



31st International Symposium on Lepton Photon Interactions at High Energies

Future Challenges For Event Generators

Davide Napoletano
Università degli Studi di Milano-Bicocca

17-21 July 2023

Abstract

In this talk I present a personal perspective on what the current and future challenges are for Monte Carlo event generators. I focus in particular on those aspects of Monte Carlo event generators that have not, historically, received the same scrutiny and level of advancements which will be mandatory in future, cleaner and more precise experimental set-ups than current day LHC.

arXiv:2309.14305v1 [hep-ph] 25 Sep 2023

1 Introduction

The main goal of a Monte Carlo event generator (MCEG) [1, 2, 3] is to describe, as accurately as possible, physical events occurring in various experimental set-ups¹. Even in the simplest of cases, this may look like an almost impossible task, as an event consists of many interleaved effects that are difficult to tackle all at once. Nevertheless, we have had great success in comparing theoretical predictions obtained through MCEGs to experimental data. The main drive for this success is the fact that while it is true that a series of effects all take place in a physical event (such as ISR, MPI, hadronisation, hadron decay) other than the hard scattering, these various effects happen at different energies regimes (times), and can thus be considered as independent from one another. The price one pays to make this approximation can be estimated by scaling arguments, and one expects that the correlation effects amongst these various aspects is suppressed by some power of their characteristic energy scales with respect to that of the hard scattering.

The main strength of this approach is that it allows for a complete separation of ingredients, where each of the separate building blocks can be improved independently from one another, as long as they are then properly matched. It is thus only natural that the main community effort has been devoted to improving the accuracy of the hard scattering, which represents, from the Monte Carlo perspective, the initial conditions that needs to be dressed with all other ingredients. Among these ingredients there is the parton shower, which incidentally is an aspect of Monte Carlo event generation that has received a relatively large attention over the years. In the following, I quickly review the main focus of theoretical developments relative to Monte Carlo event generation, which in a sense represents the succeeded challenges the community has faced. Then I describe what in my opinion are aspects that need to be developed to a similar standard in order to succeed for the challenges ahead. Lastly I conclude with some remarks on challenges the Monte Carlo community specifically (and to some extent the broader high energy physics community) needs to address in order not to repeat some of the mistakes that, in my opinion, we have made. The main take home of this talk is that while it is true that we can rely on factorisation, none of the single pieces of a Monte Carlo work on their own when the aim is precision physics.

2 Hard Scattering

The description of the hard scattering process represents the core of MCEGs. This is often referred to as fixed order, and, in general, momentum and color information coming from the hard matrix element is then used to feed the parton shower and hadronisation. As they represent the starting point of the perturbative expansion – in the sense that any other aspect of MCEG can be seen as attaching higher orders in either the coupling constants or in powers of Λ_{QCD}/Q to it – it is only natural that this is the aspect that has received the most attention over the years, and has seen a lot of success. This success can essentially be split up in two ingredients: calculation of higher order matrix elements and development of subtractions. The former is relatively straightforward in its idea, while technically complicated, and requires the calculation of multi-loop diagrams. Indeed for one-loop calculations we now know that there exists a finite set of “base” scalar integrals, and the only complication of performing a one-loop calculation lies in finding the “coefficient”

¹Please note that here and in the following MCEGs refers to general purpose generators. This means the references to providers of the underlying hard scattering process and matching are not listed here.




Figure 1: The importance of including some sort of evolution to low scales, in this case achieved by the parton shower, even when higher orders are included [4].

multiplying such base integrals. Extensions of this to two- and higher-loops are not available yet in full generality, nevertheless we have now two-loops calculations for $2 \rightarrow 2, 3$ scattering and three-loops for $2 \rightarrow 1$ processes.

Subtraction is, on the other hand, only a technical complication due to the fact that the cancellation of infrared singularities (for both QCD and QED) does not happen trivially, but only after the integration over the emission phase-space, and computer programs cannot deal with this in an effective manner. There is the additional complication that ideally one wants subtraction terms that are both effective in subtracting the infrared singularities of the matrix elements, and, at the same time, easy to integrate analytically, such as to avoid numerical integration of a logarithmically enhanced (divergent) phase-space. These complications have, however, been overcome in a variety of approaches at both NLO and NNLO. Equipped with both higher order calculations and subtraction, we can try and compare to some experimental data. Take, $Z + j$ production in Drell-Yan, for example, as depicted in Fig. 1.

As it can be seen, although the fixed order description captures well the behaviour at large transverse momentum of the Z -boson, at low p_{\perp} fixed order alone is not enough, and one would need an infinite amount of higher orders to accurately describe data. This is precisely what the parton shower does in this case, and indeed one can see that after matching we recover a good description of data across the entire spectrum.

3 Parton Shower, Matching, Merging

Parton showering can be seen in a variety of different ways. Here I present it in the most pragmatic approach possible: it evolves – by *radiating* – particles produced in




Figure 2: The importance of including non-perturbative corrections, even when shower and fixed-order corrections are included.

the hard scattering to lower energies, energies closer to the hadronisation scale. Note that I am being purposefully vague here as describing this process in detail requires much more time and space than a proceeding allows. The core idea behind parton showers dates back to the '80s [5], and has to a large extent remain unchanged since. It consists of dressing with radiation, ordered in a suitably defined variable such as to reflect time ordering, the hard matrix element. The implementation details of this vary to a large extent, as one can envision angular ordering, energy ordering, invariant mass ordering, transverse momentum (in various definition) ordering and so on. On top of this, how exactly the kinematics of the splittings is implemented, at what scale the coupling attached to a given splitting is evaluated all constitute the “implementation details” of a given shower algorithm.

For about 20 or so years, it was believed that no matter what one did with most of these choices, as long as you had an algorithm capable of describing coherence, you evaluated α_s in the so-called CMW scheme, with leading order splitting functions, you would get at least a leading-logarithmic accurate description of all observables, which could even be next-to-leading logarithmic accurate for a special class of them. This belief was dismantled when it was shown that, due exactly to those unimportant implementation details, dipole showers break NLL accuracy and LL accuracy beyond leading colour. This has started a new series of more accurate shower algorithms, and the aim is to be able achieve NNLL for most observables.

Nevertheless, based on the discussion around Fig 1 one would expect that the shower description would, by itself, give a fairly good description of data. However, when comparing for example to LEP data, as done in Fig. 2, one can see that to actually match data across the entire spectrum, one needs to include hadronisation and subsequent fragmentation effects, on top of shower emissions. Note that this goes beyond the accuracy of the shower, as the physics behind these two regimes

is intrinsically different – one is perturbative and the other non-perturbative – thus the same argument can be equally applied to more accurate showers. However there is a non-trivial subtlety in Fig. 2 and the following discussion. Hadronisation models, and more in general most models involving the non-perturbative side of event generation, undergo tuning, *i.e.* they match data because they were fitted so.

4 Non-Perturbative models

The core idea behind hadronisation models [6, 7] and more broadly non-perturbative models used in MCEGs, is that they are phenomenological models based on a – typically large – number of parameters that control various aspects of non-perturbative physics, such as the mean and distribution of charged particle multiplicities, the yield of individual hadron species, the fragmentation of heavy quarks to heavy hadrons and so on. Different models, such as “cluster” or “strings”, eventually differ in how partons, coming from the parton shower, are combined together to form hadrons and their subsequent decays products, but they share the main logic explained above.

The hope, and the common belief – although no proof or disproof exists as of yet – is that, similarly to parton distribution functions (PDF) which are extracted from DIS data and used for any process requiring them, one can tune these parameters in a clean environment such as LEP, and then, provided they are universal to some extent, re-use them for other set ups. However, one can see how this might fail. Indeed take the PDF example: they are essentially one dimensional functions of a given parton’s momentum fraction, x , and that is the only non-perturbative part of these functions. Their scale dependence is completely determined perturbatively – a.k.a. DGLAP equations. This means that the dependence on the point (factorisation scale) where one decides arbitrarily to divide the non-perturbative and perturbative regions is completely known and cancels between hard partonic matrix elements and PDF evolution at any fixed-order. In contrast, non-perturbative models’ parameters have no scale dependence – apart from that induced by tuning them at a given scale – and their evolution is not known theoretically, as such it is easy to imagine that extracting them at a given scale would not give the same result as extracting them at another energy scale, or in another experimental set-up. Indeed, novel tunings based on H1 data and clean DIS observables are starting to show evidence of incompatibility with LEP data tunes.

An additional issue is that although higher order calculations are available tunes that include such perturbative effects as to try and reduce as much as possible tuning away higher order effects are still scarce. All in all, given that – as seen for example in Fig. 2 – non-perturbative effects can give extremely large corrections in some regions of phase-space, we need to be able to at least understand these models better to better assess uncertainties on theoretical calculations.

5 Miscellaneous and Conclusions

As MCEGs cover all aspects of a collider event, and that the majority of people doing research on these topics focuses on either the hard matrix elements or the shower and their interplay, it is easy to imagine that the list of understudied topics can become quite long. Here I list a few of them, keeping in mind that this does not have the aim of being an exhaustive and complete list by any mean.

Heavy Quark Mass effects One important aspect of Monte Carlo simulations that needs to be theoretically under control is the inclusion of heavy quark mass

effects, specifically in parton showers. Historically the approach has been that of replacing massless with massive ingredients and hope for the best, with the idea that mass effects are in any case beyond the current accuracy claimed by parton showers. However, there are two important aspects to note here. First, while this may be true in general, as we move towards more exclusive observables there is a non-trivial scale interplay between the mass of the heavy quark and the energy – in the broader sense – of a given observable, which may lead to large effects which have to be controlled. Second, as the accuracy of parton showers increases, these have to be included to claim the full higher order accuracy claimed. In addition to these two aspects, there is the subtle thread of how to estimate an uncertainty of a Monte Carlo simulation. If we trust that including or not mass effects is only a matter of factorisation scheme dependence – up to purely kinematical effects of course – then the difference between including them or not, or how these are included, should be treated as a pure theoretical uncertainty, which would lead to much larger uncertainties than the ones currently reported.

Electroweak Corrections Electroweak corrections have had, in recent years, an important role. Implementations of fully automated subtractions at NLO have been implemented in most MCGs and one-loop matrix elements from loop providers are readily available. In addition, a variety of implementations of these corrections in approximations were also implemented and are now fully automated, including their matching to QCD higher orders and parton shower, including merging. There are however two important aspects, in my opinion, that have not seen the same level of attention, and that I think need to be considered amongst the set of future challenges. The first is the availability – theory papers on the topic and implementation exist but it is not entirely clear in which shape these are – of EW parton showers. The second, which is tied to the first in some sense, is the need to revisit our current concept of what an EW final state really is. This is a potentially long point to elaborate in full detail, but in short, when talking about EW corrections we typically only refer to virtual corrections, as the argument is that we can, experimentally, distinguish between a Z boson or a photon or a W boson and a final state with or without an additional massive vector boson. This is certainly true at the LHC, but to what extent this remains true at higher energies – where virtual electroweak corrections would play a relatively bigger role – remains to be seen. The point is that the inclusion of real radiation at high energies scales almost exactly like the virtuals with opposite sign, leaving only a mass-suppressed mis-cancellation. At the same time, even if it remains true that only virtual EW corrections contribute, at higher energies we need to develop frameworks capable of handling the resummation of Sudakov logarithms.

Conclusions Monte Carlo event generators are a fundamental tool to compare theoretical predictions to experimental data, as a theoretical tool for phenomenological studies. Most of the successful challenges of the past have been dedicated to develop technologies to be able to include higher order calculations and to match those with parton showers. More recently, parton showers have received a lot of attention which is thus leading towards having more accurate parton showers. Technologies on how to then match higher order accuracies parton showers with higher order calculations will have to be then developed, and in some sense this will likely be a crucial not-so-distant-future challenge. On top of this, a variety of non-perturbative and/or power-suppressed aspects of Monte Carlo event generators need to be put on more solid theoretical grounds. This is important both to provide more accurate

results, and because by developing these aspects allows us to estimate theoretical uncertainties in a fairer way.

In order for the future of Monte Carlo Event Generators to remain as bright as it is been, on top of physics challenges, I personally think we have to tackle more pragmatic ones as well. In general codes developed for wider uses, such as MCEGs, are huge and highly complicated pieces of code which not only take a long time to write and maintain, but also to learn and master to a point where developments are possible. In addition, their broad use requires that developers invest a lot of their work time in maintaining the code and supporting users. Our current way of evaluating scientific success, based on pure metric, does not help in this sense. New ideas take a lot of time to be thought of, and even more time to be transformed into practical algorithms, and as such are disfavored. Furthermore neither maintenance nor user support lead to publications, which are the only way to get positions and grants. To successfully tackle this future challenges, which will require even more new ideas on the one hand, and more advanced coding and maintenance and support on the other hand, we need to re-assess as a community how to measure in a fairer way the scientific value of people's work.

References

- [1] Enrico Bothmann et al. Event Generation with Sherpa 2.2. *SciPost Phys.*, 7(3):034, 2019.
- [2] Torbjörn Sjöstrand, Stefan Ask, Jesper R. Christiansen, Richard Corke, Nishita Desai, Philip Ilten, Stephen Mrenna, Stefan Prestel, Christine O. Rasmussen, and Peter Z. Skands. An introduction to PYTHIA 8.2. *Comput. Phys. Commun.*, 191:159–177, 2015.
- [3] Johannes Bellm et al. Herwig 7.0/Herwig++ 3.0 release note. *Eur. Phys. J. C*, 76(4):196, 2016.
- [4] Wojciech Bizon, Aude Gehrmann-De Ridder, Thomas Gehrmann, Nigel Glover, Alexander Huss, Pier Francesco Monni, Emanuele Re, Luca Rottoli, and Duncan M. Walker. The transverse momentum spectrum of weak gauge bosons at N³ LL + NNLO. *Eur. Phys. J. C*, 79(10):868, 2019.
- [5] Geoffrey C. Fox and Stephen Wolfram. A Model for Parton Showers in QCD. *Nucl. Phys. B*, 168:285–295, 1980.
- [6] Bo Andersson, G. Gustafson, and B. Soderberg. A General Model for Jet Fragmentation. *Z. Phys. C*, 20:317, 1983.
- [7] B. R. Webber. A QCD Model for Jet Fragmentation Including Soft Gluon Interference. *Nucl. Phys. B*, 238:492–528, 1984.