

SANC Monte Carlo programs for small-angle Bhabha scattering*

A.B. Arbuzov^{1,3}, S.G. Bondarenko^{1,3}, I.R. Boyko², L.V. Kalinovskaya², A.A. Kampf²,
R.R. Sadykov², V.L. Yermolchik^{2,3†}

¹ *Bogoliubov Laboratory of Theoretical Physics, JINR, Dubna, 141980 Russia*

² *Dzhelepov Laboratory of Nuclear Problems, JINR, Dubna, 141980 Russia*

³ *Dubna State University, Dubna, 141982 Russia*

Abstract

Luminosity monitoring at e+e- colliders is investigated using SANC Monte Carlo event generator ReneSANCe and integrator MCSANC for simulation of Bhabha scattering at low angles. Results are presented for center-of-mass energies of the Z boson resonance and 240 GeV for the conditions of typical luminosity detectors. It is shown that taking into account bremsstrahlung events with extremely low electron scattering angles is relevant to match the precision tags of the future electron-positron colliders.

Keywords: luminosity, Bhabha scattering, QED, Monte Carlo simulation

1 Introduction

Luminosity monitoring is the standard task for all collider experiments. One of the traditional processes for high-precision luminosity measurements at electron-positron colliders is Small-Angle Bhabha Scattering (SABS). This process has a clean detector signature and very large cross section which sharply increases at small scattering angles. From the theoretical point of view it is almost a pure QED process and thus can be described very accurately within perturbative quantum field theory. SABS occupies a special place in the physics programme of future e^+e^- colliders like FCCee [1] and CEPC [2]. Given the extremely large expected statistics, the luminosity measurement with precision 10^{-4} or better is necessary. The theoretical accuracy for SABS calculations must be significantly better than this target precision in order not to spoil the resulting uncertainty.

The most advanced codes for theoretical estimation of luminosity with the help of SABS are BabaYaga [3–7], BHLUMI [8]. The Monte Carlo (MC) generator BHLUMI is a pure QED tool and its theoretical uncertainty is estimated to be about 0.037%, see Table 2 in [9]. In that paper the future prospects of theoretical precision 1×10^{-4} was presented for luminosity measurement at the future colliders at the Z peak.

The new release of BabaYaga [10] is accounting for the various sources of radiative corrections, i.e. QED, (electro)weak and higher order effects. This generator is mainly intended for large angle Bhabha scattering, with theoretical errors of about 0.1%.

In this paper we present a study of SABS based on MCSANC integrator [11] and ReneSANCe generator [12]. The process of polarized Bhabha scattering (see Fig. 1)

$$e^+(p_1) + e^-(p_2) \rightarrow e^-(p_3) + e^+(p_4) + (\gamma(p_5))$$

*Supported by the Russian Science Foundation (project No. 22-12-00021)

†E-mail: Vitaly.Yermolchik@jinr.ru

was calculated at the complete one-loop electroweak level [13]. In addition here we consider the higher order corrections by $\delta\rho$ parameter, which are necessary to meet the high-precision requirements of the future e^+e^- experiments. The details of Bhabha scattering implementation into MC ReneSANCe are described in [12].

The aim of the present paper is to report on the study of the Bhabha scattering cross section at arbitrarily small or even vanishingly small scattering angles. The contribution from electron scattering at very small angles introduces additional, potentially sizeable, effect in the theoretical interpretation of the measured SABS cross section value. We provide the advanced assessment of SABS events with scattering angles under 10 mrad. Earlier, this kinematic region could be described by BHAGEN-1PH [14], however the calculations were limited to the contribution of hard photon Bremsstrahlung.




Fig. 1. The s and t channels of Bhabha processes at lowest order.

The outline of the paper is as follows. In Section 2 we show the comparisons with the results of alternative MC code in the conditions and setup of the CERN Workshop [15]. In Section 3 we give numerical results for the integral cross sections and angular event distributions of experimental interest in SABS. We also discuss different sources of radiative corrections and study the effect from the minimum cut-off on electron scattering angle.

2 Cross-check with the 1996 LEP Workshop

To verify the technical precision of our codes we produced the tuned comparison with results presented in the proceedings of the CERN Workshop [15] devoted to event generators for Bhabha scattering at LEP for the non-calorimetric event selection called BARE1 and the calorimetric one called CALO1. All numbers are produced within the setup of this workshop for the $\mathcal{O}(\alpha)$ matrix element without contribution of the Z exchange, up-down interference and vacuum polarization and with various values of the energy-cut $z_{\min} = s'/s$, where s' is the collision energy after initial state radiation (ISR). Table 1 shows a good agreement within numerical precision.

3 Numerical results

All results were obtained in the $\alpha(0)$ electroweak scheme using the set of input parameters listed in Table 2.

In addition, the following conditions were taken into account:

- electrons were allowed to scatter by any angle, down to zero,

Table 1. Comparison of BARE1 and CALO1 for the $O(\alpha)$ matrix element. Z exchange, up-down interference and vacuum polarization are switched off. The center of mass energy is $\sqrt{s} = 92.3$ GeV. The results are shown with various values of the energy-cut $z_{\min} = s'/s$.

z_{\min}	ReneSANCe	BHLUMI	ReneSANCe	BHLUMI
	BARE1: σ [nb]		CALO1: σ [nb]	
.100	166.01(1)	166.05(2)	166.33(1)	166.33(2)
.300	164.71(1)	164.74(2)	166.05(1)	166.05(2)
.500	162.19(1)	162.24(2)	165.26(1)	165.29(2)
.700	155.41(1)	155.43(2)	161.77(1)	161.79(2)
.900	134.36(2)	134.39(2)	149.91(1)	149.93(2)

Table 2. Input parameters.

$\alpha^{-1}(0)$	=	137.035999084		
M_W	=	80.379 GeV	Γ_W	= 2.0836 GeV
M_Z	=	91.1876 GeV	Γ_Z	= 2.4952 GeV
M_H	=	125.0 GeV	m_e	= 0.51099895 MeV
m_μ	=	0.1056583745 GeV	m_τ	= 1.77686 GeV
m_d	=	0.083 GeV	m_s	= 0.215 GeV
m_b	=	4.7 GeV	m_u	= 0.062 GeV
m_c	=	1.5 GeV	m_t	= 172.76 GeV.

- luminosity acceptance was assumed $30 \text{ mrad} < \theta < 174.5 \text{ mrad}$.

To demonstrate ReneSANCe capabilities, we generated 100 million events for the Bhabha cross section for the two c.m.s. energies $\sqrt{s} = 91.18$ GeV and 240 GeV, where each arm of the luminometer registered an energy shower from an electron or photon. We do not apply any restrictions on the minimum scattering angle of an electron, i.e. the electron can scatter down to zero.

We used two different setup for event selection (ES) called **ES-BARE** (non-calorimetric) and **ES-CALO** (calorimetric). In the **ES-BARE** case we define the SABS cross section by choosing events where each arm of the calorimeter is hit by an electron or positron. These electrons or positrons must have an energy of at least half the energy of the beam (E_{beam}). For the **ES-CALO** setup we consider a calorimetric detector that can't distinguish electrons from photons. In other words, the cross section is determined by events in which each arm of the calorimeter is hit by either a photon or an electron carrying at least half of the beam energy.

3.1 Different radiative correction contributions

To present the main sources of theoretical uncertainties of the one-loop cross section $\sigma^{1\text{-loop}}$, we divide it into gauge-invariant subsets. When evaluating the contribution cross section at the Born level (leading order, LO) σ^{Born} , both photon and Z-boson exchanges are taken into account. In order to quantify the impact of different contributions, we divide them into gauge-invariant subsets: QED one-loop corrections σ^{QED} , the vacuum polarization contribution σ^{VP} , and the pure weak contribution σ^{weak} as the difference between the complete one-loop electroweak correction and the pure QED part σ^{QED} of it. The leading higher-order (ho) corrections we denoted as σ^{ho} .

In Table 3 we show the results of the various radiative contributions to the total cross section for the Z-pole and $\sqrt{s} = 240$ GeV and evaluate corresponding relative corrections as $\delta = \sigma^{\text{contr.}}/\sigma^{\text{Born}}$.

The leading higher-order EW corrections δ^{ho} to SABS are included in our calculations through the $\Delta\alpha$ and $\Delta\rho$ parameters. A detailed description of our implementation of this contribution was presented in [16]. At two-loop level the above corrections consist of the EW at $O(G_\mu^2)$ and the mixed EW \otimes QCD at $O(G_\mu\alpha_s)$ parts. For SABS the bulk of the considered higher-order effects is due to running α .

Table 3. The results of the various radiative contributions to the total cross section for the Z-pole and $\sqrt{s} = 240$ GeV for **ES-BARE**.

\sqrt{s} , GeV	91.18	240
σ^{Born} , pb	135008.970(1)	19473.550(1)
$\delta^{\text{one-loop}}$, %	-1.562(1)	-0.821(1)
δ^{total} , %	-1.420(1)	-0.574(1)
δ^{QED} , %	-6.296(1)	-7.002(1)
δ^{VP} , %	4.6527(1)	6.1866(1)
δ^{weak} , %	0.0088(1)	-0.0064(1)
δ^{ho} , %	0.1418(1)	0.2475(1)

3.2 SABS, analysis of events for ES-BARE and ES-CALO setups

Another possible bias to the luminosity measurement arises from events where an electron is scattered at a very small angle and escape detection. Such events can be accepted by a luminometer due to energetic photons radiated at angles large enough to be detected in the detector. This effect would lead to a bias in luminosity measurements if the data is analyzed with an MC tool which uses a minimum scattering angle cut-off.

We use MCSANC integrator to compare results from **ES-BARE** setup (ignoring photons) with **ES-CALO** setup in which calorimeter can be hit by either an electron or a photon. The presence of a high-energy photon provides a natural regularisation of divergence at zero electron scattering angles. Although electrons are allowed to be scattered by zero angle, the number of such events is small because of the requirement to have an energetic photon within the acceptance of the calorimeter. We define the luminosity acceptance in the range of 30 mrad to 10 degrees (174.5 mrad), which is typical for LEP detectors as well as for future e^+e^- colliders like FCCee, CEPC and ILC.

This effect is presented in Table 4. We observe that the **ES-CALO** cross-section at $\sqrt{s} = 91.18$ and 240 GeV is 3% larger than **ES-BARE** Bhabha cross-section, when both beam particles must hit the luminometer. The largest part of the difference is due to the events with collinear photon or due to the events in which electron is scattered by an angle larger than the luminosity acceptance, while hard ISR photon hits the luminometer. Such effect can not introduce any experimental bias because the electron can be detected by large-angle calorimeters and the process can be simulated by any Bhabha generator.

Additionally, it was found that approximately 1.4 permille of the total cross section for both energies is represented by events with electron scattering angles below the given luminometer acceptance angle 30 mrad. The size of this effect $\Delta^{\text{QED}}(\vartheta < 0.030)$ can be derived from Table 4 as the difference between δ_3^{QED} and δ_2^{QED} . Note that only the technical uncertainty of numerical integration are shown in the Table, estimates of the corresponding theoretical uncertainties will be presented elsewhere.

3.3 Angular distributions

In the following, we illustrate the numerical results by the example of several angular distributions obtained with the MC generator ReneSANCe. We consider the distribution of electron scattering angles between the outgoing electron and the incoming electron as well as the distribution by the angle at which the photon was emitted.

We present angular distributions of two types:

- distribution of events by scattering angle of the Bremsstrahlung photon $\vartheta_{15} = \vartheta_\gamma$, i.e., the angle between particle p_1 (initial positron) and particle p_5 (photon),
- distribution of events by positron scattering angle ϑ_{14} , i.e., the angle between particle p_1 and particle p_4 .

Table 4. Born cross sections and relative corrections for $\sqrt{s} = 91.18$ GeV and 240 GeV. Here $\delta_1^{\text{QED}} = \delta(\text{ES-BARE})$ is the QED correction for **ES-BARE** setup, $\delta_2^{\text{QED}} = \delta(\text{ES-CALO}, \vartheta > 0.030)$ is the QED correction for the **ES-CALO** setup with electron scattering angles larger than the minimum luminosity acceptance, and $\delta_3^{\text{QED}} = \delta(\text{ES-CALO})$ is the QED correction for **ES-CALO** setup with arbitrary electron scattering angles.

\sqrt{s} , GeV	91.18	240
σ^{Born} , pb	135008.970(1)	19473.550(1)
δ_1^{QED} , %	-6.296(1)	-7.002(1)
δ_2^{QED} , %	-3.618(1)	-3.986(1)
δ_3^{QED} , %	-3.488(1)	-3.854(1)
$\Delta^{\text{QED}}(\vartheta < 0.030)$	$1.30(1) \times 10^{-3}$	$1.32(1) \times 10^{-3}$

Z resonance

Figure 2 presents the angular distributions of type a) on the left side and of type b) on the right side for c.m.s. $\sqrt{s} = 91.18$ GeV. The vertical axes show the relative fraction of events in the given bin. The sum of all events is normalized to 1.0 and the numbers in the frames show the fractions of events within the range of a given plot. As can be seen from the plots, the event yield vanishes when lepton scattering angle approaches zero. Sharp edges at 1.7 and 10 degrees correspond to acceptance of luminometer. Events with leptons scattered beyond the luminometer acceptance correspond to detection of energetic photons.




Fig. 2. Angular distributions of type a) on the left side and type b) on the right side for $\sqrt{s} = 91.18$ GeV.

In Figure 3 we show the distributions of electrons scattered at the angle less than the acceptance of the luminosity calorimeter. The peak at nearly zero electron scattering angles is due to the terms proportional to m_e^2/t^2 (here t is the square of the electron momentum transferred), which are present in the differential cross section of the radiative Bhabha process, see, e.g., ref. [17]. The total fraction of the events within this angular range (0, 30) mrad is about 1.3 permille. For the angular range 0-10 mrad the relative event yield is $0.65 \cdot 10^{-4}$. Therefore the MC generator cut-off on electron (and positron) scattering angles somewhat less than 10 mrad would be safe if the experimental systematic error on luminosity measurement is expected at




Fig. 3. Angular distributions of type b) in a range (0, 30) mrad (left) and (0, 10) mrad (right) for $\sqrt{s} = 91.18$ GeV.

the level of 10^{-4} .

Center of mass energy 240 GeV

Fig. 4–5 show the same angular distributions for the 240 GeV collision energy. The relative event yields are very similar to the case of Z resonance, i.e., 1.3 permille below 30 mrad, and less than 10^{-4} below 10 mrad.




Fig. 4. Angular distributions of type a) on the left side and type b) on the right side for $\sqrt{s} = 240$ GeV.

18.9 mrad angular cut-off




Fig. 5. Angular distributions of type a) on the left side and type b) on the right side for $\sqrt{s} = 240$ GeV.

OPAL experiment at LEP has partially taken into account the effect of very low angle scattering of electrons by generating events with 18.9 mrad minimum angular cut-off [18], which is considerably lower than the experimental acceptance domain. The contribution of scattering by smaller angles was estimated by extrapolation to be less than $2 \cdot 10^{-5}$ and was neglected. But the simple extrapolation could underestimate the neglected contribution because of the peak at extremely small angles which is seen in Fig. 5. Our calculations show that the neglected contribution amounts to about $2.3 \cdot 10^{-4}$ at 91 GeV collision energy. This is still within the total theoretical uncertainty of $5.4 \cdot 10^{-4}$ assumed in [18]¹.

4 Conclusions

In this way, we applied the Monte Carlo MCSANC integrator and ReneSANCe generator for description of small-angle Bhabha scattering. We verified that the results of the two programs are consistent with each other within statistical errors. At the level of one-loop QED radiative corrections their results agree also with the ones of the BHLUMI event generator [8]. We took into account also the leading effects due to higher-order electroweak corrections and vacuum polarization. We examined SABS as a possible process to monitor the luminosity at future e^+e^- experiments aiming at the 10^{-4} level of uncertainty. Here we limited ourselves to considering only perturbative effects, whereas in a realistic situation other effects must be taken into account, for example, beamstrahlung and the final size of the beams [19, 20] must be taken into account.

The unique feature of the SANC tools allows one to generate radiative Bhabha events with electron scattering angles down to zero. This allowed us to take into account events in which one arm of the luminosity calorimeter is fired by an energetic ISR photon, while an electron is scattered by very small angle and escapes detection. Based on calculations of both MCSANC integrator and ReneSANCe generator we observe a contribution of 1.3-1.4 permille from events with scattering angles less than 30 mrad, both at Z pole and at 240 GeV. This effect represent a significant bias given the high experimental precision expected at the future colliders. The bias can influence in particular the measurements of the total luminosity, the effective

¹Taking into account this effect would have enlarged the resulting uncertainty.

number of neutrino flavors N_ν , etc. To meet the expected precision of the future colliders ($\sim 10^{-4}$), we recommend to generate events with angular cut-off somewhat less than 10 mrad, or to use generators capable to generate zero scattering angles.

In order to match the required uncertainty, we have to implement in our codes the complete two-loop QED radiative corrections to Bhabha scattering and the leading and sub-leading contributions enhanced by large logarithms.

References

- [1] A. Abada et al. (FCC), [Eur. Phys. J. ST **228**, 261 \(2019\)](#).
- [2] M. Dong et al. (CEPC Study Group), edited by J. B. Guimarães da Costa et al. (2018).
- [3] C. M. Carloni Calame, G. Montagna, O. Nicrosini, and F. Piccinini, [Nucl. Phys. B Proc. Suppl. **131**, edited by M. Incagli and G. Venanzoni, 48 \(2004\)](#).
- [4] G. Balossini, C. M. Carloni Calame, G. Montagna, O. Nicrosini, and F. Piccinini, [Nuclear Physics B **758**, 227 \(2006\)](#).
- [5] G. Balossini, C. Bignamini, C. Carloni Calame, G. Montagna, O. Nicrosini, and F. Piccinini, [Physics Letters B **663**, 209 \(2008\)](#).
- [6] C. M. Carloni Calame, [Physics Letters B **520**, 16 \(2001\)](#).
- [7] C. M. Carloni Calame, C. Lunardini, G. Montagna, O. Nicrosini, and F. Piccinini, [Nucl. Phys. B **584**, 459 \(2000\)](#).
- [8] S. Jadach, W. Placzek, E. Richter-Was, B. F. L. Ward, and Z. Was, [Comput. Phys. Commun. **102**, 229 \(1997\)](#).
- [9] S. Jadach, W. Placzek, M. Skrzypek, and B. F. L. Ward, [Eur. Phys. J. C **81**, 1047 \(2021\)](#).
- [10] C. M. Carloni Calame, G. Montagna, O. Nicrosini, and F. Piccinini, [EPJ Web Conf. **218**, edited by A. Denig and C. F. Redmer, 07004 \(2019\)](#).
- [11] S. G. Bondarenko and A. A. Saprionov, [Comput. Phys. Commun. **184**, 2343 \(2013\)](#).
- [12] R. Sadykov and V. Yermolchik, [Comput. Phys. Commun. **256**, 107445 \(2020\)](#).
- [13] D. Bardin, Y. Dydyshka, L. Kalinovskaya, L. Romyantsev, A. Arbuzov, R. Sadykov, and S. Bondarenko, [Phys. Rev. D **98**, 013001 \(2018\)](#).
- [14] M. Caffo and H. Czyz, [Comput. Phys. Commun. **100**, 99 \(1997\)](#).
- [15] S. Jadach et al., “Event generators for Bhabha scattering”, in [CERN Workshop on LEP2 Physics \(followed by 2nd meeting, 15-16 Jun 1995 and 3rd meeting 2-3 Nov 1995\)](#) (Feb. 1996).
- [16] A. B. Arbuzov, S. G. Bondarenko, L. V. Kalinovskaya, L. A. Romyantsev, and V. L. Yermolchik, [Phys. Rev. D **105**, 033009 \(2022\)](#).
- [17] A. B. Arbuzov, G. V. Fedotov, E. A. Kuraev, N. P. Merenkov, V. D. Rushai, and L. Trentadue, [JHEP **10**, 001 \(1997\)](#).
- [18] G. Abbiendi et al. (OPAL), [Eur. Phys. J. C **14**, 373 \(2000\)](#).
- [19] V. N. Baier and V. M. Katkov, [Phys. Rev. D **66**, 053009 \(2002\)](#).
- [20] G. L. Kotkin and V. G. Serbo, [Phys. Rev. ST Accel. Beams **7**, 101001 \(2004\)](#).