# **QCD/top physics in the era of future accelerators**

Alexander Mitov

Cavendish Laboratory

**E BUNIVERSITY OF** 

# **Introduction**

 $\checkmark$  We had a lot of related talks ...

- $\checkmark$  Will not discuss EW physics (see talk by Fulvio Piccinini)
- $\checkmark$  This talk is about trying to guess what QCD may look like at FCCee
- $\checkmark$  ... we can start by looking at the LHC today and extrapolate
- $\checkmark$  The situation at present is pretty amazing: we have many, more-precise calculations for a more complicated machine (LHC) than for e<sup>+</sup>e<sup>-!</sup>
- $\checkmark$  A brief LHC status:
	- $\checkmark$  Fully differential NNLO for 2->2 and 2->3.
	- $\sqrt{N^3LO}$  already exists for 2->1 processes.

On a 10-year timescale we can expect N3LO calculations for the LHC, produced at scale

- $\checkmark$  These developments directly translate to  $e^+e^-$ :
- $\checkmark$  There are not as many e<sup>+</sup>e implementations currently simply because there is no pressing need for them.

 $\checkmark$  The bottleneck at the LHC currently, and for the foreseeable future, is the calculation of multiloop amplitudes (translates directly to e+e- ).

 $\checkmark$  Progress in multiloop amplitudes

- $\checkmark$  Definition of the set of functions needed to describe such processes
- $\checkmark$  Example 1: the description of massless 2->3 processes at NNLO required a new set of functions, the pentagon functions Papadopoulos, Tommasini, Wever '15 Gehrmann, Henn, Lo Presti '16 '18
- $\checkmark$  They evolved in a set which is fully useable for practical calculations Chicherin, Sotnikov '20
- $\checkmark$  Approach currently being generalized up to V+4j at 2 loops

Abreu, Chicherin, Ita, Page, Sotnikov, Tschernow, Zoia

 $\checkmark$  Example 2: Elliptic functions

 $\checkmark$  These appear in multiscale problems

 $\checkmark$  first such collider example was the NLO tt total inclusive cross-section).

en de la component de la compo<br>Se de la component de la compo



- √ These functions need to be systematized in order to have efficient algebra. Tremendous work ongoing work ongoing.
- $\checkmark$  Computing amplitudes will become particularly tricky for multiscale processes (like different masses)
	- $\checkmark$  Likely only fully numeric calculations are feasible. But this is OK: for example, tt@LHC@2 loops is known numerically and not yet fully analytically.

*lines represent cuts (cut lines are on-shell). Notice the crossed momentum flow in the b), c) and d)*

Figure 4: *Cut forward Feynman integrals whose differential equations introduce a priori unex-*Chen, Czakon, Poncelet '17

 $\checkmark$  Finally, even one-loop amplitudes for N<sup>3</sup>LO calculation will require additional improvements

 $\checkmark$  What can we conclude from the discussion up to here?

#### By the time FCCee becomes operational many/most e<sup>+</sup>e<sup>-</sup> processes will have NNLO or N<sup>3</sup>LO precision

 $\checkmark$  One should expect fully differential calculations, not just inclusive observables

 $\checkmark$  This will be a huge progress relative to where we are today for  $e^+e^-$ 

# **Overview of e+e- processes and their current status**

## **Top quark pair production**

- $\checkmark$  A major aim and potential major achievement for the FCCee
- √ A threshold scan allows a very precise measurement of the top quark mass, width and even its mass scheme.  $\alpha$  *g*  $\alpha$  the top
- $\checkmark$  Theory known at N<sup>3</sup>LO in QCD

**Beneke et al, '15** 



#### **Top quark pair production**

 $\checkmark$  Top Yukawa can also be constrained indirectly (albeit weakly).

Nice connection to the talk by Gauthier Durieux



 $\checkmark$  Sensitivity to the top Yukawa coupling

## **Top quark pair production**

- $\checkmark$  Further prospects for ttbar at threshold:
	- $\checkmark$  A main remaining uncertainty is ISR
	- $\checkmark$  Going beyond N<sup>3</sup>LO will likely require a multi-decade effort...
- Continuum top pair production
	- $\checkmark$  Essentially available only at NLO via MadGraph5 aMC@NLO, Whizard, ...
	- $\checkmark$  No reason not to have full NNLO at present
- $\checkmark$  Note: the state of continuum b and c production is similar.
	- $\checkmark$  Single inclusive production at high  $p<sub>T</sub>$  is known at NNLO (will revisit later in this talk)

## **Jet production and alpha\_s**

 $\checkmark$  3-jet production at the LHC is known at NNLO (in full color)

 $\checkmark$  3-jet is also known for e<sup>+</sup>e at NNLO Gehrmann-De Ridder, Gehrmann, Glover, Heinrich '07 Weinzierl '08 Del Duca, Duhr, Kardos, Somogyi, Szor, Trocsanyi, Tulipant '16

 $\checkmark$  4-jet at NNLO is doable (integrals were just derived for the LHC)

- $\checkmark$  Studies of jet substructure, jet algorithms, including flavor, has advanced tremendously during the lifetime of the LHC.
- Ultimately, N<sup>3</sup>LO for 3 jet production at  $e^+e^-$  will likely be possible within a decade or so.



#### ATLAS arXiv:2301.09351

precision.

 $\checkmark$  Measurements of the strong coupling

constant at e+e- will offer exciting possibilities

reviewed in talk by Stefan Kluth

alpha\_s at scales  $\sim M_Z$ . This is unlike the LHC

 $\checkmark$  A remark: FCCee will only give us access to

where the running of alpha\_s has already

been probed to 2 TeV or so with full NNLO

 $\pm$ 

# **Two selected aspects**

# **we can learn from at future e+e- colliders**

## **Terra Z**

- $\checkmark$  Precision remeasurement of SM parameters and processes is going to be essential for the future precision program we all hope for.
- $\checkmark$  It is just like building a house: it can be only as good as the foundation it sits on.
- $\checkmark$  Zoltan Ligeti gave an exhaustive introduction to this. Let me just add couple of more examples:
	- $\checkmark$  B and D fragmentation measurements from LEP are rather limited.
	- $\checkmark$  Only a mixture of B mesons available
	- $\checkmark$  Only a single D meson measurement available
	- $\checkmark$  Quality of available data is currently a major limiting factor on heavy flavor production
- $\checkmark$  Another potential great benefit: measurements at different c.m. energies
	- $\checkmark$  Measurements at higher energies (240GeV, 365 GeV) will be the first time we have high precision high-energy data to test precision DGLAP evolution for heavy flavors.
	- $\checkmark$  B fragmentation is currently restricted to x>0.1 ~m<sub>z</sub>/(2m<sub>B</sub>). Higher c.m. energies will allow access to fragmentation measurements with  $x < 0.1$ .
	- $\checkmark$  And a bigger lesson: acquiring confidence in treating small mass effects in unrelated processes (including muon colliders, how to properly treat the muon or electron mass – even in QED context, etc.).

#### **Small mass effects**

- $\checkmark$  Identified heavy flavor production (fragmentation) is among the basic processes QCD offers and has been measured at many colliders.
- $\checkmark$  e<sup>+</sup>e<sup>-</sup> the gold standard for such measurements (due to lack of pdf, clean environment and ease of directly relating the observable to the fragmentation function)
- $\checkmark$  Open B and D production have so far (in the last almost 30 years) been treated in FONLL (NLO+NLL).
- $\checkmark$  It has been a great success and a major step forward; its main limitation is a significant NLO scale uncertainty.
- $\checkmark$  NNLO calculations expected to improve this. Indeed, the Tevatron B-production anomaly completely disappears at NNLO



Czakon, Generet et al, to appear

Tevatron fiducial x-section for bb **at quark level**

Could also be inferred from

Catani(a), Devoto, Grazzini, Kallweit, Mazzitelli '20

#### **Small mass effects**

 $\checkmark$  Full NNLO + resummation prediction for B mesons and their decays

Czakon, Generet et al, to appear



 $\checkmark$  At future e<sup>+</sup>e- machine we should expect this observable to be known to N<sup>3</sup>LO.

 $\checkmark$  Uncertainties dominated by measurements of input parameters and treatment of mass effects.

#### **Small mass effects**

 $\checkmark$  Example: fitting LEP data is not trivial



#### arXiv:2210.06078

Figure 16. NPFF fits from one dataset at a time (blue) versus the combined fit (orange). The four datasets are (from left to right): ALEPH, DELPHI, OPAL and SLD.

# **HighTEA time**

 $\checkmark$  A very legitimate question:

- $\checkmark$  How do you make the above results available?
- $\checkmark$  If I need a new prediction, where can I get it?
- $\checkmark$  There are just two options:
	- If there is a public code one can use it to compute what one needs
		- Ø Problem 1: serious/huge CPU expense
		- $\triangleright$  Problem 2: is the user using the code correctly?
	- No public code: ask the authors. Hope they are free and have spare
- Can one bypass all of th[ese problems at once?](https://www.precision.hep.phy.cam.ac.uk/hightea/)

#### YES!

The answer can be found here:

https://www.precision.hep.phy.cam.ac.uk/hightea

 $\mathsf{P}$  $\mathsf{D}$ 

### $\checkmark$  Dedicated website

#### https://www.precision.hep.phy.cam.ac.uk/hightea/



#### Czakon, Kassabov, Mitov, Poncelet, Popescu 2023

- $\checkmark$  What is HighTEA? A library of precomputed events  $+$  all the required infrastructure.
	- $\checkmark$  No specialized knowledge needed to fully use it
	- $\checkmark$  It allows the user to compute any infrared safe n-dimensional differential distribution in any process which has already been added to the library
	- $\checkmark$  The output of a HighTEA computation is a histogram, and the input is the histogram's specification.
	- $\checkmark$  Users can define their own kinematic variables and scales.
	- $\checkmark$  No need for major computing infrastructure (typically, a large cluster). Example: A quick calculation takes 50k CPUh; the most demanding ones – over 10M CPUh.
	- $\checkmark$  Predictions derived from HighTEA are very fast (~minutes).
	- $\checkmark$  All one needs is a computer (or a smart phone) and a free Google account.
- $\checkmark$  HighTEA's limitations
	- $\checkmark$  Only processes already included can be computed
	- $\checkmark$  Fixed statistics: fine bins will result in large MC uncertainty (estimate always provided)
	- $\checkmark$  Fixed parameters like LHC energy and particle masses.

## HighTEA's logic:



#### Next:  $t_{\rm heat}$ rche.

A webform (restricted functionality): https://www.hep.phy.cam.ac.uk

V Our Library implemented in Jupyter notebooks on Google Colab. Has One needs a device and a free Google account https://colab.research.google.com/github/HighteaCollaboration/high examples/blob/master/Start.ipynb

# **Conclusions**

 $\checkmark$  Steady progress on NNLO and already N<sup>3</sup>LO calculations for the LHC

 $\checkmark$  Future FCCee program will benefit from these developments

 $\checkmark$  Expect fully differential NNLO and N<sup>3</sup>LO to be the standard for FCCee

 $\checkmark$  We need FCCee, among others, for (much) more precise measurements of basic SM parameters and processes.

 $\checkmark$  This will be critical for the success of the future precision program.