PROPERTIES OF THE HIGGS BOSON WE CANNOT "UNSEE"

André David (CERN) – Rencontres de Blois 2013

Things you can't "unsee"

[http://cern.ch/go/Dxh7]

Things you can't "unsee"

[http://cern.ch/go/Dxh7]

Things you can't "unsee"

[http://cern.ch/go/Dxh7]

TOBLERONE®

(self-inflicted) Mission: impossible



Channel	Conference note	L	Date
Spin Combination	ATLAS-CONF-2013-040	up to 25 fb-1	16/04/2013
Couplings Combination	ATLAS-CONF-2013-034	up to 25 fb-1	14/03/2013
Higgs to Diphoton spin	ATLAS-CONF-2013-029	21 fb-1	13/03/2013
Higgs to WW(lvlv) spin	ATLAS-CONF-2013-031	21 fb-1	11/03/2013
Higgs to WW(lvlv)	ATLAS-CONF-2013-030	25 fb-1	11/03/2013
2HDM WW(lvlv)	ATLAS-CONF-2013-027	13 fb-1	11/03/2013
Combined of Mass	ATLAS-CONF-2013-014	up to 25 fb-1	05/03/2013
Higgs to Diphoton	ATLAS-CONF-2013-012	25 fb-1	05/03/2013
Higgs to 4 leptons	ATLAS-CONF-2013-013	25 fb-1	05/03/2013
ZH (invisible decays)	ATLAS-CONF-2013-011	18 fb-1	05/03/2013
Higgs to dimuon	ATLAS-CONF-2013-010	21 fb-1	05/03/2013
Higgs to Zgamma	ATLAS-CONF-2013-009	25 fb-1	05/03/2013

May-2013	Full 8 TeV dataset: VBF H, H -> bb	TWiki, PAS
May-2013	Full 8 TeV dataset: ttH, H -> gamma gamma	TWiki, PAS
May-2013	Full 7+8 TeV dataset: VH, H -> bb	TWiki, PAS
May-2013	Full 8 TeV dataset: H -> WW -> lnuJ	TWiki, PAS
May-2013	Full 7+8 TeV dataset: H -> ZZ -> 2l2nu	TWiki, PAS
Apr-2013	Moriond Higgs Combination	TWiki, PAS
Mar-2013	Full 7+8 TeV dataset: H -> gamma gamma	TWiki, PAS
Mar-2013	Full 7+8 TeV dataset: H -> ZZ -> 4l	TWiki, PAS
Mar-2013	Full 7+8 TeV dataset: H -> WW -> 2l2nu	TWiki, PAS
Mar-2013	Full 7+8 TeV dataset: H -> tau tau	TWiki, PAS
Mar-2013	Full 7+8 TeV dataset: H -> Z gamma	TWiki, PAS
Mar-2013	Full 7+8 TeV dataset: H -> WWW -> 3l3nu	TWiki, PAS
Mar-2013	Full 7+8 TeV dataset: VH -> tau tau	TWiki, PAS

- Present a coherent view of present-day results of Higgs properties from the LHC and Tevatron experiments.
  - Any omission or mistake are the speaker's fault.

A tribute to those doing SM calculations

"Yesterday's discovery is today's calibration, and tomorrow's background." – V. L. Telegdi









a.david@cern.ch

Higgs in CMS – ca. 2008

[http://cern.ch/go/dJf7] [http://cern.ch/go/Sx8m]



- **Mass mechanism** – the mexican hat field, first published by Brout and Englert (1964).
- **Higgs boson** – the field's massive radial excitation, tacit to Brout and Englert, massless via approximations in Guralnik et al., and explicitly mentioned by Higgs (1964).
- **Viability** – photons and massive weak bosons can coexist was shown by Kibble (1967).

How SM Higgses are born

[http://cern.ch/go/cWH8] [http://cern.ch/go/SnJ8]

- **Gluon fusion**



- **VBF**



- **VH**



- **ttH**









How SM Higgses die

[http://cern.ch/go/qkh6] [arXiv:1208.1993]

- Coupling and kinematics drive BR ($b\bar{b}$, WW, $\tau\tau$, ZZ).
  - Decays with photons ($\gamma\gamma$, $Z\gamma$) only through loops.



Near to maximal ΠBR_i ⟶





Looking up to a new boson

[http://cern.ch/go/q8jx]



Higgsdependence day recap

[http://cern.ch/go/q8jx]

- **Both experiments at 5.0 σ.**
  - One above expectations… $\sigma_{ATLAS}/\sigma_{SM}$ = **1.2 ±0.3** (at 126.5 GeV).
  - …the other one below. σ_{CMS}/σ_{SM} = **0.80 ±0.20** (at 125 GeV).
- Mass
  - ATLAS: min. p-value at 126.5 GeV.
  - CMS: m_X = 125.3 ±0.6 GeV.
- "Proto-couplings" compatible with SM.
- ***"More data needed…"***



















From the other side of the pond

[arXiv:1207.6436]





- Combination of Tevatron VH⟶$b\bar{b}$ searches, in July 2012:
  - **2.8 σ local significance at m_H=125 GeV.**

A 2012 hit

[http://goo.gl/49c0c] [http://goo.gl/suJzZ] [http://goo.gl/ShJJG]

symmetry dimensions of particle physics

home | departments | science topics | image bank | pdf issues | archives



signal to background
May 12, 2013

The top 40 physics hits of 2012

The Higgs boson is a popular subject among the most-cited physics papers of 2012, but a particle simulation manual takes the top spot.

2012 reports for eprints

1. 568 citations in 2012
Observation of a new particle in the search for the Standard Model Higgs boson with the ATLAS detector at the LHC
ATLAS Collaboration (Georges Aad (Freiburg U.) *et al.*). Jul 2012. 24 pp.
Published in **Phys.Lett. B716 (2012) 1-29**
CERN-PH-EP-2012-218
DOI: 10.1016/j.physletb.2012.08.020
e-Print: **arXiv:1207.7214 [hep-ex]** | PDF
References | BibTeX | LaTeX(US) | LaTeX(EU) | Harvmac | EndNote
ADS Abstract Service; Link to all figures including auxiliary figures

2. 558 citations in 2012
Observation of a new boson at a mass of 125 GeV with the CMS experiment at the LHC
CMS Collaboration (Serguei Chatrchyan (Yerevan Phys. Inst.) *et al.*). Jul 2012.
Published in **Phys.Lett. B716 (2012) 30-61**
CMS-HIG-12-028, CERN-PH-EP-2012-220
DOI: 10.1016/j.physletb.2012.08.021
e-Print: **arXiv:1207.7235 [hep-ex]** | PDF
References | BibTeX | LaTeX(US) | LaTeX(EU) | Harvmac | EndNote
CERN Document Server ; ADS Abstract Service; Link to PRESSRELEASE

3. 433 citations in 2012
Combined results of searches for the standard model Higgs boson in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s}=7$ TeV
CMS Collaboration (Serguei Chatrchyan (Yerevan Phys. Inst.) *et al.*). Feb 2012.
Published in **Phys.Lett. B710 (2012) 26-48**
CMS-HIG-11-032, CERN-PH-EP-2012-023
DOI: 10.1016/j.physletb.2012.02.064
e-Print: **arXiv:1202.1488 [hep-ex]** | PDF
References | BibTeX | LaTeX(US) | LaTeX(EU) | Harvmac | EndNote
CERN Document Server ; ADS Abstract Service

4. 381 citations in 2012
Combined search for the Standard Model Higgs boson using up to 4.9 fb^{-1} of pp collision data at $\sqrt{s}=7$ TeV with the ATLAS detector at the LHC
ATLAS Collaboration (Georges Aad (Freiburg U.) *et al.*). Feb 2012. 8 pp.
Published in **Phys.Lett. B710 (2012) 49-66**
CERN-PH-EP-2012-019
DOI: 10.1016/j.physletb.2012.02.044
e-Print: **arXiv:1202.1408 [hep-ex]** | PDF
References | BibTeX | LaTeX(US) | LaTeX(EU) | Harvmac | EndNote
CERN Document Server ; ADS Abstract Service; Link to all figures including auxiliary figures

Science AAAS.ORG | FEEDBACK | HELP | LIBRARIANS | All Scienc

AAAS | NEWS | *SCIENCE* JOURNALS | CAREERS | BLOGS & COMM

Subject Collections | Online Extras | *Science* Special Collections | Archived Collections

Home > Collections > Online Extras > Special Issues 2012 > Breakthrough of the Year, 2012

Breakthrough of the Year, 2012

Every year, crowning one scientific achievement as Breakthrough of the Year is no easy task, and 2012 was no exception. The year saw leaps and bounds in physics, along with significant advances in genetics, engineering, and many other areas. In keeping with tradition, *Science*'s editors and staff have selected a winner and nine runners-up, as well as highlighting the year's top news stories and areas to watch in 2013.



FREE ACCESS

The Discovery of the Higgs Boson

A. Cho

Exotic particles made headlines again and again in 2012, making it no surprise that the breakthrough of the year is a big physics finding: confirmation of the existence of the Higgs boson. Hypothesized more than 40 years ago, the elusive particle completes the standard model of physics, and is arguably the key to the explanation of how other fundamental particles obtain mass. The only mystery that remains is whether its discovery marks a new dawn for particle physics or the final stretch of a field that has run its course.

Read more about the Higgs boson from the research teams at CERN.

Runners-Up FREE WITH REGISTRATION

This year's runners-up for Breakthrough of the Year underscore feats in engineering, genetics, and other fields that promise to change the course of science.

Who Should Be TIME's Person of the Year 2012?

As always, TIME's editors will choose the Person of the Year, but that doesn't mean readers shouldn't have their say. Cast your vote for the person you think most influenced the news this year for better or worse. Voting closes at 11:59 p.m. on Dec. 12, and the winner will be announced on Dec. 14.

THE CANDIDATES

The Higgs Boson

By Jeffrey Kluger | Monday, Nov. 26, 2012



SSPL/GETTY IMAGES

Simulation of a Higgs-Boson decaying into four muons, CERN, 1990.

What do you think?

Should **The Higgs Boson** be TIME's Person of the Year 2012?

Definitely No Way

VOTE

Take a moment to thank this little particle for all the work it does, because without it, you'd be just inchoate energy without so much as a bit of mass. What's more, the same would be true for the entire universe. It was in the 1960s that Scottish physicist Peter Higgs first posited the existence of a particle that causes energy to make the jump to matter. But it was not until last summer that a team of researchers at Europe's Large Hadron Collider — Rolf Heuer, Joseph Incandela and Fabiola Gianotti — at last sealed the deal and in so doing finally fully confirmed Einstein's general theory of relativity. The Higgs — as particles do — immediately decayed to more-fundamental particles, but the scientists would surely be happy to collect any honors or awards in its stead.

Photos: Step inside the Large Hadron Collider.

WHO SHOULD BE TIME'S PERSON OF THE YEAR 2012?

The Candidates

Video

Poll Results

PAST PERSONS OF THE YEAR

2011: The Protester

2010: Facebook's Mark Zuckerberg

2009: Ben Bernanke

2008: Barack Obama

Most Read | Most Emailed

1 Who Should Be TIME's Person of the Year 2012?

2 LIFE Behind the Picture: The Photo That Changed the Face of AIDS

3 Nativity-Scene Battles: Score One for the Atheists

4 The $7 Cup of Starbucks: A Logical Extension of the Coffee Chain's Long-Term Strategy

Who Should Be TIME's Person of the Year 2012?

As always, TIME's editors will choose the Person of the Year, but that doesn't mean readers shouldn't have their say. Cast your vote for the person you think most influenced the news this year for better or worse. Voting closes at 11:59 p.m. on Dec. 12, and the winner will be announced on Dec. 14.

THE CANDIDATES

The Higgs Boson

By Jeffrey Kluger | Monday, Nov. 26, 2012

Simulation of a Higgs-Boson decaying into four muons, CERN, 1990.



SSPL/GETTY IMAGES

Simulation of a Higgs-Boson decaying into four muons, CERN, 1990.

VOTE

Take a moment to thank this little particle for all the work it does, because without it, you'd be just inchoate energy without so much as a bit of mass. What's more, the same would be true for the entire universe. It was in the 1960s that Scottish physicist Peter Higgs first posited the existence of a particle that causes energy to make the jump to matter. But it was not until last summer that a team of researchers at Europe's Large Hadron Collider — Rolf Heuer, Joseph Incandela and Fabiola Gianotti — at last sealed the deal and in so doing finally fully confirmed Einstein's general theory of relativity. The Higgs — as particles do — immediately decayed to more-fundamental particles, but the scientists would surely be happy to collect any honors or awards in its stead.

Photos: Step inside the Large Hadron Collider.

WHO SHOULD BE TIME'S PERSON OF THE YEAR 2012?

The Candidates

Video

Poll Results

PAST PERSONS OF THE YEAR

2011: The Protester

2010: Facebook's Mark Zuckerberg

2009: Ben Bernanke

2008: Barack Obama

Most Read | Most Emailed

1 Who Should Be TIME's Person of the Year 2012?

2 LIFE Behind the Picture: The Photo That Changed the Face of AIDS

3 Nativity-Scene Battles: Score One for the Atheists

4 The $7 Cup of Starbucks: A Logical Extension of the Coffee Chain's Long-Term Strategy

Magazine | Video | LIFE | Person of the Year

TIME Person of the Year

Apps

Search TIME Go

NEWSFEED | U.S. | POLITICS | WORLD | BUSINESS | TECH | HEALTH | SCIENCE | ENTERTAINMENT | STYLE | SPORTS | OPINION | PHOTOS

2012 2011 2010 2009 2008

Who Should Be TIME's Person of the Year 2012?

As always, TIME's editors will choose the Person of the Year, but that doesn't mean readers shouldn't have their say. Cast your vote for the person you think most influenced the news this year for better or worse. Voting closes at 11:59 p.m. on Dec. 12, and the winner will be announced on Dec. 14.

Like 1.5k Tweet 536 +1 20 Share 7

THE CANDIDATES

18 of 40

The Higgs Boson

By Jeffrey Kluger | Monday, Nov. 26, 2012



What do you think?

Should **The Higgs Boson** be TIME's Person of the Year 2012?

Definitely No Way

VOTE

last summer that a team of researchers at Europe's Large Hadron Collider — Rolf Heuer, Joseph Incandela and Fabiola Gianotti — at last sealed the deal and in so doing finally fully confirmed Einstein's general theory of relativity. The

Photos: Step inside the Large Hadron Collider.

WHO SHOULD BE TIME'S PERSON OF THE YEAR 2012?

The Candidates

Video

Poll Results

PAST PERSONS OF THE YEAR



2011: The Protester

2010: Facebook's Mark Zuckerberg

Timeline of the results

2012
- ICHEP
  - LHC 5 σ per experiment.
- HCP
  - First properties.

2013
- Moriond
  - Some full LHC dataset updates.
  - More properties measurements.
- LHCP
  - More full dataset analyses.

Today

The build up of a signal









- Thanks to the excellent performance of the LHC !
  - >15 fb^{-1} delivered after July 2012.

Where we stand today

Significance Obs. (pre-fit exp.)	$H \rightarrow ZZ$	$H \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$	$H \rightarrow WW$	$H \rightarrow b\bar{b}$	$H \rightarrow \tau\tau$
ATLAS	**6.6 σ** (4.4 σ)	**7.4 σ** (4.1 σ)	**2.5 σ** (1.6 σ)	-0.4 σ (**1.0** σ)	1.1 σ (**1.7** σ)
	124.3 GeV	*126.8 GeV*	*125 GeV*		
CMS	6.7 σ (**7.1** σ)	3.9 σ (**4.2** σ)	3.9 σ (**5.6** σ)	2.0 σ (**2.1** σ)	**2.8 σ** (2.7 σ)
	125.7 GeV				

- Combined p-values $<10^{-20}$ are telling us to make measurements…

Statistics interlude

[ATL-PHYS-PUB-2011-11, CMS NOTE-2011/005]

	Test statistic	Profiled?	Test statistic sampling
LEP	$q_\mu = -2\ln\frac{\mathcal{L}(data\|\mu,\tilde{\theta})}{\mathcal{L}(data\|0,\tilde{\theta})}$	no	Bayesian-frequentist hybrid
Tevatron	$q_\mu = -2\ln\frac{\mathcal{L}(data\|\mu,\hat{\theta}_\mu)}{\mathcal{L}(data\|0,\hat{\theta}_0)}$	yes	Bayesian-frequentist hybrid
LHC	$\tilde{q}_\mu = -2\ln\frac{\mathcal{L}(data\|\mu,\hat{\theta}_\mu)}{\mathcal{L}(data\|\hat{\mu},\hat{\theta})}$	yes $(0 \leq \hat{\mu} \leq \mu)$	frequentist

- LEP: nuisances parameters (θ) not profiled.
- Tevatron: Bayesian treatment.
  - Maximise likelihood against nuisances.
- LHC: profiled likelihood.
  - Denominator uses **global best-fit likelihood** with **constrained signal strength**.

Measuring the mass





	ATLAS	CMS
m_X	125.5 ±0.2 (stat.) $^{+0.5}_{-0.6}$ (syst.) GeV	125.7 ±0.3 (stat.) ±0.3 (syst.) GeV
Naïve average: 125.6 ±0.4 GeV		

Parity: $H \rightarrow ZZ \rightarrow 4\ell$

[CMS-PAS-HIG-13-003] [ATLAS-CONF-2013-013]











- Discriminants built from decay angles and invariant masses.
- Profiled likelihood ratio test statistic.

		CMS
CL_s	**0.37%**	**0.16%**
P(obs.|0^+)	0.40	-0.5 σ
P(obs.|0^-)	0.0022	3.3 σ

Other J^P in $H \longrightarrow ZZ \longrightarrow 4\ell$

[CMS-PAS-HIG-13-003] [ATLAS-CONF-2013-013]





		J^P-MELA analysis			
		tested J^P for an assumed 0^+		tested 0^+ for an assumed J^P	CL_S
		expected	observed	observed*	
0^-	p_0	0.0011	0.0022	0.40	0.004
1^+	p_0	0.0031	0.0028	0.51	0.006
1^-	p_0	0.0010	0.027	0.11	0.031
2^+_m	p_0	0.064	0.11	0.38	0.182
2^-	p_0	0.0032	0.11	0.08	0.116

J^P	production	expect (μ=1)	obs. 0^+	obs. J^P	CL_s
0^-	$gg \rightarrow X$	2.6σ (2.8σ)	0.5σ	3.3σ	0.16%
0^+_h	$gg \rightarrow X$	1.7σ (1.8σ)	0.0σ	1.7σ	8.1%
2^+_{mgg}	$gg \rightarrow X$	1.8σ (1.9σ)	0.8σ	2.7σ	1.5%
$2^+_{mq\bar{q}}$	$q\bar{q} \rightarrow X$	1.7σ (1.9σ)	1.8σ	4.0σ	<0.1%
1^-	$q\bar{q} \rightarrow X$	2.8σ (3.1σ)	1.4σ	$>4.0\sigma$	<0.1%
1^+	$q\bar{q} \rightarrow X$	2.3σ (2.6σ)	1.7σ	$>4.0\sigma$	<0.1%

	ATLAS	CMS
CL_s for J≠0	< 18.2%	< 1.5%

ATLAS: focus on 2^+_m

[ATLAS-CONF-2013-040]









- Combined H⟶ZZ, WW, and $\gamma\gamma$.
- Scan for fraction of $(gg/q\bar{q}) \longrightarrow 2^+_m$:
  - $CL_s < 0.06\%\ \forall\ f_{q\bar{q}}$.



Oversimplified big picture

★ "seen" ☆ "tried" - "impossible"	$H\to b\bar{b}$			$H\to\tau\tau$			$H\to WW$			$H\to ZZ$			$H\to\gamma\gamma$			$H\to Z\gamma$			$H\to$inv.			$H\to\mu\mu$			$H\to c\bar{c}$ $H\to HH$		
	T	A	C	T	A	C	T	A	C	T	A	C	T	A	C	T	A	C	T	A	C	T	A	C	T	A	C
ggH	-	-	-	☆	☆	★	☆	★	★	☆	★	★	☆	★	★	-	☆	☆				-	☆		-		
VBF			☆	☆	☆	★		★	★		★	☆		★	☆	-						-			-		
VH	★	☆	★	☆		☆	☆		☆		☆			☆	☆	-				☆		-			-		
ttH		☆	☆	☆			☆								☆	-						-			-		

T – Tevatron
A – ATLAS
C – CMS

- Still much to measure to the right and to the bottom.

Relative signal strengths

[arXiv:1303.6346] [ATLAS-CONF-2013-034] [CMS-PAS-HIG-13-005]







	Tevatron	ATLAS	CMS
m_H	125 GeV	125.5 GeV	125.7 GeV
$\mu = \sigma/\sigma_{SM}$	$1.44^{+0.59}_{-0.56}$	1.30 ±0.20	0.80 ±0.14
Naïve average: 0.98 ±0.11			

Production mechanisms

[ATLAS-CONF-2013-034] [CMS-PAS-HIG-13-005]





- Scale fermion-mediated (ggH & ttH) and vector-boson-mediate (VBF & VH) together.

Production mechanisms

[ATLAS-CONF-2013-034] [CMS-PAS-HIG-13-005]





- Ratio of production scaling factors does not depend on decay mode.
- **Combined > 3 σ evidence for $\mu_{\mathrm{VBF,VH}} / \mu_{\mathrm{ggH,ttH}} > 0$.**

Scalar coupling structure

Yukawa sector

Gauge sector



Mixed sector

Up type

Down type

Loops (γ , g) are sensitive to BSM contributions.

Quark loop

Interim scalar coupling deviations framework

[arXiv:1209.0040]

Production modes

$$\frac{\sigma_{ggH}}{\sigma_{ggH}^{SM}} = \begin{cases} \kappa_g^2(\kappa_b, \kappa_t, m_H) \\ \kappa_g^2 \end{cases}$$

$$\frac{\sigma_{VBF}}{\sigma_{VBF}^{SM}} = \kappa_{VBF}^2(\kappa_W, \kappa_Z, m_H)$$

$$\frac{\sigma_{WH}}{\sigma_{WH}^{SM}} = \kappa_W^2$$

$$\frac{\sigma_{ZH}}{\sigma_{ZH}^{SM}} = \kappa_Z^2$$

$$\frac{\sigma_{t\bar{t}H}}{\sigma_{t\bar{t}H}^{SM}} = \kappa_t^2$$

Detectable decay modes

$$\frac{\Gamma_{WW^{(*)}}}{\Gamma_{WW^{(*)}}^{SM}} = \kappa_W^2$$

$$\frac{\Gamma_{ZZ^{(*)}}}{\Gamma_{ZZ^{(*)}}^{SM}} = \kappa_Z^2$$

$$\frac{\Gamma_{b\bar{b}}}{\Gamma_{b\bar{b}}^{SM}} = \kappa_b^2$$

$$\frac{\Gamma_{\tau^-\tau^+}}{\Gamma_{\tau^-\tau^+}^{SM}} = \kappa_\tau^2$$

$$\frac{\Gamma_{\gamma\gamma}}{\Gamma_{\gamma\gamma}^{SM}} = \begin{cases} \kappa_\gamma^2(\kappa_b, \kappa_t, \kappa_\tau, \kappa_W, m_H) \\ \kappa_\gamma^2 \end{cases}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma_{Z\gamma}}{\Gamma_{Z\gamma}^{SM}} = \begin{cases} \kappa_{(Z\gamma)}^2(\kappa_b, \kappa_t, \kappa_\tau, \kappa_W, m_H) \\ \kappa_{(Z\gamma)}^2 \end{cases}$$

Currently undetectable decay modes

$$\frac{\Gamma_{t\bar{t}}}{\Gamma_{t\bar{t}}^{SM}} = \kappa_t^2$$

$$\frac{\Gamma_{gg}}{\Gamma_{gg}^{SM}} : \text{see Section 3.1.2}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma_{c\bar{c}}}{\Gamma_{c\bar{c}}^{SM}} = \kappa_t^2$$

$$\frac{\Gamma_{s\bar{s}}}{\Gamma_{s\bar{s}}^{SM}} = \kappa_b^2$$

$$\frac{\Gamma_{\mu^-\mu^+}}{\Gamma_{\mu^-\mu^+}^{SM}} = \kappa_\tau^2$$

Total width

$$\frac{\Gamma_H}{\Gamma_H^{SM}} = \begin{cases} \kappa_H^2(\kappa_i, m_H) \\ \kappa_H^2 \end{cases}$$

- Narrow-width approximation, $(\sigma \times BR) = \sigma \cdot \Gamma / \Gamma_H$

Interim scalar coupling deviations framework

[arXiv:1209.0040]

Production modes

$$\frac{\sigma_{ggH}}{\sigma_{ggH}^{SM}} = \begin{cases} \kappa_g^2(\kappa_b, \kappa_t, m_H) \\ \kappa_g^2 \end{cases}$$

$$\frac{\sigma_{VBF}}{\sigma_{VBF}^{SM}} = \kappa_{VBF}^2(\kappa_W, \kappa_Z, m_H)$$

$$\frac{\sigma_{WH}}{\sigma_{WH}^{SM}} = \kappa_W^2$$

$$\frac{\sigma_{ZH}}{\sigma_{ZH}^{SM}} = \kappa_Z^2$$

$$\frac{\sigma_{t\bar{t}H}}{\sigma_{t\bar{t}H}^{SM}} = \kappa_t^2$$

Detectable decay modes

$$\frac{\Gamma_{WW^{(*)}}}{\Gamma_{WW^{(*)}}^{SM}} = \kappa_W^2$$

$$\frac{\Gamma_{ZZ^{(*)}}}{\Gamma_{ZZ^{(*)}}^{SM}} = \kappa_Z^2$$

$$\frac{\Gamma_{b\bar{b}}}{\Gamma_{b\bar{b}}^{SM}} = \kappa_b^2$$

$$\frac{\Gamma_{\tau^-\tau^+}}{\Gamma_{\tau^-\tau^+}^{SM}} = \kappa_\tau^2$$

$$\frac{\Gamma_{\gamma\gamma}}{\Gamma_{\gamma\gamma}^{SM}} = \begin{cases} \kappa_\gamma^2(\kappa_b, \kappa_t, \kappa_\tau, \kappa_W, m_H) \\ \kappa_\gamma^2 \end{cases}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma_{Z\gamma}}{\Gamma_{Z\gamma}^{SM}} = \begin{cases} \kappa_{(Z\gamma)}^2(\kappa_b, \kappa_t, \kappa_\tau, \kappa_W, m_H) \\ \kappa_{(Z\gamma)}^2 \end{cases}$$

Currently undetectable decay modes

$$\frac{\Gamma_{t\bar{t}}}{\Gamma_{t\bar{t}}^{SM}} = \kappa_t^2$$

$$\frac{\Gamma_{gg}}{\Gamma_{gg}^{SM}} : \text{ see Section 3.1.2}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma_{c\bar{c}}}{\Gamma_{c\bar{c}}^{SM}} = \kappa_t^2$$

$$\frac{\Gamma_{s\bar{s}}}{\Gamma_{s\bar{s}}^{SM}} = \kappa_b^2$$

$$\frac{\Gamma_{\mu^-\mu^+}}{\Gamma_{\mu^-\mu^+}^{SM}} = \kappa_\tau^2$$

Total width

$$\frac{\Gamma_H}{\Gamma_H^{SM}} = \begin{cases} \kappa_H^2(\kappa_i, m_H) \\ \kappa_H^2 \end{cases}$$

- Contributions resolved at NLO QCD and LO EWK.
- Peg things unmeasured to closest of kin.

Probing custodial symmetry

[arXiv:1209.0040]

Probing custodial symmetry assuming no invisible or undetectable widths

Free parameters: κ_Z, $\lambda_{WZ}(=\kappa_W/\kappa_Z)$, $\kappa_f(=\kappa_t=\kappa_b=\kappa_\tau)$.

	$H\to\gamma\gamma$	$H\to ZZ^{(*)}$	$H\to WW^{(*)}$	$H\to b\bar{b}$	$H\to\tau^-\tau^+$
ggH $t\bar{t}H$	$\frac{\kappa_f^2\cdot\kappa_\gamma^2(\kappa_f,\kappa_f,\kappa_f,\kappa_Z\lambda_{WZ})}{\kappa_H^2(\kappa_i)}$	$\frac{\kappa_f^2\cdot\kappa_Z^2}{\kappa_H^2(\kappa_i)}$	$\frac{\kappa_f^2\cdot(\kappa_Z\lambda_{WZ})^2}{\kappa_H^2(\kappa_i)}$	$\frac{\kappa_f^2\cdot\kappa_f^2}{\kappa_H^2(\kappa_i)}$	
VBF	$\frac{\kappa_{VBF}^2(\kappa_Z,\kappa_Z\lambda_{WZ})\cdot\kappa_\gamma^2(\kappa_f,\kappa_f,\kappa_f,\kappa_Z\lambda_{WZ})}{\kappa_H^2(\kappa_i)}$	$\frac{\kappa_{VBF}^2(\kappa_Z,\kappa_Z\lambda_{WZ})\cdot\kappa_Z^2}{\kappa_H^2(\kappa_i)}$	$\frac{\kappa_{VBF}^2(\kappa_Z,\kappa_Z\lambda_{WZ})\cdot(\kappa_Z\lambda_{WZ})^2}{\kappa_H^2(\kappa_i)}$	$\frac{\kappa_{VBF}^2(\kappa_Z,\kappa_Z\lambda_{WZ})\cdot\kappa_f^2}{\kappa_H^2(\kappa_i)}$	
WH	$\frac{(\kappa_Z\lambda_{WZ})^2\cdot\kappa_\gamma^2(\kappa_f,\kappa_f,\kappa_f,\kappa_Z\lambda_{WZ})}{\kappa_H^2(\kappa_i)}$	$\frac{(\kappa_Z\lambda_{WZ})^2\cdot\kappa_Z^2}{\kappa_H^2(\kappa_i)}$	$\frac{(\kappa_Z\lambda_{WZ})^2\cdot(\kappa_Z\lambda_{WZ})^2}{\kappa_H^2(\kappa_i)}$	$\frac{(\kappa_Z\lambda_{WZ})^2\cdot\kappa_f^2}{\kappa_H^2(\kappa_i)}$	
ZH	$\frac{\kappa_Z^2\cdot\kappa_\gamma^2(\kappa_f,\kappa_f,\kappa_f,\kappa_Z\lambda_{WZ})}{\kappa_H^2(\kappa_i)}$	$\frac{\kappa_Z^2\cdot\kappa_Z^2}{\kappa_H^2(\kappa_i)}$	$\frac{\kappa_Z^2\cdot(\kappa_Z\lambda_{WZ})^2}{\kappa_H^2(\kappa_i)}$	$\frac{\kappa_Z^2\cdot\kappa_f^2}{\kappa_H^2(\kappa_i)}$	

Probing custodial symmetry without assumptions on the total width

Free parameters: $\kappa_{ZZ}(=\kappa_Z\cdot\kappa_Z/\kappa_H)$, $\lambda_{WZ}(=\kappa_W/\kappa_Z)$, $\lambda_{FZ}(=\kappa_f/\kappa_Z)$.

	$H\to\gamma\gamma$	$H\to ZZ^{(*)}$	$H\to WW^{(*)}$	$H\to b\bar{b}$	$H\to\tau^-\tau^+$
ggH $t\bar{t}H$	$\kappa_{ZZ}^2\lambda_{FZ}^2\cdot\kappa_\gamma^2(\lambda_{FZ},\lambda_{FZ},\lambda_{FZ},\lambda_{WZ})$	$\kappa_{ZZ}^2\lambda_{FZ}^2$	$\kappa_{ZZ}^2\lambda_{FZ}^2\cdot\lambda_{WZ}^2$	$\kappa_{ZZ}^2\lambda_{FZ}^2\cdot\lambda_{FZ}^2$	
VBF	$\kappa_{ZZ}^2\kappa_{VBF}^2(1,\lambda_{WZ}^2)\cdot\kappa_\gamma^2(\lambda_{FZ},\lambda_{FZ},\lambda_{FZ},\lambda_{WZ})$	$\kappa_{ZZ}^2\kappa_{VBF}^2(1,\lambda_{WZ}^2)$	$\kappa_{ZZ}^2\kappa_{VBF}^2(1,\lambda_{WZ}^2)\cdot\lambda_{WZ}^2$	$\kappa_{ZZ}^2\kappa_{VBF}^2(1,\lambda_{WZ}^2)\cdot\lambda_{FZ}^2$	
WH	$\kappa_{ZZ}^2\lambda_{WZ}^2\cdot\kappa_\gamma^2(\lambda_{FZ},\lambda_{FZ},\lambda_{FZ},\lambda_{WZ})$	$\kappa_{ZZ}^2\cdot\lambda_{WZ}^2$	$\kappa_{ZZ}^2\lambda_{WZ}^2\cdot\lambda_{WZ}^2$	$\kappa_{ZZ}^2\lambda_{WZ}^2\cdot\lambda_{FZ}^2$	
ZH	$\kappa_{ZZ}^2\cdot\kappa_\gamma^2(\lambda_{FZ},\lambda_{FZ},\lambda_{FZ},\lambda_{WZ})$	κ_{ZZ}^2	$\kappa_{ZZ}^2\cdot\lambda_{WZ}^2$	$\kappa_{ZZ}^2\cdot\lambda_{FZ}^2$	

Probing custodial symmetry

[arXiv:1303.6346] [ATLAS-CONF-2013-034] [CMS-PAS-HIG-13-005]







	Tevatron [κ_W, κ_Z, κ_f]	ATLAS [λ_{WZ}, λ_{FZ}, κ_{ZZ}]	CMS [λ_{WZ}, κ_Z, κ_f]
λ_{WZ}	$1.24^{+2.34}_{-0.42}$	[0.64, 0.87]	0.86 ±0.13

Weak bosons and fermions

[arXiv:1209.0040]

Boson and fermion scaling assuming no invisible or undetectable widths

Free parameters: $\kappa_V(=\kappa_W=\kappa_Z)$, $\kappa_f(=\kappa_t=\kappa_b=\kappa_\tau)$.

	$H \to \gamma\gamma$	$H \to ZZ^{(*)}$	$H \to WW^{(*)}$	$H \to b\bar{b}$	$H \to \tau^-\tau^+$
ggH $t\bar{t}H$	$\frac{\kappa_f^2 \cdot \kappa_\gamma^2(\kappa_f,\kappa_f,\kappa_f,\kappa_V)}{\kappa_H^2(\kappa_i)}$	$\frac{\kappa_f^2 \cdot \kappa_V^2}{\kappa_H^2(\kappa_i)}$		$\frac{\kappa_f^2 \cdot \kappa_f^2}{\kappa_H^2(\kappa_i)}$	
VBF WH ZH	$\frac{\kappa_V^2 \cdot \kappa_\gamma^2(\kappa_f,\kappa_f,\kappa_f,\kappa_V)}{\kappa_H^2(\kappa_i)}$	$\frac{\kappa_V^2 \cdot \kappa_V^2}{\kappa_H^2(\kappa_i)}$		$\frac{\kappa_V^2 \cdot \kappa_f^2}{\kappa_H^2(\kappa_i)}$	

Weak bosons and fermions

[arXiv:1303.6346] [ATLAS-CONF-2013-034] [CMS-PAS-HIG-13-005]







	Tevatron	ATLAS	CMS
P(SM)	-	8%	< 1 σ

Weak bosons and fermions

[ATLAS-CONF-2013-034] [CMS-PAS-HIG-13-005]





	ATLAS	CMS
P(SM)	8%	< 1 σ

Looking for new particles

[arXiv:1209.0040]

Probing loop structure assuming no invisible or undetectable widths

Free parameters: κ_g, κ_γ.

	$H \to \gamma\gamma$	$H \to ZZ^{(*)}$	$H \to WW^{(*)}$	$H \to b\bar{b}$	$H \to \tau^-\tau^+$
ggH	$\frac{\kappa_g^2 \cdot \kappa_\gamma^2}{\kappa_H^2(\kappa_i)}$	$\frac{\kappa_g^2}{\kappa_H^2(\kappa_i)}$			
$t\bar{t}H$ VBF WH ZH	$\frac{\kappa_\gamma^2}{\kappa_H^2(\kappa_i)}$	$\frac{1}{\kappa_H^2(\kappa_i)}$			

Probing loop structure allowing for invisible or undetectable widths

Free parameters: $\kappa_g, \kappa_\gamma, BR_{inv.,undet.}$.

	$H \to \gamma\gamma$	$H \to ZZ^{(*)}$	$H \to WW^{(*)}$	$H \to b\bar{b}$	$H \to \tau^-\tau^+$
ggH	$\frac{\kappa_g^2 \cdot \kappa_\gamma^2}{\kappa_H^2(\kappa_i)/(1-BR_{inv.,undet.})}$	$\frac{\kappa_g^2}{\kappa_H^2(\kappa_i)/(1-BR_{inv.,undet.})}$			
$t\bar{t}H$ VBF WH ZH	$\frac{\kappa_\gamma^2}{\kappa_H^2(\kappa_i)/(1-BR_{inv.,undet.})}$	$\frac{1}{\kappa_H^2(\kappa_i)/(1-BR_{inv.,undet.})}$			

$$\kappa_i^2 = \Gamma_{ii}/\Gamma_{ii}^{SM}$$

Looking for new particles in loops

[ATLAS-CONF-2013-034] [CMS-PAS-HIG-13-005]





	ATLAS	CMS
κ_γ	$1.23^{+0.16}_{-0.13}$	0.97 ±0.18
κ_g	1.08 ±0.14	0.83 ±0.11

Looking for new particles

[ATLAS-CONF-2013-034] [CMS-PAS-HIG-13-005]





	ATLAS	CMS
BR_{BSM}	**< 0.6 (95% CL)**	**< 0.52 (95% CL)**

ZH⟶$\ell\ell$+invisible

[ATLAS-CONF-2013-011]



- MET > 90 GeV.
- 2D sideband on:
  - $|\mathrm{MET}-p_T^{\ell\ell}|/p_T^{\ell\ell}$
  - $\Delta\phi(\mathrm{MET}, \vec{p}_T^{\,\mathrm{miss.}})$
- Not yet sensitive to standard candle: ZH⟶ZZZ⟶$2\ell 4\nu$
- **At m_H=125 GeV, $BR_{inv.}$ < 0.65 (0.84)** (95%CL), obs.(exp.).







$H \rightarrow Z\gamma \rightarrow \ell\ell\gamma$

[ATLAS-CONF-2013-009] [CMS-PAS-HIG-13-006]



- Loop-mediated decay: sensitive to BSM.
- Both analyses on full 7 and 8 TeV data sets.









Obs. (exp.)	ATLAS	CMS
μ at 125 GeV (95% CL)	**< 18.2 (13.5)**	**< 9 (12)**

A further take on loops

- Resolve the H⟶$\gamma\gamma$, H⟶Zγ, and ggH loops.



Probing the fermion sector

[arXiv:1209.0040]

2HDM

	u-type	d-type	lepton	
I	$\frac{\cos\alpha}{\sin\beta}$	$\frac{\cos\alpha}{\sin\beta}$	$\frac{\cos\alpha}{\sin\beta}$	SM-like
I'	$\frac{\cos\alpha}{\sin\beta}$	$\frac{\cos\alpha}{\sin\beta}$	$\frac{-\sin\alpha}{\cos\beta}$	
II	$\frac{\cos\alpha}{\sin\beta}$	$\frac{-\sin\alpha}{\cos\beta}$	$\frac{-\sin\alpha}{\cos\beta}$	
II'	$\frac{\cos\alpha}{\sin\beta}$	$\frac{-\sin\alpha}{\cos\beta}$	$\frac{\cos\alpha}{\sin\beta}$	

Probing up-type and down-type fermion symmetry assuming no invisible or undetectable widths

Free parameters: $\kappa_V (= \kappa_Z = \kappa_W)$, $\lambda_{du} (= \kappa_d/\kappa_u)$, $\kappa_u (= \kappa_t)$.

	$H \to \gamma\gamma$	$H \to ZZ^{(*)}$ $H \to WW^{(*)}$	$H \to b\bar{b}$ $H \to \tau^-\tau^+$
ggH	$\frac{\kappa_g^2(\kappa_u\lambda_{du},\kappa_u)\cdot\kappa_\gamma^2(\kappa_u\lambda_{du},\kappa_u,\kappa_u\lambda_{du},\kappa_V)}{\kappa_H^2(\kappa_i)}$	$\frac{\kappa_g^2(\kappa_u\lambda_{du},\kappa_u)\cdot\kappa_V^2}{\kappa_H^2(\kappa_i)}$	$\frac{\kappa_g^2(\kappa_u\lambda_{du},\kappa_u)\cdot(\kappa_u\lambda_{du})^2}{\kappa_H^2(\kappa_i)}$
$t\bar{t}H$	$\frac{\kappa_u^2\cdot\kappa_\gamma^2(\kappa_u\lambda_{du},\kappa_u,\kappa_u\lambda_{du},\kappa_V)}{\kappa_H^2(\kappa_i)}$	$\frac{\kappa_u^2\cdot\kappa_V^2}{\kappa_H^2(\kappa_i)}$	$\frac{\kappa_u^2\cdot(\kappa_u\lambda_{du})^2}{\kappa_H^2(\kappa_i)}$
VBF WH ZH	$\frac{\kappa_V^2\cdot\kappa_\gamma^2(\kappa_u\lambda_{du},\kappa_u,\kappa_u\lambda_{du},\kappa_V)}{\kappa_H^2(\kappa_i)}$	$\frac{\kappa_V^2\cdot\kappa_V^2}{\kappa_H^2(\kappa_i)}$	$\frac{\kappa_V^2\cdot(\kappa_u\lambda_{du})^2}{\kappa_H^2(\kappa_i)}$

Probing quark and lepton fermion symmetry assuming no invisible or undetectable widths

Free parameters: $\kappa_V (= \kappa_Z = \kappa_W)$, $\lambda_{lq} (= \kappa_l/\kappa_q)$, $\kappa_q (= \kappa_t = \kappa_b)$.

	$H \to \gamma\gamma$	$H \to ZZ^{(*)}$ $H \to WW^{(*)}$	$H \to b\bar{b}$	$H \to \tau^-\tau^+$
ggH $t\bar{t}H$	$\frac{\kappa_q^2\cdot\kappa_\gamma^2(\kappa_q,\kappa_q,\kappa_q\lambda_{lq},\kappa_V)}{\kappa_H^2(\kappa_i)}$	$\frac{\kappa_q^2\cdot\kappa_V^2}{\kappa_H^2(\kappa_i)}$	$\frac{\kappa_q^2\cdot\kappa_q^2}{\kappa_H^2(\kappa_i)}$	$\frac{\kappa_q^2\cdot(\kappa_q\lambda_{lq})^2}{\kappa_H^2(\kappa_i)}$
VBF WH ZH	$\frac{\kappa_V^2\cdot\kappa_\gamma^2(\kappa_q,\kappa_q,\kappa_q\lambda_{lq},\kappa_V)}{\kappa_H^2(\kappa_i)}$	$\frac{\kappa_V^2\cdot\kappa_V^2}{\kappa_H^2(\kappa_i)}$	$\frac{\kappa_V^2\cdot\kappa_q^2}{\kappa_H^2(\kappa_i)}$	$\frac{\kappa_V^2\cdot(\kappa_q\lambda_{lq})^2}{\kappa_H^2(\kappa_i)}$

Probing the fermion sector

[CMS-PAS-HIG-13-005]



	λ_{du}	λ_{lq}
CMS	**[0.74, 1.95] (95% CL)**	**[0.57, 2.05] (95% CL)**

Summary of scalar couplings tests

[ATLAS-CONF-2013-034] [CMS-PAS-HIG-13-005]





Resolving SM contributions

[CMS-PAS-HIG-13-005]

- Individual couplings: κ_W, κ_Z, κ_b, κ_t, κ_τ.
- All loops resolved: $\kappa_\gamma(\kappa_W, \kappa_t)$, $\kappa_g(\kappa_t, \kappa_b)$.
- SMH width scaled.

- Not explicitly a LHC HXSWG benchmark.

Resolving SM contributions

[CMS-PAS-HIG-13-005]

- **P(SM)=0.52.**
- "Reduced" couplings as function of "mass":
  - $\lambda_f = \kappa_f (m_f/vev)$
  - $(g_V/2vev)^{1/2} = \kappa_V^{1/2} (m_V/vev)$



Birth of a Higgs boson

Results from ATLAS and CMS now provide enough evidence to identify the new particle of 2012 as 'a Higgs boson'.

In the history of particle physics, July 2012 will feature prominently as the date when the ATLAS and CMS collaborations announced that they had discovered a new particle with a mass near 125 GeV in studies of proton–proton collisions at the LHC. The discovery followed just over a year of dedicated searches for the Higgs boson, the particle linked to the Brout-Englert-Higgs mechanism that endows elementary particles with mass. At this early stage, the phrase "Higgs-like boson" was the recognized shorthand for a boson whose properties were yet to be fully investigated (*CERN Courier* September 2012 p43 and p49). The outstanding performance of the LHC in the second half of 2012 delivered four times as much data at 8 TeV in the centre of mass as were used in the "discovery" analyses. Thus equipped, the experiments were able to present new results at the 2013 Rencontres de Moriond in March, giving the particle-physics community enough evidence to name this new boson "a Higgs boson".

results that further elucidate the nature of the particle discovered just eight months earlier. The collaborations find that the new particle is looking more and more like a Higgs boson. However, it remains an open question whether this is *the* Higgs boson of the Standard Model of particle physics, or one of several such bosons predicted in theories that go beyond the Standard Model. Finding the answer to this question will require more time and data.

This brief summary provides an update of the measurements

Observed CL_s compared with $J^P=0^+$		0^- (gg) pseudo-scalar	2^+_m (gg) minimal couplings	2^+_m ($q\bar{q}$) minimal couplings	1^- ($q\bar{q}$) exotic vector	1^+ ($q\bar{q}$) exotic pseudo-vector
$ZZ^{(*)}$	ATLAS	2.2%	6.8%	16.8%	6.0%	0.2%
	CMS	0.16%	1.5%	<0.1%	<0.1%	<0.1%
$WW^{(*)}$	ATLAS	–	5.1%	1.1%	–	–
	CMS	–	14%	–	–	–
$\gamma\gamma$	ATLAS	–	0.7%	12.4%	–	–

Table 1. Summary of preliminary results of the hypothesis tests compared with the Standard Model hypothesis of no spin, positive parity ($J^P=0^+$). All alternatives are disfavoured using the CL_s ratio of probabilities that takes into account how the observation relates to both the Standard Model and the alternative hypotheses.



Timeline of the results

2012
- ICHEP
  - LHC 5 σ per experiment.
- HCP
  - First properties.

2013
- Moriond
  - Some full LHC dataset updates.
  - More properties measurements.
- LHCP
  - More full dataset analyses.



Today



LHC combination?

BSM in the Higgs sector?

Conclusions



- **Went from "a new particle" to "a Higgs Boson".**
  - $m_X \sim 125.6 \pm 0.4$ GeV.
- **Big picture unfailingly consistent with SMH:**
  - Per channel, per final state, and per production mode.
  - No significant deviations of scalar couplings.
  - Parity hypothesis tests disfavor 0^-.
  - Other J^P hypothesis tests disfavor $J \neq 0$.
- **Working hard to leave no stone unturned.**
  - Look for the Higgs parallel session on Wednesday.
  - **Theoretical progress still needed (ggH).**
  - Many channels in the works: ttH, $\mu\mu$, invisible.
- **For when a LHC combination?**

The ~~beautiful~~ ~~boring~~ 2013 Universe

[arXiv:1303.5062]

- **Up above:** "Simple six-parameter ΛCDM".



- **Down below:** (Not-as-simple) Standard Model of Particle Physics.





Looking forward to LHC combination and surprises at higher energy: PeV neutrinos, LHC 13 TeV, …

"...and references therein."

- ATLAS
  https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/AtlasPublic/HiggsPublicResults
- CMS
  https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/CMSPublic/PhysicsResultsHIG
- Tevatron
  http://tevnphwg.fnal.gov/
  - CDF
    http://www-cdf.fnal.gov/physics/new/hdg/Results.html
  - D0
    http://www-d0.fnal.gov/d0_publications/d0_pubs_list_bytopic.html#higgs

For discussion

VBF, $H \rightarrow b\bar{b}$

[CMS-PAS-HIG-13-011]









- Neural network event classifier.
- Simultaneous $m_{b\bar{b}}$ fits to 4 ANN categories.
- At m_H=125 GeV, **μ < 3.6 (3.0)** (95%CL), obs.(exp.) or **μ = 0.7 ±1.4.**



ttH, H⟶ $\gamma\gamma$

[CMS-PAS-HIG-13-015]









- Tagging of leptonic and hadronic W decays from top (anti-)quarks.
- At m_H=125 GeV, μ **< 5.4 (5.3)** (95%CL), obs.(exp.).

$H \rightarrow \mu\ \mu$

[ATLAS-CONF-2013-010]

- Clean final state.
- Probe coupling to second-generation fermion.
- BR < 10^{-4} in the search range.
- At m_H=125 GeV, **μ < 9.8 (8.2) (95%CL),** obs.(exp.).







Measuring the mass





- Combinations of the high-resolution channels.

Where we stand today – with cookery

Significance Obs. (pre-fit exp.)	$H \rightarrow ZZ$	$H \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$	$H \rightarrow WW$	$H \rightarrow b\bar{b}$	$H \rightarrow \tau\tau$
ATLAS	μ =1.5±0.4 **~3.8 σ** (~2.5 σ)	μ =1.6±0.3 **~5.3 σ** (~3.3 σ)	**2.5 σ** (1.6 σ)	-0.4 σ (**1.0** σ)	1.1 σ (**1.7** σ)
	125.5 GeV		*125 GeV*		
CMS	6.7 σ (**7.1** σ)	3.9 σ (**4.2** σ)	3.9 σ (**5.6** σ)	2.0 σ (**2.1** σ)	**2.8 σ** (2.7 σ)
	125.7 GeV				

- Combined p-values $<10^{-20}$ are telling us to make measurements…

Looking well ahead

[http://cern.ch/go/P8Tn] [http://cern.ch/go/I7RZ]

- 300/fb at 14 TeV:
  - Vast improvement over present datasets.
  - **Room for theory improvements.**
- For (HL-LHC) 3 ab^{-1}:
  - self-coupling seems feasible with λ_{HH} ~ 3σ /expt.



More on ATLAS mass

- Slight difference in ATLAS results:
  - $\Delta m = 2.3\ ^{+0.6}_{-0.7}$(stat.) $\pm$0.6(syst.) GeV
  - 2.4σ (p=1.5%)
- Using more conservative energy scale uncertainties: **1.8σ (p=8%).**



More on mass


ATLAS Preliminary H → ZZ(*) → 4l
√s = 7 TeV: ∫Ldt = 4.6 fb-1
√s = 8 TeV: ∫Ldt = 20.7 fb-1
4μ m̂H = 123.8 +0.8 -0.8 (stat) +0.2 -0.3 (sys) GeV
4e m̂H = 126.2 +1.2 -1.3 (stat) +0.8 -0.8 (sys) GeV
2e2μ m̂H = 125.0 +1.0 -0.9 (stat) +0.5 -0.6 (sys) GeV
2μ2e m̂H = 122.6 +1.9 -4.1 (stat) +0.5 -0.2 (sys) GeV
-2 ln Λ
mH [GeV]


CMS Preliminary √s = 7 TeV, L ≤ 5.1 fb-1 √s = 8 TeV, L ≤ 19.6 fb-1
H → γγ + H → ZZ
μZZ, μγγ(ggH,ttH), μγγ(VBF,VH)
with syst.
no syst.
- 2 Δ ln L
mX (GeV)

CMS: channel compatibility







Probing possible 2HDM

[CMS-PAS-HIG-13-005]





	λ_{du}	λ_{lq}
CMS	**[0.74, 1.95] (95% CL)**	**[0.57, 2.05] (95% CL)**

Spin is so much more than a number

[arXiv:1208.4018]

- The spin-2 amplitude has many (higher-order) terms:

$$A(X \to V_1 V_2) = \Lambda^{-1} \Big[2g_1^{(2)} t_{\mu\nu} f^{*(1)\mu\alpha} f^{*(2)\nu\alpha} + 2g_2^{(2)} t_{\mu\nu} \frac{q_\alpha q_\beta}{\Lambda^2} f^{*(1)\mu\alpha} f^{*(2)\nu\beta} + g_3^{(2)} \frac{\tilde{q}^\beta \tilde{q}^\alpha}{\Lambda^2} t_{\beta\nu} \left(f^{*(1)\mu\nu} f^{*(2)}_{\mu\alpha} + f^{*(2)\mu\nu} f^{*(1)}_{\mu\alpha} \right)$$
$$+ g_4^{(2)} \frac{\tilde{q}^\nu \tilde{q}^\mu}{\Lambda^2} t_{\mu\nu} f^{*(1)\alpha\beta} f^{*(2)}_{\alpha\beta} + m_V^2 \left(2g_5^{(2)} t_{\mu\nu} \epsilon_1^{*\mu} \epsilon_2^{*\nu} + 2g_6^{(2)} \frac{\tilde{q}^\mu q_\alpha}{\Lambda^2} t_{\mu\nu} \left(\epsilon_1^{*\nu} \epsilon_2^{*\alpha} - \epsilon_1^{*\alpha} \epsilon_2^{*\nu} \right) + g_7^{(2)} \frac{\tilde{q}^\mu \tilde{q}^\nu}{\Lambda^2} t_{\mu\nu} \epsilon_1^* \epsilon_2^* \right)$$
$$+ g_8^{(2)} \frac{\tilde{q}_\mu \tilde{q}_\nu}{\Lambda^2} t_{\mu\nu} f^{*(1)\alpha\beta} \tilde{f}^{*(2)}_{\alpha\beta} + m_V^2 \left(g_9^{(2)} \frac{t_{\mu\alpha} \tilde{q}^\alpha}{\Lambda^2} \epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \epsilon_1^{*\nu} \epsilon_2^{*\rho} q^\sigma + \frac{g_{10}^{(2)} t_{\mu\alpha} \tilde{q}^\alpha}{\Lambda^4} \epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} q^\rho \tilde{q}^\sigma \left(\epsilon_1^{*\nu} (q\epsilon_2^*) + \epsilon_2^{*\nu} (q\epsilon_1^*) \right) \right) \Big] , \quad (18)$$

Spin is so much more than a number

[arXiv:1208.4018]

- The spin-2 amplitude has many (higher-order) terms:

$$A(X \to V_1V_2) = \Lambda^{-1}\Big[2g_1^{(2)}t_{\mu\nu}f^{*(1)\mu\alpha}f^{*(2)\nu\alpha} + 2g_2^{(2)}t_{\mu\nu}\frac{q_\alpha q_\beta}{\Lambda^2}f^{*(1)\mu\alpha}f^{*(2)\nu\beta} + g_3^{(2)}\frac{\tilde{q}^\beta\tilde{q}^\alpha}{\Lambda^2}t_{\mu\beta}\left(f^{*(1)\mu\nu}f^{*(2)}_{\nu\alpha} + f^{*(2)\mu\nu}f^{*(1)}_{\nu\alpha}\right)$$
$$+ g_4^{(2)}\frac{\tilde{q}^\nu\tilde{q}^\mu}{\Lambda^2}t_{\mu\nu}f^{*(1)\alpha\beta}f^{*(2)}_{\alpha\beta} + m_V^2\left(2g_5^{(2)}t_{\mu\nu}\epsilon_1^{*\mu}\epsilon_2^{*\nu} + 2g_6^{(2)}\frac{\tilde{q}^\mu q_\alpha}{\Lambda^2}t_{\mu\nu}\left(\epsilon_1^{*\nu}\epsilon_2^{*\alpha} - \epsilon_1^{*\alpha}\epsilon_2^{*\nu}\right) + g_7^{(2)}\frac{\tilde{q}^\mu\tilde{q}^\nu}{\Lambda^2}t_{\mu\nu}\epsilon_1^*\epsilon_2^*\right)$$
$$+ g_8^{(2)}\frac{\tilde{q}_\mu\tilde{q}_\nu}{\Lambda^2}t_{\mu\nu}f^{*(1)\alpha\beta}\tilde{f}^{*(2)}_{\alpha\beta} + m_V^2\left(g_9^{(2)}\frac{t_{\mu\alpha}\tilde{q}^\alpha}{\Lambda^2}\epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}\epsilon_1^{*\nu}\epsilon_2^{*\rho}q^\sigma + \frac{g_{10}^{(2)}t_{\mu\alpha}\tilde{q}^\alpha}{\Lambda^4}\epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}q^\rho\tilde{q}^\sigma\left(\epsilon_1^{*\nu}(q\epsilon_2^*) + \epsilon_2^{*\nu}(q\epsilon_1^*)\right)\right)\Big], \qquad (18)$$

- Keep only dim-4 terms ($g_1 = g_5 \neq 0$):
  - Graviton-like "couplings" (2^+_m).

J^P: simplified picture

[arXiv:1208.4018]

- **Until there is enough data, perform hypothesis tests against SMH (0^+).**
- Select models using simplifying assumptions on amplitudes:
  - 0^- (parity) "from" ZZ.
  - 2^+_m (graviton-like minimal couplings) also "from" WW and $\gamma\gamma$.

scenario	$X \to ZZ$	$X \to WW$	$X \to \gamma\gamma$
0^+_m vs background	5.0	5.0	5.0
0^+_m vs 0^+_h	1.7	1.1	0.0
0^+_m vs 0^-	2.9	1.2	0.0
0^+_m vs 1^+	1.9	2.0	–
0^+_m vs 1^-	2.6	3.2	–
0^+_m vs 2^+_m	1.5	2.8	2.4
0^+_m vs 2^+_h	∼5	1.1	3.1
0^+_m vs 2^-_h	∼5	2.5	3.1

CMS: 2^{+}_{m} combination

- Combination of H⟶ZZ, WW:
  - p(obs.|0^{+}) = -0.34 σ
  - p(obs.|2^{+}_{m}(gg)) = 2.84 σ
  - **CL_s = 0.6%**



“C6” vs “resolved C6”

Generic coupling fit

- Assume custodial symmetry ($\kappa_V = \kappa_W = \kappa_Z$).
- Loops treated effectively (κ_γ, κ_g).
- Option to allow BSM decays, forcing $\kappa_V \leq 1$.

Resolved coupling fit

- Keep W and Z separate.
- Loops assuming SM structure:
  - κ_g (κ_b, κ_t).
  - κ_γ (κ_W, κ_b, κ_t, κ_τ).
- Only SM-like decays.

"C6" vs "resolved C6"