



Higgs Physics

Georg Weiglein, DESY

Nikhef Topical Lectures,
Amsterdam, 04 / 2016

Outline

- Introduction: what's so special about a Higgs boson?
- The Brout-Englert-Higgs (BEH) mechanism
- Higgs physics beyond the Standard Model: extended Higgs sectors and composite Higgs
- Higgs phenomenology
- What do we know so far about the discovered signal at 125 GeV and how can we interpret it?
- How about the recently observed excess at about 750 GeV?
- Conclusions

Introduction: what's so special about a Higgs boson?

Introduction: what’s so special about a Higgs boson?

Probing the fundamental laws of nature

Particle accelerators (Large Hadron Collider (LHC), . . .)
$\Rightarrow$ probe the TeV scale (Terascale)

What are the fundamental laws of nature?

$\Rightarrow$ Study the fundamental forces ("interactions") and the fundamental building blocks of matter ("elementary particles")

Probing high energies and short distances $\Leftrightarrow$ viewing the early Universe

High-energy colliders: linear and circular

LEP (≤ 2000): e^+e^- collider, $E_{\rm CM} \lesssim 206~{\rm GeV}$

circular accelerator, ≈ 28 km long



Energy loss due to synchrotron radiation: $\Delta E \sim \dfrac{E^4}{m^4\, r}$

Linear and circular colliders

$\Rightarrow$ High energy e^+e^- collider can only be realised as Linear Collider (LC): ILC, CLIC

Comparison: proposal for TLEP circular e^+e^- collider: 80–100 km long tunnel for 350 GeV machine

Synchrotron radiation loss smaller for proton by factor $(m_\mathrm{e}/m_\mathrm{p})^4 \approx 10^{-13}$

Tevatron, Run II (≤ 2011): circular $p\bar{p}$ collider, $E_\mathrm{CM} \approx 2$ TeV

LHC: circular pp collider (in LEP tunnel), $E_\mathrm{CM} \approx 14$ TeV

Physics at the LHC and the ILC (in a nutshell)

LHC: pp scattering

at $\lesssim 14\ \mathrm{TeV}$



Scattering process of proton constituents with energy up to several TeV,

strongly interacting

$\Rightarrow$ huge QCD backgrounds,

low signal–to–backgr. ratios

ILC: e^+e^- scattering

at $\lesssim$ 1 TeV



Clean exp. environment:

well-defined initial state,

tunable energy,

beam polarization, GigaZ,

$\gamma\gamma$, $e\gamma$, e^-e^- options, . . .

$\Rightarrow$ rel. small backgrounds

high-precision physics

LHC physics: exploring the Terascale

$$1\ \mathrm{TeV} \approx 1000 \times m_{\mathrm{proton}} \Leftrightarrow 2 \times 10^{-19}\ \mathrm{m}$$



[Plot adapted from J. Feng '05]

Particle accelerators: viewing the early Universe

Today's universe is cold and empty: only the stable relics and leftovers of the big bang remain

The unstable particles have decayed away with time, and the symmetries that shaped the early Universe have been broken as it has cooled

$\Rightarrow$ Use particle accelerators to pump sufficient energy into a point in space to re-create the short-lived particles and uncover the forces and symmetries that existed in the earliest Universe

$\Rightarrow$ Accelerators probe not only the structure of matter but also the structure of space-time, i.e. the fabric of the Universe itself

The Quantum Universe



Particle Physics Experiments Accelerators Underground

Quantum Field Theory (Standard Model)





Astronomy Experiments Telescopes Satellites

Standard Cosmology Model

10^{-18} m

10^{26} m

What can we learn from exploring the Terascale?

- How do elementary particles obtain the property of mass: what is the mechanism of electroweak symmetry breaking? What is the role of the discovered particle at $\sim 126\ \mathrm{GeV}$ in this context?
- Do all the forces of nature arise from a single fundamental interaction?
- Are there more than three dimensions of space?
- Are space and time embedded into a “superspace”?
- What is dark matter? Can it be produced in the laboratory?
- Are there new sources of $\mathcal{CP}$-violation?
  Can they explain the asymmetry between matter and anti-matter in the Universe?

What is the quantum structure of the vacuum?



- The recent discovery of a Higgs boson hints at a non-trivial structure of the vacuum, i.e. of the lowest-energy state in our universe

- The discovered particle provides access to studying the quantum structure of the vacuum!

- How can a Higgs boson be as light as 125 GeV?
  - A new symmetry of nature $\longrightarrow$ Supersymmetry?
  - A new fundamental interaction of nature $\longrightarrow$ composite Higgs?
  - Extra dimensions of space $\longrightarrow$ impact on gravity on small scales?
  - Multiverses $\longrightarrow$ anthropic principle?

Fundamental interactions

- Electromagnetism (electricity + magnetism)
- Strong interaction (binds quarks within the proton and protons and neutrons within nuclei)
- Weak interaction (radioactivity, difference between matter and anti-matter, . . .)
- Gravity (solar system, . . .)

Interaction between two particles is mediated by a field

E.g.: atom, interaction between proton and electron: electromagnetic field

The Universe is a quantum world

The fields are quantised

Particles are quanta of fields

The photon is the quantum of the electromagnetic field

Fundamental interactions are mediated by the exchange of field quanta, i.e. particles

- Electromagnetic interaction: photon, γ
- Weak interaction: W, Z
- Strong interaction: gluon, g
- Gravity: graviton, G

Description of fundamental interactions with quantum field theories

Classical field theory (e.g. classical electrodynamics):

Quantum field theory (e.g. QED): field is quantised,
field quantum: photon



Interaction: exchange of field quanta

The Standard Model (SM): electroweak and strong interactions

Electroweak interaction:

Fermion fields: quarks: $\begin{pmatrix} u_L \\ d_L \end{pmatrix}, u_R, d_R,$ leptons: $\begin{pmatrix} \nu_L \\ e_L \end{pmatrix}, e_R$

3 generations: $u, d,$ s, c t, b

ν_e, e ν_μ, μ ν_τ, τ

gauge bosons: γ, Z, W^+, W^-

Gauge group: $\mathrm{SU(2)_I \times U(1)_Y \supset U(1)_{em}}$

Strong interaction: QCD

quarks: q_r, q_g, q_b, gauge bosons: $g_1, \ldots g_8$: gluons, $\mathrm{SU(3)_C}$

All postulated fermions and gauge bosons experimentally verified

Construction principle of the SM: gauge invariance

Example:

Quantum electrodynamics (QED)

free electron field: $\mathcal{L}_{\text{Dirac}} = i\overline{\Psi}\gamma_\mu\partial^\mu\Psi - m\overline{\Psi}\Psi$

invariant under global gauge transformation: $\Psi \to e^{i\theta}\Psi$

Requirement of local gauge invariance:

gauge field A_μ introduced, $\partial_\mu \to D_\mu = \partial_\mu - ieA_\mu$

gauge transformation: $\Psi \to e^{ie\lambda(x)}\Psi$, $A_\mu \to A_\mu + \partial_\mu\lambda(x)$

Construction of the QED Lagrangian

$\Rightarrow$ Lagrangian with interaction term:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{QED}} = \underbrace{-\frac{1}{4}F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu}}_{\text{free photon field}} + \underbrace{\overline{\Psi}(i\gamma_\mu\partial^\mu - m)\Psi}_{\text{free electron field}} + \underbrace{\mathrm{e}\overline{\Psi}\gamma_\mu\Psi A^\mu}_{\text{interaction}}$$

free photon field free electron field interaction

invariant under local gauge transformations

mass term, $m^2 A^\mu A_\mu$: not gauge-invariant

$\Rightarrow$ A_μ: massless gauge field

How do elementary particles get mass?

- The fundamental interactions of elementary particles are described very successfully by quantum field theories that follow an underlying symmetry principle:
  "gauge invariance"
- This fundamental symmetry principle requires that all the elementary particles and force carriers should be massless
- However: W, Z, top, bottom, . . . , electron are massive, have widely differing masses

  explicit mass terms $\Leftrightarrow$ breaking of gauge invariance

How can elementary particles acquire mass without spoiling the fundamental symmetries of nature?

The Brout-Englert-Higgs (BEH) mechanism

$\Rightarrow$ Need additional concept:

Higgs mechanism, spontaneous electroweak symmetry breaking:

New field postulated that fills all of the space: the Higgs field

Higgs potential

$\Rightarrow$ non-trivial structure of the vacuum postulated!

Gauge-invariant mass terms from interaction with Higgs field

Spontaneous symmetry breaking: the interaction obeys the symmetry principle, but not the state of lowest energy

Very common in nature, e.g. ferromagnet

The BEH mechanism in the Standard Model (SM)

Postulated Higgs field: scalar SU(2) doublet $\Phi = \begin{pmatrix} \phi^+ \\ \phi^0 \end{pmatrix}$

Higgs potential: $V(\Phi) = \frac{\lambda}{4}\left(\Phi^\dagger\Phi\right)^2 + \mu^2\left(\Phi^\dagger\Phi\right), \quad \lambda > 0$

$\mu^2 < 0$

$\Rightarrow$ spontaneous symmetry breaking



Higgs potential: non-vanishing vacuum expectation value



The BEH mechanism in the Standard Model (SM)

Minimum of the potential at $\langle \Phi \rangle = \sqrt{\frac{-2\mu^2}{\lambda}} \equiv \frac{v}{\sqrt{2}}$

The state of the lowest energy of the Higgs field (vacuum state) does not obey the underlying symmetry principle (gauge invariance)



$\Rightarrow$ Spontaneous breaking of the gauge symmetry

BEH mechanism $\Leftrightarrow$ non-trivial structure of the vacuum

The BEH mechanism sounds like a rather bold assumption to cure a theoretical / aesthetical problem

But: we knew that some kind of new physics that is responsible for electroweak symmetry breaking had to be realised

We furthermore knew that without this new physics our description would have broken down at the TeV scale

Signatures of the physics of electroweak symmetry breaking (like a Higgs boson) therefore had to show up at the TeV scale

Possible alternatives to the Higgs mechanism:

- A new fundamental strong interaction ("strong electroweak symmetry breaking")
- New dimensions of space (electroweak symmetry breaking via boundary conditions for SM gauge bosons and fermions on "branes" in a higher-dimensional space)

The Higgs field and the Higgs boson

Higgs mechanism: fundamental particles obtain their masses from interacting with the Higgs field

Higgs boson(s): field quantum of the Higgs field

SM Higgs field: scalar SU(2) doublet, complex $\Phi = \begin{pmatrix} \phi^+ \\ \phi^0 \end{pmatrix}$

$\Rightarrow$ 4 degrees of freedom

3 components of the Higgs doublet $\longrightarrow$ longitudinal components of W^+, W^-, Z

4th component: H: elementary scalar field, Higgs boson

Models with two Higgs doublets (e.g. MSSM)

$\Rightarrow$ prediction: 5 physical Higgses

The discovered signal: manifestation of new physics!

The discovered signal: manifestation of new physics!

The spectacular discovery of a signal at ~125 GeV in the Higgs searches marks the start of a new era of particle physics



But: we don't know yet the physics behind the new particle!

Investigation of the properties (mass, spin, CP properties, couplings, etc.): rich harvest from LHC Run 1, much more to come

⇒ The discovered particle looks SM-like so far, but many other possibilities, corresponding to very different underlying physics, are perfectly compatible with the experimental data as well

Key questions

- What is the nature of electroweak symmetry breaking?

- What is the quantum structure of the vacuum?



$\Rightarrow$ The discovered particle provides experimental access to those (and further) questions!

Is the discovered particle the ultimate triumph for the SM?

Is the discovered particle the ultimate triumph for the SM?

Or rather the beginning of the end of the SM?

Is the discovered particle the ultimate triumph for the SM?

Or rather the beginning of the end of the SM?

One thing that we know for sure is that the discovered particle cannot be the Higgs boson of the SM!

Is the discovered particle the ultimate triumph for the SM?

Or rather the beginning of the end of the SM?

One thing that we know for sure is that the discovered particle cannot be the Higgs boson of the SM!

The SM is incomplete (in particular, it describes only three of the four fundamental interactions, i.e. it does not contain gravity) and cannot be the ultimate theory; the SM could be at best the low-energy limit of the (as yet unknown) more complete theory

Is the discovered particle the ultimate triumph for the SM?

Or rather the beginning of the end of the SM?

One thing that we know for sure is that the discovered particle cannot be the Higgs boson of the SM!

The SM is incomplete (in particular, it describes only three of the four fundamental interactions, i.e. it does not contain gravity) and cannot be the ultimate theory; the SM could be at best the low-energy limit of the (as yet unknown) more complete theory

Thus, the actual question is whether the low-energy limit of the more complete theory has just the matter content and the properties of the SM

In what sense could the discovered particle be associated with the Higgs boson of the SM?

In what sense could the discovered particle be associated with the Higgs boson of the SM?

Indeed, it is a logical possibility that the low-energy limit of the more complete theory is just the SM

In what sense could the discovered particle be associated with the Higgs boson of the SM?

Indeed, it is a logical possibility that the low-energy limit of the more complete theory is just the SM

However, this would mean that the gauge hierarchy, dark matter, the matter—anti-matter asymmetry in the Universe, … , would all have origins that are not directly related to low-scale physics

In what sense could the discovered particle be associated with the Higgs boson of the SM?

Indeed, it is a logical possibility that the low-energy limit of the more complete theory is just the SM

However, this would mean that the gauge hierarchy, dark matter, the matter—anti-matter asymmetry in the Universe, … , would all have origins that are not directly related to low-scale physics

In fact: the signal at 125 GeV poses a problem for the SM itself! From what we know so far, we cannot understand how a Higgs boson could be as light as the one that was discovered

In what sense could the discovered particle be associated with the Higgs boson of the SM?

Indeed, it is a logical possibility that the low-energy limit of the more complete theory is just the SM

However, this would mean that the gauge hierarchy, dark matter, the matter—anti-matter asymmetry in the Universe, … , would all have origins that are not directly related to low-scale physics

In fact: the signal at 125 GeV poses a problem for the SM itself! From what we know so far, we cannot understand how a Higgs boson could be as light as the one that was discovered

The mass should be affected by physics at high energy scales (e.g. Planck scale, 10^{19} GeV, where gravity is of similar strength as the other interactions)

The hierarchy problem: the SM Higgs mass is affected by large corrections from physics at high scales

The Standard Model does not include gravity

$\Rightarrow$ breaks down at the latest at $M_{\rm Planck} \approx 10^{19}$ GeV

$\Rightarrow$ "effective theory", can only be valid up to cutoff scale Λ

Higgs mass in the SM is a free parameter

Expect that in more fundamental theory the Higgs mass can be predicted

$\Rightarrow$ Physical value of $M_{\rm H}^2$ is obtained as the sum of lowest-order contribution $+$ higher-order corrections

$$M_{\rm H}^2 = M_{\rm H,0}^2 + \Delta M_{\rm H,1}^2 + \Delta M_{\rm H,2}^2 + \ldots$$

$\Rightarrow$ Calculation of corrections to $M_{\rm H}^2$ in SM with cutoff Λ

The hierarchy problem: the SM Higgs mass is affected by large corrections from physics at high scales

$$\Rightarrow \; \Delta M_H^2 \sim \Lambda^2$$

For $\Lambda = M_{\rm Planck}$: $\Delta M_{\rm H}^2 \sim M_{\rm Planck}^2 \Rightarrow \Delta M_{\rm H}^2 \approx 10^{30}\, M_{\rm H}^2$

$\Rightarrow$ Hierarchy problem, extreme fine-tuning necessary between $M_{\rm H,0}^2$ and $\Delta M_{\rm H}^2$ to get small $M_{\rm H}$, i.e. $M_{\rm H} \approx 126\ {\rm GeV}$

Hierarchy problem: how can the Planck scale and the weak scale coexist?

There exists a Higgs-like state with a mass of $\sim 126\ \mathrm{GeV}$

But what protects its mass from physics at high scales?

This has implications also in a wider context:

- "Hierarchy problem": $M_{\mathrm{Planck}}/M_{\mathrm{weak}} \approx 10^{17}$

  How can two so different scales coexist in nature?

  Via quantum effects: physics at M_{weak} is affected by physics at M_{Planck}

  $\Rightarrow$ Instability of M_{weak}

  $\Rightarrow$ Would expect that all physics is driven up to the Planck scale

- Nature has found a way to prevent this

  The Standard Model provides no explanation

How can a Higgs boson be as light as 125 GeV?

- A new symmetry of nature $\longrightarrow$ Supersymmetry?
- A new fundamental interaction of nature $\longrightarrow$ composite Higgs?
- Extra dimensions of space $\longrightarrow$ impact on gravity on small scales?
- Multiverses $\longrightarrow$ anthropic principle?

What is the quantum structure of the universe?

Higgs particle provides access to the non-trivial structure of the vacuum

$\Rightarrow$ Answers to those questions are among the prime goals of the upcoming runs of the LHC and a future e^+e^- collider

Strong motivation for BSM physics that stabilises the hierarchy; example: supersymmetry (SUSY)

Supersymmetry: fermion $\longleftrightarrow$ boson symmetry,
leads to compensation of large quantum corrections





Illustration of the hierarchy problem: correction to self-energies in effective theory with cutoff Λ

Photon self-energy in QED:



$$\Sigma^{\gamma\gamma}(0) = 0$$

Photon remains massless (to all orders)

Consequence of symmetry: $U(1)_{em}$ gauge invariance of QED

Would have expected correction proportional to $(\text{mass})^2$ on dimensional grounds

Illustration of the hierarchy problem: correction to self-energies in effective theory with cutoff Λ

Electron self-energy in QED:

$$\Sigma^{ee}(0) = -4e^2 m_e \int \frac{d^4q}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{1}{q^2(q^2 - m_e^2)} \overset{q\to\infty}{\to} \int \frac{dq}{q}$$

$$\propto m_e \log\left(\frac{\Lambda}{m_e}\right)$$

Logarithmic dependence on the cutoff Λ

Would have expected correction proportional to mass on dimensional grounds

Correction is proportional to electron mass m_e

Consequence of symmetry in limit $m_e \to 0$: invariance under chiral transformations

Illustration of the hierarchy problem: correction to self-energies in effective theory with cutoff Λ

⇒ Correction to the electron mass stays modest even for $\Lambda = M_{\text{Planck}}$

$$\Delta m_e = \frac{2\alpha_{\text{em}}}{\pi} m_e \log\left(\frac{m_{\text{Planck}}}{m_e}\right) \approx 0.24 m_e$$

⇒ Symmetry breaking is proportional to m_e

⇒ Symmetry ``protects” m_e from large corrections

Illustration of the hierarchy problem: correction to self-energies in effective theory with cutoff Λ

Higgs self-energy with contributions from fermions, e.g. top-quark t (with $N_f = 3$):



$$\Sigma_f^{HH}(0) \overset{\Lambda\to\infty}{\propto} -2N_f Y_f^2 \left[\underbrace{\int d^4q \frac{1}{q^2 - m_f^2}}_{\propto \Lambda^2} + 2m_f^2 \underbrace{\int \frac{dq}{q}}_{\propto \log \Lambda} \right]$$

No additional symmetry in the limit $M_H \to 0$

Quadratic dependence on the cutoff Λ: $\Delta M_H^2 \sim \Lambda^2$

Correction proportional to (mass)^2 as expected on dimensional grounds

Illustration of the hierarchy problem: correction to self-energies in effective theory with cutoff Λ

Higgs self-energy: additional contributions from scalar superpartners



$\propto Y_{\tilde{f}},$



$$\Sigma_{\tilde{f}}^{HH}(0) = \underbrace{N_{\tilde{f}}}_{\#\ \text{sfermions}} \underbrace{Y_{\tilde{f}}}_{\text{Yukawa}} \int \frac{d^4q}{(2\pi)^4} \left[\frac{1}{q^2 - m^2_{\tilde{f}_L}} + \frac{1}{q^2 - m^2_{\tilde{f}_R}} \right]$$

+ terms without quadratic dependence on the cutoff

$$\overset{\Lambda \to \infty}{=} 2 N_{\tilde{f}} Y_{\tilde{f}} \Lambda^2 + \ldots$$

⇒ Terms quadratic in the cutoff cancel with SM contributions if

$$N(\tilde{f}_L) = N(\tilde{f}_R) = N(f) \quad \text{and} \quad Y_{\tilde{f}} = Y_f^2$$

Illustration of the hierarchy problem: correction to self-energies in effective theory with cutoff Λ

The complete correction vanishes if furthermore

$$m_f = m_{\tilde{f}} \ (\text{in exact SUSY})$$

$$\text{For a mass splitting } m_{\tilde{f}}^2 = m_f^2 + \Delta^2 \quad \text{and} \quad Y_{\tilde{f}} = Y_f^2$$

⇔ Mass splitting between superpartners, relation between dimensionless couplings is maintained: ``soft SUSY breaking"

$$\Rightarrow \quad \Sigma^{HH}(0) \sim \Delta^2$$

⇒ Correction stays ``acceptably small" if mass splitting between superpartners is of the weak scale

Realised if mass scale of superpartners: $m_{\text{SUSY}} \lesssim 1\,\text{TeV}$

⇒ SUSY at the TeV scale provides attractive solution to the hierarchy problem

Could it be a composite Higgs?

Composite "pseudo-Goldstone boson", like the pion in QCD $\Rightarrow$ Would imply new kind of strong interaction

Relation to weakly-coupled 5-dimensional model (AdS/CFT correspondence)

Discrimination from fundamental scalar

- Precision measurements of couplings ($\Rightarrow$ high sensitivity to compositeness scale), $\mathcal{CP}$ properties, ...
  Does the new state have the right properties to unitarize $W_L W_L$ scattering?
- Search for resonances
  (light Higgs $\Leftrightarrow$ light resonances?)

BEH mechanism (much more general than the SM): gauge-invariant interaction with gauge fields

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{Higgs}} = (D_\mu \Phi)^\dagger (D^\mu \Phi) - V(\Phi);$$ unitary gauge: $\Phi = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v + H \end{pmatrix}$

$VV\Phi\Phi$ coupling:



$\Rightarrow$ VV mass terms: $\frac{1}{2} g_2^2 v^2 \equiv M_\text{W}^2, \quad \frac{1}{2}(g_1^2 + g_2^2) v^2 \equiv M_\text{Z}^2$

WWH coupling: $g_{WWH} = g_2 \, M_\text{W}$

$\Rightarrow$ Higgs coupling to W bosons is proportional to the W mass

Fermion masses, Higgs mass

Fermion mass terms: Yukawa couplings



$$m_f = v \, g_f$$ free parameters

$\Rightarrow$ Higgs couplings are proportional to masses of the particles

Mass of the Higgs boson: self-interaction



$$M_{\mathrm{H}} = v\sqrt{\lambda}$$ free parameter

Higgs self-coupling $\Leftrightarrow$ access to Higgs potential

Fermion masses in the SM

Fermion mass terms in SM Lagrangian:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\rm SM} = \underbrace{m_d \bar{Q}_L H d_R}_{\text{d-quark mass}} + \underbrace{m_u \bar{Q}_L \tilde{H} u_R}_{\text{u-quark mass}}, \quad Q_L = \begin{pmatrix} u \\ d \end{pmatrix}_L$$

$\Rightarrow$ Would at first sight expect that two doublets are needed

"Trick" used in the SM:

$$\tilde{H} = i\sigma_2 H^\dagger, \quad H \to \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v \end{pmatrix}, \quad \tilde{H} \to \begin{pmatrix} v \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

$\Rightarrow$ One Higgs doublet sufficient to give mass to both up-type and down-type fermions

Unitarity cancellation in longitudinal gauge boson scattering

E.g.: WW scattering, longitudinally polarised: $W_L W_L \to W_L W_L$

$\mathcal{M}_V =$



$= -g^2 \frac{E^2}{M_{\mathrm{W}}^2} + \mathcal{O}(1)$ for $E \gg M_{\mathrm{W}}$

$\Rightarrow$ violation of probability conservation

Compensated by Higgs contribution:

$\mathcal{M}_S =$



$= g_{WWH}^2 \frac{E^2}{M_{\mathrm{W}}^4} + \mathcal{O}(1)$ for $E \gg M_{\mathrm{W}}$, $g_{WWH} = g_2\, M_{\mathrm{W}}$

Higgs physics beyond the SM: extended Higgs sectors and composite Higgs

Standard Model: a single parameter determines the whole Higgs phenomenology: M_H

In the SM the same Higgs doublet is used "twice" to give masses both to up-type and down-type fermions

$\Rightarrow$ extensions of the Higgs sector having (at least) two doublets are quite "natural"

$\Rightarrow$ Would result in several Higgs states

Many extended Higgs theories have over large part of their parameter space a lightest Higgs scalar with properties very similar to those of the SM Higgs boson

Example: SUSY in the "decoupling limit"

Search for additional Higgs bosons

In a large variety of models with extended Higgs sectors the squared couplings to gauge bosons fulfill a ``sum rule”:

$$\sum_i g^2_{H_i VV} = \left(g^{\mathrm{SM}}_{HVV}\right)^2$$

$\Rightarrow$ •The SM coupling strength is ``shared” between the Higgses of an extended Higgs sector, $\varkappa_V \leqq 1$

•The more SM-like the couplings of the state at 125 GeV turn out to be, the more suppressed are the couplings of the other Higgses to gauge bosons; heavy Higgses usually have a much smaller width than a SM-like Higgs of the same mass

• Searches for additional Higgs bosons need to test compatibility with the observed signal at 125 GeV!

Supersymmetry (SUSY)

SUSY: unique possibility to connect space–time symmetry (Lorentz invariance) with internal symmetries (gauge invariance):

Unique extension of the Poincaré group of symmetries of relativistic quantum field theories in $3+1$ dimensions

Local SUSY includes gravity, called "supergravity"

Lightest superpartner (LSP) is stable if "R parity" is conserved
$\Rightarrow$ Candidate for cold dark matter in the Universe

Gauge coupling unification, $M_{\mathrm{GUT}} \sim 10^{16}$ GeV
neutrino masses: see-saw scale $\sim .01$–$.1\ M_{\mathrm{GUT}}$

The minimal supersymmetric extension of the Standard Model (MSSM)

Superpartners for Standard Model particles:

$\big[u, d, c, s, t, b\big]_{L,R}$ $\big[e, \mu, \tau\big]_{L,R}$ $\big[\nu_{e,\mu,\tau}\big]_L$ Spin $\frac{1}{2}$

$\big[\tilde{u}, \tilde{d}, \tilde{c}, \tilde{s}, \tilde{t}, \tilde{b}\big]_{L,R}$ $\big[\tilde{e}, \tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\tau}\big]_{L,R}$ $\big[\tilde{\nu}_{e,\mu,\tau}\big]_L$ Spin 0

g $\underbrace{W^\pm, H^\pm}$ $\underbrace{\gamma, Z, H_1^0, H_2^0}$ Spin 1 / Spin 0

$\tilde{g}$ $\tilde{\chi}^\pm_{1,2}$ $\tilde{\chi}^0_{1,2,3,4}$ Spin $\dfrac{1}{2}$

Two Higgs doublets, physical states: $h^0, H^0, A^0, H^\pm$

Exact SUSY $\Leftrightarrow m_{\mathrm{e}} = m_{\tilde{\mathrm{e}}}, \ldots$

$\Rightarrow$ SUSY can only be realised as a broken symmetry

MSSM: no particular SUSY breaking mechanism assumed, parameterisation of possible soft SUSY-breaking terms

The Higgs sector of the MSSM

Minimal Supersymmetric Standard Model (MSSM)

$\Rightarrow$ "Simplest" extension of the minimal Higgs sector:

- Two doublets to give masses to up-type and down-type fermions (extra symmetry forbids to use same doublet)

- SUSY imposes relations between the parameters

$\Rightarrow$ Two parameters instead of the one parameter (M_H) of the SM: $\tan\beta \equiv \frac{v_u}{v_d}$, $\quad M_\mathrm{A}$ (or $M_{\mathrm{H}^\pm}$)

Higgs potential of the MSSM

MSSM Higgs potential contains two Higgs doublets:

$$V = \left(|\mu|^2 + m_{H_u}^2\right)\left(|h_u^0|^2 + |h_u^+|^2\right) + \left(|\mu|^2 + m_{H_d}^2\right)\left(|h_d^0|^2 + |h_d^-|^2\right)$$

$$+ \left[b\left(h_u^+ h_d^- - h_u^0 h_d^0\right) + \text{h.c.}\right]$$

$$+ \underbrace{\frac{g^2 + g'^2}{8}}\left(|h_u^0|^2 + |h_u^+|^2 - |h_d^0|^2 - |h_d^-|^2\right)^2 + \underbrace{\frac{g'^2}{2}}\left|h_u^+ h_d^{0*} + h_u^0 h_d^{-*}\right|^2$$

gauge couplings, in contrast to the SM

Five physical states: $h^0, H^0, A^0, H^\pm$

Parameters (besides g, g'):

μ: mixing term of the two Higgs doublets in superpotential, $\mu H_d H_u$

m_{H_u}, m_{H_d}, b: soft SUSY-breaking parameters

Parameters in the MSSM Higgs potential (besides g,g')

$$v_d,\ v_u,\ \left(|\mu|^2 + m_{H_u}^2\right),\ \left(|\mu|^2 + m_{H_d}^2\right),\ b$$

Relation for M_W^2, M_Z^2 yields 1 condition:

$$M_\mathrm{W}^2 = \frac{1}{2} g'^2 (v_d^2 + v_u^2), \qquad M_\mathrm{Z}^2 = \frac{1}{2}(g^2 + g'^2)(v_d^2 + v_u^2)$$

Minimization of V w.r.t. neutral Higgs fields h_d^0, h_u^0

⇒ 2 conditions

⇒ only two free parameters remain in the Higgs potential, conventionally chosen as

$$\tan\beta \equiv \frac{v_u}{v_d}, \qquad M_\mathrm{A}^2 = -b(\tan\beta + \cot\beta)$$

⇒ M_h, M_H, mixing angle α, $M_{\mathrm{H}^\pm}$: derived quantities can be predicted

E.g., lowest-order prediction: $M_{\mathrm{H}^\pm}^2 = M_\mathrm{A}^2 + M_\mathrm{W}^2$

Conditions on the MSSM Higgs potential

Potential has to be bounded from below

$$\Rightarrow \quad 2b < 2|\mu|^2 + m_{H_u}^2 + m_{H_d}^2$$

EW symmetry breaking $\Leftrightarrow h_u^0 = h_d^0 = 0$ must not be stable minimum

$$\Rightarrow \quad b^2 > \left(|\mu|^2 + m_{H_u}^2\right)\left(|\mu|^2 + m_{H_d}^2\right)$$

The two conditions above cannot be satisfied simultaneously if $b = m_{H_u} = m_{H_d} = 0$

$\Rightarrow$ SUSY breaking required for EW symmetry breaking

Minimum conditions for the MSSM Higgs potential

Minimum conditions for V:

$$\left.\frac{\partial V}{\partial |h_u^0|}\right|_{|h_u^0|=v_u, |h_d^0|=v_d} = 0 = \left.\frac{\partial V}{\partial |h_d^0|}\right|_{|h_u^0|=v_u, |h_d^0|=v_d}$$

$$\rightarrow \qquad 2(|\mu|^2 + m_{H_u}^2)v_u - 2bv_d + \frac{g^2 + g'^2}{2}(v_u^2 - v_d^2)v_u = 0$$

$$2(|\mu|^2 + m_{H_d}^2)v_d - 2bv_u + \frac{g^2 + g'^2}{2}(v_u^2 - v_d^2)(-v_d) = 0$$

The last two equations can be transformed into:

$$|\mu|^2 + m_{H_u}^2 = b\cot\beta - \frac{m_Z^2}{2} \qquad \underbrace{\frac{v_u^2 - v_d^2}{v_u^2 + v_d^2}}_{= -\frac{1-\tan^2\beta}{1+\tan^2\beta} = -\cos 2\beta}$$

$$|\mu|^2 + m_{H_d}^2 = b\tan\beta - \frac{m_Z^2}{2}\cos 2\beta$$

⇒ Conditions need to be fulfilled for electroweak symmetry breaking

The "μ problem"

MSSM contains term $\mu H_d H_u$ in superpotential

μ: dimensionful parameter

For EW symmetry breaking required: $\mu \sim$ electroweak scale

But: no a priori reason for $\mu \neq 0$, $\mu \ll M_{\mathrm{Pl}}$

Possible solution: μ related to v.e.v. of additional field

$\Rightarrow$ Introduction of extra singlet field S, v.e.v. $s \Rightarrow$ "NMSSM"

Superpotential: $\mathcal{V} = \lambda H_d H_u S + \frac{1}{3}\kappa S^3 + \ldots$

Physical states in NMSSM Higgs-sector:

S_1, S_2, S_3 (CP-even), P_1, P_2 (CP-odd), $H^\pm$

Higgs mass bound in the MSSM

Prediction for $M_{\rm h}$, $M_{\rm H}$, ...

Tree-level result for $M_{\rm h}$, $M_{\rm H}$:

$$M^2_{\rm H,h} = \frac{1}{2}\left[M_{\rm A}^2 + M_{\rm Z}^2 \pm \sqrt{(M_{\rm A}^2 + M_{\rm Z}^2)^2 - 4M_{\rm Z}^2 M_{\rm A}^2 \cos^2 2\beta}\right]$$

$\Rightarrow M_{\rm h} \leq M_{\rm Z}$ at tree level

MSSM tree-level bound (gauge sector): excluded by LEP!

Large radiative corrections (Yukawa sector, ...):

Yukawa couplings: $\frac{e\, m_{\rm t}}{2 M_{\rm W} s_{\rm W}}$, $\frac{e\, m_{\rm t}^2}{M_{\rm W} s_{\rm W}}$, ...

$\Rightarrow$ Dominant one-loop corrections: $G_\mu m_{\rm t}^4 \ln\left(\frac{m_{\tilde{\rm t}_1} m_{\tilde{\rm t}_2}}{m_{\rm t}^2}\right)$, $\quad \mathcal{O}(100\%)$!

Higgs mass bound in the MSSM

Prediction for M_h, M_H, ...

Tree-level result for M_h, M_H:

$$M^2_{\mathrm{H,h}} = \frac{1}{2}\left[M_\mathrm{A}^2 + M_\mathrm{Z}^2 \pm \sqrt{(M_\mathrm{A}^2 + M_\mathrm{Z}^2)^2 - 4M_\mathrm{Z}^2 M_\mathrm{A}^2 \cos^2 2\beta}\,\right]$$

$\Rightarrow M_\mathrm{h} \leq M_\mathrm{Z}$ at tree level

MSSM tree-level bound (gauge sector): excluded by LEP!

$\Rightarrow$ Upper bound on lightest Higgs mass, M_h (*FeynHiggs*):
[*S. Heinemeyer, W. Hollik, G. W. '99*], [*G. Degrassi, S. Heinemeyer, W. Hollik, P. Slavich, G. W. '02*]

$M_\mathrm{h} \lesssim 135\,\mathrm{GeV}$ *(for TeV-scale stop masses)*

Higgs mass predictions in the MSSM



⇒ Upper bound on M_h; for $M_A \gg M_Z$: ``decoupling region" with SM-like light Higgs and all other Higgses heavy

Higher-order corrections in the MSSM Higgs sector

- Quartic couplings in the Higgs sector are given by the gauge couplings, g_1, g_2 (SM: free parameter)

  $\Leftrightarrow$ Upper bound on the lightest Higgs mass

- Large higher-order corrections from Yukawa sector:

Yukawa couplings: $\frac{\mathrm{e}\, m_\mathrm{t}}{2 M_\mathrm{W} s_\mathrm{W}}, \; \frac{\mathrm{e}\, m_\mathrm{t}^2}{M_\mathrm{W} s_\mathrm{W}}, \ldots$

$\Rightarrow$ Dominant one-loop corrections: $G_\mu m_\mathrm{t}^4 \ln\left(\frac{m_{\tilde{\mathrm{t}}_1} m_{\tilde{\mathrm{t}}_2}}{m_\mathrm{t}^2}\right), \qquad \mathcal{O}(100\%)$!

$\Rightarrow$ Higher-order corrections are phenomenologically very important (constraints on parameter space from Higgs sector observables)
Can induce CP-violating effects

Higgs-mass predictions in SUSY: full model (MSSM) vs. effective field theory (EFT)

Full model (MSSM):

- Contributions of all particles in the loop: $\tilde{t}, \tilde{b}, \tilde{q}, \tilde{l}, \tilde{\chi}^{\pm}, \ldots$
  contributions from all sectors of the model

- Diagrammatic / effective potential methods

- Mass effects of all particles taken into account: every possible mass pattern can be considered

- Very large higher-order corrections:
  tree-level upper bound: 91 GeV $\xrightarrow[\text{radiative corrections}]{}$ observed value: 125 GeV

$\Rightarrow$ Relative effect of higher-order corrections in M_h^2: $\gtrsim$90%

Effective field theory (EFT) approach

What if the SUSY particles (or part of the spectrum) sit at very high scales (10^{14} GeV, $M_{\rm Pl}$, …)? High-scale SUSY, split SUSY, …
⇒ very large logs, log terms dominate, need to be resummed ⇒ EFT

Heavy SUSY particles integrated out
Low-scale model is just the SM (1 Higgs doublet), or split-SUSY type scenario with 1 doublet, or 2HDM, …
Large mass gap between different scales required!

⇒ Impact of heavy particles only via boundary conditions + threshold corrections at high scale
High-scale SUSY: renormalisation-group (RG) running + Higgs-mass computation involve only SM contributions
High-scale SUSY / several thresholds, …

Full model (MSSM) vs. EFT

At very high scales the EFT approach is superior, at low scales the full model approach is superior

Questions:

- What is the range of validity of both approaches (how far down does the EFT approach provide a good description, how far up the full model one)?
- Where is the transition where one should switch from one to the other?
- What are the theoretical uncertainties from unknown higher-order corrections?

Radiative electroweak symmetry breaking

Universal boundary conditions at GUT scale, renormalisation group running down to weak scale



large corrections from top-quark Yukawa coupling

$\Rightarrow$ $m^2_{H_u}$ driven to negative values

$\Rightarrow$ ew symmetry breaking

emerges naturally at scale $\sim 10^2$ GeV for $100\ \text{GeV} \lesssim m_t \lesssim 200\ \text{GeV}$

SUSY with universal boundary conditions at the GUT scale, example: the CMSSM

The constrained MSSM (CMSSM, ``mSUGRA scenario"):

$$\text{universal scalar mass scale } m_0$$
$$\text{universal fermion mass scale } m_{1/2}$$
$$\text{universal trilinear coupling } A_0$$

$\Rightarrow$ Parameters: $m_0, m_{1/2}, A_0, \tan\beta, \mathrm{sign}(\mu)$

Absolute value of μ determined from minimum conditions

Impact of higher-order corrections on the conditions for electroweak symmetry breaking

From minimum conditions:

$$(|\mu|^2 + m_{H_u}^2)\tan\beta - (|\mu|^2 + m_{H_d}^2)\frac{1}{\tan\beta} = \frac{1}{2}m_Z^2 \underbrace{\cos(2\beta)}_{=\frac{1-\tan^2\beta}{1+\tan^2\beta}}(\tan\beta - \frac{1}{\tan\beta})$$

Expand in large $\tan\beta$:

$$m_Z^2 \approx -2(|\mu|^2 + m_{H_u}^2) + \mathcal{O}(\cot^2\beta) \qquad \Rightarrow \qquad \text{need } m_{H_u}^2 < 0 \text{ for EWSB}$$

Impact of higher order corrections to $m_{H_u}^2$:

$$m_{H_u}^2 \to m_{H_u}^2 + c m_{\tilde{t}}^2$$

⇒ Relation is affected by a quadratic dependence on the mass scale of the scalar partners of the top quark (see qualitative discussion of the hierarchy problem)

Next order: RG running of stop mass introduces quadratic dependence on the gluino mass

``Natural SUSY”

For ``natural SUSY”: expect $\mu, m_{\tilde{t}}, m_{\tilde{g}}$ to be relatively light

For mass $m_h \sim 125\,\mathrm{GeV}$: need large mixing in $\tilde{t}$ sector or/and relatively large $m_{\tilde{t}}$
+ experimental bounds on $m_{\tilde{t}}, m_{\tilde{g}}$, limits from flavor sector

⇒ Slight tension with ``natural SUSY”

⇒ ``Little hierarchy problem”

Higgs couplings

Higgs couplings, tree level:

$$g_{\mathrm{hVV}} = \sin(\beta-\alpha)\, g_{\mathrm{HVV}}^{\mathrm{SM}}, \quad g_{\mathrm{HVV}} = \cos(\beta-\alpha)\, g_{\mathrm{HVV}}^{\mathrm{SM}}, \quad V = W^{\pm}, Z$$

$$g_{\mathrm{hAZ}} = \cos(\beta-\alpha)\, \frac{g'}{2\cos\theta_{\mathrm{W}}}, \quad g_{\mathrm{HAZ}} = \sin(\beta-\alpha)\, \frac{-g'}{2\cos\theta_{\mathrm{W}}}$$

$\Rightarrow g_{\mathrm{hVV}} \leq g_{\mathrm{HVV}}^{\mathrm{SM}}$, $\quad g_{\mathrm{hVV}}, g_{\mathrm{HVV}}, g_{\mathrm{hAZ}}, g_{\mathrm{HAZ}}$ cannot all be small

In decoupling limit, $M_{\mathrm{A}} \gg M_{\mathrm{Z}}$ (already realized for $M_{\mathrm{A}} \gtrsim 150$ GeV):
$\cos(\beta-\alpha) \to 0$

$\Rightarrow$ h is SM-like, H and A decouple from gauge bosons

$\Rightarrow$ Cannot use WBF channels for production of heavy SUSY Higgses; no $H \to ZZ \to 4\mu$ decay

Higgs couplings

$$g_{\mathrm{hb\bar{b}}}, g_{\mathrm{h}\tau^+\tau^-} = -\frac{\sin\alpha}{\cos\beta}\, g^{\mathrm{SM}}_{\mathrm{Hb\bar{b}},\mathrm{H}\tau^+\tau^-}, \qquad g_{\mathrm{ht\bar{t}}} = \frac{\cos\alpha}{\sin\beta}\, g^{\mathrm{SM}}_{\mathrm{Ht\bar{t}}}$$

$$g_{\mathrm{Ab\bar{b}}}, g_{\mathrm{A}\tau^+\tau^-} = \gamma_5 \tan\beta\, g^{\mathrm{SM}}_{\mathrm{Ab\bar{b}}}$$

$\Rightarrow$ Significant suppression or enhancement w.r.t. SM couplings possible

For $M_{\mathrm{A}} \lesssim 200$ GeV, $\tan\beta \gtrsim 10$:

large enhancement of

$\Gamma(h \to b\bar{b})$, $\Gamma(h \to \tau^+\tau^-)$, ...

$\Rightarrow$ Total width of h, H can be much larger than in SM



Heavier H, A: smaller width than SM Higgs

Higgs couplings

Higgs couplings, production cross sections also affected by large SUSY loop corrections

$hf\bar{f}$ coupling:



$$A(h \to f\bar{f}) = \sqrt{Z_h}\left(\Gamma_h - \frac{\hat{\Sigma}_{\mathrm{hH}}(M_{\mathrm{h}}^2)}{M_{\mathrm{h}}^2 - m_{\mathrm{H}}^2 + \hat{\Sigma}_{\mathrm{HH}}(M_{\mathrm{h}}^2)}\Gamma_H\right)$$

Indirect constraints on the Higgs mass; example: prediction for the W-boson mass from muon decay

Fermi model





SM

M_W: Comparison of prediction for muon decay with experiment (Fermi constant G_μ)

$$\Rightarrow \quad M_\mathrm{W}^2\left(1-\frac{M_\mathrm{W}^2}{M_\mathrm{Z}^2}\right)=\frac{\pi\alpha}{\sqrt{2}G_\mu}\left(1+\Delta r\right),$$

$\Updownarrow$

loop corrections

$\Rightarrow$ Theo. prediction for M_W in terms of M_Z, α, G_μ, $\Delta r(m_\mathrm{t}, m_{\tilde{\mathrm{t}}}, \ldots)$

Tree-level prediction: $M_\mathrm{W}^\mathrm{tree}$ = 80.939 GeV, $M_\mathrm{W}^\mathrm{exp}$ = 80.385 +- 0.015 GeV

$\Rightarrow$ off by > 30 σ (accuracy of 2×10^{-4})

W-mass prediction within the SM: one-loop result vs. state-of-the-art prediction

[L. Zeune, G. W. '14]



⇒ Pure one-loop result would imply preference for heavy Higgs, M_h > 400 GeV

Corrections beyond one-loop order are crucial for reliable prediction of M_W

Indirect constraints on the Higgs mass within the SM, current situation vs. ILC (GigaZ)

Leading corrections to precision observables:

$\sim m_{\mathrm{t}}^2$

$\sim \ln M_{\mathrm{H}}$





⇒Large increase in sensitivity, could lead to tension with exp. value

Prediction for M_W (parameter scan): SM vs. MSSM

Signal interpreted as light (left) / heavy (right) CP-even Higgs

MSSM: SUSY parameters varied [S. Heinemeyer, W. Hollik, G. W., L. Zeune '14]





⇒ Slight preference for MSSM over SM

Could the SM be valid all the way up to the Planck scale? Is the vacuum stable in the SM?

Quantum corrections to the classical Higgs potential can modify its shape

$$V^{class}(\phi) = -\frac{1}{2}m^2\phi^2 + \lambda\phi^4 \longrightarrow V^{\text{eff}} \approx -\frac{1}{2}m^2(\mu)\phi^2(\mu) + \lambda(\mu)\phi^4(\mu) \sim \lambda(\mu)\phi^4(\mu)$$

$\phi \sim \mu \gg v$

λ runs



$$\frac{d\lambda}{d\ln\mu} = \frac{1}{16\pi^2}\left[+24\lambda^2 + \lambda\left(4N_cY_t - 9g^2 - 3g'^2\right) - 2N_cY_t^4 + \frac{9}{8}g^4 + \frac{3}{8}g'^4 + \frac{3}{4}g^2g'^2 + \ldots\right]$$

M_H large: λ^2 wins $\quad \lambda(M_t) \to \lambda(\mu) \gg 1 \quad$ non-perturbative regime, Landau pole

M_H small: $-Y_t^4$ wins $\quad \lambda(M_t) \to \lambda(\mu) \ll 1$

[G. Degrassi '13]

Vacuum stability in the SM

Do we live in a metastable vacuum?

[*G. Degrassi et al. ’12*]



Extended Higgs sector: contributions of additional Higgs states stabilise the vacuum

Vacuum stability and high-scale SUSY

- SM cannot be matched to the MSSM if the scale of the MSSM particles is above about 10^{11} GeV *[G. Giudice, A. Strumia '12]*

- 2HDM + MSSM at high scale with and without light higgsinos / gauginos: *[E. Bagnaschi, F. Brümmer, W. Buchmüller, A. Voigt, G. W. '15]*

$\Rightarrow$ Supersymmetric UV completion + stable vacuum + Higgs at 125 GeV works for 2HDM as low-scale model and for 2HDM + light higgsinos

Does not work for split SUSY case (light higgsinos and gauginos)

2HDM + light higgsinos at low scale, other MSSM states at high scale

[E. Bagnaschi, F. Brümmer, W. Buchmüller, A. Voigt, G. W. '15]



⇒Stable or meta-stable vacuum possible for low tanβ and large M_A

Composite Higgs

Approaches to address the question how a scalar particle can be light, $M \sim 125$ GeV:

- SUSY: elementary scalars related via SUSY to elementary fermionic superpartners, which naturally have a small mass (weakly broken chiral symmetries)

- Spontaneous breaking of a continuous global symmetry:
  $\Rightarrow$ massless Goldstone boson

  Explicit breaking of global symmetry
  $\Rightarrow$ pseudo-Goldstone boson (PGB)

  Mass of the PGB is proportional to the strength of the symmetry breaking

Earlier models without a Higgs-like particle: Technicolour

New strong interaction, similar to QCD, at the TeV scale breaks the electroweak symmetry

$\Rightarrow$ No Higgs-like particle, unitarisation of scattering amplitudes by infinitely many heavy resonances

Strong tension with electroweak precision observables (EWPO): need resonances at the TeV scale, give large tree-level contributions to EWPO

Composite PGB, identified with the Higgs boson

Composite Higgs models can be viewed as an interpolation between a weakly coupled Higgs model and a strongly coupled technicolour model

Composite Higgs is a bound state, similar to the pion in QCD

Mass of the bound state is not sensitive to virtual effects above the compositeness scale

Composite Higgs gets potential at loop level, triggers electroweak symmetry breaking

Goldstone theorem: spontaneous breaking of global symmetry G to subgroup H_1 gives rise to n = dim(G) - dim (H_1) massless Goldstone bosons

PGB Higgs

Global symmetry G dynamically broken to subgroup H_1 at the scale f (corresponds to pion decay constant)

H_0: gauged subgroup of G ($H_0 \subset G$); $H = H_0 \cap H_1$: unbroken gauge group

⇒ n = dim(G) - dim (H_1) Goldstone bosons
n_0 = dim(H_0) - dim (H) Goldstone bosons are ``eaten”, give masses to vector bosons



⇒ The remaining n - n_0 are PGBs

Minimal realisation: G = SO(5), H_1 = SO(4) contains 4 Goldstone bosons

PGB Higgs

⇒ Longitudinal components to $W^{\pm}$, Z + 1 physical Higgs

At lowest order (tree-level): SM gauge group, $G_{SM} = H_0$, is unbroken; Higgs potential vanishes at tree-level

At loop level: couplings of the SM fields to the strong sector break the global symmetry G explicitly

Higgs potential generated at loop level, can break electroweak symmetry, $G_{SM} \to U(1)_{em}$

⇒ Vacuum expectation value v is dynamically determined, $\xi = (v/f)^2$

PGB Higgs

$\xi \to 0$: ``decoupling limit", massive resonances of strong dynamics decouple

$\xi \to 1$: ``technicolour limit"

Strong constraints from EWPO, flavour physics, …

Deviations in Higgs properties can be parameterised by effective Lagrangian, e.g.: $g_{HVV} = \sqrt{(1 - \xi)}\, g_{HVV}^{SM}$

Difficult to achieve correct pattern of quark masses; ``partial compositeness": SM quarks get masses from mixing with fermion resonances, modifications of quark couplings to the Higgs

PGB Higgs

Higgs potential for Higgs mass of 125 GeV
⇒ Light fermionic top partners needed

Composite Higgs partially unitarises the SM scattering amplitudes
⇒ Strong interaction in longitudinal gauge-boson scattering at high energies in spite of light Higgs
$\sim s/f^2$; perturbativity bound: $s_{max} \approx (4\pi f)^2$

⇒ Search for strong interaction effects, resonances

Higgs phenomenology: Standard Model and beyond

Limits from the LEP Higgs searches: $e^+e^- \to ZH, H \to b\bar{b}$

$$\left(\frac{g_{\mathrm{HZZ}}}{g_{\mathrm{HZZ}}^{\mathrm{SM}}}\right)^2$$



⇒ Limit for SM Higgs (ξ = 1): $M_{\mathrm{H}} > 114.4$ GeV at 95% CL
No limit if the HZZ coupling is below 10% of the SM value

LEP / ILC,"Golden channel": $e^+e^- \to ZH, Z \to e^+e^-, \mu^+\mu^-$

Recoil method: absolute measurement of *ZH* cross section and branching ratios

Reconstruct **$Z \to l^+l^-$**

independent of Higgs decay

sensitive to invisible Higgs decays



$$m^2_{\text{recoil}} = (\sqrt{s} - E_{\ell\ell})^2 - |\vec{p}_{\ell\ell}|^2$$

ILC Higgs WG Input to Snowmass



Model-independent, absolute measurements

$Z \to e^+e^-, \mu^+\mu^-$, $\sqrt{s}$=250 GeV, L=250 fb-1

- $\sigma_{ZH} \leq 2.6\%$
- $\Delta m_H \leq 30$ MeV
- BR(invisible) < 0.7% (95% C.L.)

Gauss. width ≈ 650 MeV = 560 MeV ⊕ 330 MeV

beam energy spread **detector resolution**

Decay-mode independent search limits from LEP

$e^+e^- \to ZH, Z \to e^+e^-, \mu^+\mu^-$ with known BR(Z → ll)

⇒ Direct limit on production cross section, independently of Higgs decay properties

⇒ $M_H > 81$ GeV at 95% CL for $\sigma(ZH) = \sigma(ZH)_{SM}$

⇒ Important constraints for BSM physics

Limits in the mass region above ~100 GeV from the LHC

[CMS Collaboration ’13]



High-mass region: treatment of non-zero width, interference effects important

LHC: proton-proton scattering

pp scattering contains "hard" collision process of partons q, $\bar{q}$, g, e.g.:



[(over-) simplified parton-model picture]

$$\text{LHC: } \sigma(pp) = \int_0^1 \int_0^1 dx_1 dx_2 \sum_{q_i, q_j} q_i^p(x_1)\, q_j^p(x_2)\, \sigma(q_i q_j)$$

Available $(\text{energy})^2$ for partonic sub-process: $\hat{s} = x_1 x_2 s$

LHC: $\sqrt{s} = 14$ TeV; $\sqrt{\hat{s}}$ up to several TeV

Proton remnant lost in beam pipe: can exploit only kinematics of transverse momenta

Typical features of pdf's

<u>Typical features:</u>

- gluon distribution very large
- gluon and sea distributions grow at small x
- gluon dominates at small x
- valence distributions peak at x = 0.1 - 0.2
- largest uncertainties at very small or very large x

[G. Zanderighi '14]



Crucial property: factorization!

PDFs extracted in DIS can be used at hadron colliders. This assumption can be checked against data (but often rigorous proof is missing)

DGLAP evolution

[G. Zanderighi ’14]

The DGLAP evolution is a key to precision LHC phenomenology: it allows to measure PDFs at some scale (say in DIS) and evolve upwards to make LHC (7, 8, 13, 14, 33, 100.... TeV) predictions

Measure PDFs at 10 GeV



Evolve in Q^2 and make LHC predictions



Different PDFs evolve in different ways (different equations + unitarity constraint)

⇒ The LHC is a ``gluon factory”

Parton density coverage

- most of the LHC x-range covered by Hera
- need 2-3 orders of magnitude Q^2-evolution
- rapidity distributions probe extreme x-values
- 100 GeV physics at LHC: small-x, sea partons
- TeV physics: large x

[G. Zanderighi '14]



Precise predictions for LHC processes

Processes with many external legs are important for signal and background predictions, e.g. W + n jet production; scale uncertainty at leading order: 9% for n = 1, 28% for n = 2, 47% for n= 3, 64% for n = 4 (~ $\alpha_\mathrm{s}(\mu)^4$), ...

$\Rightarrow$ Need NLO predictions to reduce theoretical uncertainty

NLO predictions:

- Improve normalisation and shape of cross sections
- Improved description of hard jets
- ....

Difficult task for multi-leg processes

Production of a SM Higgs at the LHC

Production modes



Production of a SM Higgs at the LHC

[LHC Higgs XS WG '14]



Production of a SM Higgs at the LHC

[LHC Higgs XS WG '16]



Production of a SM Higgs at the LHC

[LHC Higgs XS WG '16]



Production of a SM Higgs at the LHC

[P. Savard, EPS 2015]







	process	8 TeV	13 TeV
ggF	gluon-gluon fusion	19 pb	44 pb
VBF	vector-boson fusion	1.6 pb	3.7 pb
VH	associated production	1.1 pb	2.2 pb
ttH	associated production	0.13 pb	0.51 pb
tH	Associated production	~20 fb	~90 fb

SM Production Modes
(M_H = 125 GeV)





Dominant production processes for a SM-like Higgs

gluon fusion: $gg \to H$, weak boson fusion (WBF): $q\bar{q} \to q'\bar{q}'H$





Prediction for Higgs production in gluon fusion

[G. Zanderighi '14]

Inclusive Higgs production via gluon-gluon fusion in the large m_t-limit:



NNLO corrections known since many years now:



virtual-virtual real-virtual real-real

Prediction for Higgs production in gluon fusion

- Loop-induced process, can be affected by loops of BSM particles (do not have to compete with SM-type lowest-order contribution)

- Very large higher-order corrections, O(100%): the phase space for the leading-order contribution is essentially just a ``single point”, $\hat{s} = M_{\mathrm{H}}^2$
$\Rightarrow$ Phase space opens up (production of additional gluon): $\hat{s} \geq M_{\mathrm{H}}^2$
sizable transverse Higgs momentum possible

- SM contribution can approximately be calculated in heavy top limit: loop correction ~ $1/m_t$ cancels m_t term from Yukawa coupling

$\Rightarrow$ Non-decoupling effect of heavy particle

$\Rightarrow$ An additional fermion generation receiving their mass via the BEH mechanism would enhance the Higgs production rate in gluon fusion by about a factor 9!

$\Rightarrow$ Measured cross section puts strong constraints

Importance of quantum corrections for Higgs physics, some examples

- Gluon fusion Higgs production: $\mathcal{O}(100\%)$ corrections



- Expect large higher-order corrections in the Higgs sector in every model which predicts the Higgs mass(es):

Large coupling of Higgs to top quark



One-loop correction $\Delta M_{\mathrm{h}}^2 \sim G_\mu m_{\mathrm{t}}^4$

- MSSM Higgs sector: large higher-order effects, sensitivity to splitting between top and stops

Most important decay channels

Good mass resolution:

- $H \to \gamma\gamma$ (loop induced)
- $H \to ZZ^* \to l^+l^-l^+l^-$, $l = e, \mu$

Poor mass resolution:

- $H \to WW^* \to \bar{\nu}l^-\nu l^+$, $l = e, \mu$
- $H \to \tau^+\tau^-$
- $H \to b\bar{b}$

SM Higgs branching fractions

[LHC Higgs XS WG ’14]



$\Rightarrow M_h = 125\,\mathrm{GeV}$ is “ideal” for observing a variety of decay channels

Search for non-standard heavy Higgses

"Typical" features of extended Higgs sectors:

- A light Higgs with SM-like properties, couples with about SM-strength to gauge bosons
- Heavy Higgs states that decouple from the gauge bosons

$\Rightarrow$

- A signal could show up in H → ZZ → 4 l as a small bump, very far below the expectation for a SM-like Higgs (and with a much smaller width)
- Particularly important search channel: H, A → $\tau\tau$
- Non-standard search channels can play an important role: H → hh, H, A → $\chi\chi$, ...

CMS result for h, H, A → ττ search

[CMS Collaboration '14]

Analysis starts to become sensitive to the presence of the signal at 125 GeV

⇒ Searches for Higgs bosons of an extended Higgs sector need to test compatibility with the signal at 125 GeV (→ appropriate benchmark scenarios) and search for additional states



m_h^{mod} benchmark scenario

[M. Carena, S. Heinemeyer, O. Stål, C. Wagner, G. W. '14]





Small modification of well-known m_h^{max} scenario where the light Higgs h can be interpreted as the signal at 125 GeV over a wide range of the parameter space

Large branching ratios into SUSY particles (right plot) and sizable BR(H → hh), up to 30%, for rel. small tanβ possible

CMS result for h, H, A → $\tau\tau$ search

[CMS Collaboration '14]

m_h^{mod} benchmark scenario

Test of compatibility of the data to the signal of h, H, A (MSSM) compared to SM Higgs boson hypothesis



``Wedge region'', where only h(125) can be detected; difficult to cover also with more luminosity

Incorporation of cross section limits and properties of the signal at 125 GeV: *HiggsBounds* and *HiggsSignals*

- Programs that use the experimental information on cross section limits (HiggsBounds) and observed signal strengths (HiggsSignals) for testing theory predictions *[P. Bechtle, O. Brein, S. Heinemeyer, O. Stål, T. Stefaniak, G. Weiglein, K. Williams '08, '12, '13]*

- *HiggsSignals:* *[P. Bechtle, S. Heinemeyer, O. Stål, T. Stefaniak, G. Weiglein '13]*

- Test of Higgs sector predictions in arbitrary models against measured signal rates and masses

- Systematic uncertainties and correlations of signal rates, luminosity and Higgs mass predictions taken into account

Heavy non-standard Higgses: application of CMS result in $\tau\tau$ channel

- CMS has published likelihood information for searches for a narrow Higgs resonance in $\tau\tau$ channel as function of the two production channels gluon fusion and b associated production
  [CMS Collaboration '14]

- Simple algorithm for mapping arbitrary models with several Higgses to narrow resonance model, incorporation into *HiggsBounds*

[P. Bechtle, S. Heinemeyer, O. Stål, T. Stefaniak, G. W. '15]



Validation: comparison with exclusion limit from dedicated CMS analysis in m_h^{max} benchmark scen.

[P. Bechtle, S. Heinemeyer, O. Stål, T. Stefaniak, G. W. '15]

Likelihood distribution and excl. limits:



Signal combinations (incoherent sum):



⇒ Good agreement with dedicated CMS analysis in the benchmark scenario (proper combination of channels possible)

Application to the m_h^{alt} benchmark scenario: "alignment without decoupling"

Alignment without decoupling: h in the MSSM behaves SM-like even for small values of M_A, m_h^{alt} scen. [M. Carena, H. Haber, I. Low, N. Shah, C. Wagner'15]

[P. Bechtle, S. Heinemeyer, O. Stål, T. Stefaniak, G. W. '15]

Likelihood distribution from H, A → ττ: Likelihood from Higgs signal rates:



Combination of likelihood information from the Higgs signal rates and the search for heavy Higgses

[P. Bechtle, S. Heinemeyer, O. Stål, T. Stefaniak, G. W. '15]

Public tools
HiggsBounds
and
HiggsSignals



⇒ Large impact on parameter space of the model
Lower limit on M_A from searches for heavy Higgses!

Higgs mixing: possible interference effects

Total cross section:

$$\sigma_{\text{tot}} = \sigma(b\bar{b}H) + \sigma(b\bar{b}A) \text{ (incoherent sum)}$$

holds only in the $\mathcal{CP}$-conserving case

But: in reality we don't know whether $\mathcal{CP}$ in the Higgs sector is conserved or not

In the general case:

Complex parameters $\Rightarrow$ loop corrections induce $\mathcal{CP}$-violation

Two Higgs states, nearly mass degenerate, large mixing

$\Rightarrow$ Large (destructive) interference possible

Search for heavy Higgs bosons at the LHC: impact of interference effects

[E. Fuchs, G. W. '15]

Exclusion limits from neutral Higgs searches in the MSSM with and without interference effects:

CP-violating case, $\phi_{A_t} = \pi / 4$

H, A are nearly mass degenerate: large mixing possible in CP-violating case!

Incoherent sum is not sufficient!



m_h^{mod+} scenario, μ = 1000 GeV

⇒ Large CP-violating interference effects between H, A possible

Sensitivity to the small signal of an additional heavy Higgs boson in a Two-Higgs-Doublet model (2HDM)



[S. Liebler, G. Moortgat-Pick, G. W. '15]



(a)



(b)

$\Rightarrow$ ILC: Potential sensitivity beyond the kinematic reach of Higgs pair production

LHC: sensitivity to an additional heavy Higgs boson of a Two-Higgs-Doublet model (2HDM)

Recent ATLAS analysis:

[ATLAS Collaboration '15]

Interference effects of heavy Higgs with background and light Higgs contribution neglected

[N. Greiner, S. Liebler, G. W. '15]
Analysis of $gg \to e^+e^-\mu^+\mu^-$ and $gg \to ll\nu\nu$ including signal, background and H-h, H-background interference contributions using *GoSam* [G. Cullen et al. '14] and *MadEvent* [F. Maltoni, T. Stelzer '02]



tanβ = 2 used as example in the plot on the next slide

$gg \to e^+e^-\mu^+\mu^-$, invariant mass distribution

[N. Greiner, S. Liebler, G. W. '15]

$\sin(\beta-\alpha) = -0.995$, $M_H = 200$ GeV, $\tan\beta = 2$ (ATLAS scenario for 13 TeV):



⇒ Pronounced h and H signal peaks

Hadronic gg → ZZ cross sections, impact of interference contributions (ATLAS scen., tanβ = 2)

Total width of heavy Higgs H:

[N. Greiner, S. Liebler, G. W. '15]



⇒ Interferences are small in the region where the ATLAS search was sensitive

Sizable interference effects possible, not necessarily correlated with a large width

Larger interference effects possible for higher values of tanβ

Hadronic gg → ZZ cross sections, impact of interference contributions for larger values of tanβ

[N. Greiner, S. Liebler, G. W. ’15]

sin(β-α) = 0.990, M_H = 400 GeV:



tanβ = 20

⇒ Interference effects provide enhanced sensitivity to heavy Higgs H

What do we know so far about the discovered signal and how can we interpret it?



What do we know so far about the discovered signal?

Discovery of a signal at about 125 GeV in the Higgs searches at ATLAS and CMS:





⇒ Discovery mainly based on the $\gamma\gamma$ and $ZZ^* \to 4\,l$ channels

Significance of the signal in ATLAS and CMS





Signal strengths and significances by channel for ATLAS and CMS

[K. Jakobs, G. Quast, G. W. '14]

Channel	ATLAS μ	ATLAS z	CMS μ	CMS z
$H \to ZZ$	$1.44^{+0.34}_{-0.31}{}^{+0.21}_{-0.11}$	8.1	$0.93^{+0.26}_{-0.23}{}^{+0.13}_{-0.09}$	6.8
$H \to \gamma\gamma$	$1.17 \pm 0.23^{+0.16}_{-0.11}$	5.2	$1.14 \pm 0.21^{+0.09}_{-0.05}{}^{+0.13}_{-0.09}$	5.7
$H \to W^+W^-$	$1.08^{+0.16}_{-0.15}{}^{+0.16}_{-0.13}$	6.1	$0.72^{+0.20}_{-0.18}$	4.3
$H \to \tau^+\tau^-$	$1.42^{+0.27}_{-0.26}{}^{+0.34}_{-0.26}$	4.5	0.78 ± 0.27	3.2
$VH \to H \to b\bar{b}$	$0.5 \pm 0.3 \pm 0.2$	1.4	1.0 ± 0.5	2.1

Signal strength and significance values



$$\mu = \frac{\sigma \times \mathrm{Br}}{(\sigma \times \mathrm{Br})_{SM}}$$

Signal strengths for production modes

[P. Savard, EPS 2015]

Obtain production signal strengths assuming SM ratios for branching ratios





Properties of the discovered signal

- Mass: ATLAS + CMS ⇒ M_H = 125.1 ± 0.2 GeV : already a precision observable (0.16%)

- Spin: can be determined by discriminating between distinct hypotheses 0, 1, 2, ... unless signal consists of superposition of more than one states ⇒ spin 0 preferred

- CP properties: compatible with pure CP-even state (SM case), pure CP-odd state excluded, only very weak bounds so far on an admixture of CP-even and CP-odd components

Mass measurement from ATLAS and CMS

[P. Savard, EPS 2015]

The SM does not predict the Higgs boson mass: we need to measure it

Given a mass, we can make predictions* for the production cross section and decay rates



Higgs mass measurements (GeV):

ATLAS: $\boxed{125.36 \ \pm 0.37 \text{ (stat)} \ \pm 0.18 \text{ (syst)}}$

CMS: $\boxed{125.02 \ \pm 0.27 \text{ (stat)} \ \pm 0.15 \text{ (syst)}}$

LHC combination:

$\boxed{125.09 \ \pm 0.21 \text{ (stat)} \ \pm 0.11 \text{ (syst)}}$

Precision measurement: <0.2%

*a lot of progress by theory community, LHCXSWG. Improvements continue…

Higgs mass measurement: the need for high precision

Measuring the mass of the discovered signal with high precision is of interest in its own right

But a high-precision measurement has also direct implications for probing Higgs physics

M_{H}: crucial input parameter for Higgs physics

BR($H \to ZZ^*$), BR($H \to WW^*$): highly sensitive to precise numerical value of M_{H}

A change in M_{H} of 0.2 GeV shifts BR($H \to ZZ^*$) by 2.5%!

$\Rightarrow$ Need high-precision determination of M_{H} to exploit the sensitivity of BR($H \to ZZ^*$), ... to test BSM physics

Relevance of off-shell effects for Higgs physics

Reason for importance of off-shell effects (and high sensitivity to Higgs mass value) for BR(H → ZZ*), BR(H → WW*):

SM Higgs branching fractions:



[LHC Higgs XS WG '14]

For a 125 GeV Higgs boson the branching ratios into BR(H → ZZ*), BR(H → WW*) are far below threshold

⇒ Strong phase-space suppression, steep rise with M_H

[N. Kauer, G. Passarino '12]

⇒ Sensitive dependence on M_H, off-shell effects are important

Total Higgs width: recent analyses from CMS and ATLAS

- Exploit different dependence of on-peak and off-peak contributions on the total width in Higgs decays to $ZZ^{(*)}$

- CMS quote an upper bound of $\Gamma/\Gamma_{\rm SM} < 5.4$ at 95% C.L., where 8.0 was expected, ATLAS: $\Gamma/\Gamma_{\rm SM} < 5.7$ at 95% C.L., 8.5 expect.
[CMS Collaboration '14] *[ATLAS Collaboration '14]*

- Problem: equality of on-shell and far off-shell couplings assumed; relation can be severely affected by new physics contributions, in particular via threshold effects (note: effects of this kind may be needed to give rise to a Higgs-boson width that differs from the SM one by the currently probed amount)
[C. Englert, M. Spannowsky '14]

$\Rightarrow$ SM consistency test rather than model-independent bound

Destructive interference between Higgs- and gauge-boson contributions (unitarity cancellations) $\Rightarrow$ difficult to reach $\Gamma/\Gamma_{\rm SM} \approx 1$ even for high statistics

Standard method at a Linear Collider for the model-independent determination of the total width

Linear Collider (LC): absolute measurements of *ZH* cross section and Higgs branching ratios possible

⇒ Model-independent determination of the total Higgs width

Reconstruct Z→l^+l^-
independent of Higgs decay
sensitive to invisible Higgs decays



$$m^2_{\text{recoil}} = (\sqrt{s} - E_{\ell\ell})^2 - |\vec{p}_{\ell\ell}|^2$$

$$\Gamma_H = \Gamma(H \to XX)/\text{BR}(H \to XX)$$





LC: constraints on the Higgs width via off-shell effects

Same theoretical assumptions as in LHC analyses

[S. Liebler, G. Moortgat-Pick, G. Weiglein ’15]



Large negative signal - background interference
(reason: unitarity cancellations)

$$N(r) = N_0(1 + R_1\sqrt{r} + R_2 r)$$

$r = \Gamma/\Gamma_{\text{SM}}$

⇒ Limited sensitivity even with high integrated luminosity

Qualitative behaviour at the LHC is the same!

CP properties

$\mathcal{CP}$ properties: more difficult than spin, observed state can be any admixture of $\mathcal{CP}$-even and $\mathcal{CP}$-odd components

Observables mainly used for investigaton of $\mathcal{CP}$-properties ($H \to ZZ^*, WW^*$ and H production in weak boson fusion) involve HVV coupling

General structure of HVV coupling (from Lorentz invariance):

$$a_1(q_1, q_2) g^{\mu\nu} + a_2(q_1, q_2) \left[(q_1 q_2) \, g^{\mu\nu} - q_1^\mu q_2^\nu \right] + a_3(q_1, q_2) \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} q_{1\rho} q_{2\sigma}$$

SM, pure $\mathcal{CP}$-even state: $a_1 = 1, a_2 = 0, a_3 = 0$,

Pure $\mathcal{CP}$-odd state: $a_1 = 0, a_2 = 0, a_3 = 1$

However: in many models (example: SUSY, 2HDM, ...) a_3 is loop-induced and heavily suppressed

CP properties

⇒ Observables involving the *HVV* coupling provide only limited sensitivity to effects of a CP-odd component, even a rather large CP-admixture would not lead to detectable effects in the angular distributions of $H \to ZZ^* \to 4\,l$, etc. because of the smallness of a_3

Hypothesis of a pure CP-odd state is experimentally disfavoured

However, there are only very weak bounds so far on an admixture of CP-even and CP-odd components

Channels involving only Higgs couplings to fermions could provide much higher sensitivity

Test of spin and CP hypotheses

[ATLAS Collaboration '13]

The SM 0^+ has been tested against different J^P hypotheses using the three ATLAS discovery channels

0^+ against 0^-



Channel	0^- assumed Exp. $p_0(J^P=0^+)$	0^+ assumed Exp. $p_0(J^P=0^-)$	Obs. $p_0(J^P=0^+)$	Obs. $p_0(J^P=0^-)$	$CL_s(J^P=0^-)$
$H\to ZZ^*$	$1.5\cdot10^{-3}$	$3.7\cdot10^{-3}$	0.31	0.015	0.022

H→ZZ analysis excludes the 0^- hypothesis at 97.8% CLs

0^+ against $1^{+/-}$

Combined H→ZZ and H→WW analysis excludes those hypotheses up to 99.7%

Channel	1^+ assumed Exp. $p_0(J^P=0^+)$	0^+ assumed Exp. $p_0(J^P=1^+)$	Obs. $p_0(J^P=0^+)$	Obs. $p_0(J^P=1^+)$	$CL_s(J^P=1^+)$
$H\to ZZ^*$	$4.6\cdot10^{-3}$	$1.6\cdot10^{-3}$	0.55	$1.0\cdot10^{-3}$	$2.0\cdot10^{-3}$
$H\to WW^*$	0.11	0.08	0.70	0.02	0.08
Combination	$2.7\cdot10^{-3}$	$4.7\cdot10^{-4}$	0.62	$1.2\cdot10^{-4}$	$3.0\cdot10^{-4}$

- **1^+ hypothesis has been excluded at 99.97%**

Channel	1^- assumed Exp. $p_0(J^P=0^+)$	0^+ assumed Exp. $p_0(J^P=1^-)$	Obs. $p_0(J^P=0^+)$	Obs. $p_0(J^P=1^-)$	$CL_s(J^P=1^-)$
$H\to ZZ^*$	$0.9\cdot10^{-3}$	$3.8\cdot10^{-3}$	0.15	0.051	0.060
$H\to WW^*$	0.06	0.02	0.66	0.006	0.017
Combination	$1.4\cdot10^{-3}$	$3.6\cdot10^{-4}$	0.33	$1.8\cdot10^{-3}$	$2.7\cdot10^{-3}$

- **1^- hypothesis has been excluded at 99.7%**

Test of spin and CP hypotheses

[CMS Collaboration '14]

- Combination of H→WW→2ℓ2ν and H→ZZ→4ℓ.
- All tested hypotheses excluded at more than 99.9% CL_S.



Hypothesis test for 0^+ vs. 1^-



Experimental analyses beyond the hypotheses of pure CP-even / CP-odd states

[CMS Collaboration '14]

$$f_{a3} = \frac{|a_3|^2\sigma_3}{|a_1|^2\sigma_1 + |a_2|^2\sigma_2 + |a_3|^2\sigma_3}$$



Experimental analyses beyond the hypotheses of pure CP-even / CP-odd states

Loop suppression of a_3 in many BSM models

⇒ Even a rather large CP-admixture would result in only a very small effect in f_{a3}!

⇒ Extremely high precision in f_{a3} needed to probe possible deviations from the SM

The Snowmass report sets as a target that should be achieved for f_{a3} an accuracy of better than 10^{-5}!

Couplings

- What is meant by measuring a coupling?
  A coupling is not directly a physical observable; what is measured is $\sigma \times \mathrm{BR}$ (within acceptances), etc.
  $\Rightarrow$ Need to specify a Lagrangian in order to define the meaning of coupling parameters

- The experimental results that have been obtained for the various channels are not model-independent
  Properties of the SM Higgs have been used for discriminating between signal and background
  Need the SM to correct for acceptances and efficiencies

Higgs coupling determination at the LHC

Problem: no absolute measurement of total production cross section (no recoil method like LEP, ILC: $e^+e^- \to ZH$, $Z \to e^+e^-, \mu^+\mu^-$)

Production $\times$ decay at the LHC yields combinations of Higgs couplings ($\Gamma_{\text{prod, decay}} \sim g^2_{\text{prod, decay}}$):

$$\sigma(H) \times \text{BR}(H \to a + b) \sim \frac{\Gamma_{\text{prod}}\Gamma_{\text{decay}}}{\Gamma_{\text{tot}}},$$

Total Higgs width cannot be determined without further assumptions

$\Rightarrow$ LHC can directly determine only ratios of couplings, e.g. $g^2_{H\tau\tau}/g^2_{HWW}$

Determination of couplings and CP properties need to be addressed together

Deviations from the SM: in general both the absolute value of the couplings and the tensor structure of the couplings (affects $\mathcal{CP}$ properties) will change

$\Rightarrow$ Determination of couplings and determination of $\mathcal{CP}$ properties can in general not be treated separately from each other

Deviations from the SM would in general change kinematic distributions

$\Rightarrow$ No simple rescaling of MC predictions possible

$\Rightarrow$ Not feasible for analysis of 2012 data set

$\Rightarrow$ LHC Higgs XS WG: Proposal of “interim framework”

``Interim framework" for analyses so far

Simplified framework for analysis of LHC data so far; deviations from SM parametrised by ``scale factors" $\varkappa_i$.

Assumptions:

- Signal corresponds to only one state, no overlapping resonances, etc.
- Zero-width approximation
- Only modifications of coupling strengths (absolute values of the couplings) are considered

⇒ Assume that the observed state is a CP-even scalar

Determination of coupling scale factors

[CMS Collaboration '13]



⇒ Compatible with the SM with rather large errors

Assumption $\varkappa_V \leqq 1$allows to set an upper bound on the total width

⇒ Upper limit on branching ratio into BSM particles: $BR_{BSM} \lesssim 0.6$ at 95% C.L.

Determination of coupling scale factors

[ATLAS Collaboration '14]



⇒ Determination of ratios of coupling scale factors

$$
\begin{aligned}
\lambda_{\gamma Z} &= \kappa_\gamma / \kappa_Z \\
\lambda_{WZ} &= \kappa_W / \kappa_Z \\
\lambda_{bZ} &= \kappa_b / \kappa_Z \\
\lambda_{\tau Z} &= \kappa_\tau / \kappa_Z \\
\lambda_{gZ} &= \kappa_g / \kappa_Z \\
\lambda_{tg} &= \kappa_t / \kappa_g \\
\kappa_{gZ} &= \kappa_g \cdot \kappa_Z / \kappa_H
\end{aligned}
$$

Constraints on coupling scale factors from ATLAS + CMS + Tevatron data

ATLAS + CMS + Tev:



HiggsSignals

[P. Bechtle, S. Heinemeyer, O. Stål, T. Stefaniak, G. W. '14]

Seven fit parameters

Assumption on additional decay modes: only invisible final states; no undetectable decay modes

⇒ Significantly improved precision compared to ATLAS or CMS results alone

Prospects for Higgs-coupling determinations at HL-LHC and ILC: with theory assumption on $\varkappa_V$

[P. Bechtle, S. Heinemeyer, O. Stål, T. Stefaniak, G. W., L. Zeune '14]

Assumed: $\kappa_V \leq 1$

HiggsSignals



Prospects for Higgs-coupling determinations at HL-LHC and ILC: without theory assumption on κ_V

[P. Bechtle, S. Heinemeyer, O. Stål, T. Stefaniak, G. W., L. Zeune '14]



Future analyses of couplings and CP properties

Effective Lagrangian approach, obtained from integrating out heavy particles
Assumption: new physics appears only at a scale $\Lambda \gg M_{\mathrm{h}} \sim 126\ \mathrm{GeV}$

Systematic approach: expansion in inverse powers of Λ; parametrises deviations of coupling strenghts and tensor structure

$$\Delta\mathcal{L} = \sum_i \frac{a_i}{\Lambda^2}\mathcal{O}_i^{d=6} + \sum_j \frac{a_j}{\Lambda^4}\mathcal{O}_j^{d=8} + \ldots$$

How about light BSM particles?

Difficult to incorporate in a generic way, need full structure of particular models

$\Rightarrow$ Analyses in terms of SM $+$ effective Lagrangian and in specific BSM models: MSSM, . . . are complementary

In which way should experimental results on coupling properties be presented in future?

- ``Simplified cross sections”

[K. Tackmann ’16]



Features

- Minimize theory uncertainties in measurements
  - Clearer and systematically improvable treatment at interpretation level
- Measurements stay long-term useful
- Decouples measurements from discussions about specific models
- Allows for interpretation with different model assumptions/BSM scenarios
  - μ_i, κ_i, effective couplings, EFT coefficients, specific models
- Can be combined with decay pseudo observables in the interpretation

- ``Pseudo observables”

Is the discovered signal a Higgs boson?

Couplings to bosons and fermions scale with particle masses in accordance with BEH mechanism
⇒ Distinction from gauge interactions (generation universality)



[CMS Collaboration '14]

⇒ Strong evidence for interpretation as a Higgs boson

Are there invisible and / or undetectable decays? What about the Higgs self-coupling?

- Invisible decays: decay into dark matter particles?
- Undetectable decays: decay products that are buried under the QCD background (non-b jets, gg, ...)
- Higgs self-coupling: needed for experimental access to Higgs potential, the ``holy grail” of Higgs physics
  - HHH: very difficult, even at HL-LHC
  - HHHH: seems out of reach in foreseeable future

Interpretation of the signal at 125 GeV in extended Higgs sectors (SUSY): signal interpreted as light state h

- Most obvious interpretation: signal at about 125 GeV is interpreted as the lightest Higgs state h in the spectrum

- Additional Higgs states at higher masses

- Differences from the Standard Model (SM) could be detected via:

  - properties of h(125): deviations in the couplings, different decay modes, different CP properties, ...

  - detection of additional Higgs states: H, A $\to$ $\tau\tau$, H $\to$ hh, H, A $\to$ $\chi\chi$, ...

Interpretation of the signal in terms of the light MSSM Higgs boson

- Detection of a SM-like Higgs with M_H > 135 GeV would have unambiguously ruled out the MSSM (with TeV-scale masses)

- Signal at 125 GeV is well compatible with MSSM prediction

- Observed mass value of the signal gives rise to lower bound on the mass of the CP-odd Higgs: $M_A > 200 \text{ GeV}$

- $\Rightarrow M_A \gg M_Z$: ``Decoupling region" of the MSSM, where the light Higgs h behaves SM-like

- $\Rightarrow$ Would not expect observable deviations from the SM at the present level of accuracy

The quest for identifying the underlying physics

In general 2HDM-type models one expects % level deviations from the SM couplings for BSM particles in the TeV range, e.g.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{g_{hVV}}{g_{h_{\rm SM}VV}} &\simeq 1 - 0.3\% \left(\frac{200\ \text{GeV}}{m_A}\right)^4 \\
\frac{g_{htt}}{g_{h_{\rm SM}tt}} = \frac{g_{hcc}}{g_{h_{\rm SM}cc}} &\simeq 1 - 1.7\% \left(\frac{200\ \text{GeV}}{m_A}\right)^2 \\
\frac{g_{hbb}}{g_{h_{\rm SM}bb}} = \frac{g_{h\tau\tau}}{g_{h_{\rm SM}\tau\tau}} &\simeq 1 + 40\% \left(\frac{200\ \text{GeV}}{m_A}\right)^2 .
\end{aligned}
$$

⇒ Need very high precision for the couplings

Possibility of a sizable deviation even if the couplings to gauge bosons and SM fermions are very close to the SM case

- If dark matter consists of one or more particles with a mass below about 63 GeV, then the decay of the state at 125 GeV into a pair of dark matter particles is kinematically open

- The detection of an invisible decay mode of the state at 125 GeV could be a manifestation of BSM physics

  - Direct search for $H \to$ invisible

  - Suppression of all other branching ratios

SUSY interpretation of the observed Higgs signal: light Higgs h
Fit to LHC data, Tevatron, precision observables: SM vs. MSSM

[P. Bechtle, S. Heinemeyer, O. Stål, T. Stefaniak, G. W., L. Zeune '14]

Observables:



HiggsSignals

$$\mu_i = \frac{(\sigma \times \mathrm{BR})_i}{(\sigma \times \mathrm{BR})_i^{\mathrm{SM}}}$$

⇒ χ^2 reduced compared to the SM, (slightly) improved fit quality

Interpretation of the signal in extended Higgs sectors (SUSY): signal interpreted as next-to-lightest state H

Extended Higgs sector where the second-lightest (or higher) Higgs has SM-like couplings to gauge bosons

⇒ Lightest neutral Higgs with heavily suppressed couplings to gauge bosons, may have a mass below the LEP limit of 114.4 GeV for a SM-like Higgs (in agreement with LEP bounds)

Possible realisations: 2HDM, MSSM, NMSSM, ...

A light neutral Higgs in the mass range of about 60-100 GeV (above the threshold for the decay of the state at 125 GeV into hh) is a generic feature of this kind of scenario. The search for Higgses in this mass range has only recently been started at the LHC. Such a state could copiously be produced in SUSY cascades.

Example: NMSSM with a light Higgs singlet

Coupling of the lightest Higgs to gauge bosons:

[F. Domingo, G. W. '15]



⇒ SM-like Higgs at 125 GeV + singlet-like Higgs at lower mass

The case where the signal at 125 GeV is not the lightest Higgs arises generically if the Higgs singlet is light

⇒ Strong suppression of the coupling to gauge bosons

NMSSM interpretation of the observed signal

Extended Higgs sector where h(125) is not the lightest state:
NMSSM with a SM-like Higgs at 125 GeV + a light singlet

[F. Domingo, G. W. '15]



⇒ Additional light Higgs with suppressed couplings to gauge bosons, in agreement with all existing constraints

Are LHC searches sensitive to a low-mass Higgs with suppressed couplings to gauge bosons?

ATLAS $h \to \gamma\gamma$ searches in the low-mass region: [ATLAS Collaboration '14]



Example: MSSM, H(125) case: BR($h_1 \to \gamma\gamma$) = 8.5 10^{-7}, three orders of magnitude below BR for a SM-like Higgs of this mass (65 GeV)

Light NMSSM Higgs: comparison of gg →h₁ → $\gamma\gamma$ with the SM case and the ATLAS limit on fiducial σ

[F. Domingo, G. W. '15]





⇒ Limit starts to probe the NMSSM parameter space
But: best fit region is far below the present sensitivity

Such a light Higgs could be produced in a SUSY cascade, e.g.
$\tilde{\chi}_2^0 \to \tilde{\chi}_1^0 h$ *[O. Stål, G. W. '11]* *[CMS Collaboration '15]*

How about the recently observed excess at about 750 GeV?

Experimental situation in December:

Two analyses, which follow closely the Run1 $H \to \gamma\gamma$ analyses:

- ⋆ CMS, 2.6 fb^{-1}
- ⋆ ATLAS, 3.2 fb^{-1}

[K. Tackmann '16]

- Search for diphoton resonances in 2015 13 TeV data
  - ⋆ CMS Search for RS gravitons, setting mass limits at 1.3 TeV ($\tilde{\kappa} = 0.01$), 3.1 TeV ($\tilde{\kappa} = 0.1$) and 3.8 TeV ($\tilde{\kappa} = 0.2$)
  - ⋆ ATLAS search for scalar resonances, setting limits on fiducial production cross section times branching ratio
- Largest deviation from SM background expectation around
  - ⋆ 750 GeV with 3.6 σ local and 2.0 σ global significance
  - ⋆ 760 GeV with 2.6 σ local and 1.2 σ global significance
  - ⋆ No obvious detector or reconstruction effect, no unusual kinematic properties on excess region compared to other regions within statistical uncertainties
- Expect 10 fb^{-1} by summer, and 30 fb^{-1} during 2016

Updates at winter conferences 2016

[ATLAS Collaboration, Moriond '16]

SPIN-0 ANALYSIS

background-only fit



2878 events ($m_{\gamma\gamma}$ > 200 GeV)

SPIN-2 ANALYSIS

background-only fit



5066 events ($m_{\gamma\gamma}$ > 200 GeV)

Updates at winter conferences 2016

[ATLAS Collaboration, Moriond '16]





- Largest deviation from B-only hypothesis
  - ✓ m_X ~ 750 GeV, Γ_X ~ 45 GeV (6%)
  - ✓ Local Z = **3.9 σ**
  - ✓ Global Z = **2.0 σ**
    - m_X = [200 GeV - 2 TeV]
    - Γ_X/m_X = [1% - 10%]

- Largest deviation from B-only hypothesis
  - ✓ m_G ~ 750 GeV, κ/M_{Pl} ~ 0.2 (Γ_G ~ 6% m_G)
  - ✓ Local Z = **3.6 σ**
  - ✓ Global Z = **1.8 σ**
    - m_X = [500 GeV – 3.5 TeV]
    - κ/M_{Pl} = [0.01 – 0.3]

ATLAS: reanalysis of 8 TeV data

[ATLAS Collaboration, Moriond '16]

- 8 TeV data re-analyzed: latest Run 1 γ calibration + same Run 1 selections + 13 TeV analysis methods

SPIN-0 ANALYSIS



- 1.9 σ at m_X = 750 GeV , Γ_X/m_X = 6%
- Compatibility with 13 TeV scalar
  - ✓ gg (scaling: 4.7) → compatibility: 1.2 σ
  - ✓ qq (scaling: 2.7) → compatibility: 2.1 σ

SPIN-2 ANALYSIS



- No significant excess
- Compatibility with 13 TeV graviton
  - ✓ gg → compatibility: 2.7 σ
  - ✓ qq → compatibility: 3.3 σ

CMS: reanalysis with improved sensitivity + analysis of B=0T data

[CMS Collaboration, Moriond '16]

What's new?

- Results presented at the CERN-LHC Seminar in December 2015 based on 2.6fb^{-1}
  (which became 2.7fb^{-1} due to an update in the luminosity measurement).
  - Based on channel-to-channel ECAL calibration extrapolated from Run 1 data.

NEW

- **Data** re-reconstruction, using **updated channel-to-channel calibration,** completed over the winter shutdown.
  - Constants to equalize channel-to-channel response obtained on 2015 data.
  - In the high mass region, **resolution improved by ~30%**
    (leading to a ~10% improvement in analysis sensitivity).

- An **additional 0.6fb^{-1}** dataset, recorded at **B=0T** was analyzed.
  - Lead to a further 10% improvement on top of the re-calibration.

NEW

CMS: invariant mass spectra at 13 TeV

[CMS Collaboration, Moriond '16]



CMS: two event categories:

- both photons in ECAL barrel
- one photon in ECAL barrel, one in ECAL endcap

CMS: combination of 13 TeV and 8 TeV data

[CMS Collaboration, Moriond '16]

- Largest excess observed at $\mathbf{m_x = 750GeV}$ and for **narrow** width.
  - **Local** significance: **3.4σ**
  - Taking into account mass range 500-3500GeV (and all signal hypotheses), "**global**" significance becomes **1.6σ**





ATLAS: non-narrow width case

[K. Tackmann '16]

- Photon energy resolution nuisance parameter pulled by $\sim$1.5 σ in narrow-width fit
- Largest deviation from background-only hypothesis found for a width of 6%$m_{\gamma\gamma}$ ($\Gamma = 45$ GeV):
  - ⋆ 3.9 σ local
  - ⋆ 2.3 σ with LEE (200 GeV - 2 TeV in mass and 1-10%$m_{\gamma\gamma}$ in width)

- Photon energy resolution uncertainty is very conservative, ranging from $^{+55\%}_{-20\%}$ at 200 GeV to $^{+110\%}_{-40\%}$ at 2 TeV, dominated by differences between 8 and 13 TeV detector and reconstruction
  - ⋆ Measurement of energy resolution corrections uses 8 TeV $Z \to ee$ reconstructed with 13 TeV reconstruction
  - ⋆ Resolution is cross checked with 13 TeV $Z \to ee$ events

Cross-section limits

[ATLAS Collaboration, Moriond '16]

Limit on fiducial cross-section

SPIN-0 ANALYSIS



$E_T^{\gamma 1} > 0.4\ m_{\gamma\gamma}$, $E_T^{\gamma 2} > 0.3\ m_{\gamma\gamma}$
E_T^{iso} (ΔR=0.4) < 0.05 E_T^{γ} + 6 GeV
$m_X \pm 2\Gamma_X$

Summary of the experimental situation

- Interesting excesses seen by ATLAS and CMS roughly at the same place, but taking into account the LEE the statistical significances are not overwhelming

- It may very well be just a statistical fluctuation

- There is some tension between the 8 TeV data and the 13 TeV data; the tension is smallest if the production mechanism is such that it gives a large enhancement factor at 13 TeV as compared to 8 TeV

- It is not conclusive at present whether there is a preference for a narrow width or a non-narrow width

Suppose it really develops into a signal, what could it be?

- Large excitement among theorists: around 200 papers since the announcement in December!

[K. Schmidt-Hoberg '16]

Simplest explanation: A **resonance at 750 GeV**

Narrow width approximation OK

$$\sigma(pp \to \gamma\gamma) \approx \sigma(pp \to \Phi) \cdot BR(\Phi \to \gamma\gamma)$$

Possible parton initial states are qq, gg, VV



Increase in cross section depends on initial state:

$r_{b\bar{b}}$	$r_{c\bar{c}}$	$r_{s\bar{s}}$	$r_{d\bar{d}}$	$r_{u\bar{u}}$	r_{gg}	$r_{\gamma\gamma}$
5.4	5.1	4.3	2.7	2.5	4.7	1.9

A new scalar resonance?

[K. Schmidt-Hoberg '16]

Landau-Yang theorem:

For a two photon final state the resonance could have **spin 0 or spin 2**.

98% of papers have considered spin 0

A heavy Higgs boson?

- In ``generic” models (SUSY, 2HDM, …) it is not easy to get a signal for a 750 GeV particle just in the $\gamma\gamma$ final state and nowhere else
- Need to have a rather high branching ratio into $\gamma\gamma$
- Lower bound on $\gamma\gamma$ branching ratio can be inferred from the existing limits in different final states at 8 TeV

Limits from other resonance searches at 8 TeV

[K. Schmidt-Hoberg '16] 1512.04933

final state f	σ at $\sqrt{s} = 8\,\text{TeV}$ observed	implied bound on $BR(S \to f)/BR(S \to \gamma\gamma)$
$e^+e^- + \mu^+\mu^-$	< 1.2 fb	$< 0.6\ (r/5)$
$\tau^+\tau^-$	< 12 fb	$< 6\ (r/5)$
$Z\gamma$	< 4.0 fb	$< 2\ (r/5)$
ZZ	< 12 fb	$< 6\ (r/5)$
Zh	< 19 fb	$< 10\ (r/5)$
hh	< 39 fb	$< 20\ (r/5)$
W^+W^-	< 40 fb	$< 20\ (r/5)$
$t\bar{t}$	< 550 fb	$< 300\ (r/5)$
$b\bar{b}$	$\lesssim 1$ pb	$< 500\ (r/5)$
jj	$\lesssim 2.5$ pb	$< 1300\ (r/5)$

$$\boxed{BR(\Phi \to \gamma\gamma)/BR(\Phi \to \text{SM SM})) \gtrsim 10^{-3}}$$

Could it be just the SM + a 750 GeV resonance?

[K. Schmidt-Hoberg '16]

1512.04928

Is it possible to have **only** SM states contributing to the effective couplings?

Decay: loop induced!



Decay to WW, tt, open:

Can estimate:

$$\frac{BR(\Phi \to \gamma\gamma)}{BR(\Phi \to W^+W^-/t\bar{t})} \sim \left(\frac{\alpha}{4\pi}\right)^2 \sim 5 \times 10^{-5}$$

Excluded by bounds from resonance searches in WW, tt, …

Need additional BSM states!

A simple working model: resonance + vector-like fermions (mass above 375 GeV)

Natural production process: gluon fusion

[K. Schmidt-Hoberg '16]



- Expect also contributions to WW, ZZ, Zγ

- Direct searches for extra fermions

Minimal version: $\gamma\gamma$ production

1512.05751



- No new coloured states needed
- Tension with Run 1 data

What if the width is large?

- New strong interaction?
- Large invisible width?
- Tree-level decays?
- …

[K. Schmidt-Hoberg ’16]



Could be very collimated photons (not resolved)

Depends on mass and coupling of a

Could it be a spin 1 particle?

Could it be a vector resonance despite Landau-Yang?

1512.06833



collimated

[K. Schmidt-Hoberg ’16]

Ingredients naturally present in Z' models:

- Higgs boson to break the U(1)'
- Anomalies: Extra fermions (non-colored) will generate couplings

3rd generation couplings (bb initial state)

Naturally large width (strongest constraint)

Or even a parent resonance?

1512.04933

A parent resonance would allow for better Run-1/Run-2 compatibility



Naturally additional signatures such as etxra jets, MET, …

Search is inclusive, but nothing suspicious seen...

To suppress MET need $\Delta = m_P - m_S - m_R$ small

⇒ If there is a real signal, there should be more new physics around!

What if the excess at 750 GeV is confirmed as a signal?

- This would of course mean that the Standard Model would be ruled out ⇔ new era of post-SM physics!

- The 2016 data will most likely tell whether it is a signal or a fluctuation

- This is just one example of possible dramatic changes in our understanding of particle physics that could happen during the next months!

- LHC run at 13 TeV: the big step in sensitivity is happening now!

Conclusions

The spectacular discovery of a signal at ~125 GeV in the Higgs searches at LHC marks the start of a new era of particle physics

The discovered particle looks SM-like so far, but many other possibilities, corresponding to very different underlying physics, are perfectly compatible with the experimental data as well

Need high-precision measurements of the properties of the detected particle + searches for BSM states + precise theory predictions ⇒ direct / indirect sensitivity to physics at higher scales

⇒ Rich physics programme at LHC, HL-LHC and ILC

Interesting excess at 750 GeV, but exp. situation is still unclear; if it is a real signal, one would expect to see additional new states

Group projects

Scenario with an extended Higgs sector

- Consider as an example for an extended Higgs sector a NMSSM scenario where the state at 125 GeV, h(125), is not the lightest Higgs in the spectrum
  Possible benchmark scenarios: see next slide

- Explore the different ways to test such a scenario:

  - Deviations of the properties of h(125) from the SM Higgs? Consider the cases where the mass of the lighter state(s) is above / below (125 GeV)/2

  - Searches for heavy NMSSM Higgs bosons

  - Searches for the light state(s) below 125 GeV: consider the LEP limits and the ones from the ATLAS searches for a Higgs below 100 GeV in the diphoton final state
    How could one detect a light Higgs that is in agreement with those limits?

Extended Higgs sector, proposals for possible benchmark scenarios in the NMSSM

- Point A or point 2 from arXiv:1509.07283, BP1 points from LHCHiggsXSWG3

NMSSMTools Parameters	Point 1 Decoupling limit	Point 2 Light singlet
λ	0.2	0.55
κ	0.6	0.45
$\tan\beta$	22.5	8
$\mu_{\rm eff}$ (GeV)	200	125
M_A (GeV)	1000	1000
A_κ (GeV)	-8.5	-288
M_1 (GeV)	250	250
M_2 (GeV)	500	500
M_3 (TeV)	1.5	1.5
$m_{\tilde{Q}_{1,2}}$ (TeV)	1.5	1.5
$m_{\tilde{Q}_3}$ (TeV; if $\neq m_{\tilde{Q}_{1,2}}$)	1.1	1
$m_{\tilde{L}}$ (GeV)	300	200
A_t (TeV)	-2.5	-2
$A_{b,\tau}$ (TeV; if $\neq A_t$)	-1.5	-1.5
Higgs Spectrum		
m_{h_1} (GeV)	125.0 D	105.6 S
m_{h_2} (GeV)	973 D	125.0 D
m_{h_3} (GeV)	1192 S	986 D
m_{A_1} (GeV)	109.7 S	307 S
m_{A_2} (GeV)	976 D	983 D
$m_{H^\pm}$ (GeV)	976	980
S_{13}^2	$\sim 0\%$	97%
S_{23}^2	0.3%	1.6%
S_{33}^2	99.7%	1.0%
P_{13}^2	99.7%	99.5%
P_{23}^2	0.3%	0.5%
M_W[err] (GeV)	80.372[17]	80.373[17]
χ^2 (/89 obs.)	81.2	76.1

Parameters	Point A (light sing.)
λ	0.54
κ	0.43
$\tan\beta$	14
$\mu_{\rm eff}$ (GeV)	120
M_A (GeV)	1700
A_κ (GeV)	-263
Higgs Spectrum	
m_{h_1} (GeV)	100.5 S
m_{h_2} (GeV)	125.2 D
m_{A_1} (GeV)	285 S
$m_{H^\pm}$ (GeV)	1671

WG3 NMSSM Topics of Interest

- WG3 NMSSM Topics of Interest
- Group organization
- Spectrum Calculators
  - FlexibleSUSY (C++)
  - NMSSMCALC (Fortran)
  - NMSSMTools (Fortran77)
  - SoftSUSY (C++)
  - SPheno (Fortran 90)
- Benchmark points
  - SM input parameters
  - Overview - Classification of Benchmark Points
  - Description of Benchmark Points
    - BP1

BP1_P1	
Spectrum	Mh1(singlet) = 93 GeV, Mh2(SM-like) = 123 GeV, Mh3(doublet) = 891 GeV,
	Ma1(singlet) = 26 GeV, Ma2(doublet) = 891 GeV
	Mchi_1^0(singlino, NLSP) = 102 GeV, mstau1(NNLSP) = 332 GeV
Signatures/Rates	
A1	ggF(a1) = 10 fb, a1 -> bb (91%) and tautau (8%)
H1	ggF(h1) = 15 pb, h1 -> bb (84%) and tautau (8%)
chi_1^0	Decays to gravitino + a1 (100%) inside the detector (displaced vertex)
stau1	Decays to chi_1^0 + tau (100%)
Maximum / Unique signature	Possibility to produce directly a 93 GeV scalar
	The 26 GeV pseudo-scalar will appear at the end of every sparticle decay chain

Bounds on a light Higgs: from LEP to the future?

Limits on a light Higgs from the LEP searches: $e^+e^- \to ZH, H \to b\bar{b}$

$$\left(\frac{g_{\mathrm{HZZ}}}{g^{\mathrm{SM}}_{\mathrm{HZZ}}}\right)^2$$



How would the limits on $\left(\frac{g_{\mathrm{HZZ}}}{g^{\mathrm{SM}}_{\mathrm{HZZ}}}\right)^2$ improve for a new e^+e^- collider at 350 GeV with 500 fb^{-1}?

Test of CP properties

- Suppose the signal at 125 GeV, h(125), actually consists of two states, a CP-even one and a CP-odd one. Consider the benchmark scenario in the 2HDM proposed by the LHCHiggsXSWG (see next slide)

- Apply the usual methods for testing CP properties to this scenario, in particular angular distributions in h(125) → 4 leptons. Can one distinguish the above scenario from a pure CP-even state in this way?

- Which other observables could one use to experimentally detect the presence of two degenerate states at 125 GeV?

Test of CP properties, 2HDM benchmark scenario

BP1: *Howard Haber, Oscar Stål*
Phenomenological benchmarks for the CP-conserving 2HDM with softly-broken Z_2-symmetry. https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/pub/LHCPhysics/LHCHXSWG3Benchmarks2HDM/HH_OS_2HDM_Benchmarks.pdf

Scenario C ($\mathcal{CP}$-overlap)

In this work we have restricted ourselves to benchmarks for a 2HDM Higgs sector with $\mathcal{CP}$-conservation. Nevertheless, we consider one scenario where overlapping $\mathcal{CP}$-odd and $\mathcal{CP}$-even Higgs bosons simultaneously have mass close to 125 GeV [13]. Since the $\mathcal{CP}$-odd Higgs boson does not couple to vector bosons at tree level, there are surprisingly few channels where it is possible to distinguish this scenario from the case with a single light Higgs, h. The most important channel where the $\mathcal{CP}$-odd contribution to the total rate could reach $\mathcal{O}(1)$ is through gluon ($b\bar{b}$) fusion, followed by the decay $h/A \to \tau^+\tau^-$. Input parameters are given in the physical basis. Note that the choice of $\lambda_5 = 0$ in this scenario is equivalent to $m_{12}^2 = \frac{1}{2} m_A^2 \sin 2\beta$.

Scenario C ($\mathcal{CP}$-overlap)

	m_h	m_H	m_A	$m_{H^\pm}$	$c_{\beta-\alpha}$	λ_5	$\tan\beta$	Type
C1	125	300	125	300	0	0	$1\ldots10$	I
C2	125	300	125	300	0	0	$1\ldots10$	II

H(750) → h(125) h(125) decays

- For a new resonance at 750 GeV the decay into a pair of the Higgs boson observed at 125 GeV, h(125), would be kinematically possible

- Simulate a search in this channel, assuming that the properties of h(125) are those of the SM Higgs

- What would be the most promising final states of h(125) in this search depending on the accumulated luminosity in Run 2 of the LHC?

- Which limits on cross section times branching ratio could one achieve for different luminosities?

- Wich mass resolution would one achieve for a signal?