

### Probing entanglement in top quark production with the CMS detector

Giulia Negro on behalf of the CMS Collaboration

Standard Model at the LHC 2024 10 May 2024





# Entanglement at the LHC

- Fundamental predictions of Quantum Mechanics:
  - entangled states cannot be described by independent superpositions
  - measuring particle spin in an entangled system immediately reveals the spin state of the second particle
- A lot of measurements with electrons and photons already performed



Nobel Prize in 2022 for Aspect, Clauser, and Zeilinger

• First observation of entanglement in tt by ATLAS at the end of last year

#### arXiv:2311.07288

• Now also with CMS!

<u>CMS-PAS-TOP-23-001</u>		
Available on the CERN CDS information server	CMS PAS TOP-23-001	
CMS Physics Analysis Summary		
Contact: cms-pag-conveners-top@cern.ch	2024/04/01	
Probing entanglement in top quark production with the CMS detector		
The CMS Collaboration		



# Entanglement of top quarks

- Top quark = ideal candidate for spin measurements:
  - extremely short lifetime allows measuring polarization and spin correlation in tt production
  - **spin information is preserved** in the angular distribution of its decay products



- Entanglement present in top quark pairs can be measured using spin correlations variables
- Entanglement depends on production mode,  $m_{t\bar{t}}$ , scattering angle of the top quark ( $\Theta$ )



Afik, De Nova Eur. Phys. J. Plus **136**, 907

### How to probe entanglement

At the LHC, top quarks are produced in a mixed state
→ can be represented as a density operator:

$$\rho = \frac{I_4 + \Sigma_i \left( B_i^+ \sigma^i \otimes I_2 + B_i^- I_2 \otimes \sigma^i \right) + \Sigma_{i,j} C_{ij} \sigma^i \otimes \sigma^j}{4}$$

- $B^{+/-}$  = 3-vectors characterizing degree of top quark/antiquark polarization
- C = 3x3 matrix characterizing top quark and antiquark spin correlations
- Peres-Horodecki criterion:

Peres, <u>Phys. Rev. Lett. 77, 1413</u> Horodecki, <u>Phys. Lett. A 232, 5</u>

if a state is separable (i.e., non-entangled), the transpose with respect to a subspace of the density operator is positive definite  $\rightarrow$  a state is non-separable (i.e., entangled) if this condition doesn't hold

→ top quarks are entangled in a certain phase space if at least one eigenvalue is < 0

### How to probe entanglement

• Peres-Horodecki criterion: using simpler observables, a sufficient condition to observe entanglement in top quarks is:

$$\Delta = C_{33} + |C_{11} + C_{22}| - 1 > 0$$
 Eur. Phys. J. Plus 136, 907

- At low  $m_{t\bar{t}}$ ,  $C_{11} > 0$  and  $C_{22} > 0 \rightarrow \Delta + 1 = tr[C] > 1$
- tr[C] can be probed from a single-differential cross section:

$$\frac{1}{\sigma} \frac{d\sigma}{d\cos\varphi} = \frac{1}{2}(1 - D\cos\varphi) \qquad D = -\frac{\operatorname{tr}[C]}{3} \to (D < -1/3) \qquad \text{for } d\cos\varphi$$

Sufficient condition or entanglement !

→ measure D to access entanglement information in top quark events!

5

cos φ = ℓ̂<sub>1</sub> · ℓ̂<sub>2</sub> is the opening angle between leptons in parent top rest frame
→ most sensitive and experimentally well measured

observable

→ focus of entanglement measurement



# Analysis strategy

- The degree of entanglement is highly phase space-dependent
  - scan of  $\cos \Theta$  vs  $m_{t\bar{t}}$  to determine most sensitive phase space while minimizing expected total uncertainties
- Focus on low-mass region ( $345 < m_{t\bar{t}} < 400$  GeV) to increase entanglement
  - threshold region dominated by gg
  - maximal sensitivity with high statistics
- Cut on velocity along the beam line of the tt system to increase  $gg/q\bar{q}$  fraction:

Aguilar-Saavedra,  
Casas 
$$\beta = |\frac{p_z^t + p_{\overline{z}}^{\overline{t}}}{E^t + E^{\overline{t}}}| < 0.9$$
  
arXiv:2205.00542

$$\frac{E^{t} + E^{t}}{E^{t} + E^{t}}$$

- Use leptonic final states to measure the helicity angle  $\cos \varphi = \hat{\ell}_1 \cdot \hat{\ell}_2$ 
  - fully encapsulates the spin correlations information for gg fusion production at low mass
- Perform a profile maximum likelihood fit of the  $\cos \varphi$  distribution in the  $m_{t\bar{t}}$   $\beta$  signal region

 $gg \to t\bar{t}$  $m(t\bar{t})$  [GeV]  $(1+\Delta)/3$ Entangled 10<sup>3</sup> -0.4 -0.6  $6 \times 10^{2}$ 1/3 -0.8 4 × 1🕰 0.75 1.00 -0.50 -0.25 0.00 0.25 -0.75 0.50 $\cos \Theta$ 



# Threshold region

- Mis-modeling at a level of ~10% seen for  $m_{t\bar{t}}$  ~345 GeV ( $m_{eu}$  < 50 GeV)
- Consistent between dilepton and lepton+jets analyses in both CMS and ATLAS



# Threshold region

- Mis-modeling at a level of ~10% seen for  $m_{t\bar{t}}$  ~345 GeV ( $m_{eu}$  < 50 GeV)
- Consistent between dilepton and lepton+jets analyses in both CMS and ATLAS
- NRQCD contributions close to threshold
  - spin and color singlet state ( $\eta_t$ ): maximally entangled *toponium*
- Excess seen could come from toponium ?

→ inclusion of toponium ( $\eta_t$ ) contributions in our signal model using simplistic model based on <u>Phys Rev D 104 034023</u>

> Toponium = predicted top quark-antiquark quasi-bound state with a mass of 343 GeV and width of 7 GeV



#### JHEP 06, 158

# Dataset and signal model

- Current analysis = extension of 2016 top quark spin correlations analysis in dilepton events
- 35.9 fb<sup>-1</sup> of data @13 TeV collected in 2016
- Combined signal model:  $t\overline{t}$  + toponium ( $\eta_t$ )
  - PowhegBox+Pythia8 as nominal tt sample
  - PowhegBox+Herwig and MG5 aMC@NLO(+MadSpin) [FxFx] as alternative tt samples
  - $\eta_t$  improves data modeling in the threshold region
    - only spin-0  $\eta_t$  accounted (colour singlet pseudoscalar state) [PRD 104 (2021) 034023]
    - toponium model generated with MG5 aMC@NLO(LO)+Pythia8 with 337  $< m_{\eta_t} < 349~{\rm GeV}$
- Main background sources:
  - Z+jets (MG5\_aMC@NLO + data-driven corrections)
  - single top (Powheg MC)
  - diboson (Pythia8 MC)



#### Phys. Rev. D 100 (2019) 072002

# **Event selection**

- Current analysis = extension of 2016 top quark spin correlations analysis in dilepton events
  - same strategy for event selection, kinematic reconstruction, and background estimation
  - optimized sensitivity for entanglement measurement
- 2 oppositely charged isolated leptons (ee, eµ and μµ)
  - including also leptons from tau decays (different from 2016 analysis)
  - $p_T$  > 25(20) GeV, for leading(trailing) lepton and  $|\eta|$  < 2.4
  - veto events with more than two leptons
  - reject events with  $m_{\ell\bar{\ell}}$  < 20 GeV
  - single lepton + dilepton triggers
- ≥ 2 jets (R=0.4), >=1 b jet
  - $p_T$  > 30 GeV and  $|\eta|$  < 2.4
  - jet cleaning:  $\Delta R(\ell, jet) > 0.4$
- ee, µµ channels:
  - $E_{\text{miss}}^T > 40 \text{ GeV}$
  - Z veto:  $|m_Z m_{\ell \bar{\ell}}| > 15 \text{ GeV}$
- Top quark reconstruction with  $m_{\ell b}$  weighting method
  - take solution with smallest  $m_{t\bar{t}}$



#### Phys. Rev. D 100 (2019) 072002



 $\cos \varphi$ 

## Extraction of entanglement proxy

- The entanglement proxy *D* is extracted with a template fit
  - all systematic effects included as nuisances
- How can we create variations of *D* outside of SM?
  - 1. generate top quark pairs with no spin correlations  $\rightarrow D = 0$  (noSC samples)
  - 2. create new samples with mixtures of SM and noSC to obtain  $D \in [D_{SM}, 0]$
  - 3. extend the fit for variations of  $[-1, D_{SM}]$
- Use mixtures of SC and noSC to change fraction of tt with aligned vs opposite spins
  → any value of D between -1 and +1 can be reached

$$\mathsf{D} \sim \frac{\sigma(\uparrow\uparrow) + \sigma(\downarrow\downarrow) - \sigma(\uparrow\downarrow) - \sigma(\downarrow\uparrow)}{\sigma(\uparrow\uparrow) + \sigma(\downarrow\downarrow) + \sigma(\uparrow\downarrow) + \sigma(\downarrow\uparrow)}$$



# Systematic uncertainties

- Current analysis = extension of 2016 top quark spin correlations analysis in dilepton events
  - same uncertainties considered + additional ones for toponium:
    - a flat uncertainty of 50% is applied on toponium
    - a binding energy uncertainty of ±0.5 GeV is considered
- Breakdown of leading syst. unc. in the entanglement proxy D at the post-fit level
- Leading experimental uncertainties:
  - Jet energy scale and resolution
- Leading theory-based uncertainties:
  - Toponium normalization
  - Parton Shower

Source	Uncertainty
	D
JES	10.1%
Toponium normalization	10.1%
Parton Shower (ISR)	6.3%
Scale	1.8%
Parton Shower (FSR)	1.2%
JER	0.9%
Z+jets shape	0.8%
b quark fragmentation	0.4%
tt normalization	0.3%
PDF	0.3%

### Results

- Result of the binned profile likelihood fit of the  $\cos \phi$  distribution
  - ~47500 signal candidates
- Good agreement with SM predictions



### Results

• Scan of the  $-2\Delta lnL$  distribution yields D at parton level, accounting for all detector effects



### Results

• Scan of the  $-2\Delta lnL$  distribution yields D at parton level, accounting for all detector effects

 $D_{obs} = -0.478 \pm 0.017(\text{stat})^{+0.018}_{-0.021}(\text{syst})$ 

$$D_{exp} = -0.465^{+0.016}_{-0.017}(\text{stat})^{+0.019}_{-0.022}(\text{syst})$$

#### >5 standard deviations observation of top quarks being entangled at tt threshold !

- Good agreement with SM predictions
  - significantly improved with  $\eta_t$  inclusion



# **Comparison with ATLAS**

- Entanglement in top quark observed by both ATLAS and CMS with >5 standard deviations!
- No clear preference for a specific MC prediction
- Both analyses are dominated by systematic uncertainty
- Total (stat.) uncertainty is an order of magnitude larger in the CMS analysis
- Total (syst.) uncertainty is similar between ATLAS & CMS, but different systematics are considered



# Conclusions

- First observation of entanglement between top quarks with CMS data
- One of few quantum information studies in high energy physics
- Even in presence of a "toponium" bound state, we confirm the existence of entanglement in the tt system with > 5 standard deviations
- A better modeling next to the production threshold is required → theory community is working on improving the prediction of mainstream generators for precision measurements









### **Top quark reconstruction**

- Use algebraic method to solve for neutrino 3-vectors
- Results in quartic equation for neutrino momenta
- Pick solution with lowest  $m_{t\bar{t}}$
- Repeat process 100x for leptons and b jets smeared within resolution
- Weight solutions by the  $m_{\ell b}$  distribution

$$0 = \sum_{i=0}^{4} c_i(m_t, p_{\ell^+}, p_{\ell^-}, p_b, p_{\bar{b}}) p_{\mathbf{x}}(\bar{v})^i$$

$$\begin{split} E_x &= p_{\nu_x} + p_{\bar{\nu}_x} \\ E_y &= p_{\nu_y} + p_{\bar{\nu}_y} \end{split}$$

$$\begin{split} m_{W^+}^2 &= (E_{\ell^+} + E_{\nu})^2 - (p_{\ell_x^+} + p_{\nu_x})^2, \\ &- (p_{\ell_y^+} + p_{\nu_y})^2 - (p_{\ell_z^+} + p_{\nu_z})^2, \\ m_{W^-}^2 &= (E_{\ell^-} + E_{\bar{\nu}})^2 - (p_{\ell_x^-} + p_{\bar{\nu}_x})^2, \\ &- (p_{\ell_y^-} + p_{\bar{\nu}_y})^2 - (p_{\ell_z^-} + p_{\bar{\nu}_z})^2, \\ m_t^2 &= (E_b + E_{\ell^+} + E_{\nu})^2 - (p_{b_x} + p_{\ell_x^+} + p_{\nu_x})^2, \\ &- (p_{b_y} + p_{\ell_y^+} + p_{\nu_y})^2 - (p_{b_z} + p_{\ell_z^+} + p_{\bar{\nu}_z})^2, \\ m_{\bar{t}}^2 &= (E_{\bar{b}} + E_{\ell^-} + E_{\bar{\nu}})^2 - (p_{\bar{b}_x} + p_{\ell_x^-} + p_{\bar{\nu}_x})^2, \\ &- (p_{\bar{b}_y} + p_{\ell_y^-} + p_{\bar{\nu}_y})^2 - (p_{\bar{b}_z} + p_{\ell_x^-} + p_{\bar{\nu}_z})^2, \end{split}$$

### Mixtures of SC and noSC

- In order to have templates implementing an alternative value of the entanglement proxy D, we employ the noSC sample and "mix" it in steps ranging from -100% to 100% with the combined signal model SM template
- The negative mixtures are created mirroring the corresponding positive mixtures around the 0% noSC mixture, i.e., the nominal combined signal model
- Any particular mixture of combined SC and noSC signal corresponds to a certain value of D at the parton level by means of calculating a 2-bin asymmetry:

 $A_D = (N(\cos \varphi > 0) - N(\cos \varphi < 0)) / (N(\cos \varphi > 0) + N(\cos \varphi < 0))$ 



yields *D* as  $-2 \cdot A_D$ , with *N* always being the sum of  $t\bar{t}$  and  $\eta_t$ .