arXiv:hep-ex/0101057v2  6 Feb 2001

# INTER-W BOSE-EINSTEIN CORRELATIONS ... OR NOT?

Š.TODOROVA-NOVÁ

*CERN, CH-1211 Geneva, Switzerland*
*E-mail:todorovova@cern.ch*

A critical summary is given of the present status of the study of Bose-Einstein Correlations in W-pair production at LEP II. In particular, the evidence is reviewed for or against the existence of Bose-Einstein correlations between pions originating both from a different of the two W's. If present, such an inter-W interference would not only form a potential bias in the determination of the W mass, but also would provide a laboratory to measure the space-time development of the overlap. If absent, this would drastically change the conventional (Hanbury Brown and Twiss) picture of pion interferometry in high energy physics.

## 1   Introduction

Correlations between pairs of identical particles (or, in the simplified experimental approach, pairs of like-sign particles) within a single hadronic system are a well known phenomenon, however the understanding of this effect is far from complete. Most often, it is considered to be an equivalent of the Hanbury Brown and Twiss effect in astronomy, reflecting the interference of identical bosons emitted *incoherently* from their source.

An alternative model, proposed by B.Andersson and collaborators,[1] takes into account the full process of particle production in the fragmentation of the Lund string. The correlations appear as a *coherent* effect in the hadronization process, and they are fully predicted for a given set of final particles (ordered along the string).

We are, therefore, in the situation that the experimentally observed correlations can be interpreted in two rather different ways: in the 'incoherent' approach, the shape of the correlation function reflects the shape of the source, and can be derived from the knowledge of the space-time density of the final particles regardless of the way they were produced. In the 'coherent' picture, the correlations stem directly from the string area decay law, and depend on the history of the string breaking.

For a simple hadronic system like $q\bar{q}$ from a $Z^0$ decay, it may be impossible to decide between the two possibilities, since the incoherent approach leaves the freedom of choice of the input particle density, which can be adjusted to reproduce the observed data (it should be noted, however, that the straightforward implementation of the 'incoherent' formalism fails to describe the $Z^0$ data [2]).

1

The situation is different in the study of two (partially) overlapping hadronic systems, see [3]. In the incoherent scenario, the difference between correlations within a single hadronic system, and correlations between the two systems, should depend only on the overlap of the two systems (sources). In the coherent scenario, however, the correlations between the two systems may not exist at all, even for overlapping sources (as long as there is no interaction -color flow- between them).

## 2 Measurements

In the light of the discussion above, the experimental measurement of correlations between two independent hadronic systems is of utmost interest, and LEP2 provides a unique laboratory for such a measurement in the study of the decay of a pair of $W^+W^-$ (resp.$Z^0Z^0$) bosons. The life-time of these bosons is much shorter than the typical hadronization scale, and they decay on top of each other, overlapping (partially) in momentum space.

The measurement of the size of the inter-W(Z) correlations can be done in different ways, and it is complicated by several factors, namely:

- the modeling of the effect is poor (none of the models discussed in the Introduction is fully implemented in MC generators); the most widely used model (LUBOEI/PYBOEI in Jetset [4]) consists in a simple reshuffling of momenta of final particles, leading to an artificial momentum transfer

- the effect is defined with respect to a reference (uncorrelated) sample, which is arbitrary to a large extent, and different for each collaboration/measurement

- detector effects can be important, and not easy to correct for because of model dependence of the correction factors for 2-particle spectra.

The experimental methods used by the LEP collaborations for this measurement can be roughly classified according to the level of their model dependence.

The 'model dependent' methods consist in tuning of a particular model at the $Z^0$/single-W decay and in comparison of the prediction of the model with real WW/ZZ events. Such a method was used by ALEPH.[5] The correlations between the like-sign particles (after rejection of identified electrons and muons) are defined with respect to the unlike-sign particles sample, and the double ratio with the Monte-Carlo sample is used to remove the effect of resonances as well as part of detector effects:

$$R^*(Q) = (\frac{N^{++,--}}{N^{+-}})^{\text{data}}/(\frac{N^{++,--}}{N^{+-}})^{\text{MC}}_{\text{noBE}} \qquad (1)$$

Figure 1: The double ratios $R^*$ measured in the $Z^0$ and in the fully hadronic $W^+W^-$ sample, compared to the prediction of the model tuned at $Z^0$ (PYBOEI BE$_3$).

The tuning of the PYBOEI routine is performed on the $Z^0$ sample enriched in light flavours and checked in the semileptonic W events. The residual discrepancies between data and simulation are corrected bin per bin and correction is applied on MC predictions for fully hadronic events, in the scenario with and without correlation between the two boson systems (Fig. 1). The $q\bar{q}$ background is included in the MC prediction. The data disfavour the presence of inter-W/Z correlations by 2.7 $\sigma$ (for this particular tuning of the model).

Apart from a strong model dependence built into this measurement, one may worry also about the fact that due to the use of double ratios, the model may be actually quite far from the data in a direct comparison (not reproducing the Q distribution, itself).

A different method with lower model dependence was used by OPAL.[6] It is based on a simultaneous fit of the correlation functions in $Z^0/\gamma^*$, $q\bar{q}l\nu$, and $q\bar{q}q\bar{q}$ events. The $Z^0$/WW content in these three samples is parametrized according to the selection efficiency obtained with the MC simulation. A correlation function, defined as the double ratio (1), is extracted for pairs of particles coming from $Z^0/\gamma$, single W, and from different W's in a simultaneous fit. The result is shown in Fig. 2. Unfortunately, due to the large uncertainties, the method is far from being sensitive to the effect of inter-boson correlations ($\lambda^{\mathrm{diff}}$), and no conclusions about the presence of these correlations can be made.

In the measurement published by L3,[7] the model dependence is largely

**OPAL preliminary**



Results of the simultaneous fit:

$$\lambda^{\mathrm{diff}} = 0.05 \pm 0.67 \pm 0.35$$
$$R^{\mathrm{diff}} = 1.51 \pm 0.05 \pm 0.09/\mathrm{fm}$$

$$\lambda^{\mathrm{same}} = 0.69 \pm 0.12 \pm 0.06$$
$$R^{\mathrm{same}} = 1.07 \pm 0.07 \pm 0.12/\mathrm{fm}$$

$$\lambda^{\mathrm{Z}^*} = 0.43 \pm 0.06 \pm 0.0$$
$$R^{\mathrm{Z}^*} = 1.01 \pm 0.08 \pm 0.14/\mathrm{fm}$$

(data at 172, 183 and 189 GeV)

Figure 2: Correlation function for the unfolded classes. The data points show the experimental distributions. The open histogram shows a) the result of the simulation including inter-W correlations, b) the result of simulation including correlations within a single W. The cross-hatched histogram in a) shows result of simulation with correlation only within a single W, while the hatched histograms in b) and c) correspond to a simulation without any BE correlations.

removed due to the use of a reference sample constructed by mixing of the hadronic parts of the semileptonic $W^+W^-$ events. Such a direct 'data-to-data' comparison [8] is experimentally robust and does not require a direct use of MC simulation (except for checking of the mixing method). The only residual model dependence is related to the subtraction of background events.

Fig. 3 shows the ratios of 2-particle densities obtained from the fully hadronic $W^+W^-$ sample and from the mixed sample:

$$D(Q) = \rho_2^{\mathrm{hadr.WW}}(Q)/\rho_2^{\mathrm{mixed\ WW}}(Q) \tag{2}$$

and the double ratio:

$$D'(Q) = D^{\mathrm{data}}(Q)/D^{\mathrm{MC,noBE}}(Q). \tag{3}$$

There is no evidence for the existence of inter-W correlations in L3 results.

Since the model dependent measurements have only very limited impact, the advantages of the method used by L3 seem to be acknowledged by the other LEP experiments which are preparing similar measurements. Recently, ALEPH released preliminary results using the mixed reference sample.[9]

4

## PRELIMINARY 98+99 DATA



Fit of the shape of D'($\pm$, $\pm$) with the function
$(1 + \epsilon Q)(1 + \Lambda \exp - k^2 Q^2)$
gives the following result (combined 98+99 data):

$$\Lambda = 0.013 \pm 0.018 \pm 0.015$$

Figure 3: The results obtained by L3 using the mixing method, for like-sign and unlike-sign pairs in WW events, compared to the prediction of the tuned model (PYBOEI BE$_{32}$).

The results cannot be quantified because of missing systematic errors. However the measurement seems to disfavour the presence of correlations, in agreement with L3 and with aforementioned ALEPH results.

The DELPHI experiment is the only experiment which reported a hint for presence of inter-W correlations.[10] However, some problems were found in the analysis, and the observation of the effect was not confirmed by an independent analysis. The discrepancies are yet to be clarified, and for the moment the results are uncertain.

## 3 Combination of LEP results

Due to the large variety of analyses performed so far, it is impossible to combine the results in a single number. Qualitatively, there is no confirmed observation of inter-W correlations. In the future, it seems probable that LEP collaborations will converge to a single method à la L3, which provides the most direct, and less biased, access to the inter-W correlations. Still, even using similar analysis method, there are quite a few problems to be solved before the combination can be done. Ideally, if the data would be corrected for the detector effects, a direct combination of measured distributions would be possible, providing at the same time a cross-check of compatibility of individual measurements. If for some reasons the data cannot be corrected for detector effects, one has to use a model for comparison between experiments. A unique choice of the model for such a comparison is a non-trivial task; the tuning of the model parameters vary significantly between experiments, and it is intertwined with the tuning of parameters of fragmentation models. In any case, a rather close collaboration between experiments is required in order to reach a combined LEP result.

## References

1. B.Andersson and W.Hofmann, *Phys. Lett.* B **169**, 364 (1986), B.Andersson and M.Ringnér, *Phys. Lett.* B **421**, 283 (1998) .
2. U.Heinz and P.Scotto, talk at the Rencontres de Moriond 2000.
3. E.A.De Wolf, hep-ph/0101243.
4. T.Sjöstrand, *Comp.Phys.Com.* **82**, 74 (1994).
5. ALEPH Coll., *Phys. Lett.* B **478**, 50 (2000).
6. OPAL Coll., OPAL PN393, *Eur. Phys. J.* **C8**, 559 (1999).
7. L3 Coll., *Phys. Lett.* B **493/3-4**, 233 (2000).
8. S.V.Chekanov, E.A.De Wolf, W.Kittel, *Eur. Phys. J.* **C6**, 403 (1999).
9. ALEPH Coll., ALEPH 2000-024 CONF.
10. DELPHI Coll., DELPHI 2000-115 CONF 414.