Forward-backward asymmetry in top-antitop production in proton-antiproton collisions

Regina Demina
University of Rochester
for
D0 collaboration

7/23/2011

Asymmetry in top-antitop production

- In early 80s asymmetry observed in $e^+e^- \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$ at sqrt(s)=34.6 GeV<< M_Z was used to verify the validity of EW theory (Phys. Rev. Lett. 48, 1701–1704 (1982))





- Similarly, asymmetry in $p\bar{p} \rightarrow t\bar{t}$ production could give information about new physics
  - Mediator with axial coupling in s-channel
  - Abnormally enhanced t-channel production
- Complications:
  - Top is not observed directly, but reconstructed through its decay products
  - Proton and antiproton are not point-like objects, lab frame is different from rest frame

Definitions

- Asymmetry defined for ee→μμ

$$A = \frac{N(\cos\theta > 0) - N(\cos\theta < 0)}{N(\cos\theta > 0) + N(\cos\theta < 0)}$$



- In proton-antiproton collisions θ→y
- *Δy* is invariant to boosts along *z*-axis

$$\Delta y = y_t - y_{\bar{t}} = q_l(y_{leptonic} - y_{hadronic})$$

- Asymmetry based on Δy is the same in lab and tt rest frame

$$A = \frac{N(\Delta y > 0) - N(\Delta y < 0)}{N(\Delta y > 0) + N(\Delta y < 0)}$$

- Asymmetry based on rapidity of lepton from top decay
  - Lepton angles are measured with a good precision

$$A_l = \frac{N(q_l y_l > 0) - N(q_l y_l < 0)}{N(q_l y_l > 0) + N(q_l y_l < 0)}$$

History of measurements and predictions

D0, reconstruction level

- PRL 100, 142002(2008) $A(0.9\,fb^{-1}) = (12 \pm 8)\%$
- ICHEP2010 $A(4.3\,fb^{-1}) = (8 \pm 4)\%$

  $A(MC@NLO) = (0.8 \pm 1)\%$

CDF, generator level

- PRL 101, 202001(2008) $A(1.9\,fb^{-1}) = (24 \pm 14)\%$
- Phys. Rev. D 83,112003 (2011) $A(5.3\,fb^{-1}) = (15.7 \pm 7.4)\%$

  $A(MC@NLO) = (5.0 \pm 0.1)\%$

Reconstruction of top-antitop signal

Require :

$\rightarrow$1 lepton with $p_T > 20 GeV$

$\rightarrow \not{E}_T > 20 GeV$

$\rightarrow \geq 4$ jets with $p_T > 20 GeV$

$\rightarrow$leading jet with $p_T > 40 GeV$

$\rightarrow \geq 1$ b - tag

$\rightarrow$In kinematic fit constrain

$- M_W = 80.4 GeV$

$- M_t = 172.5 GeV$

$\rightarrow$Charge of lepton determines which reconstructed quark is top



1581 events pass the selection requirements in 5.4 fb^{-1}

Asymmetry at reconstruction level

- Using kinematic variables of *l+jets* events construct a discriminant and fit events with Δy>0 and Δy<0 for top fraction



Leading b-jet p_T



χ^2 of kinematic fit



$k_T$min



M_{jj}



Discriminant, Δy<0



Discriminant, Δy>0

$$A = (9.2 \pm 3.6^{+0.8}_{-0.9})\% \Leftrightarrow A(MC@NLO) = (2.4 \pm 0.3^{+0.7}_{-0.5})\%$$

Asymmetry dependence on M_{tt} and |Δy|



$$A = (9.2 \pm 3.6^{+0.8}_{-0.9})\%$$

$$A(MC@NLO) = (2.4 \pm 0.3^{+0.7}_{-0.5})\%$$



Generated asymmetry

- "Unfolding" =correcting for acceptance (A) and detector resolution (S)
- **Method 1**: 4 bin Likelihood unfolding :

$$\vec{n}_{reco} = SA\vec{n}_{gen} \Rightarrow \vec{n}_{gen} = A^{-1}S^{-1}\vec{n}_{reco}$$

$$\Rightarrow A = (16.9 \pm 7.7^{+1.8}_{-2.6})\%$$



Problem with Method 1: migration of events near inner bin edge ($\Delta y \rightarrow 0$) is underestimated, while for the outer edge it is overestimated

Solution: *fine* bins closer to $\Delta y=0$

Problem: statistical fluctuations in data make the fine bin unfolding unstable

Solution: employ ***regularization***

Bonus: reduced statistical uncertainties

Method 2: fine bin unfolding with regularization

$$A = (19.6 \pm 6.0^{+1.8}_{-2.6})\%$$

Results for asymmetry, in %

- Reconstruction level (experiments cannot be directly compared, only to Monte Carlo after reconstruction and selection)
  - D0 (5.4 fb^{-1}) $9.2 \pm 3.6^{+0.8}_{-0.9}$
  - MC@NLO (D0) $2.4 \pm 0.3^{+0.7}_{-0.5}$
  - CDF (5.3 fb^{-1}) 7.5 ± 3.7
  - MC@NLO (CDF) 2.4 ± 0.5
- Generator level

(experiments can be directly compared)

  - D0 $19.6 \pm 6.0^{+1.8}_{-2.6}$
  - CDF $15.8 \pm 7.2 \pm 1.7$
  - MC@NLO 5.0 ± 0.1



Lepton-based asymmetry, in %

- Since lepton direction is defined with a very good precision, lepton based asymmetry is simpler to extract
- Lepton from top decay carries information about underlying asymmetry at production
- Can be directly compared to theoretical predictions



Reconstruction level

$$A_l = 14.2 \pm 3.7 \pm 0.7$$

$$A_l(MC@NLO) = 0.8 \pm 0.3 \pm 0.5$$

Generated level

$$A_l = 15.2 \pm 3.8^{+1.0}_{-1.3}$$

$$A_l(MC@NLO) = 2.1 \pm 0.1$$

Interpretation of the Asymmetry

- Coulomb repulsion
- QED: $e^{+}\mu^{+}$
- QCD: quark-top



- Coulomb attraction
- QED: $e^{-}\mu^{+}$
- QCD: antiquarkquark-top

Predicted asymmetry in SM



$l + 4\ jets$

$data: 12.2 \pm 4.2\%$

$MC@NLO: 3.9 \pm 0.3\%$



$l + \geq 5\ jets$

$data: -3.0 \pm 7.8\%$

$MC@NLO: -2.9 \pm 0.7\%$

Born(α_s^2) and box(α_s^4)

- Coulomb-like repulsion of top and quark and attraction of antitop and quark in QCD
- Interference – α_s^3
- Positive asymmetry
- Final state with no extra partons → small transverse momentum of the tt system

ISR (α_s^3) and FSR(α_s^3)

- Interference – α_s^3
- Negative asymmetry
- Final state with extra gluons →large transverse momentum of the tt system
- Possible extra jets

Modeling of gluon radiation



- p_T^{tt} spectrum suggests that gluon radiation might be mismodeled by MC@NLO+HERWIG
- lower radiation is preferred



- best agreement with PYTHIA ISR off
- This suggests a higher contribution from 2→2 processes, e.g. Born+box

Asymmetry and gluon radiation



- MC@NLO+HERWIG suggests strong dependence of asymmetry on p_T^{tt}
- Some PYTHIA tunes suggest even more dramatic dependence while other do not – the main parameter that affects this behavior is angular coherence of ISR
- Asymmetry dependence on p_T^{tt} is a source of systematic uncertainty on the ***measured*** value of asymmetry
- Higher weight of 2→2 processes (Born+box) would shift the ***predicted*** asymmetry toward more positive and higher values

Conclusions

- Using 5.4 fb^{-1} of data D0 measured asymmetry in top-antitop production

$$A = (19.6 \pm 6.0^{+1.8}_{-2.6})\%$$
$$A(MC@NLO) = (5.0 \pm 0.1)\%$$

- Asymmetry in leptons from top decay is

$$A_l = (15.2 \pm 3.8^{+1.0}_{-1.3})\%$$
$$A_l(MC@NLO) = (2.1 \pm 0.1)\%$$



Systematics on A

TABLE VII. Systematic uncertainties on A_{FB}.

	Absolute uncertainty [a] (%)		
	Reconstruction level		Prod. level
Source	Prediction	Measurement	Measurement
Jet reco	± 0.3	± 0.5	± 1.0
JES/JER	$+0.5$	-0.5	-1.3
Signal modeling	± 0.3	± 0.5	$+0.3/-1.6$
b-tagging	-	± 0.1	± 0.1
Charge ID	-	$+0.1$	$+0.2/-0.1$
Bg subtraction	-	± 0.1	$+0.8/-0.7$
Unfolding Bias	-	-	$+1.1/-1.0$
Total	$+0.7/-0.5$	$+0.8/-0.9$	$+1.8/-2.6$

Systematics on A_l

TABLE VIII. Systematic uncertainties on A^l_{FB}.

	Absolute uncertainty [a] (%)		
	Reconstruction level		Prod. level
Source	Prediction	Measurement	Measurement
Jet reco	± 0.3	± 0.1	± 0.8
JES/JER	$+0.1$	-0.4	$+0.1/-0.6$
Signal modeling	± 0.3	± 0.5	$+0.2/-0.6$
b-tagging	-	± 0.1	± 0.1
Charge ID	-	$+0.1$	$+0.2/-0.0$
Bg subtraction	-	± 0.3	± 0.6
Total	± 0.5	± 0.7	$+1.0/-1.3$

Migration matrix