Review diffractive and electromagnetic processes in <u>ATLAS</u>

Laurent Schoeffel

Some time ago in H1/HERA (DVCS -1999-2009 –all H1 papers-, F2D 2004-2012 –the HERA2 paper-) Now, involved in many ATLAS analyses:

convener of the physics group related to QCD and EM processes

1

CEA Irfu/SPP

France

International WE-Heraeus Physics School (2015) August 2015

The LHC experiments









Experimental techniques

Either we measure scattered protons using

forward detectors



Or we measure <u>GAPs</u> (veto on particles and/or energy flow)

This needs a large pseudo-rapidity coverage...



Central/forward detectors in ATLAS



Pseudo-rapidity coverage



LRG (large Rapidity Gaps) and proton tags A short anatomy of pp collisions / examples...

This will be covered in this presentation



Many other processes (EM) possible that can produce GAPs and/or 'intact' protons This will be covered in this presentation

Cross sections in pb ...deeper anatomy

And also...

Vector Boson Scattering (VBS)

This will be covered in this presentation



Outline

Intact protons

-- 'elastic' diffractive scattering

"The diffraction phenomena of quantum systems can however be reduced directly to a classical limit only when elastic scattering takes place..." [Alberi, Goggi 1981]

Rapidity Gaps

-- 'inelastic' diffractive scattering

"As a consequence, inelastic diffraction can be reduced to elastic diffraction scattering of the basic states, in which the initial and final states can be decomposed. The fluctuations of hadronic systems over this set of basic states, typical manifestation of quantum field-theoretical objects, are the <u>main origin of the large probability observed for inelastic diffraction..."</u> [Alberi, Goggi 1981]

EM processes and beyond

(EM extended to EWK [Electro-Weak])

15



History: rise of σ_{tot} at ISR

CERN Intersecting Storage Rings

At the ISR a rise of the total cross section was first observed.



Next, we describe precisely the measurement at ATLAS using ALFA at 7 TeV (which kind of rise: ln(s), ln²(s),...?)

Pre-LHC rise of σ_{tot}



Then, Pre-LHC measurements does not constraint the rise of the total cross section very precisely...



- Roman pots:

located 240 m from the IP

- 4 stations, 8 detectors
- Detectors: scintillating fibers
 - (i.e. trackers)



- 4 stations, 8 detectors
- Detectors: scintillating fibers (i.e. trackers)

ALFA / beams (protons)

Roman Pot detectors at 240 m from IP1 approaching the beam during special runs at high β^* .

We explain this condition in a few slides



In October 2011 ALFA had the special run 191373 with β^* =90m

and recorded 800k *good selected elastic events* used for the analysis of the total cross section and the nuclear slope B. At 7 TeV: each proton beam with momentum 3.5 TeV/c

ALFA / Hit map (1)



ALFA / Hit map (1)



Hit pattern in one station, before elastic event selection.

Pattern shape is caused only by beam optics...

We justify this map in a few slides





LHC beams (protons)

Special optics for ALFA w.r.t. nominal LHC optics

	Beam size (width) at collision point	Beam divergence	 t _{min} ∝ p ε/β*
Standard optics $\beta^* = 0.5m$	Small	Large	>0.3 GeV ²
Special optics β* = 90m	Large	Small	~0.01 GeV ²

This justifies the high β* requirement higher β* (~1km) would lead to smaller |t|_{min}~0.001 GeV² Then, what is observed/measured in ALFA?



ALFA / Hit map (2)



Hit pattern in one station. The shape is caused by the beam optics only (equations above)

A7R1

A5

A6

237 m

B7R1

A7

A8

241 m



<u>Note:</u>

If one would like to measure non-zero ξ values -- with a good acceptance

=> New RP needed ⊥ ALFA CERN-LHCC-2015-009; ATLAS-TDR-024

$$\mathbf{1}^{t = -p^2 \theta^2}$$

 $\xi = \Delta p/p$

<u>AFP</u>: diffractive protons measurement. A first-phase installation in 2016.

Longitudinal momemtum loss (fraction)

Elastic cross section / Analysis strategy

Following the previous slides =>Selection based on constrained kinematics of elastic events:

- Left (C side)-right (A side) symmetry (in x and y)
- Correlation between trajectory position (x) and elevation angle (θ)



Correlation between y on A and C sides



 $B = 19.73 \pm 0.24 \text{ GeV}^{-2}$

arXiv:1408.5778 NPB (2014), pp. 486-548 **Final result**



 (1) Measurements at 13 TeV will be important (in the range of cosmic rays)
(2) σ_{el} growing more/less rapidly than σ_{tot} ? Right now: the slope of σ_{el}(E_{cm}) is smaller than σ_{tot} (E_{cm})

Internal history of the paper in ATLAS



Back on the anatomy of pp collisions

From the **ALFA measurement(s)**:

 $\sigma_{el}/\sigma_{tot} \sim 25\%$ and thus $\sigma_{inel}/\sigma_{tot} \sim 75\%$

From this 75% of inelastic cross-section, how much of SD and DD?



The content of soft diffractive events in the inelastic cross-section can be obtained by the ratio of **single sided events (enriched in diff events)** to the total # events.

This ratio is a function of f_D ... and this fraction can be tuned in the MC up to reproduce the value of $R_{ss} => f_D \sim 27\% + 1 - 2\%$



Back on the inelastic cross-section

 σ_{inel} = 71.34 +/- 0.9 mb from ALFA at E_{cm}=7 TeV



 σ_{inel} = 11.0. ±2.3 mb for M_X < 15 GeV

(low mass inelastic cross-section)

Back on the anatomy of pp collisions Focus on low masses

For Mx<15 GeV, σ_{inel} = 11.0 +/- 2.3 mb

Out of these 11 mb, 27% are of SD and DD origins. =>**3** mb (with a 20% uncertainty)

Experiment	CERN-ISR	UA4	TOTEM	ATLAS
Energy	31-62 GeV	516 GeV	7 TeV	7 TeV
σ _{diff} (low mass)/σ _{el}	~2/7=0.3	~3/12=0.25	2.6/25=0.1	3 /24=0.12

 σ_{diff} (low mass)/ σ_{el} is decreasing with the Energy

This is an interesting experimental result... to be re-examined...

Additional: ALFA and more complex reactions



Exclusive pion production $p p \rightarrow p p \pi^+ \pi^-$

high $\beta^* = 90$ m runs (206881-) at E_{cm}=8 TeV L=37.33 /nb

Analysis strategy:

- Two tracks from common vertex with $|\eta|$ < 2.5 and $P_{\rm T}$ > 100 MeV/c
- No signal in MBTS above noise
- Single proton on both ATLAS sides -Preliminary ALFA alignment

Data contains elastic pp->pp events with overlap charged particle pair not belonging to the same interaction vertex (collinear protons) Clean exclusive signature (exclusivity line)

Rapidity Gaps

More on the anatomy of diffractive events

 $\Delta \eta_F$:= the largest of the 2 forward rapidity gaps between the first track (pT>200 MeV/c $|\eta|<2.5$) or the first CAL activity above noise and the edge of the detector $|\eta|=4.9$.





 $\Delta \eta_F > 2 => data/MC confirms$ that the event sample is dominated by SD (and DD)

Observed: [1,1.5] mb / unit of $\Delta \eta$

...to be compared to: (3.5 mb for Pythia and 2.7 for Phojet)

Note: The 2 MCs does not agree...

And there is something more...


Rapidity Gaps(P_T^{cut})

The diffractive plateau disappears for p_T^{cut} >800 MeV

As the p_T^{cut} increases, data show larger gaps => Sensitive to hadronization fluctuation and underlying event

Therefore, this is a measurement of $d\sigma/d \Delta \eta_F[\Delta \eta_F][p_T^{cut}]$ Interesting to tune MCs, certainly not to extract some physics messages *like tunes of MCs based on Minimum Bias (MB) studies...*



Rapidity Gaps

<u>For example</u>, we can check that Herwig MC is not satisfactory. <= Large gaps are produced in the absence of an explicit model of soft-diffraction in Herwig...



Another view of Gaps

Jet (1)



One key observable is the gap fraction:

 $f(Q_0) = \sigma_{ij}(Q_0) / \sigma_{ij}$

In the experimental configuration: 2 jets events with large Δy separation (GAP) with/without a veto on jets P_T in Δy (Gap events / Inclusive events)

Interesting to test interesting limits on MCs?

gap





arXiv:1407.57 EPJ C (2014) 74:3117 Gap fraction (2j)



Plateau at high Δy and $\ln(P_T/Q_0)$ => Effect of PDFs and/or diffractive exchange 2 MCs are tested (POWHEG, HEJ): *can be used as an element of tuning*....

Gaps and Azimuths

Jet (1)



Still the experimental configuration: 2 jets events with large Δy separation (GAP) Define the correlation function ($\Delta \phi$) of jets (1) and (2).

What happens when Δy increases? (for Gap versus Inclusive events)

<u>The idea</u>: if more and more gluons are emitted between the 2 jets (as Δy increases),

this should lead to a <u>de-correlation</u> of their relative azimuthal angle.



Gaps and Azimuths

Let us note $\Delta \phi$ the azimuthal difference between the 2 jets.

We can always write the Fourier series of the normalized cross-section

 $1/\sigma \, d\sigma/d\Delta\phi (.) = 1/(2\pi) \{1+2\sum C_n(.) \cos[n(\pi - \Delta\phi)]\}$

Where: $C_n(.) = \langle \cos[n(\pi - \Delta \phi)] \rangle$

If there are only 2 jets with $\Delta \phi = \pi = C_n(.) = 1$.

With the emission of partons (between the 2 jets, even with small transverse momentum) => $C_n(.) < 1$.

:= Stronger effect when $\Delta y = |y1-y2|$ is increased?!

Azimuthal decorrelation: inclusive events



Again, some tensions can be observed between the models...

None of them provide a good description of this first moment function!

However, the general behavior is correct...

Azimuthal decorrelation: gap events



Here, a veto is applied for potential jets between the 2 leading jets (this defines Gap events in the 2 jets configuration)

Similar conclusions as before

Note:

The veto enhances back-to-back topology with the gap size... [C(.) increases]





The idea is that when the velocity of a charged particle (proton, Pb) ~c, its EM field becomes Lorentz-contracted equivalent to a transverse EM (photon) field...

This is the Equivalent Photon Approximation (EPA)



The idea is that when the velocity of a charged particle (proton, Pb) ~c, its EM field becomes Lorentz-contracted equivalent to a transverse EM (photon) field...

Then, in general, we can write: $\sigma(p+p \to p+p+X) = \int \int f(\omega_1) f(\omega_2) \sigma_{\gamma\gamma \to X}(\omega_1, \omega_2) \frac{d\omega_1}{\omega_1} \frac{d\omega_2}{\omega_2}$ $f(\omega_1) f(\omega_2) \to \int \int \int n(\vec{b}_1, \omega_1) n(\vec{b}_2, \omega_2) P_{non-inel}(|\vec{b}_1 - \vec{b}_2|) d^2 \vec{b}_1 d^2 \vec{b}_2$ Number(s) of equivalent photons (impact parameter, energy)

Example of processes @13 TeV Elementary cross sections: yy->X



For pp collisions: $\sigma_{\gamma\gamma} \otimes \#$ photons from each proton

- Also, we must not forget that protons have a finite size.
- This can be translated into a survival factor of the cross section



The $pp > (\gamma \gamma) > \dots$ cross section with no account of finite size effects will be multiplied by S^2



Measurement of pp->(γγ)->ppX (at 7 TeV) with X=di-lepton

Prerequisites: The measurement (and its interpretation) are complicated by the fact that the proton does not stay necessarily intact:



Fiducial phase-space of the analysis:

- p_T^μ>10 GeV, |η_μ|<2.4, M_{μ+μ-}>20 GeV
- p_T^{e} >12 GeV, $|\eta_e|$ <2.4, M_{e+e} >24 GeV

Measurement of pp->(γγ)->ppX (at 7 TeV) with X=di-lepton

Why this is complicated!



Prior to any specific cuts, the selection (di-muon) is dominated by DY.



We are interested by the red part

Measurement of pp->(γγ)->ppX (at 7 TeV) with X=di-lepton

Analysis strategy:

- <u>ONLY 2 tracks (pT > 400 MeV) associated to vertex</u>, formed by the 2 leptons (**exclusivity** selection)
- <u>Vertex is requested to be isolated</u> from other possible tracks (to remove again some DY and pile-up backgrounds)
- The p_T of the di-lepton system is requested to be small (<1.5 GeV) to keep elastic protons and reject (as much as possible) SD and DD.
- + cuts at the Z boson peak (to remove almost all remaining DY events)

Measurement: X=di-lepton / PP->(YY)->PPX arXiv:1506.07098 Exclusivity selection

PLB 749 (2015) 242-261



Measurement: X=di-lepton / PP->(Y)->PPX DY removal and p_T spectrum before cut





Measurement: X=di-lepton / PP->(yy)->PPX Final step -1-

869 and 2124 events selected in $ee/\mu\mu$ channels

Signal events (elastic) ~50% of the analysis-selected sample

MC does not include finite size 200 Effects (or absorptive corrections) 100 => Data~80% of the prediction



We intend to determine this number precisely! for elastic and SD processes...

Measurement: X=di-lepton / PP->(YY)->PPX Final step -2-

- Binned likelihood of signal (exclusive or elastic) and background (SD)
- DY and DD fixed! (DD from Pythia, re-scattering corrections included)
- Both elastic and SD requires the factor ~80%



Measurement: X=di-lepton / PP->(Y)->PPX Systematic uncertainties

dominant sources of systematic uncertainty are from background modeling:

_		Uncertainty [%]	
_	Source of uncertainty	$\gamma\gamma \to e^+e^-$	$\gamma\gamma ightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$
	Electron reconstruction		
	and identification efficiency	1.9	-
	Electron energy scale		
	and resolution	1.4	-
	Electron trigger efficiency	0.7	-
	Muon reconstruction efficiency	-	0.2
	Muon momentum scale		
	and resolution	-	0.5
	Muon trigger efficiency	-	0.6
\rightarrow	Backgrounds	2.3	2.0
\rightarrow	Template shapes	1.0	0.9
	Pile-up description	0.5	0.5
	Vertex isolation efficiency	1.2	1.2
	LHC beam effects	0.5	0.5
	QED FSR in DY e^+e^-	0.8	-
	Luminosity	1.8	1.8
1	Total systematic uncertainty	4.3	3.3
Ţ	Data statistical uncertainty	8.2	5.1

Measurement: X=di-lepton / PP->(yy)->PPX Control distributions

Apply the derived scaling factors to MCs (elastic and SD) => The description data/MC is good!



Measurement: X=di-lepton / PP->(y)->PPX Cross sections



Cross sections in the fiducial region (inside the kinematical cuts)

Variable	Electron channel	Muon channel
p_{T}^{ℓ}	> 12 GeV	$> 10 { m GeV}$
$ \eta^{\ell} $	< 2.4	< 2.4
$m_{\ell^+\ell^-}$	$> 24 { m ~GeV}$	> 20 GeV

 $\sigma_{\gamma\gamma \to e^+e^-}^{\text{excl.}} = 0.428 \pm 0.035 \text{ (stat.)} \pm 0.018 \text{ (syst.) pb}$ $\sigma_{\gamma\gamma \to \mu^+\mu^-}^{\text{excl.}} = 0.628 \pm 0.032 \text{ (stat.)} \pm 0.021 \text{ (syst.) pb}$



Intermediate summary On pp->(γγ)->... processes

We have shown experimentally that:

This is possible to <u>define an exclusivity selection</u> in order to identify 'exclusive' events with a good efficiency –in the presence of Pile Up Events $<\mu>$ -

This is something promising for any analysis of this kind!





Intermediate summary On pp->(γγ)->ppX processes

Example of potential studies: X=WW; $X=\gamma\gamma$; ... and many others in the exotic context...

This is a wide domain of experimental research... only starting.

- A few points to keep in mind:
- a) Take the correct scale for α_{EM} (which means 0 GeV² for elastic)

b) This is not correct to write (even implicitly) a relation like: $\sigma_{eff}(2I) / \sigma_{EPA}(2I) = \sigma_{eff}(WW) / \sigma_{EPA}(WW)$

and then use this relation to scale predictions...

Interestingly, all this can be done in PbPb >(γγ)->PbPbX with advantages and drawbacks compared to pp...

Additional: MCs For pp->(γγ)->YY X processes



<u>Treatment in LPAIR</u> This produces only particles in the forward directions

Proton-dissociation

<u>'Correct' treatment in Pythia8</u> Particles are also visible in the central part of the detector



Treatment in LPAIR

This produces only particles in the forward directions

'Correct' treatment in **Pythia8** Particles are also visible in the central part of the detector

Then:

A large part of the 'total' cross-section is missed by LPAIR (/Phythia8) or any approach à la LPAIR for proton-dissociative events...

Proton-dissociation

Proton-dissociation

Additional: MCs For pp->(γγ)->YY X processes

- O(α_s) corrections to the $\gamma q \rightarrow q$ process should have to be also considered



≈ 40% contribution to the double-dissociative cross section (PYTHIA8)

- Enhancement of the cross section (diss part)
- Increased underlying event activity in the central detector
- Total cross section comparison: ($M_{\mu\mu}$ > 20 GeV, p_T^{μ} > 10 GeV, $|\eta_{\mu}|$ < 2.5)

Generator	LPAIR (s-diss)	LPAIR (d-diss)	PYTHIA 8 (d-diss)	+ MRST2004QED
Cross-section	0.87 pb	1.02 pb	7.72 pb	-

Additional: Photon Induced reactions in DY



Probing even deeper Using Vector Boson Scattering...

QGC:=Quartic Gauge Coupling



Direct probe of the nature of the electroweak symmetry breaking mechanism EWSB

General motivation: This is a high priority: we need to understand QGCs to tell if the Higgs unitarizes the process WW->WW

WW scattering

Electro-weak same-sign WW production (+2 jets) gets contributions from VBS diagrams (and non-VBS):



This is a promising channel for early VBS searches (low backgrounds) The idea to identify the VBS signature:

two jets with large rapidity separation and large mass!




WW scattering: VBS cross section



WWjj event in ATLAS



jets: $p_T^{j1} = 271$ GeV, $p_T^{j2} = 54$ GeV, $\eta^{j1} = 2.9$, $\eta^{j2} = -3.4$ muons: $p_T^{\mu 1} = 180$ GeV, $p_T^{\mu 2} = 38$ GeV, $\eta^{\mu 1} = 1.4$, $\eta^{\mu 2} = -1.3$ $E_{\rm T}^{\rm miss} = 75 \,\,{\rm GeV}$

Outlook -1-

Soon, pp elastic measurement at 8 TeV (90m optics) :within a year

On going: Some dedicated 'diffractive'-like measurements using ALFA (at higher beam intensity) instead of using LRG method (central detectors)

New runs at 13 TeV for ALFA (nominal optics) foreseen in October: we have already discussed how this measurement is important...

<u>On going:</u> new studies in $\gamma\gamma$ interactions (at 8 TeV). In parallel, we prepare some analyses for the 13 TeV data... where the large statistic expected will be decisive in the "probing deeper" topologies...

Uncovered in this presentation: photo-production of VM in PbPb collisions (on going)... for Pb, the equivalent #photons is multiplied by 82²! Making a high intensity field... (with smaller maximal energies for photons)

Outlook -2-

LHC/ATLAS is re-starting... sample of results using tracks in central detectors so important in all analyses!

Feynman plateau



2-particle correlations at large multiplicities => long range correlations($\phi \sim 0$)!

