



Global SMEFT fits from (HL)-LHC to future colliders

Jaco ter Hoeve 20/07





The high energy landscape

Lots of impressive cross-section measurements, but no clear deviation from the SM (yet) ...

... so we study their overall pattern!

[ATL-PHYS-PUB-2023-039]



Why global SMEFT fits?

- The SMEFT is our universal tool to search for BSM physics above the EW scale, with minimal assumptions on what it may look like
- Given the **cross-talk** between Higgs, top, diboson and EWPO (and flavour and low energy observables), a simultaneous fit is our only way forward
- Challenge: a large number of operators, with many datasets needed to break degeneracies



[2012.02779] Fitmaker collaboration



Anke Biekötter - HET seminar Brookhaven

Jaco ter Hoeve - ICHEP - 20/07/24

►

E. Celada, T. Giani, L. Mantani, J. Rojo, A. Rossia, M. Thomas, E. Vryonidou , JtH

[2404.12809] (Submitted to JHEP)

SMEFiT under the hood



SMEFiT3.0 in a nutshell

- SMEFiT2.0 extended with recent datasets in **top, diboson and Higgs production** based on the full Run II luminosity
- Full **independent treatment of the EWPOs** from LEP and SLD
- Dedicated **projection module** to extrapolate Run II data to HL-LHC
- FCC-ee and CEPC pseudodata from Snowmass predictions [2206.08326], updated to 4 IPs as per the FCC feasibility midterm report
- Both results in terms of Wilson coefficients and **UV-complete models**
- **Public code, data and theory**: results are fully reproducible





"Spider plots / Antarctica plots"

►

►

►

►

Full treatment of EWPOs

In the SMEFT, the SM couplings receive corrections from dim-6 operators



- SMEFiT2.0: assumed measurements at LEP were precise enough to set the coupling shifts to zero: 14 constraints, 16 d.o.f
- SMEFiT3.0: hardwired constraints get no longer imposed, EWPOs are treated on the same footing as (existing) LHC data: 14 extra d.o.f

Full treatment of EWPOs

In the SMEFT, the SM couplings receive corrections from dim-6 operators



- SMEFiT2.0: assumed measurements at LEP were precise enough to set the coupling shifts to zero: 14 constraints, 16 d.o.f
- SMEFiT3.0: hardwired constraints get no longer imposed, EWPOs are treated on the same footing as (existing) LHC data: 14 extra d.o.f

SMEFiT3.0 is simultaneously sensitive to 45 (50) Wilson coefficients at the linear (quadratic) level!







Dataset upgrade

Extend SMEFiT2.0 with recent Run II datasets from top, diboson and Higgs production

Catagory	Processes	[2105.00006] $n_{ m dat}$					
	110065565	SMEFIT2.0	SMEF1T3.0				
	$t\bar{t} + X$	94	115				
	$tar{t}Z,tar{t}W$	14	21				
	$tar{t}\gamma$	-	2				
Top quark production	single top (inclusive)	27	28				
	tZ,tW	9	13				
	$tar{t}tar{t}$, $tar{t}bar{b}$	6	12				
	Total	150	189				
	Run I signal strengths	22	22				
Higgs production	Run II signal strengths	40	40				
and decay	Run II, differential distributions & STXS	35	71				
	Total	97	133				
	LEP-2	40	40				
Diboson production	LHC	30	41				
	Total	70	81				
Z-pole EWPOs	LEP-2	-	44				
Baseline dataset	Total	317	449				

Flavour assumption: $U(2)_q \times U(3)_d \times U(2)_u \times (U(1)_\ell \times U(1)_e)^3$







Result: HL-LHC

Ratio of Uncertainties to SMEFiT3.0 Baseline, $\mathcal{O}(\Lambda^{-2})$, Marginalised

- We project all RunII datasets from the SMEFiT 3.0 baseline: one for each process and final state see backup for details
- We see an improvement ranging from 20 to 70 % in the marginalised fit
- The EW operators only improve in the marginalised fit because of correlations



Result: FCC-ee

Dataset input

- ▶ EWPOs at the Z-pole
- Light fermion pair prediction
- Higgsstrahlung and VBF
- Gauge boson pair production
- Top-quark pair production
- Optimal Observables

Enormy (/s)	$\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{int}}$ (Run time)							
Energy (\sqrt{s})	FCC-ee	CEPC						
91 GeV (Z-pole)	$300 \text{ ab}^{-1} (4 \text{ years})$	$100 \text{ ab}^{-1} (2 \text{ years})$						
161 GeV $(2 m_W)$	$20 \text{ ab}^{-1} (2 \text{ years})$	6 ab^{-1} (1 year)						
$240~{ m GeV}$	$10 \text{ ab}^{-1} (3 \text{ years})$	$20 \text{ ab}^{-1} (10 \text{ years})$						
$350~{ m GeV}$	$0.4 \text{ ab}^{-1} (1 \text{ years})$	-						
$365 { m ~GeV} (2 m_t)$	3 ab^{-1} (4 years)	1 ab^{-1} (5 years)						

Ratio of Uncertainties to SMEFiT3.0 Baseline, $\mathcal{O}(\Lambda^{-4})$, Marginalised



Result: FCC-ee energy breakdown

Ratio of Uncertainties to SMEFiT3.0 Baseline, $\mathcal{O}(\Lambda^{-2})$, Marginalised

- The FCC-ee plans to operate sequentially, hence we need to study the impact at the various energies
- Largest impact for Z-pole at 91 GeV plus the Higgs factory run at 240 GeV
- We can try other combinations too in order to find the most optimal run order for the SMEFT





UV-complete models

- We quantify the mass reach of one-particle extensions of the SM matched at tree level
- Future colliders will give an unprecedented indirect mass reach: 100 TeV, 10 TeV and 70 TeV for some of the heavy scalars, fermion, vector bosons (assuming $g_{\rm UV} = 1$)
- Models sensitive to EW operators are dominantly constrained at the FCC-ee

	Scalars		Fermions		Vectors
Particle	Irrep	Particle	Irrep	Particle	Irrep
S	$(1,1)_{0}$	N	$(1,1)_{0}$	B	$(1,1)_{0}$
\mathcal{S}_1	$(1,1)_1$	E	$(1,1)_{-1}$	\mathcal{B}_1	$(1,1)_{1}$
ϕ	$(1,2)_{1/2}$	Δ_1	$(1,2)_{-1/2}$	w	$(1,3)_0$
Ξ	$(1,3)_0$	Δ_3	$(1,2)_{-3/2}$	\mathcal{W}_1	$(1,3)_1$
Ξ1	$(1,3)_1$	Σ	$(1,3)_{0}$	G	$(8,1)_{0}$
ω_1	$(3,1)_{-1/3}$	Σ_1	$(1,3)_{-1}$	н	$(8,3)_{0}$
ω_4	$(3,1)_{-4/3}$	U	$(3,1)_{2/3}$	\mathcal{Q}_5	$(8,3)_{0}$
ζ	$(3,3)_{-1/3}$	D	$(3,1)_{-1/3}$	\mathcal{Y}_5	$(ar{6},2)_{-5/6}$
Ω_1	$(6,1)_{1/3}$	Q_1	$(3,2)_{1/6}$		
Ω_4	$(6,1)_{4/3}$	Q_7	$(3,2)_{7/6}$		
Υ	$(6,3)_{1/3}$	T_1	$(3,3)_{-1/3}$		
Φ	$(8,2)_{1/2}$	T_2	$(3,3)_{2/3}$		
		Q_5	$(3,2)_{-5/6}$		

Conclusion and outlook

- New physics might be just around the corner, and the SMEFT provides the ideal framework to capture its effects with a minimal set of model assumptions
- SMEFiT3.0: the biggest global SMEFT analysis to date with 50 WC to 449 datapoints
- Demonstrated the impact of HL-LHC and FCC-ee on the global SMEFT parameter space
- The FCC-ee offers an unprecedented indirect mass reach on new heavy particles

Conclusion and outlook

- New physics might be just around the corner, and the SMEFT provides the ideal framework to capture its effects with a minimal set of model assumptions
- SMEFiT3.0: the biggest global SMEFT analysis to date with 50 WC to 449 datapoints
- Demonstrated the impact of HL-LHC and FCC-ee on the global SMEFT parameter space
- The FCC-ee offers an unprecedented indirect mass reach on new heavy particles

Contact: jthoeve@nikhef.nl

Thanks for your attention!

Backup

HL-LHC projections

 The central values of the pseudo data are fluctuated around the SM

$$\mathcal{O}_i^{(\text{exp})} = \mathcal{O}_i^{(\text{th})} \left(1 + r_i \delta_i^{(\text{stat})} + \sum_{k=1}^{n_{\text{sys}}} r_{k,i} \delta_{k,i}^{(\text{sys})} \right)$$

 Statistical uncertainties we rescale according to the improved luminosity

$$\delta_i^{(\text{stat})} = \tilde{\delta}_i^{(\text{stat})} \sqrt{\frac{\mathcal{L}_{\text{Run2}}}{\mathcal{L}_{\text{HLLHC}}}}$$

 While systematics are rescaled by an overall factor, namely 1/2 for all datasets

$$\delta_{k,i}^{(\mathrm{sys})} = \tilde{\delta}_{k,i}^{(\mathrm{sys})} \times f_{\mathrm{red}}^{(k)} \qquad k = 1, \dots, n_{\mathrm{sys}}$$



+ flexible framework that can project any Run II dataset

- + SMEFT predictions can be recycled
 - No additional bins in the tails



Fit residuals (pulls) are largely **consistent** with the SM

$$P_i \equiv rac{\langle c_i
angle - c_i^{(\mathrm{SM})}}{\left[c_i^{\min}, c_i^{\max}
ight]^{68\% \ \mathrm{CI}}}$$

Large correlations in linear fit get lifted in the quadratic fit



Correlation: NLO $\mathcal{O}(\Lambda^{-2})$



Fit residuals (pulls) are largely **consistent** with the SM

$$P_{i} \equiv \frac{\langle c_{i} \rangle - c_{i}^{(\text{SM})}}{\left[c_{i}^{\min}, c_{i}^{\max}\right]^{68\% \text{ CI}}}$$

Large correlations in linear fit get lifted in the quadratic fit



Correlation: NLO $\mathcal{O}\left(\Lambda^{-4}\right)$

	LEP	$t\bar{t}$ 8 TeV	$tar{t}$ 13 TeV	$t\bar{t}\gamma$	$t\bar{t}W$	$t\bar{t}Z$	t 8 TeV	$t 13 \mathrm{TeV}$	tW	tZ	$t\bar{t}A_c$	W helicities	$t\bar{t}t\bar{t}+t\bar{t}b\bar{b}$	Higgs-run I	Higgs-run II	AA	$t\bar{t}$ 13 TeV HL-LHC	ttW HL-LHC	$t\bar{t}Z$ HL-LHC	t 13 TeV HL-LHC	tW HL-LHC	tZ HL-LHC	$t\bar{t}A_c$ HL-LHC	W helicities HL-LH	$t\bar{t}t\bar{t} + t\bar{t}b\bar{b}$ HL-LHC	Higgs HL-LHC	VV HL-LHC	FCC-ee 91 GeV	FCC-ee 161 GeV	FCC-ee 240 GeV	FCC-ee 365 GeV		0
c_{QQ}^1													14.0												86.0							1	U
c_{QQ}^8													15.1												84.9								
c_{Qt}^{1}													18.1												81.9						_		
c_{Qt}°													14.1												85.9						_		
c_{tt}^{-} 1.8		0.4	84	0.2	16	13					9.1		0.0	0.0	0.1		22.7	79	63				417		0.1	01							
$c_{Qq} = 1,1$		0.3	10.4	0.2	1.0	1.0					11.6		0.0	0.0	0.1		31.2	7.0	0.0				46.4		0.2	0.1					_		
$c_{Qq} = 3,8$		0.3	2.2	0.3	1.9	1.0	1.2	0.3			13.6		0.0	0.0	0.1		4.3	9.2	4.6	1.3			59.6		0.1	0.0							
C_{Qq}^{Qq} .		0.0	0.0				15.2	7.7		4.8	0.1		0.0		0.0		0.1			40.0		31.6	0.4		0.0	0.0							
C_{Qq} .		0.5	6.9	1.0	4.1	2.3					8.1		0.1	0.0	0.3		7.0	20.1	10.4				38.6		0.5	0.1							
c_{tq}^1 .		0.2	10.1								12.3		0.0				29.1						48.2		0.1							- 8	0
c_{tu}^8		0.4	8.9	0.3		0.1					13.5		0.0	0.0	0.1		14.9		0.8				60.7		0.2	0.1							
c_{tu}^1		0.2	8.9								12.7		0.0				26.9						51.1		0.2								
8		0.8	3.7	2.5		1.0					13.7		0.1	0.0	0.4		6.9		5.2				64.8		0.7	0.2							
1 1 1 1 1		0.3	11.0								12.4		0.0				27.7						48.5		0.1								
c_{td}^8		0.7	14.4	0.3		0.4					9.7		0.0	0.0	0.2		29.1		2.0				42.8		0.2	0.1						Ì	
c_{td}^1		0.5	13.8								9.6		0.0				38.8						37.1		0.2								
$\left[\frac{28}{Qd} \right]$		1.5	8.7	0.2		2.4					9.4		0.1	0.0	0.5		21.2		12.1				42.9		0.8	0.2							
$\frac{1}{Qd}$		0.4	13.8								10.2		0.0				35.6						40.0		0.1								
$c_{c\varphi}$														0.0	0.0											0.1				78.8	21.1	6	:0
$c_{b\varphi}$														0.0	0.1											0.3				70.5	29.1	ľ	^o
$c_{t\varphi}$														0.5	3.9											16.9				53.6	25.1		
$\tau \varphi$														0.0	0.1											0.0				78.7	21.2		
G d		1.8	1.3	0.1	0.0	0.1			0.0		0.0	0.0	0.1	1.3	9.1		7.5	0.1	0.9		0.0		0.0	0.0	0.4	39.9				25.4	11.9		
tW				0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		1.9		2.3	12.5				0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0		4.1		41.8				26.1	10.9		
C_{tZ}				0.0		0.0				0.0				2.5	13.3				0.0			0.0				44.6				27.9	11.6		
(3) φq (2)	3.2				0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0				0.0	0.1	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0				1.8	0.5	84.8	3.4	3.5	2.7		
$Q = \frac{1}{2}$	1.8					0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0				0.0	0.0	0.0			0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0				0.0	0.0	98.1		0.0	0.0		
p_q'	1.5					0.0				0.0				0.0	0.0	0.0			0.0			0.0				0.3	0.0	82.2		14.5	1.5		
\hat{Q}	3.8					0.0				0.0				0.0	0.0	0.0			0.0			0.0				1.1	0.0	95.1		0.0	1.0	- 4	0
φu	4.5					0.0								0.0	0.1	0.0			0.0							0.2	0.0	95.2		0.0	0.0		
φd						11.2				0.1				0.3	1.8				74.8			0.5				6.2				3.6	1.5		
·φt	1.6													0.0	0.0	0.0										0.0	0.0	42.5	0.0	28.7	27.2		
φ_{l_1}	4.6													0.0	0.0	0.0										0.0	0.0	78.1		15.6	1.7		
φ_{l_2}	3.1													0.0	0.0	0.0										0.0	0.0	81.4		13.9	1.5		
(3)	0.1			0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0				0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0				0.0	0.0	3.1	4.2	79.6	12.9		
(3)	0.1			0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0				0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0				0.0	0.0	1.1	5.1	82.5	11.2		
φ_{l_2} (3)	2.4													0.0	0.0	0.0										0.0	0.0	68.5	6.7	16.2	6.3		
'φl ₃ - Cwe	1.5													0.0	0.0	0.0										0.0	0.0	31.0	0.0	41.5	25.9		
Cou	4.3													0.0	0.0	0.0										0.0	0.0	78.6		15.4	1.7	- 2	.0
$c_{\varphi\tau}$	3.5													0.0	0.0	0.0										0.0	0.0	81.7		13.3	1.5		
c_{ll}	0.0			0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0				0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0				0.0	0.0	0.1	2.5	52.9	44.5		
ρG														0.3	2.5											10.9				58.7	27.6		
φB														2.5	13.2											44.1				28.6	11.7		
W														1.1	5.8											19.4				46.4	27.3		
VB	0.0			0.0		0.0				0.0				0.0	0.0	0.0			0.0			0.0				0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	88.6	11.1		
W	0.2									0.0						0.1						0.0					4.8		0.0	63.4	31.4		
$\rho \Box$														0.0	0.1											0.2				75.2	24.5		
	0.1			0.0		0.0				0.0				0.0	0.0	0.0			0.0			0.0				0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	88.8	11.0		

Normalized Value

Fisher information study

 The sensitivity of the EFT parameters to the Run II, HL-LHC and FCC-ee datasets is quantified by the fisher information

$$I_{ij} = \sum_{m=1}^{n_{\text{dat}}} \frac{\sigma_{m,i}^{(\text{eft})} \sigma_{m,j}^{(\text{eft})}}{\delta_{\exp,m}^2}$$

- The highest sensitivity in the 2FB sector comes in via the FCC-ee
- The FCC-ee run at 161 GeV is the least sensitive for the SMEFT

LEP	$t\bar{t}$ 8 TeV	$tar{t}$ 13 TeV	$tar{t}\gamma$	$t\bar{t}W$	$t\bar{t}Z$	$t \ 8 \ { m TeV}$	$t \ 13 { m TeV}$	tW	tZ	$t\bar{t}A_c$	W helicities	$t\bar{t}t\bar{t} + t\bar{t}b\bar{b}$	Higgs-run I Higgs-run II		$t\bar{t}$ 13 TeV HL-LHC	tłW HL-LHC	$t\bar{t}Z$ HL-LHC	t 13 TeV HL-LHC	tw hll-lhC	$t\bar{t} A_c$ HL-LHC	W helicities HL-LH	$t\bar{t}t\bar{t} + t\bar{t}b\bar{b}$ HL-LHC	Higgs HL-LHC	VV HL-LHC	FCC-ee 91 GeV	FCC-ee 161 GeV	FCC-ee 240 GeV	FCC-ee 365 GeV	
2												14.0 15.1																	
t .												18.1										81.9							
t _												14.1																	
8	0.4	8.4	0.2	1.6	1.3					9.1		0.0	0.0 0.1		22.7	7 7.9	6.3			41.7		86.0	0.1						
q1	0.3	10.4								11.6		0.0		(3	5)		•		0.5		07	1.2							
q . 8	0.3	2.2	0.3	1.9	1.0	1.2	0.3			13.6		0.0	($C_{\varphi_i}^{(0)}$	q	84.	8	3.4	3.5		2.7).	0.0						
$\begin{bmatrix} q \\ 1 \\ q \end{bmatrix}$	0.0	0.0				15.2	7.7		4.8	0.1		0.0		(3))	98.	1		0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0						
g	0.5	6.9	1.0	4.1	2.3					8.1		0.1	(φ	Q.							0.5							
<i>q</i> .	0.2	10.1								12.3		0.0	C	.(-	-)	82.	2		14.	5	1.5).1							
u	0.4	8.9	0.3		0.1					13.5		0.0	C	(-)		00	_		10.		1.0).2	0.1						
<i>u</i>	0.2	3.7	2.5		1.0					12.7		0.0	0		$\hat{\mathbf{b}}$	80.	1		16.	1	1.6).2).7	0.2						
u	0.3	11.0								12.4		0.0		74 C	6	95.	1		0.0		0.0	0.1							
	0.7	14.4	0.3		0.4					9.7		0.0		$\varphi \varphi$	u -).2	0.1						
	0.5	13.8								9.6		0.0		c_{ω}	d	95.	2		0.0		0.0).2							
d	1.5	8.7	0.2		2.4					9.4		0.1		r).8	0.2						
d	0.4	13.8								10.2		0.0		c_{arphi}	bt				3.6		1.5	0.1							
φ														• 1	,	42.	5	0.0	28.7	7 2	27.2		0.1				78.8	21.1	
φ													Ċ	$-\varphi l$	^l 1 -		-						16.9				51.6	25.1	
₽													(Col	1.	78.	1		15.6	6	1.7		0.0				78.	21.2	
μ	1.8	1.3	0.1	0.0	0.1			0.0		0.0	0.0	0.1		φ	·2 -								39.9				25.4	11.9	
V			0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		1.9		($^{2}arphi l$	l_3	81.	4		13.9	Э	1.5		418				26.1	1.9	
z]			0.0		0.0				0.0					(3	3)	31	1	42	79 6	5 1	29		44.6				27.9	11.	
3.2				0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0				($\hat{\varphi}_{i}$	\hat{l}_1 .								1.8	0.5	84.8	3.4	3.5	2.7	
) 1.8					0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0					(3))	1.1	1	5.1	82.5	5 1	11.2		0.0	0.0	98.1		0.0	0.0	
) 1.5					0.0				0.0				,	φ_{l}	l ₂ -							1	0.3	0.0	82.2		14.5	1.5	
2 3.8					0.0				0.0				(68.	5	6.7	16.2	2	6.3		1.1	0.0	95.1		0.0	0.0	
u d 4.5					0.0									φ_i	-3 -	31	0	0.0	41 4	5 2	25 Q		0.2	0.0	95.2		0.0	0.0	
					11.2				0.1					c_{φ}	e -	01.	Ŭ	0.0	41.		_0.0		6.2				3.6	1.5	
1 1.6														C_{α}	.,	78.	6		15.4	4	1.7		0.0	0.0	42.5	0.0	28.7	27.2	
2 4.6														$\varphi \varphi$	μ -								0.0	0.0	78.1		15.6	1.7	
3 3.1														c_{arphi}	au	81.	7		13.3	3	1.5		0.0	0.0	81.4		13.9	1.5	
(1 - 1) = 0.1			0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0						-	0 1	1	25	52 0		14 5		0.0	0.0	3.1	4.2	79.6	12.9	
2 2.4			0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0					c_l	11	0.		2.0	52.	<u> </u>			0.0	0.0	68.5	6.7	16.2	6.3	
3 e 1.5													0		\overline{a}				58.7	7 2	27.6		0.0	0.0	31.0	0.0	41.5	25.9	
μ 4.3														φt	<i>з</i> -								0.0	0.0	78.6		15.4	1.7	
π 3.5													($c_{\varphi I}$	В				28.6	6 1	11.7		0.0	0.0	81.7		13.3	1.5	
11 0.0			0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0					,	-				46		פ דנ		0.0	0.0	0.1	2.5	52.9	44.5	
g													C	φV	V				40.4	+ 4	27.3		10.9				58.7	27.6	
в													C	177	D	0.0)	0.0	88.6	5 1	11.1		44.1				28.6	11.7	
V .			0.0		0.0				0.0				${}^{\cup}\varphi$	VV I	ט.								0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.4 89.6	11.1	
B 0.0			0.0		0.0				0.0				c_{W1}	VV	V			0.0	63.4	4 3	31.4		J.1	4.8	5.0	0.0	63.4	31.4	
															-				75.4				0.2				75.2	24.5	
0.1			0.0		0.0				0.0				(ļφ[75.2		24.5		0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	88.8	11.0	
									_					,		0.1		0.0	88.0	2 1	110								

Fisher information study

 The sensitivity of the EFT parameters to the Run II, HL-LHC and FCC-ee datasets is quantified by the fisher information

$$I_{ij} = \sum_{m=1}^{n_{\text{dat}}} \frac{\sigma_{m,i}^{(\text{eft})} \sigma_{m,j}^{(\text{eft})}}{\delta_{\exp,m}^2}$$

The highest sensitivity in the 2FB sector comes in via the FCC-ee

Normalized Value

 The FCC-ee run at 161 GeV is the least sensitive for the SMEFT

Without statistical noise = L0

With statistical noise = L1



Ratio of Uncertainties to SMEFiT3.0 Baseline, $\mathcal{O}(\Lambda^{-4})$, Marginalised



Jaco ter Hoeve - ICHEP - 20/07/24

FCC-ee and CEPC

Ratio of Uncertainties to SMEFiT3.0 Baseline, $\mathcal{O}\left(\Lambda^{-2}\right)$, Marginalised



1-loop & multi-particle matching



SM predictions

Category	Process	\mathbf{SM}	Code/Ref	SMEFT
	$tar{t}$ (incl)	NNLO QCD	MG5_aMC NLO + NNLO K-fact	NLO QCD
	$t\bar{t} + V$	NLO QCD	MG5_aMC NLO	LO QCD + NLO SM <i>K</i> -fact
Top quark production	single- t (incl)	NNLO QCD	MG5_aMC NLO + NNLO K-fact	NLO QCD
	t + V	NLO QCD	MG5_aMC NLO	LO QCD $+$ NLO SM K -fact
	$t\bar{t}t\bar{t}$, $t\bar{b}t\bar{b}$	NLO QCD	MG5_aMC NLO	LO QCD $+$ NLO SM K -fact
	gg ightarrow h	NNLO QCD + NLO EW	HXSWG	NLO QCD
	VBF	NNLO QCD + NLO EW	HXSWG	LO QCD
Higgs production and decay	h + V	NNLO QCD + NLO EW	HXSWG	NLO QCD
	$htar{t}$	NNLO QCD + NLO EW	HXSWG	NLO QCD
	$h \to X$	NNLO QCD + NLO EW	HXSWG	NLO QCD $(X = b\bar{b})$ LO QCD $(X \neq b\bar{b})$
Diboson	$e^+e^- \rightarrow W^+W^-$	NNLO QCD + NLO EW	LEP EWWG	LO QCD
production	$pp \rightarrow VV'$	NNLO QCD	MATRIX	NLO QCD

HL-LHC projected datasets

Dataset	\mathcal{L} (fb ⁻¹)	Info	Observables	n_{dat}	Ref.
ATLAS_STXS_RunII_13TeV_2022	139	ggF , VBF, Vh , $t\bar{t}h$, th	$d\sigma/dp_T^h$ $d\sigma/dm_{jj}$ $d\sigma/dp_T^V$	36	[55]
CMS_ggF_aa_13TeV	77.4	$gg\mathrm{F},h ightarrow\gamma\gamma$	$\sigma_{gg\mathrm{F}}(p_T^h,N_{\mathrm{jets}})$	6	[83]
ATLAS_ggF_ZZ_13TeV	79.8	gg F, $h \rightarrow ZZ$	$\sigma_{gg\mathrm{F}}(p_T^h, N_{\mathrm{jets}})$	6	[84]
ATLAS_ggF_13TeV_2015	36.1	$gg{\rm F},h\to ZZ,h\to\gamma\gamma$	$d\sigma(gg{ m F})/dp_T^h$	9	[85]
ATLAS_WH_Hbb_13TeV	79.8	$Wh, h ightarrow bar{b}$	$d\sigma^{(\rm fid)}/dp_T^W$ (stage 1 STXS)	2	[86]
ATLAS_ZH_Hbb_13TeV	79.8	$Zh,h ightarrow bar{b}$	$d\sigma^{(\rm fid)}/dp_T^Z$ (stage 1 STXS)	2	[86]
CMS_H_13TeV_2015_pTH	35.9	$h \to b\bar{b}, h \to \gamma\gamma, h \to ZZ$	$d\sigma/dp_T^h$	9	[87]
ATLAS_WW_13TeV_2016_memu	36.1	fully leptonic	$d\sigma^{(\rm fid)}/dm_{e\mu}$	13	[88]
ATLAS_WZ_13TeV_2016_mTWZ	36.1	fully leptonic	$d\sigma^{({ m fid})}/dm_T^{WZ}$	6	[89]
CMS_WZ_13TeV_2016_pTZ	35.9	fully leptonic	$d\sigma^{({ m fid})}/dp_T^Z$	11	[90]
CMS_WZ_13TeV_2022_pTZ	137	fully leptonic	$d\sigma/dp_T^Z$	11	[56]

Dataset	$\mathcal{L}\left(fb^{-1}\right)$	Info	Observables	n_{dat}	Ref.
ATLAS_tt_13TeV_1jets_2016_Mtt	36.1	ℓ+jets	$d\sigma/dm_{t\bar{t}}$	7	[91]
CMS_tt_13TeV_dilep_2016_Mtt	35.9	dilepton	$d\sigma/dm_{t\bar{t}}$	7	[92]
CMS_tt_13TeV_Mtt	137	ℓ +jets	$1/\sigma d\sigma/dm_{t\bar{t}}$	14	[57]
CMS_tt_13TeV_ljets_inc	137	$\ell + jets$	$\sigma(t\bar{t})$	1	[57]
ATLAS_tt_13TeV_asy_2022	139	ℓ + jets	A_C	5	[59]
CMS_tt_13TeV_asy	138	ℓ + jets	A_C	3	[58]
ATLAS_Whel_13TeV	139	W-helicity fraction	F_0, F_L	2	[60]
ATLAS_ttbb_13TeV_2016	36.1	lepton + jets	$\sigma_{\rm tot}(t\bar{t}b\bar{b})$	1	[93]
CMS_ttbb_13TeV_2016	35.9	all-jets	$\sigma_{\rm tot}(t\bar{t}b\bar{b})$	1	[94]
CMS_ttbb_13TeV_dilepton_inc	35.9	dilepton	$\sigma_{\rm tot}(t\bar{t}b\bar{b})$	1	[<mark>68</mark>]
CMS_ttbb_13TeV_ljets_inc	35.9	lepton + jets	$\sigma_{\rm tot}(t\bar{t}b\bar{b})$	1	[68]
ATLAS_tttt_13TeV_run2	139	multi-lepton	$\sigma_{tot}(t\bar{t}t\bar{t})$	1	[95]
CMS_tttt_13TeV_run2	137	same-sign or multi-lepton	$\sigma_{tot}(t\bar{t}t\bar{t})$	1	[<mark>96</mark>]
ATLAS_tttt_13TeV_slep_inc	139	single-lepton	$\sigma_{tot}(t\bar{t}t\bar{t})$	1	[64]
CMS_tttt_13TeV_slep_inc	35.8	single-lepton	$\sigma_{tot}(t\bar{t}t\bar{t})$	1	[65]
ATLAS_tttt_13TeV_2023	139	multi-lepton	$\sigma_{tot}(t\bar{t}t\bar{t})$	1	[<mark>66</mark>]
CMS_tttt_13TeV_2023	139	same-sign or multi-lepton	$\sigma_{tot}(t\bar{t}t\bar{t})$	1	[67]
CMS_ttZ_13TeV_pTZ	77.5	$t\bar{t}Z$	$d\sigma(t\bar{t}Z)/dp_T^Z$	4	[97]
ATLAS_ttZ_13TeV_pTZ	139	$t\bar{t}Z$	$d\sigma(t\bar{t}Z)/dp_T^Z$	7	[61]
ATLAS_ttW_13TeV_2016	36.1	$t\bar{t}W$	$\sigma_{tot}(t\bar{t}W)$	1	[98]
CMS_ttW_13TeV	35.9	$t\bar{t}W$	$\sigma_{\rm tot}(t\bar{t}W)$	1	[99]
ATLAS_t_tch_13TeV_inc	3.2	t-channel	$\sigma_{\rm tot}(tq), \sigma_{\rm tot}(\bar{t}q)$	2	[100]
CMS_t_tch_13TeV_2019_diff_Yt	35.9	t-channel	$d\sigma/d y_t $	5	[101]
ATLAS_t_sch_13TeV_inc	139	s-channel	$\sigma(t + \bar{t})$	1	[<mark>69</mark>]
ATLAS_tW_13TeV_inc	3.2	multi-lepton	$\sigma_{tot}(tW)$	1	[102]
CMS_tW_13TeV_inc	35.9	multi-lepton	$\sigma_{tot}(tW)$	1	[103]
CMS_tW_13TeV_slep_inc	36	single-lepton	$\sigma_{\rm tot}(tW)$	1	[71]
ATLAS_tZ_13TeV_run2_inc	139	multi-lepton + jets	$\sigma_{\rm fid}(t\ell^+\ell^-q)$	1	[104]
CMS_tZ_13TeV_pTt	138	multi-lepton + jets	$d\sigma_{\rm fid}(tZj)/dp_T^t$	3	[70]

Operator	Coefficient	Definition
	3rd generation quarks	
$\mathcal{O}^{(1)}_{\varphi Q}$	$c^{(1)}_{\varphi Q}(*)$	$i(\varphi^{\dagger} \stackrel{\leftrightarrow}{D}_{\mu} \varphi)(\bar{Q} \gamma^{\mu} Q)$
$\mathcal{O}^{(3)}_{arphi Q}$	$c^{(3)}_{\varphi Q}$	$i(\varphi^{\dagger} \stackrel{\leftrightarrow}{D}_{\mu} \tau_{I} \varphi)(\bar{Q} \gamma^{\mu} \tau^{I} Q)$
$\mathcal{O}_{\varphi t}$	$c_{\varphi t}$	$i(\varphi^{\dagger} \stackrel{\leftrightarrow}{D}_{\mu} \varphi)(\bar{t} \gamma^{\mu} t)$
\mathcal{O}_{tW}	c_{tW}	$i(\bar{Q}\tau^{\mu\nu}\tau_I t)\tilde{\varphi}W^I_{\mu\nu}$ + h.c.
\mathcal{O}_{tB}	c_{tB} (*)	$i(\bar{Q}\tau^{\mu\nu}t)\tilde{\varphi}B_{\mu\nu}+{\rm h.c.}$
\mathcal{O}_{tG}	c_{tG}	$ig_{^S}\left(\bar{Q}\tau^{\mu\nu}T_{^A}t\right)\tilde{\varphi}G^A_{\mu\nu}+{\rm h.c.}$
\mathcal{O}_{tarphi}	c_{tarphi}	$\left(\varphi^{\dagger}\varphi\right)\bar{Q}t\tilde{\varphi} + h.c.$
\mathcal{O}_{barphi}	c_{barphi}	$\left(arphi^{\dagger} arphi ight) ar{Q} b arphi + { m h.c.}$
	1st, 2nd generation quarks	
$\mathcal{O}^{(1)}_{_{arphi q}}$	$c^{(1)}_{arphi q}$ (*)	$\sum_{i=1,2} i \left(\varphi^{\dagger} \overset{\leftrightarrow}{D}_{\mu} \varphi \right) \left(\bar{q}_i \gamma^{\mu} q_i \right)$
${\cal O}^{(3)}_{_{arphi q}}$	$c^{(3)}_{arphi q}$	$\sum_{i=1,2} i (\varphi^{\dagger} \overset{\leftrightarrow}{D}_{\mu} \tau_{I} \varphi) (\bar{q}_{i} \gamma^{\mu} \tau^{I} q_{i})$
$\mathcal{O}_{arphi u i}$	$c_{\varphi u i}$	$\sum_{i=1,2,3}^{2} i(\varphi^{\dagger} \overleftrightarrow{D}_{\mu} \varphi)(\bar{u}_{i} \gamma^{\mu} u_{i})$
$\mathcal{O}_{_{arphi di}}$	$c_{arphi di}$	$\sum\limits_{i=1,2,3} i ig(arphi^\dagger \overleftrightarrow{D}_\mu arphi ig) ig(ar{d}_i \gamma^\mu d_i ig)$
\mathcal{O}_{carphi}	c_{carphi}	$\left(arphi^{\dagger} arphi ight) ar{q}_2 c ilde{arphi} + { m h.c.}$
	two-leptons	
$\mathcal{O}^{(1)}_{_{arphi\ell_i}}$	$c^{(1)}_{\varphi \ell_i}$	$i(\varphi^{\dagger} \stackrel{\leftrightarrow}{D}_{\mu} \varphi)(\bar{\ell}_i \gamma^{\mu} \ell_i)$
$\mathcal{O}^{(3)}_{_{\varphi\ell_i}}$	$c^{(3)}_{\varphi \ell_i}$	$i(\varphi^{\dagger} \stackrel{\leftrightarrow}{D}_{\mu} \tau_{I} \varphi)(\bar{\ell}_{i} \gamma^{\mu} \tau^{I} \ell_{i})$
$\mathcal{O}_{_{arphi e}}$	$c_{arphi e}$	$i(\varphi^{\dagger} \stackrel{\leftrightarrow}{D}_{\mu} \varphi)(\bar{e} \gamma^{\mu} e)$
$\mathcal{O}_{\varphi\mu}$	$c_{\varphi\mu}$	$i(\varphi^{\dagger} \stackrel{\leftrightarrow}{D}_{\mu} \varphi)(\bar{\mu} \gamma^{\mu} \mu)$
$\mathcal{O}_{arphi au}$	$c_{\varphi\tau}$	$i(\varphi^{\dagger} \stackrel{\leftrightarrow}{D}_{\mu} \varphi)(\bar{\tau} \gamma^{\mu} \tau)$
$\mathcal{O}_{ auarphi}$	$c_{ auarphi}$	$\left(\varphi^{\dagger}\varphi\right)\bar{\ell_{3}}\tau\varphi+{\rm h.c.}$
	four-lepton	
$\mathcal{O}_{\ell\ell}$	$c_{\ell\ell}$	$\left(\bar{\ell}_1\gamma_\mu\ell_2\right)\left(\bar{\ell}_2\gamma^\mu\ell_1\right)$

Operator basis

$$\begin{split} &\mathcal{O}_{qq}^{1(ijkl)} = (\bar{q}_i \gamma^{\mu} q_j) (\bar{q}_k \gamma_{\mu} q_l), \\ &\mathcal{O}_{qq}^{3(ijkl)} = (\bar{q}_i \gamma^{\mu} \tau^I q_j) (\bar{q}_k \gamma_{\mu} \tau^I q_l), \\ &\mathcal{O}_{qu}^{1(ijkl)} = (\bar{q}_i \gamma^{\mu} q_j) (\bar{u}_k \gamma_{\mu} u_l), \\ &\mathcal{O}_{qu}^{8(ijkl)} = (\bar{q}_i \gamma^{\mu} T^A q_j) (\bar{u}_k \gamma_{\mu} T^A u_l), \\ &\mathcal{O}_{qd}^{1(ijkl)} = (\bar{q}_i \gamma^{\mu} q_j) (\bar{d}_k \gamma_{\mu} d_l), \\ &\mathcal{O}_{qd}^{8(ijkl)} = (\bar{q}_i \gamma^{\mu} T^A q_j) (\bar{d}_k \gamma_{\mu} T^A d_l), \\ &\mathcal{O}_{uu}^{(ijkl)} = (\bar{u}_i \gamma^{\mu} u_j) (\bar{u}_k \gamma_{\mu} u_l), \\ &\mathcal{O}_{ud}^{1(ijkl)} = (\bar{u}_i \gamma^{\mu} u_j) (\bar{d}_k \gamma_{\mu} d_l), \\ &\mathcal{O}_{ud}^{8(ijkl)} = (\bar{u}_i \gamma^{\mu} T^A u_j) (\bar{d}_k \gamma_{\mu} T^A d_l), \end{split}$$

Operator	Coefficient	Definition
$\mathcal{O}_{arphi G}$	$c_{arphi G}$	$\left(arphi^{\dagger}arphi ight)G_{A}^{\mu u}G_{\mu u}^{A}$
$\mathcal{O}_{arphi B}$	$c_{arphi B}$	$\left(arphi^{\dagger} arphi ight) B^{\mu u} B_{\mu u}$
$\mathcal{O}_{arphi W}$	$c_{arphi W}$	$\left(arphi^{\dagger} arphi ight) W^{\mu u}_{\scriptscriptstyle I} W^{I}_{\mu u}$
$\mathcal{O}_{arphi WB}$	$c_{arphi WB}$	$(arphi^\dagger au_{\scriptscriptstyle I} arphi) B^{\mu u} W^{\scriptscriptstyle I}_{\mu u}$
$\mathcal{O}_{arphi d}$	$c_{arphi d}$	$\partial_\mu (arphi^\dagger arphi) \partial^\mu (arphi^\dagger arphi)$
$\mathcal{O}_{arphi D}$	$c_{arphi D}$	$(arphi^\dagger D^\mu arphi)^\dagger (arphi^\dagger D_\mu arphi)$
\mathcal{O}_W	c_{WWW}	$\epsilon_{IJK}W^{I}_{\mu u}W^{J, u ho}W^{K,\mu}_{ ho}$

FCC-ee and CEPC datasets

Zh and VBF ($h\nu\nu$)

EWPOs

Z-pole EWPOs ($\sqrt{s} = 91.2 \text{ GeV}$)								
(C).	$\delta/\Delta ~ {\cal O}_i$							
\mathcal{O}_i	FCC-ee	CEPC						
$lpha(m_Z)^{-1}(imes 10^3)$	$\Delta=2.7~(1.2)$	$\Delta = 17.8$						
$\Gamma_W ~({ m MeV})$	$\Delta=0.85~(0.3)$	$\Delta=1.8~(0.9)$						
Γ_Z (MeV)	$\Delta = 0.0028~(0.025)$	$\Delta = 0.005~(0.025)$						
$A_e \left(imes 10^5 ight)$	$\Delta = 0.5~(2)$	$\Delta = 1.5$						
$A_{\mu} \left(imes 10^5 ight)$	$\Delta=1.6~(2.2)$	$\Delta=3.0~(1.8)$						
$A_{ au} \left(imes 10^5 ight)$	$\Delta=0.35~(20)$	$\Delta = 1.2~(6.9)$						
$A_b (imes 10^5)$	$\Delta = 1.7~(21)$	$\Delta = 3~(21)$						
$A_c(imes 10^5)$	$\Delta = 14~(15)$	$\Delta=6~(30)$						
$\sigma_{ m had}^0~({ m pb})$	$\Delta=0.025~(4)$	$\Delta=0.05~(2)$						
$R_e (imes 10^3)$	$\delta = 0.0028~(0.3)$	$\delta=0.003~(0.2)$						
$R_{\mu}(imes 10^3)$	$\delta = 0.0021~(0.05)$	$\delta=0.003~(0.1)$						
$R_{ au} (imes 10^3)$	$\delta = 0.0021 \ (0.1)$	$\delta = 0.003 \; (0.1)$						
$R_b(imes 10^3)$	$\delta = 0.001 \; (0.3)$	$\delta=0.005~(0.2)$						
$R_c(imes 10^3)$	$\delta = 0.011 \; (1.5)$	$\delta=0.02~(1)$						

$e^+e^- ightarrow Zh$											
	$\sqrt{s} = 24$	40 GeV	$\sqrt{s} = 36$	$55 {\rm GeV}$							
\mathcal{O}_i	$\delta_{\exp} \mathcal{O}_i$ (FCC-ee)	$\delta_{\exp} \mathcal{O}_i (\text{CEPC})$	$\delta_{\exp} \mathcal{O}_i$ (FCC-ee)	$\delta_{ ext{exp}}\mathcal{O}_i ext{ (CEPC)}$							
σ_{Zh}	0.0035	0.0026	0.0064	0.014							
$\sigma_{Zh} \times \mathrm{BR}_{b\bar{b}}$	0.0021	0.0014	0.0035	0.009							
$\sigma_{Zh} \times \mathrm{BR}_{c\bar{c}}$	0.0156	0.0202	0.046	0.088							
$\sigma_{Zh} \times \mathrm{BR}_{gg}$	0.0134	0.0081	0.0247	0.034							
$\sigma_{Zh} \times BR_{ZZ}$	0.0311	0.0417	0.0849	0.2							
$\sigma_{Zh} \times \mathrm{BR}_{WW}$	0.0085	0.0053	0.0184	0.028							
$\sigma_{Zh} \times \mathrm{BR}_{\tau^+\tau^-}$	0.0064	0.0042	0.0127	0.021							
$\sigma_{Zh} \times \mathrm{BR}_{\gamma\gamma}$	0.0636	0.0302	0.127	0.11							
$\sigma_{Zh} \times \mathrm{BR}_{\gamma Z}$	0.12	0.085	-	-							
		$e^+e^- \to h \nu \nu$									
	$\sqrt{s} = 24$	40 GeV	$\sqrt{s} = 36$	$55 { m GeV}$							
O_i	$\delta_{\exp} \mathcal{O}_i$ (FCC-ee)	$\delta_{\exp} \mathcal{O}_i (\text{CEPC})$	$\delta_{\exp} \mathcal{O}_i$ (FCC-ee)	$\delta_{\exp} \mathcal{O}_i$ (CEPC)							
$\sigma_{h\nu\nu} \times \mathrm{BR}_{b\bar{b}}$	0.0219	0.0159	0.0064	0.011							
$\sigma_{h\nu\nu} \times \mathrm{BR}_{c\bar{c}}$	-	-	0.0707	0.16							
$\sigma_{h\nu\nu} \times \mathrm{BR}_{gg}$	-	-	0.0318	0.045							
$\sigma_{h\nu\nu}\times \mathrm{BR}_{ZZ}$	-	-	0.0707	0.21							
$\sigma_{h\nu\nu} \times \mathrm{BR}_{WW}$	-	-	0.0255	0.044							
$\sigma_{h\nu\nu} \times \mathrm{BR}_{\tau^+\tau^-}$	-	-	0.0566	0.042							
$\sigma_{h\nu\nu} \times \mathrm{BR}_{\gamma\gamma}$	-	-	0.156	0.16							

FCC-ee and CEPC datasets

$e^+e^- ightarrow far{f}$										
		$\sqrt{s}=240~{ m GeV}$				$\sqrt{s} = 365 \text{ GeV}$				
${\cal O}_i$		$\Delta_{\exp} \mathcal{O}_i$ (FCC-ee)		$\Delta_{\exp} \mathcal{O}_i$ (CEPC)		$\Delta_{\exp} \mathcal{O}_i$ (FCC-ee)		$ig) \left \begin{array}{c} \Delta_{ ext{exp}} \mathcal{O}_i \end{array} ight(ext{CEPC}) \end{array} ight $		
$\sigma_{\rm tot}(e^+e^-)$ [fb]		2.29		1.62		2.74		4.68		
$A_{ m FB}(e^+e^-)$		$9.79\cdot 10^{-6}$		$6.92\cdot 10^{-6}$		$2.83\cdot 10^{-5}$		$4.83\cdot10^{-5}$		
$\sigma_{\rm tot}(\mu^+\mu^-)$ [fb]		0.405		0.287		0.48		0.82		
$A_{ m FB}(\mu^+\mu^-)$		$1.98\cdot 10^{-4}$		$1.397\cdot 10^{-4}$		$5.69\cdot10^{-4}$		$9.7 \cdot 10^{-4}$		
$\sigma_{\rm tot}(\tau^+\tau^-)$ [fb]		0.374		0.264		0.443		0.756		
$A_{ m FB}(au^+ au^-)$		$2.17\cdot 10^{-4}$		$1.53\cdot 10^{-4}$		$6.24\cdot10^{-4}$		0.00106		
$\sigma_{ m tot}(car{c})$ [fb]		0.088		0.062		0.102		0.175		
$A_{ m FB}(car{c})$		0.000813		$5.74\cdot10^{-4}$		0.00238		0.00405		
$\sigma_{ m tot}(bar{b})~[{ m fb}]$		0.151		0.107		0.171		0.29		
$A_{ m FB}(bar{b})$		$4.86\cdot10^{-4}$		$3.44\cdot10^{-4}$		0.00142		0.00243		
$e^+e^- ightarrow W^+W^-$										
\mathcal{O}_i		$\sqrt{s} = 161 \text{ GeV}$		$\sqrt{s} = 2$		$40 {\rm GeV}$	$\sqrt{s} = 365 { m ~GeV}$		$65~{ m GeV}$	
	δ_{exp} (FCC-ee)		δ_{exp} (CEPC)		δ_{exp} (FCC-ee)	δ_{exp} (CEPC)	δ_{exp} (FCC-ee) δ_{exp}		δ_{exp} (CEP	C)
σ_{WW}	$1.36\cdot 10^{-4}$		$2.48\cdot 10^{-4}$		$1.22\cdot 10^{-4}$	$8.63\cdot10^{-5}$	$2.81 \cdot 10^{-4}$ 4.8		$4.87 \cdot 10^{-1}$	-4
$BR_{W\to \ell_i\nu_i}$	$2.72\cdot10^{-4}$		$4.95\cdot10^{-4}$		$2.44\cdot 10^{-4}$	$1.73 \cdot 10^{-4}$	5.0	$63 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$9.75\cdot 10^{-1}$	-4

Light fermion production

Jaco ter Hoeve - ICHEP - 20/07/24

EWPO benchmark

