### Bounding the Higgs width using H=>VV

Ciaran Williams

Niels Bohr Institute

With John Campbell and Keith Ellis (1311.3589 and 1312.1628)



16 62 82 15 96 55 92 17 25 17 85 61 91 11 91 91 91 21 11 01 # 9 1. 9 1.



# Bounding the Width Using the Off-shell Cross Section

(CW, Campbell, Ellis 11) (Kauer, Passarino 12) (Caola, Melinikov 13) (CW, Campbell, Ellis 13)



In the resonance region the "onshell" cross section is dominated by the width.

$$\sigma_{i \to X \to f}^{on} \sim \frac{g_i^2 g_j^2}{\Gamma_X}$$



# Bounding the Width Using the Off-shell Cross Section

(CW, Campbell, Ellis 11) (Kauer, Passarino 12) (Caola, Melinikov 13) (CW, Campbell, Ellis 13)



Away from the resonance region, the "off-shell" cross section does not depend on the width.

$$\sigma_{i \to X \to f}^{off} \sim g_i^2 g_f^2$$



## Bounding the Width Using the Off-shell Cross Section

(CW, Campbell, Ellis 11) (Kauer, Passarino 12) (Caola, Melinikov 13) (CW, Campbell, Ellis 13)



The ratio of these cross sections is therefore dependent on the width and *independent* of the couplings.









#### What about K-factors ?

Personally, I think that a central (dynamic) scale should be chosen such that,

$$\sigma_{LO}^{on}(\mu_{NNLO}) \sim \sigma_{NNLO}^{on}(\mu_{NNLO})$$

This is in some ways equivalent to including a NNLO K-factor (at least in the on-shell regime).

Then in the off-shell region we use the same form of scale, i.e.

$$\sigma_{LO}^{off}(\mu_{NNLO})$$

But use the usual LO scale variation as an indicator of uncertainty (i.e an envelope of {1/2, 2})



#### Systematics of the MEM



#### MEM discriminant

$$D_S = \log\left(\frac{P_H}{P_{gg} + P_{q\overline{q}}}\right)$$

Is not sensitive to scale since



In fact for fixed scale choice dependence on  $\alpha_S\,$  drops out.

Therefore systematics are the same as the usual analysis, i.e. normalization of gluon induced samples versus qqb.

5