Summary of HERA-LHC Meeting

Robert Thorne

October 10th, 2008

University College London
In May 2008 final stage of a 4 year series of meetings at DESY and CERN.

Designed to increase interaction between HERA and LHC communities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Type</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Startup</td>
<td>26-27 March 2005</td>
<td>CERN</td>
<td>~250-300 participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>6 - 9 June 2006</td>
<td>CERN</td>
<td>~150 participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>12-16 March 2007</td>
<td>DESY</td>
<td>~160 participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>26-30 May 2008</td>
<td>CERN</td>
<td>~190 participants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With lots of additional smaller meetings, e.g. working weeks and working group meetings.

Attended majority of these, including initial and final (few) meetings, and various offshoots (later), although no formal involvement in organization.
5 core working groups.

- Parton density functions
- Multi-jet final states and energy flows
- Heavy quarks (charm and beauty)
- Diffraction
- Monte Carlo tools.

Have been rather more involved with some of these than others, and am more qualified to talk on some than others.

Summary will obviously reflect this, and will largely be highlights rather than a list. No apologies to those not mentioned – default state.

Will order roughly by topic, but not always Working Group (many overlapping sessions).

(Also try not to dwell on topics covered in detail in past few days.)
Parton Distribution Functions

At core a session acting as a PDF4LHC meeting, focusing on central topic of most recent data and fits.

Most interesting “new” data clearly that on $F_L(x, Q^2)$ (Grebenyuk, Lenderman).

Data from earliest analysis consistent with NLO predictions from various groups.
Potentially the most important data presented (probably at whole meeting) the averaged HERA measurement of total inclusive cross-section (Li).

Significant elimination of correlated errors. Accuracy of $1 - 2\%$ over enormous range of both $x$ and $Q^2$. The best test of factorization and perturbative QCD that we have.

However, data still preliminary, and at the meeting far more attention paid to presenting
Fit by HERA groups to this (still preliminary!) data

Note MSTW08 is as yet unpublished, we have a pre-release

Impressive reduction in uncertainties. However, in comparing with CTEQ and MSTW there are lots of things to consider – heavy flavour treatments, and particularly number of parameters. Much smaller in these fits with unseen constraints

Personally would rather like to see the real final data.
PDF Fitting Groups

Detailed presentation of the CTEQ6.6 PDFs for the first time (Nadolsky). Major changes, adoption of general-mass heavy flavour scheme as as default (also in 6.5) and fit to strange quarks directly (using complicated parameterization). Now 44 (previously 40) eigenvector sets.

- CTEQ6.6 $u, d$ are above CTEQ6.1 at $x \ll 10^{-2}$
  - The result of suppressed charm contribution to $F_2(x, Q)$ at HERA in the GM-VFN scheme
- very different strange PDF's
Also a major emphasis on presenting the correlation between different PDFs and consequently physical quantities, e.g. anti-correlation between relatively light $W, Z$ production where $x \sim 0.005$ and heavy $t\bar{t}$ production where $x \sim 0.1$.

Correlations of $Z$ and $t\bar{t}$ cross sections with PDF’s

LHC $Z, W$ cross sections are strongly correlated with $g(x), c(x), b(x)$ at $x \sim 0.005$.

Therefore, they are strongly anticorrelated with processes sensitive to $g(x)$ at $x \sim 0.1$ ($t\bar{t}, gg \rightarrow H$ for $M_H > 300$ GeV) as a consequence of momentum sum rule.

Ringberg HERA-LHC
MSTW have preliminary 2008 set based on a fit to a very wide variety of new data. Also have strange as free parameter, but closer to previous distribution (increases uncertainties). Now 40 (previously 30) eigenvector sets.

Most important inclusion of lots of new Tevatron data which gives detailed information of quark decomposition since it probes different weightings than structure functions.

Also new dynamical determination of tolerance. No fixed $\Delta\chi^2$ – analysis eigenvector by eigenvector.
For example, $d_V(x, Q^2)$ now chooses a different type of shape.

Mainly changed by new Tevatron $W$-asymmetry data and new neutrino structure function data.

Uncertainty growing more quickly as $x \to 0$ and $x \to 1$ than before due to better parameterisation in determining uncertainty eigenvectors.
Include CDF Run II inclusive jet data in different rapidity bins using $k_T$ jet algorithm and D0 Run II mid-point cone algorithm data.

Very good fit – $\chi^2 = 55/76$ and $\chi^2 = 115/110$.

CTEQ reported inconsistencies in preliminary fits to jet data, but mainly due (as I understand) to CDF Run II mid-point cone algorithm data.

MSTW find much softer high-$x$ gluon with new data.
Now much more stability in predictions for $W$ and $Z$ cross-sections for LHC and Tevatron (in brackets) with common fixed order QCD and vector boson width effects, and common branching ratios.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratio to MSTW 2008 (prel.)</th>
<th>$\sigma_W$</th>
<th>$\sigma_Z$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MRST 2006 NLO (unpublished)</td>
<td>1.002 (0.995)</td>
<td>1.009 (1.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRST 2006 NNLO</td>
<td>0.995 (1.004)</td>
<td>1.001 (1.010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRST 2004 NLO</td>
<td>0.974 (0.990)</td>
<td>0.982 (1.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRST 2004 NNLO</td>
<td>0.936 (0.991)</td>
<td>0.940 (1.003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTEQ6.6 NLO</td>
<td>1.019 (0.978)</td>
<td>1.022 (0.987)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Increases from MRST2006 compared to MRST2004 due to improved (NLO) or completed (NNLO) heavy flavour prescription.

Virtually no change from MRST2006 → MRST2008. Not guaranteed to be true for all quantities.

Consistent with CTEQ6.6, but systematic differences mirror shape of gluon/quarks.
Appearance of a new set of PDFs – presentation of those from the NNPDF group. (Final at July PDF4LHC meeting.)

Attempt to lose restriction in uncertainty due to fixed parameterization limitations.

- Monte Carlo sampling of data (generation of replicas of experimental data)

\[
D_i^{\text{art}(k)} = \left(1 + r_N^{(k)} \sigma_N\right) \left[D_i^{\text{exp}} + r_i^\sigma \sigma_i^{\text{stat}} + \sum_{l=1}^{N_{\text{sys}}} r_l^{(k)} \sigma_l^{\text{sys,l}}\right]
\]

where \(\sigma_i\) are the experimental errors, and \(r_i\) are random numbers chosen accordingly to the experimental correlation matrix.

- Expectation values:

\[
\langle F[g(x)] \rangle = \frac{1}{N_{\text{rep}}} \sum_{k=1}^{N_{\text{rep}}} F\left(g^{(\text{fit}(k)}(x)\right)
\]

- Errors:

\[
\sigma_{F[g(x)]} = \sqrt{\langle F[g(x)]^2 \rangle - \langle F[g(x)] \rangle^2}
\]

- Correlations between pairs of different parton distributions at different points:

\[
\langle u(x_1)d(x_2) \rangle = \frac{1}{N_{\text{rep}}} \sum_{k=1}^{N_{\text{rep}}} u^{(\text{fit}(k)}(x_1)d^{(\text{fit}(k)}(x_2)
\]
Data split into training and validation sets for each copy, and $\chi^2$ for one monitored while other minimized.

- **OPTIMAL FIT OBTAINED WHEN QUALITY OF FIT TO VALIDATION (CONTROL) DATA STOPS IMPROVING**
- **POSSIBILITY OF OVERFITTING GUARANTEES THAT MINIMUM NOT DRIVEN BY PARAMETRIZATION**

Avoid overcomplicating input PDFs by stopping when fit to validation sets stops improving. Some judgement required. Fit quality seems slightly worse at best than global fits.
PDFs seem rather similar to existing global fit sets (note at present ZM-VFNS and more limited quark decomposition.

Uncertainties generally only much bigger when there is a lack of data constraint compared to global fits. However, method of determination completely different. Interesting to see developments.
Standard Candles

A special session on this. Question of possible luminosity determinations.

Luminosity measurements at LHCb: summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008 (5pb⁻¹)</th>
<th>2009 (0.5fb⁻¹)</th>
<th>2010 (2fb⁻¹)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Van Der Meer</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5 -10%</td>
<td>5 -10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beam-Gas</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>&lt; 5%</td>
<td>&lt; 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$pp \rightarrow pp + \mu^+\mu^-$</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At LHCb (and ATLAS and CMS) in early running $Z$ production probably best (limited by fairly realistic $4 - 5\%$ theory error). Later $pp \rightarrow pp + \mu^+\mu^-$ good at LHCb but total and elastic cross-section measurements using forward detectors better at ATLAS (ALFA) and CMS (TOTEM).
I.e use TOTEM with coverage as shown.

Get about 5% precision after 1 year – 3% claimed for ALFA. Of course TOTEM and FP420 will add much more than this to physics reach.
Note that it is certainly necessary to include electroweak effects to get maximum precision on $W, Z$ cross-sections (Piccini).

- LHC, $pp \rightarrow W^+ \rightarrow \ell^+\nu\ell$, $p_{\perp,\ell}$ and $p_{\perp,\nu} > 25$ GeV, $|\eta_\ell| < 2.5$
- $\mathcal{O}(\alpha)$ EW corrections to the $M_T$ distribution

EW corrections to total cross-sections only a couple of percent (depends on EW renormalization scheme – careful when looking at predictions).

Larger corrections in $M_T$ tail due to EW Sudakov terms $\alpha_W \ln^2(M_T^2/m_W^2)$. 

Issue with EW corrections whenever a scale $\gg m_{W,Z}$ in the calculation. Much more work on combining EW and QCD corrections needed for LHC.
$\sigma_{t\bar{t}}$ also proposed as a standard candle by CTEQ. Both theory and data uncertainties may approach 5%?

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{lcc}
\textbf{PDF Uncertainties} & \\
\hline
\textbf{Tevatron} & \\
CTEQ6.5 & $\sigma = 7.61 \pm 0.38(5.1\%)$ (scales) & $+0.49(6.6\%)$ (PDFs) pb \\
MRSTW-06 & $\sigma = 7.93 \pm 0.56(7.1\%)$ (scales) & $+0.24(3.1\%)$ (PDFs) pb. \\
\hline
\textbf{LHC} & \\
CTEQ6.5 & $\sigma = 908 \pm 82(9.0\%)$ (scales) & $+30(3.3\%)$ (PDFs) pb \\
MRSTW-06 & $\sigma = 961 \pm 89(9.2\%)$ (scales) & $+11(1.1\%)$ (PDFs) pb \\
\hline
MRST–CTEQ & \\
& $= 0.32 \pm 0.45$ pb \\
& $= 53 \pm 33$ pb \\
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

Not there at present with theory (Mangano) due to PDF and cross-section uncertainty (PDF difference likely ok, old certainties underestimated). Doubts raised on data. Could maybe be future PDF constraint.
However, most obvious constraint in immediate term are vector boson production.

Uncertainty on $\sigma(Z)$ and $\sigma(W^+)$ grows at high rapidity.

Uncertainty on $\sigma(W^-)$ grows more quickly at very high $y$ – depends on less well-known down quark.

Uncertainty on $\sigma(\gamma^*)$ is greatest as $y$ increases. Depends on poorly know (even after HERA) partons at extremely small $x$. 

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{pdf_uncertainty.png}
\caption{pdf uncertainty on $d\sigma(W^+)/dy_W$, $d\sigma(W^-)/dy_W$, $d\sigma(Z)/dy_Z$, $d\sigma(DY)/dMdy$
\hspace{1cm} at LHC using MSTW2007NLO}
\end{figure}
Measurements of all these bosons (and their ratios) good enough in one detector or another to put new constraints on PDFs quite quickly.

Most dramatic high rapidity, low mass Drell-Yan. Possible at LHCb (Anderson).

![LHCb](image)

\[ \gamma^* \rightarrow \mu\mu \quad \text{After selection} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mass range (GeV)</th>
<th>Efficiency</th>
<th>Purity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$5 &lt; M_{\mu\mu} &lt; 8$</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8 &lt; M_{\mu\mu} &lt; 10$</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10 &lt; M_{\mu\mu} &lt; 15$</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15 &lt; M_{\mu\mu} &lt; 20$</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20 &lt; M_{\mu\mu} &lt; 80$</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stat. uncertainty is 1% with 100pb$^{-1}$ (independent of mass)  
" " 0.3% with 1000pb$^{-1}$

This will not only constrain the PDFs within a fixed order though.
Small-\( x \) resummations - talk by Forte here but my quick summary

Now similar results coming from the White-RT, Ciafaloni-Colferai-Salam-Stasto and Altarelli-Ball-Forte procedures, despite some differences in technique.

Full set of coefficient functions still to come in some cases. Fit to data only in White-RT approach.

Note NLO corrections lead to dip in functions below fixed order values until slower growth (running coupling effect) at very small \( x \).

May possibly be significant to small \( x \) details, and spoil 3 – 4\% theoretical accuracy.

Back to \( F_L(x, Q^2) \) measurements.
So far consistent with standard predictions – NLO, NNLO, a dipole model prediction and resummed fit. Some possibilities (LO QCD) ruled out.

Good measurements at lower $Q^2$ may give an idea of how well to trust precision QCD. Very interesting to combine these with high rapidity, low mass, Drell-Yan at LHC.
Dipole Models, Saturation

As seen on last page, small-$x$ automatically takes us to dipole models, saturation and overlap with Diffraction session.

Watt presented extended dipole model with impact parameter $b$ dependence,

Free parameters determined by fit to $F_2(x, Q^2)$ and results compared to variety of exclusive processes with good results.
Saturation scale at very low $x$ even for $b = 0$ – falling to lower $x$ as $b$ rises.

Average for inclusive processes $b \sim 2 - 3 \text{GeV}^{-1}$.

Similar results from most sophisticated and recent determinations of parameters using saturation based dipole models.

At HERA impact of saturation on inclusive quantities seems minimal.
Geometric scaling often cited as *evidence* for saturation effects.

- $\sigma(y^p)$ as a function of $\tau$

Simplest model shown. However, always going to be broken (higher orders, quark masses, ...) by more than size of error bars.

Now lots of variations on the type of geometric scaling depending on sophistication.
Theoretical evidence that geometric scaling can appear from DGLAP evolution (Caola).

More revealingly demonstrated that $F_2(x, Q^2)$ generated from MRST and CTEQ PDFs display all types of geometric scaling with good quality factors (Salek).

In this case there is no saturation in the input at all, yet is displayed by output.

Results suggest saturation effects in inclusive quantities at HERA are at very low scales. Dipole approach and very probably saturation more important for understanding exclusive quantities. Not convinced that geometric scaling (which type?) is evidence.
Developments in Perturbative QCD - Jets.

Long known that initial cone-based jet algorithms are generally infrared unsafe

\[
\alpha_s^2 + \alpha_s^3 + \alpha_s^4 \times \infty \rightarrow \alpha_s^2 + \alpha_s^3 + \alpha_s^4 \times \ln p_t/\Lambda \rightarrow \alpha_s^2 + \alpha_s^3 + \alpha_s^3
\]

Both wasted

Real life does not have infinities, but pert. infinity leaves a real-life trace

Among consequences of IR unsafety:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last meaningful order</th>
<th>JetClu, ATLAS cone</th>
<th>MidPoint [IC+pr,SM]</th>
<th>CMS it. cone [IC-PR]</th>
<th>Known at</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive jets</td>
<td>LO</td>
<td>NLO</td>
<td>NLO</td>
<td>NLO (\rightarrow NNLO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W/Z + 1 jet</td>
<td>LO</td>
<td>NLO</td>
<td>NLO</td>
<td>NLO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 jets</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>LO</td>
<td>LO</td>
<td>NLO [nlojet++]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W/Z + 2 jets</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>LO</td>
<td>LO</td>
<td>NLO [MCFM]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(m_{jet} ) in 2j + X</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>LO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Soyez presented improvements with properties similar to older algorithms.

Correspondingly strong statement in introduction – Salam

1. Infrared and Collinear unsafe jet algorithms have been with us for a long time
   It’s time to relegate them to where they belong

**20th century history**

Difficult not to agree.
From personal experience, fitting to Run II Tevatron high-$E_T$ jet data, with improved jet algorithms ($k_T$ algorithm for CDF) results in a significant change in the gluon.

Due to improvements in algorithms?
Particularly struck by new “anti-$k_t$ algorithm” which combines all soft partons within “cone” with hard parton to produce “cone-like” jet definition.

Come back to recombination-type algorithms:

$$d_{ij} = \min(k_{t,i}^{2p}, k_{t,j}^{2p}) \left( \Delta \phi_{ij}^2 + \Delta \eta_{ij}^2 \right)$$

- $p = 1$: $k_t$ algorithm
- $p = 0$: Aachen/Cambridge algorithm
- $p = -1$: anti-$k_t$ algorithm

Hard event + homogeneous soft background

Useful when using jet area to subtract underlying event and pile up, where $P_T/A$ is fairly constant except for hard jets (Cacciari).
Developments in Perturbative QCD - Calculations.

As presented by Zanderighi, lots of developments in NLO calculations.

Automation & improving performance of NLO

Want Alpgen/Sherpa@NLO $\Rightarrow$ fully automated NLO calculations

- towards automation of NLO calculations
  - Van Hameren
- NLO + parton shower
  - Nagy
- duality between one-loop and single-cut phase space integrals
  - Rodrigo
- automated one-loop N-gluon amplitudes via unitarity $\Rightarrow$ Rocket
  - Zanderighi
- automated implementation of dipole-subtraction $\Rightarrow$ TevJet
  - Seymour, Tevlin
- fast-NLO, NLOgrids, event weight grids
  - Kluge, Clements, Sutton

Ringberg HERA-LHC
Developments at NNLO. Particularly full calculations of jet event shapes (Luisoni).

**Determination of $\alpha_S$: NNLO results**

- $\alpha_S (M_Z)$
- Consistent results at NNLO,
- Scattering between variables much reduced.
- Calculate weighted average for $\alpha_S (Q)$ from 6 variables

$$\bar{\alpha}_S = \sum_{i=1}^{6} w_i \alpha_s^i, \quad w_i \propto \frac{1}{\sigma_i^2}$$

⇒ $\bar{\alpha}_S (M_Z) = 0.1240 \pm 0.0033$

Reduces uncertainty in extraction of $\alpha_S (M_Z^2)$ compared to NLO, but high value. Combination with additional resummations necessary. Nearing (reaching) completion – (JADE – 0.1210 NNLO→ 0.1172 NNLO+NLLA).
Even major progress in full NNLO calculation of heavy quark production in hadron-hadron collisions (Czakon).

\[
d\hat{\sigma}_{tt}^{\text{NNLO}} = d\hat{\sigma}_{2}^{VV} + d\hat{\sigma}_{2+1}^{VR} + d\hat{\sigma}_{2+2}^{RR}
\]

\[
d\hat{\sigma}_n = d\phi_n |M_n|^2
\]

Exact contributions for virtual corrections to quark annihilations. Total quark contributions in sight?

Other ideas? Sure... (ongoing collaboration with A. Mitov, Stony Brook)
**Heavy Flavour**

Already heard easily enough on calculating $F_i^H(x, Q^2)$ this week.

Upshot – MSTW and ACOT definitions of GM-VFNS not very different.

Note easier to define at NNLO in GM-VFNS than in FFNS.

**NNLO FFNS** needs new $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^3)$ matrix elements even for $Q^2/m_H^2 \to \infty$ limit. Calculation Bierenbaum, Klein.

Excellent new data. Can compare with anything if extracted as $F_2^H(x, Q^2)$, but need better than old (limited) MRST04 and (older) CTEQ5 for best extraction.
There will similarly be excellent coverage of heavy flavour at the LHC (Bruno)

with LHCb and particularly ALICE having triggers to extremely low $p_T$.

LHCb also measure charm with early running?
Enormous cross-section for heavy flavour production at LHC.

Doesn’t really matter that bandwidth for trigger for B physics is only about 5%.

All detectors have a wide ranging heavy flavour physics programme. Measurements of

– open heavy flavour production

– heavy flavour jets

– quarkonium production

– oscillations

– rare decays.
Measurements of heavy flavours down to low $p_T$ and at higher rapidity will test QCD in the same manner as the low-mass Drell-Yan production.

Constrain small-$x$ PDFs, check for small-$x$ resummations, saturation etc.

However, theory is even more uncertain in this case. Predictions show uncertainties of factors of $2$.

Even more scope for variations.

Lot of work for theorists here.
Possibility of very quick results on heavy meson production (Lytken – ATLAS).

**Quarkonia**

- Among first measurements + theoretical interest: What is the production mechanism?
- The Color Octet Mechanism agrees well with measured $\sigma$ shape from Tevatron Polarization measurements: CDF sees no sign of pol. for $J/\psi$ and DØ $\Upsilon(1S)$ measurements not consistent with predictions.

More data with high-$p_T$ needed!

Already with 10 pb$^{-1}$: measure $J/\psi$ pol. to same precision as TeV with 1.3 fb$^{-1}$ - but with interesting high $p_T$ data! Same precision for $\Upsilon$ polarization studies can be reached after ~100 pb$^{-1}$
Di®raction at HERA

Major improvements over time in consistency between measurements,

Comparison of inclusive diffraction using Large Rapidity Gap definition (Ruspa).
In addition inclusion of jet production has stabilised results of fit dramatically (near to fit B and MRW results).

Fit A: \( zg(z, Q_0^2) = A(1-z)^C \)
Fit B: \( C = 0 \)

mixed constant at \( Q_0^2 \)
Fit JET: \( zg(z, Q_0^2) = Az^6(1-z)^C \)

→ The singlet and gluons are constrained with similar precision across the whole kinematic range

Now time for averaged data, and (subsequently) combined fits.
Then can be used at LHC. However, while diffractive PDFs obey factorization, i.e. can determine evolution and combine with hard coefficient functions, the factorization is not universal.

Very simple application of extracted PDFs to Tevatron data does not, and was never expected to work.

Factorization known to be broken in hadronic diffraction due to soft interaction filling in gaps in both initial and final states.

Interpreted as phenomenological “gap survival” probability. Can give some reasonable accuracy for prediction of LHC processes.

Khoze – “.. not all alike. Dependence on the nature of the basic process, kinematical configuration, cuts ....”
Predictions for Diffractive processes at LHC can be tested at Tevatron.

ExHuME (Monk, Pilkington) based on KMR calculation with a 4.5% gap survival probability.
In principle test also in diffractive photoproduction. Naive guess – direct contribution (like DIS) satisfies factorization, resolved (like hadronic) – gap survival $\sim 0.3$.

Initially ZEUS and H1 data did not agree well, and suggestion of suppression $\sim 0.5$ at all $x_\gamma$.

Recent improvements in understanding data differences.
Thorough coverage by Kramer this week.

Suppression (gap survival) factor of $\sim 0.4$ for all gives best match. Others have problems at highest $x_\gamma$ – but better at high $E_T$. Still matter of investigation (Klasen, Kramer).
Monte Carlos and related tools

Considerable work on new shower developments noted by Gieseke.

- Nagy, Soper:
  - Beyond 1/Nc
  - with interference beyond soft limit
- KRKMC - Jadach, Skrzypek
  - Constrained Markov Chain
  - MC evolution like PDF evolution
  - Path to NLO

Also new dipole showers in Sherpa – Siegert

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSShower++</th>
<th>ADICIC++</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Based on Catani-Seymour dipole subtraction</td>
<td>Emission off colour dipoles (associated to initial and/or final state colour lines)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dipole terms can be used to describe splittings</td>
<td>Idea implemented in Ariadne, very good performance for LEP/HERA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correct soft &amp; collinear limits, better treatment of colour coherence</td>
<td>In addition: Initial state emission formulated completely perturbative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Update on status of all the major Monte Carlo generators and associated tools.

**CASCADE** – very different to standard MCs, based on generation of unintegrated PDFs via CCFM equation. Advantages (Hautmann)

- better treatment of high-energy logarithmic effects
- likely more suitable for simulating underlying event’s $k_\perp$

Seems very successful in some regimes.

Angular jet correlations from **CASCADE** and **HERWIG** compared with DIS data

(left) di-jet cross section; (right) three-jet cross section
Also disadvantages

Current limitations:

- radiative terms associated to $x \sim 1$ not automatically included
- procedure to correct for this not yet systematic
  \[ \rightarrow \text{ e.g.: LO-DGLAP in Höche et al} \]
- quark contributions in initial state included partially
  \[ \rightarrow \text{ see also: } k_\perp \text{ kernel for sea-quark evolution [Catani & H]} \]
- limited knowledge of u-pdf’s

From experience in similar situations concern that these may be rather important in many cases. Comparison to MC@NLO for top production Jung.

Just starting to add essential corrections, e.g. valence quark contributions (Deak).
ARIADNE - based on colour dipole cascade model Lönnblad.

- Describe gluon emissions in terms of radiation from colour dipoles
- Instead of one parton splitting into two, we have one dipole splitting into two, or two (colour-connected) partons into three.
- $g \rightarrow q\bar{q}$ is still treated as normal parton splitting

- Completely rewritten in c++ using THEPEG Main work by Nils Lavesson
- Almost all components are in place
- Simple CKKW(L) matching
- Modified model for initial-state radiation needed
- $q \rightarrow g$ splitting included
- String fragmentation with PYTHIA7
- Validated for $e^+e^-$

But unfortunately...

- ARIADNE will not be ready for LHC startup
Sherpa – various improvements outlined by Seigert.

**New features**
- AHADIC++ – Cluster fragmentation module
- HADRON++ – Complete hadron and τ decay module
- PHOTONS++ – QED radiation in the YFS formalism

**Improvements in other areas**
- CKKW merging for processes with decay chains

Along with new method for calculating high multiplicity cross-sections COMIX

---

**Example from MC4LHC comparison vs. COMIX**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>σ [pb]</th>
<th>Number of jets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e⁻e⁺ + QCD jets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMIX</td>
<td>723.5(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALPGEN</td>
<td>723.4(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMEGIC++</td>
<td>723.0(8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lots of improvements in new update HERWIG++.  

Herwig++  

- Current version: 2.2.0 released Apr/08  
- Multiple parton-parton scattering model of the underlying event, based on the FORTRAN JIMMY program.  
- New model of meson and tau decays.  
- Inclusion of BSM physics including the MSSM, UED and RS models.  
- Tuning to LEP, SLD and B-factory data.  
  - New Zh⁰, Wh⁰, Z+jet and W+jet hard processes.  
  - gg→h⁰ matrix element correction.  

full manual arXiv:0803.0883

Now available for a lot more people to start using – (Richardson).
Particular improvement in description of underlying event (Bähr).

- Major new feature is a multiple scattering model of the underlying event.
- In good agreement with CDF data on the underlying event.
Lots of improvements in new update **PYTHIA8**.

**Pythia8**

- Complete new event generator

New features, not found in 6.4:
- interleaved $p_\perp$-ordered MI + ISR + FSR evolution
- richer mix of underlying-event processes ($\gamma, J/\psi, DY, \ldots$)
- possibility for two selected hard interactions in same event
- possibility to use one PDF set for hard process and another for rest
- elastic scattering with Coulomb term (optional)
- updated decay data

Plans for the future:
- rescattering in multiple interactions (with Florian Bechtel & Richard Corke)
- more ME/PS matching (with Richard Corke)

Point 4 due to suggestion that some PDFs, e.g. LO, are appropriate for some process, e.g. underlying event, and others, e.g. NLO for different processes, e.g. $W, Z$ production. Not likely to be used. Full circle to PDF4LHC.
One approach, obtain PDFs by fitting using Monte Carlo – PDF4MC (Jung).

- branch 2: use standard MCEG like PYTHIA/HERWIG/RAKGAP but also ALPGEN/SHERPA etc and obtain PDFs from fits to $F_2$ and TeVatron data, as done in global analyses
  - neither LO or NLO is appropriate
  - define MC-PDFs, depend on generator, parton showers etc
    - MC-factorization scheme... instead of MS bar
  - include proper treatment of parton showers in initial and final state
  - include all kinematics from full simulation, no approximations

- Use LO fit....
- Fit $F_2$ by varying $xg(x, \mu) = A_0 x^{A_1} ...$ and $\alpha_s(\mu)$
- Fit changes normalization and slope of gluon ... as seen in the scan....
- $\chi^2/ndf$ improves...., but can still be better....
- Not yet the final answer...

A lot of work to do thoroughly.

My concern that good simultaneous fit will be difficult.
Problem with working entirely at LO, most NLO corrections positive, many large. Global good fit and predictions not possible.

→ Modified LO partons for LO Monte Carlos – RT, Sherstnev. Enhancement of LO* partons from momentum violation, plus use of NLO coupling with Monte Carlo inspired scale in $\alpha_S$ generally leads to best match to full NLO predictions.

Leads to much better prediction for Higgs (and many other processes) than LO or NLO PDFs. LO* and LO** available at LHAPDF for a few months.
Similar sets in preparation by CTEQ. Presented at PDF4LHC in June 2008 (Huston).

Based also (sometimes) on momentum violation in input and sometimes in this case fitting to pseudodata.

Similar to MRSTLO* and not CTEQ6.6. Final version to be decided on soon.

PDFs for Monte Carlos (one of many) ongoing project(s).
Conclusions

Consider objectives – as listed by Hannes Jung.

- To encourage and stimulate transfer of knowledge between the HERA and LHC communities and establish an ongoing interaction.
- To increase the quantitative understanding of the implication of HERA measurements on LHC physics.
- To encourage and stimulate theory and phenomenological efforts.
- To examine and improve theoretical and experimental tools.
- To identify and prioritize those measurements to be made at HERA which have an impact on the physics reach of the LHC.

Clearly been very successful in all of these, and Hannes and Albert deserve both congratulations and thanks.

Couple of minor comments:

- As talk shows, despite name of Workshop Tevatron results and people also made big contribution and involved in collaborations.

- Lot of people at LHC who looked in at first meeting decided to forget about importance of QCD. Will be forced to remember when data comes in.
Future

Clearly end of Workshops in this precise form.

However, work started will undoubtedly continue in some form.

From Parton density functions working group have developed PDF4LHC committee and series of smaller workshops – February, July and September 2008.

Already been a MC4LHC workshop, and continuing effort in MCNET network.

It would seem as though there is definitely scope for something similar along the lines of Jets4LHC, Diff4LHC, CandB4LHC etc..

Really should build on the good work started and many collaborations established by the HERA-LHC series.