Perturbative uncertainties for high-energy tails

BIC University of Sussex

LHC EW WG General Meeting CERN 12th July 2024

Jonas M. Lindert

Science & Technology

UK Research and Innovation

Multiboson tails W+W-

 $pp \rightarrow ZW^{\pm} \rightarrow \ell \ell \ell' \nu_{\ell'}$ @LHC 13 TeV

 \overline{I}

Perturbative expansion

aMC@NLO, Sherpa, Herwig… & Recola, Madloop, Gosam, OpenLoops

dedicated MC's: Matrix, MCFM, NNLOjet, …

4

5

scale variation at NNLO

EW uncertainties: Sudakov

EW corrections become sizeable at large $p_{T,V}: -30\%$ @ I TeV

Origin: virtual EW Sudakov logarithms

How to estimate corresponding pure EW uncertainties

Large EW corrections dominated by Sudakov logs

L EW uncertainties: Sudakov

Large EW corrections dominated by Sudakov logs

Uncertainty estimate of (N)NLO EW from naive exponentiation x 2:

EW uncertainties: Sudakov

 $\frac{\text{Sud}}{\text{EW}} \approx (k_{\rm NLOEW})$ Large EW corrections dominated by Sudakov logs

[Kühn, Kulesza, Pozzorini, Schulze; 05-07] Denner, Fadin, Jantzen, K¨uhn, Lipatov, Manohar, Melles, Penin, Pozzorini, Smirnov, . . .]

EW uncertainties: Sudakov

429 supporting the usage of EW Sudakov logarithms at NNLO. The usage of EW Sudakov logarithms at NNLO. The usa
At NNLO. The usage of EW Sudakov logarithms at NNLO. The usage of EW Sudakov logarithms at NNLO. The usage of

 \overline{a}

 $\Delta_{\rm EW}^{\rm hard} \approx {\rm O}(1\%)$

 $\Delta_{\text{max}}^{\text{hard}} \approx \Omega(1\%)$ e.g. from scheme variation. e.g. \overline{R} at new corrections are known exactly and also NNLL as \overline{R} $\Delta_{\rm EW}^{\rm hard} \approx {\rm O}(1 \%)$ | e.g. from scheme variation, e.g. Gmu vs. a(mZ)

Tools for EW Sudakov corrections $\overline{}$ independent way. The remaining part of $\overline{}$ and will be neglected: in $\overline{}$ lools for EW Sudakov corrections and T_{0} olofon $\Gamma\Lambda$

suppressed; if the case, this is not the case, then it's not possible to apply the algorithm. This framework is
In this framework is not possible to apply the algorithm. This framework is not possible to apply the algorith

also: alpgen *[Chiesa, et. al., '13]* **SU**, alpger

11

EW Sudakov corrections where '*i^k ,* '*i^l ,* '*i*⁰ *^k ,* '*i*⁰ *^l* can be whatever SM field according to the EW Feynman rules. In the LA,

- \overline{d} •Sizeable cancellations between different logarithmic contributions.
- •Only partial control of angular-dependent S-SSC contribution in Sudakov approximation

2.
$$
\hat{\delta}^{\text{SL}} = \hat{\delta}^{\text{PR}} + \hat{\delta}^{\text{COLL}} + \hat{\delta}^{\text{WFRC}}
$$

EW uncertainties: hard-coefficient

$e.g. \{G_\mu, m_W, m_Z\}$ \vee s. $\{\alpha(m_Z), m_W, m_Z\}$

However: scheme variations mix perturbative and parametric uncertainties!

Scheme variations **Estimate hard coefficient**

Typical size of hard EW corrections: ~2%

\n
$$
\left(\frac{\alpha}{\pi}\right) \delta_{\text{hard}}^{(1)} = 2\% \leftrightarrow \delta_{\text{hard}}^{(1)} = 10
$$
\nRequired: $\delta_{\text{hard}}^{(2)} \leq 100 \delta_{\text{hard}}^{(1)}$

\n
$$
\Delta_{\text{EW}}^{\text{hard}} = 1000 \times \left(\frac{\alpha}{\pi}\right)^2 = 0.6\%
$$

15 \overline{z} $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}$

indifferential coross section, while the three lower panels show, from top to both α corrections to inclusive *tt*

Mixed QCD-EW uncertainties

Figure 5. General *pp* **p** 2. General product regions to give rise to giant *K*-factors in the give rise to giant *K*-factors in the give rise to giant *K*-factors in the giant *K*-factors in the give rise to giant *K*-fac Mixed QCD-EW uncertainties

-
- at large pTV1: VV phase-space is dominated by V+jet (w/ soft V radiation)

^S↵4+*m*) are also referred to as corrections 16

 $pp \rightarrow \ell^- \ell^+ \nu_{\ell'} \bar{\nu}_{\ell'}$ *[M. Grazzini, S. Kallweit, JML, S. Pozzorini, M. Wiesemann; '19]*

\n- NLO QCD/LO=2-5! ("giant K-factor")
\n- at large pTV!:VV phase-space is dominated by V+jet (w/soft V radiation)
\n- $$
\frac{\partial^{\sigma_{\sigma_{\sigma_{\sigma_{\sigma}}}}}}{\partial U_{V}} = \frac{\partial^{\sigma_{\sigma_{\sigma_{\sigma_{\sigma}}}}}}{\partial U_{V}}}{\partial U_{V}} \propto \frac{\partial^{\sigma_{\sigma_{\sigma_{\sigma}}}}}{\partial S} \times \frac{\partial^{\sigma_{\sigma_{\sigma_{\sigma}}}}}{\partial V_{V}}}{\partial V_{V}} = 3
$$
 at $Q = 1$ TeV
\n- NNLO / NLO QCD moderate and NNLO under. 5-10%
\n- NPLO EW/LO=-(40-50)%
\n- Very large difference $d\sigma_{\text{NNLO QCD+EW}}$ vs. $d\sigma_{\text{NNLO QCD} \times EW}$
\n- Proplems: 1. In additive combination dominant Vj topology does not receive any EW corrections 2. In multiplicative combination EW correction for VV is applied to Vj hard process
\n- Pragmatic solution I: take average as nominal and spread as uncertainty
\n

- NNLO / NLO QCD moderate and NNLO uncert. 5-10% NNLO QUE WAS a possible approximation of the mixed QCD–EW higher-order corrections of the mixed QCD–EW higher-
	- $\frac{1}{2}$
	- Very large difference $\text{d}\sigma_{\text{NNLO\,QCD+EW\,VS}}$. boson, *p*T*,V*² ⌧ *p*T*,V*¹ . Conversely, standard QCD radiation effects correspond to a hard subprocess *P* $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ and scale $\frac{1}{2}$ in the qubit $\frac{1}{2}$ with $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ with $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1$ $d\sigma_{\rm NNLO\,QCD+EW\,VS}$, $d\sigma_{\rm NN}$ $O QCD \times EWW$ ${\rm d} \sigma_{\rm NNLO\, QCD X EW}$
- *d*LO *V V M*² *W* bosons are comparably hard, and such phase space regions will be classified as hard-*V V* regions. General real-state of the maintiplicative combination FW correction for W is applied to Vi has aring combination administry, top areal, about the theorie and process in a valid process and altiplicative combination EW correction for VV is applied to Vj hard process $\frac{1}{2}$ I. In additive combination dominant Vj topology does not receive any EW corrections noination EVV correction for VV is applied to VJ hard process 2. In multiplicative combination EW correction for VV is applied to Vj hard process
- **radiative** Pragmatic solution I: take average as nominal and spread as uncertaint • Pragmatic solution I take average as nominal and spread as uncertainty • Pragmatic solution I: take average as nominal and spread as uncertainty
	- Pragmatic solution II: **apply jet veto to constrain VJ toplogoies** • Pragmatic solution II: apply jet veto to constrain Vj toplogoies

17

MEPS @ NLO QCD + EW

WW(+jet): [Bräuer, Denner, Pellen, Schönherr, Schumann; '20] ZZ(+jet): [Bothmann, Napoletano, Schönherr, Schumann, Villani; '2 I] $\overline{1}$ $\ddot{ }$. S
Sc

• More rigorous solution: merge VVj incl. approx. EW corrections with VV with Sherpa's MEPS@NLO QCD + EWvirt *s* $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{r})$

NLO QCD ₩ EWAPPROXIMA Used in many ATLAS modern multi-purpose samples: V+jets, VV+jets, tt+jets

[Kallweit, JML, et. al.; '15]

VBF-V @ NLO QCD + EW

widely used V approximation is a gauge-invariant prescription that is a gauge-invariant prescription that is \mathcal{I}^{\ast}

-
- Otherwise, still factorise but consider QCD+EW combination as nominal (and QCDxEW as uncertainty) 19
- \triangleright Multiboson tails are becoming precision probes with often $\lt\sim$ 10% uncertainties
- ‣ EW uncertainties:
	- \odot Higher-order Sudakov corrections: $\Delta_{\rm EW}^{\rm Sud} =$ $\sqrt{2}$ δ (1) $\begin{pmatrix} 1 \ \text{Sud} \end{pmatrix}^2$
	- ๏ Higher-order hard corrections: $\Delta^{\rm hard}_{\rm EW}\approx 1\%$
	- ๏ Higher-order QED radiation: $\Delta_\text{EW}^\text{QED}$ $E_{\rm WW}^{\rm QED} = |\delta_{\rm EW}-\delta_{\rm EW+PS/YFS}|$
- ▶ QCD-EW uncertainties:
	- $_{\odot}$ Conservative: difference between add. and multipl. combination: $\Delta_{\rm QCD-EW}=\,\delta_{\rm QCD}\,\delta_{\rm EW}$
	- ϕ More aggressive: $\Delta_{\rm QCD-EW}=\delta_{\rm QCD} \left(\delta^{\rm SL}_{\rm EW}+\delta^{\rm hard}_{\rm EW}\right)~$ (applicable when $\delta_{\rm EW}\sim \delta^{\rm DL}_{\rm EW}$)
	- \bullet For processes subject to significant QCD radiation: $\Delta_{\rm QCD-EW}^{\rm multi-jet~merged}$
	- \bullet X+j ω NLO EW proxy computations might allow for estimate of non-factorising effects
	- ๏ Factorisation feasible for processes with small interferences of tower of born orders
- ‣ Necessary tools are available:
	- ๏ NLO EW in MG5_aMC@NLO / Sherpa / POWHEG
	- ๏ NLL EW in Sherpa / MG5_aMC@NLO / OpenLoops
	- ๏ NLOPS EW in POWHEG / MEPS NLO EW + YFS in Sherpa

Conclusions

- ‣ Plan for recommendation document from WG3 agreed amongst different theorists
- ▶ See also:
	- *Electroweak Radiative Corrections for Collider Physic*s (Denner & Dittmaier): [1912.06823](https://arxiv.org/abs/1912.06823)
	- [Les Houches 2023:](https://inspirehep.net/literature/2793807) [2406.00708](https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.00708)

 $\mu_{\rm QCD-EW}^{\rm multi-jet\,mergeq\alpha} = \delta_{\rm QCD} \, \delta_{\rm EW}$

-
-

Backup

- ‣ pole approximation vs. full computation: agree below the percent level +20 */*ル
- 15 0 ^d
- $\frac{3}{2}$ 35 $\frac{3}{2}$ 35 factorised approximation *d*(1*,*1)

▶ Comparison against naive factorised NLO QCD x NLO EW ansatz: fail at the 5-10% level \blacktriangleright At large $p_{\rm T,\mu^+}$ in DY: sizeable contributions from $pp\to Vj$ which receives larger EW corrections \mathbf{I}^T \overline{a} $pp \rightarrow Vf$ rison against naive factorised NLO QCD x NLO EW ansatz: fail at the 5-10% level $p_{\rm E}$ e $p_{\rm T,\mu^+}$ in DY: sizeable contributions from $pp\to Vj$ which receives larger EW corrections Figure 1. Complete 1. Complete Complete Correction to the politicity \star **X**omparison against naive factorised NLO QCD x NLO EW ansatz: fail at the 5-10% level es larger EW corrections

[Biedermann, M. Billoni, A. Denner, S. Dittmaier, L. Hofer, B. Jäger, L. Salfelder ;'16] −40 \overline{P} \overline{R} $\frac{1}{2}$ \sqcap C $\sqrt{ }$ Jer
∤ $7¹$ $\overline{1}$ ^felc

The need for off-shell computations: VV tati $\frac{1}{2}$ 10−⁶ $\overline{\mathcal{L}}$ \sim mputatio \mathbf{q} 10−6
10−6 JU r off-shell compu $\overline{\Lambda}$ −10

 $\frac{1}{10}$ µ⁺ .
IM sizeable differences in fully off-shell vs. double-pole approximation in tails in fully off-shell vs. double-pole approxima

 $\ell\ell$) $V'(\rightarrow \ell'\ell')$ and v_μ and $pp \rightarrow \ell\ell\ell'\ell'$ and of the charged-lepton $e^ \mu^+$ is the μ^+ in the μ^+ in the μ^- in the $\bar{p}_{\text{T,e}^-\mu^+}$ $\bar{\nu}_{\rm e}$ $\bar{\nu}_{\rm e}$ $\bar{\nu}_{\rm e}$ $\bar{\nu}_{\rm e}$ $\overline{}$ **b**
N $\overline{ }$ µ⁺ $\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c|c} \mu^+ & & \bar{\nu}_\text{T,e^-} \bar{\nu}_\text{e} & & \bar{p}_\text{T,e^+e^+e^-} \ \hline \bar{\nu}_\text{e} & & & \bar{p}_\text{T,e^+e^-} \end{array}$ $v_{\rm e}$ and $v_{\rm e}$ corrections to the $v_{\rm \mu}$ \sim $v_{\rm \mu}$ on \sim beam axis $\vec{p}_{\mathrm{T,e^-}\mu^+}$ $p_{\rm T,\bar{\nu}_e}$ $\vec{p}_{\mathrm{T},\nu_{\mu}}$ \bar{q} \overline{q} e− $\bar{\nu}_{\rm e}$ μ^+ Z W ν_μ

 ν_μ

Combination of QCD and EW corrections

- full calculations of $O(\alpha \alpha_s)$ out of reach
- Approximate combination: MEPS@NLO including (approximate) EW corrections
- key: QCD radiation receives EW corrections! $E = \bigcap_{i=1}^n E_i$
	- strategy: modify MC@NLO B-function to include NLO EW virtual corrections and integrated approx. real corrections = VI rateov modify MCMNII O R-function to inclu and integrated approx. real corrections

$$
\overline{B}_{n,QCD+EW_{virt}}(\Phi_n) = \overline{B}_{n,QCD}(\Phi_n) + V_{n,EW}(\Phi_n) + I_{n,EW}(\Phi_n)
$$
\nexact virtual contribution

\napproximate integrated real contribution

Mixed QCD-EW uncertainties

Estimate of non-factorising contributions

N-jettiness cut ensures approx. constant ratio V+2jets/V+jet τ_1 $\int \frac{2p_i \cdot q_k}{\cdot}$ \mathcal{L}

$$
= \sum_{k} \min_{i} \left\{ \frac{-\mu_i}{Q_i} \frac{q_k}{\sqrt{\hat{s}}} \right\}
$$

VBS @ NLO QCD + EW

-
-
-
-

• EW WWjj at NLO QCD+EW: *[Denner, Franken, Schmidt, Schwan, '22]* • QCD and EW ss-WWjj at NLO QCD+EW: *[Biedermann, Denner, Pellen '16+'17]* • EW WZjj at NLO QCD+EW: *[Denner, Dittmaier, Maierhöfer, Pellen, Schwan, '19]* • QCD and EW ZZjj at NLO QCD+EW: *[Denner, Franken, Pellen, Schmidt, '20+'21]*

g

27

