Top quark mass calibration for Monte-Carlo event generators

Moritz Preisser

(University of Vienna)

Collaborators:

M. Butenschön (UHamburg), B. Dehnadi, A. Hoang (UVienna), V. Mateu (UAMadrid), I. Stewart (MIT)

universität wien

$\int dk \prod$ Doktoratskolleg Particles and Interactions

TOP2016 Olomouc

September 20, 2016

Motivation

- Precise knowledge of top quark mass very important:
  - Electroweak precision tests of the SM
  - Stability of the SM vacuum
  - Top production important as background for BSM searches
  - ...



- Experimental determinations are very precise
  - most precise values from direct reconstruction
  - many individual measurements with uncertainty below 1 GeV → CMS combination reaches < 500 MeV
  - ➜ PDG quotes an uncertainty of ~ 900 MeV
    [K.A.Olive et.al. (PDG) 2014]

$$m_t = 173.21 \pm 0.51(\text{stat}) \pm 0.71(\text{sys})\,\text{GeV}$$

  - relies on (General Purpose) Monte Carlo (MC) generators e.g. `PYTHIA`



Question: How should one interpret the "measured" top mass?

Top Mass Determinations at Hadron Colliders

- **Goal:** Reconstruct top from its decay products → Observable ∼ invariant mass distribution

- Experimental side
  - Experimentally reconstructed (jet algorithms) decay products feed into kinematic fit
  - Distribution for reconstructed top mass m_t^{reco}
- MC side (simulated events) - theory blackbox
  - carry out same procedure for different values of m_t^{MC}
  - ➜ m_t^{MC} is determined

Question: What is m_t^{MC}?





[CMS Phys. Rev. D 93, 072004]

Top Mass Determinations at Hadron Colliders

- **Goal:** Reconstruct top from its decay products → Observable ∼ invariant mass distribution

- Experimental side
  - Experimentally reconstructed (jet algorithms) decay products feed into kinematic fit
  - Distribution for reconstructed top mass m_t^{reco}
- MC side (simulated events) - theory blackbox
  - carry out same procedure for different values of m_t^{MC}
  - ➜ m_t^{MC} is determined
- Steps in the MC:
  - Hard ME - $t\bar{t}$ production
  - Parton shower - evolution down to the shower cutoff $\Lambda_{cut} \sim 1\text{GeV}$
  - Hadronization - model dependent
  - ➜ related to short distance mass

$$m_t^{\text{MC}} : m_t^{\text{short-distance}}(1\text{GeV})$$

[Hoang, Stewart '08, Hoang '14]



[original picture D. Zeppenfeld]

Strategy

- **Strategy:** compare quark mass-sensitive hadron level QCD calculations with sample data from some MC
  - look into observables with strong kinematic mass sensitivity
  - get accurate hadron level QCD predictions ($\geq$NLO/NLL) with full control over quark mass scheme dependence
  - fit QCD masses to different values of $m_t^{\rm MC}$ $\rightarrow$ for now we use `PYTHIA`

$$\boxed{m_t^{\rm MC} = m_t^{\rm MSR}(R \simeq 1{\rm GeV}) + \Delta_{\rm t,MC}^{\rm MSR}({\rm R} \simeq 1{\rm GeV})}$$

$$\boxed{m_t^{\rm MC} = m_t^{\rm pole} + \Delta_{t,{\rm MC}}^{\rm pole}} \qquad \Delta_{t,{\rm MC}} \simeq \mathcal{O}(1{\rm GeV})$$

Uncertainties we address in our e^+e^- study

- perturbative uncertainty
- scale uncertainties
- electroweak effects
- strong coupling α_s
- non-perturbative parameters

Additional pp systematics

- PS + UE
- color reconnection
- intrinsic uncertainty

Massive Event Shapes

- We use 2-jettiness τ_2 for **boosted tops** (c.o.m. energy $Q \gg m_t \sim$ high p_T) in $e^+e^- \to t\bar{t} \to$ hadrons

  mass sensitive version of thrust

$$\tau_2 = 1 - \max_{\hat{t}} \frac{\sum_i |\hat{t} \cdot \vec{p}_i|}{Q}$$

- for $\tau_2 \ll 1$ (peak):

$$\tau_2 \approx \frac{M_1^2 + M_2^2}{Q^2}$$

  hemisphere masses M_i

peak position is highly mass sensitive



Theory Description - EFT treatment

- Boosted top jets → SCET + bHQET
  [Fleming, Hoang, Mantry, Stewart 2007]
- Developments:
  - VFNS for final state jets (with massive quarks)
    [Gritschacher, Hoang, Jemos, Mateu, Pietrulewicz '13 '14]
    [Butenschön, Dehnadi, Hoang, Mateu '16 (to appear)]



  - Non-perturbative power-corrections are included via a shape function
    [Korchemsky, Sterman 1999]
    [Hoang, Stewart 2007]
    [Ligeti, Stewart, Tackmann 2008]

$$\frac{d\sigma}{d\tau} = \frac{d\sigma^{\rm part}}{d\tau} \otimes F_{\rm mod}(\Omega_1, \Omega_2, \ldots)$$

  - Gap-scheme
  - MSR mass & R-evolution
    [Hoang, Jain, Scimemi, Stewart 2010]

NNLL + NLO non-singular
+ hadronization
+ renormalon-subtraction

Convergence, Mass Sensitivity

- $\frac{\mathrm{d}\sigma}{\mathrm{d}\tau} = f(m_t^{\mathrm{MSR}}, \alpha_s(m_Z), \Omega_1, \Omega_2, \ldots, \mu_H, \mu_J, \mu_S, \mu_M, R, \Gamma_t)$

  any scheme   non-perturbative   renorm. scales   finite lifetime



- Good convergence
- Reduction of scale uncertainty (NLL to NNLL)
- Control over whole distribution
- Higher mass sensitivity for lower Q
- Finite lifetime effects included
- Dependence on non-perturbative parameters

Preparing the Fits

- $\frac{d\sigma}{d\tau} = f(m_t^{\rm MSR}, \alpha_s(m_Z), \Omega_1, \Omega_2, \ldots, \mu_H, \mu_J, \mu_S, \mu_M, R, \Gamma_t)$

  any scheme non-perturbative renorm. scales finite lifetime

- Generating PYTHIA Samples:
  at different energies: $Q = 600, 700, 800, ..., 1400$ GeV
  - masses: $m_t^{\rm MC} = 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175$ GeV
  - width: $\Gamma_t = 1.4$ GeV
  - Statistics: 10^7 events for each set of parameters

- Feed MC data into **Fitting Procedure:** all ingredients are there
  Fit parameters: $m_t^{\rm MSR}$, $\alpha_s(m_Z)$, $\Omega_1, \Omega_2, \ldots$
  - standard fit based on χ^2 minimization
  - analysis with 500 sets of profiles (τ_2 dependent renorm. scales) for the each MC sample
  - different Q-sets: 7 sets with energies between 600 - 1400 GeV
    different n-sets: 3 choices for fitranges - (xx/yy)% of maximum peak height

- High sensitivity to top quark mass but almost no sensitivity to α_s $\rightarrow$ α_s as input

Fit Results: Pythia vs. Theory



- Good agreement of PYTHIA 8.205 with $\mathrm{N^2LL + NLO}$ QCD description in peak region
- Perturbative uncertainties on theory side estimated via scale variations (profiles)
- MC incompatibility uncertainty estimate intrinsic difference between MC & theory via difference between different Q- & n-sets

Convergence & Stability: MSR vs Pole Mass

500 profiles; $\alpha_s = .118$; $\Gamma_t = 1.4$ GeV; tune 7;
$Q = 700, 1000, 1400$ GeV; peak$(60/80)\%$

Input: $m_t^{\mathtt{MC}} = 173$ GeV

fit to find $m_t^{\mathrm{MSR}}(1\mathrm{GeV})$ or m_t^{pole}

- Good convergence and stability for $m_t^{\mathrm{MSR}}(1\mathrm{GeV})$
- Pole mass numerically not at all close to m_t^{MC}

  900/600 MeV difference at NLL/NNLL!



Final Results

- All investigated MC top mass values show consistent picture
- MC top quark mass is indeed closely related to MSR mass

  within uncertainties:
  $m_t^{\mathrm{MC}} \simeq m_t^{\mathrm{MSR}}(1\mathrm{GeV})$

$m_t^{\mathrm{MC}} = 173\,\mathrm{GeV}\quad(\tau_2^{e^+e^-})$

mass	order	central	perturb.	incompatibility	total
$m_{t,1\,\mathrm{GeV}}^{\mathrm{MSR}}$	NLL	172.80	0.26	0.14	0.29
$m_{t,1\,\mathrm{GeV}}^{\mathrm{MSR}}$	$\mathrm{N^2LL}$	172.82	0.19	0.11	0.22
m_t^{pole}	NLL	172.10	0.34	0.16	0.38
m_t^{pole}	$\mathrm{N^2LL}$	172.43	0.18	0.22	0.28



Conclusion & Outlook

- First precise MC top quark mass calibration based on e^+e^- 2-jettiness
  1608.01318

  QCD calculations at $\mathrm{NNLL} + \mathrm{NLO}$ based on an extension of the SCET approach to include massive quark effects

- Top mass calibration for `PYTHIA` 8.205 in terms of Pole and MSR mass.
  For $m_t^{\mathrm{MC}} = 173$ GeV at NNLL:
  - $m_t^{\mathrm{pole}} = 172.43 \pm 0.28\ \mathrm{GeV}$ $\rightarrow$ not equal to the MC mass
  - $m_t^{\mathrm{MSR}}(1\mathrm{GeV}) = 172.82 \pm 0.22\ \mathrm{GeV}$ $\rightarrow$ $\mathrm{m_t^{MC}} \simeq \mathrm{m_t^{MSR}}(1\mathrm{GeV})$

Outlook:

- Other observables & $(\mathrm{N^3LL} + \mathrm{N^2LO})$
- pp 2-jettiness analysis, and mass calibration with pp MC data

Conclusion & Outlook

- First precise MC top quark mass calibration based on e^+e^- 2-jettiness
  1608.01318

  QCD calculations at $\mathrm{NNLL}+\mathrm{NLO}$ based on an extension of the SCET approach to include massive quark effects

- Top mass calibration for `PYTHIA` 8.205 in terms of Pole and MSR mass.
  For $m_t^{\mathrm{MC}} = 173$ GeV at NNLL:

  - $m_t^{\mathrm{pole}} = 172.43 \pm 0.28\ \mathrm{GeV}$ $\rightarrow$ not equal to the MC mass
  - $m_t^{\mathrm{MSR}}(1\mathrm{GeV}) = 172.82 \pm 0.22\ \mathrm{GeV}$ $\rightarrow$ $\mathrm{m_t^{MC}} \simeq \mathrm{m_t^{MSR}}(1\mathrm{GeV})$

Outlook:

- Other observables & $(\mathrm{N^3LL}+\mathrm{N^2LO})$
- pp 2-jettiness analysis, and mass calibration with pp MC data

Thank you for your attention!

Backup

Pole mass - MSR mass relation

$$\alpha_s(M_Z) = 0.118$$
$$n_f = 5$$

$$m_t^{\text{pole}} - m_t^{\text{MSR}}(1\,\text{GeV}) = \overset{\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s)}{0.173} + \overset{\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^2)}{0.138} + \overset{\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^3)}{0.159} + \overset{\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^4)}{0.23}\ \text{GeV}$$

← calculated

$$+\,0.53 + 1.43 + 4.54 + 16.6\ \text{GeV}$$
$$+\,68.6 + 317.7 + 1629 + 9158\ \text{GeV}$$

← extrapolated

- No precise/stable determination of m_t^{pole}

pp-2-jettiness

- Aditya Pathak (MIT) at Boost2016: pp-2-jettiness at NLL

Pythia with hardonization and MPI turned on

- One choice for Ω_1 which works for all p_T ranges.
- Here a soft model with $\Omega_1 = 0.5$ GeV reproduces the MPI and hadronization effects for the peak location.



MC Top Mass 2

- Short distance mass schemes:

  - R-scale short distance mass: $R < \overline{m}(\overline{m})$
    e.g. **MSR** mass [Hoang, Jain, Scimemi, Stewart 2008]:

$$m^{\mathrm{MSR}}(R) - m^{\mathrm{pole}} = -R \sum_{n=1} a_{n0} \left(\frac{\alpha_s(R)}{4\pi} \right)^n$$

$$m^{\mathrm{MSR}}(m^{\mathrm{MSR}}) = \overline{m}(\overline{m})$$

absorbs fluctuations $> R$,
smoothly interpolates all R-scales



  - $\overline{\mathrm{MS}}$ mass: $\mu \geq \overline{m}(\overline{m})$:

$$\overline{m}(\overline{m}) - m^{\mathrm{pole}} = -\overline{m}(\overline{m}) \sum_{n=1} a_{n0} \left(\frac{\alpha_s(\overline{m})}{4\pi} \right)^n$$

MG5 study: $e^+e^- \to W^+W^-b\bar{b}$ - signal $t\bar{t}$ vs full

- Non-resonant contributions are irrelevant for τ_2 distribution
  - PYTHIA (or similar MCs) will give a good description of the production process at LO
  - hemisphere invariant mass $\sim$ top invariant mass (no pollution from background)





PYTHIA8 study: hemisphere mass cuts

- In our theory description we treat the top decay as inclusive w.r.t. hemisphere
  - violated by decay products which cross to the other hemisphere
  - no differential impact in resonance region (irrelevant when normalized to signal region)

Cuts on hemisphere invariant mass above and below:

$$M_i^{\text{cut}} = m_t^{\text{MC}} \pm \Delta^{\text{cut}}$$









Results: MSR/$\overline{\text{MS}}$ parametric dependence on α_s

500 profiles; $\Gamma_t = 1.4$,-1 GeV;tune 7;
diff. Q-sets; peak$(60/80)\%$

$m_t^{\texttt{PYTHIA}} = 173$ GeV



- α_s dependence:
  $m^{\text{scheme}}[\alpha_s] - m^{\text{scheme}}[.118]$
- small dependenence of MSR mass on α_s
  ~ 50 MeV error ($\delta\alpha_s = .002$)
- large sensitivity of $\overline{\text{MS}}$ mass on α_s
- not an error:
  calculated from MSR

Results: tune dependence

500 profiles; $\Gamma_t = 1.4$,-1 GeV;tune $1, 3, 7$;
diff. Q-sets; peak$(60/80)\%$

$$m_t^{\texttt{PYTHIA}} = 173 \text{ GeV}$$

- tune dependence:
  $m^{\mathrm{MSR}}[\mathrm{tune}] - \mathrm{m}^{\mathrm{MSR}}[7]$
- clear sensitivity to tune
- m^{MC} will depend on tune
- tune dependence is not a calibration uncertainty:

  (different tune $\Rightarrow$ different MC $\Rightarrow$ m_t^{MC})