QCD NLO Corrections with BlackHat and Sherpa

Daniel Maître, IPPP Durham

in collaboration with

C. Berger, Z. Bern, L. Dixon, F. Febres Cordero, D. Forde, H. Ita, D. Kosower T. Gleisberg

Wuppertal, NLO Amplitudes Workshop, 2 June 2009

Outline

- BlackHat + Sherpa
- BH Recursive rational terms
- BH Numerical stability
- BH+S Application: W+jets @ Tevatron

NLO with Blackhat+Sherpa

NLO cross section

$$\sigma_n^{NLO} = \int_n \sigma_n^{tree} + \int_n \left(\sigma_n^{virt} + \Sigma_n^{sub} \right) + \int_{n+1} \left(\sigma_{n+1}^{real} - \sigma_{n+1}^{sub} \right)$$

- Tasks
 - n-parton PS integration
 - Tree x Tree
 - Virtual x tree
 - Integrated subtraction
 - (n+1)-parton PS
 - Real emission subtraction

NLO with Blackhat+Sherpa

NLO cross section



Sherpa

[Gleisberg, Hoeche, Krauss, Schoenherr, Schumann, Siegert, Winter]



Provides

- Efficient phase space integration
- Event generation
- Analysis framework
- Automated dipole subtraction for the real part (see Tanju's talk)
- (and much more)
- Is written in C++

[Catani,Seymour] [Gleisberg,Krauss]

BlackHat

[Berger, Bern, Dixon, Febres Cordero, Forde, Ita, Kosower, DM]

- Goal : automate computation of virtual 1-loop amplitudes for QCD processes
- C++ framework
- Cut containing part: 4 Dim, using a combination of Forde's and OPP's methods [Ossola,Papadopoulos,Pittau;Forde]
- Rational part:
 - 1- loop recursion (reuse of lower point results)

[Berger,Bern,Dixon,Forde,Kosower]

 Rational extraction using D-dim unitarity [Bern,Morgan;Bern,Dixon,Dunbar,Kosower;Ellis,Giele,Kunszt,Melnikov; Badger]

Numerical Rational Terms

Many different techniques

Using Specialized Feynman Diagrams
 [Draggiotis, Garzelli, van Hameren, Ossola, Papadopoulos, Pittau]
 Implemented in Phegas/Helac

Computing the cuts in D dimensions

- Numerical method [Ellis,Giele,Kunszt,Melnikov,Zanderighi]
 implemented in Rocket.
- D-dimensionality can be seen as a mass [Badger] numerical adaptation in BlackHat
- Recursion
 - On-shell recursive approach [Berger, Bern, Dixon, Forde, Kosower] implemented in BlackHat

Recursion relations

- Recursion relations allow to compute amplitudes from lower multiplicity amplitudes. [Britto,Cachazo,Feng,Witten]
- Based on the analytic properties of the amplitudes and on the factorization properties on multi-particle poles
- Complex transformation:

 $p_1 \rightarrow p_1(z), \qquad p_2 \rightarrow p_2(z)$

- Linear transformation that preserves
 - Onshell properties: $p_1(z)^2 = 0$, $p_2(z)^2 = 0$
 - Momentum conservation: $p_1 + p_2 = p_1(z) + p_2(z)$
- $A \rightarrow A(z)$, physical amplitude is A(0)
- Use the analytic properties of A(z) to construct A(0)

Analytic structure of the amplitude

Use the analytic properties of the one-loop amplitude to construct the rational term

 $A(z_1)$

 $A(z_2)$

A(0)

 $A(z_3) \bullet$

Use a complex shift

 $p_1 \rightarrow p_1(z), p_2 \rightarrow p_2(z), \quad A \rightarrow A(z)$

on the full amplitude

Consider the complex function

- Poles, $s_{i...j}(z) \rightarrow 0$
- Branch cuts: log(s_{i...j}(z))

 $f(z) = \frac{A(z)}{z}$

Rational term

• Consider R(z)

 The value R_∞ of the contour integral at ∞ can be constructed using an auxiliary recursion.

 $\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma} \frac{R(z)}{z} = R_{\infty}$

$$R(0) = R_{\infty} - \sum_{\text{poles}\alpha} \operatorname{Res}_{z=z_{\alpha}} \frac{R(z)}{z}$$



Two types of poles: Physical and Spurious

$$R(0) = R_{\infty} - \sum_{\text{phys}} \operatorname{Res}_{z_p} \frac{R(z)}{z} - \sum_{\text{spur}} \operatorname{Res}_{z_s} \frac{R(z)}{z}$$

Rational Term: Recursive Part

$$R(0) = R_{\infty} - \sum_{\text{phys}} \text{Res}_{z_p} \frac{R(z)}{z} - \sum_{\text{spur}} \text{Res}_{z_s} \frac{R(z)}{z}$$

R(z) factorizes at the physical pole locations, so that we can use recursion relations. [Bern,Dixon,Kosower]

$$\operatorname{Res}_{z_p} \frac{R(z)}{z} = \mathbf{O} + \mathbf{$$

This part can be constructed from lower point results

$$R_D = -\sum_{z_p} \operatorname{Res}_{z_p} \frac{R(z_p)}{z_p}$$

Recursion for Rational Terms: Spurious Part

- Spurious poles appear in C(z) and R(z) due to Gram determinants
- The residues of R(z)/z and C(z)/z at the unphysical poles have to cancel since A(z) has no spurious poles.

$$\operatorname{Res}_{z_s} \frac{R_S(z)}{z} = -\operatorname{Res}_{z_s} \frac{C(z)}{z}$$



Numerical extraction

• We compute numerically



- Numerical spurious extraction is tricky, but possible because
 - Precise cut part input
 - Location of the spurious poles is known a priori
 - Only need to evaluate a small part of C(z) around the pole
 - Only need rational part of the expansion of the integral functions around vanishing Gram determinant

Spurious pole extraction

Z

Choose complex values around pole

 $z_{\beta}^{j} = z_{\beta} + \delta_{\beta} e^{2\pi i j/m}$

 $\operatorname{Res}_{z_{\beta}} f(z) \simeq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \delta e^{2\pi i j/m} f(z_{\beta}^{j})$

- Choose δ_β separately for each spurious pole, for each phase space point
- Adapt its value when requested
 - Too close: large cancellation between points
 - Too far: influence from other poles and lower/higher powers

Numerical Stability

Use high precision libraries QD

[Bailey,Hida,Li]

- Use it only when necessary
- Can use it either
 - only for the badly behaved part (cut, spurious pole)
 - for the full amplitude (large cancellation)
- Automatic reevaluation when necessary
- No need for a priori knowledge of when the precision is going to be insufficient
- For free: High precision targets for comparison
- Run time cost higher

Numerical Precision

- Different types of tests
 - On-line
 - For every phase-space point
 - For every process
 - Low (averaged) run-time cost
 - Off-line
 - Checks/prove accuracy of the method
 - No need for a very large number of phase-space points
 - Can have a higher run-time cost

Numerical Accuracy (on-line)

- The precision of the computed amplitude can be assessed using the known infrared structure of the amplitude
- Cut Part

$$A_n^{\text{oneloop}}|_{1/\epsilon, \text{ non-log}} = \frac{1}{\epsilon} \sum_k b_k = -\left[\frac{1}{\epsilon} \left(\frac{11}{3} - \frac{2}{3}\frac{n_f}{N_c}\right)\right] A_n^{\text{tree}}$$

Spurious poles

$$A_n^{\text{oneloop}}(z_s)|_{1/\epsilon, \text{ non-log}} = \frac{1}{\epsilon} \sum_k b_k(z_s) = 0$$

Numerical Accuracy (off-line)

• Off-line

- Compare with known formulae
- Compare with higher precision results
- Check combination of amplitudes



Application:

W + jets

W+jets

W/Z+jets processes are important

- For SM physics (Higgs, $t\bar{t}$, single top)
- Background to new physics
- Luminosity determination
- So far
 - MCFM

[John Campbell, Keith Ellis]

- NLO W+1 jet (Feynman diagrams)
- NLO W+2 jets (amplitudes from (early) unitarity methods)
- Leading color primitive amplitudes (2q3gW) [BlackHat]
- All primitive amplitudes [Ellis,Giele,Kunszt,Melnikov,Zanderighi]
- Leading color W+3 jets (2q3gW) [Ellis,Melnikov,Zanderighi]
- Leading color W+3 jets (all subprocesses) [BlackHat]

W+jets @ Tevatron

- CDF Collaboration
 - $320pb^{-1}$
 - Corrected for comparison with particle level
 - Comparison with
 - NLO: MCFM
 - MLM = Alpgen+Herwig
 - SMPR = Madgraph+Pythia



Leading color approximation

Neglect terms of order

 $\frac{1}{N_c^2}$ (subleading color), $\frac{N_f}{N_c}$ (closed fermion loop)

in finite part of the virtual amplitude

Works for W+1,2 jets within 3%



LC Approximation

- Validity proven to 3% for 1,2,3 jets
- Total cross section ($E_T^{nth-jet} > 25 \text{ GeV}$)

number of jets	CDF	LC NLO	NLO
1	53.5 ± 5.6	$58.3^{+4.6}_{-4.6}$	$57.8^{+4.4}_{-4.0}$
2	6.8 ± 1.1	$7.81\substack{+0.54 \\ -0.91}$	$7.62^{+0.62}_{-0.86}$
3	0.84 ± 0.24	$0.908^{+0.044}_{-0.142}$	$0.882(5)^{+0.057}_{-0.138}$

- + Allow for faster computation
- Can be more difficult to combine with real part

Preliminary

W+1 jet @ Tevatron



PDF: CTEQ6M

Jet algorithm: SISCone [Salam, Soyez]

W+2 jets @ Tevatron



PDF: CTEQ6M

Jet algorithm: SISCone [Salam, Soyez]

W+3 jet @ Tevatron



PDF: CTEQ6M

Jet algorithm: SISCone [Salam, Soyez]

Scale dependence

NLO scale dependence smaller than at LO



Conclusion

- Numerical accuracy is well under control by (dynamically) using high precision arithmetic
- Numerical implementations of unitarity+on-shell recursion can produce phenomenologically useful results
- First comparison of NLO W+3 jets and experimental data from the Tevatron
- Presented (preliminary) full color results for NLO W+3 jets at the Tevatron
- Shows potential of unitarity techniques

S@M [DM,P. Mastrolia arXiv:0710.5559]



Google: Mathematica spinor package