Possible QCD Studies @ FCCee (selected appetizers)

## Bogdan MALAESCU

# LPNHE, CNRS

24/04/2020

## Comparison of LHC / FCCee "environments"





#### @ FCCee:

→ Short distance interaction of virtual bosons with quarks

→ No PDFs

→ No underlying event & MPI

→ No pile-up

Jet substructure opportunities

→ Numerous algorithms/methods developed for studying into detail the jet substructure in the LHC environment:

Important for understanding QCD effects inside jets, jet tagging (e.g. boosted top,  $H \rightarrow bb$ ), New Physics searches



→Huge potential for doing precision studies of jet substructure in the clean FCCee environment

→ Need to perform detector optimization in terms of granularity, energy resolution, (tracking/calorimeter) acceptance

### $\alpha_{\rm S}$ evaluation from *hadronic* $\tau$ *decays* (1/3)

 $\rightarrow \tau$  hadronic spectral functions from ALEPH, unfolded of detector effects





## $\alpha_{\rm S}$ evaluation from *hadronic* $\tau$ *decays* (2/3)

 $\rightarrow \tau$  hadronic spectral functions ( $\pi\pi^0$  channel) from various experiments 0.3 Exp/Combined -CLEO ALEPH 0.2 Exp/Combined 0.2 Combined (A-C-O-B) Combined (A-C-O-B) 0.1 0.1 0 0 -0.1 -0.1 arXiv:1312.1501 -0.2 -0.2 -0.3 -0.3 0.2 0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8 0.4 0.6 0.8 1.2 1.2  $s(\pi\pi^{0})$  (GeV<sup>2</sup>)  $s(\pi\pi^0)$  (GeV<sup>2</sup>) 0.3 0.3 Exp/Combined - 1 Exp/Combined -OPAL Belle 0.2 0.2 Combined Combined (A-C-O-B) (A-C-O-B) 0.1 0.1 0 0 -0.1 -0.1 -0.2 -0.2 -0.3 -0.3 0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8 0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8 1.2  $s(\pi\pi^0)$  (GeV<sup>2</sup>)  $s(\pi\pi^{0})$  (GeV<sup>2</sup>)

- Normalisation from branching fractions best determined by ALEPH (due to the large boost)
- → Shape of the distribution best determined by Belle (high statistics)
  → What precision can one achieve at FCCee?

#### $\alpha_{\rm S}$ evaluation from *hadronic* $\tau$ *decays* (3/3)



- → Theoretical prediction available at N<sup>3</sup>LO: can hope for even higher precision at the time of FCCee
- → Need to study acceptance, reconstruction efficiency, resolution etc. in view of optimizing the detector design for SF measurements

 $\alpha_{\rm S}$  evaluation from *hadronic Z decays* 

- $\rightarrow$  Theoretical prediction available at N<sup>3</sup>LO
- → Better convergence of the perturbative series and less non-perturbative corrections compared to precise determinations at lower scales (e.g. from  $\tau$  decays)

low  $O^2$  cont. (N<sup>3</sup>LO) DIS jets (NLO) 0.3 Heavy Quarkonia (NLO) e<sup>+</sup>e<sup>-</sup> jets/shapes (NNLO+res) +\*+ pp/pp (jets NLO) 0.25 EW precision fit (N<sup>3</sup>LO) pp (top, NNLO)  $\alpha_s(\boldsymbol{Q}^2)$ 0.2 PDG 2019 0.15  $\rightarrow$  Used for "reference value":determinations at other energies 0.1 evolved at the  $m_7$  scale and then  $\equiv \alpha_{s}(M_{Z}^{2}) = 0.1179 \pm 0.0010$ compared to test the RGE from QCD 0.05 10 100 1000 Q [GeV]

→ Need to study acceptance and reconstruction efficiency etc. in view of optimizing the detector design

### $\alpha_{\rm S}$ evaluation from (ISR) jet production



 $\rightarrow$  Sensitivity to  $\alpha_{s}$  e.g. from 3/2 jet ratios

- → High luminosity allows to select large samples of events with collinear / large angle ISR photons: allows to scan √s' with the same detector and collider conditions – important for RGE test
- → Need to study jet and photon energy calibration and resolution, acceptance and reconstruction efficiency etc. in view of optimizing the detector design

# Ultimate goal: test RGE & unification of couplings



1/α(Q)

- A deviation from the SM prediction for the RGE can be an indication of New Physics
- → Are the coupling constants unified at the Plank scale?
- → Need to evaluate the strong coupling at multiple scales, with high precision

