# Standard Model electroweak highlights from CMS

#### with emphasis on measurements of triple and quartic gauge couplings

Michał Szleper National Center for Nuclear Research, Warsaw



on behalf of the CMS Collaboration Research partially funded by NCN grant 2021/41/B/ST2/01369



Epiphany 2024 Conference, Cracow, January 8-12, 2024



### What breaks the electroweak symmetry? Testing the EW sector of the Standard Model

- Standard Model electroweak gauge sector:
  - 2 massive vector bosons:  $W^{\pm}$ , Z,
  - 1 massless vector boson:  $\gamma$ ,
  - 2 triple gauge couplings: WWy, WWZ, and
  - 4 quartic gauge couplings: WWWW, WWZZ, WWZY, WWYY.
- All the above couplings are completely determined by theory. Any non-SM couplings will invoke divergences and require new particles to restore unitarity.



 Diboson production processes → best to probe triple gauge couplings Single boson production in VBF mode → independent probe of triple couplings Vector Boson Scattering → best to probe quartic gauge couplings Triboson production processes → independent probe of quartic gauge couplings



# **Standard Model Effective Field Theory**

• A theoretically consistent framework to describe the low energy behavior of BSM physics in a (quasi-) model independent way

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{Eff}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{SM}} + \frac{1}{\Lambda} \mathcal{L}_5 + \frac{1}{\Lambda^2} \mathcal{L}_6 + \frac{1}{\Lambda^3} \mathcal{L}_7 + \frac{1}{\Lambda^4} \mathcal{L}_8 + \cdots, \qquad \mathcal{L}_d = \sum_i c_i^{(d)} \mathcal{O}_i^{(d)}$$

- $O_i$  operators invariant under SM, of dimensionalities higher than 4, suppressed by appropriate powers of  $\Lambda$  the energy scale of new physics,
- *c<sub>i</sub>* dimensionless Wilson coefficients.

#### The approximation will break down at the cutoff scale $\Lambda$ (unknown a priori)

• Of practical interest: dimension-6 operators  $c_{WWW}$ ,  $c_W$ ,  $c_B$  for aTGCs, and dimension-8 operators S0-2, M0-7, T0-9 (18 in total) for aQGCs



	$\mathcal{O}_{S,0},\ \mathcal{O}_{S,1},\ \mathcal{O}_{S,2}$	0 <sub>M,0</sub> , 0 <sub>M,1</sub> , 0 <sub>M,7</sub>	$\mathcal{O}_{M,2}, \\ \mathcal{O}_{M,3}, \\ \mathcal{O}_{M,4}, \\ \mathcal{O}_{M,5}$	$\mathcal{O}_{T,0}, \ \mathcal{O}_{T,1}, \ \mathcal{O}_{T,2}$	$\mathcal{O}_{T,5},$ $\mathcal{O}_{T,6},$ $\mathcal{O}_{T,7}$	0 <sub>Т,8</sub> , О <sub>Т,9</sub>
WWWW	Х	Х		Х		
WWZZ	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	
ZZZZ	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	х
WWZ $\gamma$		Х	Х	Х	Х	
$WW\gamma\gamma$		Х	Х	Х	Х	
$ZZZ\gamma$		Х	Х	Х	Х	х
$ZZ\gamma\gamma$		Х	Х	Х	Х	х
$Z\gamma\gamma\gamma$				Х	Х	Х
$\gamma\gamma\gamma\gamma$				Х	Х	Х

Contribution to the different vertices:



# **Overview of CMS Run 2 results**



## CMS results @ 13 TeV – diboson production



35.9 fb<sup>-1</sup> (13 TeV)



# CMS results @ 13 TeV - single boson in VBF mode

W + 2 jets EPJ C 80 (2020) 43 36/fb Fiducial EW cross section, limits on aTGCs, studies of hadronic and jet activity







**Z + 2 jets** *EPJ C 78 (2018) 589* 36/fb Fiducial EW cross sections, limits on aTGCs, studies of hadronic and jet activity









### **Diboson cross sections and aTGCs summary**



7

8 TeV 13 TeV 8 TeV

13 TeV 7 TeV 8 TeV 8 TeV

8 TeV 13 TeV 13 TeV 7 TeV 7 TeV 7 TeV 8 TeV 13 TeV 7 TeV

8 TeV 13 TeV

7 TeV 8,13 TeV

8 TeV 13 TeV 7 TeV 8 TeV 8 TeV 13 TeV 13 TeV 13 TeV 13 TeV 1.96 TeV 0.20 TeV 7 TeV

8 TeV 13 TeV

7 TeV 8 TeV 13 TeV 7 TeV 8,13 TeV

8 TeV 13 TeV 7 TeV 8 TeV

8 TeV 8 TeV 13 TeV 8 TeV

13 TeV 1.96 TeV 0.20 TeV



#### CMS results @ 13 TeV – VBS processes

#### ssWW & WZ

ssWW PRL 120 (2018) 081801 36/fb, WZ PLB 795 (2019) 281 36/fb, ssWW, WZ PLB 809 (2020) 135710 137/fb >5 sigma observation, total and differential cross sections, limits on aQGCs (S0, S1, T0-2, M0, M1, M7) + comparison clipping vs no clipping Polarized ssWW PLB 812 (2020) 136018 137/fb Hints of WLWL

**ZZ** *PLB* 774 (2017) 682 36/fb *PLB* 812 (2020) 135992 137/fb 4 sigma evidence, total cross sections, limits on aQGCs (T0-2, **T8, T9**)







### CMS results @ 13 TeV – VBS processes

Wy PLB 811 (2020) 135988 36/fb, >5 sigma observation, total and differential cross sections, limits on aQGCs (M0, M1, M7, M2-5, T0-2, T5-7)

**Zy** JHEP 06 (2020) 076 36/fb, PRD 104 (2021) 072001 137/fb >5 sigma observation, total and differential cross sections, limits on aOGCs (M0-7, T0-2, T5-7, T8, T9)

#### **VV** semileptonic

WW+WZ+ZZ PLB 798 (2019) 134985 36/fb, WW+WZ PLB 834 (2022) 137438 137/fb 4.4 sigma evidence, total cross sections, limits (stringent!) on aQGCs (S0, S1, T0-2, M0, M1, M7)







10

# **VBF/VBS EW cross sections and aQGCs summary**





dim-8 M operators



### aQGCs summary contd.: dim-8 T and S operators

#### dim-8 T operators

dim-8 S operators



ſs

8 TeV

13 TeV

13 TeV

13 TeV

8 TeV

13 TeV

13 TeV

13 TeV



### CMS results @ 13 TeV – triboson production

#### WWW PRD 100 (2019) 012004 36/fb WWW, WWZ, WZZ, ZZZ

PRL 125 (2020) 151802 137/fb 5 sigma observation (total), total cross sections, limits on aQGCs (WWW)

#### Wyy, Zyy JHEP 10 (2021) 174 137/fb

3.1 & 4.8 sigma evidence, total cross sections, limits on aQGCs

Aug 2023	CMS	3 Preliminary
CMS measurements vs.	7 TeV CMS measurement (stat,stat+sys)	+++++
	12 Tol ( CMS measurement (stat, stat+sys)	
	stat sys $1.02 \pm 0.21 \pm 0.14$	137 fb <sup>-1</sup>
www	$1.16 \pm 0.30 \pm 0.28$	137 fb <sup>-1</sup>
wwz 🗝	$0.85 \pm 0.31 \pm 0.13$	137 fb <sup>-1</sup>
wzz 🛏 🔸	2.18 ± 1.47 ± 0.49	137 fb <sup>-1</sup>
wwγ <mark>-</mark>	$1.30 \pm 0.22 \pm 0.29$	138 fb <sup>-1</sup>
Wγγ μ	$1.03 \pm 0.29 \pm 0.34$	19.4 fb <sup>-1</sup>
₩γγ ⊢+++-	$0.73 \pm 0.10 \pm 0.22$	137 fb <sup>-1</sup>
Ζγγ μ	$0.98 \pm 0.11 \pm 0.14$	19.4 fb <sup>-1</sup>
Ζγγ <mark>⊬∙</mark> +	$0.91 \pm 0.09 \pm 0.11$	137 fb <sup>-1</sup>
All results at: http://cern.ch/go/pNj7	4 Production Cross Section Ratio:	$\sigma_{exp}$ / $\sigma_{theo}$





# What's new at this time: latest results, updates and followups



### **VBS: osWW first observation**



- DNN employed (eµ) to deal with dominant backgrounds: QCD induced WW, top production, DY. Kinematic inputs:  $m_{jj}$ ,  $p_T^{j1}$ ,  $|\Delta \eta_{jj}|$ ,  $p_T^{j2}$ ,  $Z_{l2}$ ,  $p_T^{II}$ ,  $\Delta \phi_{II}$ ,  $Z_{l1}$ ,  $m_T^{l1}$ .
- Data driven background normalization techniques (top, DY), simultaneous fit to the data including background dominated control regions (CRs).



top CR: inverted b veto, DY eµ CR:  $m_T$  inverted (< 60 GeV),  $50 < m_{\parallel} < 80$  GeV, DY ee, µµ CR:  $|m_{\parallel}-m_z| < 15$  GeV.



### **VBS: osWW first observation**

• Observed (expected) signal significance of **5.6 sigma (5.2 sigma)** 





### VBS: ssWW with $1\tau$ in the final state

138 fb<sup>-1</sup> (13 TeV)

SM DNN outpu

138 fb<sup>-1</sup> (13 TeV)

SM DNN output

138 fb<sup>-1</sup> (13 TeV)

SM DNN output

Vγ OS + (Z/γ + jets)

Nonprompt Lepton

OS + (Z/y + jets)

Nonprompt Leptons

V<sub>2</sub>

OS + (Z/y + jets)

Nonprompt Lepto



CMS-PAS-SMP-22-008 Preliminary

- VBS topology
- One hadronic  $\tau$  + 1 light lepton
- DNN applied to identify hadronic taus, kinematic inputs:  $m_{ii}$ ,  $m_T(I, p_T^{miss})$ ,  $p_T^{j_1}$ ,  $p_{T}^{j2}, p_{T}^{\tau}, p_{T}^{l},$

$$M_{1T}^{2} = \left(\sqrt{M_{\tau l}^{2} + p_{T}^{\tau l^{2}}} + p_{T}^{\text{miss}}\right)^{2} - \left|\vec{p_{T}}^{\tau l} + \vec{p}_{T}^{\text{miss}}\right|^{2},$$
$$M_{\circ 1}^{2} = \left(p_{T}^{\tau} + p_{T}^{l} + p_{T}^{\text{miss}}\right)^{2} - \left|\vec{p_{T}}^{\tau} + \vec{p_{T}}^{l} + \vec{p}_{T}^{\text{miss}}\right|^{2}.$$

- Data driven determination of non-prompt background
- Simultaneous fit to SR and CRs: OS CR: as SR but opposite sign, tt CR: OS and b veto reversed
- Observed (expected) signal significance: 2.7 (1.9) sigma.



# aQGC: exclusive $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow WW$ , ZZ

JHEP 07 (2023) 229 arXiv:2211.16320

Look for intact forward protons reconstructed in near-beam detector (Precision Proton Spectrometer)
+ 2 weak bosons decaying into boosted and merged jets.



- The PPS allows to reconstruct the proton scattering angle and fractional momentum loss.
- N-subjettiness used to identify hadronic W and Z from QCD jets. Signal selection:  $p_T^j > 200 \text{ GeV}$ ,  $m_{jj} > 1126 \text{ GeV}$ ,  $|\Delta \eta_{jj}| > 1.3$ , acoplanarity requirement:  $a = |1 - |(\phi_{j1} - \phi_{j2})|/\pi| < 0.01$ ,  $p_T^{j1}/p_T^{j2} < 1.3$



# aQGC: exclusive $\gamma \gamma \rightarrow WW$ , ZZ

• Matching protons to jets is based on respective rapidities and invariant masses



- Background: jets combined with unrelated protons from pileup, estimated from CRs defined by inverting acoplanarity and/or proton matching criteria.
- Cross sections upper limits at 95% CL:  $\sigma(pp \rightarrow pWWp) < 67$  fb,  $\sigma(pp \rightarrow pZZp) < 43$  fb.
- Limits on SMEFT dim-8 operators

Coupling	Observed (expected)	Observed (expected)	
	95% CL upper limit	95% CL upper limit	
	No clipping	Clipping at 1.4 TeV	
$ f_{M,0}/\Lambda^4 $	$66.0~(60.0)~{\rm TeV}^{-4}$	79.8 (78.2) $\text{TeV}^{-4}$	
$\left f_{M,1}/\Lambda^4\right $	$245.5~(214.8)~{\rm TeV}^{-4}$	$306.8 (306.8)  \mathrm{TeV}^{-4}$	
$\left f_{M,2}/\Lambda^4\right $	9.8 (9.0) TeV $^{-4}$	11.9 (11.8) $\text{TeV}^{-4}$	
$ f_{M,3}/\Lambda^4 $	73.0 (64.6) TeV $^{-4}$	91.3 (92.3) $\text{TeV}^{-4}$	
$ f_{M,4}/\Lambda^4 $	$36.0(32.9)\mathrm{TeV}^{-4}$	$43.5 (42.9) \mathrm{TeV}^{-4}$	
$ f_{M,5}/\Lambda^4 $	$67.0~(58.9)\mathrm{TeV}^{-4}$	83.7 (84.1) $\text{TeV}^{-4}$	
$ f_{M,7}/\Lambda^4 $	490.9 (429.6) $\mathrm{TeV}^{-4}$	$613.7 \ (613.7) \ {\rm TeV}^{-4}$	



#### **Triboson: WWy**

arXiv:2310.05164 submitted to PRL



- Probes triple WWy vertex, quartic vertices WWyy & WWZy
- Exactly two isolated opposite sign leptons ( $e^+\mu^-$ ,  $e^-\mu^+$ ) + photon  $p_T^{miss} > 20$  GeV,  $m_{II} > 10$  GeV,  $p_T^{II} > 15$  GeV,  $m_T^{W} > 10$  GeV
- Simultaneous fit with CRs: ss WWy CR (non-prompt background): same sign & no m<sub>T</sub><sup>w</sup> cut, Top-y CR (top production): b veto inverted & no m<sub>T</sub><sup>w</sup> cut.





# **Diboson: Wy**



PRD 105 (2022) 052003 arXiv:2111.13948

Probes WWy vertex, potential aTGC contributions from dim-6 operator  $c_{3W}$ 

• The interference issue of EFT

$$\sigma \propto |A_{full}|^2 = |A_{SM}|^2 + (A_{SM}A^*_{dim-6} + hc) + |A_{dim-6}|^2$$

- EFT fact: we naturally expect results being driven by the interference term, otherwise it is not justified to truncate the expansion at dim-6.
- "Interference resurrection" achieved by looking at azimuthal angle φ between the +ve helicity lepton (l<sup>+</sup> or anti-v) in the Wy c.o.m. frame (*arXiv:1901.04821*).

#### Here $\hat{y} = \hat{z} \times \hat{r}$ ,

 $\hat{r}$  – direction of Lorentz boost to the c.o.m. frame





### **Diboson: Wy**



+77

 $820 \pm 120$ 

 $950 \pm 260 \quad 990 \pm 270$ 

 $950\pm270$ 

 $790\pm140$ 

+10

-10

 $1037^{+78}_{-79}$ 

 $\geq 2$ 

- The effects of SM-BSM interference show up in the distribution of  $\phi$ .
- Limits on c<sub>3W</sub> calculated using SM+int. only become an order of magnitude more stringent by measuring φ and much closer to limits calculated using SM+int.+BSM

$p_{\rm T}^{\gamma}$ cutoff (GeV)	Best fit $C_{3W}$ (TeV <sup>-2</sup> )		Observed 95% CL (TeV <sup>-2</sup> )		Expected 95% CL (TeV <sup>-2</sup> )	
	SM+int. only	SM+int.+BSM	SM+int. only	SM+int.+BSM	SM+int. only	SM+int.+BSM
200	-0.86	-0.24	[-2.01, 0.38]	[-0.76, 0.40]	[-1.16, 1.27]	[-0.81, 0.71]
300	-0.25	-0.17	[-0.81, 0.34]	[-0.39, 0.28]	[-0.56, 0.60]	[-0.33, 0.33]
500	-0.13	-0.025	[-0.50, 0.25]	[-0.15, 0.12]	[-0.35, 0.38]	[-0.17, 0.16]
800	-0.20	-0.033	[-0.49, 0.11]	[-0.10, 0.08]	[-0.29, 0.31]	[-0.097, 0.095]
1500	-0.13	-0.009	[-0.38, 0.17]	[-0.062, 0.052]	[-0.27, 0.29]	[-0.066, 0.065]





# Outlook

- Run 2 has produced a lot of results from the EW gauge sector, including:
  - diboson production cross sections WW, WZ, ZZ, Wy, WV,
  - limits on anomalous triple couplings, including ZZZ (non-SM),
  - electroweak diboson (VBS) cross sections ssWW, WZ, ZZ, Wy, Zy, WV+ZV, osWW
  - study of quartic gauge couplings limits have been put on all 18 relevant SMEFT dim-8 operators,
  - triboson production cross sections VVV, Wyy, Zyy, WWy, and complementary check of quartic gauge couplings.
- The Standard Model is well.
- But we are only warming up for more data: Run 3 analyses are on the way and we look forward to Phase 2.
- We will benefit from additional statistics and we expect a lot of improvement in the EFT interpretation of the data.
- The most interesting results are yet to come!