# The Ratio of W + N jets To Z<sup>0</sup> = + N jets Versus N As a Precision Test of the Standard M odel

Erin Abouzaid and Henry Frisch Enrico Ferm i Institute, University of Chicago (Dated: January 18, 2022)

W e suggest replacing m easurem ents of the individual cross-sections for the production of W + N jets and Z + N jets in searches for new high-energy phenom ena at hadron colliders by the precision m easurem ent of the ratios (W + 0 jet)/(Z+0 jet), (W + 1 jet)/(Z+1 jet), (W + 2 jets)/(Z+2 jets),... (W + N jets)/(Z+N jets), with N as large as 6 (the number of jets in ttH). These ratios can also be formed for the case where one or more of the jets is tagged as a b or c quark. Existing m easurem ents of the individual cross sections for W ! e + N jets at the Tevatron have system atic uncertainties that grow rapidly with N, being dom inated by uncertainties in the identi cation of jets and the jet energy scale. These system atics, and also those associated with the lum inosity, parton distribution functions (PDF's), detector acceptance and e ciencies, and system atics of jet noding and b-tagging, are expected to substantially cancel in calculating the ratio of W to Z production in each N-jet channel, allowing a greater sensitivity to new contributions in these channels in R un II at the Tevatron and at the LHC.

IN T R O D U C T IO N

The signatures of the leptonic decays of the heavy gauge bosons W or Z<sup>0</sup> accompanied by jets, W ! ' + jets and Z<sup>0</sup> ! '+ ' + jets, are among the preem inentem inent search channels in very high energy particle collisions for new physics', i.e. interactions or particles that are not part of the Standard M odel [1, 2, 3, 4]. M any extensions of the SM predict new particles which have electroweak (EWK) couplings and decay into the SM gauge bosonsW,Z<sup>0</sup>, and , accompanied by jets. For example, searches have been made in the W or  $Z^{0}$  + jets channels for supersymmetric particles [5, 6], technicolored hadrons [7], heavy W<sup>0</sup> and Z<sup>0</sup> bosons [8, 9, 10] that might arise in extended gauge groups or from excitations in extra spatialdim ensions, charged Higgs bosons [11, 12], and leptoquarks [13, 14, 15, 16], am ong others. M ore generally, any production of new heavy particles with quantum num bers conserved by the strong interaction and EW K couplings is likely to contribute to signatures with one or more EWK gauge bosons; additional jets will always be present at som e level from initial-state radiation, and m ay also be created in cascade decays of new heavy particles or from the decay of associated heavy particles.

W ithin the SM, the top quark was discovered and its m ass m easured in the W + 3/4 jets channel in which at least one jet was identi ed as a b-quark 17, 18, 19, 20]. The W + 2 jets channel with b-quark identic cation has been used to search for the H iggs boson [21] and for single top (tb) production in the W + bb signature [22]. A ssociated H iggs production via ttH is expected to produce W + 6 jets, of which 4 are b-quarks; associated W and Z production via ttW or ttZ will also produce W + 6 jets, of which two will be b-quarks.

P recise m easurements of the W + N jets [23] and  $Z^{0} = + N$  jets [24] channels, where N is the number of jets, for values of N between 0 and at least 6, including

the cases where pairs of the jets are either bb or c c, would thus provide a broad search in a number of possible signatures of physics beyond the SM. The importance of calculating the cross sections for these channels has long been recognized [25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38]; the development of sophisticated M onte C arlo program s capable of handling m ore particles in the

nal state at leading order (LO), or in som e cases, next-to-leading order (NLO), now enables us to contemplate much more precise tests in the upcoming Tevatron R un II and at the LHC.

However, direct measurements of the production cross sections of W + N = + N = + N = + N = + N = suffer from inherent theoretical and experim ental uncertainties associated with the de nition and measurement (and hence counting) of jets. Am ong the dom inant experim ental uncertainties are the energy response of the detector to a jet ('energy scale'), additional energy contributions from the underlying event (that part of the pp collision not directly involved in the hard parton-parton collision that produces the W or Z), backgrounds from m isidenti ed non-electroweak events, and jet acceptance. These e ects and others can change the number of jets measured in a given event. Uncertainties in the theoretical SM predictions are dom inated by the choice of  $Q^2$  scale, the parton distribution function (PDF), initial/ nalstate radiation (ISR/FSR), and the non-perturbative evolution of partons into on-shell particles that would then be detected. All of these e ects com bined m ean that the m easurem ent of a speci c exclusive N -jet channel such as W + 4 jets will be completely dom inated by system atic uncertainties at the Tevatron in Run II and at the LHC.

In this note we use the M onte C arlo program s M ad-G raph [39, 40] and M CFM [41, 42, 43] to explore using the measured ratios of W + N jets to  $Z^{0} = + N$  jets at each value of N to provide a much more precise test of the SM than can be made by measuring the cross sections them selves [44]. The W bosons are assumed to be identi ed by the leptonic decay  $W^+$  ! e + , and the  $Z^{0} =$ intermediate state by  $Z^{0}=$ ! e<sup>+</sup> e . In most of the above models of new physics the production of new particles decaying into W and  $Z^{0} = + jet$  nal states would change the ratio from its SM prediction. The uncertainties listed above, except the misidenti cation backgrounds, are expected to cancel to a large degree, and the backgrounds can them selves be made to partially cancel by deriving the ' and "' ' event samples from a common inclusive high-pr lepton sample [45]. We use data from the CDF [46] collaboration from Run I at the Ferm ilab Tevatron to estim ate the sensitivity to contributions from non-SM processes using the  $(W + N \text{ jets}) = (Z^0 = + N \text{ jets})$  ratio m ethod.

### EXPERIMENTAL UNCERTAINTIES IN (W + N jets) = ( $Z^{\circ}$ = + N jets)

The CDF Collaboration has published comprehensive studies of inclusive [47] W ! e + N jets and  $Z^{0}$  = ! e<sup>+</sup>e + N jets production in pp collisions at P = 1.3 TeV [46]. The D collaboration has measured the ratio of cross sections (W + 1 jet)/(W + 0 jet) [48]; as the D measurem ents are less extensive in the number of jets (N) and do not include measurem ents of Z<sup>0</sup> + jets, we focus here on the CDF measurem ents.

The CDFW selection required an electron with  $E_T > 20 \text{ GeV}$  and j j< 1.0, and m issing transverse energy [45]  $E_T > 25 \text{ GeV}$ . The Z selection required one electron satisfying the same charged lepton requirements, and a second electron with  $E_T > 20 \text{ GeV}$  for j j< 1.0,  $E_T > 15 \text{ GeV}$  for 1.1 < j j< 2.4, and  $E_T > 10 \text{ GeV}$  for 2.4 < j j< 3.6. Jet identication 49] was made with a cone size in - space of R = 0.4, a threshold of  $E_T > 15 \text{ GeV}$ , and an range of j j< 2.5. Multiple jets were required to be separated from each other in -

space by a distance R > 0.52; the requirement that the electron be 'isolated' from other clusters of energy in the calorimeter also corresponds to requiring R > 0.52 between the electron and each jet [46].

The individual (exclusive) cross sections extracted from the inclusive cross sections measured by CDF for W + N jets and  $Z^{0} = + N$  jets versus the number of jets, N, are displayed in Table I and F igure 1, after being modi ed for comparison with M adG raph's  $W^+$  predictions by dividing the CDF cross sections for  $W^+ + W$  by two. The uncertainties have been calculated in two ways: assum ing no correlations (giving an upper bound for the uncertainty) and assum ing com plete correlation (giving a low er bound). The uncorrelated uncertainties at each value of N have been calculated by subtracting the uncertainties of higher values of N in quadrature, and are reported rst in the table. This overestim ates the uncertainties, but as the (N + 1)th channel is typically only 20% of the N th channel the overestim ate is not large. The correlated uncertainties at each value of N have been calculated by subtracting the uncertainties of higher values of N; these uncertainties are reported second in the table.

The estim ated CDF system atic uncertainties are broken down according to the source of each uncertainty in Table II versus the inclusive number of jets. One can see that in general the quoted system atic uncertainties grow rapidly with N, as described in detail in Ref. [46] This is due to the di culties of counting jets given the rapidly falling spectrum in E $_{\rm T}$  and the uncertainties in m easuring the energy of a jet, and, to a lesser extent, uncertainties in the position of the jet with respect to the limit in in the jet selection. In addition, energy deposited in the calorim eter from the fragm ents of the collision not directly produced by the hard' interaction that produced the boson, called the 'underlying event', contribute to the total energy m easured in the jet cone, and can prom ote jets from below threshold to over threshold, changing the num ber of jets in the event. Sim ilarly, multiple interactions from separate pp collisions in the same bunch crossing [50] can contribute energy in the jet cone. There are smaller contributions from uncertainties in the acceptance for the leptons, for the bbliteration' of a lepton by a jet (if a jet lands close to a lepton the lepton can fail the identication criteria), and uncertainties in the contribution from decays of the top quark. Lastly, the uncertainty due to backgrounds from processes other than vector boson production (QCD background') grows with the number of jets.

The largest uncertainty is from the jet energy scale. This uncertainty will cancel in the production of W + jets and  $Z^{0} = +$  jets events to the extent that the spectra in  $E_T$ , the distribution in , and the composition (e.g. quark versus gluon) of the jets in the two processes are the same [51]. Figure 2 shows the spectra in and  $E_T$  generated with the M adG raph M onte C arlo program [40] at LO.U sing the di erence of the ratio of the tted slopes of the E  $_{\rm T}$  distributions for W and Z production in Figure 2 times a typical uncertainty in the  $E_T$  scale of 20% [46] at 20 GeV gives an estim ate of the uncertainty in the ratio of 2%. The e ect of the nite acceptance in for jets depends on the di erence in the distributions in of jets in W or Z production; taking the di erence shown in Figure 2 times the estimated variation with rapidity in jet response [52] gives an estim ate of the uncertainty in the ratio of 1% .

The second largest system atic uncertainty is from the e ects of energy from the underlying event, which can promote' a 3-jet event to being a 4-jet event, for example, by boosting a low er-energy jet above the jet-counting threshold in  $E_T$ . We expect that the underlying events in W and in Z events should be very sim ilar; studies of the underlying event in jet events [53] predict that the contribution from the beam fragments, which could be di erent due to the di erent quark diagram s in W and in

TABLE I: The cross sections times branching ratios for  $W^+ + N$  jets and  $Z^0 = + N$  jets production (rst two columns) extracted from the CDF measurements versus the number of jets, at P = 1.8 TeV. These are used to calculate the ratios of the  $W^+ + N$  jets to  $Z^0 = + N$  jets jet cross section times branching ratio (third column). Also shown are the (less robust) ratios of (W + N jets) = (W + N + 1 jets) and  $(Z^0 = + N \text{ jets}) = (Z^0 = + N + 1 \text{ jets})$ . The rst uncertainty given is the uncorrelated uncertainty, while the second (in parentheses) is the correlated uncertainty. These uncertainties are derived as discussed in the text.

Ν		W + + N j			Z+Nj		W +	+ N j / Z + N j	W +	N j∕ W + N + 1j	Z + N	j/ Z+N+1j
0	1010	54	(34)	185:8	11:1	(6.7)	5 <b>:</b> 43	0:44 (0.27)	5 <b>:</b> 46	0:78 (0.53)	5:23	0 <b>:</b> 87 (0.60)
1	185	25	(17)	35:5	5:5	(3.9)	5:21	1:06(0.75)	4 <b>:</b> 46	1:10(0.81)	4:55	126(0.93)
2	41:5	8 <b>:</b> 7	(6.5)	7:8	1:8	(1.34)	5:32	1 <b>:</b> 65 (1.23)	5 <b>:</b> 42	1:98 (1.30)	4:88	1:97 (1.46)
3	7:7	2:3	(1.4)	1:6	0:53	(0.39)	4:78	2:14(1.46)	5:28	4 <b>:</b> 48 (3.77)	3:72	1:92 (1.73)
4	1:45	1:15	5(1.00)	0:43	0 <b>:</b> 17	(0.17)	3:37	2 <b>:</b> 99 (2 <b>.</b> 68)		-		_

TABLE II: The system atic uncertainties in percent on the measured CDF inclusive W + N jet production cross sections for for N = 1 to N = 4 (column 1) [46]. The successive columns are the uncertainties in the cross sections due to uncertainties in: the calorimeter jet energy scale, the underlying event, QCD background to W identication, multiple pp interactions in a single event, the value of the maximum allowed j j for jets to be counted, the W acceptance, bbliteration' of an electron by the superposition of a jet, and contributions from the top quark. The larger error bar is quoted in the case of asymmetric uncertainties.

N (Jets)	Et <sub>J</sub> Scale	UndEv	QCD Bkgd	Mult Int	J	Acc	0 blit	Тор
1	6.8%	5.8%	5.2%	3.2%	1.9%	88.0	0.2%	0.05%
2	11%	9.8%	5.4%	7.2%	3.7%	1.0%	0.3%	0.3%
3	17%	16%	9.1%	9.8%	4.8%	1.8%	0.6%	1.3%
4	23%	21%	15.8%	14%	5.5%	3.5%	1.3%	0.5%

Z production, are a sm all portion of the total. How ever, the energy per tow er contributed by the underlying event, and hence the e ect on promotion' of jets, can be directly measured in W + N jets and  $Z^{0} = + N$  jets events. We consequently assume that this uncertainty will be negligible in the ratio.

For higher (4) jet multiplicities QCD backgrounds become comparable to each of the above. The backgrounds in the  $Z^{0}$  = channel are at the few percent level, and are measurable (and hence subtractable) by counting same-sign events. Previous studies of the backgrounds to inclusive W production by CDF [54] for selection criteria similar to those used here have shown that the background is dominated by approximately equal contributions from leptons from heavy avor production and m isidenti ed hadrons. How well these can be measured with the new Run II detectors is not yet known; the form er can be measured with the silicon vertex detectors, and the latter can be measured by conventional background techniques.

The next largest system atic uncertainty in the Run I CDF cross section, contributions from multiple pp interactions, should cancel identically in the ratio, as it is uncorrelated with the hard scattering.

The remaining uncertainties due to acceptance, bbliteration' of a lepton by a jet, and contributions from top decay, are at most at the few percent level [46].

#### M ONTE CARLO PROGRAM SAND EVENT SELECTION CRITERIA

We have explored the  $\frac{W}{P}$  to Z<sup>0</sup> ratios in pp collisions at the Tevatron energy of s = 1:96 TeV using the M onte C arb program s M adG raph [40] and M CFM [43]. Sam – ples of W<sup>+</sup> (! e<sup>+</sup>) + N jets and Z<sup>0</sup> = (! e<sup>+</sup> e) + N jets, for N up to 4, were produced at LO using M ad-G raph. M CFM was used to explore the ratios for up to 2 jets at N LO, and to understand the dependence of the ratios on the Q<sup>2</sup> scale and on the parton distribution functions for up to 4 jets at LO. Jets are treated at the parton level' with kinem atic selections applied to the 4-vectors with no fragmentation or detector simulation.

We consider only the production in rst-order electrow eak processes of the W + jets and Z+ jets channels { i.e. production of boson + jets from the W W, W Z, and ZZ channels are excluded. We also exclude tt and to production; the method proposed here should allow a more precise determ ination of the non-top W + jets production, the dom inant background in the top channel, and hence should allow more precise measurem ents of the top quark m ass and cross section.

The selection criteria and strategy for W and Z<sup>0</sup> = events used in the M onte C arlo studies were developed for the m easurement of R, the ratio of inclusive cross sections R (W) = (Z<sup>0</sup> = ) [55]. To minimize systematic uncertainties in the ratio due to the trigger and lepton selection, both W and Z<sup>0</sup> = events are selected from a common sample of inclusive central high transverse momentum [45] ( $p_T$ ) leptons, with transverse



FIG.1: a) The measured cross sections for the signatures  $W^+$  (!  $e^+$  ) + N jets and  $Z^0 =$  (!  $e^+e$  ) + N jets versus the number of jets, N, in W  $^+$  and Z  $^0$  = production in pp collisions at  $rac{1}{s} = 1.8$  TeV. The data are from the CDF [46] collaboration and were originally reported as inclusive cross sections. In computing exclusive cross sections from these, the uncertainties have been calculated in two ways. The dotted error bars were calculated assuming no correlations (giving an upper bound for the uncertainty) and the solid error bars were calculated assuming complete correlation (giving a lower bound); b) the percent uncertainty in the W  $^{+}$  + N  $\,$  jets and Z <sup>0</sup> = + N jets cross sections. The uncertainties shown are the lower bounds (corresponding to the solid error bars in plot a). The gure shows the rapid growth of the uncertainties with N, the number of jets.

energy (E<sub>T</sub>) greater than 25 GeV and pseudo-rapidity

(j ) less than 1.0. The second lepton from the boson decay, either another charged lepton (from Z<sup>0</sup> = decay) or a neutrino (from W decay), is required to have E<sub>T</sub> > 25 G eV; in the neutrino case this is in plem ented by requiring the m issing transverse energy ( $\mathbf{E}_{T}$ ) to be greater than 25 G eV.

Jets are required to have  $E_T > 15$  GeV and to be within j j< 2.5.0 ur MC studies are at parton level, so that there are no considerations of cone size, energy scale, or acceptance corrections in the M onte C arb num bers.

THE PRED ICTED RATIOS ( $W^{+}$  + N jets)= ( $Z^{0}$ = + N jets)

The predicted LO ratios ( $W^{+} + N$  jets) = ( $Z^{0} = + N$  jets) are presented in Figure 3 and in Table III. To determ ine the nal uncertainty on this ratio will take a full analysis of the Run II data set; in lieu of this we have m ade some sim ple assumptions to get an estimate of the sensitivity in cross-section for non-SM physics in each of the N-jet channels in Run II of the Tevatron. We assume that the jet energy response of the calorim eter will largely cancel for jets in  $Z^{0} =$  events and W events as discussed below. We also assume the e ects of the underlying event in  $Z^{0} =$  and W events will sim ilarly cancel. These are the two largest contributors to the system atic uncertainties quoted in Ref. [46].

THE PRED ICTED RATIOS (W + N jets) = (W + N + 1 jets) A N D $(Z^{0} = + N \text{ jets}) = (Z^{0} = + N + 1 \text{ jets})$ 

W hile the ratios of cross sections (W + N jets) = (W + N + 1 jets) and  $(Z^0 = + N \text{ jets}) = (Z^0 = + N + 1 \text{ jets})$  are much more di cult to measure precisely than the  $(W^+ + N \text{ jets}) = (Z^0 = + N \text{ jets})$  ratios, we include the generator-levelLO predictions for them here as they are often used in extrapolations in N to estimate backgrounds at large N, and also to measure the strong interaction coupling. These are reported in Table III, and show n in Figure 4.

#### THEORETICAL UNCERTAINTIES IN (W<sup>+</sup> + N jets)= (Z<sup>0</sup>= + N jets)

The two largest uncertainties in the predicted LO W + N jets and Z<sup>0</sup>= + N jets cross sections are expected to be due to choice of Q<sup>2</sup> scale and parton distribution function (PDF). We investigate the dependence of the ratio on these two choices using MCFM.



FIG. 2: The plot on the left (a) shows the (normalized) jet distributions for  $W^+$  (!  $e^+$ ) + 1 jet (dashed) and  $Z^0 = (! e^+ e^-) + 1$  jet (solid) events satisfying the selection criteria described in the text. The plot on the right (b) shows the corresponding jet  $E_T$  distributions, log (dN =dE<sub>T</sub>) versus N.B oth plots are predictions at LO using M adG raph [40]. Uncertainties in the ratios ( $W^+ + N$  jets) = ( $Z^0 = - N$  jets) due to the uncertainty in the jet rapidity cut at = 2.5 are estimated from the shapes in the left-hand plot, and those due to the uncertainty in the jet energy scale from the right-hand plot.

TABLE III: M adG raph leading order predictions of cross sections times branching ratio for W<sup>+</sup> + N jets and Z<sup>0</sup> = + N jets production (rst two columns) versus the number of jets, at  $\overline{s} = 1.96$  TeV, which are used to calculate the ratios of the W<sup>+</sup> + N jets to Z<sup>0</sup> = + N jets jet cross section times branching ratio (third column). Also shown are the (less robust) ratios of (W + N jets) = (W + N + 1 jets) and (Z<sup>0</sup> = + N jets) = (Z<sup>0</sup> = + N + 1 jets) (last two columns).

Ν	W + +	Nj	Z +	Nj	W + +	Nj/Z+Nj	W + N	j∕ ₩ + N + 1j	z + n j/	Z + N + 1j
0	341:5	0:5	67 <b>:</b> 0	02	5:10	0:02	8:11	0:06	6:41	0:02
1	42:1	0:3	10:45	0:01	4:03	0:03	5:08	0:05	4:91	0:07
2	8:28	0:05	2:13	0:03	3:89	0:06	4:93	0:07	4:75	0:09
3	1:68	0:02	0:448	0:006	3 <b>:</b> 75	0:07	4:71	0:09	5:15	0:09
4	0:357	0:005	0 <b>:</b> 087	0:001	4:10	0:07		-		-

Dependence on the  $Q^2$  Scale

 $Q^2$  also are listed.

D ependence on the C hoice of P arton D istribution Function

We have used the MCFM generator and a selection of parton distribution functions to investigate the dependence of the cross sections in the W<sup>+</sup>+2jets and Z<sup>0</sup> +2jets channels. The cross sections calculated with the CTEQ 3L, CTEQ 4L [56], MRST 98 [57], and MRSG 95 [58] distributions were compared to the results calculated with CTEQ 5L, the default PDF. The results of the comparison are reported in Table V. Figure 7 gives the ratio of (W<sup>+</sup>+2jets for PDF x) to (W<sup>+</sup>+2 jets for CTEQ 5L), while Figure 8 shows the ratio of (W<sup>+</sup>+2 jets) to (Z+2 jets) for a given PDF. For the four PDF's we chose, the changes in the W and Z cross sections them -

The e ect of the choice of  $Q^2$  scale is expected to partially cancel in W + N jets and  $Z^{0} = + N$  jets production, as both proceed through a D rell-Y an-like process. Wede ne $W_N^+$  (Q<sup>2</sup>)  $W^+ + N$  jets evaluated at  $Q^2$ , and, similarly,  $Z_N$  (Q<sup>2</sup>)  $Z^{0} = + N$  jets. The ratios of W and Z cross sections evaluated at  $Q^2 = M_V^2$ and at  $Q^2 = M_V^2 + P_{T,V}^2$ ,  $W_N^+$  ( $M^2$ ) =  $W_N^+$  ( $P_t^2 + M^2$ ) and  $Z_N$  (M  $^2$ ) =  $Z_N$  (P  $_t^2$  + M  $^2$ ), are given in Table IV and shown in Figure 5. Changing the  $Q^2$  scale a ects the W cross sections by as much as 15% and a ects the Z cross sections by as much as 12%. However, changing the  $Q^2$  scale has much less e ect on the predicted ratio  $(W^+ + N \neq ts) = (Z^0 = + N \neq ts)$ , which changes less than 2%, as shown in Figure 6 and in Table IV, where the W /Z ratios evaluated at the two di erent values of

TABLE IV: M CFM predictions for the ratios W<sup>+</sup> + N jets and Z<sup>0</sup> = + N jets with di erent Q<sup>2</sup> scales (columns one and two), and the ratio R<sup>+</sup> with di erent Q<sup>2</sup> scales. R<sup>+</sup> is (W<sup>+</sup> + N jets) = (Z<sup>0</sup> = + N jets), and Q<sub>1</sub><sup>2</sup> corresponds to Q<sup>2</sup> = M<sub>V</sub><sup>2</sup>, while Q<sub>2</sub><sup>2</sup> corresponds to Q<sup>2</sup> = M<sub>V</sub><sup>2</sup> + P<sub>T,V</sub><sup>2</sup>.

N $_{\rm jets}$	$W^{+}(Q_{1}^{2}) / W^{+}(Q_{2}^{2})$	$Z^{0} (Q_{1}^{2}) / Z^{0} (Q_{2}^{2})$	$R^{+} (Q_{1}^{2}) / R^{+} (Q_{2}^{2})$
0	0.999 .001	1.000 .001	0.999 .001
1	1.017 .003	1.018 .002	0.999 .002
2	1.075 .002	1.066 .002	1.009 .002
3	1.153 .004	1.134 .002	1.017 .004



FIG. 3: A comparison of CDF data (circles) with M ad-G raph (LO) predictions (triangles) for the ratio of production cross sections times leptonic branching ratios for the signature W<sup>+</sup> + N jets to the signature Z<sup>0</sup> = + N jets, (W<sup>+</sup> + N jets) = (Z<sup>0</sup> = + N jets), versus the number of jets, N, in W<sup>+</sup> and Z<sup>0</sup> = production at  $\overline{S} = 1.8$  TeV for the data and at  $\overline{S} = 1:96$  TeV for the predictions. The case where two of the jets are b-quark jets are also shown (inverted triangles). The statistical uncertainties on the predictions are sm aller than the symbols.

selves range from +27% to -7% for the W 's and +25% to -8% for the Z's, while the the range of the change in the ratio is from +1.5% to zero, a factor of 20 sm aller.

## SENSITIVITY TO NEW CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE (W + N jets) = (Z $^{\circ}$ = + N jets) RATIO

A non-Standard M odel source of W + jets or Z + jets would result in a measured deviation from the expected SM value of the  $R_N = (W + N \text{ jets}) = (Z^0 = + N \text{ jets})$ . A ssum ing that the contribution is to W + jets, we can (crudely) estimate the sensitivity to new physics in each of the W + N -jet channels by multiplying the uncertainty on the ratio  $(W + N \text{ jets}) = (Z^0 = + N \text{ jets})$  by the exclusive W + N jets cross section (if instead the source feeds Z+ jets at the sam e crossection, the sensitivity will be larger by a factor of about 10 [59].

The estimates above of the systematic uncertainties on  $R_N$  are on the order of several percent; an estimate based on the Run ICDF experience in measuring R is that 1% in that ratio may be achievable [54]. Statistical uncertainties would then be expected to dominate over systematics in Run II at the Tevatron for N greater than 2.

Making the assumptions that the new contributions are to the W cross section and not that of the Z, that the system atics on the ratio can be reduced with a much larger dataset [60] from several percent to 1%, and that one uses only the electron modes of W and Z decays, we nd the 1-sigm a cross-section uncertainties on new physics shown in Table V I. The muon channel would be expected to double the statistics (and hence lower the uncertainties by  $\frac{1}{2}$ ).

A dditional sensitivity can come from comparing observed with expected kinem atic distributions or by boking for additional objects in the events. In particular, the production of a pair of b-quarks suppresses the cross section over that for light quark production by a large factor, in principle allowing a corresponding increase in sensitivity. Table V II shows the ratio of the QCD cross section for producing N jets including no b quarks to N jets including two b quarks, for W or Z production. How ever standard m odel top production will provide a large background for non-standard m odel physics in these signatures.

#### CONCLUSIONS

The m easurement of the production cross sections of the vector bosons W and Z<sup>0</sup> in association with a num – ber (N) of jets is now a standard way of boking for the production of new particles or processes that are not described by the Standard M odel. W ith the expected increased lum inosities of Run II and the LHC, N can be quite large; processes such as associated production of a H iggs boson with a tt pair can produce W + 6 jets (4 of which are b-quarks), for instance. Increasing the precision of the com parison with Standard M odel predictions is necessary, as there are truly di cult problem s, both



FIG.4: The ratio of cross sections times branching ratios,  $(M^+ + N)$  jets) =  $(M^+ + N + 1)$  jets) (left hand plot) and  $(Z^0 = + N)$  jets) =  $(Z^0 = + N + 1)$  jets) (right hand plot) versus the number of jets, N, in W and Z production at  $\overline{s} = 1.8$  TeV for the data and at  $\overline{s} = 1.96$  TeV for the predictions. The data (circles) are from the CDF [46] and D [48] collaborations; the predictions are at leading order from M adG raph [40]. The M adG raph cross sections for when the jets are from gluons or light quarks are shown with triangles, while inverted triangles represent when two of the jets are from b-quarks.

TABLE V:MCFM predictions for the ratios  $W^{+} + 2jets$  and  $Z^{0} + 2jets$  with di erent PDF's. The PDF's that were compared are CTEQ 3L, CTEQ 4L, CTEQ 5L, MRSG 95, MRST 98. Column one gives the ratio of  $(W^{+} + 2jet)$  at one of the PDF's to  $(W^{+} + 2jets)$  at CTEQ 5L. Column two is the analogous  $Z^{0}$  information. The third column is the ratio of  $R^{+}$  (2) at a speci c PDF to  $R^{+}$  (2) at CTEQ 5L, where  $R^{+}$  (2)=  $(W^{+} + 2jets) = (Z^{0} = + 2jets)$ .

PDF X	(W <sup>+</sup> <sub>X</sub> )/	/ ( W <sup>+</sup> <sub>L</sub> )	( $Z_X$ ) /	( Z <sub>L</sub> )	(R <sub>X</sub> <sup>+</sup> ) /	(R <sub>L</sub> <sup>+</sup> )
CTEQ5L	1.000	.000	1.000	.000	1.000	.000
CTEQ3L	1.103	.002	1.090	.002	1.011	.003
CTEQ4L	1.105	.002	1.094	.002	1.009	.003
M R SG 95	1,268	.002	1,249	.002	1.015	.003
M R ST 98	0.932	.001	0.922	.001	1.011	.002

theoretical and experim ental, in predicting the cross sections for W + N jets and  $Z^{0} = + N$  jets when N is large.

Using the Monte Carlo generators MadGraph and MCFM at the parton level, and the published CDF data on W and Z + jets production, we have made initial estimates of the systematic limits on the precision that can be achieved in the measurem ent of the ratios of W to Z production,  $(W + N = (Z^0))$ + N jets), as a function of the number of observed jets, N. The results indicate that the ratios are at least an order-ofm agnitude less sensitive to experim ental and statistical uncertainties than the individual cross sections. In particular the ratios are more robust for large values of N, where the experim ental uncertainties in the energy scale and contributions from the underlying event and multiple interactions lead to a rapid growth in the cross section uncertainty with N.

W ith respect to the theoretical uncertainties, at N = 2, for example, we nd the uncertainty due to choice of  $Q^2$  scale is a factor of 8 sm aller in the ratio (W + N jets)= ( $Z^0 = + N$  jets) than in the individual W or Z cross sections. Similarly, the uncertainty due to the choice of PDF, largely driven by the u=d quark ratio, is sm aller in the ratio by a factor of 20.

The experimental uncertainties in the cross sections, dominated by the uncertainty in the jet energy scale and contributions from the underlying event, are greatly diminished by focusing on the ratio of W and Z<sup>0</sup> = cross sections ratio than the cross sections them selves. In particular the uncertainty due to uncertainties in the jet energy scale, the contributions from the underlying event, multiple interactions in one event, etc. cancel to a high degree. We have here made estimates at the parton level; a full determination of these will require the new data and a full analysis; our initial estimates are that the ratios can



FIG.5: The ratios (W <sup>+</sup> + N jets at Q<sup>2</sup> = M  $_{\rm V}^{2}$ ) to (W <sup>+</sup> + N jets at Q<sup>2</sup> = M  $_{\rm V}^{2}$  + P  $_{\rm T,V}^{2}$ ) and (Z <sup>0</sup> = + N jets at Q<sup>2</sup> = M  $_{\rm V}^{2}$ ) to (Z <sup>0</sup> = + N jets at Q<sup>2</sup> = M  $_{\rm V}^{2}$  + P  $_{\rm T,V}^{2}$ ). Changing the Q<sup>2</sup> scale signi cantly changes the cross sections, by up to approximately 15%. However the ratio of W to Z cross sections changes much less (see Table IV).



FIG. 7: The ratios (W + 2jets for PDF X) to (W + 2jets for CTEQ 5L) and (Z+2jets for PDF X) to (Z+2jets for CTEQ 5L). Changing the PDF a exts the cross sections quite signi cantly, by up to approximately 25%. However the ratio of W to Z cross sections changes much less (see Table V).



FIG.6: The ratios  $(R^+ at Q^2 = M_V^2)$  to  $(R^+ at Q^2 = M_V^2 + P_{T,V}^2)$ , where  $R^+ = (W^+ + N_{jets}) = (Z^0 = + N_{jets})$ . Changing the  $Q^2$  scale a ects this ratio by 2% while the individual cross sections change by m ore than 15%.

be determ ined at the several percent level. This is a signi cant improvement over the present uncertainties on the cross sections them selves.

It is a pleasure to acknow ledge helpful conversations

TABLE V I: The cross section corresponding to a 1-sigm a uncertainty in the W =Z ratio in 2 fb<sup>1</sup>, and in 15 fb<sup>1</sup>. The bins up through N = 4 use the cross sections of [46]; the N = 5 and higher bins have been extrapolated using an exponential, with a factor of 4.8 for each successive jet. Note that the number of Z<sup>0</sup> ! e<sup>+</sup> e events in each bin will be approximately a factor of 10 sm aller than the corresponding number of W events. Using the dim uon channel one can gain a factor of approximately  $\frac{1}{2}$  on these uncertainties.

Event and W		P roperties	W /Z Ratio M ethod Reach						
N (Jets)		W	<sub>new</sub> 2 fb <sup>1</sup>	<sub>new</sub> 15 fb <sup>1</sup>					
0		1896 pb	20 pb (1.0%)	20 pb (1.0%)					
1		370 pb	4.4 pb (1.2%)	3.7 pb (1.0%)					
2		83 pb	1.5 pb (1.8%)	0.9 pb (1.1%)					
3		15 pb	0.5 pb (3.5%)	240 fb (1.6%)					
4		3.1 pb	230 fb (7.5%)	95fb (2.9%)					
5		650 fb	100 fb (16%)	40 fb (6%)					
6		140 fb	50 fb (36%)	18 fb (13%)					
7		28 fb	20 fb (78%)	8 fb (29%)					
8		6 fb		4 fb (63%)					

with Edward Boos, John Campbell, Jay Dittman, Lev Dudko, Keith Ellis, Michelangelo Mangano, Stephen Mrenna, Jon Rosner, and Tim Stelzer. Special thanks are due to Tim Stelzer and John Campbell for help with MadGraph and MCFM, respectively. This work was supported by the National Science Foundation, grant PHY 02-01792.

(N jets) / (bb+ (N-2)	jets) for W <sup>+</sup> or Z <sup>0</sup> =	W <sup>+</sup> + bb + N jets /Z	<sup>0</sup> = +	bb+N	jets	
W <sup>+</sup> + 2 j/W <sup>+</sup> bb+ 0 j: 90.29	.96 Z+2j/Zbb+0j:58.84	.89	₩ <sup>+</sup> bb+0j/Zbb+0j:	1.53	.03	
W <sup>+</sup> +3j/W <sup>+</sup> bb+1j:54.72	.84 Z+3j/Zbb+1j:33.94	.69	W <sup>+</sup> bb+1j/Zbb+1j:	1.61	.04	
W <sup>+</sup> +4j/W <sup>+</sup> bb+2j <b>:</b> 37.58 1	.30 Z+4j/Zbb+2j:22.83	.40	₩ <sup>+</sup> bb+2j/Zbb+2j <b>:</b>	1.65	.06	

TABLE V II: Ratios of the cross sections for  $W^+ + N$  jets (including no b quarks) to  $W^+ + N$  jets (including two b quarks), and ratios of  $Z^0 = + N$  jets (including no b quarks) to  $Z^0 = + N$  jets (including two b quarks). Also given are the ratios  $W^+ + bb + N$  jets to  $Z^0 = + bb + N$  jets.



FIG. 8: The ratios R for PDF X to R for CTEQ5L, where  $R = (W + N \text{ jets}) = (Z^{0} = + N \text{ jets})$ . Changing the PDF a ects this ratio much less -by at most 2% - than it a ects the individual cross sections.

- [1] S.L.G lashow, Nucl. Phys. 22 (1961).
- [2] S.W einberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. 19 (1967).
- [3] A. Salam, Proc. 8th Nobel Symposium, Stockholm (1979).
- [4] S.Berman, J.Bjorken, and J.Kogut, Phys. Rev. D 4 (1971).
- [5] T.A olderetal (CDF), Phys. Rev. D 63, 091101 (2001), hep-ex/0011004.
- [6] D.Acosta et al. (CDF), Phys. Rev. D 65, 052007 (2002), hep-ex/0109012.
- [7] T. A older et al. (CDF), Phys. Rev. Lett. 84, 1110 (2000).
- [8] S.Abachiet al. (D0), Phys. Rev. Lett. 76, 3271 (1996), hep-ex/9512007.
- [9] T.A older et al. (CDF), Phys. Rev. Lett. 88, 071806 (2002), hep-ex/0108004.
- [10] D.Acosta et al. (CDF) (2002), hep-ex/0209030.
- [11] B.Abbott et al (D 0), Phys. Rev. Lett. 82, 4975 (1999), hep-ex/9902028.
- [12] T.A okleretal. (CDF), Phys. Rev. D 62, 012004 (2000), hep-ex/9912013.
- [13] B.Abbott et al. (D 0), Phys. Rev. Lett. 80, 2051 (1998),

hep-ex/9710032.

- [14] F.Abe et al. (CDF), Phys. Rev. Lett. 79, 4327 (1997), hep-ex/9708017.
- [15] B.Abbott et al. (D 0), Phys. Rev. Lett. 84, 2088 (2000), hep-ex/9910040.
- [16] T. A older et al. (CDF), Phys. Rev. Lett. 85, 2056 (2000), hep-ex/0004003.
- [17] F. Abe et al. (CDF), Phys. Rev. Lett. 73, 225 (1994), hep-ex/9405005.
- [18] F.Abe et al. (CDF), Phys. Rev. D 50, 2966 (1994).
- [19] F.Abe et al. (CDF), Phys. Rev. Lett. 74, 2626 (1995), hep-ex/9503002.
- [20] S.Abachiet al. (D 0), Phys. Rev. Lett. 74, 2632 (1995), hep-ex/9503003.
- [21] F.Abe et al. (CDF), Phys. Rev. Lett. 81, 5748 (1998).
- [22] D.Acosta et al. (CDF), Phys. Rev. D 65, 091102 (2002), hep-ex/0110067.
- [23] Because the M onte C arbo program s speci cally ask for the sign of the nal state charged lepton, we use the production crossection for only one sign (W<sup>+</sup>) of W production, resulting in ratios R<sup>+</sup> which are half (5) of the usually quoted R = (W<sup>+</sup> + W) = Z<sup>0</sup> = (10).
- [24] The production in the charged dilepton channels (e.g.  $e^+e$ ) proceed through two s-channel am plitudes, the and Z<sup>0</sup> poles. W hile the Z<sup>0</sup> pole dom inates for the selection criteria used here (96%), both am plitudes m ust always be included (experim entalists have evolved the jargon that Z<sup>0</sup> m eans both am plitudes, as the source of the resulting nal state that is measured by nature cannot be untangled.).
- [25] G. A ltarelli, R. Ellis, M. G reco, and G. M artinelli, Nucl. Phys. B 246 (1984).
- [26] S.Geer and W. Stirling, PhysLett B 152 (1985).
- [27] R.Kleiss and W.J.Stirling, Nucl. Phys. B 262 (1985).
- [28] M.L.M angano and S.Parke, Phys. Rev. D 41 (1990).
- [29] F.A.Berends, H.Kuijf, B.Tausk, and W.T.Giele, Nucl. Phys. B 357 (1991).
- [30] F.A.Berends, W.T.Giele, H.Kuijf, R.Kleiss, and W.J. Stirling, Phys. Lett. B 224 (1989).
- [31] R.K.Ellis, G.Martinelli, and R.Petronzio, Nucl.Phys. B 211 (1983).
- [32] P.B.A mold and M.H.Reno, Nucl. Phys. B 319 (1989), erratum - ibid. 330, 284 (1990).
- [33] P.A mold, R.K. Ellis, and M.H.Reno, Phys. Rev. D 40 (1989).
- [34] W .T.G iele, S.K eller, and E.Laenen, Phys.Lett.B 372 (1996).
- [35] R.K.Ellis and S.Veseli, Phys. Rev.D 60 (1999).
- [36] J.M. Campbell and R.K. Ellis, Phys. Rev. D 62 (2000).
- [37] M.L.Mangano, M.Moretti, and R.Pittau, Nucl. Phys. B 632 (2002).
- [38] M.L.Mangano, Nucl. Phys. B 405 (1993).
- [39] T. Stelzer and W. Long, Comput. Phys. Commun. 81,

357 (1994).

- [40] F.Maltoniand T.Stelzer (2002), hep-ph/0208156.
- [41] R.Ellis and S.Veseli, Phys.Rev D 60 (1999).
- [42] J. M. Campbell and R. Ellis, PhysRev D 62, 114012 (2000).
- [43] J. M. Campbell and R. Ellis, PhysRev D 65, 113007 (2002).
- [44] M. Spiropulu, PhD. thesis, Harvard University (2000.), this is the rst use of the ratios  $(W + N \text{ jets}) = (Z^0 = + N \text{ jets})$  we have found; here they are used to normalize the W + N jets prediction to the Z + 2 jet data.
- [45] The transverse momentum is de ned as  $p_{\rm T}$  = p sin ; the transverse energy is de ned as  $E_{\rm T}$  = E sin . M issing transverse energy is de ned as  $E_{\rm T}$  =  $E_{\rm T}$ , where the sum is over all objects in an event. We use the convention that h om entum ' refers to pc and h ass' to m $c^2$ , so that energy, m om entum, and m ass are all measured in GeV.
- [46] D.Acosta et al. (CDF), Phys.Rev.D 65 (2002).
- [47] By `inclusive' we mean counting the number of jets N for each N; by 'exclusive' we mean counting exactly N jets.
- [48] B.Abbott (D 0) (1997), contributed to 18th International Sym posium on Lepton and Photon Interactions (LP 97), H am burg, G erm any, 28 Jul-1 Aug 1997.
- [49] F.Abe et al. (CDF), PhysRev D 45, 1448 (1992).
- [50] The proton and antiproton beams each consist of 36 bunches distributed around the 1-km radius Tevatron ring. Proton-antiproton interactions occur when the two beam cross each other; more than one collision can occur in a single crossing. The tim e-response of the detec-

tors is typically such that the e ects of multiple interactions are integrated over, with only partial discrim ination between interactions being possible by reconstructing charged tracks to di erent vertex positions.

- [51] The m easurem ent and understanding of the jet  $E_T$  and distributions is a m a jor task for R un II and the LHC; the focus here is instead on the extent that the W and  $Z^0 =$  cases cancel, and hence an estimate of the expected precision on the ratio.
- [52] A s the calorim eter response is calibrated by jet balancing in the energy scales have a maximum excursion versus of a few %. It is this uncertainty times the di erence in the jet distributions that sets the limit on the contributions to the ratio from the jet energy scale.
- [53] T.A olderetal. (CDF), PhysRevD 65, 092002 (2002).
- [54] S.Kopp, PhD. thesis, University of Chicago (1994).
- [55] F.Abe et al. (CDF), Phys. Rev. D 52 (1995).
- [56] H.L.Laiet al, Eur.Phys.J.C 12, 375 (2000), we use the interpolation rather than the table.
- [57] A.Martin, R.Roberts, W .Stirling, and R.Thome, Eur. Phys. J.C 4, 463 (1998), hep-ph/9803445.
- [58] A. Martin, W. Stirling, and R. Roberts, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A 10, 2885 (1995).
- [59] Of course it is possible that a new source feeds both numerator and denominator in equal proportion; in that case this method has no sensitivity.
- [60] W ith the larger dataset the uncertainties on such quantities as the u/d ratio, and hence the PDFs, the  $and p_T$  distributions of W and Z production, and other quantities will also be better measured.