

H1 and ZEUS
PDF Fit

LI, Gang

Outline

Data sets

Parameterization

Errors

Model
uncertainty

Results

Fit quality
PDFs
Comparison
Model Variations

Summary

extras

H1 and ZEUS Combined PDF Fit

International Symposium on Multiparticle Dynamics

LI, Gang

On behalf of ZEUS and H1 Collaboration

Sep 16, 2008 DESY

Outline: NLO DGLAP PDF fit to the combined HERA data set

H1 and ZEUS
PDF Fit

LI, Gang

Outline

Data sets

Paramterization

Errors

Model
uncertainty

Results

Fit quality
PDFs
Comparison
Model Variations

Summary

extras

- Data sets
- Choice of parametrization
- Choice of error treatment
- Model assumptions
- Results
 - Quality of fit to data
 - PDFs
 - Comparisons to older H1/ZEUS fits, and to CTEQ, MRST
 - Model Variations
- summary

Data sets

Based on published data sets of HERA I ($\sim 115 pb^{-1}$ per experiment)

data set	x range	Q^2 range(GeV ²)	$\mathcal{L}(pb^{-1})$	comment
H1 NC min. bias 97	0.00008 0.02	1.5 12	1.8	$e^+ p\sqrt{s} = 301\text{GeV}$
H1 NC Low Q^2 96–97	0.000161 0.20	12 150	17.9	$e^+ p\sqrt{s} = 301\text{GeV}$
H1 NC 94–97	0.0032 0.65	150 30000	35.6	$e^+ p\sqrt{s} = 301\text{GeV}$
H1 CC 94–97	0.013 0.40	300 15000	35.6	$e^+ p\sqrt{s} = 301\text{GeV}$
H1 NC 98–99	0.0032 0.65	150 30000	16.4	$e^- p\sqrt{s} = 319\text{GeV}$
H1 CC 98–99	0.0013 0.40	300 15000	16.4	$e^- p\sqrt{s} = 319\text{GeV}$
H1 NC 99–00	0.00131 0.65	100 30000	65.2	$e^+ p\sqrt{s} = 319\text{GeV}$
H1 CC 99–00	0.013 0.40	300 15000	65.2	$e^+ p\sqrt{s} = 319\text{GeV}$
ZEUS NC 96–97	0.00006 0.65	2.7 30000	30.0	$e^+ p\sqrt{s} = 301\text{GeV}$
ZEUS CC 94–97	0.015 0.42	280 17000	47.7	$e^+ p\sqrt{s} = 301\text{GeV}$
ZEUS NC 98–99	0.005 0.65	200 30000	15.9	$e^- p\sqrt{s} = 319\text{GeV}$
ZEUS CC 98–99	0.015 0.42	280 30000	16.4	$e^- p\sqrt{s} = 319\text{GeV}$
ZEUS NC 99–00	0.005 0.65	200 30000	63.2	$e^+ p\sqrt{s} = 319\text{GeV}$
ZEUS CC 99–00	0.008 0.42	280 17000	60.9	$e^+ p\sqrt{s} = 319\text{GeV}$

With H1 NC min. bias ($Q^2 < 12\text{GeV}^2$) moved up by 3.4% after reanalysis of luminosity.

H1 and ZEUS
PDF Fit

LI, Gang

Outline

Data sets

Parameterization

Errors

Model

uncertainty

Results

Fit quality

PDFs

Comparison

Model Variations

Summary

extras

Data Sets: Example of NC cross section

H1 and ZEUS
PDF Fit

Li, Gang

Outline

Data sets

Parameterization

Errors

Model
uncertainty


Results

Fit quality
PDFs
Comparison
Model Variations

Summary

extras

HERA I e^+p Neutral Current Scattering - H1 and ZEUS



Precise measurements from two
experiments

For $Q^2 \leq 100 \text{GeV}^2$,
 $\delta_{stat} \leq 1\%$, $\delta_{sys} \leq 3\%$;

For $Q^2 \geq 1000 \text{GeV}^2$,

$\delta_{stat} > \delta_{sys}$

Data sets: Combination procedure

H1 and ZEUS
PDF Fit

LI, Gang

Outline

Data sets

Parameterization

Errors

Model
uncertainty

Results

Fit quality
PDFs
Comparison
Model Variations

Summary

extras

- 1 Move all data points to a common $x - Q^2$ grid

- Grid: H1 x binning and ZEUS Q^2 binning basically
- Straightforward interpolation:

$$\sigma_{ep}^{meas}(x_{grid}, Q_{grid}^2) = \frac{\sigma_{ep}^{th}(x_{grid}, Q_{grid}^2)}{\sigma_{ep}^{th}(x, Q^2)} \sigma_{ep}^{meas}(x, Q^2)$$

- H1PDF2k and ZEUS-Jets fits have been used

- 2 Move 820 GeV data 920 GeV beam energy

- CC:

$$\sigma_{CC\ 920}^{e^{\pm}p}(x, Q^2) = \sigma_{CC\ 820}^{e^{\pm}p}(x, Q^2) \frac{\sigma_{CC\ 920}^{th, e^{\pm}p}(x, Q^2)}{\sigma_{CC\ 820}^{th, e^{\pm}p}(x, Q^2)}$$

- NC:

$$\sigma_{NC\ 920}^{e^{\pm}p}(x, Q^2) = \sigma_{NC\ 820}^{e^{\pm}p}(x, Q^2) + \Delta\sigma_{NC}^{e^{\pm}p}(x, Q^2, y_{920}, y_{820})$$

- 3 Calculate the average values, errors and the uncertainties related to the combination method

Data sets: Averaging Method

H1 and ZEUS
PDF Fit

LI, Gang

Outline

Data sets

Parameterization

Errors

Model
uncertainty

Results

Fit quality

PDFs

Comparison

Model Variations

Summary

extras

- Model independent combination, the key assumption is that H1 and ZEUS experiments are measuring the same cross sections at the same kinematical points. See **A. Glazov DIS05**
- It minimises the χ^2

$$\chi_{exp}^2(M^{i,true}, \Delta\alpha_j) = \sum_i \frac{\left[M^{i,true} - \left(M^i + \sum_j \frac{\partial M^i}{\partial \alpha_j} \Delta\alpha_j \right) \right]^2}{\sigma_i^2} + \sum_j \frac{\Delta\alpha_j^2}{\sigma_{\alpha_j}^2}$$

- $M^{i,true}$: measured central values
- σ_i^2 : statistical and uncorrelated systematic uncertainties
- σ_{α_j} : correlated uncertainty
- $\frac{\partial M^i}{\partial \alpha_j}$: Sensitivity of the data to the systematic source j
- M^i : Fitted H1-ZEUS combined cross section
- $\frac{\partial M^i}{\partial \alpha_j} \Delta\alpha_j$: Fitted shift of the I data due to the systematic source j

If $\Delta\alpha_j = 0$, it coincides with a standard average

Caution: Most errors are provided as relative errors, a smaller value of cross section has smaller absolute error bias toward smaller averages Can be avoided by modified χ^2 definition: insert $\frac{M^{i,true}}{M^i}$

Data Sets: Averaged NC cross sections

H1 and ZEUS
PDF Fit

Li, Gang

Outline

Data sets

Parameterization

Errors

Model
uncertainty


Results

Fit quality
PDFs
Comparison
Model Variations

Summary

extras

HERA I e^+p Neutral Current Scattering – H1 and ZEUS














Improved precision of combined
H1 and ZEUS data sets

Here predictions use PDFs of
H1 and ZEUS separate NLO
QCD PDF extractions.

Next step: H1 and ZEUS
combined fit

Chosen form of the PDF parameterization at Q_0^2

$$xf(x) = Ax^B(1-x)^C(1 + Dx + Ex^2 + Fx^3 + \dots)$$

	A	B	C	D	E
gluon	sum rule				
u_v	sum rule				
d_v	sum rule	= $B(u_v)$			
\bar{U}	$\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \bar{U}/\bar{D} \rightarrow 1$				
\bar{D}		= $B(\bar{U})$			

- The number of parameters for each parton has been optimized
- Optimization means starting with only BLUE parameters and adding D, E, F parameters until there is no further χ^2 advantage
- PDFs fitted gluon, u_v , d_v , $\bar{U} = \bar{u} + \bar{c}$, $\bar{D} = \bar{d} + \bar{s}$
 Sea flavour break-up at Q_0 : $s = f_s \times \bar{D}$, $c = f_c \times \bar{U}$, $A_D = (1 - f_s)/(1 - f_c)A_B$
 $f_s=0.33$, $f_c=0.15$: consistent with dynamical generation
- $m_c=1.4\text{GeV}$ (mass of charm quark) $m_b=4.75\text{GeV}$ (mass of beauty quark)
- Zero-mass variable flavour number scheme heavy quark scheme (for now)
- $Q_0^2 = 4 \text{ GeV}^2$ input scale $\alpha_s(M_Z) = 0.1176$ PDG2006 value
- Renormalization and factorization scale = Q^2

H1 and ZEUS
PDF Fit

LI, Gang

Outline

Data sets

Parameterization

Errors

Model
uncertainty

Results

Fit quality

PDFs

Comparison

Model Variations

Summary

extras

$$xf(x) = Ax^B(1-x)^C(1 + Dx + Ex^2 + Fx^3 + \dots)$$

- Alternative form of PDF parameterization: H1 Style

	A	B	C	D	E	F
gluon	sum rule					
U	$\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \bar{u}/\bar{d} \rightarrow 1$			sum rule		
D		$= B(U)$		sum rule		
U_{bar}	$= A(U)$	$= B(U)$				
D_{bar}	$= A(D)$	$= B(U)$				

PDFs fitted gluon, $U = u + c$, $D = d + s$, $\bar{U} = \bar{u} + \bar{c}$, $\bar{D} = \bar{d} + \bar{s}$

Sea flavour break-up at Q_0 : $s = f_s \times \bar{D}$, $c = f_c \times \bar{U}$, $A_D = (1 - f_s)/(1 - f_c)A_U$

- Alternative form of PDF parameterization: ZEUS Style

	A	B	C	D	E	F
gluon	sum rule					
u_v	sum rule					
d_v	sum rule	$= B_{uv}$		sum rule		
$\bar{u} - \bar{d}$	From Z.S.11_fit					
Sea						

PDFs fitted gluon, u_v , d_v , $Sea = u_{sea} + \bar{u} + d_{sea} + \bar{d} + s + \bar{s} + c + \bar{c}$,

Sea flavour break-up at Q_0 : $\bar{s} = (\bar{d} + \bar{u})/4$, charm dynamically generated,

$\bar{u} - \bar{d}$ fixed to fit E866 data

H1 and ZEUS
PDF Fit

LI, Gang

Outline

Data sets

Parameterization

Errors

Model
uncertainty

Results

Fit quality
PDFs
Comparison
Model Variations

Summary

extras

Choice of parameterization

H1 and ZEUS
PDF Fit

LI, Gang

Outline

Data sets

Parameterization

Errors

Model
uncertainty

Results

Fit quality
PDFs
Comparison
Model Variations

Summary

extras

All three forms have good χ^2 , our choice has the best

Further motivations are:

- Less Model dependence on B parameters than H1 parameterization.
- No need for an additional input ($\bar{d} - \bar{u}$) x -distribution in ZEUS parameterization.
- Most conservative errors.
- It is inspired by both H1 and ZEUS parameterizations.

Choice of experimental error treatment

H1 and ZEUS
PDF Fit

LI, Gang

Outline

Data sets

Parameterization

Errors

Model
uncertainty

Results

Fit quality
PDFs
Comparison
Model Variations

Summary

extras

- The data have already been combined taking full account of their correlated systematic errors, resulting in much reduced systematic uncertainties on the combined data set.
Systematic uncertainties are now smaller than statistical uncertainties across the x , Q^2 plane.
- We combine the 43 systematic uncertainties of the data with the statistical uncertainties in quadrature. Then we OFFSET the 4 systematic uncertainties which result from the combination procedure:
$$\chi^2 = 476.7 \text{ for } 562 \text{ degrees of freedom.}$$

For comparison:
treating all 47 systematic sources quadratically gives $\chi^2 = 428.0$
treating all 47 systematic sources as still correlated gives $\chi^2 = 553.1$
- All three methods give very similar central values for PDFs and very similar PDF uncertainties. Our choice is the most conservative.

The self-consistency of our data set and small systematics allows us to use $\Delta\chi^2 = 1$ to calculate the uncertainties.

Model uncertainties: to be added into the total PDF uncertainty

H1 and ZEUS
PDF Fit

LI, Gang

Outline

Data sets

Parameterization

Errors

Model
uncertainty

Results

Fit quality

PDFs

Comparison

Model Variations

Summary

extras

- m_c : 1.3 \rightarrow 1.55 GeV variation of mass of c quark
- m_b : 4.3 \rightarrow 5.0 GeV variation of mass of b quark
- f_s : 0.25 \rightarrow 0.40 variation of strange sea fraction at Q_0^2
- f_c : 0.10 \rightarrow 0.20 variation of charm sea fraction at Q_0^2
- Q_0^2 : 2.0 \rightarrow 6.0 GeV² variation of starting scale
- Q_{min}^2 : 2.5 \rightarrow 5.0 GeV² variation of cuts on the data included

Correlated variations: f_c varies when m_c is varied, variation Q_0^2 also changes f_s and f_c .

Model variations: to be compared with our results

- Variation of $\alpha_s(M_Z)$: 0.1156 \rightarrow 0.1196
- Variation of form of parametrization

Fit Results

H1 and ZEUS
PDF Fit

LI, Gang

Outline

Data sets

Parameterization

Errors

Model
uncertainty

Results

Fit quality
PDFs
Comparison
Model Variations

Summary

extras

PDF fit RESULTS

Comparison to HERA combined data

Quality of fit to data

H1 and ZEUS
PDF Fit

LI, Gang

Outline

Data sets

Parameterization

Errors

Model
uncertainty

Results

Fit quality


PDFs

Comparison

Model Variations


Summary

extras



New HERA-I PDF fit predictions vs. H1/ZEUS combined data for NC e^+p .

Total uncertainties on the PDF fit predictions are included but can barely be resolved.



Blow up just three x values to see older ZEUS-JETS PDF and H1PDF2000 plus new **HERAPDF0.1**

Quality of fit to data

H1 and ZEUS
PDF Fit

LI, Gang

Outline

Data sets

Parameterization

Errors

Model
uncertainty

Results

Fit quality


PDFs

Comparison

Model Variations

Summary

extras



New H1/ZEUS combined PDF fit predictions vs. H1/ZEUS combined data for NC e^+p and e^-p at low Q^2 .

Total uncertainties on the PDF fit predictions are included but barely be resolved.

Quality of fit to data

H1 and ZEUS
PDF Fit

LI, Gang

Outline

Data sets

Parameterization

Errors

Model
uncertainty

Results

Fit quality


PDFs

Comparison

Model Variations

Summary

extras



New H1/ZEUS combined PDF fit predictions vs. H1/ZEUS combined data for NC e^+p and e^-p at high Q^2 .

Total uncertainties on the PDF fit predictions are included but cannot be resolved.

Quality of fit to data

H1 and ZEUS
PDF Fit

LI, Gang

Outline

Data sets

Parameterization

Errors


Model
uncertainty

Results

Fit quality
PDFs
Comparison
Model Variations

Summary

extras



New H1/ZEUS combined PDF fit
predictions vs. H1/ZEUS combined data
for CC e^+p and e^-p at high Q^2 .

Total uncertainties on the PDF fit
predictions are included.

H1 and ZEUS
PDF Fit

LI, Gang

Outline

Data sets

Parameterization

Errors

Model
uncertainty

Results

Fit quality

PDFs

Comparison

Model Variations



Summary

extras

HERAPDF0.1

PDFs: **experimental** and **model** errors
Comparison to other PDFs

At the starting scale: $Q_0^2 = 4\text{GeV}^2$



New H1/ZEUS combined PDFs with **total experimental uncertainty bands** plus **model uncertainty bands**

Strange fraction is the major contribution to model uncertainty on the sea
 Choice of starting scale and Q^2 cuts to the valence and gluon

H1 and ZEUS
 PDF Fit

LI, Gang

Outline

Data sets

Parameterization

Errors

Model
 uncertainty

Results

Fit quality

PDFs

Comparison

Model Variations

Summary

extras

At $Q^2 = 10\text{GeV}^2$

H1 and ZEUS
PDF Fit

LI, Gang

Outline

Data sets

Parameterization

Errors

Model
uncertainty

Results

Fit quality



PDFs

Comparison

Model Variations

Summary

extras



New H1/ZEUS combined PDFs with **total experimental uncertainty bands** plus **model uncertainty bands**

At $Q^2 = 100\text{GeV}^2$

H1 and ZEUS
PDF Fit

LI, Gang

Outline

Data sets

Parameterization

Errors

Model
uncertainty

Results

Fit quality



PDFs

Comparison

Model Variations

Summary

extras



New H1/ZEUS combined PDFs with **total experimental uncertainty bands** plus **model uncertainty bands** from 6 sources of model variation:
Note how uncertainties are decreasing with Q^2

At $Q^2 = 10000 \text{ GeV}^2$

H1 and ZEUS
PDF Fit

Li, Gang

Outline

Data sets

Parameterization

Errors

Model
uncertainty

Results

Fit quality



PDFs

Comparison

Model Variations

Summary

extras





New H1/ZEUS combined PDFs with **total experimental uncertainty bands** plus **model uncertainty bands** from 6 sources of model variation:
At scales relevant to LHC physics uncertainties are impressively small.

Compare to published ZEUS/H1 results which also used

only HERA data

Note in published PDFs H1 has α_s variation included in model error, ZEUS does not.



Resolution of previous discrepancies, improvement in level of uncertainty

H1 and ZEUS
PDF Fit

LI, Gang

Outline

Data sets

Parameterization

Errors

Model
uncertainty

Results

Fit quality

PDFs

Comparison

Model Variations

Summary

extras

Compare to CTEQ and MRST analyses: older

H1 and ZEUS
PDF Fit

LI, Gang

Outline

Data sets

Parameterization

Errors

Model
uncertainty

Results

Fit quality



PDFs

Comparison

Model Variations

Summary

extras



Compare to CTEQ and MRST(prel.): newer

H1 and ZEUS
PDF Fit

LI, Gang

Outline

Data sets

Parameterization

Errors

Model
uncertainty

Results

Fit quality



PDFs

Comparison

Model Variations

Summary

extras



Variations: α_s

H1 and ZEUS
PDF Fit

LI, Gang

Outline

Data sets

Parameterization

Errors

Model
uncertainty

Results

Fit quality



PDFs

Comparison

Model Variations

Summary

extras



Comparison of central fit plus **total uncertainties** to variations with $\alpha_s(M_Z) = 0.1156$ (left) and 0.1196 (right)

Variation is outside the gluon error bands even when other model dependence is accounted.

Variations: use H1 style parametrization

H1 and ZEUS
PDF Fit

LI, Gang

Outline

Data sets

Paramterization

Errors

Model
uncertainty

Results

Fit quality



PDFs

Comparison

Model Variations

Summary

extras



Comparison of central fit plus **total uncertainties** to variations with **New H1 optimised parametrization**

Marginally outside normal error bands for valence even when other model dependence is accounted (but note this is at low x where valence not very significant)

Variations: use ZEUS-style parametrization

H1 and ZEUS
PDF Fit

LI, Gang

Outline

Data sets

Paramterization

Errors

Model
uncertainty

Results

Fit quality



PDFs

Comparison

Model Variations

Summary

extras



Comparison of central fit plus **total uncertainties** to variations using
New ZEUS-JETS optimised parametrization
Inside error bands if other model dependence is accounted

Resolution of an old discrepancy

H1 and ZEUS
PDF Fit

LI, Gang

Outline

Data sets

Parameterization

Errors

Model
uncertainty

Results

Fit quality
PDFs
Comparison
Model Variations

Summary


extras

For each of the parametrizations, if a non-zero D parameter for the gluon is used, there are two minima: straight gluon and humpy gluon solution.

These look rather like the published ZEUS and H1 gluons respectively!

For the H1/ZEUS combined data set the χ^2 of the straight solution is always lower by about 10 χ^2 points. But whereas the humpy solutions are disfavoured by χ^2 they are still acceptable fits.

We compare the humpy and straight solutions for our chosen parametrization here. These parametrizations are very consistent.



Summary

H1 and ZEUS
PDF Fit

LI, Gang

Outline

Data sets

Parameterization

Errors

Model
uncertainty

Results

Fit quality
PDFs
Comparison
Model Variations

Summary

extras

- The combined data set of ZEUS and H1 inclusive cross-section data for NC and CC e^+p and e^-p scattering has greatly improved precision compared to the measurements of either experiment separately
- Differences between ZEUS and H1 PDF fitting analyses have also been resolved. Treatment of experimental and model uncertainties have been carefully considered.
- **Since our combination procedure has resulted in a single data set with consistently treated systematics there is no need for an inflated $\Delta\chi^2$ in setting the errors on the PDFs.**
- **This results in the HERAPDF set which has impressive precision compared to previous HERA analyses, and to the global fits.**

THE END

H1 and ZEUS
PDF Fit

LI, Gang

Outline

Data sets

Parameterization

Errors

Model
uncertainty

Results

Fit quality

PDFs

Comparison

Model Variations

Summary

extras

THANKS A LOT !

Averaging

H1 and ZEUS
PDF Fit

LI, Gang

Outline

Data sets

Parameterization

Errors

Model
uncertainty

Results

Fit quality

PDFs

Comparison

Model Variations

Summary

extras

- Modified χ^2 definition:

$$\chi_{\text{exp}}^2(M^{i,\text{true}}, \Delta\alpha_j) = \sum_i \frac{\left[M^{i,\text{true}} - \left(M^i + \sum_j \frac{\partial M^i}{\partial \alpha_j} \frac{M^{i,\text{true}}}{M^i} \Delta\alpha_j \right) \right]^2}{\sigma_i^2} + \sum_j \frac{\Delta\alpha_j^2}{\sigma_{\alpha_j}^2}$$

Caution: Most errors are provided as relative errors, a smaller value of cross section has smaller absolute error bias toward smaller averages Can be avoided by modified χ^2 definition: insert $\frac{M^{i,\text{true}}}{M^i}$

Discrepancy

H1 and ZEUS
PDF Fit

LI, Gang

Outline

Data sets

Parameterization

Errors

Model
uncertainty

Results

Fit quality
PDFs
Comparison
Model Variations

Summary

extras

- the PDF of gluon:

$$\begin{aligned}xg(x) &= Ax^B(1-x)^C(1+Dx) \\ &= [A(x^B + Dx^{1+B})](1-x)^C\end{aligned}$$

- In the region of our data, these two forms are comparable

