





EFT strategies and synergies in global fits

TH-EXP-synergies:

How to efficiently scan SMEFT-couplings in high-dimensional spaces

In collaboration with Cornelius Grunwald, Gudrun Hiller and Kevin Kröninger

Lara Nollen IAL Kick-Off Meeting 20th March 2024

SMEFT approach to new physics

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathsf{SMEFT}} = \mathcal{L}_{\mathsf{SM}} + \sum_{d=5}^{\infty} \sum_{i} rac{C_{i}^{(d)}}{\Lambda^{d-4}} O_{i}^{(d)}$$

 $O_i^{(d)}$: Local operators, IR-sensitive

 $C_i^{(d)}$: Wilson coefficients, UV-sensitive

See also e.g. Greljo et al. [JHEP 11 (2020) 080], [JHEP 05 (2023) 087] for global SMEFT fits

SMEFT approach to new physics

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathsf{SMEFT}} = \mathcal{L}_{\mathsf{SM}} + \sum_{d=5}^{\infty} \sum_{i} \frac{C_{i}^{(d)}}{\Lambda^{d-4}} O_{i}^{(d)} \qquad \begin{array}{c} O_{i}^{(d)} : \text{ Local operators, IR-sensitive} \\ C_{i}^{(d)} : \text{ Wilson coefficients, UV-sensitive} \end{array}$$

• Dimension 6 operators: Warsaw Basis: 59 operators \rightarrow 2499 free parameters

See also e.g. Greljo et al. [JHEP 11 (2020) 080], [JHEP 05 (2023) 087] for global SMEFT fits

SMEFT approach to new physics

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathsf{SMEFT}} = \mathcal{L}_{\mathsf{SM}} + \sum_{d=5}^{\infty} \sum_{i} \frac{C_{i}^{(d)}}{\Lambda^{d-4}} O_{i}^{(d)} \qquad \begin{array}{c} O_{i}^{(d)} : \text{Local operators, IR-sensitive} \\ C_{i}^{(d)} : \text{Wilson coefficients, UV-sensitive} \end{array}$$

- Dimension 6 operators: Warsaw Basis: 59 operators \rightarrow 2499 free parameters
- Typically, only a subset of operators is used (e.g. 14 coefficients in [JHEP 11 (2023) 110])
- Oftentimes: only one operator is fitted at a time
 → New physics might hide in other operators or
 linear combinations, e.g. C^(±)_{φl} = C⁽¹⁾_{φl} ± C⁽³⁾_{φl}
- Global fits are crucial
- Our approach: EFT *fitter* [arXiv:1605.05585], based on Bayesian Analysis Toolkit - *BAT.jl* [arXiv:2008.03132]



See also e.g. Greljo et al. [JHEP 11 (2020) 080], [JHEP 05 (2023) 087] for global SMEFT fits

Flavor patterns

- Flavor patterns reduce d.o.f. and impose correlations among different sectors
- Observation that FCNCs and CP violation are strongly suppressed in the data
 - \rightarrow Minimal Flavor Violation (MFV)

See also e.g. Bruggisser et al. [arXiv:2212.02532] or Hurth et al. [arXiv:2311.04963] for MFV in SMEFT

Flavor patterns

- Flavor patterns reduce d.o.f. and impose correlations among different sectors
- Observation that FCNCs and CP violation are strongly suppressed in the data \rightarrow Minimal Flavor Violation (MFV)
- In the SM: flavor symmetry only broken by the Yukawa couplings ightarrow spurion expansion

$$\bar{q}_L q_L :\sim a_1 \mathbbm{1} + a_2 Y_u Y_u^\dagger + a_3 Y_d Y_d^\dagger + \dots \quad \bar{u}_R u_R :\sim b_1 \mathbbm{1} + b_2 Y_u^\dagger Y_u + \dots \quad \bar{d}_R d_R :\sim e_1 \mathbbm{1} + e_2 Y_d^\dagger Y_d + \dots$$



See also e.g. Bruggisser et al. [arXiv:2212.02532] or Hurth et al. [arXiv:2311.04963] for MFV in SMEFT

Flavor patterns

- Flavor patterns reduce d.o.f. and impose correlations among different sectors
- Observation that FCNCs and CP violation are strongly suppressed in the data \rightarrow Minimal Flavor Violation (MFV)
- In the SM: flavor symmetry only broken by the Yukawa couplings ightarrow spurion expansion

$$\bar{q}_L q_L \coloneqq a_1 \mathbbm{1} + a_2 Y_u Y_u^\dagger + a_3 Y_d Y_d^\dagger + \dots \quad \bar{u}_R u_R \coloneqq b_1 \mathbbm{1} + b_2 Y_u^\dagger Y_u + \dots \quad \bar{d}_R d_R \coloneqq e_1 \mathbbm{1} + e_2 Y_d^\dagger Y_d + \dots$$



- Alternatives: top-philic approach, motivated by the large top-Yukawa (e.g.[arXiv:2012.10456])
- Frogatt Nielsen models, theoretical approach to flavor hierarchies

See also e.g. Bruggisser et al. [arXiv:2212.02532] or Hurth et al. [arXiv:2311.04963] for MFV in SMEFT

Data and theory predictions

- Huge amount of data from LHC and flavor experiments \implies Global fits to exploit synergies and correlations
- Combine hundreds of observables in a single fit
- Quadratic parameterization:



$$\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}^{\mathsf{SM}} + \frac{1}{A^2} \sum_{i} C_i \mathcal{M}_i^{\mathsf{BSM}} \xrightarrow{\sigma \propto |\mathcal{M}|^2} \sigma = \sigma^{\mathsf{SM}} + \frac{1}{A^2} \sum_{i} C_i \sigma_i^{\mathsf{int}} + \frac{1}{A^4} \sum_{i \leq j} C_i C_j \sigma_{ij}^{\mathsf{BSM}}$$

$$\begin{array}{c} \sigma_{t\bar{t}} & \sigma_{t\bar{t}Z} & \sigma_{t\bar{t}Y} & \sigma_{t\bar{t}W} \\ \sigma_{t\bar{t}H} & \Gamma_t & f_0 & f_L \\ \hline R_b & A_{FB}^b & R_c & A_{FB}^c \\ \end{array} \right) \left(\begin{array}{c} e^+ e^- & e\nu \\ \mu^+ \mu^- & \mu\nu \\ \tau^+ \tau^- & \tau\nu \end{array} \right) \left(\begin{array}{c} \mathcal{B}_{\bar{B} \to X_s \gamma} & \mathcal{B}_{B^0 \to K^* \gamma} & \mathcal{B}_{B^+ \to K^{*+} \gamma} & \mathcal{B}_{\bar{B} \to X_s l^{+l-}} & \mathcal{B}_{\bar{B} \to X_s l^{+l-}} \\ \mathcal{B}_{B_s \to \mu^+ \mu^-} & \mathsf{F}_{LB^0 \to K^* \mu^+ \mu^-} & \mathcal{B}_{B^0 \to K^* \mu^+ \mu^-} & \mathcal{B}_{B^0 \to K^* \mu^+ \mu^-} & \mathcal{B}_{B^0 \to K^* \mu^+ \mu^-} \\ \mathcal{B}_{B^+ \to K^{++} \mu^+ \mu^-} & \mathsf{F}_{LB_s \to \phi \mu^+ \mu^-} & \mathsf{S}_{iB_s \to \phi \mu^+ \mu^-} & \mathcal{B}_{A_b \to A \mu^+ \mu^-} \Delta \mathcal{M}_{sB_s / \bar{B}_s} \\ \end{array} \right)$$

- $\sigma_i^{\text{int}}, \sigma_{ij}^{\text{BSM}} \rightarrow$ perturbative as well as non-perturbative computations necessary
- Crucial for flavor observables: hadronic matrix elements and form factors

IAL 2024 - Lara Nollen

- For collider observables: MC simulations (e.g. MadGraph, Sherpa, Pythia)
- Currently: mostly at tree level
- \bullet A lot of data is not unfolded \rightarrow need accurate parton shower and detector simulation

- For collider observables: MC simulations (e.g. MadGraph, Sherpa, Pythia)
- Currently: mostly at tree level
- A lot of data is not unfolded \rightarrow need accurate parton shower and detector simulation

Model definition

SMEFTsim [arXiv:2012.11343]

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathsf{SMEFT}} \,=\, \mathcal{L}_{\mathsf{SM}} + \sum_{d=5}^{\infty}\,\sum_{i}\,rac{C_{i}^{(d)}}{\Lambda^{d-4}}O_{i}^{(d)}$$

- For collider observables: MC simulations (e.g. MadGraph, Sherpa, Pythia)
- Currently: mostly at tree level
- \bullet A lot of data is not unfolded \rightarrow need accurate parton shower and detector simulation



- For collider observables: MC simulations (e.g. MadGraph, Sherpa, Pythia)
- Currently: mostly at tree level
- A lot of data is not unfolded \rightarrow need accurate parton shower and detector simulation





- For collider observables: MC simulations (e.g. MadGraph, Sherpa, Pythia)
- Currently: mostly at tree level
- \bullet A lot of data is not unfolded \rightarrow need accurate parton shower and detector simulation





Synergies from Beauty, Top, \boldsymbol{Z} and Drell-Yan



Results from [arXiv:2304.12837]

Challenges and future directions

- High-dimensional parameter space
 - \rightarrow efficient sampling algorithms, e.g. BAT, EFTFitter (see also talk by Cornelius Grunwald)
- Correlations in the data can have a significant impact ([arXiv:1912.06090])
- **PDFs** can mask NP effects \rightarrow ideally a combined fit of PDFs and SMEFT
- Dimension 8 operators are also relevant
- With the growing precision of data, theory predictions need to be improved



See e.g. [arXiv:2104.02723] for PDFs in SMEFT, [arXiv:2207.01703] for dimension 8 SMEFT fits