NNLO predictions for t-channel single-top

Fabrizio Caola, CERN

Work done in collaboration with
M. Brucherseifer and K. Melnikov

SM@LHC, Florence, Apr. 22nd 2015

Single-top: the price of precision

At the LHC: single-top is precision physics

Classical picture: 3 production mechanisms

T-CHANNEL



LHC8: ~ 82%

ASSOCIATED PRODUCTION



LHC8: ~ 15%

S-CHANNEL



LHC8: ~ 5%

With stable tops and at tree-level:
clear separation / hierarchy among different channels

The price of precision

Mixing at the quantum level

T-CHANNEL



LHC8: ~ 82%

INTERFERENCE

ASSOCIATED PRODUCTION



SAME FINAL STATE OF TOP-PAIR

S-CHANNEL



LHC8: ~ 5%

Rigid separation: good for the old 'pioneering' days, must be taken with care for precision physics

t- vs s- channels: it still makes sense



IN PRINCIPLE:

- beyond LO: interferences, no well defined distinction

HOWEVER IN PRACTICE:

- thanks to color, interference starts at NNLO (in the 5FNS)
- suppressed (color / kinematics)

CAN STILL TALK MEANINGFULLY ABOUT T (AND S) CHANNEL

- Talking about FIDUCIAL CROSS SECTION is much better
- Ideally for REALISTIC FINAL STATES

[Situation much more tricky for Wt/WWbb]

The quest for precision: t-channel @ NNLO

t-channel single top: do we need NNLO?

Look at the NLO prediction

The total cross section at the 8 TeV LHC:

$$\sigma_{\rm LO} = 53.77 + 3.03 - 4.33 \text{ pb}$$
$$\sigma_{\rm NLO} = 55.13 + 1.63 - 0.90 \text{ pb}$$

Naively:

"Small ~ 2% corrections, no need to go further"

If 'genuine' NLO corrections are at the percent level:

- NNLO in the per-mill range
- Irrelevant w.r.t. other sources of uncertainties (PDFs, m_b, m_t…)

However…

T-channel single top: do we need NNLO?

The total cross section at the 8 TeV LHC: A CLOSER LOOK

$$\sigma_{\mathrm{LO}} = 53.77 + 3.03 - 4.33 \text{ pb}$$

$$\sigma_{\mathrm{NLO}} = 55.13 + 1.63 - 0.90 \text{ pb}$$



[Campbell et al (2009)]

- Scale variation (-> h.o. est.) similar to corrections
- ~ percent difference between 4FNS/5FNS calculations

Residual perturbative uncertainty at the percent-level

t-channel single top: do we need NNLO?

'Typical' NLO corrections are much more ~10%

$$\sigma_{\rm LO} = 53.77 + 3.03 - 4.33 \text{ pb}$$

$$\sigma_{\rm NLO} = 55.13 + 1.63 - 0.90 \text{ pb}$$



+12%



-14%

Large cancellations among channels

(beware of approximations only considering one channel)

t-channel single top: do we need NNLO?

THE NLO K-FACTOR IS ACCIDENTALLY SMALL

The pattern of cancellation is (very)
phase-space dependent:

$$\sigma(p_{\perp,t} > p_{\perp,cut})$$

$p_\perp$	$\sigma_{\rm LO}$, pb	$\sigma_{\rm NLO}$, pb	$\delta_{\rm NLO}$
0 GeV	$53.8^{+3.0}_{-4.3}$	$55.1^{+1.6}_{-0.9}$	$+2.4\%$
20 GeV	$46.6^{+2.5}_{-3.7}$	$48.9^{+1.2}_{-0.5}$	$+4.9\%$
40 GeV	$33.4^{+1.7}_{-2.5}$	$36.5^{+0.6}_{-0.03}$	$+9.3\%$
60 GeV	$22.0^{+1.0}_{-1.5}$	$25.0^{+0.2}_{+0.3}$	$+13.6\%$

Corrections to more exclusive observables ~ 10%

T-channel single top: do we need NNLO?

The total cross section at the 8 TeV LHC: A CLOSER LOOK

$$\sigma_{\rm LO} = 53.77 + 3.03 - 4.33 \text{ pb}$$
$$\sigma_{\rm NLO} = 55.13 + 1.63 - 0.90 \text{ pb}$$

- Large (accidental?) cancellations between channels
- Scale variation (~ NNLO!) as large as corrections
- Larger corrections for more exclusive observables

To control single-top production at the percent level:
NNLO CORRECTION TO T-CHANNEL PRODUCTION

Anatomy of a NNLO computation

- For a long time, the problem of NNLO computations was how to consistently extract IR singularity from double-real emission/real-virtual emission
- This problem has now been solved both in theory (antenna subtraction, sector decomposition+FKS, semi-analytic subtraction, q_T) and in practice. Colorful 2->2 has been achieved (top-pair, dijet, H+jet,…)
- Now the problematic part is computing two-loop amplitudes. State of the art:
  - Numerically: 2->2 with 1 extra mass-scale (tt)
  - Analytically: 2->2 with two external mass scales (VV*)

t-channel single-top @ NNLO

Recent developments in NNLO techniques, allowed us to compute (almost) t-channel single-top corrections.

In particular, for our computation:

- Sector-decomposition+FKS [Czakon (2010); Boughezal, Melnikov, Petriello(2011); Czakon, Heymes (2014)]
- 5FNS@NNLO (2->2) (although almost all nice features of 4FNS@NLO naturally inherited)
- Fully differential (arbitrary cuts on the final state are not a problem -> fiducial region)
- For now, top is stable but in principle possible to implement top decay in the NWA with full spin correlation (polarization studies…)

Single-top in the ‘factorized’ approximation

Two-loop amplitudes:



Trivial (~NLO^2)

Simple





~OK

hard



Preliminary investigations:
[Uwer et al (2014)]

Must be interfered with tree-level -> COLOR SINGLET

The ‘hard’ amplitude contribution is suppressed by $1/N_c^2$

NEGLECTED IN OUR COMPUTATION

[same for s/t interference]

Single-top @ NNLO: total cross section

8 TeV LHC, MSTW2008, m_t = 173.2 GeV

$$\sigma_{\mathrm{LO}} = 53.8^{+3.0}_{-4.3}\ \mathrm{pb} \qquad \sigma_{\mathrm{NLO}} = 55.1^{+1.6}_{-0.9}\ \mathrm{pb}$$

$$\sigma_{\mathrm{NNLO}} = 54.2^{+0.5}_{-0.2}\ \mathrm{pb}$$

($\mu_R=\mu_F=\{m_t/2,\ m_t,\ 2\ m_t\}$)

- Still delicate interplay/cancellations between different channels -> important to consistently compute corrections to all of them
- Result very close to the NLO (-1.6%), reduced μ dependence -> good theoretical control
- μ dependence dominated by factorization scale (larger scale -> more b)

Single-top @ NNLO: more differential observables

$p_\perp$	$\sigma_{\rm LO}$, pb	$\sigma_{\rm NLO}$, pb	$\delta_{\rm NLO}$	$\sigma_{\rm NNLO}$, pb	$\delta_{\rm NNLO}$
0 GeV	$53.8^{+3.0}_{-4.3}$	$55.1^{+1.6}_{-0.9}$	$+2.4\%$	$54.2^{+0.5}_{-0.2}$	-1.6%
20 GeV	$46.6^{+2.5}_{-3.7}$	$48.9^{+1.2}_{-0.5}$	$+4.9\%$	$48.3^{+0.3}_{-0.02}$	-1.2%
40 GeV	$33.4^{+1.7}_{-2.5}$	$36.5^{+0.6}_{-0.03}$	$+9.3\%$	$36.5^{+0.1}_{+0.1}$	-0.1%
60 GeV	$22.0^{+1.0}_{-1.5}$	$25.0^{+0.2}_{+0.3}$	$+13.6\%$	$25.4^{-0.1}_{+0.2}$	$+1.6\%$



- Contrary to NLO, results stable in the full spectrum
- Scale dependence typically improved
- K-factor is small but not constant

Very similar results for anti-top

$$\sigma_{\mathrm{NNLO},\bar{t}} = 29.7^{+0.3}_{-0.1}\ \mathrm{pb}$$

$p_\perp$	σ_{LO}, pb	σ_{NLO}, pb	δ_{NLO}	σ_{NNLO}, pb	δ_{NNLO}
0 GeV	$29.1^{+1.7}_{-2.4}$	$30.1^{+0.9}_{-0.5}$	$+3.4\%$	$29.7^{+0.3}_{-0.1}$	-1.3%
20 GeV	$24.8^{+1.4}_{-2.0}$	$26.3^{+0.7}_{-0.3}$	$+6.0\%$	$26.2^{-0.01}_{-0.1}$	-0.4%
40 GeV	$17.1^{+0.9}_{-1.3}$	$19.1^{+0.3}_{+0.1}$	$+11.7\%$	$19.3^{-0.2}_{+0.1}$	$+1.0\%$
60 GeV	$10.8^{+0.5}_{-0.7}$	$12.7^{+0.03}_{+0.2}$	$+17.6\%$	$12.9^{-0.2}_{+0.2}$	$+1.6\%$



- NLO corrections slightly larger, NNLO very similar
- For some cuts, slightly larger scale variation w.r.t top, NLO scale variation can be accidentally small (fake result from channel cancellations)

Single-top total cross section, NNLO QCD

8 TeV LHC, MSTW2008, m_t = 173.2 GeV

$$\sigma^{\rm NLO}_{t+\bar t} = 85.2^{+2.5}_{-1.4}\ {\rm pb}, \qquad \sigma^{\rm NNLO}_{t+\bar t} = 83.9^{+0.8}_{-0.3}\ {\rm pb} \qquad ({\rm scale\ only})$$

$$\sigma^{\rm ATLAS}_{t+\bar t} = 82.6 \pm 1.2\ ({\rm stat.}) \pm 11.4\ ({\rm syst.}) \pm 3.1\ ({\rm PDF}) \pm 2.3\ ({\rm lumi})$$

$$\sigma^{\rm CMS}_{t+\bar t} = 83.6 \pm 2.3\ ({\rm stat.}) \pm 7.4\ ({\rm syst.}){\rm pb}$$



top/anti-top ratio very stable

$$\sigma_{t,\rm LO}/\sigma_{\bar t,\rm LO} = 1.85$$

$$\sigma_{t,\rm NLO}/\sigma_{\bar t,\rm NLO} = 1.83$$

$$\sigma_{t,\rm NNLO}/\sigma_{\bar t,\rm NNLO} = 1.83$$

No substantial modification w.r.t. NLO -> handle on PDF?

Towards the fiducial region

- Although a consistent computation of NNLO single-top with decay is not available, all ingredients are there [NWA]
  [Gao, Li, Zhu (2012); Brucherseifer, FC, Melnikov (2013)]







Next natural step:
COMBINE NNLO
PRODUCTION AND DECAY

-> Access to the fiducial region

Conclusions

Single-top: from discovery to precision physics

- Increasing experimental precision demands for accurate theory predictions. One important ingredient:
  NNLO corrections for t-channel production
  - Corrections as large as NLO on the total rate
  - Small (non-constant) K-factor, (differential) NLO stable

- Future work
  - Benchmark cross-sections, with full error estimate (PDFs, m_t/m_b…)
  - Comparisons in the fiducial region
  - Ideally, with realistic final states -> top decay
  - (matching with PS?)

Thank you for
your attention!

single-top @ NNLO: 5FNS vs 4FNS@NLO

NLO

NNLO



Inside NNLO 5FNS: ~ NLO 4FNS

- collinear regulator: MSbar vs m_b (log resummed, p.s.t. neglected)
- SLC light/heavy interference neglected in our computation
- ‘Nice’ features of 4FNS NLO (B-JET MODELING) inherited

Validating the NWA

In general, the NWA works extremely well, as expected

Conditions of applicability:

- do not look at observables sensitive to M_{Wb}
- do not look beyond kinematic edges



[Papanastasiou, Frederix, Frixione, Hirschi, Maltoni (2013)]

Towards a definition of Wt

[Cascioli, Maierhoefer, Kallweit, Pozzorini (2013), OpenLoops]

Theoretically sound procedure to remove NWA tt contribution from Wt/off-shell effects



NLO(LO) 4F NNPDFSs, $p_{T,j} = 30\,\mathrm{GeV}$

$$d\sigma_{WWb\bar{b}} \sim \frac{1}{\Gamma_t^2} d\sigma_{t\bar{t}} + \frac{1}{\Gamma_t} d\sigma_t + d\sigma_{bkg}$$

Devise cuts to enhance single-resonant region

- Non tt effects very jet-bin dependent, concentrated in the 0/1 jet bins
- Large in phase space regions with unresolved b-quarks

Put physical intuition on a precise quantitative level