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Motivations

The J/ψ has been discovered more than 30 years ago... and has since then been studied by many experiments like Tevatron, HERA, ...

Why still study quarkonia at the LHC?

- Still today quarkonium production not understood!
- Experimental data not understood!
- Theoretically recently lots of progress made, calculations should be compared with LHC data
- The LHC allows for new studies: higher $P_T$ & luminosity!
- Quarkonia crucial to understand detectors (alignment, calibration)

Still lots of interest for quarkonia studies at LHC!
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Quarkonium production models

Before CDF Run 1: J/psi’s thought to be produced via singlet mechanism. CDF data factor 50 above theory

⇒ New approaches developed!
⇒ Non-Relativistic QCD-formalism

Quarkonium state written as expansion in v in Fock-space:

(v = velocity of Q in bound state in CM) ⇒ singlet&octet mechanism

Octet contribution could explain $P_T$ spectrum at Tevatron, but not polarization!

⇒ NNLO singlet calculations ⇒ no need for octet??
⇒ $K_T$ factorization approach
⇒ Older models: soft-colour-Interaction models, colour-evap. models, ..

Quarkonium production at LHC

There are several ways to study (prompt) quarkonium production

- **Diff. cross section** measurements → Will be done in first months
  Important, but cross section sensitive to many factors (slide 10+24)...

- **Polarization** measurements → Will be done in first months
  Gives important information on production mechanism

- **Hadronic activity** around J/psi → Possible? Not yet clear!
  Might gives complementary information on production mechanism (idea with Torbjörn Sjöstrand) → today
  **How?** Compare models with different shower activity and try to investigate sensitivity of typical LHC detector (ATLAS or CMS).

These three measurements together should allow the quarkonium production puzzle to get solved at LHC!

**NB1:** For quarkonium measurement, so far concentrate on muon decays! BR (J/ψ→μμ)=5.98%  BR (Υ→μμ)=2.48%

**NB2:** Prompt production! But do not distinguish between direct&indirect.
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Quarkonium event generation: Pythia 6.409

Original implementation by S. Wolf (2002, never in official release)
- Based on NRQCD- approach
- Singlet and octet QQ produced perturbatively, followed by shower
- Parton showers for radiation off octet QQ: switches: MSTP(148), MSTP(149)

Recent (2006,2007) progress:
- Code integrated (Sjöstrand): PYTHIA ≥6.324
- Possibility to dampen cross section at small $P_T$ like for $gg \rightarrow gg$ in underlying event (PYEVWT)

For our generation: parameters checked by generating CDF events

Spa, 6-8
We will compare 4 strawman models

- MC truth + LHC-like detector (CMS, ATLAS) with fast simulation

**MODEL 1: NO RADIATION**
- Quarkonium produced direct or via $\chi$
- QQ-state produced in colour singlet in hard interaction
- Color singlet $\Rightarrow$ no g-radiation
- $J/\psi$ produced in isolation!

**MODEL 2: LOW RADIATION**
- Quarkonium produced direct or via $\chi$
- Physics-wise: shower expected from
  1) $gg\rightarrow ggg\rightarrow gggg...$
  2) $g\rightarrow QQ^{(8)}$
  3) $QQ^{(8)}\rightarrow J/\psi$ or $Y$
- Technically: cc-octetin hard interaction
- Switches MSTP(148), MSTP(149)
- $J/\psi$ produced in shower!

**MODEL 3: MEDIUM RADIATION**
**MODEL 4: HIGH RADIATION**

- NB Model (1+2), (1+3), (1+4) all fit CDF data!
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Prompt J/psi differential cross section

Prompt J/psi production cross section at LHC

The cross section is excellent observable for understanding J/psi production!!

However many parameters influence cross section shape...

- ISR & FSR
- Mass of cc-octet
- Cross section dampening at small $P_T$: free parameters!

Need more observables!!

In 100 pb-1 (Pythia prompt J/psi singlet+octet): $|\eta(\mu)| < 2.5$ $P_T(\mu) > 2.5$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$P_T (J/\psi)$</th>
<th>Produced</th>
<th>Reconstructed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 GeV</td>
<td>$\sim 2 \times 10^7$</td>
<td>$O(10^6)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 GeV</td>
<td>$\sim 3 \times 10^5$</td>
<td>$O(10^5)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 GeV</td>
<td>$\sim 5 \times 10^3$</td>
<td>$O(10^3)$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prompt J/psi: associated hadronic activity

- Shower activity of 4 models is different ➔ investigate activity around J/psi in cone R
- Differences at higher $P_T$($\text{jpsi}$)>20 GeV!
  - [low $P_T$: little shower]
- More info: see Quark.WG Hamburg 2007
- Example: “Pt-density” around J/psi

\[
\frac{dP_T^{\text{around}}(R)}{d\Omega_R} = \frac{P_T^{\text{around}}(R + dR/2) - P_T^{\text{around}}(R - dR/2)}{\pi[(R + dR/2)^2 - (R - dR/2)^2]}
\]

J/psi activity: $20 \, \text{GeV} < P_T^{j/\psi} < 40 \, \text{GeV}$

Mc truth prompt only

Or fragmentation var. z:

Mc truth prompt only
Prompt J/psi trigger & reconstruction

Triggers at LHC: at low luminosity $10^{32}$ cm$^2$ s$^{-1}$: typically a double muon trigger (with some threshold, e.g. $P_T>3$ GeV in CMS)

Offline reconstruction: Use tracker&muon chambers.

NB efficiency drops to 0 at $P_T(J/\psi)\rightarrow 0$

NB efficiency independent of hadronic activity

$\varepsilon_{\text{reconstruction}} = \frac{N_{\text{reconstructed}}}{N_{\text{generated}}}$

Z. Yang and S. Qian, CMS-note 2006/094 CMS-note-2007/017

$\varepsilon \sim 70\%$ for $P_T>30$ GeV

$\varepsilon$ vs. $P_T(J/\psi)$

Generator level filter: $P_T(mu)>2.5$ GeV

J/psi too light to decay into 2 detectable muons when $P_T(J/\psi)\rightarrow 0!$

Mc truth
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Prompt J/psi measurements: challenges

**Background:** is important for any measurement of prompt J/psi’s!

- **Non-prompt J/psi’s (b\(\rightarrow\)J/psi X)**

  Well-known behaviour of impact parameter ➞ Evaluate amount of prompt and non-prompt background

- **General QCD processes (pp\(\rightarrow\)MuX)**

  Lots of it... amount reconstructed “fake” J/psi’s with mass [3.0-3.2] ~ amount prompt J/psi’s. But well-known behaviour of invariant mass: subtract backgr. with techniques such as side-band-subtraction

  **NB:** it’s not trivial to collect background (and signal) MC statistics...
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Hadronic activity study: challenges

Unlike for cross section measurement, backgrounds is harder to deal with when studying hadronic activity!

Background studied so far: Non-prompt J/psi

Several challenges (making it probably not an analysis to do with first data):

- Non-prompt J/ψ’s have large amount of activity [high $P_T$ many of them]!
- Wrong estimation of background could lead to totally wrong conclusion
- Improvements possible! (even sharper cuts on lifetime, MC statistics, separation prompt-non-prompt, use more variables together), but maybe easier for Υ’s? (no non-prompt Υ’s!)
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Upsilon (1S) differential cross section

Promt Upsilon (1S) production cross section at LHC

MC truth

Same 4 models as J/psi generated (sl 8), and same generator cuts:
ln|\eta(\mu)|<2.5 \ PT(\mu)>2.5 GeV

Compare Upsilon/Jpsi:
- Smaller cross section so 100 pb-1 easy to generate
- Upsilon cross section falling less rapidly
- Differences in radiation less pronounced: the heavier the colored object, the less it radiates!

\[ \text{In 100 pb-1 (Pythia singlet+octet): } \]
\[ \eta(\mu)<2.5 \ PT(\mu)>2.5 \text{ GeV} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PT (\Upsilon)</th>
<th>Produced</th>
<th>Reconstructed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 GeV</td>
<td>( \sim 6 \times 10^5 )</td>
<td>O(10^5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 GeV</td>
<td>( \sim 2 \times 10^4 )</td>
<td>O(10^4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 GeV</td>
<td>( \sim 5 \times 10^2 )</td>
<td>O(10^2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Upsilon trigger: as J/psi (2Mu $P_T>3$), but with different mass window cut

Offline reconstruction: can do measurements down to zero!
(nice for studying low $P_T$ dampening)

Low $P_T^{\Upsilon}\rightarrow \mu$’s back-to-back, and can have enough momentum to be measured!
$M(\Upsilon)=9.46$ GeV

High $P_T$: eff decreases at large eta! Muons go in eta-region $>2.4$

Might be optimistic, but: unlike J/psi’s, can measure Upsilon down to zero $P_T^{\Upsilon}$!
Upsilon hadronic activity

Compared with J/psi:

- ++ Background: no non-prompt $\Upsilon$’s, only QCD processes (pp$\rightarrow$MuX)
- - - Amount of radiation off bb-state is smaller than for cc-state.
- As J/psi, for background the activity around misidentified $\Upsilon$’s is high (e.g. events with $b\rightarrow\mu + b\rightarrow\mu$)
- Not talked about: sensitive to underlying event and pile-up!!

- Current limitation: background statistics...
- Real data: measuring activity in sidebands of $\Upsilon$ inv. mass should allow for a proper subtraction of the background!

Spa, 6-8 March 2008
Outline

- Introduction
- Quarkonium production in PYTHIA 6.409
- J/psi production studies
- Upsilon production studies
- Quarkonia measurements at LHC
- Plans and conclusions
Quarkonium measurements at LHC

CMS & ATLAS & LHCb are planning:

- Differential cross section measurement: $J/\psi, \psi(2S), \Upsilon(1S), (2S)...$
- Polarization measurements
- Hadronization measurement (ATLAS, CMS?)
- Measurements of $\chi_b$ and $\chi_c$
- LHCb in addition investigating $\psi(3770) \rightarrow DD$.

NB All experiments focus on muon decay channels

More details in discussion session!
Conclusions

- Recent theory progress makes it even more exciting to compare real LHC data with theory predictions!
- For quarkonium studies at LHC: PYTHIA commonly used [easy in use]
- Cross section & polarization measurement are first observables to understand underlying quarkonium production mechanism.
- However, cross section is sensitive to several factors ➔ would be good with more observables!
- Examples of observables shown, taking into account dynamics of particles around the J/psi.
- Based on 4 “strawman” models in PYTHIA, clear separations visible, at larger values of $P_T(J/\psi)$ (>30 GeV)
- J/psi: non-prompt background forms problem
- Upsilon: less radiation, but less background: work in progress...
- CMS, ATLAS, LHCb are all planning quarkonium measurements based on muon decay channels
Thanks!

- Thanks to: Torbjörn Sjöstrand, Zongchang Yang, Fabrizio Palla, Urs Langenegger, Carlos Lourenco for help & discussions, and thanks to Jean-Philippe and the organization of this conference!
EXTRA SLIDES
Prompt J/psi differential cross section

Examples of changes in the differential cross section:

- **ISR+FSR**
  - Octet, msp(148,149)=0, yes ISR, no FSR
  - Octet, msp(148,149)=0, no ISR, no FSR
  - Octet, msp(148,149)=0, yes ISR, no FSR
  - Singlet, yes ISR, no FSR
  - Singlet, no ISR, no FSR

- **M_{cc} : 3.1 → 3.5 GeV**

**Conclusion:**
- Diff. xs can change significantly!
- Even if we can measure the spectrum, doesn’t mean we understand the production...
J/psi production in PYTHIA: PYEVWT.f

- **Problem**: even with octet, quarkonium cross section not right shape (too big at low Pt)
- **Solution**: PYEVWT.f: cross section dampened, like gg→gg in underlying event formalism
  

\[
\frac{d\sigma}{dp_T^2} \propto \frac{[\alpha_S(p_T^2)]^2}{p_T^4} \Longrightarrow \frac{[\alpha_S(p_T^0 + p_T^2)]^2}{(p_T^0 + p_T^2)^2}
\]

- Applies naturally here too!

\[w_i = \frac{\sigma_{\text{rewighted}}}{\sigma_{\text{not reweighted}}} = \left(\frac{\hat{p}_T^2}{p_T^2 + \hat{p}_T^2}\right)^2 \left(\frac{\alpha_S(p_T^0 + Q^2)}{\alpha_S(Q^2)}\right)\]

- \(p_{T0} \sim\) scale below which g cannot resolve colours
  \(\Rightarrow\) coupling decreases \(\Rightarrow\) \(\sigma\) decreases!

- \(p_{T0} \sim 2\) GeV at CDF, is assumed to grow with \(\sqrt{s}\)
  \([x\) smaller \(\Rightarrow\) denser packing of gluons \(\Rightarrow\) more screening
  LHC: \(p_{T0} = 1.94(14\) TeV/1.96 TeV\)^{0.16}=2.66 GeV
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Activity around J/psi

➢ Shower activity of 4 models is different (see slide 7) → natural observable:
Nr charged particles ($P_T > 0.9$, except $\mu$’s) around J/ψ in cone with R=0.7

➢ Scalar sum of $P_T$ of charged particles around J/ψ in cone with R=0.7

✓ The particles around the J/psi are generally low energetic!
✓ The differences are at high $P_T(J/psi)$
$z = \frac{P_T^{J/\psi \text{ itself}}}{P_T^\text{jet}}$

Possible observable: $z_{J/\psi}$

- Since for 4 models fragmentation function is different, try $z_{J/\psi} \sim$ theoretical fragmentation variable $z \Rightarrow$ Try $z_{J/\psi}$ vs $P_T^{J/\psi}$ and $z_{J/\psi}$ vs $P_T^{\text{Jet}}$

- Interesting shape!

- Investigate effect multiple interactions,

- 2M new events

- Conclusion: accidental underlying event activity around $J/\psi$ can be important

$z_{J/\psi}$ possible observable, but have to understand underlying event
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Parton showers

Singlet production

- Quarkonium produced direct or via $\chi$
- QQ-state produced in colour singlet in hard interaction
- Color singlet $\rightarrow$ no g-radiation
- $J/\psi$ produced in isolation!

MODEL 1: NO RADIATION

Octet production

- Quarkonium produced direct or via $\chi$
- Physics-wise: shower expected from
  1) $gg \rightarrow ggg \rightarrow gggg$
  2) $g \rightarrow QQ^{(8)}$
  3) $QQ^{(8)} \rightarrow J/\psi$ or $Y$
- Technically: cc-octet in hard interaction
- Switches MSTP(148), MSTP(149)
- $J/\psi$ produced in shower!

MODEL 2: LOW RADIATION

MODEL 3: MEDIUM RADIATION

MODEL 4: HIGH RADIATION
NRQCD matrix elements

- Rates for all quarkonium processes given by NRQCD matrix elements

- Motivation of tuning: agreement MC ⇔ data

- NRQCD matrix elements from: hep-ph/0003142
  - CSM values extracted from potential models (hep-ph/9503356)
  - COM values from CDF data

- Quark masses: $m_c = 1.5$ GeV, $m_b = 4.88$ GeV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARP</th>
<th>Expression</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARP(141)</td>
<td>$\langle O^{J/\psi} \left[ 3S_1^{(1)} \right] \rangle$</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARP(142)</td>
<td>$\langle O^{J/\psi} \left[ 3S_1^{(8)} \right] \rangle$</td>
<td>0.0119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARP(143)</td>
<td>$\langle O^{J/\psi} \left[ 1S_0^{(8)} \right] \rangle$</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARP(144)</td>
<td>$\langle O^{J/\psi} \left[ 3P_0^{(8)} \right] \rangle / m_c^2$</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARP(145)</td>
<td>$\langle O^{\Upsilon} \left[ 3P_0^{(1)} \right] \rangle / m_c^2$</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARP(146)</td>
<td>$\langle O^{\Upsilon} \left[ 3S_1^{(1)} \right] \rangle$</td>
<td>9.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARP(147)</td>
<td>$\langle O^{\Upsilon} \left[ 3S_1^{(8)} \right] \rangle$</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARP(148)</td>
<td>$\langle O^{\Upsilon} \left[ 1S_0^{(8)} \right] \rangle$</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARP(149)</td>
<td>$\langle O^{\Upsilon} \left[ 3P_0^{(8)} \right] \rangle / m_b^2$</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARP(150)</td>
<td>$\langle O^{\Upsilon_{b\bar{b}}} \left[ 3P_0^{(1)} \right] \rangle / m_b^2$</td>
<td>0.085</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See also talk by M. Bargiotti at HERA-LHC workshop 2006