The First Run II Measurement of the W Boson Mass by CDF

Ashutosh Kotwal
Duke University
For the CDF Collaboration



Joint Theoretical-Experimental Physics Seminar
Fermilab, 5 January 2007

Outline

- Motivation
- Analysis Strategy
- Experimental Apparatus and Data Samples
- Analysis Techniques
- Results and Systematic Uncertainties
- Implications for standard model Higgs
- Conclusions

Motivation

- The electroweak sector of the standard model is constrained by three precisely known parameters
  - $\alpha_{EM}(M_Z) = 1 / 127.918(18)$
  - $G_F = 1.16637\ (1) \times 10^{-5}\ GeV^{-2}$

    $M_Z = 91.1876\ (21)\ GeV$
- At tree-level, these parameters are related by
  - $M_W^2 = \pi\alpha / \sqrt{2} G_F \sin^2\theta_W$
  - $M_Z^2 = \pi\alpha / \sqrt{2} G_F \sin^2\theta_W \cos^2\theta_W$
  - $M_W = M_Z \cos\theta_W$
    - Where θ_W is the weak mixing angle

Motivation

- Radiative corrections due to heavy quark and Higgs loops and exotica



Motivate the introduction of the ρ parameter: $M_W^2 = \rho\, M_Z^2 \cos^2\theta_W$

with the predictions $(\rho-1) \sim M_{top}^2$ and $(\rho-1) \sim \ln M_H$

- In conjunction with M_{top}, the W boson mass constrains the mass of the Higgs boson, and possibly new particles beyond the standard model

Progress on M_{top} at the Tevatron



- From the Tevatron, $\delta M_{top} = 2.1$ GeV => $\delta M_H / M_H = 18\%$
- equivalent $\delta M_W = 12$ MeV for the same Higgs mass constraint
- Current world average $\delta M_W = 29$ MeV
  - progress on δM_W now has the biggest impact on Higgs constraint!

Motivation

- Current SM Higgs fit: $M_H = 85^{+39}_{-28}$ GeV (LEP Collaborations and LEPEWWG, hep-ex/0612034)
- LEPII direct searches exclude $M_H < 114.4$ GeV @ 95% CL (PLB 565, 61)



In addition to the Higgs,
is there another missing piece
in this puzzle?

Current M_W *vs* M_{top}



Mystery of Electroweak Symmetry Breaking

We have understood a lot about the surface

but...

The hole in the ice sheet may reveal the “tip of the iceberg”

new physics lurking just below the surface!



Analysis Strategy

W and Z production at the Tevatron



Isolated, high p_T leptons,
missing transverse momentum in W's

Z events provide excellent control sample



Typically small hadronic (jet) activity

W Boson Production at the Tevatron





Quark-antiquark annihilation dominates (80%)

Lepton p_T carries most of *W* mass information, can be measured precisely (achieved 0.03%)

Initial state QCD radiation is O(10 GeV), measure as soft 'hadronic recoil' in calorimeter (calibrate to ~1%)

Pollutes *W* mass information, fortunately $p_T(W) << M_W$

W Boson Production at the Tevatron





Quark-antiquark annihilation dominates (80%)

Lepton p_T carries most of W mass information, can be measured precisely (achieved 0.03%)

Initial state QCD radiation is O(10 GeV), measure as soft 'hadronic recoil' in calorimeter (calibrate to ~1%)

Pollutes W mass information, fortunately $p_T(W) << M_W$

W Mass Measurement at the Tevatron

(figures from Abbott *et. al.* (D0 Collaboration), PRD 58, 092003 (1998))



W mass information contained in location of transverse Jacobian edge

$M_T = \sqrt{(2\, p_T^{\,l}\, p_T^{\,\nu}\, (1 - \cos \phi_{l\nu})}$

Insensitive to $p_T(W)$ to first order

Reconstruction of $p_T^{\,\nu}$ sensitive to hadronic response and multiple interactions

$p_T(l)$ fit: provides cross-check of production model:

Needs theoretical model of $p_T(W)$

$P_T(\nu)$ fit provides cross-check of hadronic modelling

Quadrant of Collider Detector at Fermilab (CDF)

EM calorimeter provides precise electron energy measurement

COT provides precise lepton track momentum measurement



Calorimeters measure hadronic recoil particles

Select W and Z bosons with central ($|\eta| < 1$) leptons

Collider Detector at Fermilab (CDF)



Event Selection

- Goal: Select events with high p_T leptons and small hadronic recoil activity
  - to maximize W mass information content and minimize backgrounds
- Inclusive lepton triggers: loose lepton track and muon stub / calorimeter cluster requirements, with lepton $p_T > 18$ GeV
  - Kinematic efficiency of trigger ~100% for offline selection
- Offline selection requirements:
  - Electron cluster $E_T > 30$ GeV, track $p_T > 18$ GeV
  - Muon track $p_T > 30$ GeV
  - Loose identification requirements to minimize selection bias
- W boson event selection: one selected lepton, $|\boldsymbol{u}| < 15$ GeV & $p_T(\nu) > 30$ GeV
  - Z boson event selection: two selected leptons

W & Z Data Samples

Sample	Candidates
$W \to e\nu$	63964
$W \to \mu\nu$	51128
$Z \to e^+e^-$	2919
$Z \to \mu^+\mu^-$	4960

- Integrated Luminosity (collected between February 2002 – September 2003):
  - Electron channel: $\mathcal{L} = 218$ pb^{-1}
  - Muon channel: $\mathcal{L} = 191$ pb^{-1}
- Event selection gives fairly clean samples
  - Mis-identification backgrounds ~ 0.5%

Outline of Analysis

Energy scale measurements drive the W mass measurement

- Tracker Calibration
  - alignment of the COT (~2400 cells) using cosmic rays
  - COT momentum scale and tracker non-linearity constrained using $J/\psi \rightarrow \mu\mu$ and $\Upsilon \rightarrow \mu\mu$ mass fits
    - Confirmed using $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ mass fit
- EM Calorimeter Calibration
  - COT momentum scale transferred to EM calorimeter using a fit to the peak of the E/p spectrum, around E/p ~ 1
  - Calorimeter energy scale confirmed using $Z \rightarrow ee$ mass fit
- Tracker and EM Calorimeter resolutions
- Hadronic recoil modelling
  - Characterized using p_T-balance in $Z \rightarrow ll$ events

Tevatron Run 1 (100 pb^{-1}) *W* Mass Systematic Uncertainties (MeV)

	CDF μ	CDF *e*	D0 *e*
W statistics	100	65	60
Lepton energy scale	85	75	56
Lepton resolution	20	25	19
Recoil model	35	37	35
pT(W)	20	15	15
Selection bias	18	-	12
Backgrounds	25	5	9
Parton dist. Functions	15	15	8
QED rad. Corrections	11	11	12
Γ(W)	10	10	10
Total	144	113	84

Run 1 studies set the stage for the Run 2 analysis: reduce uncertainties using data-driven techniques

Drift Chamber (COT) Alignment

COT endplate geometry



Internal Alignment of COT

- Use a clean sample of ~200*k* cosmic rays for cell-by-cell internal alignment



- Fit COT hits on both sides simultaneously to a single helix (AK, H. Gerberich and C. Hays, NIMA 506, 110 (2003))
  - Time of incidence is a floated parameter in this 'dicosmic fit'

Residuals of COT cells after alignment



Final relative alignment of cells ~5 μm (initial alignment ~50 μm)

Consistency check of COT alignment procedure

- Fit separate helices to cosmic ray tracks on each side
- Compare track parameters (eg. Curvature, shown below) of the two tracks: a measure of track parameter bias



Cross-check of COT alignment

- Final cross-check and correction to beam-constrained track curvature based on difference of <E/p> for positrons *vs* electrons
- Smooth ad-hoc curvature corrections fitted and applied as a function of polar and azimuthal angle: statistical errors => $\delta M_W = 6$ MeV



Signal Simulation and Fitting

Signal Simulation and Template Fitting

- All signals simulated using a fast Monte Carlo
  - Generate finely-spaced templates as a function of the fit variable
  - perform binned maximum-likelihood fits to the data
- Custom fast Monte Carlo makes smooth, high statistics templates
  - And provides analysis control over key components of the simulation



- We will extract the W mass from six kinematic distributions: Transverse mass, charged lepton p_T and missing E_T using both electron and muon channels

Generator-level Signal Simulation



- Generator-level input for W & Z simulation provided by RESBOS (C. Balazs & C.-P. Yuan, PRD56, 5558 (1997) and references therein), which
  - Calculates triple-differential production cross section, and p_T-dependent double-differential decay angular distribution
  - calculates boson p_T spectrum reliably over the relevant p_T range: includes tunable parameters in the non-perturbative regime at low p_T
- Radiative photons generated according to energy *vs* angle lookup table from WGRAD (U. Baur, S. Keller & D. Wackeroth, PRD59, 013002 (1998))

Constraining Boson p_T Spectrum

- Fit the non-perturbative parameter g_2 in RESBOS to $p_T(ll)$ spectra: find $g_2 = 0.685 \pm 0.048$

  $\Delta M_W = 3$ MeV

  - Consistent with global fits (Landry *et al*, PRD67, 073016 (2003))
- Negligible effect of second non-perturbative parameter g_3

Position of peak in boson p_T spectrum depends on g_2





QED Radiative Corrections



- use complete NLO QED calculation (WGRAD) for single photon emission
  - We simulate final state radiation (FSR) photons
  - We estimate initial state radiation (ISR), ISR-FSR interference, and choice of infrared cutoff to contribute uncertainties of 5 MeV each
- 2-photon calculation (Carloni Calame *et. al.*, PRD69, 037301 (2004)) predict 2nd photon adds 10% shift in *W* mass compared to 1st photon
  - We apply 10% correction for 2nd photon, with 5% systematic uncertainty

$$\Delta M_W = 12 \text{ MeV}$$

Fast Monte Carlo Detector Simulation

- A complete detector simulation of all quantities measured in the data
- First-principles simulation of tracking
  - Tracks and photons propagated through a high-resolution 3-D lookup table of material properties for silicon detector and COT
  - At each material interaction, calculate
    - Ionization energy loss according to complete Bethe-Bloch formula
    - Generate bremsstrahlung photons down to 4 MeV, using detailed cross section and spectrum calculations
    - Simulate photon conversion and compton scattering
    - Propagate bremsstrahlung photons and conversion electrons
    - Simulate multiple Coulomb scattering, including non-Gaussian tail
  - Deposit and smear hits on COT wires, perform full helix fit including optional beam-constraint

Fast Monte Carlo Detector Simulation

- A complete detector simulation of all quantities measured in the data
- First-principles simulation of tracking
  - Tracks and photons propagated through a high-resolution 3-D lookup table of material properties for silicon detector and COT



  - Deposit and smear hits on COT wires, perform full helix fit including optional beam-constraint

3-D Material Map in Simulation

- Built from detailed construction-level knowledge of inner tracker: silicon ladders, bulkheads, port-cards etc.

- Based on studies of inclusive photon conversions, additional copper cables emulated (increase radiation lengths by 30%)

- Radiation lengths *vs* (ϕ,z) at different radii shows localized nature of material distribution



Outline of Analysis

Energy scale measurements drive the W mass measurement

- Tracker Calibration
  - alignment of the COT (~2400 cells) using cosmic rays
  - COT momentum scale and tracker non-linearity constrained using $J/\psi \rightarrow \mu\mu$ and $\Upsilon \rightarrow \mu\mu$ mass fits
    - Confirmed using $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ mass fit
- EM Calorimeter Calibration
  - COT momentum scale transferred to EM calorimeter using a fit to the peak of the E/p spectrum, around E/p ~ 1
  - Calorimeter energy scale confirmed using $Z \rightarrow ee$ mass fit
- Tracker and EM Calorimeter resolutions
- Hadronic recoil modelling
  - Characterized using p_T-balance in $Z \rightarrow ll$ events

Tracking Momentum Scale

Tracking Momentum Scale

- Set using $J/\psi \rightarrow \mu\mu$ and $\Upsilon \rightarrow \mu\mu$ resonance and $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ masses
  - All are individually consistent with each other
- J/ψ: $\Delta p/p = (-1.64 \pm 0.06_{stat} \pm 0.24_{sys}) \times 10^{-3}$
  - Extracted by fitting J/ψ mass in bins of $<1/p_T(\mu)>$, and extrapolating momentum scale to zero curvature





Tracking Momentum Scale

- $\Upsilon \rightarrow \mu\mu$ resonance provides
  - Momentum scale measurement at higher p_T
  - Validation of beam-constaining procedure (upsilons are promptly produced)
  - Non-beam-constrained and beam-constrained (BC) fits statistically consistent



Tracking Momentum Scale Systematics

Systematic uncertainties on momentum scale

Source	J/ψ ($\times 10^{-3}$)	Υ ($\times 10^{-3}$)	Common ($\times 10^{-3}$)
QED and energy loss model	0.20	0.13	0.13
Magnetic field nonuniformities	0.10	0.12	0.10
Beam constraint bias	N/A	0.06	0
Ionizing material scale	0.06	0.03	0.03
COT alignment corrections	0.05	0.03	0.03
Fit range	0.05	0.02	0.02
p_T threshold	0.04	0.02	0.02
Resolution model	0.03	0.03	0.03
Background model	0.03	0.02	0.02
World-average mass value	0.01	0.03	0
Statistical	0.01	0.06	0
Total	0.25	0.21	0.17

Uncertainty dominated by QED radiative corrections and magnetic field non-uniformity

$Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ Mass Cross-check & Combination

- Using the J/ψ and Υ momentum scale, measured Z mass is consistent with PDG value

- Final combined: $\Delta p/p = (-1.50 \pm 0.15_{independent} \pm 0.13_{QED} \pm 0.07_{align}) \times 10^{-3}$



$\Delta M_W = 17$ MeV

EM Calorimeter Response

Calorimeter Simulation for Electrons and Photons

- Distributions of energy loss calculated based on expected shower profiles as a function of E_T
  - Leakage into hadronic calorimeter
  - Absorption in the coil
  - Relevant for E/p lineshape



- Energy-dependent gain (non-linearity) parameterized and fit from data
- Energy resolution parameterized as fixed sampling term and two tunable constant terms
  - Constant terms are fit from the width of E/p peak and $Z \rightarrow ee$ mass peak

EM Calorimeter Scale

- E/p peak from $W \rightarrow e\nu$ decays provides measurements of EM calorimeter scale and its (E_T-dependent) non-linearity
  - $S_E = 1 \pm 0.00025_{stat} \pm 0.00011_{X0} \pm 0.00021_{Tracker}$
- Setting S_E to 1 using E/p calibration



Tail region of E/p spectrum used for tuning model of radiative material

Consistency of Radiative Material Model

- Excellent description of E/p spectrum tail
- radiative material tune factor: $S_{X0} = 1.004 \pm 0.009_{stat} \pm 0.002_{background}$ achieves consistency with E/p spectrum tail
  - CDFSim geometry confirmed as a function of pseudorapidity: S_{MAT} independent of $|\eta|$





Measurement of EM Calorimeter Non-linearity

- Perform E/p fit-based calibration in bins of electron E_T
- Pameterize non-linear response as: $S_E = 1 + \xi\,(E_T/\mathrm{GeV} - 39)$
- Tune on W and Z data: $\xi = (6 \pm 7_{stat}) \times 10^{-5}$
  - => $\Delta M_W = 23$ MeV





$Z \rightarrow ee$ Mass Cross-check and Combination

- Z mass consistent with E/p-based measurements
- Combining E/p-derived scale & non-linearity measurement with $Z \rightarrow ee$ mass yields the most precise calorimeter energy scale:
  - $S_E = 1.00001 \pm 0.00037$

$\Delta M_W = 30$ MeV



Lepton Resolutions

- Tracking resolution parameterized in the fast Monte Carlo by
  - Drift chamber hit resolution $\sigma_h = 150 \pm 3_{stat}$ μm
  - Beamspot size $\sigma_b = 39 \pm 3_{stat}$ μm
  - Tuned on the widths of the $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ (beam constrained) and $Y \rightarrow \mu\mu$ (both beam constrained and non-beam constrained) mass peaks

=> ΔM_W = 3 MeV (muons)

- Electron cluster resolution parameterized in the fast Monte Carlo by
  - $13.5\% / \sqrt{E_T}$ (sampling term)
  - Primary constant term $\kappa = 0.89 \pm 0.15_{stat}$ %
  - Secondary photon resolution $\kappa_\gamma = 8.3 \pm 2.2_{stat}$ %
  - Tuned on the widths of the E/p peak and the $Z \rightarrow ee$ peak (selecting radiative electrons)

=> ΔM_W = 9 MeV (electrons)

Hadronic Recoil Model

Constraining the Hadronic Recoil Model

Exploit similarity in production and decay of *W* and *Z* bosons

Detector response model for hadronic recoil tuned using p_T-balance in $Z \rightarrow ll$ events



Transverse momentum of Hadronic recoil (***u***) calculated as 2-vector-sum over calorimeter towers

Lepton Tower Removal

- We remove the calorimeter towers containing lepton energy from the hadronic recoil calculation
  - Lost underlying event energy is measured in ϕ-rotated windows

$\Delta M_W = 8$ MeV



Electron channel W data



Muon channel W data



Hadronic Recoil Simulation

Recoil momentum 2-vector $\boldsymbol{u}$ has

- a soft 'spectator interaction' component, randomly oriented
  - Modelled using minimum-bias data with tunable magnitude
- A hard 'jet' component, directed opposite the boson p_T
  - P_T-dependent response and resolution parameterizations
  - Hadronic response $R = \boldsymbol{u}_{\text{reconstructed}} / \boldsymbol{u}_{\text{true}}$
    - R parameterized as a logarithmically increasing function of boson p_T motivated by Z boson data



Tuning Recoil Response Model with *Z* events

Project the vector sum of $p_T(ll)$ and $\boldsymbol{u}$ on a set of orthogonal axes defined by lepton directions

Mean and rms of projections as a function of $p_T(ll)$ provide information hadronic model parameters





Hadronic model parameters tuned by minimizing χ^2 between data and simulation

$\Delta M_W = 9$ MeV

Tuning Recoil Resolution Model with Z events

At low $p_T(Z)$, p_T-balance constrains hadronic resolution due to underlying event





$\Delta M_W = 7$ MeV

At high $p_T(Z)$, p_T-balance constrains jet resolution

Testing Hadronic Recoil Model with *W* events

Compare recoil distributions between simulation and data





Recoil projection (GeV) on lepton direction



Recoil projection (GeV) perpendicular to lepton

Testing Hadronic Recoil Model with *W* events

Recoil model validation plots confirm the consistency of the model



$p_T(W)$ comparison



$\langle u_{||} \rangle$ *vs* $p_T(W)$



Parton Distribution Functions

- Affect W kinematic lineshapes through acceptance cuts
- We use CTEQ6M as the default PDF
- Use CTEQ6 ensemble of 20 'uncertainty' PDFs
  - Represent variations of eigenvectors in the PDF parameter space
  - compute δM_W contribution from each error PDF
- Using CTEQ prescription and interpreting PDF ensemble as 90% CL, obtain total transverse mass systematic uncertainty of 11 MeV
  - Cross-check: fitting MC sample generated with MRST2003 with default CTEQ6M templates yields 8 MeV shift in W mass

Backgrounds in the W sample

Source	Fraction *(electrons)*	Fraction (*muons)*
Z -> *ll*	0.24 ± 0.04 %	6.6 ± 0.3 %
W -> τν	0.93 ± 0.03 %	0.89 ± 0.02 %
Mis-identified QCD jets	0.25 ± 0.15 %	0.1 ± 0.1 %
Decays-in-flight		0.3 ± 0.2 %
Cosmic rays		0.05 ± 0.05 %

Backgrounds are small (except Z → μμ with a forward muon)

backgrounds contribute systematic uncertainty of 9 MeV on transverse mass fit

W Mass Fits

Blind Analysis Technique

- All W mass fit results were blinded with a random [-100,100] MeV offset hidden in the likelihood fitter
- Blinding offset removed after the analysis was declared frozen
- Technique allows to study all aspects of data while keeping W mass result unknown within 100 MeV

W Transverse Mass Fits



W Transverse Mass Fits



Muon & electron combined: $M_W = 80417 \pm 48$ MeV ($P(\chi^2) = 7\%$)

W Lepton p_T Fits



W Lepton p_T Fits



Muon & electron combined: $M_W = 80388 \pm 59$ MeV ($P(\chi^2) = 18\%$)

W Missing E_T Fits



W Missing E_T Fits



Muon & electron combined: $M_W = 80434 \pm 65$ MeV ($P(\chi^2) = 43\%$)

Transverse Mass Fit Uncertainties (MeV)

	electrons	*muons*	*common*
W statistics	48	54	0
Lepton energy scale	30	17	17
Lepton resolution	9	3	-3
Recoil energy scale	9	9	9
Recoil energy resolution	7	7	7
Selection bias	3	1	0
Lepton removal	8	5	5
Backgrounds	8	9	0
pT(W) model (g2,g3)	3	3	3
Parton dist. Functions	11	11	11
QED rad. Corrections	11	12	11
Total systematic	39	27	26
Total	62	60	

Systematic uncertainties shown in green: statistics-limited by control data samples

Combined Results

- Combined electrons (3 fits): $M_W = 80477 \pm 62$ MeV, $P(\chi^2) = 49\%$

- Combined muons (3 fits): $M_W = 80352 \pm 60$ MeV, $P(\chi^2) = 69\%$

- All combined (6 fits): $M_W = 80413 \pm 48$ MeV, $P(\chi^2) = 44\%$

Comparisons



The CDF Run 2 result is the most precise single measurement of the W mass

Comparisons

	W mass (MeV)
DELPHI	80336 ± 67
L3	80270 ± 55
OPAL	80416 ± 53
ALEPH	80440 ± 51
CDF-I	80433 ± 79
D0-I	80483 ± 84
LEP Average	80376 ± 33
Tevatron-I Average	80454 ± 59
Previous World Average	80392 ± 29
CDF-II (preliminary)	80413 ± 48
New Tevatron Average	80429 ± 39
New World Average	80398 ± 25

Previous M_W *vs* M_{top}



Updated M_W *vs* M_{top}



Standard Model Higgs Constraints

- previous SM Higgs fit: $M_H = 85^{+39}_{-28}$ GeV (LEPEWWG)
  - $M_H < 166$ GeV @ 95 C.L.
  - $M_H < 199$ GeV @ 95 C.L. Including LEPII direct exclusion
- Updated preliminary SM Higgs fit (M. Grunewald, private communication):
  - $M_H = 80^{+36}_{-26}$ GeV
  - $M_H < 153$ GeV @ 95 C.L.
  - $M_H < 189$ GeV @ 95 C.L. Including LEPII direct exclusion
  - SM fit results assume zero correlation between W mass and width, and follow LEPEWWG procedure

Summary

- The *W* boson mass is a very interesting parameter to measure with increasing precision

- CDF Run 2 W mass result is the most precise single measurement:

  – $M_W = 80413 \pm 34_{stat} \pm 34_{syst}$ MeV
  $= 80413 \pm 48$ MeV (preliminary)

- New preliminary $M_H = 80^{+36}_{-26}$ GeV (previous $M_H = 85^{+39}_{-28}$ GeV) further in the directly-excluded region

Summary

- The *W* boson mass is a very interesting parameter to measure with increasing precision

- CDF Run 2 W mass result is the most precise single measurement:

  – $M_W = 80413 \pm 34_{stat} \pm 34_{syst}$ MeV
  $= 80413 \pm 48$ MeV (preliminary)

- New preliminary $M_H = 80^{+36}_{-26}$ GeV (previous $M_H = 85^{+39}_{-28}$ GeV) further in the directly-excluded region

- Looking forward to $\delta M_W < 25$ MeV from 1.5 fb^{-1} of CDF data

E/p Calibration *vs* Z→ee mass consistency

- Inclusion of hadronic calorimeter leakage distribution has a ~150 MeV effect on the fitted EM calorimeter scale from the E/p distribution

- Modelling the bremsstrahlung spectrum down to 4 MeV (from 40 MeV cutoff) has a ~60 MeV effect on the E/p calibration

- Modelling the calorimeter non-linearity as a property of individual particles has a ~30 MeV effect

- Collectively, these simulated effects in the Run 2 analysis affect the consistency of the Z mass by ~240 MeV

Electron Channel Transverse Mass Fit



Electron Channel E/p Fit



Updated M_W *vs* M_{top}



Transverse Mass Fits – Stability *vs* Fit Window



Lepton p_T Fits – Stability *vs* Fit Window



Missing E_T Fits – Stability *vs* Fit Window



Internal Alignment of COT

- 'dicosmic fit' constrains the internal degrees of freedom:
  - Relative rotations and transverse shifts of superlayers
  - Transverse shifts and tilts of individual cell at the end-plates
  - Along-wire movements due to e.g. Gravitational sag and electrostatics



Cross-check of COT alignment

- Final cross-check and correction to beam-constrained track curvature based on difference of <E/p> for positrons *vs* electrons
- Smooth ad-hoc curvature corrections fitted and applied as a function of polar and azimuthal angle: statistical errors => $\delta M_W = 6$ MeV





Collider Detector at Fermilab (CDF)



Tracking Momentum Scale

- $\Upsilon \rightarrow \mu\mu$ resonance provides
  - Momentum scale measurement at higher p_T
  - Validation of beam-constaining procedure (upsilons are promptly produced)
  - Non-beam-constrained and beam-constrained fits statistically consistent





Testing Hadronic Recoil Model with *W* events

Recoil model validation plots confirm the consistency of the model







Combined Results

- Combined electrons (3 fits): $M_W = 80477 \pm 62$ MeV, $P(\chi^2) = 49\%$
- Combined muons (3 fits): $M_W = 80352 \pm 60$ MeV, $P(\chi^2) = 69\%$
- All combined (6 fits): $M_W = 80413 \pm 48$ MeV, $P(\chi^2) = 44\%$

Lepton p_T and Missing E_T Fit Uncertainties

CDF II preliminary

Uncertainty (p_T)	Electrons	Muons	Common
Lepton Scale	30	17	17
Lepton Resolution	9	3	0
Recoil Scale	17	17	17
Recoil Resolution	3	3	3
Lepton Removal	0	0	0
$u_{\parallel}$ Efficiency	5	6	0
Backgrounds	9	19	0
$p_T(W)$	9	9	9
PDF	20	20	20
QED	13	13	13
Total Systematic	45	40	35
Statistical	58	66	0
Total	73	77	35

CDF II preliminary

Uncertainty (MET)	Electrons	Muons	Common
Lepton Scale	30	17	17
Lepton Resolution	9	5	0
Recoil Scale	15	15	15
Recoil Resolution	30	30	30
Lepton Removal	16	10	10
$u_{\parallel}$ Efficiency	16	13	0
Backgrounds	7	11	0
$p_T(W)$	5	5	5
PDF	13	13	13
QED	9	10	9
Total Systematic	54	46	42
Statistical	57	66	0
Total	79	80	42

Residuals of COT cells after alignment

- Final relative alignment of cells better than 5 μm (initial alignment ~25 μm)



Hadronic Recoil Simulation

- Recoil momentum 2-vector $\boldsymbol{u}$ has
  - a soft 'spectator interaction' component, randomly oriented
    - Modelled using minimum-bias data with tunable magnitude
  - A hard 'jet' component, directed opposite the boson p_T
    - P_T-dependent response and resolution parameterizations
    - Response $R = \boldsymbol{u}_{reconstructed} / \boldsymbol{u}_{true} = \boldsymbol{a} \log (\boldsymbol{u}_{true}/\mathrm{GeV} + \boldsymbol{b}) / \log (15 + \boldsymbol{b})$
      - Logarithmically increasing hadronic response motivated by Z boson data
      - $\boldsymbol{a}$ and $\boldsymbol{b}$ are fit to the Z data
    - Jet resolution parameterized as $\boldsymbol{s}_{had} (\boldsymbol{u}_{true})^{1/2}$
      - Spectator resolution and $\boldsymbol{s}_{had}$ are fit to the Z data

Cross-checks: Consistency between W sub-samples

Lepton	Fit difference	Result (MeV/c^2)
Electron	$m_W(l^+) - m_W(l^-)$	257 ± 117
Electron	$m_W(\phi_l > 0) - m_W(\phi_l < 0)$	116 ± 117
Electron	$m_W(run > 161k) - m_W(run < 161k)$	-107 ± 117
Muon	$m_W(l^+) - m_W(l^-)$	$286 \pm 132_{\text{stat}} \pm 75_{COT}$
Muon	$m_W(\phi_l > 0) - m_W(\phi_l < 0)$	0 ± 133
Muon	$m_W(run > 161k) - m_W(run < 161k)$	75 ± 135

PDF Uncertainty Contributions