IFJPAN-IV-2010-4

Monte Carlo modelling of NLO DGLAP QCD evolution in the fully unintegrated form

S. Jadach^{ab}, A. Kusina^a, M. Skrzypek^a and M. Slawinska^a

a Institute of Nuclear Physics, Polish Academy of Sciences, ul. Radzikowskiego 152, 31-342, Kraków, Poland

^bTheory Group, Physics Department, CERN, CH-1211, Geneva 23, Switzerland

We are reporting on the ongoing effort of the Monte Carlo (MC) modelling of NLO DGLAP QCD evolution in the fully unintegrated form. The resulting parton shower MC is performing on its own the NLO QCD evolution, contrary to all known programs of this kind which are limited to LO level only. We overview this new MC scheme, for the non-singlet subset of the gluonstrahlung diagrams. Precision numerical test of this new scheme are also shown.

1. Introduction

In the so called factorization theorems, see for instance $[1,2,3]$ $[1,2,3]$ $[1,2,3]$, the scattering process with a single large transverse momentum scale (short distance interaction), can be described in the perturbative QCD [\[4,](#page-5-3)[5](#page-5-4)[,6\]](#page-5-5) (pQCD) in terms of the on-shell hard process matrix element convoluted with the *ladder part*. The hard process is calculable up to a fixed perturbative order. The ladder part, calculated for each coloured parton entering (exiting) the hard process, is conveniently described as a tree-like stream of partons, parametrized by the inclusive parton distribution function, PDF.

The logarithmic response of the inclusive PDF to the change of the large k_T scale is the so called DGLAP[\[7\]](#page-5-6) evolution of the PDFs. This evolution was mastered for the inclusive PDFs up to NLO level in the early 80's, see for instance [\[8,](#page-5-7)[9\]](#page-5-8), and recently even to the NNLO level [\[10\]](#page-5-9).

Alternatively the parton tree encapsulated in the inclusive PDF can be modelled using direct stochastic simulation of their four-momenta and other attributes, the so-called Monte Carlo (MC) technique. Here, the breakthrough was made in mid-80's, see refs. [\[11,](#page-5-10)[12\]](#page-5-11), where the LO ladder was implemented in the so-called parton shower (PS) MCs.

Standard LO level PSMC implements also the hadronization of quark and gluon partons into hadrons and is a workhorse in the software in all collider experiments. The advent of the LHC puts a challenging requirement on the quality of the pQCD calculations needed for the experimental data analysis. Some of them will soon require that the PSMC is upgraded to the complete NLO level. This, however is not an easy task, mainly because classic factorization theorems [\[1,](#page-5-0)[2](#page-5-1)[,3\]](#page-5-2) are not well suited for the exclusive MC implementation, but rather for inclusive PDFs.

In this contribution we would like to report on the serious and successful attempt of solving the above problem of constructing NLO PSMC. We shall overview main technical points and present some numerical tests of the scheme.

Possible profits from NLO PSMC include: (a) Complete set of "unitegrated soft counterterms" for combining hard process ME at NNLO with NLO PSMC; (b) Natural extensions towards $BFKL/CCFM$ at low x ; (c) Better modelling of low scale phenomena, $Q < 10 GeV$, quark thresholds, primordial k^T , underlying event, etc.; (d) Porting information on the parton distributions from DIS (HERA) to W/Z/DY (LHC) in the MC itself, instead in the collinear PDFs (universality must be preserved) and more.

The MC modelling of NLO DGLAP is not so

much the aim itself – it will be rather a starting platform for many interesting developments in pQCD in many directions.

Presently, we concentrate on constructing NLO PSMC for QCD initial state radiation (ISR) just for one initial parton such that: (a) it is based on the collinear factorization theorems [\[1](#page-5-0)[,2](#page-5-1)[,3\]](#page-5-2) as rigorously as possible, (b) we take scheme of Curci-Furmanski-Petronzio (CFP) as a main reference and guide (axial gauge, \overline{MS} dimensional regularization), (c) NLO DGLAP evolution is reproduced exactly at the inclusive level (c) MC performs NLO evolution by itself, using new exclusive NLO evolution kernels, without help of external pretabulated inclusive PDFs.

We refer the reader to Refs. [\[13](#page-5-12)[,14](#page-5-13)[,15,](#page-5-14)[16\]](#page-5-15) for discussions of other aspects of the scheme of the MC modelling of the QCD NLO evolution not reported in this contribution. We would like also to point out to some similarities of this project to works in Refs. [\[17,](#page-5-16)[18\]](#page-5-17).

2. NLO PSMC for C_F^2 part of NLO nonsinglet kernel

We start from the ISR ladder of deep inelastic scattering of the lepton-hadron and our aim is to add 1st order corrections to the LO vertex in the middle of the ladder, see the Figure below

Figure 1. Deep inelastic lepton-proton scattering.

Figure 2. Correcting the last vertex in the LO ladder to NLO level.

Let us start with correcting up to NLO level just one vertex (kernel) at the end of the ladder (next to hard process) in the LO PSMC, see the graph in Fig. [1.](#page-1-0) The multigluon distribution of the LO PSMC representing the inside of the LO PDF is

$$
e^{-S_{ISR}} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \prod_{i=1}^{n} \frac{d^3 k_i}{k_i^0} \theta_{Q>a_i>a_{i-1}} \rho_1^{(0)}(k_i) \delta_{x=\prod z_i},
$$

where S_{ISR} is the Sudakov double log formfactor, the lightcone variable of the emitted gluon is $\alpha_i =$ $\frac{k_i^+}{2E_h}$, the angular scale variable is $a_i = \frac{k_i^T}{\alpha_i}$ and the actual distribution of the $q \to Gq$ splitting is $\rho_1^{(0)}(k_i) = \frac{2C_F^2\alpha_s}{\pi} \frac{1}{k_i^{T2}}$ $\frac{1+z_i^2}{2}$, where $1-z_i = \alpha_i/(1-\alpha_i)$ $\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \alpha_j$, and C_F is colour factor.

In Fig. [2,](#page-1-1) we illustrate again the situation in which the last (top) vertex is upgraded to NLO level. Hence in the leftmost graph this vertex includes already multiplicative virtual+soft NLO correction:

$$
\left|\left|\left| \frac{\mathbf{1}}{\mathbf{1}}\cdots\right|\right|^2 = \left(1 + 2\Re(\Delta_{ISR}^{(1)})\right)\left|\left|\left|\left| \frac{\mathbf{1}}{\mathbf{1}}\right|\right|^2\right|^2.
$$

The two-gluon NLO correction coming from two graphs $\int_{-i}^{i^2}$ *1* \int_{I} is defined as:

Here, the projection operator P , represented by the rectangular box in the graph $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ *1* , should be understood as operating on the amplitude squared, spin-summed:

$$
\left|\frac{\frac{1}{\blacklozenge \cdot 2}}{\frac{1}{\blacklozenge \cdot 2}}\right|^2 = \frac{\frac{1}{\blacklozenge \cdot 2 \cdot 2 \cdot \blacklozenge} \mathsf{P}}{\frac{1}{\blacklozenge \cdot 2 \cdot 2 \cdot 2 \cdot \blacklozenge} \mathsf{P}}.
$$

This P operator is present in Fig. [2](#page-1-1) in each ladder many times and its role is to simplify the exact matrix element to the LO approximation level all over the phase space. The role of the NLO cor-**Prection** is to *undo* the simplification done by P, just for 2 gluons. One could think that it is enough to include two leftmost graphs of Fig. [2.](#page-1-1) It is, however, necessary to include the sum over all LO spectators down to the beginning of the ladder, see Fig. [2,](#page-1-1) for the second gluon entering the NLO correction *1* .

Altogether, the above NLO-corrected multigluon distribution reads as follows

$$
\rho_n(k_i^{\mu}) = e^{-S_{ISR}} \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{n} & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{n} \\ \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{n} & \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{n} \\ \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{
$$

where the MC weight component correcting the 2-gluon distribution is:

$$
W(k_2, k_1) = \frac{\left|\frac{\left|\frac{\mathbf{1}}{\mathbf{1}} \right|^{2}}{\left|\frac{\left|\frac{\mathbf{1}}{\mathbf{1}} \right|^{2}}{\left|\frac{\mathbf{1}}{\mathbf{1}} \right|^{2}}\right|^{2}} = \frac{\left|\frac{\left|\frac{\mathbf{1}}{\mathbf{1}} \right|^{2} \cdots \left|\frac{\mathbf{1}}{\mathbf{1}} \right|^{2}}{\left|\frac{\left|\frac{\mathbf{1}}{\mathbf{1}} \right|^{2} \cdots \left|\frac{\mathbf{1}}{\mathbf{1}} \right|^{2}}{\left|\frac{\left|\frac{\mathbf{1}}{\mathbf{1}} \right|^{2} \cdots \left|\frac{\mathbf{1}}{\mathbf{1}} \right|^{2}}\right|^{2}} - 1\right|}{\left|\frac{\left|\frac{\mathbf{1}}{\mathbf{1}} \right|^{2} \cdots \left|\frac{\mathbf{1}}{\mathbf{1}} \right|^{2} \cdots \left|\frac{\mathbf{1}}{\mathbf{1}} \right|^{2}}{\left|\frac{\mathbf{1}}{\mathbf{1}} \cdots \left|\frac{\mathbf{1}}{\mathbf{1}} \right|^{2}}\right|^{2}}
$$

and the virtual correction is $\beta_0^{(1)} =$ $\begin{array}{c} \hline \end{array}$ $\begin{array}{c} \hline \end{array}$ 2 *1−z z* $\overline{2}$.

Amazingly, in the expression for the PDF,
 $D(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \int dLips_n \rho_n(k_1, k_2, ... k_n) \delta(x \prod$ $\begin{array}{rcl}\n(x) & = & \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \int dLips_n \rho_n(k_1, k_2, ... k_n) \delta(x - k_1, k_2) \\
y = z_j, \quad \text{the integration of the NLO part}\n\end{array}$ $\sum_j W(\tilde{k}_n, \tilde{k}_j)$ can be done analytically leading to:

$$
\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int du \int_{Q>a_n>a_{n-1}} \frac{da_n}{a_n} \mathcal{P}_{qq}^{(1)}(u)
$$

$$
\times \left(\prod_{i=1}^{n-1} \int_{a_{i+1}>a_i>a_{i-1}} \frac{da_i}{a_i} \mathcal{P}_{qq}^{(0)}(z_i) \right) \delta_{x=u} \prod_{j=1}^{n-1} z_j,
$$

recovering for the last emission precisely the NLO part (including virtuals) of standard DGLAP kernel $\mathcal{P}_{qq}^{(1)}(u)$ defined according to:

$$
\mathcal{P}_{qq}^{(1)}(u) \ln \frac{Q}{q_0} = \int d^3 \eta_n \ \rho_{1B}^{(1)}(k_n) \ \beta_0^{(1)}(z_n) \delta_{u=z_n}
$$

$$
+ \int d^3 \eta_n \int d^3 \eta_{n'} \ \beta_1^{(1)}(\tilde{k}_n, \tilde{k}_{n'}) \ \delta_{u=z_n z_{n'}}.
$$

$$
Q > a_n > a_0 \quad a_n > a_{n'} > 0
$$

In this way at the inclusive level the NLO standard inclusive kernel of DGLAP is truly reproduced for the last $(n-th)$ vertex in the ladder.

One can repeat the same procedure for any vertex number p_1 in the middle of the ladder, sum up over p_1 , then apply the same for any two vertices p_1 and p_2 and so on, such that finally all vertices in the ladder are at the NLO level. The above general procedure will yield the following multigluon distribution:

$$
\rho_n(k_l) = e^{-S_{ISR}} \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2} & \cdots & 2 \\ \frac{1}{2} & \cdots & \cdots \end{pmatrix} + \sum_{p_1=1}^{n} \sum_{j_1=1}^{p_1-1} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2} & \cdots & 2 \\ \frac{1}{2} & \cdots & \cdots \end{pmatrix}
$$

+
$$
\sum_{p_1=1}^{n} \sum_{p_2=1}^{p_1-1} \sum_{\substack{j_1=1 \ j_2 \neq p_1, j_2}}^{p_2-1} \sum_{\substack{j_2=1 \ j_1 \neq p_2}}^{p_2-1} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \frac{1}{2} \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \\ \frac{1}{2} \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \end{array} \right\} =
$$

\n= $e^{-S_{ISR}} \left[\beta_0^{(1)}(z_p) + \sum_{p=1}^{n} \sum_{\substack{j_2=1 \ j_1 \neq p_2}}^{p_2-1} W(\tilde{k}_p, \tilde{k}_j)$
\n+
$$
\sum_{p_1=1}^{n} \sum_{p_2=1}^{p_1-1} \sum_{\substack{j_1=1 \ j_2 \neq p_1, j_2}}^{p_2-1} W(\tilde{k}_{p_1}, \tilde{k}_{j_1}) W(\tilde{k}_{p_2}, \tilde{k}_{j_2})
$$

\n+
$$
\cdots \right] \prod_{i=1}^{n} \theta_{a_i > a_{i-1}} \rho_1^{(1)}(k_i) \beta_0^{(1)}(z_i).
$$
 (1)

The above formula was already tested numerically with three digit precision.

In the upper part of the figure above we present numerical results for the (inclusive) PDF, $D(x, Q)$, from two Monte Carlo models, one with traditional inclusive evolution kernels and another one implementing our new NLO distribution of Eq. [\(1\)](#page-3-0). The trivial LO contribution is excluded from the comparison and the two curves represent the term in Eq. (1) with single W and with double W. Since the results cannot be distinguished in the upper plot, we also show their ratio in the lower plot in the Figure above. The evolution runs from $Q_0 = 10 \text{GeV}$ to $Q = 1 \text{TeV}$, starting from $D(x, Q_0) = \delta(1-x)$. The ratio

demonstrates 3-digit agreement, in units of the LO.

Let us note that the Monte Carlo weight implementing NLO corrections is positive, with small dispersion and without any nasty tails.

3. Adding $C_F C_A$ part of the NLO nonsinglet kernel of NLO PSMC

Straightforward inclusion of the gluon pair diagram in the method of the previous section would be mathematically correct, but the Monte Carlo weight would be spoilt due to presence of Sudakov double logarithmic contribution $+S_{FSR}$ in the 2real-gluon correction

$$
\left|\frac{\mathbf{1}}{\mathbf{1}}\sum_{i=1}^{2n}x_i\right|^2 = \left|\frac{\mathbf{1}}{\mathbf{1}}\sum_{i=1}^{n}x_i + \mathbf{1}\sum_{i=1}^{n}x_i + \mathbf{1}\sum_{i=1}^{n}x_i\right|^2 - \left|\frac{\mathbf{1}}{\mathbf{1}}\sum_{i=1}^{n}x_i\right|^2
$$

compensated by $-S_{FSR}$ component in the virtual correction

$$
\left|\prod_{i=1}^{n} \cdots \right|^2 = \left(1 + 2\Re(\Delta_{ISR} + V_{FSR})\right) \left|\prod_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{n}\right|^2.
$$

 $\overline{}$ $\overline{}$ $\overline{}$ I $\overline{}$

Resummation/exponentiation of FSR is therefore mandatory. Let us start again with the problem of upgrading to the NLO level the last vertex of the LO ladder. In the MC weight we add an extra term, which in the graphical form looks as follows

$$
e^{-S_{ISR}-S_{FSR}}\sum_{n,m=0}^{\infty}\sum_{r=1}^{m}\left|\begin{matrix}+\sqrt[n]{\bullet},+\bullet,+\bullet,\cdots+\bullet,\cdots+\bullet,\cdots\\ \leftarrow\\ +\ddots+\ddots+\ddots+\ddots+\ddots\\ +\ddots-\ddots+\ddots+\ddots\\ +\ddots-\ddots\end{matrix}\right|^{2},
$$

where the Sudakov term S_{FSR} is subtracted in the virtual part:

$$
\left|\frac{1}{\Gamma}\cdots\right|^2 = \left(1 + 2\Re(\Delta_{ISR} + V_{FSR} - S_{FSR})\right)\left|\frac{1}{\Gamma}\sum_{i=1}^2\right|^2,
$$

and the FSR soft counterterm is subtracted in the 2-real-gluon part:

$$
\left|\frac{1}{\left|\frac{1}{\lambda}\right|^{2}}\right|^{2}=\left|\left|\frac{1}{\lambda}\right|^{2}+\left|\frac{1}{\lambda}\right|^{2}+\left|\frac{1}{\lambda}\right|^{2}-\left|\frac{1}{\left|\frac{1}{\lambda}\right|^{2}}\right|^{2}-\left|\left|\frac{1}{\lambda}\right|^{2}\right|^{2}.
$$

It is remarkable that both above NLO corrections are free of any soft and collinear divergences, in spite of their complicated structure. This is thanks to a clever choice of the FSR counterterm \blacklozenge , which is iterated in the FSR LO MC for the gluon emitted from the ladder. It was helpful in the above exercise that we were employing angular ordering in the LO MC both for ISR and FSR parts.

Altogether, the complete MC distribution, with the last LO vertex in the ladder upgraded to the NLO level looks as follows:

where NLO correction building blocks are

Again it is possible to check analytically, that the above apparently complicated MC weight reproduces exactly the traditional NLO integrated kernels for the last vertex in the ladder. We have also performed numerical tests in which the above distribution is modelled for the $n = 1, 2$ ISR gluons and any number of FSR gluons. The comparison between MC and analytical result is in the following plot:

It shows again the excellent agreement of the exclusive implementation of the NLO corrections in the PSMC and the analytical crosscheck, this time for the complete gluonstrahlung, including both C_F^2 and $C_F C_A$ parts. Again we have checked that the MC weight is positive and the distribution of the MC weights is narrow.

4. Summary and prospects

Summarizing we state that the first serious feasibility study of the true NLO exclusive MC parton shower is almost complete for the non-singlet NLO DGLAP. The building block for the corresponding parton shower MC is tested numerically. Further work will cover the following areas:

- Short range aim: Complete non-singlet, also for hard process.
- Middle range aim: Complete singlet (quarkgluon transitions).
- Optimize MC weight evaluation (CPU time).
- 6
- Complete NLO MC for DIS at HERA and W/Z production at LHC.
- Interface to standard NLO MS PDFs,
- Extensions towards CCFM/BFKL.

5. Acknowledgements

This research has been partly supported by the the Polish Ministry of Science and Higher Education grants No. 1289/B/H03/2009/37 and No. 153/6.PR UE/2007/7.

REFERENCES

- 1. R.K. Ellis et al., Nucl. Phys. B152 (1979) 285.
- 2. J.C. Collins, D.E. Soper and G. Sterman, Nucl. Phys. B250 (1985) 199.
- 3. G.T. Bodwin, Phys. Rev. D31 (1985) 2616.
- 4. D.J. Gross and F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. D8 (1973) 3633.
- 5. D.J. Gross and F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. D9 (1974) 980.
- 6. H. Georgi and H.D. Politzer, Phys. Rev. D9 (1974) 416.
- 7. L.N. Lipatov, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. 20 (1975) 95; V.N. Gribov and L.N. Lipatov, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. 15 (1972) 438; G. Altarelli and G. Parisi, Nucl. Phys. 126 (1977) 298; Yu. L. Dokshitzer, Sov. Phys. JETP 46

(1977) 64.

- 8. E.G. Floratos, D.A. Ross and C.T. Sachrajda, Nucl. Phys. B152 (1979) 493.
- 9. G. Curci, W. Furmanski and R. Petronzio, Nucl. Phys. B175 (1980) 27.
- 10. A. Vogt, S. Moch and J.A.M. Vermaseren, Nucl. Phys. B691 (2004) 129, [hep-ph/0404111.](http://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0404111)
- 11. T. Sjostrand, Phys. Lett. B157 (1985) 321.
- 12. B.R. Webber, Nucl. Phys. B238 (1984) 492.
- 13. S. Jadach et al., (2010), 1002.0010.
- 14. S. Jadach and M. Skrzypek, Acta Phys. Polon. B40 (2009) 2071, 0905.1399.
- 15. A. Kusina et al., (2010), 1004.4131.
- 16. M. Slawinska and A. Kusina, Acta Phys. Polon. B40 (2009) 2097, 0905.1403.
- 17. K. Kato, T. Munehisa and H. Tanaka, Z. Phys. C54 (1992) 397.
- 18. H. Tanaka, Prog. Theor. Phys. 110 (2003) 963.