#### Particle Production and Fragmentation at HERA

- HERA kinematics
- Charged particle production
- Strangeness production at high Q<sup>2</sup>
- Charm fragmentation into D\*
- Summary

#### Grażyna Nowak IFJ PAN Kraków



representing the H1 and ZEUS Collaborations



#### e<sup>±</sup>p Collider HERA HERA I unpolarised e<sup>±</sup> beams 1992-2000 HERA II polarised e<sup>±</sup> beams 2002-2007



0.5 fb<sup>-1</sup> per experiment (H1 and ZEUS)

G. Nowak

#### **HERA** kinematics



$$Q^2 = -Q^2$$
 exchanged 4-momentum squared  
 $s = (P + e)^2$  ep center of mass energy squared  
 $W^2 = (P + q)^2$  hadronic final state mass squared  
 $x_{Bj} = Q^2/2qP$  Bjorken scaling variable

non-perturbative process leading to hadrons: light, strange, heavy

in the hadronic final state

Two regimes:  $Q^2 < 1 \text{ GeV}^2$  photoproduction ( $\gamma p$ )  $Q^2 > 1 \text{ GeV}^2$  Deep Inelastic Scattering (*DIS*)

#### LO QCD Models for DIS ep Interactions



Hadronisation of partons with Lund string model...

Particle Production and Fragmentation at HERA

BEACH 2010, Perugia

4

## Transverse momenta of charged particles in DIS

5<Q<sup>2</sup><100 GeV<sup>2</sup>

charged tracks in LAB;  $p_T > 0.15$  GeV,  $20^{\circ} < \theta < 155^{\circ}$ 

Expect discrimination between models:

low  $p_T$  region : sensitive to hadronization effects,

high p<sub>T</sub> region: sensitive to parton dynamic

**CCFM** (CASCADE) is above the data

data well describe by **CDM** (DJANGOH) over the whole  $p_{\tau}^*$  spectrum

**DGLAP** (RAPGAP) for  $p_{\tau}^* > 1$  GeV below the data

 $p_{T}^*$  distribution in 1.5< $\eta^*$ <2.5 region

G. Nowak

5



#### $\eta^*$ distributions of charged particles



low  $p_{\tau}^* < 1$  Gev

high  $p_{\tau}^* > 1$  GeV



#### low $p_T^*$

strong dependence on hadronization parameters

weak dependence on parton dynamics

#### high $p_T^*$

strong dependence on parton dynamics weak dependence on hadronization param.

 $\eta^*$  distributions of charged particles in (x,Q<sup>2</sup>) bins



**CDM** (DJANGOH) in better agreement with data

Differences between models larger at low  $Q^2$  and low x

# Scaled momentum spectra of charged particles in dijet- $\gamma p$ and in DIS



jet formation = parton showering & hadronization

npQCD

fixed order in  $\alpha_s$  calculations

or **resummation approach e.g. MLLA** (Modified Leading-Logarithmic Approximation)

pQCD

from partons to hadrons:

Local Parton Hadron Duality (**LPHD**) hypothesis: charged-hadron and parton distributions are related by a constant normalization scaling factor  $\kappa^{ch}$ 

•  $\kappa^{ch}$  is process independent

#### **Predictions:**

- momentum spectra of partons in the cone around the initial parton, at scales above some minimum cutoff, Λ<sub>eff</sub>
- shape of spectrum ~Gaussian

•  $\Lambda_{eff}$  process independent

Test MLLA+LPHD approach;  $\Lambda_{eff}$ ,  $\kappa^{ch}$  universality

 $\Lambda_{eff}$ ,  $\kappa^{ch}$  measured in other processes

**Prediction**:

#### Scaled momentum distributions

 $\mathsf{E}_{\mathsf{jet}}$ 



 $x_p =$ 



#### **2-jets events in photoproduction**

Extraction of  $\Lambda_{eff}$ 

- fit gaussian 1 around the arithmetic mean of the  $\xi$  distribution
- fit dependence of the peak position on energy scale

Λ<sub>eff</sub> = 275±4(stat.)<sup>+4</sup>-8(syst.)MeV





no dependence on energy scale weak dependence on cone opening angle  $\theta_c$ 

data for different processes support the **universality of**  $\Lambda_{eff}$  parameter

Extraction of  $\kappa^{ch}$  from the fit to the shape of  $\xi$  distribution

 $\kappa^{ch} = 0.55 \quad 0.01(stat.)^{+0.03}_{-0.02}(syst.)^{+0.11}_{-0.09}$  (theo.)

from pp<sup>-</sup>  $\kappa^{ch} = 0.56 \quad 0.05(stat.) \quad 0.09(syst,)$  data support the **universality of**  $\kappa^{c}$  parameter

## $x_p$ distributions in DIS

#### 10 < Q<sup>2</sup> < 40960 GeV<sup>2</sup>





#### MLLA+LPHD predictions

parameters from  $e^+e^-$  (LEP) low and high  $Q^2$  – too many particles agreement at medium  $Q^2$ 



observation of

comparison of *ep* data (ZEUS and H1) to *e*+*e*- results supports the concept of **quark fragmentation universality** 

G. Nowak

Particle Production and Fragmentation at HERA

## Hadronic final state charge asymmetry in high Q<sup>2</sup> DIS



Particle Production and Fragmentation at HERA

## Strangeness Production in DIS ep Scattering



non-perturbative process: hadronisation

LUND string fragmentation model strangeness suppression factor

 $\lambda_s = P(s)/P(q)$ 



13

Particle Production and Fragmentation at HERA

 $K_{s}^{0}$  differential prod. x-secs in LAB in  $Q^{2},\eta,p_{T}$ 





# Ratio of x- sections: $K^0_{\rm s}$ /charged hadrons



$${
m e}\,{
m p}
ightarrow{
m e}\,{
m K}_s^0\,{
m X}$$
 /  ${
m e}\,{
m p}
ightarrow{
m e}\,{
m h}^{\pm}\,{
m X}$ 



h in the same kinematic region as  $K_{s}^{0}$ 

- ratio rises strongly with p<sub>T</sub>
- ~ constant as a function of  $Q^2$  and  $\eta$

LO Monte Carlos with  $\lambda_s = 0.286$  describe the data



G. Nowak

Particle Production and Fragmentation at HERA

BEACH 2010, Perugia

## Charm fragmentation into D\*

Prod. of a charmed hadron = **perturbative production** of *c*-quark & non-perturbative transition of *c*-quark into a charmed had.

Transition process characterized by the transfer of the quark energy to a given hadron parametrized by fragmentation functions.

Parameters determined in e+e- experiments

check in *ep* experiments **universal**?

observables

$$e_{+e_{-}} \mathbf{Z} \sim \mathbf{E}_{D^{*}}/\mathbf{E}_{beam}$$
  
 $e_{p} \mathbf{Z}_{hem}$  and  $\mathbf{Z}_{jet}$ 

wy of the equarly)

#### Jet method (ZEUS,H1)

*E* of the *c*-quark is approximated by *E* of the reconstructed D\*jet  $z_{jet} = (E + p_{\parallel})_{D^*} / (E + p)_{iet}$ 



Hemisphere method (H1)

*E* of the *c* quark is approx. by *E* of the reconstructed D\* hemisphere z<sub>hem</sub>=(E+p<sub>||</sub>)<sub>D\*</sub>/∑<sub>hem</sub>(E+p)



Particle Production and Fragmentation at HERA

BEACH 2010, Perugia

16

## Charm fragmentation in Photoproduction

 $Q^2 < 1 \text{ GeV}^2$ , 130<  $W_{\gamma p} < 280 \text{ GeV}$ at least one jet (reconstructed with  $k_T$  clustering algorithm)  $E_T$ (jet)>9 GeV ,  $|\eta^{\text{jet}}|<2.4$ 

 $D^* \rightarrow D^0 \pi_S \rightarrow K \pi \pi_S$   $p_T(D^*)>2 \text{ GeV},$   $|η(D^*)|<1.5$ associated with a jet

value of  $\epsilon$  parameter extracted from fitting MC predictions to the data

 $\epsilon = 0.062 \ 0.007(\text{stat.})^{+0.008}_{-0.004}(\text{syst.})$ 

Consistent with the value 0.05 obtained from e+e- experiments

Comparison with Peterson fragmentation function (one free parameter ε) in PYTHIA



## Charm fragmentation in Photoproduction



## Comparison with NLO QCD calculations from Frixione-Mangano-Nason-Rudolfi (FMNR)



Particle Production and Fragmentation at HERA

BEACH 2010, Perugia

## Charm fragmentation in DIS

2< Q<sup>2</sup> <100 GeV<sup>2</sup>

D<sup>\*</sup>→D<sup>0</sup>π<sub>S</sub>→Kππ<sub>S</sub> 1,5< p<sub>T</sub>(D<sup>\*</sup>) < 15 GeV,  $|η(D^*)|<1.5$ jets found by  $k_T$  cluster algorithm

<u>**D**\* jet sample</u> jet containing the D\* meson  $E_T(jet)>3$  GeV

no D\* jet sample

no such jet is allowed



0.4

0.2

0.6

0.8

**Z**<sub>hem</sub> Kartvelishvili (α) Peterson (ε) **4.3**<sup>+0.5</sup>-0.4 0.035+0.007 jet method (higher excited charm states included) -0.006 hemisp. meth. 4.4<sup>+0.6</sup>-0.5 0.030+0.007 (from  $e+e-\epsilon=0.04$  with the same setting) -0.006 fragmentation universality Both methods give consistent results in e+e- and ep processes 19

#### Charm fragmentation in DIS

Events without a D\*jet with  $E_T>3$  GeV  $\rightarrow$  investigation of charm fragmentation close to the kinematic threshold possible due to hemisphere method.

values of fitted parameters:

Kartvelishvili (α)Peterson (ε)10.3+1.90.006+0.003-1.60.006+0.003

significantly **different** from values obtained for the D\*jet sample

No D\*<sup>±</sup> jet sample 1/ס dס/dz <sub>hem</sub> H1 Data 3.5 **RAPGAP**  $\alpha$  = 10.3 + 1.9 **RAPGAP**  $\alpha$  = 10.3 - 1.6 3 RAPGAP  $\alpha = 4.4$ 2.5 2 1.5 artvelishvili F 1 0.5 1.5 R 0.5 0.4 0.6 0.2 0.8 **Z**<sub>hem</sub>

Comparison with RAPGAP

(LO ME+DGLAP) simulations

The QCD model with the same value for the fragmentation function parameter is not able to describe charm fragmentation consistently in the full phase space down to the kinematic threshold

Studies also performed with CASCADE and NLO QCD – same conclusions

#### Summary

Charged particles production has been studied in photoproduction and DIS processes at HERA.

The production is sensitive to the fragmentation parameters.

The extracted parameters support the hypothesis of fragmentation universality between ep and e+e- porcesses.

Production of neutral strange mesons is well describe by LO Monte Carlos.

LO MC models and NLO calculations fail to provide a consistent description of charm fragmentation over the full space down to the kinematic threshold.

## Back-up slides



#### **Inclusive x-section**

$$\sigma_{vis}$$
 = 531 ± 17(stat.)<sup>+37</sup><sub>-39</sub>(syst.) pb



 $\sigma(ep \rightarrow eK_{s}^{0}X)/\sigma(ep \rightarrow eX)$ 



**density** ~ 0.4

no dependence on  $Q^2$  models predictions consistent with a small falling at higher x

## Frames of reference

#### LAB frame

 $\eta$  = -Intan( $\theta$ /2)  $\theta$  with respect to proton direction  $\eta$  >0 proton direction

#### **Breit frame:**

photon and proton are moving collinearly photon has momentum *Q* but no energy, photon direction defines the negative z-axis



#### **Hadronic Center of Mass**



Particle Production and Fragmentation at HERA

BEACH 2010, Perugia





In the current region the contribution of *s* quark in enhanced and equals the heavy *cb* quarks contribution in the region of high  $x_p^{CBF}$ 

## ratios: MC/data of $p_T^*$ distributions in (*x*, *Q*<sup>2</sup>) bins



strongest disagreement between both models (DGLAP, CDM) and the data at high  $p_T^*(p_T^*>1 \text{ GeV})$ at low  $Q^2$  and low x



 $\eta^*$  distributions of charged particles in  $(x, Q^2)$  bins



Reasonable description of the data for all  $(Q^2, x)$  bins by models with different parton dynamics: DGLAP (RAPGAP) and CDM (DJANGOH)  $p_{T}^{*}$ < 1 GeV



- dominant contributions from light quarks (u,d)
- heavy quarks (c,b) as the second dominant contribution
- the fraction of s quarks increases at high  $p_T$

## $K_{s}^{0}$ diff. x-sec in Breit frame in $p_{T}^{Breit}, x_{p}^{Breit}$







- s-quark from hard processes preferentially
- less sensitivity to λ<sub>s</sub> with respect to the target hem. or laboratory frame

#### target region

- hadronization process predominantly
- more sensitivity to  $\lambda_{s}$

CDM and MEPS with  $\Lambda_s = 0.286$  better describe the differential x-sections



G. Nowak

Particle Production and Fragmentation at HERA

BEACH 2010, Perugia

## Charm fragmentation in Photoproduction

photoproduction  $Q^2 < 1 \text{ GeV}^2$ , 130<  $W_{\gamma p} < 280 \text{ GeV}$ at least one jet (reconstructed with  $k_T$  clustering algorithm)  $E_T(jet) > 9 \text{ GeV}$   $|\eta^{jet}| < 2.4$  $D^* \rightarrow D^0 \pi_S \rightarrow K \pi \pi_S$ 

 $p_T(D^*)>2$  GeV,  $|\eta(D^*)|<1.5$ associated with a jet

#### ZEUS



## Charm fragmentation in DIS



#### $2 < Q^2 < 100 \text{ GeV}^2$

 $D^* \rightarrow D^0 \pi_s \rightarrow K \pi \pi_s$ 

 $1,5 < p_T(D^*) < 15 \text{ GeV},$  $|\eta(D^*)| < 1.5$ 

jets found by  $k_T$  cluster algorithm

<u>D\* jet sample</u> jet containing the D\* meson  $E_T(jet)>3 \text{ GeV}$ N(D\*)=1508 68(stat.)

no D\* jet sample

N(D\*)=1363 54(stat.)



## Comparison with fragmentation models in PYTHIA





PYTHIA with symmetric Lund string fragmentation f.+ modif. for heavy quarks (Bowler f.)  $r_Q = 1$  (default setting) gives a reasonable description deviation increases with decreasing value of  $r_Q$  PYTHIA with Peterson fragm. function

value of  $\varepsilon$  parameter extracted from fitting MC to the data

 $\epsilon = 0.062 \ 0.007(stat.) + 0.008 - 0.004 (syst.)$ 

Consistent with the value 0.05 obtained from e+e- experiments



G. Nowak

BEACH 2010, Perugia

#### **Comparison with RAPGAP simulation**

 $\begin{array}{c} \text{RAPGAP} \text{ (LO ME + DGLAP evolutions)} \\ \textbf{D}^{\star^{\pm}} \text{ jet sample} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \textbf{D}^{\star^{\pm}} \text{ jet sample} \end{array}$ 1/ס dס/dz <sub>jet</sub> 1/ס dס/dz <sub>hem</sub> H1 Data H1 Data 3.5 3.5 RAPGAP  $\alpha = 4.4 \pm 0.6$ RAPGAP  $\alpha$  = 4.3 + 0.5 3 3 **RAPGAP**  $\alpha$  = 4.3 - 0.4 **RAPGAP**  $\alpha$  = 4.4 - 0.5 2.5 2.5 2 2 1.5 1.5 1 Kartvelishvili FF 0.5 jet method .5 hemisphere method 1.5 1.5 R ≌ MC/data= 1 0.5 0.2 0.5 0.4 0.8 0.6 0.4 0.2 0.6 0.8 Z<sub>jet</sub> **Z**<sub>hem</sub> Kartvelishvili (α) Peterson (ɛ) **4.3**<sup>+0.5</sup>-0.4 0.035+0.007 jet method ALEPH setting (higher res. included) -0.006 4.4<sup>+0.6</sup>-0.5 0.030+0.007 (from e+e- ε=0.04 **fragm.universality**) hemisp. meth. -0.006 **3.1**<sup>+0.3</sup> jet method 0.061 + 0.011 default PYTHIA setting (w/o higher res.) -0.3 -0.009 **3.3**<sup>+0.4</sup>-0.4 hemisp. meth 0.049 + 0.012 -0.010 Both methods give consistent results all settings reasonably describe the data Similar results obtained with CASCADE simulation ( $k_T$  factorization+CCFR evolution)

Jet sample

**Comparison with NLO QCD calculations** Jet sample



Predictions from: NLO QCD program HVQDIS with fixed flavour number scheme using the independent *c*-quark fragmentation into D\* mesons

Data corrected to the parton level

Poor description if Peterson FF used

Good description of the data with Kartvelishvili parametrization α **3.8**<sup>+0.3</sup><sub>-0.3</sub> jet method 3.3+0.4 hemisphere method



-0.4

## Comparison with NLO QCD calculations no jet sample

Data corrected to the parton level Predictions from NLO QCD program HVQDIS

Events without a D\*jet with  $E_T>3$  GeV  $\rightarrow$  investigation of charm fragmentation close to the kinematic threshold possible due to hemisphere method.

The values for the best fits:

Kartvelishvili (param α)Peterson (param. ε) $6.1^{+0.9}_{-0.8}$  $0.007^{+0.001}_{-0.001}$ 

Predictions with fragmentation parameters obtained from D\*jet sample are not able to describe the no D\*jet data.



The same observation is true for the QCD models(RAPGAP,CASCADE): fragmentation parameters fitted to the D\*jet sample differ significantly from those for the no D\*jet sample

## Hadronic final state charge asymmetry in high Q<sup>2</sup> DIS

100<Q<sup>2</sup><8000 GeV<sup>2</sup> <u>pos - neg</u> Asymmetry pos + neg  $0.02 < X_p < 0.05$  $0.05 < X_p < 0.1$  $0 < X_{p} < 0.02$ (0, م, 4(x, 0) (0, d 0.4 H1 Data Х,<sup>д</sup> 0.4 at low  $Q^2$  (low  $x_{Bi}$ ) asymmetry ~ 0 CDM HERWIG 0.2 0.2 0 as  $Q^2$  increases asymmetry develops at high x<sub>p</sub> 10 10<sup>2</sup> 10 10<sup>2</sup> 10  $10^{2}$ Q (GeV) Q (GeV) Q (GeV) at low  $x_{D}$  it remains ~ 0  $0.2 < X_p < 0.3$  $0.3 < X_p < 0.4$  $0.1 < X_p < 0.2$ (0, d<sup>0,4</sup> (0, d %) A(x, b) A(x, (0,<sup>,d</sup> 0.4 behaviour consistent with 0.2 0.2 0.2 expectations from charged asymmetry of valence quark 10<sup>2</sup> 10<sup>2</sup> 10<sup>2</sup> 10 10 10 in the proton Q (GeV) Q (GeV) Q (GeV)  $0.4 < X_p < 0.5$  $0.5 < X_p < 0.7$  $0.7 < X_p < 1.0$ A(x<sub>p</sub>,Q) A(x<sub>p</sub>, Q) A(x<sub>p</sub>, a) Monte Carlo models describe 0.5 0.5 0.5 the magnitude and evolution of the asymmetry  $10^{2}$  $10^{2}$ 10 10  $10^{2}$ 10 Q (GeV) Q (GeV) Q (GeV)

37