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Higgs production at the LHC



## Vector Boson Fusion


[Eboli, Hagiwara, Kauer, Plehn, Rainwater, D.Z. ...]
First consideration of $h \rightarrow \gamma \gamma$ in VBF in 1997 Rainwater, D.Z, hep-ph/9712271
Semileptonic tau signal for $h \rightarrow \tau \tau$ in VBF in 1998 Rainwater, D.Z, Hagiwara, hep-ph/9808468

## VBF signature



## Characteristics:

- energetic jets in the forward and backward directions ( $p_{T}>20 \mathrm{GeV}$ )
- large rapidity separation and large invariant mass of the two tagging jets
- Higgs decay products between tagging jets
- Little gluon radiation in the central-rapidity region, due to colorless $W / Z$ exchange (central jet veto: no extra jets with $p_{T}>20 \mathrm{GeV}$ and $|\eta|<2.5$ )


## Higgs decay to tau pairs

Most sensitive search channel is via VBF. Of course, experiments consider all...


Clearly visible indication for Higgs decay to tau-lepton pairs around 120 GeV

## Comparison of $\tau \tau$ signal with SM expectation

Best fit of signal strength


Probability of background fluctuation


## Vector Boson Fusion



Most measurements can eventually be performed at the LHC with statistical accuracies on the measured cross sections times decay branching ratios, $\sigma \times \mathrm{BR}$, of order $10 \%$.
Would like theory errors below $5 \% \Longrightarrow$ Need NLO corrections

## NLO QCD correction to VBF Higgs production

Virtual correction is vertex correction only

virtual amplitude proportional to Born

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}_{V}= & \mathcal{M}_{\text {Born }} \frac{\alpha_{s}\left(\mu_{R}\right)}{4 \pi} C_{F}\left(\frac{4 \pi \mu_{R}^{2}}{Q^{2}}\right)^{\epsilon} \Gamma(1+\epsilon) \\
& {\left[-\frac{2}{\epsilon^{2}}-\frac{3}{\epsilon}+\frac{\pi^{2}}{3}-7\right]+\mathcal{O}(\epsilon) }
\end{aligned}
$$

- Divergent piece canceled via Catani Seymour algorithm

Remaining virtual corrections are accounted for by trivial factor multiplying Born cross section

$$
\left|\mathcal{M}_{\text {Born }}\right|^{2}\left(1+2 \alpha_{s} \frac{C_{F}}{2 \pi} c_{\text {virt }}\right)
$$

- Factor 2 for corrections to upper and lower quark line
- Same factor to Born cross section absorbs most of the virtual corrections for other VBF processes


## Size of NLO QCD corrections

- Small QCD corrections of $\mathcal{O}(10 \%)$
- Tiny scale dependence at NLO
- $\pm 5 \%$ for distributions
$-<2 \%$ for $\sigma_{\text {total }}$
- K-factor is phase space dependent
- QCD corrections under excellent control
confirmed by NNLO corrections to inclusive VBF cross section

Bolzoni, Maltoni, Moch, Zaro arXiv:1003.4451

- Need electroweak corrections for 5\% uncertainty

Ciccolini, Denner, Dittmaier, 0710.4749


## Limitations of the $q q \rightarrow q q H$ picture

Forget $m_{h} \approx 125 \mathrm{GeV}$ for the moment .... what would happen for a heavy Higgs?
At $m_{H}>$ few hundred GeV (for say $\Gamma_{H} / m_{H}>0.1$ ) we need to take interference with continuum electroweak into account

Implication:

- Consider full processes $q q \rightarrow q q V V$ or $q q \rightarrow q q \bar{f}_{1} f_{2} \bar{f}_{3} f_{4}$
- s-channel Higgs exchange graph with inverse propagator

$$
\Delta_{H}(s)=s-s_{H}=s-m_{H}^{2}+i m_{H} \Gamma_{H}
$$

is just one contribution.
Even with $m_{h}=125 \mathrm{GeV}$ resonance, with couplings somewhat different from SM prediction, sizable deviations from SM weak-boson-scattering are possible
$\Longrightarrow$ Need precise SM predictions, i.e. at least NLO QCD corrections to weak boson scattering

## Weak boson scattering: $q q \rightarrow q q W W, q q Z Z, q q W Z$ at NLO

- example: WW production via VBF with leptonic decays: $p p \rightarrow e^{+} \nu_{e} \mu^{-} \bar{v}_{\mu}+2 j$
- Spin correlations of the final state leptons
- All resonant and non-resonant Feynman diagrams included
- $\mathrm{NC} \Longrightarrow 181$ Feynman diagrams at LO
- $\mathrm{CC} \Longrightarrow 92$ Feynman diagrams at LO

Use modular structure, e.g. leptonic tensor




Calculate once, reuse in different processes Speedup factor $\approx 70$ compared to 2005 MadGraph for real emission corrections
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## Most challenging for virtual: pentagon corrections

Virtual corrections involve up to pentagons


(c)


(e)

(d)


The external vector bosons correspond to $V \rightarrow l_{1} \bar{l}_{2}$ decay currents or quark currents

The sum of all QCD corrections to a single quark line is simple

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}_{V}^{(i)}= & \mathcal{M}_{B}^{(i)} \frac{\alpha_{S}\left(\mu_{R}\right)}{4 \pi} C_{F}\left(\frac{4 \pi \mu_{R}^{2}}{Q^{2}}\right)^{\epsilon} \Gamma(1+\epsilon) \\
& {\left[-\frac{2}{\epsilon^{2}}-\frac{3}{\epsilon}+c_{\text {virt }}\right] } \\
+ & \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{V_{1} V_{2} V_{3}, \tau}^{(i)}\left(q_{1}, q_{2}, q_{3}\right)+\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)
\end{aligned}
$$

- Divergent pieces sum to Born amplitude: canceled via Catani Seymour algorithm
- Use amplitude techniques to calculate finite remainder of virtual amplitudes

Pentagon tensor reduction with DennerDittmaier is stable at $0.1 \%$ level
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## Helicity amplitude techniques

Amplitude techniques which are used in VBFNLO were developed by Kaoru Hagiwara and myself in the late 80's

Helicity Amplitudes for Heavy Lepton Production in $e^{+} e^{-}$Annihilation Nucl. Phys. B274 (1986) 1

Amplitudes for Multi-Parton Processes Involving a Current at $e^{+} e^{-}, e^{ \pm} p$, and Hadron Colliders Nucl. Phys. B313 (1989) 560

Formalism uses direct multiplication of $\gamma$-matrices in the Weyl-basis

- Very efficient for virtual as well as real emission amplitudes
- Formalism is basis for HELAS routines and, thereby, MadGraph
- Allows for iterative construction of amplitudes, especially for real emission contributions.


## Phenomenology: Size of NLO corrections to VBS

Study LHC cross sections within typical VBF cuts

- Identify two or more jets with $k_{T}$-algorithm $(D=0.8)$

$$
p_{T j} \geq 20 \mathrm{GeV}, \quad\left|y_{j}\right| \leq 4.5
$$

- Identify two highest $p_{T}$ jets as tagging jets with wide rapidity separation and large dijet invariant mass

$$
\Delta y_{j j}=\left|y_{j_{1}}-y_{j_{2}}\right|>4, \quad M_{j j}>600 \mathrm{GeV}
$$

- Charged decay leptons $(\ell=e, \mu)$ of $W$ and / or $Z$ must satisfy

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
p_{T \ell} \geq 20 \mathrm{GeV}, \quad\left|\eta_{\ell}\right| \leq 2.5, \quad \triangle R_{j \ell} \geq 0.4 \\
m_{\ell \ell} \geq 15 \mathrm{GeV}, \quad & \triangle R_{\ell \ell} \geq 0.2
\end{array}
$$

and leptons must lie between the tagging jets

$$
y_{j, \min }<\eta_{\ell}<y_{j, \max }
$$

For scale dependence studies we have considered

$$
\mu=\xi m_{V} \quad \text { fixed scale } \quad \mu=\xi Q_{i} \quad \text { weak boson virtuality }: Q_{i}^{2}=2 k_{q_{1}} \cdot k_{q_{2}}
$$

## WW production: $p p \rightarrow j j e^{+} \nu_{e} \mu^{-} \bar{v}_{\mu} X @$ LHC

Stabilization of scale dependence at NLO
Jäger, Oleari, DZ hep-ph/0603177


## WZ production in VBF, $W Z \rightarrow e^{+} v_{e} \mu^{+} \mu^{-}$

Transverse momentum distribution of the softer tagging jet


- Shape comparison LO vs. NLO depends on scale
- Scale choice $\mu=Q$ produces approximately constant K-factor
- Ratio of NLO curves for different scales is unity to better than $2 \%$ : scale choice matters very little at NLO

Use $\mu_{F}=Q$ at LO to best approximate the NLO results

## NLO corrections to VBF processes available in VBFNLO

Parton level Monte Carlo programs for various NLO calculations, including

- QCD corrections for Higgs production via VBF

Figy, Oleari, DZ
Now includes electroweak and SUSY corrections to VBF Higgs production
Figy,Palmer,Weiglein

- QCD corrections to Higgs plus 3 jet production in VBF

Figy,Hankele, DZ

- QCD corrections to VBF $W$ and Z production $(q q \rightarrow q q V)$

Oleari, DZ

- QCD corrections to weak boson scattering processes $(q q \rightarrow q q V V)$

Jäger, Oleari, DZ

Code is available at http:/ /www.itp.kit.edu/ ~vbfnloweb

## Example of $2 \rightarrow 4$ process at NLO: QCD WZjj production



- 4 flavour scheme
- Cuts:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& p_{T j}>20 \mathrm{GeV}, \quad\left|\eta_{j}\right|<4.5, \\
& p_{T l}>20 \mathrm{GeV}, \quad\left|\eta_{l}\right|<2.5, \\
& R_{j j}>0.4, \quad R_{l l}>0.3, \quad R_{j l}>0.4, \\
& m_{\mu^{+} \mu^{-}}>15 \mathrm{GeV}, \quad \not p_{T}>30 \mathrm{GeV}
\end{aligned}
$$

- PDF:

LO: CTEQ611
NLO: CT10, NF = 4

## Distributions for QCD WZjj production


transverse mass of WZ system


## Comments on WZjj cross sections and distributions

- Strong phase space dependence of K-factors
- VBFNLO code is extremely fast:
$1 \%$ statistical error for full NLO QCD corrected "WZjj" cross section reached with a single core in 2.5 hours
- Special care is taken to produce numerically stable code:
gauge invariance tests flag phase space points with numerical instabilities virtual corrections are recalculated with quadruple precision when needed
- $W^{+} W^{+} j j$ and $W^{-} W^{-} j j$ production at NLO QCD has been implememted also and agrees with earlier calculations of Melia, Melnikov, Rontsch and Zanderighi


## Extensions in 2014 update of VBFNLO

Additional NLO QCD corrected processes implemented in 2014 release:

- QCD WZjj production at order $\alpha^{2} \alpha_{s}^{3}$
- Wrjj production from VBF and order $\alpha^{2} \alpha_{s}^{3} \mathrm{QCD}$ sources
- Same sign QCD WWjj production
- WH and WHj associated production (with anomalous couplings)
- Higgs pair production in VBF
- Inclusion of hadronic decay of one $W$ or Z for all $V V V$ triple vector boson production and $V V j j$ vector boson scattering processes Hadronic decay simulated at LO only, but $K$ factor is $1+\alpha_{s} / \pi \approx 1.04$ Code is stable when one jet only is produced from $Z, \gamma^{*}$ decay
- Anomalous couplings for $V V \rightarrow V V$ scattering processes.

Also completed now are $Z Z j j$ and $Z \gamma j j$ production at order $\alpha^{2} \alpha_{s}^{3}$

## Tensor structure of the $H V V$ coupling

Most general $H V V$ vertex $T^{\mu \nu}\left(q_{1}, q_{2}\right)$

(a)

(b)

Physical interpretation of terms:

SM Higgs $\quad \mathcal{L}_{I} \sim H V_{\mu} V^{\mu} \longrightarrow a_{1}$
loop induced couplings for neutral scalar

CP even

$$
\mathcal{L}_{e f f} \sim H V_{\mu \nu} V^{\mu \nu} \longrightarrow a_{2}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
T^{\mu v}= & a_{1} g^{\mu v}+ \\
& a_{2}\left(q_{1} \cdot q_{2} g^{\mu v}-q_{1}^{v} q_{2}^{\mu}\right)+ \\
& a_{3} \varepsilon^{\mu v \rho \sigma} q_{1 \rho} q_{2 \sigma}
\end{aligned}
$$

CP odd

$$
\mathcal{L}_{e f f} \sim H V_{\mu \nu} \tilde{V}^{\mu \nu}
$$

$\qquad$

Must distinguish $a_{1}, a_{2}, a_{3}$ experimentally
The $a_{i}=a_{i}\left(q_{1}, q_{2}\right)$ are scalar form factors

## Connection to effective Lagrangian

We need model of the underlying UV physics to determine the form factors $a_{i}\left(q_{1}, q_{2}\right)$
Approximate its low-energy effects by an effective Lagrangian

$$
\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{eff}}=\frac{f_{W W}}{\Lambda^{2}} \phi^{\dagger} \hat{W}_{\mu \nu} \hat{W}^{\mu \nu} \phi+\frac{f_{\phi}}{\Lambda^{2}}\left(\phi^{\dagger} \phi-\frac{v^{2}}{2}\right)\left(D_{\mu} \phi\right)^{\dagger} D^{\mu} \phi+\cdots+\sum_{i} \frac{f_{i}^{(8)}}{\Lambda^{4}} \mathcal{O}_{i}^{(8)}+\cdots
$$

Gives leading terms for form factors, e.g. for hWW coupling

$$
\begin{aligned}
& a_{1}=\frac{2 m_{W}^{2}}{v}\left(1+\frac{f_{\phi}}{\Lambda^{2}} \frac{v^{2}}{2}+c_{W}^{(1)} \frac{f_{W}}{\Lambda^{2}}\left(q_{1}^{2}+q_{2}^{2}\right)+\cdots\right)+\sum_{i} c_{i}^{(1)} \frac{f_{i}^{(8)}}{\Lambda^{4}} v^{2} q^{2}+\cdots \\
& a_{2}=c^{(2)} \frac{f_{W W}}{\Lambda^{2}} v+\sum_{i} c_{i}^{(2)} \frac{f_{i}^{(8)}}{\Lambda^{4}} v q^{2}+\cdots \\
& a_{3}=c^{(3)} \frac{\tilde{f}_{W W}}{\Lambda^{2}} v+\sum_{i} c_{i}^{(3)} \frac{\tilde{f}_{i}^{(8)}}{\Lambda^{4}} v q^{2}+\cdots
\end{aligned}
$$

Describe same physics (for a particular vertex) by taking some minimal set of effective Lagrangian coefficients $f_{i}$ as form factors

## Work with Kaoru on effective Lagrangian

- Most general parameterization of $W W V$ vertex and $W$-pair production at LEP

Hagiwara, Hikasa, Peccei, D.Z, Probing the Weak Boson Sector in $e^{+} e^{-} \rightarrow W^{+} W^{-}$ Nucl. Phys. B282 (1987) 253

- Loop effects of $W W V$ anomalous couplings in an $\mathrm{SU}(2) \times \mathrm{U}(1)$ invariant effective Lagrangian setting: no strong model-independent constraints from precision observables like S,T,U
Hagiwara, Ishihara, Szalapski, D.Z., Low Energy Effects of New Interactions in the Electroweak Boson Sector, Phys. Rev. D48 (1993) 2182
- Effective Lagrangian effects on Higgs production and decay

Hagiwara, Szalapski, D.Z., Anomalous Higgs Boson Production and Decay Phys. Lett. B318 (1993) 155

## Implementation in VBFNLO

Start from effective Lagrangians (set PARAMETR1=.true. in anom_HVV.dat )

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}= & \frac{g_{5 e}^{H Z Z}}{2 \Lambda_{5}} H Z_{\mu \nu} Z^{\mu \nu}+\frac{g_{50}^{H Z Z}}{2 \Lambda_{5}} H \tilde{Z}_{\mu \nu} Z^{\mu \nu}+\frac{g_{5 e}^{H W W}}{\Lambda_{5}} H W_{\mu \nu}^{+} W_{-}^{\mu \nu}+\frac{g_{50}^{H W W}}{\Lambda_{5}} H \tilde{W}_{\mu \nu}^{+} W_{-}^{\mu \nu}+ \\
& \frac{g_{5 e}^{H Z \gamma}}{\Lambda_{5}} H Z_{\mu \nu} A^{\mu \nu}+\frac{g_{50}^{H Z \gamma}}{\Lambda_{5}} H \tilde{Z}_{\mu \nu} A^{\mu \nu}+\frac{g_{5 e}^{H \gamma \gamma}}{2 \Lambda_{5}} H A_{\mu \nu} A^{\mu \nu}+\frac{g_{50}^{H \gamma \gamma}}{2 \Lambda_{5}} H \tilde{A}_{\mu \nu} A^{\mu \nu}
\end{aligned}
$$

or , alternatively, (set PARAMETR3=.true. in anom_HVV.dat )

$$
\mathcal{L}_{\text {eff }}=\frac{f_{W W}}{\Lambda_{6}^{2}} \phi^{\dagger} \hat{W}_{\mu \nu} \hat{W}^{\mu \nu} \phi+\frac{f_{B B}}{\Lambda_{6}^{2}} \phi^{\dagger} \hat{B}_{\mu \nu} \hat{B}^{\mu \nu} \phi+\text { CP-odd part }+\cdots
$$

see VBFNLO manual for details on how to set the anomalous coupling choices
Remember to choose form factors in anom_HVV.dat

$$
F_{1}=\frac{M^{2}}{q_{1}^{2}-M^{2}} \frac{M^{2}}{q_{2}^{2}-M^{2}} \quad \text { or } \quad F_{2}=-2 M^{2} C_{0}\left(q_{1}^{2}, q_{2}^{2},\left(q_{1}+q_{2}\right)^{2}, M^{2}\right)
$$

## Jet transverse momentum

Form factors affect momentum transfer and thus jet transverse momenta (Here: $a_{2}$ only)


- Change in tagging jet $p_{T}$ distributions is sensitive indicator of anomalous couplings
- Can choose form-factor such as to approximate $\operatorname{SM} p_{T}$ distributions of the two tagging jets


## Azimuthal angle correlations

Tell-tale signal for non-SM coupling is azimuthal angle between tagging jets


Dip structure at $90^{\circ}$ (CP even) or $0 / 180^{\circ}$ (CP odd) only depends on tensor structure of $h V V$ vertex. Very little dependence on form factor, LO vs. NLO, Higgs mass etc.

Same physics in decay plane correlations for $h \rightarrow Z Z^{*} \rightarrow 4$ leptons

## Size estimates for $a_{2}$ terms

$a_{2}$ for the four $H V V$ combinations can be derived from effective Lagrangian

$$
\mathcal{L}=\frac{g_{5 e}^{H Z Z}}{2 \Lambda_{5}} H Z_{\mu \nu} Z^{\mu \nu}+\frac{g_{5 e}^{H W W}}{\Lambda_{5}} H W_{\mu \nu}^{+} W_{-}^{\mu \nu}+\frac{g_{5 e}^{H Z \gamma}}{\Lambda_{5}} H Z_{\mu \nu} A^{\mu \nu}+\frac{g_{5 e}^{H \gamma \gamma}}{2 \Lambda_{5}} H A_{\mu \nu} A^{\mu \nu}
$$

- $\operatorname{SU}(2)$ multiplets in triangle graphs producing these effective couplings tend to produce all four of same order of magnitude
- However
- $H \rightarrow \mathrm{ZZ} \rightarrow 4 \ell$ and $H \rightarrow W W \rightarrow \ell^{+} \ell^{-} v \bar{v}$ partial widths are strongly suppressed by being off-shell and by small leptonic branching ratios
- No such suppressions for $H \rightarrow \gamma \gamma$
$\Longrightarrow$ Need $g_{5 e}^{\mathrm{HZZ}} \approx g_{5 e}^{\mathrm{HWW}} \approx 1000 g_{5 e}^{\mathrm{H} \mathrm{\gamma} \mathrm{\gamma}}$ in absence of SM $a_{1}$ term
- $H Z \gamma$ coupling must also be suppressed (would see on-shell $H \rightarrow \mathrm{Z} \gamma \rightarrow \ell^{+} \ell^{-} \gamma$ otherwise)
$\Longrightarrow$ Substantial fine tuning needed
$\Longrightarrow$ Loop induced HWW and HZZ couplings, i.e. $a_{2}$ or $a_{3}$ couplings as primary origin of observed $H \rightarrow W W$ and $H \rightarrow$ ZZ decays are highly unlikely


## Conclusions

- Vector boson fusion and vector boson scattering are important processes which will give valuable information on EW symmetry breaking in run II of the LHC and beyond
- NLO QCD corrections are now known for these signal processes but also for the dominant $V V j j$ QCD backgrounds
- Effective Lagrangians and anomalous couplings are again emerging as extremely useful tools to parameterize our knowledge of Higgs couplings and vector boson scattering

Thank you, Kaoru, for many years of delightful collaboration on many of these topics

Backup

## Vector boson scattering

The $m_{h} \approx 125 \mathrm{GeV}$ Higgs will unitarize $V V \rightarrow V V$ scattering provided it has $\mathrm{SM} h V V$ couplings
$\Longrightarrow$ Check this by either

- precise measurements of the $h V V$ couplings at the light Higgs resonance
- measurement of $V V \rightarrow V V$ differential cross sections at high $p_{T}$ and invariant mass

Full $q q \rightarrow q q V V$ with $V V$ leptonic and semileptonic decay is implemented in VBFNLO with NLO QCD corrections and large set of dimension 6 and 8 terms in the effective Lagrangian

## Going beyond dimension 6

Reason for dimension 8 operators like

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_{S, 0} & =\left[\left(D_{\mu} \Phi\right)^{\dagger} D_{\nu} \Phi\right] \times\left[\left(D^{\mu} \Phi\right)^{\dagger} D^{\gamma} \Phi\right] \\
\mathcal{L}_{M, 1} & =\operatorname{Tr}\left[\hat{W}_{\mu \nu} \hat{W}^{\nu \beta}\right] \times\left[\left(D_{\beta} \Phi\right)^{\dagger} D^{\mu} \Phi\right] \\
\mathcal{L}_{T, 1} & =\operatorname{Tr}\left[\hat{W}_{\alpha \nu} \hat{W}^{\mu \beta}\right] \times \operatorname{Tr}\left[\hat{W}_{\mu \beta} \hat{W}^{\alpha \gamma}\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

- Dimension 6 operators only do not allow to parameterize $V V V V$ vertex with arbitrary helicities of the four gauge bosons

For example: $\mathcal{L}_{S, 0}$ is needed to describe $V_{L} V_{L} \rightarrow V_{L} V_{L}$ scattering

- New physics may appear at 1-loop level for dimension 6 operators but at tree level for some dimension 8 operators


## $V V \rightarrow W^{+} W^{-}$with dimension 8 operators

Effect of $\mathcal{L}_{e f f}=\frac{f_{M, 1}}{\Lambda^{4}} \operatorname{Tr}\left[\hat{W}_{\alpha \nu} \hat{W}^{\mu \beta}\right] \times \operatorname{Tr}\left[\hat{W}_{\mu \beta} \hat{W}^{\alpha \nu}\right]$
with $T_{1}=\frac{f_{M, 1}}{\Lambda^{4}}$ constant on $p p \rightarrow W^{+} W^{-} j j \rightarrow e^{+} v_{e} \mu^{-} \bar{v}_{\mu} j j$


- Small increase in cross section at high WW invariant mass??


## $V V \rightarrow W^{+} W^{-}$with dimension 8 operators

Effect of constant $T_{1}=\frac{f_{M, 1}}{\Lambda^{4}}$ on $p p \rightarrow W^{+} W^{-} j j \rightarrow e^{+} v_{e} \mu^{-} \bar{v}_{\mu} j j$


- Huge increase in cross section at high $m_{W W}$ is completely unphysical
- Need form factor for analysis or some other unitarization procedure

