## FCC-hh Physics Case

## FCC-UK September 11<sup>th</sup> 2020

Matthew McCullough CERN

# My personal perspective, for all else consult this document:

#### arXiv.org > hep-ex > arXiv:1910.11775

Search...

Help | Advar

**High Energy Physics – Experiment** 

### **Physics Briefing Book**

#### European Strategy for Particle Physics Preparatory Group

(Submitted on 25 Oct 2019)

The European Particle Physics Strategy Update (EPPSU) process takes a bottom-up approach, whereby the community is first invited to submit proposals (also called inputs) for projects that it would like to see realised in the near-term, mid-term and longer-term future. National inputs as well as inputs from National Laboratories are also an important element of the process. All these inputs are then reviewed by the Physics Preparatory Group (PPG), whose role is to organize a Symposium around the submitted ideas and to prepare a community discussion on the importance and merits of the various proposals. The results of these discussions are then concisely summarised in this Briefing Book, prepared by the Conveners, assisted by Scientific Secretaries, and with further contributions provided by the Contributors listed on the title page. This constitutes the basis for the considerations of the European Strategy Group (ESG), consisting of scientific delegates from CERN Member States, Associate Member States, directors of major European laboratories, representatives of various European organizations as well as invitees from outside the European Community. The ESG has the mission to formulate the European Strategy Update for the consideration and approval of the CERN Council.

# My personal perspective, for all else consult this document:

arXiv.org > hep-ex > **arXiv:1910.11775** 

Search...

Help | Advar

Many things contained in here that I won't cover, such as dark matter, baryogenesis, neutrino physics, etc etc. Symposium around the submitted ideas and to prepare a community discussion on the import and merits of the various proposals. The results of these discussions are then concisely summarised in this Briefing Book, prepared by the Conveners, assisted by Scientific Secretaries, and with further contributions provided by the Contributors listed on the title page. This constitutes the basis for the considerations of the European Strategy Group (ESG), consisting of scientific delegates from CERN Member States, Associate Member States, directors of major European laboratories, representatives of various European organizations as well as invitees from outside the European Community. The ESG has the mission to formulate the European Strategy Update for the consideration and approval of the CERN Council.

Scientific history is littered with empirical models, with some unexplained parameters, which were later superceded by some deeper, more microscopic structure.

These models tended to look like...







# At low energies all we have of QCD is the pions $U=f_{\pi}e^{i\Pi/f_{\pi}}$

The phenomenological action

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2} |D_{\mu}U|^2 - \text{Tr} [\Sigma U + \text{h.c.}] + \dots$$

contains the parameters which fix the dynamics, but does not explain their origin.







The G-L Theory of superconductivity involves a complex scalar field and the photon

The Free energy is

$$F = \left| \left( \nabla + 2ieA \right) \Phi \right|^2$$

$$+m^{2}(T)|\Phi|^{2} + \lambda|\Phi|^{4} + \dots$$

Where the mass depends on the temperature.



and this...



The Higgs sector of the Standard Model involves the Higgs field and the gauge fields

$$\begin{split} H & W^a_\mu \\ \text{The Lagrangian for this theory is} \\ \mathcal{L} &= \left| (\partial_\mu + ig\sigma^a W^a_\mu) H \right|^2 \\ &+ m^2(T) |H|^2 - \lambda(T) |H|^4 + \dots \end{split}$$

This is just the relativistic non-Abelian version of Ginzburg-Landau.

Perhaps you are proud of this Lagrangian? I think it's a bit of a mess. So many parameters, interactions. But most arbitrariness is linked to one, lonely, scalar field...



If this is what the ultimate fundamental theory looks like then I'm going home...

## Where next?

Personal view. I can identify the protagonist



in the next chapter of particle physics.

# How well should we know Higgs properties?

**OK:** Claiming to have a measurement of something requires around 50% precision, to claim  $2\sigma$ .

**Better:** Claiming to have discovered something requires around 20% precision, to claim  $5\sigma$ .

**Life goals:** Quantum corrections\* are around a few percent in the Higgs sector, so to claim to have probed the quantum nature, which we should, then aim for a few percent.

\* By quantum corrections, I mean an extra factor of h compared to leading result. Nothing to do with tree-versus-loop...

# How well should we know Higgs properties?

Future colliders can realise many life goals.

kappa-0	HL-LHC	LHeC	HE	LHC		ILC			CLIC		CEPC	FC	C-ee	FCC-ee/eh/h	ιĥ
			<b>S</b> 2	S2′	250	500	1000	380	15000	3000		240	365		
κ <sub>W</sub> [%]	1.7	0.75	1.4	0.98	1.8	0.29	0.24	0.86	0.16	0.11	1.3	1.3	0.43	0.14	
κ <sub>Z</sub> [%]	1.5	1.2	1.3	0.9	0.29	0.23	0.22	0.5	0.26	0.23	0.14	0.20	0.17	0.12	
<i>к</i> g [%]	2.3	3.6	1.9	1.2	2.3	0.97	0.66	2.5	1.3	0.9	1.5	1.7	1.0	0.49	
κ <sub>γ</sub> [%]	1.9	7.6	1.6	1.2	6.7	3.4	1.9	98*	5.0	2.2	3.7	4.7	3.9	0.29	
κ <sub>Zγ</sub> [%]	10.	—	5.7	3.8	99*	86*	85 <b>*</b>	120*	15	6.9	8.2	81*	75×	0.69	
$\kappa_{c}$ [%]	—	4.1	—	—	2.5	1.3	0.9	4.3	1.8	1.4	2.2	1.8	1.3	0.95	
κ <sub>t</sub> [%]	3.3	—	2.8	1.7	—	6.9	1.6	—		2.7	—	—	- \	1.0	
κ <sub>b</sub> [%]	3.6	2.1	3.2	2.3	1.8	0.58	0.48	1.9	0.46	0.37	1.2	1.3	0.67	0.43	
κμ [%]	4.6	—	2.5	1.7	15	9.4	6.2	320*	13	5.8	8.9	10	8.9	0.41	7
κ <sub>τ</sub> [%]	1.9	3.3	1.5	1.1	1.9	0.70	0.57	3.0	1.3	0.88	1.3	1.4	0.73	0.44	/

But we all know there is more to physics than Kappas...

## FCC-hh at Higgs Intensity Frontier



High energy also buys high precision. Not only for the Higgs, across the entire physics program.

## FCC-hh at Higgs Intensity Frontier

At FCC-hh TEN BILLION Higgs bosons produced. Allowing to study extremely rare behaviour.





For systematic exploration we go beyond Kappas, to EFT.

To understand the origin and nature of the Higgs boson, we need to study how it behaves.  $\mathcal{O}_T = \frac{c_T}{2M^2} (H^{\dagger} \overleftrightarrow{D}^{\mu} H)^2 \qquad \mathcal{O}_W = \frac{ig \, c_W}{2M^2} (H^{\dagger} \sigma^a \overleftrightarrow{D}^{\mu} H) D^{\nu} W^a_{\mu\nu} \qquad \mathcal{O}_{2B} = -\frac{c_{2B}}{4M^2} (\partial_{\rho} B_{\mu\nu})^2$  $\mathcal{O}_{2G} = -\frac{c_{2G}}{4M^2} (D_{\rho} G^a_{\mu\nu})^2 \quad \mathcal{O}_{\Box} = \frac{c_{\Box}}{M^2} |\Box H|^2 \quad \mathcal{O}_{WW} = \frac{g^2 c_{WW}}{M^2} |H|^2 W^{a \, \mu\nu} W^a_{\mu\nu}$  $\mathcal{O}_B = \frac{ig' c_B}{2M^2} (H^{\dagger} \overleftrightarrow{D}^{\mu} H) \partial^{\nu} B_{\mu\nu} \qquad \mathcal{O}_6 = \frac{c_6}{M^2} |H|^6 \qquad \mathcal{O}_{GG} = \frac{g_s^2 c_{GG}}{M^2} |H|^2 G^{a,\mu\nu} G^a_{\mu\nu}$  $\mathcal{O}_{H} = \frac{c_{H}}{2M^{2}} \left(\partial^{\mu} |H|^{2}\right)^{2} \qquad \mathcal{O}_{R} = \frac{c_{R}}{M^{2}} |H|^{2} |D^{\mu}H|^{2}$  $\mathcal{O}_{BB} = \frac{g^{\prime 2} \, c_{BB}}{M^2} |H|^2 B^{\mu\nu} B_{\mu\nu}$  $\mathcal{O}_{2W} = -\frac{c_{2W}}{4M^2} (D_{\rho} W^a_{\mu\nu})^2 \qquad \mathcal{O}_{WB} = \frac{gg' c_{WB}}{M^2} H^{\dagger} \sigma^a H B^{\mu\nu} W^a_{\mu\nu}$ Operators like those above capture leading effects of heavy physics beyond the standard model. Probing them could reveal origins.

Naïve dimensional analysis:

$$[H] = [A_{\mu}] = \frac{1}{LC} \quad , \quad [\psi] = \frac{1}{L^{3/2}C}$$

Fields carry not only dimension of inverse length, but also inverse coupling.







$$\begin{array}{ccc} [\boldsymbol{g}_{*}^{\boldsymbol{0}}] & [\boldsymbol{g}_{*}^{\boldsymbol{2}}] & [\boldsymbol{g}_{*}^{\boldsymbol{4}}] \\ \mathcal{O}_{\Box} = \frac{c_{\Box}}{M^{2}} |\Box H|^{2} & \mathcal{O}_{H} = \frac{c_{H}}{2M^{2}} \left(\partial^{\mu} |H|^{2}\right)^{2} & \mathcal{O}_{6} = \frac{c_{6}}{M^{2}} |H|^{6} \\ \mathcal{O}_{T} = \frac{c_{T}}{2M^{2}} (H^{\dagger} \overleftarrow{D}^{\mu} H)^{2} \\ \mathcal{O}_{R} = \frac{c_{R}}{M^{2}} |H|^{2} |D^{\mu} H|^{2} \end{array}$$

Gauge Only

$$\mathcal{O}_{2G} = -\frac{c_{2G}}{4M^2} (D_{\rho} G^a_{\mu\nu})^2 \qquad \qquad \mathcal{O}_{2W} = -\frac{c_{2W}}{4M^2} (D_{\rho} W^a_{\mu\nu})^2 \qquad \qquad \mathcal{O}_{2B} = -\frac{c_{2B}}{4M^2} (\partial_{\rho} B_{\mu\nu})^2$$

#### Mixed

 $\mathcal{O}_B = \frac{ig' c_B}{2M^2} (H^{\dagger} \overleftrightarrow{D}^{\mu} H) \partial^{\nu} B_{\mu\nu}$  $\mathcal{O}_W = \frac{ig c_W}{2M^2} (H^{\dagger} \sigma^a \overleftrightarrow{D}^{\mu} H) D^{\nu} W^a_{\mu\nu}$ 

$$\mathcal{O}_{GG} = \frac{g_s^2 c_{GG}}{M^2} |H|^2 G^{a,\mu\nu} G^a_{\mu\nu}$$
$$\mathcal{O}_{WB} = \frac{gg' c_{WB}}{M^2} H^{\dagger} \sigma^a H B^{\mu\nu} W^a_{\mu\nu}$$
$$\mathcal{O}_{WW} = \frac{g^2 c_{WW}}{M^2} |H|^2 W^{a\,\mu\nu} W^a_{\mu\nu}$$
$$\mathcal{O}_{BB} = \frac{g'^2 c_{BB}}{M^2} |H|^2 B^{\mu\nu} B_{\mu\nu}$$

 $\mathcal{O}_6 = \frac{c_6}{M^2} |H|^6$ 

The highest coupling-dimension operator.



The lowest coupling-dimension Higgs-only operator.

 $\mathcal{O}_6 = \frac{c_6}{M^2} |H|^6$ 

Parameterises BSM deviations in sole self-interaction of SM.



Parameterises BSM deviations in how the Higgs moves.

 $\mathcal{O}_6 = \frac{c_6}{M^2} |H|^6$ 

Parameterises BSM deviations in sole self-interaction of SM.



Parameterises BSM deviations in how the Higgs moves.

These operators are very special, both essentially unexplored and require future colliders.

## Context...

We got the symmetries: LEP.

$$\mathrm{SU}(2)_L \times \mathrm{U}(1)_Y \to \mathrm{U}(1)_{\mathrm{EM}}$$

Then we got the mechanism: <u>LHC</u>.

$$\langle H \rangle = v + h$$

Time to get the dynamics: Future facilities...

$$\mathcal{O}_{\Box} = \frac{c_{\Box}}{M^2} |\Box H|^2$$

The lowest coupling-dimension Higgs-only operator.

$$\mathcal{O}_6 = \frac{c_6}{M^2} |H|^6$$
 The highest coupling-dimension operator.

Measuring the Higgs self-coupling is the only way to probe the structure of the Higgs potential.



Discovering the Higgs was difficult enough, now we want to know how it interacts with itself...

### At hadron colliders dominant production is via gluon fusion



And most promising final state is

$$hh o b\overline{b}\gamma\gamma$$

although a combination is better.

At lepton colliders a variety of pair production processes are possible.













A clean detector environment helps as well.

## At high energies we can use Higgs pair production, at low energies quantum effects:



This is the future of the Higgs self coupling (Higgs potential)...

Oblique corrections have been a formidable toolkit in the effort to explore the electroweak sector.

- S-parameter
- T-parameter
- W-parameter
- Y-parameter



The latter two contribute to amplitudes in an "energy-growing" manner:

$$\Delta_W(p^2) \approx \frac{1}{p^2 - M_W^2} - \frac{\hat{W}}{M_W^2}$$

Making these oblique parameters an excellent target for hadron colliders...

Makes sense to extend to the Higgs sector. Especially since the Higgs can easily interact with new states...



This also contributes to amplitudes in an "energygrowing" manner:

$$\Delta_H(p^2) \approx \frac{1}{p^2 - m_h^2} - \frac{\dot{H}}{m_h^2} + \dots$$

However, one needs to take the Higgs off-shell, which isn't easy...

Most promising avenue to take this Higgs off-shell is through four-top production:



We may relate this Wilson coefficient to the scale of new physics as:  $\hat{H}$ 

$$\frac{H}{m_h^2} = \frac{c_{\Box}}{M^2}$$



# Let's not overlook the outlier operators...



which determine the dynamics of the Higgs, from how it moves to the shape of the Higgs potential.

# Let's not overlook the outlier operators...



Probing the dynamics of the Higgs sector unequivocally requires a future collider.

The Higgs boson has a size/wavelength. What's inside?



Precision measurements are different ways of probing the "compositeness of the Higgs".

• Future colliders offer unprecedented examination of the Higgs boson:



If the Higgs is made up of constituents

$$H = \left( \overline{f}f \right) \int \sim f \qquad \qquad \xi \sim \frac{v^2}{f^2}$$

Could resolve some puzzles of the SM, providing the microscopic origin of Higgs, like QCD for pions.

Such models can be thought of as realising the Higgs boson analogously to the pion in QCD.

$$\rho = \left( \overline{f} f \right) \right) \sim \Lambda$$

Should also get other heavy resonances then!

Including direct searches for the associated composite-sector mesons



provides valuable complementary information.



provides valuable complementary information.

# Neutral Naturalness

----h + h--

Could there be a hidden states which tame sensitivity to physics at the cutoff?

Much attention now to alternative ideas:





# Neutral Naturalness

## Naturalness not hidden, just look in new places...



## Or fundamental to small scales? Supersymmetry can stabilize the Higgs all the down to extremely short distances.

#### All Colliders: Top squark projections

(R-parity conserving SUSY, prompt searches)



	Model	L dt[ab <sup>-</sup>	1] √s [TeV]	Mass limit (95% CL exclusion)	Conditions
г-гнс	$\tilde{t}_1 \tilde{t}_1, \tilde{t}_1 {\rightarrow} t \tilde{\chi}_1^0$	3	14	1.7 TeV	$m(\tilde{\chi}_1^0)=0$
	$\tilde{t}_1\tilde{t}_1, \tilde{t}_1 \rightarrow t\tilde{\chi}_1^0/3 \text{ body}$	/ 3	14	0.85 TeV	$\Delta m(\tilde{t}_1, \tilde{\chi}_1^0) \sim m(t)$
т	$\tilde{t}_1 \tilde{t}_1, \tilde{t}_1 \rightarrow c \tilde{\chi}_1^0 / 4 \text{ bod}$	у З	14	0.95 TeV	$\Delta m( ilde{t}_1, ilde{\chi}_1^0)$ ~ 5 GeV, monojet (*)
НЕ-LHC	$\tilde{t}_1 \tilde{t}_1, \tilde{t}_1 \rightarrow b \tilde{\chi}^{\pm} / t \tilde{\chi}_1^0, \tilde{\chi}$	<sup>0</sup> <sub>2</sub> 15	27	3.65 TeV	$m(\tilde{\chi}_1^0)=0$
	$\tilde{t}_1\tilde{t}_1, \tilde{t}_1 \rightarrow t\tilde{\chi}_1^0/3\text{-body}$	/ 15	27	1.8 TeV	$\Delta m( ilde{t}_1, ilde{\chi}_1^0)$ ~ m(t) (*)
	$\tilde{t}_1 \tilde{t}_1, \tilde{t}_1 \rightarrow c \tilde{\chi}_1^0 / 4\text{-bod}$	y 15	27	2.0 TeV	$\Delta m( ilde{t}_1, ilde{\chi}_1^0)$ ~ 5 GeV, monojet (*)
LE-FCC	$\tilde{t}_1 \tilde{t}_1, \tilde{t}_1 \rightarrow t \tilde{\chi}_1^0$	15	37.5	4.6 TeV	m( $\tilde{\chi}_1^0$ )=0 (**)
	$\tilde{t}_1 \tilde{t}_1, \tilde{t}_1 \rightarrow t \tilde{\chi}_1^0 / 3\text{-body}$	/ 15	37.5	4.1 TeV	m $( ilde{\chi}^0_1)$ up to 3.5 TeV (**)
	$\tilde{t}_1 \tilde{t}_1, \tilde{t}_1 \rightarrow c \tilde{\chi}_1^0 / 4\text{-bod}$	y 15	37.5	2.2 TeV	$\Delta m(\tilde{t_1}, \tilde{\chi}_1^0) \sim 5$ GeV, monojet (**)
CLIC <sub>1500</sub>	$\tilde{t}_1 \tilde{t}_1, \tilde{t}_1 \rightarrow b \tilde{\chi}^{\pm} / t \tilde{\chi}_1^0$	2.5	1.5	0.75 TeV	$m(\tilde{\chi}_1^0)=0$
	$\tilde{t}_1 \tilde{t}_1, \tilde{t}_1 {\rightarrow} b \tilde{\chi}^{\pm} / t \tilde{\chi}_1^0$	2.5	1.5	0.75 TeV	$\Delta m(\tilde{t}_1, \tilde{\chi}_1^0) \sim m(t)$
	$\tilde{t}_1 \tilde{t}_1, \tilde{t}_1 {\rightarrow} b \tilde{\chi}^{\pm} / t \tilde{\chi}_1^0$	2.5	1.5	(0.75 - ε) TeV	$\Delta m( ilde{t}_1, ilde{\chi}_1^0) \sim$ 50 GeV
00	$\tilde{t}_1 \tilde{t}_1, \tilde{t}_1 \rightarrow b \tilde{\chi}^{\pm} / t \tilde{\chi}_1^0$	5	3.0	1.5 TeV	m(𝒱̃1)∼350 GeV
CLIC <sub>30</sub>	$\tilde{t}_1 \tilde{t}_1, \tilde{t}_1 {\rightarrow} b \tilde{\chi}^{\pm} / t \tilde{\chi}_1^0$	5	3.0	1.5 TeV	$\Delta m(\tilde{t}_1, \tilde{\chi}_1^0) \sim m(t)$
	$\tilde{t}_1 \tilde{t}_1, \tilde{t}_1 {\rightarrow} b \tilde{\chi}^{\pm} / t \tilde{\chi}_1^0$	5	3.0	(1.5 - c) TeV	$\Delta m( ilde{t}_1, ilde{\chi}_1^0) \sim$ 50 GeV
cc-hh	$\tilde{t}_1 \tilde{t}_1, \tilde{t}_1 \rightarrow t \tilde{\chi}_1^0$	30	100	10.8 TeV	$m(\tilde{\chi}_1^0)=0$
	$\tilde{t}_1 \tilde{t}_1, \tilde{t}_1 \rightarrow t \tilde{\chi}_1^0 / 3$ -body	/ 30	100	10.0 TeV	$m( ilde{\chi}_1^0)$ up to 4 TeV
ű	$\tilde{t}_1\tilde{t}_1, \tilde{t}_1 \rightarrow c\tilde{\chi}_1^0/4$ -bod	y 30	100	5.0 TeV	$\Delta m(\tilde{i}_1, \tilde{\chi}_1^0) \sim 5$ GeV, monojet (*)
			1	0 <sup>-1</sup> Mass scale [TeV]	

#### Stop!

The stops are, arguably, the most most important players. But the heavier they are, the less effective they are.

Split SUSY? Unification? Neutralino DM?

Your choice.

(\*) indicates projection of existing experimental searches

(\*\*) extrapolated from FCC-hh prospects

 $\epsilon$  indicates a possible non-evaluated loss in sensitivity

ILC 500: discovery in all scenarios up to kinematic limit  $\sqrt{s}/2$ 

# Summary

Hmm...

Not geographically accurate.

## FCC-hh Physics Case

"Scientific progress is measured in units of courage, not intelligence." Dirac.

Progress in understanding the Higgs will not come easily. The biggest questions can only be answered with the highest energies.

# Where there is darkness, let there be light...

## Only 18% of all matter in Universe is visible.

 $egin{array}{cccc} e & u & d & z & h \ \mu & c & s & & g \ au & t & b & \gamma & W \end{array}$ 

Within that 18% we observe extraordinary complexity.



The photon, despite not being matter itself, gave us our first tool to explore the visible sector.

## Only 18% of all matter in Universe is visible.

 $egin{array}{cccc} e & u & d & z & h \ \mu & c & s & & g \ au & t & b & \gamma & W \end{array}$ 

Within that 18% we observe extraordinary complexity.



Similarly, it may be the light mediators, or other states, that open the window to the dark sector.

# Darkened Windows

The standard model provides two examples of neutral bosons which can comfortably be light and have arbitrarily weak interactions:

> Standard Model

 $\pi$ 

Z





Dark Sector



Standard





### the Darkness Driving out





# Driving out the Darkness





# Driving out the Darkness



## Driving out the Darkness

Future proton colliders can also reach intensity frontier levels:



Again here searching for the decay:

a

Makes sense to extend to the Higgs sector. Especially since the Higgs can easily interact with new states...

• H-parameter:



One can also translate basis to one in which this is a fourfermion operator and some more involving the Higgs

$${\cal O} \propto {\lambda^2 \hat{H} \over m_h^2} (\overline{\psi} \psi)^2$$

If new physics model interacts primarily with Higgs, then original basis may be better for interpretation purposes.

However,

$$\mathcal{O}_6 = \frac{c_6}{M^2} |H|^6$$

is also very very special, since:

$$[c_6] = C^4$$
 ,  $[\hbar] = C^{-2}$ 

At one-loop we have:

$$[\hbar c_6] = C^2$$

Thus, if <u>any</u> other coupling enters the game, coupling dimension is too large to match any other dim-6 operator!

**Observation:** 

One-loop running 6

This operator is a mountain-top in RG-space.



Proton/Electron

Insert into any one-loop diagram and no dim-6 counterterms will be required, result always finite!



counterterms will be required, result always finite!