



Impact of CMS Measurements on Parton Distribution Functions and QCD parameters

> Engin Eren on behalf of the CMS Collaboration

EPS Conference, Venice 2017

PDF CONSTRAINTS FROM LHC

need improvements in
quark flavor separation at medium x,
gluon at low and at high x
→ impact of the LHC measurements



 jets: gluon, α_S (today) medium-high x

• top-pairs: gluon (today) high x

 DY: light quarks, flavor separation, gluon

 V+HQ: s-quark, intrinsic charm (S.Pflitsch's talk)









Jet production in pp collisions directly sensitive to PDFs and α_S

2000



CMS 8 TeV, \perp = 19.7 fb⁻¹ :

- inclusive jet production : JHEP 03 (2017) 156
- 3D dijet production: arXiv:1705.02628 (submitted to EPJC)
- multijet production: CMS-PAS-SMP-16-008

Details about measurements : P.Kokkas' talk.



CMS 8 TeV, \mathcal{L} = 19.7 fb⁻¹ inclusive jet production JHEP 03 (2017) 156 Double-differential cross sections vs of jet p_T and rapidity Constraints on PDFs and α_S : QCD analysis at NLO using herafitter 1.1.1



simultaneous fit with PDFs:

 $\alpha_s(M_Z) = 0.1185^{+0.0019}_{-0.0026}(PDF)^{+0.0022}_{-0.0018}(scale)$



Significant impact on the gluon distribution, α_S consistent with world average, dominant uncertainty emerges from the variations of the scales

CMS 8 TeV, \mathcal{L} = 19.7 fb⁻¹ dijet production: *arXiv:1705.02628 (submitted to EPJC)* 3-differential cross sections vs of jet average p_T, rapidity separation and boost

Probing x₁ and x₂ using different event topologies

for details see talk by P.Kokkas



Novel technique to access highly boosted regime ($x_1 \ll x_2$)

CMS 8 TeV, \mathcal{L} = 19.7 fb⁻¹ dijet production: *arXiv:1705.02628* (submitted to EPJC) 3-differential cross sections vs of jet average p_T , rapidity separation and boost

for details see talk by P.Kokkas

Probing x₁ and x₂ using different event topologies



By using dijet cross section in the QCD analysis in addition to HERA data...



change in the gluon shape similar as observed in the case of inclusive jet data
 significant reduction of the uncertainty in g(x) at high x

similar to inclusive jet data (note different parametrisation)

- strong coupling determined simultaneously with PDFs:

 $\alpha_s(M_Z) = 0.1199^{+0.0015}_{-0.0016}(PDF)^{+0.0026}_{-0.0016}(scale)$

CMS 8 TeV, \perp = 19.7 fb⁻¹ multi-jet production CMS-PAS-SMP-16-008

Ratio of 3/2 inclusive jet cross sections

Advantage of R₃₂ : partial or full cancellation or reduction of experimental uncertainties, theory uncertainties due to NP effects, PDFs, scale choice, EWK corrections



 α_s determined by minimizing χ^2 between the measurement and the theory

MMHT14: $\chi^2/n_{dof} = 24/28$

 $\alpha_S(M_Z) = 0.1142 \pm 0.0010(exp) \pm 0.0013(PDF) \\ \pm 0.0014(NP)^{+0.0049}_{-0.0006}(scale)$

CMS 8 TeV, \perp = 19.7 fb⁻¹ multi-jet production CMS-PAS-SMP-16-008

Ratio of 3/2 inclusive jet cross sections



$\alpha_{S}(M_{Z})$ value for each $H_{T,2}/2$ range $\rightarrow \alpha_{S}(Q)$



Evolution performed for $N_f = 5$ at 2-loops

tt @ CMS: GLUON DISTRIBUTION AT HIGH X

In pp collisions top-quark pairs are produced via gg fusion probing gluon at high x



CMS 8 TeV, \bot = 19.7 fb⁻¹ :

2d-differential tt cross sections arXiv:1703.01630 (Submitted to EPJC)



for details see talk T.Arndt

tt @ CMS: GLUON DISTRIBUTION AT HIGH X

1-d and 2-d differential cross sections for different observables studied

Results compared to those obtained by using inclusive jets @ 8 TeV



strongest constraints achieved by using 2d distributions in Mtt and ytt

Recommend to use both data sets for further improvement of g(x) at high x

Х

tt @ CMS: GLUON DISTRIBUTION AT HIGH X

In pp collisions top-quark pairs are produced via gg fusion probing gluon at high x



new kinematic range probed

CMS 5.02 TeV, $\mathcal{L} = 27.4 \text{ pb}^{-1}$ CMS-PAS-TOP-16-023 for details see talk T.Arndt

XFitter 2.0.0

Inclusive t<u>t</u>cross secti<u>o</u>n [pb] Tevatron combined 1.96 TeV (L \leq 8.8 fb⁻¹) CMS CMS $e\mu$ 7 TeV (L = 5 fb⁻¹) CMS I+j 7 TeV (L = 5 fb⁻¹ CMS eu 8 TeV (L = 19.7 fb⁻¹ CMS I+j 8 TeV (L = 19.7 fb⁻¹ CMS eµ 13 TeV (L = 2.2 fb⁻¹, 25 ns) CMS I+j 13 TeV (L = 2.2 fb⁻¹) CMS eu+uu+l+jets 5.02 TeV (L = 27.4 pb⁻¹) Effect of 0.1% LHC beam energy uncertainty: 0.22 pb (not included in the figure 100 0^2 50 NNPDF3.0 MMHT14 CT14 ABM12* NNLO+NNLL (pp) 5 √s [TeV] NNLO+NNLL (pp) Czakon, Fiedler, Mitov, PRL 110 (2013) 252004 10 NNPDF3.0, $m_{top} = 172.5 \text{ GeV}, \alpha_s(M_2) = 0.118 \pm 0.001 [*\alpha_e(M_2)=0.113]$ 2 12 6 14 4 8 10 √*s* [TeV]

theory: HATHOR, m_t=172.5 GeV



modest effect on g(x) at high x

12

SUMMARY

LHC Run I CMS data used for improvement of PDF accuracy

jet data: gluon at medium & high x, strong coupling

 → getting even more interesting with available NNLO calculation

 top quark pairs : gluon at high x

LHC Run II CMS data is forthcoming

Run I has shown high potential of the LHC to improve the understanding of the proton structure, more data are still to come to be used in precision QCD analyses

BACK UP

NEED FOR EXPERIMENTAL INPUT



Partons: quarks & gluons

- Q²: typical energy scale in the process
- x : partonic fraction of the proton momentum

Rate = (structure of 2 protons) $\otimes \sigma_{ij}$

Parton Distribution Functions $f_i(Q^2, x)$

provided by theory determined experimentally

at the very edge of theory and experiment, correlated with fundamental QCD parameters

Improvement of PDFs precision demands theory & experiment collaboration and implies a variety of measurements and theory calculations

QCD analysis: XFitter 1.2. 2, baseline data HERA inclusive DIS [EPJ C 75 (2015) 580] Theory via NLOJet++ via fastNLO, scale $\mu_r = \mu_f = p_{T,max} \cdot e^{0.3y^*}$

2	
Ð	
G	
O	
Ì	
0	
N	
C	

$xg(x) = A_g x^{B_g} (1-x)^{C_g} - A'_g x^{B'_g} (1-x)^{C'_g},$	$x\overline{U}(x) = x\overline{u}(x)$, and $x\overline{D}(x) = x\overline{d}(x) + x\overline{s}(x)$
$xu_v(x) = A_{u_v} x^{B_{u_v}} (1-x)^{C_{u_v}} (1+D_{u_v} x + E_{u_v} x^2),$	$B_{\overline{U}} = B_{\overline{D}}$ and $A_{\overline{U}} = A_{\overline{D}}(1-f_s)$
$xd_v(x) = A_{d_v} x^{B_{d_v}} (1-x)^{C_{d_v}} (1+D_{d_v} x),$	$Bd_v \neq Bu_v$
$x\overline{U}(x) = A_{\overline{U}}x^{B_{\overline{U}}}(1-x)^{C_{\overline{U}}}(1+D_{\overline{U}}x),$	
$x\overline{D}(x) = A_{\overline{D}} x^{B_{\overline{D}}} (1-x)^{C_{\overline{D}}},$	\Rightarrow 16-parameter fit

Data are consistent very good fit quality for the CMS jet data

arXiv:1705.02628		HERA data		HERA & CMS data	
data set	n _{data}	$\chi^2_{ m P}$	$\chi^2_{\rm p}/n_{\rm data}$	$\chi^2_{ m p}$	$\chi_{\rm p}^2/n_{\rm data}$
NC HERA-I+II $e^+ p E_p = 920 \text{ GeV}$	332	382.44	1.15	406.45	1.22
NC HERA-I+II $e^+ p E_p = 820 \text{ GeV}$	63	60.62	0.96	61.01	0.97
NC HERA-I+II $e^+ p E_p = 575 \text{ GeV}$	234	196.40	0.84	197.56	0.84
NC HERA-I+II $e^+ p E_p = 460 \text{ GeV}$	187	204.42	1.09	205.50	1.10
NC HERA-I+II e^-p	159	217.27	1.37	219.17	1.38
CC HERA-I+II e^+p	39	43.26	1.11	42.29	1.08
CC HERA-I+II e^-p	42	49.11	1.17	55.35	1.32
CMS Triple-Differential Dijets	122	_	—	111.13	0.91
data set(s)	n _{dof}	χ^2	$\chi^2/n_{\rm dof}$	χ^2	$\chi^2/n_{ m dof}$
HERA data	1040	1211.00	1.16	_	_
HERA & CMS data	1162		_	1372.52	1.18
16					

6

CMS 8 TeV, \mathcal{L} = 19.7 fb⁻¹ dijet production: CMS-PAS-SMP-16-011

3-differential cross sections vs of jet average p_T, rapidity separation and boost

Probing x₁ and x₂ using different event topologies

