# Legacy Photon Results from CDF

Ray Culbertson, FNAL

# **Diphoton Cross Section**

Phys Rev. Lett. 110, 101801 (2013)



## **Diphoton Production**





 $gg \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ "Box": Leading at the LHC



 $gq \rightarrow \gamma\gamma q$ Compton with radiation:  $\alpha_s \alpha^2$ 

Fragmentation:  $\alpha^2$ Suppressed by isolation

## **Diphoton Selection/Efficiency**

- Full Dataset
  E<sub>T</sub> > 15, 17 GeV
  |η| < 1 (central)</li>
- $\Delta R > 0.4$

Efficiencies
PYTHIA + GEANT, iterated
~35%, small variations
largest systematic, 6%, underlying event modeling



## **Diphoton Backgrounds**

- Backgrounds from jets with a leading  $\pi^0$
- BG subtraction by track isolation, cone R=0.4
- allow for correlations between photons
   → subtraction using a matrix of track iso efficiences
- largest systematics from modeling iso efficiencies



15/13



**PYTHIA** LO parton-shower calculation – including γγ and γj with radiation [T. Sjöstrand *et al.*, Comp. Phys. Comm. **135**, 238 (2001)]

- SHERPA LO parton-shower calculation with improved matching between hard and soft physics [T. Gleisberg *et al.*, JHEP **02**, 007 (2009)]
- MCFM fixed-order NLO calculation including non-perturbative fragmentation at LO [J. M. Campbell *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **60**, 113006 (1999)]
- DIPHOX fixed-order NLO calculation including fragmentation at NLO [T. Binoth *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D 63, 114016 (2001)]
- ♦ RESBOS low-P<sub>T</sub> analytically resummed calculation matched to high-P<sub>T</sub> NLO [T. Balazs *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D 76, 013008 (2007)]
- NNLO calculation with q<sub>T</sub> subtraction [L. Cieri *et al.*, http://arxiv.org/abs/1110.2375 (2011)] DPF 2013



Energy scaleResonances





#### *Vertical scales are not the same*



All models don't describe extremely small massesAll models do well at mid to high masses

# **Diphoton Vector Sum P<sub>T</sub>**

• At low P<sub>T</sub>, sensitive to soft radiation

•Shoulder indicates higher orders



## **Diphoton Vector Sum P<sub>T</sub>**



Pythia, DIPHOX, RESBOS, MCFM tend to miss the shoulder, SHERPA and NNLO do well
RESBOS and SHERPA do well with soft radiation



• small Δφ sensitive to higher orders

Large Δφ sensitive to soft radiation





#### Many more available!



• Low  $P_T$  and high  $\Delta \phi$  show the same pattern for low energy radiation

•  $P_T$  should r and small  $\Delta \phi$  show the same pattern for higher orders DPF 2013 12 8/15/13

# Photon and Heavy Flavor Cross Section

Phys. Rev. Lett. 111, 042003 (2013)



#### **Photon and Heavy Flavor**



Compton scattering ~  $\alpha \alpha_S$ 

- Probes the heavy flavor content in the proton
  - gluon evolution
  - intrinsic H.F.
  - $\circ$  important at low  $E_{\rm T}$



 Tests final state gluon splitting to heavy flavors
 important at high E<sub>T</sub>



#### **Photon+H.F., Photon Selection**

• Full dataset

•  $E_{T} > 30 \text{ GeV}$ •  $|\eta| < 1$  (central) • ANN photon ID • isolation • shower shape • Had/EM • fit ANN to measure jets faking photons background



•2-5% uncertainty due to modeling of isolation energy in templates



#### **Photon+H.F., Jet Selection**

•  $E_T > 20 \text{ GeV}$  $|\bullet|\eta| < 1.5$ • JetClu cone 0.4 • Secondary vertex tag Background subtraction by fitting secondary vertex mass to MC templates • efficiency  $\sim 20\%$  (b) and ~6% (c)



• 20% systematic uncertainty on track efficiencies, varies the template shapes



- NLO direct-photon and fragmentation subprocesses at O(αα<sub>s</sub><sup>2</sup>), CTEQ6.6M PDFs [T.P. Stavreva and J.F. Owens, PRD **79**, 054017 (2009)]
- ♦ SHERPA 1.4.1 tree-level matrix element (ME) with one photon and up to three jets, merged with parton shower, CT10 PDFs [T. Gleisberg *et al.*, JHEP 02, 007 (2009)]
- ↔ **PYTHIA** ME subprocesses: gQ → gQ, qq→gg, with gluon splitting: g → QQ, CTEQ5L PDFs [T. Sjöstrand et al., JHEP **05**, 026 (2006)]

# Photon and b quark

*Vertical scales are not the same* 

8/15/13



NLO low at high E<sub>T</sub> - gluon splitting at tree-level
k<sub>T</sub> and SHERPA have moderate agreement
PYTHIA with gluon splitting rate scaled matches shape

# Photon and c Quark

*Vertical scales are not the same* 



•NLO low at high E<sub>T</sub> - gluon splitting at tree-level

- k<sub>T</sub> agrees well, SHERPA has moderate agreement
- PYTHIA with gluon splitting rate scaled matches shape

# Z Decays to Photons and Neutral Pions

Ζ

## Rare and Forbidden Z decays

Small in the SM, Similar to  $W^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \gamma$ 



Tests:

- Pion form factor
- Physics beyond the SM...





Not allowed in SM - Landau-Yang theorem, Bose-Einstein statistics Tests:

- Commutativity of gauge theory
- Physics beyond the SM...



## **Selection, Efficiency**

#### • Full dataset

2 γ, E<sub>T</sub> > 15 GeV
|η| < 1 (central)</li>
ANN selection

In this energy range π<sup>0</sup>'s have an efficiency 5% smaller than a photon
Signal Monte Carlo created by reweighting angular distribution in a Z decay







#### •Subtract simulated Drell-Yan contamination





 fit the D-Y subtracted mass spectrum to an exponential and 2<sup>nd</sup> degree polynomial

| $Z \to \gamma \gamma / \pi^0 \gamma / \pi^0 \pi^0$ Search | CDF Run II Preliminary, 10.0 $\rm fb^{-1}$                     |
|---|--|
| Process   | Number of Events for $80 < m_{\gamma\gamma} < 102 \text{ GeV}$ |
| Drell-Yan   | $54 \pm 5$   |
| $\gamma\gamma, \gamma j$ , and $jj$                       | $2251\pm 61$   |
| Total background  | $2305\pm 61$   |
| Data  | 2294   |
|   |  |

DPF 2013



#### • Final limit process includes signal line shape





# Final result reported as BR Leading systematics 6% luminosity

| CDF Run II Pr                            | elimina                     | ary        |        |            | $\int \mathcal{L} =$ | = 10.0 fb <sup>-1</sup> |
|--|-----------------------------|------------|--------|------------|----------------------|-------------------------|
|  | 95% C.L. Limits             |            |        |            |                      |                         |
| Signal                                   | Expected $(\times 10^{-5})$ |            |        |            |                      | Observed                |
| Process                                  | $-2\sigma$                  | $-1\sigma$ | Median | $+1\sigma$ | $+2\sigma$           | $(\times 10^{-5})$      |
| $\operatorname{Br}(Z \to \gamma \gamma)$ | 0.88                        | 1.19       | 1.66   | 2.34       | 3.20                 | 1.66                    |
| ${ m Br}(Z 	o \pi^0 \gamma)$             | 1.21                        | 1.63       | 2.28   | 3.21       | 4.37                 | 2.28                    |
| $\operatorname{Br}(Z \to \pi^0 \pi^0)$   | 0.93                        | 1.23       | 1.72   | 2.41       | 3.29                 | 1.73                    |
|  |                             |            |        |            |                      |                         |

3.1 times smaller than world's best
2.3 times smaller than world's best
first reported

•SM expectations for BR( $Z \rightarrow \pi^0 \gamma$ ):  $10^{-9} - 10^{-12}$ 



CDF continues to report many legacy measurements

Diphoton Cross Section

most complete kinematics and comparisons

Photon and Heavy Flavor Cross Section

high statistics, new model

Z Decays to Two Reconstructed Photons

new world's best limits

Many more legacy measurements to come...

8/15/13



## Photon + H.F. Total Cross Section

|                                 | Integrated cross section (pb)                           |  |  |  |  |
|---------------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|
|                                 | γ+b+X   | $\gamma + c + X$   |  |  |  |
| Data                            | 19.7 ±0.7 <sub>stat</sub><br>(+5.0–4.2) <sub>syst</sub> | 132.2 ±4.6 <sub>stat</sub><br>(+13.2–19.2) <sub>syst</sub> |  |  |  |
| PYTHIA                          | 19.5  | 106.0  |  |  |  |
| SHERPA                          | 29.4  | 173.9  |  |  |  |
| NLO                             | 27.3 + 2.3 - 1.5  | 152.6 + 12.2 - 9.6   |  |  |  |
| k <sub>T</sub><br>factorization | 25.2  | 106.4  |  |  |  |



|              | Integrated cross section (pb)        |
|--------------|--------------------------------------|
| Data (CDF)   | $12.3 \pm 0.2_{stat} \pm 3.5_{syst}$ |
| RESBOS       | $11.3 \pm 2.4$                       |
| DIPHOX       | $10.6 \pm 0.6$                       |
| MCFM         | 11.5 ± 0.3                           |
| SHERPA       | $12.4 \pm 4.4$                       |
| ργτηια γγ+γj | 9.2                                  |
| NNLO         | 11.8 + 1.7 - 0.6                     |



| CDF Run II Prelimina         | ary                |                               |                             |                            |              | $\int \mathcal{L} = 10.0 \; \mathrm{fb^{-1}}$ |
|------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|--------------|---|
|                              | Signal             |                               |                             | Background                 |              |   |
| Systematic Uncertainties (%) |                    | $Z \rightarrow \gamma \gamma$ | $Z  ightarrow \pi^0 \gamma$ | $Z  ightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0$ | Drell-Yan    | Non-Resonant                                  |
| Luminosity                   | 6                  | $\checkmark$                  | ✓                           | ✓                          | ✓            |   |
| Z Cross Section              | 6                  | $\checkmark$                  | $\checkmark$                | $\checkmark$               | $\checkmark$ |   |
| PDF                          | 5                  | $\checkmark$                  | $\checkmark$                | $\checkmark$               |              |   |
| ISR/FSR                      | 3                  | $\checkmark$                  | $\checkmark$                | $\checkmark$               |              |   |
| Energy Scale                 | 0.2                | $\checkmark$                  | $\checkmark$                | $\checkmark$               |              |   |
| Trigger Efficiency           | 1                  | $\checkmark$                  | $\checkmark$                | $\checkmark$               | $\checkmark$ |   |
| z-Vertex                     | 0.2                | $\checkmark$                  | $\checkmark$                | $\checkmark$               | $\checkmark$ |   |
| Photon ID Efficiency         | 4                  | $\checkmark$                  | $\checkmark$                | $\checkmark$               |              |   |
| $\pi^0/\gamma$ Efficiency    | $2~{ m per}~\pi^0$ |                               | $\checkmark$                | $\checkmark$               |              |   |
| Electron Fake Rate           | 2                  |                               |                             |                            | $\checkmark$ |   |
| Sideband Fit                 | 2.7                |                               |                             |                            |              | $\checkmark$                                  |