TUM/MPP Collider Phenomenology Seminar

Towards QED at N^3LO

Yannick Ulrich

AEC, University of Bern

3 July 2024

goals for this talk

- where & why do we need QED corrections?
- why do we need (partial) $\mathrm{N}^3\mathrm{LO}$?
- what tools are needed for this?
- what to expect?
- some results from McMule

most precise measurement of $g-2$



most precise measurement of $g-2$



	value	diagrams
QED 1-loop	$\alpha/2\pi = 11\,614\,097.3$	
QED 2-loop	$-17\,723.1$	 + 3 others + 1 conspiracy theory
QED 3-loop	148.0	 + 70 others
more QED	-0.5	
EW	15.3	
HVP	$684.5(4.0)$	 + others
HLbL	$9.2(1.7)$	
total	$11\,659\,181.0(4.3)$	[$g-2$ white paper 20]
FNAL+BNL	$11\,659\,206.2(4.0)$	

largest source of uncertainty & non-perturbative



this problem is bigger than $g-2$! [CMD-3 23] [BMW 20] largest source of uncertainty & non-perturbative



this problem is bigger than $g-2$! [CMD-3 23] [BMW 20]

time-like in $ee \to$ hadrons

$$\int \mathrm{d}s \Big(K(s)$$  $$\Big)$$

space-like in $e\mu \to e\mu$

$$\int \mathrm{d}t \Big(K'(t)$$  $$\Big)$$

time-like in $ee \to$ hadrons

$$\int \mathrm{d}s \Big(K(s)$$  $$\Big)$$

space-like in $e\mu \to e\mu$

$$\int \mathrm{d}t \Big(K'(t)$$  $$\Big)$$

... but what actually happens ...

radiative return measurement

$$\int \mathrm{d}s \Big(K(s)$$  $$\Big)$$

loop-induced process

$$\int \mathrm{d}t\, K'(t) \Big($$  $$\Big)$$

radiative corrections are vital

time-like in $ee \to$ hadrons

$$\int \mathrm{d}s \Big(K(s) \Big)$$



space-like in $e\mu \to e\mu$

$$\int \mathrm{d}t \Big(K'(t) \Big)$$



... but what actually happens ...

radiative return measurement

$$\int \mathrm{d}s \Big(K(s) \Big)$$



loop-induced process

$$\int \mathrm{d}t\, K'(t) \Big(\quad - \quad - \quad \Big)$$



radiative corrections are vital

state of the art QED

benefiting from LHC technology where possible

- soft resummation: CEEX ($\to$ improved YFS exponentiation)
- collinear resummation: parton shower & structure functions
- $2 \to 2$ with mass dependence at NNLO

  $\Rightarrow$ precision: $\mathcal{O}(10^{-4})$

  MUonE needs 10^{-5}
- $2 \to 3$ with mass dependence at NLO

  $\Rightarrow$ precision: $\mathcal{O}(\text{few} \times 10^{-3})$

  radiative return needs NNLO for kinematics
- pion final states: often only very simplified models $|F_\pi(s)|^2 \times$ 

  full hadronic model needed

just like @ the LHC ...

amplitude ⟶ implementation ⟶ cross section

just like @ the LHC ...

... except fermion masses are physical $\Rightarrow$ need massive amplitude

- they are also small $\to$ we can drop terms $\sim \left(\frac{\alpha}{\pi}\right)^2 \log\frac{m^2}{Q^2} \times \frac{m^2}{Q^2}$
- based on SCET factorisation & method of regions [Penin 06; Mitov, Moch 06; Becher, Melnikov 07; Engel, Gnendiger, Signer, YU 18]
- process e.g. $e\mu \to e\mu$ at two-loop:

$$\mathcal{A}(m) = \mathcal{S} \times \sqrt{Z} \times \sqrt{Z} \times \mathcal{A}(0) + \mathcal{O}(m) \supset \{1/\epsilon^2, L^2\}$$



- soft: process-dependent $S = 1 +$ fermion loops
  $\to$ compute separately to combine with hadron loops
- collinear: universal Z, converts $1/\epsilon \to \log(m^2/Q^2)$

amplitude $\longrightarrow$ implementation $\longrightarrow$ cross section

just like @ the LHC ...

... except the real-virtual can be delicate b/c it's more exclusive



$$+\mathcal{O}\left(E_\gamma^{-1}\right)$$



amplitude ⟶ implementation ⟶ cross section

just like @ the LHC ...

... except the real-virtual can be delicate b/c it's more exclusive





amplitude ⟶ implementation ⟶ cross section

test next-to-soft stabilisation vs OL4 (OpenLoops quad) for $\mu e \to \mu e$ real-virtual



- same statistics, same result
- 70 days vs 4 days
- integrated results for different cuts

⇒ this is not an approximation but a numerical tool

NTS	OL4
$-0.29268(4)$	$-0.29267(4)$
$-0.44789(6)$	$-0.44778(6)$
$-0.64662(9)$	$-0.64649(9)$

how does an NNLO QED calculation work?

just like @ the LHC ...

- universal soft limit $\mathcal{M}_{n+1}^{(\ell)} = \mathcal{E}\mathcal{M}_n^{(\ell)} + \mathcal{O}(E_\gamma^{-1})$
- universal pole structure $e^{\hat{\mathcal{E}}} \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{M}_n^{(\ell)} = \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{M}_n^{(\ell)f} =$ finite

use this to construct an all-order subtraction scheme FKS$^\ell$ [Engel, Signer, YU 19]



amplitude ⟶ implementation ⟶ cross section

an effort to study & improve the state-of-the-art for $ee \to XX$

- next generation of [RadioMonteCarlow 0912.0749]
- calculate standard candles for $ee \to ee, \mu\mu, \pi\pi$ for various scenarios (scan & radiative return)
  - `S0.7` ($\sim$ CMD, $\sqrt{s} = 0.7\,\mathrm{GeV}$):
    $1 \le \theta_{\text{avg}} \le \pi - 1$, $|\vec{p}| > 0.45\sqrt{s}$,
    $||\phi^+ - \phi^-| - \pi| < 0.15$, $|\theta^+ - \theta^- - \pi| < 0.25$
  - `LA1` ($\sim$ KLOE, $\sqrt{s} = 1.02\,\mathrm{GeV}$):
    $50^\circ \le \theta^\pm \le 130^\circ$,
    $|p_z| > 90\,\mathrm{MeV} \vee |p_\perp| > 160\,\mathrm{MeV}$,
    $50^\circ \le \theta_\gamma \le 130^\circ$, $E_\gamma > 20\,\mathrm{MeV}$,
    $0.1\,\mathrm{GeV}^2 \le M^2_{\mu\mu} \le 0.85\,\mathrm{GeV}^2$


Eur. Phys. J. C (2010) 66: 585–686
DOI 10.1140/epjc/s10052-010-1251-4

THE EUROPEAN PHYSICAL JOURNAL C

Review

Quest for precision in hadronic cross sections at low energy: Monte Carlo tools vs. experimental data

Working Group on Radiative Corrections and Monte Carlo Generators for Low Energies

S. Actis[38], A. Arbuzov[9,e], G. Balossini[32,33], P. Beltrame[13], C. Bignamini[32,33], R. Bonciani[15], C.M. Carloni Calame[35], V. Cherepanov[25,26], M. Czakon[1], H. Czyż[19,a,f,i], A. Denig[22], S. Eidelman[25,26,g], G.V. Fedotovich[25,26,e], A. Ferroglia[23], J. Gluza[19], A. Grzelińska[8], M. Gunia[19], A. Hafner[22], F. Ignatov[25], S. Jadach[8], F. Jegerlehner[3,19,41], A. Kalinowski[29], W. Kluge[17], A. Korchin[20], J.H. Kühn[18], E.A. Kuraev[9], P. Lukin[25], P. Mastrolia[14], G. Montagna[32,33,b,d], S.E. Müller[22,f], F. Nguyen[34,d], O. Nicrosini[33], D. Nomura[36,h], G. Pakhlova[24], G. Pancheri[11], M. Passera[28], A. Penin[10], F. Piccinini[33], W. Płaczek[7], T. Przedzinski[6], E. Remiddi[4,5], T. Riemann[41], G. Rodrigo[37], P. Roig[27], O. Shekhovtsova[11], C.P. Shen[16], A.L. Sibidanov[25], T. Teubner[21,h], L. Trentadue[30,31], G. Venanzoni[11,c,i], J.J. van der Bij[12], P. Wang[2], B.F.L. Ward[39], Z. Was[8,g], M. Worek[40,19], C.Z. Yuan[2]

[1]Institut für Theoretische Physik E, RWTH Aachen Universität, 52056 Aachen, Germany
[2]Institue of High Energy Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, China
[3]Institut für Physik Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, 12489 Berlin, Germany
[4]Dipartimento di Fisica dell'Università di Bologna, 40126 Bologna, Italy
[5]INFN, Sezione di Bologna, 40126 Bologna, Italy
[6]The Faculty of Physics, Astronomy and Applied Computer Science, Jagiellonian University, Reymonta 4, 30-059 Cracow, Poland
[7]Marian Smoluchowski Institute of Physics, Jagiellonian University, Reymonta 4, 30-059 Cracow, Poland
[8]Institute of Nuclear Physics Polish Academy of Sciences, 31342 Cracow, Poland
[9]Bogoliubov Laboratory of Theoretical Physics, Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, 141980 Dubna, Russia
[10]Department of Physics, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB T6G 2J1, Canada
[11]Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati dell'INFN, 00044 Frascati, Italy
[12]Physikalisches Institut, Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg, 79104 Freiburg, Germany
[13]Physics Department, CERN, 1211 Genève, Switzerland
[14]Theory Department, CERN, 1211 Genève, Switzerland
[15]Laboratoire de Physique Subatomique et de Cosmologie, Université Joseph Fourier/CNRS-IN2P3/INPG, 38026 Grenoble, France
[16]University of Hawaii, Honolulu, HI 96822, USA
[17]Institut für Experimentelle Kernphysik, Universität Karlsruhe, 76021 Karlsruhe, Germany
[18]Institut für Theoretische Teilchenphysik, Universität Karlsruhe, 76128 Karlsruhe, Germany
[19]Institute of Physics, University of Silesia, 40007 Katowice, Poland
[20]National Science Center "Kharkov Institute of Physics and Technology", 61108 Kharkov, Ukraine
[21]Department of Mathematical Sciences, University of Liverpool, Liverpool L69 3BX, UK
[22]Institut für Kernphysik, Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz, 55128 Mainz, Germany
[23]Institut für Physik (THEP), Johannes Gutenberg-Universität, 55099 Mainz, Germany
[24]Institute for Theoretical and Experimental Physics, Moscow, Russia
[25]Budker Institute of Nuclear Physics, 630090 Novosibirsk, Russia
[26]Novosibirsk State University, 630090 Novosibirsk, Russia
[27]Laboratoire de Physique Théorique (UMR 8627), Université de Paris-Sud XI, Bâtiment 210, 91405 Orsay Cedex, France
[28]INFN, Sezione di Padova, 35131 Padova, Italy
[29]LLR-Ecole Polytechnique, 91128 Palaiseau, France
[30]Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Parma, 43100 Parma, Italy
[31]INFN, Gruppo Collegato di Parma, 43100 Parma, Italy
[32]Dipartimento di Fisica Nucleare e Teorica, Università di Pavia, 27100 Pavia, Italy
[33]INFN, Sezione di Pavia, 27100 Pavia, Italy
[34]Dipartimento di Fisica dell'Università "Roma Tre" and INFN Sezione di Roma Tre, 00146 Rome, Italy
[35]School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Southampton, Southampton SO17 1BJ, UK
[36]Theory Center, KEK, Tsukuba, Ibaraki 305-0801, Japan
[37]Instituto de Fisica Corpuscular (IFIC), Centro mixto UVEG/CSIC, Edificio Institutos de Investigacion, Apartado de Correos 22085, 46071 Valencia, Spain
[38]Paul Scherrer Institut, Würenlingen and Villigen, 5232 Villigen PSI, Switzerland
[39]Department of Physics, Baylor University, Waco, TX 76798-7316, USA
[40]Fachbereich C, Bergische Universität Wuppertal, 42097 Wuppertal, Germany
[41]Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron, DESY, 15738 Zeuthen, Germany

Springer


$e^-e^+ \to e^-e^+$ @ S0.7
$\mathrm{d}\sigma/\mathrm{d}\theta_{\rm av}$ / nb
2000
1000
McMule
LO
0.00
−0.02
−0.04
−0.06
$K^{(i)} - 1$
1.0
1.2
1.4
1.6
1.8
2.0
$\theta_{\rm av}$ / rad
PRELIMINARY


$e^-e^+ \to e^-e^+$ @ S0.7
$\mathrm{d}\sigma/\mathrm{d}\theta_{\mathrm{av}}$ / nb
2000
1000
LO
NLO
0.00
−0.02
−0.04
−0.06
$K^{(i)} - 1$
NLO
1.0
1.2
1.4
1.6
1.8
2.0
θ_{av} / rad
PRELIMINARY


$e^-e^+ \to e^-e^+$ @ S0.7
$d\sigma/d\theta_{av}$ / nb
2000
1000
LO
NLO
NNLO
0.00
−0.02
−0.04
−0.06
$K^{(i)} - 1$
NLO
NNLO
1.0
1.2
1.4
1.6
1.8
2.0
θ_{av} / rad
PRELIMINARY


$e^-e^+ \to e^-e^+$ @ S0.7
$d\sigma/d\theta_{av}$ / nb
2000
1000
0.002
0.001
0.000
−0.001
$K^{(i)} - 1$
LO
NLO
NNLO
NLO
NNLO
1.0
1.2
1.4
1.6
1.8
2.0
θ_{av} / rad
PRELIMINARY


$e^-e^+ \to \mu^-\mu^+$ @ S0.7
$d\sigma/d\theta_{av}$ / nb
72
71
70
69
1.0
0.8
0.6
0.4
0.2
0.0
1.0
1.2
1.4
1.6
1.8
2.0
θ_{av} / rad
LO
McMule
PRELIMINARY


$e^-e^+ \to \mu^-\mu^+$ @ S0.7
$d\sigma/d\theta_{av}$ / nb
72
70
68
66
LO
NLO
0.00
−0.02
−0.04
−0.06
$K^{(i)} - 1$
NLO
1.0
1.2
1.4
1.6
1.8
2.0
θ_{av} / rad
PRELIMINARY


$e^-e^+ \to \mu^-\mu^+$ @ S0.7
$d\sigma/d\theta_{av}$ / nb
72
70
68
66
LO
NLO
NNLO
$K^{(i)} - 1$
0.00
−0.02
−0.04
−0.06
NLO
NNLO
1.0
1.2
1.4
1.6
1.8
2.0
θ_{av} / rad
PRELIMINARY


$e^-e^+ \to \mu^-\mu^+\gamma$ @ LA1
$d\sigma/dM_{XX}$
0.0050
0.0025
0.0000
LO
NLO
McMule
ISC (LO)
mixed (LO)
FSC (LO)
$d\sigma/dM_{XX}$
0.002
0.000
ISC
mixed
FSC
$K-1$
0.1
0.0
400
500
600
700
800
900
M_{XX} / MeV

- this pipeline also works for $2 \to 3$
- ... as longs as $m_f^2 \ll s_{ij}$ (massification)

for $ee \to \mu\mu\gamma$

- photon is detected, i.e. hard & large angle
- the simplest part ($ee \to \gamma\gamma^*(\to \mu\mu)$) with $m_e^2 \ll s_{ij}$
- the full with $m_e^2 \sim m_\mu^2 \ll s_{ij}$ with amplitudes from $pp \to 2j + \gamma$ (WIP)

$\Rightarrow$ no theoretical showstoppers, fairly doable

missing bits for N^{3}LO

VVV

- for $ee \to \gamma^*(\to \mu\mu)$: HQFF known [Fael, Lange, Schönwald, Steinhauser 22]
- for $ee \to \mu\mu$: massification (known) $\times$ massless (expected)

RVV

- full mass dependence unlikely (DiffExp-style is too slow for Monte Carlo)
- massless known from three-jet production
- massification...?

RRV

- OpenLoops + NTS

massifying real corrections



NTS expansion





massification



jettification

jettification (WIP)

expand for $m_e^2 \sim p_e \cdot p_\gamma \ll p_e \cdot q \sim p_\gamma \cdot q$

- calculation in SCET
- two non-trivial scales: $(p_e \cdot p_\gamma)/m_e^2$ and $(p_e \cdot q)/(p_\gamma \cdot q)$
- integrals not regularised in DIMREG

$$\frac{1}{\ell \cdot \bar{n}} \to \frac{1}{(\ell \cdot \bar{n})^{1+\eta}} \qquad \text{or} \qquad \frac{1}{\ell \cdot \bar{n}} \to \frac{1}{\ell \cdot \bar{n} + \Delta}$$

- either complicates the integrals
- final result J finite in η or Δ



$$\sim \int \frac{1}{\ell_1 \cdot \bar{n}} \frac{1}{\ell_1^2} \frac{1}{\ell_2 \cdot \bar{n}} \frac{1}{\ell_2^2} \cdots$$



$$\sim \int \frac{1}{\ell_1 \cdot \bar{n}} \frac{1}{\ell_1^2} \frac{1}{\ell_2^2} \cdots$$



$$\sim \int \frac{1}{\ell_1^2} \frac{1}{\ell_2^2} \cdots$$

[WIP, Schalch, Engel, YU]

- the NNLO $2 \to 2$ era has arrived, also for QED
- NNLO $2 \to 3$ possible for many things by adapting LHC results
- (partial) N^{3}LO possible in the near future
- resumatation is vital to reach the target precision

⇒ plans for YFS-based EEX in McMule, PS-based in other codes (Babayaga/MESMER)

f.l.t.r.: F.Hagelstein (Mainz), A.Coutinho (IFIC), N.Schalch (Bern), L.Naterop (Zurich & PSI), S.Kollatzsch (Zurich & PSI), A.Signer (Zurich & PSI), M.Rocco (PSI), T.Engel (Freiburg), V.Sharkovska (Zurich & PSI), Y.Ulrich (Bern), A.Gurgone (Pavia)
not pictured: P.Banerjee (IIT Guwahati), D.Moreno (PSI), D.Radic (PSI)

McMule

`mule-tools.gitlab.io`