Resolving the spacetime structure of jets with medium

<u>Adam Takacs</u>^{*} University of Bergen (Norway) Konrad Tywoniuk Daniel Pablos



*adam.takacs@uib.no

Resolving the spacetime structure of jets with medium

Outline:

- 1. Jets and parton showers in vacuum
- 2. Representation on the Lund plane
- 3. Results from our new parton shower
- 4. Quenching with a simplified medium



Why do we use jets?



looks simple enough

Why? QCD vertex IR-divergences!





this object exists in QCD perturbation theory

At high energies as LHC N > 1, there is no more single parton.



Parton showers



What can be the scale? (evolution variable)

Almost equivalently good choices!

Parton showers: splitting schemes

 $1 \rightarrow 2$ splitting



Altarelli-Parisi splitting function

 $2 \rightarrow 3 \text{ splitting (dipole/antenna}^*)$



Catani-Seymour splitting function

PYTHIA 6, SHERPA<1.2, PYTHIA 8,

 $\begin{array}{c} \text{HERWIG,} \\ \text{DIRE,} \\ \text{ARIADNE}^*, \\ \text{SHERPA}{>}1.2 \end{array}$

The Lund plane





Hard Probes 2020

Why are there different orderings?



Ground state hadrons

*Instead of the medium one could place the scale of MPI, hadronization relevant for vacuum studies.



Our 12 new parton showers

- All flavors and energy-momentum conversation
- Different ordering variables: $p_{\perp}, m, t_{\rm f}, \theta$
- Different splittings (momentum frame): Altarelli-Parisi $(1\rightarrow 2)$ splitting: "PYTHIA6 like" Altarelli-Parisi $(1\rightarrow 2)$ splitting with recoil: "PYTHIA8 like" Catani-Seymour dipole shower $(2\rightarrow 3)$
- Medium using quenching weights: energy shift of the particles, medium coherence effects.
 - [A. Takacs QM2019 poster]





Validation in $e^-e^+ \rightarrow jets$





Validation in e⁻e⁺ \rightarrow jets

PYTHIA8 like Differential $2 \rightarrow 3$ jet resolution (Durham algorithm) Differential $3 \rightarrow 4$ jet resolution (Durham algorithm) **** $d\sigma/d \log_{10}(y_{23})$ [pb] $d\sigma/d \log_{10}(y_{34})$ [pb] 104 104 10 $e^+e^- \rightarrow \text{jets} @ 91.2 \text{ GeV} (\text{parton level})$ $e^+e^- \rightarrow \text{jets} @ 91.2 \text{ GeV} (\text{parton level})$ 10^{2} - BerGen A-P kernel p_{\perp} ordered BerGen A-P kernel p_{\perp} ordered BerGen A-P kernel *m* ordered BerGen A-P kernel *m* ordered ----- BerGen A-P kernel t_f ordered 10 - BerGen A-P kernel *t*_f ordered 103 --- BerGen A-P kernel θ ordered BerGen A-P kernel θ ordered 20 20 deviation 10 10 deviation 00 00 -10 -10 -20 -20 -1.5 -0.5 -3.5 -2.5 -2.5 -1 -3 -1.5 -1 -4 -3.5 -3 -2 -4 -2 $\log_{10}(y_{23})$ $\log_{10}(y_{34})$ Differential $4 \rightarrow 5$ jet resolution (Durham algorithm) Differential $5 \rightarrow 6$ jet resolution (Durham algorithm) $d\sigma/d \log_{10}(y_{45})$ [pb] $d\sigma/d \log_{10}(y_{56})$ [pb] 10 10 10 10 10 $e^+e^- \rightarrow \text{jets} @ 91.2 \text{ GeV} (\text{parton level})$ $e^+e^- \rightarrow \text{jets} @ 91.2 \text{ GeV} (\text{parton level})$ 10 --- BerGen A-P kernel p_{\perp} ordered - BerGen A-P kernel p_{\perp} ordered 10 BerGen A-P kernel *m* ordered BerGen A-P kernel *m* ordered \longrightarrow BerGen A-P kernel t_f ordered \longrightarrow BerGen A-P kernel t_f ordered 10 --- BerGen A-P kernel θ ordered BerGen A-P kernel θ ordered 10 20 20 deviation leviation 10 1 *o* 00 ο σ -1 O -10 -20 -20 -2.5 -3.5 -2.5 -2 -4 -3.5 -3 -2 -1.5 -4 -3 $\log_{10}(y_{45})$ $\log_{10}(y_{56})$

Different orderings are very similar.

 θ and $t_{\rm f}$ are a bit different.



Validation in e⁻e⁺ \rightarrow jets



Different orderings are very similar.

 θ and $t_{\rm f}$ are a bit different.



Jet mass (at Leading Logarithm)



LO and LL good agreement at high m. LL captures the peak. Medium suppresses high m. Medium shifts the peak.

Ratio gets flat for unresolved masses.



Jet mass (vacuum)

PYTHIA8 like





Adam Takacs

Jet mass (medium)



PYTHIA8 like





 $m_{\rm jet} \, [{\rm GeV}/c^2]$

Dipole shower





MCnet is going to support our investigations.

- 1. Introduction of parton showers uncertainties: choice of ordering variables and splitting schemes.
- 2. Systematic study of parton shower uncertainties: 12 implemented parton showers.
- 3. E-loss and coherence are implemented by quenching weights: analytic and MC comparison.

+ Future:

ready for other observables: $z_{\rm g},~r_{\rm g},~n_{\rm SD},~m_{\rm jet},$ Lund plane, include more medium effects.



Thank you for your attention!



Quenching weight

The momentum radiated out of the jet cone is described by the quenching factor Q of each parton, resulting for n particles [1]

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}^{n}\sigma_{\mathrm{med}}(p_{\mathrm{jet}})}{\mathrm{d}p_{1}\cdot\ldots\cdot\mathrm{d}p_{n}} = Q^{n}(p_{\mathrm{jet}})\frac{\mathrm{d}^{n}\sigma_{\mathrm{vac}}(p_{\mathrm{jet}})}{\mathrm{d}p_{1}\cdot\ldots\cdot\mathrm{d}p_{n}},\qquad(1)$$

assuming that all branchings are affected by energy loss. However, a **branch is quenched only if the medium resolves its color** [2]. This takes time t_d , thus the branching formation has to be long enough, and placed inside the medium $t_d < t_f < L$. This implies a separation of time-scales of vacuum and medium-induced processes. The branches and the **quenched region** are illustrated on the Lund plane below.



Quenching is implemented by the following procedure (see Fig. 1.):

1. Generate a vacuum jet.

2. Count the splittings inside the region and forbid jump-backs.

3. Reweight the whole jet by the quenching factor (extracted from data).

[1] R. Baier, Y. L. Dokshitzer, A. H. Mueller and D. Schiff, JHEP **0109**, 033 (2001).
[2] Y. Mehtar-Tani and K. Tywoniuk, Phys. Rev. **D98**, 051501 (2018).

[A. Takacs QM2019 poster]





