Non-linear Higgs portals Veronica Sanz (Sussex)

based on work with Ilaria Brivio (NBI), Belen Gavela, Luca Merlo, Rocio del Rey (Madrid) and J.M. No and Ken Mimasu (King's, UCL)

Dark Matter from aeV to ZeV, Durham

Higgs portals



Predictive scenario

e.g. Scalar DM

$$\mathcal{L} \supset -\frac{\lambda_S}{2} S^2 \Phi^{\dagger} \Phi$$

constrained by DD, relic abundance and Higgs invisible width



BRIVIO ET AL. 1511.01099

Higgs portals

In fact, what we mean is



Sensitive to the realization of EWSB

It is unclear whether the breaking is linearly or non-linearly realized

Impact of non-linearity on Higgs portals?

EWSB: spontaneous breaking delivers *longitudinal* W,Z polarizations and a another scalar particle (Higgs)

Generic parametrization of the would-be GBs

$$\mathbf{U}(x) \equiv e^{i\sigma_a \pi^a(x)/v}$$

with covariant derivative

$$\mathbf{D}_{\mu}\mathbf{U}(x) \equiv \partial_{\mu}\mathbf{U}(x) + \frac{ig}{2}W^{a}_{\mu}(x)\sigma_{a}\mathbf{U}(x) - \frac{ig'}{2}B_{\mu}(x)\mathbf{U}(x)\sigma_{3}$$

and the Higgs particle singlet under SU(2), can couple to other singlet combinations of SM fields

A limiting case of this parametrization is the SM (linear realization)

$$\Phi \equiv \frac{v+h}{\sqrt{2}} \mathbf{U} \begin{pmatrix} 0\\1 \end{pmatrix}$$

Why do we prefer a linear realization? It is **simpler**

Non-linear Lagrangian $\mathcal{A}_{LONSO ET AL. 1212.3305}$ $\mathcal{L}_{h} = \frac{1}{2} (\partial_{\mu} h) (\partial^{\mu} h) (1 + c_{H} \xi \mathcal{F}_{H}(h)) - V(h) + \frac{v^{2}}{4} \operatorname{Tr} [\mathbf{V}^{\mu} \mathbf{V}_{\mu}] \mathcal{F}_{C}(h) + c_{T} \xi \frac{v^{2}}{4} \operatorname{Tr} [\mathbf{T} \mathbf{V}^{\mu}] \operatorname{Tr} [\mathbf{T} \mathbf{V}_{\mu}] \mathcal{F}_{T}(h) + \frac{v^{2}}{4} \operatorname{Tr} [\mathbf{V}^{\mu} \mathbf{V}_{\mu}] \mathcal{F}_{C}(h) + c_{T} \xi \frac{v^{2}}{4} \operatorname{Tr} [\mathbf{T} \mathbf{V}^{\mu}] \operatorname{Tr} [\mathbf{T} \mathbf{V}_{\mu}] \mathcal{F}_{T}(h) + \frac{(v - \sqrt{2} \bar{Q}_{L} \mathbf{U}(x) \mathbf{Y} \operatorname{diag} (\mathcal{F}_{Y}^{U}(h), \mathcal{F}_{Y}^{D}(h)) Q_{R} + \mathrm{h.c.}) + \cdots + \operatorname{Higgs-fermion} Higgs-fermion$

A limiting case of this parametrization is the SM (linear realization)

$$\Phi \equiv \frac{v+h}{\sqrt{2}} \mathbf{U} \begin{pmatrix} 0\\1 \end{pmatrix}$$

Why do we prefer a linear realization? It is is good agreement with data

rho-parameter and LHC measurements coupling Higgs to vector bosons



ATLAS+CMS 8 TeV Combination

Why do we consider non-linear realizations? Needs to be tested, and it is a generic feature in Composite Higgs models



Current constraints are still weak scale of non-linearity f ~ 600 GeV

FALKOWSKI'S TALK AT HC

Linear vs non-linear portals

Linear: DM coupling to one and two Higgses are related

$$\lambda_S S^2 \Phi^{\dagger} \Phi \longrightarrow \lambda_S S^2 (v+h)^2 \longrightarrow \lambda_S S^2 (2vh+h^2)$$



Non-linear: DM coupling to Higgs is a generic function

$$\lambda_S S^2(2vh+b\,h^2)$$

yet the effect is not dramatic, dominated by SS->WW



Linear vs non-linear portals

Linear: Power-counting of interactions is the usual one

 $\mathcal{L} \supset -\frac{\lambda_S}{2} S^2 \Phi^{\dagger} \Phi$ Higgs portal: dim-4 interaction

Non-linear: Power-counting as in the pion Chiral Lagrangian

$$\mathscr{L}_{S} = \frac{1}{2} \partial_{\mu} S \partial^{\mu} S - \frac{m_{S}^{2}}{2} S^{2} \mathcal{F}_{S_{1}}(h) - \lambda S^{4} \mathcal{F}_{S_{2}}(h) + \sum_{i=1}^{5} c_{i} \mathcal{A}_{i}(h)$$

$$\mathcal{A}_{1} = \operatorname{Tr}(\mathbf{V}_{\mu} \mathbf{V}^{\mu}) S^{2} \mathcal{F}_{1}(h)$$

$$\mathcal{A}_{2} = S^{2} \Box \mathcal{F}_{2}(h)$$

$$\mathcal{A}_{3} = \operatorname{Tr}(\mathbf{T} \mathbf{V}_{\mu}) \operatorname{Tr}(\mathbf{T} \mathbf{V}^{\mu}) S^{2} \mathcal{F}_{3}(h)$$

$$\mathcal{A}_{4} = i \operatorname{Tr}(\mathbf{T} \mathbf{V}_{\mu}) (\partial^{\mu} S^{2}) \mathcal{F}_{4}(h)$$

$$\mathcal{A}_{5} = i \operatorname{Tr}(\mathbf{T} \mathbf{V}_{\mu}) S^{2} \partial^{\mu} \mathcal{F}_{5}(h)$$

$$\mathcal{C}ustodial Violating$$

 $\mathcal{F}_i(h) \equiv 1 + 2 a_i h/v + b_i h^2/v^2 + \mathcal{O}(h^3/v^3)$

Non-linear portals

New structures in the Higgs-DM interactions appear at leading-order in the chiral Lagrangian



new momentum dependence

Non-linear portals

New interactions with gauge bosons



note momentum dependence

Non-linear portals: Relic abundance

The new interactions open up the parameter space, especially at high-mass where WW dominates Excluded region is modified

e.g. coupling to WW via c1

negative c1: positive interference with linear coupling opens up parameter space

positive c1: cancellations are possible, rule out new regions



Non-linear portals: including direct detection

The new interactions open up the parameter space DD sensitivity depends on the values of non-linear interactions



Non-linear portals: new collider signatures



Mono-Higgs channel can be produced via EW bosons momentum-dependent coupling characteristic cross sections and differential distributions



Non-linear portals: new collider signatures



Mono-(W,Z) channels again, very different cross sections and differential distributions (help on reducing BG)

ratio of measurements: a possible *smoking gun* for non-linearity



Summary

- The standard Higgs portal: largely ruled out by relic abundance+DD, expect tiny signals at the LHC
- The Higgs portal is actually a portal via the sector breaking EW symmetry. EWSB could be non-linearly realized, then modifications to the portal are expected
- Non-linearity opens up a large region of the parameter space, it correlates with larger signals at LHC
- Much more work to be done: other non-scalar portals, could provide a benchmark to non-standard direct detection, new correlations with indirect detection