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Motivation
Why investigate color matrix element corrections?

- Effects of order $1/N_c^2$ can be comparable to other uncertainties, and $1/N_c$ suppression is present if there are two or more $q\bar{q}$-pairs in the process.
- The colored initial state and the higher energy at the LHC gives rise to many colored partons and hence many color suppressed terms.
- For a leading $N_c$ shower, the number of color connected pairs grows roughly as $N_{\text{partons}}$, but the number of pairs of colored partons grows as $N_{\text{partons}}^2 \rightarrow$ expect larger effects at LHC.
- Needed for exact (N)NLO matching.
- A step towards a full color shower, including virtual color rearranging gluon exchanges.
Dipole factorization gives, whenever $i$ and $j$ become collinear or one of them soft:

$$\left| \mathcal{M}_{n+1}(\ldots, p_i, \ldots, p_j, \ldots, p_k, \ldots) \right|^2 = \sum_{k \neq i, j} \frac{1}{2 p_i \cdot p_j} \langle \mathcal{M}_n(p_{\tilde{i}j}, p_{\tilde{k}}) | \mathbf{V}_{ij,k}(p_i, p_j, p_k) | \mathcal{M}_n(p_{\tilde{i}j}, p_{\tilde{k}}) \rangle$$

An emitter $\tilde{i}j$ splits into two partons $i$ and $j$, with the spectator $\tilde{k}$ absorbing the momentum to keep all partons (before and after) on-shell. (Catani, Seymour hep-ph/9605323)
The spin averaged dipole insertion operator is

\[ V_{ij,k}(p_i, p_j, p_k) = -8\pi \alpha_s V_{ij,k}(p_i, p_j, p_k) \frac{T_{\tilde{i}j} \cdot T_k}{T_{\tilde{i}j}^2} \]  

(1)

Where, for example, for a final-final dipole configuration, we have

\[ V_{q\rightarrow qq,k}(p_i, p_j, p_k) = C_F \left( \frac{2(1-z)}{(1-z)^2 + p_{\perp}^2/s_{ijk}} - (1+z) \right) \]  

(2)
For a leading $N_c$ shower, the emission probability is

$$dP_{ij,k}(p_\perp^2, z) = V_{ij,k}(p_\perp^2, z) \frac{d\phi_{n+1}(p_\perp^2, z)}{d\phi_n} \times \frac{\delta(i\bar{j}, k \text{ color connected})}{1 + \delta_{i\bar{j}g}}$$

(3)

Including subleading emissions, instead gives

$$dP_{ij,k}(p_\perp^2, z) = V_{ij,k}(p_\perp^2, z) \frac{d\phi_{n+1}(p_\perp^2, z)}{d\phi_n} \times \frac{-1}{T_{i\bar{j}}^2} \frac{\langle M_n | T_{i\bar{j}} \cdot T_k | M_n \rangle}{|M|^2}$$

(4)
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Color Matrix Element Corrections
Using Herwig’s dipole shower

- Instead of only allowing color connected emitter-spectator pairs to radiate, all possible pairs can radiate
- All pairs may radiate in proportion to (for the first emission)

$$\omega_{ik}^{n} = \frac{-1}{T_{ij}^{2}} \frac{\langle \mathcal{M}_{n} | T_{ij} \cdot T_{ik} | \mathcal{M}_{n} \rangle}{|\mathcal{M}|^{2}}$$ (5)

- Reweighting to encompass negative contributions
- The full color structure is evolved to be able to evaluate the above factor for the next emission
- Color structure is calculated using ColorFull (MS 1412.3967)
- $N_c = 3$ shower for a number of emissions, then standard leading $N_c$ shower
We can write the amplitude as a vector in some basis (trace, multiplet, etc.),

\[ |\mathcal{M}_n\rangle = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{d_n} c_{n,\alpha} |\alpha_n\rangle \leftrightarrow \mathcal{M}_n = (c_{n,1}, \ldots, c_{n,d_n})^T \quad (6) \]

and construct a “density operator” \( \mathcal{M}_n = \mathcal{M}_n \mathcal{M}_n^\dagger \), that we evolve by

\[ M_{n+1} = -\sum_{i\neq j} \sum_{k\neq i,j} \frac{4\pi\alpha_s}{p_i \cdot p_j} \frac{V_{i,j,k}(p_i, p_j, p_k)}{T^{2}_{i\tilde{j}}} T_{k,n} M_n T_{i\tilde{j},n}^\dagger \quad (7) \]

where

\[ V_{i,j,k} = T^{2}_{i\tilde{j}} \frac{p_i \cdot p_k}{p_j \cdot p_k} \quad (8) \]

This allows us to calculate the color matrix element corrections.
Evolving the density operator, we can calculate the color matrix element corrections for any number of emissions

\[
\omega_{ik}^n = -\frac{1}{T_{ij}^2} \left( \frac{\text{Tr} \left( S_{n+1} \times T_{\tilde{k},n} M_n T_{ij,n}^\dagger \right) \text{Tr} \left( S_n \times M_n \right) }{\text{Tr} \left( S_n \times M_n \right)} \right)
\]  

Note that \(\omega_{ik}^n\) can be negative, this is included through the weighted Sudakov algorithm (Bellm, SP, Richardson, Siodmok, Webster, 1605.08256)

This initially resulted in very large weights. Modifications to the weighted Sudakov veto algorithm drastically reduced the weights.
Compared to our previous $e^+e^-$ results (SP, MS 1206.0180), we have added:

- The $g \rightarrow q\bar{q}$ splitting
- Hadronic initial state, meaning initial state radiation
- Full compatibility with all of the additional functionality in Herwig 7.1. (So we can run any process now, in particular LHC events)
- Subsequent standard leading $N_c$ showering after the $N_c = 3$ shower
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Preliminary Results
Since a limited number of $N_c = 3$ emissions are kept, up to 3 for LHC and 5 for LEP, we check the $p_T$ of the last corrected emission.

- → We go far down in $p_T$ compared to relevant jet scales, at LEP close to the hadronization scale.
- → We expect convergence of most standard hard observables (this is also confirmed by allowing fewer $N_c = 3$ emissions).
For most $e^+e^-$ observables we find small corrections, at the percent level. However, some observables (thrust, out-of-plane $p_\perp$, hemisphere masses, aplanarity, jet multiplicities for many jets) are corrected by $\sim 5\%$.

Figure: Number of jets with $E > 5$GeV, and aplanarity
LHC Preliminary Results

For LHC observables, corrections are typically of order a few percent, but some observables show corrections of $10 - 20\%$.

Figure: Rapidity of hardest and second hardest jet using a 50GeV analysis cut.
If we could study quark-gluon scattering, we would find large corrections

\[ \frac{d\sigma}{dy}(\text{jet } 1) \quad [\text{pb}] \]

\[ \frac{d\sigma}{dy}(\text{jet } 2) \quad [\text{pb}] \]

Figure: Rapidity distribution of the hardest and second hardest jet while considering only $qg \to qg$ scattering and a 50 GeV analysis cut.

... but we cannot
LHC Preliminary Results

Requiring one forward (quark dominated) and one central (gluon dominated) jet we find sizable corrections for many observables.

Figure: Rapidity and $\Delta\phi_{1,3}$ for the central/forward case

$(400 < M_{12} < 600 \text{ GeV}, 3.8 < |y_1 + y_2| < 5.2, 1.5 < |y_2 - y_1| < 3.5)$
LHC Preliminary Results

We have compared to LHC data for a wide range of observables. In general we find small corrections and no overall visible change in data description.

Figure: Central transverse thrust and thrust minor for $\sqrt{s} = 7\text{GeV}$, CMS

$T_C = \max \hat{n}_T \frac{\sum_i |\vec{p}_{\perp, i} \cdot \hat{n}_T|}{\sum_i \vec{p}_{\perp, i}}$, $T_{m,C} = \frac{\sum_i |\vec{p}_{\perp, i} \times \hat{n}_T|}{\sum_i \vec{p}_{\perp, i}}$ for jet $i$, with $\eta < 1.3$
In the hard perturbative region:

- We have considered a wide range of observables at LEP and LHC and compared to data.
- Overall the data description does not change.
- As long as soft scales/observables with very many jets are not considered, the matrix element correction type of corrections are accurately described by correcting the first few emissions.
- In general, percent level corrections are found at LEP, for some observables (thrust, out-of-plane $p_{\perp}$, hemisphere masses, aplanarity, jet multiplicities for many jets) effects of around 5%.
- At the LHC, corrections are often a few percent, for some observables (mostly rapidity) corrections around 10-20%.
Going Soft/Very Many Colored Partons

For soft QCD, where we cannot expect reliable results due to the need of more color suppressed terms, resummation, hadronization and MPI, we find larger corrections in many cases, (jet resolution scales, cluster masses in Herwig, number of very soft jets at LEP, charged multiplicity distribution, individual hadron multiplicities), indicating that subleading $N_c$ effects probably play an important role for soft(ish) QCD.

Figure: Examples of large corrections: first cluster mass in Herwig, number of jets at LEP using a 2 GeV energy cut, charged multiplicity distribution.
In the soft region/region of many colored partons:

- In this region, we cannot claim accurate results, however,
- we often find large corrections of several ten percent
- This affects the state going into the hadronization
- meaning that we can expect a significant effect on the tune
- Subleading $N_c$ effects can therefore be hidden in the tune
- Need to retune
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Current Status and Future Work
Current Status and Future Work

- We can run the $N_c = 3$ parton shower for any LEP or LHC process.
- Tuning should be performed before a reliable comparison to standard showers can be done.
- We still miss virtual corrections, which rearrange the color structure without any real emissions. These are important for gap-survival observables.
- In the more distant future, an update of hadronization models to an $N_c = 3$ final state would be an interesting research task.

Thank you! I hope you could hear me...
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Backup Slides
Figure: Weight distribution for $e^+e^-$ (left) and $pp$ collisions (right) depending on the number of $N_c = 3$ emissions allowed. All generated events are used in these plots, i.e., no further analysis cut is applied.
$N_c = 3$ Shower Reaching Soft Scales

**LEP**

- 4th $N_c=3$ emission
- 5th $N_c=3$ emission
- 6th $N_c=3$ emission

**LHC 50 GeV**

- 3rd $N_c=3$ emission
- 4th $N_c=3$ emission
More LEP Observables

Figure: Out-of-plane $p_\perp$ w.r.t. the thrust and thrust major axes (left), light hemisphere mass (middle) and fraction of events containing $N_{\text{ch}}$ charged particles. DELPHI, ALEPH
Figure: Fraction of events having no additional jet with $p_{\perp}$ above $Q_0$ within a rapidity interval $|y| < 0.8$ (left) and fraction of events where the scalar sum of transverse momenta within $|y| < 0.8$ does not exceed $Q_{\text{sum}}$ (right) for $t\bar{t}$ events at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV. ATLAS 1203.5015
Figure: The angle $\beta$, $\tan \beta = \frac{|\phi_3 - \phi_2|}{\text{sign}(\eta_2)(\eta_3 - \eta_2)}$, using (left) an underlying $2 \to 2$ hard process and (right) an underlying $2 \to 3$ hard process. CMS 1102.0068
Standard veto algorithm: we want to generate a scale $q$ and additional splitting variables $x$ (e.g. $z$ and $\phi$) according to a distribution $dS_P$.

$$dS_P(\mu, x_\mu | q, x | Q) = dq d^d x \left( \Delta_P(\mu | Q) \delta(q - \mu) \delta(x - x_\mu) + P(q, x) \theta(Q - q) \theta(q - \mu) \Delta_P(q | Q) \right)$$

Where $\Delta_P$ is the Sudakov form factor,

$$\Delta_P(q | Q) = \exp \left( - \int_q^Q dk \int d^d z P(k, z) \right)$$

To do this we use an overestimate of the distribution (with nicer analytical properties) $dS_R$ (change $P \rightarrow R$ in the above eqs.). Where we require $R(q, x) \geq P(q, x)$ for all $q, x$. 
Standard veto algorithm: we want to generate a scale $q$ and additional splitting variables $x$ (e.g. $z$ and $\phi$) according to a distribution $dS_P$.

$$dS_P(\mu, x_\mu|q, x|Q) = dqd^d x \left( \Delta_P(\mu|Q)\delta(q - \mu)\delta(x - x_\mu) 
+ P(q, x)\theta(Q - q)\theta(q - \mu)\Delta_P(q|Q) \right)$$

Where $\Delta_P$ is the Sudakov form factor,

$$\Delta_P(q|Q) = \exp \left( -\int_q^Q dk \int d^d z P(k, z) \right)$$

To do this we use an overestimate of the distribution (with nicer analytical properties) $dS_R$ (change $P \to R$ in the above eqs.). Where we require $R(q, x) \geq P(q, x)$ for all $q, x$. 
Standard veto algorithm

\[ P(q, x) > 0 \text{ and } R(q, x) \geq P(q, x). \text{ Set } k = Q \]

1. Generate \( q \) and \( x \) according to \( S_R(\mu, x_\mu | q, x | k) \).
2. If \( q = \mu \), there is no emission above the cutoff scale.
3. Else, accept the emission with the probability
   \[ \frac{P(q, x)}{R(q, x)}. \]
4. If the emission was vetoed, set \( k = q \) and go back to 1.
Weighted veto algorithm

Introduce an acceptance probability $0 \leq \epsilon(q, x|k, y) < 1$ and a weight $\omega$. Set $k = Q$, $\omega = 1$.

1. Generate $q$ and $x$ according to $S_R(\mu, x_\mu|q, x|k)$.
2. If $q = \mu$, there is no emission above the cutoff scale.
3. Accept the emission with the probability $\epsilon(q, x|k, y)$, update the weight
   \[ \omega \rightarrow \omega \times \frac{1}{\epsilon} \times \frac{P}{R} \]
4. Otherwise update the weight to
   \[ \omega \rightarrow \omega \times \frac{1}{1 - \epsilon} \times \left(1 - \frac{P}{R}\right) \]
   and start over at 1 with $k = q$. 
Leading color structure:

\[
\left| \begin{array}{c}
\epsilon \\
\epsilon \\
\epsilon \\
\epsilon \\
\end{array} \right|^2 = T_R \begin{array}{c}
\epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \\
\end{array} = T_R^2 (N_c^2 - 1) \propto N_c^2.
\]
Example of $1/N_c$ suppressed terms

Leading color structure:

\[ \left| \begin{array}{c}
\text{Leading color structure:}
\end{array} \right|^{2} \propto N_c^2. \]

Interference term:

\[ \left( \begin{array}{c}
\text{Interference term:}
\end{array} \right) \left( \begin{array}{c}
\end{array} \right)^{*} = T_R - \frac{T_R}{N_c} \]

\[ = 0 - T_R \frac{N_c^2 - 1}{N_c} \propto N_c. \]
Example of $1/N_c$ suppressed terms

\[
\left( \begin{array}{c}
\quad \\
\end{array} \right) \left( \begin{array}{c}
\quad \\
\end{array} \right)^* = \begin{array}{c}
\quad \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
= TR - \frac{TR}{N_c} \propto N_c^2
\]

\[
\propto N_c^2
\]