(PSEUDO)SCALAR PHYSICS @

CMS

SCALARS 2017



Greg Landsberg Scalars 2017 Conference Warsaw, November 30, 2017



In Memoriam Maria Krawczyk





N



Outline



- (Pseudo)Scalar Physics at CMS
 - Higgs boson gauge sector interactions
 - Mass and width of the Higgs boson
 - Higgs boson Yukawa sector interactions
 - Limits on Higgs boson self-coupling
 - Exotic decays of the Higgs boson
- (Pseudo)scalars and Dark Matter
- Toward the future
- Conclusions

Disclaimer: focus only on the most recent results, most of them with full 2016 data set. For a complete list, please refer to: <u>http://cms-results.web.cern.ch/cms-results/public-results/publications/HIG/index.html</u>

က



I organized this talk by the terms of the Higgs Lagrangian

CMS

 $\begin{aligned} \chi &= -\frac{1}{4} F_{AL} F^{AU} \\ &+ i F D \mu + h.c. \\ &+ \chi_i Y_{ij} \chi_j \phi + h.c. \\ &+ |D_{\mu} \phi|^2 - V(\phi) \end{aligned}$



I organized this talk by the terms of the Higgs Lagrangian

CMS

 $\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I} &= -\frac{1}{4} F_{A\nu} F^{A\nu} \\ &+ i F \mathcal{D} \mathcal{J} + h.c. \\ &+ \mathcal{Y}_i \mathcal{Y}_{ij} \mathcal{Y}_j \mathcal{P} + h.c. \end{aligned}$ $+ |\underline{p}, \boldsymbol{\varphi}|^2 - \vee (\boldsymbol{\phi})$ Gauge boson interactions

 $(D_{\mu}\phi)^{\dagger} D^{\mu}\phi \stackrel{\theta^{i}=0}{\longrightarrow} \frac{1}{2} \partial_{\mu}H\partial^{\mu}H + (v+H)^{2} \left\{ \frac{g^{2}}{4} W^{\dagger}_{\mu}W^{\mu} + \frac{g^{2}}{8\cos^{2}\theta_{W}} Z_{\mu}Z^{\mu} \right\}$



I organized this talk by the terms of the Higgs Lagrangian

CMS

 $\begin{aligned} \chi &= -\frac{1}{4} F_{A\nu} F^{A\nu} \\ &+ i F \mathcal{D} \mathcal{V} + h.c. \\ &\uparrow \mathcal{V}_i \mathcal{Y}_{ij} \mathcal{Y}_{j} \mathcal{P} + h.c. \end{aligned}$ Yukawa interactions Gauge boson interactions

$$(D_{\mu}\phi)^{\dagger} D^{\mu}\phi \quad \stackrel{\theta^{i}=0}{\longrightarrow} \quad \frac{1}{2} \partial_{\mu}H\partial^{\mu}H + (v+H)^{2} \left\{ \frac{g^{2}}{4} W^{\dagger}_{\mu}W^{\mu} + \frac{g^{2}}{8\cos^{2}\theta_{W}} Z_{\mu}Z^{\mu} \right\}$$



I organized this talk by the terms of the Higgs Lagrangian

CMS

 $\begin{aligned} \chi &= -\frac{1}{4} F_{AL} F^{AL} \\ &+ i F B Y + h.c. \end{aligned}$ + Y: Yis Ks\$ the Yukawa interactions Gauge boson Selfinteraction interactions



I organized this talk by the terms of the Higgs Lagrangian

CMS



$$(D_{\mu}\phi)^{\dagger} D^{\mu}\phi \quad \stackrel{\theta^{i}=0}{\longrightarrow} \quad \frac{1}{2} \partial_{\mu}H\partial^{\mu}H + (v+H)^{2} \left\{ \frac{g^{2}}{4} W^{\dagger}_{\mu}W^{\mu} + \frac{g^{2}}{8\cos^{2}\theta_{W}} Z_{\mu}Z^{\mu} \right\}$$

Higgs & Gauge Sector





at CMS - Scalars 2017

Seeing Higgs w/ Light

- Analysis strategy similar to the one that led to the H(125) discovery in 2012:
 - ggH, VH, ttH, and VBF categories
 - Use of MVA for particle ID and analysis optimization





Measurements of signal strength and coupling modifiers are consistent with the SM within 1σ

• $\mu = 1.16^{+0.15} - 0.14$





H(yy) Differential

- 35.9 fb⁻¹ (13TeV) **CMS** Preliminary () 10² () 10² () 10 10 ∎ H POWHEG + HX IX aMC@NLO 10⁻² 10 15 250 300 Data agree well with the NLO predictions on the $p_{\tau}^{\gamma\gamma}$ (GeV)
- + Large number of events observed (S ~ 1900, S € fiducial total and differential cross section meas gine
 - Categories changed to classify events by the m
 - Fiducial phase space: $p_T/m_{\gamma\gamma} < 1/3$ (1/4) for the photon; $|\eta_{\gamma}| < 2.5$; $|so|_{dR = 0.3} < 10 \text{ GeV}$





Search for Low-Mass $H(\gamma\gamma)$

- CMS
- First LHC search for additional Higgs bosons at low mass (70-110 GeV) in the diphoton channel
 - Follows closely the strategy of the $H(\gamma\gamma)$ measurement
 - Based on the combination of the 8 and 13 TeV data
- Slight excess observed around 96 GeV, with an overall local (global) significance of about 2.8σ (1.3σ)



ົ



H(ZZ) Channel



- H(ZZ) measurement in the 4-lepton channel also follows closely the discovery strategy
 - Based on the MELA kinematic discriminant and event categorization according to the production mechanism
 - About 70 events observed, with large S/B ratio
 - Used to measure the signal strength, cross section, mass, and set limits on the width and anomalous couplings







- Signal strength is consistent with the SM prediction within 1 s.d.
 - Combined $\mu = 1.05^{+0.19}_{-0.17}$
 - All observed best signal strength fits, except for the ggH channel, somewhat curiously are at zero
- Fiducial cross section was measured in a simplified kinematic parameter space and is consistent with the SM predictions.





Differential Cross Sections



Clean mass peak allows to measure fiducial and differential cross sections

5.1 fb⁻¹ (7 TeV), 19.7 fb⁻¹ (8 TeV), 35.9 fb⁻¹ (13 TeV)

2

≥ 3

N(jets)



0

0



12



Differential Cross Sections



Clean mass peak allows to measure fiducial and differential

cross sections



Good agreement with the SM predictions







12





- Single, most precise Higgs boson mass measurement to date:
 m_H = 125.36 ± 0.21 GeV
 - N.B. also an indirect measurement of the self-coupling in the V(ϕ)
- Direct limit on the Higgs boson width of 1.1 GeV (1.6 GeV expected) at 95% CL (again, most stringent to date)



13



m_H = 125.36 ± 0.21 GeV

Single, most precise Higgs boson mass measurement to date:



N.B. also an indirect measurement of the self-coupling in the V(φ)
 Direct limit on the Higgs boson width of 1.1 GeV (1.6 GeV expected) at 95% CL (again, most stringent to date)





m_H = 125.36 ± 0.21 GeV

Single, most precise Higgs boson mass measurement to date:



- Γ_H(GeV) at CMS Scalars 2017
- N.B. also an indirect measurement of the self-coupling in the V(φ)
 Direct limit on the Higgs boson width of 1.1 GeV (1.6 GeV expected) at 95% CL (again, most stringent to date)









- Combined with Run 1 data, can set limits on anomalous HVV couplings:
- $A(\text{HVV}) \sim \left[a_1^{\text{VV}} + \frac{\kappa_1^{\text{VV}} q_1^2 + \kappa_2^{\text{VV}} q_2^2}{\left(\Lambda_1^{\text{VV}}\right)^2}\right] m_{\text{V1}}^2 \epsilon_{\text{V1}}^* \epsilon_{\text{V2}}^* + a_2^{\text{VV}} f_{\mu\nu}^{*(1)} f^{*(2),\mu\nu} + a_3^{\text{VV}} f_{\mu\nu}^{*(1)} \tilde{f}^{*(2),\mu\nu}$ $\bigstar \text{ Custodial symmetry dictates for tree-level terms: } a_1^{ZZ} = a_1^{WW}$
 - We additionally assume: $a_{2,3}^{ZZ} = a_{2,3}^{WW}$, $\kappa_{1,2}^{ZZ} = \kappa_{1,2}^{WW}$
- Gauge invariance and Bose-Einstein symmetry require:

$$\kappa_1^{ZZ} = \kappa_2^{ZZ} = -\exp(i\phi_{\Lambda 1}^{ZZ}), \ \kappa_{1,2}^{\gamma\gamma} = \kappa_{1,2}^{gg} = \kappa_1^{Z\gamma} = 0, \ \kappa_2^{Z\gamma} = -\exp(i\phi_{\Lambda 1}^{Z\gamma})$$

• That leaves us w/ 4 anomalous couplings: $a_2, a_3, \kappa_2/\Lambda_1^2$, and $\kappa_2^{Z\gamma}/(\Lambda_1^{Z\gamma})^2$

• Express everything in terms of fractional cross sections: $f_{ai} = |a_i|^2 \sigma_i / \sum |a_j|^2 \sigma_j$, and $\phi_{ai} = \arg(a_i/a_1)$

where a_i refers to all four couplings

 Define several MELA-like kinematic discriminants, separately for ggH, VBF, and VH production and perform a likelihood fit

14





- Combined with Run 1 data, can set limits on anomalous HVV couplings: CP violation (0⁻⁺)
- $A(\text{HVV}) \sim \left[a_1^{\text{VV}} + \frac{\kappa_1^{\text{VV}} q_1^2 + \kappa_2^{\text{VV}} q_2^2}{\left(\Lambda_1^{\text{VV}}\right)^2}\right] m_{\text{V1}}^2 \epsilon_{\text{V1}}^* \epsilon_{\text{V2}}^* + a_2^{\text{VV}} f_{\mu\nu}^{*(1)} f^{*(2),\mu\nu} + a_3^{\text{VV}} f_{\mu\nu}^{*(1)} \tilde{f}^{*(2),\mu\nu}$ $\bigstar \text{ Custodial symmetry dictates for tree-level terms: } a_1^{ZZ} = a_1^{WW}$
 - - We additionally assume: $a_{2,3}^{ZZ} = a_{2,3}^{WW}$, $\kappa_{1,2}^{ZZ} = \kappa_{1,2}^{WW}$
- Gauge invariance and Bose-Einstein symmetry require:

$$\kappa_1^{ZZ} = \kappa_2^{ZZ} = -\exp(i\phi_{\Lambda 1}^{ZZ}), \ \kappa_{1,2}^{\gamma\gamma} = \kappa_{1,2}^{gg} = \kappa_1^{Z\gamma} = 0, \ \kappa_2^{Z\gamma} = -\exp(i\phi_{\Lambda 1}^{Z\gamma})$$

+ That leaves us w/ 4 anomalous couplings: $a_2, a_3, \kappa_2/\Lambda_1^2$, and $\kappa_2^{Z\gamma}/(\Lambda_1^{Z\gamma})^2$

Express everything in terms of fractional cross sections:

 $f_{ai} = |a_i|^2 \sigma_i / \sum |a_j|^2 \sigma_j$, and $\phi_{ai} = \arg(a_i / a_1)$

where a_i refers to all four couplings

 Define several MELA-like kinematic discriminants, separately for ggH, VBF, and VH production and perform a likelihood fit

14



The results are as follows (a slight improvement seen in combination with Run 1 data)



15







- The ZZ channel has high sensitivity to additional high-mass Higgs bosons
 - To maximize the sensitivity, the search is conducted in the Z(II)Z(jj) channel, with two jets merged in a single large-radius jet
 - Categorization based on ggH and VBF production, as well as b-tagged jets from Z(bb)
 - Use of BDT improves the sensitivity by ~20%
 N
 - Analysis is based on a partial 2016 data set (12.9 fb⁻¹)
- Limits set on the production cross section time branching fraction to ZZ of narrow scalar (and tensor) resonances, significantly extending Run 1 limits



16



H(WW) Channel



- The analysis is based on 2015 (2.3 fb⁻¹) and partial 2016 (12.9 fb⁻¹) data at 13 TeV
 - \bullet Only uses the $e\mu$ channel, which offers by far the best sensitivity
 - Several event categories: ggH (0, 1, and ≥2 jets), VBF and VH (≥2 jets), and WH (trilepton)
 - Signal is extracted via fitting a 2D distribution of dilepton mass and Higgs transverse mass: $m_{\rm T}^{\rm H} = \sqrt{2p_{\rm T}^{\ell\ell}p_{\rm T}^{\rm miss}(1 \cos\Delta\phi(\ell\ell, \vec{p}_{\rm T}^{\rm miss}))}$
 - Combined signal strength: $\mu = 1.05^{+0.27}_{-0.25}$, with 4.3 σ significance



Higgs Yukawa Couplings





+ Going after four Yukawa couplings: y_t , y_b , y_τ , and y_μ



19





• Going after four Yukawa couplings: y_t , y_b , y_τ , and y_μ



19





• Going after four Yukawa couplings: y_t , y_b , y_τ , and y_μ



19





+ Going after four Yukawa couplings: y_t , y_b , y_τ , and y_μ



19





+ Going after four Yukawa couplings: y_t , y_b , y_τ , and y_μ



19



Evidence for ttH Production

g 700000

g 700000



g 000000

g 00000

Greg Landsberg - (Pseudo)scalar Physics at CMS - Scalars 2017

20



- Split by (τ) lepton multiplicity; use of BDT to extract signal
- Multilepton: μ = 1.5 +-/- 0.5 (3.3/2.5σ) observed/ expected significance
- τ lepton: μ = 0.72^{+0.62}-0.53</sub> (1.4/1.8σ)
- + Finalizing the combination; expect $\sim 3\sigma$ significance



BROWN

Search for tH Production

PAS HIG-17-005

CMS

Associated production w/ single top quark is suppressed in the SM due to negative interference between the two diagrams

- Would be significantly enhanced if couplings to fermion and bosons have opposite sign (or if the ratio is modified compared to the SM)
- Use likesign eµ and µµ, and trilepton events, w/ BDT-based analysis

 $-1.25 < \kappa_t/\kappa_V < 1.60 @ 95\%$ CL



 $\kappa_{\rm t}/\kappa_{\rm V}$



BROWN

Search for tH Production

PAS HIG-17-005

CMS

Associated production w/ single top quark is suppressed in the SM due to negative interference between the two diagrams

- Would be significantly enhanced if couplings to fermion and bosons have opposite sign (or if the ratio is modified compared to the SM)
- Use likesign eµ and µµ, and trilepton events, w/ BDT-based analysis

 $-1.25 < \kappa_t/\kappa_V < 1.60 @ 95\%$ CL



 $\kappa_{\rm t}/\kappa_{\rm V}$





Observation of H(\tau\tau)



Best fit $\mu = \sigma/\sigma_{SM}$

- + Measurement in four most important channels: $\tau_h \tau_h$, $\mu \tau_h$, $e \tau_h$, $e \mu$
 - 0-jet, VBF-like, and boosted categories

m_{rr} (GeV)

- Use of the SVFIT technique for most precise manual reconstruction
- Observed signal strength $\mu = \frac{1}{100} + \frac{100}{100} +$
- CMS arXiv:1708.00373 35.9 fb⁻¹ (13 TeV) 35.9 fb⁻¹ (13TeV) CMS 35.9 fb⁻¹ (13 TeV) GeV oralue p-valu CMS CMS Obs. - bkg. 1600 Observed 2 σ (ent 0010⁻² $\tau_h \tau_h$ 1400 20 μ=1.36 +0.40 -0.35 Expected Bkg. unc. 2016 ş 10 1200 3 σ μτ h weighted 10^{-3} $\mu = 1.14 + 0.44$ $\mu = 1.14 - 0.42$ 1000 QCD multije 50 events 10^{-4} e_{τ_h} 4 σ 800 Bka, unc μ=0.58 +0.60 -0.58 50 100 150 200 250 300 S/(S+B) -MS m_{rr} (GeV) 10^{-5} 600 0-jet: $\tau_{h}\tau_{h}$ **e**μ CMS μ=0.68 +0.69 -0.68 VBF: $\tau_{h}\tau_{h}$ 10⁻⁶ 400 Boosted: $\tau_h \tau_h$, $\mu \tau_h$, $e \tau_h$, $e \mu$ 5 σ Combined 2016 μ=1.09 +0.27 -0.26 200 2016 10⁻⁷ 300 50 100 250 300 105 110 115 120 125 130 140 145 0 1 2 150 200

m_н (GeV)

SIVI





at CMS - Scalars 2017

Physics

Trijets as Dijet Proxies

- CMS
- Standard approach fails for ggH(bb) production, due to overwhelming backgrounds
 - Thought to be impossible, until recent advances in jet substructure techniques
- ISR to rescue: look at low-mass dijets recoiling against an ISR jet to aid triggering and utilize jet substructure techniques to reconstruct boosted dijet mass
- ✦ Allows to lower the dijet mass reach to ~50 GeV, as demonstrated with the W/Z peak observation in CMS in a low-mass dijet search, validating the technique





CMS - Scalars 2017

H(bb) in Boosted Channel

 Could use the same approach to look for H(bb) decays in a b-tagged large-cone jet using advanced substructure (decorrelated tagger) and b tagging techniques

80

100

- Currently limited by the trigger; work on specialized triggers is ongoing
- + First results are very promising: achieved ~1 σ sensitivity w/ 2016 data
- Ultimately would like to probe the H(gg) decay, which can't be seen otherwise at a hadron machine



the background shape. The second set includes modified versions of the Breit-Wigner Z-peak distribution, derived and validated by fitting FEWZ predictions of the DY invariant mass distriguted n at NNLO. Both sets are summarized in Equations 1–4. In addition, FEWZ spectra templetes multiplied by polynomial functions are considered. BROWN H(μμ) offers most promising way to look for Higgs boson couplings lighter two generations of fermions
 Cspitalize on two (slientx) b(s) m of entromentum resolution translating mass resolution
 Use BDT with variables targeting gg); tht 2, and VBF production
 Observed (expected) significance (x) - 4 of (0.380)
 some categories, a variation on the modified Breit-Wigner distribution (Eq. 4) is used, multiplying it by a Bernstein polynomial of up to degree 4. USIS, which yields 95% CL limit of u < 2.64 (1.89) or u = 0.9^{+1.0} - 0.9 and significance 0.980, (1.090) ♦ H(µµ) offers most promising way to look for Higgs boson couplings to the lighter two generations of fermion a Capitotize commuc (Silentx Dill(S) m Doperno non resolution translating in 2% $\mu < 2.64$ (1.89) or $\mu = 0.9^{+1.0}$ and significance 0.980 (1.090) ground functional form separately for each rategory Figure 3 shows the dimport mass spec < 5.7 x 10⁻⁴ true for the two most sensitive categories, category 14 (right) and 12 (left). The choice of the background function is based on minimiz **CMS PAS HIG-17-019** vields. E CINS Supplementary CMS Preliminary 35.9 fb⁻¹ (13 Te 5.0 fb⁻¹ (7 TeV) + 19.8 fb⁻¹ (8 TeV) + 35.9 fb⁻¹ (13 TeV) H→uu All categories **CMS** Preliminary CL Limit on σ/σ_s 35.9 fb⁻¹ (13 TeV) Δ₁₂₅ =0.7 for m_H=125 GeV 10000 CMS S/(S+B) weighted Data CI pected background only lementary Observed CMS S+B fit B component 2016 ---- Expected ± 1σ ±2σ CMS, Expected (SM m_H = 125 GeV) ± 20 2016 Expected (SM m_H = 125 GeV) 2011 95% 2012 ±2σ 2016 B component subtracted 1 11 11 B component submacted 123 124 125 126 127 121 122 m_µ [GeV]

the background shape. The second set includes modified versions of the Breit–Wigner Z-peak distribution, derived and validated by fitting FEWZ predictions of the DY invariant mass distriguted n at NNLO. Both sets are summarized in Equations 1–4. In addition, FEWZ spectra templetes multiplied by polynomial functions are considered. BROWN H(μμ) offers most promising way to look for Higgs boson couplings lighter two generations of fermions
 Capitalize cometo (slientx p) b(s) m pop erromentum resolution translating mass resolution
 Use BDT with variables targeting gg) f, stt(2) and VBF production
 Observed (expected) significance (0.74° (0.38°))
 Some categories, a variation on the modified Breit-Wigner distribution (Eq. 4) is used, multiplying the abertstant polynomial of up to degree 4. ♦ H(µµ) offers most promising way to look for Higgs boson couplings to the lighter two generations of fermion a Capitotize commuc (Silentx Dill(S) m Doperno non resolution translating in 2% $\dot{\mu} < 2.64$ (1.89) or $\mu = 0.9^{+1.0}$ and significance 0.980 (1.090) ground functional form separately for each rates any Figure 3 shows the dimus mass spec < 5.7 x 10⁻⁴ trum for the two most sensitive categories, category 14 (right) and 12 (left). The choice of the background function is based on minimiz **CMS PAS HIG-17-019** vields. E CINS Supplementary CMS Preliminary 35.9 fb⁻¹ (13 Te 5.0 fb⁻¹ (7 TeV) + 19.8 fb⁻¹ (8 TeV) + 35.9 fb⁻¹ (13 TeV) H→uu All categories **CMS** Preliminary CL Limit on σ/σ_s 35.9 fb⁻¹ (13 TeV) Δ₁₂₅ =0.7 for m_H=125 GeV 10000 CMS S/(S+B) weighted Data CI pected background only lementary Observed CMS S+B fit B component 2016 ---- Expected ± 1σ ±2σ CMS, Expected (SM m_H = 125 GeV) ± 20 2016 Expected (SM m_H = 125 GeV) 2011 95% 2012 ±2σ 2016 B component subtracted 1 11 11 B component submacted 123 124 125 126 127 121 122 129 m_µ [GeV]

the background shape. The second set includes modified versions of the Breit-Wigner Z-peak distribution, derived and validated by fitting FEWZ predictions of the DY invariant mass distriguted n at NNLO. Both sets are summarized in Equations 1–4. In addition, FEWZ spectra templetes multiplied by polynomial functions are considered. BROWN H(μμ) offers most promising way to look for Higgs boson couplings lighter two generations of fermions
 Capitalize cometo (slientx p) b(s) m pop erromentum resolution translating mass resolution
 Use BDT with variables targeting gg) f, stt(2) and VBF production
 Observed (expected) significance (0.74° (0.38°))
 Some categories, a variation on the modified Breit-Wigner distribution (Eq. 4) is used, multiplying the abertstant polynomial of up to degree 4. ♦ H(µµ) offers most promising way to look for Higgs boson couplings to the lighter two generations of fermion a Capitotize commuc (Silentx Dill(S) m Doperno non resolution translating in 2% $\mu < 2.64$ (1.89) or $\mu = 0.9^{+1.0}$ and significance 0.980 (1.090) ground functional form separately for each rategory Figure 3 shows the dimpon mass spec < 5.7 x 10⁻⁴ true for the two most sensitive categories, category 14 (right) and 12 (left). The choice of the **CMS PAS HIG-17-019** background function is based on mini vields. CMS Preliminary 35.9 fh⁻¹ 5.0 fb⁻¹ (7 TeV) + 19.8 fb⁻¹ (8 TeV) + 35.9 fb⁻¹ (13 TeV) local p-value _0 CMS Preliminary H→uu All categories 35.9 fb⁻¹ (13 TeV) 10000 \hat{u}_{125} = 0.7 for m_H=125 GeV CMS S/(S+B) weighted CMS CMS Data entary Observer S+B fit B component 2016 Expected ± 1σ CMS. ± 2σ kpected (SM m_H = 125 GeV) 2016 2011 2012 2016 --- ± 2 σ 10-2 Observation 95% B component subtracted Expected(125) Expected 10^{-3} 1 111 1 B component submacte 121 122 123 124 125 126 127 128 129 130 m_н [GeV]







Higgs Pair Production

CMS

- The only way to directly measure the self-coupling term in the Lagrangian
- Rates are extremely small need full HL-LHC data set to be able to see SM diHiggs production
 - Nevertheless, it can be enhanced in a variety of BSM models
- Look for both resonant and non-resonant HH production in various channels: HH(4b, bbWW, bbγγ, bbττ,...)
 - Most sensitive channels are bbγγ (low masses) and 4b (high masses); the former also gives best sensitivity to SM HH production
 - Will highlight only these analyses



Grand Picture: X \rightarrow HH

29





Greg Landsberg - (Pseudo)scalar Physics at CMS - Scalars 2017

29

Slide

Grand Picture: X \rightarrow HH





Greg Landsberg - (Pseudo)scalar Physics at CMS - Scalars 2017

29

Slide

Grand Picture: X \rightarrow HH







- Low backgrounds; sensitive production
 - Use BDT unbiased in M(bb





- Eight optimizations: low- and nign-mass; medium- and nign-purity; and resonance and non-resonance analysis
- Results: $\mu_{HH} < 19.2 (16.5)$ observed (expected) @95% CL [$\sigma^{95}(pp \rightarrow HH \rightarrow bb\gamma\gamma) < 1.67 (1.44)$ fb] - the most stringent limit on HH production to date!



g





- Low backgrounds; sensitive production
 - Use BDT unbiased in M(bb





- Eight optimizations: low- and nign-mass; medium- and nign-purity; and resonance and non-resonance analysis
- Results $\mu_{HH} < 19.2 (16.5)$ observed (expected) @95% CL [$\sigma^{95}(pp \rightarrow HH \rightarrow bb\gamma\gamma) < 1.67 (1.44)$ fb] - the most stringent limit on HH production to date!



g







- Two resonant searches w/ somewhat different strategies
 - HIG-17-009: low- (250-550 GeV) and medium-mass (550-1200 GeV) regimes; resolved b jets in both cases
 - Select event in the M_{bb}M_{bb} plane; use BDT to reduce backgrounds
 - arXiv:1710.04960: high-mass regime (1250-3000 GeV); each H(bb) reconstructed as a single large-radius jet, with both jets double-b-tagged
 - Two categories, depending on the b-tag quality: TT and TL



31

0





Exotic Higgs Decays

- Vibrant search program for exotic Higgs boson decays as well as searches for light (pseudo)scalars either in the Higgs boson decays or directly
- Will highlight just a few recent results:
 - H(inv.) combination
 - Search for $H \rightarrow \mu \tau, e \tau$
 - Search for $H \rightarrow aa \rightarrow 4\mu, 4\tau, 2\mu 2\tau, 2\mu 2b$
- Also recent, but not covered in this talk:
 - pp→bba(µµ) [arXiv:1707.07283]
 - Search for doubly-charged H^{±±} in 4I [PAS HIG-16-036]
 - Search light bosons decaying to μμ [PAS HIG-16-035]





- Direct searches have been historically conducted in the Z(II,bb)H(inv.), ggH+ISR (monojet) and VBF production
- Grand combination using 7, 8, and 2015 13 TeV data:
 B(H → inv.) < 0.24 (0.23) @95% CL tightest limit to date
- Since then, new limits from monojet and Z(II)+MET analyses with 2016 data: B(H → inv.) < 0.53 (0.40) @95% CL [arXiv:1711.xxxxx] and B(H → inv.) < 0.45 (0.44) @95% CL [arXiv:1711.00431]</p>
 - They haven't been included in the combination and will further improve it



34





- Direct searches have been historically conducted in the Z(II,bb)H(inv.), ggH+ISR (monojet) and VBF production
 - Grand combination using 7, 8, and 2015 13 TeV data: $B(H \rightarrow inv.) < 0.24 (0.23) @95\% CL - tightest limit to date$
- Since then, new limits from monojet and Z(II)+MET analyses with 2016 data: B(H → inv.) < 0.53 (0.40) @95% CL [arXiv:1711.xxxxx] and B(H → inv.) < 0.45 (0.44) @95% CL [arXiv:1711.00431]
 - They haven't been included in the combination and will further improve it



34



CERN-CKC

Greg Landsberg - Recent CMS Results from Searches -

35

Slide

What about H(μτ)?

- New result from CMS based on full 2016 data:
 - Definitively excludes the 2.4σ Run 1 excess (alas...) CMS PAS HIG-17-001







CERN-CKC

Greg Landsberg - Recent CMS Results from Searches -

35

Slide

What about H(ut)?

- New result from CMS based on full 2016 data:
 - Definitively excludes the 2.4σ Run 1 excess (alas...) CMS PAS HIG-17-001







Search for Light Pseudoscalar

10³

10²

10

10

10-2

10⁻³

CMS

2HDM+S type-1

19.7 fb⁻¹ (8 TeV)

h→aa→uuuu [47]

h→aa→ττττ [48]

h→aa→ττττ

h→aa→uubb

h→aa→μμττ

expected observed

CMS arXiv:1701.02032

- One recent 8 TeV result to highlight is a $\frac{1}{2}$ pseudoscalars in Higgs boson decays: $\frac{1}{2}$
 - Consider 4τ, 2μ2τ, and 2μ2b final states ^σ
 - Also combines with earlier searches in 4 d and 4τ [1510.06534] final states
 - Interpreted as limits on product of branc several benchmark 2HDM scenarios



36

Dark Matter (Pseudo)Scalars



Dark Matter at Colliders



- There are three main approaches to detect dark matter (DM):
 - DM-nucleon scattering (direct detection, or DD)
 - Indirect detection (annihilation)
 - Pair production at colliders

✦ All three processes are topological permutations of the same Feynman diagram:

- But: how to trigger on a pair of DM particles at colliders?
- ISR (g, γ , W/Z, H, ...) to rescue!

Sensitivity to (pseudoscalar) mediators via ggF or qg production

Typically assume Yukawa couplings between the mediators and quarks





CMS Monojet Analysis

CMS

- The latest, most powerful, Run 2 analysis is built on the Run 1 techniques
 - Increased number of control regions (added e+jets, ee+jets)
 - Theoretically consistent treatment of EW/QCD corrections to SM V+jets processes, after Lindert et al., arXiv:1705.04464



39





Greg Landsberg - (Pseudo)scalar Physics at CMS - Scalars 2017

4

Slide

Mono-Higgs Production

- Another example is a mono-Higgs analysis in the context of 2HDM and vector mediator models: Higgs boson is a tag
 - Explore the H(γγ) decay mode

BRIGHT FUTURE AHEAD

Toward the Future

Toward the Future

- Another spectacular year at the LHC:
 - 50 fb⁻¹ delivered; 45 fb⁻¹ recorded by CMS
 - Upgraded pixel detector w/ 4 layers and higher resolution
 - Expect first results ready for Winter 2018 conferences
- Looking forward to >100 fb⁻¹ usable data @ 13 TeV by the end of 2018, which will significantly extend (pseudo)scalar sector program at CMS

CMS Integrated Luminosity, pp, 2017, $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV

43

Conclusions

- CMS is pursuing vibrant (pseudo)scalar program of measurement and searches
- Focus is on precision measurement of Higgs boson properties, searches for exotic decays of the Higgs boson, and extended Higgs sectors
- Deep connection with dark matter searches (first limits on pseudoscalar mediators) and SUSY searches with Higgs bosons (not covered in this talk)
- 13 TeV data allowed to improve on Run 1 legacy results, including:
 - \bullet Observation of H($\tau\tau$) and strong evidence for H(bb) decays
 - Best measurement of the Higgs boson mass to date and most restrictive direct limit on its width
 - Best limits on invisible decays of the Higgs boson
 - \bullet Best limit on the H(µµ) decay
- Looking forward to completing Run 2 program with 3-4x more data!

44

Thank You!