

Searches for resonances decaying to pairs of bosons in ATLAS

Higgs 2023, Beijing

Olof Lundberg on behalf of the ATLAS collaboration



Introduction

Several scenarios for physics beyond the Standard Model include new particles decaying into pairs of bosons

This can be due to eg. new Gauge symmetries or extensions to the Higgs sector, like the 2-Higgs Doublet Model, Supersymmetry or models introducing spin-2 gravitons.

The SM Higgs boson (in this talk denoted H) provides one (but not the only) promising potential to look for such new resonances

This talk looks at a set of recent searches for such resonances using the **full ATLAS Run 2 data**

A common challenge: The presence of very boosted particles in the final states – often only in parts of the searched signal parameter space





Di-Higgs: $X \rightarrow HH \rightarrow b\overline{b}b\overline{b}$

2 channels spanning 251 < m_X < 5000 GeV:

- **Resolved** : Four R=0.4 *b*-tagged jets, with BDT to pair them as Higgs candidates
- **Boosted:** Two R=1.0 *b*-tagged jets, p_T>250 GeV

Track jets also associated to boosted jets – also *b*-tagged – split into selection with 2, 3 or 4.

Signal region defined by invariant mass of the two Higgs candidates – background-enriched control region constrains multi-jet and top pairs

Final observable: Fit to m_{HH} spectrum.

Data agrees with SM – small excess at 1.1 TeV – 2.3 σ for Spin-O resonance, 2.5 σ for Spin-2

Used to set limits on "generic" Spin-0 boson production and Spin-2 KK graviton production



Phys. Rev. D 105 (2022) 092002



Di-Higgs: $X \rightarrow HH \rightarrow b\overline{b}\tau^+\tau^-$

2 channels spanning 251 < m_X < 1600 GeV:

- $\tau_{had}\tau_{had}$: Two opposite-charge hadronic tau leptons, no electrons or muons selected with trigger requiring leading τ p_T > 100-180 GeV
- $\tau_{lep} \tau_{had}$: Exactly one electron or muon one hadronic tau with opposite charge

Semileptonic channel split by trigger selection

Employs Parameterized Neural Networks (PNN) to discriminate signal from background : learns the m_X parametrization of signal kinematics

Final fit on PNN output – largest deviation from SM expectation a combined local (global) excess at $m_X = 1 \text{ TeV}$, of 3.1 (2.0) σ



See also boosted analysis: JHEP 11 (2020) 163

JHEP 07 (2023) 040



Di-Higgs: $X \rightarrow HH \rightarrow b\overline{b}\tau^+\tau^-$

2 channels spanning 251 < m_X < 1600 GeV:

- $\tau_{had}\tau_{had}$: Two opposite-charge hadronic tau leptons, no electrons or muons selected with trigger requiring leading τ p_T > 100-180 GeV
- $\tau_{lep} \tau_{had}$: Exactly one electron or muon one hadronic tau with opposite charge

Two b-jets, m_{bb} < 150 GeV

Semileptonic channel split by trigger selection

Employs Parameterized Neural Networks (PNN) to discriminate signal from background : learns the m_X parametrization of signal kinematics

Final fit on PNN output – largest deviation from SM expectation a combined local (global) excess at $m_X = 1 \text{ TeV}$, of 3.1 (2.0) σ





Di-Higgs: $X \rightarrow HH \rightarrow b\overline{b}\gamma\gamma$

Previous talk by E. Mazzeo covered the event selection and basic analysis strategy

Resonant search (in 2022 paper) covers 251 < m_X < 1000 GeV

2 BDTs trained and combined to discriminate signal from non-resonant (continuum) and resonant (single Higgs) backgrounds respectively

BDTs trained jointly for all mass points to overcome the challenge with low background at higher mass

 $m_{\gamma\gamma}$ fit to exponential decay (continuum) and 2-sided Crystal Ball (signal)

No significant excess observed, proceed to set limits!



Di-Higgs: Combination

A combined likelihood calculated by combining the likelihoods of all three analyses – the individual signal regions have negligible overlap, and thus are statistically independent

No significant excess! Limits set! Largest combined deviation of 3.3 (2.1) σ at 1.1 TeV

 $b\bar{b}\gamma\gamma$ strongest at low, $b\bar{b}\tau^+\tau^-$ at intermediate and $b\bar{b}b\bar{b}$ at high m_X





Di-Higgs: Combination

Interpretation: Type-I Two-Higgs Doublet Model

Extension of SM with three neutral Higgs bosons

In this context assumed:

- The resonance decaying to Higgs pair corresponds to heavy CP-even *H* decaying to two light CP-even *h*
- All parameters assumed fixed except $\cos(\beta \alpha)$, $m_{\rm H}$ and $\tan(\beta)$

The non-fixed parameter form planes in which we can set exclusion limits

Exludes certain regions still allowed by Higgs boson coupling measurements

MSSM interpretation in backup!



arXiv:2311.15956



SH: X \rightarrow SH \rightarrow VV $\tau^+\tau^-$

Scans a window of 500 < m_X < 1500 GeV, 200 < m_S < 500 GeV (assuming m_X > m_S + m_H) Select two opposite-sign τ_{had} (p_T >25 GeV, ΔR <2)

Three signal regions:

- WW1*t*: Exactly one light lepton
- ZZ2*t*: same-flavour opposite-sign leptons with m_{II} in Z window
- WW2*l*: opposite-sign leptons, vetoed if sameflavour leptons in Z window

Signal-to background (dibosons, ttV, fake τ) discrimination using **parameterized BDT** – one per signal region and m_s hypothesis – 12 in total

Simultaneous binned fits to all BDT bins, jointly analysed to test for signal presence





SH: X \rightarrow SH \rightarrow VV $\tau^+\tau^-$

No significant excess observed in data to SM background expectation

Limits set through combining the three channels, range from 538 to 72 fb for $\sigma(X \rightarrow SH)$ under assumption that branching ratios of S equal to those of SM Higgs

The single-lepton W SR main contributor

Limits also set individually on $\sigma(X \to S(\to W^+W^-)H(\to \tau^+\tau^-))$ and $\sigma(X \to S(\to ZZ)H(\to \tau^+\tau^-))$ (in backup)





$Z\gamma: X \rightarrow Z\gamma$; leptonic

Targets 220 < m_{χ} < 3400 GeV

Two channels: $\mu\mu\gamma$ and $ee\gamma$, selecting a photon and opposite-sign leptons, $p_T^{\gamma} / m_{Z\gamma} > 0.2$

Boost means degradation of *e* ID performance:

- Dedicated MVA-based ID criterion developed; combined with Loose → Mixed ID. Increases overall ID efficiency by 6.2-12.7% and allows higher mass range than previous search
- Also selection to mis-identified as photons to selection

Functional form in $m_{Z\gamma}$ to minimize bias from spurious signal, signal modelled with 2-Sided CB

No significant deviation from SM – largest local combined excess at m_X = 420 GeV of 2.3 σ





Targets 1 < m_X < 6.8 TeV resonances to $Z\gamma$ and $W\gamma$

Select high-p_T (> 200 GeV), large-radius jet (assuming highly boosted di-quark system) + photon with E_T > 200 GeV (increases with $m_{i\nu}$)

Jet substructure (energy and inter-cluster distance in large-R jet) and mass cuts enhance signal purity

Three categories:

- 2 b-tagged sub-jet selection (Z only)
- Not 2 b-tags but 2-pronged substructure
- Neither, but jet mass consistent with W/Z

Background (γ +jet) described by "best" functional form in m_{j γ}, signal parameterized as 2-sided CB

No significant excess, largest local deviation at m_X = 3640 GeV with a 2.5 σ local significance.





arXiv:2309.04364

JHEP 07 (2023) 125

$Z\gamma: X \to Z\gamma$ limits

Limits from both papers set on $\sigma(pp \rightarrow X) \times B(X \rightarrow Z\gamma)$, for Spin-0 and Spin-2 (gg as well as qq production) resonances.

Up to ~2 TeV the leptonic final state limits typically lower, above that hadronic final state typically lower

Observed limits in range 65.5 fb to 0.6 fb (leptonic), and 10 to 0.05 fb for hadronic; *NB ranges not the same*





Summary

A set of searches for resonances decaying to pairs of bosons in ATLAS has been presented

The resonance masses in these searches span from 220 < m_X < 6800 GeV, and final states with photons, light leptons, τ leptons and jets (large- and small-radius, *b*-tagged and not) have been investigated.

So far no significant excesses in data to SM expectation found, and we proceed to set limits on potential new physics beyond the Standard Model

These resonances remain a promising potential for future analyses of LHC Run 2 and Run 3 data







Boosted topologies

How to make consistent analysis strategies spanning very large mass ranges (with sometimes very different kinematics)?

-> In the scope of this talk we span resonances from 220 GeV to 6.8 TeV

How to handle very heavy resonances leading to very boosted final states?

-> "Standard" object reconstruction fail to resolve physical objects – sometimes only in part of the search space Resolved final state







Parameterized MVA





Phys. Rev. D 105 (2022) 092002 See also VBF-targeting paper: JHEP 07 (2020) 108

Di-Higgs: $X \rightarrow HH \rightarrow b\overline{b}b\overline{b}$

4b control region

$m(G_{\rm KK}^*)$ [GeV]	Corrected <i>m</i> (<i>HH</i>) range [GeV]	Data	Background model	Spin-2 signal model
260	[250, 393]	26775	26650 ± 130	368 ± 25
500	[464, 636]	4655	4719 ± 37	138.6 ± 5.7
800	[707, 950]	795	811 ± 13	52.1 ± 1.9
1200	[993, 1279]	146	120.6 ± 2.8	14.45 ± 0.67





Phys. Rev. D 105 (2022) 092002 See also VBF-targeting paper: JHEP 07 (2020) 108

Di-Higgs: $X \rightarrow HH \rightarrow b\overline{b}b\overline{b}$





<u>Phys. Rev. D 105 (2022) 092002</u> See also VBF-targeting paper: <u>JHEP 07 (2020) 108</u>

Di-Higgs: $X \rightarrow HH \rightarrow b\overline{b}b\overline{b}$





<u>JHEP 07 (2023) 040</u> See also boosted analysis: <u>JHEP 11 (2020) 163</u>

Di-Higgs: $X \rightarrow HH \rightarrow b\overline{b}\tau^+\tau^-$







<u>JHEP 07 (2023) 040</u> See also boosted analysis: <u>JHEP 11 (2020) 163</u>

Di-Higgs: $X \rightarrow HH \rightarrow b\overline{b}\tau^+\tau^-$





<u>JHEP 07 (2023) 040</u> See also boosted analysis: <u>JHEP 11 (2020) 163</u>

Di-Higgs: $X \rightarrow HH \rightarrow b\overline{b}\tau^+\tau^-$

	$ au_{ m had} au_{ m had}$	$ au_{ m lep} au_{ m had}~ m SLT$	$ au_{ m lep} au_{ m had}\ m LTT$
Data	8	7	7
Non-resonant ggF <i>HH</i> Non-resonant VBF <i>HH</i>	$\begin{array}{c} 1.58 \pm 0.27 \\ 0.0227 \pm 0.0019 \end{array}$	0.77 ± 0.13 0.0075 ± 0.0007	$\begin{array}{c} 0.25 \pm 0.05 \\ 0.00455 \pm 0.00035 \end{array}$
tī	0.5 ± 0.1	0.44 ± 0.12	1.76 ± 0.32
Single top-quark	0.47 ± 0.20	1.2 ± 0.7	0.61 ± 0.35
Z + HF	2.3 ± 0.4	1.55 ± 0.33	1.7 ± 0.4
Combined fakes	_	1.09 ± 0.22	0.8 ± 0.5
Multi-jet fakes	0.47 ± 0.17	_	_
<i>tī</i> fakes	0.29 ± 0.07	_	_
Single Higgs boson	1.7 ± 0.5	1.10 ± 0.28	0.4 ± 0.1
Other backgrounds	0.4 ± 0.1	0.48 ± 0.09	0.33 ± 0.07
Total background	6.1 ± 0.8	6 ± 1	6 ± 1





m_X [GeV]	BDT threshold	Efficiency [%]
251	0.70	6.6
260	0.75	5.7
270	0.80	5.1
280	0.85	4.5
290	0.85	4.7
300	0.85	4.9
312.5	0.85	5.2
325	0.85	5.2
337.5	0.85	5.5
350	0.85	5.8
375	0.90	5.5
400	0.80	7.6
425	0.85	7.6
450	0.85	8.1
475	0.80	9.1
500	0.75	9.9
550	0.60	11.6
600	0.45	12.9
700	0.20	14.9
800	0.10	16.2
900	0.20	19.4
1000	0.05	20.0

Di-Higgs: $X \rightarrow HH \rightarrow b\overline{b}\gamma\gamma$





Di-Higgs: Combination

Interpretation: Type-I Two-Higgs Doublet Model

Extension of SM with three neutral Higgs bosons

In this context assumed:

- The resonance decaying to Higgs pair corresponds to heavy CP-even H decaying to two light CP-even h
- All parameters assumed fixed except $\cos(\beta \alpha)$, $m_{\rm H}$ and $\tan(\beta)$

The non-fixed parameter form planes in which we can set exclusion limits

Stronger limits in certain regions of $cos(\beta - \alpha)$ than provided by Higgs boson coupling measurements





Di-Higgs: Combination

Interpretation: Minimal Supersymmetric Standard Model

Has Higgs sector of Type-II 2HDM – includes same parameters as previous interpretation

Supersymmetry constrains free Higgs sector parameters to only m_H and $tan(\beta)$ – plane in which limits are set

2 scenarios:

- (i) Mass scales very high
- (ii) Neutralinos and charginos are accessible

Excludes region around $tan(\beta) \sim 2$ and ~ 5 not probed by otherwise sensitive probes to this parameter space





SH: $\rightarrow VV\tau^+\tau^-$





SH: $\rightarrow VV\tau^+\tau^-$















$Z\gamma: X \rightarrow Z\gamma$; leptonic





















Channel	BTAG	D2	VMASS
Spin-0 $gg \to X^0 \to Z\gamma$	436	5 659	20728
Spin-2 $gg \to X^0 \to Z\gamma$	436	10772	32 281
Spin-2 $q\bar{q} \rightarrow X^0 \rightarrow Z\gamma$	436	5 618	18 264
Spin-1 $q\bar{q'} \to X^{\pm} \to W^{\pm}\gamma$		6 373	25 146





Spin-2 limits from $X \to Z \gamma$







Spin-2 limits from $X \to Z \gamma$



2023-11-29