Top-quark physics at FCCe^+e^-

Jeremy Andrea (IPHC, CNRS, Strasbourg)

$t\bar{t}$ runs (at FCCee)

- FCCee schedule : run at different collision energies.
- Top quark physics program in two steps :
  - Scan energies from ~340 to ~350 GeV, 0.2 ab^{-1} in total,
  - Large statistic run at 365 GeV, 1.5 ab^{-1}.
- At 365TeV, ~2 Mevts in total.
- 1-2 orders of magnitude lower during the scan.



Z(4 ys)	WW (1y)	ZH(3y)	LS (1y)	tt(4 ys)
72 ab^{-1}	10 ab^{-1}	5 ab^{-1}		0.2+1.5 ab^{-1}

Top quark physic at e^+e^- colliers

- Physics program at lepton colliers <=> precision !
  - Low backgrounds,
  - Perfect knowledge of the initial state,
  - Detectors with very high precision.



- $t\bar{t}$ (differential) cross sections sensitive to :
  - **top quark mass m_t**, top quark width Γ_t,
  - Couplings to Z ($t\bar{t}Z$) and ($t\bar{t}\gamma$) couplings Higgs ($t\bar{t}H$), y_t
  - On α and α_s,
  - EFT…



- Separation between $e^+e^- \to t\bar{t} \to W^+W^-b\bar{b}$ and $e^+e^- \to W^+W^-b\bar{b}$ not straightforward.
  - Processes considered inclusively.



- Below $\sqrt{s} \approx 2\times m_t$, off-shell contributions, large enhancement around 344 GeV,
- $\sqrt{s}$ up to $\approx$ 1 TeV $t\bar{t}$ dominates, beyond single top production dominates.

Top mass measurement

- Top-quark mass measurement from cross sections => resolving top mass "ambiguities" : MC mass vs mass in various renorm. scheme. Also important to study vacuum stability.
- Typical mass difference in the various renorm. schemes ~200 MeV.
- Mass extracted from various cross section measurements while scanning $\sqrt{s}$, and then compared to theoretical predictions.
- Cross section measurement precision : 1-2% to reach <200 MeV.
- Expected precisions (CLIC analysis revisited for FCCee):
    - Stat uncertainty at ~15 MeV,
    - Beam energy, reconstruction efficiency and background contamination ~50 MeV ,
    - Luminosity ... ~10 MeV,
    - Strong dependence on α_s in the interpretation,
    - **Total uncertainty below 100 MeV**, from measurements of α_s (lower energies) => **reduction to < 50 MeV could be achievable**!
- Experimental uncertainties (close to be) dominated by statistics is possible at the FCCee !
- Direct top-quark mass measurements below 200 MeV also possible.





Top quark couplings to bosons

- Sensitivity on (anomalous) $t\bar{t}$ EWK couplings.
- Based on lepton energy and polar angle :
  - very low expected experimental uncertainties,
  - dominated by stat. uncertainties (and theory).
- Lower integrated lumi and larger boost at higher energies => better precision at 365 GeV than higher energies in most cases **(assuming lowish luminosity scenario for ILC).**

JHEP(2015)182





PLB 775(2017) 25-31

- Top-quark FCNC couplings to γ, Z, H usually probed in top quarks decays in $t\bar{t}$ (probably to be updated).
- Interesting channels at lepton colliders : single top production possible for $t\gamma$ and tZ-FCNC.
- Very promising channels : higher cross section, limited by statistics and background contamination (Wjj), $t\bar{t}$ channels still useful to disentangle $t\gamma$ from tZ.
- Large impact of b and c-tagging.

Conclusion

- The top-quark physics program at lepton colliders is rich.
- Large improvements in precision measurements and sensitivity to new physics.
- FCCee will deliver a large luminosity, with excellent beam conditions and low background contaminations, but **top quark physics is very relevant at any e^+e^- colliders** !
- A significant effort is being invested in increasing the maturity of FCCee analyses, with a strong interplay with detector performance.

Backup

Beam characteristics and impact on $t\bar{t}$ at FCCee

F.Simon, PoS (ICHEP 2016) 872





- Due to the energies involved and beam optimisation, there is some beam energy spread at $t\bar{t}$ thresholds.
- Beam energy spread (BES) systematics.
  - beam energy (spread) measured with dimuon-events at top energies to very precise values,
  - high muon resolution required, known better than ~10%.
- BES can be adjusted with machine optimisation.
- At FCCee : narrow and no tails toward lower energies
  - Beamstrahlung effects on beam profile small, energy loss recovered by RF.
- Impacts of energy spread on the $t\bar{t}$ threshold scan :broader ”turn-on”
- Other beam dependent effects
  - ISR => lower effective cross sections,
  - FCCee in a favourable position regarding BS.

Precision of $t\bar{t}$ cross section measurements

- Inclusive and differential => probe of $\boldsymbol{t\bar{t}}Z$ and $\boldsymbol{t\bar{t}}\gamma$ couplings (EFT related).



- Dominant backgrounds (lepton+jets):
  - WW(dominant)/ZZ
  - WWZ, ZH => more difficult to reject, but much lower cross section (/20).

- Events selection :
  - one (relatively loose) isolated lepton with E>10 GeV, 80-90% efficiency,
  - 4 jets reconstructed using an exclusive algorithm,
  - b-tagging requirements,
  - jets and lepton association to top-quark, with a kin-fit (W and top mass).

- Overall efficiency ~60% can be achieved (JHEP 11 (2019) 003), very high purity (>90%).

- Target **systematics ~few %** (even below ?)
  - physics backgrounds very small,
  - High selection efficiency : related to detector performance (lepton/jets selection, flavour tagging) => impact on acceptance and modelling uncertainties.
  - Excellent control of selection efficiencies (from data).



Search of new physics through EFT

New vertices arise from the contributions of new particles (new physics) living at the loop level.



If the new particles are heavy enough => modelling of the loop by a new interaction vertex.

Wilson coefficients (complex number)

Higher order are neglected

$$\mathcal{L}_{\rm eff} = \sum \frac{C_x}{\Lambda^2}\mathcal{O}_{6,x} + \sum \frac{C_x}{\Lambda^4}\mathcal{O}_{8,x} + \sum \frac{C_x}{\Lambda^6}\mathcal{O}_{10,x} + \dots$$

Energy scale of new physics

Dimension-6 gauge invariant operators

- Search for new physics through EFT.
- Thanks to high precision, lepton colliders are able to very significantly improve the sensitivity.

JHEP12(2019)098



Top-quark EFT : polarization vs statistics

- At linear colliders, to constrains EFT operators
  - beams polarization give an extra handle,
  - high energies can help to improve the sensitivity on some couplings, especially in multi-parameter fits,
  - Statistics help to improve the sensitivity.

JHEP10(2018)168



- Investigating EFT at FCCee (no polarisation, 365 GeV) :
  - Lower beam backgrounds and less ISR at lower energies,
  - Lower single top background at 365 GeV compared to 500 GeV,
  - Large statistics (for instance ~factor of 2 compared to the 500 fb^{-1} ILC scenario).

- Sensitivity on (anomalous) $t\bar{t}$ EWK couplings at FCCee. Based only lepton energy and polar angle :

$$\Gamma_\mu^{ttX} = -ie\left\{\gamma_\mu\left(F_{1V}^X + \gamma_5 F_{1A}^X\right) + \frac{\sigma_{\mu\nu}}{2m_t}(p_t + p_{\bar{t}})^\nu\left(iF_{2V}^X + \gamma_5 F_{2A}^X\right)\right\},$$

  - low expected experimental uncertainties,
  - dominated by stat. uncertainties.
  - ➔ high constrains without the need for polarisation.

JHEP(2015)182



- Unpolarized beam can still lead to strong constrains on top EWK couplings.

Direct measurement of top mass from decay products (above threshold)

CLIC, EPJC 73 (2013) 2530



- Direct mass measurement from top quark decay products (in a nutshell):
  - reconstruct and identify decay products,
  - reconstruct top quarks candidates using a kin fit (determine jets-lepton associations),
  - fit the reconstructed top mass with templates issued from MC generation. Simultaneous fit with JES reduces systematics,
  - requires "calibration" : input $m_t^{MC} \neq m_t^{reco}$.

- Comparisons with CMS top reconstruction at 13 TeV, 35.9 fb^{-1}.

- Estimations of the uncertainties (CLIC@380 GeV) :
  - stat: 30-40 MeV for $1ab^{-1}$,
  - moderate impact of JES : 2% variation of light and b jets = 200 and 350 MeV,
  - JES related uncertainties can be greatly reduced by including the perfect knowledge of the initial state into the events reconstruction,

- Direct top mass measurement can be competitive with the threshold scan measurement.

Top quark couplings to bosons





PLB 775(2017) 25-31

- Top-quark Flavour Changing Neutral current => clear sign of new physics.
- Top-quark FCNC couplings can probed in $t\bar{t}$ with $t \to Xq$ $(X = \gamma, Z, H$ and $q = u, c)$, but also in single top signatures.
- Single top production possible for $t\gamma$ – and tZ-FCNC, already accessible at $\sqrt{s} = 240\ GeV$.
- Very promising channels : higher cross section than $t\bar{t}$, limited by statistics and background contamination (Wjj),
- Ultimately : combination of single top and $t\bar{t}$ channels ($t\bar{t}$ channels still useful to disentangle $t\gamma$ from tZ).
- Large impact of b and c-tagging.

Detector impact on flavour tagging

CLICdp-Note-2018-005



- Flavour (b/c)-tagging is a key element for top quark physics.
  - $\varepsilon_{t\bar{t}} \propto \varepsilon_b^2$,
  - Top-FCNC , $t \to cH(b\bar{b})$, $\varepsilon_{tHc} \propto \varepsilon_b^2 \varepsilon_c$.
- B-tagging and c-tagging performances for various single point resolutions.
- From 7μ to 3μ:
  - ε_b: ~8%(abs.) improvement at $\varepsilon_l \approx 1\%$,
  - ε_c: ~18%(abs) improvement at $\varepsilon_l \approx 10\%$.
- ➔ increase of ~10% abs (**20% rel**) of $\varepsilon_{t\bar{t}}$ (for Medium P…) and ~15% abs (**75% rel**) of ε_{tHc}.
- Physics performance ⬄ detector designs.

Discussions on backgrounds

- List of the main background and cross sections.

Beam backgrounds (large angle) M.Dam link

Energy	Process	Cross Section	Large angle $e^+e^- \to \gamma\gamma$	Large angle $e^+e^- \to e^+e^-$
90 GeV	$e^+e^- \to Z$	40 nb	0.039 nb	2.9 nb
160 GeV	$e^+e^- \to W^+W^-$	4 pb	15 pb	301 pb
240 GeV	$e^+e^- \to ZH$	0.2 pb	5.6 pb	134 pb
350 GeV	$e^+e^- \to tt$	0.5 pb	2.6 pb	60 pb



Interacting points





Top mass : target

JHEP08 98 (2012)



- Objectives of top mass measurement :
  - Test of the SM, yukawa couplings and top mass,
  - Confront pole mass to the “MC” mass (differences of a coupe f hundreds MeV),
  - Study of the stability of the vacuum, differentiations between stable and meta-stable universe.

Beam background



(a) (b)

Figure 17: Hit densities in the CLD tracking detector barrel layers (a) and discs (b) for particles originating from incoherent pairs, for operation at 365 GeV. Vertical error bars show the statistical uncertainty, horizontal bars indicate the bin size. Safety factors for the simulation uncertainties are not included.



(a) (b)

Figure 18: As Figure 17 but for hits related to synchrotron radiation photons.

Breit-Wheeler

$$\gamma + \gamma \rightarrow e^- + e^+$$

Bethe-Heitler

$$\gamma + e^\pm \rightarrow e^\pm + e^- + e^+$$

Landau-Lifshitz

$$e + e \rightarrow e + e + e^- + e^+$$

Bremsstrahlung

$$e + e \rightarrow e + e + \gamma$$

$\sqrt{s}$ (GeV)	91.2	365
Total particles	800	6200
Total E (GeV)	500	9250
Particles with $p_T \geq 5\,\text{MeV}$ and $\theta \geq 8^\circ$	6	290

Rates of electron pair backgruonds



Fig. 7.2. Rates of $e^{\pm}$ from IPC in the (p_{T}, θ) plane, in the detector frame, for $\sqrt{s} = 91.2\,\mathrm{GeV}$ (left) and 365 GeV (right). The black line in the upper-right corner delineates the CLD vertex detector acceptance within a field of 2 T.



Figure 62: Global performance of beauty tagging (left) and charm tagging (right) for jets in di-jet events at $\sqrt{s} = 500\,\text{GeV}$ with a mixture of polar angles between 20° and 90°. A comparison of performance obtained with different single point resolutions in the vertex detector is presented. On the y-axis, the misidentification probability and the ratio of misidentification probabilities with respect to the nominal (3 μm) single point resolution are given.



Notes. The second column refers to the number of photons incident at 500 μm from mask tip and with an energy >1 keV, the third and fourth columns give the incident number of photons in the central beam pipe per beam crossing and per second, respectively. Solenoid fields and collimators were not taken into account. Note that this table was calculated for an older version of the beam optics with a maximum beam energy of 175 GeV. For the more recent optics of Section 2.4 even at a beam energy of 182.5 GeV the critical photon energy is below 100 keV.

Table 2.7. Summary of the SR coming from the last soft bend upstream of the IP.

E_{beam} GeV	$E_{critical}$ keV	Incident γ/crossing (500 μm from tip)	Incoming on central pipe/crossing	γ rate on central pipe (Hz)
182.5	113.4.	3.32×10^9	1195	1.18×10^8
175	100	3.06×10^9	1040	1.25×10^8
125	36.4	1.05×10^9	10.3	1.01×10^7
80	9.56	6.11×10^8	0.18	7.02×10^5
45.6	1.77	9.62×10^7	1.92×10^{-4}	9.58×10^3

Status top FCNC at LHC



Do we need a trigger at $t\bar{t}$ threshold ?

- Trigger (at least software) might be foreseen for the Z run.
- Effects of trigger selection on analysis (my LHC bias) :
  - Could cause lower signal efficiencies ?
  - Systematics on the trigger efficiency ?

- At FCCee : mainly to reject beam-backgrounds, we want to keep all physic backgrounds (physics, alignment, calibrations and efficiencies measurements etc…).

- Rate of bunch crossing at $t\bar{t}$ (back of the envelop) : ~3000 ns of bunch spacing => ~300kHz, that is ~3 times the actual CMS/ATLAS L1 trigger rate, but half of the HL rates.

- Can/should we avoid L1 and/or HLT triggers ?

- (Naïve) questions to answer :
  - What is the rate of beam backgrounds ?
  - What is a typical size of an event ?
  - What is the needed readout speed and disk throughput ?

- At minima : low trigger requirements to detect a collision (a la LEP). Trigger systematics should be small !



General (naïve) comments on detector design "optimisation"

- Needs (resolutions, efficiencies etc…) for top quark physics are probably very similar to the Higgs physics, at first order.
- We need to verify this assumption at $t\bar{t}$ threshold **(different beam conditions and backgrounds)!**



- Tools needed for Physics performance studies :
  - FastSim => interesting to test sensitivity on detector performance, but rapidly limited,
  - FullSim => ultimately needed, but takes time, need (flexible) reconstruction,
  - Intermediate approach with some modelling ? Partial fullsim (not entire detector) to feed fastsim?
- Developments need to proceed in parallel.
- Enough work on all topics to keep us busy for years.

- Some of this work already done for CLD/IDEA : do we want to join effort there, or create our own design? A lot to learn from ILC/CLIC here as well !

High involvement required !

Franco Grancagnolo, FCC-France link





	vertex detector	tracker	calorimeter	magnet and muon detector
CLD	3 double layers + 3 double disks 25μm×25μm pixel 50μm sensor 0.6-0.7% X_0 per double layer	pixel and μ-strips 7μm×90μm (5μm×5μm 1st layer) point resolution 3 layers + 7 disks inner tracker 3 layers + 4 disks outer tracker 1-1.5% X_0 per layer	ECAL 20cm 5m×5m Si-W 1.9mm W 40 layers 22X_0, 1λ HCAL 117cm 30mm×30mm Sci-steel 19mm steel 44 layers 5.5λ	90 mm Al coil 2T field 1.5m steel yoke 6 layers RPC 30mm×30mm granularity
IDEA	3 double layers 20μm×20μm double μ-strips 50μm×1mm 4 forward disks 50μm×50μm 0.6-1% X_0 per double layer	112 layers 1.4 cm square cells 100μm×750μm point resolution Si wrapper 50μm×1mm 1.5% X_0 radially 5% X_0 forward	fully projective towers Δϑ = 1.125° Δϕ = 10.0° 2880 in barrel 2×1260 end-cap 2m Cu 8.2λ	30cm total envelope 2T field cold mass + cryostat 0.28 + 0.46 X_0 0.6m steel yoke 3 layers μ-RWELL 1.5mm×500mm granularity

14/05/2020 F. Grancagnolo - IDEA and CLD at FCC-ee 11

Beam backgrounds at $t\bar{t}$ threshold

- Beam Backgrounds (CDR) :
  - $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow hadrons$ found to be negligible,
  - Synchrotron Radiation (SR) from last bending magnet,
  - Incoherent Pair Creation (IPC, e^+e^- pair via interaction with beamstrahlung).

- Effects estimated from full simulation, impact on the CLD vertex detector shown.
  - SR largely reduced by shielding : #hits/BX reduced by 2 order of magnitude to achieved 700 hits/BX (<40 extra MeV per bunch crossing),
  - IPC contribution significant (especially in first layers), but moderate => acceptance choices.

$\sqrt{s}$ (GeV)	91.2	365
Total particles	800	6200
Total E (GeV)	500	9250
Particles with $p_T \geq 5\,\text{MeV}$ and $\theta \geq 8°$	6	290

First CLD layer acceptance



Beam backgrounds at $t\bar{t}$ threshold

- Beam Backgrounds :
  - $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow hadrons$ found to be negligible,
  - Synchrotron Radiation (SR) from last bending magnet,
  - Incoherent Pair Creation (IPC, e^+e^- pair via interaction with beamstrahlung).

- Effects estimated from full simulation, impact on the CLD vertex detector shown.
  - SR largely reduced by shielding : #hits/BX reduced by 2 order of magnitude to achieved 700 hits/BX (<40 extra MeV per bunch crossing),
  - IPC contribution significant (especially in first layers), but moderate => acceptance choices.

$\sqrt{s}$ (GeV)	91.2	365
Total particles	800	6200
Total E (GeV)	500	9250
Particles with $p_{\mathrm{T}} \geq 5\,\mathrm{MeV}$ and $\theta \geq 8°$	6	290

First CLD layer acceptance



Generators : aMC@NLO and Whizard

- Having "state-of-the-art" generators is a key element for precisions
  - Maximum possible accuracy : NLO QCD+QED,
  - NLL+NLO matching : differential cross sections at threshold, effects of $\sqrt{s}$ on kinematics,
  - Account for the beam effects discussed above,
  - We need at least 2 generators to perform comparisons,
  - Two generators under investigations : Whizard and aMC@NLO.

- Both generators contains most of the key elements (in a not-yet public release for aMC@NLO link) :
  - NLO accuracy, **Whizard** : QCD+QED, **MadGraph** :QCD (QED under developments for e+e-),
  - Initial State (QED) Radiation, **both,**
  - Beamstrahlung : **Whizard** : interface with GuineaPig/CIRCE. **MadGraph** : parametrization fitted to GuineaPig++.
  - Beam Energy Spread : **Whizard** : Gaussian smearing in case of FCCee, **Madgraph** : not available yet.

Whizard

JHEP 1803 (2018) 184



$e^+e^- \to W^+bW^-\bar{b}$, $N_{\mathrm{jets}} \geq 2$, $\sqrt{s} = 344\mathrm{GeV}$ Whizard



aMC@NLO