{L;c}^{EXACT}$ (n_f = 4) at x = 0.005. We see that the CSN result is negative and therefore unphysical for $2.5 < Q^2 < 6$ (GeV=c)² which is due to the term in 4m²=Q² and the subtraction in Eq. (35).

O neway this research work is of relevance to Ferm ilab experiments is that it produces more precise ZM – VFNS parton densities. Such densities are used extensively to predict cross sections at high energies, for example for single top quarks. Therefore the previous work on four- avorparton densities has been extended in [105] to incorporate the two-loop discontinuous m atching conditions across the bottom avorthreshold at = m_b and provided a set of ve- avor densities, which contains a bottom quark density $f_b(x; ^2)$. The di erences between the ve- avor densities and those in [106] and [35] are also discussed. Results for deep-inelastic electroproduction of bottom quarks will be presented in [107].

8. The Underlying Event in Hard Scattering Processes

by Rick Field and David Stuart

8.1. Introduction

The total proton-antiproton cross section is the sum of the elastic and inelastic cross sections. The inelastic cross section consists of a single-di ractive, doubledi ractive, and a \hard core" com ponent, where the \hard core" is everything else. \Hard core" does not necessarily imply \hard scattering." A \hard scattering" collision, such as that illustrated in Fig. 19(a), is one in which a \hard" (i.e. large transverse m om entum) 2-to-2 parton-parton subprocess has occurred. \Soft" hard core collisions correspond to events in which no \hard" interaction has occurred. W hen there is no large p_T subprocess in the collision, one is not probing short distances and it probably does not make any sense to talk about partons. The QCD \hard scattering" cross section grow swith increasing collider energy and becom es a larger and larger fraction of the total inelastic cross section. In this analysis, we used the CDF M in-B ias trigger data sample in conjunction with the JET 20 trigger data sample to study the growth and development of \charged particle jets" from p_T (jet) = 0:5 to 50 G eV. We compared several \local" jet observables with the QCD \hard scattering" Monte-Carlo models of HERW IG [1], ISAJET [2], and PYTHIA [3].

A \hard scattering" event, like that illustrated in Fig. 19(a) consists of large- p_T outgoing hadrons that originate from the large p_T partons (i.e., outgoing hard scattering \jets") and also hadrons that originate from the break-up of the proton and antiproton (i.e., the \beam -beam rem nants"). The \underlying event" is an interesting object that is not very well understood. In addition to beam beam remnants, it may contain hadrons resulting from initial-state radiation. A lso, it is possible that multiple parton scattering occurs in hadron-hadron collisions as illustrated in Fig. 19(b). This is a controversial issue, but the underlying event might also contains hadrons that originate from multiple parton interactions. PYTHIA, for example, uses multiple parton interactions as a way to enhance the activity of the underlying event [3].

In this analysis, we studied a variety of \global"

observables to probe the growth and structure of the underlying event. We nd that the underlying hard scattering" event is not the same as a \soft" pp collision. For the same available energy, the underlying event in a hard scattering is considerably more active (i.e., higher charged particle density and more p_T) than a \soft" collision. This is not surprising since a violent hard scattering has occurred! We nd that none of the QCD Monte-Carlo models (with their default parameters) describe correctly all the properties of the underlying event.

8.2. D ata Selection and M onte-C arlo M odels(1) D ata Selection

The CDF detector, described in detail in Ref. [122], measures the trajectories and transverse mom enta, p_T , of charged particles in the pseudorapidity region j j < 1:1 with the central tracking chamber (CTC), silicon vertex detector (SVX), and vertex time projection chamber (VTX), which are immersed in a 1:4 T solenoidal magnetic eld. In this analysis we consider only charged particles measured in the central tracking chamber (CTC) and use the two trigger sets of data listed in Table 9. The minimum bias (m in-bias) data were selected by requiring that at least one particle interacted with the forward beam beam counter BBC (3:4 < < 5:9) and/or the backward BBC (5:9 < 3:4). The min-bias trigger < selects predom inately the \hard core" component of the inelastic cross section.

Charged particle tracks are found with high e ciency as long as the density of particles is not high. To remain in a region of high e ciency, we consider only charged particles with $p_T > 0.5 \text{ GeV}$ and j j < 1. The observed tracks include some fake tracks that result from secondary interactions between primary particles, including neutral particles, and the detector material. There are also particles originating from other pp collisions. To reduce the contribution from these sources, we consider only tracks which point to the primary interaction vertex within 2 cm along the beam direction and 1 cm transverse to the beam direction. Detector simulations indicate that this impact parameter cut is very e cient and that the number of fake tracks is about 3:5% when a 1 cm in pact parameter cut is applied in conjunction with a 2 cm vertex cut. W ithout the im pact param eter cut the num ber of fake tracks is approxim ately 9% .

This dependence of the number of fake tracks on the CTC impact parameter cut provides a method of estimating systematic uncertainties due to fakes. Every data point P on every plot in this analysis was determined three times by using a 2 cm vertex cut in conjunction with three di erent CTC d_0 cuts; a



Figure 19. (a) Illustration of a pp collision in which a \hard" 2-to-2 parton scattering with transverse momentum, p_T (hard), has occurred. The resulting event contains particles that originate from the two outgoing partons (plus nal-state radiation) and particles that come from the breakup of the p and p (i.e., \beam -beam remnants"). The \underlying event" consists of the beam -beam remnants plus initial-state radiation; (b) Illustration of a pp collision in which a multiple parton interaction has occurred. In addition to the \hard" 2-to-2 parton scattering with transverse momentum, p_T (hard), there is an additional \sem i-hard" parton-parton scattering that contributes particles to the \underlying event." For PYTHIA, we include the contributions from multiple parton scattering in the beam -beam remnant component.

CDF Data Set	T rigger	E vents	Selection
M in-B ias	M in-Bias Trigger	626 , 966	zero or one vertex in jzj< 100 cm jz _c z _y j< 2 cm, jCTC d ₀ j< 1 cm p_T ^{track} > 0.5GeV, j j< 1
JE T 20	Calorin eter Tower cluster with E _T > 20GeV	78 , 682	zero or one vertex in jzj< 100 cm jz _c z _y j< 2 cm ,jCTC d₀j< 1 cm p _T ^{track} > 0.5GeV,j j< 1

Data sets and selection criterion used in this analysis.

Table 9

1 cm CTC d₀ cut (P), a 0.5 cm CTC d₀ cut (P₁), and no CTC d₀ cut (P₂). The 1 cm cut determ ined the value of the data point, P, and the di errence between the 0.5 cm cut value and no cut value of the data point determ ined the system atic error of the data point as follows: system or = P P_2 P₁ j=P₁ This system atic error was then added in quadrature with the statistical error. We do not correct the data for the CTC track-nding e ciency. Instead, the theoretical M onte-C arb m odel predictions are corrected.

(2) QCD \H and Scattering" M onte-C arlo M odels

The \hard" scattering QCD M onte-Carlo models used in this analysis are listed in Table 10. The QCD perturbative 2-to-2 parton-parton di erential cross section diverges as the p_T of the scattering, p_T^{hard} , goes to zero (see Fig. 19). One must set a minimum p_T^{hard} large enough so that the resulting cross section is not larger that the total \hard core" inelastic cross section, and also large enough to ensure that QCD perturbation theory is applicable. In this analysis we take $p_T^{hard} > 3 \text{ GeV}$.

Each of the QCD Monte-Carlo models handle the \beam -beam remnants" in a similar fashion. A hard scattering event is basically the superposition of a hard parton-parton interaction on top of a \soft" collision. HERW IG [1] assumes that the underlying event is a soft collision between the two \beam clusters." ISA JET [2] uses a model sim ilar to the one it uses for soft \m in-bias" events (i.e., \cut Pom eron"), but with di erent param eters, to describe the underlying beam beam rem nants. PYTHIA [3] assumes that each incom ing beam hadron leaves behind a \beam rem nant," which do not radiate initial state radiation, and sim ply sail through una ected by the hard process. However, unlike HERW IG and ISAJET, PYTHIA also uses multiple parton interactions to enhance the activity of the underlying event as illustrated in Fig. 19.

In this analysis we examine two versions of PYTHIA, PYTHIA 6.115 and PYTHIA 6.125 both with the default values for all the parameters. The default values of the parameters are dimension 6.115 and 6.125. In particular, the elective minimum p_T for multiple parton interactions, PARP (81), changed from 1.4G eV in version 6.115 to 1.9G eV in version 6.125. Increasing this cut-o decreases the multiple parton interaction cross section which reduces the amount of multiple parton scattering. For completeness, we also consider PYTHIA with no multiple parton scattering (M STP (81)=0).

Since ISA JET employs \independent fragmentation" it is possible to trace particles back to their origin and divide them into three categories: particles that arise from the break-up of the beam and target (beam beam remnants), particles that arise from initial-state radiation, and particles that result from the outgoing hard scattering jets plus nal-state radiation. The \hard scattering component" consists of the particles that arise from the outgoing hard scattering jets plus initial and nal-state radiation (sum of the last two categories). Particles from the rst two categories (beam-beam remnants plus initial-state radiation) are norm ally what is referred to as the underlying event (see Fig. 19). Of course, these categories are not directly observable experimentally. Nevertheless, it is instructive to exam ine how particles from various origins a ect the experimental observables.

Since HERW IG and PYTHIA do not use independent fragmentation, it is not possible to distinguish particles that arise from initial-state radiation from those that arise from nal-state radiation, but we can identify the beam beam remnants. When, for example, a color string breaks into hadrons it is not possible to say which of the two partons producing the string was the parent. For HERW IG and PYTHIA, we divide particles into two categories: particles that arise from the break-up of the beam and target (beam beam rem nants), and particles that result from the outgoing hard scattering jets plus initial and nal-state radiation (hard scattering component). For PYTHIA, we include particles that arise from multiple parton interactions in the beam beam rem nant component.

(3) M ethod of C om paring Theory with D ata

O urphilosophy in comparing the theory with data in this analysis is to select a region where the data is very \clean." The CTC e ciency can vary substantially for very low p_T tracks and in dense high p_T jets. To avoid this we have considered only the region $p_T > 0.5 \,\text{GeV}$ and j j < 1 where the CTC e ciency is high and stable (estimated to be 92% e cient) and we restrict ourselves to jets less than 50 GeV. The data presented here are uncorrected. Instead the theoretical M onte-C arlo predictions are corrected for the track nding e ciency and have an error (statistical plus system atic) of about 5%. The errors on the (uncorrected) data include both statistical and correlated system atic uncertainties.

In comparing the QCD \hard scattering" M onte-C arlo m odels with the data, we require that the M onte-C arlo events satisfy the CDF m in-bias trigger and we apply an 8% correction for the CTC track nding e ciency. The corrections are sm all. On the average, 8 out of every 100 charged particles predicted by the theory are removed from consideration. R equiring the theory to satisfy the m in-bias trigger is in portant when com paring with the M in-B ias data, but does not Table 10

M onte-Carlo M odel	Subprocess	C om m ents
HERW IG 5.9	QCD 2-to-2 parton scattering	Default values for all param eters
	$\mathbb{IP} \text{ROC} = 1500$	
ISA JET 7.32	QCD 2-to-2 parton scattering	D efault values for all param eters
	TW OJET	
PYTHIA 6.115	QCD 2-to-2 parton scattering	D efault values for all param eters:
	M SEL = 1	PARP(81) = 1:4
PYTHIA 6.125	QCD 2-to-2 parton scattering	Default values for all param eters:
	M SEL = 1	PARP(81) = 1:9
PYTHIA NOMS	QCD 2-to-2 parton scattering	Default values for all param eters:
	M SEL = 1	M STP (81) = 0

TheoreticalQCD \hard" scattering M onte-C arb m odels studied in this analysis. In all cases we take p_T (hard) > 3 GeV.

matter when comparing with the JET20 data since essentially all high p_T jet events satisfy the min-bias trigger.

8.3. The Evolution of Charge Particle \Jets" from 0:5 to 50 G eV

We de ne charged particle \jets" and exam ine the evolution of these \jets" from $p_T^{jet} = 0.5$ to $50 \,\text{GeV}$. As illustrated in Fig. 20, \jets" are de ned as \circular regions" (R = 0:7) in - space and contain charged particles from the underlying event as well as particles which originate from the fragmentation of high p_T outgoing partons (see Fig. 19). Also, every charged particle in the event is assigned to a \jet," with the possibility that som e \jets" might consist of just one charged particle. We adapt a very simple jet de nition since we will be dealing with \jets" that consist of only a few low p_T charged particles. The standard jet algorithm based on calorim eter clustering is not applicable at low p_T .

(1) Jet De nition (charged particles)

We de ne jets as circular regions in - space with distance R = $()^{2} + ()^{2}$. Our jet algorithm is as follows:

Order all charged particles according to their p.

Start with the highest p particle and include in the \jet" all particles within R = 0.7.

Go to the next highest p particle (not already included in a \jet") and add to the \jet" all particles (not already included in a \jet") within R = 0.7.

Continue until all particles are in a \jet."



Figure 20. Illustration of an event with six charged particles ($p_T > 0.5 \,\text{GeV}$ and j j < 1) and ve charged \jets" (circular regions in - space with R = 0.7).

W e consider all charged particles ($p_T > 0.5 \text{ GeV}$ and j j < 1) and allow the jet radius to extend outside j j < 1. Fig. 20 illustrates an event with six charged particles and ve jets. We dene the p_T of the jet to be the scalar p_T sum of all the particles within the jet (i.e., it is simply the scalar p_T sum within the circular region).

We know that the simple charged particle jet definition used here is not theoretically favored since if applied at the parton level it is not infrared safe. Of course, all jet de nitions (and in fact all observables) are infrared safe at the hadron level. We have done a detailed study comparing the nave jet de nition used here with a variety of more sophisticated charge particle jet de nitions. This analysis will be presented in a future publication. Some of the observables presented here do, of course, depend on one's de nition of a jet and it is in portant to apply the same de nition to both the theory and data. (2) Charged Jet M ultiplicity versus p_T (jet# 1)

Fig. 21 shows the average number of charged particles ($p_T > 0.5 \text{ GeV}$ and j j < 1) within jet# 1 (leading charged jet) as a function of p_T (jet# 1). The solid points are M in-B ias data and the open points are the JET20 data. The JET20 data connect sm oothly to the M in-B ias data and allow us to study observables over the range $0.5 < p_T$ ($\neq t = 1$) < 50 GeV. There is a small overlap region where the Min-Bias and JET 20 data coincide. The errors on the data include both statistical and correlated system atic uncertainties, however, the data have not been corrected for e ciency. Fig. 21 shows a sharp rise in the leading charged jet multiplicity at low p_T (jet# 1) and then a attening out and a gradual rise at high p_T (jet# 1). The data are compared with the QCD \hard scattering" Monte-Carlo predictions of HERW IG 5.9, ISA JET 7.32, and PYTHIA 6.115. The theory curves are corrected for the track nding e ciency and have an error (statistical plus system atic) of around 5% .



Figure 21. The average number of charged particles ($p_T > 0.5 \text{ GeV}$ and j j< 1) within the leading charged jet (R = 0.7) as a function of the p_T of the leading charged jet. The solid (open) points are M in-B ias (JET20) data. The errors on the (uncorrected) data include both statistical and correlated system atic uncertainties. The QCD \hard scattering" theory curves (HERW IG 5.9, ISA JET 7.32, PYTHIA 6.115) are corrected for the track noding e ciency and have an error (statistical plus system atic) of around 5%.

(3) C harged Jet Size versus p_T (jet# 1)

A lthough the charged particle jets are de ned as circular regions in - space with R = 0.7, this is not the \size" of the jet. The \size" of a jet can be

de ned in two ways: size according to particle num ber and size according to p_T. The st corresponds to the radius in - space that contains 80% of the charged particles in the jet, and the second corresponds to the radius in - space that contains 80% of the jet p_{T} . The data on the average \'et size" of the leading charge particle jet are compared with the QCD \hard scattering" M onte-C arlo predictions of H E RW IG 5.9, ISAJET 7.32, and PYTHIA 6.115 in Fig. 22. A leading 20 GeV charged jet has 80% of its charged particles contained, on the average, within a radius in - space of about 0:33, and 80% of its pr contained, on the average, within a radius of about 0:20. Fig. 22 clearly illustrates the \hot core" of jets. The radius containing 80% of the p_T is smaller than the radius that contains 80% of the particles. Furtherm ore, the radius containing 80% of the p_T decreases as the overall p_T of the jet increases due to limited momentum perpendicular to the jet direction.



Figure 22. The average radius in – space containing 80% of the charged particles (and 80% of the charged p_T) as a function of the p_T of the leading charged jet. The errors on the (uncorrected) data include both statistical and correlated system atic uncertainties. The QCD hard scattering" theory curves (HERW IG 5.9, ISA JET 7.32, PYTHIA 6.115) are corrected for the track nding e ciency and have an error (statistical plus system atic) of around 5%.

8.4. The O verall E vent Structure as a Function of p_T (jet# 1)

In the previous section, we studied \local" leading jets observables. The QCD M onte-C arlo m odels did not have to describe correctly the entire event in order to t the observable. They only had to describe correctly the properties of the leading charge particle jet, and all the models t the data fairly well (although not perfectly). Now we will study \global" observables, where to t the observable the QCD M onte-Carlo m odels will have to describe correctly the entire event structure.

(1) Overall Charged Multiplicity versus $p_{\rm T}~({\rm jet}\#~1)$

Figure 23 shows the average number of charged particles in the event with $p_T > 0.5 \text{ GeV}$ and j j < 1 (including jet# 1) as a function of p_T (jet# 1) (leading charged jet) for the M in-B ias and JE T 20 data. A gain the JE T 20 data connect smoothly to the M in-B ias data, and there is a small overlap region where the M in-B ias and JE T 20 data coincide. Figure 23 shows a sharp rise in the overall charged multiplicity at low p_T (jet# 1) and then a attening out and a gradual rise at high p_T (jet# 1) sim ilar to F ig. 21. W e would like to investigate where these charged particles are located relative to the direction of the leading charged particle jet.



Figure 23. The average total number of charged particles in the event ($p_T > 0.5 \text{GeV}$ and j j < 1 including jet# 1) as a function of the p_T of the leading charged jet. The solid (open) points are the M in-B ias (JET 20) data. The errors on the (uncorrected) data include both statistical and correlated system atic uncertainties. The QCD \hard scattering" theory curves (HERW IG 5.9, ISA JET 7.32, PYTHIA 6.115) are corrected for the track noding e ciency and have an error (statistical plus system atic) of around 5%.

(2) Correlations in relative to p_T (jet# 1)

As illustrated in Fig. 24, the angle is de ned to be the relative azimuthal angle between charged

particles and the direction of the leading charged particle jet. We label the region j _{iet#1}j< 60 as $\tow ard" jet # 1 and the region j$ _{jet#1}j> 120 is as \away" from jet# 1. The \transverse" to jet# 1 $_{jet \# 1} j < 120$. Each region is de ned by 60 < j region, \toward," \transverse," and \away" covers the same range j j j = 2120 . The \toward " region includes the particles from jet# 1 as well as a few particles from the underlying event. As we will see, the \transverse" region is very sensitive to the underlying event. The \away" region is a mixture of the underlying event and the \away-side" hard scattering jet.



Figure 24. Illustration of correlations in azim uthal angle relative to the direction of the leading charged jet in the event, jet# 1. The angle = jet# 1 is the relative azim uthal angle between charged particles and the direction of jet# 1. The region j j < 60 is referred to as "toward" jet# 1 (includes particles in jet# 1) and the region j j > 120 is called \away" from jet# 1. The \transverse" to jet# 1 region is de ned by 60 < j j < 120 . Each region, \toward," \transverse," and \away" covers the same range j j j j= 2 120 .

Figure 25 shows the data on the average number of charged particles ($p_T > 0.5 \text{ GeV}$ and j j< 1) as a function of p_T (jet# 1) for the three regions. Each point corresponds to the \toward," \transverse," or \away" N_{chg}i in a 1 GeV bin. The solid points are M in-B ias data and the open points are JET 20 data. The data in Fig. 25 de ne the average event \shape." For exam ple, for an \average" pp collider event at 1.8 TeV with p_T (jet# 1) = 20 GeV there are, on the average, 8:7 charged particles \toward" is transverse" to jet# 1, and 4:9 \away" from jet# 1.



Figure 25. The average number of \toward" (j j< 60), \transverse" (60 < j j< 120), and \away" (j j> 120) charged particles ($p_T > 0.5 \text{ GeV}$ and j j < 1 including jet# 1) as a function of the p_T of the leading charged jet. Each point corresponds to the hN chgi in a 1 GeV bin. The solid (open) points are the M in-B ias (JET 20) data. The errors on the (uncorrected) data include both statistical and correlated system atic uncertainties. The \toward," \transverse," and \away" regions are de ned in Fig.24.

Figure 26 shows the data on the average scalar p_T sum of charged particles ($p_T > 0.5 \text{ GeV}$ and j j < 1) as a function of p_T (jet# 1) for the three regions. Here each point corresponds to the \toward," \transverse," or \away" $h_{P_T \text{ sum}}$ i in a 1 G eV bin. In Fig. 27, data on h_{chg} i as a function of p_T (jet# 1) for the three regions are com pared with the QCD \hard scattering" M onte-C arb predictions of HERW IG 5.9, ISA JET 7.32, and P Y T H IA 6.115. The QCD M onte-C arb m odels agree qualitatively (but not precisely) with the data. W e will now exam ine m ore closely these three regions.

(3) The \Tow ard" and \A way" R egion versus $p_T \ (jet \# 1)$

Figure 28 shows the data from Fig. 25 on the average number of \toward" region charged particles compared with the QCD \hard scattering" Monte-Carlo predictions of HERW IG 5.9, ISAJET 7.32, and PYTHIA 6.115. This plot is very similar to the average number of charged particles within the leading jet shown in Fig.21. At p_T (jet# 1) = 20 GeV, the \toward" region contains, on the average, about 8:7 charged particles with about 6:9 of these charged particles belonging to jet# 1. As expected, the toward region is dom inated by the leading jet. This is seen clearly in Fig.29 where the predictions of ISAJET for the \toward" region are divided into three categories: charged particles that arise from the break-up of the



Figure 26. The average scalar p_T sum of \toward" (j j< 60), \transverse" (60 < j j< 120), and \away" (j j> 120) charged particles ($p_T > 0.5 \, \text{GeV}$ and j j< 1 including jet# 1) as a function of the p_T of the leading charged jet. Each point corresponds to the hPT_{sum} i in a 1GeV bin. The solid (open) points are the M in-B ias (JET20) data. The errors on the (uncorrected) data include both statistical and correlated system atic uncertainties. The \toward," \transverse," and \away" regions are de ned in Fig.24.



Figure 27. Data from Fig.25 on the average number of \toward" (j j< 60), \transverse" (60 < j j< 120), and \away" (j j > 120) charged particles (p_T > 0.5 GeV and j j < 1 including jet# 1) as a function of the p_T of the leading charged jet com pared to QCD \hard scattering" M onte-C arlo predictions of HERW IG 5.9, ISA JET 7.32, and PYTHIA 6.115. The errors on the (uncorrected) data include both statistical and correlated system atic uncertainties. The theory curves are corrected for the track nding e - ciency and have an error (statistical plus system atic) of around 5%.

beam and target (beam -beam rem nants), charged particles that arise from initial-state radiation, and charged particles that result from the outgoing jets plus nalstate radiation. For p_T (jet# 1) values below 5 GeV the \toward" region charged multiplicity arises mostly from the beam -beam rem nants, but as p_T (jet# 1) increases the contribution from the outgoing jets plus nal-state radiation quickly begins to dom inate. The bum p in the beam -beam rem nant contribution at low p_T (jet# 1) is caused by leading jets com posed alm ost entirely from the rem nants.



Figure 28. Data from Fig. 25 on the average number of charged particles ($p_T > 0.5 \text{ GeV}$ and j j < 1) as a function of p_T (jet# 1) (beading charged jet) for the \toward" region " de ned in Fig. 24 compared with the QCD \hard scattering" M onte-Carlo predictions of HERW IG 5.9, ISA JET 7.32, and PYTHIA 6.115. Each point corresponds to the \toward" hN chgi in a 1G eV bin. The errors on the (uncorrected) data include both statistical and correlated system atic uncertainties. The theory curves are corrected for the track nding e ciency and have an error (statistical plus system atic) of around 5%.

Fig. 30 shows the data from Fig. 25 on the average number of \away" region charged particles compared with the QCD \hard scattering" Monte-Carlo predictions of HERW IG 5.9, ISAJET 7.32, and PYTHIA 6.115. In Fig. 21 the data from Fig. 26 on the average scalar p_T sum in the \away" region is compared to the QCD Monte-Carlo predictions. The \away" region is a mixture of the underlying event and the \away-side" outgoing \hard scattering" jet. This can be seen in Fig. 32 where the predictions of ISAJET for the \away" region are divided into three categories: beam-beam remnants, initial-state radiation, and outgoing jets plus nal-state radiation.



Figure 29. Data from Fig. 25 on the average number of charged particles ($p_T > 0.5 \text{ GeV}$ and j j < 1) as a function of p_T (jet # 1) (leading charged jet) for the \toward" region de ned in Fig. 24 compared with the QCD "hard scattering" Monte-Carlo predictions of ISAJET 7.32. The predictions of ISAJET are divided into three categories: charged particles that arise from the break-up of the beam and target (beam-beam remnants), charged particles that arise from initial-state radiation, and charged particles that result from the outgoing jets plus nal-state radiation (see Fig. 19). The errors on the (uncorrected) data include both statistical and correlated system atic uncertainties. The theory curves are corrected for the track nding e ciency and have an error (statistical plus system atic) of around 5% .

Here the underlying event plays a more important role since the \away-side" outgoing \hard scattering" jet is sometimes outside the regions j j < 1. For the \toward" region the contribution from the outgoing jets plus nal state-radiation dom inates for p_T (jet# 1) values above about $5 \, \text{GeV}$, whereas for the \away" region this does not occur until around $20 \, \text{GeV}$.

B oth the \tow ard" and \aw ay" regions are described fairly well by the Q C D \hard scattering" M onte-C arlo m odels. These regions are dom inated by the outgoing \hard scattering" jets and as we saw in Section C the M onte-C arlo m odels describe the leading outgoing jets fairly accurately. W e will now study the \transverse" region which is dom inated by the underlying event.

8.5. The \Transverse" Region and the Underlying E vent

Fig. 25 shows that there is a lot of activity in the \transverse" region. If we suppose that the \transverse" multiplicity is uniform in azimuthalangle and pseudo-rapidity , the observed 2.3 charged particles at $p_{\rm T}$ (jet# 1) = 20 G eV translates to 3.8 charged particles



Figure 30. D ata from Fig. 25 on the average number of charged particles ($p_T > 0.5 \text{ G eV}$ and j j< 1) as a function of p_T (jet# 1) (leading charged jet) for the \away" region de ned in Fig. 24 compared with the QCD \hard scattering" M onte-C arlo predictions of H E R - W IG 5.9, ISA JET 7.32, and PYTH IA 6.115. The errors on the (uncorrected) data include both statistical and correlated system atic uncertainties. The theory curves are corrected for the track noding e ciency and have an error (statistical plus system atic) of around 5%.



Figure 31. D ata from Fig. 26 on the average scalar p_T sum of charged particles (($p_T>0.5\,G\,eV$ and j j< 1) as a function of p_T (jet# 1) (leading charged jet) for the \away" region de ned in Fig. 24 compared with the QCD \hard scattering" M onte-C arlo predictions of H E RW IG 5.9, ISA JE T 7.32, and P Y T H IA 6.115. The errors on the (uncorrected) data include both statistical and correlated system atic uncertainties. The theory curves are corrected for the track nding e – ciency and have an error (statistical plus system atic) of around 5%.



Figure 32. Data from Fig. 25 on the average number of charged particles ($p_T > 0.5 \text{ GeV}$ and jj < 1) as a function of p_T (jet # 1) (leading charged jet) for the \away" region de ned in Fig. 24 compared with the QCD \hard scattering" Monte-Carlo predictions of ISAJET 7.32. The predictions of ISAJET are divided into three categories: charged particles that arise from the break-up of the beam and target (beam-beam remnants), charged particles that arise from initial-state radiation, and charged particles that result from the outgoing jets plus nal-state radiation (see Fig. 19). The errors on the (uncorrected) data include both statistical and correlated system atic uncertainties. The theory curves are corrected for the track nding e ciency and have an error (statistical plus system atic) of around 5% .

per unit pseudo-rapidity with $p_T > 0.5 \text{ GeV}$ (multiply by 3 to get 360, divide by 2 for the two units of pseudo-rapidity, multiply by 1:09 to correct for the track nding e ciency). We know that if we include all p_T that there are roughly 4 charged particles per unit rapidity in a \soft" pp collision at 1:8 TeV, and the data show that in the underlying event of a \hard scattering" there are about 3:8 charged particles per unit rapidity in the region $p_T > 0.5 \text{GeV}$! If one includes all p_T values then the underlying event has a charge particle density that is at least a factor of two larger than the 4 charged particles per unit rapidity seen in \soft" pp collisions at this energy. As can be seen in Fig. 25, the charged particle density in the \transverse" region is a function of p_T (jet# 1) and rises very rapidity at low p_T (jet# 1) values. The \transverse" charged multiplicity doubles in going from p_T (jet#1) = 1:5GeV to p_T (jet#1) = 2:5GeV and then forms an approximately constant \plateau" for $p_T (jet # 1) > 6 G eV$.

Fig. 33 and Fig. 34 com pare the $\transverse" hN_{chg}i$ and the $\transverse" hp_{T_{sum}}i$, respectively, with the



Figure 33. D ata from Fig. 25 on the average number of charged particles ($p_T > 0.5 \text{GeV}$ and j j < 1) as a function of p_T (jet# 1) (leading charged jet) for the \transverse" region de ned in Fig. 24 com pared with the QCD \hard scattering" M onte-C arlo predictions of H E RW IG 5.9, ISA JE T 7.32, and P Y T H IA 6.115. The errors on the (uncorrected) data include both statistical and correlated system atic uncertainties. The theory curves are corrected for the track nding e - ciency and have an error (statistical plus system atic) of around 5%.



Figure 34. Data from Fig. 26 on the average scalar p_T sum of charged particles ($p_T > 0.5 \text{GeV}$ and j j < 1) as a function of p_T (jet# 1) (leading charged jet) for the \transverse" region de ned in Fig. 24 compared with the QCD \hard scattering" Monte-Carlo predictions of HERW IG 5.9, ISAJET 7.32, and PYTHIA 6.115. The errors on the (uncorrected) data include both statistical and correlated system atic uncertainties. The theory curves are corrected for the track nding e ciency and have an error (statistical plus system atic) of around 5%.

40

QCD \hard scattering" M onte-Carlo predictions of HERW IG 5.9, ISA JET 7.32, and PYTHIA 6.115. Fig. 35 and Fig. 36 compare the \transverse" hN _{chg}i and the \transverse" hPT_{sum} i, respectively, with three versions of PYTHIA (6.115, 6.125, and no multiple scattering, see Table 10). PYTHIA with no multiple parton scattering does not have enough activity in the underlying event. PYTHIA 6.115 ts the \transverse" hN _{chg}i in Fig. 28. ISA JET has a bt of activity in the underlying event, but gives the wrong p_T (jet# 1) dependence. Instead of a \plateau," ISA JET predicts a rising \transverse" hN _{chg}i and gives too m uch activity at large p_T (jet# 1) values. HERW IG does not have enough \transverse" hP T_{sum} i.



Figure 35. D ata from Fig. 35 on the average number of charged particles ($p_T > 0.5$ G eV and j j < 1) as a function of p_T (jet# 1) (leading charged jet) for the \transverse" region de ned in Fig. 24 compared with the Q C D \hard scattering" M onte-C arlo predictions of P Y T H IA 6.115, P Y T H IA 6.125, and P Y T H IA with no multiple parton scattering (N o M S). The errors on the (uncorrected) data include both statistical and correlated system atic uncertainties. The theory curves are corrected for the track nding e ciency and have an error (statistical plus system atic) of around 5%.

We expect the \transverse" region to be composed predom inately from particles that arise from the breakup of the beam and target and from initial-state radiation. This is clearly the case as can be seen in Fig. 37 where the predictions of ISA JET for the \transverse" region are divided into three categories: beam beam rem nants, initial-state radiation, and outgoing jets plus nal-state radiation. It is interesting to see that it is the beam beam rem nants that are producing the approxim ately constant \plateau". The contributions



Figure 36. D ata from Fig. 26 on the average scalar p_T sum of charged particles ($p_T > 0.5 \text{ GeV}$ and j j < 1) as a function of p_T (jet# 1) (leading charged jet) for the \transverse" region de ned in Fig. 24 com pared with the QCD \hard scattering" M onte-C arlo predictions of PYTHIA 6.115, PYTHIA 6.125, and PYTHIA with no multiple parton scattering (No MS). The errors on the (uncorrected) data include both statistical and correlated system atic uncertainties. The theory curves are corrected for the track nding e ciency and have an error (statistical plus system atic) of around 5%.

from initial-state radiation and from the outgoing hard scattering jets both increase as p_T (jet# 1) increases. In fact, for ISA JE T it is the sharp rise in the initial-state radiation component that is causing the disagreem ent with the data for p_T (jet# 1) > 20 G eV.

As we explained in Section B, for HERW IG and PYTHIA it makes no sense to distinguish between particles that arise from initial-state radiation from those that arise from nal-state radiation, but one can separate the \hard scattering component" from the beam -beam rem nants. For PYTHIA the beam -beam rem nants include contributions from multiple parton scattering as illustrated in Fig. 19. Fig. 38 and Fig. 39 com pare the $\transverse"$ hN _{chq} i with the QCD \hard scattering" M onte-C arlo predictions of H E RW IG 5.9 and PYTHIA 6.115, respectively. Here the predictions are divided into two categories: charged particles that arise from the break-up of the beam and target (beam beam rem nants), and charged particles that result from the outgoing jets plus initial and nal-state radiation (hard scattering component). As was the case with ISAJET the beam -beam remnants form the approxin ately constant \plateau" and the hard scattering com ponent increase as p_T (jet# 1) increases. How ever, the hard scattering component of HERW IG and PYTHIA does not rise nearly as fast as the hard scattering component of ISA JET. This can be seen



Figure 37. Data from Fig. 25 on the average number of charged particles ($p_T > 0.5 \text{ GeV}$ and j j < 1) as a function of p_T (jet # 1) (leading charged jet) for the \transverse" region de ned in Fig. 24 com pared with the QCD \hard scattering" Monte-Carlo predictions of ISAJET 7.32. The predictions of ISAJET are divided into three categories: charged particles that arise from the break-up of the beam and target (beam-beam remnants), charged particles that arise from initial-state radiation, and charged particles that result from the outgoing jets plus nal-state radiation (see Fig. 19). The errors on the (uncorrected) data include both statistical and correlated system atic uncertainties. The theory curves are corrected for the track nding e ciency and have an error (statistical plus system atic) of around 5% .

clearly in Fig. 40 where we compare directly the hard scattering component (outgoing jets plus initial and nal-state radiation) of the \transverse" hN _{chg} i from ISA JET 7.32, HERW IG 5.9, and PYTHIA 6.115. PYTHIA and HERW IG are similar and rise gently as p_T (jet# 1) increases, whereas ISA JET produces a much sharper increase as p_T (jet# 1) increases.

There are two reasons why the hard scattering component of ISA JET is di erent from HERW IG and PYTHIA. The rst is due to di erent fragmentation schemes. ISA JET uses independent fragmentation, which produces too many soft hadrons when partons begin to overlap. The second di erence arises from the way the QCD M onte-C arb produce \parton showers". ISA JET uses a leading-log picture in which the partons within the shower are ordered according to their invariant m ass. K inematics requires that the invariant m ass of daughter partons be less than the invariant m ass of the parent. HERW IG and PYTHIA modify the leading-log picture to include \cobr coherence e ects" which leads to \angle ordering" within the parton shower. A ngle ordering produces less high p_T



Figure 38. Data from Fig. 25 on the average number of charged particles ($p_T > 0.5 \text{ GeV}$ and j j < 1) as a function of p_T (jet# 1) (beading charged jet) for the \transverse" region de ned in Fig. 24 compared with the QCD \hard scattering" M onte-C arlo predictions of HERW IG 5.9. The predictions of HERW IG are divided into two categories: charged particles that arise from the break-up of the beam and target (beam beam rem nants), and charged particles that result from the outgoing jets plus initial and nal-state radiation (hard scattering component) (see Fig. 19). The errors on the (uncorrected) data include both statistical and correlated system atic uncertainties. The theory curves are corrected for the track noting e ciency and have an error (statistical plus system atic) of around 5%.

radiation within a parton showerwhich is what is seen in Fig. 40. Without further study, we do not know how much of the di erence seen in Fig. 40 is due to the di erent fragmentation schemes and how much is due to the color coherence e ects.

The beam -beam rem nant contribution to the \transverse" hN chqi is di erent for each of the QCD M onte-Carlo models. This can be seen in Fig. 41 where we com pare directly the beam -beam rem nant com ponent of the \transverse" hN chqi from ISA JET 7.32, HER -W IG 5.9, PYTHIA 6.115, and PYTHIA with no multiple parton interactions. Since we are considering only charged particles with $p_T > 0.5 \,\text{GeV}$, the height of the \plateaus" in Fig. 41 is related to the p_T distribution of the beam -beam rem nant contributions. A steeper p_T distribution m eans less particles with $p_T >$ 0:5GeV.PYTHIA uses multiple parton scattering to enhance the underlying event and we have included these contributions in the beam -beam rem nants. For PYTHIA the height of the \plateau" in Fig. 41 can be adjusted by adjusting the amount of multiple parton scattering. HERW IG and ISAJET do not include multiple parton scattering. For HERW IG and



Figure 39. Data from Fig. 25 on the average number of charged particles ($p_T > 0.5 \text{ GeV}$ and j j < 1) as a function of p_T (jet # 1) (leading charged jet) for the \transverse" region de ned in Fig. 24 com pared with the QCD \hard scattering" Monte-Carlo predictions of PYTHIA 6.115. The predictions of PYTHIA are divided into two categories: charged particles that arise from the break-up of the beam and target (beam-beam remnants), and charged particles that result from the outgoing jets plus initial and nal-state radiation (hard scattering component). For PYTHIA, the beam -beam remnants include contributions from multiple parton scattering (see Fig. 19). The errors on the (uncorrected) data include both statistical and correlated system atic uncertainties. The theory curves are corrected for the track nding e ciency and have an error (statistical plus system atic) of around 5% .

ISA JET the height of the \plateau" can be adjusted by changing the $p_T\,$ distribution of the beam-beam rem nants.

8.6. Sum m ary and Conclusions

For pp collisions at 1:8 TeV m in-bias does not necessarily imply \soft" physics. There is a lot of QCD \hard scattering" in the M in-B ias data. We have studied both \local" leading jet observables and \global" observables where to t the data the QCD M onte-C arlo m odels have to correctly describe the entire event structure. Our sum m ary and conclusions are as follows.

The Evolution of Charge Particle Jets

Charged particle jets are \bom" som ew here around p_T (jet) of about 2 G eV with, on the average, about 2 charged particles and grow to, on the average, about 10 charged particles at 50 G eV. The QCD \hard scattering" models describe quite well (although not perfectly) \bocal" leading jet observables such as the



Figure 40. QCD \hard scattering" Monte-Carlo predictions from HERW IG 5.9, ISAJET 7.32, and PYTHIA 6.115 of the average number of charged particles ($p_T > 0.5 \text{ GeV}$ and j j < 1) as a function of p_T (jet# 1) (leading charged jet) for the \transverse" region de ned in Fig.24 arising from the outgoing jets plus initial and nial-state radiation (hard scattering component). The curves are corrected for the track nding e ciency and have an error (statistical plus system atic) of around 5%.



Figure 41. QCD \hard scattering" Monte-Carbo predictions from HERW IG 5.9, ISA JET 7.32, PYTHIA 6.115, and PYTHIA with no multiple parton scattering (No MS) of the average number of charged particles ($p_T > 0.5 \text{GeV}$ and j j < 1) as a function of p_T (jet# 1) (leading charged jet) for the \transverse" region de ned in Fig. 7 arising from the break-up of the beam and target (beam-beam rem nants). For PYTHIA the beam beam rem nants include contributions from multiple parton scattering (see Fig. 19). The curves are corrected for the track nding e ciency and have an error (statistical plus system atic) of around 5%. multiplicity distribution of charged particles within the leading jet, the \size" of the leading jet, the radial ow of charged particles and p_T around the leading jet direction, and the momentum distribution of charged particles within the leading jet. In fact, the QCD \hard" scattering M onte-C arlo m odels agree as well with 2 GeV charged particle jets as they do with 50 G eV charged particle jets! The charge particle jets in the M in-B ias data are simply the extrapolation (down to small p_T) of the high p_T jets observed in the JET20 data. For a xed p_T (hard), the QCD \hard" scattering cross section grows with increasing collider energy. As the center-of-m assenergy of a pp collision grows, \hard" scattering becomes a larger and larger fraction of the total inelastic cross section. At 1:8 TeV \hard scattering" m akes up a sizable part of the \hard core" inelastic cross section and a lot ofm in-bias events have 2 TeV or 3 GeV jets.

The \Underlying Event"

A hard scattering collider event consists of large p_T outgoing hadrons that originate from the large p_T partons (outgoing jets) and also hadrons that originate from the break-up of the proton and antiproton (beam - beam remnants). The \underlying event" is form ed from the beam beam remnants, initial-state radiation, and possibly from multiple parton interactions. Our data show that the charged particle multiplicity and scalar p_T sum in the \underlying event" grows very rapidly with the transverse momentum of the leading charged particle jet and then forms an approximately constant \plateau" for p_T (jet# 1) > 6 G eV. The height of this\plateau" is at least twice that observed in \soft" collisions at the same corresponding energy.

None of the QCD M onte-Carlo m odels we exam ined correctly describe all the properties of the underlying event seen in the data. HERW IG 5.9 and PYTHIA 6.125 do not have enough activity in the underlying event. PYTHIA 6.115 has about the right amount of activity in the underlying event, but as a result produces too much overall charged multiplicity. ISA JET 7.32 has a lot of activity in the underlying event, but with the wrong dependence on p_T (jet# 1). Because ISA JET uses independent fragm entation and HERW IG and PYTHIA do not, there are clear di erences in the hard scattering component (mostly initial-state radiation) of the underlying event between ISA JET and the other two M onte-C arlo m odels. Here the data strongly favor HERW IG and PYTHIA over ISA JET.

The beam-beam remnant component of both ISAJET 7.32 and HERW IG 5.9 has the wrong p_T dependence. ISAJET and HERW IG both predict too steep of a p_T distribution. PYTHIA does a

better jbb, but is still slightly too steep. It is, of course, understandable that the M onte-C arb m odels m ight be som ewhat o on the param eterization of the beam -beam rem nants. This component cannot be calculated from perturbation theory and m ust be determ ined from data. W ith what we have learned from the data presented here, the beam -beam rem nant component of the QCD \hard scattering" M onte-C arlo m odels can be tuned to better describe the overall event in pp collisions.

REFERENCES

- G.Marchesini, BR.Webber, G.Abbiendi, IG. Knowles, M.H.Seymour and L.Stanco, Comput. Phys.Commun.67 (1992) 465.
- F E.Paige, S D.Protopescu, H.Baer and X.Tata, hep-ph/9810440.
- T.Sjostrand, Comput.Phys.Commun.82 (1994) 74.
- 4. G.Bodwin, Phys.Rev.D 31 (1985) 2616; J.C.Collins, D E.Soper, G.Sterman, Nucl.Phys. B 261 (1985) 104.
- 5. M.Bengtsson, T.Sjostrand and M.van Zijl, Z. Phys.C 32 (1986) 67.
- 6. V N.G ribov and L N.Lipatov, Sov.J.Nucl.Phys. 15 (1972) 438;
 G. Altarelli and G. Parisi, Nucl. Phys. B 126 (1977) 298;
 Yu L.D okshitzer, Sov.Phys.JETP 46 (1977) 641.
- 7. R.Odorico, Nucl. Phys. B 172 (1980) 157.
- R.K.Ellis, W.J.Stirling and B.Webber, \QCD and Collider Physics," Cambridge University Press (UK) 1996.
- 9. T.Sjostrand, Phys.Lett. 157B (1985) 321.
- 10. G. M archesini and B R. W ebber, Nucl. Phys. B 238 (1984) 1; B R.W ebber, Ann.Rev.Nucl.Part.Sci.36 (1986) 253.
- 11. Y J. Dokshitzer, D J. D'Yakonov, S J. Troyan, Phys.Lett. B 79 (1978) 269.
- 12. G.Parisi, R.Petronzio, Nucl. Phys. B 154 (1979) 427.
- S.D. Ellis, N. Fleishon, and W.J. Stirling, Phys. Rev. D 24 (1981) 1386.
- 14. J.Collins, D.Soper, Nucl. Phys. B 193 (1981) 381; Erratum B 213 (1983) 545; B 197 (1982) 446.
- J. Collins, D. Soper, G. Sterm an, Nucl. Phys. B 250 (1985) 199.
- G.Altarelli, R.K. Ellis, M. Greco, G. Martinelli, Nucl. Phys. B 246 (1984) 12.
- G. Altarelli, R.K. Ellis, G. Martinelli, Z. Phys. C 27 (1985) 617.
- 18. PB.Amold, RP.Kau man, Nucl. Phys. B349

(1991) 381.

- 19. R.K. Ellis, S.Veseli, Nucl. Phys. B 511 (1998) 649.
- A. Kulesza and W.J. Stirling, eprint [hepph/9902234].
- 21. J.K odaira and L.Trentadue, Phys.Lett. 112B (1982) 66.
- 22. C. Balazs, C.P. Yuan, Phys. Rev. D 56 (1997) 5558.
- 23. H.Baer and M.H.Reno, Phys.Rev.D 44 (1991) 3375, D 45 (1992) 1503.
- 24. J.Andre and T.Sjostrand, Phys.Rev.D 57 (1998) 5767;

G.Ingelm an, in Physics at HERA, Vol. 3, p. 1366; M.H.Seym our, Zeit. Phys. C 56 (1992) 161.

25. M .Bengtsson and T .Sjostrand, Phys.Lett.B 185 (1987) 435;

G. Gustafson and U. Pettersson, Nucl. Phys. B 306 (1988) 746;

L.Lonnblad, Com put.Phys.Com m un.71 (1992) 15;

M H. Seymour, preprint LU TP 94-12, InternationalConference on High Energy Physics, G lasgow, U K., 20{27 July 1994; Nucl. Phys. B 436 (1995) 443;

G.Corcella and M.H.Seymour, Phys.Lett.B 442 (1998) 417.

- 26. G.M iu, eprint [hep-ph/9804317];
- G.M iu and T.Sjostrand, eprint [hep-ph/9912455] 27. D Collaboration, S.Abachi et al., Phys. Rev.
- Lett. 80 (1998) 5498.
- 28. CDF Collaboration, T.A older et al, Phys.Rev. Lett. 84 (2000) 845.
- 29. S. Frixione, M L. Mangano, P. Nason and G. Ridol, Nucl. Phys. B 431 (1994) 453; L.Apanasevich et al., eprint [hep-ph/9808467].
- 30. C. Balazs, JW . Qui, C. (P. Yuan, Phys. Lett. B 355 (1995) 548.
- R.Meng, F.J.O lness, D.E. Soper, Phys. Rev. D 54 (1996) 1919.
- 32. N. Kidonakis, G. Stem an, Nucl. Phys. B 505 (1997) 321;
 R. Bonciani, S. Catani, M. Mangano, P. Nason, Nucl. Phys. B 529 (1998) 424;
 N. Kidonakis, G. O derda, G. Stem an, Nucl. Phys. B 531 (1998) 365;
 S. Catani, M. Mangano, P. Nason, JHEP 9807: 024 (1998).
- 33. P.B.Amold, M.H.Reno, Nucl. Phys. B 319 (1989) 37; Erratum B 330 (1990) 284.
- 34. S.M renna, Com put. Phys. Com m un. 101 (1997) 232.
- 35. H L. Lai, J. Huston, S. Kuhlmann, J. Morfin, F. Olness, J. Owens, J. Pumplin, W K. Tung, hepph/9903282.

- P.Eden and G.Gustafson, Z.Phys.C 75 (1997)
 41.
- 37. C. Friberg and T. Sjostrand, LU TP 99{11 and hep-ph/9907245, to appear in Eur. Phys. J.C.
- 38. M .Bengtsson and T .Sjostrand, Phys.Lett.B 185 (1987) 435; G .G ustafson and U .Pettersson, Nucl. Phys.B 306 (1988) 746; M H .Seym our, Com put. Phys.Commun.90 (1995) 95.
- 39. G.M iu and T.S jostrand, Phys.Lett.B 449 (1999) 313.
- 40. J.Huston, these proceedings.
- 41. G. Corcella and M.H. Seymour, RAL-TR-1999-051 and hep-ph/9908388.
- 42. S.M renna, UCD -99-4 and hep-ph/9902471.
- 43. S.M renna, in preparation.
- 44. J.Andre and T.Sjostrand, Phys.Rev.D 57 (1998) 5767.
- 45. C. Friberg and T. Sjostrand, in Monte Carlo Generators for HERA Physics', eds. A.T. Doyle, G. Grindhammer, G. Ingelman and H. Jung, DESY-PROC-1999-02, p. 181.
- 46. W A 82 Collaboration, M. A dam ovich et al., Phys. Lett. B 305 (1993) 402; E 769 Collaboration, G A. A lves et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 72 (1994) 812; E 791 Collaboration, E M. A itala et al., Phys.Lett. B 371 (1996) 157.
- 47. E.Nombin and T.Sjostrand, Phys. Lett. B 442 (1998) 407, in preparation.
- B. Andersson, G. Gustafson, G. Ingelm an and T. Sjostrand, Phys. Rep. 97 (1983) 31; T. Sjostrand, Nucl. Phys. B 248 (1984) 469.
- 49. T. Sjostrand and M. van Zijl, Phys. Rev. D 36 (1987) 2019.
- CDF collaboration, F.Abe et al, Phys.Rev.Lett.
 79 (1997) 584.
- 51. G.Gustafson and G.Miu, LU TP 99{43.
- 52. J.D ischler and T.Sjostrand, in preparation.
- 53. A. Donnachie and P.V. Landsho , Phys. Lett. B 296 (1992) 227.
- 54. G.Gustafson, U.Pettersson and P.Zerwas, Phys. Lett. B 209 (1988) 90.
- 55. T. Sjostrand and VA. Khoze, Z. Phys. C 62 (1994) 281, Phys. Rev. Lett. 72 (1994) 28.
- 56. G. Gustafson and J. Hakkinen, Z. Phys. C 64 (1994) 659; L.Lonnblad, Z.Phys. C 70 (1996) 107; S.Todorova {N ova, D E LP H I Internal N ote 96–158 PHYS 651; J.Ellis and K.Geiger, Phys.Rev.D 54 (1996) 1967, Phys. Lett. B 404 (1997) 230; B R. Webber, J.Phys.G 24 (1998) 287.
- 57. J. Hakkinen and M. Ringner, Eur. Phys. J. C 5 (1998) 275.
- 58. L. Lonnblad and T. Sjostrand, Phys. Lett. B 351 (1995) 293, Eur. Phys. J. C 2 (1998) 165.
- 59. S. Jadach and K. Zalewski, Acta Phys. Pol. B 28

(1997) 1363; V.Kartvelishvili, R.Kvatadze and R.M ller, Phys. Lett. B 408 (1997) 331; K. Fialkowski and R.W ±, Acta Phys. Pol. B 28 (1997) 2039, Eur. Phys. J.C 2 (1998) 691; S. Todorova{Nova and J.Rames, hep-ph/9710280.

- 60. V A.Khoze and T.Sjostrand, Phys.Lett.B 328 (1994) 466.
- 61. A.Edin, G. Ingelm an and J.Rathsman, Z.Phys. C 75 (1997) 57.
- 62. A.Edin, G.Ingelm an and J.Rathsm an, Phys. Rev. D 56 (1997) 7317.
- L.Lonnblad, Comput.Phys.Commun.118 (1999) 213.
- 64. http://fnth37.fnal.gov/susy.html
- 65. http://runIIcomputing.fnal.gov/ strongdynamics/web/strongdynamics.html
- 66. http://fnth37.fnal.gov/higgs/draft.html
- 67. http://fnth37.fnal.gov/sugra.html
- 68. http://b0nd10.fnal.gov/ ~regina/tcolor.html
- 69. http://www-theory.fnal.gov/ people/bdob/dimensions.html
- 70. F.Abe et al., \Evidence for top quark production in pp collisions at P s = 1.8 TeV," Phys.Rev.D 50 (1994) 2966.
- 71. F. Abe et al., \Search for Scalar Top and Scalar Bottom in pp collisions at Ps = 1.8 TeV," hepex/9912018, submitted to Phys. Rev. Lett.
- 72. JM. Campbell, RK. Ellis (Fermilab) This proceedings.
- 73. F. Abe et al., \M easurement of Correlated b Jet Cross Sections in pp Collisions at ^Ps = 1:8 TeV," Phys. Rev. D 53 (1996) 1051.
- 74. F. Abe et al., \A Measurement of the Bottom Quark Production Cross Section in 1.8 TeV pp Collisions U sing Sem ileptonic Decay Muons," Phys.Rev.Lett.71 (1993) 2396.
- 75. T. Nakaya, \M easurement of the D + (2010) production cross section in pp collisions at ^Ps = 1:8 TeV," report CDF-ANAL-BOTTOM-CDFR-5025.
- 76. F. Abe et al., \M easurement of the B0 anti-B0 O scillation Frequency U sing pi-B M eson Charge-Flavor Correlations in pp Collisions at ^Ps = 1:8 TeV," Phys. Rev. Lett. 80 (1998) 2057; F. Abe et al., \A M easurement of the B M eson and b Quark Cross Section at ^Ps = 1:8 TeV U sing the Exclusive D ecay B⁰! J=K (892)," Phys. Rev. D 50 (1994) 4252; F. Abe et al., \A M easurement of the B M eson and b Quark Cross Section at ^Ps = 1:8 TeV U sing the Exclusive D ecay B⁺! J=K ⁺," Phys. Rev. Lett. 68 (1992) 3403.
- 77. http://www-theory.fnal.gov/ people/ellis/Talks/top.ps.gz

- 78. See the references at http://www-d0.fnal.gov/ R.Roosen, (W orld Scientic, 1998), p. 162-166, ~heinson/thinkshop/singletop_papers_thinkshop.html hep-ph/9804445;
- 79. JM .Cam pbell, R K .E llis, Phys.Rev.D 60 (1999) 113006.
- 80. T A dam s et al., in Proceedings of the 33rd Rencontres de Moriond, QCD and Hadronic Interactions, (to be published), hep-ex/9906037.
- SA Rabinow itz et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 70 (1993) 134.
- 82. P.Vilain et al, Eur. Phys. J.C 11 (1999) 19.
- 83. H.Abram owicz et al, Z.Phys.C15 (1982) 19.
- 84. M. Gluck, E. Reya, A. Vogt, \D ynam ic parton distributions of the proton and sm all-x physics," Z.Phys.C 67 (1995) 433.
- 85. H L. Lai, et al., \Improved Parton D istributions from G lobal Analysis of Recent Deep Inelastic Scattering and Inclusive Jet Data," Phys. Rev. D 55 (1997) 1280.
- 86. F.Abe et al., \Search for New Particles Decaying into bb and Produced in Association with W Bosons Decaying into e and at the Tevatron," Phys. Rev. Lett. 79 (1997) 3819.
- 87. E. Laenen, S. Riemersma, J. Smith and W L. van Neerven, Nucl. Phys. B 392 (1993) 162; ibid. (1993) 229.
- J.Collins, F.W ilczek and A.Zee, Phys.Rev.D18 (1978) 242.
- S. Riemersma, J. Smith and W L. van Neerven, Phys.Lett. B 347 (1995) 43.
- 90. M. Buza, Y. Matiounine, J. Smith, R. Migneron and W. L. van Neerven, Nucl. Phys. B 472 (1996) 611.
- 91. B W . Harris and J. Sm ith, Nucl. Phys. B 452 (1995) 109.
- 92. J. Breitweg et al. (ZEUS Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B 407 (1997) 402, hep-ex/9908012.
- 93. C. Adlo et al. (H1-collaboration), Nucl. Phys. B 545 (1999) 21.
- 94. M. Buza, Y. Matiounine, J. Smith, W L. van Neerven, Eur. Phys. J. C 1 (1998) 301.
- 95. W L. van Neerven and E B. Zijlstra, Phys. Lett. B 272 (1991) 127, E B. Zijlstra and W L. van Neerven, Phys. Lett. B 273 (1991) 476, Nucl. Phys. B 383 (1992) 525.
- 96. P.J. Rijken and W L. van Neerven, Phys. Rev. D 51 (1995) 44.
- 97. A. Chuvakin, J. Smith and W L. van Neerven, hep-ph/9910250.
- 98. M. Buza, Y. Matiounine, J. Smith, W L. van Neerven, Phys.Lett. B 411 (1997) 211; W L. van Neerven, Acta Phys.Polon.B 28 (1997) 2715; W L. van Neerven in Proceedings of the 6th International W orkshop on Deep Inelastic Scattering and QCD "D IS98" edited by GH.Corem ans and

nlhep-ph/9804445; J.Smith in New Trends in HERA Physics, edited by B.A. Kniehl, G. Kramer and A. Wagner,

- (W orld Scienti c, 1998), p. 283, hep-ph/9708212.
 99. M A G. Aivazis, J.C. Collins, F.I.O lness and W. K. Tung, Phys. Rev. D 50 (1994) 3102; F. O lness and S.Riemersma, Phys. Rev. D 51 (1995) 4746.
- 100.J.C. Collins, Phys. Rev. D 58 (1998) 0940002.
- 101.R S.Thome and R G.Roberts, Phys.Lett.B 421 (1998) 303; Phys.Rev.D 57 (1998) 6871.
- 102.M.G luck, E.Reya and A.Vogt, Eur.Phys.J.C 5 (1998) 461.
- 103.W L.van Neerven and JAM.Verm aseren, Nucl. Phys.B238 (1984) 73; See also S.K retzer and I. Schienbein, Phys.Rev.D 58 (1998) 094035.
- 104.F A. Berends, G J.J. Burgers and W L. van Neerven, Nucl. Phys. B 297 (1988) 429; Erratum ibid. Nucl. Phys. B 304 (1988) 921.
- 105.A. Chuvakin, J. Sm ith, hep-ph/9911504.
- 106.A D.Martin, R.G.Roberts, W J.Stirling and R. Thome, Eur. Phys. J.C 4 (1998) 463.
- 107.A.Chuvakin, J.Sm ith and W L.van Neerven, in preparation.
- 108.ATLAS D etector and Physics Perform ance TechnicalD esign Report, CERN/LHCC/99-14.
- 109.C.Schm idt, private communication.
- 110.S. Catani and B R. W ebber, Nucl. Phys. B 349 (1991) 635.
- 111.C.Balazs and C.P.Yuan, Phys.Rev.D 56, 5558
 (1997) hep-ph/9704258; C.Balazs and C.P.Yuan,
 hep-ph/0001103.
- 112.H L. Lai, J. Huston, S. Kuhlmann, F. Olness, J. Owens, D. Soper, W K. Tung, H. Weerts, Phys. Rev. D 55 (1997) 1280.
- 113.G.Corcella, talk at the LHC workshop, October 1999.
- 114.G.Ladinsky, C.P.Yuan, Phys. Rev. D 50 (1994) 4239.
- 115.C.Balazs, J.Collins and D.Soper, these proceedings.
- 116.F.Abe et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 70 (1993) 2232; T. Takano, PhD. thesis, U. Tsukuba (1998); CDF Collaboration, paper in preparation.
- 117.C. Balazs, P. Nadolsky, C. Schmidt and C. P. Yuan, hep-ph/9905551.
- 118.P. Aurenche, A. Douri, R. Baier, M. Fontannaz, Z. Phys. C 29 (1985) 423; B. Bailey, J. Owens, J. Ohnemus, Phys. Rev. D 46 (1992) 2018; T. Binoth, J.P. Guillet, E. Pilon, M. Werlen, hepph/9911340.
- 119.PYTHIA manual update for version 6.1.
- 120.D. Denegri, private com munication.
- 121.S. M renna, talk at the Run 2 workshop, Nov

1999, Ferm ilab; C.Balazs, J.Huston, S.M renna, I.Puljak, Proceedings of the Run 2 W orkshop.

- 122.F. Abe et al, Nucl. Instrum. M ethods, A 271 (1988) 387.
- 123.R.K. Ellis and Sinisa Veseli, PhysRev. D 60 (1999) 011501.
- 124.Z.Bern, L.Dixon, D.Kosower and S.Weinzierl, Nucl.Phys.B489 (1997) 3;
 Z.Bern, L.Dixon and D.Kosower, Nucl.Phys. B513 (1998) 3.
- 125.L.Dixon, Z.Kunszt and A.Signer, Nucl. Phys. B 531 (1998) 3.
- 126.R K. Ellis, D A. Ross and A E. Terrano, Nucl. Phys. B 178 (1981) 421.
- 127.S.Catani and M H. Seymour, Nucl. Phys. B 485 (1997) 291, Erratum, ibid B 510 (1997) 503.
- 128.G. A ltarelli, R K. Ellis and G. Martinelli, Nucl. Phys. B 157 (1979) 461.
- 129.J.Kubar, M.Le Bellac, JL.Meunier, G.Plaut, Nucl.PhysB175 (1980) 251.
- 130.H.Georgi, Nucl. Phys.B 363 (1991) 301.
- 131.A D. Martin, R.G. Roberts, W.J. Stirling, R.S. Thome, eprint [hep-ph/9907231]
- 132.S.Kim, S.Kuhlmann and W M.Yao, presented at 1996 DPF/DPB Summer Study on New Directions for High-energy Physics (Snowmass 96), Snowmass, CO, July 1996;

P. Agrawal, D. Bowser-Chao and K. Cheung, Phys. Rev. D 51 (1995) 6114.

133.J.C. Collins and D. Soper, Phys. Rev. D 16 (1977) 2219.