Heavy scalar decay to top pairs at NLO in the EFT

Eleni Vryonidou Nikhef in collaboration with D. Franzosi and C. Zhang



LHCTheory Meeting Louvain la neuve 22/3/2016

New physics in top pair production

No new light states

SMEFT: Dimension-6 operators

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{Eff}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{SM}} + \sum_{i} \frac{C_i^{(6)} O_i^{(6)}}{\Lambda^2} + \mathcal{O}(\Lambda^{-4})$$



Typically deviations in the mtt tails

New particles: Top resonances A wide range of possibilities

- Spin 0 colour singlet
 - SUSY, 2HDM
- Spin 0 colour octet
 - MFV models
- Spin 1 colour singlet
 - Z'
- Spin 1 colour octet
 - KK gluons, colorons, axigluons
- Spin 2 colour singlet
 - Gravitons

LHC searches for resonances



Scalar resonances in tt



Line-shapes





Precise description of the line shapes

- Interference: crucial for a realistic description of the line shape (in particular for a gluon initiated scalar resonance)
- Experiments moving towards including this interference: optimised experimental strategies beyond Breit-Wigner ATLAS-CONF-2016-073
- Need for precise predictions:
 - Background: NNLO Czakon, Mitov et al arXiv:1601.05375, 1606.03350
 - Signal: NLO (higgs production and decay into heavy quarks)
 - Interference: LO + NLO approximation
 K-factor approximation: Hespel, Maltoni, EV arXiv:1606.04149
 Soft-gluon approximation: Bernreuther et al. arXiv:1511.0558

Interference beyond LO

\$0000000

Non-factorisable corrections

0000



Very hard multi-scale integrals

- Vanishing for Signal@NLO
- Relevant for interference

What if a heavy quark runs in the loop? EFT limit



2-loop becomes 1-loop

$gg \to H(A) \to t\bar{t}$ in the EFT



Exact for heavy VLQ running in the loop

$$O_{HG} = g_s^2 G^A_{\mu\nu} G^{A\mu\nu} H \quad \text{and/or} \quad O_{A\tilde{G}} = g_s^2 G^A_{\mu\nu} \tilde{G}^{A\mu\nu} A$$

Operator coefficient can be matched to UV theory



For a VLQ coupling to a scalar $L_{Yuk} = y_F \bar{F}FH + \tilde{y}_F F i \gamma^5 FA$

$gg \to H(A) \to t\bar{t}$ at NLO in the EFT Effective Lagrangian $L_{Eff} = L_{SM} + y_t \bar{t}t H + \tilde{y}_t \bar{t}i\gamma^5 tA + \frac{C_{HG}}{\Lambda}O_{HG} + \frac{C_{A\tilde{G}}}{\Lambda}O_{A\tilde{G}}$ Not renormalisable on its own UV divergent diagrams At NLO O_{HG} mixes into $O_{tG} = g_s y_t \bar{t} \sigma^{\mu\nu} T^A t G^A_{\mu\nu}$ Needs to be added to the theory $C_{tG} \to C_{tG}^{(0)} = Z_{tG,i}C_i$ $Z_{tG,HG} = -\frac{\alpha_s}{2\pi} \epsilon_{UV}^{-1}$ to cancel the UV poles



Matching (two-loop ggH and Barr-Zee) Running: RG equations Alonso et al. arxiv:1312.2014 10

NLO implementation

After matching: a NLO EFT calculation in MG5_aMC@NLO: Similar implementation to:

- top pair production: Franzosi and Zhang (arxiv:1503.08841)
- single top production: C. Zhang (arxiv:1601.06163)
- ttZ/γ, gg>HZ: O. Bylund, F. Maltoni, I. Tsinikos, EV, C. Zhang (arXiv: 1601.08193)
- ttH, H, Hj, HH: F. Maltoni, EV, C. Zhang (arXiv:1607.05330)



Results: Fixed order



Matching to the PS: subtleties

- Resonance information in the event record: Shower instructed to preserve the reconstructed resonance mass
- Different shower evolution depending on the information in the event file even for the same final state kinematics
- The choice is an arbitrary one
- Procedure to determine whether information is recorded in MG5_aMC@NLO: Frederix et al 1603.01178
 - based on integration channel: Feynman diagram-based
 - for an s-channel resonance information written if $|m_{\beta}^{\text{rec}} m_{\beta}| < x_{\text{cut}}\Gamma_{\beta}$
 - Relevant information passed to MC counterterms

Matching to the PS (1)



- Is there a meaningful way to compute the interference independently of c?
- In the context of EFT typically deviations are small
- Computation gives B+cI+c²S
- To extract the interference use optimal c (plus/minus) and then rescale, but c is not an overall rescaling due to the shower

In this case we need to ensure our use of optimal c choice does not change the line shape



Is this even possible?

Matching to the PS (2)



- How big is the difference between background (no resonance recorded) and signal-like showering (always recorded)? This can be large. Is this expected?
- Different behaviour at LO and NLO.
- Check for consistency and code modifications

Top-loop induced scenarios: 2HDM



| | Type | aneta | $\sin(\beta - \alpha)$ | m_H | m_A |
|----|------|-------|------------------------|-------|-------|
| B1 | Ι | 2.0 | 1.0 | 300 | 450 |
| B2 | II | 0.9 | 1.0 | 450 | 600 |

One or two resonances depending on masses

How bad is the EFT in this case?



Exact and EFT: phase difference

Top-loop induced scenarios: 2HDM



| | Type | aneta | $\sin(\beta - \alpha)$ | m_H | m_A |
|----|------|-------|------------------------|-------|-------|
| B1 | Ι | 2.0 | 1.0 | 300 | 450 |
| B2 | II | 0.9 | 1.0 | 450 | 600 |

One or two resonances depending on masses

How bad is the EFT in this case?



Exact and EFT: phase difference \rightarrow Introducing a phase

$$c'_{HG} = c_{HG} \cdot (a + bi) \quad _{16}$$

Results for the 2HDM

- Can we obtain results beyond LO?
- Use Born reweighting at NLO using the ratio $\mathcal{B}_{FT}/\mathcal{B}_{HEFT}$ on an event-by-event basis (known to work well for single Higgs-even heavy mass)
- Use phase-improved EFT to avoid infinities?



Preliminary

Conclusions-Outlook

- Top-anti-top resonances: an interesting possibility in various BSM scenarios
- Experimental searches demand a good theoretical description for the signal, background and interference
- Interference computed for the first time at NLO in QCD in the EFT limit (heavy quark in loop), taking into account all relevant operators
- Scenarios with dominant top-loop contributions can be possibly improved by reweighting
- Subtleties related to treatment of resonances in the parton shower to be further investigated