Singlet quarks beyond the top at the Tevatron?

V.Barger^a and R.J.N.Phillips^b

^aP hysics D epartm ent, University of W isconsin, M adison, W I 53706, USA ^bR utherford Appleton Laboratory, Chilton, D idcot, O xon OX11 0QX, UK

Abstract

The rst evidence for the top quark at the Tevatron m ay indicate a cross section higher than the QCD expectation. We consider the possibility that isosinglet heavy quarks m ay be contributing to the signal and discuss ways of testing this possibility. For example, a charge $\frac{2}{3}$ singlet quark, approximately degenerate and mixing with the top quark, would e ectively double the standard top signals. A charge $\frac{1}{3}$ singlet quark mixing with the bottom quark would not a ect top signals but would generate excess Z + multijet events with a b-tag.

The rst evidence for a top-quark signal has just been presented by the CDF experiment. at the Ferm ilab Tevatron pp collider[1], indicating a m ass $m_t = 174 \quad 10^{+13}_{12} \text{ GeV}$. An excess of multipet events is found, containing either two W -bosons or a W -boson and at least one b-jet, where these W -bosons are identied by W ! ' leptonic decays. The observed signal rate is somewhat higher than the standard QCD expectations for pp! ttX production [2]. A lthough this higher rate may be attributed to statistical uctuations or background uncertainties, it has already encouraged theoretical speculation about possible enhancem ents of the tt cross section, such as a color singlet and octet resonances coupled strongly to top quarks[3] or a technieta resonance[4]. A di erent new physics possibility is not that tt production itself is enhanced but that other heavy quarks are produced and contribute to the observed signals. A fourth-generation quark (mentioned as a possibility in Ref.[1]) is not particularly attractive, since a fourth light sequential neutrino is excluded by Z decay data 5]. However, a theoretically interesting possibility is the existence of isosinglet quarks that occur for example in superstring-inspired E_6 m odels [6,7,8,9] or other exotic quarks outside the Standard M odel[10,11]. Isosinglet quarks are among the few classes of new particle that could exist near the electroweak m ass scale without much perturbing the standard analysis of electroweak radiative corrections. In the present letter we concentrate on the isosinglet options, the phenom enologies of which have been considered in other contexts [6,7,8,9,10,12].

In addition to the ferm ions of the Standard M odel (SM), we address the possibility that each generation includes either a singlet charge $\frac{1}{3}$ quark Q = x_d ; x_s ; x_b or a singlet charge $\frac{2}{3}$ quark Q = x_u ; x_c ; x_t . These new singlet quarks are color-triplets and are produced by standard QCD subprocesses; their production rates are exactly those for SM quarks of the sam e m asses. They decay via m ixing with SM quarks of the sam e charge into qW , q^0 Z and q^0 H channels, where $q(q^0)$ is a lighter quark and H is the SM Higgs boson; if the m ixing is sm all the decay interactions and branching fractions are simply related [6,7,8,9,10]:

$$B(Q ! qW):B(Q ! q^{0}Z):B(Q ! q^{0}H)' 2:1:1;$$
(1)

apart from kinematic factors that are ' 1 for m $_{\rm Q}$ >> M $_{\rm W}$;M $_{\rm Z}$;m $_{\rm H}$. W e assume for sim -

plicity that the mixing occurs mostly within the same generation, in which case $q(q^0)$ is the corresponding light quark: x_d ! uW;dZ;dH, etc. The Higgs considerations generalize som ewhat beyond the SM; in the minimal supersymmetric extension [13], for example, if there is only one light Higgs boson (the charged and other neutral Higgses comparatively heavy) then its couplings are close to those of the SM. For present purposes we shall assume $m_H < M_Z$; if H is very much heavier than this, it will be suppressed in decays of singlet quarks near the top m ass.

Since these new quarks introduce new decay modes, it may be pertinent now to mention some further aspects of the CDF top search [1]. Compared to standard expectations and the measured top production rate, CDF reports a decit of a few events in the W + 4 jets background rate (that might be explained by few er top events) and an excess of 2 events in the tagged Z + 4 jets channel compared with 0:64 0:06 expected. Both e ects could be statistical uctuations[1].

Consider rst the case of charge $\frac{1}{3}$ (\down-type") singlet quarks and suppose that at least one of them has mass nearm t and is pair produced at the Tevatron at a rate com parable with tt. Its decay branching fractions [6,7,8,9,10] are then approximately

B
$$(x_{d} ! uW ; dZ ; dH) ' \frac{1}{2}; \frac{1}{4}; \frac{1}{4};$$

B $(x_{s} ! dW ; sZ ; sH) ' \frac{1}{2}; \frac{1}{4}; \frac{1}{4};$ (2)
B $(x_{b} ! tW ; bZ ; bH) ' 0; \frac{1}{2}; \frac{1}{2};$

with x_b ! tW forbidden by kinematics. It follows immediately that only the x_d and x_s options yield large qW decay fractions. These additional singlet Q ! qW contributions are super cially similar to t ! bW decays, but dier in important ways.

(i) The untagged single-W signal rate is only about half of that for tt production with the same mass (where bW decays are 100 %), assuming that the qZ and qH hadronic decays look passably like hadronic qW.

(ii) The untagged two-W signal rate is only about a quarter of that for tt.

(iii) The nalquark q = u or c is not a b-quark; however c-quarks can som etim es satisfy the

3

lepton or vertex criteria used in b-tagging and therefore m asquerade as b.

(iv) The charged lepton in the subsequent W ! ' decay has a di erent kinem atical distribution relative to the initial and nal quark m om enta [12] (to be precise, it corresponds to the neutrino distribution in t ! bW ! b'); how ever, in sm all data sam ples this distribution cannot be accurately determined.

There is therefore some potential for x_s ! dW decays to m in ic b-tagged top signals, but at rates reduced by the x_s ! dW branching fraction and by the tag-factor for c-jets. Thus the tendency would be to increase the untagged W + 4 jets background much more than the apparent top signal; but in the CDF data this background seem s already too low, so to this extent the Q = x_s hypothesis is disfavored. On the other hand, the equally populated x_s ! sZ; sH modes give rise to $x_s x_s$! ssW Z (W H; ZZ; H H; ZH) nal states, with no counterparts in top decays. As noted above, W Z and W H can contribute to the single-W top signal, since Z ! qq or H ! bb dijet decays can m in ic W ! qq⁰. But in cases where Z is identi ed by Z ! ``or Z ! (m issing p_T), excess csW Z events with two extra hard quark jets could be seen. A loo the ssZ Z and ssZ H modes contribute excess Z + multijets events with high b-tag probability (from Z; H ! bb); the CDF excess of tagged Z + 4 jet events might be explained in this way. However, each (Z ! ``)jjjj event in plies approximately six (W ! `)jjjj events from other $x_s x_s$ decay modes, so explaining the Z + 4 jet excess in this way would make the W + 4 jets de cit m ore acute.

A lternatively, if we address the Z + 4 jets excess alone, the case $Q = x_b$ becomes attractive. It generates no top-like signal nor unwanted W + m ultijets background, but gives new bbZ H, bbZ Z and bbH H nal states, of which the rst two could easily provide tagged Z + 4 jets events (and incidentally a possible H iggs signal[8,9,10]).

Consider next the case of charge $\frac{2}{3}$ (\up-type") singlet quarks and suppose that at least one of them has mass near m_t and is pair produced at the Tevatron at a rate comparable with tt. Its decay branching fractions[10] are then approxim ately

B (
$$x_u$$
 ! dW ; uZ ; uH) ' $\frac{1}{2}$; $\frac{1}{4}$; $\frac{1}{4}$;
B (x_c ! sW ; cZ ; cH) ' $\frac{1}{2}$; $\frac{1}{4}$; $\frac{1}{4}$; (3)
B (x_t ! bW ; tZ ; tH) ' 1; 0; 0

with $x_t ! tZ$; tH forbidden by kinematics. Each of these options yields large qW decay fractions, but the capacity to m in ic top decays depends on the particular case.

(i) $x_u x_u$ and $x_c x_c$ production give untagged single-W and two-W signals similar to tt, with reduced rates (like down-type singlets) but similar lepton distribution to t decay (unlike down-type singlets). However, the associated quarks are d and s, so these signals would only get into a b-tagged sample via m is tagging. There would be b-tagged Z + 4 jet contributions but the W + multijets background de cit would get worse. There is little to recommend these cases.

(ii) $x_t x_t$ production however gives signals almost identical to tt. The x_t decays to Z and H are suppressed (but could proceed at some level via mixing with other generations). A major di erence between $x_t x_t$ and standard tt signals is in the lifetim e[14]: the t decays before hadronization can happen, so e ects like spin depolarization and quarkonia formation are suppressed for tt; x_t lives much longer, due to the smallt x_t mixing, so such e ects are allowed for $x_t x_t$ states.

(iii) x_t -onia are an interesting subject in them selves. Quarkonium states can be produced via gluon fusion at hadron colliders. Their single-quark decay modes would be suppressed by the small x_t tmixing and hence various annihilation decays, such as ZZ, Z, ZH, HH and H [15], might be detectable.

To sum marize, the central question is whether singlet quarks Q with mass near m_t may be contributing a signi cant part of the CDF top signals. We conclude as follows.

(a) The cases $Q = x_d; x_b; x_u; x_c$ cannot contribute signi cantly to the CDF top signals; their single-W and two-W signals are reduced by the Q ! qW branching fraction (that vanishes for x_b) and further suppressed by b-tagging.

5

(b) The case $Q = x_s$ is less suppressed by b-tagging and can contribute a small fraction of the top signal. E₆ m odels can accom m odate such charge $\frac{1}{3}$ singlets.

(c) The case $Q = x_b$ is interesting for a di erent reason; it contributes nothing to the CDF top signals nor W + multijets backgrounds, but it can provide tagged Z + 4 jets events as seen by CDF, most of which would be bbZH events containing a Higgs signal[8,9,10]. E₆ m odels can accommodate this case too.

(d) This Z + multiget production could be important in other contexts, e.g. as an extra source of events with high m issing transverse energy \mathbf{E}_{T} , that m ight be confused with supersymmetry signals. Two events with high \mathbf{E}_{T} were reported in early CDF data [16].

(e) The case $Q = x_t$ can almost exactly duplicate the top signals; for mass $m_{x_t} = m_t$ it would double the top signal rate. However, we know of no popular models containing this case.

(f) W e recall that all heavy singlet scenarios in ply heavy quarkonium possibilities [15].

(g) Event ratios in the more interesting cases may be sum marized approximately:

$x_s x_s$)	cdW W	:CSW 2	Z :csW	H :ss	ΖH	:ssZ Z	:ssH	н ′	4:4:4	:2:1:1	
x _b x _b)				b	ZH	:bbZZ	:bbH	н ′		8:4:4	(4)
X+X+)	bbw w							,	16		

(h) In all these down-type and up-type singlet scenarios, it is understood that the combined tt plus QQ events would not simply be distributed like a standard top signal alone. Beside the questions of lepton m om entum and decay width m entioned above, the presence of two (generally di erent) m asses would broaden m any distributions such as the reconstructed top m ass and the apparent tt invariant m ass.

A cknow ledgm ents

This research was supported in part by the U.S.D epartment of Energy under Contract No.DE-AC02-76ER00881 and in part by the University of W isconsin Research Committee with funds granted by the W isconsin A lum ni Research Foundation.

6

References

- [1] CDF collaboration: F.Abe et al, FERM ILAB-PUB-94/097-E; the D0 experim ent also presented a top candidate event in S.Abachi et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 72, 2138 (1994).
- [2] R.K. Ellis, PhysLett. B 259, 492 (1991); E. Laenen, J. Sm ith and W. L. van Neerven,
 ibid. B 321, 254 (1994).
- [3] C.Hilland S.Parke, FERM ILAB-Pub-93/397-T.
- [4] E.Eichten and K.Lane, FERM ILAB-Pub-94/007-T.
- [5] The LEP collaborations: ALEPH, DELPHI, L3, OPAL, Phys. Lett. B 276, 247 (1992); SLD collaboration, M od. Phys. Lett. A 8, 2237 (1993).
- [6] V.Barger, N.G.Deshpande, R.J.N. Phillips and K.W hisnant, Phys. Rev. D 33, 1912 (1986).
- [7] T.G.Rizzo, Phys. Rev. D 34, 1438 (1986); JL.Hewett and T.G.Rizzo, Z.Phys.C 34, 49 (1987); Phys. Rep. 183, 193 (1989).
- [8] F. delAguila, E. Laerm ann and P. Zerwas, Nucl. Phys. B 297, 1 (1988); F. delAguila,G.L.Kane and M. Quiros, Phys. Rev. Lett. 63, 942 (1989).
- [9] V.Barger and K.W hisnant, Phys. Rev. D 41, 2120 (1990).
- [10] F. del Aguila, L. Am etller, G. L. Kane and J. Vidal, Nucl. Phys. B 334, 1 (1990).
- [11] V.Barger and E.Ma, University of Wisconsin-Madison report MAD/PH/811 (1993).
- [12] V.Barger and R.J.N. Phillips, Phys. Rev. D 41, 52 (1990).
- [13] For a review see JF. Gunion, HE. Haber, GL. Kane and SW. Dawson, \The Higgs Hunter's Guide", Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, 1990.

- [14] V. Barger, H. Baer, K. Hagiwara and R.J.N. Phillips, Phys. Rev. D 30, 947 (1984);
 I.Bigi, Y. Dokshitzer, V. Khose, J. Kuhn and P. Zerwas, Phys. Lett. B 181, 157 (1986);
 V. Barger, J. Ohnem us and R.J.N. Phillips, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A 4, 617 (1989).
- [15] V. Barger et al, Phys Rev. Lett. 57, 1672 (1986); Phys. Rev. D 35, 3366 (1987); JL.Hewett and T.G.Rizzo, Phys. Rev. D 35, 2194 (1987).
- [16] CDF collaboration: F.Abe et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 69, 3439 (1992).