

Motivation

± 1%



Motivation





Motivation



Its good to have an indoor project

NNLO HADRON-COLLIDER CALCULATIONS VS. TIME



Progress in QCD

NNLO 2->2 for LHC now standard.





N³LO HADRON-COLLIDER CALCULATIONS VS. TIME

Shamelessly stolen from Leandro Cieri's Moriond QCD talk.



N3LO is still something we are learning to do!

N3LC

Handful of different calculations for cross sections.

Higgs production known differentially.



Coefficient of N3LO correction to the width is

$$\frac{d\,\Delta\Gamma_{H\to b\bar{b}}^{\rm N3LO}}{d\,\mathcal{O}_m} = \int d\Gamma_{H\to b\bar{b}}^{VVV} F_2^m(\Phi_2) d\Phi_2$$

$$+ \int d\Gamma^{RVV}_{H \to b\bar{b}} F_3^m(\Phi_3) d\Phi_3$$

$$+ \int d\Gamma^{RRV}_{H \to b\bar{b}} F_4^m(\Phi_4) d\Phi_4$$

$$+ \int d\Gamma^{RRR}_{H \to b\bar{b}} F_5^m(\Phi_5) d\Phi_5$$







Coefficient of N3LO correction to the width is

$$\frac{d\,\Delta\Gamma_{H\to b\bar{b}}^{\rm N3LO}}{d\,\mathcal{O}_m} = \int d\Gamma_{H\to b\bar{b}}^{VVV} F_2^m(\Phi_2) d\Phi_2$$

$$+\int d\Gamma^{RVV}_{H\to b\bar{b}}F^m_3(\Phi_3)d\Phi_3$$

$$+ \int d\Gamma^{RRV}_{H \to b\bar{b}} F_4^m(\Phi_4) d\Phi_4$$

$$+ \int d\Gamma^{RRR}_{H \to b\bar{b}} F_5^m(\Phi_5) d\Phi_5$$







Coefficient of N3LO correction to the width is

$$\frac{d\,\Delta\Gamma_{H\to b\bar{b}}^{\rm N3LO}}{d\,\mathcal{O}_m} = \int d\Gamma_{H\to b\bar{b}}^{VVV} F_2^m(\Phi_2) d\Phi_2$$

$$+\int d\Gamma^{RVV}_{H\to b\bar{b}}F^m_3(\Phi_3)d\Phi_3$$



real double-virtual (2-loops 3 partons)

$$+ \int d\Gamma^{RRV}_{H \to b\bar{b}} F_4^m(\Phi_4) d\Phi_4$$

$$+ \int d\Gamma^{RRR}_{H \to b\bar{b}} F_5^m(\Phi_5) d\Phi_5$$









N3LO

 $F_i^m(\Phi_i)$ defines the measurement function and tell us how to make m-jets out of i partons.

$$\frac{d\,\Delta\Gamma_{H\to b\bar{b}}^{\rm N3LO}}{d\,\mathcal{O}_m} = \int d\Gamma_{H\to b\bar{b}}^{VVV} F_2^m(\Phi_2) d\Phi_2 + \int d\Gamma_{H\to b\bar{b}}^{RVV} F_3^m(\Phi_3) d\Phi_3 + \int d\Gamma_{H\to b\bar{b}}^{RRV} F_4^m(\Phi_4) d\Phi_4 + \int d\Gamma_{H\to b\bar{b}}^{RRR} F_5^m(\Phi_5) d\Phi_5$$



Inclusive Width

The measurement function adds nearly all of the complexity. If I'm only interested in the total decay rate I can remove it and obtain the inclusive (partial) width.

Can obtain the inclusive partial width coefficient by using the optical theorem applied to the 4-loop two-point correlator



Infrared issues

The measurement function makes life difficult since it exposes us to a multitude of Infrared singularities, which exist in the individual parton phase spaces, but cancel upon combination into a suitably inclusive observable.

For example consider the triple-soft limit in which all of the gluons in this diagram have vanishing momentum.





Generational States of Contract States of Contract

Infrared issues

The measurement function makes life difficult since it exposes us to a multitude of Infrared singularities, which exist in the individual parton phase spaces, but cancel upon combination into a suitably inclusive observable.

For example consider the triple-soft limit in which all of the gluons in this diagram have vanishing momentum.





Generative States Stat

Infrared issues

The measurement function makes life difficult since it exposes us to a multitude of Infrared singularities, which exist in the individual parton phase spaces, but cancel upon combination into a suitably inclusive observable.

For example consider the triple-soft limit in which all of the gluons in this diagram have vanishing momentum.



Generational States of Contract States and States of Contract States

Projection to Born

There is no one set technique for dealing with IR issues at either NLO, NNLO or N3LO.

We're going to use Projection to Born Method (Cacciari, Dreyer, Karlberg, Salam, Zanderighi 1506.02660)



Projection to Born

There is no one set technique for dealing with IR issues at either NLO, NNLO or N3LO.

We're going to use Projection to Born Method (Cacciari, Dreyer, Karlberg, Salam, Zanderighi 1506.02660)



Generated event with $|\mathcal{M}^2|$



Projection to Born

There is no one set technique for dealing with IR issues at either NLO, NNLO or N3LO.

We're going to use Projection to Born Method (Cacciari, Dreyer, Karlberg, Salam, Zanderighi 1506.02660)



Generated event with $|\mathcal{M}^2|$



Projection to Born

There is no one set technique for dealing with IR issues at either NLO, NNLO or N3LO.

We're going to use Projection to Born Method (Cacciari, Dreyer, Karlberg, Salam, Zanderighi 1506.02660)





Projection to Born

There is no one set technique for dealing with IR issues at either NLO, NNLO or N3LO.

We're going to use Projection to Born Method (Cacciari, Dreyer, Karlberg, Salam, Zanderighi 1506.02660)





 $|\mathcal{M}^2| \times \left(F_2^5(\Phi_5) - F_2^2(\Phi_B) \right)$







 $|\mathcal{M}^2| \times \left(F_2^5(\Phi_5) - F_2^2(\Phi_B) \right)$

This is exactly the triple unresolved region.









 $|\mathcal{M}^2| \times \left(F_2^5(\Phi_5) - F_2^2(\Phi_B) \right)$

This is exactly the triple unresolved region.

Does not cancel exactly when only partons are unresolved (e.g. two gluons are soft)







 $|\mathcal{M}^2| \times \left(F_2^5(\Phi_5) - F_2^2(\Phi_B) \right)$

This is exactly the triple unresolved region.

Does not cancel exactly when only partons are unresolved (e.g. two gluons are soft)

This is an **NNLO** calculation.







 $|\mathcal{M}^2| \times \left(F_2^5(\Phi_5) - F_2^2(\Phi_B)\right)$

This is exactly the triple unresolved region.

Does not cancel exactly when only partons are unresolved (e.g. two gluons are soft)

This is an **NNLO** calculation.

So ingredient 1 for a projection to Born Method is an NNLO calculation of H=>3j (Mondini's talk)





We just arbitrarily subtracted a counterterm.

Projection to Born

We just arbitrarily subtracted a counterterm.

On its own this is not cool, since it is not part of the SM, just a regulator.



Projection to Born

We just arbitrarily subtracted a counterterm.

On its own this is not cool, since it is not part of the SM, just a regulator.

We had better reintroduce it.

However now we're going to explicitly integrate out the phase space



Generational States of Contract States and States of Contract States

Projection to Born

We just arbitrarily subtracted a counterterm.

On its own this is not cool, since it is not part of the SM, just a regulator.

We had better reintroduce it.

However now we're going to explicitly integrate out the phase space

If we integrate over all the projected Born phase space, we'll just recover the inclusive width (multiplying a LO phase space factor)



Generative States Stat

Projection to Born

We just arbitrarily subtracted a counterterm.

On its own this is not cool, since it is not part of the SM, just a regulator.

We had better reintroduce it.

However now we're going to explicitly integrate out the phase space

If we integrate over all the projected Born phase space, we'll just recover the inclusive width (multiplying a LO phase space factor)

So ingredient 2 for a projection to Born Method is the inclusive partial width (cross section) as a function of the LO kinematics.



Chetyrkin hep-ph/9608318





LO Phase space

H=>bb at LO is super trivial, two massless partons back to back.

We want some interesting observables at LO to test the IR cancellations in our code, so we introduce a fictitious collision axis, and measure relative to that.



Now we can define pt and rapidity like at the LHC.

We cluster with the Durham jet algorithm (ask your academic grandparents)







It works!

The size of corrections are observable dependent, scale variation is tiny



Generative States Stat



Results

Corrections to "real" observables are a little different.

Three regions :

1) $\delta(\mathcal{O})$ all phases spaces contribute, small uncertainty

2) Bulk, 3 parton+ phase spaces contribute, NNLO style scale variation

3) Tail 4 parton+ phase spaces contribute, looks like NLO scale variation



Results



Corrections to "real" observables are a little different.

Three regions :

1) $\delta(\mathcal{O})$ all phases spaces contribute, small uncertainty

2) Bulk, 3 parton+ phase spaces contribute, NNLO style scale variation

3) Tail 4 parton+ phase spaces contribute, looks like NLO scale variation





Conclusions

- We computed N3LO corrections to H=>bb/
- We used the projection to Born method + N-jettiness slicing to deal with the IR singular structure
- Our calculation is fully differential and could be deployed out of the rest frame for LHC/ FCC applications.
- Differential effects at N3LO are larger than small inclusive ones.









$$y_{ij} = \frac{2\min(E_i^2, E_j^2)(1 - \cos\theta_{ij})}{Q^2},$$







nclusive
$$\Delta \Gamma_{H \to b\bar{b}}^{\text{N3LO}} = \left(\frac{\alpha_s}{\pi}\right)^3 \int 8\pi \, \Gamma_{H \to b\bar{b}}^{\text{LO}} \Gamma_{H \to b\bar{b}}^{(3)} \, d\Phi_2$$
$$= \int \Delta \hat{\Gamma}_{H \to b\bar{b}}^{\text{N3LO}} \, d\Phi_2 \, .$$

Differential
$$\frac{d \Delta \Gamma_{H \to b\bar{b}}^{\text{N3LO}}}{d \mathcal{O}_m} = \int \Delta \hat{\Gamma}_{H \to b\bar{b}}^{\text{N3LO}} F_2^m(\Phi_B) d\Phi_B$$
$$+ \int d\Gamma_{H \to b\bar{b}}^{RVV} \left[F_3^m(\Phi_3) - F_2^m(\Phi_B)\right] d\Phi_3$$
$$+ \int d\Gamma_{H \to b\bar{b}}^{RRV} \left[F_4^m(\Phi_4) - F_2^m(\Phi_B)\right] d\Phi_4$$
$$+ \int d\Gamma_{H \to b\bar{b}}^{RRR} \left[F_5^m(\Phi_5) - F_2^m(\Phi_B)\right] d\Phi_5.$$



NNLO Validation









NNLO Validation



$$\tau_N = \sum_{j=1,n} \min_{i=1,2,N} \left\{ \frac{2q_i \cdot p_j}{Q_i} \right\}$$



Generative at Buffalo

N3LO Validation



$$\tau_N = \sum_{j=1,n} \min_{i=1,2,N} \left\{ \frac{2q_i \cdot p_j}{Q_i} \right\}$$

