

Effective Field Theory interpretations of Standard Model and Higgs measurements the ATLAS experiment

> an Kortman on behalf of the ATLAS collaboration gs 2022 Conference, 7-11 November



- **Observation** of the Higgs boson production in **Run 1**
- The experimental profile of the Higgs boson is becoming less blurry
  - Excellent precision measurements performed in Run 2
- **Run 3** ongoing!  $\rightarrow$  exciting times and results ahead
- **Combine results of seemingly very different analyses and** slight deviations from the SM in a near-model independent <u>way</u>
- (selection) recent (combined) EFT interpretations of
  - Higgs boson pair searches in  $bb\gamma\gamma$  and  $bb\tau\tau$  (ATL-PHYS-PUB-2022-019)
- **Featured** in this talk
  - EFT interpretation of HWW and SMWW measurement (<u>ATL-PHYS-PUB-202-010</u>)
  - EFT interpretation of combined single Higgs measurement (ATLAS-CONF-2021-053)

  - EFT interpretation of Higgs, EW and LEP data (<u>ATLAS-PHYS-PUB-2022-037</u>)



Combination of EW  $Z(\nu\bar{\nu})\gamma jj$  production, limits on anomalous quartic gauge couplings (arXiv:2208.12741) Flavour-changing neutral current (FCNC)  $tqH(q = u, c), H \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-$  (arXiv:2208.11415)

differential cross-sections of WW, WZ, 4I, and Z+2j production(<u>ATL-PHYS-PUB-2021-022</u>)





# Precision is key

- Precision measurements may hold the key for observing physics beyond the SM
- complete theory

$$\mathscr{L}_{SMEFT} = \mathscr{L}_{SM}^4 + \sum_{i} \frac{c_i^{(5)}}{\Lambda} \mathcal{O}_i^{(5)} +$$

- Deviations from the SM interpreted through:
  - Higher dimension **orthogonal** operators  $\mathcal{O}_i^{(d)}$ , suppressed by  $\Lambda^{(d-4)}$
  - Scaled by Wilson coefficients  $c_{\cdot}^{(d)}$
- All new operators respect symmetries of the SM  $\bullet$
- BSM scenarios show up as a **combination of**  ${\color{black}\bullet}$ operators

When interpreting them the SM may written down as a low-energy approximation or EFT to an UV



# SMEFT interpretations of ATLAS measurements

- A popular EFT model for interpretations is the SMEFT
- Multiple orthogonal basis available for interpretation e.g. the <u>SILH</u> or the <u>Warsaw</u> basis
- EFT operators affect
  - Input parameters:
  - $\Delta G_F(c_{Hl}^{(3)}, c_{ll}), \Delta m_z^2(c_{HD}, c_{HWB})$ 
    - **CP-Even/Odd Interactions**
- **Necessary** to retain all relevant operators in interpretations
- No single measurement can constrain all operators simultaneously
  - A Global fit is required

Operators important in Higgs + EW + LEP Assuming  $U(3)^5 = U(3)_q \times U(3)_u \times U(3)_d \times U(3)_l \times U(3)_e$ 

Z.W couplings



## SMEFT interpretation of SM WW + $H \rightarrow WW^*$

- First ATLAS Run 2 combination of **Higgs** and **EW** measurements (using  $36.1 fb^{-1}$ )
- Developed methodology for EW+Higgs combinations
- Orthogonality ensured via opposite  $m_{e\mu}$  selection at 55 GeV , any overlap in data removed during combination
- Ensured **consistent statistical treatment** of EFT effects in signal and background (WW)





# PCA of SM WW + $H \rightarrow WW^*$ combination

- Extracting eigenvectors (EV's) from **principal component** analysis (PCA), using Fischer info. Matrix
- **Linear** comb. of Wilson coefficients, along **sensitive** directions of parameter space
  - Grouping operators in terms of **impact** and **physics** motivation
  - **Eliminating** flat directions in the fit
  - Fitted simultaneously and can be translated back into Wilson coefficients













<b>~</b> h	u,lq	(3)	lq'	2
с	[1] [2] <sup>=</sup>	= 0	).1	
С	io1	= 1	.0	
С	[9] [4]	= 1	0.0	C
С	[**] [5]	= 1	0.0	C
С	[0] [6]	= 1	.0	
С	[7]	= 1	.0	
С	[8] <sup>=</sup>	= 1	.0	
С	i =	= 1	.0	

с	<sup>[1]</sup> HG,uG,uH= <b>0.01</b>
С	<sup>[2]</sup> HG,uG,uH= <b>10.0</b>
С	<sup>[3]</sup> HG,uG,uH= <b>10.0</b>

# SMEFT interpretation of SM WW + $H \rightarrow WW^*$

- Perform fits for all 20  $c_i^{(6)}$  coefficients **one-at-atime** with others fixed to SM ( $c_i^{(6)}$ =0)
- Compare 3 different combinations (HWW, SMWW, HWW+SMWW)
- Flat directions (EV's) set constant in the fit
- Simultaneous fit with 8 sensitive EV directions,
   1 being a direct Wilson coefficient (*c<sub>W</sub>*)





# SMEFT interpretations of combined single Higgs measurements

nnc

∆(σ×B)(c<sub>i</sub>)/SN

∆(σ×B)(c<sub>,</sub>)/SM

∆(<del>o</del>×B)(c<sub>i</sub>)/SM

∆(σ×B)(c<sub>,</sub>)/SM

-0.5

0.5

-0.5

0.5

-0.5

0.5

-0.5

<u>Higgs STXS measurements</u>												
Decay Channel	Productio	Ref.										
$H  o \gamma \gamma$	ggF, VBF, V	H, ttH+tH	[1]									
$H \rightarrow ZZ^* \rightarrow 4l$	ggF, VBF, V	H, ttH+tH	[2]									
$H \to WW^* \to l\nu l\nu$	ggF, `	VBF	[3]									
$H \rightarrow bb$	VBF, VH,	ttH+tH	[4],[5],[6],[7]									
$H \to \tau \tau$	ggF, VBF, V	H, ttH+tH	[8]									

Most important changes w.r.t previous combination

- Adding more measurements improves sensitivity
- Allows for de-correlating of Wilson coefficients



unc.

∆(<del>م×</del>B)(c<sub>,</sub>)/SM

∆(σ×B)(c<sub>,</sub>)/SM

∆(<del>م×</del>B)(c ¦)/SM

∆(σ×B)(c<sub>,</sub>)/SM

0.4 0.2

Decay Channel	Production modes	Ref.
$H  o \gamma \gamma$	ggF, VBF, VH, ttH+tH	[1]
$H \rightarrow ZZ^* \rightarrow 4l$	ggF, VBF, VH, ttH+tH	[2]
$H \to WW^* \to l\nu l\nu$	ggF, VBF	[3]
$H \rightarrow bb$	VBF, VH, ttH+tH	[4],[5],[6],[7]
$H \to \tau \tau$	ggF, VBF, VH, ttH+tH	[8]

Wilson coefficient	Operator	Wils	on coefficient	Operator
$c_{H\square}$	$(H^\dagger H) \square (H^\dagger H)$		$c_{uG}$	$(\bar{q}_p \sigma^{\mu\nu} T^A u_r) \widetilde{H} G^A_{\mu\nu}$
C <sub>HDD</sub>	$\left(H^{\dagger}D^{\mu}H ight)^{*}\left(H^{\dagger}D_{\mu}H ight)$		$c_{uW}$	$(\bar{q}_p \sigma^{\mu\nu} u_r) \tau^I \widetilde{H} W^I_{\mu\nu}$
$c_{HG}$	$H^{\dagger}HG^{A}_{\mu u}G^{A\mu u}$		$c_{uB}$	$(\bar{q}_p \sigma^{\mu\nu} u_r) \widetilde{H} B_{\mu\nu}$
C <sub>HB</sub>	$H^{\dagger}H B_{\mu u}B^{\mu u}$		$c'_{ll}$	$(\bar{l}_p \gamma_\mu l_t) (\bar{l}_r \gamma^\mu l_s)$
$c_{HW}$	$H^{\dagger}HW^{I}_{\mu\nu}W^{I\mu\nu}$		$c_{qq}^{(1)}$	$(\bar{q}_p \gamma_\mu q_t) (\bar{q}_r \gamma^\mu q_s)$
C <sub>HWB</sub>	$H^{\dagger}\tau^{I}HW^{I}_{\mu\nu}B^{\mu\nu}$		$\mathcal{C}_{\boldsymbol{q}\boldsymbol{q}}^{\scriptscriptstyle{(3)}}$	$(\bar{q}_p \gamma_\mu \tau^I q_r) (\bar{q}_s \gamma^\mu \tau^I q_t)$
C <sub>eH</sub>	$(H^{\dagger}H)(l_{p}e_{r}H)$		$c_{qq}$	$(\bar{q}_p \gamma_\mu q_t) (\bar{q}_r \gamma^\mu q_s)$
$C_{uH}$	$(H^{\dagger}H)(\bar{q}_{p}u_{r}H)$		$c_{qq}^{\scriptscriptstyle{(31)}}$	$(\bar{q}_p \gamma_\mu \tau^I q_t) (\bar{q}_r \gamma^\mu \tau^I q_s)$
C <sub>dH</sub>	$(H^{\dagger}H)(\bar{q}_{p}d_{r}H)$		C <sub>uu</sub>	$(\bar{u}_p \gamma_\mu u_r)(\bar{u}_s \gamma^\mu u_t)$
$c_{Hl}^{\scriptscriptstyle (1)}$	$(H^{\dagger}i \overleftrightarrow{D}_{\mu}H)(\bar{l}_{p}\gamma^{\mu}l_{r})$		<i>C</i> <sup>(1)</sup> <i>uu</i>	$(\bar{u}_p \gamma_\mu u_t)(\bar{u}_r \gamma^\mu u_s)$
$c_{Hl}^{\scriptscriptstyle (3)}$	$(H^{\dagger}i D^{I}_{\mu}H)(\bar{l}_{p}\tau^{I}\gamma^{\mu}l_{r})$		$c_{qu}^{(1)}$	$(\bar{q}_p \gamma_\mu q_t) (\bar{u}_r \gamma^\mu u_s)$
$c_{He}$	$(H^{\dagger}i\overleftrightarrow{D}_{\mu}H)(\bar{e}_{p}\gamma^{\mu}e_{r})$		$c_{ud}^{(8)}$	$(\bar{u}_p \gamma_\mu T^A u_r) (\bar{d}_s \gamma^\mu T^A d_t)$
$c_{Hq}^{\scriptscriptstyle (1)}$	$(H^{\dagger}i\overleftarrow{D}_{\mu}H)(\bar{q}_{p}\gamma^{\mu}q_{r})$		C <sup>(8)</sup> <i>Qu</i>	$(\bar{q}_p \gamma_\mu T^A q_r) (\bar{u}_s \gamma^\mu T^A u_t)$
$c_{Hq}^{\scriptscriptstyle (3)}$	$(H^{\dagger}i\overleftrightarrow{D}_{\mu}^{I}H)(\bar{q}_{p}\tau^{I}\gamma^{\mu}q_{r})$		$c_{qd}^{_{(8)}}$	$(\bar{q}_p \gamma_\mu T^A q_r) (\bar{d}_s \gamma^\mu T^A d_t)$
$C_{Hu}$	$(H^{\dagger}i\overleftrightarrow{D}_{\mu}H)(\bar{u}_{p}\gamma^{\mu}u_{r})$		c <sub>W</sub>	$\epsilon^{IJK}W^{I u}_{\mu}W^{J ho}_{ u}W^{K\mu}_{ ho}$
C <sub>Hd</sub>	$(H^{\dagger}i\overleftrightarrow{D}_{\mu}H)(\bar{d}_{p}\gamma^{\mu}d_{r})$		CG	$f^{ABC}G^{A\nu}_{\mu}G^{B\rho}_{\nu}G^{C\mu}_{\rho}$

Assuming  $U(3)^{5} = U(3)_{a} \times U(3)_{u} \times U(3)_{d} \times U(3)_{l} \times U(3)_{e}$ 

Weak+Higgs boson interactions

**Boson (** $\gamma$ /*V*/*H***) Couplings to fermions** 

**4-fermion interactions** 



Bryan Kortman, Higgs 2022 Conference, 7-11 November





## EFT interpretation of differential cross-sections of WW, WZ, 4I, and Z+2j production

## • EW differential distributions

Process	Phase space req	Observable
$pp \rightarrow e^{\pm} \nu \mu^{\mp} \nu$	$m_{ll} > 55 \; GeV, p_T^{jet} < 35 \; GeV$	$p_T^{lead,lep}$
$pp \rightarrow l^{\pm} \nu l^{+} l^{-}$	$m_{ll} \in (81,101) \; GeV$	$m_T^{WZ}$
$pp \rightarrow l^+ l^- l^+ l^-$	$m_{4l} > 180 \; GeV$	m <sub>Z2</sub>
$pp \rightarrow l^+ l^- jj$	$m_{jj} > 1000 \; GeV, m_{ll} \in (81, 101) \; GeV$	$\Delta \phi_{jj}$

- Combination performed of 4 unfolded differential cross section measurements
- Fit performed after PCA assuming  $top \; U(3)_l$  flavour symmetry
  - 33 operators included in 15 sensitive directions, 2 direct operators
  - Basis ready for including top measurements
- **CP-even** operators (sensitive to CP-odd only in  $\Delta \phi_{ii}$ )
- Including all  $1/\Lambda^2$  terms, some  $1/\Lambda^4$  terms

11

### ATL-PHYS-PUB-2021-022





Measurement	Туре	Ref.
ATLAS Higgs boson	Simplified Template Cross section(STXS)	[1]
ATLAS electroweak	Differential cross section	[2]
Electroweak precision	Electroweak precision variables (EWPO)	[3]

- Included results from **LEP** 
  - Observables describing **physics at** the **Z**-pole
- First **global** EFT interpretation in ATLAS
  - $top U(3)_{I}$  flavour symmetry
- **Tight limits** provided by LEP
  - Only sensitive to a **limited** number of parameters
- <u>Higgs STXS measurements</u>
- **EW differential distributions** WW ( $p_T^{l1}$ ), WZ( $m_{WZ}$ ), 4I ( $m_{Z2}$ ) and VBF Z ( $\Delta \phi_{ii}$ )

oun 1 |∆EFT|/SM -10<sup>-1</sup>



## SMEFT interpretation of Higgs, EW and decay + electroweak precision observables

- <u>Higgs STXS measurements</u>
- **EW differential distributions** WW ( $p_T^{l1}$ ), WZ( $m_{W7}$ ), 4I ( $m_{77}$ ) and VBF Z  $(\Delta \phi_{ii})$
- LEP/SLD EWPO  $\Gamma_{Z}, R_{l}^{0}, R_{b}^{0}, A_{FR}^{0,l}, A_{FR}^{0,c}, A_{FR}^{0,b}, \sigma_{had}^{0}$
- Constraining 22 linear combinations and 6 individual Wilson coeff.
- Several constraints driven by either EW, Higgs, or LEP
  - Example:  $c_{2a2l}^{[1]}, c_{tG}, c_{HVV,Vff}^{[1]}$
- Clearly shows the **complementarity** of each measurement
- **Simplified likelihood model** available for re-interpretions!

13



# Summary

- Many Higgs and EW measurements being interpreted in terms of Effective Field Theories.
- The Combined interpretation of Higgs STXS and EW measurements has made big steps in the last few years.
  - SMWW+HWW, **7** EV's and **1** Wilson coeff. measured
  - EW combination, **13** EV's and **2** Wilson coeff. measured
  - Higgs STXS, **13** EV's and **3** Wilson coeff. measured
  - Higgs+EW+LEP, 22 EV's and 6 Wilson coeff. measured
- First global ATLAS EFT interpretation available, also providing a simplified likelihood model for re-interpretation
- Next up: including Top analyses in the global fit, treatment of truncation, Higher-order uncertainties, etc.





# Backup

DERIVATION OF A CONTRACT OF A



k h

# Backup



# SMEFT interpretation of SM WW + $H \rightarrow WW^*$

CW

C<sub>Hd</sub>

**C**<sub>ld</sub>

C<sub>uH</sub>

C<sub>dH</sub>

C<sub>HWB</sub>

C<sub>HW</sub>

**C**HDD

С<sub>НВ</sub>

- Observed one-at-a-time fit parameter limits
- Split for HWW, SMWW, HWW+SMWW

### ATL-PHYS-PUB-2021-010



## ATL-PHYS-PUB-2022-037 SMEFT interpretation of Higgs, EW + electroweak precision observables

Acceptance parametrisation applied for  $H \rightarrow 4l$  decay rate.





### ATL-PHYS-PUB-2022-037 SMEFT interpretation of Higgs, EW and decay + electroweak precision observables

## Fitted EigenVectors after PCA



19

0.02	-0.01																															
		0.95	-0.2	0.22	0.11																											
		0.27	0.89	-0.23	-0.2	-0.2	-0.1	-0.08	-0.03	-0.02	-0.02	0.01	0.01																			
																0.8	-0.45		0.02		0.01	-0.23	0.3	0.01	0.02	-0.02	-0.04	-0.06	0.01	-0.06		
																	-0.01	0.84	-0.47	0.27		-0.01	0.01	-0.01								0
																0.29	-0.2	0.09	0.15	0.03		0.61	-0.55	0.35	-0.05	0.05	0.11	0.12	-0.02	0.12		
																0.23	0.51	0.24	0.47	0.08	0.59	0.11	0.21	-0.05	-0.01		0.01	0.03	0.02	0.03		0
																-0.02	-0.02	-0.06	-0.09	0.01	-0.03	0.56	0.24	-0.17	-0.03	0.03	0.05	-0.54	0.09	-0.54		
																-0.32	-0.24	0.17	0.32	0.04	0.01	-0.13	0.3	0.75		0.01		-0.14	0.04	-0.14		0
																						0.48	0.59	-0.04	0.09	-0.16	-0.15	0.39	-0.06	0.39		
																-0.11	-0.13	-0.08	-0.08	0.09	-0.1	0.40										
																-0.11 -0.01	-0.13 -0.01	-0.08	-0.08	0.09 0.01	-0.1 -0.03	0.40	0.07	-0.03	-0.02	0.94	-0.31	0.05		0.05	0.01	
																-0.11 -0.01 0.06	-0.13 -0.01 0.12	-0.08 -0.06	-0.08 -0.08	0.09 0.01 0.06	-0.1 -0.03 -0.14	0.03 -0.03	0.07	-0.03 0.05	-0.02 -0.18	0.94 0.26	-0.31 0.88	0.05 0.1	0.12	0.05	0.01 -0.03	_(
																-0.11 -0.01 0.06 -0.2	-0.13 -0.01 0.12 -0.4	-0.08 -0.06 0.03	-0.08 -0.08 0.43	0.09 0.01 0.06 0.65	-0.1 -0.03 -0.14 -0.01	0.03 -0.03 -0.06	0.07 0.21 -0.1	-0.03 0.05 -0.41	-0.02 -0.18 -0.05	0.94 0.26 0.02	-0.31 0.88 0.1	0.05 0.1 -0.01	0.12 -0.05	0.05 0.1 - 0.01 -	0.01 -0.03 -0.02	_(
																-0.11 -0.01 0.06 -0.2 0.17	-0.13 -0.01 0.12 -0.4 0.34	-0.08 -0.06 0.03 -0.38	-0.08 -0.08 0.43 -0.29	0.09 0.01 0.06 0.65 0.7	-0.13 -0.03 -0.14 -0.01 -0.01	0.03 -0.03 -0.06 -0.05	0.07 0.21 -0.1 -0.02	-0.03 0.05 -0.41 0.33	-0.02 -0.18 -0.05 0.06	0.94 0.26 0.02 -0.03	-0.31 0.88 0.1 -0.15	0.05 0.1 0.01 0.05	0.12 -0.05 0.03	0.05 0.1 -0.01 -0.05	0.01 -0.03 -0.02	( (
																-0.11 -0.01 0.06 -0.2 0.17 -0.01	-0.13 -0.01 0.12 -0.4 0.34 -0.03	-0.08 -0.06 0.03 -0.38 0.03	-0.08 -0.08 0.43 -0.29 0.06	0.09 0.01 0.06 0.65 0.7 0.01	-0.1 -0.03 -0.14 -0.01 -0.01 -0.05	0.03 -0.03 -0.06 -0.05	0.07 0.21 -0.1 -0.02 -0.05	-0.03 0.05 -0.41 0.33 -0.05	-0.02 -0.18 -0.05 0.06 0.34	0.94 0.26 0.02 -0.03 -0.02	-0.31 0.88 0.1 -0.15 -0.05	0.05 0.1 0.01 0.05 0.06	0.12 0.05 0.03 0.93	0.05 0.1 · -0.01 · -0.05	0.01 -0.03 -0.02 0.05	( ( 0
																-0.11 -0.01 0.06 -0.2 0.17 -0.01 0.11	-0.13 -0.01 0.12 -0.4 0.34 -0.03 0.23	-0.08 -0.06 0.03 -0.38 0.03 0.14	-0.08 -0.08 0.43 -0.29 0.06 0.24	0.09 0.01 0.06 0.65 0.7 0.01	-0.13 -0.03 -0.14 -0.01 -0.01 -0.05 -0.47	0.03 -0.03 -0.06 -0.05	0.07 0.21 -0.1 -0.02 -0.05	-0.03 0.05 -0.41 0.33 -0.05 -0.01	-0.02 -0.18 -0.05 0.06 0.34	0.94 0.26 0.02 -0.03 -0.02 0.04	-0.31 0.88 0.1 -0.15 -0.05 0.11	0.05 0.1 -0.01 -0.05 0.06 -0.05	0.12 -0.05 0.03 0.93 -0.3	0.05 0.1 -0.01 -0.05 0.06	0.01 -0.03 -0.02 0.05 0.1	( ( 0
																-0.11 -0.01 0.06 -0.2 0.17 -0.01 0.11 -0.15	-0.13 -0.01 0.12 -0.4 0.34 -0.03 0.23 -0.29	-0.08 -0.06 0.03 -0.38 0.03 0.14 -0.16	-0.08 -0.08 0.43 -0.29 0.06 0.24 -0.28	0.09 0.01 0.06 0.65 0.7 0.01 0.01	-0.1 -0.03 -0.14 -0.01 -0.01 -0.05 -0.47 0.63	0.03 -0.03 -0.06 -0.05	0.07 0.21 -0.1 -0.02 -0.05	-0.03 0.05 -0.41 0.33 -0.05 -0.01 0.02	-0.02 -0.18 0.06 0.34 0.72 0.55	0.94 0.26 0.02 -0.03 -0.02 0.04 0.11	-0.31 0.88 0.1 -0.15 -0.05 0.11 0.23	0.05 0.1 -0.01 -0.05 0.06 -0.05	0.12 -0.05 0.03 0.93 -0.3 -0.14	0.05 0.1 -0.01 -0.05 0.06 -0.05 -0.05	0.01 -0.03 -0.02 0.05 0.1 -0.02	( ( 0
		I       I         I	Image: second	Image: select	Image: select	Image: select	Image: select	Image: select	Image: select	Image: select	Image: section of the section of th	Image: select	Image: section of the section of th	Image: select	Image: select	Image: selection of the se	Image: state stat	1       1      1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1	1       1	1       1	1       1	1       1	1       1	1       1	1       1	1       1	1       1	1       1	1       1	1       1	   	1       1





## ATL-PHYS-PUB-2022-037 SMEFT interpretation of Higgs, EW and decay + electroweak precision observables

Correlation matrix of the fitted Eigenvectors

> HVV, ี HVV,V เ81 HVV. c<sup>ling</sup><sub>HVV,Vff</sub> с<sub>еН</sub>







### ATL-PHYS-PUB-2022-037 SMEFT interpretation of Higgs, EW and decay + electroweak precision observables

Constraints on Wilson coefficients from the combined ATLAS-only analysis





## ATL-PHYS-PUB-2022-037 SMEFT interpretation of Higgs, EW and decay + electroweak precision observables

- Constraints on Wilson coefficients from Full likelihood model compared to the simplified likelihood model
- Using a Gaussian approximation of the likelihood
- Using  $n_{\mu} = 128$  in a Multivariate Gaussian

$$L(\boldsymbol{\mu}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^{n_{\mu}} \det(V_{\mu})}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\Delta\boldsymbol{\mu}\right)$$

$$\Delta \mu = \mu - \hat{\mu}$$







Higgs  $\mathbf{O}$ of SM and AS experime  $\mathbf{O}$ etati  $\mathbf{O}$  $\mathbf{O}$ **D**  $(\mathbf{D})$ Ф measu Combine

23

## EFT interpretation of differential cross-sections of WW, WZ, 4I, and Z+2j production

Fitted EigenVectors after PCA 

EV	σ	<b>A7</b>	<b>LA</b>	S	Pr	eliı	mir	nar	У	<b>√s</b> =	= 13	Те	V, 3	86-1	39	fb <sup>-1</sup>							
c <sub>w</sub>	0.15	1.00																					
$c_{Hq}^{(3)}$	0.0498		1.00																				
c' <sup>[0]</sup> Vff	0.0863			0.81	0.38	0.14	0.37	-0.09	-0.14	0.12	-0.06	0.02											
c' <sup>[1]</sup> Vff	0.149			0.01	-0.03	0.72	-0.29	-0.47	0.39	0.13	-0.04	0.02											
c' <sup>[2]</sup> Vff	0.386			0.38	0.17	-0.31	-0.55	0.26	0.56	-0.19	0.07	-0.03											
c <sup>r[3]</sup> <sub>Vff</sub>	0.756			0.06	-0.12	-0.21	-0.17	-0.02	-0.03	0.86	0.37	-0.16											
c <sup>r[4]</sup> <sub>Vff</sub>	1.01			-0.34	0.49	0.23	0.35	0.50	0.40	0.24		-0.02					•••••						
c <sup>r[5]</sup> <sub>Vff</sub>	1.22		-	-0.03	0.29	0.35	-0.32	0.22	-0.45	-0.23	0.61	-0.14											
c' <sup>[6]</sup> Vff	1.68				-0.12	-0.15	0.46	-0.32	0.38	-0.26	0.65	-0.10											
c' <sup>[7]</sup> Vff	2.11		-	-0.28	0.69	-0.34	-0.14	-0.55	-0.08	0.02	-0.06	0.03					•••••						
c <sup>,[0]</sup> 2q2l	0.0297												-0.37	0.89	-0.11	0.03	-0.21	0.04	-0.13				
c <sup>[1]</sup> 2q2l	0.338												0.56	0.44	0.02		0.61	-0.10	0.34				
c <sup>,[2]</sup> <sub>2q2l</sub>	0.932												0.68	0.14	0.31	-0.04	-0.52	0.13	-0.36				
c <sup>,[3]</sup> 2q2l	3.26												-0.25	0.04	0.78	-0.39	0.27	-0.22	-0.21				
c <sup>[0]</sup> <sub>4q</sub>	0.0568											·····								0.11	0.22	0.95	-0.20
		c <sub>w</sub>	c <sup>(3)</sup> C	HWB	с <sub>нр</sub>	c <sub>HI</sub> <sup>(1)</sup>	c <sup>(3)</sup>	C <sub>He</sub>	<b>c</b> <sub>∥</sub> <sup>(1)</sup>	c <sup>(1)</sup> <sub>Hq</sub>	C <sub>Hu</sub>	С <sub>Нd</sub>	$c_{lq}^{(1)}$	<b>c</b> <sup>(3)</sup> <sub>lq</sub>	C <sub>lu</sub>	C <sub>ld</sub>	<b>C</b> <sub>eu</sub>	C <sub>ed</sub>	C <sub>qe</sub>	<b>C</b> <sup>(11)</sup>	<b>C</b> <sup>(18)</sup>	<b>C</b> <sup>(31)</sup>	<b>C</b> <sup>(38)</sup> <sub>qq</sub>

### ATL-PHYS-PUB-2021-022



Higgs

## EFT interpretation of differential cross-sections of WW, WZ, 4I, and Z+2j production

Impact plot of  $c_W$ ,  $c_{Hq}^{(3)}$ ,  $c_{Vff}^{'[0]}$ ,  $c_{Vff}^{'[1]}$ ,  $c_{Vff}^{'[2]}$ ,  $c_{2q2l}^{'[0]}$ ,  $c_{4q}^{'[0]}$ 



### ATL-PHYS-PUB-2021-022

Preliminary FeV, 36-139 fb <sup>-1</sup>	ent, for $\Lambda = 1 \text{ TeV}$				Linear Effect of Wilson C Lin+Quad Effect of Wilso Experimental Uncertainty	oefficie n Coeff
9						
1 						
17						
3						
3						
						_
.061						
2						
>300 p <sub>T</sub> <sup>lead. lep</sup> [GeV]	0	>600 m <sub>T</sub> <sup>WZ</sup> [GeV]	m <sub>4l</sub> ≈m <sub>z</sub> off-shell 5 50 5 95 5 m <sub>Z2</sub> in m	m <sub>4</sub> >2m <sub>z</sub> 90 1100 n <sub>41</sub> regions [GeV		·····È····· <sub>C</sub>
pp → evµv	pp → lllv		pp →	41	pp → Iljj	

Bryan Kortman, Higgs 2022 Conference, 7-11 November



icient

