EW, QCD, and interference contributions

Mathieu PELLEN

Institute for Theoretical Physics and Astrophysics,
University Würzburg

Based on: **[arXiv:1611.02951] Phys.Rev.Lett. 118 (2017) no.26, 261801,**
[arXiv:1708.00268] JHEP 1710 (2017) 124
in collaboration with: Benedikt Biedermann and Ansgar Denner

[arXiv:1801.XXXX]
+ VBSCAN MC team (incomplete list): Brass, Dittmaier, **Grossi**, **Karlberg**, **Pelliccioli**, **Rauch**, Reuter, **Rothe**, **Schwan**, **Stienemeier**, **Zaro**

Monte-Carlo description of VBS
Amsterdam, the Netherlands

16th of November 2017

Outline

Content

pp $\to \mu^+\nu_\mu e^+\nu_e jj$

→ All partonic channels taken into account

- $uu \to \mu^+\nu_\mu e^+\nu_e dd$
- $u\bar{d} \to \mu^+\nu_\mu e^+\nu_e s\bar{c}$
- $uc \to \mu^+\nu_\mu e^+\nu_e sd$
- $\bar{d}\bar{d} \to \mu^+\nu_\mu e^+\nu_e \bar{u}\bar{u}$
- $u\bar{d} \to \mu^+\nu_\mu e^+\nu_e d\bar{u}$
- $u\bar{s} \to \mu^+\nu_\mu e^+\nu_e d\bar{c}$
- $\bar{s}\bar{d} \to \mu^+\nu_\mu e^+\nu_e \bar{u}\bar{c}$

→ Tree amplitudes of order $\mathcal{O}\left(g^6\right)$ and $\mathcal{O}\left(g_s{}^2 g^4\right)$



$pp \to \mu^+\nu_\mu e^+\nu_e jj$

Three contributions at LO:

- $\mathcal{O}\left(\alpha^6\right)$ (= "EW contribution")
- $\mathcal{O}\left(\alpha_s\alpha^5\right)$ (= "interference")
- $\mathcal{O}\left(\alpha_s{}^2\alpha^4\right)$ (= "QCD contribution")

Cuts: inspired by Refs. [1405.6241, 1611.02428, 1410.6315, CMS-PAS-SMP-17-004]

charged lepton:	$p_{T,\ell} > 20\,\text{GeV}$,	$\lvert y_\ell \rvert < 2.5$,	$\Delta R_{\ell\ell} > 0.3$
jets:	$p_{T,j} > 30\,\text{GeV}$,	$\lvert y_j \rvert < 4.5$,	$\Delta R_{j\ell} > 0.3$
missing energy:	$p_{T,\text{miss}} > 40\,\text{GeV}$,		

$+$ Extra VBS cuts on m_{jj} and Δy_{jj}

$\to$ "Play the experimentalist" and scan over m_{jj} and Δy_{jj}





VBSCAN MC team / full computation

→ Background contributions become very relevant on the peak









VBSCAN MC team / full computation

→ Experimentalist are doing a good job!

($m_{jj} > 500\,\text{GeV}$ and $|\Delta y_{jj}| > 2.5$ are good values)

→ Check the validity of the VBS approximation (implemented in different variants in: BONSAY, POWHEG, VBFNLO, and MG_aMC@NLO)

→ Comparison at LO: full vs. VBS approximation



VBSCAN MC team

→ Reasonable agreement away from the resonance region

Message: do not use the VBS for $m_{jj} < 200\,\text{GeV}$ and $|\Delta y_{jj}| < 2.0$

$\to$ Follow up

- NLO computations running (now):
  $\to$ full vs. VBS approximation (as implemented in BONSAY)
  $\to$ $m_{jj} > 200\,\text{GeV}$ and $|\Delta y_{jj}| > 2.0$
- Is the approximation failing?
- If yes, by how much?

$\to$ Stay tuned

Content

$\rightarrow$ Calculation of both NLO QCD and EW corrections to

$$pp \rightarrow \mu^+\nu_\mu e^+\nu_e jj$$

- Off-shell and non-resonant contributions
  $\rightarrow$ Realistic final state
- Full calculations vs. VBS approximation
- EW corrections can be large in certain phase space regions
  $\rightarrow$ Sudakov logarithms
- Theoretical and numerical challenge to consider $2 \rightarrow 6$ process
  $\rightarrow$ Virtual corrections involving up to 8-point functions

pp $\rightarrow \mu^+\nu_\mu e^+\nu_e jj$

LO cross sections at $\mathcal{O}(\alpha^6)$, $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s\alpha^5)$, and $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s{}^2\alpha^4)$



NLO cross sections at $\mathcal{O}(\alpha^7)$, $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s\alpha^6)$, $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s{}^2\alpha^5)$, and $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s{}^3\alpha^4)$

$\rightarrow$ Order $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s\alpha^6)$ and $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s{}^2\alpha^5)$: QCD and EW corrections mix
$\rightarrow$ Combined measurement

Predictions for $\sqrt{s} = 13$TeV at the LHC
pp $\to \mu^+\nu_\mu e^+\nu_e jj$

- NNPDF3.0QED [NNPDF collaboration]
- dynamical renormalisation and factorisation scale:
  $\mu_{\rm ren} = \mu_{\rm fac} = \sqrt{p_{\rm T,j_1}\, p_{\rm T,j_2}}$
- Cuts inspired by Refs. [1405.6241, 1611.02428, 1410.6315, CMS-PAS-SMP-17-004] :

$$\text{charged lepton:}\quad p_{\rm T,\ell} > 20\,\text{GeV},\quad |y_\ell| < 2.5,\quad \Delta R_{\ell\ell} > 0.3$$
$$\text{jets:}\quad p_{\rm T,j} > 30\,\text{GeV},\quad |y_{\rm j}| < 4.5,\quad \Delta R_{\rm j\ell} > 0.3$$
$$\text{missing energy:}\quad p_{\rm T,miss} > 40\,\text{GeV},$$

→ For the two leading jet in $p_{\rm T}$:

$$\text{jet-jet:}\quad m_{\rm jj} > 500\,\text{GeV},\quad |\Delta y_{\rm jj}| > 2.5.$$

→ Final state: 2 jets, missing $p_{\rm T,}$, and 2 same sign leptons

- anti-$k_{\rm T}$ jet algorithm [Cacciari, Salam, Soyez; 0802.1189]
  $R = 0.4$ for jet recombination and $R = 0.1$ for photon recombination

→ LO fiducial cross sections:

Order	$\mathcal{O}(\alpha^6)$	$\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s\alpha^5)$	$\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^2\alpha^4)$	Sum
σ_{LO} [fb]	1.4178(2)	0.04815(2)	0.17229(5)	1.6383(2)

→ NLO fiducial cross sections: (normalised to σ_{LO})

Order	$\mathcal{O}(\alpha^7)$	$\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s\alpha^6)$	$\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^2\alpha^5)$	$\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^3\alpha^4)$	Sum
$\delta\sigma_{\mathrm{NLO}}$ [fb]	−0.2169(3)	−0.0568(5)	−0.00032(13)	−0.0063(4)	−0.2804(7)
$\delta\sigma_{\mathrm{NLO}}/\sigma_{\mathrm{LO}}$ [%]	−13.2	−3.5	0.0	−0.4	−17.1

Updated with respect to Split presentation [Biedermann, Denner, MP; 1708.00268]

→ Large EW corrections at $\mathcal{O}(\alpha^7)$
→ Negative corrections at $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s\alpha^6)$:
$\sim$ 0.6% difference with respect to VBS approximation
(negelecting *s*-channel and *t*-/*u*-channel interferences)
→ Tuned comparison against [Denner, et al.; 1209.2389] and [Jäger, et al.; 0907.0580]
→ VBS approximation in RECOLA
→ Photon PDF contribution at NLO (not included in NLO definitions):
+1.50% with LUXqed [Manohar et al.; 1607.04266]

Separated contributions



Updated with respect to Split presentation [Biedermann, Denner, MP; 1708.00268]

→ Clear hierarchy of LO contributions

→ Different behaviour of the NLO corrections (normalised to the full LO)

Combined predictions



Updated with respect to Split presentation [Biedermann, Denner, MP; 1708.00268]

→ Large negative corrections for the full process

→ Corrections dominated by EW correction to EW process

  → Bands do not overlap

Content

LO: $\mathcal{O}(\alpha^6)$
NLO: $\mathcal{O}(\alpha^7)$

σ^{LO} [fb]	$\sigma^{\mathrm{NLO}}_{\mathrm{EW}}$ [fb]	δ_{EW} [%]
1.5348(2)	1.2895(6)	−16.0



[Biedermann, Denner, MP; 1611.02951]

→ Huge NLO electroweak correction (!)

- Leading behaviour dominated by:
  Sudakov logarithms (bosonic part of the virtual), $\log^2\left(\frac{Q^2}{M_W^2}\right)$
  $\rightarrow$ Usually in the tail of the distribution (suppressed)
  $\rightarrow$ Usually small for total cross section
  $\rightarrow$ Usually smaller than the QCD corrections
- Large corrections not due to VBS cuts
  $\rightarrow$ remove $m_{jj} > 500\,\text{GeV}$ and $|\Delta y_{jj}| > 2.5$
  $\rightarrow$ relax $p_{T,j}$ and $p_{T,miss}$

- Double-pole approximation: [Dittmaier, Schwan; 1511.01698]
  leading contribution of expansion about the resonance poles
  → Required two W bosons for the virtual contributions



- Agree within 1% with full calculation
- Dominated by factorisable corrections
  → Large corrections driven by the scattering process

- Effective Vector Boson approximation:



- Simplify the discussion to $W^+W^+ \to W^+W^+$
- Leading logarithm approximation [Denner, Pozzorini; hep-ph/0010201]

$$\sigma_{LL} = \sigma_{LO}\left[1 - \frac{\alpha}{4\pi} 4 C_W^{ew} \log^2\left(\frac{Q^2}{M_W^2}\right) + \frac{\alpha}{4\pi} 2 b_W^{ew} \log\left(\frac{Q^2}{M_W^2}\right)\right]$$

(double EW logs, collinear single EW logs, and single logs from parameter renormalisation included) (angular-dependant logarithms omitted)

$$\sigma_{\mathrm{LL}} = \sigma_{\mathrm{LO}} \left[1 - \frac{\alpha}{4\pi} 4 C_{\mathrm{W}}^{\mathrm{ew}} \log^2\left(\frac{Q^2}{M_{\mathrm{W}}^2}\right) + \frac{\alpha}{4\pi} 2 b_{\mathrm{W}}^{\mathrm{ew}} \log\left(\frac{Q^2}{M_{\mathrm{W}}^2}\right) \right]$$

- For $Q = \langle m_{4\ell} \rangle \sim 390\,\mathrm{GeV}$

$$\delta_{\mathrm{EW}}^{\mathrm{LL}} = -16\%\ (!)$$

→ Corrections 3-4 times larger than for $q\bar{q} \to \mathrm{W}^+\mathrm{W}^+$

- C^{ew} larger for bosons than fermions
- $\langle m_{4\ell} \rangle$ larger for VBS (massive t-channel [Denner, Hahn; hep-ph/9711302])
  NB: $\langle m_{4\ell} \rangle \sim 250\,\mathrm{GeV}$ for $q\bar{q} \to \mathrm{W}^+\mathrm{W}^+$

Large NLO EW corrections:
intrinsic feature of VBS at the LHC



[Biedermann, Denner, MP; 1611.02951]

→ Near $y_{j_1j_2} = 0$: two jets back-to-back
Bulk of the cross section, $\sim -16\%$ corrections
→ Band: $\pm 1/\sqrt{N_{\text{obs}}}$ for $3000\,\text{fb}^{-1}$ → probe of the EW sector

Content

Conclusion

- Study of the fiducial region
  → Validity of the VBS approximation
- Full NLO corrections to pp $\to \mu^+\nu_\mu e^+\nu_e jj$:
  [Biedermann, Denner, MP; 1708.00268]
  - At NLO VBS and QCD-induced contributions mix:
    → Combined measurement
  - Full computations:
    → Small differences with respect to the VBS approximation
- NLO EW corrections to VBS:
  [Biedermann, Denner, MP; 1611.02951]
  - Unexpected large EW corrections
    → Probe of the EW sector



Back-up slides

BACK-UP

- Tools
  → Virtual corrections: RECOLA [Actis, Denner, Hofer, Lang, Scharf, Uccirati]
  + COLLIER [Denner, Dittmaier, Hofer]
  → Private Monte Carlos (MOCANLO [Feger] + another one)
  → Dipole subtraction scheme [Catani,Seymour], [Dittmaier]
  → Complex-mass scheme [Denner et al.]
- Inputs
  → G_μ scheme:

$$\alpha = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi} G_\mu M_W^2 \left(1 - \frac{M_W^2}{M_Z^2}\right) \quad \text{with} \quad G_\mu = 1.16637 \times 10^{-5}\,\text{GeV}$$

  → Parameters:

$$\begin{aligned} m_t &= 173.21\,\text{GeV}, & \Gamma_t &= 0\,\text{GeV} \\ M_Z^{OS} &= 91.1876\,\text{GeV}, & \Gamma_Z^{OS} &= 2.4952\,\text{GeV} \\ M_W^{OS} &= 80.385\,\text{GeV}, & \Gamma_W^{OS} &= 2.085\,\text{GeV} \\ M_H &= 125\,\text{GeV} & \Gamma_H &= 4.07 \times 10^{-3}\,\text{GeV} \end{aligned}$$

Validations

- Two independent Monte Carlo integrators
- Tree-level matrix elements: MadGraph5_aMC@NLO [Alwall et al.; 1405.0301]
- One-loop matrix elements:
  - vs. MadLoops [Hirschi et al.; 1103.0621]:
    - $\mathcal{O}(\alpha^7)$ and $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^3\alpha^4)$
  - Two libraries in Collier [Denner, Dittmaier, Hofer; 1407.0087, 1604.06792]:
    - $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s\alpha^6)$, $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^2\alpha^5)$, and $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^3\alpha^4)$
- NLO computations:
  - DPA for $\mathcal{O}(\alpha^7)$ (automatised in [MP et al.; 1607.05571, 1612.07138] following [Dittmaier, Schwan; 1511.01698])
  - $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s\alpha^6)$ vs. [Denner, et al.; 1209.2389] in the VBS approximation
- IR-subtraction/finiteness:
  - Variation of α parameter [Nagy, Troscanyi; hep-ph/9806317]
  - Variation of technical cuts
  - Variation of IR-scale

Distributions extra



DPA (1) [Dittmaier, Schwan; 1511.01698]

- At LO



- At NLO



DPA (2) [Dittmaier, Schwan; 1511.01698]

- Factorisable corrections

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{virt,fact,PA}} = \sum_{\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_r} \left(\prod_{i=1}^{r} \frac{1}{K_i} \right) \Bigg[\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{virt}}^{I\to N,\overline{R}} \prod_{j=1}^{r} \mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{LO}}^{j\to R_j} + \mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{LO}}^{I\to N,\overline{R}} \sum_{k=1}^{r} \mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{virt}}^{k\to R_k} \prod_{j\neq k}^{r} \mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{LO}}^{j\to R_j} \Bigg]_{\left\{\overline{k}_l^2 \to \widehat{\overline{k}}_l^2 = M_l^2\right\}_{l\in\overline{R}}}$$

- Non-factorisable corrections:

$$2\mathrm{Re}\left\{ \mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{LO,PA}}^{*} \mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{virt,nfact,PA}} \right\} = \left| \mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{LO,PA}} \right|^2 \delta_{\mathrm{nfact}}$$

- On-shell projection
- DPA applied to virtual corrections and I-operator
- Full Born and Real contributions: