Lattice QCD and Physics

Andreas S. Kronfeld Fermilab & IAS TU München

Workshop on the High Energy Circular Electron-Positron Collider Beijing + Zoom October 25, 2022





Need for Precision

- Beauty factories (Belle II, LHCb) producing *B* mesons (and other *b*-hadrons) at unprecedented rates.
- Similarly for charm factories (BES III, LHCb, Belle II).
- CEPC/FCC have potential to combine high rate and boost of LHC with cleanliness of asymmetric e^+e^- machines.
- Lingering puzzles in strangeness: will *b* anomalies linger too?
- Two-prong strategy:
 - determine parameters of the Standard Model;
 - study rare processes with well-predicted SM rate.

Outline

- Need for precision
- QCD and lattice gauge theory
- Some precise results from lattice QCD
 - Hadron masses and quark masses
 - Quark flavor
 - Muon *g*-2
- Enabling precision lattice QCD

Lattice QCD

QCD Lagrangian

• SU(3) gauge symmetry and $1 + n_f + 1$ parameters:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{QCD}} = \frac{1}{g_0^2} \operatorname{tr}[F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu}] \qquad \qquad M_{\Omega} \text{ or similar, ;} - \sum_{f} \bar{\psi}_f (\not{D} + m_f) \psi_f \qquad \qquad M_{\pi}, M_{K}, M_{J/\psi}, M_{Y}, \dots; + \frac{i\theta}{32\pi^2} \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \operatorname{tr}[F_{\mu\nu}F_{\rho\sigma}] \qquad \qquad \theta = 0.$$

• Gauge coupling g_0 and quarks masses m_f are not directly measurable:

- quarks bound into hadrons: use meson masses to fix m_f ;
- "dimensional transmutation"; use another mass to eliminate g_0 .

QCD Lagrangian

• SU(3) gauge symmetry and $1 + n_f + 1$ parameters:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{QCD}} = \frac{1}{g_0^2} \operatorname{tr}[F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu}] \qquad \qquad M_{\Omega} \text{ or similar, ;} - \sum_f \bar{\psi}_f (\not D + m_f) \psi_f \qquad \qquad M_{\pi}, M_K, M_{J/\psi}, M_Y, \dots;$$

Humankind's most perfect theory—Wilczek

- Gauge coupling g_0 and quarks masses m_f are not directly measurable:
 - quarks bound into hadrons: use meson masses to fix m_f ;
 - "dimensional transmutation"; use another mass to eliminate g_0 .

QCD Functional Integral

• Everything from integrals:

$$\langle \mathscr{O}(U, \psi, \bar{\psi}) \rangle = \frac{1}{Z} \int \mathscr{D}U \mathscr{D}\psi \mathscr{D}\bar{\psi} \mathscr{O}(U, \psi, \bar{\psi}) e^{-S} \quad \text{imaginary time:} \\ t = x^0 = -ix_4$$
 gluons (anti)quarks

- Infinite spacetime lattice makes set of integration variables countable; finite lattice makes them finite.
- Markov chain Monte Carlo with important sampling:

$$\langle \mathscr{O}(U,G) \rangle = \frac{1}{C} \sum_{c=0}^{C-1} \mathscr{O}(U,G)$$

Hybrid Monte Carlo (HMC) Duane, Kennedy, Pendleton, Roweth <u>Phys. Lett. B 195 (1987) 216</u>

QCD Correlation Functions

• Everything (almost) from correlation functions:

Masses, annihilation matrix elements:

• Decay and mixing matrix elements:



• Valence & sea quarks: different parts of code, so masses can differ.

Lattice QCD Data

• Computer generates data in a slab of a 10-dimensional parameter space:



Combine data with effective field theories (EFT) [e.g., hep-lat/0205021].





• Effective field theories: Symanzik ($a \rightarrow 0$), chiral perturbation theory $(m'_q, m_q \rightarrow m_u, m_d)$, heavy quark theory $(m_Q \rightarrow m_b, m_c)$.



$\pi...\Omega$: BMW, MILC, PACS-CS, QCDSF; ETM (2+1+1); η-η': RBC, UKQCD, Hadron Spectrum (ω).

Hadron Spectrum



Hadron Spectroscopy

- Not much interest in normal hadron masses these days:
 - even M_n – M_p studied vs. m_d – m_u & α a while ago [arXiv:1406.4088].
- Lots of interest in exotic hadrons (XYZ, tetraquarks, pentaquarks): lattice QCD ↔ structure [<u>USQCD-WP</u>, <u>SnowWP</u>].
- Most precisely calculable masses are pseudoscalar meson masses:
 - adjust bare quark masses until n_f of them agree with experiment $-\pi$, $K^0 \pm K^+$, $D_{(s)}(\eta_c)$, $B_{(s)}(\eta_b)$;
 - convert them to quark masses in renormalization schemes used in continuum QCD (MS, RGI).

Quark Masses: bottom, charm

• Flavor Lattice Averaging Group (FLAG), arXiv:2111.09849.



• Green passes all quality criteria; solid enters average (hatched superseded).

Quark Masses: bottom, charm

• Flavor Lattice Averaging Group (FLAG), arXiv:2111.09849.



· Green passes all quality criteria; solid enters average (hatched superseded).

Quark Masses: strange, down/up



• arXiv:1802.04248, arXiv:1805.06225

4.0

4.5

MeV

3.0

3.5

 $m_{u,\overline{\text{MS}}}(2 \text{ GeV}) = 2.130(41) \text{ MeV}$ $m_{d,\overline{\text{MS}}}(2 \text{ GeV}) = 4.675(56) \text{ MeV}$

- Numerous methods:
 - different observables;
 - different probes;
 - different systematics.
- Consider "heavyCurr"
 - same PT as in $e^+e^- \rightarrow Q\bar{Q}$ determination.

 α_{s} FLAG2021 **FLAG** estimate ALPHA 17 PACS-CS 09A Step Ayala 20 TUMQCD 19 Takaura 18 Bazavov 14 Bazavov 12 Pot lightCurr Cali 20 Hudspith 18 JLQCD 10 HPQCD 10 Maltman 08 HPQCD 08A Wloop HPOCD 05A Petreczky 20 Boito 20 Petreczky 19 heavyCurr Maezawa 16 JLQCD 16 HPQCD 14A HPQCD 10 HPQCD 08B Zafeiropoulos 19 ETM 13D ETM 12C ETM 11D Vert ы. Б Nakayama 18 0.115 0.120 0.125 0.110

• <u>SnowWP</u> on α_s .











CEPC jets: determine α_s or test QCD/OPE (cf., LHC data testing OPE <u>arXiv:2205.02857</u>)



August 2021

Matrix Elements

$\mathcal{B}(\mathsf{B}^0_{\mathrm{s}} \to \mu^+ \mu^-) = \left[3.83^{+0.38}_{-0.36} \text{ (stat)} {}^{+0.19}_{-0.16} \text{ (syst)} {}^{+0.14}_{-0.13} (f_{\mathrm{s}}/f_{\mathrm{u}}) \right] \times 10^{-9} \mathbf{LIA}$ $\mathcal{B}(\mathsf{B}^0 \to \mu^+ \mu^-) = \left[0.37^{+0.75}_{-0.67} \text{ (stat)} {}^{+0.08}_{-0.09} \text{ (syst)} \right] \times 10^{-10}.$



$\mathcal{B}(B_{s}^{0} \to \mu^{+}\mu^{-}) = \left[3.83^{+0.38}_{-0.36} \text{ (stat)}^{+0.19}_{-0.16} \text{ (syst)}^{+0.14}_{-0.13} (f_{s}/f_{u})\right] \times 10^{-9} \text{LIM}$ $\mathcal{B}(B^{0} \to \mu^{+}\mu^{-}) = \left[0.37^{+0.75}_{-0.67} \text{ (stat)}^{+0.08}_{-0.09} \text{ (syst)}\right] \times 10^{-10}.$



Cabibbo Angle Anomaly

- Leptonic decays π_{l2}/K_{l2} with f_K/f_{π} yield $|V_{ud}|/|V_{us}|$.
- Semileptonic decay K_{l3} with $f_{+}(0)$ yields $|V_{us}|$.
- Superallowed nuclear decay with nuclear theory yields $|V_{ud}|$.
- Unitarity crisis (3.2o):

$$|V_{ud}|_{0^+}^2 - |V_{us}|_{K_{l3}}^2 = 0.0021(2)(2)(2)(2)(5)_{NS}$$

• Improve NS or (some day) just use $\pi \& K$.

Coming Soon: IV_{cd} and IV_{cs}

• Semileptonic decays: great way to determine CKM: check if shapes agree & the fit relative normalization. Plots by Will I. Jay.

- $|V_{cd}| \& |V_{cs}|$ to ~1%.
- Same approach for $|V_{cb}| \& |V_{ub}|$: (<)1% for $|V_{ub}| (|V_{cb}|)$ in ~2 years.

Semileptonic B-Meson Decays

- $B \rightarrow \pi l \nu = |V_{ub}|; B \rightarrow D l \nu = |V_{cb}|.$
- · Same approach as previous slide.
- Three collaborations; two sets of ensembles.
- Existing results are, by now, several years old:
 - 2+1+1-flavor results in a couple years [cf. <u>arXiv:2111.05184</u>].

• (click on plots 🖙 full set of references)

SM may also expose new physics. To determine CKM matrix elements to high precision and to r

Form Factors

arXiv:2105.14019

An Error Budget

Source	$h_V(\%)$	$h_{A_1}(\%)$	$h_{A_2}(\%)$	$h_{A_3}(\%)$
Chiral-continuum fit error	4.2	2.0	17.4	6.9
(Statistics)	(3.7)	(1.2)	(16.9)	(6.3)
(Chiral-continuum extr.)	(0.8)	(0.9)	(1.7)	(0.5)
(LQ and HQ discretization)	(2.6)	(1.3)	(9.7)	(4.4)
(HQ mistuning)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(1.7)	(0.0)
(Matching $O(am_c \alpha_s)$)	(0.3)	(0.2)	(1.7)	(0.5)
LQ mistuning	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0
Matching $O(\alpha_s^2)$	0.7	0.3	0.5	0.3
Scale setting	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.1
Isospin effects	0.1	0.1	0.4	0.2
Finite volume				
Total error	4.3	2.0	17.4	6.9

Flavor Anomalies

arXiv:2105.14019

Flavor Anomalies – Summary

- Many rely on QCD input:
 - decay constants;
 - form factors;
 - four-quark operators.
- (Angular observables and LFUV profit from, but don't rely on, form factors.)
- Plot by Patrick Koppenburg (LHCb).

patrick.koppenburg@cern.ch 2022-05-16

Flavor Anomalies – Summary

- Many rely on QCD input:
 - decay constants;
 - form factors;
 - four-quark operators.
- (Angular observables and LFUV profit from, but don't rely on, form factors.)
- Plot by Patrick Koppenburg (LHCb).

Muon g-2

Muon g-2: Hadronic Contributions

- Putative 4.2σ discrepancy between experiment and SM (see below).
- SM uncertainty mostly from two virtual hadronic processes:
 - hadronic vacuum polaration (HVP)—
 - 6845(40) = 6931(40) 98.3(7) + 12.4(1);
 - hadronic light-by-light scattering (HLbL)—
 - 92(18) = 90(17) + 2(1).

- Two methods: experimental data + dispersion theory OR lattice QCD:
 - Can we get from 6931(40) [actually 7075(55)] to 7000(13)?

Hadronic Light-by-Light

- Lattice QCD and dispersive method both support model estimates.
- Agreement is too good and error is too small for HLbL to explain the discrepancy.

 Plot from Mg–2TI <u>SnowWP</u>.

Hadronic Vacuum Polarization

• Discrepancy: HVP vs. BSM?!?

[Mg-2TI, <u>SnowWP</u>]

Many Contributions

- *u*, *d*, *s* connected dominates.
- Also need conversion from QCD units to muon units: m_{μ}/M_{Ω} .
- Need independent lattice-QCD calculations:
 - Fermilab Lattice+MILC+ HPQCD; Aubin *et alia*;
 - χQCD; RBC+UKQCD;
 - Mainz/CLS; ETM;
 - BMW.

BMW <u>arXiv:2002.12347</u>

Road to Precision

- Goal is 0.2%, which will be $0.5\%/\sqrt{\text{few}}$.
- Road to precision will involve jumping through windows [arXiv:1801.07224]:

$$a_{\mu} = a_{\mu}^{\mathrm{SD}}(t_0, \Delta) + a_{\mu}^{\mathrm{W}}(t_0, t_1, \Delta) + a_{\mu}^{\mathrm{LD}}(t_1, \Delta)$$

- TI put forward intermediate window as a useful point of comparison.
- Also amenable to $R(e^+e^-)$ via Laplace transform.
- Very active: <u>arXiv:2111.15329</u> (ETM), <u>arXiv:2204.01280</u> (χQCD), <u>arXiv:2206.06582</u> (Mainz/CLS), <u>arXiv:2206.15084</u> (ETM), <u>arXiv:2207.04765</u> (Fermilab/HPQCD/MILC).

Road to Precision

- Goal is 0.2%, which will be $0.5\%/\sqrt{\text{few}}$.
- Road to precision will involve jumping through windows [arXiv:1801.07224]:

$$a_{\mu} = a_{\mu}^{\mathrm{SD}}(t_0, \Delta) + a_{\mu}^{\mathrm{W}}(t_0, t_1, \Delta) + a_{\mu}^{\mathrm{LD}}(t_1, \Delta)$$

• TI put forward intermediate window as a useful point of comparison.

Outlook: Enabling Precision

Enabling Precision Lattice QCD

- The push beyond 1% requires QED ($q_d \neq q_u$) and strong isospin breaking ($m_d \neq m_u$). QED requires theoretical development as well as computational.
- Lattice QCD is (mostly) carried out by collaborations with a mix of skills:
 - computing, phenomenology, theory;
 - on the computing side, generous support (in U.S.) from the Exascale Computing Project (ECP from DOE ASCR) until end 2023;
 - phenomenology and theory need students, postdocs, junior faculty.
- Lattice gauge theory (QCD and BSM) is a tool valuable in a wide variety of topics in particle physics, nuclear physics, and astrophysics.

Thank you for your attention!

LGT @ Snowmass: <u>arXiv:2209.10758</u> USQCD @ TF: <u>arXiv:2207.07641</u> USQCD @ CompF: <u>arXiv:2204.00039</u>