Robust estimates of theoretical uncertainties at fixed-order in perturbation theory

Rene Poncelet

based on [Lim, Poncelet, 2412.14910]

**THE HENRYK NIEWODNICZAŃSKI**
INSTITUTE OF NUCLEAR PHYSICS
**POLISH ACADEMY OF SCIENCES**

Outline

- Precision predictions at the LHC

- Missing Higher Order Uncertainties (MHOU)
  How to estimate the uncertainty of (truncated) perturbative expansions?

  - Scale variations for fixed-order and resummed cross sections

  - Bayesian methods

  - Theory Nuisance Parameters (TNPs)

- Application of TNPs to fixed-order perturbation theory

- Discussion/Summary/Outlook

Standard Model phenomenology at the LHC

Scattering experiments

Credit: CERN


Credit: ATLAS

Theory/Model

Credit: Jack Lindon, CERN

Precision example: strong coupling from pT(Z)

[ATLAS 2309.12986]

Sensitivity of Z-boson's recoil to the strong coupling constant:

$pp \rightarrow Z$, $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV

$\alpha_s(m_Z) = 0.108$
$\alpha_s(m_Z) = 0.118$
$\alpha_s(m_Z) = 0.128$

→ at low pT resummation regime!
→ theory uncertainty?

ATLAS

- Hadron Colliders
- Category Averages PDG 2022
- Lattice Average FLAG 2021
- World Average PDG 2022
- ATLAS Z p_T 8 TeV

	$\alpha_s(m_Z)$
ATLAS ATEEC	0.1185 ± 0.0021
CMS jets	0.1170 ± 0.0019
H1 jets	0.1147 ± 0.0025
HERA jets	0.1178 ± 0.0026
CMS $t\bar{t}$ inclusive	0.1145 ± 0.0034
Tevatron+LHC $t\bar{t}$ inclusive	0.1177 ± 0.0034
CDF Z p_T	0.1191 ± 0.0015
Tevatron+LHC W, Z inclusive	0.1188 ± 0.0016
τ decays and low Q^2	0.1178 ± 0.0019
$Q\bar{Q}$ bound states	0.1181 ± 0.0037
PDF fits	0.1162 ± 0.0020
e^+e^- jets and shapes	0.1171 ± 0.0031
Electroweak fit	0.1208 ± 0.0028
Lattice	0.1184 ± 0.0008
World average	0.1179 ± 0.0009
ATLAS Z p_T 8 TeV	0.1183 ± 0.0009

~0.7 % rel. precision

Precision example: W-mass measurement by CMS

Mass dependence of pT(l):


Jacobian peak position ~m(W)/2 → resummation sensitive → theory uncertainty?

Precision example: strong-coupling from TEEC

Next-to-Next-to-Leading Order Study of Three-Jet Production at the LHC
Czakon, Mitov, **Poncelet** Phys.Rev.Lett. 127 (2021) 15, 152001 [ATLAS 2301.09351]

Multi-jet angular correlations

Uncertainties driven by
fixed-order precision through ratio:

$$R^i(\mu_R, \mu_F, \mathrm{PDF}, \alpha_{S,0}) = \frac{\mathrm{d}\sigma_3^i(\mu_R, \mu_F, \mathrm{PDF}, \alpha_{S,0})}{\mathrm{d}\sigma_2^i(\mu_R, \mu_F, \mathrm{PDF}, \alpha_{S,0})}$$

ATLAS

Particle-level TEEC

$\sqrt{s}$ = 13 TeV; 139 fb^{-1}

anti-k_t R = 0.4

p_T > 60 GeV

$|\eta|$ < 2.4

$\mu_{R,F} = \hat{H}_T$

$\alpha_s(m_Z)$ = 0.1180

NNPDF 3.0 (NNLO)

— Data
--- LO
--- NLO
— NNLO

Precision example: strong-coupling from TEEC

NLO QCD

ATLAS Preliminary

$\alpha_s(m_Z) = 0.1181 \pm 0.0011$ (PDG 2018)

$\alpha_s(m_Z) = 0.1196^{+0.0072}_{-0.0106}$ (TEEC global fit)

[ATLAS-CONF-2020-025]

NNLO QCD

$\alpha_s(m_Z) = 0.1175^{+0.0035}_{-0.0018}$ (TEEC Global)

$\alpha_s(m_Z) = 0.1179 \pm 0.0009$ (PDG 2022)

[ATLAS 2301.09351]

Theory uncertainty dominant effect!

LHC Precision era and future experiments

[Credit: CERN]

Uncertainties in precision phenomenology

Experiments are getting more precise → theory uncertainties matter!

Sources of theory uncertainties:

- parametric (values of coupling parameters etc.)
→ variation of parameters within their uncertainties

- parton distribution functions (PDFs)
→ different error propagation methods (fit parameter, replicas,...)

- non-perturbative parameters in Monte Carlo simulations.
→ needs data constraints by definition. Problematic if dominant effect...

- missing higher orders in fixed-order and resummed predictions (MHOU)
→ tricky because we are trying to estimate the unknown....

[Credit: SHERPA]

Theory uncertainties from scale variations

Lets focus on QCD as an example:

RGE

$$\mathrm{d}\sigma = \mathrm{d}\sigma^{(0)} + \alpha_s \mathrm{d}\sigma^{(1)} + \alpha_s^2 \mathrm{d}\sigma^{(2)} + \ldots$$

$$\mu \frac{\mathrm{d}\sigma^{(n)}}{\mathrm{d}\mu} = \mathcal{O}\left(\alpha_s^{(n_0+n+1)}\right)$$

Of same order as the next dominant term → exploiting this to estimate size of $\mathrm{d}\sigma^{(n+1)}$

Scale variation prescription

- choose 'sensible' μ_0

$\sigma^{(n)}(\mu_{\mathrm{FAC}}) = 0$ → principle of fasted apparent convergence

$\mu \frac{\mathrm{d}\sigma(\mu)}{\mathrm{d}\mu}\Big|_{\mu=\mu_{\mathrm{PMC}}} = 0$ → principle of minimal sensitivity

→ ...

- vary with a factor (typically 2)

- take envelope as uncertainty

- ad-hoc and heuristic choice

Missing higher orders

Generic perturbative expansion:

$$f(\alpha) = f_0 + f_1\alpha + f_2\alpha^2 + f_3\alpha^3 + \ldots$$

For QCD: $\alpha = \alpha_s(\mu_0)$

f_i : the coefficient of the series, potentially unknown

We can compute the truncated series:

$$f^{\mathrm{LO}}(\alpha) = \hat{f}_0 \qquad f^{\mathrm{NLO}}(\alpha) = \hat{f}_0 + \hat{f}_1\alpha \qquad f^{\mathrm{NNLO}}(\alpha) = \hat{f}_0 + \hat{f}_1\alpha + \hat{f}_2\alpha^2$$

$\hat{f}_i$: the true value, i.e. a value we actually computed

The missing terms are the source of uncertainty.
(assume convergence → the first missing is the dominant one)

$$f^{\mathrm{LO+1}}(\alpha) = \hat{f}_0 + f_1\alpha \quad f^{\mathrm{NLO+1}}(\alpha) = \hat{f}_0 + \hat{f}_1\alpha + f_2\alpha^2 \quad f^{\mathrm{NNLO+1}}(\alpha) = \hat{f}_0 + \hat{f}_1\alpha + \hat{f}_2\alpha^2 + f_3\alpha^3$$

Scale variation approach

Change of scale = change of renormalisation scheme: $\tilde{\alpha}(\alpha) = \alpha(1 + b_0\alpha + b_1\alpha^2 + b_2\alpha^3 + \dots)$

For QCD: $\alpha = \alpha_s(\mu_0)$ $\tilde{\alpha} = \alpha_s(\mu)$

$$b_0 = \frac{\beta_0}{2\pi}L \qquad b_1 = \frac{\beta_0^2}{4\pi^2}L^2 + \frac{\beta_1}{8\pi^2}L \qquad b_2 = \frac{\beta_0^3}{8\pi^3}L^3 + \frac{5\beta_0\beta_1}{32\pi^2}L^2 + \frac{\beta_2}{32\pi^3}L \qquad L = \ln\frac{\mu_0}{\mu}$$

$$\tilde{f}^{\text{LO}}(\tilde{\alpha}) = \hat{\tilde{f}}_0$$

$$\tilde{f}^{\text{NLO}}(\tilde{\alpha}) = \hat{\tilde{f}}_0 + \hat{\tilde{f}}_1\tilde{\alpha} = \hat{f}_0 + \alpha\hat{f}_1 + \boxed{\alpha^2 b_0 \hat{f}_1} + \mathcal{O}(\alpha^3)$$

$$\tilde{f}^{\text{NNLO}}(\tilde{\alpha}) = \hat{\tilde{f}}_0 + \hat{\tilde{f}}_1\tilde{\alpha} + \hat{\tilde{f}}_2\tilde{\alpha}^2 = \hat{f}_0 + \alpha\hat{f}_1 + \alpha^2\hat{f}_2 + \boxed{\alpha^3(2b_0(\hat{f}_2 - b_0\hat{f}_1) + b_1\hat{f}_1)} + \mathcal{O}(\alpha^4)$$

Scale variation approach

Change of scale = change of renormalisation scheme: $\tilde{\alpha}(\alpha) = \alpha(1 + b_0\alpha + b_1\alpha^2 + b_2\alpha^3 + \dots)$

For QCD: $\alpha = \alpha_s(\mu_0)$ $\quad$ $\tilde{\alpha} = \alpha_s(\mu)$

$$b_0 = \frac{\beta_0}{2\pi}L \qquad b_1 = \frac{\beta_0^2}{4\pi^2}L^2 + \frac{\beta_1}{8\pi^2}L \qquad b_2 = \frac{\beta_0^3}{8\pi^3}L^3 + \frac{5\beta_0\beta_1}{32\pi^2}L^2 + \frac{\beta_2}{32\pi^3}L \qquad L = \ln\frac{\mu_0}{\mu}$$

$$\Delta f^{\mathrm{NLO}} = f^{\mathrm{NLO}} - \tilde{f}^{\mathrm{NLO}}(\tilde{\alpha}) = -\alpha^2 b_0 \hat{f}_1 + \mathcal{O}(\alpha^3)$$

$$\Delta f^{\mathrm{NNLO}} = f^{\mathrm{NNLO}} - \tilde{f}^{\mathrm{NNLO}}(\tilde{\alpha}) = \alpha^3(2b_0(\hat{f}_2 - b_0\hat{f}_1) + b_1\hat{f}_1) + \mathcal{O}(\alpha^4)$$

Issues:
1) There is no reason to believe that there is a value L (i.e. scale choice) that describes all $\hat{f}_i$
2) If f is not a scalar, correlations are unclear

Still, scale variation works …

Badger, Czakon, Hartanto, Moodie, Peraro, **Poncelet**, Zoia
[2304.06682]

...sometimes :/

Three photon production

NNLO QCD corrections to three-photon production at the LHC, Chawdhry, Czakon, Mitov, **Poncelet**
[JHEP 02 (2020) 057]

Higgs production

[talk by Grazzini]

Short comings of scale variations

- not always reliable

- ...but in most cases issues are understood/expected:
    new channels, phase space constraints, etc.
    → workarounds

- however, some issues are more fundamental:

    → how to choose the central scale? → not a physical parameter, no 'true' value
        (Principle of fasted apparent convergence, principle of minimal sensitivity,...)

    → how to propagate the estimated uncertainty, no statistical interpretation!

    → what about correlations? Based on 'fixed form' of the lower orders and RGE.

    (At the moment) two alternative approaches under investigation:
    "Bayesian" and "Theory Nuisance Parameter"

Bayesian approach I

→ Instead of ad-hoc fixed variation try to give some probabilistic interpretation

$$\mathrm{d}\sigma = \mathrm{d}\sigma^{(0)}(1 + \delta^{(1)} + \delta^{(2)} + \dots)$$

Probability to find coefficient $\delta^{(n+1)}$ given $\delta^{(n)}$:   [Cacciari,Houdeau 1105.5152]

$$P(\delta^{(n+1)}|\delta^{(n)}) = \frac{P(\delta^{(n+1)})}{P(\delta^{(n)})} = \frac{\int \mathrm{d}a P(\delta^{(n+1)}|a)P_0(a)}{\int \mathrm{d}a P(\delta^{(n)}|a)P_0(a)}$$

Need to provide model and prior

Bayes: $P(A|B) = P(B|A)P(A)/P(B)$ with: $P(\delta^{(n)}|\delta^{(n+1)}) = 1$

CH model: $\delta_k = c_k \alpha_s^k$ c_k come from geometric series: $|c_k| \leq \bar{c}$ $\forall k$

Geometric model: $|\delta_k| \leq ca^k$ $\forall k$ [Bonvini 2006.16293]

abc model: $b - c \leq \dfrac{\delta_k}{a^k} \leq b + c$ $\forall k$ [Duhr, Huss, Mazeliauskas, Szafron 2106.04585]

Bayesian approach II

Inclusion of scale dependence:
$$P(\delta_{n+1}|\delta_n) = \int \mathrm{d}\mu\, P(\delta_{n+1}|\delta_n; \mu) P(\mu|\delta_n)$$

Scale marginalisation (the scale becomes a model parameter)

$$\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{sm}}(\Sigma|\mathbf{\Sigma}_n) \approx \frac{\int d\mu\, P(\Sigma - \Sigma_n(\mu)|\mathbf{\Sigma}_n(\mu))\, P(\mathbf{\Sigma}_n(\mu))\, P_0(\mu)}{\int d\mu'\, P(\mathbf{\Sigma}_n(\mu'))\, P_0(\mu')}\,.$$
μ_{FAC}

Scale average (the results are averaged with weight function)

$$\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{sa}}(\Sigma|\mathbf{\Sigma}_n) \approx \int d\mu\, w(\mu)\, P(\Sigma - \Sigma_n(\mu)|\mathbf{\Sigma}_n(\mu))$$
μ_{PMS}

Bayesian approach III

Example: Higgs production in gluon - fusion

Comparison of different unc. estimates:

centre → median
error box → 68% CI
error bar → 95% CI

Introducing theory nuisance parameters (TNPs)

Generic perturbative expansion:

Beyond Scale Variations: Perturbative Theory Uncertainties from Nuisance Parameters, Frank Tackmann [2411.18606]

$$f(\alpha) = f_0 + f_1\alpha + f_2\alpha^2 + f_3\alpha^3 + \ldots$$

$$f^{\mathrm{LO+1}}(\alpha) = \hat{f}_0 + f_1(\theta)\alpha$$

$$f^{\mathrm{NLO+1}}(\alpha) = \hat{f}_0 + \hat{f}_1\alpha + f_2(\theta)\alpha^2$$

$$f^{\mathrm{NNLO+1}}(\alpha) = \hat{f}_0 + \hat{f}_1\alpha + \hat{f}_2\alpha^2 + f_3(\theta)\alpha^3$$

Introduce a parametrisation of unknown coefficients in terms of

"Theory nuisance parameters" θ

- The parametrization such that there is a true value: $f_i(\hat{\theta}) = \hat{f}_i$

- Distributions of θ "known" (for example from already existing computations)

→ Expert knowledge to construct such a parametrisation

Example: TNPs in resummed cross sections

Transverse momentum resummation:

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\sigma}{\mathrm{d}p_T} = [H \times B_a \times B_b \times S](\alpha_s, \ln\left(\frac{p_T}{Q}\right)) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{p_T}{Q}\right)$$

$$X(\alpha_s, L) = X(\alpha_s) \exp \int_0^L \mathrm{d}L'\{\Gamma(\alpha_s(L'))L' + \gamma_X(\alpha_s(L'))\}$$

Perturbative expansion of resummation ingredients:

$$X(\alpha_s) = X_0 + \alpha_s X_1 + \alpha_s^2 X_2 + \cdots + \alpha_s^n X_n(\theta)$$

$$\Gamma(\alpha_s) = \alpha_s[\Gamma_0 + \alpha_s\Gamma_1 + \alpha_s^2\Gamma_2 + \cdots + \alpha_s^n\Gamma_n(\theta)]$$

$$\gamma(\alpha_s) = \alpha_s[\gamma_0 + \alpha_s\gamma_1 + \alpha_s^2\gamma_2 + \cdots + \alpha_s^n\gamma_n(\theta)]$$

Task: find suitable parametrization and variation range

TNP parametrisations for resummation

$\gamma(\alpha_s)$	N_n	$\hat{\gamma}_0/N_0$	$\hat{\gamma}_1/N_1$	$\hat{\gamma}_2/N_2$	$\hat{\gamma}_3/N_3$	$\hat{\gamma}_4/N_4$
β	1	-15.3	-77.3	-362	-9652	-30941
	4^{n+1}	-3.83	-4.83	-5.65	-37.7	-30.2
	$4^{n+1}C_F C_A^n$	$\mathbf{-1.28}$	$\mathbf{-0.54}$	$\mathbf{-0.21}$	$\mathbf{-0.47}$	$\mathbf{-0.12}$
γ_m	1	-8.00	-112	-950	-5650	-85648
	4^{n+1}	-2.00	-7.028	-14.8	-22.1	-83.6
	$4^{n+1}C_F C_A^n$	$\mathbf{-1.50}$	$\mathbf{-1.76}$	$\mathbf{-1.24}$	$\mathbf{-0.61}$	$\mathbf{-0.77}$
$2\Gamma_{\mathrm{cusp}}^q$	1	$+10.7$	$+73.7$	$+478$	$+282$	$(+140000)$
	4^{n+1}	$+2.67$	$+4.61$	$+7.48$	$+1.10$	$(+137)$
	$4^{n+1}C_F C_A^n$	$\mathbf{+2.00}$	$\mathbf{+1.15}$	$\mathbf{+0.62}$	$\mathbf{+0.03}$	$\mathbf{(+1.27)}$

$\vdots$

"Statistic of many computations"

Matrix elements

$n_{\mathrm{entries}} = 79$
$\mu = -0.11 \pm 0.11$
$\sigma = 0.94 \pm 0.07$

$f_n(n_f = 5)$

relative count — $\hat{\theta}_n^f$

Anomalous dimensions

$n_{\mathrm{entries}} = 93$
$\mu = 0.16 \pm 0.11$
$\sigma = 1.05 \pm 0.08$

$\gamma_n(n_f = 5)$

relative count — $\hat{\theta}_n^\gamma$

Higgs pT spectrum

Figure 6: Relative uncertainty from varying each theory nuisance parameter as a function of p_T^{cut} for two different STXS bins.

Example: incomplete knowledge of NNLL resummation

→ some two-loop ingredients unknown
→ parametrise by TNPs

→ Make predictions and vary TNPs:

- correlated uncertainty for different bins!

- See impact of different missing ingredients

Constraint of TNPs from data → W-mass extraction

Resummation ingredients the same for W or Z production
→ constraint from precisely measured pT(Z) → use for pT(W)
→ massive reduction of unc. with correct correlations!

Some remarks on TNPs in resummation

Picture: simple ingredients that enter different computations/processes etc.

→ ideal situation

But actually not that simple:

- Scheme dependence of ingredients? E.g. scales, IR subtraction, …
  → might need modified parametrisations

- Some TNPs represent directly numbers: $\Gamma,\ \gamma,\ H$ for simple processes
  but others are functions → Beam functions, hard functions for more complicated processes

- Parametrisation works for the resummed spectrum. What about other observables?

- "Easy to implement" for use-cases so far
  → might be really expensive if each variation needs a full computations (Monte Carlos,…)

TNP approach for fixed-order computations

$$\mathrm{d}\sigma = \alpha_s^n N_c^m \, \mathrm{d}\bar{\sigma}^{(0)} + \alpha_s^{n+1} N_c^{m+1} \, \mathrm{d}\bar{\sigma}^{(1)} + \alpha_s^{n+2} N_c^{m+2} \, \mathrm{d}\bar{\sigma}^{(2)} + \ldots$$

$$= \alpha_s^n N_c^m \, \mathrm{d}\bar{\sigma}^{(0)} \left[1 + \alpha_s N_c \left(\frac{\mathrm{d}\bar{\sigma}^{(1)}}{\mathrm{d}\bar{\sigma}^{(0)}} \right) + \alpha_s^2 N_c^2 \left(\frac{\mathrm{d}\bar{\sigma}^{(2)}}{\mathrm{d}\bar{\sigma}^{(0)}} \right) + \ldots \right]$$

Observation, i.e. "expert knowledge": $\dfrac{\mathrm{d}\bar{\sigma}^{(i)}}{\mathrm{d}\bar{\sigma}^{(0)}} \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$

Use some knowledge about lower orders but introduce parametric dependence:

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\bar{\sigma}_{\mathrm{TNP}}^{(N+1)}}{\mathrm{d}\bar{\sigma}^{(0)}} = \sum_{j=1}^{N} f_k^{(j)} \left(\vec{\theta}, x \right) \left(\frac{\mathrm{d}\bar{\sigma}^{(j)}}{\mathrm{d}\bar{\sigma}^{(0)}} \right)$$

x → mapped kinematic variable

Approximation of original TNP philosophy
→ there is only $f_i(\hat{\theta}) \approx \hat{f}_i$

Bernstein: $f_k^B \left(\vec{\theta}, x \right) = \sum_{i=0}^{k} \theta_i \begin{pmatrix} k \\ i \end{pmatrix} x^{k-i} (1-x)^i$

$x \in [0, 1]$

Chebyshev: $f_k^C \left(\vec{\theta}, x \right) = \dfrac{1}{2} \sum_{i=0}^{k} \theta_i T_i(x)$

$x \in [-1, 1]$

$pp \to t\bar{t} \to \ell\bar{\ell}\, 2b-$jets, LHC @ 13 TeV central scale: $\mu = H_T/4$ Bernstein parameterisation (k=2)

Band: sample
$\theta \in [-1, 1]$
Quad: add individual
$\theta = \pm 1$
in quadrature

Uncertainties from TNPs - ZZ

$pp \to ZZ^* \to e^+e^-\mu^+\mu^-$, LHC @ 13 TeV central scale: $\mu = M_T$ Chebyshev parameterisation (k=2)

Example of TNP fit: pp → ZZ

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\bar{\sigma}_{\mathrm{TNP}}^{(N+1)}}{\mathrm{d}\bar{\sigma}^{(0)}} = \sum_{j=1}^{N} f_k^{(j)}\left(\vec{\theta}, x\right) \left(\frac{\mathrm{d}\bar{\sigma}^{(j)}}{\mathrm{d}\bar{\sigma}^{(0)}}\right) \qquad f_k^B\left(\vec{\theta}, x\right) = \sum_{i=0}^{k} \theta_i \left(\begin{array}{c} k \\ i \end{array}\right) x^{k-i}(1-x)^i$$

$pp \rightarrow ZZ^* \rightarrow e^+e^-\mu^+\mu^-$, LHC @ 13 TeV central scale: $\mu = M_T$

Process meta study

| Process	$\sqrt{s}/\text{TeV}$	Scale	PDF	Distributions
$pp \to H$ (full theory)	13	$m_H/2$	NNPDF3.1	y_H
$pp \to ZZ^* \to e^+ e^- \mu^+ \mu^-$	13	M_T	NNPDF3.1	$M_{e^+\mu^+}$, $p_T^{e^+e^-}$, y_{e^+}
$pp \to WW^* \to e\nu_e \mu\nu_\mu$	13	m_W	NNPDF3.1	M_{WW}, $p_T^{\mu^-}$, y_{W^-}
$pp \to (W \to \ell\nu) + c$	13	$E_T + p_T^c$	NNPDF3.1	p_T^ℓ , $|y_\ell|$,
$pp \to t\bar{t}$	13	$H_T/4$	NNPDF3.1	$M_{t\bar{t}}$, p_T^t, y_t
$pp \to t\bar{t} \to b\bar{b}\ell\bar{\ell}$	13	$H_T/4$	NNPDF3.1	$M_{\ell\bar{\ell}}$, $p_T^{b_1}$, $p_{T,\ell_1}/p_{T,\ell_2}$
$pp \to \gamma\gamma$	8	$M_{\gamma\gamma}$	NNPDF3.1	$M_{\gamma\gamma}$, $p_T^{\gamma_1}$, $y_{\gamma\gamma}$
$pp \to \gamma\gamma j$	13	$H_T/2$	NNPDF3.1	$M_{\gamma\gamma}$, $p_T^{\gamma\gamma}$, $\cos\phi_{\text{CS}}$, $|y_{\gamma_1}|$, $\Delta\phi_{\gamma\gamma}$
$pp \to jjj$	13	$\hat{H}_T$	MMHT2014	TEEC with $H_{T,2} \in [1000, 1500), [1500, 2000), [3500, \infty)$ GeV
$pp \to \gamma jj$	13	H_T	NNPDF3.1	$M_{\gamma jj}$, p_T^j, $|y_{\gamma-\text{jet}}|$, $E_{T,\gamma}$

Fits - Bernstein parametrisation

TNPs in Bernstein parameterisation

$$f_k^B\left(\vec{\theta}, x\right) = \sum_{i=0}^{k} \theta_i \left(\begin{array}{c} k \\ i \end{array} \right) x^{k-i}(1-x)^i$$

Fits - Chebyshev parametrisation

TNPs in Chebyshev parameterisation

$$f_k^C\left(\vec{\theta}, x\right) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=0}^{k}\theta_i T_i(x)$$

Caveats and open questions

Some arising questions regarding fixed-order model:

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\bar{\sigma}^{(N+1)}_{\mathrm{TNP}}}{\mathrm{d}\bar{\sigma}^{(0)}} = \sum_{j=1}^{N} f_k^{(j)}\left(\vec{\theta}, x\right)\left(\frac{\mathrm{d}\bar{\sigma}^{(j)}}{\mathrm{d}\bar{\sigma}^{(0)}}\right)$$

- How does the uncertainty estimate depend on the central scale choice?
  → **bad scale choices lead to large uncertainties by construction due to large corrections.**

- What about NLO uncertainty if $\mathrm{d}\bar{\sigma}^{(1)} = 0$ for given scale?
  → **amend parametrisation by j = 0 term.**

- How sensitive are we to the parametrisation? How many terms?
 → **two quite general parametrisations tested, increase degree by demand.**

Challenging case

"Bad" scale choice $\mu = E_T$ no j=0 term

"Good" choice $\mu = H_T$ no j=0 term

Challenging case → extended parametrisations

"Bad" scale choice $\mu = E_T$ with j=0 term

"Good" choice $\mu = H_T$ with j=0 term

Challenging case → comparisons

NLO QCD

NNLO QCD

More caveats and open questions

Some arising questions regarding fixed-order model:
$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\bar{\sigma}_{\mathrm{TNP}}^{(N+1)}}{\mathrm{d}\bar{\sigma}^{(0)}} = \sum_{j=1}^{N} f_k^{(j)}\left(\vec{\theta}, x\right)\left(\frac{\mathrm{d}\bar{\sigma}^{(j)}}{\mathrm{d}\bar{\sigma}^{(0)}}\right)$$

- Each parametrisation is for one observable at a time

  - How to deal with higher dimensional distributions?

  - Consistency upon integration?

  → **work in progress**

- What about EW corrections?
  → here the approach should work well for Sudakov logs!
  → Radiation from resonances more difficult.

- How to correlate different processes?
  → that's tricky…

$$\mathrm{d}\bar{\sigma}^{(n)}(\theta) = \mathrm{d}\Phi \left\langle M^0 \right| \mathcal{P}(\theta) \left| M^0 \right\rangle$$

$\mathcal{P}(\theta)$ → process-independent "operator"

Discussion/Summary/Outlook

- Theory precision is more and more relevant → needs accurate uncertainty estimates
- De-facto standard: scale variations
  → various short-comings: robustness, no statistical interpretation, correlations,…
- Alternative approaches to scale variations: Bayesian and TNP approach
- Theory Nuisance Parameters
  - In principle less biased →does not depend on any "known" orders
  - Statistical interpretation
  - Needs "expert knowledge"
  - Resummed computations are well-suited scenario
  - Fixed-order more difficult: not much knowledge about higher-order terms
    Proposed TNP parametrisation shows promising results
    → applications to fits

Backup

TNP parametrisations for resummation