



# COMETA polarisation study 4th meeting, 19.06.2024

Giovanni Pelliccioli (🚿







### Agenda

- → Agree on the YODA format
- → LO results (tree level and loop-induced)
- → Spotted issues
- → Next step



#### YODA format

# drop

- → we should agree on the format in all details
- → complete content must be included: scale variations (now somewhat missing)
- → format should be described in some brief documentation: input from Mareen, Frank
- → for fixed-order calculations & comparison we stick to the "basic" format

# urpp											
1	0.0	0.2	0.03366140917517741	0.00018901621063600914	0.041177364219372105	0.042025848389118076	0.032981799508479466	0.03366140917517741	0.033808848627155046	0.027593458128667894	0.027714319508044274
2	0.2	0.4	0.10740598228153844	0.00034082497775796757	0.13140910396376818	0.13409502567042375	0.10525464178406327	0.10740598228153844	0.10786191714716475	0.08804451588555477	0.08841826196251665
3	0.4	0.6	0.17437250991830475	0.00042919978402626926	0.21341407569862253	0.2177018979484838	0.1709380964619299	0.17437250991830475	0.1750631621480169	0.14293936793262976	0.14350552020756657
4	0.6	0.8	0.236886597554931	0.0005076138277969747	0.29007473442420395	0.2957499545681256	0.23234092114991725	0.236886597554931	0.23772273010631353	0.19418439605003116	0.19486980373531868
5	0.8	1.0	0.29334006089803516	0.00055289929210769	0.3594690802246423	0.36623139755081185	0.2879236531581551	0.29334006089803516	0.2941951802797915	0.24046131419298394	0.24116228606057055
6	1.0	1.2	0.3447960280128414	0.0005943201253109428	0.4228839264033251	0.4304735289906782	0.33871699027862534	0.3447960280128414	0.3455570489301742	0.28264160636860974	0.2832654423675233
7	1.2	1.4	0.3910852432034445	0.0006275683213738394	0.48014431438210675	0.48826503526801035	0.38458079608302254	0.3910852432034445	0.391618294856776	0.32058652764401285	0.32102348910334666
8	1.4	1.6	0.43293803217780896	0.00065860787006766	0.5321805044099684	0.540517718895896	0.42626018035690294	0.43293803217780896	0.4330876278563072	0.3548947520597266	0.3550173809749222
9	1.6	1.8	0.4758416419848543	0.0006807280851049996	0.5855677443517895	0.59408233919188	0.46902171396773973	0.4758416419848543	0.4755713539412088	0.3900643718049691	0.38984280705181557
10	1.8	2.0	0.5201120367955319	0.0006926924661350885	0.6409239488275863	0.6493533734720398	0.5133603274797869	0.5201120367955319	0.5192313840793084	0.4263543939840931	0.4256324915312332
11	2.0	2.2	0.5676240530875181	0.0007142510797968876	0.7005240025384049	0.708671531632292	0.5610981334188568	0.5676240530875181	0.5659658071846742	0.46530168895143	0.46394236561919655



## LO results (tree level): integrated

code	OS approx.	full	unpol.	LL	LT	$\mathrm{TL}$	TT
MoCANLO	DPA	11.336(1)	11.242(1)	0.6574(1)	1.3332(2)	1.3370(2)	7.7874(8)
Stripper	DPA	11.3357(4)	11.2451(2)	0.6560(0)	1.3326(0)	1.3365(0)	7.7925(1)
MulBos	DPA	_	11.2393(3)	0.6572(0)	1.3329(1)	1.3366(1)	7.7846(2)
ВВмс	DPA	11.3372(4)	11.2424(3)	0.6574(0)	1.3333(1)	1.3372(1)	7.7872(2)
Sherpa	NWA	11.363(6)	12.135(5)	0.7112(5)	1.4444(8)	1.4396(8)	8.3821(37)
MadGraph	NWA	10.62(4)	10.52(4)	0.604(2)	1.237(5)	1.228(4)	7.3760(269)
PowHeg	DPA	11.448(1)	8. M				

**Table 3.** Integrated cross sections at LO (tree level).

- → Sherpa: systematic shift of +8% for all pol/unpol modes (+0.1% for full), cuts? NWA?
- → MadGraph: shift between -5% (TT) and -8% (LL) for all results, cuts? NWA?
- → DPA results agree by less than 3 STDs
- → PowHeg: runs on the way
- → photon-photon (only in full) below 0.02% of the total



### LO results (loop ind.): integrated

code	OS approx.	full	unpol.	LL	LT	TL	TT
MoCANLO	DPA	1.6968(6)	1.6978(6)	0.0914(0)	0.0360(0)	0.0356(0)	1.5360(5)
Stripper	DPA	1.682(7)	1.700(2)	0.0912(1)	0.0360(0)	0.0357(0)	1.538(2)
MulBos	DPA	_	1.6981(9)	0.0913(1)	0.0360(0)	0.0357(0)	1.5363(8)
MadGraph	NWA	1.699(6)	1.697(6)	0.0902(3)	0.0355(1)	0.0359(1)	1.539(6)

Table 4. Integrated cross sections at LO in the gg loop-induced channel.

- → DPA results agree by less than 2 STDs for pol/unpol and full
- → MadGraph agrees well with DPA ones for full/unpol, slight discrepancy for LL

## LO results (tree level): full off-shell



- → MadGraph overall shift
- → asymmetric-shape issue with Sherpa distribution in y(µ-)



→ Sherpa agrees with DPA in other distributions, e.g. M(4l)

COMETA

#### LO results (tree level): unpolarised

[fb/GeV]

da/dMe<sup>+e-</sup>

[/WoCaNL0]

6.0

[STDs]

-5.1

3 STD:



→ MadGraph and Sherpa overall shifts

 $\rightarrow$ 

NWA vs DPA: different M(e+e-) shapes, but first need to fix normalisation issues

 $pp \rightarrow e^+e^-\mu^+\mu^- \oplus LO$  (tree level),  $\sqrt{s} = 13 \text{ TeV}$ , NNPDF3.1luxQED

MoCaNLO

STRIPPER

Sherpa

MulBos

ladGraph

RBMC

COMETA

#### COMFTA

#### LO results (tree level): polarised







- shape-wise agreement in decay angles, apart  $\rightarrow$ from asymmetry in STRIPPER
- similar effects in TL/LT and for  $\Delta \phi$  and other  $\rightarrow$ variables, reduced but still present in TT
- discrep. at low pT's, but also large stat. oscillations
- MadGraph results with poor stat. already at  $\rightarrow$ moderate pT's 27



 $aa \rightarrow e^+e^-\mu^+\mu^- \otimes LO$  (loop-ind.),  $\sqrt{s} = 13 \text{ TeV}$ . NNPDF3.1luxOE

#### LO results (loop ind.): differential







→ good agreement for unpolarised (both angular and pT/mass)  asymmetry in STRIPPER LL in decay angle reduced but still present

 $aa \rightarrow e^+e^-\mu^+\mu^- \otimes LO$  (loop-ind.),  $\sqrt{s} = 13$  TeV. NNPDF3.11uxOED

- deviation of MadGraph close to Δφ(e+e-)=π, for LL (not for TT/TL!), not present in Δφ(e+µ+) instead
- → TL and LT swap in MadGraph: check



#### Technical issues and remarks

- → in MoCaNLO wrong definition in  $\cos\theta(e+\mu+)$  and M(3l): re-running ongoing
- →  $\cos\Delta\theta(e+\mu+)$  problem in BBMC only for TT mode at LO

- → understand overall shifts in MadGraph and Sherpa
- → understand asymmetric longitudinal shape distortions in STRIPPER

→ notation (raised by Richard): L/T or 0/T for longitudinal/transverse?



#### Next steps

- → analysis script and output plots will be pushed soon to the git repo
- → please have a look at the LO results: we should all give feedback and understand discrepancies in LO results which do not come from "trivial" mistakes

- → improve statistics in the pT tails where possible already at LO
- → assess compatibility of scale uncertainties at LO
- → NLO QCD runs (fixed order!)

→ next meeting end before summer break: Wed. 17th of July at 3pm CERN time?