

LEPTON PAIR PRODUCTION IN DEEP INELASTIC  $e-\gamma$  SCATTERING

The CELLO Collaboration

H.-J. BEHREND, H. FENNER, U. GÜMPEL, M.-J. SCHACHTER <sup>1</sup>,  
V. SCHRÖDER, H. SINDT*Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron, DESY, Hamburg, Germany*G. D'AGOSTINI, W.-D. APEL, S. BANERJEE <sup>2</sup>, J. BODENKAMP, J. ENGLER,  
G. FLÜGGE, D.C. FRIES, W. FUES, K. GAMERDINGER, G. HOPP, H. KÜSTER,  
H. MÜLLER, H. RANDOLL, G. SCHMIDT, H. SCHNEIDER*Kernforschungszentrum Karlsruhe and Universität Karlsruhe, Germany*W. de BOER, G. BUSCHHORN, G. GRINDHAMMER, P. GROSSE-WIESMANN,  
B. GUNDERSON, C. KIESLING, R. KOTTHAUS, U. KRUSE <sup>3</sup>, H. LIERL,  
D. LÜERS, H. OBERLACK, P. SCHACHT*Max-Planck-Institut für Physik und Astrophysik, Munich, Germany*G. CARNESECCHI <sup>4</sup>, P. COLAS, A. CORDIER, M. DAVIER, D. FOURNIER,  
J.-F. GRIVAZ, J. HAÏSSINSKI, V. JOURNÉ, F. LAPLANCHE,  
F. Le DIBERDER, U. MALLIK, J.-J. VEILLET*Laboratoire de l'Accélérateur Linéaire, Orsay, France*J.H. FIELD <sup>5</sup>, R. GEORGE, M. GOLDBERG, B. GROSSETÊTE, O. HAMON,  
F. KAPUSTA, F. KOVACS, G. LONDON, L. POGGIOLI, M. RIVOAL*Laboratoire de Physique Nucléaire et des Hautes Energies, Université de Paris, France*

and

R. ALEKSAN, J. BOUCHEZ, G. COZZIKA, Y. DUCROS, A. GAIDOT,  
Y. LAVAGNE, J. PAMELA, J.-P. PANSART, F. PIERRE*Centre d'Etudes Nucléaires, Saclay, France*

Received 21 March 1983

At PETRA we have measured the process  $e + \gamma \rightarrow e + \ell^+ + \ell^-$ , where  $\ell$  is either an electron or a muon, at an average  $Q^2$  of  $9.5 \text{ GeV}^2/c^2$ . The total number of collected events is 240. We find that our data agree with QED predictions based either on exact Feynman graph calculations or on the photon structure function expressions.

*1. Introduction.* Using data collected at the  $e^+e^-$  storage ring PETRA at DESY in 1980 and 1981, the CELLO Collaboration has investigated deep inelastic  $e-\gamma$  scattering (DIS) along three lines:

(i) lepton pair production at medium  $Q^2$  values ( $\langle Q^2 \rangle \sim 10 \text{ GeV}^2/c^2$ ) where  $Q^2$  is the four-momen-

<sup>1</sup> Present address: Waitzstrasse 43, Hamburg 52, Germany.

<sup>2</sup> Present address: Tata Institute, Bombay, India.

<sup>3</sup> Visitor from the University of Illinois, Urbana, USA.

<sup>4</sup> Present address: Centre d'Etudes Nucléaires, Saclay, France.

<sup>5</sup> On leave of absence from DESY, Hamburg, Germany.

tum transfer squared of the scattered electron,

(ii) measurement of the hadronic photon structure function  $F_2(x, Q^2)$  in the same  $Q^2$  range,

(iii) study of hadronic DIS events at very high  $Q^2$  ( $\langle Q^2 \rangle \sim 100 \text{ GeV}^2/c^2$ ).

This letter presents the first part of this program while the second part is described in the next letter [1]. Results on the high  $Q^2$  hadronic events have been published previously [2].

We report here on the purely leptonic reactions

$$e + \gamma \rightarrow e + e^+ + e^- , \quad (1)$$

$$e + \gamma \rightarrow e + \mu^+ + \mu^- , \quad (2)$$

where the three final leptons are detected. The process which actually takes place in the storage ring is

$$e^+ + e^- \rightarrow e^+ + e^- + \ell^+ + \ell^- \quad (\ell = e, \mu) . \quad (3)$$

Only very limited experimental results have been reported [3,4] up to now on this process when one of the scattered electrons is detected at large angles. To a very good approximation, the cross section, of order  $\alpha^4$ , is given [5] by the two Feynman graphs shown in fig. 1a. The Vermaseren integration program [6] allows to take into account 4 other graphs (see fig. 1b) which describe virtual bremsstrahlung in the t-channel of Bhabha scattering. The contribution of virtual bremsstrahlung in the s-channel is negligible.

**2. The CELLO detector.** A detailed description of CELLO can be found in ref. [7]. The scattered electron of reaction (1) or (2) is tagged by an end cap electromagnetic calorimeter. The latter consists of 4 liquid argon modules which accept polar angles ranging between 0.130 and 0.400 rad and provide an almost complete azimuthal coverage. The resolution of these modules has been determined by analyzing Bhabha scattering events collected at  $E_{\text{beam}} = 17 \text{ GeV}$ . For such events we have found a 6% energy resolution and a 4 mrad angular resolution when the shower develops away from the module edges. Monte Carlo calculations show that the energy resolution drops to about 15% when the electron energy is only 7 GeV and edge effects are taken into account. The latter resolution value has been checked by a detailed study of radiative Bhabha events where the photon is detected in an end cap module.

Both particles of the lepton pair ( $e^+e^-$  or  $\mu^+\mu^-$ ) in reaction (1) or (2) are detected in a set of 12 cylindrical wire chambers placed in a 1.3 T magnetic field. The momentum resolution of this tracking device, which includes 7 drift chambers, is  $\sigma_{p_T}/p_T = 2\% P_T$  ( $P_T$  in GeV/c) where  $p_T$  is the transverse momentum with respect to the beam. We demand at least 7 hits per track. This requirement implies the cut  $|\cos \theta| < 0.92$ .

These chambers are surrounded by a barrel liquid argon calorimeter which is 20 radiation lengths thick.




Fig. 1. (a) Feynman graphs of the deep inelastic  $e-\gamma$  scattering process. (b) Feynman graphs of virtual bremsstrahlung in the t-channel of Bhabha scattering.

Its angular acceptance is  $|\cos \theta| < 0.86$ . Read out strips in 3 different directions (longitudinal, transverse and  $45^\circ$ ) allow for shower reconstruction with an angular precision of 4 mrad and an energy resolution  $\sigma_E/E = 13\%/\sqrt{E}$  (GeV).

Muons are detected in drift chambers located behind 5 to 6 absorption lengths of iron. They cover 92% of  $4\pi$ .

The trigger used for these measurements is activated by two charged particles with  $p_T > 0.250$  GeV/c in the central chambers or by an end cap shower above 3 GeV combined with either a charged particle in the central chambers or an energy deposition of more than 3 GeV in the barrel calorimeter.

**3. Data collection and event selection.** The data used in this analysis were collected at an average beam energy of 17 GeV for an integrated luminosity of  $7.5 \text{ pb}^{-1}$ .

The event selection starts with a search for *single* isolated showers in the end cap modules. These showers are required to have an energy above 3.6 GeV and a polar angle  $0.140 < \theta < 0.370$  rad. It follows that  $Q_{\min}^2 = 1.2 \text{ GeV}^2/c^2$ . A Monte-Carlo simulation shows that, within such cuts, the tagging efficiency is 92%, taking into account losses in the shower reconstruction stage.

We then demand two and only two tracks of opposite charge in the central detector originating from the interaction region defined by  $|z| < 3.5$  cm and  $r < 2$  cm. These tracks must satisfy  $P_T > 0.120$  GeV/c. This cut is introduced by the tracking program. Events which include an electromagnetic shower in addition to the two charged particles in the central detector are kept when such a shower can be linked to one of the tracks.

Next, we check the visible transverse momentum balance in order to reject DIS events with  $\tau^+\tau^-$  or multihadron production. We first apply a loose cut at 2.8 GeV/c to the sum  $|P_{Te} + P_{T1} + P_{T2}|$  of the transverse momenta of the tagged electron and of the two particles measured in the central detector. We further demand that  $P_{Te}$  be back to back within  $\pm 0.6$  rad with the combined transverse momentum  $P_{T1} + P_{T2}$  of the large angle tracks.

Finally, only those events which satisfy  $W^2 > 1 \text{ GeV}^2/c^4$  are kept where  $W$  is the invariant mass of the  $\ell^+\ell^-$  system.

**4. Particle identification.** In a preliminary analysis, a sample of 111 muon events has been obtained by using the muon chambers. The main characteristics of these events have been briefly reported in ref. [8]. This sample has been used to cross-check a second identification procedure which is based on a detailed analysis of the energy deposition in the barrel liquid argon calorimeter and which allows the selection of electrons and muons separately. In this analysis, the fiducial volume is restricted well within the liquid argon stacks, and  $\ell^\pm$  tracks with a momentum greater than 0.8 GeV/c are the only ones used. 399 events have at least one track which meets these requirements. 158 of them are easily recognized as being either  $e^+e^- \rightarrow e^+e^- \gamma$  radiative Bhabha scattering events or  $e^+e^- \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^- \gamma$  radiative annihilation events where the photon simulates a tagged electron in the end cap modules. Indeed, these events have a good *total* momentum balance and a total visible energy (end cap shower + 2 central track energies) greater than 75% of  $2E_{\text{beam}}$ . Their number and their kinematical characteristics agree well with the predictions of the Berends and Kleiss [9] program. For the rejection of such events we do not rely on a single cut but we require that at least two criteria be met among a set of 4 which involves the event total energy, the total momentum, the degree of coplanarity of the 3 tracks and the higher of the 2 central track momenta.

The identification of the particle as an electron or a muon is then based on the longitudinal distribution of the total charge  $q$  collected in the liquid argon stacks and on the ratio  $q/P$ , where  $P$  is the particle momentum as measured with the central chambers. The analysis of events where both central particles can be submitted to this identification procedure (about 1/3 of the total sample), together with a study of a sample of cosmic rays and a sample of  $e^+e^-$  pairs produced by  $\gamma$  conversions in the beam pipe shows that misidentifications occur at a level which is below 3%.

It will be seen below that the pion contamination is expected to represent less than 1% of the total sample of events. Therefore no attempt has been made to recognize pion tracks, i.e. they have been categorized either as electron tracks or as muon tracks. Subtractions based on Monte Carlo simulations have been made to correct for this contamination.

This selection leads to 130 electronic DIS candi-

dates and 111 muonic candidates <sup>†1</sup>. All candidates and a fraction of those events which are rejected by the selection procedure have been scanned.

*5. Background.* The background to the  $e^+e^- \rightarrow e^+e^- \ell^+\ell^-$  process may originate in (i)  $e\gamma$  DIS leading to  $\tau^+\tau^-$  production, (ii)  $e\gamma$  DIS leading to multihadron production where only two particles are seen in the central detector, or (iii) radiative annihilation events  $e^+e^- \rightarrow X\gamma$  where X is either a lepton pair or a multihadron final state and where the photon or a  $\pi^0$  (in the X = multihadron case) fakes a tagged electron.

As far as the  $e^+e^- \rightarrow e^+e^-\pi^+\pi^-$  two-photon reaction is concerned, single tag studies [10,11] of  $f^0$  production at  $Q^2 \sim 0.3 \text{ GeV}^2/c^2$  and an upper limit [12] put on the  $\pi^+\pi^-$  continuum investigated at  $0.1 < Q^2 < 10.0 \text{ GeV}^2/c^2$  and  $W > 2.0 \text{ GeV}/c^2$  indicate that this process is rapidly suppressed when one of the photons becomes virtual. By extrapolating these results to our kinematical region, we find that we may neglect this exclusive  $\pi^+\pi^-$  production with respect to the  $\ell^+\ell^-$  yield.

Each one of the above background sources has been simulated by Monte Carlo programs. The Berends and Kleiss [9] program has been used for the radiative processes. Within our tagging acceptance, the total cross section of process (i) is one order of magnitude lower than that of reaction (1) or reaction (2). The  $P_T$  cuts further reduce the background due to this process to a negligible amount. As far as process (ii) is concerned, its total cross section is comparable to those of reactions (1) or (2) but the low multiplicity requirement combined with the  $P_T$  cuts are quite effective in eliminating such events and the subtraction implied by this contamination is just one event. It also turns out that, within our cuts, the background due to process (iii) is negligible.

The virtual bremsstrahlung contribution to the cross section has been calculated with the Vermaseren program. Because of the  $W^2 > 1 \text{ GeV}^2/c^4$  cut, this contribution is less than 1%. Nevertheless, we have also examined the possibility of a forward backward asym-

metry originating from the interference between the graphs of fig. 1a and those of fig. 1b which differ by the C value of the  $\ell^+\ell^-$  pair. We define NF (respectively NB) the number of leptons  $\ell$  which are detected in the forward (respectively backward) hemisphere with respect to the direction of the beam which carries the same electric charge as  $\ell$ . It turns out that numerical integration by the Vermaseren routine leads to a value of  $A = (NF - NB)/(NF + NB)$  less than 2% for both electrons <sup>†2</sup> and muons under our experimental conditions. The data show some positive asymmetry in both lepton final states but are compatible, within statistics, with the results of the Vermaseren program. We consider that this point should be further investigated when more data will be available.

#### 6. Comparison of the data with QED predictions.

Once the backgrounds are subtracted, our data are compared to theoretical expectations drawn either from the Vermaseren program or from a Monte Carlo program which makes use of the photon structure functions  $F_{1,2}(x, W^2)$ . In fact we find negligible differences between these two approaches when three precautions are taken in the calculations based on the structure functions:

(i) The angle dependent expression [13,14] is used for the target photon flux. We obtain such an expression by differentiating the following formula with respect to the electron scattering angle  $\theta_e$

$$dn/dx_1 = (\alpha/\pi)x_1^{-1} \{ [1 + (1 - x_1)^2] \times \ln \{ 2(E_{\text{beam}}/m_e)[(1 - x_1)/x_1] \sin \frac{1}{2}\theta_e \} - 1 + x_1 \},$$

where  $x_1 = E_\gamma/E_{\text{beam}}$ . This formula gives the photon flux integrated over the electron scattering angle up to  $\theta_e$ .

(ii) Off-mass-shell effects are included. We use the following expression [5] for the  $F_2$  structure function

$$F_2 = (\alpha/\pi)x \{ [x^2 + (1-x)^2] \ln \{ W^2/[m_q^2 + tx(1-x)] \} - 1 + 8x(1-x) - tx(1-x)/[m_q^2 + tx(1-x)] \}.$$

$x = Q^2/(Q^2 + W^2)$  is the standard scaling variable and  $t = -k^2$  where  $k$  is the target photon four-momentum (the presence of the  $t$  dependent corrections reduces

<sup>†1</sup> It so happens that this muon sample has precisely the same size as the one previously obtained with the muon chambers. The intersection of these two samples represents 75% of either of them. This fraction agrees with what is expected from the differences in phase space acceptance of the two selection methods.

<sup>†2</sup> The complete antisymmetrization of the  $4e^\pm$  final state is not performed in the  $e^+ + e^- \rightarrow e^+ + e^- + e^+ + e^-$  case.





Fig. 2. (a) Lepton momentum distribution in deep inelastic  $e-\gamma$  scattering. Comparison between data and QED prediction. (b) Lepton acollinearity angle distribution compared with QED prediction.





Fig. 3. (a)  $W^2$  distribution of lepton pairs produced in deep inelastic  $e-\gamma$  scattering. Comparison between data and QED prediction. (b)  $Q^2$  distribution compared with QED prediction.

the total cross section by as much as 45% in the case of reaction (1) and by 12% in the case of reaction (2) under our experimental conditions).

(iii) The  $\gamma + \gamma \rightarrow \ell^+ \ell^-$  angular distribution – which

has to be introduced since the detector acceptance does not cover the full  $\ell^+\ell^-$  production – takes into account the fact that the two photons are virtual: in these conditions the angular distribution of the final leptons is less peaked than it would be in the case of two real photons sharing the same total center of mass energy.

We have investigated the consequences of real photon emission by the incoming electron (see left hand side of reaction (1) or (2)). We have found that this emission implies a 4% radiative correction which has been applied to the theoretical predictions.

Since the electron and muon kinematical distributions are very much alike in our acceptance region we do not present separate plots. Fig. 2 compares the uncorrected data to predictions based on theory and a detailed detector simulation for the lepton momenta and for the acollinearity angle. Notice that in fig. 2a *both* the electron and the muon momentum distributions have two peaks at about the same values. Data and theory are also compared in fig. 3 where the  $W^2$  and the  $Q^2$  distributions are displayed. The average  $Q^2$  is  $9.5 \text{ GeV}^2/c^2$ .

As far as absolute yields are concerned, we expect from QED and the detector simulation  $122 \pm 9.5$  and  $110.5 \pm 8.5$  events for reactions (1) and (2) respectively while we observe  $130 \pm 11.4$  and  $110 \pm 10.5$ . The error attached to the theoretical numbers takes into account uncertainties concerning the luminosity, the detection efficiency and radiative corrections which have only been partially applied.

**7. Results concerning  $F_2$ .** When applied to reactions (1) or (2) the structure function formalism gives an insight into the lepton content of the photon. This formalism deals with the cross section integrated over the whole  $\ell^+\ell^-$  phase space, while in practice a fraction of the DIS events is very difficult to observe, since one of the two leptons tends to be lost in the beam pipe. In such an analysis, the fact that electrons are much lighter than muons has three consequences: (i) the total  $e^+e^-$  yield which corresponds to our tagging acceptance is about twice the  $\mu^+\mu^-$  yield; (ii) the fraction of leptons which are lost in the beam pipe is larger in the  $e^+e^-$  case; we observe 13% of all events for reaction (1) and 22% for reaction (2); (iii) the corrections to  $F_2$  due to the non vanishing mass of the target photon are much larger for the electrons (num-




Fig. 4. Comparison between the theoretical and the measured values of  $F_2(x)$  for the reaction  $e + \gamma \rightarrow e + \mu^+ + \mu^-$ . The values of  $F_2$  have been averaged over the  $Q^2$  distribution which corresponds to the CELLO tagging acceptance (cf. fig. 3b). In this figure, the theoretical curve and the experimental points are absolute ones (they have not been normalized to each other).

bers are given above). It follows from (ii) and (iii) that we do not give results concerning  $F_2$  in the  $e^+e^-$  case. In the  $\mu^+\mu^-$  case, the extrapolation needed to determine  $F_2$  appears safe as long as the angular distribution modification mentioned above – which is small for reaction (2) – is taken into account. Thus, from the  $dn/dx$  distribution of the muonic events, we infer results concerning  $F_2$  as shown in fig. 4. The curve and the experimental points shown in this figure represent  $F_2(x, Q^2)$  values averaged over the observed  $Q^2$  distribution. The theoretical curve is an absolute prediction. There is an overall 8% uncertainty on the experimental points mainly due to luminosity, acceptance and detection efficiency errors.

**8. Conclusion.** We have observed a high order QED process ( $\sigma \propto \alpha^4$ ) at an average  $Q^2$  of  $9.5 \text{ GeV}^2/c^2$ . Our data agree with exact Feynman graph calculations. Good agreement is also obtained with the structure function formalism which indicates that we have a good basis to investigate the hadronic photon structure function [1].

We would like to thank M. Defrise and P. Kessler for fruitful discussions. We are indebted to the PETRA machine group for its excellent support during the experiments. We acknowledge the invaluable effort of all engineers and technicians of the collaborating institutions in the construction and maintenance of the apparatus, in particular the operation of the magnet system by G. Mayaux and Dr. Horlitz and their groups. The visiting groups wish to thank the DESY directorate for the support and kind hospitality extended to them.

### References

- [1] CELLO Collab., H.-J. Behrend et al., Phys. Lett. 126B (1983) 391.
- [2] CELLO Collab., H.-J. Behrend et al., Phys. Lett. 118B (1982) 211.
- [3] PLUTO Collab., Ch. Berger et al., Proc. XXth Intern. Conf. on High energy physics (Madison, 1980) (American Institute of Physics, New York).
- [4] MARK-J Collab., B. Adeva et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 48 (1982) 721.
- [5] V.M. Budnev et al., Phys. Rep. 15C (1974) 181.
- [6] R. Bhattacharya, J. Smith and G. Grammer Jr., Phys. Rev. D15 (1977) 3267; J.A.M. Vermaseren, Proc. Intern. Workshop on  $\gamma\gamma$  collisions (Amiens, 1980) (Springer, Berlin).
- [7] CELLO Collab., H.-J. Behrend et al., Phys. Scripta 23 (1981) 610.
- [8] J. Haïssinski (CELLO), XVIIth Rencontre de Moriond, vol. II (1982) (Editions Frontières, Dreux); CELLO Collab., H.-J. Behrend et al., Proc. XXIst Intern. Conf. on High energy physics (Paris, 1982) (Les Editions de Physique, Paris).
- [9] F.A. Berends and R. Kleiss, Nucl. Phys. B177 (1981) 237.
- [10] PLUTO Collab., Ch. Berger et al., Phys. Lett. 94B (1980) 254.
- [11] TASSO Collab., R. Brandelik et al., DESY report 81/026 (1981).
- [12] PLUTO Collab., Ch. Berger et al., Nucl. Phys. B202 (1982) 189.
- [13] N. Arteaga-Romero, A. Jaccarini and P. Kessler, Phys. Rev. D3 (1971) 1569.
- [14] J.H. Field, Nucl. Phys. B168 (1980) 477; B176 (1980) 545(E); Ch. Berger and J.H. Field, Nucl. Phys. B187 (1981) 585.