Double Higgs production at the 14 TeV LHC and 100 TeV hadron colliders

Dong-Ming Zhang

Peking University

Co-authors: Qing-Hong Cao, Gang Li, Bin Yan and Hao Zhang

International Symposium on Higgs Boson and Beyond Standard Model Physics

Outline

- Motivations
- Effective Lagrangian
- Sensitivity on NP from Double Higgs production
- Conclusions

Motivations

• The Higgs potential is still undetermined.

$$m_h, v \iff V(H)$$

 $V'(H) = \mu^2 |H|^2 + \lambda_4 |H|^4 + \frac{\lambda_6}{\Lambda^2} |H|^6$ degeneracy!

• We should measure the Higgs-trilinear coupling to distinguish the degeneracy of the Higgs potential.



Motivations

 The cross section is very small in the SM, making NP very sensitive.





R. Frederix, S. Frixione, V. Hirschi, F. Maltoni, O. Mattelaer, P. Torrielli, E. Vryonidou, M. Zaro Phys.Lett. B732 (2014) 142

11.8 fb (8 TeV), 37.95 fb (13 TeV) 45.05 fb (14 TeV), 1749 fb (100 TeV) LHC Higgs Cross Section Working Group (2016)

Cancellation in the SM!

Motivations

- To motivate why to study the Double Higgs at 100 TeV hadron colliders.
- 14 TeV LHC: $\sigma(gg \rightarrow hh) \sim 40 \text{ fb}$
 - ATLAS's result: $S/\sqrt{S+B} \sim 1.2$ @3000 fb⁻¹ HL-LHC ATL-PHY-PUB-2014-019 (2015).
- 100 TeV hadron colliders: $\sigma(gg \rightarrow hh) \sim 1700 \text{ fb}$
 - Result: $S/\sqrt{S+B} \sim 61$ @30 ab⁻¹ 100 TeV hadron colliders

R. Contino, et. al, Physics at a 100 TeV pp collider: Higgs and EW symmetry breaking studies.

 $\implies S/\sqrt{S+B} \sim 5$ @200 fb⁻¹ 100 TeV hadron colliders

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}} = -\frac{m_t}{v} \bar{t} (c_t + i \tilde{c}_t \gamma_5) th - \frac{m_t}{v^2} \bar{t} (c_{2t} + i \tilde{c}_{2t} \gamma_5) th^2 + \frac{\alpha_s h}{12\pi v} (c_g G^A_{\mu\nu} G^{\mu\nu}_A + \tilde{c}_g G^A_{\mu\nu} \tilde{G}^{\mu\nu}_A) + \frac{\alpha_s h^2}{24\pi v^2} (c'_g G^A_{\mu\nu} G^{\mu\nu}_A + \tilde{c}'_g G^A_{\mu\nu} \tilde{G}^{\mu\nu}_A) - c_{3h} \frac{m_h^2}{2v} h^3$$





$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}} = -\frac{m_t}{v} \bar{t} (c_t + i\tilde{c}_t \gamma_5) th - \frac{m_t}{v^2} \bar{t} (c_{2t} + i\tilde{c}_{2t} \gamma_5) th^2 + \frac{\alpha_s h}{12\pi v} (c_g G^A_{\mu\nu} G^{\mu\nu}_A + \tilde{c}_g G^A_{\mu\nu} \tilde{G}^{\mu\nu}_A) + \frac{\alpha_s h^2}{24\pi v^2} (c'_g G^A_{\mu\nu} G^{\mu\nu}_A + \tilde{c}'_g G^A_{\mu\nu} \tilde{G}^{\mu\nu}_A) - c_{3h} \frac{m_h^2}{2v} h^3$$





$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}} = -\frac{m_t}{v} \bar{t} (c_t + i\tilde{c}_t \gamma_5) th - \frac{m_t}{v^2} \bar{t} (c_{2t} + i\tilde{c}_{2t} \gamma_5) th^2 + \frac{\alpha_s h}{12\pi v} (c_g G^A_{\mu\nu} G^{\mu\nu}_A + \tilde{c}_g G^A_{\mu\nu} \tilde{G}^{\mu\nu}_A) + \frac{\alpha_s h^2}{24\pi v^2} (c'_g G^A_{\mu\nu} G^{\mu\nu}_A + \tilde{c}'_g G^A_{\mu\nu} \tilde{G}^{\mu\nu}_A) - c_{3h} \frac{m_h^2}{2v} h^3$$





$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}} = -\frac{m_t}{v} \bar{t} (c_t + i\tilde{c}_t \gamma_5) th - \frac{m_t}{v^2} \bar{t} (c_{2t} + i\tilde{c}_{2t} \gamma_5) th^2 + \frac{\alpha_s h}{12\pi v} (c_g G^A_{\mu\nu} G^{\mu\nu}_A + \tilde{c}_g G^A_{\mu\nu} \tilde{G}^{\mu\nu}_A) + \frac{\alpha_s h^2}{24\pi v^2} (c'_g G^A_{\mu\nu} G^{\mu\nu}_A + \tilde{c}'_g G^A_{\mu\nu} \tilde{G}^{\mu\nu}_A) - c_{3h} \frac{m_h^2}{2v} h^3$$





$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}} = -\frac{m_t}{v} \bar{t} (c_t + i\tilde{c}_t \gamma_5) th - \frac{m_t}{v^2} \bar{t} (c_{2t} + i\tilde{c}_{2t} \gamma_5) th^2 + \frac{\alpha_s h}{12\pi v} (c_g G^A_{\mu\nu} G^{\mu\nu}_A + \tilde{c}_g G^A_{\mu\nu} \tilde{G}^{\mu\nu}_A) + \frac{\alpha_s h^2}{24\pi v^2} (c'_g G^A_{\mu\nu} G^{\mu\nu}_A + \tilde{c}'_g G^A_{\mu\nu} \tilde{G}^{\mu\nu}_A) - c_{3h} \frac{m_h^2}{2v} h^3$$





$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}} = -\frac{m_t}{v} \bar{t} (c_t + i\tilde{c}_t \gamma_5) th - \frac{m_t}{v^2} \bar{t} (c_{2t} + i\tilde{c}_{2t} \gamma_5) th^2 + \frac{\alpha_s h}{12\pi v} (c_g G^A_{\mu\nu} G^{\mu\nu}_A + \tilde{c}_g G^A_{\mu\nu} \tilde{G}^{\mu\nu}_A) + \frac{\alpha_s h^2}{24\pi v^2} (c'_g G^A_{\mu\nu} G^{\mu\nu}_A + \tilde{c}'_g G^A_{\mu\nu} \tilde{G}^{\mu\nu}_A) - \frac{c_{3h}}{2v} \frac{m_h^2}{2v} h^3$$

Assumption:





and the second second

$$\frac{d\sigma(\hat{s})}{d\cos\theta} = \left|\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_0(\hat{s})\right|^2 P_0(\cos\theta)^2 + \left|\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_2(\hat{s})\right|^2 P_2(\cos\theta)^2$$

S-Wave d-wave



s-wave dominant!

Based on $\mathcal{M}_{hh}(\hat{s},\theta) \approx \mathcal{M}_{hh}(\hat{s})$

- We can use a universal cut efficiency function $A(\hat{s})$ to mimic the simulation on any of the NP signals.
- Previous study:
 - 14 TeV HL-LHC ATL-PHY-PUB-2014-019 (2015).
 - 100 TeV 30 ab⁻¹ hadron colliders R. Contino, et. al, Physics at a 100 TeV pp collider: Higgs and EW symmetry breaking studies.



- 14 TeV HL-LHC ATL-PHY-PUB-2014-019 (2015)
 - Event Selections

$$\begin{split} p_T^{b_1} &> 40 \text{ GeV}, \ p_T^{b_2} > 25 \text{ GeV}, \ |\eta^b| < 2.5, \\ p_T^{\gamma} &> 30 \text{ GeV}, \ |\eta^{\gamma}| < 1.37 \text{ or } 1.52 < |\eta^{\gamma}| < 2.37, \\ \Delta R_0 &< \Delta R_{bb,\gamma\gamma} < 2.0 \ , \ \Delta R_{b\gamma} > \Delta R_0, \ \Delta R_0 = 0.4 \ , \\ 100 \text{ GeV} &< m_{bb} < 150 \text{ GeV}, \ p_T^{bb} > 110 \text{ GeV}, \\ 123 \text{ GeV} &< m_{\gamma\gamma} < 128 \text{ GeV}, \ p_T^{\gamma\gamma} > 110 \text{ GeV}, \end{split}$$



- 14 TeV HL-LHC ATL-PHY-PUB-2014-019 (2015)
 - Event Selections

 $p_T^{b_1} > 40 \text{ GeV}, \ p_T^{b_2} > 25 \text{ GeV}, \ |\eta^b| < 2.5,$ $p_T^{\gamma} > 30 \text{ GeV}, \ |\eta^{\gamma}| < 1.37 \text{ or } 1.52 < |\eta^{\gamma}| < 2.37,$ $\Delta R_0 < \Delta R_{bb,\gamma\gamma} < 2.0 , \ \Delta R_{b\gamma} > \Delta R_0, \ \Delta R_0 = 0.4 ,$ $100 \text{ GeV} < m_{bb} < 150 \text{ GeV}, \ p_T^{bb} > 110 \text{ GeV},$ $123 \text{ GeV} < m_{\gamma\gamma} < 128 \text{ GeV}, \ p_T^{\gamma\gamma} > 110 \text{ GeV},$

Results

Background : 47.1 ± 3.5 Signal : 8.4 ± 0.1







• 2σ Exclusion limit and 5σ discovery limit @14 TeV HL-LHC



• 2σ Exclusion limit and 5σ discovery limit @100 TeV 10 fb⁻¹ hadron colliders



Comparable to the 14 TeV HL-LHC results

• 5 σ discovery significance @100 TeV 30 ab,⁻¹ hadron colliders considering the SM double Higgs is the background





NP deviates from SM with 1~2% can be discovered!

Conclusions

- Double Higgs production is essential to measure the Higgs-trilinear coupling and also very sensitive to NP.
- Using the effective Lagrangian approach and based on the s-wave dominant signature of the NP, we have studied the sensitivity on NP at 14 TeV LHC and 100 TeV hadron colliders.
- The sensitivity can be comparable between 14 TeV HL-LHC and 100 TeV 10 fb⁻¹ hadron colliders.
- NP deviates from SM with 1~2% can be discovered at 100 TeV 30 ab⁻¹ hadron colliders.



Single Higgs Production

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}} = -\frac{m_t}{v} \bar{t} (c_t + i \tilde{c}_t \gamma_5) th - \frac{m_t}{v^2} \bar{t} (c_{2t} + i \tilde{c}_{2t} \gamma_5) th^2 + \frac{\alpha_s h}{12\pi v} (c_g G^A_{\mu\nu} G^{\mu\nu}_A + \tilde{c}_g G^A_{\mu\nu} \tilde{G}^{\mu\nu}_A) + \frac{\alpha_s h^2}{24\pi v^2} (c'_g G^A_{\mu\nu} G^{\mu\nu}_A + \tilde{c}'_g G^A_{\mu\nu} \tilde{G}^{\mu\nu}_A) - c_{3h} \frac{m_h^2}{2v} h^3$$





Constraints from Single Higgs Measurements

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}} = -\frac{m_t}{v} \bar{t} (c_t + i\tilde{c}_t \gamma_5) th - \frac{m_t}{v^2} \bar{t} (c_{2t} + i\tilde{c}_{2t} \gamma_5) th^2 + \frac{\alpha_s h}{12\pi v} (c_g G^A_{\mu\nu} G^{\mu\nu}_A + \tilde{c}_g G^A_{\mu\nu} \tilde{G}^{\mu\nu}_A) + \frac{\alpha_s h^2}{24\pi v^2} (c_g' G^A_{\mu\nu} G^{\mu\nu}_A + \tilde{c}_g' G^A_{\mu\nu} \tilde{G}^{\mu\nu}_A) - c_{3h} \frac{m_h^2}{2v} h^3$$



$$-\frac{1}{h} \int \left(\frac{1}{\Gamma(h \to \gamma \gamma)} \right)_{\text{SM}} = \frac{\Gamma(h \to \gamma \gamma)}{\Gamma(h \to \gamma \gamma)_{\text{SM}}} = \frac{|2F_1(\tau_W) + \frac{8}{3}c_t F_{1/2}^{\text{even}}(\tau_t)|^2 + |\frac{8}{3}\tilde{c}_t F_{1/2}^{\text{odd}}(\tau_t)|^2}{|2F_1(\tau_W) + \frac{8}{3}F_{1/2}^{\text{even}}(\tau_t)|^2} = (-0.28c_t + 1.28)^2 + (0.43\tilde{c}_t)^2$$

Constraints from Single Higgs Measurements



Brod, Joachim and Haisch, Ulrich and Zupan, Jure, 1310.1385

$$\mathcal{O}_{Ht} = H^{\dagger} H \bar{q}_L \tilde{H} t_R$$
$$c_{2t} = \frac{3}{2} (c_t - 1)$$

$$\mathcal{O}_{H} = \frac{1}{2} \partial_{\mu} (H^{\dagger} H) \partial^{\mu} (H^{\dagger} H)$$
$$\mathcal{L}_{kin} = \frac{1}{2} (1 + \frac{c_{H} v^{2}}{\Lambda^{2}}) \partial_{\mu} H \partial^{\mu} H$$
$$H' = \sqrt{1 + \frac{c_{H} v^{2}}{\Lambda^{2}}} H \approx (1 + \frac{c_{H} v^{2}}{2\Lambda^{2}}) H - \frac{c_{H} v^{2}}{8\Lambda^{2}} H^{2}$$

$$\bar{q}_L \tilde{H} t_R \to \bar{q}_L \left[\left(1 + \frac{c_H v^2}{2\Lambda^2} \right) \tilde{H} - \frac{c_H v^2}{8\Lambda^2} H^2 \right] t_R$$
$$c_{2t} \neq \frac{3}{2} (c_t - 1)$$

• Tensor basis expansion

$$\mathcal{M}_{hh} = -\frac{\alpha_s \hat{s} \delta^{ab}}{4\pi v^2} \epsilon_\mu(p_a) \epsilon_\nu(p_b) \left\{ \left[c_t^2 F_{\Box} + \tilde{c}_t^2 F_{\Box}^{(1)} + \frac{3m_H^2}{\hat{s} - m_H^2} c_{3h} \left(c_t F_{\Delta} + \frac{2}{3} c_g \right) + \frac{2}{3} c_g + c_{2t} F_{\Delta} \right] A^{\mu\nu} + \left(c_t^2 G_{\Box} + \tilde{c}_t^2 G_{\Box}^{(1)} \right) B^{\mu\nu} - \left[c_t \tilde{c}_t F_{\Box}^{(2)} + \frac{3m_H^2}{\hat{s} - m_H^2} c_{3h} \left(\tilde{c}_t F_{\Delta}^{(3)} + \frac{2}{3} \tilde{c}_g \right) + \frac{2}{3} \tilde{c}_g + \tilde{c}_{2t} F_{\Delta}^{(3)} \right] C^{\mu\nu} \right\}$$

numerically very small

Helicity basis expansion

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_{hh} &= \mathcal{M}_{+-} + \mathcal{M}_{-+} + \mathcal{M}_{++} + \mathcal{M}_{--} & \text{non-decoupling limit} \\ \mathcal{M}_{+-} &\supset B^{\mu\nu} & \mathcal{M}_{++}, \ \mathcal{M}_{--} \xrightarrow{m_t \to +\infty} \# \\ \mathcal{M}_{-+} &\supset B^{\mu\nu} & \mathcal{M}_{+-}, \ \mathcal{M}_{-+}, \ \mathcal{M}_{-+} \xrightarrow{m_t \to +\infty} 0 \xrightarrow{\text{decoupling limit}} \\ \mathcal{M}_{+-}, \ \mathcal{M}_{-+} \xrightarrow{m_t \to +\infty} 0 \xrightarrow{\text{limit}} \\ \mathcal{M}_{+-}, \ \mathcal{M}_{-+} &\sim G_{\Box}, \ G_{\Box}^{(1)} \sim \frac{p_T^2}{m_t^2} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} A^{\mu\nu} &= g^{\mu\nu} - \frac{p_a^{\nu} p_b^{\mu}}{p_a \cdot p_b} \qquad C^{\mu\nu} = \frac{p_{a\rho} p_{b\sigma}}{p_a \cdot p_b} \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \\ B^{\mu\nu} &= g^{\mu\nu} + \frac{p_c^2 p_a^{\nu} p_b^{\mu}}{p_T^2 p_a \cdot p_b} - \frac{2p_b \cdot p_c p_a^{\nu} p_c^{\mu}}{p_T^2 p_a \cdot p_b} - \frac{2p_a \cdot p_c p_b^{\mu} p_c^{\nu}}{p_T^2 p_a \cdot p_b} + \frac{2p_c^{\mu} p_c^{\nu}}{p_T^2} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{split} F_{\Box} &= \frac{2m_t^2}{\hat{s}} \{ m_t^2 (8m_t^2 - \hat{s} - 2m_H^2) (D_0^t + D_0^u + D_0^{u}) + p_T^2 (4m_t^2 - m_H^2) D_0^{tu} \\ &+ 2 + 4m_t^2 C_0^s + \frac{2}{\hat{s}} (m_H^2 - 4m_t^2) [(\hat{t} - m_H^2) C_0^t + (\hat{u} - m_H^2) C_0^u] \}, \\ G_{\Box} &= \frac{m_t^2}{\hat{s}} \{ 2(8m_t^2 + \hat{s} - 2m_H^2) [m_t^2 (D_0^t + D_0^u + D_0^{u}) - C_0^{sm}] - 2[\hat{s}C_0^s + (\hat{t} - m_H^2) C_0^t + (\hat{u} - m_H^2) C_0^u] \\ &+ \frac{1}{\hat{s}p_T^2} [\hat{s}\hat{u}(8\hat{u}m_t^2 - \hat{u}^2 - m_H^4) D_0^u + \hat{s}\hat{t}(8\hat{t}m_t^2 - \hat{t}^2 - m_H^4) D_0^t + (8m_t^2 + \hat{s} - 2m_H^2) \\ &= [\hat{s}(\hat{s} - 2m_H^2) C_0^s + \hat{s}(\hat{s} - 4m_H^2) C_0^{sm} + 2\hat{t}(m_H^2 - \hat{t}) C_0^t + 2\hat{u}(m_H^2 - \hat{u}) C_0^u]] \}, \\ F_{\Box}^{(1)} &= \frac{2m_t^2}{\hat{s}^2} \{ m_H^2 (2\hat{t}C_0^t + 2\hat{u}C_0^u - \hat{t}\hat{u}D_0^{tu}) - 2m_H^4 (C_0^t + C_0^u) + m_H^6 D_0^{tu} \\ &+ \hat{s}[2 + m_t^2] (4C_0^s - (D_0^t + D_0^u + D_0^{tu})(\hat{t} + \hat{u})]] \} \\ G_{\Box}^{(1)} &= \frac{m_t^2}{2\hat{s}} \{ \frac{2}{m_H^4 - \hat{t}\hat{u}} [-\hat{s}(2m_H^4 + \hat{t}^2 + \hat{u}^2) C_0^s + 2(m_H^2 - \hat{t})(m_H^4 + \hat{t}^2) C_0^t + 2(m_H^2 - \hat{u})(m_H^4 + \hat{u}^2) C_0^u \\ &- (\hat{t} + \hat{u})(2m_H^4 - \hat{t}^2 - \hat{u}^2) C_0^{sm} + \hat{s}\hat{t}(\hat{t}^2 + m_H^4) D_0^t + \hat{s}\hat{u}(\hat{u}^2 + m_H^4) D_0^u] \\ &- 4m_t^2(\hat{t} + \hat{u})(D_0^t + D_0^u + D_0^{tu}) \}, \\ F_{\Box}^{(2)} &= 4m_t^4 (D_0^t + D_0^u + D_0^{tu}), \\ F_{\Delta} &= \frac{2m_t^2}{\hat{s}} [2 + (4m_t^2 - s) C_0^s], \\ F_{\Delta}^{(3)} &= 2m_t^2 C_0^s. \end{split}$$

• Physical reason

 $m_t \to +\infty$

- s-wave has non-decoupling effect
- d-wave has decoupling effect



$\mathcal{M}_{hh}(\hat{s},\theta) \approx \mathcal{M}_{hh}(\hat{s})$

- Any NP doesn't change the distribution of the Higgs pair, neither of the distribution of the decay final state due to the scalar signature of the Higgs boson.
- For a specific decay final state and kinematic cuts, cut efficiency will be universal for all NP at a given \hat{s}
- We can use a universal cut efficiency function $A(\hat{s})$ to mimic the simulation on any of the NP signal.

 Previous searches for double Higgs production at 8 TeV and 13 TeV LHC

► 8 TeV, non-resonant *hh* production $b\bar{b}\gamma\gamma \leq 2.2 \text{ pb}$ ATLAS Phys. Rev. Lett. 114, 081802 (2015) $b\bar{b}b\bar{b} \leq 0.62 \text{ pb}$ ATLAS Eur. Phys. J. C75, 412 (2015) $b\bar{b}\tau^+\tau^- \leq 1.6 \text{ pb}$ ATLAS Phys. Rev. D92, 092004 (2015) $\gamma\gamma W^+W^- \leq 11 \text{ pb}$ ATLAS Phys. Rev. D92, 092004 (2015) the combined result: $\sigma_{hh}(8 \text{ TeV}) \leq 0.69 \text{ pb} \simeq 70 \sigma_{hh}^{SM}(8 \text{ TeV})$ ATLAS Phys. Rev. D92, 092004 (2015)

• 13 TeV, non-resonant *hh* production $b\bar{b}\gamma\gamma \leq 3.76$ pb atlas-conf-2016-004 (2016) $b\bar{b}b\bar{b} \leq 3.9$ pb atlas-conf-2016-017 $b\bar{b}\tau^+\tau^- \leq 8.8$ pb cms-pas-HIG-16-012

- 14 TeV HL-LHC ATL-PHY-PUB-2014-019 (2015).
 - Irreducible backgrounds: $b\bar{b}\gamma\gamma, t\bar{t}h(\gamma\gamma), Z(b\bar{b})h(\gamma\gamma), b\bar{b}h(\gamma\gamma)$
 - Reducible backgrounds:

 $jj\gamma\gamma$, $c\bar{c}\gamma\gamma$, $b\bar{b}\gamma j$, $t\bar{t}$, $t\bar{t}\gamma$



 $p_T^{bb} > 110 \text{ GeV}$

 $100 \text{ GeV} < m_{bb} < 150 \text{ GeV}$



Expected yields (3000 fb ⁻¹)	Total	Barrel	End-cap
Samples			
$H(b\bar{b})H(\gamma\gamma)(\lambda/\lambda_{SM}=1)$	8.4±0.1	6.7±0.1	1.8 ± 0.1
$H(b\bar{b})H(\gamma\gamma)(\lambda/\lambda_{SM}=0)$	13.7±0.2	10.7 ± 0.2	3.1±0.1
$H(b\bar{b})H(\gamma\gamma)(\lambda/\lambda_{SM}=2)$	4.6±0.1	3.7±0.1	0.9 ± 0.1
$H(b\bar{b})H(\gamma\gamma)(\lambda/\lambda_{SM}=10)$	36.2±0.8	27.9 ± 0.7	8.2±0.4
$b\bar{b}\gamma\gamma$	9.7±1.5	5.2±1.1	4.5±1.0
<i>c̄γ</i> γ	7.0±1.2	4.1±0.9	2.9±0.8
b̄bγj	8.4±0.4	4.3±0.2	4.1±0.2
bībjj	1.3±0.2	0.9 ± 0.1	0.4±0.1
jjγγ	7.4±1.8	5.2±1.5	2.2±1.0
$t\bar{t} \ge 1$ lepton)	0.2±0.1	0.1±0.1	0.1±0.1
$t\bar{t}\gamma$	3.2±2.2	1.6±1.6	1.6±1.6
$t\bar{t}H(\gamma\gamma)$	6.1±0.5	4.9±0.4	1.2 ± 0.2
$Z(b\bar{b})H(\gamma\gamma)$	2.7±0.1	1.9 ± 0.1	0.8±0.1
$b\bar{b}H(\gamma\gamma)$	1.2 ± 0.1	1.0 ± 0.1	0.3±0.1
Total Background	47.1±3.5	29.1±2.7	18.0±2.3
$S/\sqrt{B}(\lambda/\lambda_{SM}=1)$	1.2	1.2	0.4

Table 4: Expected yields in 3000 fb⁻¹ for all events, events with both photons in the barrel calorimeter region ("barrel") and events with at least one photon in the endcap calorimeter region ("end-cap"). The quoted errors are from MC statistics only. The final two rows show the total background and the resulting signal significance, S/ \sqrt{B} , in 3000 fb⁻¹; combining the "barrel" and "endcap" categories in quadrature the final significance reaches ~ 1.3 σ .







- 100 TeV 30 ab⁻¹ hadron colliders R. Contino, et. al, Physics at a 100 TeV pp collider: Higgs and EW symmetry breaking studies.
 - Event Selections

```
\begin{split} \gamma \text{ isolation } R &= 0.4 \\ \text{jets: anti-kt, parameter } R &= 0.4 \\ p_T^{b_1} &> 60 \text{ GeV}, \ p_T^{b_2} &> 35 \text{ GeV}, \ |\eta^b| < 4.5, \\ p_T^{\gamma_1} &> 60 \text{ GeV}, p_T^{\gamma_2} &> 35 \text{ GeV}, \ |\eta^\gamma| < 4.5, \\ p_T(bb) &> 100 \text{ GeV}, p_T(\gamma\gamma) > 100 \text{ GeV}, \\ \Delta R_{bb} &< 3.5 , \ \Delta R_{\gamma\gamma} < 3.5, \\ 100 \text{ GeV} &< m_{b\bar{b}} < 150 \text{ GeV}, \\ 123 \text{ GeV} &< m_{\gamma\gamma} < 128 \text{ GeV}, \end{split}
```

Results

Background : 27118 Signal : 12061

