

Charm Fragmentation into D^* at HERA

Shuangshi Fang



on behalf of the ZEUS and H1 Collaborations

OUTLINE

Introduction

Fragmentation function in photoproduction

Fragmentation function in DIS

Summary

Introduction

➤ Why fragmentation ?

- non-perturbative process
- phenomenological models

Peterson function: $f(z) \propto \frac{1}{[z(1-1/z - \epsilon/(1-z))^2]}$

Kartvelishvili function: $f(z) \propto z^\alpha (1-z)$


Bowler function: $f(z) \propto \frac{1}{z^{1+r_0 b m_0^2}} (1-z)^a \exp\left(-\frac{b m_\perp^2}{z}\right)$

- needs experimental study
- check fragmentation universality

➤ e^+e^- collisions: $z \sim E_{D^*} / E_{\text{beam}}$

➤ ep collisions

- the definition of z is not unique
- two methods used at HERA




Experimental Definitions at HERA

➤ Jet method(ZEUS,H1)

- energy of c-quark is approximated by the energy of the reconstructed D^* jet


$$z = (E+p_{\parallel})_{D^*} / (E+p)_{\text{jet}}$$



➤ Hemisphere method(H1)

- energy of c-quark is approximated by the energy of reconstructed D^* -hemisphere

$$z = (E+p_{\parallel})_{D^*} / \Sigma(E+p)_i$$



Charm Fragmentation in Photoproduction


JHEP 0904:082,2009




- HERA I data: 1996-2000, 120pb^{-1}
- Golden channel: $D^* \rightarrow D^0 \pi_s \rightarrow K \pi \pi_s$
- D^* selection in photoproduction

- ❑ $Q^2 < 1 \text{ GeV}^2$, $130 < W_{\gamma p} < 280 \text{ GeV}$
- ❑ $P_T(D^*) > 2 \text{ GeV}$, $|\eta_{D^*}| < 1.75$
- ❑ $E_T(\text{jet}) > 9 \text{ GeV}$

- $N(D^*) = 1307 \pm 53$



- Extract parameter of Peterson function in PYTHIA with minimum χ^2 method
- $\epsilon = 0.062 \pm 0.007^{+0.008}_{-0.004}$
- The best value from fit is consistent with the default value **0.05** obtained from fit to e^+e^- experiment





Fit to NLO QCD

ZEUS



- NLO QCD calculation : FMNR corrected for hadronization (PYTHIA)



- parameters of Peterson and Kartvelishvili function

- ε = 0.079^{+0.013}_{-0.009}
- α = 2.67^{+0.25}_{-0.31}

Charm Fragmentation in DIS

Eur. Phys.J. C59:589,2009



- HERA I data: 1999-2000, 47pb^{-1}
- Golden channel: $D^* \rightarrow D^0 \pi_s \rightarrow K \pi \pi_s$
- D^* selection in DIS


- ❑ $2 < Q^2 < 100 \text{ GeV}^2$
- ❑ $1.5 < P_T(D^*) < 15 \text{ GeV}$
- ❑ $|\eta_{D^*}| < 1.5$

- Jet sample, $E_T(\text{jet}) > 3 \text{ GeV}$

$N(D^*) = 1508 \pm 68$

- No jet sample,


$N(D^*) = 1363 \pm 54$



Fit to RAPGAP simulation: jet sample



- Two methods used:
 - Jet method
 - Hemisphere method
- RAPGAP contains higher resonances (Aleph tune) as opposed to the ZEUS analysis: the fragmentation parameters can not be directly compared




	Kartvelishvili(α)	Peterson(ϵ)
Jet method:	$4.3^{+0.5}_{-0.4}$	$0.035^{+0.007}_{-0.006}$
Hemisphere method:	$4.4^{+0.6}_{-0.5}$	$0.030^{+0.007}_{-0.006}$

both methods give consistent results



Fit to NLO QCD: jet sample

- NLO QCD: HVQDIS
- data corrected to parton level
- compared with NLO partonic cross sections




	Kartvelishvili(α)	Peterson(ϵ)
Jet method:	3.8 ± 0.3	$0.034^{+0.004}_{-0.004}$
Hemisphere method:	3.3 ± 0.4	$0.068^{+0.015}_{-0.013}$



Fit to NLO QCD: no jet sample

- NLO QCD: HVQDIS
 - Investigation of the threshold region
 - events not fulfilling hard scale cut $E_T(\text{jet}) > 3\text{GeV}$
 - compared with NLO partonic cross sections
 - models describing the jet data are not able to describe the no-jet data with the same set of parameters.
- Observation confirmed with RAPGAP data



	Kart.(α)	Peterson(ϵ)
Hemisphere method	$6.1^{+0.9}_{-0.8}$	$0.007^{+0.001}_{-0.001}$


ZEUS $z = (E+P_{\parallel})/2E_{\text{jet}}$

H1 $z = (E+P_{\parallel})/\Sigma_{\text{hem}}(E+P)$ Hemisphere

ALEPH $\sqrt{s} = 91.2 \text{ GeV}$, $z = E_{D^*}/E_{\text{beam}}$

CLEO $\sqrt{s} = 10.5 \text{ GeV}$, $z = P_{D^*}/P_{\text{max}}$

Belle $\sqrt{s} = 10.6 \text{ GeV}$, $z = P_{D^*}/P_{\text{max}}$



□ z mean

$$\square \langle z \rangle = \sum_i^n z_i \cdot \left(\frac{d\sigma}{dz} \right)_i$$

□ $\langle z \rangle = 0.588 \pm 0.024 \pm 0.028$ (ZEUS)

□ $\langle z \rangle = 0.4878 \pm 0.0046 \pm 0.0061$ (ALEPH)

□ $\langle z \rangle = 0.6122 \pm 0.0004 \pm 0.0014$ (Belle)

□ $\langle z \rangle = 0.611 \pm 0.007 \pm 0.004$ (CLEO)

□ z mean from ALEPH is a little lower due to gluon emission

- The data sets were normalized to $1/(\text{bin width})$ for $z > 0.3$
- Although different definitions, spectra similar in shape

Summary

- Fragmentation function for D^* was measured in photoproduction and DIS regime
- Parameters of Peterson and Kartvelishvili functions were extracted
- Both of the fragmentation functions provide a reasonable description of data
- Fragmentation seems universal within PYTHIA, far away from the production threshold
- Different experimental methods yield compatible results within same kinematic region
- Results in threshold region differ from results at high p_T
 - ➔ more refined theoretical treatment needed!


Thank you !

Backup

Comparison with MC predictions




ZEUS





- Fragmentation observable distribution
- PYTHIA6.1 seems to be better in describing data

- Compared with Symm. Lund + Bowler model
- The default value, $r_Q=1$, in PYTHIA gives a reasonable description of data
- The prediction deviates more and more from data as r_Q decreases






Comparison with RAPGAP: jet sample




Fit to RAPGAP simulation: jet sample



D*[±] jet sample



D*[±] jet sample



Fit to NLO QCD: jet sample

