



---

# A Measurement of the Cross Section Ratio $R_b$ and the Forward-Backward Asymmetry $A_{FB}^b$ for $b\bar{b}$ Events with the DELPHI Detector at LEP 2.

K. Cieřlik<sup>1</sup>, P. Collins, M. Elsing, T. Lesiak<sup>1</sup>, W. Liebig, G. Wilkinson

Preliminary

## Abstract

Measurements of the cross section ratio  $R_b = \sigma_{b\bar{b}}/\sigma_{\text{had}}$  and the  $b$  forward-backward asymmetry  $A_{FB}^b$  have been performed in  $e^+e^- \rightarrow Z/\gamma^*$  events with the DELPHI detector using data delivered by LEP from 1997 to 1999. They correspond to centre-of-mass energies ranging from 183 to 202 GeV and comprise a total integrated luminosity of  $435 \text{ pb}^{-1}$ . For the identification of  $b\bar{b}$  events a tagging variable was used which combines the information coming from  $B$  lifetime, the mass found in secondary vertices and the rapidity of tracks coming from a secondary vertex.

The asymmetry measurement uses the charged tracks to distinguish between the  $b$  and  $\bar{b}$  hemispheres.  $A_{FB}^b$  is extracted from the charge signed polar angle distribution using an unbinned log likelihood fit.

Prepared for winter conferences 2000

---

<sup>1</sup>partially supported by the KBN grant 2 P03B 111 16 and SPUB/CERN/P-03/DZ3/99

# 1 Introduction

During the last four years the LEP accelerator has delivered over  $500\text{pb}^{-1}$  to each of the four experiments at centre-of-mass energies ranging from 130 to 202 GeV. In this energy region above the  $Z$  resonance the photon exchange and its interference with the  $Z$  is no longer suppressed with respect to the  $Z$  exchange, resulting in a very different behaviour of the production characteristics of fermion pair events.

A measurement of the cross section ratio  $R_b$  and the forward-backward asymmetry  $A_{\text{FB}}^b$  has been performed at energies between 183 and 202 GeV using data collected with the DELPHI detector [1]. Unlike at LEP 1,  $R_b$  is defined as  $\frac{\sigma_{b\bar{b}}}{\sigma_{\text{had}}}$  rather than  $\frac{\Gamma(Z\rightarrow b\bar{b})}{\Gamma(Z\rightarrow\text{had})}$ . The  $b\bar{b}$  events are isolated using well understood techniques developed at LEP1, with efficient  $b$ -tagging extended to a polar angle of  $25^\circ$  due to the LEP II silicon tracker upgrade. The  $b$ -tagging is cross calibrated using data taken on the  $Z$  resonance in the same running periods as the high energy data. The good efficiency, together with the large amount of data accumulated, particularly in 1998 and 1999, allows a test of the Standard Model prediction for  $b\bar{b}$  production in two-fermion events. Previous results concerning the energy range 130–172 GeV can be found in ref. [2].

The paper starts with the presentation of the selection and  $b$  tagging techniques applicable to both the  $R_b$  and  $A_{\text{FB}}^b$  measurements, followed by a separate description of the measurements themselves.

## 2 Track Selection

The polar acceptance for charged tracks is limited by the geometry of the tracking system to a polar angle region between  $11^\circ$  and  $169^\circ$ . The track selection imposes additional constraints, selecting charged tracks only if :

- their momentum is between 0.1 GeV and  $1.5 \cdot E_{\text{beam}}$ ,
- the relative error on the momentum measurement is less than 100%,
- the distance of their closest approach to the beam-spot is less than 4 cm in the plane perpendicular to the beam axis and less than  $4/\sin\theta$  cm along the beam axis.

For jet clustering and the computation of event cut variables, neutral particles are also used. They are accepted in a polar angle region between  $3^\circ$  and  $177^\circ$ , which gives a good rejection of off-momentum electrons. A minimum energy cut is applied on neutral tracks, which is 0.3 GeV for the barrel electromagnetic and small angle calorimeters, HPC and STIC, and 0.4 GeV for the electromagnetic calorimeter in the forward region, FEMC.

## 3 Event Selection

The signal coming from the process  $e^+e^- \rightarrow qq(\gamma)$  was selected using global event variables deduced from the set of selected tracks. The following set of cuts provides a selection of hadronic events while rejecting Bhabha and two-photon background events:

- $N_{\text{charged}} \geq 7$ ,

- $E_{\text{FEMC}} := \sqrt{E_{\text{F}}^2 + E_{\text{B}}^2} \leq 85\% E_{\text{beam}}$ ,
- $\sum E_{\perp} \geq 20\% E_{\text{CMS}}$ ,
- $E_{\text{charged}} \geq 10\% E_{\text{CMS}}$ .

$E_{\text{FEMC}}$  is constructed from  $E_{\text{F}}$  and  $E_{\text{B}}$ , the sum of all showers found in the forward and backward arms of the forward electromagnetic calorimeter. Cutting on this quantity as a percentage of the beam energy rejects electrons from bhabha events. The request for a minimum transverse energy,  $\sum E_{\perp}$ , rejects two-photon events better than a comparably high  $E_{\text{charged}}$  cut, thus allowing the latter to be reduced.

At energies well above the  $Z$ -resonance, not only two-fermion final states with an effective centre-of-mass energy  $\sqrt{s'}$  near the initial energy  $\sqrt{s}$  contribute to the sample of measured events, but also radiative return events with  $\sqrt{s'} \sim m_Z$  and several kinds of four-fermion events. To be able to study the values of  $R_b$  at  $\sqrt{s'} \sim \sqrt{s}$ , additional selection criteria are applied:

- Four-fermion events coming from the process  $e^+e^- \rightarrow WW/ZZ \rightarrow qqqq$  usually can be easily forced into a four-jet structure and lead to a high  $(1 - T)$  value. Two-fermion events with a back-to-back topology have, if forced into four jets as well, at least one jet with considerably lower energy and smaller angle towards a neighbouring jet. An energy-dependent cut on  $E_{\text{min}} \cdot \Theta_{\text{min}}$  and a remaining soft cut on the Thrust,  $(1 - T) \leq 0.31$  (0.35 for 1997,1998), further reduce the contamination with four-fermion events. The  $E_{\text{min}} \cdot \Theta_{\text{min}}$  cut is chosen  $\leq \sqrt{s} \cdot 0.083^\circ$  for the data of 1997,  $\leq \sqrt{s} \cdot 0.079^\circ$  for 1998 and  $\leq \sqrt{s} \cdot 0.075^\circ$  for 1999.
- The acceptance is limited to the silicon tracker polar angle coverage by requiring the thrust axis to have a minimal polar angle of  $25^\circ$ .
- The high energy sample is defined by rejecting any event with a reconstructed centre-of-mass energy  $\sqrt{s'}$  [3] lower than 85% of the initial centre-of-mass energy.

Furthermore, runs which do not fulfill the demands on the detector quality were rejected, along with very short fills, especially at 202 GeV, where the beamspot was not reliably reconstructed and the  $b$ -tagging degraded.

The influence of remaining background events was estimated using full detector simulation data sets generated by the EXCALIBUR four-fermion generator in versions 0.91, 1.01 and 1.08. High energy and radiative  $q\bar{q}(\gamma)$  events were simulated using the PYTHIA generator, versions 5.72 and 6.125.

The data sets analysed and the number of selected events obtained via the above selection cuts are listed in table 1.

## 4 Identification of $b$ Quarks

The DELPHI silicon tracker [4] provides up to six three dimensional points per track from three layers at radii between 6 and 11 cm. The precise track extrapolations provide a means of distinguishing between tracks from the primary vertex and tracks coming from decays of short lived hadrons.

The characteristics of heavy quark production are expressed in three observables:

$\sqrt{s}$	$\int \mathcal{L} dt$	$N_{\text{had}}^{\text{RD}}$
182.65	53.20(8)	1383
188.63	157.5(2)	3493
191.58	25.11(7)	533
195.52	76.1(2)	1579
199.52	83.0(2)	1572
201.64	40.0(1)	766

Table 1: Average energies, integrated luminosities and numbers of selected hadronic events for the analysed data sets.

- a lifetime variable constructed from the impact parameters in a jet,
- the mass of the secondary vertex if one is present.
- the rapidities of the tracks from the secondary vertex or jet.

These variables are combined in an event probability variable ranging from -5 to +10. A detailed description of the observables and their combination can be found in [5].

High values of the tagging variable correspond to a high  $b$  purity, whereas light quark events are accumulated at low values.  $c\bar{c}$  events are enriched in the intermediate region but are not clearly separated from the other flavour types. The distribution of the probability variable is displayed in figure 1 for the selected events measured at  $\sqrt{s} = 200$  GeV together with the simulation prediction consisting of  $Z/\gamma^*$  signal and different background types.

## 5 The $R_b$ Measurement

By cutting on the event probability variable at  $\mathcal{P}_b > 0.625$ , a subsample ( $N_{\text{tagged}}^{\text{RD}}$ ) is selected from the total number of selected events ( $N_{\text{total}}^{\text{RD}}$ ) with a  $b$  purity between 88% and 90%, depending on the data set. When the background content is subtracted from the tagged and total selected events, the ratio of the two numbers can be expressed as a function of  $R_b$  using the tagging efficiencies for  $b$ ,  $c$  and  $uds$  quarks ( $\varepsilon_b$ ,  $\varepsilon_c$ ,  $\varepsilon_{uds}$ ).

$$\frac{N_{\text{tagged}}^{\text{RD}} - N_{\text{tagged}}^{\text{ISR}} - N_{\text{tagged}}^{\text{4f}}}{N_{\text{total}}^{\text{RD}} - N_{\text{total}}^{\text{ISR}} - N_{\text{total}}^{\text{4f}}} = R_b \varepsilon_b^{\text{meas.}} + R_c^{\text{SM}} \varepsilon_c^{\text{MC}} + (1 - R_b - R_c^{\text{SM}}) \varepsilon_{uds}^{\text{MC}} \quad (1)$$

The constraint that the cross section ratios add up to one requires that  $R_{uds}$  contains the measured  $R_b$  as well. The different coefficients are explained more detailed in the following.




Figure 1: Distribution of the event tagging variable in the 200 GeV data set. The simulation is divided into  $b\bar{b}$ ,  $c\bar{c}$ , light quark and background events. The quality of the agreement between data and simulation is an ingredient of the systematic error estimation.

## 5.1 Background estimation

The event selection reduces the remaining radiative return contamination to  $\sim 8\%$  and four-fermion background to  $\sim 12\%$ , with the latter dropping to 3% in the  $WW$ -depleted  $b$  tagged sample.

The remaining backgrounds from selected four-fermion events ( $N_{\text{tagged}}^{4f}$ ,  $N_{\text{total}}^{4f}$ ) and from radiative events ( $N_{\text{tagged}}^{\text{ISR}}$ ,  $N_{\text{total}}^{\text{ISR}}$ ) contribute to the samples of selected and tagged events. They are estimated to be

$$N_{\text{tot/tag}}^{4f, \text{ISR}} = (\int \mathcal{L}) \cdot \sigma_{4f, Z/\gamma^*} \cdot \varepsilon_{\text{tot/tag}}^{4f \text{ISR}} \quad (2)$$

and then subtracted from the number of measured events.

The cross section for four-fermion background ( $\sigma_{4f}$ ) was taken from the Monte Carlo generator, EXCALIBUR, whereas the  $q\bar{q}(\gamma)$  cross section ( $\sigma_{Z/\gamma^*}$ ) is replaced by the semi-analytic ZFITTER [8] prediction. As ZFITTER and PYTHIA agree very well in the distribution of the true  $\sqrt{s'}$ , the fraction of radiative two-fermion events is taken from simulation. It is contained in  $\varepsilon^{\text{ISR}, 4f}$ , which is in both cases defined as the ratio of selected events to all

events found in the simulated data set. Table 2 shows the resulting estimated background contamination compared to the number of events in the data sample for the 200 GeV measurement.

	real data	ISR bg	4f bg
$N_{\text{total}}$	1572	166(2)	179(2)
$N_{\text{tagged}}$	206	13.9(5)	6.7(3)

Table 2: Example of  $N^{\text{ISR}}$ ,  $N^{\text{4f}}$  estimated based on eq. 2 for the 200 GeV data sample. The errors are related to the limited simulation statistics.

## 5.2 Efficiency determination

In order to minimise the dependence on the description of the  $b$ -modelling in the simulation, the  $b$  efficiency  $\varepsilon_b$  is calibrated by applying equation 1 to the  $Z$  peak data of the corresponding LEP running period. The accurately measured cross section ratio from the LEP 1 period is used [6], leading to a measured  $\varepsilon_b^0$  which is then extrapolated to high energies. Thus only the relative change in efficiency needs to be taken from simulation. More precisely, the inefficiency  $\bar{\varepsilon}$  is extrapolated, giving

$$\varepsilon_b^{\text{meas.}} = 1 - r \cdot (1 - \varepsilon_b^0) \text{ with the relative change } r = \frac{\bar{\varepsilon}^{\text{MC}}(E)}{\bar{\varepsilon}^{\text{MC}}(m_Z)}. \quad (3)$$

$\varepsilon_c$  and  $\varepsilon_{uds}$  are taken directly from high energy simulation.

## 5.3 $R_c$ and acceptance correction

Standard Model predictions for  $R_c$  at high energies as well as on the peak are obtained from ZFITTER<sup>2</sup>[8].

The Standard Model ratios measured at LEP 1 and predicted by ZFITTER correspond to the full angular acceptance and a 100% hadronic selection efficiency. The Standard Model ratios are acceptance corrected before they are used in eq. 1. The measured  $R_b$  results are corrected to full acceptance.

## 5.4 Sources of systematic error

The following sources of systematic error are taken into account:

- A detector resolution dependence arises from the use of the flavour tagging method. It is determined by swapping the  $b$  tagging calibration files for real data and simulation and by shifting the probability variable distributions for  $c$  and  $uds$  events to higher values, improving the agreement in the probability distribution on the  $Z$ . The second change is smaller than the first due to the high purity working point.

---

<sup>2</sup>Version 6.22 with the FINR flag set to 0

- Imperfections in the  $b$  modelling do not enter the analysis method directly, because it calibrates itself on the  $Z$  data. However the statistical errors of the  $Z$  data sets, and also of the simulated samples used for extrapolation, result in an uncertainty in  $\varepsilon_b$ , which is of the same order of magnitude as the difference between calibrated and simulated  $\varepsilon_b$ . The corresponding effect on  $R_b$  is quoted as  $\varepsilon_b$  uncertainty.
- Uncertainties in the  $c$  and  $uds$  modelling have been studied for the LEP 1  $R_b$  measurement [6]. They arise mainly from the  $c\bar{c} \rightarrow D^+$  fraction and the  $D$  decay multiplicity in case of  $\varepsilon_c$ , and from light hadron modelling and gluon splitting in case of  $\varepsilon_{uds}$ . Their size is scaled to the working point of this analysis and multiplied with a confidence factor of 2, taking into account the different working point and energy.
- Another source of systematic error originates from correcting the measured  $R_b$  to full acceptance. Its size is taken as one third of the correction.
- For the four-fermion background modelling, it has to be taken into account that very small contributions such as  $Zee$  and  $llqq$  events have been neglected, and that the estimation relies on the correct knowledge of cross sections and data luminosities. These effects are summarised in a variation of the four-fermion cross section by  $\pm 5\%$ , which is larger than its theoretical error ( $2 - 3\%$ ).
- The cut on the reconstructed centre-of-mass energy could introduce a bias due to ISR modelling or detector effects. Its size is estimated by varying the cut by  $\pm 5$  GeV and averaging the impact on  $R_b$  over all 6 energy points in order to minimise the influence of statistical fluctuations. A cross check is performed by going back to a simpler form of the  $\sqrt{s'}$  reconstruction algorithm which uses only topological information. Its effect is in agreement with the cut variation.
- A theoretical uncertainty in the modelling of the initial state / final state QED interference is quoted as well (“INTF modelling”). It is taken as half the change in the ZFITTER prediction when switching off the  $\mathcal{O}(\alpha)$  interference correction, which is active by default.

An overview of the individual systematic error contributions for each of the six energy points is given in table 3. The total systematic error on  $R_b$  is obtained by quadratic summation and can be compared to the statistical error on real data.

The dependence on  $R_c$  is quoted in the systematic error breakdown in table 3 as well; it refers to the proportionality factor between  $R_b$  and the deviation from the Standard Model expectation:  $R_b = R_b^{\text{meas.}} + \alpha \cdot (R_c - R_c^{\text{SM}})$ .

## 5.5 Results

The measured results for  $R_b$  are summarised in table 4 and plotted in figure 2 together with the prediction from ZFITTER. The plot also contains published measurements both on-peak and off-peak [6] and the 130-172 GeV results from [2]. Both the high energy ( $\sqrt{s'}/\sqrt{s} > 0.85$ ) and the inclusive ( $\sqrt{s'}/\sqrt{s} > 0.10$ ) theoretical prediction are included in the plot. The measured  $R_b$  values show a good agreement with the Standard Model within their statistical errors.

<b>Energy [GeV]</b>	<b>182.65</b>	<b>188.63</b>	<b>191.58</b>	<b>195.52</b>	<b>199.52</b>	<b>201.64</b>
stat error MC	0.0006	0.0006	0.0022	0.0008	0.0008	0.0013
$\varepsilon_b$ error	0.0023	0.0020	0.0033	0.0019	0.0020	0.0024
accept. corr.	0.0005	0.0007	0.0001	0.0004	0.0009	0.0009
4f BG modelling	0.0010	0.0013	0.0015	0.0015	0.0020	0.0019
$\varepsilon_c$ uncertainty	-0.0019	-0.0023	-0.0022	-0.0024	-0.0024	-0.0025
$\varepsilon_{uds}$ uncertainty	-0.0012	-0.0013	-0.0013	-0.0012	-0.0014	-0.0013
detector resolution	0.0018	0.0012	0.0015	0.0016	0.0016	0.0016
$\sqrt{s'}$ cut var.	-0.0008	-0.0005	-0.0013	-0.0007	-0.0008	-0.0011
INTF modelling	0.0009	0.0009	0.0009	0.0009	0.0009	0.0009
<b>total</b>	<b>0.0041</b>	<b>0.0040</b>	<b>0.0055</b>	<b>0.0043</b>	<b>0.0047</b>	<b>0.0050</b>
(stat. error RD)	0.0154	0.0103	0.0262	0.0150	0.0160	0.0229
$R_c$ dependence ( $\alpha$ )	-0.0473	-0.0557	-0.0540	-0.0594	-0.0581	-0.0617

Table 3: List of systematic uncertainties. A negative sign denotes an anti-correlation with respect to variation. The total systematic error is computed as quadratic sum of all preceding contributions.

<b>Energy [GeV]</b>	<b><math>R_b</math> (<math>\pm</math>stat, <math>\pm</math>syst. error)</b>	<b>SM expectation</b>
182.65	$0.1373 \pm 0.0154 \pm 0.0041$	0.1671
188.63	$0.1563 \pm 0.0103 \pm 0.0040$	0.1660
191.58	$0.1688 \pm 0.0262 \pm 0.0055$	0.1655
195.52	$0.1653 \pm 0.0150 \pm 0.0043$	0.1648
199.52	$0.1834 \pm 0.0160 \pm 0.0047$	0.1642
201.64	$0.1775 \pm 0.0229 \pm 0.0050$	0.1639

Table 4: Preliminary results for  $R_b$  at energies between 183 and 202 GeV. Statistical and systematic errors are quoted separately. The Standard Model prediction has been computed with ZFITTER.






Figure 2: The cross section ratio  $R_b$  versus the LEP centre-of-mass energy  $\sqrt{s}$ . The data points show the preliminary results obtained with this analysis (closed circles) and previous results published in [2] and [6]. The LEP 2 results have to be compared with the high energy prediction ( $\sqrt{s'}/\sqrt{s} > 0.85$ ) given by ZFITTER (full curve).

## 6 The $A_{FB}^b$ Measurement

For events with a reconstructed centre-of-mass energy  $\sqrt{s'}$  of close to 200 GeV, the forward-backward asymmetries,  $A_{FB}$ , of quarks are expected to be significantly higher than at the Z pole. The angular distribution of the  $b$  quarks as a function of their production angle  $\theta$  can be described by

$$\frac{d\sigma}{d\cos\theta} = 1 + \cos^2\theta + \frac{8}{3}A_{FB}\cos\theta, \quad (4)$$

where uncertainties due to the interference between initial and final state radiation have been neglected, as their impact on the measurement described here is small [10].

Experimentally the quark charge can be estimated from the final state particles. In the regime  $\sqrt{s'}/\sqrt{s} > 0.85$  the events are back-to-back, and the thrust axis of the event may be used to divide the event into forward and backward hemispheres, where the forward hemisphere is defined to be the one containing the incoming electron. The momenta of the charged tracks are projected onto the forward unit thrust axis  $\vec{T}$ , and the charges of the forward ( $Q_F$ ) and backward ( $Q_B$ ) hemisphere are computed to be:

$$Q_{F(B)} = \frac{\sum_i q_i |\vec{p}_i \cdot \vec{T}|^\kappa}{\sum_i |\vec{p}_i \cdot \vec{T}|^\kappa} \quad (5)$$

where  $q_i$  is the particle charge,  $p_i$  its momentum, and the exponent  $\kappa$  is set to a value of 0.6, chosen to optimise the discrimination. The sum runs over all charged tracks  $i$ , and all terms with  $\vec{p}_i \cdot \vec{T} > 0$  contribute to  $Q_F$ , while all terms with  $\vec{p}_i \cdot \vec{T} < 0$  contribute to  $Q_B$ . The information from the two hemispheres is combined in the charge flow variable  $Q_{FB}$ ,

$$Q_{FB} = Q_F - Q_B \quad (6)$$

the sign of which is sensitive to whether the  $b$  quark is in the forward or backward hemisphere. The knowledge of the true quark charge is limited by the fragmentation, but improves for greater absolute values of  $Q_{FB}$ . If a cut is made requiring  $|Q_{FB}| > 0.1$  the fraction of  $b$  events with an incorrect charge assignment,  $\omega_q$ , is about 0.26 according to the Monte Carlo.

The variable  $x$  is defined to be the cosine of the event thrust axis signed by  $-Q_{FB}$ . The observed asymmetry  $A_{FB}^{obs}$  is fitted to the distribution of the events in  $x$  by maximising the likelihood

$$\ln \mathcal{L} = \sum_i \ln \left( 1 + x_i^2 + \frac{8}{3}A_{FB}^{obs}x_i \right) \quad (7)$$

where the sum runs over all events. The observed charge asymmetry contains contributions from the various backgrounds included in the sample. The  $WW$  background and the contamination from low  $\sqrt{s'}$  are subtracted with asymmetries as measured on the Monte Carlo, giving corrections of about 3%. The remaining asymmetry can be expressed as

$$A_{FB}^{obs} = \sum_{q=u,d,s,c,b} s_q D_q A_{FB}^q F_q \quad (8)$$

where the sum is over the quark species,  $A_{FB}$  is the asymmetry,  $F$  the relative abundance,  $D$  a dilution factor for each quark coming from charge misassignment, and the sign  $s$  is  $+1$  for  $b$ ,  $d$  and  $s$  quarks, and  $-1$  for  $u$  and  $c$  quarks. The dilution factors are determined from the Monte Carlo, by repeating the maximum likelihood fit on the Monte Carlo sample with and without use of the truth information to determine  $Q_{FB}$ . For the quarks other than the  $b$  quarks the Standard Model value for  $A_{FB}^q$  is taken. For this analysis, a high-purity working point is chosen with  $F_b = 0.96$  and  $F_c = 0.03$ , minimising the corrections due to the non  $b$  quark contamination. This formula is used to extract  $A_{FB}^b$ .

The fit to the distribution in the variable  $x$  is illustrated in figure 3 for the data sets from 189 to 202 GeV.

## 6.1 Systematic Error Estimation

The principal contributions to the systematic error were as follows:

- **Knowledge of the dilution factors.** The dilution factors were cross checked using the values of  $\omega_q$  as measured on the Monte Carlo, and the relation  $D_q = 1 - 2\omega_q$ . The knowledge of the dilution factors was also checked by making the measurement on the  $Z^0$  data accumulated in 1998 and 1999 and comparing to the LEP1 measured value of  $A_{FB}^b$ , and by looking at variations between the different years and energy points. Finally the exponent  $\kappa$  was varied between values of 0.3 and 0.9 and the dilution factors recomputed. The systematic error estimated from the variations between these methods was 7%.
- **Detector Effects.** The following detector effects were considered:
  - Variation of purity with  $\cos \theta$
  - Changes of beamspot size and width between years and data samples
  - Estimated asymmetry in detector efficiency
  - Placement in  $z$  of the silicon tracker in data and simulation

A conservative error from these effects was estimated to be 5%.

- **Backgrounds.** The WW and ISR backgrounds were varied by 50%, leading to an uncertainty of less than 2%.

The total systematic error was estimated at 9%. Note that the chosen working point means that the dependence of the result on the assumed branching fractions into  $b\bar{b}$  and  $c\bar{c}$  is negligible.

## 6.2 Results

The measured results for  $A_{FB}^b$  are summarised in table 6.2 and plotted in figure 4 together with the prediction from ZFITTER, and the previously published values. The measurements are compatible with the Standard Model predictions.




Figure 3: The distribution of the variable  $x$ , the signed  $\cos\theta$  of the event thrust axis, for the data sets from 189 GeV to 202 GeV inclusive. The data points have a symmetric  $\cos\theta$  correction applied for the  $b$ -tagging efficiency. The line shows the result of the maximum likelihood fit to  $A_{FB}^{obs}$ .

Energy (GeV)	number of selected events	$A_{FB}^b \pm \text{stat.} \pm \text{syst. error}$
188.6	206	$0.50^{+0.13}_{-0.14} \pm 0.05$
191.6	44	$0.37^{+0.30}_{-0.31} \pm 0.03$
195.5	110	$0.72^{+0.18}_{-0.19} \pm 0.06$
199.5	117	$0.74^{+0.18}_{-0.19} \pm 0.07$
201.6	53	$0.59^{+0.27}_{-0.29} \pm 0.05$

Table 5: Preliminary results for  $A_{FB}^b$  at energies between 189 and 202 GeV. Statistical and systematic errors are quoted separately.




Figure 4: The  $b$  quark asymmetries  $A_{FB}^b$  versus the LEP centre-of-mass energy  $\sqrt{s}$ . The data points show the preliminary results obtained with this analysis (closed circles) and previous results published in [2] and [9]. The solid line shows the high energy prediction ( $\sqrt{s'}/\sqrt{s} > 0.85$ ) given by ZFITTER.

# References

- [1] DELPHI Coll. – P.Abreu et al., Nucl. Inst. and Meth. **A 378** (1996) 57.
- [2] DELPHI Coll. – P.Abreu et al., Eur. Phys. J. **C11** (1999) 383.
- [3] P. Abreu et al., *SPRIME – A Package for Estimating the Effective  $\sqrt{s'}$  Centre of Mass Energy in  $q\bar{q}\gamma$  Events*, DELPHI internal note 96-124 PHYS 632;  
P. Abreu et al., *The Estimation of the Effective Centre of Mass Energy in  $q\bar{q}\gamma$  Events from DELPHI*, unpublished.
- [4] The DELPHI Silicon Tracker Group – P. Chochula et al., Nucl. Inst. Meth **A 412** (1998) 304.
- [5] G.V.Borisov, *Lifetime Tag of events  $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$  with the DELPHI detector — AABTAG program*, DELPHI internal note 94-125 PROG 208;  
G.V.Borisov, *Combined b-tagging*, DELPHI internal note 97-094 PHYS 716.
- [6] DELPHI Coll. – P.Abreu et al., Eur. Phys. J. **C10** (1999) 415.
- [7] The LEP Collaborations et al., *A Combination of Preliminary Electroweak Measurements and Constraints on the Standard Model*, CERN-EP-2000-016.
- [8] D. Bardin et al., *ZFI<sup>IT</sup>\_<sub>ER</sub>v.6.21 - A Semi-Analytical Program for Fermion Pair Production in  $e^+e^-$  Annihilation*, DESY 99-070 – hep-ph/9908433.
- [9] DELPHI Coll. – P.Abreu et al., E. Phys. J. **C9** (1999) 367.
- [10] ALEPH Coll., Phys. Lett. **B399** (1997) 329;  
DELPHI Coll., Z. Phys. **C72** (1996) 31.