

# Overview of Theoretical Luminosity Precision of Future $e^+e^-$ Colliders

**B.F.L. Ward**

Baylor University, Waco, TX, USA

Jul. 7, 2022

*in collaboration with*

*S. Jadach, W. Placzek, M. Skrzypek, S. A. Yost*

– see Phys.Lett.B **790** (2019) 314, Eur.Phys.J.C **81** (2021) 1047

## Current Situation, Related to LEP

### LEP update 2018(2019)

Type of correction / Error	1999	Update 2018
(a) Photonic $O(L_e\alpha^2)$	0.027% [5]	0.027%
(b) Photonic $O(L_e^3\alpha^3)$	0.015% [6]	0.015%
(c) Vacuum polariz.	0.040% [7,8]	0.013% (0.011%(JJ))
(d) Light pairs	0.030% [10]	0.010% [18, 19]
(e) s-channel Z-exchange	0.015% [11, 12]	0.015%
(f) Up-down interference	0.0014% [27]	0.0014%
(f) Technical Precision	–	(0.027)%
Total	0.061% [13]	0.038% (0.037%(JJ))

## Current Situation, Related to LEP

- Implied Upgrade of BHLUMI: 'not urgent' in Review for US DOE OHEP Funding Program
- Recent Work by Banerjee *et al.*, PLB 820 (2021) 136547, T. Engel *et al.*, in arXiv:2203.12557, contacts

Type of correction / Error	Update 2018	FCCEe forecast
(a) Photonic $O(L_e^4 \alpha^4)$	0.027%	$0.6 \times 10^{-5}$
(b) Photonic $O(L_e^2 \alpha^3)$	0.015%	$0.1 \times 10^{-4}$
(c) Vacuum polariz.	0.014% [25]	$0.6 \times 10^{-4}$
(d) Light pairs	0.010% [18, 19]	$0.5 \times 10^{-4}$
(e) Z and s-channel $\gamma$ exchange	0.090% [11]	$0.1 \times 10^{-4}$
(f) Up-down interference	0.009% [27]	$0.1 \times 10^{-4}$
(f) Technical Precision	(0.027)%	$0.1 \times 10^{-4}$
Total	0.097%	$1.0 \times 10^{-4}$

# Current Situation, Related to LEP



Contents lists available at [ScienceDirect](#)

Physics Letters B

[www.elsevier.com/locate/physletb](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/physletb)



## Bhabha scattering at NNLO with next-to-soft stabilisation

Pulak Banerjee<sup>a</sup>, Tim Engel<sup>a,b,\*</sup>, Nicolas Schalch<sup>c</sup>, Adrian Signer<sup>a,b</sup>, Yannick Ulrich<sup>d</sup>



<sup>a</sup> Paul Scherrer Institut, CH-5232 Villigen PSI, Switzerland

<sup>b</sup> Physik-Institut, Universität Zürich, Winterthurerstrasse 190, CH-8057 Zürich, Switzerland

<sup>c</sup> Albert Einstein Center for Fundamental Physics, Institut für Theoretische Physik, Universität Bern, Sidlerstrasse 5, CH-3012 Bern, Switzerland

<sup>d</sup> Institute for Particle Physics Phenomenology, University of Durham, South Road, Durham DH1 1LE, United Kingdom

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article history:

Received 21 June 2021

Received in revised form 12 July 2021

Accepted 21 July 2021

Available online 24 July 2021

Editor: A. Ringwald

### ABSTRACT

A critical subject in fully differential QED calculations originates from numerical instabilities due to small fermion masses that act as regulators of collinear singularities. At next-to-next-to-leading order (NNLO) a major challenge is therefore to find a stable implementation of numerically delicate real-virtual matrix elements. In the case of Bhabha scattering this has so far prevented the development of a fixed-order Monte Carlo at NNLO accuracy. In this paper we present a new method for stabilising the real-virtual matrix element. It is based on the expansion for soft photon energies including the non-universal subleading term calculated with the method of regions. We have applied this method to Bhabha scattering to obtain a stable and efficient implementation within the McMULE framework. We therefore present for the first time fully differential results for the photonic NNLO corrections to Bhabha scattering.

© 2021 The Authors. Published by Elsevier B.V. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>). Funded by SCOAP<sup>3</sup>.



## Current Situation, Related to LEP

References on Virtual Correction to Bremsstrahlung at  $O(\alpha^2L)$

1. S. Jadach et al., Phys. Lett. B 377 (1996) 168.
2. S. Jadach et al., Phys. Lett. B 450 (1999) 262.
3. S. Jadach et al., Comput. Phys. Commun. 70 (1992) 305.
4. S. Jadach et al., Comput. Phys. Commun. 102 (1997) 229.
5. S. Jadach et al., Acta Phys. Pol. B30 (1999) 1745.

## Current Situation, Related to LEP

### Comparisons:

1. Exact  $O(\alpha^2 L) \Rightarrow O(\alpha^2/\pi^2) \sim 5.4 \times 10^{-6}$  is missing
2. BaBaYaga vs Banerjee et al. :

$$E_{\min} = 408 \text{ MeV}, 20^\circ < \theta_{\pm} < 160^\circ, \zeta_{\max} = 10^\circ$$

Agreement: 0.07% (technical?)

Soft expansion:  $\lim_{\xi \rightarrow 0} \xi^2 \mathcal{M}_{n+1}^{(\xi)} = \mathcal{E} \mathcal{M}_n^{(\xi)} + \xi \mathcal{M}_{n+1} + \dots$ ,  
next-to-soft term

## Current Situation, Related to LEP

### Comparisons:

1. BHLUMI:  $O(\alpha^2 L)$  term implemented  $\Rightarrow O(\alpha^2/\pi^2)$  is missing in  $\tilde{\beta}_{1U}^{(r)}$ ,  $\tilde{\beta}_{1L}^{(r)}$

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma^{(r)} = & \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{n'=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} \frac{1}{n'!} \int \frac{d^3 p_2}{p_2^0} \int \frac{d^3 q_2}{q_2^0} \prod_{j=1}^n \int_{k_j \notin \Omega_U} \frac{d^3 k_j}{k_j^0} \tilde{S}_p(k_j) \prod_{l=1}^{n'} \int_{k'_l \notin \Omega_L} \frac{d^3 k'_l}{k'^l_0} \tilde{S}_q(k'_l) \\ & \times \delta^{(4)} \left( p_1 - p_2 + q_1 - q_2 - \sum_{j=1}^n k_j - \sum_{l=1}^{n'} k'_l \right) e^{Y_r(\Omega_U) + Y_q(\Omega_L)} \\ & \times \left\{ \tilde{\beta}_0^{(r)} + \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\tilde{\beta}_{1U}^{(r)}(k_j)}{\tilde{S}_p(k_j)} + \sum_{l=1}^{n'} \frac{\tilde{\beta}_{1L}^{(r)}(k'_l)}{\tilde{S}_q(k'_l)} + \sum_{n \geq j > k \geq 1} \frac{\tilde{\beta}_{2UU}^{(r)}(k_j, k_k)}{\tilde{S}_p(k_j) \tilde{S}_p(k_k)} \right. \\ & \left. + \sum_{n' \geq l > m \geq 1} \frac{\tilde{\beta}_{2LL}^{(r)}(k'_l, k'_m)}{\tilde{S}_q(k'_l) \tilde{S}_q(k'_m)} + \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^{n'} \frac{\tilde{\beta}_{2UL}^{(r)}(k_j, k'_l)}{\tilde{S}_p(k_j) \tilde{S}_q(k'_l)} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

No semi-soft approximation



## Current Situation, Higher Energies

Higher Energies and/or Different Acceptances:

Machine	$\theta_{\min} - \theta_{\max}$ (mrad)	$\sqrt{s}$ (GeV)	$\bar{i}/s$	$\sqrt{\bar{i}}$ (GeV)
LEP	28–50	$M_Z$	$3.5 \times 10^{-4}$	1.70
FCCee	64–86	$M_Z$	$13.7 \times 10^{-4}$	3.37
FCCee	64–86	350	$13.7 \times 10^{-4}$	13.0
ILC	31–77	500	$6.0 \times 10^{-4}$	12.2
ILC	31–77	1000	$6.0 \times 10^{-4}$	24.4
CLIC	39–134	3000	$13.0 \times 10^{-4}$	108

=> Different  $\sqrt{\bar{i}}$



## Current Situation, Higher Energies

Higher Energies and/or Different Acceptances: Generalizing our FCCee analysis to higher energies, we get

ILC 500 setup

Type of correction/error	Update 2019	Forecast
(a) Photonic [ $\mathcal{O}(L_e\alpha^2)$ ] $\mathcal{O}(L_e^2\alpha^3)$	0.033%	$0.13 \times 10^{-4}$
(b) Photonic [ $\mathcal{O}(L_e^3\alpha^3)$ ] $\mathcal{O}(L_e^4\alpha^4)$	0.028%	$0.27 \times 10^{-4}$
(c) Vacuum polariz.	0.022% [34]	$1.1 \times 10^{-4}$
(d) Light pairs	0.010% [7]	$0.4 \times 10^{-4}$
(e) Z and s-channel $\gamma$ exchange	0.5% (0.06%)	$1.0 \times 10^{-4}$
(f) Up-down interference	0.004% [13]	$<0.1 \times 10^{-4}$
(g) Technical Precision	(0.027%)	$0.1 \times 10^{-4}$
Total	0.5% (0.078%)	$1.6 \times 10^{-4}$

## Current Situation, Higher Energies

and the forecasts

Forecast			
Type of correction/error	FCCee350	ILC1000	CLIC3000
(a) Photonic $\mathcal{O}(L_2^2\alpha^3)$	$0.13 \times 10^{-4}$	$0.15 \times 10^{-4}$	$0.20 \times 10^{-4}$
(b) Photonic $\mathcal{O}(L_2^4\alpha^4)$	$0.27 \times 10^{-4}$	$0.37 \times 10^{-4}$	$0.63 \times 10^{-4}$
(c) Vacuum polariz.	$1.1 \times 10^{-4}$	$1.1 \times 10^{-4}$	$1.2 \times 10^{-4}$
(d) Light pairs	$0.4 \times 10^{-4}$	$0.5 \times 10^{-4}$	$0.7 \times 10^{-4}$
(e) Z and s-channel $\gamma$ exchange	$1.0 \times 10^{-4(4)}$	$2.4 \times 10^{-4}$	$16 \times 10^{-4}$
(f) Up-down interference	$0.1 \times 10^{-4}$	$< 0.1 \times 10^{-4}$	$0.1 \times 10^{-4}$
Total	$1.6 \times 10^{-4}$	$2.7 \times 10^{-4}$	$16 \times 10^{-4}$

(no technical error included).

Summary: We need financial support!