Andrea Ghira, based on results in collaboration with P. Dhani, O. Fedkevych, S. Marzani and G. Soyez

Jet substructure at lepton colliders

FCC-ee and Lepton Colliders, Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati,

23th of January 2025

Lepton Colliders and Jet Substructure Studies

- **Key Features of Lepton Colliders**
- QCD Dynamics Confined to Final State:
	- No Pile-Up or Underlying Event (UE) effects,
	- Free from PDFs complexities,
- Precisely Controlled Initial State:
	- Collision energy directly measurable,
	- All energy is used efficiently (up to QED ISR),

Current Focus in Jet Studies

- **•** Active developments on jets and jet algorithms focus more on:
- **◦** Hadron Collisions (e.g., LHC),
	- **◦** Heavy Ion Collisions,
- **•** Yet, Monte Carlo event generators are primarily tuned with:
- **◦** LEP data.

Hadrons vs Leptons

Why Lepton Colliders for Jet Substructure?

- Cleanest Environment for studying:
	- Final state jet substructure,
	- Testing perturbative QCD.
- Impact of JSS studies:
	- Jet flavour identification,
	- \circ Electroweak boson tagging (e.g. W^{\pm}, Z),
	- Top quark tagging.
- $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$
	- 1. Silicon vertex detector
	- 2. Drift chamber
	- 3. Time projection chamber
	- 4. Electromagnetic calorimeter
	- Superconducting magnet coil
	- 6. Hadron calorimeter
	- 7. Muon chambers
	- Luminosity monitors
- A. Test of light and heavy flavor fragmentation
	- B. Determination of α_{S} at per mille accuracy
-

Electron-positron collisions

- We consider $q\bar{q}$ production in e^+e^- collisions
- At lowest order in perturbation theory, the energy is divided between the two produced quarks

Jets at e^+e^- can be clustered into two hemispheres *e*+*e*[−]

• Gluon soft and collinear radiation does not alter this picture

Jet formation at parton level

At high energies, soft ($z \rightarrow 0$) and collinear ($\theta^2 \rightarrow 0$) emissions are favored in QCD $z\rightarrow 0$) and collinear ($\theta^2\rightarrow 0$

$$
d\sigma \simeq \frac{\alpha_s C_F}{2\pi} \frac{dz}{z} \frac{d\theta^2}{\theta^2}
$$

z= gluon energy fraction

 θ^2 = gluon splitting angle

This relation reflects the fact that at high energy, massless QCD is a scale invariant QFT

Jet substructure in a nutshell

- Prong finders: find hard cores within jets
- Radiation constraints: examine gluon radiation pattern
- Groomers: removes large angle soft radiation \bigcirc

- Importance of knowing the hard process that originates the jets
- Distinguish different kind of jets (light flavor vs heavy flavor jet)

The Soft Drop algorithm

The jet constituents are re-clustered to form an angular ordered tree. The declustering is then applied.

$$
\frac{\min(E_i, E_j)}{E_i + E_j} > z_{\text{cut}} \left(2(1 - \cos \theta_{ij}) \right)^{\frac{\beta}{2}}
$$

 θ_{ij} : angle between branches i, j

[A. Larkoski et al](https://arxiv.org/pdf/1402.2657)

Jet substructure at LEP

Recent comparison with ALEPH data for z_g , R_g and for the jet mass distributions

See [Yang-Ting Chien et al.](https://arxiv.org/pdf/2111.09914)

Cumulative distributions

-
- must be IRC safe *v*
- $\Sigma(v)$ is computed to all orders exploiting QCD factorization theorems

Given a substructure observable v , from a theoretical point of view, it is

natural to compute the resummation of the cumulative distribution

$$
\Sigma(v) = \int_0^v dv' \frac{d\sigma}{dv}
$$

• ν is a function of momenta that vanish when no emissions occur (Born level)

Probability of measuring a value of the observable less than *v*

We begin studying the case of the single emission off a quark. The matrix element factorizes in the soft and collinear limit:

-
- $\mathcal V$ represents the soft and collinear limit of the observable and in general can
	- *θa*+*^b*

be written

Soft-Collinear factorization

$$
\Sigma(\nu) = 1 - \frac{\alpha_S C_F}{2\pi} \sum_{\ell} \int_0^1 \frac{dz}{z} \int_0^1 \frac{d\theta^2}{\theta^2} \Theta\left(\mathcal{V}_{\ell}(z, \theta^2) - \nu\right) \qquad \qquad \mathcal{M}^{(n)} \qquad \qquad \overbrace{\longrightarrow}^{\mathcal{N}^{(n)}} \frac{q(p_1)}{q(p_1)}
$$

$$
\mathcal{V} = z^a \theta^a
$$

-
-

Corresponds to the LO radiator *R*(*v*)

All order calculation

 $\Sigma(\nu)$ is computed order by order in perturbation theory:

However, if we are interested in the regime where $\nu \ll 1$, the convergence of the perturbative series is spoiled:

$$
\Sigma(\nu) = \sum_{k} \left(\frac{\alpha_{S}}{\pi}\right)^{k} c_{k}(\nu)
$$

$$
\Sigma(v) \simeq 1 + \alpha_s L^2 + \alpha_s^2 L^4 + \frac{1}{\sigma(1)}
$$

Need to rearrange the perturbative series: $\Sigma(v) = \exp \Big|$

Lund Plane geography

The all order calculation of the cumulative distribution can be performed exploiting Lund diagrams

Lund diagrams: representation of the phase space available by emissions

Heavy flavor jets

- $m_{\mathcal{Q}} > \Lambda_{\text{QCD}}$, $\mathcal{Q} = c, b, t$
- Linked to Higgs physics and to EW symmetry breaking

- Heavy flavor processes offer a more robust test of pQCD
- \bullet Long-enough lifetime of B hadrons and D mesons: easily detected in collider experiments identifying their displaced vertices
- Top quark decays before hadronizing

Dead cone effect

When jets are initiated by a heavy flavor, the quark mass shields the collinear singularity

the radiation emitted off a heavy flavor is suppressed inside a cone of opening angle $\theta_D \sim m/E$ [\(ALICE\)](https://arxiv.org/pdf/2106.05713.pdf)

nass

Dead cone effect

$$
d\sigma \simeq \frac{\alpha_S C_F}{2\pi} \frac{dz}{z} \frac{d\theta^2}{\theta^2 + \frac{m^2}{E^2}} \qquad m = \text{heavy quark m}
$$

All order calculation with heavy flavours

- How do we model calculations we heavy flavours?
- Many scales involved:
- 1. Mass of the heavy quark *m*, larger than $\Lambda_{\rm QCD} \sim 1 \text{ GeV}$
- 2. Hard scale of the process \sqrt{s} (center of mass energy)
- 3. Substructure variable ν we want to probe

We need to understand the hierarchy between the various scales and to perform multiple resummations ($log —, log v$) *m*2 *s* , log *v*

Lund Plane with heavy flavors

In the case of emissions off heavy flavour Lund plane diagrams receives substantial corrections:

[\(A.G, S. Marzani, G. Ridolfi\)](https://arxiv.org/pdf/2309.06139.pdf)

- 1. Collinear factorization is replaced by quasi-collinear factorization ($k_t \sim m \ll \sqrt{s}$)
- 2. The mass of the heavy flavour imposes a boundary on the emission rapidity.
- 3. Horizontal line at constant k_t divides the five flavour region from the four flavour one.

-
- λ^α and energy correlation functions e_2^α 2

We want to study observable sensitive to dead-cone effect We study jet angularities λ^α and energy correlation functions In a massless theory, considering only one emission:

 $\lambda^{\alpha} \simeq e^{\alpha}$

massive quarks studied in [\(C. Lee, P. Shrivastava, V. Vaidya\)](https://arxiv.org/pdf/1901.09095) with SCET

Jet angularities and ECFs

Many possible choices in the case of massive particles within the jet. ECFs with

Which one is more sensitive to the dead-cone effect?

$$
\tfrac{\alpha}{2} \simeq z\theta^{\alpha}
$$

Possible definitions in e^+e^- collisions

$$
e_2^{\alpha} = \sum_{\mathcal{H}} \sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{H}, i < j} z_i z_j \left[2(1 - \cos \theta_{ij}) \right]^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \Theta\left((\vec{p}_i \cdot \vec{n})(\vec{p}_j \cdot \vec{n}) \right) \simeq \sum_{\mathcal{H}} \sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{H}, i < j} z_i z_j \theta_{ij}^{\alpha}
$$

$$
\dot{e}_{2}^{\alpha} = \sum_{\mathcal{H}} \sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{H}, i < j} z_{i} z_{j} \left[\frac{2p_{i} \cdot p_{j}}{E_{i} E_{j}} \right]^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \Theta\left((\vec{p}_{i} \cdot \vec{n})(\vec{p}_{j} \cdot \vec{n}) \right) \simeq \sum_{\mathcal{H}} \sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{H}, i < j} z_{i} z_{j} \left(\theta_{ij}^{2} + \frac{m_{i}^{2}}{E_{i}^{2}} + \frac{m_{j}^{2}}{E_{j}^{2}} \right)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}
$$

- We focus for simplicity on ECFs (many more possible definitions for λ^{α})
- The two observables do not coincide in the quasi collinear limit

 \vec{n} : reference vector that defines the hemisphere \mathscr{H}

Monte Carlo analysis

- The dot observables exhibits a larger peak than e_2^{α} : more mass sensitive.
- The mass contribution in the e_2^{α} distribution comes only from the matrix elements ("dynamical") 2

2

Monte Carlo analysis

the tail of the distribution. We cannot have an arbitrarily soft emission: $\min(z_i, z_j) > z_{\text{cut}}$

In the groomed case, the solid red curve starts to exhibit a small peak in

All order calculation

From analytical point of view, all the cumulative distribution resum in the same way at

NLL.

However, the differential distribution is discontinuous.

- To smooth the transition we decide to incorporate fixed order calculation
- These are NNLL contributions, which depend on the specific definition of the observable

Comparison with MC: ungroomed case

-
- It appears that the dead cone effect manifests earlier than predicted by theoretical calculations $v \simeq 2 m_b/\sqrt{s}$
- Large discrepancy with between analytics and MC in the ungroomed case

• Plot of there ratio of the cumulative Σ^b/Σ^q (massive/massless) for $e^+e^-\to 2$ jets

P. Dhani, O. Fedkevych, A. Ghira soon to appear

Comparison with MC: groomed case

- Plot of there ratio of the cumulative Σ^b/Σ^q (massive/massless) for $e^+e^-\to 2$ jets
- Very good agreement between MC and analytics
- MC predictions are close to each other

Hadron correction groomed case

- Comparison between parton level and hadron level simulations
- Soft Drop reduces the impact of hadronization corrections
- Both the observables are very robust under NP corrections (e_2^{α} in particular)

2

• Study of JSS observable for HF jets at e^+e^- : the angularities and ECFs defined with the scalar products are more sensitive to mass effects. Mass dependence both in the definition of the

- observable and at amplitude level.
- suppression of the radiation: $\lambda^{\alpha=1}, e^{\alpha=1}_2$ best way to probe the dead-cone *λα*=1 , *eα*=1 2
- Study of top quark dead cone effect at ILC $\sqrt{s}=2$ TeV (<u>Maltoni et al.</u>)

• The distribution associated to plain observable depends on the mass only through the square matrix element, thus all the mass effects that we see are related to a dynamical

Conclusions & outlook

Thanks for your attention!!!