Max Baak (CERN),
on behalf of the Gfitter group (*)

Seminar at LAPP, Annecy,
25th October 2013

Gfitter

http://cern.ch/Gfitter

EPJC 72, 2205 (2012), arXiv:1209.2716

After the Higgs: Status and Prospects of The ElectroWeak fit of the SM and Beyond





(*) M. Baak, J. Cuth, J. Haller, A. Höcker, R. Kogler, K. Mönig, M. Schott, J. Stelzer

Outline

Gfitter

This presentation:

- Introduction to the Electroweak Fit
  - Inputs to the electroweak fit
- ✓ After the Higgs: predictions for key observables
- ✓ BSM: Modified Higgs couplings
- ✓ Prospects for LHC-300 and ILC/GigaZ
- Conclusion & Outlook

The Gfitter Project – Introduction

Gfitter

A Generic Fitter Project
for HEP Model Testing

- Gfitter = state-of-the-art HEP model testing tool for LHC era

- Latest results always available at: http://cern.ch/Gfitter
  - *(Most) results of this presentation: EPJC 72, 2205 (2012)*
  - *LHC-300 and ILC/GigaZ prospects paper to appear on arXiv this week !*

- Gfitter software and features:
  - Modular, object-oriented C++, relying on ROOT, XML, python, etc.
  - Core package with data-handling, fitting, and statistics tools
  - Independent "plug-in" physics libraries: SM, 2HDM, multiple BSM models, ...

The global electroweak fit of the SM



Idea behind electroweak fits

- ✓ Observables receive quantum loop corrections from 'unseen' virtual effects.

- ✓ If system is over-constrained, one can fit for unknown parameters or test the model's self-consistency.

- ✓ If precision is better than typical loop factor ($\alpha \approx 1/137$), test the model or try to obtain info on new physics in loops.
  - For example, in the past EW fits were used to predict the Higgs mass.

Global EW fits: a long history

- Huge amount of pioneering work by many!
  - Needed to understand importance of loop corrections
    - Important observables (now) known at least at two-loop order, sometimes more.
  - High-precision Standard Model (SM) predictions and measurements required
    - First from LEP/SLC, then Tevatron, now LHC.



- Top mass predictions from loop effects available since ~1990.
  - Official LEPEW fit since 1993.
- The EW fits have always been able to predict the top mass correctly!

Global EW fits: many fit codes

- EW fits performed by many groups in past and present.
  - D. Bardinet al. (ZFITTER), G. Passarino et al. (TOPAZ0), LEPEW WG (M. Grünewald, K. Mönig et al.), J. Erler (GAP), Bayesian fit (M. Ciuchini, L. Silvestrini et al.), etc …
  - Important results obtained!
- Several groups pursuing global beyond-SM fits, especially SUSY.
- Global SM fits also used at lower energies [CKM-matrix].



- Fits of the different groups agree very well.

- Some differences in treatment of theory errors, which just start to matter.
  - E.g. Gfitter uses “R-fit prescription”: theoretical uncertainties included in χ^2 with flat likelihood in allowed ranges
    - I.e. theoretical and experimental errors added linearly (= conservative).

The predictive power of the SM

- As the Z boson couples to all fermions, it is ideal to measure & study both the electroweak and strong interactions.
- Tree level relations for $Z \to f\bar{f}$
  - $i\bar{f}\gamma^\mu \left(g_{V,f} - g_{A,f}\gamma_5\right) f Z_\mu$





- Prediction EWSB at tree-level: $$\frac{M_W^2}{M_Z^2 c_W^2} = 1$$

- The impact of loop corrections
  - Absorbed into EW form factors: ρ, κ, Δr
  - Effective couplings at the Z-pole
  - Quadraticly dependent on m_t, *logarithmic* dependence on M_H

$$g_{V,f} = \sqrt{\rho_Z^f}\left(I_3^f - 2Q^f \sin^2\theta_{\text{eff}}^f\right)$$

$$g_{A,f} = \sqrt{\rho_Z^f} I_3^f$$

$$\sin^2\theta_{\text{eff}}^f = \kappa_Z^f \sin^2\theta_W$$

$$M_W^2 = \frac{M_Z^2}{2}\left(1 + \sqrt{1 - \frac{\sqrt{8}\pi\alpha(1+\Delta r)}{G_F M_Z^2}}\right)$$



Hunt for the Higgs

Gfitter group, EPJC 72, 2003 (2012)



- M_H was last missing input parameter of the electroweak fit
- Indirect determination from EW fit (2012): $M_H = 96^{+31}_{-24}$ GeV
  - With direct limits incorporated in the EW fit: $M_H = 120^{+12}_{-5}$ GeV

The SM fit with Gfitter, including the Higgs

- Discovery of Higgs-like boson at LHC
  - Cross section, production rate time branching ratios, spin, parity sofar compatible with SM Higgs boson.
- This talk: assume boson is SM Higgs.

- Use in EW fit: M_H = 125.7 ± 0.4 GeV
  - ATLAS: M_H = 126.0 ± 0.4 ± 0.4 GeV
  - CMS: M_H = 125.3 ± 0.4 ± 0.5 GeV

    [arXiv:1207.7214, arXiv:1207.7235]

- Change in average between fully uncorrelated and fully correlated systematic uncertainties is minor: δM_H : 0.4 → 0.5 GeV





The SM fit with Gfitter, including the Higgs

Unique situation:

- *For first time SM is fully over-constrained.*
- *And for first time electroweak observables can be unambiguously predicted at loop level.*
- *Powerful predictions of key observables now possible, much better than w/o M_H*

Can now test for:

→ Self-consistency of SM

→ Possible contributions from BSM models

- The focus of this talk …

Measurements at the Z-pole (1/2)

- Total cross-section of $Z \to f\bar{f}$
  - Expressed in terms of partial decay width of initial and final width:

$$\sigma^Z_{f\bar{f}} = \sigma^0_{f\bar{f}} \frac{s\Gamma_Z^2}{(s - M_Z^2)^2 + s^2\Gamma_Z^2/M_Z^2} \frac{1}{R_{\mathrm{QED}}} \quad \text{with} \quad \sigma^0_{f\bar{f}} = \frac{12\pi}{M_Z^2} \frac{\Gamma_{ee}\Gamma_{f\bar{f}}}{\Gamma_Z^2}$$

Corrected for QED radiation

  - Full width: $\Gamma_Z = \Gamma_{ee} + \Gamma_{\mu\mu} + \Gamma_{\tau\tau} + \Gamma_{\mathrm{had}} + \Gamma_{\mathrm{inv}}$
  - (Correlated set of measurements.)

- Set of input (width) parameters to EW fit:
  - Z mass and width: M_Z, Γ_Z
  - Hadronic pole cross section:

$$\sigma^0_{\mathrm{had}} = 12\pi/M_Z^2 \cdot \Gamma_{ee}\Gamma_{\mathrm{had}}/\Gamma_Z^2$$

  - Three leptonic ratios (lepton univ.):

$$R^0_\ell = R^0_e = \Gamma_{\mathrm{had}}/\Gamma_{ee} \; (= R^0_\mu = R^0_\tau)$$

  - Hadronic-width ratios: R^0_b, R^0_c



Measurements at the Z-pole (2/2)

- Definition of Asymmetry
  - Distinguish vector and axial-vector couplings of the Z

$$A_f = \frac{g_{L,f}^2 - g_{R,f}^2}{g_{L,f}^2 + g_{R,f}^2} = \frac{2 g_{V,f}\, g_{A,f}}{g_{V,f}^2 + g_{A,f}^2}$$

  - Directly related to: $\sin^2\theta_{\mathrm{eff}}^{f\bar{f}} = \frac{1}{4Q_f}\left(1 + \mathcal{R}e\left(\frac{g_{V,f}}{g_{A,f}}\right)\right)$

- Observables
  - In case of no beam polarisation (LEP) use final state angular distribution to define *forward/backward asymmetry:*

$$A_{FB}^{f} = \frac{N_F^f - N_B^f}{N_F^f + N_B^f} \qquad A_{FB}^{0,f} = \frac{3}{4} A_e A_f$$

  - Polarised beams (SLC), define *left/right asymmetry:*

$$A_{LR}^{f} = \frac{N_L^f - N_R^f}{N_L^f + N_R^f}\,\frac{1}{\langle |P|_e \rangle} \qquad A_{LR}^{0} = A_e$$

  - Measurements: $A_{FB}^{0,\ell}$, $A_{FB}^{0,c}$, $A_{FB}^{0,b}$, A_ℓ, A_c, A_b

Latest averages for M_W and m_{top}

Latest Tevatron result from: arXiv:1204.0042





Tevatron result from: arXiv:1305.3929



(LHC average: $173.29 \pm 0.95\ \mathrm{GeV}/c^2$)

The electromagnetic coupling

- The EW fit requires precise knowledge of $\alpha(M_Z)$ – better than 1% level
  - Enters various places: hadr. radiator functions, predictions of M_W and $\sin^2\theta^f_{eff}$
- Conventionally parametrized as ($\alpha(0)$ = fine structure constant) :

$$\alpha(s) = \frac{\alpha(0)}{1 - \Delta\alpha(s)}$$

- Evolution with renormalization scale:

$$\Delta\alpha(s) = \Delta\alpha_{\rm lep}(s) + \Delta\alpha^{(5)}_{\rm had}(s) + \Delta\alpha_{\rm top}(s)$$

The electromagnetic coupling

- The EW fit requires precise knowledge of $\alpha(M_Z)$ – better than 1% level
  - Enters various places: hadr. radiator functions, predictions of M_W and $\sin^2\theta^f_{eff}$
- Conventionally parametrized as ($\alpha(0)$ = fine structure constant) :

$$\alpha(s) = \frac{\alpha(0)}{1 - \Delta\alpha(s)}$$

- Evolution with renormalization scale:

$$\Delta\alpha(s) = \Delta\alpha_{\rm lep}(s) + \Delta\alpha^{(5)}_{\rm had}(s) + \Delta\alpha_{\rm top}(s)$$

- Leptonic term known up to *four* loops (for $q^2 \gg m_l^2$) [C.Sturm, arXiv: 1305.0581]
- Top quark contribution known up to 2 loops, *small: -0.7×10^{-4}* [M. Steinhauser, PLB 429, 158 (1998)]

The electromagnetic coupling

- The EW fit requires precise knowledge of $\alpha(M_Z)$ – better than 1% level
  - Enters various places: hadr. radiator functions, predictions of M_W and $\sin^2\theta^f_{eff}$
- Conventionally parametrized as ($\alpha(0)$ = fine structure constant) :

$$\alpha(s) = \frac{\alpha(0)}{1 - \Delta\alpha(s)}$$

- Evolution with renormalization scale:

$$\Delta\alpha(s) = \Delta\alpha_{\mathrm{lep}}(s) + \Delta\alpha^{(5)}_{\mathrm{had}}(s) + \Delta\alpha_{\mathrm{top}}(s)$$

- Hadronic contribution (from the 5 light quarks) completely dominates overall uncertainty on $\alpha(M_Z)$.

- Difficult to calculate, cannot be obtained from pQCD alone.
  - Analysis of low-energy e^+e^- data
  - Usage of pQCD if lack of data

$$\Delta\alpha^{(5)}_{had}(M_Z) = (274.9 \pm 1.0)\cdot 10^{-4}$$

- Similar analysis to evaluation of hadronic contribution to $(g-2)_\mu$

[M. Davier et al., Eur. Phys. J. C71, 1515 (2011)]

Theoretical inputs

- Radiative corrections are important!
  - E.g. consider tree-level EW unification relation: $$M_W^2\Big|_{\text{tree-level}} = \frac{M_Z^2}{2}\cdot\left(1+\sqrt{1-\frac{\sqrt{8}\pi\alpha}{G_F M_Z^2}}\right)$$
    - This predicts: $M_W = (79.964 \pm 0.005)$ GeV
    - Experiment: $M_W = (80.385 \pm 0.015)$ GeV
- Without loop corrections: shift of 400 MeV, 27σ discrepancy!

Theoretical inputs

- Radiative corrections are important!
  - E.g. consider tree-level EW unification relation:
    - This predicts: $M_W = (79.964 \pm 0.005)$ GeV
    - Experiment: $M_W = (80.385 \pm 0.015)$ GeV

$$M_W^2\Big|_{\text{tree-level}} = \frac{M_Z^2}{2} \cdot \left(1 + \sqrt{1 - \frac{\sqrt{8}\pi\alpha}{G_F M_Z^2}}\right)$$

- Without loop corrections: shift of 400 MeV, 27σ discrepancy!

- In EW fit with Gfitter we use state-of-the-art calculations:
  - M_W Mass of the W boson [M. Awramik et al., Phys. Rev. D69, 053006 (2004)]
  - $\sin^2\theta^f_{\text{eff}}$ Effective weak mixing angle [M. Awramik et al., JHEP 11, 048 (2006), M. Awramik et al., Nucl.Phys.B813:174-187 (2009)]
    - Full two-loop + leading beyond-two-loop form factor corrections
  - Γ_{had} QCD Adler functions at N^3LO [P. A. Baikov et al., PRL108, 222003 (2012)]
    - N^3LO prediction of the hadronic cross section
  - R_b Partial width of $Z \to bb$ [Freitas et al., JHEP08, 050 (2012)] ⟵ **Update! EW 2-loop calc.**

Theoretical inputs

- Radiative corrections are important!
  - E.g. consider tree-level EW unification relation:
    $$M_W^2\Big|_{\text{tree-level}} = \frac{M_Z^2}{2}\cdot\left(1+\sqrt{1-\frac{\sqrt{8}\pi\alpha}{G_F M_Z^2}}\right)$$
    - This predicts: $M_W = (79.964 \pm 0.005)$ GeV
    - Experiment: $M_W = (80.385 \pm 0.015)$ GeV
- Without loop corrections: shift of 400 MeV, 27σ discrepancy!

- In EW fit with Gfitter we use state-of-the-art calculations:
  - M_W Mass of the W boson [M. Awramik et al., Phys. Rev. D69, 053006 (2004)]
  - $\sin^2\theta^f_{\text{eff}}$ Effective weak mixing angle [M. Awramik et al., JHEP 11, 048 (2006), M. Awramik et al., Nucl.Phys.B813:174-187 (2009)]
    - Full two-loop + leading beyond-two-loop form factor corrections
  - Γ_{had} QCD Adler functions at N^3LO [P. A. Baikov et al., PRL108, 222003 (2012)]
    - N^3LO prediction of the hadronic cross section
  - R_b Partial width of $Z\to bb$ [Freitas et al., JHEP08, 050 (2012)] ⟵ **Update! EW 2-loop calc.**
- Two nuisance parameters in EW fit for theoretical uncertainties:
  - *δM_W (4 MeV), $\delta\sin^2\theta^l_{\text{eff}}$ (4.7×10^{-5})*

Updated calculation of R_b

- The branching ratio R^0_b = partial decay width of $Z \to bb$ to $Z \to qq$

- We use calculation with full EW 2-loop corrections of $Z \to bb$
  - From A. Freitas etal, JHEP 1208 (2012) 050, Erratum. 1305 (2013) 074.

Recently a mistake was found in this calculation.

- ***Old:*** Two-loop corrections to R^0_b comparable to experimental uncertainty (6.6×10^{-4})
  - Moved theoretical prediction by 1.5σ
    - Much more than the originally estimated theory uncertainty!
- ***New:*** bug in calculation of R^0_b has been corrected, resulting in a sizable reduction of the size of the two-loop correction.

- All results shown here and on Gfitter homepage use the corrected R^0_b calculation.

- Latest experimental inputs:
  - Z-pole observables: from LEP / SLC
    [ADLO+SLD, Phys. Rept. 427, 257 (2006)]
  - M_W and Γ_W from LEP/Tevatron
    [arXiv:1204.0042, arXiv:1302.3415]
  - m_{top} latest avg from Tevatron
    [arXiv:1305.3929]
  - m_c, m_b world averages (PDG)
    [PDG, J. Phys. G33,1 (2006)]
  - $\Delta\alpha_{had}^{(5)}(M_Z^2)$ including α_S dependency
    [Davier et al., EPJC 71, 1515 (2011)]
  - M_H from LHC
    [arXiv:1207.7214, arXiv:1207.7235]
- 7 (+2) free fit parameters:
  - M_H, M_Z, $\alpha_S(M_Z^2)$, $\Delta\alpha_{had}^{(5)}(M_Z^2)$, m_t, m_c, m_b
  - 2 theory nuisance parameters
    - δM_W (4 MeV), $\delta\sin^2\theta^l_{eff}$ (4.7×10^{-5})

M_H [GeV]$^\circ$	125.7 ± 0.4	LHC
M_W [GeV]	80.385 ± 0.015	Tevatron
Γ_W [GeV]	2.085 ± 0.042	Tevatron
M_Z [GeV]	91.1875 ± 0.0021	LEP
Γ_Z [GeV]	2.4952 ± 0.0023	LEP
σ^0_{had} [nb]	41.540 ± 0.037	LEP
R^0_ℓ	20.767 ± 0.025	LEP
$A^{0,\ell}_{FB}$	0.0171 ± 0.0010	LEP
A_ℓ $^{(\star)}$	0.1499 ± 0.0018	LEP / SLC
$\sin^2\theta^\ell_{eff}(Q_{FB})$	0.2324 ± 0.0012	LEP
A_c	0.670 ± 0.027	SLC
A_b	0.923 ± 0.020	SLC
$A^{0,c}_{FB}$	0.0707 ± 0.0035	LEP
$A^{0,b}_{FB}$	0.0992 ± 0.0016	LEP
R^0_c	0.1721 ± 0.0030	LEP / SLC
R^0_b	0.21629 ± 0.00066	LEP / SLC
$\overline{m}_c$ [GeV]	$1.27^{+0.07}_{-0.11}$	
$\overline{m}_b$ [GeV]	$4.20^{+0.17}_{-0.07}$	
m_t [GeV]	173.20 ± 0.87	Tevatron
$\Delta\alpha^{(5)}_{had}(M_Z^2)$ $^{(\dagger\triangle)}$	2756 ± 10	

Electroweak Fit – SM Fit Results

- From the Gfitter Group, EPJC 72, 2205 (2012)
- Left: full fit incl. M_H
- Middle: not incl. M_H
- Right: fit incl M_H, not the row

Parameter	Input value	Free in fit	Fit Result	Fit without M_H measurements	Fit without exp. input in line
M_H [GeV]°	$125.7^{+0.4}_{-0.4}$	yes	$125.7^{+0.4}_{-0.4}$	94.7^{+25}_{-22}	94.7^{+25}_{-22}
M_W [GeV]	80.385 ± 0.015	–	$80.367^{+0.006}_{-0.007}$	$80.367^{+0.006}_{-0.007}$	80.360 ± 0.011
Γ_W [GeV]	2.085 ± 0.042	–	2.091 ± 0.001	2.091 ± 0.001	2.091 ± 0.001
M_Z [GeV]	91.1875 ± 0.0021	yes	91.1878 ± 0.0021	91.1878 ± 0.0021	91.1978 ± 0.0114
Γ_Z [GeV]	2.4952 ± 0.0023	–	2.4954 ± 0.0014	2.4954 ± 0.0014	2.4950 ± 0.0017
$\sigma^0_{\rm had}$ [nb]	41.540 ± 0.037	–	41.479 ± 0.014	41.479 ± 0.014	41.471 ± 0.015
R^0_ℓ	20.767 ± 0.025	–	20.740 ± 0.017	20.740 ± 0.017	20.715 ± 0.026
$A^{0,\ell}_{\rm FB}$	0.0171 ± 0.0010	–	$0.01626^{+0.0001}_{-0.0002}$	$0.01626^{+0.0001}_{-0.0002}$	0.01624 ± 0.0002
A_ℓ $^{(\star)}$	0.1499 ± 0.0018	–	0.1472 ± 0.0007	0.1472 ± 0.0007	–
$\sin^2\theta^\ell_{\rm eff}(Q_{\rm FB})$	0.2324 ± 0.0012	–	$0.23149^{+0.00010}_{-0.00008}$	$0.23149^{+0.00010}_{-0.00008}$	0.23150 ± 0.00009
A_c	0.670 ± 0.027	–	$0.6679^{+0.00034}_{-0.00028}$	$0.6679^{+0.00034}_{-0.00028}$	0.6680 ± 0.00031
A_b	0.923 ± 0.020	–	$0.93464^{+0.00005}_{-0.00007}$	$0.93464^{+0.00005}_{-0.00007}$	0.93463 ± 0.00006
$A^{0,c}_{\rm FB}$	0.0707 ± 0.0035	–	0.0738 ± 0.0004	0.0738 ± 0.0004	0.0737 ± 0.0004
$A^{0,b}_{\rm FB}$	0.0992 ± 0.0016	–	0.1032 ± 0.0005	0.1032 ± 0.0005	0.1034 ± 0.0003
R^0_c	0.1721 ± 0.0030	–	0.17223 ± 0.00006	0.17223 ± 0.00006	0.17223 ± 0.00006
R^0_b	0.21629 ± 0.00066	–	0.21548 ± 0.00005	0.21548 ± 0.00005	0.21547 ± 0.00005
$\overline{m}_c$ [GeV]	$1.27^{+0.07}_{-0.11}$	yes	$1.27^{+0.07}_{-0.11}$	$1.27^{+0.07}_{-0.11}$	–
$\overline{m}_b$ [GeV]	$4.20^{+0.17}_{-0.07}$	yes	$4.20^{+0.17}_{-0.07}$	$4.20^{+0.17}_{-0.07}$	–
m_t [GeV]	173.20 ± 0.87	yes	173.53 ± 0.82	173.53 ± 0.82	$176.11^{+2.88}_{-2.35}$
$\Delta\alpha^{(5)}_{\rm had}(M^2_Z)$ $^{(\dagger\triangle)}$	2757 ± 10	yes	2755 ± 11	2755 ± 11	2718^{+49}_{-43}
$\alpha_s(M^2_Z)$	–	yes	$0.1190^{+0.0028}_{-0.0027}$	$0.1190^{+0.0028}_{-0.0027}$	0.1190 ± 0.0027
$\delta_{\rm th} M_W$ [MeV]	$[-4, 4]_{\rm theo}$	yes	4	4	–
$\delta_{\rm th} \sin^2\theta^\ell_{\rm eff}$ $^{(\dagger)}$	$[-4.7, 4.7]_{\rm theo}$	yes	-0.6	-0.5	–

Electroweak Fit – SM Fit Results

- Results drawn as *pull values:* → deviations to the *indirect* determinations, divided by *total error.*
- Total error: *error of direct measurement plus error from indirect determination.*

- Black: direct measurement (data)
- Orange: full fit
- Light-blue: fit excluding input from the row

- The prediction (light blue) is often more precise than the measurement!



Electroweak Fit – SM Fit Results

- Results drawn as *pull values:* → deviations to the *indirect* determinations, divided by *total error*.
- Total error: *error of direct measurement plus error from indirect determination.*

- Black: direct measurement (data)
- Orange: full fit
- Light-blue: fit excluding input from the row

- The prediction (light blue) is often more precise than the measurement!



Electroweak Fit – SM Fit Results



Plot inspired by Eberhardt et al. [arXiv:1209.1101]

- No individual value exceeds 3σ
- Small pulls for M_H, M_Z, $\Delta\alpha_{had}^{(5)}(M_Z^2)$, $\overline{m}_c$, $\overline{m}_b$ indicate that input accuracies exceed fit requirements
- Largest deviations in b-sector: $A^{0,b}_{FB}$ with 2.5σ
  - → largest contribution to χ^2
- R^0_b using one-loop calculation -0.8σ
  - R^0_b has only little dependence on M_H
- Most affected when including M_H : M_W prediction:
  - Shift in predicted M_W value of ~13 MeV.



- Toy analysis: p-value for wrongly rejecting the SM = $18^{+2\,(theo)}$ %
  - p-value is equivalent to 0.9σ
  - Evaluated with 20k pseudo experiments – follows χ^2 with 14 d.o.f.
  - For comparison: χ^2_{min}= 18.1 → Prob(χ^2_{min}, 14) = 20 %
- Large value of χ^2_{min} *not* due to inclusion of M_H measurement.
  - Without M_H measurement: χ^2_{min}= 16.7 → Prob(χ^2_{min}, 13) = 21%

Higgs results of the EW fit

- Scan of $\Delta\chi^2$ profile versus M_H
  - Grey band: fit w/o M_H measurement
  - Blue line: full SM fit, with M_H meas.
  - Fit w/o M_H measurement gives: $M_H = 94^{+25}_{-22}$ GeV
  - Consistent at 1.3σ with LHC measurement.



- Bottom plot: impact of other most sensitive Higgs observables
  - Determination of M_H removing all sensitive observables except the given one.
  - Known tension (2.5σ) between A_l(SLD), $A^{0,b}_{FB}$, and M_W clearly visible.

fit below only includes the given observable



Indirect determination of W mass

- Scan of $\Delta\chi^2$ profile versus M_W
  - Also shown: SM fit with minimal inputs: M_Z, G_F, $\Delta\alpha_{had}^{(5)}(M_Z)$, $\alpha_s(M_Z)$, M_H, and fermion masses
  - Good consistency between total fit and SM w/ minimal inputs



- M_H measurement allows for precise constraint on M_W
  - Agreement at 1.4σ
- Fit result for indirect determination of M_W (full fit w/o M_W):

$$M_W = 80.3593 \pm 0.0056_{m_t} \pm 0.0026_{M_Z} \pm 0.0018_{\Delta\alpha_{\rm had}} \pm 0.0017_{\alpha_S} \pm 0.0002_{M_H} \pm 0.0040_{\rm theo}$$

$$= 80.359 \pm 0.011_{\rm tot} \,,$$

- More precise estimate of M_W than the direct measurements!
  - Uncertainty on world average measurement: 15 MeV

Indirect effective weak mixing angle

- Right: scan of $\Delta\chi^2$ profile versus $\sin^2\theta^l_{eff}$
  - All sensitive measurements removed from the SM fit.
  - Also shown: SM fit with minimal inputs
- M_H measurement allows for very precise constraint on $\sin^2\theta^l_{eff}$



- Fit result for indirect determination of $\sin^2\theta^l_{eff}$:

$$\sin^2\theta^\ell_{\rm eff} = 0.231496 \pm 0.000030_{m_t} \pm 0.000015_{M_Z} \pm 0.000035_{\Delta\alpha_{\rm had}} \pm 0.000010_{\alpha_S} \pm 0.000002_{M_H} \pm 0.000047_{\rm theo} ,$$

$$= 0.23150 \pm 0.00010_{\rm tot} ,$$

- More precise than direct determination (from LEP/SLD) !
  - Uncertainty on LEP/SLD average: $1.6\text{x}10^{-4}$

Indirect determination of top mass



- Shown: scan of $\Delta\chi^2$ profile versus m_t (without m_t measurement)
  - M_H measurement allows for significant better constraint of m_t
  - Indirect determination consistent with direct measurements
    - Remember: fully obtained from loop corrections!
- **Indirect result: $m_t = 176.1^{+2.9}_{-2.4}$ GeV**

Tevatron: 173.2 ± 0.9 GeV
LHC: 173.3 ± 1.0 GeV

State of the SM: W versus top mass

- Scan of M_W vs m_t, with the direct measurements excluded from the fit.
- Results from Higgs measurement significantly reduces allowed indirect parameter space → corners the SM!



- Observed agreement demonstrates impressive consistency of the SM!

State of the SM: W mass versus $\sin^2\theta^l_{eff}$

- Scan of M_W vs $\sin^2\theta^l_{eff}$, with direct measurements excluded from the fit.
- Again, significant reduction allowed indirect parameter space from Higgs mass measurement.



- M_W and $\sin^2\theta^l_{eff}$ have become *the* sensitive probes of new physics!
  - Reason: both are 'tree-level' SM predictions.

Beyond the SM



Constraints on Oblique Corrections

G fitter BSM

- If energy scale of NP is high, BSM physics appears dominantly through vacuum polarization corrections
  - Aka, "oblique corrections"
- Oblique corrections reabsorbed into electroweak form factors
  - $\Delta\rho$, $\Delta\kappa$, Δr parameters, appearing in: M_W^2, $\sin^2\theta_{eff}$, G_F, α, etc.
- Electroweak fit sensitive to BSM physics through oblique corrections
  - Similar to sensitivity to top and Higgs loop corrections.



- Oblique corrections from New Physics described through STU parametrization
  [Peskin and Takeuchi, Phys. Rev. D46, 1 (1991)]

$$O_{meas} = O_{SM,REF}(m_H, m_t) + c_S S + c_T T + c_U U$$

- S : New Physics contributions to neutral currents
- T : Difference between neutral and charged current processes – sensitive to weak isospin violation
- U : (+S) New Physics contributions to charged currents. U only sensitive to W mass and width, usually very small in NP models (often: U=0)

- Also implemented: extended parameters (VWX), correction to Z→bb couplings.
  [Burgess et al., Phys. Lett. B326, 276 (1994)]
  [Burgess et al., Phys. Rev. D49, 6115 (1994)]

Fit results for S, T, U

- S,T,U obtained from fit to the EW observables
- SM: M_H = 126 GeV, m_t = 173 GeV
  - This defines (S,T,U) = (0,0,0)
- SM: S, T depend logarithmically on M_H
- Fit result:

$S = 0.03 \pm 0.10$

$T = 0.05 \pm 0.12$

$U = 0.03 \pm 0.10$

	S	*T*	*U*
S	1	+0.89	-0.54
T		1	-0.80
U			1

- Stronger constraints from fit with U=0.
- Also available for Z→bb correction.
- No indication for new physics.
- Can now use this to constrain 4th gen, Ex-Dim, T-C, *Higgs couplings*, etc.





Modified Higgs couplings

- Study of potential deviations of Higgs couplings from SM.
- BSM modeled as extension of SM through effective Lagrangian.
  - Consider leading corrections only.

$$L_V = \frac{h}{v}\left(2\kappa_V m_W^2 W_\mu W^\mu + \kappa_V m_Z^2 Z_\mu Z^\mu\right)$$

$$L_F = -\frac{h}{v}\left(\kappa_F m_t \bar{t}t + \kappa_F m_b \bar{b}b + \kappa_F m_\tau \bar{\tau}\tau\right)$$

- Popular benchmark model:
  - Scaling of Higgs-vector boson (κ_V) and Higgs-fermion couplings (κ_F)
  - No additional loops in the production or decay of the Higgs, no invisible Higgs decays and undetectable width.

- Main effect on EWPO due to modified Higgs coupling to gauge bosons (κ_V)
  - Involving the longitudinal d.o.f.



- Most BSM models: $\kappa_V < 1$
  - Additional Higgses typically give *positive* contribution to M_W.

Modified Higgs couplings

- Main effect on EWPO due to Higgs coupling to gauge bosons (κ_V).
  - $S = \frac{1}{12\pi}(1-\kappa_V^2)\log\left(\frac{\Lambda^2}{M_H^2}\right)$, $T = -\frac{3}{16\pi c_W^2}(1-\kappa_V^2)\log\left(\frac{\Lambda^2}{M_H^2}\right)$, $\Lambda = \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{|1-\kappa_V^2|}}$
  - Formulas from: Espinosa et al [arXiv:1202.3697]

- Cut-off scale Λ represents mass scale of new states that unitarize longitudinal gauge-boson scattering.
  - (As required in this model.)

- λ is varied between 1 and 10 TeV, nominally fixed to 3 TeV (4πv).



Higgs coupling results by ATLAS and CMS

ATLAS arXiv:1307.1427



CMS PAS-HIG-13-005



- Input: Higgs production times decay rate measurements (μ's)
- Interpret as κ_V and κ_F using LHC HXSWG formalism.
  - [arXiv:1209.0040]

Reproduction of ATLAS and CMS results









- Decent reproduction of ATLAS and CMS results within limited public-info available.

Higgs coupling results

- **Private LHC combination:**
  - $\kappa_V = 1.00 \pm 0.06$
  - $\kappa_F = 0.89 \pm 0.13$
  - Perfectly consistent with SM.



- **Result from stand-alone EW fit:**
  - $\kappa_V = 1.032^{+0.036}_{-0.025}$ (λ = 1 TeV)
  - $\kappa_V = 1.024^{+0.024}_{-0.018}$ (λ = 3 TeV)
  - $\kappa_V = 1.019^{+0.019}_{-0.014}$ (λ = 10 TeV)

- Note: some dependency in central value and error on cut-off scale λ.

1. EW fit sofar more precise result for κ_V than current LHC experiments.
2. EW fit: positive deviation of κ_V from 1.0.
   - (Many BSM models: $\kappa_V < 1$)

EW fit: Higgs coupling results

- EW fit: positive deviation of κ_V from one driven by small tension in W mass prediction versus measurement.





- Private LHC combination:
  - $\kappa_V = 1.00 \pm 0.06$
  - $\kappa_F = 0.89 \pm 0.13$

- Above: dependency on λ
- (Will be interesting to see how these measurements develop.)



Prospects for the Standard Model fit

Two prospects scenarios: LHC-300, ILC/GigaZ

Prospects of EW fit tested for two scenarios:

1. LHC Run-2+3
2. ILC with GigaZ(*)

(*) GigaZ:

- Operation of ILC at lower energies like Z-pole or WW threshold.
  - Allows to perform precision measurements of EW sector of the SM.
- At Z-pole, several billion Z's can be studied within 1-2 months.
- Physics of LEP1 and SLC can be revisited with few days of data.

In following studies:
Central values of input measurements adjusted to M_H = 126 GeV.

- *(Except where indicated.)*

Prospects of EW fit for: ILC with Giga Z

Future Linear Collider can improve precision of EWPO's tremendously.

- *WW threshold scan + kinematic reconstruction, to obtain M_W*
  - From threshold scan: δM_W : 15 → 5 MeV
- *ttbar threshold scan, to obtain m_t*
  - Obtain m_t indirectly from production cross section: δm_t : 0.9 → 0.1 GeV
- *Z pole measurements*
  - High statistics: 10^9 Z decays: $\delta R^0_{lep} : 2.5 \cdot 10^{-2} \rightarrow 4 \cdot 10^{-3}$
  - With polarized beams, uncertainty on $\delta A^{0,f}_{LR}$: $10^{-3} \rightarrow 10^{-4}$, which translates to $\delta \sin^2\theta^l_{eff} : 1.6 \cdot 10^{-4} \rightarrow 1.3 \cdot 10^{-5}$
- *H→ZZ and H→WW couplings*: measured at 1% precision.

ILC prospects: from ILC TDR (Vol-2).

Prospects of EW fit for: LHC Run-2+3

LHC Run-2+3 (300/fb)

- *W mass measurement* : δM_W : 15 → 8 MeV
- *Final top mass measurement m_t* : δm_t : 0.9 → 0.6 GeV
- *H→ZZ and H→WW couplings*: measured at 4.5% precision.

LHC prospects: possibly optimistic scenario, but not impossible.

Prospects of EW fit

LHC Run-2+3 (300/fb)

- *W mass measurement* : δM_W : 15 → 8 MeV
- *Final top mass measurement m_t* : δm_t : 0.9 → 0.6 GeV
- *H→ZZ and H→WW couplings*: measured at 4.5% precision.

For both LHC-300 and ILC:

- Low-energy data results to improve $\Delta\alpha_{had}$:
  - ISR-based (BABAR), KLOE-II, VEPP-2000 (at energy below cc resonance), and BESIII e^+e^- cross-section measurements, in particular around cc resonance.
  - Plus: improved α_s, improvements in theory: $\Delta\alpha_{had}$: $10^{-4} \rightarrow 5 \cdot 10^{-5}$

- Assuming ~25% of today's theoretical uncertainties on M_W and $\sin^2\theta^l_{eff}$
  - Implies three-loop EW calculations!
  - δM_W (4→1 MeV), $\delta\sin^2\theta^l_{eff}$ ($4.7\text{x}10^{-5} \rightarrow 1\text{x}10^{-5}$)
  - (Theoretical uncertainty estimates from recent Snowmass report)

Prospects of EW fit



- Logarithmic dependency on M_H → cannot compete with direct M_H meas.
- Indirect prediction M_H dominated by theory uncertainties.
  - No theory uncertainties: $M_H = 126 \pm 7$ GeV
  - With theory errors (R-fit scheme): $M_H = 126^{+10}_{-9}$ GeV
  - Present day theory uncertainties: $M_H = 126^{+20}_{-17}$ GeV
- If EWP-data central values unchanged, i.e. keep favoring low value of Higgs mass (94 GeV), ~5σ discrepancy with measured Higgs mass.

Prospects of EW fit



- Huge reduction of uncertainty on indirect determinations of m_t, m_W, and $\sin^2\theta^l_{eff}$, by a factor of 3 or more.
- Assuming central values of m_t and M_W do not change, (at ILC) a deviation between the SM prediction and the direct measurements would be prominently visible.

Confrontation of measurement and prediction

- Breakdown of individual contributions to errors of M_W and $\sin^2\theta^l_{eff}$
- Parametric uncertainties (not the full fit).

Parameter	Scenario	δ_{meas}	δ_{pred}	error due to uncertainty ($\pm 1\sigma$)					
				δ_{exp}	δM_Z	δm_t	$\delta\Delta\alpha_{had}$	$\delta\alpha_S$	δ_{theo}
M_W [MeV]	Present	15	10.4	6.4	2.6	5.2	1.8	1.7	4.0
	LHC	8	5.8	4.8	2.6	3.6	0.9	1.7	1.0
	ILC	5	3.8	2.8	2.6	0.6	0.9	0.4	1.0
$\sin^2\theta^\ell_{eff}$ $^{(\circ)}$	Present	16	9.5	4.8	1.5	2.8	3.5	1.0	4.7
	LHC	16	4.1	3.1	1.5	1.9	1.6	1.0	1.0
	ILC	1.3	3.2	2.2	1.5	0.3	1.6	0.2	1.0

$^{(\circ)}$In units of 10^{-5}.

- M_W and $\sin^2\theta^l_{eff}$ are sensitive probes of new physics! For all scenarios.
- At ILC/GigaZ, precision of M_Z will become important again!

Prospects of EW fit





- For STU parameters, improvement of factor of >3 is possible at ILC.
- Again, at ILC a deviation between the SM predictions and direct measurements would be prominently visible.
- Competitive results between EW fit and Higgs coupling measurements!
  - (At level of 1%.)

Conclusions 1/2



- Including M_H measurement, precise predictions of EW observables at loop level are possible for the first time.
- Overall consistency of the SM fit is very good.
  - M_H consistent at 1.3σ with indirect prediction from EW fit.
  - p-Value of global electroweak fit of SM: 18^{+2} % (pseudo-experiments)

Conclusions 2/2

- Paradigm shift for EW fit: from Higgs mass prediction to consistency tests of the Standard Model.
- Knowledge of M_H dramatically improves SM prediction of key observables
  - M_W (28→11 MeV), $\sin^2\theta^l_{eff}$ ($2.3\times10^{-5}\rightarrow1.0\times10^{-5}$), m_t (6.2→2.5 GeV)
  - Only surpassed sofar by top mass measurement.
- δM_W (indirect) = = 11 MeV
  - Large contributions to δM_W (and $\delta\sin^2\theta^l_{eff}$) from top and unknown higher-order EW corrections.
- δM_W (direct) = 15 MeV



- Improved accuracies set benchmark for new direct measurements!
  - M_W, $\sin^2\theta^l_{eff}$ (and Higgs couplings) sensitive probes of new physics.

Outlook

- Next step is evident: further exploration of Higgs couplings in the EW fit.
  - (Several groups already doing this. Gfitter too.)
- Prospects: including new data electroweak fits remain very interesting in coming years!
  - In particular ILC provides excellent New Physics sensitivity.
- Latest results always available at: http://cern.ch/Gfitter
  - Results of this presentation: EPJC 72, 2205 (2012)
  - *LHC-300 and ILC/GigaZ prospects paper to appear on arXiv this week !*

Thanks!

G fitter

A Generic Fitter Project for HEP Model Testing

Backup

Summary of indirect predictions

Parameter	Experimental input [±1σ] Present	LHC	ILC/GigaZ	Indirect determination [$\pm 1\sigma_{exp} \pm 1\sigma_{theo}$] Present	LHC	ILC/GigaZ
M_H [GeV]	0.4	< 0.1	< 0.1	${}^{+24}_{-20}\,{}^{+1}_{-2}$	${}^{+20}_{-18}\,{}^{+2}_{-3}$	${}^{+6.9}_{-6.6}\,{}^{+2.8}_{-2.3}$
M_W [MeV]	15	8	5	6.4 ± 4.6	5.0 ± 1.1	1.8 ± 1.7
M_Z [MeV]	2.1	2.1	2.1	10.6 ± 1.0	7.0 ± 0.9	2.6 ± 1.1
m_t [GeV]	0.9	0.6	0.1	${}^{+2.3}_{-2.3}\,{}^{+0.4}_{-0.1}$	${}^{+1.0}_{-1.8}\,{}^{+0.0}_{-0.4}$	${}^{+0.7}_{-0.2}\,{}^{+0.3}_{-0.2}$
$\sin^2\theta^\ell_{eff}$ [$\cdot 10^{-5}$]	16	16	1.3	4.8 ± 4.7	2.7 ± 1.2	2.0 ± 1.2
$\Delta\alpha^5_{had} M_Z^2$ [$\cdot 10^{-5}$]	10	4.7	4.7	${}^{+42}_{-42}\,{}^{+7}_{-1}$	${}^{+35}_{-35}\,{}^{+5}_{-4}$	6 ± 3
R^0_l [$\cdot 10^{-3}$]	25	25	4	–	–	–
$\alpha_s(M_Z^2)$ [$\cdot 10^{-4}$]	–	–	–	27 ± 1	27 ± 1	4 ± 1
$S\|_{U=0}$	–	–	–	0.10	0.10	0.03
$T\|_{U=0}$	–	–	–	0.12	0.07	0.03

- M_W and $\sin^2\theta^l_{eff}$ are (and will be) sensitive probes of new physics!

TLEP prospects

- From: arXiv:1308.6176

Table 9: Selected set of precision measurements at TLEP. The statistical errors have been determined with *(i)* a one-year scan of the Z resonance with 50% data at the peak, leading to $7 10^{11}$ Z visible decays, with resonant depolarization of single bunches for energy calibration at O(20min) intervals;*(ii)* one year at the Z peak with 40% longitudinally-polarized beams and a luminosity reduced to 20% of the nominal luminosity; *(iii)* a one-year scan of the WW threshold (around 161 GeV), with resonant depolarization of single bunches for energy calibration at O(20min) intervals; and *(iv)* a five-years scan of the $t\bar{t}$ threshold (around 346 GeV). The systematic uncertainties indicated below are only a "first look" estimate and will be revisited in the course of the design study.

Quantity	Physics	Present precision		Statistical uncertainty	Systematic uncertainty	Key	Challenge
m_Z (keV)	Input	91187500 ± 2100	Z Line shape scan	5 keV	< 100 keV	E_{beam} calibration	QED corrections
Γ_Z (keV)	$\Delta\rho$ (not $\Delta\alpha_{had}$)	2495200 ± 2300	Z Line shape scan	8 keV	< 100 keV	E_{beam} calibration	QED corrections
R_ℓ	α_s, δ_b	20.767 ± 0.025	Z Peak	0.0001	< 0.001	Statistics	QED corrections
N_ν	PMNS Unitarity, ...	2.984 ± 0.008	Z Peak	0.00008	< 0.004		Bhabha scat.
N_ν	... and sterile ν's	2.92 ± 0.05	$Z\gamma$, 161 GeV	0.001	< 0.001	Statistics	
R_b	δ_b	0.21629 ± 0.00066	Z Peak	0.000003	< 0.000060	Statistics, small IP	Hemisphere correlations
A_{LR}	$\Delta_\rho, \epsilon_3, \Delta\alpha_{had}$	0.1514 ± 0.0022	Z peak, polarized	0.000015	< 0.000015	4 bunch scheme, 2exp	Design experiment
m_W (MeV)	$\Delta\rho$, ϵ_3, ϵ_2, $\Delta\alpha_{had}$	80385 ± 15	WW threshold scan	0.3 MeV	< 0.5 MeV	E_{beam}, Statistics	QED corrections
m_{top} (MeV)	Input	173200 ± 900	tt threshold scan	10 MeV	< 10 MeV	Statistics	Theory interpretation

Two prospects scenarios: LHC-300, ILC/GigaZ

- Uncertainty estimates used:

Parameter	Experimental input [$\pm 1\sigma$] Present	LHC	ILC/GigaZ
M_H [GeV]	0.4	< 0.1	< 0.1
M_W [MeV]	15	8	5
M_Z [MeV]	2.1	2.1	2.1
m_t [GeV]	0.9	0.6	0.1
$\sin^2\theta^{\ell}_{\rm eff}$ [$\cdot 10^{-5}$]	16	16	1.3
$\Delta\alpha^5_{\rm had} M_Z^2$ [$\cdot 10^{-5}$]	10	4.7	4.7
R^0_l [$\cdot 10^{-3}$]	25	25	4
$\alpha_s(M_Z^2)$ [$\cdot 10^{-4}$]	–	–	–

  - ILC prospects from: ILC TDR (Vol-2).
  - Theoretical uncertainty estimates from recent Snowmass report
- Central values of input measurements adjusted to M_H = 126 GeV.

- Scan of $\Delta\chi^2$ versus α_s
  - Also shown: SM fit with minimal inputs: M_Z, G_F, $\Delta\alpha_{had}^{(5)}(M_Z)$, $\alpha_s(M_Z)$, M_H, and fermion masses
- Determination of α_s at N^3LO.
  - Most sensitive through total hadronic cross-section σ^0_{had} and partial leptonic width R^0_l



$$\alpha_s(M_Z) = 0.1190^{+0.0028}_{-0.0027}\,(\mathrm{exp.}) \pm 0.0001\,(\mathrm{theo.})$$

- Theory uncertainty at per-mille level (obtained by scale variation of Γ_{had}).

- *In good agreement with value from τ decays, also at N^3LO, and with WA.*
  - (Improvements in precision only expected with ILC/GigaZ. See later.)

New R^0_b calculation

- The branching ratio R^0_b: partial decay width of $Z \to bb$ to $Z \to qq$
- Freitas et al: full EW 2-loop calculation of $Z \to bb$
- Contribution of same terms as in the calculation of $\sin^2\theta^{bb}_{eff}$
  → cross-check of two results found good agreement
- Two-loop EW corrections now much smaller than experimental uncertainty (6.6×10^{-4})

	1-loop EW and QCD correction to FSR	2-loop EW correction	2-loop EW and 2+3-loop QCD correction to FSR	1+2-loop QCD correction to gauge boson self-energies
M_H [GeV]	$\mathcal{O}(\alpha) + \mathrm{FSR}_{\alpha,\alpha_s,\alpha_s^2}$ [10^{-4}]	$\mathcal{O}(\alpha^2_{\mathrm{ferm}})$ [10^{-4}]	$\mathcal{O}(\alpha^2_{\mathrm{ferm}}) + \mathrm{FSR}_{\alpha_s^3,\alpha\alpha_s,m_b^2\alpha_s,m_b^4}$ [10^{-4}]	$\mathcal{O}(\alpha\alpha_s, \alpha\alpha_s^2)$ [10^{-4}]
100	−35.66	−0.856	−2.496	−0.407
200	−35.85	−0.851	−2.488	−0.407
400	−36.09	−0.846	−2.479	−0.406

Radiator Functions

- Partial widths are defined inclusively:
  contain both QCD and QED contributions.
- Corrections expressed as so-called radiator functions $R_{A,f}$ and $R_{V,f}$

$$\Gamma_{f\bar{f}} = N_c^f \frac{G_F M_Z^3}{6\sqrt{2}\pi} \left(|g_{A,f}|^2 R_{A,f} + |g_{V,f}|^2 R_{V,f}\right)^2$$

[D. Bardin, G. Passarino, "The Standard Model in the Making", Clarendon Press (1999)]

- High sensitivity to the strong coupling α_s
- Recently, full four-loop calculation of QCD Adler function became available (N^{3}LO)
- Much-reduced scale dependence!
- Theoretical uncertainty of 0.1 MeV, compared with experimental uncertainty of 2.0 MeV.



[P. Baikov et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 108, 222003 (2012)]
[P. Baikov et al Phys. Rev. Lett. 104, 132004 (2010)]

Calculation of M_W

- Full EW one- and two-loop calculation of fermionic and bosonic contributions.
- One- and two-loop QCD corrections and leading terms of higher order corrections.
- Results for Δr include terms of order $O(\alpha)$, $O(\alpha\alpha_s)$, $O(\alpha\alpha_s^2)$, $O(\alpha^2_{ferm})$, $O(\alpha^2_{bos})$, $O(\alpha^2\alpha_s m_t^4)$, $O(\alpha^3 m_t^6)$
- Uncertainty estimate:
  - Missing terms of order $\mathbf{O(\alpha^2\alpha_s)}$: about 3 MeV (from $O(\alpha^2\alpha_s m_t^4)$)
  - Electroweak three-loop correction $\mathbf{O(\alpha^3)}$: < 2 MeV
  - Three-loop QCD corrections $\mathbf{O(\alpha_s^3)}$: < 2 MeV
- Total: $\delta M_W \approx 4$ MeV

[M Awramik et al., Phys. Rev. D69, 053006 (2004)]
[M Awramik et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 89, 241801 (2002)]



[A Freitas et al., Phys. Lett. B495, 338 (2000)]



[M Awramik et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 93, 201805 (2004)]
[M Awramik et al., JHEP 11, 048 (2006)]

- Effective mixing angle:

$$\sin^2\theta_{\rm eff}^{\rm lept} = \left(1 - M_W^2/M_Z^2\right)(1+\Delta\kappa)$$



- Two-loop EW and QCD correction to $\Delta\kappa$ known, leading terms of higher order QCD corrections.
- Fermionic two-loop correction about 10^{-3}, whereas bosonic one 10^{-5}.
- Uncertainty estimate obtained with different methods, geometric progression, leading to total of: $\delta\sin^2(\theta^l_{eff}) = 4.7\times10^{-5}$



Uncertainty in Top mass definition

- Difficult to define a pole mass for heavy, unstable and colored particle.
  - Single top decays before hadronizing. To have colorless final states, additional quarks needed.
  - *Non-perturb.* color-reconnection effects in fragmentation → biases in simulation.
  - 'Renormalon' ambiguity in top mass definition.
    - For pole mass, not for MS-bar scheme.
  - Impact of finite top width effects.



- Result: $m_t^{exp} \neq m_t^{pole}$, and event-dependent.
- The top mass extracted in hadron collisions is not well defined below a precision of $O(\Gamma_t)$ ~ 1 GeV

- Hard to estimate additional theo. uncertainties. With 0.5 GeV on m_t:
  - $M_H = 90^{+34}_{-21}$ GeV, $M_W = 80.359 \pm 0.013$ GeV, $\sin^2\theta^l_{eff} = 0.23148 \pm 0.00010$.
  - Only small deterioration in precision.

Electroweak Fit – SM Fit Results

- From the Gfitter Group, EPJC 72, 2205 (2012)
- Left: full fit incl. M_H

Parameter	Input value	Free in fit	Fit Result
M_H [GeV]$^{\circ}$	$125.7^{+0.4}_{-0.4}$	yes	$125.7^{+0.4}_{-0.4}$
M_W [GeV]	80.385 ± 0.015	–	$80.367^{+0.006}_{-0.007}$
Γ_W [GeV]	2.085 ± 0.042	–	2.091 ± 0.001
M_Z [GeV]	91.1875 ± 0.0021	yes	91.1878 ± 0.0021
Γ_Z [GeV]	2.4952 ± 0.0023	–	2.4954 ± 0.0014
σ^0_{had} [nb]	41.540 ± 0.037	–	41.479 ± 0.014
R^0_ℓ	20.767 ± 0.025	–	20.740 ± 0.017
$A^{0,\ell}_{\mathrm{FB}}$	0.0171 ± 0.0010	–	$0.01626^{+0.0001}_{-0.0002}$
A_ℓ $^{(\star)}$	0.1499 ± 0.0018	–	0.1472 ± 0.0007
$\sin^2\theta^\ell_{\mathrm{eff}}(Q_{\mathrm{FB}})$	0.2324 ± 0.0012	–	$0.23149^{+0.00010}_{-0.00008}$
A_c	0.670 ± 0.027	–	$0.6679^{+0.00034}_{-0.00028}$
A_b	0.923 ± 0.020	–	$0.93464^{+0.00005}_{-0.00007}$
$A^{0,c}_{\mathrm{FB}}$	0.0707 ± 0.0035	–	0.0738 ± 0.0004
$A^{0,b}_{\mathrm{FB}}$	0.0992 ± 0.0016	–	0.1032 ± 0.0005
R^0_c	0.1721 ± 0.0030	–	0.17223 ± 0.00006
R^0_b	0.21629 ± 0.00066	–	0.21548 ± 0.00005
$\overline{m}_c$ [GeV]	$1.27^{+0.07}_{-0.11}$	yes	$1.27^{+0.07}_{-0.11}$
$\overline{m}_b$ [GeV]	$4.20^{+0.17}_{-0.07}$	yes	$4.20^{+0.17}_{-0.07}$
m_t [GeV]	173.20 ± 0.87	yes	173.53 ± 0.82
$\Delta\alpha^{(5)}_{\mathrm{had}}(M_Z^2)$ $^{(\dagger\triangle)}$	2757 ± 10	yes	2755 ± 11
$\alpha_s(M_Z^2)$	–	yes	$0.1190^{+0.0028}_{-0.0027}$
$\delta_{\mathrm{th}} M_W$ [MeV]	$[-4, 4]_{\mathrm{theo}}$	yes	4
$\delta_{\mathrm{th}} \sin^2\theta^\ell_{\mathrm{eff}}$ $^{(\dagger)}$	$[-4.7, 4.7]_{\mathrm{theo}}$	yes	-0.6

Electroweak Fit – SM Fit Results

- From the Gfitter Group, EPJC 72, 2205 (2012)
- Left: full fit incl. M_H
- Middle: not incl. M_H

Parameter	Input value	Free in fit	Fit Result	Fit without M_H measurements
M_H [GeV]°	$125.7^{+0.4}_{-0.4}$	yes	$125.7^{+0.4}_{-0.4}$	94.7^{+25}_{-22}
M_W [GeV]	80.385 ± 0.015	–	$80.367^{+0.006}_{-0.007}$	$80.367^{+0.006}_{-0.007}$
Γ_W [GeV]	2.085 ± 0.042	–	2.091 ± 0.001	2.091 ± 0.001
M_Z [GeV]	91.1875 ± 0.0021	yes	91.1878 ± 0.0021	91.1878 ± 0.0021
Γ_Z [GeV]	2.4952 ± 0.0023	–	2.4954 ± 0.0014	2.4954 ± 0.0014
σ^0_{had} [nb]	41.540 ± 0.037	–	41.479 ± 0.014	41.479 ± 0.014
R^0_ℓ	20.767 ± 0.025	–	20.740 ± 0.017	20.740 ± 0.017
$A^{0,\ell}_{\mathrm{FB}}$	0.0171 ± 0.0010	–	$0.01626^{+0.0001}_{-0.0002}$	$0.01626^{+0.0001}_{-0.0002}$
A_ℓ $^{(\star)}$	0.1499 ± 0.0018	–	0.1472 ± 0.0007	0.1472 ± 0.0007
$\sin^2\theta^\ell_{\mathrm{eff}}(Q_{\mathrm{FB}})$	0.2324 ± 0.0012	–	$0.23149^{+0.00010}_{-0.00008}$	$0.23149^{+0.00010}_{-0.00008}$
A_c	0.670 ± 0.027	–	$0.6679^{+0.00034}_{-0.00028}$	$0.6679^{+0.00034}_{-0.00028}$
A_b	0.923 ± 0.020	–	$0.93464^{+0.00005}_{-0.00007}$	$0.93464^{+0.00005}_{-0.00007}$
$A^{0,c}_{\mathrm{FB}}$	0.0707 ± 0.0035	–	0.0738 ± 0.0004	0.0738 ± 0.0004
$A^{0,b}_{\mathrm{FB}}$	0.0992 ± 0.0016	–	0.1032 ± 0.0005	0.1032 ± 0.0005
R^0_c	0.1721 ± 0.0030	–	0.17223 ± 0.00006	0.17223 ± 0.00006
R^0_b	0.21629 ± 0.00066	–	0.21548 ± 0.00005	0.21548 ± 0.00005
$\overline{m}_c$ [GeV]	$1.27^{+0.07}_{-0.11}$	yes	$1.27^{+0.07}_{-0.11}$	$1.27^{+0.07}_{-0.11}$
$\overline{m}_b$ [GeV]	$4.20^{+0.17}_{-0.07}$	yes	$4.20^{+0.17}_{-0.07}$	$4.20^{+0.17}_{-0.07}$
m_t [GeV]	173.20 ± 0.87	yes	173.53 ± 0.82	173.53 ± 0.82
$\Delta\alpha^{(5)}_{\mathrm{had}}(M_Z^2)$ $^{(\dagger\triangle)}$	2757 ± 10	yes	2755 ± 11	2755 ± 11
$\alpha_s(M_Z^2)$	–	yes	$0.1190^{+0.0028}_{-0.0027}$	$0.1190^{+0.0028}_{-0.0027}$
$\delta_{\mathrm{th}} M_W$ [MeV]	$[-4, 4]_{\mathrm{theo}}$	yes	4	4
$\delta_{\mathrm{th}} \sin^2\theta^\ell_{\mathrm{eff}}$ $^{(\dagger)}$	$[-4.7, 4.7]_{\mathrm{theo}}$	yes	-0.6	-0.5

Electroweak Fit – SM Fit Results

- From the Gfitter Group, EPJC 72, 2205 (2012)
- Left: full fit incl. M_H
- Middle: not incl. M_H
- Right: fit incl M_H, not the row

Parameter	Input value	Free in fit	Fit Result	Fit without M_H measurements	Fit without exp. input in line
M_H [GeV]°	$125.7^{+0.4}_{-0.4}$	yes	$125.7^{+0.4}_{-0.4}$	94.7^{+25}_{-22}	94.7^{+25}_{-22}
M_W [GeV]	80.385 ± 0.015	–	$80.367^{+0.006}_{-0.007}$	$80.367^{+0.006}_{-0.007}$	80.360 ± 0.011
Γ_W [GeV]	2.085 ± 0.042	–	2.091 ± 0.001	2.091 ± 0.001	2.091 ± 0.001
M_Z [GeV]	91.1875 ± 0.0021	yes	91.1878 ± 0.0021	91.1878 ± 0.0021	91.1978 ± 0.0114
Γ_Z [GeV]	2.4952 ± 0.0023	–	2.4954 ± 0.0014	2.4954 ± 0.0014	2.4950 ± 0.0017
$\sigma^0_{\rm had}$ [nb]	41.540 ± 0.037	–	41.479 ± 0.014	41.479 ± 0.014	41.471 ± 0.015
R^0_ℓ	20.767 ± 0.025	–	20.740 ± 0.017	20.740 ± 0.017	20.715 ± 0.026
$A^{0,\ell}_{\rm FB}$	0.0171 ± 0.0010	–	$0.01626^{+0.0001}_{-0.0002}$	$0.01626^{+0.0001}_{-0.0002}$	0.01624 ± 0.0002
A_ℓ $^{(\star)}$	0.1499 ± 0.0018	–	0.1472 ± 0.0007	0.1472 ± 0.0007	–
$\sin^2\theta^\ell_{\rm eff}(Q_{\rm FB})$	0.2324 ± 0.0012	–	$0.23149^{+0.00010}_{-0.00008}$	$0.23149^{+0.00010}_{-0.00008}$	0.23150 ± 0.00009
A_c	0.670 ± 0.027	–	$0.6679^{+0.00034}_{-0.00028}$	$0.6679^{+0.00034}_{-0.00028}$	0.6680 ± 0.00031
A_b	0.923 ± 0.020	–	$0.93464^{+0.00005}_{-0.00007}$	$0.93464^{+0.00005}_{-0.00007}$	0.93463 ± 0.00006
$A^{0,c}_{\rm FB}$	0.0707 ± 0.0035	–	0.0738 ± 0.0004	0.0738 ± 0.0004	0.0737 ± 0.0004
$A^{0,b}_{\rm FB}$	0.0992 ± 0.0016	–	0.1032 ± 0.0005	0.1032 ± 0.0005	0.1034 ± 0.0003
R^0_c	0.1721 ± 0.0030	–	0.17223 ± 0.00006	0.17223 ± 0.00006	0.17223 ± 0.00006
R^0_b	0.21629 ± 0.00066	–	0.21548 ± 0.00005	0.21548 ± 0.00005	0.21547 ± 0.00005
$\overline{m}_c$ [GeV]	$1.27^{+0.07}_{-0.11}$	yes	$1.27^{+0.07}_{-0.11}$	$1.27^{+0.07}_{-0.11}$	–
$\overline{m}_b$ [GeV]	$4.20^{+0.17}_{-0.07}$	yes	$4.20^{+0.17}_{-0.07}$	$4.20^{+0.17}_{-0.07}$	–
m_t [GeV]	173.20 ± 0.87	yes	173.53 ± 0.82	173.53 ± 0.82	$176.11^{+2.88}_{-2.35}$
$\Delta\alpha^{(5)}_{\rm had}(M^2_Z)$ $^{(\dagger\triangle)}$	2757 ± 10	yes	2755 ± 11	2755 ± 11	2718^{+49}_{-43}
$\alpha_s(M^2_Z)$	–	yes	$0.1190^{+0.0028}_{-0.0027}$	$0.1190^{+0.0028}_{-0.0027}$	0.1190 ± 0.0027
$\delta_{\rm th} M_W$ [MeV]	$[-4, 4]_{\rm theo}$	yes	4	4	–
$\delta_{\rm th} \sin^2\theta^\ell_{\rm eff}$ $^{(\dagger)}$	$[-4.7, 4.7]_{\rm theo}$	yes	-0.6	-0.5	–

Electroweak Fit – SM Fit Results

- From the Gfitter Group, EPJC 72, 2205 (2012)
- Left: full fit incl. M_H
- Middle: not incl. M_H
- Right: fit incl M_H, not the row

Parameter	Input value	Free in fit	Fit Result	Fit without M_H measurements	Fit without exp. input in line
M_H [GeV]°	$125.7^{+0.4}_{-0.4}$	yes	$125.7^{+0.4}_{-0.4}$	94.7^{+25}_{-22}	94.7^{+25}_{-22}
M_W [GeV]	80.385 ± 0.015	–	$80.367^{+0.006}_{-0.007}$	$80.367^{+0.006}_{-0.007}$	80.360 ± 0.011
Γ_W [GeV]	2.085 ± 0.042	–	2.091 ± 0.001	2.091 ± 0.001	2.091 ± 0.001
M_Z [GeV]	91.1875 ± 0.0021	yes	91.1878 ± 0.0021	91.1878 ± 0.0021	91.1978 ± 0.0114
Γ_Z [GeV]	2.4952 ± 0.0023	–	2.4954 ± 0.0014	2.4954 ± 0.0014	2.4950 ± 0.0017
σ^0_{had} [nb]	41.540 ± 0.037	–	41.479 ± 0.014	41.479 ± 0.014	41.471 ± 0.015
R^0_ℓ	20.767 ± 0.025	–	20.740 ± 0.017	20.740 ± 0.017	20.715 ± 0.026
$A^{0,\ell}_{\mathrm{FB}}$	0.0171 ± 0.0010	–	$0.01626^{+0.0001}_{-0.0002}$	$0.01626^{+0.0001}_{-0.0002}$	0.01624 ± 0.0002
A_ℓ $^{(\star)}$	0.1499 ± 0.0018	–	0.1472 ± 0.0007	0.1472 ± 0.0007	–
$\sin^2\theta^\ell_{\mathrm{eff}}(Q_{\mathrm{FB}})$	0.2324 ± 0.0012	–	$0.23149^{+0.00010}_{-0.00008}$	$0.23149^{+0.00010}_{-0.00008}$	0.23150 ± 0.00009
A_c	0.670 ± 0.027	–	$0.6679^{+0.00034}_{-0.00028}$	$0.6679^{+0.00034}_{-0.00028}$	0.6680 ± 0.00031
A_b	0.923 ± 0.020	–	$0.93464^{+0.00005}_{-0.00007}$	$0.93464^{+0.00005}_{-0.00007}$	0.93463 ± 0.00006
$A^{0,c}_{\mathrm{FB}}$	0.0707 ± 0.0035	–	0.0738 ± 0.0004	0.0738 ± 0.0004	0.0737 ± 0.0004
$A^{0,b}_{\mathrm{FB}}$	0.0992 ± 0.0016	–	0.1032 ± 0.0005	0.1032 ± 0.0005	0.1034 ± 0.0003
R^0_c	0.1721 ± 0.0030	–	0.17223 ± 0.00006	0.17223 ± 0.00006	0.17223 ± 0.00006
R^0_b	0.21629 ± 0.00066	–	0.21548 ± 0.00005	0.21548 ± 0.00005	0.21547 ± 0.00005
$\overline{m}_c$ [GeV]	$1.27^{+0.07}_{-0.11}$	yes	$1.27^{+0.07}_{-0.11}$	$1.27^{+0.07}_{-0.11}$	–
$\overline{m}_b$ [GeV]	$4.20^{+0.17}_{-0.07}$	yes	$4.20^{+0.17}_{-0.07}$	$4.20^{+0.17}_{-0.07}$	–
m_t [GeV]	173.20 ± 0.87	yes	173.53 ± 0.82	173.53 ± 0.82	$176.11^{+2.88}_{-2.35}$
$\Delta\alpha^{(5)}_{\mathrm{had}}(M^2_Z)$ $^{(\dagger\triangle)}$	2757 ± 10	yes	2755 ± 11	2755 ± 11	2718^{+49}_{-43}
$\alpha_s(M^2_Z)$	–	yes	$0.1190^{+0.0028}_{-0.0027}$	$0.1190^{+0.0028}_{-0.0027}$	0.1190 ± 0.0027
$\delta_{\mathrm{th}} M_W$ [MeV]	$[-4, 4]_{\mathrm{theo}}$	yes	4	4	–
$\delta_{\mathrm{th}} \sin^2\theta^\ell_{\mathrm{eff}}$ $^{(\dagger)}$	$[-4.7, 4.7]_{\mathrm{theo}}$	yes	-0.6	-0.5	–

Moriond 2011: Prediction for Higgs mass

- LEP + Tevatron (Fall 2010) :
  - CL^{2s}_{s+b} central value $\pm 1\sigma$: $M_H = 120.2^{+17.9}_{-5.2}$ GeV
  - 2σ interval:

$$-2\ln Q: \quad [115,152]\ \text{GeV}$$
$$CL^{2-sided}_{s+b}: \quad [114,155]\ \text{GeV}$$

- LEP + Tevatron (Moriond 2011) :
  - CL^{2s}_{s+b} central value $\pm 1\sigma$: $M_H = 120.2^{+12.3}_{-4.7}$ GeV
  - 2σ interval:

$$-2\ln Q: \quad [115,138]\ \text{GeV}$$
$$CL^{2-sided}_{s+b}: \quad [114,149] \cup [152,155]\ \text{GeV}$$

- Fit with LEP + Tevatron + LHC ($H \to WW$) searches (Moriond 2011) :
  - Central value unchanged
  - 2σ interval:

$$-2\ln Q: \quad [115,137]\ \text{GeV}$$
$$CL^{2-sided}_{s+b}: \quad [114,14?]\ \text{GeV}$$





Low energy observables

- Low energy observables with interesting precision will soon become available.



Input correlations of the EW fit

- Input correlation coefficients between Z pole measurements

	M_Z	Γ_Z	$\sigma^0_{\rm had}$	R^0_ℓ	$A^{0,\ell}_{\rm FB}$
M_Z	1	−0.02	−0.05	0.03	0.06
Γ_Z		1	−0.30	0.00	0.00
$\sigma^0_{\rm had}$			1	0.18	0.01
R^0_ℓ				1	−0.06
$A^{0,\ell}_{\rm FB}$					1

	$A^{0,c}_{\rm FB}$	$A^{0,b}_{\rm FB}$	A_c	A_b	R^0_c	R^0_b
$A^{0,c}_{\rm FB}$	1	0.15	0.04	−0.02	−0.06	0.07
$A^{0,b}_{\rm FB}$		1	0.01	0.06	0.04	−0.10
A_c			1	0.11	−0.06	0.04
A_b				1	0.04	−0.08
R^0_c					1	−0.18

Table 2: Correlation matrices for observables determined by the Z lineshape fit (left), and by heavy flavour analyses at the Z pole (right) [56].

Full EW 2-loop calculations

- Recent paper by A. Freitas, arXiv:1310.2256.
- Contains full two-loop fermionic EW corrections to the Z-boson width and production rate.
- Only small impact on EW fit results compared with 1-loop results.



Experimental inputs – Predicted uncertainties

Parameter	Present		LHC		ILC/GigaZ		TLEP
	Experimental input $[\pm 1\sigma]$						
M_H [GeV]	0.4	⇨	< 0.1		< 0.1		< 0.1
M_W [MeV]	15	⇨	8	⇨	5	⇨	1.3
M_Z [MeV]	2.1		2.1		2.1	⇨	0.1
m_t [GeV]	0.9	⇨	0.6		0.1		0.08
Γ_Z [MeV]	2.3		2.3	⇨	0.8	⇨	0.1
$\sin^2\theta^\ell_{\rm eff}$ $[\cdot 10^{-5}]$	16		16	⇨	1.3	⇨	0.3
R^0_l $[\cdot 10^{-3}]$	25		25	⇨	4	⇨	1.3
$\Delta\alpha^5_{\rm had}(M^2_Z)$ $[\cdot 10^{-5}]$	10	⇨	4.7		4.7		4.7
$\alpha_S(M^2_Z)$ $[\cdot 10^{-4}]$	–		–		–		–
$\delta_{\rm th} M_W$ [MeV]	4	⇨	1		1		1
$\delta_{\rm th} \sin^2\theta^\ell_{\rm eff}$ $[\cdot 10^{-5}]$	4.7	⇨	1		1		1

TLEP scenario:

- *Preliminary estimates*
- Clearly not the same level of understanding as LHC or ILC.
- Uncertainties may turn out completely different.
  - From arXiv:1308.6176,
  - and Snowmass report.
    - Of these two, we take most conservative estimate.
- Note: top mass dominated by theoretical uncertainty.
- Higher statistics
- From beam energy precision: improved M_Z and Γ_Z

Prospects of the EW fit: Higgs mass (126 GeV)

Present / LHC / ILC



Future scenario



- Logarithmic dependency on M_H → cannot compete with direct M_H meas.
- Indirect prediction M_H dominated by theory uncertainties.
  - ILC with (without) theory errors: $M_H = 126^{+10}_{-9}$ (±7) GeV
  - ILC with present-day theory uncertainties: $M_H = 126^{+20}_{-17}$ GeV
  - TLEP with (without) theory errors: M_H = 126 ± 5 (±3) GeV

Prospects of the EW fit: Higgs mass (94 GeV)

Present / LHC / ILC



Future scenario



- If EWP-data central values are unchanged, i.e. they keep favoring low value of Higgs mass (94 GeV), >5σ discrepancy with measured Higgs mass.
  - In both ILC and TLEP scenarios.

Prospects of the EW fit: W mass and $\sin^2\theta^l_{eff}$



Prospects of the EW fit: W mass versus $\sin^2\theta^l_{eff}$





- Huge reduction of uncertainty on indirect determinations of m_W, and $\sin^2\theta^l_{eff}$, by a factor of ≳3 (≳4-5) at ILC (TLEP).
- Assuming central values of M_W and $\sin^2\theta^l_{eff}$ do not change, a deviation between the SM prediction and the direct measurements would be prominently visible, at both ILC and TLEP.
  - But also in LHC-300 scenario, from improved theory uncertainties.

Confrontation of measurement and prediction

- Breakdown of individual contributions to errors of M_W and $\sin^2\theta^l_{eff}$
- Parametric uncertainties (not the full fit).

Parameter	Scenario	δ_{meas}	δ_{pred}	error due to uncertainty ($\pm 1\sigma$) δ_{exp}	δM_Z	δm_t	$\delta\Delta\alpha_{had}$	$\delta\alpha_S$	δ_{theo}
M_W [MeV]	Present	15	10.4	6.4	2.6	5.2	1.8	1.7	4.0
	LHC	8	5.8	4.8	2.6	3.6	0.9	1.7	1.0
	ILC	5	3.8	2.8	2.6	0.6	0.9	0.4	1.0
	Future	1.3	2.0	1.0	0.1	0.5	0.9	0.3	1.0
$\sin^2\theta^\ell_{eff}$ $^{(\circ)}$	Present	16	9.5	4.8	1.5	2.8	3.5	1.0	4.7
	LHC	16	4.1	3.1	1.5	1.9	1.6	1.0	1.0
	ILC	1.3	3.2	2.2	1.5	0.3	1.6	0.2	1.0
	Future	0.3	2.7	1.7	0.1	0.3	1.6	0.2	1.0

$^{(\circ)}$In units of 10^{-5}.

- M_W and $\sin^2\theta^l_{eff}$ are sensitive probes of new physics! In all scenarios.
- At ILC/GigaZ, precision of M_Z will become important again.
- At TLEP ('Future'), limited by external inputs: theory errors and $\Delta\alpha_{had}$

Prospects of the EW fit: W versus top mass



- Huge reduction of uncertainty on indirect determinations of m_t and m_W by a factor of ≳3 (≳5) at ILC (TLEP).
- Assuming central values of m_t and M_W do not change, a deviation between the SM prediction and the direct measurements would be prominently visible.

Prospects of EW fit: S versus T





- For STU parameters, improvement of factor of ≳4 (≳10) is possible at ILC (TLEP).
- Again, at both ILC and TLEP a deviation between the SM predictions and direct measurements would be prominently visible.

Predicted uncertainties from EW fit

					error due to uncertainty ($\pm 1\sigma$)					
Parameter	$\delta_{\rm meas}$	$\delta_{\rm fit}^{\rm tot}$	$\delta_{\rm fit}^{\rm exp}$	$\delta_{\rm fit}^{\rm theo}$	δM_W	δM_Z	δm_t	$\delta \sin^2\theta^{\ell}_{\rm eff}{}^{(\circ)}$	$\delta \Delta\alpha_{\rm had}{}^{(\circ)}$	$\delta \alpha_S{}^{(\triangle)}$
				ILC prospects						
M_H [GeV]	< 0.1	$^{+9.6}_{-9.0}$	$^{+6.9}_{-6.6}$	$^{+2.7}_{-2.4}$	$^{+4.2}_{-0.8}$	$^{+4.4}_{-4.0}$	$^{+0.9}_{-0.8}$	$^{+3.1}_{-3.3}$	$^{+4.2}_{-4.1}$	$^{+0.6}_{-0.6}$
M_W [MeV]	5	3.6	1.9	1.7	–	1.7	0.3	1.2	0.7	0.2
M_Z [MeV]	2.1	3.7	2.6	1.1	2.4	–	0.5	1.3	1.9	0.3
m_t [GeV]	0.1	1.0	0.7	$^{+0.3}_{-0.2}$	$^{+0.5}_{-0.6}$	0.5	–	$^{+0.3}_{-0.2}$	0.4	–
$\sin^2\theta^{\ell}_{\rm eff}$ $^{(\circ)}$	1.3	3.2	2.0	1.2	1.7	1.2	0.2	–	1.5	0.1
$\Delta\alpha_{\rm had}$ $^{(\circ)}$	4.7	8.6	5.7	2.9	2.5	4.2	0.8	3.9	–	0.5
				Future prospects						
M_H [GeV]	< 0.1	5.3	3.3	2.0	3.0	0.3	1.0	$^{+0.0}_{-1.2}$	3.2	0.6
M_W [MeV]	1.3	1.9	0.4	1.5	–	0.1	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.1
M_Z [MeV]	0.1	1.5	1.0	0.5	1.0	–	0.3		0.9	0.4
m_t [GeV]	0.08	0.38	0.24	0.14	0.24	0.03	–	0.01	0.22	0.02
$\sin^2\theta^{\ell}_{\rm eff}$ $^{(\circ)}$	0.3	$^{+2.8}_{-2.4}$	1.4	$^{+1.5}_{-1.1}$	1.2		0.1	–	1.3	0.5
$\Delta\alpha_{\rm had}$ $^{(\circ)}$	4.7	0.4	0.1	0.3			0.1	0.1	–	

$^{(\circ)}$In units of 10^{-5}. $^{(\triangle)}$In units of 10^{-4}

- Breakdown of uncertainties derived from EW fit. (Note: *correlated* errors.)
- Compared to parametric breakdown: reduced experimental, but increased theory errors. Slightly smaller total errors.