


IFI and ISR effects for Z Drell-Yan Observables using $\mathcal{K}\mathcal{K}$ MC-hh

Scott Yost

Revised 12/12/18

The Citadel – The Military College of South Carolina



with S. Jadach, B.F.L. Ward, and Z. Wąs

$\mathcal{K}\mathcal{K}$ MC-hh

- $\mathcal{K}\mathcal{K}$ MC-hh is an event-generator for Z production and decay in hadronic collisions, which grew from the e^+e^- event generator $\mathcal{K}\mathcal{K}$ MC created by S. Jadach, B.F.L. Ward, and Z. Was and later adapted for $q\bar{q}$ collisions.
- $\mathcal{K}\mathcal{K}$ MC-hh adds an LHAPDF interface and an interface to a shower generator, presently HERWIG6.5, but an external generator can be used.
- This talk will focus on the effect of QED radiative corrections in angular distributions, specifically A_{FB} and A_4 .
- In particular, we will look at how angular distributions are affected by photon ISR (Initial-State Radiation) and IFI (Initial-Final Interference).

$\mathcal{K}\mathcal{K}$ MC-hh Assumptions and Settings

- For the results in this talk, $\mathcal{K}\mathcal{K}$ MC-hh was run at an 8 TeV CM energy using MRST 2008 PDFs and a HERWIG6.521 shower.
- Note: $\mathcal{K}\mathcal{K}$ MC-hh should be used only with non-QED PDFs, since it includes collinear logarithms that are resummed in the PDFs. This is in contrast to the approach of programs such as WGRAD, ZGRAD and HORACE, in which the collinear logarithms are assumed to be in the PDFs, so running with QED PDFs would be appropriate.
- The most precise mode of $\mathcal{K}\mathcal{K}$ MC-hh, denoted CEEX2, includes soft photon ISR and FSR radiation exponentiated to all orders, supplemented by $\mathcal{O}(\alpha^2)$ hard photon residuals calculated through NLL order. $\mathcal{O}(\alpha)$ hard matrix element corrections are included via DIZET6.21.
- In its default CEEX mode, KKMC-hh includes IFI with exponentiation of resonance effects.
- The HERWIG shower adds to this LO QCD with resummed LL radiation in the shower.

Standard Model Input Parameters

DIZET uses a $G_\mu, \alpha(0), M_Z$ scheme ($\alpha(0)v_0$ in Elżbieta Richter-Wąs' Nov. talk). The $\sin^2(\theta_W)$ values below are calculated by DIZET. The quark current masses are used in $\mathcal{K}\mathcal{K}$ MC-hh's ISR. DIZET has different hard-wired quark masses depending on the hadronic vacuum polarization option. Those are shown in parentheses for the default Jegerlehner fit (IHVP=1).

$1/\alpha(0)$	137.03599991	$1/\alpha(M_Z)$	128.952 (in), 128.885 (out)
$\alpha_s(M_Z)$	0.12018	$\alpha_s(M_t)$	0.1094
G_F	$1.16637 \times 10^{-5} \text{ GeV}^{-2}$	α_s	0.12018
$\sin^2(\theta_W)$	0.22339867	$\sin^2(\theta_W)_{\text{eff}}$	0.23171962
M_Z	91.1876 GeV	Γ_Z	2.4952 GeV
M_W	80.3591 GeV	Γ_W	2.085 GeV
M_H	125 GeV	m_d	4.7 MeV (83 MeV)
m_u	2.2 MeV (62 MeV)	m_s	150 MeV (215 MeV)
m_c	1.2 GeV (1.5 GeV)	m_b	4.6 GeV (4.7 GeV)
m_t	173.5 GeV (same)	m_e	510.999 keV
m_μ	105.6583 MeV	m_τ	1.777 GeV


M_W is calculated NLO+HO corrections before calculating $\sin^2(\theta_W)$.

Angular Variables for $pp \rightarrow Z/\gamma^* \rightarrow \ell\bar{\ell}$

We will consider distributions of the angle θ_{CS} of the negative lepton defined in the Collins-Soper frame: the CM frame of ℓ^\pm , relative to a \hat{z} axis oriented as shown relative to the proton beams.

If $P = p_\ell + p_{\bar{\ell}}$ and $p^\pm = p^0 \pm p^z$ in the lab,

$$\cos(\theta_{CS}) = \text{sgn}(P^z) \frac{p_\ell^+ p_{\bar{\ell}}^- - p_{\bar{\ell}}^+ p_\ell^-}{\sqrt{P^2 P^+ P^-}}$$



Angular Variables

We will be primarily interested in the contribution of radiative corrections, in particular IFI, to the forward-backward asymmetry A_{FB} and angular coefficient A_4 as determined by θ_{CS} :

$$A_{\text{FB}} = \frac{\sigma_F - \sigma_B}{\sigma_F + \sigma_B}, \quad A_4 = 4\langle \cos(\theta_{\text{CS}}) \rangle = 4 \frac{\int \cos(\theta_{\text{CS}}) d\sigma}{\sigma}.$$

- In the absence of radiated photons, the CM frames of the final leptons, the initial quarks, and the rest frame of the Z would be identical.
- There might be a better way to approximate the rest frame of the Z boson in the presence of radiation, although IFI makes the source of the photons, and hence the inferred Z momentum, ambiguous.
- For example, one might add back photons that appear to be FSR by a proximity measure. This is already done in $\mathcal{K}\mathcal{K}$ MC-hh when defining the Z momentum passed to the QCD shower.
- I've included some slides in which FSR photons are identified as those closer (in the lab) to an outgoing fermion than to the beam.

Results from $\mathcal{K}\mathcal{K}$ MC-hh

- The following tests were done using ~ 100 M muon event samples, with MSTW2008 PDFs (LHAPDF index 21100).
- **All A_{FB} results are with lepton cuts, all A_4 results are without these.**
- A_4 was calculated with only a cut $70 < M < 110$ GeV.
- A_{FB} was calculated with an additional cut $p_T > 25$ GeV, $|\eta| < 2.5$ on both muons.
- The differential cross sections were calculated both with and without these additional muon cuts.
- Results for A_{FB} and A_4 are given in bins in M and Y :

$$M = 70 - 80, \quad 80 - 100, \quad 100 - 125, \quad 125 - 150, \quad 150 - 250 \quad \text{GeV},$$
$$|Y| = 0 - 1, \quad 1 - 2, \quad 2 - 3, \quad 3 - 4.$$

Numerical Results at 8 TeV

	Full CEEEX2	no IFI	no ISR
Uncut σ (pb)	864.62 ± 0.14	864.38 ± 0.13	877.17 ± 0.06
Cut σ (pb)	387.42 ± 0.09	387.41 ± 0.09	389.85 ± 0.53
A_{FB}	$(1.330 \pm 0.017) \times 10^{-2}$	$(1.316 \pm 0.017) \times 10^{-2}$	$(1.259 \pm 0.015) \times 10^{-2}$
A_4	$(6.662 \pm 0.025) \times 10^{-2}$	$(6.661 \pm 0.025) \times 10^{-2}$	$(6.518 \pm 0.025) \times 10^{-2}$

"Uncut" includes the M cut but no p_T or η cuts.

The following table shows the differences between the full CEEEX2 result and the calculations of A_{FB} and A_4 without IFI or ISR. These will be called the "contributions of IFI and ISR to the full CEEEX2 result" in the following.


	IFI Contribution	ISR Contribution
A_{FB}	$(-1.39 \pm 0.82) \times 10^{-4}$	$(-7.09 \pm 2.35) \times 10^{-4}$
A_4	$(-0.03 \pm 2.09) \times 10^{-4}$	$(-1.44 \pm 0.35) \times 10^{-3}$

Angular Distributions: $\text{Cos}(\theta_{CS})$


$70 < M < 110$ GeV, no p_T, η cuts.

The IFI contribution is $< 0.1\%$ while ISR is $\sim 1.5\%$. This is similar to what I showed in my last talk at 7 TeV.

$\text{Cos}(\theta_{CS})$ Distribution: Without Cuts



Fractional Contributions to Full CEEEX2 Result




Angular Distributions: $\text{Cos}(\theta_{CS})$


$$70 < M < 110 \text{ GeV}, p_T > 25 \text{ GeV}, |\eta| < 2.5$$

With the extra cuts, $\text{IFI} < 0.1\%$ again, and $\text{ISR} \sim 0.5\%$ was seen in the uncut case.

$\text{Cos}(\theta_{CS})$ Distribution: With Cuts




Fractional Contributions to Full CEEEX2 Result




A_{FB} Binned in M_{ll}

$$p_T > 25 \text{ GeV}, |\eta| < 2.5$$

Dependence of A_{FB} on M_{ll}




Contribution to Full CEEEX2 A_{FB}




A_{FB} Binned in Y_{ll}

$70 < M < 110 \text{ GeV}, p_T > 25 \text{ GeV}, |\eta| < 2.5$

Dependence of A_{FB} on $|Y_{ll}|$



Contribution to Full CEEEX2 A_{FB}




A_4 Binned in M_{ll}


No lepton cuts.

The IFI contribution is close to zero near the Z resonance, where it is suppressed.

Dependence of A_4 on M_{ll}




Contribution to Full CEE X2 A_4




A_4 Binned in Y_{ll}

$70 < M < 110$ GeV

Dependence of A_4 on $|Y_{ll}|$




Contribution to Full CEEEX2 A_4




FSR Effect on $\cos(\theta_{CS})$

The CS angle is supposed to be in the frame of the Z, but was calculated with final leptons. Separating FSR from ISR is ambiguous due to IFI. Here, the photons that are closer to a muon than the quarks are taken to be FSR.

Cos(θ_{CS}) Definition Comparison: Without Cuts




Ratio: FSR-corrected to Uncorrected: Without Cuts




FSR Effect on Angular Distributions

This is a similar plot with the lepton cuts applied.

$\text{Cos}(\theta_{CS})$ Definition Comparison: With Cuts




Ratio: FSR-corrected to Uncorrected: With Cuts




FSR Effect on A_{FB}

The effect of the same FSR correction is shown here on A_{FB} .

Dependence of A_{FB} on M_{ll}




Dependence of A_{FB} on Y_{ll}




FSR Effect on A_4

The effect of the same FSR correction is shown here on A_4 .

Dependence of A_4 on M_{\parallel}



Dependence of A_4 on Y_{\parallel}



KKMC ISR vs PDF ISR

- KKMC-hh includes soft exponentiation of both ISR and FSR. This includes collinear emission. It must be used with a PDF which does not include such radiation.
- Some other calculations, such as WGRAD/ZGRAD and the POWHEG Box assume collinear radiation is accounted for in the PDF and set a QED factorization scale which renders the hard process insensitive to collinear emission, so that quark masses are merely regulators. These programs must be used with a QED PDF or they will miss effects from collinear ISR.
- KKMC-hh includes non-collinear ISR, but if all of ISR is left to the PDFs by setting a high QED factorization scale, non-collinear photon emission will be missed.
- The following slides compare the effect of using CT14 non-QED vs CT14 QED PDFs (LHAPDF index 13100 and 13300 respectively). The results are from an unshowered run at 8 TeV with 10M muon events, and the same cuts as before. IFI is not included. We compare:
 - KKMC-hh without ISR and a non-QED PDF (no ISR (baseline case))
 - KKMC-hh with ISR and a non-QED PDF (labeled KKMC ISR)
 - KKMC-hh without ISR and a QED PDF (labeled QED PDF)
 - KKMC-hh with ISR and a QED PDF (labeled QED PDF + KKMC ISR)


PDF Comparison: $\text{Cos}(\theta_{\text{CS}})$ Distribution

This is an unshowered comparison with and without the cut


$$70 < M < 110 \text{ GeV}, p_T > 25 \text{ GeV}, |\eta| < 2.5.$$

The figures show ratios with respect to the baseline case of no ISR and a non-QED CT14 PDF.

Ratios to no ISR, no QED in PDF: Uncut




Ratios to no ISR, no QED in PDF: Cut




PDF Comparison for A_{FB}

The same comparisons are shown here for A_{FB} . The right-hand graph shows differences relative to no ISR with a non-QED CT14 PDF.

Contributions of KKMC ISR or QED PDF to A_{FB}





Contributions of KKMC ISR and QED PDF to A_{FB}



PDF Comparison for A_4

The same comparisons are shown here for A_4 . The right-hand graph shows differences relative to no ISR with a non-QED CT 14PDF.





Quark Masses and Collinear ISR

- The presence of collinear logarithms in $\mathcal{K}\mathcal{K}$ MC-hh ISR has raised the question of whether excessive ISR is being produced. In contrast to approaches where the logarithms are assumed to be factorized into the PDFs, the value of the quark masses has an influence on the results.
- We follow the MRST 2004 approach of using current masses for the light quarks. This is justified for energetic quarks by asymptotic freedom, which implies that perturbative calculations are applicable for both QED and QCD.
- Although the current mass appears to be preferred on general principles, I've included a few slides comparing the use of constituent and current quark masses, to show how much this affects the IFI and ISR contributions to A_{FB} and A_4 . These tests were run at 7 TeV and without a shower, but otherwise the same parameters, and MSTW 2008 PDFs.

Quark Mass Comparison for A_{FB}

The effect on A_{FB} of using constituent versus current quark masses is shown here.



QED-QCD Competition

- The issue has been brought up about whether competition between QED and QCD emission should suppress photon ISR.
- $\mathcal{K}\mathcal{K}$ MC-hh treats QCD and QED radiation in a factorizable approximation, which is consistent with the negligible contribution of nonfactorizable terms in the $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s\alpha)$ perturbative results of Dittmaier, Huss and Schwinn (arXiv:1403.3216).
- To the extent that QED and QCD corrections factorize, it should be a good approximation to treat them independently. This is rigorously true in the LL limit where the shower is constructed. At higher QCD precision, the issue may eventually need to be revisited. Presently, the competition manifests itself only through phase space constraints.
- This subject seems to be worthy of further discussion and clarification.

Summary

- For $70 < M_{ll} < 110$ GeV, the IFI contribution to A_{FB} is consistent with zero, but the statistics will improve as the current run progresses.
- The results seen here are generally consistent with what was seen at 7 TeV in my previous talk, although the ratio comparisons (rather than differences used here) in those slides can obscure this.
- Cuts can strongly affect the contribution of IFI, so it should always be checked for specific cuts of interest.
- ISR alone is a bigger effect than IFI, typically a few %, as seen in earlier studies with $\mathcal{K}\mathcal{K}$ MC-hh. This is also cut dependent, and largely due to bin migration, since ISR reduces the CM energy.
- As expected, there is some sensitivity to how whether the FSR photons are removed before calculating the CS angle. There is an intrinsic ambiguity in how to do this in the presence of IFI.
- More details on $\mathcal{K}\mathcal{K}$ MC-hh can be found in
 - Phys. Rev. D94 (2016) 074006 (arXiv:1608.01260)
 - arXiv:1707.06502 (submitted to Phys. Rev. D)