



Exploring new avenues at the LHC with lepton-induced processes

Francesco Tramontano francesco.tramontano@unina.it

Work done in collaboration with: L. Buonocore, P. Nason, G. Zanderighi + A. Greljo, U. Haisch, P. Krack, N. Selimović

A life in phenomenology: a conference in honour of Paolo Nason Unimib - 15 September 2022

Lepton pdfs

• Lux method for lepton pdfs: compare two calculations for a cross section

[Manohar, Nason, Salam, Zanderighi, PRL (2016)] [Manohar, Nason, Salam, Zanderighi, JHEP (2017)]

- 1. pre QCD calculation: the proton interact via a virtual photon and the corresponding structure functions
- 2. the lepton and the photon are partons (with zero virtuality)

$$\text{(for leptons) [Buonocore, Nason, FT, Zanderighi, JHEP (2020)]}$$

$$\text{with:} \\ x_{\ell}f_{\ell}(x_{\ell},\mu_{F}^{2}) = \left(\frac{1}{2\pi}\right)^{2} \int_{x_{\ell}}^{1} \frac{dx}{x} z_{\ell} \int_{x}^{1} \frac{dz}{z} \int_{\frac{m_{F}^{2}z}{1-z}}^{\frac{\mu_{F}^{2}}{1-z}} \frac{dQ^{2}}{Q^{2}} \alpha^{2}(Q^{2})$$

$$\text{with:} \\ x_{\ell} = x_{\ell}/x \\ x_{\text{bj}} = x/z \\ \text{K}_{\text{bj}} = \frac{1+(1-z)^{2}}{z} \\ \text{K}_{\text{bj}} = \frac{1+(1-z)^{2}}{z} \\ \text{K}_{\text{bj}} = \frac{1+(1-z)^{2}}{z} \\ \text{K}_{\text{bj}} = \frac{1+(1-z)^{2}}{z} \\ \text{K}_{\text{bj}} = 1-2z_{\ell} + 2z_{\ell}^{2} \\ \text{K}_{\text{bj}} = 1-2z_{\ell} + 2z_{\ell}^{2} \\ \text{K}_{\text{bj}} = 1-2z_{\ell} + 2z_{\ell}^{2} \\ \text{K}_{\text{bj}} = \frac{1+2z^{2}}{z} \\ \text{K}_{\text{bj}} = \frac{1+2z^{2}}{z^{2}} \\ \frac{1+2z^{2}}{z^{$$

Luminosities



- PDF-Uncertainty under extremely good control \rightarrow good start for pheno studies with leptons in the initial state
- In principle, all lepton-lepton combinations are available and in a broad energy spectrum
- We have to explore all the physics opportunities offered by the monumental data campaign ongoing at the LHC!

• A crucial aspect which prevented so far to fully explore the phenomenology offered by lepton initiated processes is **the lack of a precise determination of the lepton densities**



[Bertone, Carrazza, Pagani, Zaro, JHEP (2015)]

Plan

Iepton-lepton scattering at the LHC LeptoQuarks

- Non-DY lepton pair production:
 - opposite sign and different flavor
 - same sign and different flavor
 - same sign and identical flavor



- Processes with small cross-section, but a typical signature (back-to-back leptons with no radiation)
- On general ground: one could make the partonic computation starting with (on-shell) photons
 - situation analogous as for b quarks (4Fvs5F modes)
 - In this case the balance is among large logs (numerical instabilities) and higher multiplicity vs resummation, good numerical control and simpler calculations
- Main background: double DY
 - we impose cuts to enhance S/B



- Non-DY lepton pair production:
 - opposite sign and different flavor
 - same sign and different flavor
 - same sign and identical flavor



Processes with small cross-section, but a typical signature (back-to-back leptons with no radiation)



- Going at NLO: we consider only the leading contribution and apply cuts to reduce double DY bkg
 - lepton pdf is suppressed by αL ($L = \log (Q^2 / \Lambda) \sim 1 / \alpha_S$) w.r.t the photon pdf
 - so, photon initiated real corrections (a), (b) and (c) are enhanced by $\alpha/(\alpha L) \sim \alpha_S$
 - (d) is special, collinear region (Compton scattering) suppressed with isolation (we use lepton mass as a natural regulator)
 - virtual contribution (α) are neglected

Scale dependence

[Buonocore, Nason, FT, Zanderighi, JHEP (2021)]



[Buonocore, Nason, FT, Zanderighi, JHEP (2021)]

Scale dependence: vary by 2 and 1/2 around

$$u_{F,max} \mid \sigma_{NLO}(\mu_{F,max}) = \max_{\mu} \sigma_{NLO}(\mu)$$

Cross sections @LHC13 (fb)

Proc.	$p_{ m cut}$	$K_{ m F}$		NLO		LO		HT
		min	\max	\min	\max	\min	\max	
	5	0.80	3.20	6.203	7.113	4.907	12.091	7.41
$e^+\mu^-$	10	0.70	2.80	1.451	1.604	1.116	2.563	1.67
	20	0.70	2.80	0.305	0.333	0.241	0.510	0.346
	5	0.50	2.00	4.961	5.515	3.521	9.127	6.65
$e^{-}\mu^{-}$	10	0.40	1.80	1.176	1.299	0.784	2.046	1.53
	20	0.40	1.60	0.264	0.280	0.183	0.409	0.322
e^+e^+	05	0.40	1.60	3.285	3.745	2.719	6.338	4.9
	10	0.35	1.40	0.777	0.853	0.602	1.363	1.05
	20	0.25	1.20	0.167	0.182	0.110	0.267	0.213

• strong reduction of (factorization) scale error



- HT: Hadronic Tenson computation, but also Highly non Trivial check!
- good agreement with full Hadronic Tensor computation (at all orders in QCD)
 - HT result slightly larger: in which kinematic region do they differ? can we improve the agreement?

• Where

• Why

[Buonocore, Nason, FT, Zanderighi, JHEP (2021)]



(ii) We veto events with extra leptons with $p_t > 0.9$ GeV in a cone of radius r < 0.3.



- NNLO contribution not included in our partonic computation
- the effect is strongly reduced by requiring:

(iii)
$$m_{l\ell} > |p_t^{(l)}| + |p_t^{(\ell)}|$$
 (cut A)

that also reduces double DY bkg





[Buonocore, Nason, FT, Zanderighi, JHEP (2021)]

• Signal and bkg (DDY) for the transverse momentum of the pair of leptons



(i) Both signal leptons must have $|\eta| < 2.4$, $p_t > p_{cut}$.

(cutT)

(ii) We veto events with extra leptons with $p_t > 0.9 \,\text{GeV}$ in a cone of radius r < 0.3.

(iii)
$$m_{l\ell} > |p_t^{(l)}| + |p_t^{(\ell)}|$$
 (cut A)
(iv) $|p_t^{l\ell}|/(|p_t^{(l)}| + |p_t^{(\ell)}|) < 0.2$ (cut B)

(v) If there is another lepton passing cuts i and ii with $p_t > 3 \text{ GeV}$ the event is vetoed (cut D).

[Buonocore, Nason, FT, Zanderighi, JHEP (2021)]

• Let's compare signal and bkg (DDY) for the transverse momentum of the pair of leptons

LHC13								
$e^-\mu^-$	Т	TA	TAB	TABD				
σ (fb), $p_{\rm cut} = 5 \text{GeV}$								
LO	$5.789^{+3.343}_{-2.267}$	$5.789^{+3.343}_{-2.267}$	$5.789^{+3.343}_{-2.267}$	$5.789^{+3.343}_{-2.267}$				
NLO	$5.53_{-0.57}$	$4.41_{-1.07}$	$2.21\substack{+0.59 \\ -1.95}$	$1.88\substack{+0.69\\-2.08}$				
LHE	$6.300_{-0.762}$	$5.493_{-0.591}$	$3.802_{-0.519}$	$3.580_{-0.544}$				
NLO+HW7	6.646	5.532	3.255	2.858				
HT	6.65	5.232	3.13	2.82				
DDY	104.	28.5	4.33	1.22				
σ (fb), $p_{\rm cut} = 10 { m GeV}$								
σ (fb), $p_{\rm cut}$ =	= 10 GeV							
σ (fb), $p_{cut} =$ LO	10 GeV $1.432^{+0.734}_{-0.520}$	$1.432^{+0.734}_{-0.520}$	$1.432\substack{+0.734\\-0.520}$	$1.432\substack{+0.734 \\ -0.520}$				
σ (fb), $p_{cut} =$ LO NLO	$ 10 \text{GeV} $ $ 1.432^{+0.734}_{-0.520} $ $ 1.28_{-0.14} $	$\frac{1.432^{+0.734}_{-0.520}}{1.03^{+0.02}_{-0.24}}$	$\frac{1.432^{+0.734}_{-0.520}}{0.56^{+0.15}_{-0.40}}$	$\frac{1.432^{+0.734}_{-0.520}}{0.31^{+0.23}_{-0.49}}$				
σ (fb), $p_{cut} =$ LO NLO LHE	$= 10 \text{ GeV}$ $1.432^{+0.734}_{-0.520}$ $1.28_{-0.14}$ $1.469_{-0.128}$	$\begin{array}{c} 1.432^{+0.734}_{-0.520} \\ 1.03^{+0.02}_{-0.24} \\ 1.281_{-0.093} \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 1.432^{+0.734}_{-0.520} \\ 0.56^{+0.15}_{-0.40} \\ 0.920_{-0.129} \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{r} 1.432\substack{+0.734\\-0.520}\\ 0.31\substack{+0.23\\-0.49}\\ 0.752_{-0.145}\end{array}$				
σ (fb), $p_{cut} =$ LO NLO LHE NLO+HW7	$= 10 \text{ GeV}$ $1.432^{+0.734}_{-0.520}$ $1.28_{-0.14}$ $1.469_{-0.128}$ 1.488	$\begin{array}{c} 1.432^{+0.734}_{-0.520}\\ 1.03^{+0.02}_{-0.24}\\ 1.281_{-0.093}\\ 1.262\end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 1.432\substack{+0.734\\-0.520}\\ 0.56\substack{+0.15\\-0.40}\\ 0.920_{-0.129}\\ 0.847\end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 1.432\substack{+0.734\\-0.520}\\ 0.31\substack{+0.23\\-0.49}\\ 0.752_{-0.145}\\ 0.664\end{array}$				
σ (fb), $p_{cut} =$ LO NLO LHE NLO+HW7 HT	$= 10 \text{ GeV}$ $1.432^{+0.734}_{-0.520}$ $1.28_{-0.14}$ $1.469_{-0.128}$ 1.488 1.53	$\begin{array}{c} 1.432^{+0.734}_{-0.520}\\ 1.03^{+0.02}_{-0.24}\\ 1.281_{-0.093}\\ 1.262\\ 1.234\end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 1.432^{+0.734}_{-0.520} \\ 0.56^{+0.15}_{-0.40} \\ 0.920_{-0.129} \\ 0.847 \\ 0.80 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 1.432\substack{+0.734\\-0.520}\\ 0.31\substack{+0.23\\-0.49}\\ 0.752_{-0.145}\\ 0.664\\ 0.63\end{array}$				

• Excellent agreement among NLO+PS and HT computations

[Buonocore, Nason, FT, Zanderighi, JHEP (2021)]

• Let's compare signal and bkg (DDY) for the transverse momentum of the pair of leptons

LHC13				 	
$e^-\mu^-$	Т	ТА	TAB	TABD	
σ (fb), $p_{\rm cut}$ =	= 5 GeV				
LO	$5.789^{+3.343}_{-2.267}$	$5.789^{+3.343}_{-2.267}$	$5.789^{+3.343}_{-2.267}$	$5.789^{+3.343}_{-2.267}$	
NLO	$5.53_{-0.57}$	$4.41_{-1.07}$	$2.21\substack{+0.59 \\ -1.95}$	$1.88\substack{+0.69\\-2.08}$	
LHE	$6.300_{-0.762}$	$5.493_{-0.591}$	$3.802_{-0.519}$	$3.580_{-0.544}$	
NLO+HW7	6.646	5.532	3.255	2.858	
HT	6.65	5.232	3.13	2.82	S at 2 4
DDY	104.	28.5	4.33	1.22	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{B}} \sim 2$
σ (fb), $p_{\rm cut} =$	= 10 GeV				V D
LO	$1.432^{+0.734}_{-0.520}$	$1.432\substack{+0.734 \\ -0.520}$	$1.432\substack{+0.734 \\ -0.520}$	$1.432\substack{+0.734\\-0.520}$	
NLO	$1.28_{-0.14}$	$1.03\substack{+0.02\\-0.24}$	$0.56\substack{+0.15 \\ -0.40}$	$0.31\substack{+0.23 \\ -0.49}$	
LHE	$1.469_{-0.128}$	$1.281_{-0.093}$	$0.920_{-0.129}$	$0.752_{-0.145}$	
NLO+HW7	1.488	1.262	0.847	0.664	
HT	1.53	1.234	0.80	0.63	$\frac{S}{} \sim 1$
DDY	51.7	17.	3.02	0.47	\sqrt{B}

- Lepton scattering at very high energy measurable at the LHC!
- on going analysis in both ATLAS and CMS

Precision vs New Physics



Search... All fields V Search Help | Advanced Search

High Energy Physics – Phenomenology

New submissions

Submissions received from Thu 8 Sep 22 to Fri 9 Sep 22, announced Mon, 12 Sep 22

- New submissions
- Cross-lists
- Replacements

[total of 38 entries: 1-38] [showing up to 2000 entries per page: fewer | more]

New submissions for Mon, 12 Sep 22

[1] arXiv:2209.03968 [pdf, other]

Standard Model Predictions for Rare K and B Decays without New Physics Infection

Andrzej J. Buras

Comments: 26 pages, 1 Figure

Subjects: High Energy Physics - Phenomenology (hep-ph); High Energy Physics - Experiment (hep-ex); High Energy Physics - Lattice (hep-lat)

The Standard Model (SM) does not contain by definition any new physics (NP) contributions to any observable but contains four CKM parameters which are not predicted by this model. We point out that if these four parameters are determined in a global fit that includes processes which are infected by NP, the resulting SM contributions to rare decay branching ratios cannot be considered as true SM contributions to the latter. On the other hand true SM predictions, that are free from the CKM dependence, can be obtained for suitable ratios of the K and B rare decay branching ratios to ΔM_s , ΔM_d and $|\varepsilon_K|$, all calculated within the SM. These three observables contain by now only small hadronic uncertainties and are already well measured so that rather precise true SM predictions for the ratios in question can be obtained. In this context the rapid test of NP infection in the $\Delta F = 2$ sector is provided by a $|V_{cb}| - \gamma$ plot that involves ΔM_s , ΔM_d , $|\varepsilon_K|$, and the mixing induced CP-asymmetry $S_{\psi K_s}$. As with the present hadronic matrix elements this test turns out to be negative, assuming negligible NP infection in the $\Delta F = 2$ sector and setting the values of these four observables to the experimental ones, allows to obtain SM predictions for 26 branching ratios for rare semileptonic and leptonic K and B decays with the $\mu^+\mu^-$ pair or the $\nu\bar{\nu}$ pair in the final state. Most interesting turn out to be the anomalies in the low q^2 bin in $B^+ \to K^+\mu^+\mu^-$ (5.1 σ) and $B_s \to \phi\mu^+\mu^-$ (4.8 σ).

• The way in which BSM Physics is perceived in our community is changing, but still....

- LQ naturally emerge in unified theories that shed some light on the mystery of fractional charge
- The existence of LQ is also invoked to justify some phenomenological anomalies
- So far LQ searches at the LHC proceed under the assumption of three production mechanisms with signatures made of 2 final state hard leptons, or 1 lepton+MET, plus jet(s) for the resonant searches



- Double production: coupling is α_S



• Single production: lq-coupling λ , wider phase space



• DY production: non resonant

Lentoullarks



Overview of CMS EXO results

17



scalar LQ (pair prod.), coupling to 1^{st} gen. fermions, $\beta = 1$ scalar LQ (pair prod.), coupling to 1^{st} gen. fermions, $\beta = 0.5$ scalar LQ (pair prod.), coupling to 2^{nd} gen. fermions, $\beta = 1$ scalar LQ (pair prod.), coupling to 2^{nd} gen. fermions, $\beta = 1$ scalar LQ (pair prod.), coupling to 2^{nd} gen. fermions, $\beta = 0.5$ scalar LQ (pair prod.), coupling to 3^{rd} gen. fermions, $\beta = 1$ scalar LQ (single prod.), coupling to 1^{st} gen. fermions, $\beta = 0$, $\lambda = 1$ scalar LQ (single prod.), coupling to 3^{rd} gen. fermions, $\beta = 1, \lambda = 1$





• ATLAS and CMS limits

[Schmaltz and Zhong, JHEP (2019)]



• ATLAS and CMS limits

[Schmaltz and Zhong, JHEP (2019)]



- Let's take for example: $M=2\,{
m TeV}$ and $\lambda_{S_{\mu\mu}}=y_{\mu\mu}=0.5$ and compute s-channel production rate

[Buonocore, Nason, FT, Zanderighi, JHEP (2021)]

• Let's consider the resonant LQ production as a lepton-quark fusion!





• Main background is $W(l\nu) + j$



• The second thing we discovered is that: our idea was good, but not new...



1994 paper: very interesting, but almost forgotten...

- Reasons to forget:
 - Results contain explicit logarithms of the electron and light quark masses
 - No recipe to compute errors

Estimate for signal and bkg



LHC, $\sqrt{s} = 13 \text{ TeV}$

[Buonocore, Haisch, Nason, FT, Zanderighi, PRL (2020)]

analysis cuts:

$$p_T^l, p_T^j > 500 \text{ GeV}$$

 $|\eta_l|, |\eta_j| < 2.5$
 $p_T^{\text{miss}} < 50 \text{ GeV}$

veto additional leptons and jets with: $|\eta_l|, |\eta_j| < 2.5$ $p_T^l > 7 \text{ GeV}$ $p_T^j > 30 \text{ GeV}$

[Buonocore, Haisch, Nason, FT, Zanderighi, PRL (2020)]

0.2

0.1

ec



- s-channel resonant LQ production provides comparable better limits for large couplings (complementarity)
- But...
 - signal is only LO accurate
 - no shower MC for initial state leptons at the time
 - we used PYTHIA exchanging an initial lepton with a photon (mis-modelling of radiation)
- Similar exercise done for the third generation

[Haisch, Polesello, JHEP (2021)]





— PP, 36 fb⁻¹ — DY, 36 fb⁻¹

3000

2000

M [GeV]

4000 5000

- Relaxing the approximations:
 - 1. compute NLO corrections in the production stage and let the shower describe all radiation from the decay product (including finite width effects).



Inclusive NLO results



In general:

- both QCD and QED corrections are large
- they cancel in part
- strong reduction on the factorization scale dep.

[Greljo, Selimović, JHEP (2020)]

- Relaxing the approximations:
 - 2. match fixed order computation to Herwig7 that now handle processes initiated by leptons
- Non trivial modification to the POWHEG-BOX
 - possibility to set the color charge ('3', '3bar', 'adj') of possible new (emitter) particles
 - updated logic for the contribution of the collinear remnants
 - ✓ from a constructions based on the <u>LO</u> existing subprocesses to one based on the radiation regions really present in the calculation, that in turn are determined by the analysis of the <u>REAL</u> subprocesses
 - these modifications makes the implementation of new processes much simpler and are very useful for debugging purposes (split of the calculation in subparts)

[Buonocore, Greljo, Krack, Nason, Selimović, FT, Zanderighi, 2209.02599 (2020)]

- Impact on the projected LHC bounds
- photon-quark vs lepton-quark scattering: mis-modeling of the hadronic activity First radiation generated by the shower is likely to be a colored parton most of the time while in a true lepton-quark scattering event, the photon splitting process $\gamma \rightarrow l\bar{l}$ competes with QCD radiation in the backward evolution
- Benchmark point with M = 3 TeV and $y_{eu} = 1$
- analysis cuts:
 - cut A: $|\eta_l|, |\eta_j| < 2.5$

• cut B: $p_T^l, p_T^j > 500 \,\text{GeV}$

veto additional leptons and jets with:

$$|\eta_l|, |\eta_j| < 2.5$$
, $p_T^l > 7 \,\text{GeV}$, $p_T^j > 30 \,\text{GeV}$

	cut A (noFSR)	$cut \ A{+}B \ ({ m noFSR})$	$cut \ A$	$cut \ A + B$
LO	0.96	0.89	0.96	0.89
LO+PS (HW7)	0.98	0.48	0.98	0.28
NLO_P	0.97	0.42	0.97	0.42
$\mathrm{NLO}_P+\mathrm{PS}\ (\mathrm{HW7})$	0.98	0.37	0.99	0.20
${ m LO+PS}_{\gamma q}~({ m PY8})$	0.97	0.51	0.98	0.29

- Inclusion of FSR reduces acceptance by 50%
- NLO+PS is 30% lower then LO+PS: ~15% relax on the limits reported in the previous slides)

Differential results: *lj*-mass system

- Radiation from the decay further reduces the acceptance. Since the NLO_P computation does not contain such effects, it fails to describe the total result.
- LO+PS predictions and the more accurate NLO_P+PS one includes radiative effects from the decay as modeled by FSR of the parton shower
- PS's usually provide a good description of FSR and one may expect that the NLO_P+PS description captures the main radiative effects (ME corrections)
- Nonetheless, given the impact of FSR on the acceptance, a natural extension of the this work would be to match the NLO computation for the 2 → 2 quarklepton processes to the parton shower, thus including radiation from all legs and (or) resonant intermediate states.

[Buonocore, Greljo, Krack, Nason, Selimović, FT, Zanderighi, 2209.02599 (2020)]



 $m_{\ell i}$ [GeV]



Conclusion

- Lepton pdfs allow for new searches at the LHC and the HL phase
- lepton scattering in proton collisions at very high energy is measurable!
- New BSM searches are possible
- Resonant production relevant in the case of LQ with relatively large coupling
- Simulation for NLO(prod)+PS is done and available on the POWHEG-BOX page

Conclusion

- Lepton pdfs allow for new searches at the LHC and the HL phase
- lepton scattering in proton collisions at very high energy is measurable!
- New BSM searches are possible
- Resonant production relevant in the case of LQ with relatively large coupling
- Simulation for NLO(prod)+PS is done and available on the POWHEG-BOX page

Stay tuned!

Backup slides

Differential results: *lj*-mass system

- with no FSR, all predictions are close-by among each other except LO+PS (HW7)
- Due to the different shower mechanisms and recoil prescriptions in Pythia8 and Herwig7, whose impact becomes less prominent after performing the matching to the NLO_P computation



1.00

0.75

0.50

2000 2250 2500 2750

3000 3250

 $m_{\ell j}$ [GeV]

 $3500 \quad 3750$

4000





Differential results: *lj*-mass system

- When FSR is excluded the NLO_P+PS (HW7) generator only mildly differs from the NLO_P one.
- Only the first few emissions are relevant for the computation of the acceptance



Differential results: *lj*-mass system

- With full simulation including FSR and vetoes there is a reduction for the predictions that contains effects beyond LO
- The radiative tail is effectively cut out



• Fully inclusive results at FCC-hh

$m_{ m LQ}[{ m TeV}]$	Partons	$\sigma_{\mathrm{S}^{1/3}}$ [pb]	$\sigma_{\mathrm{S}^{5/3}}$ [pb]
	u + e	$(1.06 \times 10^{-2})^{+3.0\%}_{-3.4\%} \pm 1.5\%$	$(1.14 \times 10^{-2})^{+2.9\%}_{-3.2\%} \pm 1.5\%$
	$u + \mu$	$(1.02 \times 10^{-2})^{+3.0\%}_{-3.4\%} \pm 1.5\%$	$(1.1 \times 10^{-2})^{+2.9\%}_{-3.2\%} \pm 1.5\%$
5.0	$u + \tau$	$(8.72 \times 10^{-3})^{+3.1\%}_{-3.5\%} \pm 1.6\%$	$(9.54 \times 10^{-3})^{+3.0\%}_{-3.3\%} \pm 1.6\%$
0.0	c + e	$(1.48 \times 10^{-3})^{+3.7\%}_{-4.2\%} \pm 7.5\%$	$(1.59 \times 10^{-3})^{+3.5\%}_{-3.9\%} \pm 7.6\%$
	$c + \mu$	$(1.45 \times 10^{-3})^{+3.7\%}_{-4.1\%} \pm 7.4\%$	$(1.55 \times 10^{-3})^{+3.5\%}_{-3.9\%} \pm 7.5\%$
	$c + \tau$	$(1.23 \times 10^{-3})^{+3.7\%}_{-4.2\%} \pm 7.5\%$	$(1.33 \times 10^{-3})^{+3.5\%}_{-4.0\%} \pm 7.5\%$
	t + e	$(3.18 imes 10^{-4})^{+7.0\%}_{-7.9\%} \pm 0.6\%$	$(3.05 imes 10^{-4})^{+7.3\%}_{-8.3\%}\pm 0.6\%$
	$t + \mu$	$(3.12 \times 10^{-4})^{+7.0\%}_{-7.9\%} \pm 0.6\%$	$(2.97 imes 10^{-4})^{+7.3\%}_{-8.3\%} \pm 0.6\%$
	$t + \tau$	$(2.63 \times 10^{-4})^{+7.3\%}_{-8.2\%} \pm 0.6\%$	$(2.49 \times 10^{-4})^{+7.6\%}_{-8.6\%} \pm 0.7\%$

- hierarchical for heavy quarks
- comparable for diff. leptons
- similar behavior for larger LQ masses

- no set with both top and lepton pdfs. top from the NNPDF31_nlo_as_0118_nf_6 set "added" to the LUXlep-NNPDF31_nlo_as_0118_luxqed
- xs involving top quarks are sizable
- promising prospects at the FCC-hh given the luminosity target is up to 30 ab⁻¹

$m_{ m LQ}$ [TeV]	Partons	$\sigma_{\mathrm{S}^{2/3}}$ [pb]	$\sigma_{\mathrm{S}^{4/3}} \; \mathrm{[pb]}$
	d + e	$(6.93 imes 10^{-3})^{+3.0\%}_{-3.3\%} \pm 1.6\%$	$(7.18 \times 10^{-3})^{+2.8\%}_{-3.2\%} \pm 1.6\%$
	$d + \mu$	$(6.72 \times 10^{-3})^{+2.9\%}_{-3.3\%} \pm 1.6\%$	$(6.98 \times 10^{-3})^{+2.9\%}_{-3.2\%} \pm 1.6\%$
5.0	$d + \tau$	$(5.74 \times 10^{-3})^{+3.1\%}_{-3.4\%} \pm 1.7\%$	$(5.99 \times 10^{-3})^{+3.1\%}_{-3.3\%} \pm 1.7\%$
	s + e	$(2.4 imes 10^{-3})^{+3.2\%}_{-3.6\%} \pm 3.8\%$	$(2.48 \times 10^{-3})^{+3.1\%}_{-3.5\%} \pm 3.9\%$
	$s + \mu$	$(2.34 imes 10^{-3})^{+3.2\%}_{-3.6\%} \pm 3.8\%$	$(2.42 \times 10^{-3})^{+3.1\%}_{-3.5\%} \pm 3.9\%$
	$s + \tau$	$(1.99 imes 10^{-3})^{+3.3\%}_{-3.7\%} \pm 3.9\%$	$(2.07 \times 10^{-3})^{+3.2\%}_{-3.6\%} \pm 3.9\%$
	b + e	$(1.11 imes 10^{-3})^{+3.8\%}_{-4.3\%} \pm 1.3\%$	$(1.15 \times 10^{-3})^{+3.7\%}_{-4.2\%} \pm 1.3\%$
	$b + \mu$	$(1.09 \times 10^{-3})^{+3.8\%}_{-4.3\%} \pm 1.3\%$	$(1.13 \times 10^{-3})^{+3.7\%}_{-4.2\%} \pm 1.3\%$
	$b + \tau$	$(9.22 \times 10^{-4})^{+3.9\%}_{-4.5\%} \pm 1.4\%$	$(9.62 \times 10^{-4})^{+3.8\%}_{-4.3\%} \pm 1.4\%$

[Buonocore, Greljo, Krack, Nason, Selimović, FT, Zanderighi, 2209.02599 (2020)]

• Example: S_3 model. Scalar leptoquark that is in a $\overline{3}$ of color and in a 3 of $SU(2)_L$ with Y = 1/3



 $-\mathcal{L} \supset \lambda_{q\ell} \bar{Q}_L^{Ca} \epsilon^{ab} (\sigma^k S_3^k)^{bc} L_L^c + \lambda_{qq} \bar{Q}_L^{Ca} \epsilon^{ab} ((\sigma^k S_3^k)^{\dagger})^{bc} Q_L^c + \text{h.c.}$

Simplified analisys:

- relatively narrow resonance
- fully inclusive
- 100 events