Prospects for constraining light-quark electroweak couplings at e^+e^- colliders

Krzysztof Mękała

DESY, Hamburg, Germany

Faculty of Physics, University of Warsaw, Poland

based on work in collaboration with D. Jeans, J. Reuter, J. Tian, A.F. Żarnecki

The 2024 International Workshop on the High Energy Circular Electron Positron Collider (CEPC), 24.10.2024



A nice picture but it is not "**self-explanatory**":
it contains many free parameters.

ACCELERATING SCIENCE

Measuring precision observables allows to constrain the SM parameters but also to search for New Physics.







Z decays to hadrons are constrained from LEP and SLC...

$R_b = \Gamma(b\bar{b})/\Gamma(\text{hadrons})$ — Γ_{12}/Γ_8

OUR FIT is obtained by a simultaneous fit to several c- and b-quark measurements as explained in the note "The Z boson" and ref. LEP-SLC 06.

The Standard Model predicts R_b=0.21581 for m_t=174.3 GeV and M_H=150 GeV.

VALUE		DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
0.21629±0.00066 OUR FIT					
0.21594±0.00094±0.00075	1	ABE	05F	SLD	E_{cm}^{ee}=91.28 GeV
0.2174 ±0.0015 ±0.0028	2	ACCIARRI	00	L3	E_{cm}^{ee}= 89–93 GeV
0.2178 ±0.0011 ±0.0013	3	ABBIENDI	99B	OPAL	E_{cm}^{ee}= 88–94 GeV
0.21634±0.00067±0.00060	4	ABREU	99B	DLPH	E_{cm}^{ee}= 88–94 GeV
0.2159 ±0.0009 ±0.0011	5	BARATE	97F	ALEP	E_{cm}^{ee}= 88–94 GeV

Review of Particle Physics,
PDG, 2022

$R_c = \Gamma(c\bar{c})/\Gamma(\text{hadrons})$ — Γ_{11}/Γ_8

OUR FIT is obtained by a simultaneous fit to several c- and b-quark measurements as explained in the note "The Z boson" and ref. LEP-SLC 06.

The Standard Model predicts $R_c = 0.1723$ for $m_t = 174.3$ GeV and $M_H = 150$ GeV.

VALUE		DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
0.1721±0.0030 OUR FIT					
0.1744±0.0031±0.0021	1	ABE	05F	SLD	E_{cm}^{ee}=91.28 GeV
0.1665±0.0051±0.0081	2	ABREU	00	DLPH	E_{cm}^{ee}= 88–94 GeV
0.1698±0.0069	3	BARATE	00B	ALEP	E_{cm}^{ee}= 88–94 GeV
0.180 ±0.011 ±0.013	4	ACKERSTAFF	98E	OPAL	E_{cm}^{ee}= 88–94 GeV
0.167 ±0.011 ±0.012	5	ALEXANDER	96R	OPAL	E_{cm}^{ee}= 88–94 GeV

$\Gamma((u\bar{u}+c\bar{c})/2)/\Gamma(\text{hadrons})$ — Γ_9/Γ_8

This quantity is the branching ratio of $Z \to$ "up-type" quarks to $Z \to$ hadrons. Except ACKERSTAFF 97T the values of $Z \to$ "up-type" and $Z \to$ "down-type" branchings are extracted from measurements of Γ(hadrons), and $\Gamma(Z \to \gamma+$ jets) where γ is a high-energy (>5 or 7 GeV) isolated photon. As the experiments use different procedures and slightly different values of M_Z, Γ(hadrons) and α_s in their extraction procedures, our average has to be taken with caution.

VALUE		DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
0.166±0.009 OUR AVERAGE					
$0.172^{+0.011}_{-0.010}$	1	ABBIENDI	04E	OPAL	E_{cm}^{ee} = 91.2 GeV
0.160±0.019±0.019	2	ACKERSTAFF	97T	OPAL	E_{cm}^{ee}= 88–94 GeV
$0.137^{+0.038}_{-0.054}$	3	ABREU	95X	DLPH	E_{cm}^{ee}= 88–94 GeV
0.137±0.033	4	ADRIANI	93	L3	E_{cm}^{ee}= 91.2 GeV

Future e^+e^- colliders operating at the Z-pole would be a perfect place to study the couplings.



ILC

CEPC



FCC-ee

Source	$e^-e^+ \to c\bar{c}$				$e^-e^+ \to b\bar{b}$			
	$P_{e^-e^+}(-0.8,+0.3)$		$P_{e^-e^+}(+0.8,-0.3)$		$P_{e^-e^+}(-0.8,+0.3)$		$P_{e^-e^+}(+0.8,-0.3)$	
	R_c	$A_{FB}^{c\bar{c}}$	R_c	$A_{FB}^{c\bar{c}}$	R_b	$A_{FB}^{b\bar{b}}$	R_b	$A_{FB}^{b\bar{b}}$
Statistics	**0.18%**	**0.38%**	**0.27%**	**0.52%**	**0.12%**	**0.24%**	**0.23%**	**0.70%**
Preselection eff.	<0.01%	0.12%	0.02%	0.16%	<0.01%	0.08%	0.06%	0.12%
Background	0.01%	0.01%	0.02%	0.02%	0.01%	0.01%	0.06%	<0.01%
heavy quark mistag	0.11%	<0.01%	0.06%	<0.01%	0.12%	<0.01%	0.22%	<0.01%
uds mistag	0.03%	<0.01%	0.02%	<0.01%	0.08%	<0.01%	0.14%	<0.01%
Angular correlations	0.10%	0.10%	0.10%	0.10%	0.10%	0.10%	0.10%	0.10%
Beam Polarisation	<0.01%	<0.01%	0.02%	0.01%	<0.01%	0.01%	0.03%	0.15%
Systematics	**0.15%**	**0.16%**	**0.12%**	**0.19%**	**0.18%**	**0.13%**	**0.29%**	**0.22%**
Total	**0.24%**	**0.41%**	**0.30%**	**0.55%**	**0.21%**	**0.27%**	**0.37%**	**0.73%**

A. Irles *et al.*, [2306.11413]

The cross sections to heavy quarks could be well constrained thanks to excellent flavour-tagging.

But how to take the measurement if...

- tagging is imperfect (*s* quark)?
- tagging is unavailable (*u*, *d* quarks)?

Outline

1. How to measure *Z* couplings to light quarks?
2. How to generate Monte Carlo events?
3. How to select events?

How to measure Z couplings to light quarks?

General idea

We want to measure quark couplings:

$$c_f = v_f^2 + a_f^2$$

They are given in the SM by:

$$v_f = 2I_{3,f} - 4Q_f \sin^2\theta_W \qquad a_f = 2I_{3,f}$$

Γ_{had} scales as:

$$\Gamma_{had} \sim (3c_d + 2c_u)$$

and $\Gamma_{had+\gamma}$ *as*:

$$\Gamma_{had+\gamma} \sim \frac{\alpha}{2\pi} f(y_{cut}) \left(3q_d^2 c_d + 2q_u^2 c_u\right)$$

The correction factor $f(y_{cut})$ to be determined for a given value of the resolution parameter y_{cut}.

Resolution parameter y_{cut}

- By measuring the radiative and non-radiative decays, one can disentangle c_d and c_u. The definition of a *radiative* event is crucial.
- The photon resolution criterion may depend on an arbitrarily chosen isolation parameter, e.g. the photon transverse momentum w.r.t. the jet direction, q^T:

$$q^T = E_\gamma \sin(\theta_{j\gamma})$$



Measurement at the Z-pole – recipe

1. Count 2-jet events (n_j) and 2-jet events with a tagged photon ($n_{\gamma j}$). We consider 4 tags: "light", s, c and b.

$$j = (ud)(ud), (ud)s, (ud)c, ..., ss, sc, sb, ...$$

Measurement at the Z-pole – recipe

1. Count 2-jet events (n_j) and 2-jet events with a tagged photon ($n_{\gamma j}$). We consider 4 tags: "light", s, c and b.

$$j = (ud)(ud), (ud)s, (ud)c, \ldots, ss, sc, sb, \ldots$$

2. Compare to the expected numbers of events:

$$N_j = (\text{exp. acceptance}) \cdot (\text{class. prob.}) \cdot (\text{lumi.}) \cdot \sigma_q \equiv A_{jq} \cdot \sigma_q$$

$$N_{\gamma j} = B^{\gamma}_{jq}(y_{cut}) \cdot \sigma_{\gamma q} + B^{0}_{jq}(y_{cut}) \cdot \sigma_{0q} \equiv B_{jq} \cdot \sigma_q$$

[2310.03440]

Measurement at the Z-pole – recipe

1. Count 2-jet events (n_j) and 2-jet events with a tagged photon ($n_{\gamma j}$). We consider 4 tags: "light", s, c and b.

   $j = (ud)(ud), (ud)s, (ud)c, \ldots, ss, sc, sb, \ldots$

2. Compare to the expected numbers of events:

$$N_j = (\text{exp. acceptance}) \cdot (\text{class. prob.}) \cdot (\text{lumi.}) \cdot \sigma_q \equiv A_{jq} \cdot \sigma_q$$

$$N_{\gamma j} = B^{\gamma}_{jq}(y_{cut}) \cdot \sigma_{\gamma q} + B^{0}_{jq}(y_{cut}) \cdot \sigma_{0q} \equiv B_{jq} \cdot \sigma_q$$

[2310.03440]

3. Minimise the χ^2 distribution to extract the cross sections:

$$\chi^2 = \sum_j \frac{(n_j - N_j)^2}{N_j} + \sum_j \frac{(n_{\gamma j} - N_{\gamma j})^2}{N_{\gamma j}}$$

Measurement at the Z-pole – recipe

1. Count 2-jet events (n_j) and 2-jet events with a tagged photon ($n_{\gamma j}$). We consider 4 tags: "light", s, c and b.

$$j = (ud)(ud), (ud)s, (ud)c, \ldots, ss, sc, sb, \ldots$$

2. Compare to the expected numbers of events:

$$N_j = (\text{exp. acceptance}) \cdot (\text{class. prob.}) \cdot (\text{lumi.}) \cdot \sigma_q \equiv A_{jq} \cdot \sigma_q$$

$$N_{\gamma j} = B^{\gamma}_{jq}(y_{cut}) \cdot \sigma_{\gamma q} + B^{0}_{jq}(y_{cut}) \cdot \sigma_{0q} \equiv B_{jq} \cdot \sigma_q$$

[2310.03440]

3. Minimise the χ^2 distribution to extract the cross sections:

$$\chi^2 = \sum_j \frac{(n_j - N_j)^2}{N_j} + \sum_j \frac{(n_{\gamma j} - N_{\gamma j})^2}{N_{\gamma j}}$$

Systematic uncertainties can also be included:

$$\chi^2 = \sum_j \frac{\left(n_j - N_j(\vec{\delta})\right)^2}{N_j(\vec{\delta})} + \sum_j \frac{\left(n_{\gamma j} - N_{\gamma j}(\vec{\delta})\right)^2}{N_{\gamma j}(\vec{\delta})} + \sum_k \delta_k^2$$

How to generate Monte Carlo events?

Analysis setup

We want to consider:

$$e^+e^- \to q\bar{q}(\gamma)$$

Experimentally measured photons can originate not only from the Final State Radiation but also from the Initial State Radiation, hadronisation and decays...

One may encounter the following issues:

- **Matrix Element** calculations – divergent or very slow for low photon-emission angles;
- **ISR structure functions** – good for small angles, a proper matching procedure needed;
- **FSR showers** – important for QCD emissions, may cause double-counting;
- **hadron decays** – photons to be included properly.

Matching procedure – *Whizard* perspective

- matching: *soft* physics invisible in the detector,
  hard physics properly reconstructed

- soft ISR photons simulated using built-in structure functions

- soft FSR photons simulated using parton showers

- hard photons simulated using full ME calculations
  (0, 1, 2... ME γ samples)

→ momentum transfer and energy to define the soft and hard regimes

Efficiency of the matching procedure

About 7-8% of Whizard events are rejected to avoid double-counting.



How to select events?

work in progress

Event reconstruction

Measurable photons can originate from:

- Initial State Radiation,
- Final State Radiation,
- hadronisation and decays.

The interesting information comes only from FSR so the reconstruction criteria should reduce the other contributions.

A dedicated approach is crucial!

Photon kinematics – transverse momentum



Detector simulation for ILC

Systematic uncertainties

The optimal isolation parameter can be chosen only if systematic uncertainties are included.

Uncertainty	[%]
Luminosity	0.01
Acceptance of radiative events	5
Acceptance of non-radiative events	50
b tagging	1
c tagging	2
s tagging	5
u/d tagging	10

Preliminary results





Assuming 100 fb^{-1} collected at ILC

Conclusions

- The couplings of the Z boson to light quarks are weakly constrained but an excellent improvement could be achieved at future colliders.
- Proper assessment of the uncertainties requires deep understanding of theoretical calculations, event simulation and reconstruction.
- First estimates: **sub-percent** precision for *d* and *u*, **sub-permille** precision for *s*, *c* and *b*
- *Work in progress...*

Backup

Starting point

Some part of the work has already been done...



Simulating hard photon production with WHIZARD

J. Kalinowski *et al.*, [2004.14486]

General idea:

- soft ISR photons simulated using the built-in structure function
- hard ISR photons simulated at the ME level
- matching in $q_{\pm}$:

$$q_- = \sqrt{4E_0E_\gamma}\sin\frac{\theta_\gamma}{2}$$
$$q_+ = \sqrt{4E_0E_\gamma}\cos\frac{\theta_\gamma}{2}$$

Extension of the procedure

Simulating events with *Whizard* and *Pythia6* (shower and hadronisation)

- ME cuts:
  - **all** γ's:

$$q_{\pm} > 0.5\ \text{GeV}\ \underline{\text{and}}\ E > 0.5\ \text{GeV}\ \underline{\text{and}}\ M(\gamma, q_{\text{i}}) > 1\ \text{GeV}$$

- event selection:
  - **all** ISR SF γ's:

$$q_{\pm} < 0.5\ \text{GeV}\ \underline{\text{or}}\ E < 0.5\ \text{GeV}\ \underline{\text{or}}\ M(\gamma, q_{\text{i}}) < 1\ \text{GeV}$$

  - **all** FSR shower γ's whose parents are initial quarks:

$$q_{\pm} < 0.5\ \text{GeV}\ \underline{\text{or}}\ E < 0.5\ \text{GeV}\ \underline{\text{or}}\ M(\gamma, q_{\text{i}}) < 1\ \text{GeV}$$

Note: a single quark can emit multiple photons.

Photon kinematics – pseudorapidity



Photon kinematics – energy





What decays?

[%]	d	u	s	c	b
π^0	94	94	94	93	88
η	4.5	4.5	4.3	3.7	3.6
D mesons	-	-	-	1.9	2.0
B mesons	-	-	-	-	5.6

hadronisation by *Pythia6*