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Conclusions

A LAMENT.

In war, there is always the temptation to think that some great new weapon will bring victory; one thinks of the V weapons from the later stages of WWII. In WWI, the armaments company Krupp produced a giant cannon that could send shells as far as Paris from behind the front line. This weapon had no effect on the outcome of the war despite the damage to buildings and the loss of life. One can imagine a multiparticle physicist visiting Big Bertha, as the gun was called, and asking the Director General of the Big Bertha Battalion how he knows if the gun is pointing in the right direction. The reply might be "I don’t know, but it sure is a big gun!"
A new beginning...

- ISMD has a long and well established history of expertise in “early-LHC” measurements focusing on softQCD and interplay between hard and soft regions
  - Multiplicities
  - BE correlations
  - Underlying event studies
  - Strange particles
  - Diffraction
  - etc., etc.

- The main gateway to new physics at the LHC is through understanding of strong forces responsible for “multihadron production”.

- This symposium is the main forum with the largest attendance of experts in this field, bringing together theorists and experimentalists to discuss the major issues in multiparticle production:
  - QCD physics at the new energy frontier
  - mechanisms for particle production at highest pp-collision energies and test various particle-production models
  - Interplay between soft and hard QCD
  - LHPD hypothesis testing
Outline of ISMD10

- **Single-particle distributions**
  - Multiplicities, UE studies, diffraction
  - Strangeness production
  - Baryon asymmetries etc.

- **Two (and more) -particle densities and correlations**
  - Two-particle densities
  - Short and long range Eta-Phi correlations
  - BE correlations

- **Jets and high-pT EWK**
  - LHC, Tevatron/HERA: mature high-precision high-statistics results

- **Particle spectroscopy**
  - BaBar etc.

- **High-density matter**
  - RHIC. Heavy-ion studies
New energy frontier

- With increased center-mass energies at LHC, we have entered regions with smallest momentum fractions “z=k/p” (largest probability for multihadron production)

\[
dw(q\rightarrow q+g) \sim \alpha_s(k_T) \left[ 1 + \left( 1 - \frac{k}{p} \right)^2 \right] \frac{dk}{k} \frac{dk_T^2}{k_T^2}
\]

- Extra jet at large angle with probability \( \sim \alpha_s(k_T) \)
- Probability soft/quasicollinear partons: \( \sim \alpha_s(k_T) \log^2 E \)

For MinBias events, LHC studies of multihadron final state is already on the frontline with unknown. LHC is just about to enter highest-pT regions with smallest ever “z” for parton production and largest average multiplicities inside jets
New energy frontier

First LHC measurement constrains energy dependence for $hh$ .. and agrees with AA slope!

LHC data at 2.36 TeV

E. Sarkisyan-Grinbaum
New energy frontier

- analyzers per experiment
- what technology can stop this trend?
- ~2000
- ~20

A new era in experimental HEP

LHC experiments – not only **Multi-particle**, but also **“Multi-scientist”** experiments

- Previously, a “typical” experimental paper could done by a few Ph.D. students.

- **How to write experimental papers with 10, 20 or 50 analyzers?**
  - usually scattered between multiple time zones
  - not well attached to experiment hosting laboratory
  - often remote communication
  - results are hard to attribute to a particular person, group of persons or even to a particular country
  - small chances for analyzers to present their results at major HEP conferences like this?

**Results of this experiment is as interesting as the physics outcome!**
single-particle densities
Charge-particle multiplicity measurements

- Most model fail (below the data)
Examples from the past

- Same discrepancies have been observed in early HERA and Tevatron experiments
- MC description is never perfect after entering a new energy frontier
- Only later tuning work helped to reconcile data and MC and move forward with “high-precision measurements”

**Figure 4:** The unfolded multiplicity distribution in the interval $115 \, \text{GeV} < W < 150 \, \text{GeV}$ and $Q^2 > 10 \, \text{GeV}^2$, in indicated pseudorapidity domains. The distribution for $1 < \eta^* < 5$
Charge-particle distributions

- MC failures to describe the data (ATLAS)
- Consistency with previous measurements (CMS)
  - + focus on “MC-less” approach
Multi, multi, particle experiments

CMS Preliminary
\( \sqrt{s} = 7 \text{ TeV} \)

Yield = 243552 \times 1000
Mass = 1115.997 \pm 0.003 \text{ MeV/c}^2
\( \sigma_p = 1.87 \pm 0.00 \text{ MeV/c}^2 
\rho_{d} = 4.35 \pm 0.01 \text{ MeV/c}^2 
\)
Fraction with \( \rho \) = 0.604
Statistical uncertainties only

Candidates: 2.00 GeV/c^2

pp @ 900 GeV

ALICE performance work in progress

ATLAS Preliminary

\( \sqrt{s} = 7 \text{ TeV} \)

K\_c candidates |\( \eta |(\eta) < 1.2 \)

\( \Lambda \) candidates |\( \eta |(\eta) < 1.2 \)

7 TeV
Strangeness and baryon production (CMS, ATLAS, LHCb, ALICE)

CMS:
- Identification of strange hadrons
- Monte Carlo: Lower multiplicity
- Increasing CM energy and strangeness: larger discrepancy

Same comment as for multiplicities:
- no strong predictive power once entered new CM energies
- “energy” dependent parameters?
Baryon production (LHCb)

LHCb:
Ratio's LambdaLambda/K0s are wrong

P/barP ratios: good agreement with Peruja0
- precisely the MC which does not describe MinBias data for ATLAS/CMS!
The “underlying event” consists of:
- hard initial & final-state radiation
- beam-beam remnants
- possible multiple parton interactions


- Suggested by R. Field as early LHC measurement
- Does not require jet algorithms (generally)
- Useful for:
  - Understanding of energy flow around a leading jet
  - Energy flow in regions sensitive to underlying events ("transverse regions")
  - MC tuning

Fresh measurements from ATLAS/CMS!
UE studies

All tunes underestimate particle density by ~10-15% in the plateau region (ATLAS); CW tune from CMS look better.

There is a factor of ~2 increase in activity going from 900 GeV to 7 TeV; all tunes predict a comparable increase.

C. Buszello
D. Piparo
UE studies

- Tune Z1 does nice job of fitting the CMS and ATLAS UE data at 900 GeV and 7 TeV!
- But Tune Z1 is a little high at CDF (1.96 TeV)!
UE studies. Try to tune!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Tune Z1 (R. Field CMS)</th>
<th>Tune AMBT1 (ATLAS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parton Distribution Function</td>
<td>CTEQ5L</td>
<td>LO*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARP(82) – MPI Cut-off</td>
<td>1.932</td>
<td>2.292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARP(89) – Reference energy, E0</td>
<td>1800.0</td>
<td>1800.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARP(90) – MPI Energy Extrapolation</td>
<td>0.275</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARP(77) – CR Suppression</td>
<td>1.016</td>
<td>1.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARP(78) – CR Strength</td>
<td>0.538</td>
<td>0.538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARP(80) – Probability colored parton from BBR</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARP(83) – Matter fraction in core</td>
<td>0.356</td>
<td>0.356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARP(84) – Core of matter overlap</td>
<td>0.651</td>
<td>0.651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARP(62) – ISR Cut-off</td>
<td>1.025</td>
<td>1.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARP(93) – primordial kT-max</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSTP(81) – MPI, ISR, FSR, BBR model</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSTP(82) – Double gaussian matter distribution</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSTP(91) – Gaussian primordial kT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSTP(95) – strategy for color reconnection</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Can we a simpler description than THIS? (UE observable can be fitted with analytical function with 2-3 free parameters!)
Getting a grip on MI

- Can MI be disentangled and studied in a simpler process (ep?)
- MI not needed for jets $p_T > 21$ GeV (but might be needed for lower $p_T$!)

Pythia+MI is in agreement for charged-particle densities!
But alternative PS (CCFM) without MI is closer to data than Pythia (without MPI)
→ PS dependence!
→ MI is needed, but its size depends on factorization scheme!
Diffraction

Diffractive processes are non-trivial part of $\sigma(pp)$
- Currently dominant uncertainty for luminosity measurements
- Introduce uncertainty for MC tuning
- Hard component is not well known

Diffraction observed in two ways:
1) peak at low $\xi$ values and 2) presence of a Large Rapidity Gap

Current measurement: $\xi=\text{Sum}(E-pz)$ (runs over all CAL energy depositions)
- related to the momentum loss of the scattered proton

$\sigma(pp) = \sigma(\text{el}) + \sigma(\text{ND}) + \sigma(\text{SD}) + \sigma(\text{DD})$

$\sim 30\% (\text{inel})$

D.Piparo
Forward physics at the LHC and beyond

- **ATLAS**: MBTS, LUCID, ZDC, ALFA up to 13 units in \( \eta \).
- **CMS**: HF, BSC, ZDC, CASTOR
- **ALICE**: V0A, V0C, ZDC
- **LHCf** – first results → Completed operations at 900 GeV and 7 TeV.
- Important input for MC low \( x \) & shower simulation in cosmic ray physics (>10^{15} eV)
  - talk on Pierre Auger Observatory status (goal to understand range > 10^{18} eV)

**CMS**: PYTHIA D6T the best. PHOJET fails
For dijets – all MC fail

**ATLAS**: PHOJET is close to data
Beyond single-particle densities
(correlations, fluctuations, etc.)
CMS taking the lead!

- Explored lower pT tracking range earlier than ATLAS
- Short range correlations have been studied at 0.9, 2.36 and 7 TeV
- Background was from track-mixing techniques

Description in terms of cluster size and width: (K. Eggert et al., Nucl. Phys. B86:201, 1975)

- PYTHIA fails to describe cluster sizes
- Agreement with other experiments is fair
CMS observation of a ridge-like structure in pp collisions


First observation of a long-range, near-side feature in two-particle correlation functions in hh collisions!

\[ R(Dh, Dj) = \langle \left( N - 1 \right) \left( \frac{S_N(Dh, Dj)}{B_N(Dh, Dj)} - 1 \right) \rangle_N \]

Particle densities in the high multiplicity events of pp collisions begin to approach those in high-energy collisions of nuclei

Do we see same features in pp as in AA?

→ Wait for ATLAS/ALICE

I would be interested in the relative height of the ridge structure compared to the peak at |\eta|\sim0 (truncated by CMS!)

The ridge-structure could be missing by previous experiments due to low statistics (see dA reaction)
Example from recent past..

ZEUS, Nuclear Physics B 786 (2007) 181

- seemingly simple process (DIS, ep) looks like AA collisions!
Angular correlation measurements

- Major focus:
  - UE studies & MC comparison
- MC fails everywhere where it can fail
correlations
+ Hanbury-Brown-Twiss

Exponential form = \( \exp(-Qr) \)

Gaussian form = \( \exp(-Q^2r^2) \)

Exponential shape.
Multiplicity dependence
First measurements from ALICE!

Source radius increases with multiplicity, consistent with previous measurements.

Well known behavior in nuclear collisions.

Gaussian form to fit the signal (exponential form is a cross check!)
Back to the history..

If the power law is confirmed in the small $Q^2$ region by future experiments, this is in contradiction to the conventional Gaussian or Bessel-type parametrization of Bose-Einstein correlations. Furthermore, it is important to note that even in the larger $Q^2$ region ($0.006 < Q^2 < 1 \text{ GeV}^2$) conventional Bose-Einstein parametrization and power law are indistinguishable. So, self-similarity of the correlation function is in fact even there an interpretation alternative to the conventional view of Bose-Einstein correlations (the latter relating the low $Q^2$ enhancement to the static size of an interaction region).

Density fluctuations in NA22, by W.Kittel, 1993

(iv) It is found that the Gaussian distribution, the exponential function and power functions of Lorentzian for $E_{\gamma}^2$ show almost the same $\chi^2$-values in analyses of the data of NA44 Collaboration in both frameworks. In other words, we cannot determine a concrete source function from the data of NA44 Collaboration.

correlations

Bose - Einstein

+ Hanbury-Brown-Twiss

\[ R(Q_{12}) = \alpha (1 + \beta Q_{12}) (1 + \lambda e^{-r^2 Q_{12}^2}) , \]

No need for this ad-hoc term
→ “deep” naturally comes from the tau-model

Presented by W.Metzger
High-pT physics
High-pT EWK

- EWK cross sections at highest CM energies!
- Perfect agreement with the SM

\[ \int L \, dt = 198 \, \text{nb}^{-1} \]

**NNLO, MSTW08 68\% CL prediction**

\[ \sigma( pp \rightarrow W+X \rightarrow \ell\nuX ) \quad [ \text{nb} ] \]

\[ \begin{align*}
W \rightarrow \mu\nu & \quad 9.14 \pm 0.33_{\text{stat}} \pm 0.58_{\text{syst}} \pm 1.00_{\text{lumi}} \, \text{nb} \\
W \rightarrow e\nu & \quad 9.34 \pm 0.36_{\text{stat}} \pm 0.70_{\text{syst}} \pm 1.03_{\text{lumi}} \, \text{nb} \\
W \rightarrow \nu (\text{combined}) & \quad 9.22 \pm 0.24_{\text{stat}} \pm 0.47_{\text{syst}} \pm 1.01_{\text{lumi}} \, \text{nb}
\end{align*} \]

**ATLAS/CMS:**
A.Alonso
A.Magnan

High-pT jets

- With only \( \sim 10 \text{ pb}^{-1} \) of LHC data, the reach in jet transverse momentum at the LHC will be twice that attained by previous experiments.
- Not there yet.
Jet substructure / track jets

PYTHIA fails, PHOJET OK
(opposite to MinBias results!)

Jet substructure is important for searches of boosted jets from TeV-scale particles
(i.e., for searches of extra dimensions, parallel universes etc.)
Jet substructure / track jets

PYTHIA fails, PHOJET OK
(opposite to MinBias results!)

Jet substructure is important for searches of boosted jets from TeV-scale particles
(i.e. for searches of extra dimensions, parallel universes etc.)

For jet measurements, CMS and ATLAS already live in parallel universes:
- anti-kT jet cone sizes 0.5, 0.7 for CMS and 0.4, 0.6 for ATLAS!

\[ \left\langle \frac{1}{r} \frac{d^2 N}{dr d\phi} \right\rangle_{\text{jets}} = \frac{1}{A N_{\text{jet}}} \sum_{\text{jets}} \int_{0}^{\Delta r/2} p_T(r - \Delta r/2, r + \Delta r/2) \]
**Searches**

- **Searches for Higgs and physics beyond the Standard Model** will be the primary task of the LHC.
- Most simple observables at highest $-p_T$ do not indicate deviations from the SM.
- But exotic physics may exhibit itself through multi-object final states (leptons, jets etc.) at medium $p_T$'s.
  - Example: decays with copious lepton production in LeptoSusy with a long decay chain for charginos decaying to stable sleptons and leptons (~4).

**Techniques developed for the description of multihadron production can be useful!**
from young to mature

from the LHC to
TEVATRON, HERA, RHIC, SVD-2, BaBar, NA49, NA61, L3
During this meeting, known as NOT the world's highest-energy particle collider

But as high-statistics, high-precision well-understood experiments with $\sim 10 \text{ fb}^{-1}$ of pp data

Because of this, TEVATRON is the main competitor of LHC for many discovery channels and provides reference QCD measurements for early LHC results

Probing cross sections at 1 pb level!

A. Safonov

see “Higgs searches at the TEVATRON”
HERA (1992-2007)
- 820-920 GeV p, 27 GeV e⁺
- 2001 HERA II Lumi upgrade + polarised e⁺
- Machine operation ended in June 2007
- About 0.5 fb⁻¹ per experiment collected

Q² (photon virtuality):
- Q²~0 (<1 GeV²) - Photoproduction: photon-proton scattering
- Q²>1 GeV² - Deep Inelastic Scattering (DIS), probing the proton structure

During this meeting, we get used to speak about “HERA” results, rather than H1, and ZEUS results
- unique information on proton structure over wide x
- combined results with stunning precision. Very convincing.
- elaborate experimental techniques
- unique role in HEP as the only world’s ep collider with clean and well understood environment
Precision is good enough to discriminate between different theory predictions!
Combined H1+ZEUS results on searches for isolated leptons and missing pX

Not yet “HERA result”, but good agreement between H1 and ZEUS - in pipeline to be combined.
Next challenge after HERA

Due to its angular acceptance and low trigger thresholds, events at LHCb will probe a totally unexplored kinematic region. In particular it will have access to low-x at both high and low $Q^2$.

Using $\sim 50\text{ nb}^{-1}$ of data LHCb find 66 $W$s and 2 $Z$s in agreement with expectations.
BaBar

• Collected world’s largest sample of $\Upsilon(3S)$ in 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particle</th>
<th>Rate (fb$^{-1}$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\Upsilon(4S)$</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Upsilon(3S)$</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Upsilon(2S)$</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (mostly off-resonant)</td>
<td>$\sim$60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiment</th>
<th>$\Upsilon(3S)$</th>
<th>$\Upsilon(2S)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Babar</td>
<td>120 M</td>
<td>100 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belle</td>
<td>11 M</td>
<td>175 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEO</td>
<td>6 M</td>
<td>9 M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\Upsilon(3S) \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^- \Upsilon(1S)$

$\Upsilon(3S) \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^- \Upsilon(2S)$

$\Upsilon(2S) \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^- \Upsilon(1S)$
Heavy-ion program

- RHIC has a very active program to study strongly interacting matter under extreme conditions: high temperature and high density
  - \( \eta' \) mass reduction, correlation studies (direct impact on LHC studies!)
  - Searches for quark-gluon plasma
  - Testing hydrodynamics description of particle production
  - Understanding of energy loss
  - Relevant for high-multiplicity pp events and future heavy-ion LHC program!

Talks: T.Csorgo, Y.Hama, T. Trainor, C.Vale, M. Tokarev, Zborovsky, C. Marquet etc

1. Nuclei (initial condition)
2. Pre-equilibrium state collision
3. Quark Gluon Plasma thermalization, expansion
4. Hadron gas cooling with expansion
5. Individual hadrons freeze out

space-time picture of heavy-ion collisions
Probing quark-gluon plasma

For pp collisions with high associated multiplicity and with transverse energy $\sim 10$ GeV per unit rapidity, it is possible that quark-gluon plasma is produced. If so, a produced secondary high-pT quark or gluon might lose tens of GeV of its initial transverse momentum while plowing through quark-gluon plasma in its local environment. *(unpublished FERMILAB-Pub-82/59-THY, J.D.Bjorken)*

$$R_{AA} \sim \text{Yield}(AA)/\text{Yield}(pp)$$

Now one of the standard measurements!

After first decade of RHIC running, PHENIX is close to produce a complete picture of energy losses using identified particles and jets!
Experiments for searches for collective phenomena

- **SVD program:**
  - Cherenkov gluon emission;
  - Gluon Dominance Model (GDM)
  - Clusterization; turbulence phenomena.
- continue this Fall (2010)

**NA61 (Shine) experiment:**
Successor and extension of NA49
- Critical Point and
- Onset of Deconfinement

\[ p + C @ 31 \text{ GeV} \]
Summary

• **LHC experiments are dominant players**
  – Multiparticle results at highest ever energies are a major milestone on our road to understand multihadron production and soft QCD
  – MC comparisons:
    • Generally, all fail (multiplicities, strangeness, baryon production etc..)
    • Tunes which agree for some measurements, fail for others
  – Too high expectations? Maybe we will be less confused considering MCs as a tool to embed data into a theoretically-motivated fit every time we enter new energies?
  – Generally, good agreement with NLO for jets and electroweak measurements

• **Combined results from HERA experiments**
  – HERA PDF's lead to ~2% accuracy on W measurements at the LHC!
  – ~5% uncertainties using separate H1 and ZEUS data

• **7 fb⁻¹ collected by each experiment at Tevatron**
  – Sensitive to cross sections below 1 pb. Most precise W measurements

• **Ongoing heavy-ion program to understand energy losses and other phenomena**
Same (philosophical) remark

If you still believe in the evolutionary theory:

“Each child as he develops is retracing the whole history of mankind, physically and spiritually, step by step. A baby starts off in the womb as a single tiny cell, just the way the first living thing appeared in the ocean. Weeks later, as he lies in the amniotic fluid of the womb, he has gills like a fish.

-child development author Dr. Spock-

So do the newborn LHC experiments when retracing the whole history of HEP in their early measurements

Many discussed topics are known for 40-50(!) years:

- Strangeness production
- Multiplicities, KNO scaling (1970, Polyakov and of Koba, Nielsen and Olesen)
- Correlations, cluster models (Eggert 1975)
- BE correlations (Hanbury, Brown, Twiss, 1954, Goldhaber et al. 1959)
Discovery vs rediscovery

CERN-EP/83-73
3 June 1983

EXPERIMENTAL OBSERVATION OF LEPTON PAIRS OF INVARIANT MASS
AROUND 95 GeV/c² AT THE CERN SPS COLLIDER

UA1 Collaboration, CERN, Geneva, Switzerland

ABSTRACT

We report the observation of four electron-positron pairs and one muon pair which have the signature of a two-body decay of a particle of mass \( \sim 95 \text{ GeV/c}^2 \).

These events fit well the hypothesis that they are produced by the process

\[ \bar{p} + p \rightarrow Z^0 + X \text{ (with } Z^0 \rightarrow \ell^+ + \ell^- \text{), where } Z^0 \text{ is the Intermediate Vector Boson postulated by the electroweak theories as the mediator of weak neutral currents.} \]

Rediscoveries
By ATLAS/CMS:

+ top candidates
After 40 years (Paris, 1970)

  - How to describe hh collision events at ~ few GeV with >2 outgoing hadrons?
  - No theory telling to an experimentalist what exactly to look for
    - only a few models around (L. Van Hove's longitudinal phase space model etc.)
After 40 years (Paris, 1970)

  – How to describe $hh$ collision events at ~ few GeV with >2 outgoing hadrons?
  – No theory telling to an experimentalist what exactly to look for
    • only a few models around (L. Van Hove's longitudinal phase space model etc.)

• Now:
  – TeV-scale collisions, monstrous colliding experiments and collaborations
  – >10k produced charged particles (ALICE), >7 jets, $>10^6$ of W/Z bosons
  – Digital data recording. Computer-intensive pattern recognition
  – Theory:
    • The Standard Model!
    • Sophisticated analytical calculations (pQCD+LHPD)
    • Numerical LO, NLO, NNLO, N...LO calculations
    • Monte Carlo generators
  – Theory-driven experimental research!
Experimental results from the LHC and high-precision measurements from HERA, RHIC, LEP, BaBar and TEVATRON are good snapshot of our progress in experimental HEP!

Apologize to the speakers whose plots are not shown (time & my limitation)

Thanks to the organizers, conveners and the speakers for very inspiring meeting

Organizing Committee
P. Van Mechelen (co-chair)
N. Van Remortel (co-chair)
E. De Wolf (honorary chair)
X. Janssen
H. Jung
K. Kutak
P. Marage
A. De Roeck
R. Rougny
S. Van Mierlo

Happy 40th Anniversary

Happy anniversary! Happy retirement!