Higher order corrections to $e^+ e^- \rightarrow H^+Z$ and $e^+ e^- \rightarrow H^+ \gamma$ production at **CEPC**

Yu Jia

IHEP, Theory Division



CEPC Theory Group Workshop, July 11-14,2017

Part 1

$e^+ e^- \rightarrow H^+Z$

Golden production channel for Higgs at CEPC

so-called Higgsstrahlung process

Motivations

Three next-generation e^+e^- colliders have been proposed to serve as Higgs factory: International Linear Collider (ILC), Future Circular Collider (FCCee), formerly called TLEP, and Circular Electron-Positron Collider (CEPC). All of them intend to operate at center-of-mass energy within the 240–250 GeV range. At such energy, the Higgsstrahlung process, $e^+e^- \rightarrow HZ$, is the dominant Higgs production mechanism.

Motivations

CEPC can measure production cross section for $\sigma(ZH)$ to an exquisite precision of 0.51%

Knowing the NLO EW correction (a few percent) is not sufficient to meet experimental precision!

 $O(\alpha^2)$ and $O(\alpha\alpha_s)$ corrections need be considered!

We will investigate the latter, which should be more manageable and even more important!

Various Higgs Production mechanism



As is seen above, the Higgsstrahlung process, e⁺e⁻ → HZ is dominant in e⁺e⁻ colliders at energy below 400 GeV. Its contribution is much more important than that of WW and ZZ fusion mechanism.

Previous NLO work on $e^+e^- \rightarrow HZ$

The $\mathcal{O}(\alpha)$ corrections to $e^+e^- \rightarrow HZ$ have been calculated independently by three groups:

- J. Fleischer and F. Jegerlehner, Nucl. Phys. B 216 (1983) 469.
- B. A. Kniehl,
 Z. Phys. C 55 (1992) 605.
- A. Denner, J. Kublbeck, R. Mertig and M. Bohm,

Z. Phys. C 56 (1992) 261.



Fig. 15. The relative corrections to the differential cross section for different polarizations of the Z-boson and different CMS energies

Our recent work on $e^+e^- \rightarrow HZ$ at $\mathcal{O}(\alpha \alpha_s)$ arXiv:1609.03995 by Sun, Feng, Jia and Sang

arXiv.org > hep-ph > arXiv:1609.03995

High Energy Physics - Phenomenology

Mixed electroweak-QCD corrections to $e^+e^- ightarrow HZ$ at Higgs factories

Qing-Feng Sun, Feng Feng, Yu Jia, Wen-Long Sang

(Submitted on 13 Sep 2016)

The prospective e^+e^- Higgs factories, exemplified by ILC, FCC-ee, CEPC, plan to conduct the precision Higgs measurements at center-of-mass energy around 250 GeV. The cross sections for the dominant Higgs production channel, the Higgsstrahlung process, can be measured to a sub-percent accuracy. Apart from the well-known next-to-leading order electroweak correction, this unprecedented precision also necessitates our knowledge about the mixed electroweak-QCD corrections. In this work, we calculate the $\mathcal{O}(\alpha \alpha_s)$ correction to $e^+e^- \rightarrow HZ$ for both unpolarized and polarized Z boson. The corrections turn out to reach one percent level of the leading order cross section, thereby must be incorporated in the future confrontation with the data.

Comments: 11 pages, 4 figures, 1 table Subjects: High Energy Physics - Phenomenology (hep-ph); High Energy Physics - Experiment (hep-ex) Cite as: arXiv:1609.03995 [hep-ph] (or arXiv:1609.03995v1 [hep-ph] for this version)

Submission history

From: Yu Jia [view email] [v1] Tue, 13 Sep 2016 19:44:39 GMT (415kb)

Collaborators: Feng Feng (China Univ. of Mining), Wen-Long Sang (Southwest Univ.) Qing-Feng Sun (PhD student at USTC, will join IHEP / EPC as a postdoc fellow this Nov.)

Search or Article-id

An independent calculation by another group arXiv:1609.03955 by Gong, Li, Xu, Yang

arXiv.org > hep-ph > arXiv:1609.03955

Search or Article-id

High Energy Physics - Phenomenology

Mixed QCD-EW corrections for Higgs boson production at e^+e^- colliders

Yinqiang Gong, Zhao Li, Xiaofeng Xu, Li Lin Yang

(Submitted on 13 Sep 2016)

Since the discovery of the Higgs boson at the Large Hadron Collider, a future electron-position collider has been proposed for precisely studying its properties. We investigate the production of the Higgs boson at such an e^+e^- collider and calculate for the first time the mixed QCD-electroweak corrections to the total cross sections. We find that the $O(\alpha \alpha_s)$ corrections amount to a 1.2% increase of the cross section for a center-of-mass energy around 250 GeV. This is larger than the expected experimental accuracy and has to be included for extracting the properties of the Higgs boson from the measurements of the cross sections in the future.

Subjects: High Energy Physics - Phenomenology (hep-ph) Cite as: arXiv:1609.03955 [hep-ph] (or arXiv:1609.03955v1 [hep-ph] for this version)

Submission history

From: Li Lin Yang [view email] [v1] Tue, 13 Sep 2016 18:05:00 GMT (6kb)

Typical higher-order Feynman diagrams to the *Higgsstrahlung* process



FIG. 1: LO diagram for $e^+e^- \to HZ$, together with some representative higher-order diagrams up to order- $\alpha \alpha_s$.

Typical Feynman diagrams for eeZ vertex, selfenergy and ZZH vertex.



FIG. 2: Representative diagrams for the radiative corrections to the renormalized eeZ vertex, γ/Z self-energy, and VZH vertex, through order- $\alpha\alpha_s$. The cross represents the quark mass counterterm in QCD, cap denotes the electroweak counterterm in on-shell scheme.

Detailed Techniques and results

• Techniques

We renormalize the UV divergences with on-mass-shell scheme. Ref.:

A. Sirlin, Phys. Rev. D 22, 971 (1980).

A. Denner, Fortsch. Phys. 41, 307 (1993).

The top quark mass appears in internal top quark propagator and the $Ht\bar{t}$ Yukawa vertex, which is renormalized in on-shell scheme as:

$$\delta m_t = -m_t \Gamma(1+\epsilon) \left(\frac{4\pi\mu^2}{m_t^2}\right)^{\epsilon} \frac{C_F}{4} \frac{\alpha_s}{\pi} \frac{3-2\epsilon}{\epsilon(1-2\epsilon)}$$

We calculate the electroweak counter terms δZ_e , δM_Z^2 , δM_W^2 , δM_H^2 , δZ_{ZZ} , $\delta Z_{\gamma Z}$ and δZ_H analytically, and adopt the so-called $\alpha(0)$ scheme where $\alpha =$ 1/137.035999 and the charge renormalization constant $\delta Z_e = e Z_e$ in $\alpha(0)$ scheme is expressed as:

$$\delta Z_e \Big|_{\alpha(0)} = \frac{1}{2} \Delta \alpha_{\text{had}}^{(5)}(M_Z^2) + \frac{1}{2} \text{Re} \,\Pi^{\gamma\gamma(5)}(M_Z^2) + \frac{1}{2} \Pi_{\text{rem}}^{\gamma\gamma}(0) - \frac{s_W}{c_W} \frac{\Sigma_T^{\gamma Z}(0)}{M_Z^2},$$

Where $\Delta \alpha_{had}^{(5)} = 0.02771$ represents the nonperturbative hadronic contributions to the running effect of the electroweak coupling and $\Pi_{rem}^{\gamma\gamma(5)}(0)$ is the remaining possible photon vacuum polarizations from other charged SM particles.

Methodology and Comparison with existing NLO predictions

Throughout this work, we only retain the top quark mass and treat the remaining five quarks massless. We work in Feynman gauge and adopt the dimensional regularization to regularize UV divergence. The Feynman diagrams and corresponding amplitudes are generated by FeynArts [25]. The packages FeynCalc/FormLink [26, 27] are employed to carry out the trace over Dirac/color matrices, and the packages Apart [28] and FIRE [29] are utilized to perform partial fraction together with integration-by-parts (IBP) reduction. We combine FIESTA/CubPack [30, 31] to perform sector decomposition and subsequent numerical integrations for Master Integrals (MI) with quadruple precision. We also employed LoopTools [32] to perform an independent cross-check. The counterterms are computed analytically [20]. After completing the renormalization procedure, we have compared our UV-finite NLO predictions with numerous differential and integrated cross sections enumerated in [18], and found gross agreement. Reassuringly, we also compare our integrated NLO cross sections with those high-precision predictions rendered by the automatic package GRACE-loop [33] for a variety of input values of \sqrt{s} and M_H , and always found better-than-per-mille agreement.

We confirm Denner et al.'s analytic NLO results

Our NLO predictions to integrated cross sections are accurate to an exquisite degree, actually we get fully analytic results. ¹³

We apply three variants of On-Shell renormalization schemes:

$$\alpha(0) \text{ scheme} \qquad \delta Z_e \Big|_{\alpha(0)} = \frac{1}{2} \Delta \alpha_{\text{had}}^{(5)}(M_Z^2) + \frac{1}{2} \text{Re} \, \Pi^{\gamma\gamma(5)}(M_Z^2) \\ + \frac{1}{2} \Pi_{\text{rem}}^{\gamma\gamma}(0) - \frac{s_W}{c_W} \frac{\Sigma_T^{\gamma Z}(0)}{M_Z^2},$$

$$\Delta \alpha(M_Z^2) = \prod_{\substack{f \neq t}}^{\gamma \gamma} (0) - \operatorname{Re} \prod_{\substack{f \neq t}}^{\gamma \gamma} (M_Z^2)$$

$$\alpha(MZ) \text{ scheme } \delta Z_e|_{\alpha(M_Z^2)} = \delta Z_e|_{\alpha(0)} - \frac{1}{2}\Delta \alpha(M_Z^2)$$

$$\alpha(M_Z^2) = \frac{\alpha(0)}{1 - \Delta \alpha(M_Z^2)},$$

$$\alpha(M_Z^2) = \frac{\alpha(0)}{1 - \Delta \alpha(M_Z^2)},$$

$$\alpha_{G_{\mu}} = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi} G_{\mu} M_W^2 \left(1 - \frac{M_W^2}{M_Z^2}\right)$$

Input Parameters

Phenomenology. We will take $\sqrt{s} = 240, 250 \text{ GeV}$ as two benchmark energy points at Higgs factory. We adopt the following values for the input parameters: $M_H = 125.09 \text{ GeV}, M_Z = 91.1876 \text{ GeV}, M_W =$ $80.385 \text{ GeV}, m_t = 174.2 \text{ GeV}, m_e = 0.510998928 \text{ MeV},$

 $m_{\mu} = 105.6583715 \text{ MeV}, m_{\tau} = 1.77686 \text{ GeV}, \alpha(0) = 1/137.035999, \Delta \alpha_{had}^{(5)}(M_Z) = 0.02764 \pm 0.00013$ [24] and $G_{\mu} = 1.1663787 \times 10^{-5} \text{ GeV}^2$. We take $\alpha(M_Z^2) = 1/128.943$ in the $\alpha(M_Z^2)$ scheme and evaluate the QCD running coupling $\alpha_s(\mu)$ using package RunDec [42].

Our predictions in $\alpha(0)$ scheme (including corrections for polarized cross section)

$\sqrt{s} \; (\text{GeV})$		LO (fb)	O (fb) NLO Weak (fb)			NNLO mixed EW-QCD (fb)			
		$\sigma^{(0)}$	$\sigma^{(\alpha)}$	$\sigma^{(0)} + \sigma^{(\alpha)}$	$\sigma_Z^{(lpha lpha_s)}$	$\sigma_{\gamma}^{(lphalpha_{s})}$	$\sigma^{(\alpha \alpha_s)}$	$\sigma^{(0)} + \sigma^{(\alpha)} + \sigma^{(\alpha\alpha_s)}$	
240	Total	223.14	6.64	229.78	2.42	0.008	2.43	232.21	
	L	88.67	3.18	91.86	0.96	0.003	0.97	92.82	
	Т	134.46	3.46	137.92	1.46	0.005	1.46	139.39	
250	Total	223.12	6.08	229.20	2.42	0.009	2.42	231.63	
	L	94.30	3.31	97.61	1.02	0.004	1.02	98.64	
	Т	128.82	2.77	131.59	1.40	0.005	1.40	132.99	

TABLE I: The (un)polarized Higgsstrahlung cross sections at $\sqrt{s} = 240(250)$ GeV in $\alpha(0)$ scheme. We enumerate the NLO weak corrections, together with the NNLO $\mathcal{O}(\alpha \alpha_s)$ corrections. For the latter, we also list individual contribution given in (13).

NLO enhances the LO prediction by about **3.1%**

NNLO mixed EW-QCD correction is sizable, about **1.1%** of the LO prediction!

υ

Our predictions for unpolarized cross section in three different schemes (including uncertainty)

\sqrt{s}	schemes	$\sigma_{\rm LO}~({\rm fb})$	$\sigma_{\rm NLO}$ (fb)	$\sigma_{\rm NNLO}$ (fb)
	lpha(0)	223.14 ± 0.47	229.78 ± 0.77	$232.21\substack{+0.75+0.10\\-0.75-0.21}$
240	$\alpha(M_Z^2)$	252.03 ± 0.60	$228.36\substack{+0.82\\-0.81}$	$231.28\substack{+0.80+0.12\\-0.79-0.25}$
	G_{μ}	239.64 ± 0.06	$232.46_{-0.07}^{+0.07}$	$233.29\substack{+0.07+0.03\\-0.06-0.07}$
250	$\alpha(0)$	223.12 ± 0.47	229.20 ± 0.77	$231.63\substack{+0.75+0.12\\-0.75-0.21}$
	$\alpha(M_Z^2)$	252.01 ± 0.60	$227.67\substack{+0.82 \\ -0.81}$	$230.58\substack{+0.80+0.14\\-0.79-0.25}$
	G_{μ}	239.62 ± 0.06	231.82 ± 0.07	$232.65\substack{+0.07+0.04\\-0.07-0.07}$

Observe strong scheme dependence!

The NNLO predictions now range from 230 To 233 fb!

Need go to 2-loop EW correction to reduce Scheme dependence!

Bad news for prescribed 0.51% precision at CEP₁C?

TABLE II: The unpolarized Higgsstrahlung cross sections at $\sqrt{s} = 240(250)$ GeV in three different schemes. To estimate the errors caused by the input parameters, we take $M_W = 80.385 \pm 0.015 \,\text{GeV}, \ m_t = 174.2 \pm 1.4 \,\text{GeV}$ and $\Delta \alpha_{\text{had}}^{(5)}(M_Z) = 0.02764 \pm 0.00013$. We also change the strong coupling constant from $\alpha_s(M_Z)$ to $\alpha_s(\sqrt{s})$ with its centeral value taken as $\alpha_s = \alpha_s(\sqrt{s}/2)$. The remaining parameters are taken the same as in Table I.

We also redo the calculation retaining finite bottom quark mass, effect too small to include

Angular distribution of the (polarized) Z boson in the *Higgsstrahlung* process



FIG. 3: Differential unpolarized/polarized cross sections for Higgsstrahlung at $\sqrt{s} = 240$ GeV for the NLO $\mathcal{O}(\alpha)$ and NNLO $\mathcal{O}(\alpha\alpha_s)$ corrections. The green band indicates the uncertainties from the input parameters as adopted in Table II and three different schemes.

Part 2

$e^+ e^- \rightarrow H^+ \gamma$

A very **rare** Higgs production channel at CEPC several orders-of-magnitude smaller than HZ production

Loop-induced process, a sensitive channel to seek the footprint of new physics





Figure 1: Representative LO Feynman diagrams for $e^+e^- \rightarrow H\gamma$ in SM.

LO results are known since Abbasabadi et al. (95); Gounaris et al. (95); Djouadi et al. (96)



Figure 2: Typical Feynman diagrams for the NLO QCD corrections to $e^+e^- \rightarrow H\gamma$. The cap signifies the insertion of the top quark mass counterterm δm_t , as given in (7).

For the first time, we have computed the NLO QCD correction

Angular distribution of Higgs



Figure 3: Differential cross sections for $e^+e^- \rightarrow H\gamma$ at $\sqrt{s} = 240$ GeV (left panel) and $\sqrt{s} = 500$ GeV (right panel).

CEPC

ILC

The NLO QCD correction is negligible at CEPC energy

Integrated cross section versus CM energy (LO)

Interesting interference patter arise: double hump structure



Figure 4: The LO cross section as a function of \sqrt{s} (The solid line). To trace the origin of the nontrivial line shape, we deliberately list the contributions from two classes of diagrams. The dotted, dashed and dot-dashed lines represent the contributions from the top quark loop, from all other diagrams that involve weak gauge bosons, and their interference, respectively.

Integrated cross section versus CM energy (NLO)



Figure 5: The integrated cross sections as a function of \sqrt{s} , both at LO and NLO.

Near the ILC energy, the QCD correction seems to be sizable

Summary and Outlook

- Mixed EW-QCD correction for the *Higgsstrahlung* process appears to be significant, about 1% of LO cross sections
- 2. Strong α -scheme dependence observed, also sizable uncertainty arising from input parameters. So far, cannot meet precision of CEPC measurement.

What we can do to improve?

Compute NNLO EW correction??

Technically feasible??

Summary and Outlook (cont')

- 3. ISR effect is very important, and must be included to match the realistic experimental measurements. (relatively easier to manipulate? Much experience can be borrowed from LEP?)
- 4. Finite **Z**⁰ width effect? How good is the *narrow width approximation* ?
- 5. For $e^+ e^- \rightarrow H^+\gamma$, the QCD correction at CEPC seems completely negligible. (Harbor of new physics)

Thanks for your attention!