Jets

Davison E. Soper
University of Oregon

CTEQ School, Pittsburgh, July 2013

What are jets?

- Denote angles in the detector by

  azimuthal angle ϕ

  pseudorapidity $\eta = -\log\tan(\theta/2)$



- Lego plot event display.
- Plot $P_T = |\vec{P}_T|$ in each calorimeter cell versus η and ϕ.



- An Atlas event.



- Sometimes there are more jets.



- The P_T is concentrated in a few narrow sprays of particles.
- These sprays are called jets.
- In this event, there are two jets.



- Events with big $\sum_i P_{T,i}$ are rare.
- When they happen, the P_T is always in jets.

Why are there jets?

- Here is a Feynman diagram for quark-quark scattering, with additional radiation.
- Diagram has a factor $1/(p_1 + p_2)^2$.



$p_1 \ (p_1^2 = 0)$

$p_2 \ (p_2^2 = 0)$

$p_1 + p_2$



- If $p_1 \to 0$, then $1/(p_1 + p_2)^2 \to \infty$.
- If $p_2 \to 0$, then $1/(p_1 + p_2)^2 \to \infty$.
- If $p_2 \to \lambda p_1$, then $1/(p_1 + p_2)^2 \to \infty$.

- So probability is big to get a spray of collimated particles plus some low momentum particles at wide angles.

Prediction pre-QCD

- Bjorken, Berman and Kogut (1971) had it figured out before jets were seen and before QCD.
- "... the isolated high P_T partons will communicate with the 'wee' partons by cascade emission of partons."



FIG. 4. A momentum-space visualization of hadron-hadron deep-inelastic scattering occurring in three steps.

Electron-positron to hadrons provided early evidence

- The PETRA accelerator (DESY) had enough energy to make jets clearly visible.
- The PETRA experiments had 4π detectors, so that one could be convinced that two and three jet events existed with single event displays.



Fig.9 A typical three jet event

from G. Wolf, Multiparticle Conference, 1983

Renormalization of the QCD coupling

- At each vertex in a diagram, there is a factor g.
- $g^2/(4\pi) = \alpha_s$.
- Consider a diagram in which momenta are of order Q.



- We can add loop diagrams with $\int d^4k \cdots$.

- For some loop diagrams, $k^2 \gg Q^2$ is important.



- Surprisingly, we can (approximately) omit these loop diagrams if we simply adjust α_s.



- Then the value of the effective α_s depends on Q.

- Result of renormalization group analysis (M = cutoff scale).

$$\alpha_s(Q) \sim \alpha_s(M) - (\beta_0/4\pi)\log(Q^2/M^2)\ \alpha_s^2(M) + (\beta_0/4\pi)^2\log^2(Q^2/M^2)\ \alpha_s^3(M) + \cdots$$

$$= \frac{\alpha_s(M)}{1 + (\beta_0/4\pi)\alpha_s(M)\log(Q^2/M^2)}$$

$$= \frac{\alpha_s(M_Z)}{1 + (\beta_0/4\pi)\alpha_s(M_Z)\log(Q^2/M_Z^2)}$$

- Note that $\alpha_s(Q)$ decreases as Q increases.

Running can be tested

- Plot value of $\alpha_s(Q)$ determined from experiments at scale Q.



Plot from Review of Particle Properties (2012)

A lesson

- Perturbation theory, an expansion in powers of $\alpha_s(Q)$, is not reliable unless Q is large.



Jet cross sections

- Consider, for example, the one jet inclusive cross section

$$\frac{d\sigma}{dP_T\, dy}$$

P_T = transverse momentum of the jet

y = rapidity of the jet $\approx -\log\tan(\theta/2)$

- Here "inclusive" means that the event has one jet with P_T, y plus anything else.
- One can also look at Z-boson + two jets, missing P_T plus jet, ...

- A result from Atlas.



● = experiment

▬ = QCD theory
next-to-leading order

- Note nine orders of magnitude variation in cross section at one $|y|$.

- Agreement of theory and experiment means no new-physics effects are seen to 1 TeV.

We need a jet definition

- Otherwise, jets are ambiguous and we cannot define a cross section.

- How many jets are there here?



The definition must be infrared safe

- What jets we measure must not depend on small Q^2 physics.



- Suppose $p_2 \approx 0$ and p_1 is almost collinear with p_3
- Then the Q^2 for the two splittings shown is small.
- The corresponding $\alpha_s(Q)$ couplings are large.
- Perturbation theory breaks down.

Infrared safety

- We construct jets from particle momenta $\{p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_n\}$.
- We get N jets with momenta $\{P_1, P_2, \ldots, P_N\}$.



- If any p_i becomes very small, we should get the same jets by leaving particle i out.

- If any two momenta p_i and p_j become collinear, we should get the same jets by replacing the particles by one with momentum $p_i + p_j$.

What does IR safety mean?

- The physical meaning is that for an IR-safe quantity, the physical event with hadron jets should give approximately the same measurement as a parton event.



- It also means that in a Monte Carlo simulation (to be discussed later) the hadronization model and the underlying event model should not much matter.

Two kinds of jet algorithms

- There are two kinds of algorithms for defining jets:
  - ✴cone algorithms
  - ✴successive combination algorithms
- Both can be infrared safe.
- I will discuss just the successive combination algorithms.
- These trace back to the JADE collaboration at DESY.

The k_T jet algorithm



- Choose a resolution parameter R.
- Start with a list of protojets, specified by their p_j^μ.
- Start with an empty list of finished jets.
- Result is a list of finished jets with their momenta.
- Many are low p_T debris; just ignore these.

1. For each pair of protojets define

$$d_{ij} = \min(p_{T,i}^2, p_{T,j}^2)\,[(\eta_i - \eta_j)^2 + (\phi_i - \phi_j)^2]/R^2$$

For each protojet define

$$d_i = p_{T,i}^2$$

2. Find the smallest of all the d_{ij} and the d_i. Call it $d_{\min}$

3. If $d_{\min}$ is a d_{ij}, merge protojets i and j into a new protojet k with

$$p_k^\mu \quad = \quad p_i^\mu + p_j^\mu$$

4. If $d_{\min}$ is a d_i, then protojet i is "not mergable." Remove it from the list of protojets and add it to the list of jets.

5. If protojets remain, go to 1.

Example

$$d_{ij} = \min(p_{T,i}^2, p_{T,j}^2)\,[(\eta_i - \eta_j)^2 + (\phi_i - \phi_j)^2]/R^2$$

$$d_i = p_{T,i}^2$$



Infrared safety of this

- Suppose $p_j \to 0$.
- Then when it merges with another protojet,

$$p_k = p_i + p_j \to p_i$$

- If it never merges, then it just remains as a low p_T jet at the end.
- Suppose $p_i = \lambda p_j$.
- Then protojets i and j are merged at the start to

$$p_k = p_i + p_j$$

Why the name?

$$d_{ij} = \min(p_{T,i}^2, p_{T,j}^2)\,[(\eta_i - \eta_j)^2 + (\phi_i - \phi_j)^2]/R^2$$

is essentially

$$d_{ij} = k_T^2/R^2$$



The "no merge" condition

- Suppose $p_{T,i}^2 < p_{T,j}^2$.



$$d_{ij} = \min(p_{T,i}^2, p_{T,j}^2)\,[(\eta_i - \eta_j)^2 + (\phi_i - \phi_j)^2]/R^2$$
$$d_i = p_{T,i}^2$$

- Protojet i is not mergable with parton j if $d_{ij} > d_i$. That is if

$$[(\eta_i - \eta_j)^2 + (\phi_i - \phi_j)^2] > R^2$$

Why the no merge condition



- There will be many soft jets.
- They should not merge into a few giant jets.

Example with k_T

- Here is an example event from Cacciari, Salam, and Soyez (2008).
- With the k_T algorithm, we see what detector area goes into each jet. The area is irregular.



Shower histories

- The graph of parton joinings (read right to left) can be thought of as a graph of parton splittings (read left to right) in a parton shower.

- If we use the k_T jet algorithm, then the parton splittings go from harder (high k_T) to softer (low k_T).

- Beware: the same final state can be generated in many different ways in a parton shower.

The Cambridge-Aachen algorithm

- This is a variation on the general successive combination plan.
- Use

$$d_{ij} = [(\eta_i - \eta_j)^2 + (\phi_i - \phi_j)^2]/R^2$$

$$d_i = 1$$

- Thus only angles count.
- Keep everything else the same.

Example with *C-A*

- Here is the same example event from Cacciari, Salam, and Soyez (2008).
- With the Cambridge-Aachen algorithm, we see what detector area goes into each jet. Jets are irregular.



The anti-k_T algorithm

- This is another variation on the general successive combination plan.
- Use

$$d_{ij} = \min\left(\frac{1}{p_{T,i}^2}, \frac{1}{p_{T,j}^2}\right)[(\eta_i - \eta_j)^2 + (\phi_i - \phi_j)^2]/R^2$$

$$d_i = \frac{1}{p_{T,i}^2}$$

- Keep everything else the same.

$$d_{ij} = \min\left(\frac{1}{p_{T,i}^2}, \frac{1}{p_{T,j}^2}\right)[(\eta_i - \eta_j)^2 + (\phi_i - \phi_j)^2]/R^2$$

$$d_i = \frac{1}{p_{T,i}^2}$$

- This puts protojets together in an order that is nothing like the order that any shower Monte Carlo would generate splittings.



- The highest P_T protojet has priority to absorb nearby softer protojets (out to radius R).

Example with anti-k_T

- Here is the same example event from Cacciari, Salam, and Soyez (2008).
- With the anti-k_T algorithm, we see what detector area goes into each jet. High P_T jets are round.



Conclusions

- QCD gives us jets.
- Jets are seen in experiments.
- To measure jet cross sections, you need a careful definition of a jet.
- The definition needs to be infrared safe.
- Definitions typically use an angular size parameter R.
- The conceptually simplest kind of definition successively combine small protojets into bigger ones.