

Particle Physics Phenomenology exercise 6

1. a) Do a toy Monte Carlo “shower” simulation, using the veto algorithm, to estimate how the average x value of a quark decreases in the evolution towards higher Q scales by initial-state radiation of gluons. To be specific, assume an initial $x_0 = 0.5$ at $Q_0 = 1$ GeV and evolve to $Q = 100$ GeV for a fix $\alpha_s = 0.15$. Compare the result when you regularize the $q \rightarrow qg$ splitting kernel at a $z_{\max} = 0.9, 0.99$ and 0.999 .

Hint: You may reuse parts of the expressions from exercise 3.3, but note that the evolution now goes towards larger Q scales.

(b) Compare the result you obtain with the analytic result of exercise 4.4.

2. Assume that bunch crossings at the LHC are uniform (same number of protons per bunch, same impact-parameter profile), so that the “pileup” number of pp collisions μ per crossing is described by a Poissonian with average $\langle\mu\rangle$:

$$P_i = \frac{\langle\mu\rangle^i}{i!} \exp(-\langle\mu\rangle) .$$

a) What is the distribution of pileup events in those crossings where a Higgs is produced?

Hint: View the Higgs cross section as a vanishingly small fraction ϵ of the total cross section. Then a (binomial) expansion of $((1 - \epsilon) + \epsilon)^i$ allows you to pick up the terms related to the production of exactly one Higgs.

b) A similar argumentation can be used for the number of MPIs in a single pp collision where a Higgs is produced. The difference is that the multiplicity distribution is much broader than a Poissonian, owing to the impact-parameter dependence. As a simple example, consider a geometrical distribution

$$P_i = \frac{\langle\mu\rangle^i}{(\langle\mu\rangle + 1)^{i+1}} .$$

What distribution is then obtained for the number of additional MPIs? What are the implications, relative to the Poissonian case?

Hint: The binomial-expansion result above is still valid.

3. a) Study the properties of nondiffractive events at LHC at 8 TeV,
`SoftQCD:nonDiffractive = on`,
 e.g. the charged multiplicity distribution dP/dn_{ch} , the pseudorapidity distribution $dn_{\text{ch}}/d\eta$, the transverse momentum distribution $dn_{\text{ch}}/dp_{\perp}$, and the average transverse momentum as a function of multiplicity $\langle p_{\perp} \rangle(n_{\text{ch}})$.
 b) How are these distributions changed if MPIs are switched off,
`PartonLevel:MPI = off`?
 c) How are the distributions instead changed if colour reconnection is switched off,
`ColourReconnection:reconnect = off`?

4. Extend the exercise above with a study of forward–backward correlations. To this end, select two symmetrically located, one unit wide bins in rapidity (or pseudorapidity), with a variable central separation Δy : $[\Delta y/2, \Delta y/2 + 1]$ and $[-\Delta y/2 - 1, -\Delta y/2]$. For each event you may find n_F and n_B , the charged multiplicity in the “forward” and “backward” rapidity bins. Suitable averages over a sample of events then gives the forward–backward correlation coefficient

$$\rho_{FB}(\Delta y) = \frac{\langle n_F n_B \rangle - \langle n_F \rangle \langle n_B \rangle}{\sqrt{(\langle n_F^2 \rangle - \langle n_F \rangle^2)(\langle n_B^2 \rangle - \langle n_B \rangle^2)}} = \frac{\langle n_F n_B \rangle - \langle n_F \rangle^2}{\langle n_F^2 \rangle - \langle n_F \rangle^2} ,$$

where the last equality holds for symmetric distributions such as in pp and $\bar{p}p$. Compare how $\rho_{FB}(\Delta y)$ changes for increasing $\Delta y = 0, 1, 2, 3, \dots, 8$, with and without MPI switched on.