Model independent Odderon results based on new TOTEM data at 8 TeV

T. Csörgő^{1,2} T. Novák², R. Pasechnik³, <u>A. Ster¹</u>, I. Szanyi^{1,2,4}

¹ Wigner RCP, Budapest, Hungary
² MATE KRC, Gyöngyös, Hungary
³ University of Lund, Lund, Sweden
⁴ Eötvös University, Budapest, Hungary









Supported by NKFIH: K 74458, Hungary

Outline

Statistically Significant Observations of Odderon in 2021

Model independent (Hungarian-Swedish Collaboration): Significance \geq 6.26 σ : EPJC (2021) 81:180

Model dependent (Hungarian-Polish Collaboration): Significance \geq 7.08 σ : EPJC (2021) 81:611 and EPJC (2022) 82:827

Partially model independent (D0-TOTEM Collaboration): Significance \geq 5.2 σ : PRL (2021) 127, 062003

New in 2022: TOTEM data at 8 TeV published

Motivation: Einstein said something like: "Even infinite number of experiments can not prove that you are right, but one experiment is enough to prove that you are wrong"

Odderon: 48 years old scientific puzzle



Odderon name coined: D. Joynson, E. Leader, <u>B. Nicolescu</u>, C. Lopez, Nuovo Cim. 30A, 345 (1975) - Well established in QCD by now ! Honorable mention: A. V. Efremov, R. Peschanski, JINR-E2-6350 (1972)

Odderon: elusive experimentally

Odderon search at ISR: indication but no conclusive result Breakstone et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 54, 2180 (**1985**): CL = 99.9 %



Indication of Odderon CL = 99.9 %, Significance: 3.35σ

2021 observations of Odderon with > 5 σ

Evidence of Odderon-exchange from scaling properties of elastic scattering at TeV energies #5				
T. Csörgó (Wigner RCP, Budapest and CERN), <u>T. Novak</u> (Unlisted, Budapest), <u>I. Szanyi</u> (Wigner RCP, Budapest) (Dec 26, 2019)	HU), R. Pasechnik (Lund U., Dept. Theor. Phys.), <u>A. Ster</u> (Wigner RCP,			
Published in: Eur.Phys.J.C 81 (2021) 2, 180 • e-Print: 1912.11968 [Hungarian-Swedish Odderon:			
🖹 pdf 🖉 DOI 🖃 cite	Eur. Phys. J. C (2021) 81 : 180, <u>Published: 23 February 2021</u> <u>https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-021-08867-6</u>			
Observation of Odderon effects at LHC energies: a real extended Bialas–Bzdak model study #2				
T. Csorgo (Wigner RCP, Budapest and EKU KRC, Gyongyos), I. Szanyi (Eotvos U. and Wigner RCP, Budapest) (May 28, 2020)				
Published in: Eur.Phys.J.C 81 (2021) 7, 611 • e-Print: 2005.14319	Hungarian-Polish Odderon:			
🛱 pdf 🕜 DOI 🖃 cite	Eur. Phys. J. C (2021) 81 :611 , <u>Published: 13 July 2021</u> https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-021-09381-5			

Odderon Exchange from Elastic Scattering Differences between pp and $par{p}$ Data at 1.96 TeV and ${}^{\#}$		
from pp Forward Scattering Measurements		
TOTEM and D0 Collaborations • V.M. Abazov (Dubna, JINR) et al. (Dec 7, 2020)		
Published in: Phys.Rev.Lett. 127 (2021) 6, 062003 • e-Print: 20 D0-TOTEM Odderon:		
🔓 pdf 🕜 links 🖉 DOI 🖂 cite	Phys. Rev. Lett. 127 (2021) 6, 062003, Published: 4 August 2021 https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.127.062003	

2022 observations of Odderon with > 5 σ

Characterisation of the dip-bump structure observed in proton–proton elastic scattering at \sqrt{s} = $\frac{\#1}{2}$				
8 TeV				
TOTEM Collaboration • G. Antchev (Pilsen U.) et al. (Nov 23, 2021)				
Published in: Eur.Phys.J.C 82 (2022) 3, 263 • e-Print: 2111.119	8 TeV: EPJ C (2022) 82, 263 (2022). <u>Published: March 26, 2022</u>			
🔓 pdf 🕜 DOI 🖃 cite	https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-022-10065-x Publishes final data for D0-TOTEM PRL published in 2021			

The ReBB model and its H(x) scaling version at 8 TeV: Odderon exchange is a certainty			
I. Szanyi (Eotvos U. and Wigner RCP, Budapest and Karoly Robert U. Coll.), T. Csörgő (Wigner RCP, Budapest and Karoly Robert U.			
Coll.) (Apr 21, 2022)	New TOTEM 8 TeV data vs ReBB model predictions:		
Published in: Eur.Phys.J.C 82 (2022) 9, 827, Eur.Phys.J.C 82 (20	EPJ C 82 (2022) 9, 827. <u>Published: Sept 19, 2022</u>		
Dopdf ∠2 DOL Discite	In the ReBB model, Odderon exchange is a certainty		
N bar R. Pol C. and	Presented at Zimányi'22 by I. Szanyi		

Model indepedent observation, 2019 -

Definition of the model independent H(x) scaling function constructed from published data:

$H(x) = 1/(B\sigma_{el}) d\sigma/dt, x = Bt$

B: slope at t=0 (data, published with $d\sigma/dt$) σ_{el} : total elastic σ (data, published with $d\sigma/dt$)

Definition of χ^2 according to def. in ref. of PHENIX Collaboration:

7

$$\begin{split} \chi^2_{2 \to 1} &= \sum_{j=1}^{n_{21}} \frac{(d_1^j + \epsilon_{b,1} e_{B,1}^j - d_{21}^j - \epsilon_{b,21} e_{B,21}^j)^2}{(\tilde{e}_{A,1}^j)^2 + (\tilde{e}_{A,21}^j)^2} + \epsilon_{b,1}^2 + \epsilon_{b,21}^2, \\ \tilde{e}_{A,k}^j &= e_{A,k}^j \frac{d_k^j + \epsilon_{b,k} e_{B,k}^j}{d_k^j}, \\ e_{M,k}^j &= \sqrt{(\sigma_{M,k}^j)^2 + (d_k'^j)^2 (\delta_{M,k}^j x)^2}, \end{split}$$

A. Adare et al. (PHENIX), Phys. Rev. C77, 064907 (2008), 0801.1665.

Model indepedent observation, 2019 -



$$x = -Bt = -B_0(s)t$$

Data agree within 1 of σ standard deviation.

H(x) scaling of elastic p+p scattering data at ISR energies of 23 - 63GeV. (See details in the publication)

Model indepedent observation, 2019 -



 $B \equiv B_0(s)$ from now on

 $x = -Bt = -B_0(s)t$

S: Model independent Odderon significance \geq 6.26 σ C1: All D0 and TOTEM published data at 1.96, 2.76 and 7.0 TeV C2: domain of validity is still determined model dependently.

Model dependent observation, 2020-



Partially model independent, 2020-

Odderon Exchange from Elastic Scattering Differences between pp and $par{p}$ Data at 1.96 TeV and ~~ from pp Forward Scattering Measurements

TOTEM and D0 Collaborations • V.M. Abazov (Dubna, JINR) e Phys. Rev. Lett. **127** (2021) 6, 062003, Published: 4 August 2021 Published in: Phys.Rev.Lett. 127 (2021) 6, 062003 • e-Print: 20 <u>https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.127.062003</u>



S: Odderon significance \geq 5.2 σ , C1: *almost* model independently combined with $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV data **at t = 0**: σ_{tot} and ρ_0

C2: one additional **pp dataset** at 8 TeV and **one additional data point** at 2.76 TeV, C3: 8 out of the 17 D0 points are used

C4: D0 pbarp data and TOTEM pp extrap.data are **assumed** to be **equal at t=0** C5: ρ_0 (1.96 TeV) = 0.145

Some reflections on D0-TOTEM results

Odderon Exchange from Elastic Scattering Differences between pp and $p\bar{p}$ Data at 1.96 TeV and #1 from pp Forward Scattering Measurements #1 TOTEM and D0 Collaborations • V.M. Abazov (Dubna, JINR) et al. (Dec 7, 2020) #2 Published in: Phys.Rev.Lett, 127 (2021) 6, 062003 • e-Print; 2012,03981 [hep-ex] #1			
🔓 pdf 🕜 links 🖉 DOI 🖃 cite	Phys. Rev. Lett. 127 (2021) 6, 062003, Published: 4 August 2021 https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.127.062003		
Lack of evidence for an odderon at small t A. Donnachie (Manchester U.), P.V. Landshoff (Cambridge U.) (Ma Published in: <i>Phys.Lett.B</i> 831 (2022) 137199 • e-Print: 2203.00290	#1 ar 1, 2022) D [hep-ph]		
Image: Solit of the state			

Back to Scaling: Model independently



Energy range: tested **both** model independently and with modelling. Modelling is useful, but model independent tests more important!



Energy range: H(x) scaling valid between \sqrt{s} = 8 and 2.76 TeV. Uses final, published TOTEM d_{\sigma}/dt data at 8 TeV



Energy range: H(x) scaling model independently up to \sqrt{s} = 8 TeV. Uses final, published TOTEM d_{\sigma}/dt data at 8 TeV



Closer look: systematic effects beyond the reported errors at dateset1 of 7 TeV (regarding type A and B ones, Type_C cancels)



Closer look: systematic effects beyond the reported errors at dataset1 of 7 TeV (regarding all types of errors, type_C cancels)

This is a first direct observation of systematics in the 7 TeV low –t dataset beyond the reported errors.

Such problems were also seen in many earlier data analyses, but the problems were always attributed to the insufficiency of the methods applied in the analyses. A few examples:

- In this presentation: Model independent analysy
 - Fagundes et al.,: Phys. Rev. D88, 094019
 - Ster, Jenkovszzky and Csörgő. Phys. Rev. D91, 074018; also presented in Bad Honnef at WE Heraeus Physics Scholl, 2015:

"Extracting the Odderon from pp and pp⁻ scattering data"

H(x): Odderon signal, new 8 TeV data



H(x) scaling is violated between \sqrt{s} = 8 TeV pp and 1.96 TeV pbarp. Hungarian-Swedish Odderon signal confirmed with final, published TOTEM d_{\sigma}/dt data at 8 TeV. Model independently.

H(x|pbarp)/H(x|pp): Odderon peak



H(x) scaling is violated between \sqrt{s} = 8 TeV pp and 1.96 TeV pbarp. TOTEM d_{\sigma}/dt data at 8 TeV. Odderon exchange, as a peak.

7 TeV: CLOSING DOORS/GATES



-Bt

7 TeV RESULTS, CLOSING GATES

Two sliding gates of size n and size m: (n,m): Leaving out the first n and last m D0 point

Sliding door technique with two wings (n,m)

Left door excludes the first n, right door excludes the last m D0 points

n	m	Odderon signal	Background	
2	2	6.27 σ	1.68 σ	
3	2	6.33 σ	1.70 σ	
4	2	6.21 σ	2.37 σ	

MODEL INDEPENT RESULT 1: In best window, optimized Odderon signal is 6.33 σ

MODEL INDEPENT RESULT 2:

Best window: leaving out first 3 and last 2 D0 point

MODEL INDEPENT RESULT 3: Outside the best window: H(x|pp) = H(x,pbarp) **pp and pbarp backgrounds agree within 1.7** σ

SUMMARY: ODDERON DISCOVERED IN 3 PAPERS, NEW: FOCUS ON ITS PROPERTIES

The H(x) analysis of the 8 TeV data CONFIRMED the existence Odderon. The united significance with the 7 and 8 TeV data, using the Stouffer's method is: 7.02 σ

Odderon first discovered in three published papers: three different analysis, each with a statistical significance > 5 σ

Oth property: Odderon exists!

Odderon properties: from Bialas-Bzdak model, so far valid in a limited s and -t > 0.37 GeV² range only. 1.96 TeV - 8 TeV: Threshold effect, just appearing.

There is an ongoing debate in reflective papers about the magnitude of the significance in the D0-TOTEM PRL For exemple, is there enough evidence for Odderon at t= 0?