

1-1-2011

Search for first generation leptoquark pair production in the electron + missing energy + jets final state

V. M. Abazov

Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, Russia

Kenneth A. Bloom

University of Nebraska - Lincoln, kbloom2@unl.edu

Daniel R. Claes

University of Nebraska - Lincoln, dclaes1@unl.edu

K. DeVaughan

University of Nebraska-Lincoln

A. Dominguez

University of Nebraska - Lincoln, adominguez2@unl.edu

See next page for additional authors

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/physicsbloom>



Part of the [Physics Commons](#)

Abazov, V. M.; Bloom, Kenneth A.; Claes, Daniel R.; DeVaughan, K.; Dominguez, A.; Eads, Michael; Johnston, D; Katsanos, Ioannis; Malik, Sudhir; and Snow, Gregory, "Search for first generation leptoquark pair production in the electron + missing energy + jets final state" (2011). *Kenneth Bloom Publications*. Paper 319.

<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/physicsbloom/319>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Research Papers in Physics and Astronomy at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Kenneth Bloom Publications by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

Authors

V. M. Abazov, Kenneth A. Bloom, Daniel R. Claes, K. DeVaughan, A. Dominguez, Michael Eads, D Johnston, Ioannis Katsanos, Sudhir Malik, and Gregory Snow

Search for first generation leptoquark pair production in the electron + missing energy + jets final state

V. M. Abazov,³⁵ B. Abbott,⁷³ B. S. Acharya,²⁹ M. Adams,⁴⁹ T. Adams,⁴⁷ G. D. Alexeev,³⁵ G. Alkhazov,³⁹ A. Alton,^{61,*} G. Alverson,⁶⁰ G. A. Alves,² M. Aoki,⁴⁸ M. Arov,⁵⁸ A. Askew,⁴⁷ B. Åsman,⁴¹ O. Atramentov,⁶⁵ C. Avila,⁸ J. BackusMayes,⁸⁰ F. Badaud,¹³ L. Bagby,⁴⁸ B. Baldin,⁴⁸ D. V. Bandurin,⁴⁷ S. Banerjee,²⁹ E. Barberis,⁶⁰ P. Baringer,⁵⁶ J. Barreto,³ J. F. Bartlett,⁴⁸ U. Bassler,¹⁸ V. Bazterra,⁴⁹ S. Beale,⁶ A. Bean,⁵⁶ M. Begalli,³ M. Begel,⁷¹ C. Belanger-Champagne,⁴¹ L. Bellantoni,⁴⁸ S. B. Beri,²⁷ G. Bernardi,¹⁷ R. Bernhard,²² I. Bertram,⁴² M. Besançon,¹⁸ R. Beuselinck,⁴³ V. A. Bezzubov,³⁸ P. C. Bhat,⁴⁸ V. Bhatnagar,²⁷ G. Blazey,⁵⁰ S. Blessing,⁴⁷ **K. Bloom**,⁶⁴ A. Boehnlein,⁴⁸ D. Boline,⁷⁰ E. E. Boos,³⁷ G. Borissov,⁴² T. Bose,⁵⁹ A. Brandt,⁷⁶ O. Brandt,²³ R. Brock,⁶² G. Brooijmans,⁶⁸ A. Bross,⁴⁸ D. Brown,¹⁷ J. Brown,¹⁷ X. B. Bu,⁴⁸ M. Buehler,⁷⁹ V. Buescher,²⁴ V. Bunichev,³⁷ S. Burdin,^{42,†} T. H. Burnett,⁸⁰ C. P. Buszello,⁴¹ B. Calpas,¹⁵ E. Camacho-Pérez,³² M. A. Carrasco-Lizarraga,⁵⁶ B. C. K. Casey,⁴⁸ H. Castilla-Valdez,³² S. Chakrabarti,⁷⁰ D. Chakraborty,⁵⁰ K. M. Chan,⁵⁴ A. Chandra,⁷⁸ G. Chen,⁵⁶ S. Chevalier-Théry,¹⁸ D. K. Cho,⁷⁵ S. W. Cho,³¹ S. Choi,³¹ B. Choudhary,²⁸ S. Cihangir,⁴⁸ **D. Claes**,⁶⁴ J. Clutter,⁵⁶ M. Cooke,⁴⁸ W. E. Cooper,⁴⁸ M. Corcoran,⁷⁸ F. Couderc,¹⁸ M.-C. Cousinou,¹⁵ A. Croc,¹⁸ D. Cutts,⁷⁵ A. Das,⁴⁵ G. Davies,⁴³ K. De,⁷⁶ S. J. de Jong,³⁴ E. De La Cruz-Burelo,³² F. Déliot,¹⁸ M. Demarteau,⁴⁸ R. Demina,⁶⁹ D. Denisov,⁴⁸ S. P. Denisov,³⁸ S. Desai,⁴⁸ C. Deterre,¹⁸ **K. DeVaughan**,⁶⁴ H. T. Diehl,⁴⁸ M. Diesburg,⁴⁸ P. F. Ding,⁴⁴ **A. Dominguez**,⁶⁴ T. Dorland,⁸⁰ A. Dubey,²⁸ L. V. Dudko,³⁷ D. Duggan,⁶⁵ A. Duperrin,¹⁵ S. Dutt,²⁷ A. Dyshkant,⁵⁰ **M. Eads**,⁶⁴ D. Edmunds,⁶² J. Ellison,⁴⁶ V. D. Elvira,⁴⁸ Y. Enari,¹⁷ H. Evans,⁵² A. Evdokimov,⁷¹ V. N. Evdokimov,³⁸ G. Facini,⁶⁰ T. Ferbel,⁶⁹ F. Fiedler,²⁴ F. Filthaut,³⁴ W. Fisher,⁶² H. E. Fisk,⁴⁸ M. Fortner,⁵⁰ H. Fox,⁴² S. Fuess,⁴⁸ A. Garcia-Bellido,⁶⁹ V. Gavrilov,³⁶ P. Gay,¹³ W. Geng,^{15,62} D. Gerbaudo,⁶⁶ C. E. Gerber,⁴⁹ Y. Gershtein,⁶⁵ G. Ginther,^{48,69} G. Golovanov,³⁵ A. Goussiou,⁸⁰ P. D. Grannis,⁷⁰ S. Greder,¹⁹ H. Greenlee,⁴⁸ Z. D. Greenwood,⁵⁸ E. M. Gregores,⁴ G. Grenier,²⁰ Ph. Gris,¹³ J.-F. Grivaz,¹⁶ A. Grohsjean,¹⁸ S. Grünendahl,⁴⁸ M. W. Grünewald,³⁰ T. Guillemin,¹⁶ F. Guo,⁷⁰ G. Gutierrez,⁴⁸ P. Gutierrez,⁷³ A. Haas,^{68,‡} S. Hagopian,⁴⁷ J. Haley,⁶⁰ L. Han,⁷ K. Harder,⁴⁴ A. Harel,⁶⁹ J. M. Hauptman,⁵⁵ J. Hays,⁴³ T. Head,⁴⁴ T. Hebbeker,²¹ D. Hedin,⁵⁰ H. Hegab,⁷⁴ A. P. Heinson,⁴⁶ U. Heintz,⁷⁵ C. Hensel,²³ I. Heredia-De La Cruz,³² K. Herner,⁶¹ G. Hesketh,^{44,§} M. D. Hildreth,⁵⁴ R. Hirosky,⁷⁹ T. Hoang,⁴⁷ J. D. Hobbs,⁷⁰ B. Hoeneisen,¹² M. Hohlfield,²⁴ X. Huang,⁶⁸ Z. Hubacek,^{10,18} N. Huske,¹⁷ V. Hynek,¹⁰ I. Iashvili,⁶⁷ Y. Ilchenko,⁷⁷ R. Illingworth,⁴⁸ A. S. Ito,⁴⁸ S. Jabeen,⁷⁵ M. Jaffré,¹⁶ D. Jamin,¹⁵ A. Jayasinghe,⁷³ R. Jesik,⁴³ K. Johns,⁴⁵ M. Johnson,⁴⁸ **D. Johnston**,⁶⁴ A. Jonckheere,⁴⁸ P. Jonsson,⁴³ J. Joshi,²⁷ A. W. Jung,⁴⁸ A. Juste,⁴⁰ K. Kaadze,⁵⁷ E. Kajfasz,¹⁵ D. Karmanov,³⁷ P. A. Kasper,⁴⁸ **I. Katsanos**,⁶⁴ R. Kehoe,⁷⁷ S. Kermiche,¹⁵ N. Khalatyan,⁴⁸ A. Khanov,⁷⁴ A. Kharchilava,⁶⁷ Y. N. Kharzheev,³⁵ M. H. Kirby,⁵¹ J. M. Kohli,²⁷ A. V. Kozelov,³⁸ J. Kraus,⁶² S. Kulikov,³⁸ A. Kumar,⁶⁷ A. Kupco,¹¹ T. Kurča,²⁰ V. A. Kuzmin,³⁷ J. Kvita,⁹ S. Lammers,⁵² G. Landsberg,⁷⁵ P. Lebrun,²⁰ H. S. Lee,³¹ S. W. Lee,⁵⁵ W. M. Lee,⁴⁸ J. Lellouch,¹⁷ L. Li,⁴⁶ Q. Z. Li,⁴⁸ S. M. Lietti,⁵ J. K. Lim,³¹ D. Lincoln,⁴⁸ J. Linnemann,⁶² V. V. Lipaev,³⁸ R. Lipton,⁴⁸ Y. Liu,⁷ Z. Liu,⁶ A. Lobodenko,³⁹ M. Lokajicek,¹¹ R. Lopes de Sa,⁷⁰ H. J. Lubatti,⁸⁰ R. Luna-Garcia,^{32,||} A. L. Lyon,⁴⁸ A. K. A. Maciel,² D. Mackin,⁷⁸ R. Madar,¹⁸ R. Magaña-Villalba,³² **S. Malik**,⁶⁴ V. L. Malyshev,³⁵ Y. Maravin,⁵⁷ J. Martínez-Ortega,³² R. McCarthy,⁷⁰ C. L. McGivern,⁵⁶ M. M. Meijer,³⁴ A. Melnitchouk,⁶³ D. Menezes,⁵⁰ P. G. Mercadante,⁴ M. Merkin,³⁷ A. Meyer,²¹ J. Meyer,²³ F. Miconi,¹⁹ N. K. Mondal,²⁹ G. S. Muanza,¹⁵ M. Mulhearn,⁷⁹ E. Nagy,¹⁵ M. Naimuddin,²⁸ M. Narain,⁷⁵ R. Nayyar,²⁸ H. A. Neal,⁶¹ J. P. Negret,⁸ P. Neustroev,³⁹ S. F. Novaes,⁵ T. Nunnemann,²⁵ G. Obrant,^{39,††} J. Orduna,⁷⁸ N. Osman,¹⁵ J. Osta,⁵⁴ G. J. Otero y Garzón,¹ M. Padilla,⁴⁶ A. Pal,⁷⁶ N. Parashar,⁵³ V. Parihar,⁷⁵ S. K. Park,³¹ J. Parsons,⁶⁸ R. Partridge,^{75,‡} N. Parua,⁵² A. Patwa,⁷¹ B. Penning,⁴⁸ M. Perfilov,³⁷ K. Peters,⁴⁴ Y. Peters,⁴⁴ K. Petridis,⁴⁴ G. Petrillo,⁶⁹ P. Pétrouff,¹⁶ R. Piegaia,¹ M.-A. Pleier,⁷¹ P. L. M. Podesta-Lerma,^{32,||} V. M. Podstavkov,⁴⁸ P. Polozov,³⁶ A. V. Popov,³⁸ M. Prewitt,⁷⁸ D. Price,⁵² N. Prokopenko,³⁸ S. Protopopescu,⁷¹ J. Qian,⁶¹ A. Quadt,²³ B. Quinn,⁶³ M. S. Rangel,² K. Ranjan,²⁸ P. N. Ratoff,⁴² I. Razumov,³⁸ P. Renkel,⁷⁷ M. Rijssenbeek,⁷⁰ I. Ripp-Baudot,¹⁹ F. Rizatdinova,⁷⁴ M. Rominsky,⁴⁸ A. Ross,⁴² C. Royon,¹⁸ P. Rubinov,⁴⁸ R. Ruchti,⁵⁴ G. Safronov,³⁶ G. Sajot,¹⁴ P. Salcido,⁵⁰ A. Sánchez-Hernández,³² M. P. Sanders,²⁵ B. Sanghi,⁴⁸ A. S. Santos,⁵ G. Savage,⁴⁸ L. Sawyer,⁵⁸ T. Scanlon,⁴³ R. D. Schamberger,⁷⁰ Y. Scheglov,³⁹ H. Schellman,⁵¹ T. Schliephake,²⁶ S. Schlobohm,⁸⁰ C. Schwanenberger,⁴⁴ R. Schwienhorst,⁶² J. Sekaric,⁵⁶ H. Severini,⁷³ E. Shabalina,²³ V. Shary,¹⁸ A. A. Shchukin,³⁸ R. K. Shivpuri,²⁸ V. Simak,¹⁰ V. Sirotenko,⁴⁸ P. Skubic,⁷³ P. Slattery,⁶⁹ D. Smirnov,⁵⁴ K. J. Smith,⁶⁷ **G. R. Snow**,⁶⁴ J. Snow,⁷² S. Snyder,⁷¹ S. Söldner-Rembold,⁴⁴ L. Sonnenschein,²¹ K. Soustruznik,⁹ J. Stark,¹⁴ V. Stolin,³⁶ D. A. Stoyanova,³⁸ M. Strauss,⁷³ D. Strom,⁴⁹ L. Stutte,⁴⁸ L. Suter,⁴⁴ P. Svoisky,⁷³ M. Takahashi,⁴⁴ A. Tanasijczuk,¹ W. Taylor,⁶ M. Titov,¹⁸ V. V. Tokmenin,³⁵ Y.-T. Tsai,⁶⁹ D. Tsybychev,⁷⁰ B. Tuchming,¹⁸ C. Tully,⁶⁶ L. Uvarov,³⁹ S. Uvarov,³⁹ S. Uzunyan,⁵⁰ R. Van Kooten,⁵² W. M. van Leeuwen,³³ N. Varelas,⁴⁹ E. W. Varnes,⁴⁵ I. A. Vasilyev,³⁸

P. Verdier,²⁰ L. S. Vertogradov,³⁵ M. Verzocchi,⁴⁸ M. Vesterinen,⁴⁴ D. Vilanova,¹⁸ P. Vokac,¹⁰ H. D. Wahl,⁴⁷ M. H. L. S. Wang,⁴⁸ J. Warchol,⁵⁴ G. Watts,⁸⁰ M. Wayne,⁵⁴ M. Weber,^{48,**} L. Welty-Rieger,⁵¹ A. White,⁷⁶ D. Wicke,²⁶ M. R. J. Williams,⁴² G. W. Wilson,⁵⁶ M. Wobisch,⁵⁸ D. R. Wood,⁶⁰ T. R. Wyatt,⁴⁴ Y. Xie,⁴⁸ C. Xu,⁶¹ S. Yacoub,⁵¹ R. Yamada,⁴⁸ W.-C. Yang,⁴⁴ T. Yasuda,⁴⁸ Y. A. Yatsunenko,³⁵ Z. Ye,⁴⁸ H. Yin,⁴⁸ K. Yip,⁷¹ S. W. Youn,⁴⁸ J. Yu,⁷⁶ S. Zelitch,⁷⁹ T. Zhao,⁸⁰ B. Zhou,⁶¹ J. Zhu,⁶¹ M. Zielinski,⁶⁹ D. Zieminska,⁵² and L. Zivkovic⁷⁵

(D0 Collaboration)

- ¹Universidad de Buenos Aires, Buenos Aires, Argentina
²LAFEX, Centro Brasileiro de Pesquisas Físicas, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
³Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
⁴Universidade Federal do ABC, Santo André, Brazil
⁵Instituto de Física Teórica, Universidade Estadual Paulista, São Paulo, Brazil
⁶Simon Fraser University, Vancouver, British Columbia, and York University, Toronto, Ontario, Canada
⁷University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, People's Republic of China
⁸Universidad de los Andes, Bogotá, Colombia
⁹Charles University, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, Center for Particle Physics, Prague, Czech Republic
¹⁰Czech Technical University in Prague, Prague, Czech Republic
¹¹Center for Particle Physics, Institute of Physics, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, Prague, Czech Republic
¹²Universidad San Francisco de Quito, Quito, Ecuador
¹³LPC, Université Blaise Pascal, CNRS/IN2P3, Clermont, France
¹⁴LPSC, Université Joseph Fourier Grenoble 1, CNRS/IN2P3, Institut National Polytechnique de Grenoble, Grenoble, France
¹⁵CPPM, Aix-Marseille Université, CNRS/IN2P3, Marseille, France
¹⁶LAL, Université Paris-Sud, CNRS/IN2P3, Orsay, France
¹⁷LPNHE, Universités Paris VI and VII, CNRS/IN2P3, Paris, France
¹⁸CEA, Irfu, SPP, Saclay, France
¹⁹IPHC, Université de Strasbourg, CNRS/IN2P3, Strasbourg, France
²⁰IPNL, Université Lyon 1, CNRS/IN2P3, Villeurbanne, France and Université de Lyon, Lyon, France
²¹III. Physikalisches Institut A, RWTH Aachen University, Aachen, Germany
²²Physikalisches Institut, Universität Freiburg, Freiburg, Germany
²³II. Physikalisches Institut, Georg-August-Universität Göttingen, Göttingen, Germany
²⁴Institut für Physik, Universität Mainz, Mainz, Germany
²⁵Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, München, Germany
²⁶Fachbereich Physik, Bergische Universität Wuppertal, Wuppertal, Germany
²⁷Panjab University, Chandigarh, India
²⁸Delhi University, Delhi, India
²⁹Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, Mumbai, India
³⁰University College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland
³¹Korea Detector Laboratory, Korea University, Seoul, Korea
³²CINVESTAV, Mexico City, Mexico
³³Nikhef, Science Park, Amsterdam, the Netherlands
³⁴Radboud University Nijmegen, Nijmegen, the Netherlands and Nikhef, Science Park, Amsterdam, the Netherlands
³⁵Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, Russia
³⁶Institute for Theoretical and Experimental Physics, Moscow, Russia
³⁷Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia
³⁸Institute for High Energy Physics, Protvino, Russia
³⁹Petersburg Nuclear Physics Institute, St. Petersburg, Russia
⁴⁰Institució Catalana de Recerca i Estudis Avançats (ICREA) and Institut de Física d'Altes Energies (IFAE), Barcelona, Spain
⁴¹Stockholm University, Stockholm and Uppsala University, Uppsala, Sweden
⁴²Lancaster University, Lancaster LA1 4YB, United Kingdom
⁴³Imperial College London, London SW7 2AZ, United Kingdom
⁴⁴The University of Manchester, Manchester M13 9PL, United Kingdom
⁴⁵University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona 85721, USA
⁴⁶University of California Riverside, Riverside, California 92521, USA
⁴⁷Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida 32306, USA
⁴⁸Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, Batavia, Illinois 60510, USA
⁴⁹University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, Illinois 60607, USA
⁵⁰Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, Illinois 60115, USA
⁵¹Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois 60208, USA

- ⁵²Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana 47405, USA
⁵³Purdue University Calumet, Hammond, Indiana 46323, USA
⁵⁴University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana 46556, USA
⁵⁵Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa 50011, USA
⁵⁶University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas 66045, USA
⁵⁷Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas 66506, USA
⁵⁸Louisiana Tech University, Ruston, Louisiana 71272, USA
⁵⁹Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts 02215, USA
⁶⁰Northeastern University, Boston, Massachusetts 02115, USA
⁶¹University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109, USA
⁶²Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48824, USA
⁶³University of Mississippi, University, Mississippi 38677, USA
⁶⁴University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska 68588, USA
⁶⁵Rutgers University, Piscataway, New Jersey 08855, USA
⁶⁶Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey 08544, USA
⁶⁷State University of New York, Buffalo, New York 14260, USA
⁶⁸Columbia University, New York, New York 10027, USA
⁶⁹University of Rochester, Rochester, New York 14627, USA
⁷⁰State University of New York, Stony Brook, New York 11794, USA
⁷¹Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, New York 11973, USA
⁷²Langston University, Langston, Oklahoma 73050, USA
⁷³University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma 73019, USA
⁷⁴Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma 74078, USA
⁷⁵Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island 02912, USA
⁷⁶University of Texas, Arlington, Texas 76019, USA
⁷⁷Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas 75275, USA
⁷⁸Rice University, Houston, Texas 77005, USA
⁷⁹University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia 22901, USA
⁸⁰University of Washington, Seattle, Washington 98195, USA
(Received 12 July 2011; published 11 October 2011)

We present a search for the pair production of first generation scalar leptoquarks (LQ) in data corresponding to an integrated luminosity of 5.4 fb^{-1} collected with the D0 detector at the Fermilab Tevatron Collider in $p\bar{p}$ collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 1.96 \text{ TeV}$. In the channel $LQLQ \rightarrow eq\nu_e q'$, where q, q' are u or d quarks, no significant excess of data over background is observed, and we set a 95% C.L. lower limit of 326 GeV on the LQ mass, assuming equal probabilities of LQ decays to eq and $\nu_e q'$.

DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevD.84.071104

PACS numbers: 13.85.Rm, 14.80.Sv

Because of the limitations of the standard model (SM), several extensions have been proposed, among them supersymmetry [1], grand unified theories [2], and string theory [3]. Many of these extensions predict the existence of particles that directly connect the lepton and quark sectors. By combining leptons and quarks in multiplets of a larger symmetry group, they are expected to interact with each other through new mediating bosons called leptoquarks (LQ) [4,5]. LQ s can be either scalar or vector

fields. This paper will focus on the search for scalar LQ s, and in the following we will not distinguish particles from antiparticles. This search is performed within effective models [6,7], and thus is independent of specific extensions of the SM.

In $p\bar{p}$ collisions such as those that occur at the Tevatron Collider, LQ s can be produced in leptoquark-antileptoquark pairs. LQ pair production can occur via both quark-antiquark annihilation and gluon-gluon fusion, although quark-antiquark annihilation is expected to be dominant. The production cross section for scalar LQ s depends only on the strong coupling constant and on the LQ mass and is known at next-to-leading order (NLO) [8].

Once produced, LQ s can decay to two final states: lq and $\nu q'$ (where $l = e, \mu, \text{ or } \tau$). It is assumed that in the low energy limit there is no intergenerational mixing. For first generation LQ pairs, the final state will contain a pair of leptons (e or ν_e) and a pair of quarks (u or d) of the first generation. In this paper, the case in which one LQ decays

* Visitor from Augustana College, Sioux Falls, SD, USA.

† Visitor from The University of Liverpool, Liverpool, UK

‡ Visitor from SLAC, Menlo Park, CA, USA.

§ Visitor from University College London, London, UK.

|| Visitor from Centro de Investigacion en Computacion—IPN, Mexico City, Mexico.

¶ Visitor from ECFM, Universidad Autonoma de Sinaloa, Culiacán, Mexico.

** Visitor from Universität Bern, Bern, Switzerland.

†† Deceased.

to eq and the other to $\nu_e q'$ is considered (charge conjugate states are assumed here).

We define β to be the branching ratio of a first generation LQ to decay to eq . Then the probability for an LQ to decay to $\nu_e q'$ is $(1 - \beta)$, and the probability for a LQ pair to decay to the final state $eq\nu_e q'$ is $\text{BR}(LQLQ \rightarrow eq\nu_e q') = 2\beta(1 - \beta)$. Thus, the probability for the final state $eq\nu_e q'$ is maximized when $\beta = 0.5$.

Limits on the production of first generation LQ s have been reported by the DELPHI [9], OPAL [10,11], H1 [12,13], ZEUS [14], CDF [15], and D0 [16] collaborations. Recently, CMS [17,18], and ATLAS [19] published the first searches for scalar LQ pair production at the CERN LHC. Both LHC experiments have a similar sensitivity with expected limits of 345 GeV (CMS) and 350 GeV (ATLAS), respectively, for $\beta = 0.5$.

The D0 detector consists of tracking, calorimeter, and muon systems [20–22]. The central-tracking system consists of a silicon microstrip tracker and a central fiber tracker, both located within a 2 T superconducting solenoid. A liquid-argon and uranium calorimeter consists of a central section (pseudorapidity $|\eta| < 1.1$ [23]) and two end sections ($1.5 < |\eta| < 4.2$). The calorimeters have fine transverse and longitudinal segmentation with three principal layers identified as electromagnetic, and fine and coarse hadronic. An outer muon system ($|\eta| < 2$) consists of a layer of tracking detectors and scintillation trigger counters in front of 1.8 T toroids, followed by two similar layers after the toroids [24]. Data were collected with the D0 detector at the Fermilab Tevatron $p\bar{p}$ Collider operating at $\sqrt{s} = 1.96$ TeV between August 2002 and June 2009 and correspond to an integrated luminosity of 5.4 fb^{-1} .

An electron is identified from energy deposits in the electromagnetic calorimeter that are consistent with the shower development expected for an electron and have a matching track extrapolated from the central tracker.

Jets are reconstructed using a midpoint cone algorithm, with a cone size of 0.5 [25]. The jet energy is corrected to the particle level using jet energy scale corrections determined from data [26]. The missing transverse energy (\cancel{E}_T) is reconstructed from all the cells of the electromagnetic and hadronic calorimeters, except for the coarse hadronic sector where a noise-reduction algorithm is applied. Additional corrections are then applied for all identified objects including jets, electrons, and muons.

Events must satisfy at least one trigger from the single-electron and electron + jets suites of triggers. For all data samples, trigger objects are required to match the reconstructed objects. The trigger efficiencies are measured in data and parameterized for specific lepton and jet identification criteria.

Scalar LQ pair Monte Carlo (MC) samples are generated using PYTHIA [27] with CTEQ6L1 [28] parton density functions. Signal samples are produced for different LQ

TABLE I. Scalar LQ pair production cross sections, calculated at NLO, for different M_{LQ} [8].

M_{LQ} (GeV)	200	210	220	230	240	250	260	270
σ (fb)	268	193	141	103	764	562	424	31
M_{LQ} (GeV)	280	290	300	310	320	340	360	
σ (fb)	23	17	13	10	7.4	4.2	2.4	

masses between 200 and 360 GeV. The corresponding cross sections at NLO are listed in Table I.

Diboson (WW , WZ , and ZZ) background samples are produced with PYTHIA making use of the parton distribution functions CTEQ6L1. The $t\bar{t}$ and $V(V = W \text{ or } Z) + \text{jets}$ events are simulated with the matrix-element generator ALPGEN [29], interfaced to PYTHIA for subsequent parton showering and hadronization. Single top quark production is simulated using COMPHEP [30]. The cross sections for background processes are calculated at NLO (diboson [31]) and next-to-next-to-leading order ($V + \text{jets}$ [32] and $t\bar{t}$ [33]). We correct the generated spectrum of the transverse momentum (p_T) of the Z boson in MC to match a corresponding dedicated measurement [34]. The p_T spectrum of the W boson is corrected taking into account the differences between predicted Z and W boson p_T spectra at next-to-next-to-leading order [35].

A full GEANT-based detector simulation program [36], followed by the same reconstruction program as utilized for data, is used to process signal and background events from MC. In order to model detector noise and contributions from the presence of additional $p\bar{p}$ interactions, events from randomly selected beam crossings with the same instantaneous luminosity profile as data are overlaid on the simulated events. Background from multijet production (MJ), where one of the jets mimics an electron, is evaluated from data using a data driven technique [37]. In MC simulations, electron energies are corrected so that they match the energy resolution in data. In addition, residual differences in jet energy scale and resolution between data and MC are reduced by applying dedicated corrections to MC events. All corrections are evaluated in independent samples. Electron related corrections are obtained from $Z \rightarrow ee$ samples, and jet related from either photon + jets or $Z + \text{jets}$ samples.

In the $eq\nu_e q'$ final state, it is not known *a priori* how to assign the jets to the LQ decaying to eq or $\nu_e q'$. Therefore, to reconstruct the properties such as mass and p_T of the LQ s from the final products, an algorithm is needed to choose the best pairing. We do not impose a requirement on the number of jets, but we use only the two leading p_T jets for pairings. There are two possible combinations, corresponding to the leading jet pairing with either the electron or the neutrino. We found that it is most effective to choose the pairing that minimizes the difference between the transverse masses, $M_T = \sqrt{E_T^2 - \vec{p}_T^2}$, where E_T

and \vec{p}_T are the transverse energy and the transverse momentum vector of the two LQ s. This pairing algorithm is successful in making the correct assignment in about 75% of MC signal events.

Events are selected to be consistent with the $LQLQ \rightarrow eq\nu e q'$ process. We require one electron with $p_T > 15$ GeV in the central calorimeter region $|\eta_e| < 1.1$; $\cancel{E}_T > 15$ GeV, to be consistent with the undetected neutrino; and at least two jets with $p_T > 20$ GeV and $|\eta_{\text{jet}}| < 2.5$. To suppress MJ background, events are required to satisfy $\cancel{E}_T/50 + M_T^{e\nu}/70 \geq 1$, where $M_T^{e\nu}$ is the transverse mass of the (e, ν) combination, and \cancel{E}_T and $M_T^{e\nu}$ are in GeV.

At this stage we observe 65 992 data events, while we expect $65\,703 \pm 61(\text{stat}) \pm 5958(\text{sys})$ from SM background and $50.4 \pm 0.4(\text{stat}) \pm 6.8(\text{sys})$ events from scalar LQ production for $M_{LQ} = 260$ GeV and $\beta = 0.5$. Figure 1(a) shows the $M_T^{e\nu}$ distribution for the data and SM processes. Data are consistent with the SM predictions. To reduce the dominant SM $V + \text{jets}$ background, we require $M_T^{e\nu} \geq 110$ GeV. The pairing algorithm described previously allows us to reconstruct M_{LQ} . Since the longitudinal component of the neutrino momentum, p_z , is not measurable, we reconstruct only the visible mass of the decay $LQ \rightarrow \nu_e q'$ as $M_{LQ} = M(\text{jet} + \nu_{\text{vis}})$, where the four vector of ν_{vis} is given as $(\cancel{p}_x, \cancel{p}_y, 0, \cancel{E}_T)$. Figure 1(b) shows the distribution of the sum $\sum M_{LQ}$ of the invariant mass of the decay $LQ \rightarrow eq$ and the visible mass of the decay $LQ \rightarrow \nu_e q'$ after the requirement $M_T^{e\nu} \geq 110$ GeV. We then use $\sum M_{LQ}$ to reduce SM backgrounds, further requiring that $\sum M_{LQ} > 350$ GeV. Finally, we require that the scalar sum of the p_T of the lepton, the \cancel{E}_T , and the two jets, S_T , shown in Fig. 1(c) after all selections, be greater than 450 GeV. Selection criteria are optimized to achieve the best expected sensitivity for $M_{LQ} = 260$ GeV. This yields 15 observed events for an expected background of $14.8 \pm 0.6(\text{stat}) \pm 1.1(\text{sys})$ events. The event counts after each requirement are shown in Table II.

Systematic uncertainties that affect only the normalization of the background and the signal efficiency include uncertainties on cross sections of signal (10%) and background (6%–10%) processes, normalization of the MJ background (20%), integrated luminosity (6.1%), and lepton trigger and identification (4%). Uncertainties that also affect the differential distribution of S_T , which is the quantity used to set the limits on LQ , are due to the jet energy resolution and scale, jet identification efficiency, parton distribution functions, and the modeling of the jet p_T distribution of the dominant $W + \text{jets}$ background. Their impacts are evaluated by repeating the analysis with values varied by ± 1 standard deviation. For the uncertainty on the jet p_T modeling, the impact is estimated by comparing the jet p_T distributions between ALPGEN and data unfolded to particle level from the recent D0 measurement [38]. The ratio is applied as weight to the




FIG. 1 (color online). (a) $M_T^{e\nu}$ distribution after preselection, (b) $\sum M_{LQ}$ for $M_T^{e\nu} > 110$ GeV, (c) the S_T for $M_T^{e\nu} > 110$ GeV and $\sum M_{LQ} > 350$ GeV, which is used to set an upper limit on the LQ pair production cross section after the final selection.

$W + \text{jets}$ jet p_T distribution, and the new distribution is taken as ± 1 standard deviation band.

The distribution of the S_T after all selection requirements, shown in Fig. 1(c), is used as a discriminant to set

TABLE II. Event counts and the predicted number of signal events for $M_{LQ} = 260$ GeV and $\beta = 0.5$ after each selection requirement.

	Data	Total background	Signal
Preselection	65 992	$65\,703 \pm 5958$	50 ± 7
$M_T^{e\nu} > 110$ GeV	990	986 ± 82	34 ± 5
$\sum M_{LQ} > 350$ GeV	64	55 ± 4	27 ± 4
$S_T > 450$ GeV	15	15 ± 1	24 ± 3




FIG. 2 (color online). Expected and observed upper limits calculated at the 95% C.L. on the LQ cross section as a function of M_{LQ} for a scalar LQ compared with the NLO prediction for $\beta = 0.5$. The NLO cross section is shown for different choices of the renormalization and factorization scales, $\mu = M_{LQ}$, $\mu = 0.5 \times M_{LQ}$, and $\mu = 2 \times M_{LQ}$.

an upper limit on the LQ pair production cross section in the $eq\nu_e q'$ channel. For each generated M_{LQ} the limit is calculated at the 95% C.L. using the semifrequentist CL_s method based on a Poisson log-likelihood test statistic [39]. Signal and background normalizations and shape variations due to systematic uncertainties are incorporated assuming Gaussian priors. The best fit to the background distributions is evaluated by minimizing a profile likelihood function with respect to the observed data and various sources of uncertainty, maintaining all correlations among systematic uncertainties [40]. Limits on the cross section multiplied by the branching fraction and the theoretical LQ cross section for $\beta = 0.5$ are shown in Fig. 2. Considering β as a free parameter [41], the limit on the LQ mass as a function of β is determined as shown in Fig. 3, and compared to the previous D0 [16], CMS [17,18], and ATLAS [19] results.




FIG. 3 (color online). 95% C.L. observed limit for $\mu = M_{LQ}$ on the LQ mass as a function of β compared with the previous D0 result [16], and CMS [17,18] and ATLAS [19] results.

In summary, we have searched for scalar LQ pair production in the $eq\nu_e q'$ final state in 5.4 fb^{-1} of integrated luminosity of $p\bar{p}$ collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 1.96 \text{ TeV}$. In the absence of a signal, we exclude the production of first generation LQ s with $M_{LQ} < 326 \text{ GeV}$ for $\beta = 0.5$ at the 95% C.L. If the $LQ \rightarrow lq$ and $LQ \rightarrow \nu q'$ couplings are not too large ($\beta \leq 0.3$) [13], this result represents the most stringent limit to date.

We thank the staffs at Fermilab and collaborating institutions and acknowledge support from the DOE and NSF (USA); CEA and CNRS/IN2P3 (France); FASI, Rosatom and RFBR (Russia); CNPq, FAPERJ, FAPESP, and FUNDUNESP (Brazil); DAE and DST (India); Colciencias (Colombia); CONACyT (Mexico); KRF and KOSEF (Korea); CONICET and UBACyT (Argentina); FOM (The Netherlands); STFC and the Royal Society (United Kingdom); MSMT and GACR (Czech Republic); CRC Program and NSERC (Canada); BMBF and DFG (Germany); SFI (Ireland); The Swedish Research Council (Sweden); and CAS and CNSF (China).

-
- [1] S. P. Martin, [arXiv:hep-ph/9709356](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/9709356).
[2] H. Georgi and S. L. Glashow, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **32**, 438 (1974).
[3] J. L. Hewett and T. G. Rizzo, *Phys. Rep.* **183**, 193 (1989).
[4] D. E. Acosta and S. K. Blessing, *Annu. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **49**, 389 (1999).
[5] K. Nakamura *et al.* (Particle Data Group), *J. Phys. G* **37**, 075021 (2010).
[6] M. Kuze and Y. Sirois, *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **50**, 1 (2003).
[7] W. Buchmuller, R. Ruckl, and D. Wyler, *Phys. Lett. B* **191**, 442 (1987); **448**, 320 (1999).
[8] M. Krämer, T. Plehn, M. Spira, and P. M. Zerwas, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79**, 341 (1997).
[9] P. Abreu *et al.* (DELPHI Collaboration), *Phys. Lett. B* **446**, 62 (1999).
[10] G. Abbiendi *et al.* (OPAL Collaboration), *Eur. Phys. J. C* **31**, 281 (2003).
[11] G. Abbiendi *et al.* (OPAL Collaboration), *Phys. Lett. B* **526**, 233 (2002).
[12] A. Aktas *et al.* (H1 Collaboration), *Phys. Lett. B* **629**, 9 (2005).
[13] F. D. Aaron *et al.* (H1 Collaboration), [arXiv:1107.3716](https://arxiv.org/abs/1107.3716) [*Phys. Lett. B* (to be published)].

- [14] S. Chekanov *et al.* (ZEUS Collaboration), *Phys. Rev. D* **68**, 052004 (2003).
- [15] D. E. Acosta *et al.* (CDF Collaboration), *Phys. Rev. D* **72**, 051107 (2005).
- [16] V. M. Abazov *et al.* (D0 Collaboration), *Phys. Lett. B* **681**, 224 (2009).
- [17] V. Khachatryan *et al.* (CMS Collaboration), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **106**, 201802 (2011).
- [18] S. Chatrchyan *et al.* (CMS Collaboration), arXiv:1105.5237 [Phys. Lett. B (to be published)].
- [19] G. Aad *et al.* (ATLAS Collaboration), *Phys. Rev. D* **83**, 112006 (2011).
- [20] V. M. Abazov *et al.* (D0 Collaboration), *Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A* **565**, 463 (2006).
- [21] M. Abolins *et al.* (D0 Collaboration), *Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A* **584**, 75 (2008).
- [22] R. Angstadt *et al.* (D0 Collaboration), *Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A* **622**, 298 (2010).
- [23] The pseudorapidity is defined as $\eta = -\ln[\tan(\theta/2)]$, where θ is the polar angle with respect to the proton beam direction.
- [24] V. M. Abazov *et al.* (D0 Collaboration), *Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A* **552**, 372 (2005).
- [25] G. C. Blazey *et al.*, in *Proceedings of the Workshop: QCD and Weak Boson Physics in Run II*, edited by U. Baur, R. K. Ellis, and D. Zeppenfeld, Report No. Fermilab-Pub-00/297.
- [26] V. M. Abazov *et al.* (D0 Collaboration), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101**, 062001 (2008).
- [27] T. Sjöstrand, S. Mrenna, and P. Z. Skands, *J. High Energy Phys.* **05** (2006) 026.
- [28] J. Pumplin *et al.*, *J. High Energy Phys.* **07** (2002) 012.
- [29] M. L. Mangano, M. Moretti, F. Piccinini, R. Pittau, and A. D. Polosa, *J. High Energy Phys.* **07** (2003) 001.
- [30] E. Boos *et al.* (CompHEP Collaboration), *Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A* **534**, 250 (2004).
- [31] J. M. Campbell and R. K. Ellis, *Phys. Rev. D* **60**, 113006 (1999).
- [32] J. M. Campbell and R. K. Ellis, *Phys. Rev. D* **65**, 113007 (2002).
- [33] S. Moch and P. Uwer, *Phys. Rev. D* **78**, 034003 (2008).
- [34] V. M. Abazov *et al.* (D0 Collaboration), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 102002 (2008).
- [35] K. Melnikov and F. Petriello, *Phys. Rev. D* **74**, 114017 (2006).
- [36] R. Brun and F. Carminati, CERN Program Library Long Writeup Report No. W5013, 1993.
- [37] V. M. Abazov *et al.* (D0 Collaboration), *Phys. Rev. D* **78**, 012005 (2008).
- [38] V. M. Abazov *et al.* (D0 Collaboration), arXiv:1106.1457 [Phys. Lett. B (to be published)].
- [39] T. Junk, *Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A* **434**, 435 (1999).
- [40] W. Fisher, Report No. FERMLAB-TM-2386-E.
- [41] J. L. Hewett and T. G. Rizzo, *Phys. Rev. D* **58**, 055005 (1998).