Search for pair-production of strongly-interacting particles decaying to pairs of jets in $p\bar{p}$ collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 1.96$ TeV
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We present a search for the pair-production of a non-standard-model strongly-interacting particle that decays to a pair of quarks or gluons, leading to a final state with four hadronic jets. We consider both non-resonant production via an intermediate gluon as well as resonant production via a distinct non-standard-model intermediate strongly-interacting particle. We use data collected by the CDF experiment in proton-antiproton collisions at \( \sqrt{s} = 1.96 \text{ TeV} \) corresponding to an integrated luminosity of 6.6 fb\(^{-1}\). We find the data to be consistent with standard model predictions. We report limits on \( \sigma(pp \rightarrow jjjj) \) as a function of the masses of the hypothetical intermediate particles. Upper limits on the production cross sections for non-standard-model particles in several resonant and non-resonant processes are also derived.
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One of the few hints of possible physics beyond the standard model (SM) at the TeV scale is the anomalous top-quark forward-backward asymmetry \( A_{FB} \) observed at the Tevatron [1][3]. This asymmetry could be generated by non-SM physics through the production of top-quark pairs via a light axi-gluon [4], a particle with axial couplings to quarks, that interferes with standard model (SM) \( t \bar{t} \) production to produce the observed asymmetry. The axi-gluon would be visible in its alternate decay mode to low-mass strongly-interacting particles, each of which decays to a pair of jets [5] yielding a four-jet final state. This final state is of broad interest, as various models predict pair-production of strongly-interacting particles decaying to jet pairs with no intermediate resonance [6][7] and \( R \)-parity-violating supersymmetric theories [8] predict pair-production of light partners of the top quark (stop quarks), each decaying into to pairs of light quarks.

The masses of the axi-gluon and its strongly-interacting decay products are not predicted, but must be fairly light (< 400 GeV/c\(^2\)) to explain the \( A_{FB} \) measurement [9]. The LHC experiments have excellent sensitivity
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Selection and trigger efficiency

Parton distribution functions (PDF). Additional parton study II detector [12], a general purpose detector designed to resonant case, we consider the production process model with the minimal particle content. In the non-resonant and resonant production of pairs of strongly-interacting are no current limits on resonant production.

In this Letter we report a search for both non-resonant and resonant production of pairs of strongly-interacting particles, each of which decays to a pair of jets. Rather than probing a specific theory, we construct a simplified model with the minimal particle content. In the non-resonant case, we consider the production process $p\bar{p} \rightarrow YY \rightarrow jj jj$, with the mass of the hypothetical $Y$ state, $m_Y$ as a single free parameter. In the resonant case, $p\bar{p} \rightarrow X \rightarrow YY \rightarrow jj jj$, we also explore the mass of the $X$ state, $m_X$ (Fig. 1). In both cases, we assume that the natural width of the particles is small compared to the experimental resolution.

We analyze a sample of events corresponding to an integrated luminosity of $6.6\pm0.5$ fb$^{-1}$ recorded by the CDF II detector [12], a general purpose detector designed to study $p\bar{p}$ collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 1.96$ TeV produced by the Fermilab Tevatron collider. The tracking system consists of a silicon microstrip tracker and a drift chamber immersed in a 1.4 T axial magnetic field [13]. Electromagnetic and hadronic calorimeters surrounding the tracking system measure particle energies, with muon detection provided by an additional system of drift chambers located outside the calorimeters.

We reconstruct jets in the calorimeter using the JETCLU [14] algorithm with a clustering radius of 0.4 in $\eta-\phi$ space [15], and calibrated using the techniques outlined in Ref. [16]. Events are selected online (triggered) by the requirement of three jets, each with $E_T > 20$ GeV and with $\Sigma j^\text{jets}E_T > 130$ GeV [15]. The data set used in this search is limited to 6.6 fb$^{-1}$ because the trigger selection was not available in early data. After trigger selection, events are retained if at least four jets are found with $E_T > 15$ GeV and $|\eta| < 2.4$.

We model resonant and non-resonant production with MADGRAPH5 [17] version 1.4.8.4 and the CTEQ6L1 [18] parton distribution functions (PDF). Additional parton radiation, hadronization, and underlying-event modeling are described by PYTHIA [19] version 6.420. The detector response for all simulated samples is modeled by the GEANT-based CDF II detector simulation [20].

The trigger and selection requirements have an efficiency on the signal up to 90% if $\Sigma j^\text{jets}E_T$ exceeds significantly the 130 GeV trigger threshold. For events with smaller $\Sigma j^\text{jets}E_T$, the efficiency decreases rapidly (Fig. 2). In the non-resonant-production model, the $\Sigma j^\text{jets}E_T$ is strongly correlated with $m_Y$. In the resonant-production model it is correlated with $m_X$; additionally if $m_X - 2m_Y$ is large, the $p_T$ of the resulting $Y$ is large, which leads to a small opening angle of its decay products and a loss of efficiency due to merged jets. The trigger efficiency is measured in simulated events, and uncertainties derived from validation in disjoint samples; the measured trigger efficiency and uncertainty are applied to the signal model.

To reconstruct the di-jet resonance, we consider the four leading jets and evaluate the invariant mass of each of the di-jet pairs in the three permutations, choosing the permutation with the smallest mass difference between the pairs. As the pair masses are correlated, we take the mean of the two pair masses as the estimate of the di-jet resonance mass. To reduce backgrounds, we require that the relative mass difference between the two pairs is less than 50%, and that the production angle $\theta^*$ of the di-jet resonance in the $YY$ pair center-of-mass frame satisfies $\cos(\theta^*) < 0.9$. In the resonant production analysis, we calculate the four-jet invariant mass. No specific $m_Y$-dependent selections are made; the requirement that the relative di-jet mass difference be small ensures compatibility with the $X \rightarrow YY$ hypothesis. Figures 3 and 4 show the observed di-jet and four-jet spectra, re-
The dominant source of systematic uncertainty is due to the multi-jet background model. The functional form is an approximation, which even in the absence of a narrow feature may deviate from the observed spectrum. We estimate the impact of these potential deviations by measuring their magnitude in two background-enriched control samples. These two control samples are adjacent to the signal region and capture the expected deviations in two independent directions. The first requires a large relative di-jet mass difference, greater than 50%, and the second requires $\cos(\theta^*) > 0.9$. The observed relative deviations are then applied to the observed spectrum in the signal region to estimate the magnitude of spurious deviations due to possible mismodeling. In addition, we verify that the fitting procedure gives an unbiased estimate of the signal rate.

An additional uncertainty is due to knowledge of the trigger efficiency [22] extracted from the simulated signal samples, varying from 20% relative at $\Sigma_{\text{jets}}E_T = 120$ GeV to 10% above $\Sigma_{\text{jets}}E_T = 200$ GeV. Uncertainties in the levels of parton radiation [23] and in the calibration of the jet energy and resolution modeling [16] also contribute to uncertainties in the trigger and selection efficiency and reconstructed mass spectrum of the signal samples. These uncertainties are small (< 10%) relative to the fitting and trigger uncertainties.

In the non-resonant analysis, for each $Y$ mass hypothesis, we fit the most likely value of the $Y$ pair-production cross section ($\sigma_{YY}$) by performing a maximum likelihood fit of the binned di-jet mass distribution, allowing for systematic and statistical fluctuations via template morphing [24]. The likelihood takes the form of

$$L(\sigma_{YY}) = \prod_{\text{bin}} f_{\text{bg}}(\vec{a}) + \sigma_{YY} \mathcal{L} \epsilon f_{\text{sig}},$$

where $f_{\text{bg}}(\vec{a})$ is the parametric function with nuisance parameters $\vec{a}$ defined above to describe the background spectrum, $f_{\text{sig}}$ is a normalized template of the expected shape of the signal determined from simulated events, and $\mathcal{L}$ is the product of the integrated luminosity and efficiency. No evidence is found for the presence of pair-production of di-jet resonances and upper limits on $Y$ pair-production at 95% confidence level (C.L.) are set.

Limits are calculated using the CLs [25] method by repeating the measurement on sets of simulated experiments that include signal contributions corresponding to various hypothetical production cross-sections, and variation of systematic uncertainties. The values of ini-
sance parameters are not fit in the experiments. The observed limits are consistent with expectation for the background-only hypothesis. The resonant analysis is very similar, but is done as a function of the X mass hypothesis, fitting the four-jet mass distribution for the most likely value of X production cross section, σX.

In the non-resonant case, this analysis sets limits on coloron or stop-quark pair production, excluding 50-100 GeV/c² and 50-125 GeV/c², respectively; see Table I and the top of Fig. 5. The uncertainty on the theoretical cross-section prediction comes from two sources: the envelope of the section prediction comes from two sources summed in quadrature. The first uncertainty is the envelope of the PDF uncertainties from the CTEQ uncertainties and an alternative PDF choice, MSTW2008LO [20] (5% relative). The second uncertainty comes from a variation of the renormalization and factorization scales by a factor of two in each direction from their default values of the per-event mass scale. These theoretical uncertainties are illustrated in Figure 3.

In the resonant case, this analysis excludes axi-gluon (A) production leading to pairs of σ particles and four-
ghon final state for $m_A \in [150, 400], m_\sigma \in [50, m_A/2]$ in the case of coupling to quarks $C_q = 0.4$ (see Table II) and the bottom of Fig. 1 which is close to the value required to explain the top-quark $A_{tb}$ result [9]. To be consistent with this analysis, the couplings would have to be smaller by an order of magnitude. Maintaining consistency with the top-quark $A_{tb}$ result would require different couplings to light quarks and heavy quarks, with the heavy-quark coupling approaching the perturbative limit, $C_q < 1$.
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