Measurement of Energy Correlations in e⁺e⁻ → Hadrons*

D. Schlatter, G. S. Abrams, D. Amidei, A. Bäcker,[a] C. A. Blocker,
A. Blondel,[b] A. M. Boyarski, M. Breidenbach, D. L. Burke,
W. Chinowsky, M. W. Coles,[c] G. von Dardel,[d] W. E. Dieterle,
J. B. Dillon, J. Dorenbosch,[e] J. M. Dorfan, M. W. Eaton,
G. J. Feldman, M. E. B. Franklin, G. Gidal, L. Gladney, G. Goldhaber,
L. J. Golding, G. Hanson, R. J. Hollebeek, W. R. Innes, J. A. Jaros,
A. D. Johnson, J. A. Kadyk, A. J. Lankford, R. R. Larsen, B. LeClaire,
M. Levi, N. Lockyer, B. Löhr,[f] V. Lüth, C. Matteuzzi, M. E. Nelson,
J. F. Patrick, M. L. Perl, B. Richter, A. Roussarie,[g] T. Schaad,
D. L. Scharre, H. Schellman, R. F. Schwitters, J. L. Siegrist,
J. Strait, G. H. Trilling, R. A. Vidal, I. Videau,[b] Y. Wang,[h]
J. M. Weiss, M. Werlen,[i] J. M. Yelton, C. Zaiser, and G. Zhao[h]

Stanford Linear Accelerator Center
Stanford University, Stanford, California 94305

Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory and Department of Physics
University of California, Berkeley, California 94720

Department of Physics
Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

ABSTRACT

Energy correlations have been measured with the MARK II detector at
PEP at c.m. energy of 29 GeV and are compared to first order QCD pre-
dictions. Fragmentation processes are significant and limit the preci-
sion with which the first order strong coupling constant can be deter-
mined.

We present a measurement of energy correlations[1] of hadrons produced in high-energy e^+e^- annihilations. This kind of measurement probes the general structure of hadronic events in a simple way and can be used to test QCD, the candidate theory of the strong interactions. It has several advantages over other techniques[2] of testing QCD: It does not require either the selection of specific event topologies, such as three-jet events, or the definition of a jet axis. It uses a simple parameterization to account for the fragmentation process[3] rather than detailed Monte Carlo simulations. In particular, to first order, the backward-forward asymmetry in the correlation function is proportional to the strong coupling constant α_s and is assumed to be independent of fragmentation processes[4]. Good statistics allows us to make the first experimental test of the validity of this assumption. We find a significicant nonperturbative contribution to the asymmetry in the data which could be due to the fragmentation in three jet events. This has to be taken into account in a determination of the strong coupling constant.

The data reported here were taken at a center-of-mass energy of 29 GeV with the MARK II detector at the PEP storage ring of the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center and correspond to an integrated luminosity of 15000 nb^{-1}. The essential features of the MARK II detector have been described previously[5].

Charged tracks are used in the analysis if they have a momentum greater than 100 MeV/c and appear to come from within 10 cm of the interaction point along the beam direction. Photons are used if they are measured to have an energy greater than 200 MeV in the lead-liquid argon calorimeters and are further than 10 cm from any charged track at

the entrance of the calorimeters. Events are accepted if there are at least five charged tracks and at least one photon passing above criteria, if the total visible energy is larger than 15 GeV, and if the event vertex is within 7 cm of the interaction point in the beam direction and within a radial distance of 5 cm from the beam axis. The total visible energy is the sum of the energies of photons as measured in the liquid argon modules and of the energies of charged particles as measured in the drift chamber. Since we do not distinguish between particle masses, a pion mass has been assigned to all charged particles.

The fiducial volume for this measurement is taken to be -0.7 < cosθ < 0.7, where θ is the angle with respect to the incident beams, and the entire azimuthal acceptance with the exception of eight gaps of 6° width corresponding to the edges of the lead-liquid argon calorimeter modules. With the above selection criteria, 3000 events have tracks inside the fiducial volume.

The energy weighted cross section for observing the energy E in the solid angle dΩ and the energy E' in the solid angle dΩ' is defined by:

$$\frac{1}{\sigma_o} \frac{d\Sigma}{d\Omega d\Omega'} = \frac{1}{Nd\Omega d\Omega'} \sum \sum \frac{EE'}{s} \quad . \qquad (1)$$

The first sum is over all pairs of particles in the solid angles dΩ and dΩ' while the second sum runs over all N events. The total hadronic cross section is denoted by σ_o , and the center-of-mass energy is $\sqrt{s}$. In this Letter we will study this cross section as a function of the angle χ between dΩ and dΩ'. In order to obtain the cross section given in Eq. (1), corrections for the effects of resolution, detection ineffi-

ciency, initial state radiation and weak decays have been made by a Monte Carlo simulation. The sum of these corrections is small inside the fiducial volume and in the range of $20° < \chi < 160°$. They amount to 20% at $\chi = 20°$ and 5% at $\chi = 90°$.

The sum over all external angles keeping the opening angle χ fixed gives the following cross section:

$$\frac{1}{\sigma_o} \frac{d\Sigma}{d\cos\chi} = \frac{1}{N\Delta\cos\chi} \sum\sum \frac{EE'}{s} \qquad . \qquad (2)$$

This corrected cross section summed over all pairs of particles inside the fiducial volume is shown in Fig. 1 as a function of $\cos\chi$ [6]. The peaks at $\cos\chi = +1$ and -1 show the tendency of the events to form into two back-to-back jets. Studying the deviations of the data from a two jet structure requires comparison with a detailed theoretical calculation. The cross section as defined in Eq. (1) has been calculated for partons in the framework of first order perturbative QCD [1,7]. The explicit form is:

$$\frac{1}{\sigma_o} \frac{d\Sigma}{d\Omega d\Omega'} = \frac{3}{16\pi}\left(A(\chi,\alpha_s)(2 + \cos^2\theta + \cos^2\theta') + B(\chi,\alpha_s)(\cos\chi + \cos\theta\cos\theta')\right)$$

$$(3)$$

The direction of a particle with respect to the beam is given by the polar angle θ. The functions A and B have been calculated in the framework of perturbative QCD to first order in α_s and they depend only on χ and α_s. They describe the energy correlation of a quark, antiquark and a gluon, according to the two external angular terms. In the partonic picture quark-antiquark events $(q\bar{q})$ contribute only at $\chi = 0°$ and $\chi =$

180° to the energy correlation. The first order perturbative cross section has singularities at $x = 0°$ and $x = 180°$, where the gluon, quark, and antiquark become collinear. In the intermediate angular range ($20° < x < 160°$) there is a very pronounced asymmetry around $x = 90°$. Only those terms of the cross section proportional to α_s contribute to this asymmetry.

In order to compare the theory with an experiment, in which hadrons are observed instead of partons, a nonperturbative correction has to be added to account for the fragmentation of partons into hadrons[1]. The fragmentation of the $q\bar{q}$-process is in leading order symmetric around 90° and is accounted for by an additional term added to A. This term has been estimated to first order in $1/\sqrt{s}$ as:

$$A_{q\bar{q}f}(x) = \frac{A_f^o}{\sqrt{s}\ \sin^3 x} \quad . \tag{4}$$

A second fragmentation term for events with a gluon radiated off a quark or an antiquark ($q\bar{q}g$) has to be added to A. The dominant effect due to this fragmentation is to spread the correlation at 0° to larger values of the angle x. This term is asymmetric with respect to 90° since for these three jet events there is no jet at 180°. Following the description of fragmentation of a quark according to Eq. (4) we tried the following ansatz to account for the fragmentation from $q\bar{q}g$ events[8]:

$$A_{q\bar{q}gf}(x) = \alpha_s \frac{A_f^1}{\sqrt{s}\ \sin^3 x} \qquad \text{for } x < 90° \tag{5a}$$

$$= \alpha_s \frac{A_f^1}{\sqrt{s}} (1 + \cos x) \qquad \text{for } x > 90° \text{ [9]} \tag{5b}$$

Equation (5) is only an estimate of the net contribution from $q\bar{q}g$-fragmentation, but it agrees well with a Monte Carlo simulation in the angular range $0° < \chi < 80°$. For angles $> 80°$ the actual shape of the fragmentation term is less important since it is small there. As will be shown below, the addition of a fragmentation term like Eq. (5) is necessary in order to describe the data. Note that all terms which are asymmetric about $\chi = 90°$ come from three-parton processes and are thus proportional to α_s in this model.

The solid curve in Fig. 1 is the result of a fit of Eqs. (3-5), integrated over the MARK II solid angle. For the parameters we obtained $\alpha_s = 0.19 \pm 0.02$, $A^0_f = (0.7 \pm 0.2)$GeV and $A^1_f = (2.6 \pm 0.5)$GeV with a χ^2 of 25 for 22 degrees of freedom. The errors are statistical only. The fragmentation terms account for $\simeq 40\%$ of the observed correlation at $\chi = 90°$. The $q\bar{q}g$-fragmentation term is important in order to describe the observed energy correlation. A fit without this term ($A^1_f = 0$) increases χ^2 by a factor of two while the value of α_s changes to 0.14.

The measurement of the asymmetry $D(\chi) = 1/\sigma_0[d\Sigma/dcos\chi(\pi-\chi) - d\Sigma/dcos\chi(\chi)]$, which is given in Fig. 2, shows a change of nearly two orders of magnitude from $\chi = 20°$ to $\chi = 90°$. The sum of the pertubative and the $q\bar{q}g$-fragmentation component with parameters as determined from the full cross section is shown together with the pure perturbative pre- diction. The fragmentation of $q\bar{q}g$ events reduces the asymmetry by about a factor of two.

The systematic error in α_s has been estimated to be 0.03. The major source of this error is the uncertainty in the form for the fragmentation terms, particularly Eq. (5). We have estimated the uncertainty by trying alternate forms of Eq. (5) that are roughly consistent with the shape predicted by the Monte Carlo simulations. The uncertainties from the fragmentation terms dominate the ones introduced by the Monte Carlo corrections.

There are two other sources of uncertainty which are not included in the error estimate because, in some sense, they are beyond the level of approximation we are considering. First, it is possible that the $q\bar{q}$ fragmentation has a second-order ,($\propto 1/s$), asymmetric component. Monte Carlo simulations indicate that such components exist and, if included, would reduce the value of α_s by about 10%. Second, no correction has been made for second-order perturbative terms in the cross section, because the calculation of them has not yet been done.

Our result is in reasonable agreement with several determinations of α_s made at PETRA[10-13] at $\sqrt{s}$ around 30 GeV[14]. The values of α_s vary between 0.15 and 0.20. The systematic uncertainties in these measurements come not only from different experimental methods but also from different treatment of the fragmentation. The energy correlation method treats the fragmentation with a global parametrization, whereas the other methods rely on Monte Carlo simulations.

In conclusion, the energy correlation cross section is a rather unbiased measure of the hadronic final state and allows a comparison with theoretical predictions with, in principle, minimal use of a Monte Carlo model. Quantitative tests of perturbative QCD predictions however

depend on additional assumptions on the nonperturbative hadronization process, even in the opposite-side to same-side asymmetry, in contrast to previous expectations. Including the fragmentation terms the strong coupling constant as defined in the first order QCD calculation of C.Basham et al., is in good agreement with results from other experiments.

References

1. C. Basham, L.Brown, S.Ellis and S. Love, Phys. Rev. D19, 2018 (1979) and Phys. Rev. D24, 2383 (1981).

2. A review is given by: C.Llewellyn Smith, 1980 Proc. of the XXth Int. Conf. on High Energy Physics, Madison Wisconsin.

3. R. Cashmore, 1979 Proc. of the Int. Conf. on High Energy Physics, Geneva, p.330; R.Brandelik et al., Phys.Lett. 86B, 243 (1979); Ch.Berger et al., Phys.Lett. 86B, 418 (1979); D.P.Barber et al., Phys.Rev.Lett. 43, 830 (1979); W.Bartel et al., Phys.Lett. 91B, 142 (1980).

4. The first use of this general method of analysis was by the PLUTO group at PETRA published in Ch. Berger et al., Phys. Lett. 99B, 292 (1981)

5. R.H. Schindler et al., Phys. Rev. D24, 78 (1981) and references therin.

6. Note that the cross section is for the fiducial volume and not extrapolated to the full solid angle.

7. G. Fox and S. Wolfram, Z. Phys. C4, 237 (1980).

8. In the original work of C.Basham et al., the $q\bar{q}g$-fragmentation term has been neglected.

9. In order to avoid a discotinuity at $90°$, we have added a linear extrapolation to zero for $x > 90°$.

10. S. Yamada, Proceedings of the XX International Conference on High Energy Physics, Madison, Wisconsin (1980).

11. D.P. Barber et al., Phys.Lett. 89B, 139 (1979) and H. Newman, Pro-

ceedings of the XX International Conference on High Energy Physics, Madison, Wisconsin (1980).

12. R. Brandelik et al. Phys.Lett. 94B, 437 (1980).

13. Ch. Berger et al., Phys.Lett. 97B, 459 (1980)

14. An other type of determination of α_s, using the data of the Υ decay, yields to a value of 0.16 ± 0.01 (ref. 15) which gives a relative small value for α_s at $\sqrt{s}$ = 30 GeV. Due to the very different analysis, this difference may reflect the systematic uncertainties in the theoretical assumptions.

15. P.B. Mackenzie and G.P. Lepage, Phys.Rev.Lett. 47,1244 (1981).

FIGURE CAPTIONS

1. $(1/\sigma_0)d\Sigma/d\cos\chi$ as a function of $\cos\chi$. The size of the dots corresponds to the statistical errors. The dashed line is the QCD prediction of Ref. 1. The dashed-dotted line is the QCD result plus the $q\bar{q}$ fragmentation term (Eq. 4). The solid line is the sum of the QCD prediction and the two non-perturbative contributions from Eqs. 4 and 5.

2.   The asymmetry $D(\chi)$ as a function of $\cos\chi$. The solid line is the QCD prediction with α_s = 0.19 and the $q\bar{q}g$ fragmentation term with A'_f = 2.6 GeV. The dotted line is perturbative QCD alone.

Fig. 1

$$\frac{1}{\sigma_0}\left[\frac{d\Sigma}{d\cos\chi}(\pi-\chi)-\frac{d\Sigma}{d\cos\chi}(\chi)\right]$$

$\cos(\chi)$

3-82

4196A5

Fig. 2