The LHC Connection to EW Cosmology

(2HDMs, the Electroweak Phase Transition & the decay $A_0 \rightarrow ZH_0$)

Jose Miguel No (Sussex U.)

In collaboration with G. Dorsch, S. Huber, K. Mimasu

Physics Challenges in the face of LHC14, IFT UAM/CSIC, Madrid, September 2014



University of Sussex

Outline

Motivation

<u>Matter-antimatter Asymmetry: Baryogenesis at Electroweak Scale</u> <u>Cosmology of EW Symmetry Breaking</u>

2 An Archetype Scenario: Extended Higgs Sectors 2HDMs: a ^{simple} paradigm for the EW Phase Transition & Baryogenesis The LHC Connection:

 \Rightarrow A "smoking gun" signature: $A_0 \rightarrow H_0 Z$

 $\Rightarrow \text{ Benchmarks for LHC searches: } \overline{bb} \,\ell\ell \quad \text{and } W^+W^-\,\ell\ell \to 4\ell\,2\nu \quad \text{channels}$ Promising discovery prospects in the upcoming 14 TeV run!

Comment on other Scenarios: Higgs Portal

B Conclusions, Outlook & Debate

What is the Origin of the Baryon Asymmetry?

⇒ Leptogenesis
⇒ Baryogenesis at EW Scale
⇒ ...

Sakharov Conditions



B Violation 🖌 C & CP Violation 🗡 Departure from Thermal Equilibrium 🗶

What is the Origin of the Baryon Asymmetry?

⇒ Leptogenesis
⇒ Baryogenesis at EW Scale
⇒ ...



What is the Origin of the Baryon Asymmetry?



What is the Origin of the Baryon Asymmetry?



Possible Connection to Naturalness

N. Craig, C. Englert, M. McCullough, Phys. Rev. Lett. 111 (2013) 121803

... sphalerons are shut - off by the EW Phase Transition

What is the Origin of the Baryon Asymmetry?



N. Craig, C. Englert, M. McCullough, Phys. Rev. Lett. 111 (2013) 121803

... sphalerons are shut - off by the EW Phase Transition

Cosmology of Electroweak Symmetry Breaking?

(Nature of the EW Phase Transition)

Arquetype Scenarios: 2HDM

Extended Higgs Sectors can provide the Missing Ingredients for Baryogenesis

→ Adding a Second Scalar Doublet to the SM:

 $Z_{2} \text{ Symmetric (softly broken) 2HDM}$ $V_{s}(\Phi_{1}, \Phi_{2}) = -\mu_{1}^{2} \Phi_{1}^{\dagger} \Phi_{1} - \mu_{2}^{2} \Phi_{2}^{\dagger} \Phi_{2} - \frac{\mu^{2}}{2} (\Phi_{1}^{\dagger} \Phi_{2} + h.c.)$ $+ \frac{\lambda_{1}}{2} (\Phi_{1}^{\dagger} \Phi_{1})^{2} + \frac{\lambda_{2}}{2} (\Phi_{2}^{\dagger} \Phi_{2})^{2} + \lambda_{3} (\Phi_{1}^{\dagger} \Phi_{1}) (\Phi_{2}^{\dagger} \Phi_{2})$ $+ \lambda_{4} (\Phi_{1}^{\dagger} \Phi_{2}) (\Phi_{1}^{\dagger} \Phi_{2}) + \frac{\lambda_{5}}{2} \left((\Phi_{1}^{\dagger} \Phi_{2})^{2} + h.c. \right)$

- New bosons coupled to SM Higgs contribute to thermal eff. potential \rightarrow Strong First Order EW Phase Transition
- New Sources of CP Violation (I will not discuss it here)
- Simple Extension of the SM, Testable at LHC
- Connection between Cosmology and Collider Physics

$$\begin{aligned} V_{s}(\Phi_{1},\Phi_{2}) &= -\mu_{1}^{2}\Phi_{1}^{\dagger}\Phi_{1} - \mu_{2}^{2}\Phi_{2}^{\dagger}\Phi_{2} - \frac{\mu^{2}}{2}(\Phi_{1}^{\dagger}\Phi_{2} + h.c.) & \langle \Phi_{1} \rangle = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v\cos\beta \end{pmatrix} \\ &+ \frac{\lambda_{1}}{2}(\Phi_{1}^{\dagger}\Phi_{1})^{2} + \frac{\lambda_{2}}{2}(\Phi_{2}^{\dagger}\Phi_{2})^{2} + \lambda_{3}(\Phi_{1}^{\dagger}\Phi_{1})(\Phi_{2}^{\dagger}\Phi_{2}) \\ &+ \lambda_{4}(\Phi_{1}^{\dagger}\Phi_{2})(\Phi_{1}^{\dagger}\Phi_{2}) + \frac{\lambda_{5}}{2}\left((\Phi_{1}^{\dagger}\Phi_{2})^{2} + h.c.\right) & \langle \Phi_{2} \rangle = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v\sin\beta \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

- For Simplicity, we do not consider CP Violation (Future Work)
- New "Heavy" Scalars H_0 (CP-Even), A_0 (CP-Odd) and H^{\pm}
- 6 Parameters: m_{H_0} m_{A_0} $m_{H^{\pm}}$ μ α $an\beta$

$$\begin{aligned} V_{s}(\Phi_{1},\Phi_{2}) &= -\mu_{1}^{2}\Phi_{1}^{\dagger}\Phi_{1} - \mu_{2}^{2}\Phi_{2}^{\dagger}\Phi_{2} - \frac{\mu^{2}}{2}(\Phi_{1}^{\dagger}\Phi_{2} + h.c.) & \langle \Phi_{1} \rangle = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v\cos\beta \end{pmatrix} \\ &+ \frac{\lambda_{1}}{2}(\Phi_{1}^{\dagger}\Phi_{1})^{2} + \frac{\lambda_{2}}{2}(\Phi_{2}^{\dagger}\Phi_{2})^{2} + \lambda_{3}(\Phi_{1}^{\dagger}\Phi_{1})(\Phi_{2}^{\dagger}\Phi_{2}) \\ &+ \lambda_{4}(\Phi_{1}^{\dagger}\Phi_{2})(\Phi_{1}^{\dagger}\Phi_{2}) + \frac{\lambda_{5}}{2}\left((\Phi_{1}^{\dagger}\Phi_{2})^{2} + h.c.\right) & \langle \Phi_{2} \rangle = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v\sin\beta \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

- For Simplicity, we do not consider CP Violation (Future Work)
- New "Heavy" Scalars H_0 (CP-Even), A_0 (CP-Odd) and H^{\pm}
- 6 Parameters: m_{H_0} m_{A_0} $m_{H^{\pm}}$ μ α $an\beta$
- Our convention: $\alpha = \beta$ means light Higgs h is SM-like (Differs from Usual Definition by $\frac{\pi}{2}$)

$$\begin{aligned} V_{s}(\Phi_{1},\Phi_{2}) &= -\mu_{1}^{2}\Phi_{1}^{\dagger}\Phi_{1} - \mu_{2}^{2}\Phi_{2}^{\dagger}\Phi_{2} - \frac{\mu^{2}}{2}(\Phi_{1}^{\dagger}\Phi_{2} + h.c.) & \langle \Phi_{1} \rangle = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v\cos\beta \end{pmatrix} \\ &+ \frac{\lambda_{1}}{2}(\Phi_{1}^{\dagger}\Phi_{1})^{2} + \frac{\lambda_{2}}{2}(\Phi_{2}^{\dagger}\Phi_{2})^{2} + \lambda_{3}(\Phi_{1}^{\dagger}\Phi_{1})(\Phi_{2}^{\dagger}\Phi_{2}) \\ &+ \lambda_{4}(\Phi_{1}^{\dagger}\Phi_{2})(\Phi_{1}^{\dagger}\Phi_{2}) + \frac{\lambda_{5}}{2}\left((\Phi_{1}^{\dagger}\Phi_{2})^{2} + h.c.\right) & \langle \Phi_{2} \rangle = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v\sin\beta \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

- For Simplicity, we do not consider CP Violation (Future Work)
- New "Heavy" Scalars H_0 (CP-Even), A_0 (CP-Odd) and H^{\pm}
- 6 Parameters: m_{H_0} m_{A_0} $m_{H^{\pm}}$ μ α $an\beta$
- Our convention: $\alpha = \beta$ means light Higgs h is SM-like (Differs from Usual Definition by $\frac{\pi}{2}$)



$$\begin{aligned} V_{s}(\Phi_{1},\Phi_{2}) &= -\mu_{1}^{2}\Phi_{1}^{\dagger}\Phi_{1} - \mu_{2}^{2}\Phi_{2}^{\dagger}\Phi_{2} - \frac{\mu^{2}}{2}(\Phi_{1}^{\dagger}\Phi_{2} + h.c.) & \langle \Phi_{1} \rangle = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v\cos\beta \end{pmatrix} \\ &+ \frac{\lambda_{1}}{2}(\Phi_{1}^{\dagger}\Phi_{1})^{2} + \frac{\lambda_{2}}{2}(\Phi_{2}^{\dagger}\Phi_{2})^{2} + \lambda_{3}(\Phi_{1}^{\dagger}\Phi_{1})(\Phi_{2}^{\dagger}\Phi_{2}) \\ &+ \lambda_{4}(\Phi_{1}^{\dagger}\Phi_{2})(\Phi_{1}^{\dagger}\Phi_{2}) + \frac{\lambda_{5}}{2}\left((\Phi_{1}^{\dagger}\Phi_{2})^{2} + h.c.\right) & \langle \Phi_{2} \rangle = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v\sin\beta \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

- For Simplicity, we do not consider CP Violation (Future Work)
- New "Heavy" Scalars H_0 (CP-Even), A_0 (CP-Odd) and H^\pm
- 6 Parameters: m_{H_0} m_{A_0} $m_{H^{\pm}}$ μ α $an\beta$
- Our convention: $\alpha = \beta$ means light Higgs h is SM-like (Differs from Usual Definition by $\frac{\pi}{2}$)

Arquetype Scenarios: **2HDM** $(\mathbb{Z}_2$ Symmetric (softly broken))

The EW Phase Transition in 2HDM

 \rightarrow Monte Carlo Scan: m_{H_0} m_{A_0} $m_{H^{\pm}}$ $\mu \alpha \tan\beta$

- \Rightarrow Stability of the Effective Potential at 1-loop Select Points Satisfying Unitarity,
- ⇒ Code interfaced to 2HDMC & HiggsBounds → Perturbativity, EWPO, Collider Bounds D. Eriksson, J. Rathsman, O. Stal, Comput. Phys. Commun. 181 (2010) 189 P. Bechtle, O. Brein, S. Heinemeyer, G. Weiglein, K. Williams, Comput. Phys. Commun. 181 (2010) 138

Arquetype Scenarios: **2HDM** $(\mathbb{Z}_2$ Symmetric (softly broken))

The EW Phase Transition in 2HDM

\rightarrow Monte Carlo Scan: m_{H_0} m_{A_0} $m_{H^{\pm}}$ $\mu \alpha \tan\beta$

- ⇒ Stability of the Effective Potential at 1-loop Select Points Satisfying Unitarity,
- ⇒ Code interfaced to 2HDMC & HiggsBounds Perturbativity, EWPO, Collider Bounds D. Eriksson, J. Rathsman, O. Stal, Comput. Phys. Commun. 181 (2010) 189 P. Bechtle, O. Brein, S. Heinemeyer, G. Weiglein, K. Williams, Comput. Phys. Commun. 181 (2010) 138
- $\Rightarrow Impose Flavour Constraints (mainly b \rightarrow s \gamma)$ F. Mahmoudi, O. Stal, Phys. Rev D 81 (2010) 035016 Constraints on α and $\tan\beta$
- ⇒ Global Fit to light Higgs Properties C. Chen, S. Dawson, M. Sher, Phys. Rev D 88 (2013) 015018

Points satisfying all above constraints are "Physical"

The EW Phase Transition in 2HDM

 \rightarrow Monte Carlo Scan: m_{H_0} m_{A_0} $m_{H^{\pm}}$ $\mu \alpha \tan\beta$

- ⇒ Stability of the Effective Potential at 1-loop Select Points Satisfying Unitarity,
- Code interfaced to 2HDMC & HiggsBounds Perturbativity, EWPO, Collider Bounds D. Eriksson, J. Rathsman, O. Stal, Comput. Phys. Commun. 181 (2010) 189 P. Bechtle, O. Brein, S. Heinemeyer, G. Weiglein, K. Williams, Comput. Phys. Commun. 181 (2010) 138
- $\Rightarrow Impose \ Flavour \ Constraints \ (mainly \ b \rightarrow s \ \gamma \)$ F. Mahmoudi, O. Stal, Phys. Rev D 81 (2010) 035016 Constraints on α and $\tan\beta$
- ⇒ Global Fit to light Higgs Properties C. Chen, S. Dawson, M. Sher, Phys. Rev D 88 (2013) 015018

Points satisfying all above constraints are "Physical"

- → Strength of the EW Phase Transition:
 - \Rightarrow Daisy Resummed 1-loop Thermal Effective Potential $V_{\text{eff}}(\phi, T)$
 - \Rightarrow Critical Temperature T_{c}

 $\Rightarrow v_{c}/T_{c} > 1$

Strongly First Order EW Phase Transition



The EW Phase Transition in 2HDM

Strong EW Phase Transition vs "Physical":

• SM-like light Higgs h (Small $\alpha - \beta$ and $\tan\beta \ge 1$)

2HDM EW Phase Transition "in good shape" from measurements of Higgs properties G. Dorsch, S. Huber, J.M. No, JHEP **1310** (2013) 029

- Light H_0 : $m_{H_0} < 250$ GeV
- Large Mass Splitting $m_{A_0} m_{H_0} \sim v$ (& $m_{A_0} > 300$ GeV)



G. Dorsch, S. Huber, K. Mimasu, J.M. No, arXiv:1405.5537

The EW Phase Transition in 2HDM

Strong EW Phase Transition vs "Physical":

• SM-like light Higgs h (Small $\alpha - \beta$ and $\tan\beta \ge 1$)

2HDM EW Phase Transition "in good shape" ³ from measurements of Higgs properties G. Dorsch, S. Huber, J.M. No, JHEP **1310** (2013) 029

- Light H_0 : $m_{H_0} < 250$ GeV
- Large Mass Splitting $m_{A_0} m_{H_0} \sim v$ (& $m_{A_0} > 300$ GeV)



G. Dorsch, S. Huber, K. Mimasu, J.M. No, arXiv:1405.5537

⇒ A Strong 1st Order EW Phase Transition points towards <u>very different 2HDM</u> <u>than usually considered</u> (MSSM-like):

 $\Rightarrow \mu$ and v set the overall scale. Mass Splittings set by quartic couplings λ_i Large Mass Splittings $\Delta m \sim v$ Suggest

 \Rightarrow In MSSM, $\Delta m \ll v$ Strongly Coupled UV Completions

> J. Mrazek, A. Pomarol, R. Ratazzi, M. Redi, J. Serra, A. Wulzer, Nucl. Phys. B **853** (2011) 1 E. Bertuzzo, T. Ray, H. de Sandes, C. Savoy, JHEP **1305** (2013) 153

The EW Phase Transition in 2HDM



 \Rightarrow H_0 searches in WW and ZZ channels are Challenging

The EW Phase Transition in 2HDM



- \Rightarrow H₀ searches in WW and ZZ channels are Challenging
- $\Rightarrow Opens New Decay Channels \phi_i \rightarrow V \phi_j \quad (not widely considered...)$ B. Coleppa, F. Kling, S. Su, arXiv:1404.1922 G. Dorsch, S. Huber, K. Mimasu, J.M. No, arXiv:1405.5537

Forbidden in MSSM-like 2HDM

The EW Phase Transition in 2HDM



7

<u>The LHC Connection</u>: $A_0 \rightarrow H_0 Z$

- Decay $A_0 \rightarrow H_0 Z$ Dominant for $m_{A_0} m_{H_0} \sim v$
 - $\Rightarrow A_0 \rightarrow h Z \text{ supressed by } \sin(\alpha \beta) \qquad A_0 \rightarrow \bar{t}t \sim (\tan\beta)^{-2} \text{ depends on } m_{H^{\pm}}$ $\Rightarrow \text{ Competing Channels} \qquad A_0 \rightarrow H^{\pm} W^{\mp} \text{ from strong PT}$

G. Dorsch, S. Huber, K. Mimasu, J.M. No, In Preparation B. Coleppa, F. Kling, S. Su, arXiv:1408.4119



<u>The LHC Connection</u>: $A_0 \rightarrow H_0 Z$

- Decay $A_0 \rightarrow H_0 Z$ Dominant for $m_{A_0} m_{H_0} \sim v$
 - $\Rightarrow A_0 \to h Z \quad supressed \ by \ \sin(\alpha \beta) \qquad \checkmark A_0 \to \bar{t}t \sim (\tan\beta)^{-2}$
 - ⇒ Competing Channels —

 $A_0
ightarrow H^{\pm} W^{\mp}$ EWPO require $m_{H^{\pm}} \sim m_{A_0}$ or $m_{H^{\pm}} \sim m_{H_0}$ closed open



<u>The LHC Connection</u>: $A_0 \rightarrow H_0 Z$

- Decay $A_0 \rightarrow H_0 Z$ Dominant for $m_{A_0} m_{H_0} \sim v$
 - $\Rightarrow A_0 \to h Z \quad supressed \ by \ \sin(\alpha \beta) \qquad \checkmark A_0 \to \bar{t}t \sim (\tan\beta)^{-2}$
 - $\Rightarrow Competing Channels \qquad \qquad \checkmark A_0 \rightarrow H^{\pm} W^{\mp}$
- Simple Benchmarks for a Strong EW Phase Transition: $m_{A_0} = m_{H^{\pm}} = 400, \ m_{H_0} = 180, \ \mu = 100 \ (GeV)$ $\tan\beta = 2$ (controls $gg \rightarrow A_0$ production) $A: \alpha - \beta = 0.001\pi$ (aligned) $\overline{b}b$
- Search Strategy Dictated by Dominant Decay Mode of $H_0 \prec B: \alpha \beta = 0.1\pi$ (non-aligned) WW, ZZ

8



Arquetype Scenarios: **2HDM** $(\mathbb{Z}_2$ Symmetric (softly broken))

LHC Discovery Potential of Benchmark Scenarios

- A few words on the Analysis...
 - ⇒ *Type I 2HDM implemented in* FeynRules (*including gluon-fusion*).
 - ⇒ Signal & relevant backgrounds generated using MadGraph5_aMC@NLO. Generated events passed on to Pythia for Parton Showering and Hadronization and subsequently to Delphes for detector simulation.
 - \rightarrow Use of NLO flat K-factors for signal (SusHi) and dominant backgrounds.
 - ⇒ "Cut & Count" analysis on a small set of kinematical variables, to extract signal over background.
 - ⇒ Determined required Integrated Luminosity at 14 TeV to achieve a 5 σ statistical significance via a CLs hypothesis test.
 Only statistical uncertainties.
 10% systematic uncertainty on background.
 - \Rightarrow Also considered current 8 TeV LHC data for $\overline{b}b \,\ell\ell$

LHC Discovery Potential of Benchmark Scenarios

2 Benchmark A: $A_0 \rightarrow H_0 Z \rightarrow bb \,\ell\ell$ $(\alpha - \beta = 0.001\pi)$

 \Rightarrow Irreducible backgrounds are $Z\overline{b}b$, $\overline{t}t$, ZZ, hZ

 $\Rightarrow Analysis at 14 \text{ TeV} (\text{potential sensitivity already with 7-8 TeV LHC data}): Event Selection ATLAS-CONF-2013-079}$ $\rightarrow Anti-kT Jets with distance parameter <math>R = 0.6$.

 \rightarrow 2 *b*-tagged Jets with $|\eta| < 2.5$.

 \rightarrow 2 Isolated (within a cone of 0.3), Same-flavour leptons. $|\eta| < 2.5$ (2.7) for electrons (muons)

$$\rightarrow P_T^{\ell_1} > 40 \text{ GeV}, P_T^{\ell_2} > 20 \text{ GeV}.$$

K-factor:	1.6	1.5	1.4	-	-
	Signal	$t\bar{t}$	$Z b \overline{b}$	ZZ	Zh
Event selection	14.6	1578	424	7.3	2.7
$80 < m_{\ell\ell} < 100~{\rm GeV}$	13.1	240	388	6.6	2.5
$egin{aligned} H_T^{ m bb} > 150{ m GeV} \ H_T^{\ell\ell m bb} > 280{ m GeV} \end{aligned}$	8.2	57	83	0.8	0.74
$\Delta R_{bb} < 2.5, \Delta R_{\ell\ell} < 1.6$	5.3	5.4	28.3	0.75	0.68
$m_{bb}, m_{\ell\ell bb} \text{ signal region}$	3.2	1.37	3.2	< 0.01	< 0.02

LHC Discovery Potential of Benchmark Scenarios

2 Benchmark A: $A_0 \rightarrow H_0 Z \rightarrow \overline{bb} \ell \ell$ $(\alpha - \beta = 0.001\pi)$

 \Rightarrow Irreducible backgrounds are $Z\overline{b}b$, $\overline{t}t$, ZZ, hZ

 $\Rightarrow Analysis at 14 \text{ TeV} (\text{potential sensitivity already with 7-8 TeV LHC data}): Event Selection}$ $\xrightarrow{\text{ATLAS-CONF-2013-079}} \rightarrow Anti-kT Jets with distance parameter R = 0.6.$

 \rightarrow 2 *b*-tagged Jets with $|\eta| < 2.5$.

 \rightarrow 2 Isolated (within a cone of 0.3), Same-flavour leptons. $|\eta| < 2.5$ (2.7) for electrons (muons)



10

LHC Discovery Potential of Benchmark Scenarios

- **3** Benchmark B: $A_0 \to H_0 Z \to W^+ W^- \ell \ell \to 4\ell + 2\nu$ (α - $\beta = 0.1\pi$)
 - ⇒ Most sensitive A search channel away from alignment. G. Dorsch, S. Huber, K. Mimasu, J.M. No, arXiv:1405.5537
 - $\Rightarrow A_0 \rightarrow H_0 Z \rightarrow ZZ\ell\ell \rightarrow 4\ell + 2j \text{ also promising.}$ B. Coleppa, F. Kling, S. Su, arXiv:1404.1922
 - \Rightarrow Main backgrounds are ZZ, $Z\bar{t}t hZ$, ZWW subdominant

Analysis & Event Selection similar to previous case:

→ 4 Isolated (cone of 0.3) leptons, same-flavour pairs. $|\eta| < 2.5$ (2.7) for electrons (muons) → $P_T^{\ell_1} > 40 \text{ GeV}, P_T^{\ell_{2,3,4}} > 20 \text{ GeV}.$

LHC Discovery Potential of Benchmark Scenarios

- **3** Benchmark B: $A_0 \to H_0 Z \to W^+ W^- \ell \ell \to 4\ell + 2\nu$ (α - $\beta = 0.1\pi$)
 - ⇒ Most sensitive A search channel away from alignment. G. Dorsch, S. Huber, K. Mimasu, J.M. No, arXiv:1405.5537
 - $\Rightarrow A_0 \rightarrow H_0 Z \rightarrow ZZ\ell\ell \rightarrow 4\ell + 2j \text{ also promising.}$ B. Coleppa, F. Kling, S. Su, arXiv:1404.1922
 - \Rightarrow Main backgrounds are ZZ, $Z\bar{t}t hZ$, ZWW subdominant

 $\Rightarrow Analysis \& Event Selection similar to previous case:$ $<math display="block">\rightarrow 4 \text{ Isolated (cone of 0.3) leptons, same-flavour pairs. } |\eta| < 2.5 (2.7) \text{ for electrons (muons)}$ $<math display="block">\Rightarrow P_T^{\ell_1} > 40 \text{ GeV}, P_T^{\ell_{2,3,4}} > 20 \text{ GeV}. \qquad 14 \text{ TeV LHC}, \mathcal{L} = 60 \text{ fb}^{-1}$ $\Rightarrow 1 \text{ pair of SF leptons must reconstruct } m_z \qquad 40$ $\Rightarrow \text{ Transverse mass variables:} \qquad 30$

$$(m_T^{\ell\ell})^2 = (\sqrt{p_{T,\ell\ell}^2 + m_{\ell\ell}^2 + \not\!\!p_T})^2 - (\vec{p}_{T,\ell\ell} + \not\!\!p_T)^2$$
$$m_T^{4\ell} = \sqrt{p_{T,\ell'\ell'}^2 + m_{\ell'\ell'}^2} + \sqrt{p_{T,\ell\ell}^2 + (m_T^{\ell\ell})^2}$$

 $m_T^{4\ell} > 260 \text{ GeV}$ allows for Signal Extraction



LHC Discovery Potential of Benchmark Scenarios

- **3** Benchmark B: $A_0 \to H_0 Z \to W^+ W^- \ell \ell \to 4\ell + 2\nu$ (α - $\beta = 0.1\pi$)
 - ⇒ Most sensitive A search channel away from alignment. G. Dorsch, S. Huber, K. Mimasu, J.M. No, arXiv:1405.5537
 - $\Rightarrow A_0 \rightarrow H_0 Z \rightarrow ZZ\ell\ell \rightarrow 4\ell + 2j \text{ also promising.}$ B. Coleppa, F. Kling, S. Su, arXiv:1404.1922
 - \Rightarrow Main backgrounds are ZZ, $Z\bar{t}t hZ, ZWW$ subdominant

⇒ Analysis & Event Selection similar to previous case:

→ 4 Isolated (cone of 0.3) leptons, same-flavour pairs. $|\eta| < 2.5 (2.7)$ for electrons (muons) → $P_T^{\ell_1} > 40 \text{ GeV}, P_T^{\ell_{2,3,4}} > 20 \text{ GeV}.$ 14 TeV LHC, $\mathscr{L} = 60 \text{ fb}^{-1}$

 5σ signal significance for: $\mathscr{L} = 60 \, fb^{-1}$ (statistics only) $\mathscr{L} = 200 \, fb^{-1}$ (10% systematics)

(conservative...)



Arquetype Scenarios: Higgs Portal

R. Schabinger, J. Wells, Phys. Rev. **D72** (2005) 093007 B. Patt, F. Wilczek, hep-ph/0605188





Conclusions and Outlook

- ⇒ EW scale Baryogenesis as a motivation for New Physics Beyond the SM. (New Bosons at EW Scale ⇒ Possible Connection to Naturalness)
- ⇒ Extended Higgs sectors as Archetype scenarios of such a connection between EW Cosmology and LHC Physics.

<u>2HDM</u>:

- \rightarrow Simple & testable extension of the SM, capable of providing the Ingredients for EWBG missing in the SM.
- → A Strong First Order EW Phase Transition favours a 2HDM scenario different from the one usually considered

 $\begin{array}{ll} SM\text{-like light Higgs h (Small $\alpha - \beta & \tan\beta \geq 1$) \\ Light H_0 (m_{H_0} < 250 \text{ GeV}) \\ Large Mass Splitting $m_{A_0} - m_{H_0} \sim v$ \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{ll} \text{``smoking gun''} \\ A_0 \to H_0 Z \end{array}$

- \rightarrow Two main search channels: $\bar{b}b \, \ell \ell$ & $W^+W^- \, \ell \ell \rightarrow 4\ell \, 2\nu$
- \rightarrow Current data could already be sensitive to this signature in bb $\ell\ell$ final state!
- \rightarrow "Cut & count" analysis for two benchmark shows these searches are very promising at LHC14

Higgs Portal: Nature of the EW Phase Transition explorable via Resonant Di-Higgs Production

Conclusions and Outlook

- ⇒ These results very much motivate taking such searches seriously at LHC
- \Rightarrow For 2HDM, we aim to:
 - \rightarrow Extend the present analysis beyond Benchmark scenarios
 - \rightarrow Further investigate the Sensitivity of current 7-8 TeV LHC data to these scenarios
 - \rightarrow Include Charged Higgs: $A_0 \rightarrow H^{\pm} W^{\mp}$
 - \rightarrow Include CP Violation

$\begin{array}{l} \text{ATLAS-CONF-2013-079]} \hline \overline{b}b\,\ell\ell & \text{at 7-8 TeV} \end{array}$

- Defines signal regions according to number of leptons, additional jets.
- Splits them according to the p_T of the Z (no m_{bb} requirement).
- Global fit extracts the background normalisations and signal strength of a 125 GeV SM Higgs.
- P_T^Z in our signal set by $m_{A_0} m_{H_0}$. Signal will populate boosted kinematical region.

