

One-Loop Phenomenology in the SM EFT

Lampros Trifyllis

Section of Theoretical Physics
University of Ioannina



HEP 2021 – 38th Conference on Recent Developments
in High Energy Physics and Cosmology

17 June 2021, Thessaloniki, Greece

Outline

- 1 Introduction & Motivation
- 2 Renormalisation scheme in SMEFT
- 3 Phenomenology in SMEFT
- 4 Summary

Publications

Collaborators: A. Dedes, J. Rosiek, M. Paraskevas, K. Suxho

- *The decay $h \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ in SMEFT*, AD, MP, JR, KS, LT
JHEP **08** (2018) 103 [arXiv:1805.00302[hep-ph]]
- *The decay $h \rightarrow Z\gamma$ in SMEFT*, AD, KS, LT
JHEP **06** (2019) 115 [arXiv:1903.12046[hep-ph]]
- *smeftFR – Feynman rules generator for the SMEFT*, AD, MP, JR, KS, LT
Comput.Phys.Commun. **247** (2020) 106931 [arXiv:1904.03204[hep-ph]]

Why use Effective (Field) Theories?

- Separation of scales
- Each theory is an **effective** theory
- Calculate **measurable** quantities without **UV** input
- **Systematically** reduce theoretical error

For a review: Manohar, arXiv:1804.05863[hep-ph]

■ Categorising operators

Dimensionality	Renormalisation	Relevance
$D < d$	super-renormalisable	relevant
$D = d$	renormalisable	marginal
$D > d$	non-renormalisable	irrelevant

d : dimensionality of spacetime

D : dimensionality of operator

■ An EFT is a QFT with a power counting formula

E.g. $\delta = p/\Lambda$, where Λ is a UV scale

- Approaching the cut-off makes the EFT lose its predictive power
- Renormalisation works perfectly fine inside the EFT validity region in a truncated EFT
- Effective operators are suppressed, not wrong

SM is a phenomenologically successful theory for the EW (and strong) interactions

- Renormalisable, quantum gauge field theory
- Clearly *not* the Theory of Everything but an effective theory
- The most general SM EFT Lagrangian can be written as

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{SMEFT}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{SM}} + \sum_{p=1}^{\infty} \sum_i \frac{c_{p,i}}{\Lambda^p} Q_i^{(4+p)}$$

where Λ is the energy scale of the UV theory, and $c_{p,i}$ s are the Wilson coefficients of the effective operators

- The SM is a limiting case of the SMEFT ($\Lambda \rightarrow \infty$)

A non-redundant set of dim-6 SMEFT is the “Warsaw basis”.¹

X^3		φ^6 and $\varphi^4 D^2$		$\psi^2 \varphi^3$	
Q_G	$f^{ABC} G_\mu^{Av} G_\nu^{B\rho} G_\rho^{C\mu}$	Q_φ	$(\varphi^\dagger \varphi)^3$	$Q_{e\varphi}$	$(\varphi^\dagger \varphi)(\bar{l}_p e_r \varphi)$
$Q_{\tilde{G}}$	$f^{ABC} \tilde{G}_\mu^{Av} G_\nu^{B\rho} G_\rho^{C\mu}$	$Q_{\varphi\Box}$	$(\varphi^\dagger \varphi)\Box(\varphi^\dagger \varphi)$	$Q_{u\varphi}$	$(\varphi^\dagger \varphi)(\bar{q}_p u_r \tilde{\varphi})$
Q_W	$\epsilon^{IJK} W_\mu^{I\nu} W_\nu^{J\rho} W_\rho^{K\mu}$	$Q_{\varphi D}$	$(\varphi^\dagger D^\mu \varphi)^* (\varphi^\dagger D_\mu \varphi)$	$Q_{d\varphi}$	$(\varphi^\dagger \varphi)(\bar{q}_p d_r \varphi)$
$Q_{\tilde{W}}$	$\epsilon^{IJK} \tilde{W}_\mu^{I\nu} W_\nu^{J\rho} W_\rho^{K\mu}$				
$X^2 \varphi^2$		$\psi^2 X \varphi$		$\psi^2 \varphi^2 D$	
$Q_{\varphi G}$	$\varphi^\dagger \varphi G_{\mu\nu}^A G^{A\mu\nu}$	Q_{eW}	$(\bar{l}_p \sigma^{\mu\nu} e_r) \tau^I \varphi W_{\mu\nu}^I$	$Q_{\varphi l}^{(1)}$	$i(\varphi^\dagger \overleftrightarrow{D}_\mu \varphi)(\bar{l}_p \gamma^\mu l_r)$
$Q_{\varphi \tilde{G}}$	$\varphi^\dagger \varphi \tilde{G}_{\mu\nu}^A G^{A\mu\nu}$	Q_{eB}	$(\bar{l}_p \sigma^{\mu\nu} e_r) \varphi B_{\mu\nu}$	$Q_{\varphi l}^{(3)}$	$i(\varphi^\dagger \overleftrightarrow{D}_\mu^I \varphi)(\bar{l}_p \tau^I \gamma^\mu l_r)$
$Q_{\varphi W}$	$\varphi^\dagger \varphi W_{\mu\nu}^I W^{I\mu\nu}$	Q_{uG}	$(\bar{q}_p \sigma^{\mu\nu} T^A u_r) \tilde{\varphi} G_{\mu\nu}^A$	$Q_{\varphi e}$	$i(\varphi^\dagger \overleftrightarrow{D}_\mu \varphi)(\bar{e}_p \gamma^\mu e_r)$
$Q_{\varphi \tilde{W}}$	$\varphi^\dagger \varphi \tilde{W}_{\mu\nu}^I W^{I\mu\nu}$	Q_{uW}	$(\bar{q}_p \sigma^{\mu\nu} u_r) \tau^I \tilde{\varphi} W_{\mu\nu}^I$	$Q_{\varphi q}^{(1)}$	$i(\varphi^\dagger \overleftrightarrow{D}_\mu \varphi)(\bar{q}_p \gamma^\mu q_r)$
$Q_{\varphi B}$	$\varphi^\dagger \varphi B_{\mu\nu} B^{\mu\nu}$	Q_{uB}	$(\bar{q}_p \sigma^{\mu\nu} u_r) \tilde{\varphi} B_{\mu\nu}$	$Q_{\varphi q}^{(3)}$	$i(\varphi^\dagger \overleftrightarrow{D}_\mu^I \varphi)(\bar{q}_p \tau^I \gamma^\mu q_r)$
$Q_{\varphi \tilde{B}}$	$\varphi^\dagger \varphi \tilde{B}_{\mu\nu} B^{\mu\nu}$	Q_{dG}	$(\bar{q}_p \sigma^{\mu\nu} T^A d_r) \varphi G_{\mu\nu}^A$	$Q_{\varphi u}$	$i(\varphi^\dagger \overleftrightarrow{D}_\mu \varphi)(\bar{u}_p \gamma^\mu u_r)$
$Q_{\varphi WB}$	$\varphi^\dagger \tau^I \varphi W_{\mu\nu}^I B^{\mu\nu}$	Q_{dW}	$(\bar{q}_p \sigma^{\mu\nu} d_r) \tau^I \varphi W_{\mu\nu}^I$	$Q_{\varphi d}$	$i(\varphi^\dagger \overleftrightarrow{D}_\mu \varphi)(\bar{d}_p \gamma^\mu d_r)$
$Q_{\varphi \tilde{W}B}$	$\varphi^\dagger \tau^I \varphi \tilde{W}_{\mu\nu}^I B^{\mu\nu}$	Q_{dB}	$(\bar{q}_p \sigma^{\mu\nu} d_r) \varphi B_{\mu\nu}$	$Q_{\varphi ud}$	$i(\varphi^\dagger D_\mu \varphi)(\bar{u}_p \gamma^\mu d_r)$

The full set of **Feynman Rules** for dim-6 SMEFT in linear R_ξ -gauges has been produced using version 1.0 of **SmeftFR**.²

¹B. Grzadkowski, M. Iskrzynski, M. Misiak, J. Rosiek [arXiv:1008.4884]

²A. Dedes, W. Materkowska, M. Paraskevas, J. Rosiek, K. Suxho [arXiv:1704.03888]

- Prior to our work:

$h \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$: C. Hartmann and M. Trott [arXiv:1507.03568; 1505.02646]

$h \rightarrow Z\gamma$: S. Dawson and P.P. Giardino [arXiv:1801.01136]

- Features of our work

- Use of linear R_ξ -gauges
- Analytic proof of gauge invariance
- Simple renormalisation framework
- Analytical and semi-numerical expressions for $\delta\mathcal{R}_{h \rightarrow \gamma\gamma, Z\gamma}$
- Bounds on Wilson coefficients

Calculating the decays $h \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ and $h \rightarrow Z\gamma$

- We choose a hybrid renormalisation scheme
 - On-shell renormalisation for the SM-like couplings³
 - \overline{MS} renormalisation for the Wilson coefficients⁴
- The decays $h \rightarrow \gamma\gamma, Z\gamma$, are loop-generated in the SM
- SM renormalisation conditions for the SM-like couplings

³Following A. Sirlin (1980)

⁴R. Alonso, E.E. Jenkins, A.V. Manohar, M. Trott, arXiv:1308.2627; 1310.4838; 1312.2014

On-shell S -matrix element for $h \rightarrow Z\gamma$ reads

$$\langle \gamma(\epsilon^\mu, p_1), Z(\epsilon^\nu, p_2) | S | h(q) \rangle = \sqrt{Z_h} \sqrt{Z_\gamma} \sqrt{Z_Z} [i\mathcal{A}^{\mu\nu}(h \rightarrow Z\gamma)] \epsilon_\mu^*(p_1) \epsilon_\nu^*(p_2)$$

where the amplitude is

$$i\mathcal{A}^{\mu\nu}(h \rightarrow Z\gamma) \epsilon_\mu^*(p_1) \epsilon_\nu^*(p_2) =$$

The diagrams represent the following terms:

- Tree-level diagram: h (dashed) enters from the left, hits a black square vertex, and splits into γ (wavy) and Z (wavy).
- Loop diagrams (rows 2 and 3): h (dashed) enters from the left, hits a vertex, and splits into γ and Z (wavy). The vertex is part of a loop with either a grey circle (row 2) or a white circle with an X (row 3).

- We renormalise couplings, not fields
- Renormalisation conditions
 - Cancellation of tadpoles, $\delta m_V^2 = \text{Re } A_{VV}(M_V^2)$, etc
- Splitting the counterterms

$$\text{---} \otimes \text{---} \equiv \text{---} \otimes \text{---} \Big|_{\Delta} + \text{---} \otimes \text{---} \Big|_g$$

where $\Delta^{\mu\nu}(p_1, p_2) = p_1^\nu p_2^\mu - (p_1 \cdot p_2)g^{\mu\nu}$, we find

$$\text{---} \otimes \text{---} \Big|_g + \text{---} \otimes \text{---} \Big|_g = 0$$

- Interesting cancelations (even in the SM)

Deviations from the SM

$$\mathcal{R}_\chi = \frac{\Gamma(\text{BSM}, \chi)}{\Gamma(\text{SM}, \chi)} = 1 + \delta\mathcal{R}_\chi$$

$$\chi = h \rightarrow \gamma\gamma, h \rightarrow Z\gamma$$

Assuming that operators affecting $h \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$, $Z\gamma$ decays do *not* affect $\sigma(pp \rightarrow h)$ and $\Gamma_{tot}(h)$, then

$$\text{ATLAS:} \quad \mathcal{R}_{h \rightarrow \gamma\gamma} = 0.99_{-0.14}^{+0.15}$$

$$\text{CMS:} \quad \mathcal{R}_{h \rightarrow \gamma\gamma} = 1.18_{-0.14}^{+0.17}$$

$$\text{LHC:} \quad \mathcal{R}_{h \rightarrow Z\gamma} \lesssim 6.6$$

$$\begin{aligned}\delta\mathcal{R}_{h\rightarrow\gamma\gamma} = & - \left[48.04 - 1.07 \log \frac{\mu^2}{M_W^2} \right] \frac{C^{\varphi B}(\mu)}{\Lambda^2} \\ & - \left[14.29 - 0.12 \log \frac{\mu^2}{M_W^2} \right] \frac{C^{\varphi W}(\mu)}{\Lambda^2} \\ & + \left[26.17 - 0.52 \log \frac{\mu^2}{M_W^2} \right] \frac{C^{\varphi WB}(\mu)}{\Lambda^2} \\ & + \left[2.11 - 0.84 \log \frac{\mu^2}{M_W^2} \right] \frac{C_{33}^{uB}(\mu)}{\Lambda^2} \\ & + \left[1.13 - 0.45 \log \frac{\mu^2}{M_W^2} \right] \frac{C_{33}^{uW}(\mu)}{\Lambda^2} \\ & + \dots\end{aligned}$$

Λ is in TeV units and μ is the renormalization scale parameter

- Bounds on C 's from $\delta\mathcal{R}_{h \rightarrow \gamma\gamma} \lesssim 15\%$ for $\mu = M_W$

$$\frac{|C^{\varphi B}|}{\Lambda^2} \lesssim \frac{0.003}{(1 \text{ TeV})^2},$$

$$\frac{|C^{\varphi W}|}{\Lambda^2} \lesssim \frac{0.011}{(1 \text{ TeV})^2},$$

$$\frac{|C_{33}^{ruB}|}{\Lambda^2} \lesssim \frac{0.071}{(1 \text{ TeV})^2},$$

$$\frac{|C_{33}^{ruW}|}{\Lambda^2} \lesssim \frac{0.133}{(1 \text{ TeV})^2}.$$

$$\frac{|C^{\varphi WB}|}{\Lambda^2} \lesssim \frac{0.006}{(1 \text{ TeV})^2},$$

- Bounds for $C^{\varphi WB}$ comparable to the EW ones
- Bounds onto all other Wilsons from $h \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ are an order of magnitude stronger than other observables (e.g., top-quark)

$$\begin{aligned}\delta\mathcal{R}_{h\rightarrow Z\gamma} = & - \left[14.88 - 0.15 \log \frac{\mu^2}{M_W^2} \right] \frac{C^{\varphi W}(\mu)}{\Lambda^2} \\ & + \left[14.99 - 0.35 \log \frac{\mu^2}{M_W^2} \right] \frac{C^{\varphi B}(\mu)}{\Lambda^2} \\ & + \left[9.44 - 0.26 \log \frac{\mu^2}{M_W^2} \right] \frac{C^{\varphi WB}(\mu)}{\Lambda^2} \\ & + \dots\end{aligned}$$

Λ is in TeV units and μ is the renormalization scale parameter

- Weaker bounds than $h \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$
- 23 operators (17 common with $h \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$)
- New operators affect ratio $< 1\%$, but are Potentially Tree-Generated: Disentangle new physics models

Using our result for $h \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ and $h \rightarrow Z\gamma$ at one-loop and the tree-level result for the ΔS parameter we perform a principal component analysis⁵

Theoretical inputs: $\mu = m_W$, $\Lambda = 1\text{TeV}$

$$\begin{aligned}\delta R_{h \rightarrow \gamma\gamma} &= -48.04 C^{\varphi B} - 14.29 C^{\varphi W} + 26.17 C^{\varphi WB}, \\ \delta R_{h \rightarrow Z\gamma} &= +14.99 C^{\varphi B} - 14.88 C^{\varphi W} + 9.44 C^{\varphi WB}, \\ \Delta S &= 13.35 C^{\varphi WB}\end{aligned}$$

Experiment: $O_{exp} = (1.10, 2.05, 0.02) \pm (0.10, 0.95, 0.10)$

Best fit Wilsons:

$$\begin{aligned}C^{\varphi B} &= 0.015 \pm 0.030 \\ C^{\varphi W} &= -0.055 \pm 0.100 \\ C^{\varphi WB} &= 0.001 \pm 0.015\end{aligned}$$

⁵K.Mantzaropoulos, LT

We present

- The EFT approach to physics Beyond the SM
- Higgs decays in the SMEFT
- Renormalisation procedure for SMEFT calculations
- Analytic calculation of observables in SMEFT

Future Plans

- EW precision data
- Extend renormalisation scheme
- ...



The research work was supported by the Hellenic Foundation for Research and Innovation (HFRI) under the HFRI PhD Fellowship grant (Fellowship Number: 1588.).

Thank you!