

# Towards Z+jet NNLO event generation matched to parton showers in GENEVA







**Simone Alioli**

MILANO-BICOCCA UNIVERSITY & INFN

# The Geneva method

- ▶ Monte Carlo fully-differential event generation at higher-orders (NNLO)
- ▶ Resummation plays a key role in the defining the events in a physically sensible way
- ▶ Results at partonic level can be further evolved by different shower matching and hadronization models



# Resolution parameters for N extra emissions

- ▶ The key idea is the introduction of a resolution variable  $r_N$  that measure the hardness of the  $N + 1$ -th emission in the  $\Phi_N$  phase space.

- ▶ For color singlet production one can have  $r_0 = q_T, p_T^j, k_T$ -ness,....

- ▶ N-jettiness is a valid resolution variable: given an M-particle phase space point with  $M \geq N$

$$\mathcal{T}_N(\Phi_M) = \sum_k \min \{ \hat{q}_a \cdot p_k, \hat{q}_b \cdot p_k, \hat{q}_1 \cdot p_k, \dots, \hat{q}_N \cdot p_k \}$$

- ▶ The limit  $\tau_N \rightarrow 0$  describes a N-jet event where the unresolved emissions are collinear to the final state jets/initial state beams or soft


- ▶ For color-singlet final states, it reduces to 0-jettiness

$$\mathcal{T}_0 = \sum_k |\vec{p}_{kT}| e^{-|\eta_k - Y|}$$


[Stewart, Tackmann, Waalewijn '09, '10]

- ▶ When an extra jet is present 1-jettiness used for  $r_1$


$$\mathcal{T}_1 = \sum_k \min \left\{ \frac{2q_a \cdot p_k}{Q_a}, \frac{2q_b \cdot p_k}{Q_b}, \frac{2q_J \cdot p_k}{Q_J} \right\}$$




# Partitioning phase space with resolution cuts





$$\frac{d\sigma}{d\Phi_2}(r_0 > r_0^{cut}, r_1 > r_1^{cut})$$




## 1 jet



$$\frac{d\sigma}{d\Phi_1}(r_0 > r_0^{cut}, r_1^{cut})$$



## 0 jets



$$\frac{d\sigma}{d\Phi_0}(r_0^{cut})$$

When emissions become unresolved, cuts must be resummed.  
 Differential information below cut is lost during projection.

**No difference for preserved quantities**, in general can be made a power correction.

Mapping that preserves singular behavior is required for correct event definition.



# Resummation of resolution parameters



Resumming resolutions parameters not really a new idea, SMCs have been doing it since the '80s with Sudakov factors

Using resummation at higher orders has several benefits: **systematically improvable** (NLL, NNLL, N3LL,...), lowering theoretical uncertainty at each step.

Higher accuracy allows to lower the cuts without risking missing higher logarithms being numerically relevant.

The lower the cut the **smaller** the nonsingular **power corrections** due to phase-space projections will affect the results differentially.

For NNLO event generation one needs at least NNLL'  $r_0$  + NNLO accuracy to control the full  $\alpha_s^2$  singular contributions.



# From resummation to event generation

Final GENEVA partonic formulae combine resummation and matching to fixed-order



Lacking multi-differential resummation at this order, resummed results in  $\mathcal{T}_0$  need to be made more differential via splitting functions, capturing the singular behaviour of different resolution variables as best as they can.

$$\frac{d\sigma^{\text{MC}_0}}{d\Phi_0}(\mathcal{T}_0^{\text{cut}}) = \frac{d\sigma^{\text{NNLL}'}}{d\Phi_0}(\mathcal{T}_0^{\text{cut}}) + \frac{d\sigma_0^{\text{nons}}}{d\Phi_0}(\mathcal{T}_0^{\text{cut}})$$

$$\frac{d\sigma_0^{\text{nons}}}{d\Phi_0}(\mathcal{T}_0^{\text{cut}}) = \frac{d\sigma_0^{\text{NNLO}_0}}{d\Phi_0}(\mathcal{T}_0^{\text{cut}}) - \left[ \frac{d\sigma^{\text{NNLL}'}}{d\Phi_0}(\mathcal{T}_0^{\text{cut}}) \right]_{\text{NNLO}_0}$$

$$\frac{d\sigma^{\text{MC}_1}}{d\Phi_1}(\mathcal{T}_0 > \mathcal{T}_0^{\text{cut}}; \mathcal{T}_1^{\text{cut}}) = \frac{d\sigma_{\geq 1}^{\text{C}}}{d\Phi_1} U_1(\Phi_1, \mathcal{T}_1^{\text{cut}}) \theta(\mathcal{T}_0 > \mathcal{T}_0^{\text{cut}}) + \frac{d\sigma_1^{\text{match}}}{d\Phi_1}(\mathcal{T}_0 > \mathcal{T}_0^{\text{cut}}; \mathcal{T}_1^{\text{cut}})$$

$$\frac{d\sigma^{\text{MC}_{\geq 2}}}{d\Phi_2}(\mathcal{T}_0 > \mathcal{T}_0^{\text{cut}}, \mathcal{T}_1 > \mathcal{T}_1^{\text{cut}}) = \frac{d\sigma_{\geq 1}^{\text{C}}}{d\Phi_1} U'_1(\Phi_1, \mathcal{T}_1) \theta(\mathcal{T}_0 > \mathcal{T}_0^{\text{cut}}) \Big|_{\Phi_1 = \Phi_1^{\mathcal{T}}(\Phi_2)} \times \mathcal{P}(\Phi_2) \theta(\mathcal{T}_1 > \mathcal{T}_1^{\text{cut}}) + \frac{d\sigma_{\geq 2}^{\text{match}}}{d\Phi_2}(\mathcal{T}_0 > \mathcal{T}_0^{\text{cut}}, \mathcal{T}_1 > \mathcal{T}_1^{\text{cut}})$$









WRONG  
#  $\alpha_s^i \log\left(\frac{p_T^H}{q}\right)$

# Implemented color-singlet processes

Method has been tested and validated with several color singlet production processes:

DY, ZZ,  $W\gamma$ , VH,  $\gamma\gamma$ , ggH, ggHH, WW using both  $\mathcal{T}_0$ ,  $q_T$  and  $p_T^{\text{jet}}$




Method also extended to top-quark pair production with zero-jettiness resummation

# Extension to processes with jets

- ▶ Focus of color-singlet plus jet production

$$\mathcal{T}_1 = \sum_k \min \left\{ \frac{2q_a \cdot p_k}{Q_a}, \frac{2q_b \cdot p_k}{Q_b}, \frac{2q_J \cdot p_k}{Q_J} \right\}$$



- ▶ To remove energy-dependence and minimize only along directions  $Q_i = 2E_i$ 's must be frame-dependent

$$\hat{\mathcal{T}}_1 = \sum_k \min \left\{ \frac{\hat{n}_a \cdot \hat{p}_k}{\rho_a}, \frac{\hat{n}_b \cdot \hat{p}_k}{\rho_b}, \frac{\hat{n}_J \cdot \hat{p}_k}{\rho_J} \right\}$$

- ▶ The choice of the  $\rho_i$ 's determines the frame in which the one-jettiness resummation is performed: e.g. LAB or CS-frame  $Y_V = 0$  which has

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_a &= e^{\hat{Y}_V}, \\ \rho_b &= e^{-\hat{Y}_V}, \\ \rho_J &= \frac{e^{-\hat{Y}_V} (\hat{p}_J)_+ + e^{\hat{Y}_V} (\hat{p}_J)_-}{2\hat{E}_J} \end{aligned}$$

# GENEVA to-do list for color-singlet plus jet:



Derive factorization theorem and perform the resummation of the main resolution variable (at least at NNLL')



Implement GENEVA formula and validate NNLO accuracy of results for fully differential distributions (NNLO integrator)



Construct the maps that preserve the main resolution variable ( $\mathcal{T}_1$ ), building a true NNLO event generator with events whose weights are IR-finite and properly resummed.



Add (N)LL resummation of secondary resolution variable and interface with the shower.



# Resummation of one-jettiness for Z+jet

Factorization formula in the region  $\mathcal{T}_1 \ll Q$  hard scales:  $\sqrt{s}, M_{\ell+\ell-}, M_{T,\ell+\ell-}, \mathcal{T}_0$

$$\frac{d\sigma}{d\Phi_1 d\mathcal{T}_1} = \sum_{\kappa=\{q\bar{q}g, qgq, ggg\}} H_\kappa(\Phi_1) \int dt_a dt_b ds_J B_{\kappa_a}(t_a) B_{\kappa_b}(t_b) J_{\kappa_J}(s_J) \\ \times S_\kappa \left( n_{a,b} \cdot n_J, \mathcal{T}_1 - \frac{t_a}{Q_a} - \frac{t_b}{Q_b} - \frac{s_J}{Q_J} \right)$$

Free choice of the frame, allowing to test different cases in GENEVA.

It is convenient to transform the soft, beam and jet functions in Laplace space to solve the RG equations, the factorization formula is turn into a product.

The color factorizes trivially in soft and hard functions for 3 colored partons.

$$\mathcal{L} \left[ \frac{d\sigma}{d\Phi_1 d\mathcal{T}_1} \right] = \sum_{\kappa} H_\kappa(\Phi_1) \tilde{S}_\kappa \left( \ln \frac{\lambda_E^2}{\mu^2} \right) \tilde{B}_{\kappa_a} \left( \ln \frac{Q_a \lambda_E}{\mu^2} \right) \tilde{B}_{\kappa_b} \left( \ln \frac{Q_b \lambda_E}{\mu^2} \right) \tilde{J}_{\kappa_J} \left( \ln \frac{Q_J \lambda_E}{\mu^2} \right)$$

# Hard, soft, beam and jet functions

Hard functions known analytically up to 2-loops. [Gehrmann, Tancredi et al. '12, '22]

From NNLL' accuracy include the loop-squared  $gg \rightarrow Zg$ , although numerically very small

Beam and jet boundary conditions known up to 3-loop [Mistlberger et al. '20]

[Becher, Bell '10] [Gaunt et al. '14]

We compute the one-loop soft boundary terms as on-the-fly integrals using results in

[Jouttenus et al. '11]

$$S_{\mathcal{T}_1, -1}^{\kappa(1)} = 2c_s^{\kappa} \left[ L_{ab}^2 - \frac{\pi^2}{6} + 2(I_{ab,c} + I_{ba,c}) \right] + 2c_t^{\kappa} \left[ L_{ac}^2 - \frac{\pi^2}{6} + 2(I_{ac,b} + I_{ca,b}) \right] + 2c_u^{\kappa} \left[ L_{bc}^2 - \frac{\pi^2}{6} + 2(I_{bc,a} + I_{cb,a}) \right]$$

Also studied for different jet measures in [Bertolini et al. '17]


$$I_{ij,m} \equiv I_0 \left( \frac{\hat{s}_{jm}}{\hat{s}_{ij}}, \frac{\hat{s}_{im}}{\hat{s}_{ij}} \right) \ln \frac{\hat{s}_{jm}}{\hat{s}_{ij}} + I_1 \left( \frac{\hat{s}_{jm}}{\hat{s}_{ij}}, \frac{\hat{s}_{im}}{\hat{s}_{ij}} \right)$$

# Hard, soft, beam and jet functions

The 2-loop contribution  $S_{\mathcal{T}_1-1}^{\kappa(2)}$  is provided by SoftSERVE collaboration in the form of an interpolation grid [Bell, Dehnadi, Morhmann, Rahn `23]

Approach validated comparing to the interpolation used in MCFM.

[Campbell, Ellis, Mondini, Williams `18]



Reproduces leading power behavior at extreme angles, important for resummation  $\geq$  NNLL' and for N3LO singular contribution

# Hard evolution

For every channel ( $q\bar{q}g, qgq, ggg, \dots$ ), **hard anomalous dimension** has the form [T. Becher and M. Neubert 1908.11379]

$$\Gamma_C^\kappa(\mu) = \Gamma_C^\kappa(\mu) \mathbf{1} = \left\{ \frac{\Gamma_{\text{cusp}}(\alpha_s)}{2} \left[ (C_c - C_a - C_b) \ln \frac{\mu^2}{(-s_{ab} - i0)} + \text{cyclic permutations} \right] \right. \quad \text{4-loops}$$

$$\left. + \gamma_C^a(\alpha_s) + \gamma_C^b(\alpha_s) + \gamma_C^c(\alpha_s) + \frac{C_A^2}{8} f(\alpha_s)(C_a + C_b + C_c) \right\} \mathbf{1} \quad \text{3-loops}$$

$$+ \sum_{(i,j)} \left[ -f(\alpha_s) \mathcal{T}_{ijj} + \sum_{R=F,A} g^R(\alpha_s) (3\mathcal{D}_{ijj}^R + 4\mathcal{D}_{iii}^R) \ln \frac{\mu^2}{(-s_{ij} - i0)} \right] + \mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^5)$$

$f(\alpha_s)$  and  $g^R(\alpha_s)$  start at  $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^3)$  and  $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^4)$  computed in [Henn, Korchemsky, Mistlberger 1911.10174], [Von Manteuffel, Panzer, Schabinger 2002.04617]. Evaluated these contributions as functions of  $N_c$  using the *colour space formalism*

$$\mathcal{D}_{ijkl}^R = d_R^{abcd} \mathbf{T}_i^a \mathbf{T}_j^b \mathbf{T}_k^c \mathbf{T}_l^d \quad \mathcal{T}_{ijkl} = f^{ade} f^{bce} (\mathbf{T}_i^a \mathbf{T}_j^b \mathbf{T}_k^c \mathbf{T}_l^d) +$$

$$d_R^{a_1 \dots a_n} = \text{Tr}_R(\mathbf{T}^{a_1} \dots \mathbf{T}^{a_n})_+ \equiv \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\pi} \text{Tr}(\mathbf{T}_R^{a_{\pi(1)}} \dots \mathbf{T}_R^{a_{\pi(n)}})$$

Using color conservation and symmetry properties of  $d_R^{abcd}$ , we found the following relations

$$3(\mathcal{D}_{ijj}^R + \mathcal{D}_{jji}^R) + 4(\mathcal{D}_{iii}^R + \mathcal{D}_{jjj}^R) = (D_{kR} - D_{iR} - D_{jR}) \mathbf{1} \quad i \neq j \neq k$$

← Quartic Casimirs

Similarity to the quadratic case

$$\mathbf{T}_a \cdot \mathbf{T}_b = [\mathbf{T}_c^2 - \mathbf{T}_a^2 - \mathbf{T}_b^2]/2$$

$$C_4(R_i, R) = \frac{d_{R_i}^{abcd} d_R^{abcd}}{N_{R_i}} \equiv D_{iR}$$

# Hard evolution

$$\Gamma_C^\kappa(\mu) = \left[ -\bar{c}^\kappa \Gamma_{\text{cusp}}(\alpha_s) + \sum_{R=F,A} \bar{c}_4^{\kappa,R} g^R(\alpha_s) \right] \ln \frac{Q^2}{\mu^2}$$

$$+ \sum_{i=a,b,c} \gamma_C^i(\alpha_s) + f(\alpha_s) c_f^\kappa - \bar{c}_L^\kappa \Gamma_{\text{cusp}}(\alpha_s)$$

$$+ \sum_{R=F,A} g^R(\alpha_s) \bar{c}_{4,L}^{\kappa,R}$$

$$c_f^\kappa = - \left[ \frac{C_A^2}{4} \bar{c}^\kappa + \sum_{i \neq j} \frac{\langle \mathcal{M} | \mathcal{T}_{ii} | \mathcal{M} \rangle}{\langle \mathcal{M} | \mathcal{M} \rangle} \right]$$

$$\bar{c}^\kappa = c_s^\kappa + c_u^\kappa + c_t^\kappa = -(C_a + C_b + C_c)/2 \quad \longleftrightarrow \quad \bar{c}_4^{\kappa,R} = D_{aR} + D_{bR} + D_{cR}$$

$$\bar{c}_L^\kappa = c_s^\kappa L_s + c_u^\kappa L_u + c_t^\kappa L_t \quad \longleftrightarrow \quad \bar{c}_{4,L}^{\kappa,R} \equiv c_{4,s}^{\kappa,R} L_s + c_{4,u}^{\kappa,R} L_u + c_{4,t}^{\kappa,R} L_t$$

$$c_s^\kappa = \mathbf{T}_a \cdot \mathbf{T}_b, \quad c_u^\kappa = \mathbf{T}_b \cdot \mathbf{T}_c, \quad c_t^\kappa = \mathbf{T}_a \cdot \mathbf{T}_c \quad \longleftrightarrow \quad c_{4,s}^{\kappa,R} = D_{aR} + D_{bR} - D_{cR}$$

$$c_{4,t}^{\kappa,R} = D_{aR} + D_{cR} - D_{bR}$$

$$c_{4,u}^{\kappa,R} = D_{bR} + D_{cR} - D_{aR}$$

Kinematic dependent logs

$$L_s = \ln \frac{-s_{ab} - i0}{Q^2} = \ln \frac{s_{ab}}{Q^2} - i\pi$$

$$L_u = \ln \frac{s_{bc}}{Q^2} \quad L_t = \ln \frac{s_{ac}}{Q^2}$$



# Beam, Jet and soft evolution

**Beam and Jet** functions in **Laplace space**:

$$\mu \frac{d}{d\mu} \ln \tilde{B}_a(\zeta_B, x, \mu) = -2 \left[ C_a \Gamma_{\text{cusp}}(\alpha_s) + 2 \sum_{R=F,A} D_{aR} g^R(\alpha_s) \right] \ln \left( \frac{Q_a \zeta_B}{\mu^2} \right) + \gamma_B^a(\alpha_s)$$

$$\mu \frac{d}{d\mu} \ln \tilde{J}_c(\zeta_J, \mu) = -2 \left[ C_c \Gamma_{\text{cusp}}(\alpha_s) + 2 \sum_{R=F,A} D_{cR} g^R(\alpha_s) \right] \ln \left( \frac{Q_J \zeta_J}{\mu^2} \right) + \gamma_J^c(\alpha_s)$$

The **soft functions** depend on  $\hat{s}_{ij} = \frac{2 q_i \cdot q_j}{Q_i Q_j}$  which are frame dependent

$$\hat{s}_{aJ}^{\text{LAB}} = \frac{n_a \cdot n_J}{2} = \rho_a \rho_J \hat{s}_{aJ}^{\text{CS}} \longrightarrow$$

Moderately sized  $\hat{s}_{aJ}^{\text{CS}}$  may require to evaluate the LAB-frame soft function at very small values of  $\hat{s}_{aJ}^{\text{LAB}}$  depending on the boost factor  $\rho_a \rho_J$

**Soft** functions in **Laplace space**:

$$\begin{aligned} \mu \frac{d}{d\mu} \ln \tilde{S}^\kappa(\zeta_S, \mu) = & 2 \left[ -\bar{c}^\kappa \Gamma_{\text{cusp}}(\alpha_s) + \sum_{R=F,A} \bar{c}_4^{\kappa,R} g^R(\alpha_s) \right] \ln \left( \frac{\zeta_S^2}{\mu^2} \right) \\ & + \left[ \gamma_{S_{N=1}}^\kappa(\alpha_s) + 2\Gamma_{\text{cusp}}(\alpha_s) (c_s^\kappa L_{ab} + c_t^\kappa L_{ac} + c_u^\kappa L_{bc}) \right. \\ & \left. - 2 \sum_{R=F,A} g^R(\alpha_s) (c_{4,s}^{\kappa,R} L_{ab} + c_{4,t}^{\kappa,R} L_{bc} + c_{4,u}^{\kappa,R} L_{bc}) \right] \end{aligned}$$

# N3LL resummed formula

Combine the solutions to the RG equations for the hard, soft, beam and jet functions to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{d\sigma^{N^3LL}}{d\Phi_1 d\mathcal{T}_1} = & \sum_{\kappa} \exp \left\{ 4(C_a + C_b)K_{\Gamma_{\text{cusp}}}(\mu_B, \mu_H) + 4C_c K_{\Gamma_{\text{cusp}}}(\mu_J, \mu_H) - 2(C_a + C_b + C_c)K_{\Gamma_{\text{cusp}}}(\mu_S, \mu_H) \right. \\
 & \left. - 2C_c L_J \eta_{\Gamma_{\text{cusp}}}(\mu_J, \mu_H) - 2(C_a L_B + C_b L'_B) \eta_{\Gamma_{\text{cusp}}}(\mu_B, \mu_H) + K_{\gamma_{\text{tot}}} \right. \\
 & \left. + \left[ C_a \ln \left( \frac{Q_a^2 u}{st} \right) + C_b \ln \left( \frac{Q_b^2 t}{su} \right) + C_{\kappa_j} \ln \left( \frac{Q_J^2 s}{tu} \right) + (C_a + C_b + C_c) L_S \right] \eta_{\Gamma_{\text{cusp}}}(\mu_S, \mu_H) \right\} \\
 & + \sum_{R=F,A} \left[ 8(D_{aR} + D_{bR})K_{g^R}(\mu_B, \mu_H) + 8D_{cR}K_{g^R}(\mu_J, \mu_H) \right. \\
 & \left. - 4(D_{aR} + D_{bR} + D_{cR})K_{g^R}(\mu_S, \mu_H) - 4D_{cR}L_J \eta_{g^R}(\mu_J, \mu_H) - 4(D_{aR}L_B + D_{bR}L'_B) \eta_{g^R}(\mu_B, \mu_H) \right. \\
 & \left. + 2 \left[ D_{aR} \ln \left( \frac{Q_a^2 u}{st} \right) + D_{bR} \ln \left( \frac{Q_b^2 t}{su} \right) + D_{cR} \ln \left( \frac{Q_J^2 s}{tu} \right) + (D_{aR} + D_{bR} + D_{cR}) L_S \right] \eta_{g^R}(\mu_S, \mu_H) \right] \Big\} \\
 & \times H_{\kappa}(\Phi_1, \mu_H) \tilde{S}^{\kappa}(\partial_{\eta_S} + L_S, \mu_S) \tilde{B}_{\kappa_a}(\partial_{\eta_B} + L_B, x_a, \mu_B) \tilde{B}_{\kappa_b}(\partial_{\eta'_B} + L'_B, x_b, \mu_B) \tilde{J}_{\kappa_j}(\partial_{\eta_J} + L_J, \mu_J) \\
 & \times \frac{Q^{-\eta_{\text{tot}}}}{\mathcal{T}_1^{1-\eta_{\text{tot}}}} \frac{\eta_{\text{tot}} e^{-\gamma_E \eta_{\text{tot}}}}{\Gamma(1 + \eta_{\text{tot}})}
 \end{aligned}$$

Up to NNLL'

New N3LL ingredients

where we defined  $\eta_{\text{tot}} = \eta_B + \eta'_B + \eta_J + 2\eta_S$

$$L_H = \ln \left( \frac{Q^2}{\mu_H^2} \right), \quad L_B = \ln \left( \frac{Q}{\mu_B^2} \right), \quad L'_B = \ln \left( \frac{Q_b Q}{\mu_B^2} \right)$$

$$L_J = \ln \left( \frac{Q_J Q}{\mu_J^2} \right), \quad L_S = \ln \left( \frac{Q^2}{\mu_S^2} \right)$$



$$K_{g^R}(\mu_H, \mu) \equiv \int_{\alpha_s(\mu_H)}^{\alpha_s(\mu)} \frac{d\alpha_s}{\beta(\alpha_s)} g^R(\alpha_s) \int_{\alpha_s(\mu_H)}^{\alpha_s} \frac{d\alpha'_s}{\beta[\alpha'_s]}$$

$$\eta_{g^R}(\mu_H, \mu) \equiv \int_{\alpha_s(\mu_H)}^{\alpha_s(\mu)} \frac{d\alpha_s}{\beta(\alpha_s)} g^R(\alpha_s)$$

$$K_f(\mu_H, \mu) \equiv \int_{\alpha_s(\mu_H)}^{\alpha_s(\mu)} \frac{d\alpha_s}{\beta(\alpha_s)} f(\alpha_s)$$

# Nonsingular behavior



- ▶ Different  $\mathcal{T}_1$  choices have different subleading power corrections
- ▶ Investigated for one-jettiness subtraction at LL NLP [Boughezal, Isgro', Petriello '20]



Dimensionless definition  $\tau_1 = 2\mathcal{T}_1 / \sqrt{M_{\ell^+ \ell^-}^2 + q_T^2}$

# Nonsingular behavior

- ▶ Similar behaviour when cutting on Z boson trans. momentum  $q_T$



Dimensionless definition  $\tau_1 = 2\mathcal{T}_1 / \sqrt{M_{\ell^+ \ell^-}^2 + q_T^2}$

# Two dimensional profile scales


A final state with  $N$  particles  
is subject to the constraint

$$\frac{\mathcal{T}_1(\Phi_N)}{\mathcal{T}_0(\Phi_N)} \leq \frac{N-1}{N} = \begin{cases} 1/2, & N=2 \\ 2/3, & N=3 \end{cases}$$



$$\mu_S(\mathcal{T}_1/\mu_{\text{FO}}, \mathcal{T}_1/\mathcal{T}_0) = \mu_{\text{FO}} \left[ (f_{\text{run}}(\mathcal{T}_1/\mu_{\text{FO}}) - 1) s^{(p,k)}(\mathcal{T}_1/\mathcal{T}_0) + 1 \right]$$

Behaves as smooth  
Theta function

$$s^{(p,k)}(\mathcal{T}_1/\mathcal{T}_0) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{pk(\mathcal{T}_1/\mathcal{T}_0 - 1/p)}}$$



We use  $p = 2$  (determines the transition point)  
and  $k = 100$  (slope of the transition)





Kinematical boundaries



# Resummed results




- ▶ Summing in quadrature profile scales variations and fixed-order ones
- ▶ Nice convergence and reduction of theoretical uncertainties



# Matched results

$$\frac{d\sigma^{\text{match.}}}{d\Phi_1 d\mathcal{T}_1} = \frac{d\sigma^{\text{res.}}}{d\Phi_1 d\mathcal{T}_1} + \frac{d\sigma^{\text{f.o.}}}{d\Phi_1 d\mathcal{T}_1} - \frac{d\sigma^{\text{res.exp.}}}{d\Phi_1 d\mathcal{T}_1}$$




- ▶  $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^3)$  gives sizable contribution, important to include it for small values of  $\mathcal{T}_0$



- ▶ Nonsingular divergent for  $\mathcal{T}_0 \rightarrow 0$ . Joint  $(\mathcal{T}_0, \mathcal{T}_1)$  resummation required to handle both divergencies

# Matched results

- ▶ Similarly large nonsingular contribution when cross section defined by cut on Z transverse momentum in the limit  $q_T \rightarrow 0$





# NNLO validation - 1-jettiness slicing





- Crucial to check the NNLO accuracy: expand matching formula to NNLO ( $\mathcal{T}_1$ -slicing) and compare with NNLOJET the pure  $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^3)$  coeff.

$$O^{\delta\text{NNLO}_1}(\Phi_1) = \frac{d\sigma^{\text{N3LL}}}{d\Phi_1}(\mathcal{T}_1^{\text{cut}}) \Big|_{\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^3)} + \int_{\mathcal{T}_1^{\text{cut}}}^{\mathcal{T}_1^{\text{max}}} \frac{d\Phi_2}{d\Phi_1} \frac{d\sigma^{\delta\text{NNLO}_2}}{d\Phi_2} O(\Phi_{\{2,3\}})$$

Analytic cumulant expanded
NLO with local FKS subtraction



# NNLO differential distributions $\mathcal{T}_1$ -slicing



- ▶ Small  $\mathcal{T}_1^{\text{cut}}$  needed to correctly capture the low  $q_T$  behaviour, but increased stat errors at large  $q_T$  due to larger numerical cancellations




# $\mathcal{T}_1$ - slicing and subtraction with dynamic cuts

- ▶ Solution is to dynamically adapt the  $\mathcal{T}_1^{\text{cut}}$  value according to the kinematics (multi-scale problem).

One can use  $m_T^Z, \mathcal{T}_0, q_T, \dots$

$$\mathcal{T}_1^{\text{cut}} = \min\{10^{-4} f(q_T), \mathcal{T}_0/2\}$$



- ▶ Additionally we can subtract the singular spectrum locally in  $\mathcal{T}_1$

$$O^{\delta\text{NNLO}_1}(\Phi_1) = \frac{d\sigma^{\text{N3LL}}}{d\Phi_1}(\mathcal{T}_1^{\text{cut}}) \Big|_{\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^3)} O(\Phi_1) + \int_{\mathcal{T}_1^{\text{cut}}}^{\mathcal{T}_1^{\text{max}}} \frac{d\Phi_2}{d\Phi_1} \frac{d\sigma^{\delta\text{NLO}_2}}{d\Phi_2} O(\Phi_{\{2,3\}})$$


Allows for larger  $\mathcal{T}_1^{\text{cut}}$  while still providing complete inclusive power corrections

down to  $\mathcal{T}_1^{\text{IR}} \ll \mathcal{T}_1^{\text{cut}}$

$$+ \int_{\mathcal{T}_1^{\text{IR}}}^{\mathcal{T}_1^{\text{cut}}} \frac{d\Phi_2}{d\Phi_1} \left[ \frac{d\sigma^{\delta\text{NLO}_2}}{d\Phi_2} O(\Phi_{\{2,3\}}) - \frac{d\sigma^{\text{N3LL}}}{d\Phi_1 d\mathcal{T}_1} \Big|_{\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^3)} \mathcal{P}(z, \varphi) O(\Phi_1) \right]$$



$\mathcal{P}(z, \varphi)$  normalized splitting functions  $\int dz d\varphi \mathcal{P}(z, \varphi) \equiv 1$

# $\mathcal{T}_1$ slicing and subtraction with dynamic cuts



- ▶ Complete agreement with NNLOJET and statistical errors comparable with similar running times ( $\sim 80\text{k}$  CPU hours)

# Validation with $\mathcal{T}_0$ and $q_T$ singular spectra



- ▶ Comparison with  $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^3)$  singular spectra in  $\mathcal{T}_0$  and  $q_T$  tells us how much we can push our approach before it breaks down, due to internal technical cuts or just by large numerical cancellations.
- ▶ GENEVA nonsingular well behaved for  $\mathcal{T}_0$  down to 0.5 GeV, this NNLOJET run has generation cut at 1 GeV.
- ▶ Both approached more demanding for  $q_T$ , seems OK down to  $\sim 1$  GeV but singular still decreasing....

# Conclusion and outlook

- ▶ The inclusion of state-of-the-art theoretical predictions in SMC generators is mandatory to match the experimental precision and fully exploit the discovery potential of LHC measurements
- ▶ GENEVA method allows for interfacing higher-order resummation of resolution variables in event generation with NNLO accuracy and parton showers. Several color-singlet processes implements, using different resolution variables: N-jettiness,  $q_T$ , jet veto...
- ▶ Implemented one-jettiness resummation, prerequisite for  $V_j@NNLO+PS$  in GENEVA. Studied different  $\mathcal{T}_1$  definitions, performed resummation up to N3LL and matched to corresponding fixed-order. Observed nice convergence and reduction of theory unc. in presence of an hard jet.
- ▶ Validated NNLO accuracy of Z+jet with  $\mathcal{T}_1$ -slicing and subtraction against NNLOJET finding perfect agreement and competitive efficiency.
- ▶ Last steps for event generator matched to parton showers are work in progress....

Thank you for your attention.

# Workshop on HighLumi-LHC and Hadron Colliders

1–4 Oct 2024

Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati (Rome), Italy

Europe/Rome timezone



Overview

Scientific Programme

Timetable

Registration

Participant List

How to reach LNF

Venue

Safety Rules

Internet Access

Hotel Accommodation

LNF Guest House

The **Workshop on HighLumi-LHC and Hadron Colliders** will be held in the Bruno Touschek Auditorium (**Bldg. 36**, - see [map](#)).

---

Inspired by the MCWS [https://virgilio.mib.infn.it/~nason/mcws/scientific\\_programme.htm](https://virgilio.mib.infn.it/~nason/mcws/scientific_programme.htm)

organised at LNF on the eve of LHC, and motivated by the 2025-2026 Update of the European Strategy for Particle Physics, we present some topical workshops on future colliders, focused on the opportunities and challenges, both theoretical and experimental, with the goal of informing and blending Italian researchers (of any age bracket) with different backgrounds.

Each event will be staged at LNF, which is the birthplace of collider physics and is endowed with large meeting facilities and, beyond the MCWS mentioned above, has a long tradition of events characterised by a strong interaction between theorists and experimenters.

Each event will start off with an elementary introduction to the workshop main topics, to be followed by focused

**Next workshops : February 2025 on FCC- ee**

**May 2025 (?) on muon collider**

**BACKUP**

# Using the jet $p_T$ as resolution variable

GENEVA recently extended to jet veto resummation in [\[Gavardi et al. 2308.11577\]](#).

Factorization most easily derived for cumulant of the cross-section. SCET II problem. Numerical derivative to get the spectrum. For hardest-jet we have

$$\frac{d\sigma}{d\Phi_0}(p_T^{\text{cut}}, \mu, \nu) = \sum_{a,b} H_{ab}(\Phi_0, \mu) B_a(Q, p_T^{\text{cut}}, R, x_a, \mu, \nu) B_b(Q, p_T^{\text{cut}}, R, x_b, \mu, \nu) S_{ab}(p_T^{\text{cut}}, R, \mu, \nu)$$

Two loop Beam and Soft functions recently computed in [\[Abreu et al. 2207.07037, 2204.02987\]](#)

Focus on  $W^+W^- \rightarrow \mu^+\nu_\mu e^-\bar{\nu}_e$  with jet veto, in 4-flavor scheme to avoid top contaminations.

Massless two-loop hard function taken from `qqVVamp` [\[Gehrmann et al. 1503.04812\]](#)

Interface to SCETlib [\[Tackmann et al.\]](#) allows to perform also resummation also for  $p_T$  of the second jet at the cumulant level. Refactorization of soft sector into **global soft**, **soft-coll** and **nonglobal** contributions [\[Cal et al.\]](#)

$$\frac{d\sigma}{d\Phi_1}(p_T^{\text{cut}}, \mu, \nu) = \sum_{\kappa} H_{\kappa}(\Phi_1, \mu) B_a(Q, p_T^{\text{cut}}, R, x_a, \mu, \nu) B_b(Q, p_T^{\text{cut}}, R, x_b, \mu, \nu) S_{\kappa}(p_T^{\text{cut}}, y_J, \mu, \nu) \times \mathcal{S}_j^R(p_T^{\text{cut}}, R, \mu) J_j(p_T^J, R, \mu) \mathcal{S}_j^{\text{NG}}\left(\frac{p_T^{\text{cut}}}{p_T^J}\right).$$




# Resumming second jet resolution at NLL' in GENEVA

Extension of the GENEVA approach to include resummation of  $r_1^{\text{cut}}$  to NLL' accuracy

Now truly capturing the correct nonsingular behaviour when approaching the single-jet limit

$$\frac{d\sigma_1^{\text{MC}}}{d\Phi_1}(r_1^{\text{cut}}) = \left\{ \left[ \frac{d\sigma^{\text{NNLL}'_{r_0}}}{d\Phi_0 dr_0} - \frac{d\sigma^{\text{NNLL}'_{r_0}}}{d\Phi_0 dr_0} \Big|_{\text{NLO}_1} \right] \mathcal{P}_{0 \rightarrow 1}(\Phi_1) U_1(\Phi_1, r_1^{\text{cut}}) + \frac{d\sigma^{\text{NLO}_1}}{d\Phi_1}(r_1^{\text{cut}}) + \frac{d\sigma^{\text{NLL}'_{r_1}}}{d\Phi_1}(r_1^{\text{cut}}) - \frac{d\sigma^{\text{NLL}'_{r_1}}}{d\Phi_1}(r_1^{\text{cut}}) \Big|_{\text{NLO}_1} \right\} \theta(r_0 > r_0^{\text{cut}}) + \frac{d\sigma^{\text{LO}_1}_{\text{nonproj}}}{d\Phi_1} \theta(r_0 < r_0^{\text{cut}})$$

$$\frac{d\sigma_2^{\text{MC}}}{d\Phi_2} = \left\{ \left[ \frac{d\sigma^{\text{NNLL}'_{r_0}}}{d\Phi_0 dr_0} - \frac{d\sigma^{\text{NNLL}'_{r_0}}}{d\Phi_0 dr_0} \Big|_{\text{NLO}_1} \right] \mathcal{P}_{0 \rightarrow 1}(\Phi_1) U'_1(\Phi_1, r_1) \mathcal{P}_{1 \rightarrow 2}(\Phi_2) + \frac{d\sigma^{\text{LO}_2}}{d\Phi_2} + \left[ \frac{d\sigma^{\text{NLL}'_{r_1}}}{d\Phi_1 dr_1} - \frac{d\sigma^{\text{NLL}'_{r_1}}}{d\Phi_1 dr_1} \Big|_{\text{LO}_2} \right] \mathcal{P}_{1 \rightarrow 2}(\Phi_2) \right\} \theta(r_1 > r_1^{\text{cut}}) \theta(r_0 > r_0^{\text{cut}}) + \frac{d\sigma^{\text{LO}_2}_{\text{nonproj}}}{d\Phi_2} \theta(r_1 < r_1^{\text{cut}}) \theta(r_0 > r_0^{\text{cut}}).$$



NLL' accuracy of the second jet only maintained in presence of a hard first jet.



Resummation formula not able to handle the  $r_0 \sim r_1 \ll \mu_H$  hierarchy, double resummation required there.

# Validation of WW production

We include the resummation of the  $q\bar{q}$  channel at NNLL' and the  $gg$  channel at NLL



Jet veto resummation available in MCFM up to partial N3LL accuracy. Different treatment of uncertainties.

[Campbell et al. 2301.11768]






NNLO validation against MATRIX

[Grazzini et al. 1711.06631]



# Showering



Inclusive quantities well-preserved by the shower,  $p_T$  of the hardest jet is extremely sensitive to shower effects and gets mildly shifted. Few percent effect at 30 GeV.





This is entirely due to FSR emissions (the shower splits the hardest jet above  $p_T$  cut into 2 jets below  $p_T$  cut). Placing constraints to avoid this preserves  $p_{T1st}$  but not physically motivated.

Investigating resummation of different 1-jet resolution variable  $\mathcal{T}_1^{k_T}$  (SCET II fact.)

# Data comparison

Inclusion of  $gg$  channel necessary for agreement with data.

Extension of  $gg$  channel to NLO+NLL' ongoing



# Zero-jettiness factorization for top-quark pairs

Factorization formula derived using SCET+HQET in the region where  $M_{t\bar{t}} \sim m_t \sim \sqrt{\hat{s}}$  are all hard scales. [SA et al. 2111.03632]

In case of boosted regime  $M_{t\bar{t}} \gg m_t$  one would instead need a modified two-jettiness [Fleming, Hoang, Mantry, Stewart '07][Bachu, Hoang, Mateu, Pathak, Stewart '21]

$$\frac{d\sigma}{d\Phi_0 d\tau_B} = M \sum_{ij=\{q\bar{q}, \bar{q}q, gg\}} \int dt_a dt_b B_i(t_a, z_a, \mu) B_j(t_b, z_b, \mu) \text{Tr} \left[ \mathbf{H}_{ij}(\Phi_0, \mu) \mathbf{S}_{ij} \left( M\tau_B - \frac{t_a + t_b}{M}, \Phi_0, \mu \right) \right]$$

Beam functions [Stewart, Tackmann, Waalewijn, [1002.2213], known up to N<sup>3</sup>LO
Hard functions (color matrices)
Soft functions (color matrices)

It is convenient to transform the soft and beam functions in Laplace space to solve the RG equations, the factorization formula is turn into a product of (matrix) functions

$$\mathcal{L} \left[ \frac{d\sigma}{d\Phi_0 d\tau_B} \right] = M \sum_{ij=\{q\bar{q}, \bar{q}q, gg\}} \tilde{B}_i \left( \ln \frac{M\kappa}{\mu^2}, z_a \right) \tilde{B}_j \left( \ln \frac{M\kappa}{\mu^2}, z_b \right) \text{Tr} \left[ \mathbf{H}_{ij} \left( \ln \frac{M^2}{\mu^2}, \Phi_0 \right) \tilde{\mathbf{S}}_{ij} \left( \ln \frac{\mu^2}{\kappa^2}, \Phi_0 \right) \right]$$

# Zero-jettiness resummation for top pairs

Resummed formula valid up to NNLL' accuracy

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\sigma}{d\Phi_0 d\tau_B} &= U(\mu_h, \mu_B, \mu_s, L_h, L_s) \\ &\times \text{Tr} \left\{ \mathbf{u}(\beta_t, \theta, \mu_h, \mu_s) \mathbf{H}(M, \beta_t, \theta, \mu_h) \mathbf{u}^\dagger(\beta_t, \theta, \mu_h, \mu_s) \tilde{\mathbf{S}}_B(\partial_{\eta_s} + L_s, \beta_t, \theta, \mu_s) \right\} \\ &\times \tilde{B}_a(\partial_{\eta_B} + L_B, z_a, \mu_B) \tilde{B}_b(\partial_{\eta'_B} + L_B, z_b, \mu_B) \frac{1}{\tau_B^{1-\eta_{\text{tot}}}} \frac{e^{-\gamma_E \eta_{\text{tot}}}}{\Gamma(\eta_{\text{tot}})}. \end{aligned}$$

where



$$\begin{aligned} U(\mu_h, \mu_B, \mu_s, L_h, L_s) &= \\ &\exp \left[ 4S(\mu_h, \mu_B) + 4S(\mu_s, \mu_B) + 2a_{\gamma_B}(\mu_s, \mu_B) - 2a_\Gamma(\mu_h, \mu_B) L_h - 2a_\Gamma(\mu_s, \mu_B) L_s \right] \end{aligned}$$

and  $L_s = \ln(M^2/\mu_s^2)$ ,  $L_h = \ln(M^2/\mu_h^2)$ ,  $L_B = \ln(M^2/\mu_B^2)$  and  $\eta_{\text{tot}} = 2\eta_s + \eta_B + \eta_{B'}$

The final accuracy depends on the availability of the perturbative ingredients

# Resummed results

$\text{NNLL}'_a$  is our best prediction, it includes NNLO beam functions, all mixed NLO x NLO terms, NNLL evolution matrices, all NNLO soft logarithmic terms. Resummation is switched off via profile scales








# Matched results

Matching to  $t\bar{t} + j$  @NLO improves the perturbative accuracy across the whole spectrum

$$\frac{d\sigma^{\text{match}}}{d\mathcal{T}_0} = \frac{d\sigma^{\text{resum}}}{d\mathcal{T}_0} + \frac{d\sigma^{\text{FO}}}{d\mathcal{T}_0} - \left[ \frac{d\sigma^{\text{resum}}}{d\mathcal{T}_0} \right]_{\text{FO}}$$




Extension to full NNLL' and to event generation is in progress.

# Interface with the parton shower

$\mathcal{T}_N(\Phi_{N+1})$  measures the hardness of the N+1-th emission

- ▶ If shower ordered in  $k_T$ , start from largest value allowed by N-jettiness
- ▶ Let the shower evolve unconstrained.
- ▶ At the end veto an event if after  $M \geq 1$  shower emissions

$\mathcal{T}_N(\Phi_{N+M}) > \mathcal{T}_N(\Phi_N + 1)$  and **retry** the whole shower.



$$\mathcal{T}_{N+M-1}(\Phi_{N+M}) \leq \mathcal{T}_{N+M-2}(\Phi_{N+M}) \leq \dots \leq \mathcal{T}_N(\Phi_{N+M})$$

Ensures the relevant phase space is correctly covered to avoid spoiling the resummation accuracy for  $\mathcal{T}$ . Shower accuracy for other observables is more delicate for dipole shower, effects numerically negligible .

0-jet and 1-jet bins are treated differently: starting scale is resolution cutoff.

Method rather independent from shower used: PYTHIA8, DIRE & SHERPA.

# Interface with the parton shower

Effect of shower on resolution variables different from what is resummed more marked, albeit shower accuracy is maintained.

GENEVA framework allows this comparison for DY when resumming  $q_T$  or  $\mathcal{T}_0$

Best approach here would be joint  $(\mathcal{T}_0, \vec{q}_T)$  resummation, avoids need of splitting func.

