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In hadron–hadron collisions, high-energy photons ($\gamma$) emerge unaltered from the hard-scattering process of two partons and therefore provide a clean probe of the parton level dynamics. Study of such photons (called prompt or direct) produced in association with a $b$-quark jet is of particular interest, as it provides information about the $b$-quark and gluon ($g$) parton distribution functions (PDFs) of the incoming hadrons. Such events are produced in Quantum Chromodynamics (QCD) primarily through the Compton-like scattering process $gb \rightarrow \gamma b$, which dominates up to photon transverse momenta ($p_T^\gamma$) of $\approx 70$ GeV, and through quark–antiquark annihilation $q\bar{q} \rightarrow \gamma g \rightarrow \gamma b\bar{b}$, which dominates at high $p_T^\gamma$ [1]. The inclusive $\gamma + b$ production may also originate from partonic processes like $gg \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ or $bg \rightarrow bg$, where the final state $b$-quark or gluon fragments into a photon [1]. However, photon isolation requirements substantially reduce the contributions from this process.

The measurements of the differential cross section as a function of $p_T^\gamma$ and the photon (and/or $b$-jet) rapidity can be used to test the $\gamma + b$ production mechanism and the underlying dynamics of QCD hard-scattering subprocesses with different momentum transfer scales $Q^2$ and parton momentum fraction $x$. Measurements involving $\gamma/Z$-boson and $b$-quark final states have previously been performed by the D0 and CDF Collaborations [2–6]. In comparison to the previous $\gamma + b$ measurement [6], we now consider not only the leading (in $p_T$) $b$-jet, but all $b$-jets in the event. To increase statistics in $p_T^\gamma$ bins, we have also extended the $|y_{\gamma b}|$ region which results in a larger contribution from the annihilation process. The large integrated luminosity recorded with the D0 detector in $p\bar{p}$ collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 1.96$ TeV at the Fermilab Tevatron Collider and more advanced photon and $b$-jet identification tools [7–9] enable us to perform more precise measurements and to extend them in kinematic regions previously unexplored.

In this Letter, we present measurements of the inclusive $\gamma + b$-jet production cross sections using data collected from June 2006 to September 2011. The cross sections are measured as a function of $p_T^\gamma$ in the photon rapidity regions, $|y_{\gamma}| < 1.0$ (central) and $1.5 < |y_{\gamma}| < 2.5$ (forward). The rapidity, $y$, is related to the polar scattering angle $\theta$ with respect to the proton beam axis by
energy corrections as a function of $y^*$. They are derived using a detailed 
GEANT-based [13] simulation of the D0 detector response. These 
corrections are largest, $\approx 2\%$, at photon energies of about 30 GeV. 
The data used in this analysis satisfy D0 data quality requirements 
and are collected using a combination of triggers requiring a clus-
ter of energy in the electromagnetic (EM) calorimeter with loose 
shower shape requirements, and correspond to an integrated luminosity of $8.7 \pm 0.5$ fb$^{-1}$ [14]. The trigger efficiency is $\approx 96\%$ 
for photon candidates with $p_T^\gamma \sim 30$ GeV and $\approx 100\%$ for $p_T^\gamma > 40$ GeV.

Offline event selection requires a reconstructed $p\bar{p}$ interaction 
vertex [12] within 60 cm of the center of the detector along the beam 
axis. The efficiency of the vertex requirement is $\approx (96–98)\%$, 
depending on $p_T^\gamma$. The missing transverse momentum in the event 
is required to be less than $0.7p_T^\gamma$ to suppress background from $W \to e\nu$ decays. Such a requirement is highly efficient for sig-
nal events, with an efficiency $\sim 98\%$ even for events with semi-
leptonic heavy-flavor quark decays.

To reconstruct photon candidates, projective towers of calorim-
eter cells with large deposits of energy are used as seeds to create 
clusters of energy in the EM calorimeter in a cone of radius $R = 0.4$, 
where $R = \sqrt{(\Delta\eta)^2 + (\Delta\phi)^2}$. Once an EM energy cluster 
is formed, the final energy ($E_{\text{EM}}$) is obtained summing the 
energies of all the calorimeter cells in a smaller cone of $R = 0.2$. 
Photon candidates are required to have: (i) $> 97\%$ of their en-
ergy in the EM section; (ii) calorimeter isolation $I = E_{\text{tot}}(0.4) 
- E_{\text{EM}}(0.2)/E_{\text{EM}}(0.2) < 0.07$, where $E_{\text{tot}}(R)$ [$E_{\text{EM}}(R)$] is the total 
[EM only] energy in a cone of radius $R$; (iii) scalar sum of $p_T$ less 
than 1.5 GeV, calculated from all tracks with $p_T > 0.5$ GeV orig-
inating from the $p\bar{p}$ primary interaction point in an annulus 
of $0.05 < R < 0.4$ around the EM cluster; and (iv) energy-weighted 
EM shower width consistent with that expected for an electromag-
netic shower. To suppress electrons misidentified as photons, the 
EM clusters are required to be not spatially matched to signifi-
cant tracker activity, either a reconstructed track or, in the central 
rapidity region, a density of hits in the SMT and CFT consistent 
with that of an electron [15]. In the following, this requirement is 
referred to as the “track-match veto.”

To further suppress jets misidentified as photons, an artificial 
nearby neutral angular ($\gamma$-NN) discriminant is defined [8]. It relies 
on differences between photons and jets in tracker activity, 
energy deposits in the calorimeter, and in the CPS for the central 
photons/jets. This $\gamma$-NN is trained using PYTHIA [10] Monte Carlo 
(MC) samples of photon and jet production, which are processed 
through a GEANT-based [13] simulation of the detector geometry 
and response. In order to accurately model the effects of mul-
tiple $p\bar{p}$ interactions and detector noise, events from random $p\bar{p}$ 
crossings with a similar instantaneous luminosity spectrum as in 
data are overlaid on the MC events. These MC events are then pro-
cessed using the same reconstruction code as for the data. The 
$\gamma$-NN performance is verified using a data sample consisting 
of photons radiated from leptons in Z boson decays ($Z \to \ell^+\ell^-\gamma$, 
$\ell = e, \mu$) [16]. The $\gamma$-NN output $Q_{\text{NN}}$ distributions for photons 
in data and MC are in good agreement and exhibit a significant sep-
oration from the distribution for misidentified jets [7,8]. Photon 
candidates are required to have $Q_{\text{NN}} > 0.3$, which is $\approx 98\%$ effi-
cient for photons.

We calculate corrections to the observed number of candidate 
events to account for the photon detection efficiency and for the 
acceptance of the selection using simulated samples of $\gamma + b$-jet 
events. In these samples, the photon is required to be isolated at 

---

11 The polar angle $\theta$ and the azimuthal angle $\phi$ are defined with respect to 
the positive $z$ axis, which is along the proton beam direction. Pseudorapidity is defined 
as $\eta = -\ln(\tan(\theta/2))$. Also, $\eta_{\text{det}}$ and $\eta_{\text{gen}}$ are the pseudorapidity and the azimuthal 
angle measured with respect to the center of the detector.

12 The primary $p\bar{p}$ interaction vertex is that found to be the most likely collision 
point, among possibly several collisions within a specific beam crossing, from which 
our selected objects emanate. The algorithm for defining it can be found in [9].
particle level by $E_T^{\mathrm{iso}} = E_T^{\gamma\gamma}(0.4) - E_T^\gamma < 2.5$ GeV, where $E_T^{\gamma\gamma}$ is the total transverse energy of particles within a cone of radius $\mathcal{R} = 0.4$ centered on the photon, and $E_T^\gamma$ is the photon transverse energy. Here, the particle level includes all stable particles as defined in Ref. [17]. Signal events are generated using the SHERPA [18] and PYTHIA event generators, processed through a GEANT-based [13] simulation and events reconstruction as described above. The acceptance is driven by the selection requirements in $\eta_{\text{jet}}$ (applied to avoid edge effects in the calorimeter regions used for the measurement) and $\phi_{\text{bin}}$ in the central rapidity region (to avoid periodic calorimeter module boundaries [12] that bias the EM cluster energy and position measurements), photon rapidity $y^\gamma$ and energy, and bin-to-bin migration effects due to the finite energy and angular resolution of the EM calorimeter. The acceptance varies within (82–90)% with a relative systematic uncertainty of (2–5)%. The EM clusters reconstructed in the acceptance region are required to pass the photon identification criteria listed in the previous paragraph. Average correction factors to account for differences between data and simulations are obtained with the SHERPA events, while the difference from the corrections obtained with PYTHIA is used as systematic uncertainty. Small differences between data and MC in the photon selection efficiencies are corrected for with suitable scale factors derived using control samples of electrons from Z boson decays, as well as photons from the radiative Z boson decays [16]. The total efficiency of the above photon selection criteria is (68–85)% depending on the $p_T^\gamma$ and rapidity region. The systematic uncertainties on these values are 3% for $|y^\gamma| < 1.0$ and 7.3% for $1.5 < |y^\gamma| < 2.5$ and are mainly due to uncertainties caused by the track-match veto, isolation, and the $\gamma$-NN requirements. The contamination from $Z(\rightarrow e^+e^-)$ + jet and $W(\rightarrow e\nu)$ + jet events is estimated from the simulation and is found to be negligible ($\lesssim 1\%$) for both photon rapidity regions.

At least one jet with $p_T^\gamma > 15$ GeV and $|y^{\text{jet}}| < 1.5$ must be present in each selected event. Jets are reconstructed using the D0 Run II algorithm [19] with a cone radius of $\mathcal{R} = 0.5$. The jet acceptance with respect to the $p_T^\gamma$ and $|y^{\text{jet}}|$ kinematic cuts varies between 88% and 100% in different photon $p_T$ bins. The uncertainties on the acceptance due to the jet energy scale, jet energy resolution, and difference in energy scale correction between light flavor and b-jets vary between 1% and 7%, increasing for smaller $p_T^\gamma$. The jet is required to have at least two associated tracks with $p_T > 0.5$ GeV with at least one hit in the SMT. The track with the highest $p_T$ must have $p_T > 1.0$ GeV. These criteria ensure that there is sufficient information to classify the jet as a heavy-flavor candidate and have a typical efficiency of about 90%. Light jets (caused by light quarks or gluons) are suppressed using a dedicated artificial neural network (b-NN) [9] that employs the longer lifetimes of heavy-flavor hadrons relative to their lighter counterparts. The inputs to the b-NN combine several characteristic quantities of the jet and associated tracks to provide a continuous output value that tends towards one for b-jets and zero for the light jets. The b-NN input variables providing most of the discrimination are the number of reconstructed secondary vertices (SV) in the jet, the invariant mass of charged particle tracks associated with the SV ($M_{SV}$), the number of tracks used to reconstruct the SV, the two-dimensional decay length significance of the SV in the plane transverse to the beam, a weighted combination of the tracks’ transverse impact parameter significances, and the probability that the tracks associated with the jet originate from the $p\bar{p}$ interaction vertex. The jet is required to have a b-NN output $> 0.3$. Depending on $p_T^\gamma$, this selection is (40–52)% efficient for b-jets with systematic uncertainties of (6–23)% for the $\gamma + b$ events with $|y^\gamma| < 1.0$ and of (7–11)% for those with $1.5 < |y^\gamma| < 2.5$, both increasing as a function of $p_T^\gamma$. Only 0.2–0.4% of light jets are misidentified as heavy-flavor jets, comprising 7% to 10% of the final sample.

After all selection requirements, 199,515 (139,710) events remain in the data samples with the central (forward) photons. In addition to events with light-flavor jets a second source of background is represented by multi-jet events in which one jet is misidentified as a photon. To estimate the photon purity, the $\gamma$-NN distribution in data is fitted to a linear combination of templates for photons and jets obtained from simulated $\gamma$ + jet and dijet samples, respectively. An independent fit is performed in each $p_T^\gamma$ bin, yielding photon purities between 62% and 99% for the events with the central photons and between 40% and 55% for the events with the forward photons. The obtained photon fractions are shown in Fig. 2. The $p_T^\gamma$ dependence of the purity is fitted in each region using a two-parameter function $P = 1 - \exp(a + bp_T^\gamma)$. The systematic uncertainties on the fit are estimated using two alternative fitting functions. These photon purities differ at most by 7% when compared with those obtained for inclusive events, i.e., without the requirement of a heavy-flavor jet. An additional systematic uncertainty in the photon fractions due to the fragmentation model implemented in PYTHIA is also taken into account [20]. This uncertainty is estimated by varying the production rate of $\pi^0$ and $\eta$ mesons by $\pm 50\%$ with respect to their central values [21]. It is found to be about 6% at $p_T^\gamma \simeq 30$ GeV, 2% at $p_T^\gamma \simeq 50$ GeV, and $\leq 1\%$ at $p_T^\gamma \gtrsim 70$ GeV.

![Fig. 2. Photon purity as a function of $p_T^\gamma$ in the selected data sample in the central rapidity region ($|y^\gamma| < 1.0$ (a) and the forward rapidity region $1.5 < |y^\gamma| < 2.5$ (b).](image-url)
The fractions of $b$-jets are determined by fitting $M_{SV}$ templates for $b$, $c$, and light jets to the data. Jets from $b$-quarks tend to have larger values of $M_{SV}$, in contrast to light jets. For $b$- and $c$-jets, the templates are obtained from simulation, while the light jet template is derived from a data sample, enriched in light jets, referred to as negatively tagged data (NT data). The NT data comprises the jets that have negative values for some of the inputs to the $b$-NN algorithm (such as negative decay length and negative impact parameter significance) which are caused by detector resolution effects [9]. After correcting the NT data for the small contamination from heavy-flavor jets, we have verified that the $M_{SV}$ template shapes in NT data and light jets in the MC simulation agree well.

The result of a maximum likelihood fit to $M_{SV}$ templates, normalized to the number of events in data, is shown in Fig. 3 for central photons with $50 < p_T^\gamma < 60$ GeV, as an example. As shown in Fig. 4, the estimated fraction of $b$-jets grows with $p_T^\gamma$ from about $35\%$ to about $42\%$. The corresponding relative uncertainties range between $4\%$-$24\%$, increasing at higher $p_T^\gamma$ and are dominated by the limited data statistics. The data corrected for the photon and jet acceptance, for reconstruction efficiencies, for the contribution of background events, and for bin-migration effects, are presented at the particle level, as defined in Ref. [17].

The differential cross sections of $\gamma + b$ production are extracted in nine (six) bins of $p_T^\gamma$ for central (forward) photons, and are listed in Tables 1 and 2. The results are also shown in Fig. 5 as a function of $p_T^\gamma$ for the two photon rapidity intervals. The data points are plotted at the value of $p_T^\gamma$ for which the value of the smooth function describing the cross section equals the averaged cross section in the bin [22]. The $\gamma + b$-jet simulated sample with SHERPA has been used to determine mean $p_T^\gamma$ values.

The cross sections with the central (forward) photons fall by about four (three) orders of magnitude in the range $30 < p_T^\gamma < 300$ (200) GeV. The statistical uncertainty on the results ranges from $2\%$ in the first $p_T^\gamma$ bin to $\approx 11\%$ in the last $p_T^\gamma$ bins, while the total systematic uncertainty varies between $12\%$ and $36\%$. The main source of the uncertainty at low $p_T^\gamma$ is due to the photon purity (up to $8\%$), the $b$-jet fraction fit ($6\%$-$7\%$), and the luminosity ($6.1\%$) [14]. At higher $p_T^\gamma$, the uncertainty is dominated by the fractions of $b$-jets and their selection efficiencies. Systematic uncertainties are highly bin-to-bin correlated for the first three $p_T^\gamma$ bins, while the total systematic uncertainty is nearly uncorrelated across the bins at $p_T^\gamma > 70$ GeV.

Next-to-leading order (NLO) perturbative QCD predictions, with the renormalization scale $\mu_R$, factorization scale $\mu_F$, and fragmentation scale $\mu_f$ all set to $p_T$, are also given in Tables 1 and 2. These predictions [1] are based on a phase space slicing method used to calculate the cross section analytically [23]. The uncertainty from the choice of scale is estimated through a simultaneous variation of all three scales by a factor of two, i.e. for $\mu_{R,F,F}$, and $2p_T^\gamma$. The predictions utilize cteq6.6M PDFs [11] and are corrected for non-perturbative effects of parton-to-hadron fragmentation and multiple parton interactions. The latter are evaluated using SHERPA and PYTHIA MC samples using their default settings [18,10]. The overall correction varies from about $0.90$ at $30 < p_T^\gamma < 40$ GeV to about $0.95$ at high $p_T^\gamma$, and an uncertainty of $\lesssim 2\%$ is assigned to account for the difference between the two MC generators.

The prediction based on the $k_T$-factorization approach [24,25] and unintegrated parton distributions [26] are also given in Tables 1 and 2. The $k_T$-factorization formalism contains additional contributions to the cross sections due to resummation of gluon

---

Fig. 3. Distribution of observed events for secondary vertex mass after all selection criteria for the representative bin $50 < p_T^\gamma < 60$ GeV ($|y^\gamma| < 1.0$). The distributions for the $b$-, $c$-, and light jet templates are shown normalized to their respective fitted fractions. Also included at the bottom is the ratio of data to the result of the fit. Fits in the other $p_T^\gamma$ bins are of similar quality.

Fig. 4. The $b$-jet fraction (with total uncertainties) as a function of $p_T^\gamma$ in the data sample after applying all selections in the central rapidity region $|y^\gamma| < 1.0$ (a) and the forward rapidity region $1.5 < |y^\gamma| < 2.5$ (b).
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The results indicate a need for higher order perturbative QCD corrections in the large $p_T^γ$ region, that is dominated by the annihilation process $q\bar{q} → γg$ ($g → b\bar{b}$), and resummation of diagrams with additional gluon radiation. The QCD predictions from the $k_T$-factorization approach is in better agreement with data.

In conclusion, we have performed a measurement of the differential cross sections between data and NLO QCD predictions with uncertainties for the rapidity regions $|y| < 1.0$ (a) and $1.5 < |y| < 2.5$ (b). The uncertainties on the data include both statistical (inner error bar) and full uncertainties (entire error bar). Also shown are the uncertainties on the theoretical QCD scales and the $cteq6.6M$ PDFs. The ratio of NLO predictions with $cteq6.6M$ to those with $mstw2008$ [28] and $abkmegko$ [29] are also shown.

Fig. 6. The ratio of $γ + b$ production differential cross sections between data and NLO QCD predictions with uncertainties for the rapidity regions $|y| < 1.0$ (a) and $1.5 < |y| < 2.5$ (b). The uncertainties on the data include both statistical (inner error bar) and full uncertainties (entire error bar). Also shown are the uncertainties on the theoretical QCD scales and the $cteq6.6M$ PDFs. The ratio of NLO predictions with $cteq6.6M$ to those with $mstw2008$ [28] and $abkmegko$ [29] are also shown.
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