EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS ON HEAVY QUARK FRAGMENTATION *

L. K. GLADILIN

Skobeltsyn Institute of Nuclear Physics, Moscow State University
Vorob'evy Gory, Moscow, RU-119992, Russia
E-mail: gladilin@sinp.msu.ru

Experimental results on c- and b-quark fragmentation are reviewed. The discussion is concentrated on measurements of heavy-quark fragmentation functions and fragmentation fractions. Measurements of various heavy-quark fragmentation ratios are also discussed. The experimental results are compared with theoretical expectations and model predictions.

1. Introduction

The initial stage of charm/bottom quark fragmentation can be described by perturbative QCD (pQCD) calculations [1]. A non-perturbative (NP) parameterisation is needed to describe the final heavy-quark transformation to a particular charmed or bottom hadron. Such parameterisation can include effects producing by the excited states decaying to a given hadron. The NP fragmentation parameterisation can be splited in two parts: fragmentation function and fragmentation fraction. Fragmentation functions are used to parameterise the transfer of the quark's energy to a given meson; they can be different for different pQCD calculations used to describe the initial fragmentation. Fragmentation fractions are the fractions of c/b quarks hadronising as a particular charmed/bottom hadron; they are expected to be universal for all pQCD calculations.

Measurements of the heavy quark fragmentation allow testing pQCD calculations and extracting fragmentation functions and fractions. A deeper phenomenological understanding of the heavy quark fragmentation can be obtained by measuring various heavy-quark fragmentation ratios. In partic-

*Participation in DIS 2006 was supported by the local organising committee and grant 06-02-26609-z of the Russian Foundation for Basic Research.

ular, we will discuss the ratio of neutral and charged D/B meson production rates, $R_{u/d}$, the strangeness-suppression factor, γ_s, and the fraction of D/B mesons produced in a vector state, $P_{\rm v}$.

2. Bottom quark fragmentation

The b-quark fragmentation function was measured at LEP [2,3,4] and SLD [5]. The measured spectra were compared with predictions of the leading-logarithmic (LL) JETSET 7.4 [6] Monte Carlo (MC) using different parametrisations for the fragmentation function. The best description of the data with a parametrisation with one free parameter was obtained using the parametrisation of Kartvelishvili et al. [7]. The Bowler [8] and symmetric LUND [9] parametrisations with two free parameters provided a better data description. The Peterson [10] and Collins-Spiller [11] parameterisations, and the HERWIG cluster model [12] predictions were found to be too broad to describe the data. The b-quark fragmentation function measurements were also used for fitting the NP parametrisation with the next-to-leading-order (NLO) calculations [13,14].

The b-quark fragmentation fractions were obtained by combining of all published LEP and CDF results on production of the weakly decaying B hadrons with measurements of the time-integrated mixing probabilities [15,16]. The isospin invariance, i.e. $R_{u/d} = 1$, was assumed in this procedure. Using the measured fragmentation fractions, the strangeness-suppression factor for bottom mesons is

$$\gamma_s = 2f(\bar{b} \to B_s^0)/[f(\bar{b} \to B^0) + f(\bar{b} \to B^+)] = 0.27 \pm 0.03.$$

Thus, bottom-strange meson production is suppressed by a factor ≈ 3.7. The combined LEP value for the fraction of B mesons, produced in a vector state, is $P_{\rm v} = 0.75 \pm 0.04$ [16], that is in perfect agreement with the naive spin counting expectation (0.75).

3. Charm quark fragmentation

The c-quark fragmentation function has been recently measured with high precision by the CLEO [17] and BELLE [18] collaborations. The data comparison with the JETSET MC predictions revealed the same picture as for the b-quark fragmentation. The best description of the data was obtained using the Bowler parametrisation with two free parameters, and the parametrisation of Kartvelishvili et al. with one free parameter.

A discrepancy between the NP parametrisations obtained with the CLEO/BELLE data and earlier ALEPH measurement [19] has been observed using the NLO initial conditions, next-to-leading logarithmic (NLL) evolution, NLO coefficient functions and NLL Sudakov resummation [1,13]. The difference, which was attributed to the evolution between the $\Upsilon(4S)$ and Z^0 energies, results in an additional uncertainty in predictions for $D^{*\pm}$ hadroproduction of the order 20%. To reduce the uncertainty direct measurements of the charm fragmentation function at hadronic machines would be useful. Such measurements were already performed in ep interactions at HERA by the ZEUS [20] and H1 [21] collaborations; their results were found to be in qualitative agreement with those obtained in e^+e^- annihilations.

Table 1. The fractions of c quarks hadronising as a particular charm hadron, $f(c \to D, \Lambda_c)$. The fractions are shown for the D^+, D^0, D_s^+ and Λ_c^+ charm ground states and for the D^{*+} state.

	ZEUS (γp) [22]	Combined e^+e^- data [24]	H1 (DIS) [23]
	stat. syst. br.	stat.$\oplus$syst. br.	total
$f(c \to D^+)$	$0.217 \pm 0.014\,^{+0.013}_{-0.005}\,^{+0.014}_{-0.016}$	$0.226 \pm 0.010\,^{+0.016}_{-0.014}$	0.203 ± 0.026
$f(c \to D^0)$	$0.523 \pm 0.021\,^{+0.018}_{-0.017}\,^{+0.022}_{-0.032}$	$0.557 \pm 0.023\,^{+0.014}_{-0.013}$	0.560 ± 0.046
$f(c \to D_s^+)$	$0.095 \pm 0.008\,^{+0.005}_{-0.005}\,^{+0.026}_{-0.017}$	$0.101 \pm 0.009\,^{+0.034}_{-0.020}$	0.151 ± 0.055
$f(c \to \Lambda_c^+)$	$0.144 \pm 0.022\,^{+0.013}_{-0.022}\,^{+0.037}_{-0.025}$	$0.076 \pm 0.007\,^{+0.027}_{-0.016}$	
$f(c \to D^{*+})$	$0.200 \pm 0.009\,^{+0.008}_{-0.006}\,^{+0.008}_{-0.012}$	$0.238 \pm 0.007\,^{+0.003}_{-0.003}$	0.263 ± 0.032

Table 1 compares the c-quark fragmentation fractions measured in ep interactions at HERA by the ZEUS [22] and H1 [23] collaborations with those obtained in e^+e^- annihilations. The latter values were compiled previously [24] and updated with the recent branching ratio values [16]. The measurements performed in e^+e^- and ep interactions are consistent. Measurements of the $R_{u/d}$ value in charm fragmentaion confirmed isospin invariance [22,23,24,25]. Meausurements of the strangeness-suppression factor in charm fragmentation showed that charmed-strange meson production is suppressed by a factor ≈ 3.9 (similar to the suppression in bottom fragmentation). The fraction of charged D mesons produced in a vector state, P_{v}^d, was found to be ≈ 0.6[22,23,24,25] in both e^+e^- and ep interactions. The value is significantly smaller than that obtained in bottom fragmentation and does not agree with the naive spin counting expectation (0.75).

4. Summary

The b-qaurk fragmentation function and fractions were measured in e^+e^- annihilations, while the c-quark fragmenation was studied in both e^+e^- and

ep interactions. Comparison of the charm fragmentation characteristics, obtained in e^+e^- and ep interactions, generally supports the hypothesis that fragmentation proceeds independently of the hard sub-process.

The fraction of charged D mesons produced in a vector state, P_v^d, in charm fragmentation was found to be ≈ 0.6 in both e^+e^- and ep interactions. The value is significantly smaller than that obtained in bottom fragmentation and does not agree with the naive spin counting expectation (0.75).

References

1. C. Oleari, these proceedings.
2. A. Heister *et al.*, ALEPH Collab., *Phys. Lett.* **B512**, 30 (2001).
3. G. Abbiendi *et al.*, OPAL Collab., *Eur. Phys. J.* **C29**, 463 (2003).
4. DELPHI Collab., Abstract 583, International Conference on High Energy Physics, Amsterdam, The Netherlands (ICHEP 2002), July 2002; http://delphiwww.cern.ch/pubxx/conferences/amsterdam02/.
5. K. Abe *et al.*, SLD Collab., *Phys. Rev.* **D65**, 092006 (2002).
6. T. Sjöstrand, *Comp. Phys. Comm.* **82**, 74 (1994).
7. V.G Kartvelishvili, A.K. Likhoded, V.A. Petrov, *Phys. Lett.* **B78**, 615 (1978).
8. M.G. Bowler, *Z. Phys.* **C11** 169 (1981).
9. B. Anderson, G. Gustafson, B. Södeberger, *Z. Phys.* **C20** 317 (1983).
10. C. Peterson *et al.*, *Phys. Rev.* **D27** 105 (1983).
11. P.D.B. Collins, T.P. Spiller, *J. Phys.* **G11** 1289 (1985).
12. G. Marchesini *et al.*, *Comp. Phys. Comm.* **67**, 465 (1992).
13. M. Cacciari, P. Nason, C. Oleari, *JHEP* **0604**, 006 (2006).
14. J. Binnewies, B.A. Kniehl, G. Kramer, *Phys. Rev.* **D58**, 034016 (1998).
15. Heavy Flavour Averaging Group (HFAG), http://www.slac.stanford.edu/xorg/hfag/osc/.
16. S. Eidelman *et al.*, *Phys. Lett.* **B592**, 1 (2004).
17. M. Artuso *et al.*, CLEO Collab., *Phys. Rev.* **D70**, 112001 (2004).
18. R. Seuster *et al.*, BELLE Collab., *Phys. Rev.* **D73**, 032002 (2006).
19. R. Barate *et al.*, ALEPH Collab., *Eur. Phys. J.* **C16**, 597 (2000).
20. ZEUS Collab., Abstract 778, International Conference on High Energy Physics, Amsterdam, The Netherlands (ICHEP 2002), July 2002; http://www-zeus.desy.de/physics/phch/conf/amsterdam_paper.html.
21. H1 Collab., Abstract 649, International Europhysics Conference on High Energy Physics, Lisbon, Portugal (HEP 2005), July 2005; http://www-h1.desy.de/h1/www/publications/conf/list.EPS2005.html.
22. S. Chekanov *et al.*, ZEUS Collab., Eur. Phys. J. **C44** (2005) 351.
23. A. Aktas *et al.*, H1 Collab., Eur. Phys. J. **C38** (2005) 447.
24. L. Gladilin, Preprint hep-ex/9912064, 1999.
25. ZEUS Collab., Abstract 351, International Europhysics Conference on High Energy Physics, Lisbon, Portugal (HEP 2005), July 2005; http://www-zeus.desy.de/physics/phch/conf/lp05_eps05/.