Z→ee Pythia studies in athena

M. Flowerdew with the Liverpool SM group, especially U. Klein and T. Kluge

UK SM group, 04/06/08





Outline

- Modern tools for HO calculations
- Pythia+Photos in athena
- Why Pythia output isn't LO
- Pseudo-HO effects in Pythia+Photos
 - **→** ISR
 - Primordial k
 - Parton Shower
 - **→** FSR
- LO \rightarrow NLO K-factors
- Acceptances with cuts
- Conclusions

Tools for HO calculations

Several tools now exist that allow accurate computation of cross sections in p-p collisions. Some examples:

- MCFM NLO calculations with spin correlations
- MadGraph/MadEvent LO calculations for (almost) arbitrary processes
- FEWZ Fully Exclusive W,Z production (NNLO QCD)
- Horace specialised program for O(α) electroweak corrections to W and Z production

These have been extensively tested and cross-normalised here at Liverpool

See T. Kluge's talk from January for more on this: http://indico.cern.ch/getFile.py/access?contribId=5&resId=0&materialId=slides&confId=25354

Cross sections from HO tools

Many factors affect the cross section predictions from these tools

- HO settings
- PDF choice
- Kinematic selection
- Electroweak parameterisation

With consistent settings, the different tools agree. An example benchmark (LO cross section):

MCFM: 1713.3 ± 1.7 pb FEWZ: 1712.3 ± 1.4 pb Madgraph: 1713.9 ± 1.4 pb $\begin{array}{ll} \mbox{pdf: CTEQ6L1} \\ \mbox{M}_{Z} > 60 \ \mbox{GeV only} & \mbox{G}_{F} = 1.17 \times 10^{-5} \\ \mbox{α(Q^{2}=M_{Z}) = 1/132.5$} & \mbox{sin}^{2}(\theta_{W}) = 0.2222 \\ \mbox{M}_{Z} = 91.188 \ \mbox{GeV} & \mbox{$\Gamma_{Z} = 2.49$} \ \mbox{GeV} \\ \mbox{M}_{W} = 80.419 \ \mbox{GeV} & \mbox{$\Gamma_{W} = 2.06$} \ \mbox{GeV} \\ \mbox{Factorisation scale} = \\ \mbox{Renormalisation scale} = M_{Z} \end{array}$

So why bother with Pythia?

The motivation for looking at Pythia here is largely practical: Several large MC samples are generated with Pythia+Photos

- (SM): Minbias, QCD Dijets, Photon+Jet, W/Z, Drell-Yan, ...
- Most SM detector-level studies implicitly depend on Pythia's assumptions
- But Pythia calculates Leading Order cross sections
 - So NLO Result = Pythia * (NLO/LO) ??
 - No!
 - Pythia (+Photos) already emulate some aspects of higherorder behaviour
 - Subject of this talk

Running Pythia in athena

Official evgen "job transform" was designed to handle large-scale event generation. It's actually quite simple to use:

Job transform script csc evgen trf.py Removes event number restriction -test 005144 Sample number First event # \mathbf{O} 20000 Number of events 23040 Random seed CSC.005144.PythiaZee.py Job options file 005144.evgen.0.pool.root Output POOL file 005144.histo.0.root Output histogram file Output ntuple file 005144.ntuple.0.root

20k events take 30 mins (LO) to 1h50 (ATLAS default) on Liverpool's 800 MHz batch nodes

Running Pythia in athena



Comparison: LO vs ATLAS default

Pythia+Photos in athena by default looks very different from LO:

- M_{ee} is shifted from M_z by Photos
- The Z is more central than in LO, and has non-zero p_T (from TeVatron results)
- The large peak in p_T^e at M_Z/2 (LO) is absent in ATLAS production







Discovering LO Pythia

Solution lies in all the other things that are in Pythia itself:

- Parametrised ISR/FSR
- Parton Shower (ie non-perturbative QCD)
- Multiple Interactions
- "Primordial" k_{T} of the incident partons

So, whatever the default Pythia is, it is not "Leading Order" in the Horace sense!

Thanks to Marc Goulette for help in finding all these!

Side note: from now on, the MC filter has been removed

• 1 lepton with $p_T > 10 \text{ GeV}$ and $|\eta| < 2.7 \ (\epsilon = 85.5\%)$



Comparing LO calculations

To fully integrate Pythia predictions with those of HO tools, we'd like to compare the total LO cross section too

- σ_{tot} is independent of all the pseudo-HO effects
- Large dependence on EW parameters
 - $M_{Z}, \Gamma_{Z}, M_{W}, \Gamma_{W}, \sin^{2}(\theta_{W}), \alpha(Q^{2}), M_{t}, G_{F}, \dots$
 - * and which are independent?
- Ongoing study to align Pythia with the HO tools

MCFM, MadEvent, FEWZ concordance: Pythia, ATLAS defaults: Pythia, new EW values and EW scheme 0: Pythia, new EW values and EW scheme 1: Pythia, new EW values and EW scheme 2: 1713(1) pb 1680(1) pb 1809(1) pb 1700(1) pb 1698(1) pb

QCD effects: ISR

ISR is the radiation of partons in the initial state. By default, both QCD and QED radiation is accounted for in Pythia.

The main effect is to impart p_T to the boson (right), which has knock-on effects on several distributions.

- The resulting bosons and leptons are more central
- The peak in the LO p_T^e distribution is washed out

Despite the size of these effects, there is clearly something else too...





QCD effects: k₇

Pythia parameterises the "primordial" k_T of the incoming partons as Gaussian

This contributes ~2-3 GeV to the boson pT, appearing to be the sub-dominant contribution here

 Test (to do): What does p_T^Z look like for LO+ISR+k_T?



QCD effects: Parton Shower

Parton Shower has negligible effectK-factors are 1 within stat. errors

What's left? FSR...



QED effects: FSR

In ATLAS MC, QED FSR is managed by Photos, not Pythia

 For leptonic final states, QCD FSR expected to have a tiny residual effect

We've already seen its effect on M_{ee}

• Together with ISR and primordial k_T , QED FSR also contributes significantly to p_T^{ee} (note: not p_T^{Z})



Defining LO → **NLO K-factors**

A final goal of this study is to enable K factors calculated for (N)NLO to be used with the Pythia MC production. As this is not LO, can this be done consistently?

One solution: Find distributions where one factor dominates, or are otherwise "simple", ie

$$\frac{ATLAS}{ATLAS - X} = \frac{LO + X}{LO}$$

In these cases, K-factors from LO can be used





Defining LO → **NLO K-factors**

Some distributions are simply too quickly changing at LO to do this. Most notably:

- p_T^{Z} (=0 at LO)
 - Need to correct using ResBos anyway
- p_T^e (spike at $M_Z^2/2$)
 - K-factors from LO and from ATLAS defaults show large differences (left)

In these cases, we will probably have to relate the HO tool predictions directly to Pythia, "bypassing" LO



Acceptances with kinematic cuts

Most plots so far show "inclusive" distributions, ie without cuts Acceptance factors with realistic cuts need not be flat or independent of the physics considered

Electron n

1911482

Entries

Some benchmark cuts have been chosen:

- ATLAS filter: at least 1 e with $p_T > 10$ GeV, $|\eta| < 2.7$
- Eta cut: both e with $|\eta| < 2.5$
- Pt cut: both e with $p_T > 20 \text{ GeV}$
- Pt&Eta cut: Simply Pt cut \cap Eta cut



"Global" Acceptances

Generator settings	ATLAS filter	Eta cut	pTcut	Eta&pT cuts
Leading Order	82.12%	44.43%	85.20%	42.11%
LO + Photos	81.57%	44.55%	80.31%	40.10%
LO + Parton Shower	82.13%	44.52%	85.20%	42.18%
LO + primodial kT	82.24%	44.52%	84.06%	41.82%
LO + ISR	84.59%	47.26%	78.60%	41.72%
ATLAS default	84.02%	47.27%	74.40%	39.64%
ATLAS - Photos	84.56%	47.34%	78.62%	41.73%
ATLAS - PS	84.08%	47.28%	74.42%	39.71%
ATLAS - primordial kT	84.02%	47.29%	74.44%	39.69%
ATLAS - ISR	81.66%	44.60%	79.37%	39.81%

 $|\eta| < 2.5$

 $p_T > 20 GeV$

ISR and Photos have the greatest impact on A, up to $\sim 5\%$

- Checks done "from both ends" (LO and ATLAS defaults)
- Correlations (eg between p_T and η cuts) as yet uninvestigated

Typical uncertainty ~0.05%

Conclusions and future plans

Understanding Pythia and its physics content is essential for relating ATLAS simulation to more up-to-date theoretical models

- Pythia + Photos is not just LO!
- Some of the work of HO corrections seems to already be done (Photos vs Horace?)
- Other distributions (p_T^Z?) will be difficult to match to NLO, NNLO calculations

To avoid (near-)singularities, we hope to use (N)NLO/{Pythia+Photos} to form effective K-factors

Some cross-checks (eg overall normalisation, sensitivity to event selection) are yet to be completed