

$\Delta M_W \leq 10 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ at the LHC: a forlorn hope? [†]**Abstract**

At the LHC, the measurement of the W mass with a precision of $\mathcal{O}(10) \text{ MeV}/c^2$ is both mandatory and difficult. In the analysis strategies proposed so far, shortcuts have been made that are justified for proton-antiproton collisions at the Tevatron, but not for proton-proton collisions at the LHC. The root of the problem lies in the inadequate knowledge of parton density functions of the proton. It is argued that in order to reach a $10 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ precision for the W mass, more precise parton density functions of the proton are needed, and an LHC-specific analysis strategy ought to be pursued. Proposals are made on both issues.

M.W. Krasny^{1,*}, F. Dydak², F. Fayette¹, W. Płaczek³, and A. Siódmok^{1,3}

¹ LPNHE, Universités Paris VI et VII and CNRS-IN2P3, Paris, France

² CERN, Geneva, Switzerland

³ Institute of Physics, Jagiellonian University, Cracow, Poland

(To be submitted to European Physical Journal C)

[†] Work in part supported by the cooperation programme between the French IN2P3 and Polish COPIN Laboratories No. 05-116, and by the EU Marie Curie Research Training Network grant No. MRTN-CT-2006-035505

* Corresponding author; e-mail: krasny@lpnhep.in2p3.fr

1 INTRODUCTION

In much the same way as precise measurements of radiative corrections served to test and establish QED, precise measurements of input parameters and their use in the calculation of radiative corrections in the Electroweak Standard Model serve as benchmarks for new theoretical concepts. Therefore, besides the direct searches for new phenomena, the precision measurement of parameters of the Electroweak Standard Model¹⁾—e.g., the W mass—with greater precision than available from LEP and the Tevatron, is an important and indispensable part of the LHC programme.

Whilst the Z mass (M_Z) is well measured to $\pm 2.1 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ [1], M_W is measured at the Tevatron to $\pm 31 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ [2]²⁾ and at LEP to $\pm 33 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ [3]. Of the three independent input parameters of the Electroweak Standard model, M_W , M_Z and the fine-structure constant, M_W is by one order of magnitude less precise than M_Z that is second-best.

Although a precision of M_W that matches the precision of M_Z is experimentally not within reach, a much better precision than available today is desirable to exploit the full potential of the relation between M_W and the Fermi coupling constant G_F that is also well measured with a relative precision of 1×10^{-5} .

The relation between G_F and the three input parameters, M_W , M_Z and the fine-structure constant, is a cornerstone of the Electroweak Standard Model. Radiative corrections of this relation that depend *inter alia* on the mass of the Higgs boson, suggest a broad range for the Higgs mass that is nevertheless well within reach at the LHC. However, in case the Higgs boson will not be found, the hunt for alternative models of electroweak symmetry breaking will be on. Then the highest possible precision of M_W will be a central issue, for a better measured relation between the quantities G_F , M_W , M_Z , and the fine-structure constant, will put more stringent constraints on theoretical models.

In previous analyses, it was claimed that an M_W precision of $10 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ or better will be obtained at the LHC [4, 5]. This paper questions such claims and argues that shortcuts have been made that are not justified, and hence the claimed measurement precision is much too optimistic. The reason is that the analysis of $p_{T,1}$ spectra from leptonic W and Z boson decays in $p\bar{p}$ collisions at the Tevatron—that served as template for the respective analyses at the LHC—benefits from symmetry properties that are absent in pp collisions at the LHC. A considerably better knowledge of the $u_v - d_v$, $s - c$, and b parton density functions (PDFs) of the proton³⁾ than available today is needed, together with an LHC-specific measurement and analysis programme.

No improvement of the current situation is expected unless special experimental efforts are made to obtain the missing high-precision PDFs. Two ways forward are discussed. One is to complement the pp programme of the LHC with a deuteron-deuteron collision programme. Another is to obtain missing input from a new high-precision muon–nucleon scattering experiment, and to analyze these data coherently with LHC pp and Tevatron $p\bar{p}$ data.

This paper is structured as follows. Section 2 discusses the subtleties of the W mass measurement at the LHC, with emphasis on biases caused by the inadequate knowledge of certain PDFs.

¹⁾Hereafter referred to as ‘electroweak parameters’.

²⁾The ultimate W mass error at the Tevatron may be as low as $\pm 15 \text{ MeV}/c^2$.

³⁾Throughout this paper, PDFs refer to the proton.

Section 3 describes the salient features of an LHC-specific programme for the precision measurement of electroweak parameters at the LHC.

In Section 4 two experimental programmes are put forward that would permit a $10 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ precision of M_W at the LHC.

2 MEASUREMENT OF THE W MASS AT THE LHC

Throughout this paper, it is taken for granted that the intrinsic W^+ and W^- masses are equal⁴⁾.

2.1 The lepton transverse momentum and the scale gap

In pp as well as in $p\bar{p}$ collisions, M_W is determined by the Jacobian peak in the p_T spectrum of charged leptons from $W \rightarrow l\nu$ decays. The scale gap between the Jacobian peak around $40 \text{ GeV}/c$ and the wanted M_W precision at the $10 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ level amounts to a factor of 4000.

The quantitative consequences of this scale gap are highlighted in Fig. 1 which shows the change of the p_T spectrum of charged leptons from the decay $W \rightarrow l\nu$ by the inclusion of what PYTHIA [6] predicts as p_T of W's at the LHC. Since the W mass depends on the characteristics




Fig. 1: Simulation of the p_T spectrum of charged leptons from the decay $W \rightarrow l\nu$; the full line is generated with zero p_T of the W's, the broken line represents the effect of a non-zero p_T as predicted by PYTHIA.

of the Jacobian peak, it is intuitively clear that a very precise understanding of the shape of the p_T spectrum is mandatory, as is the calibration of the relation between the p_T spectrum of W decay leptons and M_W by means of the reference relation between the p_T spectrum of Z decay leptons and the precisely known M_Z . Great care must be devoted to all effects that cause either

⁴⁾The best experimental support of this assertion stems from a comparison of the measured μ^+ and μ^- lifetimes [1], which translates into an equality of W^+ and W^- masses at the $1.6 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ level, a precision which is out of reach at the LHC.

the production characteristics of W and Z to be different, or the decay characteristics of $W \rightarrow l\nu$ and $Z \rightarrow l^+l^-$ to be different, or both. Any such difference would lead to different p_T spectra of leptons from W decays and from the reference Z decays.

The detector acceptance needs consideration, too. Since charged leptons with a pseudorapidity $|\eta| > 2.5$ can hardly be measured, this limitation of the pseudorapidity range impacts on the p_T spectrum of charged leptons.

2.2 Parton density functions

Table 1 recalls that quite different quark–antiquark pairs contribute to the production of W^+ , W^- and Z. The following properties of the contributing quarks lead to intrinsic differences in

W^+	$u\bar{d} + u\bar{s} + u\bar{b} + c\bar{d} + c\bar{s} + \dots$
W^-	$d\bar{u} + d\bar{c} + s\bar{u} + s\bar{c} + \dots$
Z	$u\bar{u} + d\bar{d} + s\bar{s} + c\bar{c} + b\bar{b} + \dots$

Table 1: Quark–antiquark pairs that contribute to W^+ , W^- and Z production.

the p_T spectra of leptons from W^+ , W^- and Z leptonic decays: (i) their PDFs, and (ii) their weak coupling constants.

In this paper, in contrast to the usual nomenclature where a PDF is a one-dimensional function of the variable x , where x denotes the fractional longitudinal momentum of the respective parton of the proton longitudinal momentum, what is termed ‘PDF’ generally refers to a two-dimensional function of x and k_T , where k_T is the transverse momentum of the respective parton, unless explicitly specified otherwise. The concept of a two-dimensional PDF is motivated by the large transverse momentum of the annihilating quarks in the production of W and Z which is not at the few 100 MeV/ c level like for the production of low-mass particles such as pions, but rather at the level of several GeV/ c . The differential of the two-dimensional PDF of the quark q , $dq(x, k_T; Q^2)$, denotes the number dN of quarks of type q with a fraction of the proton longitudinal momentum in the range $[x, x + dx]$, with a transverse momentum in the range $[k_T, k_T + dk_T]$, at the scale Q^2 . The one-dimensional PDF $q(x; Q^2)$, referred to below as ‘ k_T -integrated PDF’, is the integral of the two-dimensional PDF $q(x, k_T; Q^2)$ over k_T . Whereas the two-dimensional PDF has one longitudinal and one transverse dimension, the k_T -integrated PDF has only the longitudinal dimension.

The concept of two-dimensional PDFs takes into account (i) the correlation between x and k_T of the contributing quarks and antiquarks (small x is correlated with large k_T), (ii) the correlation of k_T with the hardness scale of the process (the W and Z masses are different), and (iii) the dependence of k_T on the quark type (heavier quarks have larger k_T).

The two-dimensional PDFs are not process-independent universal functions⁵⁾. Their functional forms are not predicted by QCD, they are experimentally determined. Their use is restricted to the analysis of purely leptonic observables for which the initial- and final-state interactions can be factorized⁶⁾.

Throughout this paper, the two-dimensional PDFs refer to the scale $Q^2 = M_W^2$.

⁵⁾This is a departure from the conventional approach that considers PDFs as universal, i.e. process-independent.

⁶⁾There is no gluon exchange between initial and final state.

Five quark flavours participate in the production of W and Z . Since quarks and antiquarks are to be considered, *a priori* ten two-dimensional PDFs need to be known.

2.3 W and Z polarization

By virtue of the different weak coupling constants and the different longitudinal and transverse momentum distributions of the annihilating quarks in W and Z production, the spin components in the longitudinal and transverse directions and the polarizations, respectively, are different for W^+ , W^- and Z . Because the W mass is determined from the p_T spectrum of decay leptons, the interest focuses on the direction *perpendicular* to the beam. The respective non-zero spin components perpendicular to the beam direction constitute ‘longitudinal’ polarizations⁷⁾.

The differences in the longitudinal W^+ , W^- and Z polarizations propagate through leptonic-decay characteristics into differences of the charged-lepton p_T spectra.

2.4 W^+ , W^- and Z leptonic-decay characteristics

With respect to the W^+ , W^- and Z spin directions, the angular distributions of decay leptons are different according to the $V-A$ and $V+A$ amplitudes in the boson–lepton coupling. In the W^\pm rest frame, the pure $V-A$ amplitude leads to the following angular distribution of the charged-lepton emission amplitude:

$$w(\theta) \propto 1 \pm \cos \theta^* , \quad (1)$$

where θ^* denotes the angle between the direction of the spin vector and charged-lepton emission. In the Z rest frame, the mixture of $V-A$ and $V+A$ amplitudes⁸⁾ leads to the angular distribution

$$w(\theta) \propto 1 + \gamma \cos \theta^* , \quad (2)$$

where $0 < \gamma \ll 1$.

The charged-lepton emission asymmetries are modified by the Lorentz boost from the boson rest frame into the laboratory system.

On top of the genuine differences in the longitudinal polarizations of W^+ , W^- and Z bosons, an important contribution to the differences in the p_T distribution of charged leptons in the laboratory system stems from the interference between transverse and longitudinal boson polarization amplitudes.

Altogether, from the different longitudinal polarizations of W^+ , W^- and Z , in conjunction with their different angular distributions of charged-lepton emission, and in conjunction with their momentum spectra, the question arises whether the differences of the p_T spectra of decay leptons from W^+ , W^- and Z can be sufficiently well understood to overcome the scale gap.

2.5 Shortcuts revisited

There are important differences of W^+ , W^- and Z production in pp collisions at the LHC and in $p\bar{p}$ collisions at the Tevatron.

In $p\bar{p}$ collisions at the Tevatron, there is a small forward–backward asymmetry in the production of charged leptons from Z decay, and a strong asymmetry from the decays of W^+ and W^- , since e.g. W^+ are produced preferentially along the incoming proton direction. However, the rates and the momentum spectra of positive leptons from W^+ at the polar angle θ are the

⁷⁾In analogy to the longitudinal polarization vector of a virtual photon.

⁸⁾Because of Nature’s choice of $\sin^2 \theta_w$ close to $1/4$, the $V-A$ and $V+A$ amplitudes are nearly equal and the Z decay is nearly parity-conserving, in contrast to W decay which violates parity maximally.

same as the rates of negative leptons from W^- at the polar angle $\pi - \theta$. The same holds when integrated over the same range of θ and $\pi - \theta$, respectively. This lends itself to a common analysis of leptons with positive and negative charge.

In pp collisions at the LHC, there is for any of the three bosons forward–backward symmetry in the production of charged leptons: at the polar angles θ and $\pi - \theta$, the rates and the momentum spectra are identical. However, the rates and the momentum spectra are mutually different between W^+ , W^- and Z. In particular, the difference in the rates and the momentum spectra of charged leptons from W^+ and W^- decays renders a common analysis of leptons with positive and negative charge questionable.

Figure 2, taken from Ref. [7], illustrates the rapidity y and the p_T of W^\pm production, and Fig. 3, also taken from Ref. [7], shows the pseudorapidity and the p_T for the respective decay leptons. The difference between the characteristics of W production and decay in $p\bar{p}$ collisions and in pp collisions is rather striking. In pp collisions, the difference between W^+ and W^- production is smallest at $|y| \sim 0$, because in this region the contribution from the annihilation of sea quarks with sea quarks is largest.




Fig. 2: Rapidity y and the transverse momentum p_T of W^\pm 's, in $p\bar{p}$ collisions (left panels) and in pp collisions (right panels).

A common analysis of charged leptons from W^+ and W^- is equivalent to a W decay with equal V–A and V+A amplitudes, which is parity-conserving and resembles closely the nearly parity-conserving Z decay. Therefore, at the Tevatron it is straightforward and justified to calibrate in a ‘charge-blind’ analysis the p_T spectrum of charged leptons from W decay with the p_T




Fig. 3: Pseudorapidity η and the transverse momentum p_T of charged leptons from the decay of W^\pm 's, in $p\bar{p}$ collisions (left panels) and in pp collisions (right panels).

spectrum of charged leptons from Z decay. The ensuing systematic error of the W mass at the Tevatron is not dominant and comparable with the statistical error.

At the LHC, for the preponderance of W^+ over W^- production in pp collisions, there is no cancellation at work that lends itself to a charge-blind analysis. If there were only sea quarks involved in the production of W's in pp collisions, symmetry between W^+ and W^- production would not be broken. In practice, symmetry is broken by valence quarks, more specifically by the difference of the u_v and d_v PDFs of the proton. The charge-blind analysis that is valid for $p\bar{p}$ collisions at the Tevatron, cannot be used as template for the analysis of pp collisions at the LHC.

The effect of the valence quarks on the $p_{T,l}$ spectra of W^+ and W^- is shown in Fig. 4. It follows that this difference, as well as the amount of sea quarks with u and d flavour, must be known with better precision than needed at the Tevatron. This is the LHC-specific effect from the 1st quark family.

In Fig. 5, taken from Ref. [8], the contributions of different quark-antiquark annihilations to the W^+ , W^- and Z cross-sections are shown as a function of beam energy, and specifically for the Tevatron and LHC energies. The much stronger contributions from c and b quarks at the LHC energy are noteworthy.

The effects of s and c quarks on the $p_{T,l}$ spectra of W^+ (left panel) and W^- (right panel) in pp collisions at the LHC are shown in Fig. 6. The partner of a c quark to form a W boson, the s




Fig. 4: The effect of the valence quarks on the $p_{T,l}$ spectra of W^+ (left panel) and W^- (right panel) in pp collisions at the LHC.

quark, has different distributions in x and k_T than a c quark that is needed as partner to form a Z boson. Therefore, to know the difference between the s and c PDFs of the proton is important. This is the LHC-specific effect of the 2nd quark family.

Although both for W and Z production the contribution from b quarks is negligible at the Tevatron, and also for W production at the LHC, the contribution of b quarks to Z production is important at the LHC and a sufficiently precise knowledge of the PDF of the b quark is needed. This is the LHC-specific effect of the 3rd quark family.

The importance of the LHC-specific intricacies of the production and decay mechanisms, and their effect on the p_T spectra of decay leptons of W^+ , W^- and Z , has been missed in the LHC physics studies made so far. Not a single study made a difference between charged leptons from W^+ and W^- decays. As a consequence of these shortcuts, unrealistically small errors at or below the $10 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ level were reported for the W mass measurement at the LHC⁹⁾

2.6 A biased W mass

In this section, it is argued that the current precision of pertinent proton PDFs is overestimated. It is shown that with realistic errors of these PDFs, and with correlations taken into account, the advocated W mass precision of $10 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ or better [4, 5] is much too optimistic. If the current underestimation of systematic uncertainties is not rectified the W mass from the LHC may be seriously biased.

The current understanding of the parton density functions is summarized in Fig. 7 which shows the MSTW–2008 set [8]. It is advocated and widely believed that the proton PDFs are precise enough not to pose a limitation for LHC data analysis. For example, the u_v and d_v PDFs are claimed to be precise to 2% [8].

Why then differ the CTEQ [9] and MSTW [10] proton PDFs by much more than 2%, as shown in Fig. 8 taken from Ref. [10], although they stem largely from the same input data? A

⁹⁾The discussion in this paper applies *mutatis mutandis* also to the determination of the W mass from m_T spectra. The determination of m_T involves the reconstruction of the neutrino transverse momentum as missing transverse momentum. The systematic error of this measurement which involves the reconstruction of the hadronic system, is too large to be useful for the measurement of the W mass at the $10 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ level, *inter alia* for reasons of reconstruction efficiency and acceptance close to the beam pipe.




Fig. 5: Contributions of different quark–antiquark annihilations to W^\pm (left panel) and Z (right panel) production, as a function of the beam energy.

5% error of the PDFs of the u and d quarks appears more realistic.

The present experimental uncertainty of the PDF of the c quark is at the 10% level¹⁰⁾, see Fig. 9 taken from Ref. [10]. The present experimental uncertainty of the PDF of the b quark is at the 20% level, see Fig. 10 taken from Ref. [10].

Another problem for the use of current proton PDFs in the analysis of W and Z production and decay at the LHC arises from ‘compensating’ PDF changes: a change of the PDF of one quark can be compensated by a change of the PDF of the other quark of the same family that leaves the Z rapidity distribution nearly invariant and hence escapes detection¹¹⁾.

For the 3rd quark family compensating PDF changes are obviously not possible.

The above uncertainties of PDFs are incorporated in the simulation of p_T spectra from W^+ , W^- and Z leptonic decays. This simulation uses the LHAPDF package [11] of PDFs, and PYTHIA 6.4 [6] for the modelling of the QCD/QED initial-state parton shower and its hadronization; the transverse momentum k_T of quarks and antiquarks is the one incorporated in PYTHIA. The tool for event generation is WINHAC 1.31 [12], a Monte Carlo generator for single W production in hadronic collisions, and subsequent leptonic decay. WINHAC includes also neutral-current processes with γ and Z bosons in the intermediate state. The novel feature

¹⁰⁾Theoretical calculations of heavy-quark PDFs from the gluon PDF are claimed to have a smaller error margin.

¹¹⁾The condition of invariance of the Z rapidity distribution, and hence invisibility even in high-statistics data samples, is decisive: if the measured Z rapidity distribution looked differently than expected from the current proton PDFs, an appropriate change of the proton PDFs would be unavoidable.




Fig. 6: The effects of s and c quarks on the $p_{T,l}$ spectra of W^+ (left panel) and W^- (right panel) in pp collisions at the LHC.

of WINHAC is that it describes W and Z production and decay in terms of spin amplitudes [13]. These involve, besides all possible spin configurations of the W and Z bosons, also the ones of the initial- and final-state fermions. The advantage of this approach is that one has explicit control over all spin states, and thus over transverse and longitudinal boson polarization amplitudes and their interferences.

As an example LHC detector, ATLAS is chosen. Charged leptons from W and Z decays are accepted with $p_T > 20 \text{ GeV}/c$ and $|\eta| < 2.5$. The event statistics correspond to an integrated luminosity of 10 fb^{-1} . Both the electron- and muon decay channels of W and Z are considered. Since in pp collisions the spectra of positive and negative leptons are to be analyzed separately, it is natural to make the same distinction also for the leptons from Z decay. Along this line of reasoning, ‘ Z^+ ’ and ‘ Z^- ’ lepton p_T spectra are generated, in analogy to ‘ W^+ ’ and ‘ W^- ’ lepton p_T spectra¹²⁾. All spectra are generated with various proton PDF configurations. The Z^+ and Z^- lepton p_T spectra are corrected for the evolution from $Q^2 = M_W^2$ to $Q^2 = M_Z^2$.

From a fit of the Jacobian peaks in the p_T distributions and by calibrating with the known Z mass, the W^+ and W^- masses are determined.

For technical reasons, not M_{W^+} and M_{W^-} are separately determined but, equivalently, the average $(M_{W^+} + M_{W^-})/2 = M_W$ and the difference $M_{W^+} - M_{W^-}$ of the masses.

Table 2 lists the biases of M_W and of $M_{W^+} - M_{W^-}$ caused by compensating changes of the PDFs of quarks of the 1st family¹³⁾. If the lepton rapidity range is reduced from $|\eta| < 2.5$ to $|\eta| < 0.3$, the quoted errors would reduce roughly by a factor of two.

Table 3 lists the biases of M_W and of $M_{W^+} - M_{W^-}$ caused by compensating changes of the PDFs of quarks of the 2nd family.

Table 4 lists the biases of M_W caused by changes of the PDF of the b quark.

The conclusion is, when allowing for compensating PDF changes and a realistic PDF error margin, that there is no way to obtain M_W with a precision at the $10 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ level with the currently available proton PDFs.

¹²⁾This appears appropriate as a non-zero longitudinal Z polarization causes the p_T spectra of the positive and negative decay leptons to be slightly different, for the charge-dependent correlation of the Z spin with the emission of charged decay leptons.

¹³⁾The differences $M_{W^+} - M_{W^-}$ are taken from Ref. [7].




Fig. 7: The MSTW-2008 proton PDFs at $Q^2 = 10 \text{ GeV}^2/c^4$; the widths of the bands characterize the estimated uncertainty.

Can the pertinent PDFs be improved with data from ongoing lepton-nucleon scattering experiments, from the Tevatron, or from the LHC? As will be discussed in Section 4, the answer is no. New avenues of experimentation are asked for.

3 AN LHC-SPECIFIC PROGRAMME

A charge-blind analysis like for $p\bar{p}$ collisions at the Tevatron is not appropriate for pp collisions at the LHC. But there are more good reasons to think of a generic, LHC-specific, measurement and analysis programme:

1. The measurement of electroweak parameters should be based on a set of observables with reduced sensitivity to systematic measurement errors and to theoretical uncertainties of perturbative and non-perturbative QCD.
2. The two-dimensional PDFs in the W and Z analysis at the LHC should be defined such that compatibility is maintained with the k_T -integrated PDFs used at the Tevatron, and with the missing high-precision k_T -integrated PDFs that are to come from new experimental avenues.
3. To avoid theoretical uncertainties in the modelling of the lepton p_T distributions in leptonic W and Z decays, Q^2 -scale effects should be determined from the data.
4. To calibrate the lepton momentum with sufficient precision, special data-taking actions should be undertaken.




Fig. 8: Comparison of the CTEQ6.6 and MSTW2008 (NLO) PDFs of u_v , d_v , u , d and s quarks, and of gluons.

An LHC-specific measurement and analysis programme along these lines is outlined below.

3.1 Inclusive cross-sections of charged leptons from W and Z decay

At hadron colliders, the best precision of electroweak parameters is expected from leptons from purely leptonic decays of W and Z . Since the kinematical variables of neutrinos can only be inferred from measurements involving hadrons and hence are subject to larger measurement uncertainties, only observables based on charged leptons l^\pm (more specifically: electrons and muons) are considered.

There are three classes: events with one l^+ , events with one l^- , and events with one oppositely charged lepton pair l^+l^- . It is assumed that these events result from the decays of W^+ , W^- , and $Z^{14)}$. Corrections for acceptance, trigger efficiency, resolution effects, and losses from selection cuts have been applied¹⁵⁾. All background is assumed to be subtracted.

¹⁴⁾Throughout this paper, Z stands for Z/γ .

¹⁵⁾Methods of selecting event samples which minimize biases in acceptance and efficiency corrections between W and Z are discussed in Ref. [14].

Charm structure function, $F_2^{c\bar{c}}(x, Q^2)$




Fig. 9: The measured PDF of the c quark, and the MSTW2008 fit, at different values of Q^2 .

The following five inclusive cross-sections are measured:

$$\Sigma_{W^+}(p_{T,l}, \eta_l) = d^2\sigma / (dp_{T,l} d\eta_l), \quad (3)$$

$$\Sigma_{W^-}(p_{T,l}, \eta_l) = d^2\sigma / (dp_{T,l} d\eta_l), \quad (4)$$

$$\Sigma_Z(M_{ll}, p_{T,ll}, y_{ll}) = d^3\sigma / (dM_{ll} dp_{T,ll} dy_{ll}), \quad (5)$$

$$\Sigma_{Z^+}(M_{ll}, p_{T,ll}, y_{ll}, p_{T,l}, \eta_l) = d^5\sigma / (dM_{ll} dp_{T,ll} dy_{ll} dp_{T,l} d\eta_l), \quad (6)$$

$$\Sigma_{Z^-}(M_{ll}, p_{T,ll}, y_{ll}, p_{T,l}, \eta_l) = d^5\sigma / (dM_{ll} dp_{T,ll} dy_{ll} dp_{T,l} d\eta_l), \quad (7)$$

where $p_{T,l+}$ and η_{l+} ($p_{T,l-}$ and η_{l-}) denote the transverse momentum and pseudorapidity of positively (negatively) charged leptons, and M_{ll} , y_{ll} and $p_{T,ll}$ the mass, rapidity and transverse momentum of the charged lepton pair. The latter two cross-sections are not independent, only one of them, or a suitable combination, can be used.

There is one correction of the above cross-sections that still needs to be applied, though: the calibration of the positive and negative lepton momenta in terms of the functions $\epsilon_{l+}(\rho_l, \eta_l)$ and $\epsilon_{l-}(\rho_l, \eta_l)$ which specify the relation between the true and the reconstructed radius ρ of track curvature in the magnetic field of the respective spectrometer:

$$\rho_{l\pm}^{\text{rec}} = \rho_{l\pm}^{\text{true}} [1 + \epsilon_{l\pm}(\rho_l, \eta_l)]. \quad (8)$$




Fig. 10: The measured PDF of the b quark, and the MSTW2008 fit, at different values of Q^2 .

While a dependence of the calibration functions on the azimuthal angle can be factorized out and experimentally corrected, and therefore their possible ϕ -dependence has been dropped, the dependence on ρ_1 and η_1 cannot, and must be experimentally determined from the data concurrently with the measurement of the electroweak parameters.

The above cross-sections are interpreted in terms of Standard Model parameters and two-dimensional PDFs. These are for W^\pm

$$u, d, s, c, \bar{u}, \bar{d}, \bar{s}, \bar{c}, M_W, \Gamma_W,$$

and for Z

$$u, d, s, c, b, \bar{u}, \bar{d}, \bar{s}, \bar{c}, \bar{b}, M_Z, \Gamma_Z, \sin^2 \theta_W, \alpha,$$

where M_W , M_Z , Γ_W and Γ_Z denote the masses and widths of W and Z (assuming $M_{W^+} = M_{W^-} = M_W$ and $\Gamma_{W^+} = \Gamma_{W^-} = \Gamma_W$), $\sin^2 \theta_W$ the electroweak mixing angle, and α the fine-structure constant. CKM matrix elements are considered as constants and dropped for reasons of simplicity. The $u, d, s, c, b, \bar{u}, \bar{d}, \bar{s}, \bar{c}, \bar{b}$ denote two-dimensional PDFs and refer to $Q^2 = M_W^2$. Their evolution from M_W^2 to M_Z^2 is determined from the data as will be discussed in Section 3.4.

	ΔM_W	$\Delta[(M_{W^+} - M_{W^-})]$
$u_v^{\text{bias}} = 1.05 u_v$ $d_v^{\text{bias}} = d_v - 0.05 u_v$	+79 MeV	+115 MeV
$u_v^{\text{bias}} = 0.95 u_v$ $d_v^{\text{bias}} = d_v + 0.05 u_v$	-64 MeV	-139 MeV

Table 2: Biases from uncertainties in the 1st quark family.

	ΔM_W	$\Delta[(M_{W^+} - M_{W^-})]$
$c^{\text{bias}} = 0.9 c$ $s^{\text{bias}} = s + 0.1 c$	+148 MeV/ c^2	+17 MeV/ c^2
$c^{\text{bias}} = 1.1 c$ $s^{\text{bias}} = s - 0.1 c$	-111 MeV/ c^2	-11 MeV/ c^2

Table 3: Biases from uncertainties in the 2nd quark family.

Since all QCD terms, both perturbative and nonperturbative, will be determined experimentally when relating W and Z observables, the accuracy of the leading and higher-order terms in the functional forms of the cross-sections is of secondary importance¹⁶⁾. The functional forms of cross-sections in terms of the parameters of the Electroweak Standard Model are the ones implemented in the WINHAC and ZINHAC generators [13, 15–19].

	ΔM_W
$b^{\text{bias}} = 1.2 b$	+42 MeV/ c^2
$b^{\text{bias}} = 0.8 b$	-39 MeV/ c^2

Table 4: Biases from uncertainties in the 3rd quark family.

This approach differs from the one used at the Tevatron: there, the measurement of the Standard Model parameters relies on one-dimensional k_T -integrated PDFs [20, 21], and on perturbative-QCD based algorithms for the relationship of the p_T distributions of W and Z [22, 23].

3.2 Four observables

With a view to minimizing systematic measurement errors, the observables should have little sensitivity to detection acceptances and efficiencies. For their use in the precision measurement

¹⁶⁾One of the motivations for this approach is the non-existence of a Monte Carlo generator that provides a full representation of the interplay between QCD and electroweak effects.

of several electroweak parameters, the dependence of the observables on these should be as uncorrelated as possible. Further, the observables should lend themselves to the experimental determination of perturbative and nonperturbative QCD effects, and should clearly point to missing input if needed.

The following four ratios are proposed as observables:

$$\mathcal{A}_W(p_{T,1}, \eta) = \frac{\Sigma_{W^+}(p_{T,1}, \eta) - \Sigma_{W^-}(p_{T,1}, \eta)}{\Sigma_{W^+}(p_{T,1}, \eta) + \Sigma_{W^-}(p_{T,1}, \eta)}, \quad (9)$$

$$\mathcal{A}_Z(y_{11}, p_{T,11}, p_{T,1}, \eta) = \frac{\Sigma_{Z^+}(y_{11}, p_{T,11}, p_{T,1}, \eta) - \Sigma_{Z^-}(y_{11}, p_{T,11}, p_{T,1}, \eta)}{\Sigma_{Z^+}(y_{11}, p_{T,11}, p_{T,1}, \eta) + \Sigma_{Z^-}(y_{11}, p_{T,11}, p_{T,1}, \eta)}, \quad (10)$$

$$\mathcal{R}_{WZ}(p_{T,1}, \eta) = \frac{\Sigma_{W^+}(p_{T,1}, \eta) + \Sigma_{W^-}(p_{T,1}, \eta)}{\Sigma_{Z^+}(p_{T,1}, \eta) + \Sigma_{Z^-}(p_{T,1}, \eta)}, \text{ and} \quad (11)$$

$$\mathcal{R}_Z^{\text{norm}}(p_{T,11}, y_{11}) = \frac{\Sigma_Z(p_{T,11}, y_{11})}{\Sigma_{1^+1^-}^{\text{norm}}}, \quad (12)$$

where

$$\Sigma_Z(p_{T,11}, y_{11}) = \int_{M_Z - 3\Gamma_Z}^{M_Z + 3\Gamma_Z} \Sigma_Z(M_{11}, p_{T,11}, y_{11}) dM_{11}, \quad (13)$$

$$\Sigma_{Z^{+(-)}}(y_{11}, p_{T,11}, p_{T,1}, \eta) = \int_{M_Z - 3\Gamma_Z}^{M_Z + 3\Gamma_Z} [\Sigma_{Z^{+(-)}}(M_{11}, y_{11}, p_{T,11}, p_{T,1}, \eta)] dM_{11}, \text{ and} \quad (14)$$

$$\Sigma_{1^+1^-}^{\text{norm}} = \int \int \int \Sigma_Z(M_{11}, p_{T,11}, y_{11}) dM_{11} dp_{T,11} dy_{11}. \quad (15)$$

The latter integral is over the phase space of 1^+1^- pairs with a back-to-back configuration in the transverse plane, in peripheral proton–proton interactions, as developed and detailed in Ref. [24]. The measurement of electroweak parameters primarily rests on lepton pairs with their invariant mass restricted to the peak region of M_Z . Lepton pairs with invariant mass below the peak region of M_Z will play a different rôle. They will allow to determine Q^2 -scale effects when relating cross-sections at the M_Z^2 scale to the ones at the M_W^2 scale (for a detailed discussion, see Section 3.4).

Although each of the proposed observables depends, in general, on all electroweak parameters, the respective sensitivity is different. The \mathcal{A}_W observable is primarily sensitive to $M_{W^+} - M_{W^-}$ and $\Gamma_{W^+} - \Gamma_{W^-}$. The \mathcal{A}_Z observable is merely sensitive¹⁷⁾ to the value of $\sin^2 \theta_W$. The \mathcal{R}_{WZ} observable is primarily sensitive to M_W , but shows also a non-negligible sensitivity to Γ_W .

All the above observables are correlated via common PDFs and QCD algorithms. The \mathcal{A}_W observable is primarily sensitive to the difference $u - d$, both for valence and sea quarks, and (to a lesser extent) to the difference $s - c$. The \mathcal{A}_Z observable is sensitive mainly to the differences between valence and sea quarks, regardless of their flavour. The \mathcal{R}_{WZ} observable is sensitive to the $u - d$ and $s - c$ differences, to the differences between the density functions of valence and sea quarks, and to the density function of b quarks. The $\mathcal{R}_Z^{\text{norm}}$ observable is primarily sensitive to quark-mass effects both in the longitudinal and the transverse momentum density functions of the quarks.

¹⁷⁾With fixed values of M_Z and Γ_Z , assumed throughout this paper.

Lepton momentum bias	ΔM_W [MeV/c ²]	
	with \mathcal{R}_{WZ}	with $\mathcal{R}_{WZ}^{\text{mod}}$
$\epsilon_{1+} = +\epsilon_{1-} = +0.005$	+226	+5
$\epsilon_{1+} = +\epsilon_{1-} = -0.005$	-223	-2
$\epsilon_{1+} = -\epsilon_{1-} = +0.005$	+40	+22
$\epsilon_{1+} = -\epsilon_{1-} = -0.005$	-19	-31

Table 5: Systematic shifts of M_W caused by lepton momentum biases as defined in Eq. 8; the statistical error of M_W is 7 MeV/c², corresponding to an integrated luminosity of 10 fb⁻¹.

3.3 Lepton momentum calibration

Primarily to measure the M_{W^+} and M_{W^-} masses with a precision of 10 MeV/c², the lepton momentum calibration functions $\epsilon_{1+}(\rho_1, \eta_1)$ and $\epsilon_{1-}(\rho_1, \eta_1)$ (see Section 3.1) ought to be known with the rather demanding accuracy of 2×10^{-4} [4].

The proposal presented here aims first at a reduced sensitivity of electroweak parameters on the average lepton-momentum scale, i.e. $\epsilon_{1+}(\rho_1, \eta_1) + \epsilon_{1-}(\rho_1, \eta_1)$. This is advantageous, for the number of Z events will be statistically limited when subdivided into bins of ρ_1 and η_1 , and split into time intervals. The second aim is, for the inadequacy of a charge-blind analysis at the LHC, a calibration of the momentum-scale difference between positive and negative leptons, i.e. $\epsilon_{1+}(\rho_1, \eta_1) - \epsilon_{1-}(\rho_1, \eta_1)$.

As for the first aim, the \mathcal{R}_{WZ} observable is mostly concerned, and to a lesser extent the $\mathcal{R}_Z^{\text{norm}}$ observable, while the \mathcal{A}_W and \mathcal{A}_Z observables only weakly depend on the average lepton-momentum scale. Therefore, the discussion focuses on the \mathcal{R}_{WZ} observable.

The proposal of an LHC-specific calibration procedure [14] is the following.

1. Collect data at two centre-of-mass energies $\sqrt{s_1}$ and $\sqrt{s_2} = (M_Z/M_W) \times \sqrt{s_1}$. These two settings ascertain the same momentum fractions of the quarks that annihilate to W and Z, if the W sample is collected at $\sqrt{s_1}$ and the Z sample at $\sqrt{s_2}$.
2. Reduce the current i of the spectrometer magnet when running at the lower centre-of-mass energy $\sqrt{s_1}$ by a factor of M_W/M_Z , with a view to equalizing the radius of curvature ρ_1 for charged leptons from W and Z decays.
3. Use a modified version of the \mathcal{R}_{WZ} observable defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{R}_{WZ}^{\text{mod}}(\rho_1, \eta_1) = \frac{\Sigma_{W^+}(\rho_1, \eta_1; s_1, i(s_1)) + \Sigma_{W^-}(\rho_1, \eta_1; s_1, i(s_1))}{\Sigma_{Z^+}(\rho_1, \eta_1; s_2, i(s_2)) + \Sigma_{Z^-}(\rho_1, \eta_1; s_2, i(s_2))}. \quad (16)$$

The integrated luminosity at the reduced centre-of-mass energy can be smaller than the one at the nominal energy by a factor of ten, with a view to achieving comparable statistics of W and Z events.

It is shown in Ref. [14] and summarized in Table 5, that with the use of the $\mathcal{R}_{WZ}^{\text{mod}}$ rather than the \mathcal{R}_{WZ} observable, the sensitivity of the W mass measurement on the average lepton-momentum scale is reduced by two orders of magnitude. This very significant gain results from the same topology of lepton tracks in the two settings with different centre-of-mass energy.

Next, the calibration of the momentum-scale difference $\epsilon_{1+}(\rho_1, \eta_1) - \epsilon_{1-}(\rho_1, \eta_1)$ between positive and negative leptons is discussed. The needed accuracy is 2×10^{-3} if the W mass is to

measured with a precision of $10 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ with the assumption $M_{W^+} = M_{W^-}$, and 2×10^{-4} if the M_{W^+} and M_{W^-} masses are measured separately, as shown in Refs. [7, 25]. This demanding accuracy at the LHC contrasts with the Tevatron case, where the possibility of a charge-blind analysis eliminates the need of a precise calibration of the momentum-scale difference between positive and negative leptons.

The ‘Double Asymmetry’ method, discussed in Refs. [7, 25], requires two running periods with opposite polarity of the spectrometer magnet. It makes use of the following modification of the \mathcal{A}_W observable:

$$\mathcal{D}_W(\rho_1) = \frac{1}{2} \left[\mathcal{A}_W^{\vec{B}=B\vec{e}_z}(\rho_1) + \mathcal{A}_W^{\vec{B}=-B\vec{e}_z}(\rho_1) \right], \quad (17)$$

where ρ_1 represents the radius of the lepton track, and B the magnetic field strength.

This latter method can be used for the W mass measurement and provides the needed calibration precision. However, as far as only the measurement of the W mass under the assumption $M_{W^+} = M_{W^-}$ is concerned, what is needed can be obtained in a simpler way without changing the magnet polarity. Use is made of l^+l^- pairs with invariant mass close to the Z peak. Thanks to Nature’s choice of $\sin^2 \theta_W$ close to $1/4$, the difference of the p_T distributions of positive and negative leptons is minimal, while the statistics of events is large. The comparison of the Z^+ and Z^- p_T distributions delivers what is wanted. The sensitivity to the precise value of $\sin^2 \theta_W$ is sufficiently weak to permit to factorize out the calibration procedure at the precision level of 2×10^{-3} .

As this precision is not sufficient for separate precision measurements of M_{W^+} and M_{W^-} , the ‘Double Asymmetry’ method is indispensable for these.

The conclusion is that the momentum scale of both positive and negative leptons can be calibrated with sufficient precision so as not to limit the precision of electroweak parameters.

3.4 Q^2 evolution

The rationale to deal with Q^2 evolution builds on the concept of rescaling the LHC energy and of the field of the spectrometer magnet in such a way that production and leptonic decays of W and Z are on the same footing: for a given W or Z rapidity, the fractions of the proton momentum carried by annihilating quarks are the same, as is the radius of curvature of leptons from W and Z decays.

The equality of the ρ_1 and η_1 distributions of the leptons holds exactly, though, only for collinear massless quarks with flavour-independent PDFs. Even in such an ideal case the observables proposed in this paper are still sensitive to the Q^2 -dependence of the two-dimensional PDFs of the annihilating quarks. Moreover, the $\mathcal{R}_{WZ}^{\text{mod}}$ observable is sensitive to the relative normalization of the W and Z samples obtained in separate settings.

The Q^2 -scale dependent effects concern primarily the $\mathcal{R}_{WZ}^{\text{mod}}$ observable, hence the following discussion refers to this observable. The generalization to other observables is straightforward.

It is proposed to select pairs of opposite-charge leptons and calculate the ratio

$$\mathcal{C}_{\text{QCD}} = \frac{\int_{M_Z-3\Gamma_Z}^{M_Z+3\Gamma_Z} N_{l^+l^-}(s_2, i(s_2), M_{l^+l^-}) dM_{l^+l^-}}{\int_{M_W-3\Gamma_W}^{M_W+3\Gamma_W} f_{\text{BW}}(s_{l^+l^-}, M_W, \Gamma_W) w_{\text{EW}} N_{l^+l^-}(s_1, i(s_1), M_{l^+l^-}) dM_{l^+l^-}} \quad (18)$$

as a function of ρ_1 and η_1 of a randomly chosen l^+ or l^- . Each pair with an invariant mass $M_Z - 3\Gamma_Z \leq M_{l^+l^-} \leq M_Z + 3\Gamma_Z$ and $M_W - 3\Gamma_W \leq M_{l^+l^-} \leq M_W + 3\Gamma_W$, respectively, is

σ_{k_T} [GeV/c]	ΔM_W [MeV/c ²]		
	with \mathcal{R}_{WZ}	with $\mathcal{R}_{WZ}^{\text{mod}}$	with $\mathcal{R}_{WZ}^{\text{QCD}}$
0	-180	-26	-8
3	-68	-7	-3
6	+206	+12	+4

Table 6: Systematic shifts of M_W caused by different quark k_T 's; the statistical error of M_W is 7 MeV/c², corresponding to an integrated luminosity of 10 fb⁻¹.

weighted with the Breit–Wigner function¹⁸⁾

$$f_{\text{BW}}(s_{1+1-}, M_W, \Gamma_W) = \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{M_W \Gamma_W}{(s_{1+1-} - M_W^2)^2 + M_W^2 \Gamma_W^2}, \quad (19)$$

where $s_{1+1-} = M_{1+1-}^2$. The factor w_{EW} normalizes the integral of the M_{1+1-} spectrum between $M_W - 3\Gamma_W$ and $M_W + 3\Gamma_W$ to the cross section of a Z -like boson with the mass and the width of the W -boson. As a result, the numerical value of \mathcal{C}_{QCD} is close to unity.

In order to eliminate the Q^2 -scale dependence of the two-dimensional PDFs, the $\mathcal{R}_{WZ}^{\text{mod}}$ observable is replaced by the observable

$$\mathcal{R}_{WZ}^{\text{QCD}}(\rho_1, \eta_1) = \mathcal{R}_{WZ}^{\text{mod}}(\rho_1, \eta_1) \times \mathcal{C}_{\text{QCD}}(\rho_1, \eta_1). \quad (20)$$

The detector-level simulation and the numerical evaluation of this concept is presented in Refs. [14]. Here, the result for the most sensitive electroweak parameter, the W mass, is summarized in Table 6. When varying the k_T of quarks¹⁹⁾ over the rather conservative range 0–6 GeV/c, the W mass varies with the \mathcal{R}_{WZ} observable between -180 and $+206$ MeV/c², while there is no significant variation with the $\mathcal{R}_{WZ}^{\text{QCD}}$ observable.

The $\mathcal{R}_{WZ}^{\text{QCD}}$ observable is insensitive to the precision of the relative normalization of the two data sets taken at the energies $\sqrt{s_1}$ and $\sqrt{s_2}$.

3.5 The missing input

At the LHC, the number of observables, Eqs. 9–12, is four whereas *a priori* the number of two-dimensional PDFs (for five quark flavours u, d, s, c, b) is ten = five (quark flavours) \times two (quarks and antiquarks). Both the observables and the PDFs are two-dimensional functions of one longitudinal and one transverse variable.

The method, discussed in Section 3.4, of determining experimentally the Q^2 evolution of the observables from M_W^2 to M_Z^2 , permits to define all PDFs at the M_W^2 scale. For simplicity, their Q^2 dependence is henceforth dropped.

Can the number of PDFs be reduced to match the number of observables?

¹⁸⁾This formula corresponds to the so-called fixed-width scheme, however it can also be applied to the running-width scheme in which case both M_W and Γ_W have to be divided by the factor $\sqrt{1 + (\Gamma_W/M_W)^2}$.

¹⁹⁾Specifically: the value of the PYTHIA smearing parameter σ_{k_T} of the flavour-independent partonic k_T density function.

In a first step it is discussed how to determine, at fixed x , the ten $k_T(x)$ densities for the u, d, s, c, b quarks and antiquarks. Then, in a second step, it is discussed how to determine the x dependence of the ten k_T -integrated PDFs.

It can be assumed that, at fixed x , the k_T dependence of the two-dimensional PDFs of quarks and antiquarks is the same. This is suggested because W and Z bosons are produced predominantly by the annihilations of sea quarks, hence the equality $k_T^q(x) = \bar{k}_T^q(x)$ is a reasonable assumption for all five quark flavours²⁰⁾. This reduces the number of needed k_T densities from ten to five. Assuming further that the k_T densities are the same for the u and d quarks, the p_T dependences of the four LHC observables permit the determination of all four remaining k_T densities, $k_T^{u,d}(x)$, $k_T^s(x)$, $k_T^c(x)$, and $k_T^b(x)$. In practice, better precision is obtained if in addition the further assumption $k_T^{u,d}(x) = k_T^s(x)$ is made.

As for the x dependence of the ten needed k_T -integrated PDFs, the equality of the quark and antiquark densities of the s, c, and b flavours is assumed²¹⁾, $s(x) = \bar{s}(x)$, $c(x) = \bar{c}(x)$ and $b(x) = \bar{b}(x)$. This reduces the number of needed k_T -integrated PDFs from ten to seven. Given the η dependences of the four LHC observables, three experimental constraints are missing, sufficiently precise input PDFs are needed from elsewhere.

The following three k_T -integrated flavour-singlet PDFs are least constrained by the LHC data alone: $u_v(x) - d_v(x)$, $s(x) - c(x)$ and $b(x)$. They are referred to below as ‘missing input’. This choice of missing input is also made in other papers on this subject (Refs. [7, 14, 26, 27]).

The rationale behind the choice of the bulk of the missing input in terms of differences of PDFs is to focus attention on the possibility of compensating PDF changes that was discussed in Section 2.6.

The reason for the preference of the flavour-nonsinglet PDF $u_v - d_v$ is that it will have to be obtained from data taken at smaller Q^2 scales and subsequently extrapolated to the M_W^2 scale. The Q^2 evolution of non-singlet PDFs is independent of the initial form of the gluon density function, hence the extrapolation uncertainty is reduced.

The crucial point is whether the missing input, taken from existing data, is precise enough.

The uncertainties in the missing input used in the pertinent studies in Refs. [7, 14, 26, 27] reflect the uncertainties of the experimental data used to obtain the missing input. The studies gave the following results: an uncertainty of $\mathcal{O}(100)$ MeV/ c^2 for M_W and for the difference $M_{W^+} - M_{W^-}$, an uncertainty of $\mathcal{O}(40)$ MeV/ c^2 for Γ_W , and an uncertainty of $\mathcal{O}(0.001)$ for $\sin^2 \theta_W$. Already for an integrated luminosity as small as 1 fb^{-1} the errors that result from the uncertainties of today’s missing input, are larger than statistical and systematic errors stemming from the LHC data.

The conclusion is that the current precision [1] of the above electroweak parameters cannot be improved at the LHC unless the precision of the missing input is significantly improved. This conclusion is in conflict with the prognoses made by the LHC experiments. The conflict is particularly apparent for the W mass where the measurement precision is found to be 5–10 times worse than estimates made by the LHC Collaborations [4, 5].

In order to ascertain the origin of these discrepancies the analysis was repeated using the LHC Collaborations’ method of studying the impact of the uncertainties of k_T -integrated PDFs on the electroweak observables. With the same range of uncertainty of the parameters of the k_T -integrated PDFs, the results became compatible with the results of the LHC Collaborations.

²⁰⁾The contributions from valence quarks calls for a small correction to be applied.

²¹⁾For s quarks, a small violation of this equality is likely which calls for a small correction to be applied; however, for u and d quarks, at $x \sim 6 \times 10^{-3}$ such equality is violated at the level of $\sim 15\%$.

The discrepancy can be traced back to two sources: a lack of considering compensating PDF changes especially in regions where such changes are hardly constrained by existing experimental data, and too rigid a restriction of the functional forms of the missing input at the initial hardness scale.

4 WAYS FORWARD

There is much discussion about improvements of the parton density functions from HERA experiments. The HERA programme is completed. Results from the e^\pm -proton scattering data of the H1 and ZEUS Collaborations have been published [28], more results from common analyses are forthcoming. Although the ultimate measurement errors are expected to be reduced by a factor of up to two, the level of uncertainty of the PDFs of u_v , d_v and s quarks as assumed in this paper's analysis is appropriate. The HERA data are dominated by neutral-current e^\pm -proton scattering, while the separation between quarks and antiquarks requires charged-current scattering. The scarce statistics of charged-current scatterings (less than 20 k events) render them inadequate to provide the missing input for the LHC. Moreover, the neutral-current scatterings are largely insensitive to compensating changes of the PDFs of u_v and d_v quarks.

The final results of the H1 and ZEUS Collaborations on heavy-flavour production are not yet available. However, again for scarce statistics, these data cannot pin down the PDFs of c and b quarks relative to those of the u and d quarks at the required level of $\sim 1\%$.

Also, the present and the possible future experimental programme at the Jefferson Laboratory cannot improve the knowledge of the proton PDFs at the M_W^2 and M_Z^2 scales. This is because only a fraction of the pertinent deep-inelastic scattering data—where the higher-twists and target-mass corrections can be neglected—lends itself to QCD fits of PDFs²²⁾. At the Jefferson Laboratory where $W_{\max}^2 = 11 \text{ GeV}^2/c^4$, the relevant kinematical region is beyond reach.

If, as planned, the electron beam momentum at the Jefferson Laboratory is increased to 12 GeV/c, the boundary of the useful region will be crossed but only barely so²³⁾.

4.1 Deuteron–deuteron collisions at the LHC

The impact of the uncertainties from missing input PDFs can be considerably reduced by operating the LHC with isoscalar beams. The natural choice is to collide deuteron beams.

The LHC luminosity is expected to scale like $\mathcal{L}_{\text{ion-ion}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{pp}}/A^2$ where A is the mass number of a light ion. Then the event rates with high p_T -signatures will be comparable for the proton and for the light-ion collisions. The experimental environment at the LHC that is characterized by multiple proton–proton collisions within the same bunch-crossing, is not rendered more difficult by parasitic collisions of spectator nucleons in light-ion collisions.

The deuteron beams restore isospin symmetry for the quarks of the 1st family. The four independent k_T -integrated PDFs $u(x)$, $d(x)$, $\bar{u}(x)$ and $\bar{d}(x)$ are reduced to two: $u(x) + d(x)$ and $\bar{u}(x) + \bar{d}(x)$. Equality of W^+ and W^- production is restored and the spin-density matrices of W and Z produced by quarks of the 1st family are nearly the same²⁴⁾. If the contributions from quarks of the 2nd and 3rd family could be neglected, the isospin symmetry of deuterons at the LHC would play the same rôle as the matter–antimatter symmetry at the Tevatron.

²²⁾For example, in the MSTW set of QCD fits, only data are used that satisfy the condition $W^2 > 15 \text{ GeV}^2/c^4$ on the squared hadronic mass [10].

²³⁾The useful data would have inelasticity $y > 0.75$ where resonant photo-production processes are dominant and where QED radiative corrections are large.

²⁴⁾It is assumed that the Q^2 -evolution from the M_W^2 to the M_Z^2 scale is handled as proposed in Section 3.4.

The isospin symmetry of the 1st quark family reduces the number of needed two-dimensional PDFs from ten to eight. With the assumption that the PDFs of the s , c and the b quark flavours are the same for quarks and antiquarks, the number of needed PDFs is further reduced from eight to five. Given the four constraints from the measured W^+ and W^- and Z cross-sections in dd collisions, there is only one two-dimensional PDF left unconstrained.

With a view to solving this problem, the sensitivity of the most sensitive electroweak parameter, the W mass, to the uncertainty in the b quark density function has been investigated by analyzing the Z cross-sections not in the full pseudorapidity range $|\eta_1| < 2.5$, but in the restricted region $2 < |\eta_1| < 2.5$. Since the contribution of $b\bar{b}$ annihilations is reduced in this kinematical region, the sensitivity of the Z cross-section to the b quark PDFs is reduced, too. Varying the b -quark PDF by 40% from its central value, the W mass changed by $5 \text{ MeV}/c^2$, comparable with the statistical error of the pseudo-data sample. Since this is perfectly acceptable, one might conclude that taking data with deuterons in the LHC would provide the wanted precision of electroweak parameters.

However, caveats remain.

A limitation arises from the statistical error of the \mathcal{A}_W observable that measures in dd collisions directly the $s(x) - c(x)$ distribution [7,25]. For the smallness of the Cabibbo angle, reducing the statistical error to the level sufficient to determine M_W with a precision of $10 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ requires a substantial integrated luminosity of dd collisions: 25 fb^{-1} .

The PDFs of the proton and of the neutron bound in deuterons are different with respect to the PDFs of free nucleons. The nuclear binding effects, off-shellness, and shadowing effects, could however be absorbed in a consistent way into the W and Z observables proposed in Section 3.2.

In summary, high-statistics data from dd collisions at the LHC would be sufficient to provide electroweak parameters with the desired precision.

4.2 pp at the LHC, $p\bar{p}$ at the Tevatron, and muon–nucleon scattering combined

The concept of solving the missing-input problem by dd collisions in the LHC is elegant and technically feasible, though not realistic in the near future. Therefore, an alternative is discussed: obtaining with sufficient precision from a joint analysis of Tevatron $p\bar{p}$ data, of data from a new muon–nucleon scattering experiment, and of LHC pp data, all needed PDFs with adequate precision.

Two intrinsic difficulties come along with this concept.

A minor difficulty is cross-normalization between pp and $p\bar{p}$ experiments with adequate precision²⁵⁾. This problem can be solved by measuring the luminosity through the well-known cross-section of l^+l^- pairs with a back-to-back configuration in the transverse plane, in peripheral proton–proton interactions and proton–antiproton interactions, respectively [24].

A major difficulty is that very different x domains of pertinent PDFs are populated, and that for W and Z production only the product of the x values of the annihilating quarks is known, $x_1 \cdot x_2$. Therefore, different x intervals must be considered, ranging from ‘very small x ’ at the LHC over ‘small x ’ at the Tevatron until ‘medium x ’ at the muon–nucleon scattering experiment. The intervals are partially overlapping—generally, if x_1 is small, x_2 is large, and *vice versa*. In the following it is discussed how in a coherent way, yet with different strategies in different x intervals, the information from different intervals can be linked and the missing

²⁵⁾The majority of the observables are normalization-independent ratios but not all, see Eq. 12.

high-precision PDFs for the analysis of LHC pp data across the full range of x_1 and x_2 be obtained.

The LHC is operated at a much higher energy than the Tevatron. Be $x_{\text{low}}^{\text{LHC}}$ and $x_{\text{high}}^{\text{LHC}}$ the minimal and the maximal x of the quarks that produce W and Z at the LHC, and $x_{\text{low}}^{\text{TEV}}$ and $x_{\text{high}}^{\text{TEV}}$ their equivalents at the Tevatron. The unfolding of the PDFs will be different in the LHC-exclusive interval $[x_{\text{low}}^{\text{LHC}}, x_{\text{low}}^{\text{TEV}}]$, in the overlap interval $[x_{\text{low}}^{\text{TEV}}, x_{\text{high}}^{\text{LHC}}]$, and in the Tevatron-exclusive interval $[x_{\text{high}}^{\text{LHC}}, x_{\text{high}}^{\text{TEV}}]$.

It is assumed that the observables have been corrected for their Q^2 evolution and are defined at $Q^2 = M_W^2$. Likewise, the needed two-dimensional PDFs refer to $Q^2 = M_W^2$ and have no energy dependence²⁶⁾.

Like in Section 3.5, in a first step it is discussed how to determine, at fixed x , the ten $k_T(x)$ densities for the u, d, s, c, b quarks and antiquarks. Then, in a second step, it is discussed how to determine the x dependence of the ten k_T -integrated PDFs.

The discussion proceeds in the order of increasing x .

- In the *LHC-exclusive interval* which concerns the very-low x region, the analysis problem was partly discussed already in Section 3.5. As for the $k_T(x)$ densities, it was concluded that the three densities $k_T^{u,d,s}(x)$, $k_T^c(x)$, and $k_T^b(x)$ can be determined from the p_T dependence of the four LHC observables.

As for the x dependence of the ten needed k_T -integrated PDFs, the equality of the quark and antiquark densities of all five quark flavours is assumed, for W and Z are dominantly produced in the annihilation of sea quarks²⁷⁾. This reduces the number of needed k_T -integrated PDFs from 10 to five, still one more than can be determined from the η distribution of the four LHC observables.

The obvious choice is to rely on the ‘HERA-combination’ of PDFs,

$$4/9 [u(x) + \bar{u}(x) + c(x) + \bar{c}(x)] + 1/9 [d(x) + \bar{d}(x) + s(x) + \bar{s}(x)] ,$$

evolved with the DGLAP equations from the HERA- Q^2 to the M_W^2 scale. However, this evolution algorithm that *per se* leads already to a $\sim 2\%$ uncertainty at the M_W^2 scale [28], is not undisputed for very low x [29].

With the latter proviso, the problem is solved.

- In the *overlap interval*, the needed ten $k_T(x)$ densities are constrained by the p_T dependence of eight observables, four from the LHC and four from the Tevatron, which are sufficiently independent of each other. Two assumptions must be made. A straightforward choice is $k_T^c(x) = k_T^{\bar{c}}(x)$ and $k_T^b(x) = k_T^{\bar{b}}(x)$.

The same assumptions can also be made for the x dependence of the k_T -integrated PDFs of the c and b quarks and antiquarks²⁸⁾, $c(x) = \bar{c}(x)$ and $b(x) = \bar{b}(x)$. Then from the η dependence of the eight observables the x dependences of the eight remaining k_T -integrated PDFs can be determined.

The problem is solved.

²⁶⁾A possible small energy dependence of the $k_T(x)$ distributions, at fixed x , can be corrected for.

²⁷⁾At $x \sim 6 \times 10^{-3}$, this assumption is violated for the u and d quarks at the $\sim 15\%$ level which calls for an appropriate correction to be applied.

²⁸⁾In case that the Tevatron precision of the \mathcal{A}_Z observable is not good enough, the equality of the two-dimensional PDFs of the s quarks and antiquarks can be assumed with negligible effects on the uncertainties of the measured electroweak parameters.

- In the *Tevatron-exclusive interval*, the contribution of annihilations involving the bottom quark can be neglected, which reduces the needed k_T densities from ten to eight. Assuming further that $k_T^c(x) = k_T^{\bar{c}}(x)$, that the k_T densities of the u, d, and s antiquarks is the same, $k_T^{\bar{u},\bar{d},\bar{s}}(x)$, and that the k_T densities of the u and d valence quarks are the same, $k_T^{u_v,d_v}(x)$, all four remaining k_T densities can be determined from the p_T dependence of the four observables.

As for the x dependence of the eight needed k_T -integrated PDFs that remain after neglecting the contributions from b quarks and antiquarks, it is assumed that $c(x) = \bar{c}(x)$ and $c(x) = 0$ ²⁹⁾. This leaves six k_T -integrated PDFs to be determined. Given only the η dependences of four Tevatron observables, two k_T -integrated PDFs remain unconstrained.

There remains a problem which can be solved only with additional data. Such data would be provided by a high-precision muon–nucleon scattering experiment.

The muon–nucleon scattering experiment would measure from the deep-inelastic scattering of $\mathcal{O}(100)$ GeV/c muons on stationary hydrogen and deuterium targets the asymmetry

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_{\text{DIS}}^{\text{p,n}} &= \frac{\sigma(\mu, \text{p}) - \sigma(\mu, \text{n})}{\sigma(\mu, \text{p}) + \sigma(\mu, \text{n})} \\ &\propto u_v - d_v + 2 \cdot (\bar{u} - \bar{d}) + \text{corr.} , \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

which is—as far as the difference between \bar{u} and \bar{d} is concerned—complementary to what is measured by the W production asymmetry (Eq. 9)

$$\mathcal{A}_W \propto u_v \cdot \bar{d} - d_v \cdot \bar{u} + \text{corr.} \quad (22)$$

It is recalled that the difference between \bar{u} and \bar{d} is an important ingredient for the understanding of W^+ , W^- and Z polarizations at the LHC.

The asymmetry $\mathcal{A}_{\text{DIS}}^{\text{p,n}}$ has the advantage of bypassing normalization problems but provides only one constraint where two are needed. For the second constraint, the assumption $s(x) = \bar{s}(x)$ is a reasonable choice³⁰⁾.

With the inclusion of the muon–nucleon scattering data, the problem of missing high-precision PDFs for the analysis of LHC pp data is solved.

The present uncertainty on $\mathcal{A}_{\text{DIS}}^{\text{p,n}}$ from lepton–nucleon scattering experiments stems from three sources: (i) the statistical precision of (1–4)%, (ii) uncertainties of $\sim 2\%$ in nuclear corrections, and (iii) uncertainties of $\sim 2\%$ in the Q^2 evolution to the M_W^2 scale. The new muon–nucleon scattering experiment would have to reduce the statistical error by a factor of four, and improve by a comparable factor the experimental and theoretical control of uncertainties from nuclear effects in the deuteron. As for the latter, the electron–nucleon scattering programme at the Jefferson Laboratory is expected to provide new insights.

A Letter of Intent [30] for such an experiment was submitted to CERN Programme Committees. Therein, the exposure of the COMPASS detector to the muon beam of the CERN–SPS was proposed.

²⁹⁾Close to the overlap interval, at $x \sim 8 \times 10^{-2}$, the latter assumption is violated at the $\sim 5\%$ level which requires a small correction to be applied.

³⁰⁾This assumption can be questioned; in this case, rather than measuring the asymmetry $\mathcal{A}_{\text{DIS}}^{\text{p,n}}$, absolute cross-sections $\sigma(\mu, \text{p})$ and $\sigma(\mu, \text{n})$ would have to be measured.

5 CONCLUSION

The measurement of the W mass at the LHC with a precision of $\mathcal{O}(10)$ MeV/c^2 is *per se* important, and even more important if the Higgs boson will not be found. However, the prognoses by the LHC Collaborations that they can achieve this precision are much too optimistic, for the inadequate knowledge of certain proton PDFs that are not relevant in the analysis of $p\bar{p}$ collisions at the Tevatron but are relevant in the analysis of pp collisions at the LHC.

The missing input for the precise measurement of parameters of the Electroweak Standard Model from pp collisions at the LHC is identified. Proposals are discussed how to solve the missing-input problem. One possibility is to complement the pp programme of the LHC with a deuteron-deuteron collision programme. Another possibility is to obtain missing input from a new high-precision muon–nucleon scattering experiment, and to analyze these data coherently with LHC pp and Tevatron $p\bar{p}$ data. In the framework of an LHC-specific programme for the precision measurement of parameters of the Electroweak Standard Model, a precision of $10 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ of M_W can be achieved.

Unless efforts as discussed in this paper are undertaken, the precision of the W mass, and of other parameters of the Electroweak Standard Model, will not be improved at the LHC. Thus a chance may be missed towards understanding the mechanism that regularizes the unitarity problem of this Model.

REFERENCES

- [1] C. Amsler *et al.* (Particle Data Group), *Phys. Lett.* **B667** (2008) 1 2, 3, 20
- [2] The Tevatron Electroweak Working Group, Updated Combination of CDF and D0 results for the Mass of the W Boson, FERMILAB–TM–2439–E, arXiv: 0908.1374 [hep-ex] 2
- [3] The LEP Electroweak Working Group, A Combination of Preliminary Electroweak Measurements and Constraints on the Standard Model, CERN–PH–EP–2006–042, arXiv: hep-ex/0612034 2
- [4] ATLAS Detector and Physics Performance, Report ATLAS TDR 15 (CERN/LHCC 99-15); N. Besson *et al.* (ATLAS Collaboration), *Eur. Phys. J.* **C57** (2008) 627, arXiv: hep-ex/0805.2093; N. Besson (for the ATLAS Collaboration), presentation at the Int. Europhysics Conference on High Energy Physics (EPS–HEP2009), Cracow (Poland), July 2009 2, 8, 17, 20
- [5] V. Buge *et al.* (CMS Collaboration), *J. Phys.* **G34** (2007) 995 2, 8, 20
- [6] T. Sjostrand, S. Mrenna, and P. Skands, *JHEP* **05** (2006) 26 3, 9
- [7] F. Fayette *et al.*, *Eur. Phys. J.* **C63** (2009) 33, arXiv:0812.2571 6, 10, 18, 20, 22
- [8] J. Stirling, MSTW2008: Parton distributions for the LHC, Seminar given at CERN on 18 February, 2009 7, 8
- [9] P.M.Nadolsky *et al.*, *Phys. Rev.* **D 78** (2008) 013004, arXiv:0802.0007 [hep-ph] 8
- [10] A.D. Martin *et al.*, Parton distributions for the LHC, arXiv:0901.0002v2 [hep-ph] 8, 9, 21
- [11] M.R. Whalley, D. Bourilkov, and R.C. Group, arXiv: hep-ph/0508110 9
- [12] W. Płaczek and S. Jadach, <http://cern.ch/placzek/winhac> 9
- [13] W. Płaczek and S. Jadach, *Eur. Phys. J.* **C 29** (2003) 325 10, 15
- [14] M.W. Krasny *et al.*, *Eur. Phys. J.* **C51**, 607 (2007), hep-ph/0702251 12, 17, 19, 20
- [15] C.M. Carloni Calame *et al.*, *Acta Phys. Polon.* **B35** (2004) 1643, arXiv: hep-ph/0402235 15

- [16] C.E. Gerber *et al.* (TeV4LHC-Top and Electroweak Working Group), arXiv: 0705.3251 15
- [17] D. Bardin *et al.*, arXiv: 0806.3822 15
- [18] W. Płaczek, WINHAC—the Monte Carlo event generator for single W-boson production in hadronic collisions, arXiv: 0911.0572 [hep-ph] 15
- [19] A. Siódmok and A. W. Płaczek, ZINHAC—the Monte Carlo event generator for single Z-boson production in hadronic collisions, <http://th-www.if.uj.edu.pl/ZINHAC> 15
- [20] D. Stump *et al.*, JHEP **10** (2003) 46, arXiv: hep-ph/0303013 15
- [21] A.D. Martin, W.J. Stirling and R.G. Roberts, Phys. Rev. **D50** (1994) 6734, arXiv: hep-ph/9406315 15
- [22] T. Aaltonen *et al.* (CDF Collaboration), Phys. Rev. **D77** (2008) 112001 15
- [23] V.M. Abazov *et al.* (D0 Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **103** (2009) 141801 15
- [24] M.W. Krasny, J. Chwastowski, and K. Slowikowski, Nucl. Instrum. Meth. Phys. Res. **A584** (2008) 42, arXiv: hep-ex/0610052 16, 22
- [25] F. Fayette, Strategies for precision measurements of the charge asymmetry of the W boson mass at the LHC within the ATLAS experiment, arXiv: 0906.4260 [hep-ex], PhD thesis 18, 22
- [26] K. Rejzner *et al.*, Measurement of the W width at the LHC, paper in preparation 20
- [27] M.W. Krasny *et al.*, Measurement of $\sin^2 \theta_W$ at the LHC, paper in preparation 20
- [28] H1 and ZEUS Collaborations, Combined Measurement and QCD Analysis of the Inclusive $e^\pm p$ Scattering Cross Sections at HERA, Preprint DESY 09–158, arXiv: 0911.0884 [hep-ex] 21, 23
- [29] K.J. Golec-Biernat, M.W. Krasny and S. Riess, Phys. Lett. **B337** (1994) 367 23
- [30] F. Dydak, M. W. Krasny, and R. Voss, Document CERN-SPSC-2009-028 / CERN-LHCC-2009-014 24