Toward N^3LL resummation of a DIS Event Shape

Daekyoung Kang (LANL)

In collaboration with
Iain Stewart (MIT), **Chris Lee** (LANL), **Ou Labun**(Arizona)

1303.6952: factorization & NNLL resummation
1407.6707: analytic 1-loop nonsingular
1504.04006: 2-loop soft functions
Work in progress for N^3LL

Jan 11, 2016

Santa Fe
Jets and Heavy Flavor Workshop

Event shape: Thrust

$$\tau_{ee} = 1 - \frac{1}{Q} \max_{\vec{n}} \sum_i |\vec{p}_i \cdot \vec{n}|$$ Farhi

- Up to $O(\alpha_s^3)$+N^{3}LL Becher and Schwartz Abbate, Fickinger, Hoang, Mateu, Stewart

$$\alpha_s(m_Z) = 0.1135 \pm 0.0011$$



$$\tau_{\rm DIS} = 1 - \frac{1}{E_J} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{H}_J} |\vec{p}_i \cdot \vec{n}|$$

- one hemisphere
- Up to $O(\alpha_s^2)$+NLL Antonelli, Dasgupta, Salam

$$\alpha_s(m_Z) = 0.1198 \pm 0.0013(\text{exp.}) \; {}^{+0.0056}_{-0.0043}(\text{th.})$$

- *Higher precision in DIS?* NNLL or higher ?



Some Recent $\alpha_s(m_Z)$ Results



e^+e^- event shapes

Discrepancy from Lattice result.

Need independent test!

Outline

- ***1**-jettiness* in **3** ways in DIS
- Factorization theorems
- Preliminary N^3LL results
- Sensitivity to α_s, PDFs





H1 Event from *www-h1.desy.de*

Event shape: 1-jettiness

- **N-jettiness**
  - Generalization of thrust
  - N-jet limit: $\tau_N \to 0$

$$\tau_N = \frac{2}{Q^2} \sum_i \min\{q_B \cdot p_i, q_1 \cdot p_i, \ldots, q_N \cdot p_i\}$$

Stewart, Tackmann, Waalewijn

- **1-jettiness:** 1 jet + 1 ISR
  - q_B, q_J are axes to project particle mom.
  - Considering 3 ways to define q_J
  - min. groups particles into 2 regions

$$\tau_1 = \frac{2}{Q^2} \sum_{i \in X} \min\{q_B \cdot p_i, q_J \cdot p_i\}$$



Why 1-jettiness?

DIS thrusts (measured): Non-Global Log beyond NLL

Dasgupta, Salam

Recent progress to resum NGL

Neill, Larkoski, Moult

1-jettiness: No NGL, N^nLL (n>1) accessible

derive factorization thm. by using SCET

accuracy systematically improved with higher order ME's

1-jettiness in 3 ways

CM frame





Breit frame



$$\tau_1 = \frac{2}{Q^2} \sum_{i \in X} \min\{q_B \cdot p_i, q_J \cdot p_i\}$$

CM frame



Kang, Mantry, Qiu PRD2012, 2013

same axes as  but different weighting for Jet and Beam regions

Factorization theorems

$$\frac{1}{\sigma_0}\frac{d\sigma}{dx\,dQ^2\,d\tau_1^a} = H_q(\mu)\int dt_B\,dt_J\,dk_s\,\delta\left(\tau_1^a - \frac{t_B}{Q^2} - \frac{t_J}{Q^2} - \frac{k_s}{Q}\right)$$

$$\times B_q\left(t_B, x, \mu\right)\;\; J_q\left(t_J, \mu\right)\;\; S\left(k_s, \mu\right) + \left(q \leftrightarrow \bar{q}\right)$$



$$\frac{1}{\sigma_0}\frac{d\sigma}{dx\,dQ^2\,d\tau_1^b} = H_q(\mu)\int dt_B\,dt_J\,dk_s\,\delta\left(\tau_1^a - \frac{t_B}{Q^2} - \frac{t_J}{Q^2} - \frac{k_s}{Q}\right)$$

$$\times\int d^2\vec{p}_\perp\, B_q\left(t_B, x, \vec{p}_\perp^{\,2}, \mu\right)\;\; J_q\left(t_J - \vec{p}_\perp^{\,2}, \mu\right)\;\; S\left(k_s, \mu\right) + \left(q \leftrightarrow \bar{q}\right)$$

Transverse momentum dependent Beam function

$$\frac{1}{\sigma_0}\frac{d\sigma}{dx\,dQ^2\,d\tau_1^c} = H_q(\mu)\int dt_B\,dt_J\,dk_s\,\delta\left(\tau_1^a - \frac{t_B}{Q^2} - \frac{t_J}{xQ^2} - \frac{k_s}{\sqrt{x}Q}\right)$$

$$\times\int d^2\vec{p}_\perp\, B_q\left(t_B, x, \vec{p}_\perp^{\,2}, \mu\right)\;\; J_q\left(t_J - (\vec{q}_\perp + \vec{p}_\perp)^2, \mu\right)\;\; S\left(k_s, \mu\right) + \left(q \leftrightarrow \bar{q}\right)$$

Beam, Jet, Soft functions







NNLL predictions







DK, Lee, Stewart 2013



- One order higher than DIS thrust resummation (NLL)
- Higher precision?

$$d\tilde{\sigma} = \exp\left[L\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}(\alpha_s L)^k + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}(\alpha_s L)^k + \alpha_s\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}(\alpha_s L)^k + \cdots\right] + \mathrm{NS}(\alpha_s)$$

singular part: LL, NLL, NNLL, N^{3}LL,…

nonsingular part: $O(\alpha_s)$, $O(\alpha_s^2)$,…

Nonsingular part at $O(\alpha_s)$

- B is done analytically. DK, Lee, Stewart 2014
  - A requires jet algorithm and is done numerically. Kang, Liu, Mantry 1312.0301
- H1 and ZEUS experiments measured Jet region
  - difficult to measure the beam region



- B C can be obtained from measuring jet region alone, while A requires measuring two regions.

$$\tau_1^b \overset{\text{Breit}}{=} \frac{1}{Q}\sum_{i\in X}\min\{n_z\cdot p_i, \bar{n}_z\cdot p_i\}$$
$$= \frac{1}{Q}\Big[\sum_{i\in\mathcal{H}_J^b}(E_i - p_{z\,i}) + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{H}_B^b}(E_i + p_{z\,i})\Big]$$
$$= \frac{1}{Q}\Big[\sum_{i\in X}(E_i + p_{z\,i}) - 2\sum_{i\in\mathcal{H}_J^b} p_{z\,i}\Big],$$

Antonelli, Dasgupta, Salam JHEP 2000

$$\tau_1^b \overset{\text{Breit}}{=} 1 - \frac{2}{Q}\sum_{i\in\mathcal{H}_J^b} p_{z\,i}$$

$$\tau_1^c \overset{\text{CM}}{=} \frac{1}{xy\sqrt{s}}\sum_{i\in X}\min\{n_z\cdot p_i, \bar{n}_z\cdot p_i\}$$
$$= \frac{1}{xy\sqrt{s}}\Big[\sum_{i\in X}(E_i + p_{z\,i}) - 2\sum_{i\in\mathcal{H}_J^c} p_{z\,i}\Big]$$

$$\tau_1^c \overset{\text{CM}}{=} \frac{1}{x}\Big(1 - \frac{2}{y\sqrt{s}}\sum_{i\in\mathcal{H}_J^c} p_{z\,i}\Big)$$

Log vs Non-Logs in DIS

(singular versus nonsingular)



Log vs Non-Logs in DIS

(singular versus nonsingular)

smaller x



Log vs Non-Logs in DIS

(singular versus nonsingular)

smaller x



Log vs Non-Logs in DIS

(singular versus nonsingular)

smaller x



Log vs Non-Logs in DIS

(singular versus nonsingular)

smaller x



Log vs Non-Logs in DIS

(singular versus nonsingular)

smaller x



Log vs Non-Logs in DIS

(singular versus nonsingular)

smaller x



Log vs Non-Logs in DIS

(singular versus nonsingular)

smaller x



Log vs Non-Logs in DIS

(singular versus nonsingular)

reset



Log vs Non-Logs in DIS

(singular versus nonsingular)

larger x



Log vs Non-Logs in DIS

(singular versus nonsingular)

larger x



Log vs Non-Logs in DIS

(singular versus nonsingular)

larger x



Log vs Non-Logs in DIS

(singular versus nonsingular)

smaller Q



Log vs Non-Logs in DIS

(singular versus nonsingular)

smaller Q



Log vs Non-Logs in DIS

(singular versus nonsingular)

reset



Log vs Non-Logs in DIS

(singular versus nonsingular)

larger Q



Log vs Non-Logs in DIS

(singular versus nonsingular)

larger Q



Log vs Non-Logs: Summary



SCET works better for smaller x region at $O(\alpha_s)$!

Toward N^{3}LL

	$\Gamma[\alpha_s]$	$\gamma[\alpha_s]$	$\beta[\alpha_s]$	$\{H,J,B,S\}[\alpha_s]$
LL	α_s	1	α_s	1
NLL	α_s^2	α_s	α_s^2	1
NNLL	α_s^3	α_s^2	α_s^3	α_s
N^{3}LL	α_s^4	α_s^3	α_s^4	α_s^2

Pade approx.

$$\Gamma_3^q = (1 \pm 2)\frac{(\Gamma_2^q)^2}{\Gamma_1^q}$$

0.2 % in e^+e^- thrust

B function up to 2 loops

Gaunt, Stahlhofen, Tackmann 1401.5478

$S_{ee} = S_{ep} = S_{pp}$ up to 2 loops

Kelley, Schabinger, Schwartz, Zhu

Catani and Grazzini 2000

DK, Lee and Labun 2015

Soft function at 2 loop

Catani and Grazzini 2000
DK, Labun, and Lee 2015

- Wilson lines are different.

e^+e^-: $\langle 0|\bar{T}\left[\tilde{Y}_{\bar{n}}^\dagger \tilde{Y}_n\right] \delta(\cdots)\, T\left[\tilde{Y}_n^\dagger \tilde{Y}_{\bar{n}}\right]|0\rangle$

ep: $\langle 0|\bar{T}\left[Y_{\bar{n}}^\dagger \tilde{Y}_n\right] \delta(\cdots)\, T\left[\tilde{Y}_n^\dagger Y_{\bar{n}}\right]|0\rangle$

pp: $\langle 0|\bar{T}\left[Y_{\bar{n}}^\dagger Y_n\right] \delta(\cdots)\, T\left[Y_n^\dagger Y_{\bar{n}}\right]|0\rangle$

incoming and outgoing lines give different sign in the Eikonal propagator

$$\frac{i}{n\cdot k \pm i\epsilon}$$

The sign could matter in the loop integral.



- Well known at $O(\alpha_s)$:

  virtual is scaleless and zero.

  no loop in the real.

- at $O(\alpha_s^2)$:

  virtual are scaleless and zero.

  2 gluon cut has no loop.

  1 gluon cut needs to be checked.

  Nontrivial only for triple gluon vertex

  Same for e^+e^-, ep, pp!





Perturbative Convergence

Preliminary







Perturbative Convergence

smaller x







Perturbative Convergence

smaller x







Perturbative Convergence

reset







Perturbative Convergence

larger x







Perturbative Convergence

larger x







Perturbative Convergence

reset







Perturbative Convergence

smaller Q







Perturbative Convergence

smaller Q







Perturbative Convergence

reset







Perturbative Convergence

larger Q







Perturbative Convergence

larger Q







Perturbative Convergence: Summary



Sensitivity to α_s and PDFs

$\alpha_s(m_Z)$ versus Perturbative & PDF Uncertainty

PDF at 90% conf.

α_s variation includes δPDF



Sensitivity to α_s and PDFs

$\alpha_s(m_Z)$ versus Perturbative & PDF Uncertainty

larger x

PDF at 90% conf.

α_s variation includes δPDF



Sensitivity to α_s and PDFs

$\alpha_s(m_Z)$ versus Perturbative & PDF Uncertainty

larger x

PDF at 90% conf.

α_s variation includes δPDF



Sensitivity to α_s and PDFs

$\alpha_s(m_Z)$ versus Perturbative & PDF Uncertainty

reset

PDF at 90% conf.

α_s variation includes δPDF



Sensitivity to α_s and PDFs

$\alpha_s(m_Z)$ versus Perturbative & PDF Uncertainty

smaller x

PDF at 90% conf.

α_s variation includes δPDF



Sensitivity to α_s and PDFs

$\alpha_s(m_Z)$ versus Perturbative & PDF Uncertainty

smaller x

PDF at 90% conf.

α_s variation includes δPDF



Sensitivity to α_s and PDFs

$\alpha_s(m_Z)$ versus Perturbative & PDF Uncertainty

reset

PDF at 90% conf.

α_s variation includes δPDF



Sensitivity to α_s and PDFs

$\alpha_s(m_Z)$ versus Perturbative & PDF Uncertainty

smaller Q

PDF at 90% conf.

α_s variation includes δPDF



Sensitivity to α_s and PDFs

$\alpha_s(m_Z)$ versus Perturbative & PDF Uncertainty

smaller Q

PDF at 90% conf.

α_s variation includes δPDF



Sensitivity to α_s and PDFs

$\alpha_s(m_Z)$ versus Perturbative & PDF Uncertainty

reset

PDF at 90% conf.

α_s variation includes δPDF



Sensitivity to α_s and PDFs

$\alpha_s(m_Z)$ versus Perturbative & PDF Uncertainty

larger Q

PDF at 90% conf.

α_s variation includes δPDF



Sensitivity to α_s and PDFs

$\alpha_s(m_Z)$ versus Perturbative & PDF Uncertainty

larger Q

PDF at 90% conf.

α_s variation includes δPDF



Summary



- Factorization thms for 1-jettiness

$$\sigma \sim H \times B \otimes J \otimes S$$

$$B = f \otimes \mathcal{I}$$

- N^{3}LL predictions for 

- Progress toward N^{3}LL+O(α_s) predictions for 

- Accuracy $\delta\alpha_s$= 2% or better at x=0.2~0.5

  better than $\delta\alpha_s$ = 4% theory uncertainty in H1 analysis

  comparable to MSTW PDF uncertainty
- Need O(α_s^2) nonsingular

Backup

Nonsingular part at $O(\alpha_s)$

DK, Lee, Stewart 2014

$$\frac{d\sigma}{dx dQ^2 d\tau_1} = \frac{4\pi\alpha^2}{Q^4}\left[(1+(1-y)^2)F_1 + \frac{1-y}{x}F_L\right]$$



Nonsingular part of F1

$$B_q = Q_f^2 \frac{\alpha_s C_F}{2\pi}\left[N_1(\tau,x) + N_0(\tau,x) + \int_x^{\frac{1}{1+\tau}} \frac{dz}{z} f_q\left(\frac{x}{z}\right) R^q(\tau,z)\right.$$
$$\left. + (1+\tau)\, f_q(x(1+\tau))\Delta_2^q(\tau) + \delta(\tau-1)\int_x^{1/2} \frac{dz}{z} f_q\left(\frac{x}{z}\right)\Delta_1^q(z)\right]$$

$$N_1(\tau,x) = -4\frac{\ln\tau}{\tau}\left[(1+\tau/2)f_q(x(1+\tau)) - f_q(x)\right]$$

enhanced at small x

singular term cancels

$$\Delta_1^q(x) = \frac{(1-2x)(1-4x)}{2(1-x)} + \frac{1+x^2}{1-x}\ln\left(\frac{1-x}{x}\right)$$

Nonpertubative Effect

- Estimating nonperturbative part of soft function
- For $\tau \gg \Lambda_{QCD}/Q$
  OPE gives power correction with $\mathcal{O}(\Lambda_{QCD}/\tau Q)$ suppression

$$\sigma(\tau) = \sigma_{\rm pert}(\tau) - \boxed{\frac{2\Omega}{Q}} \frac{d\sigma_{\rm pert}(\tau)}{d\tau} \approx \sigma_{\rm pert}(\tau - 2\Omega/Q)$$

  - $\Omega \sim \Lambda_{QCD}$: nonpertubative matrix element
- For $\tau \geq \Lambda_{QCD}/Q$
  significant nonpertubative effect
  convolving shape function
  consistent with power correction



$$\sigma(\tau) = \int dk \sigma_{\rm pert}(\tau - k/Q)\, F(k)$$

$$\to \sigma_{\rm pert}(\tau) - \boxed{\left(\int dk\, \frac{k}{Q} F(k)\right)} \frac{d\sigma_{\rm pert}(\tau)}{d\tau}$$

$$F(k) = \frac{1}{\lambda}\left[\sum_{n=0}^{N} c_n f_n\left(\frac{k}{\lambda}\right)\right]^2$$

Ligeti, Tackmann, Stewart

Sensitivity to $\alpha_s(m_Z)$, Ω_1, and PDFs

Degeneracy between $\alpha_s(m_Z)$ and Ω_1 broken by Q



Sensitivity to $\alpha_s(m_Z)$, Ω_1, and PDFs

Degeneracy between $\alpha_s(m_Z)$ and Ω_1 broken by Q



Sensitivity to $\alpha_s(m_Z)$, Ω_1, and PDFs

Degeneracy between $\alpha_s(m_Z)$ and Ω_1 broken by Q



Sensitivity to $\alpha_s(m_Z)$, Ω_1, and PDFs

Degeneracy between $\alpha_s(m_Z)$ and Ω_1 broken by Q



Sensitivity to $\alpha_s(m_Z)$, Ω_1, and PDFs

Degeneracy between $\alpha_s(m_Z)$ and Ω_1 broken by Q
not by x



Sensitivity to $\alpha_s(m_Z)$, Ω_1, and PDFs

Degeneracy between $\alpha_s(m_Z)$ and Ω_1 broken by Q
not by x



Sensitivity to $\alpha_s(m_Z)$, Ω_1, and PDFs

Degeneracy between $\alpha_s(m_Z)$ and Ω_1 broken by Q
not by x



Sensitivity to $\alpha_s(m_Z)$, Ω_1, and PDFs

Degeneracy between $\alpha_s(m_Z)$ and Ω_1 broken by Q
not by x



Sensitivity to $\alpha_s(m_Z)$, Ω_1, and PDFs

Degeneracy between $\alpha_s(m_Z)$ and Ω_1 broken by Q
not by x



Choice of scales





- For $\Lambda_{QCD} \ll \tau \ll 1$

  $\mu_H = Q \quad \mu_{B,J} = \sqrt{\tau} Q$

  $\mu_S = \tau Q$

- For $\tau \sim \Lambda_{QCD}/Q$

  significant nonperturbative effect

  soft scale freezing at $\mu_S \sim \Lambda_{QCD}$

  $\mu_{B,J} \sim \sqrt{\Lambda_{QCD} Q}$

- For $\tau \sim 1$

  no hierarchy in scales

  no large logs

  $\mu_H \sim \mu_{B,J} \sim \mu_S \sim Q$

Resummation and RGE

- Fourier transformation

y : conjugate variable of τ_1

$$\frac{d\tilde{\sigma}}{dy} = \int d\tau_1\, e^{-iy\tau_1} \frac{d\sigma}{d\tau_1} = H(\mu)\, \widetilde{B}_q(y,x,\mu)\; \widetilde{J}_q(y,\mu)\; \widetilde{S}(y,\mu)$$

$$\ln \frac{d\tilde{\sigma}}{dy} = \underbrace{L \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (\alpha_s L)^k}_{LL} + \underbrace{\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (\alpha_s L)^k}_{NLL} + \underbrace{\alpha_s \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (\alpha_s L)^k}_{NNLL} + \cdots$$

$$L = \log(iy)$$

- Resumming large logs
  - No large logs in each function at its natural scale μ_i
  - *RG evolution* from μ_i to common scale μ



missing particles in forward region

$$\eta = -\ln(\tan\theta/2)$$

- Proton remnants and particles moving very forward region out of detector coverage: $0 < \theta < \theta_{\rm cut}\ ,\ \eta > \eta_{\rm cut}$
  - H1 : $\theta_{\rm cut} = 4^\circ(0.7^\circ)$ and $\eta_{\rm cut} = 3.4(5.1)$ for main cal. (PLUG cal.)
  - ZEUS: $\theta_{\rm cut} = 2.2^\circ$ and $\eta_{\rm cut} = 4.0$ for FCAL
- Boost to CM frame: $\eta^{\rm CM} = \eta - \Delta\eta$

$$\Delta\eta = \ln\frac{E_p^{\rm lab}}{E_p^{\rm CM}} = \ln\frac{920}{157} = 1.8$$

  - H1: $\eta_{\rm cut}^{\rm CM} = 1.6(3.3)$, $e^{-\eta_{\rm cut}^{\rm CM}} = 0.2(0.04)$
  - ZEUS: $\eta_{\rm cut}^{\rm CM} = 2.2$, $e^{-\eta_{\rm cut}^{\rm CM}} = 0.1$

Suppression factor!

- Maximum missing measurement: $\tau_{\rm miss} = \dfrac{2q_B\cdot p_{\rm miss}}{Q^2} = \dfrac{m_T}{Q_B}e^{-\eta}$
  - $m_T^{\rm max} = E_p^{\rm lab}\sin\theta_{\rm cut}$

    about 64(11) GeV for H1 and 32 GeV for ZEUS

$$Q_B = \sqrt{y/x}Q,\ xQ$$

Future

- P_T dependent observable for TMDPDF

$$\sigma \sim H \times B \otimes J \otimes S \qquad B = f \otimes \mathcal{I}$$

- Toward multi-jet events in DIS
- Jet substructure: heavy meson, quarkonium in a jet