# NLO effects in off-shell Top-quark pair production

Stefano Pozzorini Zürich University

in collaboration with

A. Denner, S. Dittmaier and S. Kallweit

Standard Model Benchmarks at High-Energy Hadron Colliders DESY Zeuthen, June 16, 2011 Outline of the talk

- 1. Why  $pp \rightarrow t\bar{t} \rightarrow W^+W^-b\bar{b}$  at NLO?
- 2. Technical aspects of the calculation
- **3. NLO predictions for Tevatron and LHC**

NLO priority list (Les Houches '05): completed  $2 \rightarrow 4$  calculations

- Two calculations for  $pp \rightarrow t\bar{t}b\bar{b}$  with permille agreement
  - arXiv:0905.0110 and arXiv:1001.4006 by Bredenstein, Denner, Dittmaier and S. P.
     Feynman diagrams and tensor integrals
  - arXiv:0907.4723 by Bevilacqua, Czakon, Papadopoulos, Pittau and Worek OPP reduction and HELAC
- Two calculations for  $pp \rightarrow Vjjj$ 
  - arXiv:0906.1445 by Ellis, Melnikov and Zanderighi
     D-dimensional unitarity (leading colour)
  - arXiv:0907.1984 (Wjjj) and arXiv:1004.1659 (Zjjj) by Berger, Bern, Dixon, Febres Cordero, Forde, Gleisberg, Ita, Kosower and Maitre generalized unitarity (full colour)
- First result for  $pp \rightarrow t\bar{t}jj$ 
  - arXiv:1002.4009 by Bevilacqua, Czakon, Papadopoulos and Worek OPP reduction and HELAC

- One calculation for  $pp \rightarrow WWjj$ 
  - arXiv:1007.5313 and arXiv:1104.2327 by Melia, Melnikov, Rontsch and Zanderighi D-dimensional unitarity
- First 7-leg result for  $pp \rightarrow W + 4j$ 
  - arXiv:1009.2338 by Berger, Bern, Dixon, Febres Cordero, Forde, Gleisberg, Ita, Kosower and Maitre generalized unitarity (leading colour)
- One calculation for  $pp \rightarrow b\bar{b}b\bar{b}$ 
  - arXiv:1105.3624 by Greiner, Guffanti, Reuter and Reiter
     Feynman diagrams and OPP reduction (GOLEM–SAMURAI)
- Two (almost simultaneous) calculations for  $pp \rightarrow W^+W^-b\bar{b}$ 
  - arXiv:1012.3975 by Denner, Dittmaier, Kallweit and S. P.
     Feynman diagrams and tensor integrals
  - arXiv:1012.4230 by Bevilacqua, Czakon, van Hameren, Papadopoulos and Worek OPP reduction and HELAC

# Why $W^+W^-b\bar{b}$ production at NLO?



#### Full description of $t\bar{t}$ prod×decay

- off-shell tops and non-resonant backgr.
- W  $\rightarrow l\nu$  decays in spin-correlated NWA

#### Huge $\mathrm{t}\bar{\mathrm{t}}$ samples at hadron colliders

- Tevatron: few  $10^4$  events  $\Rightarrow \frac{\delta\sigma}{\sigma} < 10\%$
- LHC at 7(14) TeV:  $1.5(9) \times 10^5$  events per fb<sup>-1</sup>  $\Rightarrow \frac{\delta\sigma}{\sigma} = \text{few \%}$

#### Crucial measurements and tests

- precise studies of rich variety of (differential) observables
- checks and tuning of many theoretical/experimental tools
- $\delta m_{\rm t}^{\rm exp} \sim 1 \,{\rm GeV}$  measurements

#### **Relevance for discoveries**

- leptons + jets + missing  $E_{\rm T}$ is a typical discovery signature (SUSY, H  $\rightarrow$  W<sup>+</sup>W<sup>-</sup>, ...)
- various BSM scenarios predict heavy resonances decaying into tt

Precise predictions for hadronic  $t\bar{t}$  production (and decay)

#### **NLO QCD corrections**

Beenakker, Dawson, Ellis, Frixione, Kuijf, Meng, Nason, van Neerven, Schuler, Smith

#### **Electroweak NLO corrections**

Beenakker, Bernreuther, Denner, Fücker, Hollik, Kao, Kollar, Kühn, Ladinsky, Mertig, Moretti, Nolten, Ross, Sack, Scharf, Si, Uwer, Wackeroth, Yuan

#### From LL to NNLL resummations

Ahrens, Beneke, Berger, Bonciani, Catani, Contopanagos, Czakon, Falgari, Ferroglia, Frixione, Kidonakis, Kiyo, Laenen, Mangano, Mitov, Moch, Nason, Neubert, Pecjak, Ridolfi, Schwinn, Sterman, Uwer, Vogt, Yang

#### Towards full NNLO predictions

Anastasiou, Aybat, Bonciani, Czakon, Dittmaier, Ferroglia, Gehrmann, Gerhmann–De Ridder, Kniehl, Körner, Langenfeld, Maitre, Merebashvili, Mitov, Moch, Ritzmann, Rogal, Studerus, von Manteuffel, Uwer, Weinzierl

#### **NLO** $t\bar{t}$ production×decay in spin-correlated narrow-width approx.

Bernreuther, Brandenburg, Melnikov, Schulze, Si, Uwer

Full  $W^+W^-b\bar{b}$  description vs Narrow-Width Approximation in LO







#### Narrow-Width Approximation

- only doubly-resonant channels
- narrow-with limit of Breit-Wigner top resonances

$$\lim_{\Gamma_{t}\to 0} |\frac{1}{p_{t}^{2} - m_{t}^{2} + i\Gamma_{t}m_{t}}|^{2} = \frac{\pi}{\Gamma_{t}m_{t}}\delta(p_{t}^{2} - m_{t}^{2})$$

# Finite-width contributions to $\mathrm{W}^+\mathrm{W}^-\mathrm{b}\bar{\mathrm{b}}$

- Off-shell corrections to doubly-resonant channels
- Singly + non-resonant channels and interferences
- finite-width corrections to *inclusive* observables of order  $\Gamma_t/m_t \simeq 1\%$

# Full $W^+W^-b\bar{b}$ description vs Narrow-Width Approximation in NLO

#### Narrow-Width Approximation

- only factorisable corrections
- huge technical simplification

#### Finite-width contributions to $W^+W^-b\bar{b}$

- pentagons and hexagons
- non-factorisable and non-DR corrections

In *inclusive* observables non-fact. virtual and real  $\ln(\Gamma_t/m_t)$  corr. from soft gluons cancel, and finite-width effects remain  $\mathcal{O}(\Gamma_t/m_t)$  suppressed [Fadin/Khoze/Martin '94].

#### Finite-width effects can be important for

- percent-level precision in  $\sigma_{\rm incl}$
- Shape of top resonance and related observables ( $m_t$  measurement)
- cuts suppressing on-shell  $t\bar{t}$  background and enhancing off-shell  $W^+W^-b\bar{b}$



# (2) Technical aspects of the calculation

# Ingredients of $pp \rightarrow W^+W^-b\bar{b}$ at NLO

#### Partonic channels



14 trees



280 loops

788 loops





222 NLO trees

90 NLO trees

90 NLO trees

Full calculation twice and independently

# Generation of Feynman diagrams

• FeynArts 1.0 / 3.2

# Algebraic reduction

• MATHEMATICA / FormCalc [ Hahn ]

# Tensor integrals & numerics

• Fortran77 / C++ executables: 0.25-1.2 GB

# **Real emission & IR Subtraction**

- Madgraph & spinors
- Dipoles [Catani/Dittmaier/Seymour/Trócsányi '97/'02] & AutoDipole [Hasegawa/Moch/Uwer '09]

# Integration over 11-dim PS

• adaptive multi-channel Monte Carlo with 250–650 mappings per partonic channel

Feynman diagrams and tensor integrals

$$\sum_{\text{col,pol}} \left( \begin{array}{c} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \end{array} \right)^* = \sum_{\text{col,pol}} \left( \begin{array}{c} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \end{array} \right)^* = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \left( \begin{array}{c} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \end{array} \right)^* = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \left( \begin{array}{c} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \end{array} \right)^* = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \left( \begin{array}{c} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \end{array} \right)^* = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \left( \begin{array}{c} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \end{array} \right)^* = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \left( \begin{array}{c} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \end{array} \right)^* = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \left( \begin{array}{c} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \end{array} \right)^* = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \left( \begin{array}{c} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \end{array} \right)^* = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \left( \begin{array}{c} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \end{array} \right)^* = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \left( \begin{array}{c} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \end{array} \right)^* = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \left( \begin{array}{c} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \end{array} \right)^* = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \left( \begin{array}{c} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \end{array} \right)^* = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \left( \begin{array}{c} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \end{array} \right)^* = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \left( \begin{array}{c} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \end{array} \right)^* = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \left( \begin{array}{c} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \end{array} \right)^* = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \left( \begin{array}{c} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \end{array} \right)^* = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \left( \begin{array}{c} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \end{array} \right)^* = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \left( \begin{array}{c} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \end{array} \right)^* = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \left( \begin{array}{c} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \end{array} \right)^* = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \left( \begin{array}{c} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \end{array} \right)^* = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \left( \begin{array}{c} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \end{array} \right)^* = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \left( \begin{array}{c} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \end{array} \right)^* = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \left( \begin{array}{c} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \end{array} \right)^* = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \left( \begin{array}{c} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \end{array} \right)^* = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \left( \begin{array}{c} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \end{array} \right)^* = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \left( \begin{array}{c} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \end{array} \right)^* = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \left( \begin{array}{c} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \end{array} \right)^* = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \left( \begin{array}{c} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \end{array} \right)^* = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \left( \begin{array}{c} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \end{array} \right)^* = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \left( \begin{array}{c} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \end{array} \right)^* = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \left( \begin{array}{c} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \end{array} \right)^* = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \left( \begin{array}{c} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \end{array} \right)^* = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \left( \begin{array}{c} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \end{array} \right)^* = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \left( \begin{array}{c} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \end{array} \right)^* = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \left( \begin{array}{c} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \end{array} \right)^* = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \left( \begin{array}{c} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \end{array} \right)^* = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \left( \begin{array}{c} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \end{array} \right)^* = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \left( \begin{array}{c} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \end{array} \right)^* = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \left( \begin{array}{c} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \end{array} \right)^* = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \left( \begin{array}{c} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \end{array} \right)^* = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \left( \begin{array}{c} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \end{array} \right)^* = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \left( \begin{array}{c} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \end{array} \right)^* = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \left( \begin{array}{c} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \end{array} \right)^* = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \left( \begin{array}{c} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \end{array} \right)^* = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \left( \begin{array}{c} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \end{array} \right)^* = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \left( \begin{array}{c} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \end{array} \right)^* = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{O}} \left( \begin{array}{c$$

 $\sum d_i + c_j + c_j + b_k + a_l$ 

Numerical tensor-integral reduction

 $e^+e^- \rightarrow 4f$  methods [ Denner/Dittmaier'05 ] completely general and numerically stable! Very high CPU efficiency

First physical application up to tensor rank P = 5

- CPU cost of colour/helicity summed gg → W<sup>+</sup>W<sup>-</sup>bb loop amplitudes very low (450ms) similarly as for gg → ttbb (180 ms) where P = 4
- $\sigma_{\text{NLO}}$  with statistical accuracy of  $\mathcal{O}(10^{-3})$  requires  $\mathcal{O}(10^8)$  events obtained within 5–10 days on single CPU
- Total CPU cost at LHC dominated by real and virtual gg-channel corrections

# Treatment of unstable particles

Regularisation of unstable-particle propagators via  $\text{Im}[\Sigma(M^2)] = M\Gamma$  resummation

$$\frac{1}{p^2 - M^2 + i\epsilon} \rightarrow \frac{1}{p^2 - M^2 + iM\Gamma + i\epsilon}$$

can violate gauge invariance

Complex mass scheme at NLO (introduced for  $e^+e^- \rightarrow 4f$  Denner/Dittmaier '05)

- $\Gamma$  is absorbed into the renormalised pole mass  $M^2 \to \mu^2 = M^2 iM\Gamma$  without modifying the bare Lagrangian
- Lagrangian symmetries require (in general) complex couplings

#### Technical aspects

- On-shell renormalisation with complex momenta:  $\hat{\Sigma}(p^2) = 0$  at  $p^2 = \mu^2$
- Scalar box integrals with complex masses (subtle analytic continuations!)
  - 't Hooft/Veltman approach:  $24 \rightarrow 108 \text{ Li}_2$  Nhung/Ninh '09; van Hameren '10
  - Denner/Niertse/Scharf approach:  $16 \rightarrow 32$  Li<sub>2</sub>

Denner/Dittmaier '10

# (3.1) $W^+W^-b\bar{b}$ cross section at the Tevatron (1.96 TeV) and the LHC (7 TeV)

Particle masses and widths  $(M_{\rm H} = \infty, m_{\rm b} = 0)$ 

 $m_{\rm t} = 172.0 \,{\rm GeV}$   $M_{\rm W} = 80.399 \,{\rm GeV}$   $M_{\rm Z} = 91.1876 \,{\rm GeV}$  $\Gamma_{\rm t,LO} = 1.4655 \,{\rm GeV}$   $\Gamma_{\rm t,NLO} = 1.3376 \,{\rm GeV}$   $\Gamma_{\rm W,NLO} = 2.0997 \,{\rm GeV}$ 

 $G_{\mu}$ -scheme couplings  $(G_{\mu} = 1.16637 \times 10^{-5} \,\text{GeV}^{-2})$  $\sin^2 \theta_{w} = 1 - M_{W}^2 / M_Z^2, \qquad \alpha = \sqrt{2} G_{\mu} M_{W}^2 \sin^2 \theta_{w} / \pi$ 

**PDFs and**  $\alpha_{\rm S}$ : MSTW2008NLO(LO) with  $1/2 \leq \mu_{\rm R,F}/m_{\rm t} \leq 2$  variations

#### Anti- $k_{\rm T}$ Jet Algorithm

QCD partons with  $|\eta| < 5 \implies$  jets with  $\sqrt{\Delta \phi^2 + \Delta y^2} > R = 0.4 (0.5)$ 

#### Typical Tevatron (LHC) cuts

b-jets:  $p_{T,b} > 20 (30) \text{ GeV}$   $|\eta_b| \le 2.5$ leptons:  $p_{T,l} > 20 \text{ GeV}$   $|\eta_l| \le 2.5$   $p_{T,miss} > 25 (20) \text{ GeV}$ 





Integrated  $e^+ \nu_e \mu^- \bar{\nu}_\mu b\bar{b}$  cross section

Predictions for  $\mu_{\rm R,F} = m_{\rm t}$  and  $m_{\rm t}/2 \leq \mu_{\rm R,F} \leq 2m_{\rm t}$ 

σ	LO	NLO	NLO/LO
Tevatron	$44.31^{+19.68}_{-12.49}$ fb	$41.75^{+0.00}_{-3.79}$ fb	$0.942^{+0.000}_{-0.085}$
LHC	$662.4^{+263.4}_{-174.1}\mathrm{fb}$	$840^{+27}_{-75}\mathrm{fb}$	$1.27_{-0.11}^{+0.04}$

### Scale uncertainty at the Tevatron (LHC)

• 44% (40%) LO uncertainty is mostly due to  $\frac{\Delta \sigma_{\rm LO}}{\sigma_{\rm LO}} \simeq \frac{\Delta \alpha_{\rm S}^2(\mu)}{\alpha_{\rm S}^2(\mu)}$  and reduces to 9%(9%) at NLO

# Moderate NLO corrections

•  $K_{\text{Tevatron}} \simeq 0.94$  and  $K_{\text{LHC}} \simeq 1.27$ 

	Agreemen	t with HE	[Bevilacqua et al.	'10]	
_	$\sigma_{\mathrm{Tevatron}}$	LO	NLO		
_	DDKP	44.310[3] fb	41.75[5] fb		
	BCHPW	$44.32[3]{\rm fb}$	$41.86[6]\mathrm{fb}$		



Off-shell and non-resonant contributions to  $\sigma_{\rm int.}$ 

Assessment of finite-width effects  $\sigma(\Gamma_t) - \sigma(0)$ 

• numerical extrapolation to  $\Gamma \to 0$  using five rescaled values  $\Gamma_t \to \xi \Gamma_t$  with  $0.1 \lesssim \xi \leq 1$ 

# Cancellation of soft-gluon $\ln(\Gamma_t/m_t)$ singularities

- dipole-subtracted virtual and real parts diverge logarithmically when  $\Gamma \to 0$
- linear convergence of  $\sigma(\Gamma_t) \rightarrow \sigma(0)$  provides nontrivial consistency and stability check

Finite-width effects comparable to  $\Gamma_{\rm t}/m_{\rm t}\simeq 0.8\%$ 

	$\sigma_{ m LO}(\Gamma_{ m t})/\sigma_{ m LO}(0)-1$	$\sigma_{\rm NLO}(\Gamma_{\rm t})/\sigma_{\rm NLO}(0) - 1$
Tevatron	-0.8%	-0.9%
LHC	+0.4%	+0.2%

quantifies precision of NWA for  $\sigma_{\rm incl}$ 

(3.2) Differential  $W^+W^-b\bar{b}$  distributions at the Tevatron (1.96 TeV) and the LHC (7 TeV)



#### **b-jet** $p_{\rm T}$ at the Tevatron

# Soft b-jet (upper)

- $\bullet\,$  saturates cut at 20 GeV
- +20% to -40% corrections
- strong shape distortions (relevant for acceptance)

# Hard b-jet (lower)

- peaked around 80  ${\rm GeV}$
- +50% to -30% corrections
- strong shape distortions



### **b-jet** $p_{\rm T}$ at the LHC

# Soft b-jet (upper)

- $\bullet\,$  saturates cut at 30 GeV
- +30% to -10% corrections
- strong shape distortions (relevant for acceptance)

# Hard b-jet (lower)

- $\bullet\,$  peaked around 80 GeV
- +40% to +20% corrections
- moderate shape distortions



Lepton  $p_{\rm T}$  at the Tevatron

- $e^+$  ( $\mu^-$ ) from  $W^+$  ( $W^-$ ) decay
  - have typically  $p_{\rm T} \lesssim 100 \,{\rm GeV}$  and tend to saturate the cut at 20  $\,{\rm GeV}$
  - corrections range from 0% to -40%

# Shape distortion

- mild in the vicinity of the cut but fairly strong at high  $p_{\rm T}$
- relevant for boosted tops and NP searches
- when  $p_{\rm T} \gtrsim 100 \,\text{GeV}$  fixed  $\mu = m_{\rm t}$  should be replaced by dynamical QCD scale



Lepton  $p_{\rm T}$  at the LHC

- $e^+$  ( $\mu^-$ ) from  $W^+$  ( $W^-$ ) decay
  - have typically  $p_{\rm T} \lesssim 100 \,{\rm GeV}$  and tend to saturate the cut at 20  $\,{\rm GeV}$
  - corrections range from +30% to 0%

# Shape distortion

- mild in the vicinity of the cut but fairly strong at high  $p_{\rm T}$
- relevant for boosted tops and NP searches
- when  $p_{\rm T} \gtrsim 100 \,\text{GeV}$  fixed  $\mu = m_{\rm t}$  should be replaced by dynamical QCD scale



#### Charged-lepton rapidity at the Tevatron

# LO $y_{e^+}$ distribution

- e<sup>+</sup> populates central region
- almost exactly symmetric due to t  $\leftrightarrow \bar{t}$ invariance of  $q\bar{q}/gg \rightarrow t\bar{t}$

# NLO charge and FB asymmetry

- IS–FS gluon exchange induces tt charge asymmetry
- reflected in  $y_{e^+}$  shape distortion ( -15% to +10% corrections) and FB asymmetry

$$A_{\rm FB} = \frac{\sigma(y_{\rm e^+} > 0) - \sigma(y_{\rm e^+} < 0)}{\sigma(y_{\rm e^+} > 0) + \sigma(y_{\rm e^+} < 0)} = 0.035(2)$$

consistent with NWA [  $_{\rm Bernreuther/Si\ '10}$  ]



Top-quark invariant mass at the Tevatron

Although not observable  $M_t = M_{be^+\nu_e}$ reflects off-shell nature of  $2 \rightarrow 4$  calculation

- Breit–Wigner shape in the resonance region
- $\delta \Gamma_{\rm NLO} / \Gamma_{\rm LO} \simeq -9\%$  crucial for consistent normalisation of  $\sigma_{\rm incl.} \sim 1/\Gamma_{\rm t}^2$
- Pole of top-quark progagator not shifted in on-shell scheme, but QCD radiation leads to invariant-mass shift  $\lesssim 1 \,\text{GeV}$
- $m_{\rm t}$ -shift depends on jet algorithm

**NLO** and  $\Gamma_t$  effects will improve description of observables used for  $m_t$  determination



Top-quark invariant mass at the LHC

Although not observable  $M_t = M_{be^+\nu_e}$ reflects off-shell nature of  $2 \rightarrow 4$  calculation

- Breit–Wigner shape in the resonance region
- $\delta \Gamma_{\rm NLO} / \Gamma_{\rm LO} \simeq -9\%$  crucial for consistent normalisation of  $\sigma_{\rm incl.} \sim 1/\Gamma_{\rm t}^2$
- Pole of top-quark progagator not shifted in on-shell scheme, but QCD radiation leads to invariant-mass shift  $\lesssim 1 \,\text{GeV}$
- $m_{\rm t}$ -shift depends on jet algorithm

NLO and  $\Gamma_t$  effects will improve description of observables used for  $m_t$  determination



Invariant mass of b-jet $-e^+$  pair at the LHC

#### Observable related to $m_t$ measurement

- visible decay products in  $t \to bW^+ \to be^+\nu_e$ retain significant fraction of  $m_t$
- good sensitivity to  $m_t$  via kinematic bound

$$M_{\rm be^+}^2 \le m_{\rm t}^2 - M_{\rm W}^2 \simeq (152 \,{\rm GeV})^2$$

in LO and narrow-width approximation

# **Off-shell and NLO corrections**

- $M_{\rm be^+}$  bound violated by LO off-shell effects
- additional violation from NLO radiation
- strong NLO shape distortion below the bound: from +40% to +5% corrections



Large off-shell effects in  $WWb\bar{b}$  backg.

# $\mathrm{pp} \to \mathrm{WH} \to \mathrm{Wb}\bar{\mathrm{b}}$ search at the LHC

- huge QCD background suppressed with boosted-Higgs strategy
- $p_{\mathrm{T,b\bar{b}}} > 200 \,\mathrm{GeV}$  and  $p_{\mathrm{T},j}^{\mathrm{veto}} = 30 \,\mathrm{GeV}$  yield  $S/B \sim 1$  and  $S/\sqrt{B} \sim 3\sigma$  with  $30 \,\mathrm{fb}^{-1}$

Butterworth et. al. (2008)

#### Corrections to dominant $WWb\bar{b}$ background

- 0.4% off-shell effects increase to  $\gtrsim~30\%$
- strong WWbbj NLO emission very sensitive to jet veto
- **NLO unstable for**  $p_{T,j}^{\text{veto}} < 60 \,\text{GeV}$

Full  $2 \rightarrow 4$  NLO crucial to control WWbb !



Large off-shell effects in WWb $\bar{b}$  backg.

# $\mathrm{pp} \to \mathrm{WH} \to \mathrm{Wb}\bar{\mathrm{b}}$ search at the LHC

- huge QCD background suppressed with boosted-Higgs strategy
- $p_{\mathrm{T,b\bar{b}}} > 200 \,\mathrm{GeV}$  and  $p_{\mathrm{T},j}^{\mathrm{veto}} = 30 \,\mathrm{GeV}$  yield  $S/B \sim 1$  and  $S/\sqrt{B} \sim 3\sigma$  with  $30 \,\mathrm{fb}^{-1}$

Butterworth et. al. (2008)

#### Corrections to dominant $WWb\bar{b}$ background

- 0.4% off-shell effects increase to  $\gtrsim~30\%$
- strong WWbbj NLO emission very sensitive to jet veto
- **NLO unstable for**  $p_{T,j}^{\text{veto}} < 60 \,\text{GeV}$

Full  $2 \rightarrow 4$  NLO crucial to control WWbb !

# Conclusions

# NLO QCD calculation for $\mathrm{W}^+\mathrm{W}^-\mathrm{b}\bar{\mathrm{b}}$ production

- precise description of  $t\bar{t}$  production and decay
- including off-shell effects, non-resonant backgrounds and interferences

#### Inclusive cross section at the Tevatron (LHC)

- moderate corrections K=0.94~(1.27) and stable NLO predictions  $(\delta\sigma/\sigma \simeq 9\%)$
- quantitative assessment of finite-width effects  $\lesssim \Gamma_{\rm t}/m_{\rm t} = 0.8\%$

#### **NLO corrections to differential distributions**

- rich and non-trivial kinematic dependence
- potentially large impact on acceptances and shape-dependent precision measurements (like  $m_{\rm t}$ )
- large off-shell effects in  $t\bar{t}$  background to  $pp \rightarrow WH$  boosted-Higgs search

# **BACKUP SLIDES**

Reduction of tensor integrals – *collection* of  $e^+e^- \rightarrow 4f$  methods [Denner/Dittmaier '05]

(A) **Space-time 4-dim**  $(N \ge 5 \text{ prop.})$  simultaneous prop. & rank reduction

Melrose '65; Denner/Dittmaier '02&'05; Binoth et. al. '05



(B) Lorentz invariance ( $N \leq 4$  prop.)

reduction of rank (P)

Passarino/Veltman '79; Denner '93

$$2(D+P-N-1) T_{00i_3...i_P}^{(P)} = \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} f_k T_{ki_3...i_P}^{(P-1)} + 2m_0^2 T_{i_3...i_P}^{(P-2)} + \text{lower-point}$$

$$\sum_{n=1}^{N-1} Z_{mn} T_{ni_2...i_P}^{(P)} = -2 \sum_{r=2}^{P} \delta_{mi_r} T_{00i_2...\hat{i_r}...i_P}^{(P)} - f_m T_{i_2...i_P}^{(P-1)} + \text{lower-point}$$

inversion of Gram matrix  $Z_{mn} = 2p_m p_n$  unstable when  $det(Z) \to 0$ 

# (C) General and robust solution of instability problems iterative det(Z)-expansion (and various alternative methods)

$$\begin{split} \tilde{X}_{0j}T_{i_{1}\dots i_{P}}^{(P)} &= \det(Z) \ T_{ji_{1}\dots i_{P}}^{(P+1)} + 2\sum_{n=1}^{N-1} \tilde{Z}_{jn} \sum_{r=1}^{P} \delta_{ni_{r}} T_{00i_{1}\dots \hat{i}_{r}\dots i_{P}}^{(P+1)} + \text{lower-point} \\ 2\tilde{Z}_{kl}T_{00i_{2}\dots i_{P}}^{(P+1)} &= \left\{ -\det(Z) \ T_{kli_{2}\dots i_{P}}^{(P+1)} + 2m_{0}\tilde{Z}_{kl}T_{i_{2}\dots i_{P}}^{(P-1)} + \sum_{n,m=1}^{N-1} \left[ f_{n}f_{m}T_{i_{2}\dots i_{P}}^{(P-1)} + 2\sum_{r=2}^{P} (f_{n}\delta_{mi_{r}} + f_{m}\delta_{ni_{r}}) \right] \\ \times T_{00i_{2}\dots \hat{i}_{P}}^{(P)} &= \left\{ -\det(Z) \ T_{kli_{2}\dots i_{P}}^{(P+1)} + 2m_{0}\tilde{Z}_{kl}T_{i_{2}\dots i_{P}}^{(P-1)} + \sum_{n,m=1}^{N-1} \left[ f_{n}f_{m}T_{i_{2}\dots i_{P}}^{(P-1)} + 2\sum_{r=2}^{P} (f_{n}\delta_{mi_{r}} + f_{m}\delta_{ni_{r}}) \right] \\ \times T_{00i_{2}\dots i_{P}}^{(P)} &= \left\{ -\det(Z) \ T_{kli_{2}\dots i_{P}}^{(P+1)} + 2m_{0}\tilde{Z}_{kl}T_{i_{2}\dots i_{P}}^{(P-1)} + \sum_{n,m=1}^{N-1} \left[ f_{n}f_{m}T_{i_{2}\dots i_{P}}^{(P-1)} + 2\sum_{r=2}^{P} (f_{n}\delta_{mi_{r}} + f_{m}\delta_{ni_{r}}) \right] \\ \times T_{00i_{2}\dots i_{P}}^{(P)} &= \left\{ -\det(Z) \ T_{kli_{2}\dots i_{P}}^{(P+1)} + 2m_{0}\tilde{Z}_{kl}T_{i_{2}\dots i_{P}}^{(P-1)} + \sum_{n,m=1}^{N-1} \left[ f_{n}f_{m}T_{i_{2}\dots i_{P}}^{(P-1)} + 2\sum_{r=2}^{P} (f_{n}\delta_{mi_{r}} + f_{m}\delta_{ni_{r}}) \right] \\ \times T_{00i_{2}\dots i_{P}}^{(P)} &= \left\{ -\det(Z) \ T_{kli_{2}\dots i_{P}}^{(P+1)} + 2m_{0}\tilde{Z}_{kl}T_{i_{2}\dots i_{P}}^{(P-1)} + 2\sum_{r=2}^{P} (f_{n}\delta_{mi_{r}} + f_{m}\delta_{ni_{r}}) \right\} \\ \times T_{00i_{2}\dots i_{P}}^{(P)} &= \left\{ -\det(Z) \ T_{kli_{2}\dots i_{P}}^{(P+1)} + 2m_{0}\tilde{Z}_{kl}T_{i_{2}\dots i_{P}}^{(P-1)} + 2\sum_{r=2}^{P} (f_{n}\delta_{mi_{r}} + f_{m}\delta_{ni_{r}}) \right\} \\ \times T_{00i_{2}\dots i_{P}}^{(P)} &= \left\{ -\det(Z) \ T_{kli_{2}\dots i_{P}}^{(P+1)} + 2m_{0}\tilde{Z}_{kl}T_{i_{2}\dots i_{P}}^{(P-1)} + 2\sum_{r=2}^{P} (f_{n}\delta_{mi_{r}} + f_{m}\delta_{ni_{r}}) \right\} \\ \times T_{00i_{2}\dots i_{P}}^{(P)} &= \left\{ -\det(Z) \ T_{kli_{2}\dots i_{P}}^{(P+1)} + 2m_{0}\tilde{Z}_{kl}T_{i_{2}\dots i_{P}}^{(P-1)} + 2m_{0}\tilde{Z}_{kl}T_{i_{$$

$$\times T^{(P)}_{00i_{2}...\hat{i}_{r}...i_{P}} + 4 \sum_{\substack{r,s=2\\r\neq s}} \delta_{ni_{r}} \delta_{mi_{s}} T^{(P+1)}_{0000i_{2}...\hat{i}_{r}...\hat{i}_{s}...i_{P}} \Big] \tilde{\tilde{Z}}_{(kn)(lm)} + \text{ lower-point} \Big\} (D+1+P-N+\sum_{r=2} \bar{\delta}_{i_{r}0})^{-1}$$

Boosted-Higgs search in  $pp \rightarrow VH(H \rightarrow b\bar{b})$ 



ATLAS note ATL-PHYS-PUB-2009-088 (cut-based analysis)

- $M_{\rm H} = 120 \,{\rm GeV}, \,\sqrt{s} = 14 \,{\rm TeV}, \,L = 30 \,{\rm fb}^{-1}$
- $p_{b\bar{b}}^{T}, p_{V}^{T} > 200 \,\text{GeV} \Rightarrow 5\% \text{ signal}$
- $p_{\text{jet veto}}^{\text{T}} = 20 \,\text{GeV}$  in (a)

- $t\bar{t}$  simulated with HERWIG
- $(S/\sqrt{B})_a = 3.0, (S/B)_a \simeq 2/3$

• 
$$(S/\sqrt{B})_{a+b+c} = 3.7$$