

Search for Large Extra Dimensions in the Monojet + \cancel{E}_T Channel with the DØ Detector

V. M. Abazov,²¹ B. Abbott,⁵⁵ A. Abdesselam,¹¹ M. Abolins,⁴⁸ V. Abramov,²⁴ B. S. Acharya,¹⁷ D. L. Adams,⁵³ M. Adams,³⁵ S. N. Ahmed,²⁰ G. D. Alexeev,²¹ A. Alton,⁴⁷ G. A. Alves,² E. W. Anderson,⁴⁰ Y. Arnoud,⁹ C. Avila,⁵ V. V. Babintsev,²⁴ L. Babukhadia,⁵² T. C. Bacon,²⁶ A. Baden,⁴⁴ S. Baffioni,¹⁰ B. Baldin,³⁴ P. W. Balm,¹⁹ S. Banerjee,¹⁷ E. Barberis,⁴⁶ P. Baringer,⁴¹ J. Barreto,² J. F. Bartlett,³⁴ U. Bassler,¹² D. Bauer,²⁶ A. Bean,⁴¹ F. Beaudette,¹¹ M. Begel,⁵¹ A. Belyaev,³³ S. B. Beri,¹⁵ G. Bernardi,¹² I. Bertram,²⁵ A. Besson,⁹ R. Beuselinck,²⁶ V. A. Bezzubov,²⁴ P. C. Bhat,³⁴ V. Bhatnagar,¹⁵ M. Bhattacharjee,⁵² G. Blazey,³⁶ F. Blekman,¹⁹ S. Blessing,³³ A. Boehnlein,³⁴ N. I. Bojko,²⁴ T. A. Bolton,⁴² F. Borchering,³⁴ K. Bos,¹⁹ T. Bose,⁵⁰ A. Brandt,⁵⁷ R. Breedon,²⁹ G. Briskin,⁵⁶ R. Brock,⁴⁸ G. Brooijmans,³⁴ A. Bross,³⁴ D. Buchholz,³⁷ M. Buehler,³⁵ V. Buescher,¹⁴ V. S. Burtovoi,²⁴ J. M. Butler,⁴⁵ F. Canelli,⁵¹ W. Carvalho,³ D. Casey,⁴⁸ Z. Casilum,⁵² H. Castilla-Valdez,¹⁸ D. Chakraborty,³⁶ K. M. Chan,⁵¹ S. V. Chekulaev,²⁴ D. K. Cho,⁵¹ S. Choi,³² S. Chopra,⁵³ J. H. Christenson,³⁴ D. Claes,⁴⁹ A. R. Clark,²⁸ L. Coney,³⁹ B. Connolly,³³ W. E. Cooper,³⁴ D. Coppage,⁴¹ S. Crépe-Renaudin,⁹ M. A. C. Cummings,³⁶ D. Cutts,⁵⁶ H. da Motta,² G. A. Davis,⁵¹ K. De,⁵⁷ S. J. de Jong,²⁰ M. Demarteau,³⁴ R. Demina,⁴² P. Demine,⁹ D. Denisov,³⁴ S. P. Denisov,²⁴ S. Desai,⁵² H. T. Diehl,³⁴ M. Diesburg,³⁴ S. Doulas,⁴⁶ L. V. Dudko,²³ S. Duensing,²⁰ L. Duflost,¹¹ S. R. Dugad,¹⁷ A. Duperrin,¹⁰ A. Dyshkant,³⁶ D. Edmunds,⁴⁸ J. Ellison,³² J. T. Eltzroth,⁵⁷ V. D. Elvira,³⁴ R. Engelmann,⁵² S. Eno,⁴⁴ G. Eppley,⁵⁹ P. Ermolov,²³ O. V. Eroshin,²⁴ J. Estrada,⁵¹ H. Evans,⁵⁰ V. N. Evdokimov,²⁴ D. Fein,²⁷ T. Ferbel,⁵¹ F. Filthaut,²⁰ H. E. Fisk,³⁴ Y. Fisyak,⁵³ F. Fleuret,¹² M. Fortner,³⁶ H. Fox,³⁷ S. Fu,⁵⁰ S. Fuess,³⁴ E. Gallas,³⁴ A. N. Galyaev,²⁴ M. Gao,⁵⁰ V. Gavrilov,²² R. J. Genik II,²⁵ K. Genser,³⁴ C. E. Gerber,³⁵ Y. Gershtein,⁵⁶ G. Ginther,⁵¹ B. Gómez,⁵ P. I. Goncharov,²⁴ H. Gordon,⁵³ L. T. Goss,⁵⁸ K. Gounder,³⁴ A. Goussiou,²⁶ N. Graf,⁵³ P. D. Grannis,⁵² J. A. Green,⁴⁰ H. Greenlee,³⁴ Z. D. Greenwood,⁴³ S. Grinstein,¹ L. Groer,⁵⁰ S. Grünendahl,³⁴ S. N. Gurzhiev,²⁴ G. Gutierrez,³⁴ P. Gutierrez,⁵⁵ N. J. Hadley,⁴⁴ H. Haggerty,³⁴ S. Hagopian,³³ V. Hagopian,³³ R. E. Hall,³⁰ C. Han,⁴⁷ S. Hansen,³⁴ J. M. Hauptman,⁴⁰ C. Hebert,⁴¹ D. Hedin,³⁶ J. M. Heinmiller,³⁵ A. P. Heinson,³² U. Heintz,⁴⁵ M. D. Hildreth,³⁹ R. Hirosky,⁶⁰ J. D. Hobbs,⁵² B. Hoeneisen,⁸ J. Huang,³⁸ Y. Huang,⁴⁷ I. Iashvili,³² R. Illingworth,²⁶ A. S. Ito,³⁴ M. Jaffré,¹¹ S. Jain,¹⁷ R. Jesik,²⁶ K. Johns,²⁷ M. Johnson,³⁴ A. Jonckheere,³⁴ H. Jöstlein,³⁴ A. Juste,³⁴ W. Kahl,⁴² S. Kahn,⁵³ E. Kajfasz,¹⁰ A. M. Kalinin,²¹ D. Karmanov,²³ D. Karmgard,³⁹ R. Kehoe,⁴⁸ A. Khanov,⁴² A. Kharchilava,³⁹ B. Klima,³⁴ B. Knuteson,²⁸ W. Ko,²⁹ J. M. Kohli,¹⁵ A. V. Kostitskiy,²⁴ J. Kotcher,⁵³ B. Kothari,⁵⁰ A. V. Kozelov,²⁴ E. A. Kozlovsky,²⁴ J. Krane,⁴⁰ M. R. Krishnaswamy,¹⁷ P. Krivkova,⁶ S. Krzywdzinski,³⁴ M. Kubantsev,⁴² S. Kuleshov,²² Y. Kulik,³⁴ S. Kunori,⁴⁴ A. Kupco,⁷ V. E. Kuznetsov,³² G. Landsberg,⁵⁶ W. M. Lee,³³ A. Leflat,²³ C. Leggett,²⁸ F. Lehner,^{34,*} C. Leonidopoulos,⁵⁰ J. Li,⁵⁷ Q. Z. Li,³⁴ J. G. R. Lima,³ D. Lincoln,³⁴ S. L. Linn,³³ J. Linnemann,⁴⁸ R. Lipton,³⁴ A. Lucotte,⁹ L. Lueking,³⁴ C. Lundstedt,⁴⁹ C. Luo,³⁸ A. K. A. Maciel,³⁶ R. J. Madaras,²⁸ V. L. Malyshev,²¹ V. Manankov,²³ H. S. Mao,⁴ T. Marshall,³⁸ M. I. Martin,³⁶ A. A. Mayorov,²⁴ R. McCarthy,⁵² T. McMahon,⁵⁴ H. L. Melanson,³⁴ M. Merkin,²³ K. W. Merritt,³⁴ C. Miao,⁵⁶ H. Miettinen,⁵⁹ D. Mihalcea,³⁶ C. S. Mishra,³⁴ N. Mokhov,³⁴ N. K. Mondal,¹⁷ H. E. Montgomery,³⁴ R. W. Moore,⁴⁸ Y. D. Mutaf,⁵² E. Nagy,¹⁰ F. Nang,²⁷ M. Narain,⁴⁵ V. S. Narasimham,¹⁷ N. A. Naumann,²⁰ H. A. Neal,⁴⁷ J. P. Negret,⁵ A. Nomerotski,³⁴ T. Nunnemann,³⁴ D. O'Neil,⁴⁸ V. Oguri,³ B. Olivier,¹² N. Oshima,³⁴ P. Padley,⁵⁹ K. Papageorgiou,³⁵ N. Parashar,⁴³ R. Partridge,⁵⁶ N. Parua,⁵² A. Patwa,⁵² O. Peters,¹⁹ P. Pétrouff,¹¹ R. Piegai,¹ B. G. Pope,⁴⁸ E. Popkov,⁴⁵ H. B. Prosper,³³ S. Protopopescu,⁵³ M. B. Przybycien,^{37,†} J. Qian,⁴⁷ R. Raja,³⁴ S. Rajagopalan,⁵³ P. A. Rapidis,³⁴ N. W. Reay,⁴² S. Reucroft,⁴⁶ M. Ridel,¹¹ M. Rijssenbeek,⁵² F. Rizatdinova,⁴² T. Rockwell,⁴⁸ C. Royon,¹³ P. Rubinov,³⁴ R. Ruchti,³⁹ J. Rutherford,²⁷ B. M. Sabirov,²¹ G. Sajot,⁹ A. Santoro,³ L. Sawyer,⁴³ R. D. Schamberger,⁵² H. Schellman,³⁷ A. Schwartzman,¹ E. Shabalina,³⁵ R. K. Shivpuri,¹⁶ D. Shpakov,⁴⁶ M. Shupe,²⁷ R. A. Sidwell,⁴² V. Simak,⁷ V. Sirotenko,³⁴ P. Slattery,⁵¹ R. P. Smith,³⁴ G. R. Snow,⁴⁹ J. Snow,⁵⁴ S. Snyder,⁵³ J. Solomon,³⁵ Y. Song,⁵⁷ V. Sorín,¹ M. Sosebee,⁵⁷ N. Sotnikova,²³ K. Soustruznik,⁶ M. Souza,² N. R. Stanton,⁴² G. Steinbrück,⁵⁰ D. Stoker,³¹ V. Stolin,²² A. Stone,⁴³ D. A. Stoyanova,²⁴ M. A. Strang,⁵⁷ M. Strauss,⁵⁵ M. Strovink,²⁸ L. Stutte,³⁴ A. Sznajder,³ M. Talby,¹⁰ W. Taylor,⁵² S. Tentindo-Repond,³³ S. M. Tripathi,²⁹ T. G. Trippe,²⁸ A. S. Turcot,⁵³ P. M. Tuts,⁵⁰ R. Van Kooten,³⁸ V. Vaniev,²⁴ N. Varelas,³⁵ L. S. Vertogradov,²¹ F. Villeneuve-Seguié,¹⁰ A. A. Volkov,²⁴ A. P. Vorobiev,²⁴ H. D. Wahl,³³ Z.-M. Wang,⁵² J. Warchol,³⁹ G. Watts,⁶¹ M. Wayne,³⁹ H. Weerts,⁴⁸ A. White,⁵⁷ J. T. White,⁵⁸ D. Whiteson,²⁸ D. A. Wijngaarden,²⁰ S. Willis,³⁶ S. J. Wimpenny,³² J. Womersley,³⁴ D. R. Wood,⁴⁶ Q. Xu,⁴⁷ R. Yamada,³⁴ P. Yamin,⁵³ T. Yasuda,³⁴ Y. A. Yatsunenkov,²¹ K. Yip,⁵³ S. Youssef,³³ J. Yu,⁵⁷ M. Zanabria,⁵ X. Zhang,⁵⁵ H. Zheng,^{39,‡} B. Zhou,⁴⁷ Z. Zhou,⁴⁰ M. Zielinski,⁵¹ D. Zieminska,³⁸ A. Zieminski,³⁸ V. Zutshi,³⁶ E. G. Zverev,²³ and A. Zylberstejn¹³

(DØ 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
⁴Institute of High Energy Physics, Beijing, People's Republic of China
⁵Universidad de los Andes, Bogotá, Colombia
⁶Charles University, Center for Particle Physics, Prague, Czech Republic
⁷Institute of Physics, Academy of Sciences, Center for Particle Physics, Prague, Czech Republic
⁸Universidad San Francisco de Quito, Quito, Ecuador
⁹Institut des Sciences Nucléaires, IN2P3-CNRS, Université de Grenoble I, Grenoble, France
¹⁰CPPM, IN2P3-CNRS, Université de la Méditerranée, Marseille, France
¹¹Laboratoire de l'Accélérateur Linéaire, IN2P3-CNRS, Orsay, France
¹²LPNHE, Universités Paris VI and VII, IN2P3-CNRS, Paris, France
¹³DAPNIA/Service de Physique des Particules, CEA, Saclay, France
¹⁴Universität Mainz, Institut für Physik, Mainz, Germany
¹⁵Panjab University, Chandigarh, India
¹⁶India Delhi University, Delhi, India
¹⁷Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, Mumbai, India
¹⁸CINVESTAV, Mexico City, Mexico
¹⁹FOM-Institute NIKHEF and University of Amsterdam/NIKHEF, Amsterdam, The Netherlands
²⁰University of Nijmegen/NIKHEF, Nijmegen, The Netherlands
²¹Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, Russia
²²Institute for Theoretical and Experimental Physics, Moscow, Russia
²³Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia
²⁴Institute for High Energy Physics, Protvino, Russia
²⁵Lancaster University, Lancaster, United Kingdom
²⁶Imperial College, London, United Kingdom
²⁷University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona 85721, USA
²⁸Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory and University of California, Berkeley, California 94720, USA
²⁹University of California, Davis, California 95616, USA
³⁰California State University, Fresno, California 93740, USA
³¹University of California, Irvine, California 92697, USA
³²University of California, Riverside, California 92521, USA
³³Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida 32306, USA
³⁴Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, Batavia, Illinois 60510, USA
³⁵University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, Illinois 60607, USA
³⁶Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, Illinois 60115, USA
³⁷Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois 60208, USA
³⁸Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana 47405, USA
³⁹University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana 46556, USA
⁴⁰Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa 50011, USA
⁴¹University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas 66045, USA
⁴²Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas 66506, USA
⁴³Louisiana Tech University, Ruston, Louisiana 71272, USA
⁴⁴University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742, USA
⁴⁵Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts 02215, USA
⁴⁶Northeastern University, Boston, Massachusetts 02115, USA
⁴⁷University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109, USA
⁴⁸Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48824, USA
⁴⁹University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska 68588, USA
⁵⁰Columbia University, New York, New York 10027, USA
⁵¹University of Rochester, Rochester, New York 14627, USA
⁵²State University of New York, Stony Brook, New York 11794, USA
⁵³Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, New York 11973, USA
⁵⁴Langston University, Langston, Oklahoma 73050, USA
⁵⁵University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma 73019, USA
⁵⁶Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island 02912, USA
⁵⁷University of Texas, Arlington, Texas 76019, USA

⁵⁸Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas 77843, USA⁵⁹Rice University, Houston, Texas 77005, USA⁶⁰University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia 22901, USA⁶¹University of Washington, Seattle, Washington 98195, USA

(Received 11 February 2003; published 24 June 2003)

We present a search for large extra dimensions (ED) in $p\bar{p}$ collisions at a center-of-mass energy of 1.8 TeV using data collected by the DØ detector at the Fermilab Tevatron in 1994–1996. Data corresponding to $78.8 \pm 3.9 \text{ pb}^{-1}$ are examined for events with large missing transverse energy, one high- p_T jet, and no isolated muons. There is no excess observed beyond expectation from the standard model, and we place lower limits on the fundamental Planck scale of 1.0 and 0.6 TeV for 2 and 7 ED, respectively.

DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.90.251802

PACS numbers: 11.25.Wx, 11.10.Kk, 13.85.Rm

The standard model (SM) of particle physics is a spectacular scientific achievement, with nearly every prediction confirmed to a high degree of precision. Nevertheless, the SM still has unresolved and unappealing characteristics, including the problem of a large hierarchy in the gauge forces, with gravity being a factor of 10^{33} – 10^{38} weaker than the other three. A new framework for addressing the hierarchy problem was proposed recently by Arkani-Hamed, Dimopoulos, and Dvali [1], through the introduction of large compactified extra spatial dimensions in which only gravitons propagate. In the presence of n of these extra dimensions, the fundamental Planck scale in $4 + n$ dimensions can be lowered to the TeV range, i.e., to a value comparable to the scale that characterizes the other three forces, thereby eliminating the puzzling hierarchy.

The radius (R) of the compactified extra dimensions can be expressed as a function of a fundamental Planck scale, $M_D \approx 1 \text{ TeV}$, the number of extra dimensions n , and the usual Planck scale $M_{\text{Pl}} = 1/\sqrt{G_N}$. Assuming compactification on a torus, the relationship is [2]

$$R = \frac{1}{\sqrt[n]{8\pi}M_D} (M_{\text{Pl}}/M_D)^{2/n}.$$

The value $n = 1$ is ruled out by the $1/r^2$ dependence of the gravitational force at large distances. The current limits from tests of gravity at short distances [3], as well as from stringent astrophysical and cosmological bounds [4], have significantly constrained the case of two extra dimensions. For $n > 2$, the constraints from direct gravitational measurements and cosmological observations are relatively weak. However, high-energy colliders can provide effective ways to test such models of large extra dimensions (ED) [5].

In the framework of large ED, at high energies, the strength of gravity in four dimensions is enhanced through a large number of graviton excitations, or Kaluza-Klein modes (G_{KK}) [8]. This leads to new phenomena predicted for collisions at high energy [2,9]: virtual graviton exchange and direct graviton emission. Virtual graviton exchange leads to anomalous difermion and diboson production, and searches for these effects have been pursued at the Tevatron [10], LEP [11], and

HERA [12]. For real graviton emission, since the graviton escapes detection, the signature involves large missing transverse energy \cancel{E}_T , accompanying a single jet or a vector boson at large transverse momentum. LEP experiments [11] and the CDF collaboration [13] have recently set limits on M_D based on $\gamma + G_{\text{KK}}$ production.

In this Letter, we report results of the first search for large ED in the jet + \cancel{E}_T channel. The advantage of this channel is its relatively large cross section, with the tradeoff of large background. Besides $Z(\nu\bar{\nu}) + \text{jets}$, which is the irreducible background, there are instrumental backgrounds from mismeasurement of, e.g., jet E_T , vertex position, undetected leptons, cosmic rays, etc. The data used for this search were collected in 1994–1996 by the DØ collaboration [14] at the Fermilab Tevatron, using proton-antiproton collisions at a center-of-mass energy of 1.8 TeV. This sample, representing an integrated luminosity of $78.8 \pm 3.9 \text{ pb}^{-1}$, was obtained using \cancel{E}_T triggers with thresholds between 35 and 50 GeV.

The DØ detector [14] consists of three major components: an inner detector for tracking charged particles, a uranium/liquid-argon calorimeter for measuring electromagnetic and hadronic showers, and a muon spectrometer consisting of magnetized iron toroids and three layers of drift tubes. Jets are measured with an energy resolution of approximately $\sigma(E)/E = 0.8/\sqrt{E}$ (E in GeV). \cancel{E}_T is measured with a resolution of $\sigma(\cancel{E}_T) = a + b \times S_T + c \times S_T^2$, where S_T is the scalar sum of transverse energies in all calorimeter cells, $a = 1.89 \pm 0.05 \text{ GeV}$, $b = (6.7 \pm 0.7) \times 10^{-3}$, and $c = (9.9 \pm 2.1) \times 10^{-6} \text{ GeV}^{-1}$ [15].

After eliminating events of poor quality (e.g., containing hot cells in the calorimeter), events with one central (detector pseudorapidity $|\eta_d| \leq 1.0$ [16]) high- E_T jet (j_1) and large \cancel{E}_T , with $E_T(j_1) > 150 \text{ GeV}$ and $\cancel{E}_T > 150 \text{ GeV}$, were selected for further study. Since the signal can contain initial or final-state radiation (ISR or FSR), additional jets can also be present in such interactions. To improve signal efficiency, we therefore allow additional jets in the event, but require the second jet (j_2) to have $E_T(j_2) < 50 \text{ GeV}$, which reduces the background from dijet production, while retaining most of the signal containing ISR or FSR. To suppress W or Z production

with a muon in the final state, as well as to reduce the background from cosmic rays, we reject events with isolated muons, that is, with $\Delta\mathcal{R}(j_1, \mu) > 0.5$, based mainly on information from the muon system (referred to as DØ as Isolated Muon Veto 1), and based on information from the calorimeter (Isolated Muon Veto 2), to suppress W or Z production with a muon in the final state as well as to reduce the background from cosmic rays. [The separation between objects is defined as $\Delta\mathcal{R} = \sqrt{(\Delta\eta)^2 + (\Delta\phi)^2}$, where η is the pseudorapidity and ϕ is the azimuthal angle.] Backgrounds with isolated electrons are expected to be small, and we therefore do not use any special criteria to suppress electrons. We also require $\Delta\phi(j_2, \cancel{E}_T) > 15^\circ$, to reduce the background from mismeasured jets in multijet (“QCD”) events. An additional source of background is from hard bremsstrahlung of cosmic-ray muons that pass through the DØ calorimeter. For any showers induced by photons radiated in the hadronic layers of the calorimeter, the resulting “jets” usually contain only a handful of cells with significant energy deposition, and such jets therefore fail our quality criteria. However, for bremsstrahlung that occurs in the EM section of the calorimeter, the shower is usually reconstructed as an EM object, and not as a jet. Thus, most of the background arises from showers that originate near the regions of confusion at the interface of the EM and hadronic calorimeters. To reduce this background, we remove events with such “jets,” as well as events that contain “tracks” of minimum energy deposition, which are typical of muons observed in the finely segmented DØ calorimeters. Jet “pointing,” based on tracking information in the leading jet (j_1), is used to confirm the longitudinal position of the primary-vertex by requiring that Δz (j_1 -vertex, primary-vertex) ≤ 10 cm. This suppresses the background from cosmic rays as well as from events with incorrectly reconstructed primary vertices. The requirements on η_d of the leading jet and on the event primary-vertex confirmation are chosen to maximize the significance of signal relative to background. A total of 38 events remain in the data sample after applying all selections, as shown in Table I.

The PYTHIA Monte Carlo (MC) generator [17], with implementation of the ED signal via Ref. [18], including the parton-level subprocesses $qg \rightarrow qG_{KK}$, $q\bar{q} \rightarrow gG_{KK}$, and $gg \rightarrow gG_{KK}$, is used to generate signal events. This is followed by processing through DØ fast-detector simulation QSIM routines [19]. The signal is simulated for $n = 2$ to $n = 7$ extra dimensions, with M_D ranging from 600 to 1400 GeV in 200 GeV steps. The acceptance for signal varies from about 5% to 8%, depending on the values of n and M_D . The 13% contribution to the uncertainty on the overall acceptance is due to the limited size of the MC samples, and is of the same order as the contributions from the jet-energy scale [20] (5%–12%) and the choice of parton distribution functions (PDFs) (3%–5%). [The CTEQ3M set of PDFs [21] was used as a default choice in the analysis.]

TABLE I. Observed number of events passing each requirement in the data with $E_T(j_1) > 150$ GeV, $\cancel{E}_T > 150$ GeV, and $E_T(j_2) < 50$ GeV.

Criterion	Number of events
Event quality	301 325
Isolated muon veto 1	296 742
Leading jet, \cancel{E}_T , and second-jet requirement	141
$\Delta\phi(j_2, \cancel{E}_T)$	129
Cosmic ray rejection	69
Primary vertex confirmation	39
Isolated muon veto 2	38

The SM background from W and Z -boson production is also modeled by PYTHIA, followed by QSIM detector simulation. We normalize the W and Z production cross sections to the published DØ measurements in the electron channel [22]. The sources of background are detailed in Table II. With our event selection, the contribution from backgrounds other than $Z(\nu\bar{\nu}) + \text{jets}$ is small, and the background from all W and Z sources is estimated to be 30.2 ± 6.4 events. The dominant uncertainty on the estimate of $Z(\nu\bar{\nu}) + \text{jets}$ is from the uncertainty of the jet-energy scale. The residual background from mismeasured multijet events and cosmic muons is estimated from data, using the uncorrelated Δz and $\Delta\phi$ variables described above: We define four data samples, depending on whether the events pass or fail the above criteria; we then normalize the events that fail event vertex confirmation to the candidate sample, using the ratio of the number of events in the two data samples with $\Delta\phi(j_2, \cancel{E}_T) \leq 15^\circ$; the background from QCD and cosmic rays in the candidate sample is thereby estimated as

$$N_{\text{QCD+cosmics}} = N_{\Delta z > 10, \Delta\phi > 15^\circ}^{\Delta z > 10} \times N_{\Delta z \leq 10, \Delta\phi \leq 15^\circ}^{\Delta z \leq 10} / N_{\Delta z > 10, \Delta\phi \leq 15^\circ}^{\Delta z > 10}.$$

This yields 7.8 ± 7.1 events. The uncertainty is due primarily to the low statistics of the data samples. The total background estimate is 38 ± 10 events. As shown in Fig. 1(a), the \cancel{E}_T distribution in the data is consistent

TABLE II. The expected and observed number of events in the final jet + \cancel{E}_T sample.

Background	N
$Z(\nu\nu) + \text{jets}$	21.0 ± 5.1
$Z(ee) + \text{jets}$	< 0.01
$Z(\mu\mu) + \text{jets}$	0.01 ± 0.01
$Z(\tau\tau) (+ \text{jets})$	< 0.09
$W(e\nu) + \text{jets}$	3.1 ± 0.7
$W(\mu\nu) + \text{jets}$	0.8 ± 0.3
$W(\tau\nu) (+ \text{jets})$	5.2 ± 2.3
QCD and cosmics	7.8 ± 7.1
Total background	38.0 ± 9.6
Data	38




FIG. 1. (a) Comparison of data (points with error bars) with expected background (dashed histogram), and the sum of background and signal for $n = 2$, $M_D = 800$ GeV (dotted histogram), as a function of \cancel{E}_T , for $E_T(j_1) > 150$ GeV, $\cancel{E}_T > 150$ GeV, and $E_T(j_2) < 50$ GeV; and (b) comparison of \cancel{E}_T for data with $E_T(j_1) > 115$ GeV, $\cancel{E}_T > 115$ GeV, and $E_T(j_2) < 40$ GeV with expected background.

with that expected from background. Examination of the event with \cancel{E}_T near 450 GeV reveals that the energy deposited by the jet is concentrated in only three calorimeter layers, typical of bremsstrahlung from a cosmic muon, rather than from a true jet. Nevertheless, the event is kept in the candidate sample, as it passes all *a priori* selection criteria. From extrapolation, we expect about 0.2 ± 0.2 background events for $\cancel{E}_T > 300$ GeV.

As a cross check of our background estimate, we define a data sample with less stringent requirements, while maintaining roughly the same $E_T(j_1)/E_T(j_2)$ ratio: $E_T(j_1) > 115$ GeV, $\cancel{E}_T > 115$ GeV, and $E_T(j_2) < 40$ GeV. We estimate the background in this sample using the same techniques as described above. This yields an expectation of 105 ± 16 W/Z + jets events and 16 ± 9 QCD and cosmic-ray events, consistent with the 127 events observed in this data sample. The \cancel{E}_T distributions for this sample and for the expected background are shown in Fig. 1(b).

In the absence of evidence for large ED, we calculate upper limits on the cross section for such processes. These limits can be interpreted as lower bounds on the fundamental Planck scale M_D for different integer values of n , as listed in Table III. Using a Bayesian approach [23], we set limits on n and M_D using the leading-order cross sections, as well as approximate estimates of next-to-leading-order (NLO) corrections via a constant K factor of 1.34, typical of processes at the Tevatron energies, e.g., Drell-Yan [24] or direct photon production. As there are no NLO calculations of direct graviton emission to date, the limits with the K factor should be regarded with caution, as purely a measure of sensitivity to the (unknown) NLO effects. The exclusion contours at 95% confidence, and a comparison with limits from LEP and CDF for the single-photon channel [11,13], are shown in Fig. 2. While the $D\emptyset$ limits are worse than those from LEP at low values of n , the sensitivity of the monojet search exceeds the LEP sensitivity at large n , due to the higher center-of-mass energy at the Tevatron. The limits correspond to compactification radii ranging from $R < 0.6$ mm ($n = 2$) to $R < 9$ fm ($n = 7$), without correcting for the K factor, and $R < 0.5$ mm ($n = 2$) to $R < 9$ fm ($n = 7$) with approximate NLO effects taken into account. For all n , the sensitivity in the single-photon channel at the Tevatron is not as high as in the monojet channel, as the comparison with the CDF limits in Fig. 2 demonstrates.

In summary, we have performed the first search for large extra dimensions in the monojet channel. No evidence for large extra dimensions is observed. We set 95% confidence-level lower limits on the fundamental Planck scale between 0.6 and 1.0 TeV, depending on the number of extra dimensions. Our limits are complementary to those obtained at LEP in the single-photon channel, and are most restrictive to date for $n > 5$.

We thank Konstantin Matchev for providing us with the PYTHIA code for simulation of signal, and for many helpful discussions. We also thank the staffs at Fermilab and collaborating institutions, and acknowledge support from the Department of Energy and National Science Foundation (U.S.A.), Commissariat à l'Énergie Atomique and CNRS/Institut National de Physique Nucléaire et de Physique des Particules (France), Ministry for Science and Technology and Ministry for Atomic Energy (Russia), CAPES and CNPq (Brazil), Departments of Atomic Energy and Science and Education (India), Colciencias (Colombia), CONACyT (Mexico), Ministry of Education and KOSEF (Korea),

TABLE III. 95% C.L. lower limits on M_D .

n	2	3	4	5	6	7
M_D limit without K -factor scaling (TeV)	0.89	0.73	0.68	0.64	0.63	0.62
M_D limit with K -factor scaling (TeV)	0.99	0.80	0.73	0.66	0.65	0.63




FIG. 2. The 95% C.L. exclusion contours on the fundamental Planck scale (M_D) and number of extra dimensions (n) for monojet production at $D\bar{O}$ (solid lines). The dashed curves correspond to limits from LEP, and the dotted curve is the limit from CDF, both for $\gamma + G_{KK}$ production.

CONICET and UBACyT (Argentina), The Foundation for Fundamental Research on Matter (The Netherlands), PPARC (United Kingdom), Ministry of Education (Czech Republic), A.P. Sloan Foundation, and the Research Corporation.

*Visitor from University of Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland.

†Visitor from Institute of Nuclear Physics, Krakow, Poland.

‡Now at California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California 91125, USA.

- [1] N. Arkani-Hamed, S. Dimopoulos, and G. Dvali, Phys. Lett. B **429**, 263 (1998); I. Antoniadis, N. Arkani-Hamed, S. Dimopoulos, and G. R. Dvali, Phys. Lett. B **436**, 257 (1998); N. Arkani-Hamed, S. Dimopoulos, and G. R. Dvali, Phys. Rev. D **59**, 086004 (1999).
- [2] G. Giudice, R. Rattazzi, and J. Wells, Nucl. Phys. B **544**, 3 (1999); revised version 2, hep-ph/9811291.
- [3] Eöt-Wash Collaboration, C. D. Hoyle *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 1418 (2001); Eöt-Wash Collaboration, E. G. Adelberger *et al.*, hep-ex/0202008; J. Chiaverini, S. J. Smullin, A. A. Geraci, D. M. Weld, and A. Kapitulnik, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 151101 (2003); J. C. Long *et al.*, hep-ph/0210004.
- [4] S. Cullen and M. Perelstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 268 (1999); L. Hall and D. Smith, Phys. Rev. D **60**, 085008 (1999); V. D. Barger, T. Han, C. Kao, and R. J. Zhang, Phys. Lett. B **461**, 34 (1999); M. Fairbairn, Phys. Lett. B

- 508**, 335 (2001); C. Hanhart, J. A. Pons, D. R. Phillips, and S. Reddy, Phys. Lett. B **509**, 1 (2001); C. Hanhart, D. R. Phillips, S. Reddy, and M. J. Savage, Nucl. Phys. B **595**, 335 (2001); S. Hannestad and G. G. Raffelt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 071301 (2002); M. Fairbairn and L. M. Griffiths, J. High-Energy Phys. 0202 (2002) 024.
- [5] Recent calculations of the production of mini-black-holes in high-energy particle collisions [6], applied to results from the HiRes and AGASA experiments [7], indicate a sensitivity competitive with that of collider experiments for small values of n .
- [6] S. Dimopoulos and G. Landsberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 161602 (2001); S. B. Giddings and S. Thomas, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 056010 (2002); J. L. Feng and A. D. Shapere, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 021303 (2002).
- [7] L. A. Anchordoqui, J. L. Feng, H. Goldberg, and A. D. Shapere, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 124027 (2002); **66**, 103002 (2002).
- [8] Th. Kaluza, Sitzungsber. Preuss. Akad. Wiss. Phys. Math. Klasse, 996 (1921); O. Klein, Z. Phys. **37**, 895 (1926); O. Klein, Nature (London) **118**, 516 (1926).
- [9] T. Han, J. D. Lykken, and R.-J. Zhang, Phys. Rev. D **59**, 105006 (1999); E. A. Mirabelli, M. Perelstein, and M. E. Peskin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 2236 (1999); J. L. Hewett, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 4765 (1999).
- [10] $D\bar{O}$ Collaboration, B. Abbott *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 1156 (2001); J. Zhou, hep-ex/0205098.
- [11] For a summary of current collider limits, see, e.g., D. Bourilkov, hep-ex/0103039; G. Landsberg, hep-ex/0105039; C. Pagliarone, hep-ex/0111063v2.
- [12] H1 Collaboration, C. Adloff *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **479**, 358 (2000); A. F. Zarnecki, in Proceedings of the Conference on Higgs and Supersymmetry, Orsay, 2001.
- [13] CDF Collaboration, D. Acosta *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 281801 (2002).
- [14] $D\bar{O}$ Collaboration, S. Abachi *et al.*, Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A **338**, 185 (1994).
- [15] M. Paterno, Ph.D. thesis, SUNY at Stony Brook, 1994.
- [16] Detector pseudorapidity η_d is defined as $-\ln[\tan(\theta_d/2)]$, where θ_d is the polar angle with respect to the proton beam, as measured relative to the center of the detector.
- [17] T. Sjöstrand, P. Edén, C. Friberg, L. Lönnblad, G. Miu, S. Mrenna, and E. Norrbin, Comput. Phys. Commun. **135**, 238 (2001). We used PYTHIA version 6.1.
- [18] J. Lykken and K. Matchev (private communication).
- [19] R. J. Genik II, Ph.D. thesis, Michigan State University, 1998 (unpublished).
- [20] $D\bar{O}$ Collaboration, B. Abbott *et al.*, Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A **424**, 352 (1999).
- [21] CTEQ Collaboration, H. L. Lai *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **51**, 4763 (1995); **55**, 1280 (1997).
- [22] $D\bar{O}$ Collaboration, B. Abbott *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **513**, 292 (2001); $D\bar{O}$ Collaboration, B. Abbott *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 2792 (2000); **84**, 5710 (2000).
- [23] I. Bertram *et al.*, Fermilab-TM-2104, 2000.
- [24] See, e.g., V. Barger and R. Phillips, "Collider Physics," Perseus Pr, 1996.