NuTeV Strange/Antistrange Sea Measurements from Neutrino Charm Production

> David Mason University of Oregon

for the NuTeV Collaboration





# What's NuTeV?

- $\nu$ -N DIS ( $\langle E_{\nu} \rangle \sim 120 GeV$ )
- FNAL '96-'97 fixed target run
- Detector calibration beam throughout run
- High purity, selectable  $\nu$  and  $\overline{\nu}$  beams









### Charm Production $\Rightarrow$ Dimuons

- CC  $\nu N$  makes charm
  - $\longrightarrow$  fragmentation
  - $\longrightarrow$  semileptonic decay to  $\mu$
- Very clear signature
- Direct look at strange sea
- With sign selected beam NuTeV can look at s(x),  $\overline{s}(x)$ independently
- Can also study charm mass, fragmentation







## Some background...

- Original  $\mu\mu$  cross section result
  - Goncharov et al: PRD64 (2001) 112006
  - Model independent description of data
  - Intended for global fitting use
- NuTeV final  $\sin^2 \theta_W$  result
  - Zeller et al: PRL 88 (2002) 091802
  - $-0.22773 \pm 0.00135 \text{ (stat)} \pm 0.00093 \text{ (syst)}$
  - 3  $\sigma$  from SM. prediction
  - $-s \overline{s}$  asymmetry popular explanation
  - $-\int_0^1 x \left[ s(x) \overline{s}(x) \right] dx \sim +0.0068 \text{ required}$







## My Objective: NLO dimuon analysis

- NLO strange sea of global interest
- Large gluon contribution
- Fragmentation requires convolution integral
- use DISCO (S. Kretzer, F. Olness, D.M.; PRD65 (2002) 074010)
- Must fit to cross section tables
- Have re-analyzed data in preparation for finalizing NLO results







## Improvements to Analysis

- Measure dimuon cross section relative to inclusive CC data
- Relied on 5% prescaled inclusive sample
- Moved to 100% sample
- Discovered subsample (0.4%) of events had leaked into 5% unprescaled
- Affects normalization & results
- Fixed!  $\implies$  More accurate result!









Data/MC Agreement: Neutrinos



• Red points are data, black is MC







• Red points are data, black is MC





#### New Preliminary Dimuon Cross Section



• Plotting xsec vs x, normalized so  $\frac{G_F^2 ME}{\pi} = 1$ 





# Preliminary LO QCD fits

|                                | $m_c$ | $\epsilon$ | $\kappa$ | $\overline{\kappa}$ | $\alpha$ | $\overline{\alpha}$ | $B_c$ | $S^{-}$ |
|--------------------------------|-------|------------|----------|---------------------|----------|---------------------|-------|---------|
| Central Value                  | 1.38  | 1.24       | 0.240    | 0.215               | 2.39     | 1.28                | 0.119 | 0.0009  |
| Statistical Error              | 0.25  | 0.19       | 0.041    | 0.027               | 1.02     | 0.57                | 0.009 | 0.0012  |
| $ u$ $\pi$ -K (15%)            | 0.02  | 0.24       | 0.013    | 0.017               | 0.03     | 0.04                | 0.007 | 0.0002  |
| $\overline{ u}$ $\pi$ -K (21%) | 0.02  | 0.07       | 0.001    | 0.012               | 0.03     | 0.29                | 0.001 | 0.0004  |
| $\mu$ energy scale (1%)        | 0.08  | 0.12       | 0.032    | 0.015               | 0.32     | 0.31                | 0.008 | 0.0006  |
| Had energy scale $(0.5\%)$     | 0.01  | 0.05       | 0.005    | 0.003               | 0.03     | 0.04                | 0.000 | 0.0001  |
| $R_L~(20\%)$                   | 0.04  | 0.05       | 0.001    | 0.006               | 1.04     | 0.12                | 0.002 | 0.0002  |
| MC statistics                  | 0.05  | 0.01       | 0.009    | 0.003               | 0.50     | 0.00                | 0.000 | 0.0002  |
| Flux                           | 0.01  | 0.01       | 0.001    | 0.000               | 0.07     | 0.01                | 0.000 | 0.0000  |
| Total Systematics              | 0.11  | 0.29       | 0.036    | 0.026               | 1.20     | 0.45                | 0.011 | 0.0008  |

- Based on new NuTeV total cross section
  - Use new extracted flux and bgpar parameterization
  - see Martin Tzanov's talk, this conf.
- Systematics still being finalized
  - NLO analysis will eliminate need for  $R_L$  systematic

$$s(x) = \kappa (1-x)^{\alpha} \left( \frac{\overline{u}(x) + \overline{d}(x)}{2} \right)$$
$$\overline{s}(x) = \overline{\kappa} (1-x)^{\overline{\alpha}} \left( \frac{\overline{u}(x) + \overline{d}(x)}{2} \right)$$
$$S^{-} \equiv \int x \ (s-\overline{s}) dx$$





#### Effect of data fix on strange seas





## Strange Asymmetry and NuTeV $\sin^2 \theta_W$

- NuTeV measures  $R^- = \frac{\sigma_{NC}^{\nu} \sigma_{NC}^{\overline{\nu}}}{\sigma_{CC}^{\nu} \sigma_{CC}^{\overline{\nu}}}$
- From that  $\sin^2 \theta_W$  is extracted
  - Insensitive to sea quark uncertanties
  - But assumes symmetric strange sea
- QCD requires  $\int (s \overline{s}) dx = 0$
- No QCD restriction on  $S^- \equiv \int x \ (s \overline{s}) dx$
- $R^-$  correction for asymmetric strange sea is proportional to  $S^-$



•  $S^- \sim 0.0068$  required for agreement with S.M.





# LO $S^-$ comparisons



- Yellow region brings NuTeV  $\sin^2 \theta_W$  to S.M.
  - Effect on  $\sin^2 \theta_W$  is x dependent

asymmetry at high x would need to be larger.

- Use functional in Zeller et al; Phys.Rev. D65 (2002) 111103
- Red point uses final NuTeV bgpar and flux, which best describes NuTeV data





# Branching Ratio

- Desire accurate  $B_c$  from external measurements
- $B_c$  is an average semi- $\mu$  branching ratio over all charm states
- At LO, we include as parameter in fits
- Half of asymmetry error comes from  $B_c$ uncertainty
- In NLO analysis will fix  $B_c$  and  $m_c$  for highest accuracy in  $S^-$  measurement









- In preparation for final dimuon results have re-analyzed data
- Discovered and fixed flaws in past  $\mu\mu$  result
- Have new preliminary cross section table
- Presented new preliminary LO strange sea fits
- Will become final with final NLO results later this spring!





### The NuTeV Collaboration:

T. Adams<sup>4</sup>, A. Alton<sup>4</sup>, S. Avvakumov<sup>8</sup>, L. de Barbaro<sup>5</sup>, P. de Barbaro<sup>8</sup>, R. H. Bernstein<sup>3</sup>, A. Bodek<sup>8</sup>, T. Bolton<sup>4</sup>, J. Brau<sup>6</sup>, D. Buchholz<sup>5</sup>, H. Budd<sup>8</sup>, L. Bugel<sup>3</sup>, J. Conrad<sup>2</sup>, R. B. Drucker<sup>6</sup>, B. T. Fleming<sup>2</sup>, R. Frey<sup>6</sup>, J. A. Formaggio<sup>2</sup>, J. Goldman<sup>4</sup>, M. Goncharov<sup>4</sup>, D. A. Harris<sup>8</sup>, R. A. Johnson<sup>1</sup>, J. H. Kim<sup>2</sup>, S. Koutsoliotas<sup>2</sup>, M. J. Lamm<sup>3</sup>, W. Marsh<sup>3</sup>, D. Mason<sup>6</sup>, J. McDonald<sup>7</sup>, K. S. McFarland<sup>8,3</sup>, C. McNulty<sup>2</sup>, D. Naples<sup>7</sup>, P. Nienaber<sup>3</sup>, V. Radescu<sup>7</sup>, A. Romosan<sup>2</sup>, W. K. Sakumoto<sup>8</sup>, H. Schellmann<sup>5</sup>, M. H. Shaevitz<sup>2</sup>, P. Spentzouris<sup>2</sup>, E. G. Stern<sup>2</sup>, N. Suwonjandee<sup>1</sup>, M. Tzanov<sup>7</sup>, M. Vakili<sup>1</sup>, A. Vaitaitis<sup>2</sup>, U. K. Yang<sup>8</sup>, J. Yu<sup>3</sup>, G. P. Zeller<sup>5</sup>, and E. D. Zimmerman<sup>2</sup> <sup>1</sup>University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH <sup>2</sup>Columbia University, New York, NY <sup>3</sup>Fermi National Acelerator Laboratory, Batavia, IL <sup>4</sup>Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS <sup>5</sup>Northwestern University, Evanston, IL <sup>6</sup>University of Oregon, Eugene, OR <sup>7</sup>University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA <sup>8</sup>University of Rochester, Rochester, NY



