Karlsruher Institut für Technologie

# Theory of quartic gauge-boson couplings in VBS

**Dieter Zeppenfeld (KIT)**

KIT Center Elementary Particle and Astroparticle Physics - KCETA

# VBS and anomalous quartic gauge couplings (aQGC)




VBS provides rich source of information on dynamics of electroweak gauge bosons and EW symmetry breaking

Signature is VVjj final state with well separated tagging jets: simulate with VBFNLO




Contributions from
- EW radiation
- Higgs exchange

- Triple gauge couplings
- Quartic gauge couplings

Use EFT to describe them

# EFT operators for VBS

$$\mathcal{L}_{EFT} = \sum_{d=6}^{\infty} \sum_i \frac{f_i^{(d)}}{\Lambda^{d-4}} O_i^{(d)} = \sum_i \frac{f_i^{(6)}}{\Lambda^2} O_i^{(6)} + \sum_i \frac{f_i^{(8)}}{\Lambda^4} O_i^{(8)} + \ldots$$

$$= \frac{f_{WWW}}{\Lambda^2} \mathrm{Tr}\left(\hat{W}^{\mu}{}_{\nu}\, \hat{W}^{\nu}{}_{\rho}\, \hat{W}^{\rho}{}_{\mu}\right) + \ldots$$

$$+ \frac{f_{T_0}}{\Lambda^4} \mathrm{Tr}\left(\hat{W}^{\mu\nu}\, \hat{W}_{\mu\nu}\right) \mathrm{Tr}\left(\hat{W}^{\alpha\beta}\, \hat{W}_{\alpha\beta}\right) + \ldots$$

$$+ \frac{f_{M_0}}{\Lambda^4} \mathrm{Tr}\left[\hat{W}_{\mu\nu}\, \hat{W}^{\mu\nu}\right] \times \left[(D_\beta \Phi)^\dagger\, D^\beta \Phi\right] + \ldots$$

$$+ \frac{f_{S_0}}{\Lambda^4} \left[(D_\mu \Phi)^\dagger\, D_\nu \Phi\right] \times \left[(D^\mu \Phi)^\dagger\, D^\nu \Phi\right] + \ldots.$$

Extensively used tool for describing BSM effects in vector boson scattering….
Problem: unitarity violation within LHC energy range

# Example: dim-8 effects with/out unitarization

$$qq \to W^+Zjj \to l^+l^-l^+\nu_l jj,$$




EFT for S0 operator (simulated with VBFNLO)

Tu-model unitarization applied to WZ→WZ matrix elements (see arXiv 1807.02707 for details)

# Many open questions

- How realistic is EFT description (with or without unitarization) as a function of energy ($m_{VV}$)?
- What is the validity range of the EFT?
- Relations between Wilson coefficients
- What experimental strategy is most promising to discover BSM effects in VBS (as opposed to merely setting limits)
- Can VBS be first place to see BSM physics?

## Study EFT as approximation to a UV complete model

- arXiv 2103.16517 (with Lang, Liebler, Schäfer-Siebert) considers transverse operators as simplest case: dimension 6 and 8 operators which contain SU(2) field strength, no Higgs couplings
- Field strength tensor naturally (and only) generated at loop level: Need loops of extra fields with SU(2) charges ($U(1)_Y$ neglected for simplicity)
- UV complete model must be renormalizable and should be perturbatively treatable
- At our disposal: gauge theory with extra scalars, fermions, and gauge fields

# The model(s)

- $n_R$ SU(2) multiplets of isospin $J_R$ of scalars (R=S) or Dirac fermions (R=F) with their SU(2) gauge interactions (no hypercharge couplings)

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2}(\partial_\mu H)^2 - \frac{m_H^2}{2}H^2 - \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Tr}\left(\hat{W}^{\mu\nu}\hat{W}_{\mu\nu}\right) + \frac{m_W^2}{2}\left(\sum_{a=1}^{3} W_\mu^a W^{a\mu}\right)\left(1+\frac{H}{v}\right)^2$$
$$+ \bar{\Psi}\left(i\gamma_\mu D^\mu - M_F\right)\Psi + (D^\mu\Phi)^\dagger(D_\mu\Phi) - {M_S}^2\Phi^\dagger\Phi\,.$$

- Yukawa couplings of fermions to Higgs doublet absent if no fermion multiplets with $J_F$ ±½ are present
- Yields *natural dark matter models* for $J_R \geq 2$
- Very small splitting induced by SU(2)xU(1) breaking in SM (order 160 MeV to few GeV)
- Pair production at LHC hard to detect due to tiny phase space for β-decay
- Refinements like extra (confining) gauge interactions, several multiplets, hypercharge contributions keep our results as LO approximation
  → very generic class of models

# Matching of 1-loop results to EFT operators with field strength tensors



Massive BSM matter fields in isospin $J_R$ multiplets induce EFT operators like

$$O_{WWW} = \mathrm{Tr}\left(\hat{W}^{\mu}{}_{\nu}\hat{W}^{\nu}{}_{\rho}\hat{W}^{\rho}{}_{\mu}\right),$$

$$O_{DW} = \mathrm{Tr}\left([\hat{D}_{\alpha},\hat{W}^{\mu\nu}][\hat{D}^{\alpha},\hat{W}_{\mu\nu}]\right)$$

$$\sim T_R = \tfrac{1}{3}\left[J_R(J_R+1)(2J_R+1)\right]$$



and also anomalous quartic gauge couplings (aQGC), like

$$O_{T_0} = \mathrm{Tr}\left(\hat{W}^{\mu\nu}\hat{W}_{\mu\nu}\right)\mathrm{Tr}\left(\hat{W}^{\alpha\beta}\hat{W}_{\alpha\beta}\right)$$

$$O_{T_1} = \mathrm{Tr}\left(\hat{W}^{\mu\nu}\hat{W}_{\alpha\beta}\right)\mathrm{Tr}\left(\hat{W}^{\alpha\beta}\hat{W}_{\mu\nu}\right)$$

$$O_{T_2} = \mathrm{Tr}\left(\hat{W}^{\mu\nu}\hat{W}_{\nu\alpha}\right)\mathrm{Tr}\left(\hat{W}^{\alpha\beta}\hat{W}_{\beta\mu}\right)$$

$$O_{T_3} = \mathrm{Tr}\left(\hat{W}^{\mu\nu}\hat{W}^{\alpha\beta}\right)\mathrm{Tr}\left(\hat{W}_{\nu\alpha}\hat{W}_{\beta\mu}\right)$$

$$\sim C_{2,R}\, T_R$$

- Loop suppressed, but $(J_R)^3$ enhanced for trilinear couplings, $(J_R)^5$ for aQGC
- Find Wilson coefficients, e.g.

$$\frac{f_{WWW}}{\Lambda^2} = \sum_F n_F \frac{13 T_F}{360\pi^2 M_F^2} + \sum_S n_S \frac{T_S}{360\pi^2 M_S^2}$$

$$\frac{f_{T_1}}{\Lambda^4} = \sum_F n_F \frac{(-28C_{2,F}+13)\,T_F}{10080\pi^2 M_F^4} + \sum_S n_S \frac{(14C_{2,S}-5)\,T_S}{40320\pi^2 M_S^4}$$

# Unitarity considerations limit size of isospin representations

- At large $J_R$, model becomes non-perturbative




- Energy dependence of dominant partial wave amplitude




Consider $J_F \leq 4$ and $J_S \leq 6$ as range of perturbative domain

# Constraints from experiment:







limits on individual Wilson coefficients:

No serious competition to VBS from aTGC Measurements in VV production

(Assume wide EFT validity range)

Deviation in Drell-Yan cross section, normalized to SM expectation (1- and 2-σ error bands adapted from CMS: arXiv:2103.02708 )






## Parameter choices:

- Use fermion model with $J_F = 4$ and $M_F = 600$ GeV
  or scalar model with $J_S = 6$ and $M_S = 600$ GeV
  for illustration from here on

- Parameter choices are optimistic for sake of sizable VBS signals

- $J_F \leq 3$ better accomodates Drell-Yan constraints
- $J_S \leq 5$ better fits in the perturbative domain (as estimated from unitarity)
- Qualitative results, below, do not depend on this

# Comparison for LHC: full model – EFT – unitarized EFT







- Bad news: Violent disagreement between full model and EFT approximation
- Good news: Sizable effects are possible at modest invariant mass

- Disclaimer: VBFNLO implementation is so far approximate, based on on-shell VV→ VV amplitudes

# EFT validity range







- EFT is valid only well below threshold at $2M_S$ =1200 GeV (as expected)
- Deviations from SM barely reach 10% within EFT validity range, even for $J_S$= 6
- Because of $J_R^5$ vs $J_R^3$ growth, dim-8 terms are much more important than dim-6

# Conclusions

- There are many UV-complete models which generate EFT operators with field strength tensors at low energy
- They require existence of extra SU(2) scalar or fermion multiplets which generate these EFT operators via 1-loop contributions
- Sizable effects in VBS require very high multiplicity of BSM fields, like SU(2) nonets (quintets may do): rarely expected in BSM models
- Model is generic: existence of additional SU(2) multiplets in loops is also necessary condition for EFT operators with W field strength
- Further complexity does not change basic result, e.g.

- Additional confining gauge interaction of multiplets averages out (analogous to quark-hadron duality in QCD)
- Perturbative coupling of two multiplets to Higgs doublet field generates modest multiplet splitting (suppressed by $(v/M_R)^2$ ) which smears out threshold structure

# Conclusions continued…

- VBS signal is most dramatic close to threshold, not at highest energy => do not concentrate efforts on highest energy bin

- VBS is competitive with other searches for this type of model:
- Qq →VV is not as sensitive due to mere $J_R^3$ growth and cancellations
- Direct search for the extra multiplets is hampered by compressed spectra
- Drell-Yan process is most likely competitor

- EFT as tool for describing BSM effects is of only limited use in describing processes with vast dynamic range such as VBS at the LHC ➔ use models discussed here as alternative benchmark for VBS studies

# Backup

# Dim-6 and dim-8 operators needed for matching of hypercharge Y=0 multiplets

- Dim-6

$$O_{WWW} = \mathrm{Tr}\left(\hat{W}^{\mu}{}_{\nu}\hat{W}^{\nu}{}_{\rho}\hat{W}^{\rho}{}_{\mu}\right), \qquad \text{aTGC …}$$

$$O_{DW} = \mathrm{Tr}\left([\hat{D}_{\alpha},\hat{W}^{\mu\nu}][\hat{D}^{\alpha},\hat{W}_{\mu\nu}]\right) \qquad \text{Propagator correction …}$$

- Dim-8

$$O_{T_0} = \mathrm{Tr}\left(\hat{W}^{\mu\nu}\hat{W}_{\mu\nu}\right)\mathrm{Tr}\left(\hat{W}^{\alpha\beta}\hat{W}_{\alpha\beta}\right)$$

$$O_{T_1} = \mathrm{Tr}\left(\hat{W}^{\mu\nu}\hat{W}_{\alpha\beta}\right)\mathrm{Tr}\left(\hat{W}^{\alpha\beta}\hat{W}_{\mu\nu}\right)$$

$$O_{T_2} = \mathrm{Tr}\left(\hat{W}^{\mu\nu}\hat{W}_{\nu\alpha}\right)\mathrm{Tr}\left(\hat{W}^{\alpha\beta}\hat{W}_{\beta\mu}\right) \qquad \text{aQGC …}$$

$$O_{T_3} = \mathrm{Tr}\left(\hat{W}^{\mu\nu}\hat{W}^{\alpha\beta}\right)\mathrm{Tr}\left(\hat{W}_{\nu\alpha}\hat{W}_{\beta\mu}\right)$$

$$O_{DWWW_0} = \mathrm{Tr}\left([\hat{D}_{\alpha},\hat{W}^{\mu}{}_{\nu}][\hat{D}^{\alpha},\hat{W}^{\nu}{}_{\rho}]\hat{W}^{\rho}{}_{\mu}\right)$$

$$O_{DWWW_1} = \mathrm{Tr}\left([\hat{D}_{\alpha},\hat{W}^{\mu\nu}][\hat{D}_{\beta},\hat{W}_{\mu\nu}]\hat{W}^{\alpha\beta}\right) \qquad \text{aTGC …}$$

$$O_{D2W} = \mathrm{Tr}\left([\hat{D}_{\alpha},[\hat{D}^{\alpha},\hat{W}^{\mu\nu}]][\hat{D}_{\beta},[\hat{D}^{\beta},\hat{W}_{\mu\nu}]]\right) \qquad \text{Propagator correction …}$$

# Full dim6+8 EFT considered

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_{EFT} = {} & f_{WW}\mathrm{Tr}\left(\hat{W}^{\mu\nu}\hat{W}_{\mu\nu}\right) + \frac{f_{DW}}{\Lambda^2}\mathrm{Tr}\left([\hat{D}_\alpha,\hat{W}^{\mu\nu}][\hat{D}^\alpha,\hat{W}_{\mu\nu}]\right) \\
& + \frac{f_{WWW}}{\Lambda^2}\mathrm{Tr}\left(\hat{W}^{\mu}{}_{\nu}\hat{W}^{\nu}{}_{\rho}\hat{W}^{\rho}{}_{\mu}\right) + \frac{f_{D2W}}{\Lambda^4}\mathrm{Tr}\left([\hat{D}_\alpha,[\hat{D}^\alpha,\hat{W}^{\mu\nu}]][\hat{D}_\beta,[\hat{D}^\beta,\hat{W}_{\mu\nu}]]\right) \\
& + \frac{f_{DWWW_0}}{\Lambda^4}\mathrm{Tr}\left([\hat{D}_\alpha,\hat{W}^{\mu}{}_{\nu}][\hat{D}^\alpha,\hat{W}^{\nu}{}_{\rho}]\hat{W}^{\rho}{}_{\mu}\right) \\
& + \frac{f_{DWWW_1}}{\Lambda^4}\mathrm{Tr}\left([\hat{D}_\alpha,\hat{W}^{\mu\nu}][\hat{D}_\beta,\hat{W}^{\mu\nu}]\hat{W}^{\alpha\beta}\right) \\
& + \frac{f_{T_0}}{\Lambda^4}\mathrm{Tr}\left(\hat{W}^{\mu\nu}\hat{W}_{\mu\nu}\right)\mathrm{Tr}\left(\hat{W}^{\alpha\beta}\hat{W}_{\alpha\beta}\right) + \frac{f_{T_1}}{\Lambda^4}\mathrm{Tr}\left(\hat{W}^{\mu\nu}\hat{W}_{\alpha\beta}\right)\mathrm{Tr}\left(\hat{W}^{\alpha\beta}\hat{W}_{\mu\nu}\right) \\
& + \frac{f_{T_2}}{\Lambda^4}\mathrm{Tr}\left(\hat{W}^{\mu}{}_{\nu}\hat{W}^{\nu}{}_{\alpha}\right)\mathrm{Tr}\left(\hat{W}^{\alpha}{}_{\beta}\hat{W}^{\beta}{}_{\mu}\right) + \frac{f_{T_3}}{\Lambda^4}\mathrm{Tr}\left(\hat{W}^{\mu\nu}\hat{W}^{\alpha\beta}\right)\mathrm{Tr}\left(\hat{W}_{\nu\alpha}\hat{W}_{\beta\mu}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

# Wilson coefficients with $C_{2,R} = J_R(J_R+1)$ $T_R = \frac{1}{3}\left[J_R(J_R+1)(2J_R+1)\right]$

- Propagator and higher

$$\frac{f_{DW}}{\Lambda^2} = \sum_F n_F \frac{T_F}{120\pi^2 M_F^2} + \sum_S n_S \frac{T_S}{960\pi^2 M_S^2},$$

$$\frac{f_{D2W}}{\Lambda^4} = \sum_F n_F \frac{T_F}{1120\pi^2 M_F^4} + \sum_S n_S \frac{T_S}{13440\pi^2 M_S^4}$$

- aTGC and higher

$$\frac{f_{WWW}}{\Lambda^2} = \sum_F n_F \frac{13T_F}{360\pi^2 M_F^2} + \sum_S n_S \frac{T_S}{360\pi^2 M_S^2},$$

$$\frac{f_{DWWW_0}}{\Lambda^4} = \sum_F n_F \frac{2T_F}{105\pi^2 M_F^4} + \sum_S n_S \frac{T_S}{1120\pi^2 M_S^4}$$

$$\frac{f_{DWWW_1}}{\Lambda^4} = \sum_F n_F \frac{T_F}{630\pi^2 M_F^4} + \sum_S n_S \frac{T_S}{4032\pi^2 M_S^4}$$

- aQGC and higher

$$\frac{f_{T_0}}{\Lambda^4} = \sum_F n_F \frac{(-14C_{2,F}+1)\,T_F}{10080\pi^2 M_F^4} + \sum_S n_S \frac{(7C_{2,S}-2)\,T_S}{40320\pi^2 M_S^4},$$

$$\frac{f_{T_1}}{\Lambda^4} = \sum_F n_F \frac{(-28C_{2,F}+13)\,T_F}{10080\pi^2 M_F^4} + \sum_S n_S \frac{(14C_{2,S}-5)\,T_S}{40320\pi^2 M_S^4},$$

$$\frac{f_{T_2}}{\Lambda^4} = \sum_F n_F \frac{(196C_{2,F}-397)\,T_F}{25200\pi^2 M_F^4} + \sum_S n_S \frac{(14C_{2,S}-23)\,T_S}{50400\pi^2 M_S^4},$$

$$\frac{f_{T_3}}{\Lambda^4} = \sum_F n_F \frac{(98C_{2,F}+299)\,T_F}{25200\pi^2 M_F^4} + \sum_S n_S \frac{(7C_{2,S}+16)\,T_S}{50400\pi^2 M_S^4}.$$

# Constraints from experiment: limits on individual Wilson coefficients






## Constraints from experiment:

**Deviation in Drell-Yan cross section, normalized to SM expectation (1- and 2-σ error bands adapted from CMS: arXiv:2103.02708 )**






# EFT validity range for ZZ production in VBS







- EFT is valid only well below threshold at 2 $M_S$ =1200 GeV (as expected)
- Deviations from SM barely reach 10% within EFT validity range, even for $J_S$= 6
- Because of $J_R^5$ vs $J_R^3$ growth, dim-8 terms are much more important than dim-6













Onshell cross sections

# Diboson mass vs transverse mass






# Dependence on multiplet mass