

Inclusive Jet Cross Section Update: 163 pb^{-1}

Blessing for Summer 2003 conferences...

We now have updated results based on 163 pb^{-1} , nearly double the data that was presented in the Spring (85 pb^{-1}) conferences.

We also have a better understanding of the energy scale uncertainty ($5\% \rightarrow 3\%$)

Analysis details can be found in CDF6298 (writeup for the blessed Spring 2003 results)

Plots collected at:

<http://ncdf76.fnal.gov/~chlebana/qcd/ana/incJet/blessSummer2003/>

- Same unsmearing procedure as used in Run I and for the preliminary Run II results
- Used offline version 4.10.4
- Redid Calorimetry and Jet reconstruction
→ corrected the falling response in the high η region...
- Using the 5.5% energy scale correction and 3% uncertainty
- Offline luminosity scaled by 1.9%

ntuples based on DataAccess located at:

```
fcdfsgi2:/cdf/data40b/s0/qcd/chlebana/jets_4.10.4
```

Good Run Selection

```
AND rc.SHIFTCREW_STATUS = 1
AND rc.RUNCONTROL_STATUS = 1
AND RC.RUNNUMBER >= 138815
AND rc.CLC_STATUS = 1
AND rc.L1T_STATUS = 1
AND rc.L2T_STATUS = 1
AND rc.L3T_STATUS = 1
AND rc.CAL_STATUS = 1
AND rc.CCAL_OFFLINE = 1
AND (rc.COT_STATUS = 1 OR rc.COT_OFFLINE = 1)
```

Started with gjet08 and gjet09 datasets: 174 pb^{-1}

Offline bits set for runs: 138815 - 163527

No “CCAL bits” for runs: 163956 - 166063 (about 26 pb^{-1})

→ *removed the `rc.CCAL_OFFLINE = 1` requirement*

Also require that event count for the J20 in ntuple match with that recorded in the database, removed 64 runs for 14 pb^{-1}

Prescale Determination

The prescale on the Level 2 15 GeV Cluster (CL15) trigger changed part way into the run.

L1 Trigger	L2 Trigger	L3 Trigger
ST5 (20)	CL15 (12, 25)	J20
	CL40 (1)	J50
ST10 (1)	CL60 (8)	J70
	CL90 (1)	J100

Need to determine the effective prescale from the data

For an independent trigger counted the number of events that “Fired” the trigger compared to the number that was “Accepted” after prescaling.

Trigger	Fired	Accepted	Effective Prescale
ST5	2.70714e+06	135998	19.9058
C15	2.83026e+06	150739	18.7759
C60	2.36417e+06	295247	8.0074

Vertex Cut Correction

→ Scaling the data by 1.05 before unsmearing.

W.K. Sakumoto and A. Hocker, “Event $|Z_{vtx}| < 60\text{cm}$ Cut Efficiency for Run II”, CDF/ANAL/ELECTROWEAK/CDFR/6331.


Event Selection

$$0.1 < |\eta_{Det}| < 0.7$$

$$|z| \leq 60 \text{ cm}$$

$$MEtSig \leq X$$

$$E_{tot} \leq 1500 \text{ GeV}$$







```

if ((jetFlag == 20)  && (metSig > 3.5)) evtOK = 0;
if ((jetFlag == 50)  && (metSig > 5))   evtOK = 0;
if ((jetFlag == 70)  && (metSig > 6))   evtOK = 0;
if ((jetFlag == 100) && (metSig > 7))   evtOK = 0;

```


CDF Run II Preliminary




Staying far away from trigger threshold effects...

Trigger	ET Range	Trigger	ET Range
J20	40 - 70	J70	95 - 130
J50	70 - 95	J100	130 - 620

For Blessing



For Blessing



Systematic Errors


Consider the same sources of systematic error as in Run I.

Details can be found in FERMILAB-Pub-01/008-E

- “hi pt” : High p_T hadronic response $+3.2\%$ -2.2% .
- “lo pt” : Low p_T hadronic response $\pm 5\%$.
- “E scale” : Energy scale stability $\pm 5\%$.
- “frag” : Fragmentation.
- “uEvt” : Underlying event $\pm 30\%$.
- “el/ph” : Electron/photon response $\pm 2\%$.
- “Res” : Calorimeter resolution $\pm 10\%$.


For Blessing

CDF Run II Preliminary



The dominant source of systematic error comes from the energy scale uncertainty (reduced from 5% to 3%).

For Blessing...



Error bands on the plots now show the total systematic error

Other Sanity Checks

- Comparisons of the MC and DATA measured distributions have the same qualitative features
- Varied the resolution functions used in the unsmearing → had a negligible effect on the corrected cross section.
- Unsmear the MC.
 - Want to see if we can get back the inputted PDF when unsmearing the Run II MC using the Run I unsmearing procedure
 - Using Pythia Tune A with CTEQ 5L (LO)
 - Combined the different samples PT 5, 10, 40, 60, 90

Issues:

The Run II MC simulation does not reproduce the Run I energy response.


Using Run I unsmearing (central calorimeter region is the same...)

Compared the unsmear results to CTEQ6.1, not CTEQ5L.

Data scatter at low E_t is a feature of weighting the MC samples (will fix this)...

Currently running over a PT 18 sample...



Graph




Looks encouraging - Does not appear that the unsmearing procedure is doing something crazy...

With the increased statistics the data is smoothing out.

For Blessing





For Blessing...




For Blessing...

CDF Run II Preliminary




For Blessing...



See same features as in Run I

Low at low E_T high at high E_T



With the increased statistics these features are more evident...

Conclusions

We now have significantly more data (more than the Run I analyzes)

Better understanding of the energy scale (5% \rightarrow 3%).

See same features as in Run I and with the increased statistics they are more evident.

Still want to do additional checks before showing the corrected cross section. **Hope to show the corrected cross section at Lepton-Photon**

Want to show *measured distributions* based on 146 pb^{-1} at EPS