arXiv:0912.4691v1 [hep-ex] 23 Dec 2009

Search for New Physics with a Dijet plus Missing E_T Signature in $p\bar{p}$ Collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 1.96$ TeV

T. Aaltonen,[24] J. Adelman,[14] B. Álvarez González[v,12] S. Amerio[dd,44] D. Amidei,[35] A. Anastassov,[39] A. Annovi,[20]
J. Antos,[15] G. Apollinari,[18] A. Apresyan,[49] T. Arisawa,[58] A. Artikov,[16] J. Asaadi,[54] W. Ashmanskas,[18]
A. Attal,[4] A. Aurisano,[54] F. Azfar,[43] W. Badgett,[18] A. Barbaro-Galtieri,[29] V.E. Barnes,[49] B.A. Barnett,[26]
P. Barria[ff,47] P. Bartos,[15] G. Bauer,[33] P.-H. Beauchemin,[34] F. Bedeschi,[47] D. Beecher,[31] S. Behari,[26]
G. Bellettini[ee,47] J. Bellinger,[60] D. Benjamin,[17] A. Beretvas,[18] A. Bhatti,[51] M. Binkley,[18] D. Bisello[dd,44]
I. Bizjak[jj,31] R.E. Blair,[2] C. Blocker,[7] B. Blumenfeld,[26] A. Bocci,[17] A. Bodek,[50] V. Boisvert,[50] D. Bortoletto,[49]
J. Boudreau,[48] A. Boveia,[11] B. Brau[a,11] A. Bridgeman,[25] L. Brigliadori[cc,6] C. Bromberg,[36] E. Brubaker,[14]
J. Budagov,[16] H.S. Budd,[50] S. Budd,[25] K. Burkett,[18] G. Busetto[dd,44] P. Bussey,[22] A. Buzatu,[34] K. L. Byrum,[2]
S. Cabrera[x,17] C. Calancha,[32] S. Camarda,[4] M. Campanelli,[36] M. Campbell,[35] F. Canelli[14,18] A. Canepa,[46]
B. Carls,[25] D. Carlsmith,[60] R. Carosi,[47] S. Carrillo[n,19] S. Carron,[18] B. Casal,[12] M. Casarsa,[18] A. Castro[cc,6]
P. Catastini[ff,47] D. Cauz,[55] V. Cavaliere[ff,47] M. Cavalli-Sforza,[4] A. Cerri,[29] L. Cerrito[q,31] S.H. Chang,[28]
Y.C. Chen,[1] M. Chertok,[8] G. Chiarelli,[47] G. Chlachidze,[18] F. Chlebana,[18] K. Cho,[28] D. Chokheli,[16] J.P. Chou,[23]
K. Chung[o,18] W.H. Chung,[60] Y.S. Chung,[50] T. Chwalek,[27] C.I. Ciobanu,[45] M.A. Ciocci[ff,47] A. Clark,[21]
D. Clark,[7] G. Compostella,[44] M.E. Convery,[18] J. Conway,[8] M.Corbo,[45] M. Cordelli,[20] C.A. Cox,[8] D.J. Cox,[8]
F. Crescioli[ee,47] C. Cuenca Almenar,[61] J. Cuevas[v,12] R. Culbertson,[18] J.C. Cully,[35] D. Dagenhart,[18] M. Datta,[18]
T. Davies,[22] P. de Barbaro,[50] S. De Cecco,[52] A. Deisher,[29] G. De Lorenzo,[4] M. Dell'Orso[ee,47] C. Deluca,[4]
L. Demortier,[51] J. Deng[f,17] M. Deninno,[6] M. d'Errico[dd,44] P.-O. Deviveiros,[34] A. Di Canto[ee,47] G.P. di Giovanni,[45]
B. Di Ruzza,[47] J.R. Dittmann,[5] M. D'Onofrio,[4] S. Donati[ee,47] P. Dong,[18] T. Dorigo,[44] S. Dube,[53] K. Ebina,[58]
A. Elagin,[54] R. Erbacher,[8] D. Errede,[25] S. Errede,[25] N. Ershaidat[bb,45] R. Eusebi,[54] H.C. Fang,[29] S. Farrington,[43]
W.T. Fedorko,[14] R.G. Feild,[61] M. Feindt,[27] J.P. Fernandez,[32] C. Ferrazza[gg,47] R. Field,[19] G. Flanagan[s,49]
R. Forrest,[8] M.J. Frank,[5] M. Franklin,[23] J.C. Freeman,[18] I. Furic,[19] M. Gallinaro,[51] J. Galyardt,[13] F. Garberson,[11]
J.E. Garcia,[21] A.F. Garfinkel,[49] P. Garosi[ff,47] H. Gerberich,[25] D. Gerdes,[35] A. Gessler,[27] S. Giagu[hh,52]
V. Giakoumopoulou,[3] P. Giannetti,[47] K. Gibson,[48] J.L. Gimmell,[50] C.M. Ginsburg,[18] N. Giokaris,[3] M. Giordani[ii,55]
P. Giromini,[20] M. Giunta,[47] G. Giurgiu,[26] V. Glagolev,[16] D. Glenzinski,[18] M. Gold,[38] N. Goldschmidt,[19]
A. Golossanov,[18] G. Gomez,[12] G. Gomez-Ceballos,[33] M. Goncharov,[33] O. González,[32] I. Gorelov,[38]
A.T. Goshaw,[17] K. Goulianos,[51] A. Gresele[dd,44] S. Grinstein,[4] C. Grosso-Pilcher,[14] R.C. Group,[18] U. Grundler,[25]
J. Guimaraes da Costa,[23] Z. Gunay-Unalan,[36] C. Haber,[29] S.R. Hahn,[18] E. Halkiadakis,[53] B.-Y. Han,[50]
J.Y. Han,[50] F. Happacher,[20] K. Hara,[56] D. Hare,[53] M. Hare,[57] R.F. Harr,[59] M. Hartz,[48] K. Hatakeyama,[5]
C. Hays,[43] M. Heck,[27] J. Heinrich,[46] M. Herndon,[60] J. Heuser,[27] S. Hewamanage,[5] D. Hidas,[53] C.S. Hill[c,11]
D. Hirschbuehl,[27] A. Hocker,[18] S. Hou,[1] M. Houlden,[30] S.-C. Hsu,[29] R.E. Hughes,[40] M. Hurwitz,[14] U. Husemann,[61]
M. Hussein,[36] J. Huston,[36] J. Incandela,[11] G. Introzzi,[47] M. Iori[hh,52] A. Ivanov[p,8] E. James,[18] D. Jang,[13]
B. Jayatilaka,[17] E.J. Jeon,[28] M.K. Jha,[6] S. Jindariani,[18] W. Johnson,[8] M. Jones,[49] K.K. Joo,[28] S.Y. Jun,[13]
J.E. Jung,[28] T.R. Junk,[18] T. Kamon,[54] D. Kar,[19] P.E. Karchin,[59] Y. Kato[m,42] R. Kephart,[18] W. Ketchum,[14]
J. Keung,[46] V. Khotilovich,[54] B. Kilminster,[18] D.H. Kim,[28] H.S. Kim,[28] H.W. Kim,[28] J.E. Kim,[28] M.J. Kim,[20]
S.B. Kim,[28] S.H. Kim,[56] Y.K. Kim,[14] N. Kimura,[58] L. Kirsch,[7] S. Klimenko,[19] K. Kondo,[58] D.J. Kong,[28]
J. Konigsberg,[19] A. Korytov,[19] A.V. Kotwal,[17] M. Kreps,[27] J. Kroll,[46] D. Krop,[14] N. Krumnack,[5] M. Kruse,[17]
V. Krutelyov,[11] T. Kuhr,[27] N.P. Kulkarni,[59] M. Kurata,[56] S. Kwang,[14] A.T. Laasanen,[49] S. Lami,[47] S. Lammel,[18]
M. Lancaster,[31] R.L. Lander,[8] K. Lannon[u,40] A. Lath,[53] G. Latino[ff,47] I. Lazzizzera[dd,44] T. LeCompte,[2]
E. Lee,[54] H.S. Lee,[14] J.S. Lee,[28] S.W. Lee[w,54] S. Leone,[47] J.D. Lewis,[18] C.-J. Lin,[29] J. Linacre,[43] M. Lindgren,[18]
E. Lipeles,[46] A. Lister,[21] D.O. Litvintsev,[18] C. Liu,[48] T. Liu,[18] N.S. Lockyer,[46] A. Loginov,[61] L. Lovas,[15]
D. Lucchesi[dd,44] J. Lueck,[27] P. Lujan,[29] P. Lukens,[18] G. Lungu,[51] J. Lys,[29] R. Lysak,[15] D. MacQueen,[34]
R. Madrak,[18] K. Maeshima,[18] K. Makhoul,[33] P. Maksimovic,[26] S. Malde,[43] S. Malik,[31] G. Manca[e,30]
A. Manousakis-Katsikakis,[3] F. Margaroli,[49] C. Marino,[27] C.P. Marino,[25] A. Martin,[61] V. Martin[k,22] M. Martínez,[4]
R. Martínez-Ballarín,[32] P. Mastrandrea,[52] M. Mathis,[26] M.E. Mattson,[59] P. Mazzanti,[6] K.S. McFarland,[50]
P. McIntyre,[54] R. McNulty[j,30] A. Mehta,[30] P. Mehtala,[24] A. Menzione,[47] C. Mesropian,[51] T. Miao,[18] D. Mietlicki,[35]
N. Miladinovic,[7] R. Miller,[36] C. Mills,[23] M. Milnik,[27] A. Mitra,[1] G. Mitselmakher,[19] H. Miyake,[56] S. Moed,[23]
N. Moggi,[6] M.N. Mondragon[n,18] C.S. Moon,[28] R. Moore,[18] M.J. Morello,[47] J. Morlock,[27] P. Movilla Fernandez,[18]
J. Mülmenstädt,[29] A. Mukherjee,[18] Th. Muller,[27] P. Murat,[18] M. Mussini[cc,6] J. Nachtman[o,18] Y. Nagai,[56]

J. Naganoma,[56] K. Nakamura,[56] I. Nakano,[41] A. Napier,[57] J. Nett,[60] C. Neu[z],[46] M.S. Neubauer,[25] S. Neubauer,[27]
J. Nielsen[g],[29] L. Nodulman,[2] M. Norman,[10] O. Norniella,[25] E. Nurse,[31] L. Oakes,[43] S.H. Oh,[17] Y.D. Oh,[28]
I. Oksuzian,[19] T. Okusawa,[42] R. Orava,[24] K. Osterberg,[24] S. Pagan Griso[dd],[44] C. Pagliarone,[55] E. Palencia,[18]
V. Papadimitriou,[18] A. Papaikonomou,[27] A.A. Paramanov,[2] B. Parks,[40] S. Pashapour,[34] J. Patrick,[18]
G. Pauletta[ii],[55] M. Paulini,[13] C. Paus,[33] T. Peiffer,[27] D.E. Pellett,[8] A. Penzo,[55] T.J. Phillips,[17] G. Piacentino,[47]
E. Pianori,[46] L. Pinera,[19] K. Pitts,[25] C. Plager,[9] L. Pondrom,[60] K. Potamianos,[49] O. Poukhov[*],[16] F. Prokoshin[y],[16]
A. Pronko,[18] F. Ptohos[i],[18] E. Pueschel,[13] G. Punzi[ee],[47] J. Pursley,[60] J. Rademacker[c],[43] A. Rahaman,[48]
V. Ramakrishnan,[60] N. Ranjan,[49] I. Redondo,[32] P. Renton,[43] M. Renz,[27] M. Rescigno,[52] S. Richter,[27]
F. Rimondi[cc],[6] L. Ristori,[47] A. Robson,[22] T. Rodrigo,[12] T. Rodriguez,[46] E. Rogers,[25] S. Rolli,[57] R. Roser,[18]
M. Rossi,[55] R. Rossin,[11] P. Roy,[34] A. Ruiz,[12] J. Russ,[13] V. Rusu,[18] B. Rutherford,[18] H. Saarikko,[24] A. Safonov,[54]
W.K. Sakumoto,[50] L. Santi[ii],[55] L. Sartori,[47] K. Sato,[56] P. Savard,[34] A. Savoy-Navarro,[45] P. Schlabach,[18]
A. Schmidt,[27] E.E. Schmidt,[18] M.A. Schmidt,[14] M.P. Schmidt[*],[61] M. Schmitt,[39] T. Schwarz,[8] L. Scodellaro,[12]
A. Scribano[ff],[47] F. Scuri,[47] A. Sedov,[49] S. Seidel,[38] Y. Seiya,[42] A. Semenov,[16] L. Sexton-Kennedy,[18] F. Sforza[ee],[47]
A. Sfyrla,[25] S.Z. Shalhout,[59] T. Shears,[30] P.F. Shepard,[48] M. Shimojima[t],[56] S. Shiraishi,[14] M. Shochet,[14] Y. Shon,[60]
I. Shreyber,[37] A. Simonenko,[16] P. Sinervo,[34] A. Sisakyan,[16] A.J. Slaughter,[18] J. Slaunwhite,[40] K. Sliwa,[57]
J.R. Smith,[8] F.D. Snider,[18] R. Snihur,[34] A. Soha,[18] S. Somalwar,[53] V. Sorin,[4] P. Squillacioti[ff],[47] M. Stanitzki,[61]
R. St. Denis,[22] B. Stelzer,[34] O. Stelzer-Chilton,[34] D. Stentz,[39] J. Strologas,[38] G.L. Strycker,[35] J.S. Suh,[28]
A. Sukhanov,[19] I. Suslov,[16] A. Taffard[f],[25] R. Takashima,[41] Y. Takeuchi,[56] R. Tanaka,[41] J. Tang,[14] M. Tecchio,[35]
P.K. Teng,[1] J. Thom[h],[18] J. Thome,[13] G.A. Thompson,[25] E. Thomson,[46] P. Tipton,[61] P. Ttito-Guzmán,[32]
S. Tkaczyk,[18] D. Toback,[54] S. Tokar,[15] K. Tollefson,[36] T. Tomura,[56] D. Tonelli,[18] S. Torre,[20] D. Torretta,[18]
P. Totaro[ii],[55] S. Tourneur,[45] M. Trovato[gg],[47] S.-Y. Tsai,[1] Y. Tu,[46] N. Turini[ff],[47] F. Ukegawa,[56] S. Uozumi,[28]
N. van Remortel[b],[24] A. Varganov,[35] E. Vataga[gg],[47] F. Vázquez[n],[19] G. Velev,[18] C. Vellidis,[3] M. Vidal,[32]
I. Vila,[12] R. Vilar,[12] M. Vogel,[38] I. Volobouev[w],[29] G. Volpi[ee],[47] P. Wagner,[46] R.G. Wagner,[2] R.L. Wagner,[18]
W. Wagner[aa],[27] J. Wagner-Kuhr,[27] T. Wakisaka,[42] R. Wallny,[9] S.M. Wang,[1] A. Warburton,[34] D. Waters,[31]
M. Weinberger,[54] J. Weinelt,[27] W.C. Wester III,[18] B. Whitehouse,[57] D. Whiteson[f],[46] A.B. Wicklund,[2]
E. Wicklund,[18] S. Wilbur,[14] G. Williams,[34] H.H. Williams,[46] P. Wilson,[18] B.L. Winer,[40] P. Wittich[h],[18]
S. Wolbers,[18] C. Wolfe,[14] H. Wolfe,[40] T. Wright,[35] X. Wu,[21] F. Würthwein,[10] A. Yagil,[10] K. Yamamoto,[42]
J. Yamaoka,[17] U.K. Yang[r],[14] Y.C. Yang,[28] W.M. Yao,[29] G.P. Yeh,[18] K. Yi[o],[18] J. Yoh,[18] K. Yorita,[58] T. Yoshida[l],[42]
G.B. Yu,[17] I. Yu,[28] S.S. Yu,[18] J.C. Yun,[18] A. Zanetti,[55] Y. Zeng,[17] X. Zhang,[25] Y. Zheng[d],[9] and S. Zucchelli[cc6]
(CDF Collaboration[†])

[1]*Institute of Physics, Academia Sinica, Taipei, Taiwan 11529, Republic of China*
[2]*Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, Illinois 60439*
[3]*University of Athens, 157 71 Athens, Greece*
[4]*Institut de Fisica d'Altes Energies, Universitat Autonoma de Barcelona, E-08193, Bellaterra (Barcelona), Spain*
[5]*Baylor University, Waco, Texas 76798*
[6]*Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare Bologna,* [cc]*University of Bologna, I-40127 Bologna, Italy*
[7]*Brandeis University, Waltham, Massachusetts 02254*
[8]*University of California, Davis, Davis, California 95616*
[9]*University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California 90024*
[10]*University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, California 92093*
[11]*University of California, Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, California 93106*
[12]*Instituto de Fisica de Cantabria, CSIC-University of Cantabria, 39005 Santander, Spain*
[13]*Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA 15213*
[14]*Enrico Fermi Institute, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois 60637*
[15]*Comenius University, 842 48 Bratislava, Slovakia; Institute of Experimental Physics, 040 01 Kosice, Slovakia*
[16]*Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, RU-141980 Dubna, Russia*
[17]*Duke University, Durham, North Carolina 27708*
[18]*Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, Batavia, Illinois 60510*
[19]*University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida 32611*
[20]*Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati, Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, I-00044 Frascati, Italy*
[21]*University of Geneva, CH-1211 Geneva 4, Switzerland*
[22]*Glasgow University, Glasgow G12 8QQ, United Kingdom*
[23]*Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138*
[24]*Division of High Energy Physics, Department of Physics,*
University of Helsinki and Helsinki Institute of Physics, FIN-00014, Helsinki, Finland
[25]*University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois 61801*

[26]*The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland 21218*
[27]*Institut für Experimentelle Kernphysik, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, D-76131 Karlsruhe, Germany*
[28]*Center for High Energy Physics: Kyungpook National University,*
Daegu 702-701, Korea; Seoul National University, Seoul 151-742,
Korea; Sungkyunkwan University, Suwon 440-746,
Korea; Korea Institute of Science and Technology Information,
Daejeon 305-806, Korea; Chonnam National University, Gwangju 500-757,
Korea; Chonbuk National University, Jeonju 561-756, Korea
[29]*Ernest Orlando Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, California 94720*
[30]*University of Liverpool, Liverpool L69 7ZE, United Kingdom*
[31]*University College London, London WC1E 6BT, United Kingdom*
[32]*Centro de Investigaciones Energeticas Medioambientales y Tecnologicas, E-28040 Madrid, Spain*
[33]*Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139*
[34]*Institute of Particle Physics: McGill University, Montréal, Québec,*
Canada H3A 2T8; Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, British Columbia,
Canada V5A 1S6; University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario,
Canada M5S 1A7; and TRIUMF, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada V6T 2A3
[35]*University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109*
[36]*Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48824*
[37]*Institution for Theoretical and Experimental Physics, ITEP, Moscow 117259, Russia*
[38]*University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico 87131*
[39]*Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois 60208*
[40]*The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio 43210*
[41]*Okayama University, Okayama 700-8530, Japan*
[42]*Osaka City University, Osaka 588, Japan*
[43]*University of Oxford, Oxford OX1 3RH, United Kingdom*
[44]*Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, Sezione di Padova-Trento,* [dd]*University of Padova, I-35131 Padova, Italy*
[45]*LPNHE, Universite Pierre et Marie Curie/IN2P3-CNRS, UMR7585, Paris, F-75252 France*
[46]*University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104*
[47]*Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare Pisa,* [ee]*University of Pisa,*
[ff]*University of Siena and* [gg]*Scuola Normale Superiore, I-56127 Pisa, Italy*
[48]*University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15260*
[49]*Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana 47907*
[50]*University of Rochester, Rochester, New York 14627*
[51]*The Rockefeller University, New York, New York 10021*
[52]*Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, Sezione di Roma 1,*
[hh]*Sapienza Università di Roma, I-00185 Roma, Italy*
[53]*Rutgers University, Piscataway, New Jersey 08855*
[54]*Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas 77843*
[55]*Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare Trieste/Udine,*
I-34100 Trieste, [ii]*University of Trieste/Udine, I-33100 Udine, Italy*
[56]*University of Tsukuba, Tsukuba, Ibaraki 305, Japan*
[57]*Tufts University, Medford, Massachusetts 02155*
[58]*Waseda University, Tokyo 169, Japan*
[59]*Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan 48201*
[60]*University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin 53706*
[61]*Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut 06520*

(Dated: December 23, 2009)

We present results of a signature-based search for new physics using a dijet plus missing transverse energy ($\not\!\!E_T$) data sample collected in 2 fb^{-1} of $p\bar{p}$ collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 1.96$ TeV with the CDF II detector at the Fermilab Tevatron. We observe no significant event excess with respect to the standard model prediction and extract a 95% C.L. upper limit on the cross section times acceptance for a potential contribution from a non-standard model process. Based on this limit the mass of a potential first or second generation scalar leptoquark is constrained to be above 187 GeV/c^2.

PACS numbers: 13.85.Rm,14.80.Sv

---

[*] Deceased

[†] With visitors from [a]University of Massachusetts Amherst, Amherst, Massachusetts 01003, [b]Universiteit Antwerpen, B-2610

Events featuring two energetic jets and significant missing transverse energy ($\not\!\!E_T$) [1] are a potential signature for phenomena not included in the standard model (SM), such as supersymmetry [2], universal extra dimensions [3], and leptoquark production [4]. In general, any model predicting pair production of unstable particles whose decay products are a single parton and a non-interacting particle could be observable as an event excess above the SM expectation in the dijet + $\not\!\!E_T$ channel.

In this Letter we report on a signature-based search for new physics contributions to the dijet + $\not\!\!E_T$ final state in CDF Run II data collected in $p\overline{p}$ collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 1.96$ TeV corresponding to an integrated luminosity of 2 fb^{-1}. In contrast with previous CDF [5] and D0 [6] searches in this final state, no *a priori* optimization of the kinematic selection criteria is performed to maximize sensitivity to a particular model. Here the criteria are chosen to encompass the widest possible kinematic range consistent with the trigger used to collect the data sample. We perform a simple counting experiment on this inclusive sample, comparing the number of observed events against the SM expectation, to search for potential indications of non-SM contributions. A second, analogous counting experiment is made on a subsample of the highest energy events from within the inclusive sample, which is a more sensitive testbed for observing contributions from some classes of non-SM production processes. The tighter kinematic selections that define this event subset are chosen to give a fixed (15%) uncertainty on the data-driven SM background prediction made for this sample. From here forward, we refer to these sets of candidate events as our loose and tight samples. Based on the counting experiment results, we place 95% C.L. upper limits on the cross section times acceptance ($\sigma \times A$) for a generic, non-SM process that can contribute events to the candidate samples. Finally, we use the generic limit on $\sigma \times A$ to extract a lower limit on leptoquark mass for the specific case of scalar leptoquark production, which serves as a sensitivity benchmark for the result.

A detailed description of the CDF II detector can be found in Ref. [7]. The data sample was collected using a three-level trigger system based on a minimum $\not\!\!E_T$ requirement of 45 GeV. Reconstructed candidate events are required to have $\not\!\!E_T > 80$ GeV to ensure full trigger efficiency. Jets are reconstructed from energy deposits in the calorimeter using a cone-based algorithm with a fixed radius of 0.7 in $\eta - \phi$ space. The measured jet E_T is corrected for detector effects and contributions from multiple $p\overline{p}$ interactions per bunch crossing [8]. Events in the candidate samples are required to have two reconstructed jets with $|\eta| < 2.4$ and $E_T > 30$ GeV and no additional jets with $|\eta| < 3.6$ and $E_T > 15$ GeV. In addition, the scalar sum of the two jet transverse energies, $H_T = E_T(\text{jet1}) + E_T(\text{jet2})$, must be greater than 125 GeV. A separation of at least 0.5 radians in azimuthal angle is required between the $\not\!\!E_T$ and both jets to help suppress multi-jet backgrounds in which significant $\not\!\!E_T$ is produced by poorly measured jets. Events from beam-related backgrounds and cosmic rays are removed using standard criteria [9] to tag reconstructed tracks and jets that are inconsistent with having been produced by particles originating from the $p\overline{p}$ collision. The subset of events that satisfy tighter kinematic thresholds of $\not\!\!E_T > 100$ GeV and $H_T > 225$ GeV define the tight candidate sample.

A number of SM processes capable of producing the high $\not\!\!E_T$ signature in our detector contribute events to our candidate samples. The largest SM background is Z+jets where the Z boson decays into a pair of neutrinos. This process results in a signature indistinguishable from that of potential signal and its relative contribution to the candidate samples is therefore irreducible. The next most significant SM contribution is from W+jets in which the W decays via a charged lepton (e, μ, or τ) and neutrino. We suppress this background by rejecting events that contain either an isolated track [9] with $p_T > 10$ GeV/c (μ or τ candidate) or a jet with $E_T > 15$ GeV and electromagnetic energy fraction above 90% (e candidate).

The W/Z+jets backgrounds are modeled using separate data samples collected with single lepton triggers to circumvent significant systematic uncertainties inherent in the simulation of these processes. We estimate the number of SM background events from W/Z+jets production in our dijet + $\not\!\!E_T$ candidate samples using cross section measurements obtained from $Z(\rightarrow \ell\ell)$+jets and $W(\rightarrow \ell\nu)$+jets ($\ell = e$ or μ) events with fully reconstructed leptons. The measured cross sections con-

---

Antwerp, Belgium, [c]University of Bristol, Bristol BS8 1TL, United Kingdom, [d]Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100864, China, [e]Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, Sezione di Cagliari, 09042 Monserrato (Cagliari), Italy, [f]University of California Irvine, Irvine, CA 92697, [g]University of California Santa Cruz, Santa Cruz, CA 95064, [h]Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853, [i]University of Cyprus, Nicosia CY-1678, Cyprus, [j]University College Dublin, Dublin 4, Ireland, [k]University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh EH9 3JZ, United Kingdom, [l]University of Fukui, Fukui City, Fukui Prefecture, Japan 910-0017 [m]Kinki University, Higashi-Osaka City, Japan 577-8502 [n]Universidad Iberoamericana, Mexico D.F., Mexico, [o]University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA 52242, [p]Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS 66506 [q]Queen Mary, University of London, London, E1 4NS, England, [r]University of Manchester, Manchester M13 9PL, England, [s]Muons, Inc., Batavia, IL 60510, [t]Nagasaki Institute of Applied Science, Nagasaki, Japan, [u]University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN 46556, [v]University de Oviedo, E-33007 Oviedo, Spain, [w]Texas Tech University, Lubbock, TX 79609, [x]IFIC(CSIC-Universitat de Valencia), 56071 Valencia, Spain, [y]Universidad Tecnica Federico Santa Maria, 110v Valparaiso, Chile, [z]University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA 22906 [aa]Bergische Universität Wuppertal, 42097 Wuppertal, Germany, [bb]Yarmouk University, Irbid 211-63, Jordan [jj]On leave from J. Stefan Institute, Ljubljana, Slovenia,

tain contributions from diboson production where two jets are produced in the hadronic decay of one the bosons, and potential diboson contributions to the dijet + $\not\!\!E_T$ samples are therefore included within the resulting background estimates. Events in the samples used to make these measurements are required to have at least one electron ($E_T > 25$ GeV) or one muon ($p_T > 20$ GeV/c) passing standard selection criteria [7]. We select $W \to \ell\nu$ candidates by requiring $\not\!\!E_T > 25$ GeV for electrons ($\not\!\!E_T > 20$ GeV for muons) and $Z \to \ell\ell$ candidates by requiring a second lepton satisfying a looser set of selection criteria [7]. We then apply the full set of dijet + $\not\!\!E_T$ selections described previously to the selected W/Z candidates to obtain $W(\to \ell\nu)$+jets and $Z(\to \ell\ell)$+jets event samples. To be consistent with the criteria used in selecting dijet + $\not\!\!E_T$ signal events, reconstructed tracks and calorimeter energy deposits associated with the charged lepton(s) are removed prior to application of the isolated track veto and $\not\!\!E_T$ requirement.

To extract W/Z+jets cross sections from these samples, we correct for the acceptance of the $W \to \ell\nu$ (25-32%) or $Z \to \ell\ell$ (15-33%) pieces of the selection criteria using simulated ALPGEN [10] events run through a full detector simulation based on GEANT3 [11]. Acceptances depend on the specific lepton ($\ell = e$ or μ) decay channel and on the associated loose or tight dijet + $\not\!\!E_T$ selection criteria. To account for observed differences in lepton reconstruction and identification efficiencies between data and Monte Carlo, corrections of up to 10% per lepton are applied to the simulated acceptances. Uncertainties on these acceptance and efficiency corrections are small (~ 1-2%) compared with those coming from candidate sample statistics and the methods used to estimate sample background contributions. The observed agreement in the cross section measurements made using high-statistics $W(\to e\nu)$+jets and $W(\to \mu\nu)$+jets candidate samples provides validation of the techniques used to estimate $W \to \ell\nu$ background contributions. To minimize statistical uncertainties, the cross sections used to estimate backgrounds are a combination of the measurements made using both lepton decay channels.

Estimates of the dijet + $\not\!\!E_T$ candidate sample backgrounds from Z+jets production, in which the Z boson decays to neutrinos, are taken directly from the measured $Z(\to \ell\ell)$+jets cross sections based on the difference in the Z branching fractions for charged leptons and neutrinos. A second, independent estimate of this background is obtained from the measured $W(\to \ell\nu)$+jets cross sections incorporating a theoretical prediction for $R_{(\frac{W}{Z})}$, the ratio of the W+jets and Z+jets production cross sections. We determine $R_{(\frac{W}{Z})}$ with a next-to-leading order (NLO) calculation using the MCFM generator [12]. The value of $R_{(\frac{W}{Z})}$, which depends on the exact choice of jet requirements, is calculated to be 8.7 ± 0.2 (8.2 ± 0.2) for the loose (tight) dijet+$\not\!\!E_T$ sample. The final background estimates are obtained by combining results from the two statistically-independent techniques which are found to be consistent.

Similarly, the measured $W(\to \ell\nu)$+jets cross sections are used to extract W+jets background estimates for our dijet + $\not\!\!E_T$ candidate samples. The probability for the charged lepton in these events to fail the lepton veto criteria is obtained from the simulated event samples (~ 20% for electrons, ~ 33% for muons, and ~ 55% for taus) and applied as an acceptance factor on the measured cross section. Smaller backgrounds from Z+jets, where the Z boson decays into a pair of charged leptons that both fail lepton veto criteria, are estimated from the measured $Z(\to \ell\ell)$+jets cross sections using the same technique. Since the same measured cross sections are used to estimate all W/Z+jets backgrounds, the uncertainties on these predictions are fully correlated. Small event contributions from $t\bar{t}$ and single-top production are obtained directly from simulated event samples. We use a measured Run II cross section [13] for $t\bar{t}$ and a NLO cross section calculation [14] for single-top production for the normalization of these samples.

The dominant multi-jet topology contributing events to our candidate samples is three-jet events in which the third jet is either not reconstructed or has an E_T below our jet threshold (15 GeV). The magnitude of this background is estimated from data using three-jet events in which the observed $\not\!\!E_T$ points in the direction of the least-energetic jet. We perform a linear extrapolation of the E_T distribution obtained from the least-energetic jets in these events into the region where the E_T falls below the threshold for defining jets. Before performing the extrapolation, corrections obtained from simulation are applied to the distribution to remove W/Z+jets contributions. A simulated PYTHIA [15] event sample is used to determine the relative fraction of events originating from other multi-jet topologies (20%), and the result is used to scale the three-jet background estimates to account for all processes. This scaling factor is assigned a conservative 100% uncertainty that does not contribute significantly to the total uncertainty on the multi-jet background estimate, which is dominated by statistical uncertainties due to the size of the three-jet candidate samples.

The small background contribution from events in which a photon is produced in association with jets is taken from simulated samples generated with PYTHIA. The estimates are normalized using a Run II D0 measurement of the γ+jets cross section [16]. The uncertainty associated with this measurement is the dominant contributor to the total uncertainty on the γ+jets background estimates. Finally, the small, residual non-collision background is estimated using timing information from the hadronic calorimeter.

The estimated SM backgrounds and number of observed events in both the loose and tight dijet + $\not\!\!E_T$ candidate samples are summarized in Table I. The

TABLE I: Estimated SM backgrounds and the number of observed data events for loose (H_T >125 GeV, $\not\!\!E_T$ >80 GeV) and tight (H_T >225 GeV, $\not\!\!E_T$ >100 GeV) candidate samples.

Background	Loose Sample	Tight Sample
$Z \to \nu\overline{\nu}$	888 ± 54	86.4 ± 12.7
$W \to \tau\nu$	669 ± 42	50.6 ± 8.0
$W \to \mu\nu$	399 ± 25	32.9 ± 5.2
$W \to e\nu$	256 ± 16	14.0 ± 2.2
$Z \to \ell\ell$	29 ± 4	1.7 ± 0.2
Top quark production	74 ± 9	10.8 ± 1.7
Multi-jet production	49 ± 30	9.0 ± 9.0
γ+jets	75 ± 11	4.8 ± 1.1
Non-collision	4 ± 4	1.0 ± 1.0
Total expected	2443 ± 151	211.2 ± 29.8
Data observed	2506	186



FIG. 1: 95% C.L. upper cross section limits on first and second generation qν scalar leptoquark pair production (q being u,d,s or c) as a function of leptoquark mass (M_{LQ}).

dominant source of uncertainty on the combined SM background predictions is the statistical size of the $W(\to \ell\nu)$+jets and $Z(\to \ell\ell)$+jets candidate samples (4.6% and 12.2% on the total background estimates for the loose and tight samples, respectively). Other non-negligible uncertainty contributions come from the background estimates used in the $W(\to \ell\nu)$+jets and $Z(\to \ell\ell)$+jets cross section measurements (2.4% and 4.0%), the input parameters to the theoretical calculation of $R_{(\frac{W}{Z})}$ (1.8% and 1.8%), and the statistics of the three-jet samples used to perform the linear extrapolation for extracting multi-jet background estimates (1.2% and 4.3%). The final combined uncertainties on the predicted SM backgrounds for the loose and tight candidate samples are 6.2% and 14.1%.

In both the loose and tight candidate samples we observe no significant excess of events in data with respect to the SM prediction, which constrains the potential contribution from new physics processes to these samples. An upper limit on the number of non-SM signal events present in each candidate sample is obtained using a Bayesian approach with a flat prior for the number of signal events and priors based on gamma distributions for both the acceptance and the number of SM background events [17]. Limits on the number of signal events can be directly translated into upper limits on $\sigma \times A$ for any new physics process that contributes events to our candidate samples. These limits do not assume any central value for the signal acceptance, which is detector-dependent and varies significantly for different processes. The quoted limits are based on a specific choice of values for acceptance uncertainties, which vary less among different processes. For a 15% signal acceptance uncertainty we obtain a 95% C.L. upper limit of 0.18 pb (0.02 pb) on $\sigma \times A$ for the loose (tight) candidate sample. Increasing the signal acceptance uncertainty by a factor of two leads to a 25% degradation in the quoted limits.

For the case of scalar leptoquark pair production with the subsequent decay of each leptoquark into a quark and neutrino, we provide an example of the detector-dependent acceptance calculation required to extract model limits. We simulate signal acceptance using PYTHIA in conjunction with a full detector simulation. The loose (tight) dijet+$\not\!\!E_T$ selection criteria yield an acceptance of 14% (4%) to a first generation leptoquark with a mass of 150 GeV/c^2. Acceptance increases as a function of leptoquark mass (M_{LQ}), rising to 20% (9%) at 200 GeV/c^2. The relative uncertainty on the acceptance is 13% (20%) independent of M_{LQ} and comes from potential variations in parton distribution functions (PDFs), ambiguity in the absolute jet energy scale [8], modeling of initial and final state radiation, data sample luminosity, and selection efficiencies. Mass limits are based on a NLO production cross section calculation [18] using the CTEQ6.1M PDF set [19] and $\mu = M_{LQ}$ for the renormalization and factorization scales. Uncertainties on the cross section due to PDF modeling (from the full set of CTEQ6.1M eigenvectors) and scale choice (from varying μ between $M_{LQ}/2$ and $2 \times M_{LQ}$) are added in quadrature. We determine which sample has the best *a priori* sensitivity to the leptoquark model at each mass point, and set a 95% C.L. lower mass limit based on the point where the cross section limit from the more sensitive sample intersects with the lower uncertainty band of the NLO calculation. Figure 1 shows the cross section limits as a function of leptoquark mass that result in a lower mass limit of 187 GeV/c^2 for a first or second generation qν scalar leptoquark (correponding to an upper cross section limit of 0.33 pb at this mass point). This result significantly improves upon the previous CDF limit [5] and is only slightly looser than the D0 lower mass limit of 205 GeV/c^2 [6] obtained from an optimized search on a 25% larger data sample.

In summary, this article presents a signature-based search for potential non-SM contributions in the dijet+$\not\!\!E_T$ final state. No excess above the SM prediction is observed and we set a 95% C.L. upper limit on the cross section times acceptance for potential non-SM production processes. For the specific case of first and second generation scalar leptoquark production, we obtain a 95% C.L. lower mass limit of 187 GeV/c^2.

We thank M. Krämer for calculating the next-to-leading order leptoquark production cross sections. We thank the Fermilab staff and the technical staffs of the participating institutions for their vital contributions. This work was supported by the U.S. Department of Energy and National Science Foundation; the Italian Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare; the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology of Japan; the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada; the National Science Council of the Republic of China; the Swiss National Science Foundation; the A.P. Sloan Foundation; the Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung, Germany; the World Class University Program, the National Research Foundation of Korea; the Science and Technology Facilities Council and the Royal Society, UK; the Institut National de Physique Nucleaire et Physique des Particules/CNRS; the Russian Foundation for Basic Research; the Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación, and Programa Consolider-Ingenio 2010, Spain; the Slovak R&D Agency; and the Academy of Finland.

---

[1] We use a coordinate system where θ is the polar angle to the proton beam, ϕ is the azimuthal angle about this beam axis, and η is the pseudorapidity defined as $-\ln\tan(\theta/2)$. Missing transverse energy, $\not\!\!E_T$, is defined as the magnitude of $-\sum_i E_T^i \hat{n}_i$ where $\hat{n}_i$ is a unit vector in the azimuthal plane that points from the beamline to the ith calorimeter tower and E_T^i is the transverse component of the measured energy in the tower, defined as $E^i \cdot \sin\theta$.

[2] G.L. Kane and J.P. Leville, Phys. Lett. B **112**, 227 (1982); P.R. Harrison and C.H. Llewellyn-Smith, Nucl. Phys. **B213**, 223 (1983).

[3] C. Macesanu, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **21**, 2259-2296 (2006).

[4] J.L. Hewett and T.G. Rizzo, Phys. Rev. D **56**, 5709 (1997); M. Krämer, T. Plehn, M. Spira, and P. M. Zerwas, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 341 (1997).

[5] D. Acosta *et al.* (CDF Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D **72**, 051107 (2005); T. Aaltonen *et al.* (CDF Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 121801 (2009).

[6] V.M. Abazov *et al.* (D0 Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **668**, 357 (2008); V.M. Abazov *et al.* (D0 Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **660**, 449 (2008).

[7] A. Abulencia *et al.* (CDF Collaboration), J. Phys. G: Nucl. Part. Phys., 2457 (2007).

[8] A. Bhatti *et al.*, Nucl. Instrum. Methods A **566**, 375 (2006).

[9] A. Abulencia *et al.* (CDF Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 171802 (2006).

[10] M.L. Mangano *et al.*, J. High Energy Phys. 07 (2003) 001.

[11] R. Brun *et al.*, Tech. Rep. CERN-DD/EE/84-1 (1987); S. Agostinelli *et al.*, Nucl. Instrum. Methods A **506**, 250 (2003).

[12] John Campbell and R.K. Ellis, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 113007 (2002).

[13] A. Abulencia *et al.* (CDF Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 082004 (2006).

[14] B.W. Harris *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 054024 (2002); Z. Sullivan, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 114012 (2004).

[15] T. Sjöstrand *et al.*, Comput. Phys. Commun. **135**, 238 (2001).

[16] V.M. Abazov *et al.* (D0 Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **639**, 151 (2006).

[17] J. Heinrich *et al.*, arXiv:physics/0409129 (2004).

[18] M. Krämer *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 341 (1997).

[19] J. Pumplin *et al.*, J. High Energy Phys. 07 (2002) 012. D. Stump *et al.*, J. High Energy Phys. 10 (2003) 046.