Top physics at CLIC and ILC

Aleksander Filip Żarnecki

Faculty of Physics, University of Warsaw

on behalf of CLICdp collaboration and ILC Physics and Detector Study

38th International Conference on High Energy Physics August 4, 2016

A.F.Żarnecki (University of Warsaw)

Top physics at CLIC and ILC

August 4, 2016 1 / 29

Outline



2 Colliders and Experiments

3 Top measurements

- Mass and width
- Electroweak couplings
- Yukawa coupling
- Rare decays

4 Conclusions



Motivation





Top quark

- the heaviest known elementary particle
- Yukawa coupling to Higgs boson $y_t \sim 1$ \Rightarrow key to understanding of EWSB
- decays before hadronizing: the only "naked" quark
 ⇒ test ground for QCD
- large loop contributions to many precision measurements
- sensitive to many BSM scenarios
 ⇒ a window to "new physics"

Credit: Hitoshi Murayama

A.F.Żarnecki (University of Warsaw)



International Linear Collider

Technical Design (TDR) completed in 2013 arXiv:1306.6328

- superconducting accelerating cavities
- 250 500 GeV c.m.s. energy (baseline), 1 TeV upgrade possible
- footprint 31 km
- polarisation for both e^- and e^+ (80%/30%)

Colliders



Compact Linear Collider



Conceptual Design (CDR) presented in 2012

CERN-2012-007

- high gradient, two-beam acceleration scheme
- staged implementation plan with c.m.s energy from 380 GeV to 3 TeV
- footprint of 11 to 50 km
- e^- polarisation, e^+ polarisation as possible upgrade
- ongoing R&D and large-scale system tests



Detector Requirements

Jet reconstruction and jet energy measurement based on "Particle Flow" concept

Single particle reconstruction/ID ⇒ high calorimeter granularity



Benchmark reaction $e^+e^-
ightarrow t \overline{t}
ightarrow 6 j$





Detector Requirements

Jet reconstruction and jet energy measurement based on "Particle Flow" concept

Single particle reconstruction/ID \Rightarrow high calorimeter granularity

Best possible jet energy estimate \Rightarrow precise momentum measurement









Detector Requirements

Jet reconstruction and jet energy measurement based on "Particle Flow" concept

Single particle reconstruction/ID \Rightarrow high calorimeter granularity

- Best possible jet energy estimate \Rightarrow precise momentum measurement
- Very efficient flavour tagging \Rightarrow high precision vertex detector









Detector Requirements

Jet reconstruction and jet energy measurement based on "Particle Flow" concept

Single particle reconstruction/ID \Rightarrow high calorimeter granularity

- Best possible jet energy estimate \Rightarrow precise momentum measurement
- Very efficient flavour tagging \Rightarrow high precision vertex detector

 $\begin{array}{l} \mbox{Missing energy measurement} \\ \Rightarrow \mbox{hermecity} \end{array}$



Benchmark reaction $e^+e^-
ightarrow tar{t}
ightarrow 4j+l+
u$





Detector Requirements

- Track momentum resolution: $\sigma_{1/p} < 5 \cdot 10^{-5} \text{ GeV}^{-1}$
- Impact parameter resolution: $\sigma_d < 5\mu m \oplus 10\mu m \frac{1 \text{ GeV}}{n \sin^{3/2} \Theta}$
- Jet energy resolution: $\sigma_E/E = 3 4\%$ (highest jet energies)
- Hermecity: $\Theta_{min} = 5 \text{ mrad}$

Three detailed LC detector concepts:





H-20 scenario for ILC

Initial stage

- $\sqrt{s} = 500 \text{ GeV}$ with 500 fb⁻¹ in 3.7 years
- $\sqrt{s} = 350 \text{ GeV}$ with 200 fb⁻¹ in 1.3 years
- $\sqrt{s} = 250 \text{ GeV}$ with 500 fb⁻¹ in 3.1 years

Additional 3'500 fb⁻¹ at $\sqrt{s} = 500$ GeV and 1'500 fb⁻¹ at $\sqrt{s} = 250$ GeV possible after luminosity upgrade (in about 11 years)



H-20 scenario for ILC

Initial stage

- $\sqrt{s} = 500 \text{ GeV}$ with 500 fb⁻¹ in 3.7 years
- $\sqrt{s} = 350 \text{ GeV}$ with 200 fb⁻¹ in 1.3 years
- $\sqrt{s} = 250 \text{ GeV}$ with 500 fb⁻¹ in 3.1 years

Additional 3'500 fb⁻¹ at $\sqrt{s} = 500$ GeV and 1'500 fb⁻¹ at $\sqrt{s} = 250$ GeV possible after luminosity upgrade (in about 11 years)

CLIC running scenario

Three construction stages (each 5 to 7 years of running)

- $\sqrt{s} = 380 \text{ GeV}$ with 500 fb⁻¹ + 100 fb⁻¹ at $t\bar{t}$ threshold selected as an optimal choice for precision Higgs and top physics
- $\sqrt{s} = 1.5 \text{ TeV}$ with 1500 fb⁻¹
- $\sqrt{s} = 3 \text{ TeV}$ with 3000 fb⁻¹



Top pair production cross section around threshold: resonance-like structure corresponding to narrow $t\bar{t}$ bound state. Very sensitive to top properties and model parameters:



Significant cross section smearing due to luminosity spectra and ISR



Precision top mass measurement possible already with 100 fb^{-1}

ILC

CLIC



Energy scan: 10 cross section measurements, 10 fb $^{-1}$ each





Precision top mass measurement possible already with 100 fb^{-1}

- statistical uncertainty 15–20 MeV
- current theoretical uncertainties $\sim 40 \text{ MeV}$ F.Simon ID:953 (poster)

+ parametric α_s uncertainty ~30 MeV (for today's WA)

- other uncertainties (backgrounds, spectra, etc.) on 10–20 MeV level
 - \Rightarrow total uncertainty on the top mass ~ 50 MeV feasible
- top width can be extracted to 40 MeV A.Ishikawa @ TopLC'2015

Top physics at CLIC and ILC



Main advantage: well defined from theoretical point of view Total uncertainty on the top mass $\sim 50~\text{MeV}$

Direct reconstruction Possible for all energies above the threshold (continuum) High statistical precision: 80 MeV estimated for 100 fb⁻¹ at 500 GeV Suffers from significant theoretical uncertainties when converting to particular mass scheme (as in LHC).

Radiative events

P. Gomis @ ECFA LC Workshop 2016

At higher energies, we are still sensitive to $t\bar{t}$ threshold in radiative events. Threshold in ISR distribution \Rightarrow statistical precision ~ 100 MeV feasible

Other considered methods

- *b*-jet energy distribution ("one prong")
- event shape analysis (Thrust distribution)

R.Franceschini @ TopLC'2016

A.Hoang @ TopLC'2016



Pair production provides direct access to top electroweak couplings

Possible higher order corrections ⇒ sensitive to "new physics" contribution

General coupling form:

$$\Gamma_{\mu}^{t\bar{t}X}(k^{2},q,\bar{q}) = ie\left\{\gamma_{\mu}\left(F_{1V}^{X}(k^{2}) + \gamma_{5}F_{1A}^{X}(k^{2})\right) - \frac{\sigma_{\mu\nu}}{2m_{t}}(q+\bar{q})^{\nu}\left(iF_{2V}^{X}(k^{2}) + \gamma_{5}F_{2A}^{X}(k^{2})\right)\right\}$$





Pair production provides direct access to top electroweak couplings

- Possible higher order corrections ⇒ sensitive to "new physics" contribution
- General coupling form:

$$\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{y}$$

$$\Gamma_{\mu}^{t\bar{t}X}(k^{2},q,\bar{q}) = ie\left\{\gamma_{\mu}\left(F_{1V}^{X}(k^{2}) + \gamma_{5}F_{1A}^{X}(k^{2})\right) - \frac{\sigma_{\mu\nu}}{2m_{t}}(q+\bar{q})^{\nu}\left(iF_{2V}^{X}(k^{2}) + \gamma_{5}F_{2A}^{X}(k^{2})\right)\right\}$$

Form factors can be constrained through measurement of:

- total cross-section
- forward-backward asymmetry
- helicity angle distribution in top decays

for two polarization combinations: $e_L^- e_R^+$ and $e_R^- e_L^+$

500 fb⁻¹ @ 500 GeV

The cross section can be measured to 0.5%

For semi-leptonic events slope of the helicity angle distribution measured to ${\sim}4\%$

Polar Angle Spectrum requires tighter selection cuts to reach 2% precision



Detailed simulation of the ILD detector M.S. Amjad, et al., Eur.Phys.J. C75 (2015) 512



500 fb^{-1} @ 500 GeV

- The cross section can be measured to 0.5%
- For semi-leptonic events slope of the helicity angle distribution measured to $\sim 4\%$
- Polar Angle Spectrum requires tighter selection cuts to reach 2% precision
- Analysis can still be improved by b-jet charge reconstruction



With improved particle ID one could also consider using hadronic decays





Expected coupling precision at LHC, ILC (500 GeV) and CLIC (380 GeV)





IFIC-LAL Collaboration, M.Perello @ ECFA LC'2016



Already with 500 fb $^{-1}$ top coupling determinated to $\sim 1\%$ at ILC



 \Rightarrow significant constraints on different SM extensions



Already with 500 fb $^{-1}$ top coupling determinated to ${\sim}1\%$ at ILC



⇒ to profit from ILC luminosity upgrade we need to control theoretical and experimental uncertainties to per mille level



A.Ishikawa @ TopLC'2015

Pair production at threshold: 9% Higgs exchange contribution $\Rightarrow y_t$ can be extracted with statistical uncertainty $\sim 6\%$ (100 fb⁻¹), assuming α_s can be constrained from other measurements theoretical uncertainties $\sim 20\%$, need to be reduced



A.Ishikawa @ TopLC'2015

Pair production at threshold: 9% Higgs exchange contribution $\Rightarrow y_t$ can be extracted with statistical uncertainty ~6% (100 fb⁻¹), assuming α_s can be constrained from other measurements theoretical uncertainties ~20%, need to be reduced

Higher energies (above 500 GeV)

Can be extracted from the measurement of $e^+e^-
ightarrow t ar{t} H$ events



VARSAW UNIVERSIT

Pair production at threshold: 9% Higgs exchange contribution $\Rightarrow y_t$ can be extracted with statistical uncertainty $\sim 6\%$ (100 fb⁻¹), assuming α_s can be constrained from other measurements theoretical uncertainties $\sim 20\%$, need to be reduced

Higher energies (above 500 GeV) Can be extracted from the measurement of $e^+e^- \rightarrow t\bar{t}H$ events

Difficult measurement:

- very low statistics
- large backgrounds
- requires perfect detector performance (8 jets, 4 *b*-tags)



A.Ishikawa @ TopLC'2015

Yukawa coupling



ILD simulation, $2 \times 500 \text{ fb}^{-1}$ at 500 GeV

Y.Sudo @ TopLC'2016

 $t\bar{t}H \rightarrow 8j$



 $t\bar{t}H \rightarrow l\nu + 6j$

Yukawa coupling



ILD simulation. $2 \times 500 \text{ fb}^{-1}$ at 500 GeV

Y.Sudo @ TopLC'2016

 $t\bar{t}H \rightarrow 8i$



 \Rightarrow statistical uncertainty of about 11% (6.4% with 4'000 fb⁻¹)

Precision vs energy

Significant improvement when going to higher energies:

- 4% at 520 GeV and 3% at 540 GeV, with 4'000 fb $^{-1}$
- 4-5% at 1 TeV (ILC) or 1.4 TeV (CLIC), with 1'500 fb⁻¹

T.Price et al., Eur.Phys.J. C75 (2015) 309

Rare decays



In the Standard Model, FCNC top decays are strongly suppressed (GIM mechanism + CKM suppression):

 $BR(t \to c \ \gamma) \sim 5 \cdot \ 10^{-14}, \ BR(t \to c \ Z) \sim 1 \cdot 10^{-14}, \ BR(t \to c \ H) \sim 3 \cdot 10^{-15}$

Significant enhancement possible in many "new physics" scenarios

Rare decays



In the Standard Model, FCNC top decays are strongly suppressed (GIM mechanism + CKM suppression):

 $BR(t \to c \ \gamma) \sim 5 \cdot \ 10^{-14}, \ BR(t \to c \ Z) \sim 1 \cdot 10^{-14}, \ BR(t \to c \ H) \sim 3 \cdot 10^{-15}$

Significant enhancement possible in many "new physics" scenarios

Decay $t \rightarrow c H$ most interesting

- $\bullet\,$ enhancement up to $10^{-5}\!\!-\!\!10^{-2}$
- test of Higgs boson couplings
- well constrained kinematics
- seems most difficult for LHC Run II: BR < 0.46% HL-LHC: BR < 2 · 10⁻⁴





Parton level simulation results, 2HDM(III)



Precise determination of top parameters is crucial for validation of the Standard Model (or any alternative BSM theory)

Top threshold scan at the e^+e^- collider gives unique oportunities for precise mass, width and coupling determination

Direct measurement of Yukawa and electroweak couplings require running at higher beam energies

High precision and background suppression capabilities allow per mile level measurements and searches for rare processes.

Even in clean e^+e^- environment, top event reconstruction is very challenging. Stringent requirements are imposed on detector performance.



Thank you!

Backup



Motivation

Precise determination of the top mass and other properties crucial for Standard Model verification and indirect "new physics" searches



Backup



Motivation

Top mass is a key to understanding of the SM stability



Higgs mass M_h in GeV

uncertainty on the stability conditions dominated by top mass



Future e^+e^- colliders

Expected luminosity of considered accelerators



Backup



Top mass

ATLAS+CMS Preliminary LHCtop WG	m _{top} summary,/s = 7-8 TeV	Sep 2015
World Comb. Mar 2014, [7] stat total uncertainty	total stat	
m _{top} = 173.34 ± 0.76 (0.36 ± 0.67) GeV	m _{rep} ± total (stat± syst)	is Ref.
ATLAS, I+jets (*)	172.31±1.55 (0.75±1.35) 7 TeV [1]
ATLAS, dilepton (*)	173.09±1.63 (0.64±1.50) 7 TeV [2]
CMS, I+jets	173.49±1.06 (0.43±0.97) 7 TeV [3]
CMS, dilepton	172.50±1.52 (0.43±1.46) 7 TeV [4]
CMS, all jets	173.49±1.41 (0.69±1.23) 7 TeV [5]
LHC comb. (Sep 2013)	173.29± 0.95 (0.35± 0.88	7 TeV [6]
World comb. (Mar 2014)	173.34± 0.76 (0.36± 0.67) 1.96-7 TeV [7]
ATLAS, I+jets	172.33± 1.27 (0.75± 1.02) 7 TeV [8]
ATLAS, dilepton	173.79±1.41 (0.54±1.30) 7 TeV [8]
ATLAS, all jets	+ 175.1±1.8 (1.4±1.2)	7 TeV [9]
ATLAS, single top	172.2±2.1 (0.7±2.0)	8 TeV [10]
ATLAS comb. (Mar 2015)	172.99± 0.91 (0.48± 0.78	7 TeV [8]
CMS, I+jets	172.35±0.51 (0.16±0.48) 8 TeV [11]
CMS, dilepton	172.82± 1.23 (0.19± 1.22) 8 TeV [11]
CMS, all jets	172.32±0.64 (0.25±0.59) 8 TeV [11]
CMS comb. (Sep 2015) HHH	172.44± 0.48 (0.13± 0.47	7+8 TeV [11]
	[1] ATLAS-CONF-2013-046 [7]	nrXiv:1403.4427
	[2] ATLAS-CONF-2013-077 [8]	Eur.Phys.J.C (2015) 75:330
(1) Commencient Incommute	[3] JHEP 12 (2012) 105 [9]	Eur.Phys.J.C75 (2015) 158
shown below the line	(4) Bur.Phys.J.C72 (2012) 2202 [10 (8) Bur.Phys.J.C72 (2012) 2202 [10	0 ATLAS-CONF-2014-055
165 170 175	5 180	185
m _{top} [GeV]		

LHC mass measurements dominated by systematics

The mass extracted from data-MC comparison ⇒ theoretical uncertainties when converting to particular mass scheme

Backup



Top mass



M.Beneke et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 115, 192001 (2015)

LHC mass measurements dominated by systematics

The mass extracted from data-MC comparison ⇒ theoretical uncertainties when converting to particular mass scheme

Threshold for

 $e^+e^-
ightarrow tar{t}$

 \Rightarrow much better understood

theoretical error below 50 MeV feasible



Top pair production cross section around threshold: resonance-like structure corresponding to narrow $t\bar{t}$ bound state. Very sensitive to top properties and model parameters:





Top pair production cross section around threshold: resonance-like structure corresponding to narrow $t\bar{t}$ bound state. Very sensitive to top properties and model parameters:





Top pair production cross section around threshold: resonance-like structure corresponding to narrow $t\bar{t}$ bound state. Very sensitive to top properties and model parameters:



Significant cross section smearing due to luminosity spectra and ISR

Backup

Continuum

Mass measurement above the threshold is still interesting

- help to understand the "different" masses better
- try to see the running of the top quark mass



K.Seidel et al., Eur. Phys. J. C73 (2013) 2530



For CLIC running at 500 GeV



\Rightarrow statistical precision of 100 MeV feasible full simulation study ongoing

Backup

Radiative events

•

At higher energies, we are still sensitive to $t\bar{t}$ threshold in radiative events. We can determine

threshold position by reconstructing

$$s' = s \left(1 - \frac{2E_{\gamma}}{\sqrt{s}} \right)$$







