Top Mass Measurements at e+e- Colliders

Frank Simon **Max-Planck-Institute for Physics**

Community Summer Study 編 2022 July 17-26 Seattle

Snowmass '21 CSS Seattle, WA, July 2022



MAX-PLANCK-INSTITUT



Outline

- Different experimental routes
- A detailed look at the threshold
- Snowmass '21 Systematics summary
- A further look at key uncertainties



Top Quark Mass: Measurement Strategies

At and above threshold

- The accelerator side: Requires sufficient collision energy for top pair production
 - So far thoroughly studied for ILC, CLIC, threshold studies common for CLIC, FCC-ee, ILC



EF03 - Top Mass in e⁺e⁻ — Snowmass CSS, July 2022



energy for top pair production d studies common for CLIC, FCC-ee, ILC



Top Quark Mass: Measurement Strategies

At and above threshold

- The accelerator side: Requires sufficient collision energy for top pair production
 - So far thoroughly studied for ILC, CLIC, threshold studies common for CLIC, FCC-ee, ILC



EF03 - Top Mass in e⁺e⁻ – Snowmass CSS, July 2022



Key references:

EPJ C73, 2530 (2013) (CLIC, (ILC): Threshold, direct)

JHEP 11, 003 (2019) (CLIC: Threshold, radiative, direct)

PLB 804,135353 (2020)

(ILC, CLIC: radiative)

+ a rich set of reports and conference proceedings on arXiv







Direct Kinematic Reconstruction above Threshold

Interpretation challenges



EF03 - Top Mass in e⁺e⁻ – Snowmass CSS, July 2022



4

Top Mass in Radiative Events

A threshold scan at higher collision energies

 A new(er) idea to measure the top mass in a theoretically well-defined scheme in high-energy running above the threshold



EF03 - Top Mass in e⁺e⁻ — Snowmass CSS, July 2022





Top Mass in Radiative Events

A threshold scan at higher collision energies

 A new(er) idea to measure the top mass in a theoretically well-defined scheme in high-energy running above the threshold



EF03 - Top Mass in e⁺e⁻ — Snowmass CSS, July 2022



	,			. .	
	cms energy	CLIC,	$\sqrt{s} = 380 \mathrm{GeV}$	ILC, \sqrt{s} =	= 5
	luminosity $[fb^{-1}]$	500	1000	500	
culation	statistical	$140\mathrm{MeV}$	$V = 90 \mathrm{MeV}$	$350\mathrm{MeV}$	11
	theory	$46\mathrm{MeV}$		55 N	Me
	lum. spectrum	$20\mathrm{MeV}$		20 Me	
d in explicitly;	photon response	1	$6\mathrm{MeV}$	85]	Me
	total	$150 \mathrm{MeV}$	$7 110 \mathrm{MeV}$	$360\mathrm{MeV}$	15



Top Mass in Radiative Events

A threshold scan at higher collision energies

• A new(er) idea to measure the top mass in a theoretically well-defined scheme in high-energy running above the threshold



EF03 - Top Mass in e⁺e⁻ – Snowmass CSS, July 2022



		ъ. 4		5 A	
	cms energy	CLIC, \sqrt{s}	$\overline{s} = 380 \mathrm{GeV}$	ILC, \sqrt{s} :	= 5
	luminosity $[fb^{-1}]$	500	1000	500	
culation	statistical	$140\mathrm{MeV}$	$90{ m MeV}$	$350\mathrm{MeV}$	11
	theory	$46\mathrm{MeV}$		$55\mathrm{MeV}$	
	lum. spectrum	$20\mathrm{MeV}$		20 MeV	
l in explicitly;	photon response	16	MeV	85	Me
MSP mass	total	$150\mathrm{MeV}$	$110\mathrm{MeV}$	$360{ m MeV}$	15

can provide 5σ evidence for scale evolution ("running") of the top quark MSR mass from ILC500 data alone



Ultimate precision at the threshold







Ultimate precision at the threshold



The threshold is sensitive to top quark properties

EF03 - Top Mass in e⁺e⁻ — Snowmass CSS, July 2022





Ultimate precision at the threshold



The threshold is sensitive to top quark properties

EF03 - Top Mass in e⁺e⁻ — Snowmass CSS, July 2022





Ultimate precision at the threshold



The threshold is sensitive to top quark properties

EF03 - Top Mass in e⁺e⁻ — Snowmass CSS, July 2022





Ultimate precision at the threshold



The threshold is sensitive to top quark properties

EF03 - Top Mass in e⁺e⁻ – Snowmass CSS, July 2022







Differences between Colliders

The Luminosity Spectrum

• Linear collider luminosity spectra are characterized by a beamstrahlung tail, FCC-ee is close to Gaussian



EF03 - Top Mass in e⁺e⁻ – Snowmass CSS, July 2022



FCC vs



Differences between Colliders

The Luminosity Spectrum

• Linear collider luminosity spectra are characterized by a beamstrahlung tail, FCC-ee is close to Gaussian



EF03 - Top Mass in e⁺e⁻ – Snowmass CSS, July 2022





Frank Simon (fsimon@mpp.mpg.de)







Differences between Colliders

The Luminosity Spectrum

beamstrahlung tail, FCC-ee is close to Gaussian



EF03 - Top Mass in e⁺e⁻ – Snowmass CSS, July 2022



7

The Standard Threshold Scan

Experimental Assumptions





- The standard assumptions: Efficiency, signal and background yields taken from EPJ C73, 2530 (2013): 70.2% signal efficiency, 73 fb effective background cross section after selection
- A 10-point threshold scan, with equal luminosity sharing, spacing by 1 GeV, from 340 - 349 GeV
- ILC, FCC-ee assume 200 fb⁻¹ total, CLIC 100 fb⁻¹ (for easier comparisons, 200 fb⁻¹ numbers are often also quoted for CLIC)
- Top mass (and other parameters, such as Γ_t , y_t , α_s) extracted via template fits of predicted cross sections with different input parameters. **Theory essential** - here NNNLO QCD [Beneke et.al.]









Theory Uncertainties A key factor





• QCD scale uncertainties highly relevant.



Theory Uncertainties A key factor





- QCD scale uncertainties highly relevant.
- Also need to calculate other effects, such as ISR, to the required precision!





Choosing the Scan Range

Parameter Sensitivity



EF03 - Top Mass in e⁺e⁻ — Snowmass CSS, July 2022



- Plot shows the derivative of the cross section for various parameters - to make this understandable this is normalised to typical changes of these parameters
- Full use to optimize scan range requires knowledge of mass to ~ 200 MeV in PS scheme. Can be achieved with $2 \times 5 \text{ fb}^{-1}$:

point 1: $\sqrt{s} = 2 \times m_t^{PS}$,LHC - 1.5 GeV

point 2: $\sqrt{s} = 2 \times m_t^{PS}$, LHC + 0.5 GeV [arXiv:<u>1902.07246</u>] (N.B.: This is safe also when taking theory uncertainties into account)

• Optimizing for particular parameters can reduce the statistical uncertainty by ~ 25% [JHEP 7, 70 (2021)]







Choosing the Scan Range

Enter theory uncertainty





- QCD scale uncertainties dominate over point-by-point statistical uncertainties for typical threshold scans: At this point optimising scan strategies to reduce statistical uncertainties does not improve the total uncertainty - in fact concentrating on a very small range may make systematic control more difficult.
- In general: Also to separate contributions from different parameters, the most relevant range is 340 -346 GeV.
 - Higher energy points would primarily benefit a yt measurement.







Choosing the Scan Range

Bottom line for FCC-ee studies





 Mildly optimized scan (mass & width) for FCCee as a balance between different sensitivities:
 8 points in the range of 340 - 346 GeV

assumed for most results in the following



Fitting Multiple Parameters

Mass, Width, Yukawa Coupling



• ~ 45 MeV on width



• ~ 11.5% on Yukawa coupling



Uncertainties Overview

ILC as starting point

• Relatively thorough evaluation for ILC leading up to European Strategy, and adjusted also for CLIC in the framework of the CLIC top physics paper.

error source	Δm
stat. error (200 fb ^{-1})	
theory (NNNLO scale variations, PS scheme)	
parametric (α_s , current WA: 9 x 10 ⁻⁴)	
non-resonant contributions (such as single top)	
residual background / selection efficiency	
luminosity spectrum uncertainty	
beam energy uncertainty	
combined theory & parametric	
combined experimental & backgrounds	
total (stat. $+$ syst.)	





assuming standard 10 point scan

- 40 45, depending on scan range evaluated with current WA
- 2015 study, reduce with theory work 2012 study, basis for all newer threshold studies evaluated for CLIC
- very conservative estimate expect to be better

Uncertainties Overview

My Snowmass'21 Bottom Line

$\delta m_t^{ m PS}~[{ m MeV}]$	ILC	CLIC	FCC-ee	alightly, a sparson of a same	
$\mathcal{L}[\mathrm{fb}^{-1}]$		100 [200]	200	for II C. ECC-ee	
Statistical uncertainty	10	20 [13]	9		
Theoretical uncertainty (QCD)	40 - 45		•	latest evaluation with 8-point scans	
Parametric uncertainty α_s	26	26	3.2	ultimate α_s (1.2 x 10 ⁻⁴) assumed for	
Parametric uncertainty y_t (HL-LHC)	5		•	FCC-ee, current WA for ILC, CLIC	
Non-resonant contributions	< 40			(do we have something better?)	
Experimental systematic uncertainty		5-30	11 - 20		
Total uncertainty	40 - 75				
		-			

- Assumptions on experimental systematics:
 - residual background and selection similar for all
 - very slight advantage for FCC-ee due to absence of luminosity spectrum uncertainty
 - circular)



• Beam energy uncertainty for FCC-ee 3 MeV (for 5 MeV energy uncertainty) - original conservative estimate for ILC and CLIC can likely be improved to similar range (same energy measurement techniques for linear and





Uncertainties: Luminosity Spectrum

A few more details









Uncertainties - Parametric

A few more details





Correlation of mass with α_s , y_t

Uncertainty scales with input precision: $\Delta m \sim 2.6$ MeV per 10^{-4} in a_s $\Delta m \sim 1.6$ MeV per 1% in y_t: ~ 5 MeV for 3.4% from HL-LHC

Uncertainties - Non-resonant contributions

A few more details









A few more details

Impact of QCD scale uncertainties on mass, width, Yukawa extraction





A few more details

• Impact of QCD scale uncertainties on mass, width, Yukawa extraction





A few more details







A few more details







Bottom Line

- on the top quark mass
- leading uncertainty overall.
- \Rightarrow Advances in theory directly translate into improvements of overall precision.

• e⁺e⁻ Colliders running at the top quark pair production threshold will provide the ultimate precision

• A challenge for theory: Understanding parameters on a level comparable to expected experimental precision. Theory is a / the leading systematic for many measurements - for the mass it is the

