D* production in DIS and Photoproduction at H1



- Introduction:
  - experimental methods
  - theoretical models
- Single & double differential D* cross sections
- Conclusions

Andreas W. Jung for the H1 collaboration
Kirchhoff Institut für Physik
Universität Heidelberg

D* production: Boson-Gluon-Fusion

Dominant process for charm-production in *ep* -scattering:



Kinematic at $\sqrt{s} \approx 320$ GeV :

- Photon Virtuality:

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

  Q^2 < 2: Photoproduction

  Q^2 > 5: Deep Inelastic Scattering

- Inelasticity: $y = \frac{qp}{kp}$

- Mass of hadronic system:

$$W^2_{\gamma p} = (\boldsymbol{q} + \boldsymbol{P})^2 = y \cdot s - Q^2$$

D* via Fragmentation:

- Pseudorapidity: $\eta = \ln \tan \left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right)$
- Transverse momentum: p_t

--> hard scale allows pQCD: $m_c \gg \Lambda_{QCD}$

--> sensitive to the gluon density

D* Production: theory models



LO (α_s) + Parton shower:

RAPGAP: (DGLAP)
- charm is massive in BGF
- radiative events from Heracles

PYTHIA: (DGLAP)
- only charm: massive in BGF
- all flavors: massless in BGF

CASCADE: (CCFM)
- charm is massive in BGF
- only gluons in proton

NLO (α_s^2) calculations:

- Fixed Flavor number scheme
- charm produced in hard subprocess
- massive in BGF
- outgoing particles: $c\bar{c}$-pair + 1 light parton

FMNR:
- with Peterson fragmentation

HVQDIS:
- with Kartvelishvili fragmentation

--> DIS: RAPGAP (direct), CASCADE, HVQDIS

--> Photoproduction: PYTHIA (direct+resolved+excitation), CASCADE, FMNR

Event selection: $Q^2 > 5$

D* reconstructed in golden decay channel: $D^{*\pm} \rightarrow D^0 \pi^{\pm}_{slow} \rightarrow (K^{\mp}\pi^{\pm})\pi^{\pm}_{slow}$

$\eta > 0$: forward $\eta < 0$: backward



- scattered electron in backward calorimeter
- three charged tracks in central tracking detector
- high multiplicity events

Trigger: DIS case

- scattered electron in backward Calorimeter
- tracks

Event selection: $Q^2 < 2$

D* reconstructed in golden decay channel: $D^{*\pm} \rightarrow D^0 \pi^{\pm}_{slow} \rightarrow (K^{\mp}\pi^{\pm})\pi^{\pm}_{slow}$

$\eta > 0$: forward $\eta < 0$: backward



- three charged tracks in central tracking detector
- high multiplicity events

Trigger: DIS case

- scattered electron in backward Calorimeter
- tracks

Trigger: (untagged) Photoproduction case:

- no scattered electron
- D* reconstructed at trigger level using the **H1 Fast Track Trigger**

Event selection: photoprod.

D* in photoproduction:



- decay: $D^{*\pm} \rightarrow D^0\pi^{\pm}_{slow} \rightarrow (K^{\mp}\pi^{\pm})\pi^{\pm}_{slow}$
- higher resolution in mass difference:
  dM = M(Kππ)-M(Kπ)
- select events by mass difference dM

Photoproduction sample (L = 93 pb^{-1}):

- ~8500 D* mesons: 8x HERA1 statistic
- increased phase space – HERA1 used electron tagger for measurement (limited W-acceptance)
- Total systematic error: ~ 11%



12 wire layers grouped in four trigger layers



Event selection: DIS

D* in DIS:



- decay: $D^{*\pm} \rightarrow D^0 \pi^{\pm}_{slow} \rightarrow (K^{\mp}\pi^{\pm})\pi^{\pm}_{slow}$
- higher resolution in mass difference:
  dM = M(Kππ)-M(Kπ)
- select events by mass difference dM

DIS sample ($\mathcal{L}$ = 347 pb^{-1}):

- ~21000 D* mesons: 10x HERA1 statistic
- Get smallest systematic error possible
- Total systematic error: ~ 9%
- Born-level cross sections by correcting for radiative effects

Changes to previous analysis:

- reconstruction method changed to electron-Σ-method
- **allows lower y of 0.02**
- decreased systematic uncertainty, especially in $\eta(D^*) > 0$

Common fit function:

asymmetric Peak:

Crystal-Ball:

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{\left(\frac{n}{|\alpha|}\right)^n \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\alpha^2\right)}{\left(\frac{n}{|\alpha|} - |\alpha| - \frac{x-m}{\sigma}\right)^n} & \text{if } \frac{x-m}{\sigma} < -\alpha, \quad \text{exponential decay} \\ \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{x-m}{\sigma}\right)\right)^2 & \text{if } \frac{x-m}{\sigma} \geq -\alpha \quad \text{Gauss distribution} \end{cases}$$

Background (Granet Parametrisation:)

$$f(x) = p_0 \cdot (x - m_{\text{Cutoff}})^{p_1} \cdot e^{-p_2 \cdot x \, (-p_3 \cdot x^2)}$$



- Signal function: Gauss with exp. tail
- α determines where they are fit together in units of σ
- Un-binned likelihood fit of signal & background function
- Describes MC and data well

D* selection: visible range

DIS analysis:

Q^2 : 5 - 100 GeV^2

y : 0.02 - 0.70

$p_T(D^*)$: > 1.5 GeV

$|\eta(D^*)|$: < 1.5

D* cuts:

$p_T(K)$ > 0.3 GeV

$p_T(\pi)$ > 0.3 GeV

$p_T(\pi_{slow})$ > 0.12 GeV

$p_T(K) + p_T(\pi)$ > 2 GeV

$|M(D^0)|$ < 0.080 GeV

Photoproduction analysis:

Q^2 : < 2 GeV^2

y : 0.10 – 0.80 ($100 < W_{\gamma P} < 250$)

$p_T(D^*)$: > 1.8 GeV

$|\eta(D^*)|$: < 1.5

D* cuts:

$p_T(K)$ > 0.5 GeV

$p_T(\pi)$ > 0.3 GeV

$p_T(\pi_{slow})$ > 0.12 GeV

$p_T(K) + p_T(\pi)$ > 2.2 GeV

$|M(D^0)|$ < 0.080 GeV

$$\sigma_{\mathrm{tot}}^{\mathrm{vis}} = \frac{N_{D^\star} \cdot (1 - r)}{\mathcal{L} \cdot \mathcal{B}(D^\star \to K\pi\pi_{\mathrm{slow}}) \cdot \epsilon \cdot (1 - \delta_{rad})}$$

Correction due to reflections – applied for both analysis (4%)

Correction due to radiative effects – applied for DIS analysis (~2%)

Contribution due to b-quarks is not subtracted !

Cross sections: kin. variables

DIS:

- Q^2
- $y - Q^2$

Photoproduction:

- $W_{\gamma P}$

Cross sections: kin. variables



--> reasonable description for all MC

--> normalization for RAPGAP (CTEQ65m) is off (not expected to fit)

For shape comparison the ratio:

$$R = \frac{1/\sigma^{calc}_{tot,vis} \cdot \frac{d\sigma^{calc}}{dY}}{1/\sigma^{data}_{tot,vis} \cdot \frac{d\sigma^{data}}{dY}}$$

is used.

--> shape of Q^2 reasonably well described by RAPGAP and CASCADE

--> CASCADE slightly better in shape

Cross sections: kin. variables



--> HVQDIS: both PDF give good description, MRST slightly lower in normalization

Error estimation of the NLO-calculation with parameter variation:

charm mass: $1.3 < m_c < 1.6$ GeV

renormalization & factorization scale:

$1 < \mu_{f,r}/\mu_0 < 4$,

with $\mu_0^2 = Q^2 + 4m_c^2$

fragmentation: α(Kartvelishvili) = 3.3 ± 0.4

Cross sections: kin. variables



Error estimation of the NLO-calculation with parameter variation:

charm mass: $1.3 < m_c < 1.6$ GeV

renormalization & factorization scale:

$1 < \mu_{f,r}/\mu_0 < 4$,

with $\mu_0^2 = Q^2 + 4m_c^2$

fragmentation: α(Kartvelishvili) = 3.3 ± 0.4

--> HVQDIS: both PDF give good description, MRST slightly lower in normalization

Total integrated Cross section:

Data:	**(4.85 ± 0.07(stat.) ± 0.42 (sys.)) nb**
HVQDIS (CTEQ):	**(4.43 +0.69 -0.47) nb**
HVQDIS (MRST):	**(4.17 +0.59 -0.37) nb**

Cross sections: kin. variables



--> HVQDIS: both proton PDF give a good description of the y-Q^2 dependence

--> lowest new y-bin also described in HVQDIS

Cross sections: kin. variables





--> increased phase space compared to HERAI publication !

--> all MC models to steep

--> PYTHIA massless is best ...

Parameter variation:

charm mass: 1.3 < m_c < 1.7 GeV

renormalization & factorization scale:

$1 < \mu_{f,r}/\mu_0 < 4$,

with $\mu_0^2 = m_c^2 + p_T^2$

fragmentation: ε(Peterson) = 0.035, no variation

--> FMNR is somewhat better

Cross sections: D* variables

DIS:

- p_T, η
- η - p_T

Photoproduction:

- p_T, η
- η - p_T

Cross sections: D* variables



--> DIS: - $p_T(D^*)$ shape reasonably well described by all MC models

Cross sections: D* variables





--> DIS: - $p_T(D^*)$ shape reasonably well described by all MC models

--> Photoproduction: - $p_T(D^*)$ shape described by CASCADE but steeper slope for both PYTHIA models

Cross sections: D* variables





--> DIS & Photoproduction:
- $p_T(D^*)$ shape reasonably well described by NLO
- but normalization should be correct

Cross sections: D* variables



--> DIS: - CASCADE describes the distribution in shape and normalization

- RAPGAP: data sensitive to the Proton PDF (CTEQ65m is better in shape)

Cross sections: D* variables





--> DIS: - CASCADE describes the distribution in shape and normalization

- RAPGAP: data sensitive to the Proton PDF (CTEQ65m is better in shape)

--> Photop.: - PYTHIA (massless) describes the data in shape & normalization

- CASCADE fails in shape (differences for $\eta(D^*) > 0$) & normalization

Cross sections: D* variables



--> DIS: - difference at forward η(D*) between data & NLO confirmed with full HERA2 statistics

- MRST (other gluon density) gives a better description, low in normalization

Cross sections: D* variables





--> DIS: - difference at forward η(D*) between data & NLO confirmed with full HERA2 statistics

- MRST (other gluon density) gives a better description, low in normalization

--> Photoproduction: NLO fails at forward η(D*)

Are the differences located in p_T(D*) ?

Cross sections: D* variables









--> In general NLO gives a good description of the data

--> forward $\eta(D^*)$ and low $p_T(D^*)$ data is above the NLO-calculations

--> better precision of the data is needed.

Cross sections: D* variables







- H1 data (prel.)
- Pythia6.2(massiv)
- Pythia6.2(massless)
- Cascade1.2

--> low $p_T(D^*)$:

- models differ !
- PYTHIA (massless) describes the shape
- CASCADE is good in shape

--> high $p_T(D^*)$:

- models are the same !
- PYTHIA fails at forward $\eta(D^*)$
- CASCADE is also low at forward $\eta(D^*)$

Cross sections: D* variables







H1 data (prel.)

FMNR (CTEQ5f3)

$1.3 < m_c < 1.7$ GeV

$\mu_0^2 = m_c^2 + p_t^2$

$1 < \mu_f/\mu_0 < 4$

$0.5 < \mu_r/\mu_0 < 2$

--> backward η(D*):

- for whole p_T(D*) range it is described

--> forward η(D*):

- NLO fails over the whole p_T(D*) spectrum
- most probably not due to resolved processes

Conclusions

- **Full HERA2 data statistic (10x HERA1 statistics) for D* production in DIS and photoproduction analysed**

- DIS: - NLO calculations describe the data, taking the (large) theory uncertainties into account
  - small differences at forward $\eta(D^*)$ located at small $p_T(D^*)$
  - sensitive to the Proton PDF
- Photoproduction: - $\eta(D^*)$ - $p_T(D^*)$ - correlation (in larger phase space) not understood in any model !
  - Largest differences for the NLO calculation at forward $\eta(D^*)$ and high $p_T(D^*)$

Backup

Additional material:

Different Proton PDFs:



Collected Data samples:



Cross sections: D* variables



--> CASCADE & RAPGAP give a good description of the y-Q^2 dependence

--> new y-bin tends to be above the MC

Cross sections: D* variables









--> CASCADE describes the $\eta(D^*)$ distribution in shape and normalization

--> RAPGAP with CTEQ6ll gives also a good description except the forward $\eta(D^*)$ at small $p_T(D^*)$

Event selection: DIS

D* in DIS:



- decay: $D^{*\pm} \rightarrow D^0 \pi^{\pm}_{slow} \rightarrow (K^{\mp}\pi^{\pm})\pi^{\pm}_{slow}$
- higher resolution in mass difference:

  dM = M(Kππ)-M(Kπ)
- select events by mass difference dM