Differential measurements of jet sub-structure observables and their correlations in $p+p$ collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 200$ GeV in STAR

Monika Robotkova for the STAR Collaboration

Nuclear Physics Institute
Czech Academy of Sciences

ICNFP 2021, Kolymbari, Crete
September 1, 2021

Supported in part by U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY | Office of Science

Jets

- Hard scattered partons evolve via parton shower and hadronize
- Jets are collimated sprays of hadrons



- Measurements of jet sub-structure serve as an experimental tool for studying QCD - increasingly studied in recent years

SoftDrop

- Grooming technique used to remove soft wide-angle radiation from the jet in order to mitigate non-perturbative effects
- Connects parton shower and angular tree
- Parton shower is described by the momentum and angular scales



Larkoski, Marzani, Thaler, Tripathee, Xue,
Phys. Rev. Lett. 119, 132003 (2017)

- **Shared momentum fraction** z_g

$$z_g = \frac{\min(p_{T,1}, p_{T,2})}{p_{T,1} + p_{T,2}} > z_{cut}\theta^{\beta},$$

where $\theta = \frac{\Delta R_{12}}{R}$

$p_{T,1}, p_{T,2}$ - transverse momenta of the subjets
z_{cut} - threshold (0.1)
β - angular exponent (0)
ΔR_{12} - distance of subjets in the rapidity-azimuth plane

- **Groomed radius** R_g - first ΔR_{12} that satisfies SoftDrop condition

Overview of jet sub-structure measurements

p+p **collisions:**

- Allow detailed comparisons with QCD predictions and tuning of MC generators

A+A collisions:

- Study medium modification of intra-jet distributions
- Probe various jet quenching effects (energy loss, broadening, color coherence)



ATLAS, Phys. Rev. Lett. **124**, 222002 (2020)



STAR, Phys. Lett. B 811 (2020) 135846



ALICE, arXiv:2107.12984



CMS, Phys. Rev. Lett. **120**, 142302 (2018)

STAR experiment

TPC - *Time Projection Chamber*

- Reconstruction of charged particle tracks
- Full azimuthal angle, $|\eta| \leq 1$
- Transverse momenta of tracks: $0.2 < p_{\mathrm{T}} < 30$ GeV$/c$

BEMC - *Barrel Electromagnetic Calorimeter*

- Reconstruction of neutral component of the jets
- Full azimuthal angle, $|\eta| < 1$
- Segmentation $(\Delta\eta \times \Delta\phi) = (0.05 \times 0.05)$
- Tower requirements: $0.2 < E_{\mathrm{T}} < 30$ GeV

- Located at the *Relativistic Heavy Ion Collider* (RHIC) in *Brookhaven National Laboratory* (BNL)



Motivation

- Our goal is to access parton showers through experimental observables
- Two options how to study parton showers:
  - **Correlation between sub-structure observables at the first split**
  - **Evolution of the splitting observables as we travel along the jet shower**



Correlation between sub-structure observables at the first split





Correlation between sub-structure observables at the first split

- So far the momentum and angular scales have been measured independently via z_g and R_g at STAR
- **We focus on the correlation between z_g and R_g as a function of $p_{T,jet}$**





STAR, Phys. Lett. B 811 (2020) 135846

Correlation between sub-structure observables at the first split



Correction in 2+1D for z_g, R_g, and $p_{T,jet}$

- Results are in 3D $\rightarrow$ z_g vs. R_g is unfolded in 2D and correction for $p_{T,jet}$ in 1D is needed
  - For each particle-level $p_{T,jet}$ bin, we do projection of this bin into detector-level $p_{T,jet}$, and get the weights from detector-level $p_{T,jet}$ bins



STAR, Phys. Lett. B 811 (2020) 135846

- We unfold z_g vs. R_g via iterative Bayesian unfolding in 2D using RooUnfold and unfolded spectra for each detector-level $p_{T,jet}$ bin are weighted and summed
- Additional corrections for trigger and jet finding efficiencies are applied

Details on systematic uncertainties available in back up

Unfolded z_g distributions with respect to R_g for $20 \leq p_{T,\mathrm{jet}} < 25$ GeV/c with $R = 0.4$





- When we go from small to large R_g we move from collinear hard splitting to softer wide angle splitting

Unfolded z_g distributions with respect to R_g for different $p_{T,jet}$ with $R = 0.4$



- Distributions change mildly with varying $p_{T,jet} \rightarrow R_g$ is the driving factor for the change in shape of z_g distributions

Evolution of the splitting observables as we travel along the jet shower





Evolution of the splitting observables as we travel along the jet shower

- Enables a study of self-similarity and effect of restricting available phase space for radiation due to virtuality evolution
- Two ways how to look at the observables:
  - Vary jet kinematics ($p_{\mathrm{T,jet}}$) and compare z_{g} and R_{g} distributions at the 1st, 2nd and 3rd splits
  - Vary initiator kinematics ($p_{\mathrm{T,initiator}}$) and compare z_{g} and R_{g} distributions at the 1st, 2nd and 3rd splits



Correction in 2+1D for $p_{\mathrm{T,jet/initiator}}$, z_g, R_g

- Splits can be affected by detector efficiency and resolution
- Observables at a given split are smeared
- Splitting hierarchy is modified going from particle level to detector level



Unfolded z_g and R_g distributions at 1st, 2nd and 3rd splits for various $p_{T,jet}$

- Differences between first, second and third splits
- z_g distribution becomes **flatter** and R_g distribution becomes **narrower** with higher split, i.e. collinear emissions are enhanced



Unfolded z_g and R_g distributions at 1st, 2nd and 3rd splits for various $p_{T,\text{initiator}}$

- Splits have same $p_{T,\text{initiator}}$ but different positions in the shower
- Distributions show a gradual variation in the available phase space
- Hint of differences in shape for $p_{T,\text{initiator}}$ vs. $p_{T,\text{jet}}$ $\rightarrow$ points to jets/splits of varying kinematics $\rightarrow$ enables a forthcoming detailed study of self-similarity of jet splittings



Comparison with MC models

- Leading order MC models describe the trend observed in data
- Further studies aim to disentangle the impact of perturbative and non-perturbative effects in the MC



First split



Summary

- First measurement of z_g vs. R_g as a function of $p_{T,jet}$ was shown
  - 2+1D unfolding was applied
- Observed significantly **harder/symmetric** splitting at the **third/narrow** split compared to the first and second splits
- Jet sub-structure measurements at RHIC energies allow to disentagle perturbative and non-perturbative dynamics of jet evolution

Next steps:

- Compare to different MC models and theoretical calculations
  - Different hadronization (Sherpa) and parton shower (Herwig, Pythia) models
- Sub-structure observables, **splitting scale** k_T and **groomed mass fraction** μ, are being studied (not shown in this presentation)
- We are exploring other unfolding methods, e.g. machine learning techniques such as OmniFold (Phys. Rev. Lett. **124**, 182001 (2020))





Thank you for your attention!

Back up

Jet clustering algorithms

- Jets are defined using algorithms

Anti-k_T algorithm

- $d_{ij} = \frac{\min(1/p_{Ti}^2, 1/p_{Tj}^2)\Delta R_{ij}^2}{R}$, $d_{iB} = 1/p_{Tj}^2$
- Clustering starts from the particles with the highest transverse momentum

Cambridge/Aachen (C/A) algorithm

- $d_{ij} = \Delta R_{ij}^2 / R^2$, $d_{iB} = 1$
- Particles are clustered exclusively based on angular separation, ideal to be used to resolve jet sub-structure

d_{iB} - distance of the particle i from the beam
p_T - transverse momentum
ΔR_{ij} - distance between the particle i and j
R - jet resolution parameter





Cacciari, Salam, Soyez, JHEP 0804:063 (2008)

SoftDrop

- Grooming technique used to remove soft wide-angle radiation from the jet
- Connects parton shower and angular tree

1. Jets are first found using the anti-k_T algorithm
2. Recluster jet constituents using the C/A algorithm
3. Jet j is broken into two sub-jets j_1 and j_2 by undoing the last stage of C/A clustering
4. Jet j is final SoftDrop jet, if sub-jets pass the condition on the right, otherwise the process is repeated



Larkoski, Marzani, Thaler, Tripathee, Xue, Phys. Rev. Lett. 119, 132003 (2017)

- **Shared momentum fraction** z_g

$$z_g = \frac{\min(p_{T,1}, p_{T,2})}{p_{T,1} + p_{T,2}} > z_{cut}\theta^{\beta},$$

where $\theta = \frac{\Delta R_{12}}{R}$

- **Groomed radius** R_g - first ΔR_{12} that satisfies SoftDrop condition

$p_{T,1}, p_{T,2}$ - transverse momenta of the subjets
z_{cut} - threshold (0.1)
β - angular exponent (0)
ΔR_{12} - distance of subjets in the rapidity-azimuth plane

Lund Plane measurement

- Previous ATLAS measurement uses Lund jet plane
- Significant differences in varying hadronization models at high $p_{\mathrm{T,jet}}$ at the LHC $\rightarrow$ we want to study this at lower $p_{\mathrm{T,jet}}$, where non-perturbative effects are expected to be larger
- While Lund jet plane integrates over all splits, we focus on the first split



ATLAS, Phys. Rev. Lett. **124**, 222002 (2020)

Data analysis

- $p + p$ **collisions at** $\sqrt{s} = 200$ **GeV, 2012**
- $\sim$11 million events analyzed

Event and track selection

- Transverse momenta of tracks: $0.2 < p_{\mathrm{T}} < 30$ GeV/c
- Tower requirements: $0.2 < E_{\mathrm{T}} < 30$ GeV

Jet reconstruction

- Jets reconstructed with anti-k_{T} algorithm, reclustered with the C/A algorithm
- Transverse momenta of jets: $15 < p_{\mathrm{T,jet}} < 40$ GeV/c
- Resolution parameters: $R = 0.4$, $R = 0.6$
- SoftDrop parameters: $z_{\mathrm{cut}} = 0.1$, $\beta = 0$

$$\frac{\min(p_{\mathrm{T},1}, p_{\mathrm{T},2})}{p_{\mathrm{T},1} + p_{\mathrm{T},2}} > z_{\mathrm{cut}} \left(\frac{\Delta R_{12}}{R}\right)^{\beta}$$

2D Bayesian Unfolding

- 2D iterative Bayesian method implemented in the RooUnfold
- Procedure has following steps:
  1. The jets at the detector and particle level are reconstructed separately
  2. Jets are matched based on $\Delta R < 0.6$
  3. Jets without match - missed jet (particle level) and fake jets (detector level)
  4. Response between detector level and particle level for observables is constructed
- We use RooUnfold response which contains Matches and Fakes
  - Unfolding is done separately for p_{T}^{det} intervals 15-20, 20-25, 25-30, 30-40 GeV/c
- Then unfolded spectra are weighted with values from our projection and put together
- Together with trigger missed and unmatched weighted spectra we get our fully unfolded spectrum

Systematic uncertainties

- Systematic uncertainties estimated by varying the detector response
  - Hadronic correction - fraction of track momentum subtracted is varied
  - Tower scale variation - tower gain is varied by 3.8%
  - Tracking efficiency - efficiency is varied by 4%
  - Unfolding - iterative parameter is varied from 4 to 6
- Systematics due to prior shape variation will be included in the final publication



$0 \leq R_g < 0.15$ $0.15 \leq R_g < 0.30$ $0.30 \leq R_g \leq 0.40$

Unfolded z_g distributions with respect to R_g for $20 \leq p_{T,jet} < 25$ GeV/c with $R = 0.4$ and $R = 0.6$

$R = 0.4$



$R = 0.6$



- No significant change of distributions is observed with larger resolution parameter

Comparison with MC models



- Flattering of the splitting z_g as we increase split number captured by the MC simulations
- Small differences between PYTHIA and HERWIG seen in the first split