LOOKING FOR THE HIGGS BOSON WITHOUT (TOO MUCH) PREJUDICE

ROBERTO CONTINO (UNIVERSITY OF ROME "LA SAPIENZA")

The starting point (and main assumption):

Evidence for Electroweak Symmetry Breaking

massive (light) spin-1 particles

$$\left\{W^{\pm}_{\mu}, \, Z_{\mu}\right\}$$

 $\left\{\chi^{\pm},\,\chi^{0}\right\}$

Longitudinal polarizations = Nambu-Goldstone bosons of SU(2)_L×U(1)_Y→U(1)_{em}

strongly coupled at $E \sim 4\pi f = 4\pi \left(\frac{m_V}{g}\right)$

$$\left\{ W^T_\mu,\, Z^T_\mu \right\}$$

Transverse polarizations = gauge fields

elementary up to $E \gg 4\pi \left(\frac{m_V}{a}\right)$

Top-Down Approach

UV

PERTURBATIVE MODEL

 $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ Linearly Realized

IR

LOW-ENERGY PHENOMENOLOGY

verify model's predictions

Bottom-Up Approach

Scenario #1 no linear regime

 $\begin{array}{ll} {\rm UV} & {\rm strong \ dynamics} \\ {\rm (new \ resonances \ }\rho \ , \ ...) \end{array}$

IR effective theory of χ^i

Bottom-Up Approach



Bottom-Up Approach



Bottom-Up Approach



Bottom-Up Approach

If a light scalar is discovered at the LHC, we want to <u>experimentally</u> determine which scenario (#1, #2 or #3) is realized

Bottom-Up Approach

If a light scalar is discovered at the LHC, we want to <u>experimentally</u> determine which scenario (#1, #2 or #3) is realized

Notice: the light scalar might be an "impostor" (light dilaton ?), have nothing to do with EWBS, so that we would be in scenario #1 (no linear regime)

Rules (CCWZ):

[Coleman, Wess, Zumino PRD 117 (1969) 2239 Callan, Coleman, Wess, Zumino PRD 117 (1969) 2247]

[1.] Any U(1)_{em} locally-invariant Lagrangian can be dressed up with NG-bosons and rewritten ad manifestly $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ invariant

Ex: $\operatorname{Tr}[W_{\mu}^{2}] \longrightarrow \operatorname{Tr}[(D_{\mu}\Sigma)^{\dagger}(D_{\mu}\Sigma)] \qquad (\Sigma = \exp(i\chi/v))$ $W_{\mu}^{+}W_{\mu}^{-}Z_{\mu\nu} \longrightarrow \operatorname{Tr}[(D_{\mu}\Sigma)^{\dagger}\sigma^{a}W_{\mu\nu}^{a}(D_{\nu}\Sigma)]$

[2.] Fields must come in multiplets of U(1)_{em}
 (i.e. not necessarily of SU(2)_L×U(1)_Y)

Possible Extra Rules:

 The EWSB sector has an approximate custodial SU(2)_c invariance:

 $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y \rightarrow U(1)_{em} \implies SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \rightarrow SU(2)_c$

or equivalently

SO(4)→SO(3)

Possible Extra Rules:

• The EWSB sector has an approximate custodial SU(2)_c invariance:

see Grojean's talk for a bottom-up approach w/o custodial symmetry

 $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y \rightarrow U(1)_{em} \implies SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \rightarrow SU(2)_c$

or equivalently SO(4)→SO(3)

Possible Extra Rules:

 The EWSB sector has an approximate custodial SU(2)_c invariance:

see Grojean's talk for a bottom-up approach w/o custodial symmetry

 $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y \rightarrow U(1)_{em} \implies SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \rightarrow SU(2)_c$

or equivalently

SO(4)→SO(3)

- The Higgs is a (pseudo) NG boson of a larger symmetry breaking
 - Ex: $SO(5) \rightarrow SO(4)$ $H = [\chi^i, h]$

Additional invariance (broken by spurions only): $h(x) \to h(x) + \alpha$

 $T_h \in \operatorname{Alg}\left\{\frac{SO(5)}{SO(4)}\right\}$

(Higgs shift symmetry)

Assumptions:

- Higgs boson is a scalar, singlet of $U(1)_{em}$ (SU(2)_c)
- No extra light particles
- No tree-level FCNC (mediated by the Higgs)

Assumptions:

- Higgs boson is a scalar, singlet of $U(1)_{em}$ (SU(2)_c)
- No extra light particles
- No tree-level FCNC (mediated by the Higgs)

Chiral expansion parameter = $\left(\frac{\partial_{\mu}}{\Lambda}\right)$ $\Lambda \lesssim 4\pi v = \Lambda_s$

The cutoff can be made larger if the Higgs partly unitarizes all scattering amplitudes

Ex: Higgs is a pNG boson

$$\Lambda \lesssim 4\pi f = \frac{4\pi v}{\sqrt{\xi}} \qquad \qquad \xi = \left(\frac{v}{f}\right)^2$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} &= \frac{1}{2} (\partial_{\mu} h)^2 - \frac{1}{2} m_h^2 h^2 - \frac{d_3}{6} \left(\frac{3m_h^2}{v} \right) h^3 - \frac{d_4}{24} \left(\frac{3m_h^2}{v^2} \right) h^4 \dots \\ &- \left(m_W^2 W_{\mu} W_{\mu} + \frac{1}{2} m_Z^2 Z_{\mu} Z_{\mu} \right) \left(1 + 2a \frac{h}{v} + b \frac{h^2}{v^2} + \dots \right) \\ &- \sum_{\psi = u, d, l} m_{\psi^{(i)}} \bar{\psi}^{(i)} \psi^{(i)} \left(1 + c_{\psi} \frac{h}{v} + c_{2\psi} \frac{h^2}{v^2} + \dots \right) \\ &+ \frac{g^2}{16\pi^2} \left(c_{WW} W_{\mu\nu}^+ W_{\mu\nu}^- + c_{ZZ} Z_{\mu\nu}^2 + c_{Z\gamma} Z_{\mu\nu} \gamma_{\mu\nu} \right) \frac{h}{v} + \dots \\ &+ \frac{g^2}{16\pi^2} \left[\gamma_{\mu\nu}^2 \left(c_{\gamma\gamma} \frac{h}{v} + \dots \right) + G_{\mu\nu}^2 \left(c_{gg} \frac{h}{v} + c_{2gg} \frac{h^2}{v^2} \dots \right) \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$+ \frac{g^2}{16\pi^2} \left[\frac{c_{hhgg}}{\Lambda^2} G_{\mu\nu}^2 \frac{(\partial_\rho h)^2}{v^2} + \frac{c'_{hhgg}}{\Lambda^2} G_{\mu\rho} G_{\rho\nu} \frac{\partial_\mu h \partial_\nu h}{v^2} + \dots \right]$$

 $+ \dots$

[RC Grojean, Moretti, Piccinini, Rattazzi, JHEP 1005 (2010) 089; Azatov, R.C., Galloway, JHEP 1204 (2012) 127]

o(p²) terms

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2} (\partial_{\mu} h)^{2} - \frac{1}{2} m_{h}^{2} h^{2} - \frac{d_{3}}{6} \left(\frac{3m_{h}^{2}}{v} \right) h^{3} - \frac{d_{4}}{24} \left(\frac{3m_{h}^{2}}{v^{2}} \right) h^{4} \dots$$
$$- \left(m_{W}^{2} W_{\mu} W_{\mu} + \frac{1}{2} m_{Z}^{2} Z_{\mu} Z_{\mu} \right) \left(1 + 2a \frac{h}{v} + b \frac{h^{2}}{v^{2}} + \dots \right)$$
$$- \sum_{\psi=u,d,l} m_{\psi^{(i)}} \bar{\psi}^{(i)} \psi^{(i)} \left(1 + c_{\psi} \frac{h}{v} + c_{2\psi} \frac{h^{2}}{v^{2}} + \dots \right)$$
$$+ \frac{g^{2}}{12\pi^{2}} \left(c_{WW} W_{\mu\nu}^{+} W_{\mu\nu}^{-} + c_{ZZ} Z_{\mu\nu}^{2} + c_{Z\gamma} Z_{\mu\nu} \gamma_{\mu\nu} \right) \frac{h}{v} + \dots$$

$$+ \frac{g^2}{16\pi^2} \left[\gamma_{\mu\nu}^2 \left(c_{\gamma\gamma} \frac{h}{v} + \dots \right) + G_{\mu\nu}^2 \left(c_{gg} \frac{h}{v} + c_{2gg} \frac{h^2}{v^2} \dots \right) \right]$$

$$+ \frac{g^2}{16\pi^2} \left[\frac{c_{hhgg}}{\Lambda^2} G_{\mu\nu}^2 \frac{(\partial_\rho h)^2}{v^2} + \frac{c'_{hhgg}}{\Lambda^2} G_{\mu\rho} G_{\rho\nu} \frac{\partial_\mu h \partial_\nu h}{v^2} + \dots \right]$$

 $+ \dots$

[RC Grojean, Moretti, Piccinini, Rattazzi, JHEP 1005 (2010) 089; Azatov, R.C., Galloway, JHEP 1204 (2012) 127]

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2} (\partial_{\mu} h)^{2} - \frac{1}{2} m_{h}^{2} h^{2} - \frac{d_{3}}{6} \left(\frac{3m_{h}^{2}}{v} \right) h^{3} - \frac{d_{4}}{24} \left(\frac{3m_{h}^{2}}{v^{2}} \right) h^{4} \dots$$
$$- \left(m_{W}^{2} W_{\mu} W_{\mu} + \frac{1}{2} m_{Z}^{2} Z_{\mu} Z_{\mu} \right) \left(1 + 2a \frac{h}{v} + b \frac{h^{2}}{v^{2}} + \dots \right)$$
$$- \sum_{\psi=u,d,l} m_{\psi^{(i)}} \bar{\psi}^{(i)} \psi^{(i)} \left(1 + c_{\psi} \frac{h}{v} + c_{2\psi} \frac{h^{2}}{v^{2}} + \dots \right)$$
$$+ \frac{g^{2}}{16\pi^{2}} \left(c_{WW} W_{\mu\nu}^{+} W_{\mu\nu}^{-} + c_{ZZ} Z_{\mu\nu}^{2} + c_{Z\gamma} Z_{\mu\nu} \gamma_{\mu\nu} \right) \frac{h}{v} + \dots$$

$$+ \frac{g^2}{16\pi^2} \left[\gamma_{\mu\nu}^2 \left(c_{\gamma\gamma} \frac{h}{v} + \dots \right) + G_{\mu\nu}^2 \left(c_{gg} \frac{h}{v} + c_{2gg} \frac{h^2}{v^2} \dots \right) \right]$$

$$+ \frac{g^2}{16\pi^2} \left[\frac{c_{hhgg}}{\Lambda^2} G_{\mu\nu}^2 \frac{(\partial_\rho h)^2}{v^2} + \frac{c_{hhgg}'}{\Lambda^2} G_{\mu\rho} G_{\rho\nu} \frac{\partial_\mu h \partial_\nu h}{v^2} + \dots \right]$$

 $+ \dots$

[RC Grojean, Moretti, Piccinini, Rattazzi, JHEP 1005 (2010) 089; Azatov, R.C., Galloway, JHEP 1204 (2012) 127]

o(p²) terms

o(p⁴) terms

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} &= \frac{1}{2} (\partial_{\mu} h)^2 - \frac{1}{2} m_h^2 h^2 - \frac{d_3}{6} \left(\frac{3m_h^2}{v} \right) h^3 - \frac{d_4}{24} \left(\frac{3m_h^2}{v^2} \right) h^4 \dots \\ &- \left(m_W^2 W_{\mu} W_{\mu} + \frac{1}{2} m_Z^2 Z_{\mu} Z_{\mu} \right) \left(1 + 2a \frac{h}{v} + b \frac{h^2}{v^2} + \dots \right) \\ &- \sum_{\psi=u,d,l} m_{\psi^{(i)}} \bar{\psi}^{(i)} \psi^{(i)} \left(1 + c_{\psi} \frac{h}{v} + c_{2\psi} \frac{h^2}{v^2} + \dots \right) \\ &+ \frac{g^2}{16\pi^2} \left(c_{WW} W_{\mu\nu}^+ W_{\mu\nu}^- + c_{ZZ} Z_{\mu\nu}^2 + c_{Z\gamma} Z_{\mu\nu} \gamma_{\mu\nu} \right) \frac{h}{v} + \dots \\ &+ \frac{g^2}{16\pi^2} \left[\gamma_{\mu\nu}^2 \left(c_{\gamma\gamma} \frac{h}{v} + \dots \right) + G_{\mu\nu}^2 \left(c_{gg} \frac{h}{v} + c_{2gg} \frac{h^2}{v^2} \dots \right) \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$+ \frac{g^2}{16\pi^2} \left[\frac{c_{hhgg}}{\Lambda^2} G_{\mu\nu}^2 \frac{(\partial_\rho h)^2}{v^2} + \frac{c'_{hhgg}}{\Lambda^2} G_{\mu\rho} G_{\rho\nu} \frac{\partial_\mu h \partial_\nu h}{v^2} + \dots \right]$$

 $+ \dots$

[RC Grojean, Moretti, Piccinini, Rattazzi, JHEP 1005 (2010) 089; Azatov, R.C., Galloway, JHEP 1204 (2012) 127]

o(p²) terms

o(p⁴) terms

o(p⁶) terms

Chiral Lagrangian for *c* Light Llight Controls the hWW, hZZ couplings

 $= a \cdot g_{hWW}^{SM}$

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2} (\partial_{\mu} h)^2 - \frac{1}{2} m_h^2 h^2 - \frac{d_3}{6} \left(\frac{3m_h^2}{v}\right) h^3 - \frac{d_4}{24} \left(\frac{3m_h^2}{v^2}\right) h^4 \dots - \left(m_W^2 W_\mu W_\mu + \frac{1}{2} m_Z^2 Z_\mu Z_\mu\right) \left(1 + 2a \frac{h}{v} + b \frac{h^2}{v^2} + \dots\right)$$

$$-\sum_{\psi=u,d,l} m_{\psi^{(i)}} \,\bar{\psi}^{(i)} \,\psi^{(i)} \left(1 + c_{\psi} \frac{h}{v} + c_{2\psi} \frac{h^2}{v^2} + \dots\right)$$

$$+ \frac{g^2}{16\pi^2} \Big(c_{WW} W^+_{\mu\nu} W^-_{\mu\nu} + c_{ZZ} Z^2_{\mu\nu} + c_{Z\gamma} Z_{\mu\nu} \gamma_{\mu\nu} \Big) \frac{h}{v} + \dots \\ + \frac{g^2}{16\pi^2} \Big[\gamma^2_{\mu\nu} \Big(c_{\gamma\gamma} \frac{h}{v} + \dots \Big) + G^2_{\mu\nu} \Big(c_{gg} \frac{h}{v} + c_{2gg} \frac{h^2}{v^2} \dots \Big) \Big]$$

$$+ \frac{g^2}{16\pi^2} \left[\frac{c_{hhgg}}{\Lambda^2} G_{\mu\nu}^2 \frac{(\partial_\rho h)^2}{v^2} + \frac{c'_{hhgg}}{\Lambda^2} G_{\mu\rho} G_{\rho\nu} \frac{\partial_\mu h \partial_\nu h}{v^2} + \dots \right]$$

grangian for c light light Controls the hWW, hZZ couplings

 $= a \cdot g_{hWW}^{SM}$

Controls the $h\psi\psi$ coupling

$$= c_{\psi} \cdot g_{h\psi\psi}^{SM} \qquad \frac{3m_{h}^{2}}{v} h^{3} - \frac{d_{4}}{24} \left(\frac{3m_{h}^{2}}{v^{2}}\right) h^{4} .$$
$$- \left(m_{W}^{2} W_{\mu} W_{\mu} + \frac{1}{2} m_{Z}^{2} Z_{\mu} Z_{\mu}\right) \left(1 + 2a \frac{h}{v} + b \frac{h^{2}}{v^{2}} + ...\right)$$
$$- \sum_{\psi=u,d,l} m_{\psi^{(i)}} \bar{\psi}^{(i)} \psi^{(i)} \left(1 + c_{\psi} \frac{h}{v} + c_{2\psi} \frac{h^{2}}{v^{2}} + ...\right)$$

$$+ \frac{g^2}{16\pi^2} \Big(c_{WW} W^+_{\mu\nu} W^-_{\mu\nu} + c_{ZZ} Z^2_{\mu\nu} + c_{Z\gamma} Z_{\mu\nu} \gamma_{\mu\nu} \Big) \frac{h}{v} + \dots \\ + \frac{g^2}{16\pi^2} \Big[\gamma^2_{\mu\nu} \Big(c_{\gamma\gamma} \frac{h}{v} + \dots \Big) + G^2_{\mu\nu} \Big(c_{gg} \frac{h}{v} + c_{2gg} \frac{h^2}{v^2} \dots \Big) \Big]$$

$$+ \frac{g^2}{16\pi^2} \left[\frac{c_{hhgg}}{\Lambda^2} G_{\mu\nu}^2 \frac{(\partial_\rho h)^2}{v^2} + \frac{c'_{hhgg}}{\Lambda^2} G_{\mu\rho} G_{\rho\nu} \frac{\partial_\mu h \partial_\nu h}{v^2} + \dots \right]$$





$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2} (\partial_{\mu} h)^2 - \frac{1}{2} m_h^2 h^2 - \frac{d_3}{6} \left(\frac{3m_h^2}{v}\right) h^3 - \frac{d_4}{24} \left(\frac{3m_h^2}{v^2}\right) h^4 \dots - \left(m_W^2 W_{\mu} W_{\mu} + \frac{1}{2} m_Z^2 Z_{\mu} Z_{\mu}\right) \left(1 + 2a \frac{h}{v} + b \frac{h^2}{v^2} + \dots\right)$$

$$-\sum_{\psi=u,d,l} m_{\psi^{(i)}} \,\bar{\psi}^{(i)} \,\psi^{(i)} \left(1 + c_{\psi} \frac{h}{v} + c_{2\psi} \frac{h^2}{v^2} + \dots\right)$$

$$+ \frac{g^2}{16\pi^2} \left(c_{WW} W^+_{\mu\nu} W^-_{\mu\nu} + c_{ZZ} Z^2_{\mu\nu} + c_{Z\gamma} Z_{\mu\nu} \gamma_{\mu\nu} \right) \frac{h}{v} + \dots + \frac{g^2}{16\pi^2} \left[\gamma^2_{\mu\nu} \left(c_{\gamma\gamma} \frac{h}{v} + \dots \right) + G^2_{\mu\nu} \left(c_{gg} \frac{h}{v} + c_{2gg} \frac{h^2}{v^2} \dots \right) \right]$$

$$+ \frac{g^2}{16\pi^2} \left[\frac{c_{hhgg}}{\Lambda^2} G_{\mu\nu}^2 \frac{(\partial_\rho h)^2}{v^2} + \frac{c'_{hhgg}}{\Lambda^2} G_{\mu\rho} G_{\rho\nu} \frac{\partial_\mu h \partial_\nu h}{v^2} + \dots \right]$$

Contributes to $WW \rightarrow hh$



$$Contributes to gg \to hh$$

$$g = 0000 \qquad h \qquad h^{3} - \frac{d_{4}}{24} \left(\frac{3m_{h}^{2}}{v^{2}}\right) h^{4} \dots$$

$$g = 0000 \qquad h \qquad \left(1 + 2a \frac{h}{v} + b \frac{h^{2}}{v^{2}} + \dots\right)$$

$$- \sum_{\psi=u,d,l} m_{\psi^{(i)}} \bar{\psi}^{(i)} \psi^{(i)} \left(1 + c_{\psi} \frac{h}{v} + c_{2\psi} \frac{h^{2}}{v^{2}} + \dots\right)$$

$$+ \frac{g^2}{16\pi^2} \Big(c_{WW} W^+_{\mu\nu} W^-_{\mu\nu} + c_{ZZ} Z^2_{\mu\nu} + c_{Z\gamma} Z_{\mu\nu} \gamma_{\mu\nu} \Big) \frac{h}{v} + \dots \\ + \frac{g^2}{16\pi^2} \Big[\gamma^2_{\mu\nu} \Big(c_{\gamma\gamma} \frac{h}{v} + \dots \Big) + G^2_{\mu\nu} \Big(c_{gg} \frac{h}{v} + c_{2gg} \frac{h^2}{v^2} \dots \Big) \Big]$$

$$+ \frac{g^2}{16\pi^2} \left[\frac{c_{hhgg}}{\Lambda^2} G_{\mu\nu}^2 \frac{(\partial_\rho h)^2}{v^2} + \frac{c'_{hhgg}}{\Lambda^2} G_{\mu\rho} G_{\rho\nu} \frac{\partial_\mu h \partial_\nu h}{v^2} + \dots \right]$$

Contributes to $WW \rightarrow hh$







How to use the Chiral Lagrangian

Rules of chiral expansion:

```
LO = tree-level O(p^2)
NLO = 1-loop O(p^2) + tree-level O(p^4)
NNLO = 2-loops O(p^2) + 1-loop O(p^4) + tree-level O(p^6)
```

• QCD corrections (expansion in α_s) factorize

How to use the Chiral Lagrangian

Rules of chiral expansion:

LO = tree-level $O(p^2)$ NLO = 1-loop $O(p^2)$ + tree-level $O(p^4)$ NNLO = 2-loops $O(p^2)$ + 1-loop $O(p^4)$ + tree-level $O(p^6)$

Ex: h→WW



in models with partial compositeness and pNG Higgs







 $c_t \, \frac{m_h^2}{v} \, \frac{g_s^2}{16\pi^2} \, F\left(\frac{m_h^2}{m_t^2}\right)$

in models with partial compositeness and pNG Higgs



$$c_t = 1 + O(\xi) + O\left[\left(\frac{g_*^2 v^2}{M^2}\right) \left(\frac{\lambda^2}{g_*^2}\right)\right]$$

in models with partial compositeness and pNG Higgs







 $c_t = 1 + O(\xi) + O\left[\left(\frac{g_*^2 v^2}{M^2}\right) \left(\frac{\lambda^2}{g_*^2}\right)\right]$

from Higgs non-linearities

in models with partial compositeness and pNG Higgs





 $c_{gg} \, \frac{m_h^2}{v} \, \frac{g_s^2}{16\pi^2}$

 $c_t = 1 + O(\xi) + O\left[\left(\frac{g_*^2 v^2}{M^2}\right) \left(\frac{\lambda^2}{g_*^2}\right)\right]$

from Higgs non-linearities

from corrections to wave-function

in models with partial compositeness and pNG Higgs



In minimal pNG Higgs models with in models with partial compos partial compositeness loops of heavy fermions exactly cancel the wave function correction 0000 Falkowski, PRD 77 (2008) 055018 Low, Rattazzi, Vichi, JHEP 1004 (2010) 126 0000 Azatov, Galloway, PRD 85 (2012) 055013 $c_t \, \frac{m_h^2}{v} \, \frac{g^2}{16\pi^2} \, F\left(\frac{m_h^2}{m_t^2}\right)$ $\frac{g_s^2}{16\pi^2}$ c_{gg} 0000 $c_t = 1 + O(\xi) + O\left[\left(\frac{g_*^2 v^2}{M^2}\right) \left(\frac{\lambda^2}{g_*^2}\right)\right]$ 0000 from Higgs from corrections non-linearities $c_{gg} \sim \left(\frac{g_*^2 v^2}{M^2}\right) \left(\frac{\lambda^2}{q_*^2}\right)$ wave-function
in models with partial compositeness and pNG Higgs



$$\frac{\hat{s}}{v^2} \frac{g_s^2}{16\pi^2} \left[c_t^2 F_{\Box} \left(\frac{\hat{s}}{m_t^2} \right) + \left(c_{2t} + c \, d_3 \, \frac{m_h^2}{\hat{s}} \right) F_{\Delta} \left(\frac{\hat{s}}{m_t^2} \right) \right] \qquad c_t = 1 + O(\xi) + O\left[\left(\frac{g_* v}{M^2} \right) \left(\frac{\lambda}{g_*^2} \right) \right] \\ c_{2t} = O(\xi) + O\left[\left(\frac{g_* v^2}{M^2} \right) \left(\frac{\lambda^2}{g_*^2} \right) \right] \\ \frac{\hat{s}}{v^2} \frac{g_s^2}{16\pi^2} \left(c_{2gg} + \frac{\hat{s}}{\Lambda^2} \, c_{hhgg} + \dots \right)$$

 $\Gamma \left(2 2 2 \right) \left(12 \right)$

in models with partial compositeness and pNG Higgs



 $c_t = 1 + O(\xi) + O\left[\left(\frac{g_*^2 v^2}{M^2}\right) \left(\frac{\lambda^2}{g_*^2}\right)\right]$ $\frac{\hat{s}}{v^2} \frac{g_s^2}{16\pi^2} \left[c_t^2 F_{\Box} \left(\frac{\hat{s}}{m_t^2} \right) + \left(c_{2t} + c \, d_3 \, \frac{m_h^2}{\hat{s}} \right) F_{\bigtriangleup} \left(\frac{\hat{s}}{m_t^2} \right) \right]$ $c_{2t} = O(\xi) + O\left[\left(\frac{g_*^2 v^2}{M^2}\right) \left(\frac{\lambda^2}{g_*^2}\right)\right]$

$$\frac{\hat{s}}{v^2} \frac{g_s^2}{16\pi^2} \left(c_{2gg} + \frac{\hat{s}}{\Lambda^2} c_{hhgg} + \dots \right)$$

$$c_{2gg} \sim \left(\frac{g_*^2 v^2}{M^2}\right) \left(\frac{\lambda^2}{g_*^2}\right)$$
$$c_{hhgg} \sim \left(\frac{g_*^2 v^2}{M^2}\right)$$

in models with partial compositeness and pNG Higgs



$$\frac{\hat{s}}{v^2} \frac{g_s^2}{16\pi^2} \left[c_t^2 F_{\Box} \left(\frac{\hat{s}}{m_t^2} \right) + \left(c_{2t} + c \, d_3 \, \frac{m_h^2}{\hat{s}} \right) F_{\bigtriangleup} \left(\frac{\hat{s}}{m_t^2} \right) \right]$$

$$\frac{\hat{s}}{v^2} \frac{g_s^2}{16\pi^2} \left(c_{2gg} + \frac{\hat{s}}{\Lambda^2} c_{hhgg} + \dots \right)$$

 $c_{2gg} \sim \begin{pmatrix} g_*^2 v^2 \\ M^2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^2 \\ g_*^2 \end{pmatrix}$ $c_{hhgg} \sim \begin{pmatrix} g_*^2 v^2 \\ M^2 \end{pmatrix}$

In minimal pNG Higgs models with partial compositeness loops of heavy fermions cancel the wave function correction only at zero Higgs momentum

 $c_t = 1 + O(\xi) + O\left[\left(\frac{g_*^2 v^2}{M^2}\right) \left(\frac{\lambda^2}{g_*^2}\right)\right]$ $c_{2t} = O(\xi) + O\left[\left(\frac{g_*^2 v^2}{M^2}\right) \left(\frac{\lambda^2}{g_*^2}\right)\right]$

The O(p⁶) terms might be numerically important

- σ(gg→hh) much more sensitive on new tthh couplings c₂ than on trilinear d₃
 - [First noticed by:

Dib, Rosenfeld, Zerwekh, JHEP 0605 (2006) 074 Grober and Muhlleitner, JHEP 1106 (2011) 020]



results from:

R.C., Ghezzi, Moretti, Panico, Piccinini, Wulzer, arXiv:1205.5444

- σ(gg→hh) much more sensitive on new tthh couplings c₂ than on trilinear d₃
 - [First noticed by:

Dib, Rosenfeld, Zerwekh, JHEP 0605 (2006) 074 Grober and Muhlleitner, JHEP 1106 (2011) 020]



results from:

R.C., Ghezzi, Moretti, Panico, Piccinini, Wulzer, arXiv:1205.5444



If BR(h)≃BR(h)_{SM} best channel is hh→bbγγ [Baur, Plehn, Rainwater, PRD 69 (2004) 053004]

 ξ =0.15 $\rightarrow \sigma(gg \rightarrow hh) \times BR \sim 3 [\sigma(gg \rightarrow hh) \times BR]_{SM}$

 If c≃0 (fermiophobic Higgs) a very promising channel is hh→WWγγ→Wqqlvγγ

ξ=0.5 (c=0), √s=8TeV → σ(gg→hh)xBR ~ 0.7fb

Extracting c_2 from $gg \rightarrow hh \rightarrow bb\gamma\gamma$

Discovery luminosity (fb⁻¹)



Ex: $\sqrt{s}=14$ TeV L=300fb⁻¹ \Rightarrow c₂>0.8 c₂<-0.2

results from:

R.C., Ghezzi, Moretti, Panico, Piccinini, Wulzer, arXiv:1205.5444

Extracting c_2 from $gg \rightarrow hh \rightarrow bb\gamma\gamma$

Discovery luminosity (fb⁻¹)



Ex: $\sqrt{s}=14\text{TeV}\ L=300\text{fb}^{-1}$ \Rightarrow c₂>0.8 c₂<-0.2

Precision on couplings (curves at 68% prob.)



Ex: Injected ξ =0.3 (c=d₃=0.48 c₂=-0.6)

 $\Delta c_2/c_2 = 15-20\%$

results from:

R.C., Ghezzi, Moretti, Panico, Piccinini, Wulzer, arXiv:1205.5444

- Current information made public by experimental collaborations is (often) not sufficient to allow theorists to make a rigorous fit
 - Need: [1] cut efficiencies for each Higgs production mode and event category
 - [2] likelihoods functions for each event category

- Current information made public by experimental collaborations is (often) not sufficient to allow theorists to make a rigorous fit
 - Need: [1] cut efficiencies for each Higgs production mode and event category
 - [2] likelihoods functions for each event category
- Even with full info at disposal one should combine channels by taking into account all correlations (systematics, theory errors, etc.)

This means: marginalizing over O(100) nuisance parameters !

- Current information made public by experimental collaborations is (often) not sufficient to allow theorists to make a rigorous fit
 - Need: [1] cut efficiencies for each Higgs production mode and event category
 - [2] likelihoods functions for each event category
- Even with full info at disposal one should combine channels by taking into account all correlations (systematics, theory errors, etc.)
 - This means: marginalizing over O(100) nuisance parameters !
- Best if fit is done by experimentalists; theorists can give support on how to perform calculations (with chiral Lagrangian)

For the impatient: I'll show a fit performed with reasonable simplifying assumptions.

We concentrate on leading effects and keep only two parameters: (a,c)

results from: Azatov, R.C., Galloway, JHEP 1204 (2012) 127

For the impatient: I'll show a fit performed with reasonable simplifying assumptions.

We concentrate on leading effects and keep only two parameters: (a,c)

results from: Azatov, R.C., Galloway, JHEP 1204 (2012) 127 See talks by Azatov for more details

For the impatient: I'll show a fit performed with reasonable simplifying assumptions.

We concentrate on leading effects and keep only two parameters: (a,c)

results from: Azatov, R.C., Galloway, JHEP 1204 (2012) 127 See talks by Azatov for more details

Similar fits done by several other groups:

Carmi, Falkowski, Kuflik, Volansky, arXiv:1202.3144 Espinosa, Grojean, Muhlleitner, Trott, arXiv:1202.3697 Giardino, Kannike, Raidal, Strumia, arXiv:1203.4254 Ellis and You, arXiv:1204.0464 Farina, Grojean, Salvioni, arXiv:1205.0011 Klute, Lafaye, Plehn, Rauch, Zerwas, arXiv:1205.2699 see talks by Falkowski, Grojean, Strumia

95% Exclusion for various mH







First solution SM-like (a=1.0, c=0.75)





First solution SM-like (a=1.0, c=0.75)



Second solution due to degeneracy in $\gamma\gamma$:

$$a_2 \simeq + a_1 \frac{4.5 a_1 - c_1}{4.5 a_1 + c_1}$$
$$c_2 \simeq -c_1 \frac{4.5 a_1 - c_1}{4.5 a_1 + c_1}$$



First solution SM-like (a=1.0, c=0.75)





Second solution due to degeneracy in $\gamma\gamma$:

 $a_2 \simeq + a_1 \frac{4.5 a_1 - c_1}{4.5 a_1 + c_1}$ $c_2 \simeq -c_1 \frac{4.5 a_1 - c_1}{4.5 a_1 + c_1}$

First solution SM-like (a=1.0, c=0.75)





Second solution due to degeneracy in $\gamma\gamma$:

$$a_2 \simeq + a_1 \frac{4.5 a_1 - c_1}{4.5 a_1 + c_1}$$

 $c_2 \simeq - c_1 \frac{4.5 a_1 - c_1}{4.5 a_1 + c_1}$

(from J. Galloway, talk at Pheno 2012)

CMS all channels combined: WW and $\gamma\gamma$ fully EXCLUSIVE

CMS Likelihoods [$\leq 4.8 \text{ fb}^{-1} @ 7 \text{ TeV}$]: All Exclusive



(from J. Galloway, talk at Pheno 2012)

CMS all channels combined: WW and $\gamma\gamma$ fully EXCLUSIVE

CMS Likelihoods [$\leq 4.8 \text{ fb}^{-1} @ 7 \text{ TeV}$]: All Exclusive



CMS all channels combined: WW and $\gamma\gamma$ fully INCLUSIVE



(from J. Galloway, talk at Pheno 2012)

CMS all channels combined: WW and $\gamma\gamma$ fully EXCLUSIVE

CMS Likelihoods [$\leq 4.8 \text{ fb}^{-1} \otimes 7 \text{ TeV}$]: All Exclusive



absence of excess in WWjj and exclusive $\gamma\gamma$ analysis of CMS rule out FP region with a>1

CMS all channels combined: WW and $\gamma\gamma$ fully INCLUSIVE



(from J. Galloway, talk at Pheno 2012)

CMS all channels combined: WW and $\gamma\gamma$ fully EXCLUSIVE

CMS Likelihoods [$\leq 4.8 \text{ fb}^{-1} \otimes 7 \text{ TeV}$]: All Exclusive



absence of excess in WWjj and exclusive $\gamma\gamma$ analysis of CMS rule out FP region with a>1

CMS all channels combined: WW and $\gamma\gamma$ fully INCLUSIVE



Moral: Exclusive analyses probe individual Higgs productions and are much more powerful than inclusive ones

Exclusive vs Inclusive: the $h \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ channel

Projection at 20 fb⁻¹ (SM injected) Breakdown of exclusive categories



Projection at 20 fb⁻¹ (SM injected) Fully exclusive vs inclusive analysis



$$\mu_{jj} \sim \mu_{1l} \sim a^2 \, \frac{(4.5 \, a - c)^2}{c^2}$$

$$\mu_{incl} \sim (c^2 + \zeta a^2) \, \frac{(4.5 \, a - c)^2}{c^2}$$

Shall we break the degeneracy ?

Projection at 40 fb⁻¹ (SM injected) Breakdown of individual channels



Projection at 40 fb⁻¹ (SM injected) All channels combined



Shall we break the degeneracy?

Projection at 40 fb⁻¹ (SM injected) Breakdown of individual channels

Projection at 40 fb⁻¹ (SM injected) All channels combined



Shall we break the degeneracy?

Projection at 40 fb⁻¹ (SM injected) Breakdown of individual channels

Projection at 40 fb⁻¹ (SM injected) All channels combined



ττ channel currently not very powerful Background underestimated in old studies on Higgs couplings

Shall we break the degeneracy?

Projection at 40 fb⁻¹ (SM injected) Breakdown of individual channels

Projection at 40 fb⁻¹ (SM injected) All channels combined



ττ channel currently not very powerful Background underestimated in old studies on Higgs couplings

Results of Higgs searches can/should be presented (also) in a model-independent way

- Results of Higgs searches can/should be presented (also) in a model-independent way
- Theory predictions can be made in a fully-consistent and systematic way by means of Chiral Lagrangian (bottom-up approach)

- Results of Higgs searches can/should be presented (also) in a model-independent way
- Theory predictions can be made in a fully-consistent and systematic way by means of Chiral Lagrangian (bottom-up approach)
- First fit to (a,c) based on LHC data shows: i) SM is in good shape; ii) there is a second, degenerate solution

- Results of Higgs searches can/should be presented (also) in a model-independent way
- Theory predictions can be made in a fully-consistent and systematic way by means of Chiral Lagrangian (bottom-up approach)
- First fit to (a,c) based on LHC data shows: i) SM is in good shape; ii) there is a second, degenerate solution
- Exclusive vs Inclusive analyses much more powerful in a model-independent approach

- Results of Higgs searches can/should be presented (also) in a model-independent way
- Theory predictions can be made in a fully-consistent and systematic way by means of Chiral Lagrangian (bottom-up approach)
- First fit to (a,c) based on LHC data shows: i) SM is in good shape; ii) there is a second, degenerate solution
- Exclusive vs Inclusive analyses much more powerful in a model-independent approach
- Double Higgs production via gluon fusion (gg→hh) strongly sensitive on tthh coupling (c2)

EXTRA SLIDES

Precision on couplings (curves at 68% prob.)



results from:

R.C., Ghezzi, Moretti, Panico, Piccinini, Wulzer, arXiv:1205.5444



Ex: with L=300fb⁻¹

 $\Delta \xi / \xi = 30\%$ for $\xi = 0.2$
Exclusive vs Inclusive: the $h \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ channel



 $\mu(i) \equiv \frac{\sigma \times BR(i)}{[\sigma \times BR(i)]_{SM}}$

Fit at m_H=125GeV





Exclusive vs Inclusive: the $h \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ channel

FP signal ($a=1/\sqrt{2}$, c=0) injected Breakdown of exclusive categories



FP signal ($a=1/\sqrt{2}$, c=0) injected Fully exclusive vs inclusive analysis



results from: Azatov, R.C., Del Re, Galloway, Grassi, Rahatlou, arXiv:1204.4817

FP point (a=1/ $\sqrt{2}$, c=0) still allowed by CMS combined limits for 123 GeV< m_H < 130GeV

Exclusive vs Inclusive: the $h \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ channel

Fit of $\gamma\gamma$ based on CMS data



courtesy of A. Azatov

Shall we break the degeneracy?

