$\begin{array}{l} \mbox{Multi-scalar final states} \\ \mbox{in the } \mathbb{Z}_2 \,\otimes\, \mathbb{Z}_2' \mbox{ two real singlet extension} \end{array}$

Tania Robens based on recent work with T. Stefaniak, J. Wittbrodt (work in progress)

Ruder Boskovic Institute

HH Subgroup Meeting

13.5.19

Tania Robens

 $\mathbb{Z}_2 \otimes \mathbb{Z}'_2$ two real singlet benchmarks

HH subgroup, 13.5.19

- 34

イロト イポト イヨト イヨト

ADDING TWO REAL SCALAR SINGLETS

Scalar potential $\mathcal{V} = \mu_{\Phi}^2 \Phi^{\dagger} \Phi + \mu_{S}^2 S^2 + \mu_{X}^2 X^2 + \lambda_{\Phi} (\Phi^{\dagger} \Phi)^2 + \lambda_{S} S^4 + \lambda_{X} X^4 +$ $\lambda_{\Phi S} \Phi^{\dagger} \Phi S^2 + \lambda_{\Phi X} \Phi^{\dagger} \Phi X^2 + \lambda_{S X} S^2 X^2.$ Imposed $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}'_2$ symmetry, which is spontaneously broken by singlet vevs. \Rightarrow three CP-even neutral Higgs bosons: h_1, h_2, h_3 Two interesting cases: **Case (a):** $\langle S \rangle \neq 0, \langle X \rangle = 0 \Rightarrow X$ is DM candidate; **Case (b):** $\langle S \rangle \neq 0, \langle X \rangle \neq 0 \Rightarrow$ all scalar fields mix. Again, Higgs couplings to SM fermions and bosons are universally reduced by mixing. Tim Stefaniak (DESY) | BSM Higgs physics | ALPS 2019 | 27 April 2019

[some material stolen from T. Stefaniak, Talk at ALPS 2019, April '19]

Tania Robens

 $\mathbb{Z}_2 \, \otimes \, \mathbb{Z}_2'$ two real singlet benchmarks

HH subgroup, 13.5.19

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三 のので

10

Constraints

• Theory:

boundedness from below for potential, perturbative unitarity;

• Experiment:

electroweak precision via S, T, U; agreement with measurements of 125 GeV scalar; agreement with null-results for additional searches;

also tested: W-mass as precision observable [à la Lopez-Val, TR, Phys. Rev. D 90, 114018]

Tools which were used:

HiggsBounds*, HiggsSignals, ScannerS*

Tania Robens

 $\mathbb{Z}_2 \, \otimes \, \mathbb{Z}_2'$ two real singlet benchmarks

HH subgroup, 13.5.19

< ロ > < 同 > < 三 > < 三 >

[*: private updated version]

3

Possible production and decay patterns

 $M_1 \leq M_2 \leq M_3$

Production modes at *pp* and decays

$$pp \rightarrow h_3 \rightarrow h_1 h_1;$$
 $pp \rightarrow h_3 \rightarrow h_2 h_2;$
 $pp \rightarrow h_2 \rightarrow h_1 h_1;$ $pp \rightarrow h_3 \rightarrow h_1 h_2$

$$h_2 \rightarrow SM; h_2 \rightarrow h_1 h_1; h_1 \rightarrow SM$$

\Rightarrow two scalars with same or different mass decaying directly to SM, or $h_1 h_1 h_1$, or $h_1 h_1 h_1$

[h1 decays further into SM particles]

 $\begin{bmatrix} BRs \text{ of } h_i \text{ into } X_{SM} = \frac{\kappa_i \Gamma_{h_i \to X}^{SM}(M_i)}{\kappa_i \Gamma_{tot}^{SM}(M_i) + \sum_{j,k} \Gamma_{h_i \to h_j} h_k}; \kappa_i: \text{ rescaling for } h_i \end{bmatrix}$ Tania Robens $\mathbb{Z}_2 \otimes \mathbb{Z}'_2 \text{ two real singlet benchmarks} \qquad HH \text{ subgroup, } 13.5.19$

Benchmark points/ planes [ASymmetric/ Symmetric]

AS **BP1**: $h_3 \rightarrow h_1 h_2$ ($h_3 = h_{125}$)

SM-like decays for both scalars: $\sim~3\,{\rm pb};~h_1^3$ final states: $\sim~3{\rm pb}$

AS BP2: $h_3 \rightarrow h_1 h_2$ ($h_2 = h_{125}$)

SM-like decays for both scalars: $\sim~1.4\,{\rm pb};~h_1^3$ final states: $\sim~30\,{\rm fb}$

AS **BP3:** $h_3 \rightarrow h_1 h_2$ $(h_1 = h_{125})$ [see also lans talk]

(a) SM-like decays for both scalars $\sim 0.7 \,\mathrm{pb}$; (b) h_1^3 final states: $\sim 0.25 \,\mathrm{pb}$

S BP4: $h_2 \rightarrow h_1 h_1$ ($h_3 = h_{125}$)

up to 60 pb

S BP5: $h_3 \rightarrow h_1 h_1$ ($h_2 = h_{125}$)

up to $2.5\,\mathrm{pb}$

S BP6: $h_3 \rightarrow h_2 h_2$ $(h_1 = h_{125})$ [see also lans talk]

SM-like decays: up to 0.4 pb; h_1^4 final states: around 6 fb

Tania Robens

 $\mathbb{Z}_2 \otimes \mathbb{Z}'_2$ two real singlet benchmarks

HH subgroup, 13.5.19

イロト イポト イヨト イヨト



- $\Rightarrow h_1 h_1 h_1$ final states: reconstructing to M_3 , with one pair reconstructing to M_2
- \Rightarrow both scalars as in SM: 2 light scalars reconstructing to M_3

 $[\kappa_3 = 0.99976]$

Tania Robens

 $\mathbb{Z}_2 \otimes \mathbb{Z}'_2$ two real singlet benchmarks

HH subgroup, 13.5.19

BP3b: $h_3 ightarrow h_1 h_2 \; (h_1 = h_{125})$ [up to 0.25 pb]

Example: $h_1 \simeq h_{\text{SM}}$ at 125 GeV

$$\begin{split} &\sigma(pp \rightarrow h_3) \simeq 0.04 \cdot \sigma(pp \rightarrow h_{SM})|_{m=M_3} \\ &\operatorname{BR}(\mathrm{h}_3 \rightarrow \mathrm{h}_{125}\mathrm{h}_2) \text{ always} \gtrsim 60\%. \\ &\operatorname{if} M_2 < 250 \, \mathrm{GeV} : \Rightarrow h_2 \rightarrow \mathrm{SM} \\ &\operatorname{particles.} \\ &\operatorname{if} M_2 > 250 \, \mathrm{GeV} : \\ &\Rightarrow \mathrm{BR}(\mathrm{h}_2 \rightarrow \mathrm{h}_{125}\mathrm{h}_{125}) \approx 100\%, \end{split}$$

⇒ spectacular triple-Higgs signature

[maximal close to thresholds]



 $[\kappa_3~=~0.21]~[\Gamma_3/M_3~\leq~0.1~{
m for}~M_3~\lesssim~800~{
m GeV}]$

Tania Robens

 $\mathbb{Z}_2 \otimes \mathbb{Z}'_2$ two real singlet benchmarks

1000

→ < ≥ > < ≥ >
HH subgroup, 13.5.19

BP5: $h_3 o h_1 h_1 \; (h_2 = h_{125})$ [up to 2.5 pb]



two light scalars reconstructing to M_3

Tania Robens

 $\mathbb{Z}_2 \ \otimes \ \mathbb{Z}_2'$ two real singlet benchmarks

HH subgroup, 13.5.19

$\begin{array}{rl} \mathsf{BP2:} \ h_3 \to h_1 h_2 \ (h_2 = h_{125}) \ {}_{\scriptscriptstyle [1.4 \ \text{pb}]}; \\ & \mathsf{BP4:} \ h_2 \to h_1 h_1 \ (h_3 = h_{125}) \ {}_{\scriptscriptstyle [60 \ \text{pb}]} \end{array}$



two scalars decaying as in SM at mass $M_{1,2}$,

reconstructing to M_3 ; $[\kappa_3 = -0.2]$

two lights scalars decaying as in SM at mass M_1 ,

reconstructing to M_2 ; $[\kappa_2 = 0.22]$

Please consult our note for many more details !!

Tania Robens

 $\mathbb{Z}_2 \otimes \mathbb{Z}'_2$ two real singlet benchmarks

HH subgroup, 13.5.19

we impose additional symmetry
 ⇒ smaller number of free parameters

[after setting of Higgs mass and vev: 7]

- BPs 3,6: similar kinematical configuration [in certain limits]
- however, we allow for mixing of all states ⇒ also h₂ decays to SM particles
- in addition, also consider 125 GeV state to be heaviest (BPs 1,4) and intermediate (BPs 2,5) state
- \Rightarrow in general, different decay topologies

Tania Robens

Plots I could not show for time reasons (Appendix)

Tania Robens

 $\mathbb{Z}_2 \ \otimes \ \mathbb{Z}_2'$ two real singlet benchmarks

HH subgroup, 13.5.19

E 996

イロト イポト イヨト イヨト

BP6: $h_3 \to h_2 h_2 \ (h_1 = h_{125})$ [0.4 pb]



h_1^4 can be up to 6.5 fb;

 $[\kappa_3 = 0.25][\Gamma_3/M_3 \le 0.1 \text{ for } M_3 \lesssim 700 \text{ GeV}]$

 $[{\sf BR} \ h_3 \ \to \ h_2 \ h_2 \ \ge \ 0.6]$

Tania Robens

 $\mathbb{Z}_2 \otimes \mathbb{Z}'_2$ two real singlet benchmarks

HH subgroup, 13.5.19

э

<ロ> <同> <同> < 回> < 回>

BP3a: $h_3 o h_1 h_2 \; (h_1 = h_{125})$ [0.7 pb]



h_2 decays dominantly into SM; 2 scalars h_1 , h_2 decaying into SM final states

 $[\kappa_3~=~0.25]~[\Gamma_3/M_3~\leq~0.1~{
m for}~M_3~\lesssim~600~{
m GeV}]$

Tania Robens

 $\mathbb{Z}_2 \,\otimes\, \mathbb{Z}_2'$ two real singlet benchmarks

HH subgroup, 13.5.19

- ∢ ≣ →

< 4 ₽ > < 3

Decays of light SM-like scalars



Tania Robens

W mass bounds

AS BP2: $h_3 \rightarrow h_1 h_2$ ($h_2 = h_{125}$)

SM-like decays for both scalars: $\sim 1.4\,{\rm pb};\,\hbar_1^3$ final states: $\sim 30\,{\rm fb}$ excluded for $M_3\,\geq\,400\,{\rm GeV}$ [no problem]

AS **BP3**: $h_3 \rightarrow h_1 h_2$ ($h_1 = h_{125}$)

(a) SM-like decays for both scalars $\sim 0.7\,{\rm pb};$ (b) h_1^3 final states: $\sim 0.25\,{\rm pb}$ excluded

S BP5: $h_3 \rightarrow h_1 h_1$ ($h_2 = h_{125}$)

 $_{\rm up \ to \ 2.5 \ pb}$ excluded for ${\it M}_3 \, \geq \, 300 \, {\rm GeV}$ [no problem]

S BP6: $h_3 \rightarrow h_2 h_2$ ($h_1 = h_{125}$)

SM-like decays: up to 0.4 pb; h_1^4 final states: around 6 fb excluded for $M_3 \geq 270\,{
m GeV}$

Tania Robens