## Full event simulation of Photoproduction at NLO QCD in SHERPA DIS 2023 @ MSU

Peter Meinzinger

IPPP, Durham University

March 28th 2023

A D > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 0 < 0</p>

## Outline

Motivation

Photoproduction simulation

NLO calculation

Validation

Outlook: "All-inclusive" minimum bias

◆□ ▶ ◆□ ▶ ◆三 ▶ ◆三 ▶ ●□ ● ● ●

Notes on LHC and EIC physics

Conclusion

### What is photoproduction?

Consider electromagnetic interaction in lepton-lepton and lepton-hadron collisions



Discern two types of electromagnetic interaction: Electroproduction  $\Rightarrow$  high virtuality ( $\rightarrow$  e.g. DIS)

 $\textit{Photoproduction} \Rightarrow \textsf{low virtuality} \Rightarrow \textsf{"quasi-real photons"}$ 

## Why do we need photoproduction?

- 1. Direct measurements, e.g.
  - quartic gauge couplings, electromagnetic fluxes, Onium-states
  - QCD observables
  - BSM signals, e.g. ALPs
- 2. Background measurement
  - Dominant contribution for QCD at  $e^+e^-$  and  $e^-p^+$  colliders
  - complementary picture to DIS
- 3. Interplay of perturbative and non-perturbative QCD
  - evolution from real to virtual photons
  - parton content of photon and relation to vector meson states

see also talks by F. Staszewski and F. Krauss yesterday

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ヨ□ のへで

# The Equivalent Photon Approximation [1–3]

Observe that

- ▶ for photon virtuality  $Q^2 < \Lambda^2_{cut}$ , the photo-absorption cross-section can be approximated by its mass-shell value
- the same domain gives the dominant contribution in photoproduction
- ▶ approximate the cross-section by  $d\sigma_{eX} = \sigma_{\gamma X}(Q^2 = 0)dn$ , with dn the photon spectrum

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ヨ□ のへで

- $\Rightarrow Q_{\max}^2$  is process-/experiment-dependent
  - form factors for protons implemented, too
  - also extendible for ions (WIP)
  - corresponds to elastic production modes

#### Plotting the spectrum for electrons

$$\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{n} = \frac{\alpha_{\mathrm{em}}}{2\pi} \frac{\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}}{\boldsymbol{x}} \left[ \left( 1 + (1-\boldsymbol{x})^2 \right) \log \left( \frac{Q_{\mathrm{max}}^2}{Q_{\mathrm{min}}^2} \right) + 2m_e^2 \boldsymbol{x}^2 \left( \frac{1}{Q_{\mathrm{min}}^2} - \frac{1}{Q_{\mathrm{max}}^2} \right) \right]$$

with x the energy fraction,  $Q^2$  the virtualities.



## Photon PDFs

The total physical cross-section is given by

$$d\sigma^{(\gamma_H)}(P_{\gamma}, P_H) = d\sigma^{(\gamma_H)}_{\text{point}}(P_{\gamma}, P_H) + d\sigma^{(\gamma_H)}_{\text{hadr}}(P_{\gamma}, P_H)$$

with

$$\begin{split} d\sigma_{\text{point}}^{(\gamma_H)}(P_{\gamma}, P_{\scriptscriptstyle H}) &= \sum_{j} \int dx f_{j}^{({\scriptscriptstyle H})}(x, \mu_{\scriptscriptstyle F}) d\hat{\sigma}_{\gamma j}(P_{\gamma}, x P_{\scriptscriptstyle H}, \alpha_{\scriptscriptstyle S}(\mu_{\scriptscriptstyle R}), \mu_{\scriptscriptstyle R}, \mu_{\scriptscriptstyle F}, \mu_{\gamma}) \\ d\sigma_{\text{hadr}}^{(\gamma_H)}(P_{\gamma}, P_{\scriptscriptstyle H}) &= \sum_{ij} \int dx dy f_{i}^{(\gamma)}(x, \mu_{\gamma}) f_{j}^{({\scriptscriptstyle H})}(y, \mu_{\scriptscriptstyle F}') \\ &\times d\hat{\sigma}_{ij}(x P_{\gamma}, y P_{\scriptscriptstyle H}, \alpha_{\scriptscriptstyle S}(\mu_{\scriptscriptstyle R}'), \mu_{\scriptscriptstyle R}', \mu_{\scriptscriptstyle F}', \mu_{\gamma}) \end{split}$$

and the evolution obeys

$$\frac{\partial f_i^{(\gamma)}}{\partial \log \mu^2} = \frac{\alpha_{\rm em}}{2\pi} P_{i\gamma} + \frac{\alpha_s}{2\pi} \sum_j P_{ij} \otimes f_j^{(\gamma)}$$

Dependence on  $\mu_{\gamma}$  only cancels in the physical cross-section!

# Photon PDFs

Included in SHERPA: Glück-Reya-Vogt [4], Glück-Reya-Schienbein [5], Slominski-Abramowicz-Levy [6], Schuler-Sjöstrand [7, 8]

- need non-perturbative input from ρ<sup>0</sup>, ω and φ
- GRS and SaS also for virtual photon
- many more available, but rather hard to find
- uncertainties of factor
   \$\mathcal{O}\$(10)\$
- new fit to data possible?



# NLO matching

[hep-ph/9306337]

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ヨ□ のへで

- collinear singularities of the photon can be subtracted
   ⇒ cancel against PDF
- all the (factorisation) scales can be chosen equal
- $\blacktriangleright$  MC@NLO matching possible under neglection of inhomogenous term in DGLAP and for PDFs with  $\overline{\rm MS}$  scheme
- $\Rightarrow$  update photoproduction phenomenology with the LHC machinery

(Note:  $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow$  QED FS is already available in SHERPA)

## Some technical remarks

Typical observables are:

- (average) jet transverse energy  $E_T$
- pseudo-rapidity  $\eta$
- ▶  $\cos \Theta^*$ , the angle between the two jets (approximately)
- $\triangleright$   $x_{\gamma}^{\pm}$ , which is defined as

$$x_{\gamma}^{\pm} = \frac{\sum_{j=1,2} E^{(j)} \pm p_{z}^{(j)}}{\sum_{i \in hfs} E^{(i)} \pm p_{z}^{(i)}}$$
(1)

Setup:

- MC@NLO (di-)jet production for LEP data and HERA data
- 1M weighted events including 7-point scale variation
- c- and b-quarks are massive
- Disclaimer: preliminary results

### Photoproduction cross-section, exemplified for LEP

Three different hard processes: direct, single-resolved and double-resolved:  $\sigma_{tot} = \sigma_{\gamma\gamma} + 2\sigma_{j\gamma} + \sigma_{jj}$ 



▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ヨ□ のへで

Validated against data from ZEUS, OPAL and L3.

### SHERPA calculations for LEP at LO – preliminary



Figure: Distribution for jet transverse momentum  $p_T$  for LEP at  $\sqrt{s} = 206$  GeV, averaged over all 10 PDF sets.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ >

### SHERPA calculations for LEP at MC@NLO – preliminary



Figure: Distribution for average jet transverse energy  $\bar{E}_{\overline{F}}$  for EP at  $\sqrt{s} \equiv 198 \equiv 900$ 

### SHERPA calculations for HERA at MC@NLO – preliminary



Figure: Distribution for jet transverse energy €7 for HERA. < ■ > ■ = つへで

# Extension to inclusive modes

Multiple-parton interactions are non-negligible in photoproduction

[Z.Phys.C 72 (1996) 637-646]

Implementation based on [Sjostrand:1987su]

- But why stop there?
  - EPA combinable with (non-)elastic LUXqed PDFs for semi-diffractive production
  - Same framework can be used for Pomeron flux
  - Factorise the multi-parton interaction model
  - Allow MPIs for photon-photon, photon-proton and proton-proton interactions
  - Model includes diffractive and elastic modes
  - Tuning in progress

Arrive at a fully-inclusive picture of the interaction in proton–proton and proton–electron collisions

Interesting starting point for study of non-perturbative collider physics

# LHC and EIC physics

LHC:

Pomeron flux allows for, e.g., Instanton search, c.f. [Eur.Phys.J.C 83 (2023) 1, 35]

Study of forward physics without Sudakov on impact parameter EIC:

- > Step towards complete description of events over full  $Q^2$  region
- ► diffractive and semi-inclusive production would need form factors for proton diffraction and  $\gamma \rightarrow V$  transition probability

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ヨ□ のへで

# Conclusion

- wealth of physics there to explore
- Simulation in SHERPA validated against LEP and HERA data
- Uncertainties in QCD observables dominated by photon PDFs
- NLO<sub>QCD</sub> matching achieved, validation is WIP
- Generalized mulitple interaction model will allow new perspective on inclusive measurements

Step towards updating photon physics onto state-of-the-art machinery

Thank you for the attention!

・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・

- C. F. v. Weizsäcker. 'Ausstrahlung bei Stössen sehr schneller Elektronen'. In: Z. Phys. 88.9-10 (1934), pp. 612–625.
- [2] E. J. Williams. 'Nature of the High Energy Particles of Penetrating Radiation and Status of Ionization and Radiation Formulae'. In: *Phys. Rev.* 45.10 (May 1934), pp. 729–730.
- [3] V. M. Budnev et al. 'The two-photon particle production mechanism. Physical problems. Applications. Equivalent photon approximation'. In: *Physics Reports* 15.4 (Jan. 1975), pp. 181–282.
- [4] M. Glück, E. Reya and A. Vogt. 'Photonic parton distributions'. In: *Phys. Rev. D* 46.5 (Sept. 1992), pp. 1973–1979.
- M. Glück, E. Reya and I. Schienbein. 'Radiatively Generated Parton Distributions of Real and Virtual Photons'. In: *Phys.Rev.D60:054019,1999; Erratum-ibid.D62:019902,2000* 60 (Mar. 1999).
- [6] W. Slominski, H. Abramowicz and A. Levy. 'NLO photon parton parametrization using ee and ep data'. In: *Eur. Phys. J. C* 45 (Apr. 2006), pp. 633–641.

- [7] Gerhard A. Schuler and Torbjörn Sjöstrand. 'Low- and high-mass components of the photon distribution functions'. In: Z. Phys. C 68.4 (Dec. 1995), pp. 607–623.
- [8] Gerhard A. Schuler and Torbjörn Sjöstrand. 'Parton Distributions of the Virtual Photon'. In: *Phys. Lett. B* 376 (Jan. 1996), pp. 193–200.
- [9] Gerhard A. Schuler and Torbjörn Sjöstrand. 'Towards a Complete Description of High-Energy Photoproduction'. In: *Nuclear Physics B* 407.3 (Oct. 1993), pp. 539–605.
- T. H. Bauer et al. 'The hadronic properties of the photon in high-energy interactions'. In: *Reviews of Modern Physics* 50.2 (Apr. 1978). [Erratum: Rev.Mod.Phys. 51, 407 (1979)], pp. 261–436.
- J. M. Butterworth, J. R. Forshaw and M. H. Seymour.
   'Multiparton Interactions in Photoproduction at HERA'. In: Z. Phys. C 72 (Jan. 1996), pp. 637–646.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆目▶ ◆目▶ ④○♡

# Backup

## Extension to virtual photons: VMD-type model [9, 10]

*Vector-Meson Dominance model* – needed for stringent description of event characteristics

Photonic interaction can be either **bare** or through fermionic fluctuations:

- $\blacktriangleright \ \text{leptonic} \rightarrow \text{negligible for jet production}$
- ▶ 'hard' quarks →  $p_{\perp}^2 \sim Q^2 > 0$  → short-lived and perturbatively calculable
- ▶ 'soft' quarks  $\rightarrow p_{\perp}^2 \sim Q^2 \approx 0 \rightarrow$  long-lived and non-perturbative  $\rightarrow$  meson production and non-perturbative hadron physics

 $(Q^2 - virtuality)$ 

(日)
 (日)

 (日)

 (日)

 (日)

 (日)

 (日)

 (日)

 (日)

 (日)

 (日)

 (日)

 (日)

 (日)

 (日)

 (日)

 (日)

 (日)

 (日)

 (日)

 (日)

 (日)

 (日)

 (日)

 (日)

 (日)

 (日)

 (日)

 (日)

 (日)

 (日)

 (日)

 (日)

 (日)

 (日)

 (日)

 (日)

 (日)

 (日)

 (日)

 (日)

 (日)

 (日)

 (日)

 (日)

 (日)

 (日)

 (日)

 (日)

 (日)

 (日)

 (日)

 (日)

 (日)

 (日)

 (日)

 (日)

#### The phase space setup



Figure: Schematic sketch of the phase space mappings between the Equivalent Photon Approximation (EPA) and the Initial State Radiation (ISR), and the Matrix Element (ME).

#### SHERPA calculations for LEP – preliminary



### SHERPA calculations for LEP



Figure: Distributions  $x_{\gamma}^{\pm}$ , collectively denoted as  $x_{\gamma}$  in different bins of average transverse jet energy:  $\bar{E}_{T} \in [5 \text{ GeV}, 7 \text{ GeV}]$  (left),  $\bar{E}_{T} \in [7 \text{ GeV}, 11 \text{ GeV}]$  (middle),  $\bar{E}_{T} \in [11 \text{ GeV}, 25 \text{ GeV}]$  (right). Results of the SHERPA simulation are compared with results from OPAL at an  $e^{-}e^{+}$  c.m.-energy of 198 GeV.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ >

#### SHERPA calculations for HERA at LO – preliminary



Figure: Distribution for jet pseudo-rapidity  $\eta$  for HERA. The drop at  $\eta > 1.5$  is  $\circ \circ \circ$