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## The Standard Model and the Higgs boson

Our current paradigma: The Standard Model
The Higgs boson: The Standard Model predicts a scalar particle, which gives rise to the mass of all other particles.

- yet to be discovered -

Up to the Higgs boson manifests itself only through quantum corrections!

(Electroweak Working Group, hep-ex/0509008.)

## Electroweak precision physics

Precision observables allow us to extract the values of the five input parameters for the Standard model at the $Z$-pole.

Input parameters are:
$\alpha\left(m_{Z}^{2}\right), \alpha_{s}\left(m_{Z}^{2}\right), m_{Z}, m_{t}, m_{H}$.
Check how individual measurements agree with the results of this fit.

The forward-backward asymmetry for b-quarks shows the largest pull.


## The forward-backward asymmetry



A first definition of the forward-backward asymmetry:

$$
A_{F B}=\frac{N_{F}-N_{B}}{N_{F}+N_{B}}
$$

But: Free quarks are not observed, instead hadronic jets are seen in the detector !

## Perturbation theory

Due to the smallness of the coupling constants $\alpha$ and $\alpha_{s}$, we may compute observables at high energies reliable in perturbation theory,

$$
\langle O\rangle=\langle O\rangle_{L O}+\frac{\alpha_{s}}{2 \pi}\langle O\rangle_{N L O}+\left(\frac{\alpha_{s}}{2 \pi}\right)^{2}\langle O\rangle_{N N L O}+\ldots
$$

provided that the observable is infrared-safe!
In particular, it is required that they do not change value, if infinitessimal soft or collinear particles are added.

$$
O_{n+l}\left(p_{1}, \ldots, p_{n+l}\right) \quad \rightarrow \quad O_{n}\left(p_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, p_{n}^{\prime}\right),
$$

The forward-backward asymmetry is measured experimentally with a precision at the per cent level.

To match this precision the inclusion of QCD corrections in a theoretical calculation is mandatory.

## Prior art

Calculation of the NNLO QCD corrections to the forward-backward asymmetry in massless QCD:

$$
A_{F B}=A_{F B}^{(0)}\left(1+\frac{\alpha_{s}}{2 \pi} B_{F B}+\left(\frac{\alpha_{s}}{2 \pi}\right)^{2} C_{F B}\right)+o\left(\alpha_{s}^{3}\right)
$$

- G. Altarelli and B. Lampe, 1993;
- V. Ravindran and W. L. van Neerven, 1998;
- S. Catani and M. H. Seymour, 1999.

NLO corrections including mass corrections:
J. Jersak, E. Laermann, and P. M. Zerwas, 1981; J. G. Körner, G. Schuler, G. Kramer, and B. Lampe, 1986; A. B. Arbuzov,
D. Y. Bardin, and A. Leike, 1992; A. Djouadi, B. Lampe, and P. M. Zerwas, 1995; B. Lampe, 1996;

Partial results for mass corrections at NNLO:
W. Bernreuther, A. Brandenburg, and P. Uwer, 2000; W. Bernreuther et al., 2006;

## Diagrams

Some examples of diagrams contributing to the various orders in perturbation theory:
LO:

NNLO:



Purely virtual diagrams cancel in the correction to the asymmetry!

## Definitions used in the literature

How to define the direction of the $b$-quark in the presence of additional partons?

- Define the direction by the momentum of the quark.
- Use the thrust axis as direction.

How to treat the $b b \bar{b} \bar{b}$ final state if two $b$-quarks are tagged?

- Count it once.
- Count it twice.

The experimental analysis seems to have used the thrust axis and counted $b b \bar{b} \bar{b}$ final states with weigth two.

## Infrared finiteness

Catani ans Seymour have shown, that none of the combinations thrust axis/ quark axis and weight two/ weight one yields an infrared finite observable.

The divergence is proportional to

$$
\int_{0}^{1} d z P_{q \rightarrow q q \bar{q}}(z) \ln \frac{Q^{2}}{m_{b}^{2}}
$$

To absorb this divergence one can introduce a $b$-quark fragmentation function. This brings along additional uncertainties related to non-perturbative physics.

## Questions

Can the introduction of the fragmentation function and dependence on nonperturbative physics be avoided?

How to define the forward-backward asymmetry in an infrared-safe way?
What about a jet axis ?

## Jet algorithms

The most fine-grained look at hadronic events consistent with infrared safety is given by classifying the particles into jets.

Ingredients:

- a resolution variable $y_{i j}$ where a smaller $y_{i j}$ means that particles $i$ and $j$ are "closer";
- a combination procedure which combines two four-momenta into one;
- a cut-off $y_{\text {min }}$ which provides a stopping point for the algorithm.

A typical algorithm:

- for each pair $i, j$, calculate $y_{i j}$
- select pair with smallest $y_{i j}$; if $y_{i j}<y_{\text {min }}$, combine $i$ and $j$
- repeat until the smallest $y_{i j}>y_{\text {min }}$


## The Durham algorithm

Example: The Durham or $k_{\perp}$-algorithm for partons, whose flavour is not detected. (Dokshitzer, 1991)

Resolution variable:

$$
y_{i j}^{\text {DURHAM }}=\frac{2\left(1-\cos \theta_{i j}\right)}{Q^{2}} \min \left(E_{i}^{2}, E_{j}^{2}\right)
$$

Combination procedure:

$$
p_{(i j)}^{\mu}=p_{i}^{\mu}+p_{j}^{\mu}
$$

## Jets with flavour

The Durham algorithm is not infrared-safe for jets with flavour, since at order $\alpha_{s}^{2}$ a soft gluon can split into a soft $q \bar{q}$ pair.

The Durham measure

$$
y_{i j}^{D U R H A M}=\frac{2\left(1-\cos \theta_{i j}\right)}{Q^{2}} \min \left(E_{i}^{2}, E_{j}^{2}\right)
$$

assumes that parton emission has a soft and a collinear divergence.

However, there is no soft divergence in the $g \rightarrow q \bar{q}$ splitting.

## The flavour- $k_{\perp}$ algorithm

In order to account for tagged flavours modify the Durham measure

$$
y_{i j}^{\text {DURHAM }}=\frac{2\left(1-\cos \theta_{i j}\right)}{Q^{2}} \min \left(E_{i}^{2}, E_{j}^{2}\right)
$$

towards

$$
y_{i j}^{\text {flavour }}=\frac{2\left(1-\cos \theta_{i j}\right)}{Q^{2}} \times \begin{cases}\min \left(E_{i}^{2}, E_{j}^{2}\right), & \text { softer of } i, j \text { is flavourless }, \\ \max \left(E_{i}^{2}, E_{j}^{2}\right), & \text { softer of } i, j \text { is flavoured }\end{cases}
$$

This yields an infrared-safe definition of jets if flavours are tagged.
Banfi, Salam and Zanderighi, (2006).

## Definition of the forward-backward asymmetry

- Assign flavour number +1 to a $b$-quark and -1 to a $\bar{b}$-quark. All other particles have flavour number zero.
- Cluster particles into jets, using the flavour- $k_{\perp}$ algorithm.
- If two particles are combined, the flavour numbers are added.
- Select two jet events, where one jet has flavour number $>0$.
- The jet axis of this jet defines the direction relevant to the forward-backward asymmetry.


## Calculation of the NLO and NNLO corrections

To compute for this definition the NLO and NNLO corrections, a general purpose program for NNLO corrections to $e^{+} e^{-} \rightarrow 2$ jets is used.
S.W., 2006.

The relevant matrix elements are known for a long time.
T. Matsuura and W. L. van Neerven, 1988; T. Matsuura, S. C. van der Marck, and W. L. van Neerven, 1989; G. Kramer and
B. Lampe, 1987; R. K. Ellis, D. A. Ross, and A. E. Terrano, 1981; A. Ali et al., 1979;

Difficulty: Cancellation of IR divergences.

## General methods at NLO

Fully differential NLO Monte Carlo programs need a general method to handle the cancelation of infrared divergencies.

- Phase space slicing
$-e^{+} e^{-}$: W. Giele and N. Glover, (1992)
- initial hadrons: W. Giele, N. Glover and D.A. Kosower, (1993)
- massive partons, fragmentation: S. Keller and E. Laenen, (1999)
- Subtraction method
- residue approach: S. Frixione, Z. Kunzst and A. Signer, (1995)
- dipole formalism: s. Catani and M. Seymour, (1996)
- massive partons: L. Phaf and S.W. (2001), S. Catani, S. Dittmaier, M. Seymour and Z. Trócsányi, (2002)


## The dipole formalism

The dipole formalism is based on the subtraction method. The NLO cross section is rewritten as

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sigma^{N L O} & =\int_{n+1} d \sigma^{R}+\int_{n} d \sigma^{V} \\
& =\int_{n+1}\left(d \sigma^{R}-d \sigma^{A}\right)+\int_{n}\left(d \sigma^{V}+\int_{1} d \sigma^{A}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

The approximation $d \sigma^{A}$ has to fulfill the following requirements:

- $d \sigma^{A}$ must be a proper approximation of $d \sigma^{R}$ such as to have the same pointwise singular behaviour in $D$ dimensions as $d \sigma^{R}$ itself. Thus, $d \sigma^{A}$ acts as a local counterterm for $d \sigma^{R}$ and one can safely perform the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.
- Analytic integrability in $D$ dimensions over the one-parton subspace leading to soft and collinear divergences.


## The subtraction method at NNLO

- Singular behaviour
- Factorization of tree amplitudes in double unresolved limits, Berends, Giele, Cambell, Glover, Catani, Grazzini, Del Duca, Frizzo, Maltoni, Kosower '99
- Factorization of one-loop amplitudes in single unresolved limits, Bern, Del Duca, Kilgore, Schmidt, Kosower, Uwer, Catani, Grazzini, '99
- Extension of the subtraction method to NNLO Kosower; s.W.; Anastasiou, Melnikov, Petriello; Kilgore; Gehrmann-De Ridder, Gehrmann, Glover, Heinrich; Frixione, Grazzini; Somogyi, Trócsányi and Del Duca;
- Applications:
- $p p \rightarrow W$, Anastasiou, Dixon, Melnikov, Petriello '03,
$-e^{+} e^{-} \longrightarrow 2$ jets, Anastasiou, Melnikov, Petriello '04,


## The subtraction method at NNLO

Contributions at NNLO:

$$
\begin{aligned}
d \sigma_{n+2}^{(0)} & =\left(\mathscr{A}_{n+2}^{(0)}{ }^{*} \mathscr{A}_{n+2}^{(0)}\right) d \phi_{n+2}, \\
d \sigma_{n+1}^{(1)} & =\left(\mathscr{A}_{n+1}^{(0)}{ }^{*} \mathscr{A}_{n+1}^{(1)}+\mathscr{A}_{n+1}^{(1)} * \mathcal{A}_{n+1}^{(0)}\right) d \phi_{n+1}, \\
d \sigma_{n}^{(2)} & =\left(\mathscr{A}_{n}^{(0)^{*}} \mathscr{A}_{n}^{(2)}+\mathscr{A}_{n}^{(2)^{*}} \mathscr{A}_{n}^{(0)}+\mathscr{A}_{n}^{(1)^{*}} \mathscr{A}_{n}^{(1)}\right) d \phi_{n},
\end{aligned}
$$

Adding and subtracting:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\langle O\rangle_{n}^{N N L O}= & \int\left(o_{n+2} d \sigma_{n+2}^{(0)}-o_{n+1} \circ d \alpha_{n+1}^{(0,1)}-o_{n} \circ d \alpha_{n}^{(0,2)}\right) \\
& +\int\left(o_{n+1} d \sigma_{n+1}^{(1)}+o_{n+1} \circ d \alpha_{n+1}^{(0,1)}-o_{n} \circ d \alpha_{n}^{(1,1)}\right) \\
& +\int\left(o_{n} d \sigma_{n}^{(2)}+o_{n} \circ d \alpha_{n}^{(0,2)}+o_{n} \circ d \alpha_{n}^{(1,1)}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

## NNLO subtraction terms

The $(n+2)$-parton contribution:

$$
\int\left(o_{n+2} d \sigma_{n+2}^{(0)}-o_{n+1} \circ d \alpha_{n+1}^{(0,1)}-o_{n} \circ d \alpha_{n}^{(0,2)}\right), \quad d \alpha_{n}^{(0,2)}=d \alpha_{(0,0) n}^{(0,2)}-d \alpha_{(0,1) n}^{(0,2)}
$$

has to be integrable for all double and single unresolved limits.
The $(n+1)$-parton contribution:

$$
\int\left(o_{n+1} d \sigma_{n+1}^{(1)}+o_{n+1} \circ d \alpha_{n+1}^{(0,1)}-o_{n} \circ d \alpha_{n}^{(1,1)}\right), \quad d \alpha_{n}^{(1,1)}=d \alpha_{(1,0) n}^{(1,1)}+d \alpha_{(0,1) n}^{(1,1)}
$$

has to be integrable over single unresolved limits. In addition, explicit poles in $\varepsilon$ have to cancel.

## Example: $q g g \bar{q}$ final state for $e^{+} e^{-} \rightarrow \mathbf{2}$ jets

NNLO subtraction terms for the $(n+2)$-parton configuration:

$$
\begin{aligned}
d \alpha_{(0,0)}^{(0,2)}= & \frac{1}{2}\left\{\frac{N}{2} C_{F}\left[A_{4}^{0}(1,2,3,4)+A_{4}^{0}(1,3,2,4)\right]\right. \\
& \left.-\frac{1}{2 N} C_{F}\left[A_{4, s c}^{0}(1,2,3,4)+A_{4, s c}^{0}(1,3,2,4)\right]\right\}\left|\mathscr{A}_{2}^{(0)}\right|^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
d \alpha_{(0,1)}^{(0,2)}= & \frac{1}{2}\left\{\frac{N}{2}\left[D_{3}^{0}(1,2,3)+D_{3}^{0}(1,3,2)+D_{3}^{0}(4,2,3)+D_{3}^{0}(4,3,2)\right]\right. \\
& \left.-\frac{1}{2 N}\left[A_{3}^{0}(1,2,4)+A_{3}^{0}(1,3,4)\right]\right\} C_{F} A_{3}^{0}\left(1^{\prime}, 2^{\prime}, 3^{\prime}\right)\left|\mathcal{A}_{2}^{(0)}\right|^{2} .
\end{aligned}
$$

## Spin-averaged antenna functions

Spin-averaged $q g g \bar{q}$ antenna function obtained from the matrix element $\gamma^{*} \rightarrow q g g \bar{q}$ :

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathfrak{A}_{4}^{(0)}\left(q_{1}, g_{2}, g_{3}, \bar{q}_{4}\right)=e g^{2}\left[\left(T^{2} T^{3}\right)_{14} A_{4}^{(0)}\left(q_{1}, g_{2}, g_{3}, \bar{q}_{4}\right)+\left(T^{3} T^{2}\right)_{14} A_{4}^{(0)}\left(q_{1}, g_{3}, g_{2}, \bar{q}_{4}\right)\right] \\
& \left|\mathcal{A}_{4}^{(0)}\right|^{2}=e^{2} g^{4} \frac{N\left(N^{2}-1\right)}{4}\left(A_{4}^{(0)}(2,3), A_{4}^{(0)}(3,2)\right)\left(\begin{array}{cc}
1-\frac{1}{N^{2}} & -\frac{1}{N^{2}} \\
-\frac{1}{N^{2}} & 1-\frac{1}{N^{2}}
\end{array}\right)\binom{A_{4}^{(0)}(2,3)}{A_{4}^{(0)}(3,2)}
\end{aligned}
$$

Leading-colour antenna function:

$$
A_{4}^{0}(1,2,3,4)=\left|A_{4}^{(0)}(2,3)\right|^{2} /\left|A_{2}^{(0)}\right|^{2}
$$

Subleading-colour:

$$
A_{4, s c}^{0}(1,2,3,4)+A_{4, s c}^{0}(1,3,2,4)=\left|A_{4}^{(0)}(2,3)+A_{4}^{(0)}(3,2)\right|^{2} /\left|A_{2}^{(0)}\right|^{2}
$$

## Example: Leading colour $q g g \bar{q}$ antenna function

$$
\begin{aligned}
& A_{4}^{0}(1,2,3,4)= \\
& \frac{1}{4 s_{1234}}\left(\frac{48 s_{1234}}{s_{234}^{2}}+\frac{32 s_{1234}}{s_{23^{2}}^{2}}+\frac{48 s_{1234}}{s_{123^{2}}}+\frac{48 s_{23}-48 s_{123}+64 s_{1234}}{s_{12} s_{234}}+\frac{-32 s_{123} s_{1234}+16 s_{123}^{2}-32 s_{34} s_{1234}+16 s_{34}{ }^{2}+32 s_{1234}{ }^{2}}{s_{12} s_{23} s_{234}}\right. \\
& +\frac{-48 s_{12}-96 s_{23}-48 s_{34}-96 s_{1234}}{s_{123} s_{234}}-\frac{16 s_{1234}}{s_{34} s_{234}}+\frac{-32 s_{123} s_{1234}+16 s_{123^{2}}-32 s_{1234} s_{234}+16 s_{234}^{2}+32 s_{1234}^{2}}{s_{12} s_{23} s_{34}}+\frac{96}{s_{123}}+\frac{32 s_{1234}}{s_{12} s_{34}} \\
& -\frac{16 s_{1234}}{s_{12} s_{123}}+\frac{64 s_{12} s_{34} s_{1234}}{s_{23} s_{123} s_{234}}+\frac{64 s_{12} s_{1234}-32 s_{12}^{2}+64 s_{34} s_{1234}-32 s_{34}^{2}-128 s_{1234}^{2}}{s_{23} s_{123} s_{234}}+\frac{16 s_{23} s_{1234}}{s_{34} s_{234}^{2}}+\frac{48 s_{23}-48 s_{234}+64 s_{1234}}{s_{123} s_{34}} \\
& +\frac{48 s_{12}-48 s_{123}+32 s_{1234}}{s_{23} s_{234}}+\frac{64 s_{34} s_{1234}}{s_{23} s_{234}{ }^{2}}+\frac{64 s_{12} s_{1234}}{s_{23} s_{123^{2}}}-\frac{64 s_{34} s_{1234}}{s_{23}{ }^{2} s_{234}}+\frac{48 s_{34}-48 s_{234}+32 s_{1234}}{s_{23} s_{123}}+\frac{32 s_{34} s_{1234}}{s_{23}{ }^{2} s_{234}{ }^{2}}-\frac{64 s_{12} s_{1234}}{s_{23}{ }^{2} s_{123}} \\
& +\frac{32 s_{12}^{2} s_{1234}}{s_{23}{ }^{2} s_{123^{2}}^{2}}+\frac{16 s_{23} s_{1234}}{s_{12} s_{123^{2}}^{2}}+\frac{-32 s_{12} s_{1234}+16 s_{12}^{2}-32 s_{1234} s_{234}+16 s_{234}^{2}+32 s_{1234}^{2}}{s_{23} s_{123} s_{34}} \\
& +\frac{-32 s_{23} s_{1234}-16 s_{23}^{2}+48 s_{34} s_{1234}-16 s_{34}^{2}-64 s_{1234}^{2}}{s_{12} s_{123} s_{234}}+\frac{48 s_{12} s_{1234}-16 s_{12}^{2}-32 s_{23} s_{1234}-16 s_{23}^{2}-64 s_{1234}^{2}}{s_{123} s_{34} s_{234}} \\
& \left.+\frac{32 s_{23} s_{1234}{ }^{2}+16 s_{23}{ }^{2} s_{1234}+32 s_{1234}{ }^{3}}{s_{12} s_{123} s_{34} s_{234}}+\frac{-32 s_{23} s_{1234}+16 s_{123} s_{1234}-32 s_{1234}^{2}}{s_{12} s_{34} s_{234}}+\frac{-32 s_{23} s_{1234}+16 s_{1234} s_{234}-32 s_{1234}^{2}}{s_{12} s_{123} s_{34}}+\frac{96}{s_{234}}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

## Spin correlations

In the collinear limit spin correlations remain:

$$
A_{\mu} \frac{k_{\perp}^{\mu} k_{\perp}^{\nu}}{k_{\perp}^{2}} A_{\nu}, \quad \text { where } k_{\perp}=(1-z) p_{i}+z p_{j}-(1-2 z) \frac{y}{1-y} p_{k}
$$

Let $\varphi$ be the azimuthal angle of $p_{i}$ around $p_{i}+p_{j}$. Then

$$
A_{\mu} \frac{k_{\perp}^{\mu} k_{\perp}^{v}}{k_{\perp}^{2}} A_{\vee} \quad \sim \quad C_{0}+C_{2} \cos (2 \varphi+\alpha)
$$

One can perform the average with two points:

$$
\varphi, \quad \varphi+\frac{\pi}{2}
$$

while all other coordinates remain fixed.

## Phase space generation

Dimension of phase space for $n$ final state particles: $3 n-4$.
Split the phase space into different channels, according to which invariants are the smallest.

For each channel, use a parameterization such that $\varphi$ is along a coordinate axis:

$$
\begin{aligned}
d \phi_{n+1}= & d \phi_{n} d \phi_{\text {dipole }} \\
& d \phi_{\text {dipole }}=\frac{s_{i j k}}{32 \pi^{3}}(1-y) d y d z d \varphi
\end{aligned}
$$

Construct the momenta of the $(n+1)$ event from the ones of the $n$ parton event and the values of $y, z$ and $\varphi$.

## Numerical results for the forward-backward asymmetry of $b$-quarks

## Perturbative expansion:

$$
A_{F B}=A_{F B}^{(0)}\left(1+\frac{\alpha_{s}}{2 \pi} B_{F B}+\left(\frac{\alpha_{s}}{2 \pi}\right)^{2} C_{F B}\right)+o\left(\alpha_{s}^{3}\right)
$$

Select two-jet events defined by the flavour- $k_{\perp}$ algorithm and a given $y_{c u t}$. Leading order result independent of $y_{\text {cut }}$ :

$$
A_{F B, b}^{(0)}=0.11161
$$

QCD corrections:

| $y_{\text {cut }}$ | $B_{F B, b}$ | $C_{F B, b}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 0.01 | $-0.070 \pm 0.005$ | $-0.4 \pm 0.8$ |
| 0.03 | $-0.145 \pm 0.003$ | $-1.7 \pm 0.5$ |
| 0.1 | $-0.294 \pm 0.002$ | $-4.3 \pm 0.3$ |
| 0.3 | $-0.512 \pm 0.001$ | $-10.2 \pm 0.1$ |
| 0.9 | $-0.565 \pm 0.001$ | $-13.4 \pm 0.1$ |

Plot


## Numerical results for the forward-backward asymmetry of $c$-quarks

## Perturbative expansion:

$$
A_{F B}=A_{F B}^{(0)}\left(1+\frac{\alpha_{s}}{2 \pi} B_{F B}+\left(\frac{\alpha_{s}}{2 \pi}\right)^{2} C_{F B}\right)+o\left(\alpha_{s}^{3}\right)
$$

Select two-jet events defined by the flavour- $k_{\perp}$ algorithm and a given $y_{c u t}$. Leading order result independent of $y_{\text {cut }}$ :

$$
A_{F B, c}^{(0)}=0.08003
$$

QCD corrections:

| $y_{\text {cut }}$ | $B_{F B, c}$ | $C_{F B, c}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 0.01 | $-0.070 \pm 0.005$ | $-0.5 \pm 0.7$ |
| 0.03 | $-0.145 \pm 0.003$ | $-2.1 \pm 0.5$ |
| 0.1 | $-0.294 \pm 0.002$ | $-4.8 \pm 0.2$ |
| 0.3 | $-0.513 \pm 0.001$ | $-12.1 \pm 0.2$ |
| 0.9 | $-0.565 \pm 0.001$ | $-15.9 \pm 0.1$ |

## Summary

- The forward-backward asymmetry shows the largest discrepancy in a fit of the Standard Model parameter.
- Experimental analysis based on an infrared-unsafe definition.
- Infrared-safe definition of the forward-backward asymmetry.
- Calculation of the NLO and NNLO QCD corrections.
- The corrections are small, useful observable also for a future linear collider.

