

HEAVY FLAVOUR PRODUCTION*

P. Nason

INFN, Sez. di Milano, Milan, Italy

November 13, 2018

Abstract

Recent progress in Heavy Flavour Production phenomenology are discussed. In particular, the long-standing discrepancy of the Tevatron b production data is considered. It is shown that a better use of e^+e^- data in constraining the effect of fragmentation reduces the discrepancy considerably.

1 Introduction

The phenomenology of heavy flavour production has been so far a mixed success. Although the order of magnitude of the total cross sections, and the shape of differential distribution is reasonably predicted, large discrepancy are present, especially for b production.

The theoretical framework for the description of heavy flavour production is the QCD improved parton model. Besides the well-established NLO corrections to the inclusive production of heavy quark in hadron-hadron [1, 2, 3, 4], hadron-photon [5, 6, 7], and photon-photon collisions [8], much theoretical work has been done in the resummation of contributions enhanced in certain regions of phase space: the Sudakov region, the large transverse momentum region and the small- x region.

The theoretical effort involved is justified by the large variety of applications that heavy quark production physics has, in top, bottom and charm production. Besides the need of modeling these processes, heavy quark production is an important benchmark for testing QCD and parton model ideas, due to the relative complexity of the production process, the large range of masses available, and the existence of different production environments, like e^+e^- annihilation, hadron, photon-hadron and photon-photon collisions.

*Invited talk at the 6-th International Workshop on Heavy Quarks and Leptons, May 27/June 1, 2002, Vietri s/m, Salerno, Italy.

2 Total cross section for top and bottom

Top production [9, 10] has been a most remarkable success of the theoretical model. The measured cross section has been found in good agreement with theoretical calculations, as shown in fig. 1. Resummation of soft gluon effects




Figure 1: *Results on top cross sections at the Tevatron.*

[11] reduces the theoretical uncertainty in the cross section, pushing it toward the high side of the theoretical band. It remains, however, inside the theoretical band of the fixed order calculation, thus showing consistency with the estimated error.

Recently, the HERA-B experiment has measured the $b\bar{b}$ total cross section [12]. This experiment is sensitive to the moderate transverse momentum region, where the bulk of the total cross section is concentrated. Since the production is (in a certain sense) close to threshold, resummation of Sudakov effects is useful also in this case. A comparison of the HERA-b measurement with a theoretical calculation is shown in fig. 2. The HERA-b result is compatible with the central value prediction, with the b pole mass around 4.75 GeV. Higher precision may constrain further the b quark mass.




Figure 2: $b\bar{b}$ total cross section versus theoretical predictions, including resummation of soft gluons.

3 Differential distributions

CDF has a longstanding disagreement with QCD in b production. A very recent publication of the B^+ differential cross section [13] has quantified the disagreement as a factor of $2.9 \pm 0.2 \pm 0.4$ in the ratio of the measured cross section over the theoretical prediction. This discrepancy has been present since a long time, and it has been observed both in CDF and D0. Some authors [14] have argued that the discrepancy could be interpreted as a signal for Supersymmetry.

Because of the large theoretical uncertainties, this discrepancy has been often downplayed. In fact, several effects may conspire to raise the b cross section to an appropriate value. It was early recognized that small- x effects may be important in b production at the Tevatron [1]. Resummation of these effects [15, 16] leads to an increase of the cross section of the order of 30%. Threshold effects are small in this case [11], being below 15%, but they are nevertheless positive. Resummation of large $\log p_T$ yields an increase in the p_T spectrum of the order of 20% in the intermediate p_T region [17]. The presence of many possible enhancements should not lead, however, to excessive optimism. First of all, it is not clear whether these effect can be added up without overcounting. Furthermore, they are all higher order effects, and thus should not push the

cross section too far out of the theoretical band, which includes estimates of unknown higher order effects.

It has been observed since some time that an improper understanding of fragmentation effects may be one of the causes of the Tevatron discrepancy. This possibility stems from the fact that b quark cross sections are in reasonable agreement with the Tevatron measurements of the B meson spectrum, while the cross section obtained by applying a standard fragmentation function of the Peterson form [18] with $\epsilon = 0.006$ to the quark cross section yields too soft a spectrum, as can be seen in fig. 3. In ref. [19] it was suggested to study b quark




Figure 3: *Quark versus Hadron differential cross section compared to CDF data. The Hadron cross section is obtained by convoluting the quark cross section with a Peterson fragmentation function, with $\epsilon = 0.006$.*

jets rather than B meson's distributions. In fact, the jet momentum should be less sensitive to fragmentation effects than the hadron momentum. A D0 study [20] has demonstrated that by considering b jets instead of B hadrons the agreement between theory and data improves considerably (see fig. 4).

4 Fragmentation

If fragmentation effects are so important, they should be assessed very carefully before claiming a discrepancy with data. Non-perturbative fragmentation is




Figure 4: $D0$ b -jet data compared with the calculation of ref. [19].

usually introduced by writing the hadron-level cross section for B mesons as

$$\frac{d\sigma^B}{dp_T} = \int d\hat{p}_T dz \frac{d\sigma^b}{d\hat{p}_T} D(z) \delta(p_T - z\hat{p}_T), \quad (1)$$

where p_T is the hadron, and \hat{p}_T is the quark transverse momentum. Traditionally, $D(z)$ is given by the Peterson form [18]

$$D(z) \propto \frac{z(1-z)^2}{((1-z)^2 + \epsilon z)^2}. \quad (2)$$

Strictly speaking, this procedure is justifiable only in the limit of large transverse momenta (i.e. $p_T \gg m_b$). It can however be considered a rough model of the effect of fragmentation at moderate and small transverse momenta, as long as the variable z is referred to the momentum or the kinetic energy, rather than the energy or the $+$ component, of the quark momentum.

Eq. (2) is often used with $\epsilon = 0.006$ for bottom and $\epsilon = 0.06$ for charm, in conjunction with shower Monte Carlo programs. These values of ϵ were obtained from fits to inclusive heavy flavour production distributions in e^+e^- collisions. The shower Monte Carlo accounts for hard fragmentation effects (i.e. hard gluon radiation), where hard means from the typical transverse momentum of the process down to some cutoff, of the order of the hadron mass. This accounts for scaling violation in the inclusive cross section for the production heavy quarks¹.

¹The inclusive cross section for single particle production in e^+e^- collisions is sometimes

It has become common practice to adopt the value $\epsilon = 0.006$ also in conjunction with NLO calculations of b production cross sections. This practice is not totally justified, since the procedure used to obtain this value of ϵ does not match the accuracy of the NLO calculation. A better approach is possible; one can use NLL resummation of transverse momentum logarithms in the context of e^+e^- data in order to extract an appropriate non-perturbative fragmentation function, and supplement NLO heavy flavour production calculations with NLL resummation, in order to correctly account for scaling violation. The theoretical tools to do this are in fact available in the literature:

- 1 Single inclusive particle production in hadronic collisions [21]. Single hadron production are described in term of NLO single parton cross section convoluted with a NLL fragmentation function;
- 2 Heavy quark Fragmentation Function [22]; a method for the computation of the heavy quark fragmentation function at all orders in perturbation theory is developed, and applied at NLL. Several applications in e^+e^- physics have appeared [23, 24, 25, 26].
- 3 Single inclusive heavy quark production at large p_T [27]; item 1 and 2 are combined to give a NLL resummation of transverse momentum logarithms in heavy quark production;
- 4 FONLL calculation of single inclusive heavy quark production; item 3 is merged without overcounting with standard NLO calculations. This procedure has been implemented both in hadroproduction [17] and in photoproduction [28, 29].

When using these ingredients, it was found that the CDF discrepancy is considerably reduced [30]. It can be quantified as a factor of 1.7 ± 0.5 (theory) ± 0.5 (expt). Reduction in the discrepancy is due to four basic points:

- 1 FONLL calculation brings about a 20% increase in the intermediate p_T region.
- 2 The fragmentation step for going from a “perturbative” b quark to a B hadron seems to be too strong at small p_T in the CDF implementation. We get a 20% increase in the small p_T region.
- 3 A Peterson fragmentation function with $\epsilon = 0.006$ is too soft (present e^+e^- data favour values around 0.002); this is a 20% effect.

also called fragmentation function, which is often a source of confusion




Figure 5: Comparison of CDF data with the calculation of ref. [30].

- 4 A more accurate use of e^+e^- input data on the fragmentation function, described in the following section, brings about another 20% effect.

The net effect is $1.2^3 = 1.7$ and $2.9/1.7 = 1.7$, so that the 2.9 CDF discrepancy becomes our 1.7.

5 A better use of e^+e^- data on b fragmentation

$D(z)$ is extracted from fits to e^+e^- data. One has

$$\underbrace{\frac{d\sigma(e^+e^- \rightarrow B + X)}{dp}}_{\text{measured}} = \int d\hat{p} dz \underbrace{\frac{d\sigma(e^+e^- \rightarrow b + X)}{d\hat{p}}}_{\text{computed}} \underbrace{D(z)}_{\text{fitted}} \delta(p - z\hat{p}) \quad (3)$$

From the above equation it is easy to show that

$$\langle x_B^{N-1} \rangle = \langle x_b^{N-1} \rangle D_N \quad (4)$$

where

$$x_B = \frac{p}{p_{\max}}, \quad x_b = \frac{\hat{p}}{\hat{p}_{\max}}, \quad D_N = \int dz z^{N-1} D(z). \quad (5)$$

It turns out that for the computation of the hadronic cross sections, only the first few moments of the fragmentation function are important. This follows from the fact that the heavy quark hadroproduction cross section is a steeply




Figure 6: As in fig. 5, ratios of data to theory.

falling function of the transverse momentum, following roughly a power law. Assuming the form

$$\frac{d\sigma(H_1 H_2 \rightarrow b + X)}{d\hat{p}_T} \approx A \hat{p}_T^{-n} \quad (6)$$

one finds

$$\frac{d\sigma(H_1 H_2 \rightarrow b + X)}{dp_T} \approx \int dz d\hat{p}_T D(z) \frac{A}{\hat{p}_T^n} \delta(p_T - z\hat{p}_T) = \frac{A}{p_T^n} D_n = \frac{d\sigma}{d\hat{p}_T} D_n \cdot \quad (7)$$

This simple fact was noticed long ago [31, 32]. The exponent n ranges from 3 to 5 in hadronic collisions. In ref. [32] it was shown that eq. (7) is also an excellent approximation to the exact convolution.

When fitting the non-perturbative fragmentation function from e^+e^- data, the low moments relevant for hadroproduction are not well fitted. The Peterson form with $\epsilon = 0.002$ gives a good fit to the shape of the inclusive cross section, but not to the moments. For the purpose of predicting hadronic cross section it is instead better to make sure that the first few moments are accurately fitted. In fig. 7, it is shown that a fit to the second moment alone with the simple form $x(1-x)^\beta$, yields a good fit to all moments in the interesting region (i.e. between 3 and 5). We also notice that the second moment fit ($N = 2$ fit from now on), the $\epsilon = 0.002$ and the $\epsilon = 0.006$ fits differ by 20% around the $N = 4$ moment.

The reason why x fits do not yield good fits to moments is easy to explain.




Figure 7: The measured $\langle x_B^{N-1} \rangle$, compared with the perturbative NLL calculation supplemented with different non-perturbative fragmentation forms. The solid line is obtained using a one-parameter form fitted to the second moment.

The large x region in the inclusive production of heavy flavoured hadrons in e^+e^- annihilation is a very difficult region to model. It is in fact affected by large perturbative (i.e. Sudakov) and non-perturbative effects. It is unlikely that the simple forms used commonly for the non-perturbative fragmentation function can accurately model these complex effects. Thus, the large x region is usually excluded from the fits. On the other hand, this region is the most important one for moments.

From fig. 7, another important fact becomes apparent. When using NLL calculations for the perturbative part of the fragmentation function, the importance of the non-perturbative effects on moments is greatly reduced. This can be taken as an indication of the fact that the heavy quark fragmentation function is, to a considerable extent, perturbatively calculable.

6 Other B production data

The procedure of ref. [30] may affect other b production data at hadron colliders. Here I consider, as an example, the inclusive muon cross section in the central and forward region, where the muons come from the semileptonic decays of the b flavoured hadrons. These distributions were measured by the D0[33] experiment, and found to be higher than theoretical prediction by up to a factor of 4 in the forward region. The result of the calculation performed with the method of ref. [30] is reported in fig. 8. As one can see, the agreement with data is now




Figure 8: *D0 forward muon data compared with a calculation performed using the method of ref. [30].*

quite remarkable.

7 Conclusions

The theory of heavy flavour production seems to give a good qualitative description of the available data. In the case of top production, the comparison between theory and experiment is satisfactory also at a quantitative level.

Recent progress has taken place in the field of b hadroproduction. The HERA-b experiment has provided a cross section for b production at relatively

low CM energy. Some progress in understanding the role of fragmentation has considerably reduced the longstanding problem of the b momentum spectrum at the Tevatron.

Major problems do remain in the (perhaps less developed) areas of bottom production in $\gamma\gamma$ and γp collisions. A discussion of these problems is given in ref. [34].

References

- [1] P. Nason, S. Dawson and R. K. Ellis, *Nucl. Phys.* **B303** (1988) 607.
- [2] P. Nason, S. Dawson and R. K. Ellis, *Nucl. Phys.* **B327** (1989) 49–92.
- [3] W. Beenakker, W. L. van Neerven, R. Meng, G. A. Schuler and J. Smith, *Nucl. Phys.* **B351** (1991) 507–560.
- [4] M. L. Mangano, P. Nason and G. Ridolfi, *Nucl. Phys.* **B373** (1992) 295–345.
- [5] R. K. Ellis and P. Nason, *Nucl. Phys.* **B312** (1989) 551.
- [6] J. Smith and W. L. van Neerven, *Nucl. Phys.* **B374** (1992) 36–82.
- [7] S. Frixione, M. L. Mangano, P. Nason and G. Ridolfi, *Nucl. Phys.* **B412** (1994) 225–259, [hep-ph/9306337](#).
- [8] M. Drees, M. Kramer, J. Zunft and P. M. Zerwas, *Phys. Lett.* **B306** (1993) 371–378.
- [9] **CDF** Collaboration, T. Affolder *et. al.*, *Phys. Rev.* **D64** (2001) 032002, [hep-ex/0101036](#).
- [10] **D0** Collaboration, V. M. Abazov *et. al.*, [hep-ex/0205019](#).
- [11] R. Bonciani, S. Catani, M. L. Mangano and P. Nason, *Nucl. Phys.* **B529** (1998) 424–450, [hep-ph/9801375](#).
- [12] **HERA-B** Collaboration, I. Abt *et. al.*, [hep-ex/0205106](#).
- [13] **CDF** Collaboration, D. Acosta *et. al.*, *Phys. Rev.* **D65** (2002) 052005, [hep-ph/0111359](#).
- [14] E. L. Berger *et. al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86** (2001) 4231–4234, [hep-ph/0012001](#).

- [15] S. Catani, M. Ciafaloni and F. Hautmann, *Nucl. Phys.* **B366** (1991) 135–188.
- [16] J. C. Collins and R. K. Ellis, *Nucl. Phys.* **B360** (1991) 3–30.
- [17] M. Cacciari, M. Greco and P. Nason, *JHEP* **05** (1998) 007, [hep-ph/9803400](#).
- [18] C. Peterson, D. Schlatter, I. Schmitt and P. M. Zerwas, *Phys. Rev.* **D27** (1983) 105.
- [19] S. Frixione and M. L. Mangano, *Nucl. Phys.* **B483** (1997) 321–338, [hep-ph/9605270](#).
- [20] **D0** Collaboration, B. Abbott *et. al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85** (2000) 5068–5073, [hep-ex/0008021](#).
- [21] F. Aversa, M. Greco, P. Chiappetta and J. P. Guillet, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **65** (1990) 401–403.
- [22] B. Mele and P. Nason, *Nucl. Phys.* **B361** (1991) 626–644.
- [23] G. Colangelo and P. Nason, *Phys. Lett.* **B285** (1992) 167–171.
- [24] M. Cacciari, M. Greco, S. Rolli and A. Tanzini, *Phys. Rev.* **D55** (1997) 2736–2740, [hep-ph/9608213](#).
- [25] M. Cacciari and M. Greco, *Phys. Rev.* **D55** (1997) 7134–7143, [hep-ph/9702389](#).
- [26] P. Nason and C. Oleari, *Nucl. Phys.* **B565** (2000) 245–266, [hep-ph/9903541](#).
- [27] M. Cacciari and M. Greco, *Nucl. Phys.* **B421** (1994) 530–544, [hep-ph/9311260](#).
- [28] M. Cacciari, S. Frixione and P. Nason, *JHEP* **03** (2001) 006, [hep-ph/0102134](#).
- [29] S. Frixione and P. Nason, *JHEP* **03** (2002) 053, [hep-ph/0201281](#).
- [30] M. Cacciari and P. Nason, [hep-ph/0204025](#).
- [31] S. Frixione, M. L. Mangano, P. Nason and G. Ridolfi, *Adv. Ser. Direct. High Energy Phys.* **15** (1998) 609–706, [hep-ph/9702287](#).

- [32] P. Nason *et. al.*, “Bottom Production”, in the “1999 CERN Workshop on Standard Model Physics (and more) at the LHC”, CERN, Geneva, Switzerland, 25 - 26 May 1999 - CERN, Geneva, 2000, [CERN-2000-004] - pp.231-304 (1999), [hep-ph/0003142](#).
- [33] D0 Collaboration, B. Abbott *et. al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84** (2000) 5478–5483, [hep-ex/9907029](#).
- [34] P. Nason, Invited talk at 20th International Symposium on Lepton and Photon Interactions at High Energies (LP 01), Rome, Italy, 23-28 Jul 2001, [hep-ph/0111024](#).