## The Monash 2013 Tune of PYTHIA 8 Peter Skands (CERN)



Current Default = **4C** (from 2010)

LEP tuning undocumented (from 2009) LHC tuning only used very early data based on CTEQ6L1

### Aims for the Monash 2013 Tune

- Revise (and document) constraints from e<sup>+</sup>e<sup>-</sup> measurements
  - In particular in light of possible interplays with LHC measurements
- Test drive the new NNPDF 2.3 LO PDF set (with  $\alpha_s(m_Z) = 0.13$ ) for pp & ppbar
  - Update min-bias and UE tuning + energy scaling  $\rightarrow$  2013
  - Follow "Perugia" tunes for PYTHIA 6: use same  $\alpha_s$  for ISR and FSR
  - Use the PDF value of  $\alpha_s$  for both hard processes and MPI

In Pythia 8.185 Tune:ee = 7; Tune:pp = 14 + complete writeup (Apr 22 2014): <u>arXiv:1404.5630</u>

Monash University Melbourne



## Overview

### Current tunes:

~ describe average UE properties Reasonable agreement with LHC min-bias data on charged tracks in central region (except for tails)

## Discrepancies have been observed

In particular in forward region and for identified particles (strange particles and baryons)

- Collective phenomena? Flow? CR?
- Not much of this has yet been put in the context of the constraints from LEP

E.g., how much room is there to adjust strangeness and baryon rates and spectra at LEP?

# Definitions

### Revised definition of chi2:

We include a blanket 5% "theory uncertainty" in the definition of the  $\chi^2$  value, as a baseline sanity limit for the achievable accuracy of the modelling

Also gives a basic protection against overfitting.

To avoid low statistics generating artificially low  $\chi^2$  values, we use the generated MC statistics to compute a ± uncertainty on the calculated  $\chi^2$  value:

$$\langle \chi_{5\%}^2 \rangle = \frac{1}{N_{\text{bins}}} \sum_{i=1}^{N_{\text{bins}}} \frac{(\text{MC}_i - \text{Data}_i)^2}{\sigma_{\text{Data},i}^2 + (0.05 \text{MC}_i)^2}$$

with the corresponding MC uncertainty,  $\sigma_{\rm MC,i}$ , used to compute the statistical uncertainty on the  $\chi^2$ 



## LEP: Nch & Xp 2|p|/Mz



Note: these fragmentation parameters go directly into the modelling of diffraction

# Strangeness



Consistency: Rates of  $D_s$  and  $B_s$  also improve. Kaon fraction at LHC also improves

# Strangeness: scaling



Consistency: improvements repeated across all ee energies

# Charm

#### Rates ~ unchanged



## Beauty



#### Rates ~ unchanged



## PP: the Total Cross Section





## Charged-Particle Multiplicities



Note: would be interesting to see with/without forward proton tag to isolate diffractive contributions

## <pT> vs Nch

### No big changes



NB: now developing new CR model; Expect significant changes for identified-particle components!

### **IDENTIFIED PARTICLES**

10% more **kaons** (as expected) Now agrees with CMS

But shape of pT distribution still not understood **Collective effects?** New CR model?



Figure 23: pp collisions at 7 TeV.  $K_S^0$  rapidity and  $p_{\perp}$  spectrum, compared with CMS data [99].

 $\chi^2_{5\%}/N_{bins}$ 

5.9 ±0.1

6.6 ±0.3

10.5 ±0.5

p\_ [GeV]

7000 GeV pp 7000 GeV 0.4 </br>  $1/n_{\Lambda} dn_{\Lambda}/dp_{T}$ Λ<sup>0</sup> p<sub>-</sub> (lyl<2.0, NSD) <dn( $\Lambda^0$ )/dlyl> (NSD) CMS CMS  $\chi^2_{5\%}/N_{bin}$ PY8 (Monash 13) 6.4 ±0.0 PY8 (Monash 13) 7.8 ±0.0 10 ×-- PY8 (2C) 14.7 ±0. 0.2 10-2 10<sup>-3</sup> 0 10 Data from JHEP 1105 (2011) 064 Data from JHEP 1105 (2011) 064 Pythia 8 185 Pvthia 8 185 10<sup>-5</sup> 1.4 1.4 Fheory/Data Theory/Data 1.2 1.2 0.8 0.8 0.6 0.6

Still not enough **baryons** and shape of pT distributions not understood New CR model?

Note: EPOS has striking success describing these spectra, but uses hydro! How to discriminate? **Correlations?** 

# Going Forward



Increased <N<sub>ch</sub>> in TOTEM acceptance. Slightly steeper CMS FWD E flow.

# Underlying Event

### Slight increase in UE with respect to 4C



# pT(Z)

## Slightly softer spectrum

	M13	<b>4C</b>
SpaceShower:alphaSvalue	= 0.1365	= 0.137
BeamRemnants:primordialKTsoft BeamRemnants:primordialKThard BeamRemnants:halfScaleForKT BeamRemnants:halfMassForKT	= 0.9 = 1.8 = 1.5 = 1.0	= 0.5 = 2.0 = 1.0 = 1.0

### Note: peak very sensitive to soft effects, IR regularization, etc.

Lesson: do not assume this stays exactly the same when doing matching





# Summary

Complete writeup : arXiv:1404.5630

Apologies: did not do dedicated study of diffraction

E.g., gap-size distributions not included, though interesting

Revised ee fragmentation parameters and pp tune using new NNPDF2.3 LO PDF set

Increased strangeness and more forward activity

Low-multiplicity region and strangeness spectra still challenging

Work underway:

Pythia 8.185 Monash 2013
Tune:ee=7; Tune:pp = 14;

Improved colour-reconnection model (PS + J.R. Christiansen)

Inclusion of diffractive Z (T. Sjostrand + C. Rasmussen)

Improved model for  $g \rightarrow QQ$  (T. Sjostrand + student)