New results for Higgs production in association with a jet

JHEP06 (2013) 072

Radja Boughezal



QCD@LHC 2013, September 5, Hamburg



Roughly a year ago (July 4th, 2012):ATLAS and CMS discovered a bump at 125.5 GeV





Roughly a year ago (July 4th, 2012): ATLAS and CMS discovered a bump at 12.





3





Great progress on signal strength



Denominator = $\sigma_{SM} \times Br_{SM}$ needed precise theory already, eg. σ_{NNLO} ; more needed for LHC Run II



• Higgs cross-sections in $pp \rightarrow H \rightarrow WW$ are binned according to the jet multiplicity to beat the background

• The measured value of $pp \rightarrow H \rightarrow WW$ production cross section results from combining 0 jet, 1 jet and 2 jet cross sections. Each of them has its own uncertainty

• What we knew so far: H+0j @ NNLO, H+1j and H+2j @ NLO





The H+1 jet bin: large NLO K-factor and large theoretical uncertainty



- Theory uncertainties becoming a limiting factor in many analyses, especially H→WW
- Precise exclusive results are needed, also to separate between gg and VBF...

Urgently need NNLO for H+jets to resolve these issues!



Need the following ingredients for H+Ij @ NNLO cross section



• All ingredients were available, some even for a while, what stopped us from having this calculation done before now?

• IR singularities cancel in the sum of real and virtual corrections and mass factorization counterterms but only after phase space integration for real radiations

• Virtual corrections have explicit IR poles, whereas real corrections have implicit IR poles that need to be extracted.

• A generic procedure to extract IR singularities from RR and RV was unknown until very recently



One method successfully used in the past to obtain NNLO cross sections is sector decomposition Binoth, Heinrich; Anastasiou, Melnikov, Petriello (2003)
 Basic idea: introduce explicit parameterizations of phase space in which the

 Basic idea: introduce explicit parameterizations of phase space in which the poles in ε can be easily extracted via a plus-distribution expansion

$$\begin{split} \int |M|^2 d\Phi \rightarrow \\ \int [|M|^2 x] \{dy\} \frac{dx}{x^{1+\epsilon}} &= -\frac{1}{\epsilon} F(0) + \int dx \frac{F(x) - F(0)}{x} + \dots \\ F(x) &= \int [|M|^2 x] \{dy\} \end{split}$$

Remap singular denominators on the hypercube

Singularities are extracted before integration



Successfully applied for NNLO differential cross sections, but for "special" processes



Note that:

- Parametrization known only for one collinear direction
- In its original version, sector decomposition is a highly process-dependent framework



• To illustrate the drawbacks, use Higgs production as an example



• Invariants that occur in this topology : s_{13} , s_{24} , s_{134} , s_{34} . These contain the collinear singularities $p_1||p_3, p_2||p_4, p_3||p_4, p_1||p_3||p_4$

• Initial uses of sector decomposition attempted to find a **global** parameterization of phase space to handle all of these singularities at once

• However, can only have: p1||p3 & p2||p4 or p1||p3||p4. Not all invariants above can have collinear singularities simultaneously

• The attempt to find suitable global parameterizations meant that one would need to find an entirely new parameterization for Higgs+jet, since the additional final-state parton leads to new singularities; can't recycle information from differential Higgs production



 Much more complicated singularity structure, in particular three collinear directions:



Potential troubles: s_{1g} , s_{2g} , s_{3g} , s_{gg} , s_{2gg} , s_{3gg} and combinations Finding a 'good' global parametrization is (very) hard Sector-improved subtraction scheme

• A combination of sector decomposition and FKS (Frixione,Kunszt,Signer) ideas makes the extraction of singularities more systematic Czakon (2010)

• @ NNLO the elementary building block is the double unresolved phase space where two unresolved particles can become soft or collinear to one or two hard directions

• partition the phase space such that in each partition only a subset of particles leads to singularities: only two soft singularities can occur, and only one triple collinear or one double collinear singularity can occur.

• we can now pick a **local** parametrization for each partition

• the partitioning is done using energies and angles of the unresolved particles w.r.t. the hard parton(s) emitting them



No matter how complicated the process is, it can be reduced to the sum of individual contributions. For each of them, we know a sector decomposition-friendly PS parametrization



• disentangling singularities as energies and angles vanish leads to a tree of sectors.



- Need to consider the following partitions for H+Ij:
 - triple collinear partitions:
 (5||4||1), (5||4||2), (5||4||3);
 - double collinear partitions:
 (5||1,4||2), (5||1,4||3), (5||3,4||1),
 (5||3,4||2), (5||2,4||1), (5||2,4||3)



Building blocks for H+j

Recall the general structure: $F(x) = \int [|M|^2 x] \{dy\}$ $\int |M|^2 d\phi = \frac{F(0)}{\epsilon} + \int dx \frac{F(x) - F(0)}{x} + \dots$

The Subtraction terms are constructed from reduced matrix elements using QCD factorization of soft and collinear singularities

We need to provide

- $F(\vec{x}; \{y\})$: fully-resolved matrix element (RR and RV)
- $\lim_{x_i \to 0} F(\vec{x}; \{y\})$: matrix element in a singular configuration

 $\lim_{x_i \to 0} F(\vec{x}; \{y\}) : \text{reduced (=lower multiplicity) matrix} \\ \text{element times universal eikonals / splitting functions} \\ \text{[Catani, Grazzini (1998, 2000); Kosower, Uwer (1999)]} \end{cases}$

 $\sim \frac{P_{ggg} \otimes |M_j|^2}{s_{iag}}, \quad \frac{P_{gg} \otimes |M_{jj}|^2}{s_{ag}}$



Because of gluon spin correlations, we are forced to work in full CDR



Since the amplitudes have to be evaluated near singular configurations, numerical stability of all the above amplitudes is very important



Checks:

• Two separate calculations were performed and agreement was found on all the steps

• Correctness of the limits: the subtraction terms should approach the full amplitudes in the singular limit. This is a non-trivial check since the two contributions are calculated independently from each other.

 Numerical cancellation of poles. This is another non-trivial check since all the ingredients including renormalization and collinear subtraction contribute. A typical cancellation of poles is 10⁻⁴ for ep⁻² and 10⁻³ for ep⁻¹.



H+jet @ NNLO: gg-channel



 We compute partonic cross sections for gg→H+jet at LO, NLO, NNLO in QCD

- We use the k_T -jet algorithm, $P_{T_j} > 30$ GeV, R=0.4, mH=125GeV
- Hadronic cross sections for $pp \rightarrow H+jet$ at 8TeV LHC are produced by convoluting with PDFs. We present results using NNPDFs for the scale choices $m_H/2$, m_H , $2m_H$

H+jet @ NNLO: gg-channel



R.B., Caola, Melnikov, Petriello, Schulze (2013)

$$\sigma_{\rm LO}(pp \to Hj) = 2713^{+1216}_{-776}$$
 fb,
 $\sigma_{\rm NLO}(pp \to Hj) = 4377^{+760}_{-738}$ fb,
 $\sigma_{\rm NNLO}(pp \to Hj) = 6177^{-204}_{+242}$ fb.

 $\sigma_{\text{NLO}}/\sigma_{\text{LO}} = 1.6$ $\sigma_{\text{NNLO}}/\sigma_{\text{NLO}} = 1.3$

 Significant reduction of scale dependence from 50% at LO to 20% at NLO to less than 5% at NNLO.





R.B., Caola, Melnikov, Petriello, Schulze (2013)

gg-channel is the dominant one for phenomenological studies: at NLO gg (70%), qg(30%)
quark channels necessary for achieving the relevant precision: ongoing work R.B., Caola, Melnikov, Petriello, Schulze



We have moved very quickly from the discovery stage of the Higgs boson to precise measurements of its properties

On the theory side the pace of progress in understanding SM Higgs production is remarkable

Solution New results for Higgs+jet at NNLO in QCD (gg-chanel), an extremely challenging calculation and one of the first NNLO QCD results for two-to-two scattering processes at LHC

Quark channels are necessary for achieving the relevant precision for Higgs+jet: ongoing work R.B., Caola, Melnikov, Petriello, Schulze