

# Exploring the global symmetry structure of the Higgs potential via same-sign pair production of charged Higgs bosons

Masashi Aiko, Shinya Kanemura, and Kentarou Mawatari  
*Department of Physics, Osaka University, Toyonaka, Osaka 560-0043, Japan*

## Abstract

We propose a novel process where singly charged Higgs bosons are produced in a same-sign pair via vector boson fusion at hadron colliders in two Higgs doublet models. The process directly relates to the global symmetry structure of the Higgs potential. The produced charged Higgs bosons predominantly decay into a tau lepton and the neutrino or into a pair of top and bottom quarks, depending on the type of Yukawa interactions. We evaluate the signal and the background for the both cases at the CERN Large Hadron Collider and future higher-energy hadron colliders. We find that the process can be feasible and useful to explore the nature of the Higgs potential.

PACS numbers: 14.80.Cp, 13.85.-t

Since the discovery of the Higgs boson, it has been empirically confirmed that the idea of mass generation in the standard model (SM), which is based on the electroweak symmetry breaking (EWSB), is correct. Measured Higgs boson couplings with various SM particles have turned out to be consistent with the predictions of the SM under the experimental and theoretical uncertainties [1], while no other new particle has been found up to now. The SM is a good description of Nature below the EWSB scale.

Although the Higgs boson was found, the structure of the Higgs sector remains unknown, and physics behind the EWSB is still mysterious. In the SM, the Higgs sector is assumed to be composed of an isospin doublet scalar field as a minimal realization. However, the Higgs sector causes the hierarchy problem, and new physics beyond the SM is expected to appear at TeV scales. In addition, there are phenomena which cannot be explained in the SM, such as dark matter, baryon asymmetry of the Universe and tiny neutrino masses. Mechanisms to explain these phenomena would also be related to the Higgs sector.

Non-minimal Higgs sectors are often introduced in various new physics models motivated by the hierarchy problem or the above mentioned phenomena. They can be consistent with the current data like the SM. The multiplet structure is an important property; i.e., the number of additional scalars and their representations under the SM gauge symmetries [2]. In addition, the global symmetry structure of the Higgs potential, whatever it is exact, approximate, softly broken or spontaneously broken, is also a key to physics beyond the SM. Therefore, in order to determine the nature of the EWSB and also to narrow down scenarios of physics beyond the SM, a detailed study of models with extended Higgs sectors is getting more and more important.

In this Letter, we discuss an interesting new process to approach the global symmetry structure of the Higgs potential, which is pair production of same-sign charged Higgs bosons via vector boson fusion (VBF) at hadron

colliders. Recently, ATLAS and CMS observed production of same-sign W boson pairs via VBF [3, 4]. Having ongoing and future experiments, extended Higgs sectors can also be explored by using VBF processes.

We consider the two Higgs doublet model (THDM) with isospin doublet scalar fields  $\Phi_1$  and  $\Phi_2$  with the hypercharge 1/2. It is one of the well-motivated simple extensions among many candidates. The most general potential is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
 V(\Phi_1, \Phi_2) = & \sum_{i=1}^2 m_i^2 |\Phi_i|^2 - (m_3^2 \Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_2 + \text{h.c.}) \\
 & + \sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{1}{2} \lambda_i |\Phi_i|^4 + \lambda_3 |\Phi_1|^2 |\Phi_2|^2 + \lambda_4 |\Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_2|^2 \\
 & + \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \lambda_5 (\Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_2)^2 + (\lambda_6 |\Phi_1|^2 + \lambda_7 |\Phi_2|^2) \Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_2 + \text{h.c.} \right\}, \quad (1)
 \end{aligned}$$

where  $m_{1,2}^2$  and  $\lambda_{1-4}$  are real, while  $m_3^2$  and  $\lambda_{5-7}$  are complex. Global symmetries of the potential in the THDM have been deeply investigated in Refs. [5–8].

We here assume CP invariance, taking all parameters real. The fields  $\Phi_{1,2}$  are parameterized as

$$\Phi_i = \left( \begin{array}{c} \omega_i^+ \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(v_i + h_i + iz_i) \end{array} \right), \quad i = 1, 2,$$

where  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  are vacuum expectation values, which satisfy  $v = (v_1^2 + v_2^2)^{1/2} = (\sqrt{2}G_F)^{-1/2} \simeq 246$  GeV with  $G_F$  being the Fermi constant, and  $\tan \beta = v_2/v_1$ . Diagonalizing the mass matrix of CP-even neutral scalars by introducing the mixing angle  $\alpha$ , there are five mass eigenstates, two CP-even ( $h, H$ ), CP-odd ( $A$ ) and charged states ( $H^\pm$ ). We here identify  $h$  as the discovered Higgs boson.

Some important experimental constraints have been known on the Higgs potential [9]; a) suppressed flavor changing neutral current, and b) the rho parameter being close to unity. In addition, as new knowledge after

the Higgs boson discovery, we have c) Higgs boson couplings being SM like [1]. These facts would suggest that at least approximately the Higgs potential respectively has a) a (softly-broken) discrete  $Z_2$  symmetry ( $\Phi_1 \rightarrow \Phi_1$  and  $\Phi_2 \rightarrow -\Phi_2$ ) [10], b) the custodial  $SU(2)_V$  symmetry [11], and c) the alignment [12, 13] when additional Higgs bosons are relatively light. In the following discussion, we take these three conditions as guiding principles as the first approximation.

First, the condition a) requires  $\lambda_6 = \lambda_7 = 0$ .

Second, natural realization of the alignment c) would require that the off diagonal component of CP-even neutral scalars in the Higgs basis vanishes for all values of  $\tan\beta$  [13], which implies  $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \lambda_3 + \lambda_4 + \lambda_5$  and  $\lambda_6 = \lambda_7 = 0$ . The quartic coupling part of the potential in Eq. (1) is then written as

$$V_4 = +\frac{1}{2}c_1(|\Phi_1|^2 + |\Phi_2|^2)^2 + \frac{1}{2}c_2(|\Phi_1|^2 - |\Phi_2|^2)^2 + \frac{1}{2}c_3(\Phi_1^\dagger\Phi_2 + \Phi_2^\dagger\Phi_1)^2 + \frac{1}{2}c_4(\Phi_1^\dagger\Phi_2 - \Phi_2^\dagger\Phi_1)^2, \quad (2)$$

where  $c_1 = \lambda_3 + (\lambda_4 + \lambda_5)/2$ ,  $c_2 = c_3 = (\lambda_4 + \lambda_5)/2$ , and  $c_4 = -(\lambda_4 - \lambda_5)/2$ .

Third, before the EWSB the term of  $c_1$  in Eq. (2) is invariant under the maximal global symmetry  $O(8)^1$ , and that of  $c_2$  is invariant under  $O(4) \times O(4)' (\subset O(8))$  [5]. The term of either  $c_3$  or  $c_4$  is invariant under  $O(4)$ , depending on the choice. After the EWSB,  $O(4) \simeq SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \rightarrow SU(2)_V$ . Two choices for b) the custodial  $SU(2)_V$  symmetry in  $V_4$  are described by [6, 7]

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(Case I)} \quad c_4 &= (m_{H^\pm}^2 - m_A^2)/v^2 = 0, \\ \text{(Case II)} \quad c_3 &= (m_H^2 - m_{H^\pm}^2)/v^2 = 0, \end{aligned}$$

where  $m_\phi$  represents the mass of a field  $\phi$ .

Finally, imposing simultaneously a) the discrete  $Z_2$  symmetry, c) the natural alignment, and b) the custodial  $SU(2)_V$  symmetry to the quartic coupling part  $V_4$  of the Higgs potential, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(Case I)} \quad c_1 &= m_h^2/v^2 - \eta, \quad c_2 = c_3 = \eta, \quad c_4 = 0, \\ \text{(Case II)} \quad c_1 &= m_h^2/v^2, \quad c_2 = c_3 = 0, \quad c_4 = \eta, \end{aligned}$$

where  $m_h = 125\text{GeV}$  and  $\eta = (m_H^2 - m_A^2)/v^2$ . For both cases,  $\eta$  is crucial for the global symmetry structure of  $V_4$ . If  $\eta = 0$ ,  $V_4$  respects  $O(8)$ , otherwise  $O(4)$ . Therefore, measuring  $\eta$  by experiments is extremely important.

One of the ways to determine  $\eta$  is to separately measure  $m_H$  and  $m_A$  by directly discovering  $H$  and  $A$ . In this Letter, however, we discuss an interesting new process  $W^\pm W^\pm \rightarrow H^\pm H^\pm$ , whose amplitude is proportional to  $\eta$ , by which we can directly extract the global symmetry structure of the potential at collider experiments. In the




FIG. 1: Feynman graphs (shown only the t-channel ones).

alignment limit c'), which implies  $\sin(\beta - \alpha) = 1$ , the helicity amplitudes are given by

$$\mathcal{M}_{\tilde{\lambda}_1 \tilde{\lambda}_2}(W^\pm W^\pm \rightarrow H^\pm H^\pm) = -2\eta(1 + \mathcal{O}(\eta)),$$

for all helicity set  $(\tilde{\lambda}_1, \tilde{\lambda}_2)$  of the W bosons. This can be seen by the fact that, in the alignment limit, the diagrams of  $H$  mediation and those of  $A$  are destructive and exactly cancel for  $m_H = m_A$ . Null amplitude implies that  $V_4$  respects a higher global symmetry than  $O(4)$ , having  $m_H = m_A = m_{H^\pm}$ <sup>2</sup>. Therefore, at hadron colliders, we can directly measure  $\eta$  by searching for the same sign pair production of charged Higgs bosons via W boson fusion,  $pp \rightarrow W^{\pm*} W^{\pm*} jj \rightarrow H^\pm H^\pm jj$ .

Relation between this process and the global symmetry of  $V_4$  may also be understood partially as follows. In  $V_4$ , the term of  $\omega^\pm \omega^\pm H^\mp H^\mp$  is given by  $\eta$ , where  $\omega^\pm$  are the Nambu-Goldstone bosons to be absorbed by longitudinal components of  $W^\pm$ . At high energies  $\sqrt{s} \gg m_W$ , by the equivalence theorem [14], we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_{00}(W^\pm W^\pm \rightarrow H^\pm H^\pm) \\ \simeq \mathcal{M}(\omega^\pm \omega^\pm \rightarrow H^\pm H^\pm) \simeq -2\eta, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathcal{M}_{00}$  is the longitudinally polarized amplitude that dominates other polarizations in the high energy limit.

Charged Higgs bosons have been searched at LEP [15] and the CERN Large Hadron Collider (LHC) [16]. In Refs. [17–19], the constraints on  $m_{H^\pm}$  in THDMs are summarized for each type of Yukawa interaction (Type-I, II, X or Y [20]). The mass below 160 GeV is excluded from  $t \rightarrow H^\pm b$ ,  $H^\pm \rightarrow \tau\nu$  searches for  $\tan\beta < 8, 10, 4$  in the Type-I, -X and -Y THDM, respectively, while the same mass region is excluded irrespective of  $\tan\beta$  in Type II. Flavor experiments also give a strong constraint [21]; e.g.,  $m_{H^\pm} > 580$  GeV independently of  $\tan\beta$  in Type-II and Type-Y. Including measurements of Higgs boson coupling strengths and flavor physics observables, the constraints in THDMs are summarized in Ref. [22].

We now investigate the feasibility of the process  $pp \rightarrow W^{\pm*} W^{\pm*} jj \rightarrow H^\pm H^\pm jj$  at the LHC as well

<sup>1</sup> For the entire Higgs sector of the THDM with the kinetic terms,  $SO(5)$  is maximal [8].

<sup>2</sup> On the contrary, the amplitudes for the opposite-sign process  $W^+ W^- \rightarrow H^+ H^-$  do not vanish for  $m_H = m_A$ .




FIG. 2: [Left] Cross sections for  $pp \rightarrow H^\pm H^\pm jj$  at  $\sqrt{s} = 14$  TeV as a function of  $m_{H^\pm}$  for  $\Delta m (\equiv m_A - m_H) = 200$  GeV and 300 GeV. [Right] Ratios of the cross sections evaluated at different  $pp$  collision energies.

as at future higher-energy hadron colliders. To evaluate cross sections and to generate events, we use the THDM UFO model file [23], and employ MADGRAPH5\_AMC@NLO [24]. The partonic total amplitude for  $q_1 q_2 \rightarrow W^{\pm*} W^{\pm*} q'_1 q'_2 \rightarrow H^\pm H^\pm q'_1 q'_2$  (see Fig. 1) is calculated using Ref. [25]. Convoluting with the parton distribution functions, we obtain the total cross section shown in Fig. 2, where we required presence of at least two jets with the transverse momentum and the pseudorapidity as  $p_T^j > 30$  GeV and  $|\eta^j| < 5$ . In addition, we imposed an invariant mass cut and a rapidity separation cut on the two leading jets as the VBF baseline selection,  $m_{jj} > 500$  GeV and  $|\Delta\eta_{jj}| > 2.5$ .

In Fig. 2 (left) we show cross sections for  $pp \rightarrow H^+ H^+ jj$  (solid) and  $H^- H^- jj$  (dashed) at  $\sqrt{s} = 14$  TeV as a function of  $m_{H^\pm}$  in the alignment limit with the custodial  $SU(2)_V$  symmetry of Case II. The results are shown for  $\Delta m (\equiv m_A - m_H) = 200$  GeV and 300 GeV. As expected, the cross sections is larger for larger  $\Delta m$ , while it is zero for  $\Delta m = 0$  ( $\eta = 0$ ). In Fig. 2 (right), we show the ratios of the cross sections evaluated at  $\sqrt{s} = 27$  TeV and 100 TeV over those at 14 TeV for  $\Delta m = 200$  GeV.

We evaluate signal sensitivity for two decay modes of charged Higgs bosons,  $H^\pm \rightarrow \tau\nu$  and  $H^\pm \rightarrow tb$ , by taking into account the SM background. The  $\tau\nu$  decay mode is dominant for  $m_{H^\pm} < m_t + m_b \simeq 180$  GeV or for  $\tan\beta \gtrsim 20$  in Type-X, otherwise the  $tb$  decay mode is dominant. Significance is defined by  $\sqrt{2((s+b)\ln(1+s/b) - s)}$  with  $s$  and  $b$  respectively being event numbers of the signal and the background [26].

First, signature for the signal  $pp \rightarrow H^\pm H^\pm jj$  with  $H^\pm \rightarrow \tau\nu$  is a same-sign tau-lepton pair with two forward jets. The main SM background is same-sign W boson pairs via VBF, which was recently observed at the LHC [3, 4]. We estimate  $s$  and  $b$  with the integrated luminosity  $L$  in the final state with two jets and two same-sign

hadronic tau-leptons,  $\tau_h^\pm \tau_h^\pm jj$ , as

$$\begin{aligned} s &= L \sigma_{pp \rightarrow H^+ H^+ jj}^{\text{VBF}} (B_{H^+ \rightarrow \tau\nu})^2 \epsilon_{\text{sel}}^\tau (\epsilon_\tau)^2, \\ b &= L \sigma_{pp \rightarrow W^+ W^+ jj}^{\text{VBF}} (B_{W^+ \rightarrow \tau\nu})^2 \epsilon_{\text{sel}}^\tau (\epsilon_\tau)^2, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\sigma^{\text{VBF}}$  is the cross section with the VBF selection. The signal cross sections are shown in Fig. 2, while the background rate is estimated at LO as 163 (568) fb at  $\sqrt{s} = 14$  (27) TeV. The decay branching ratio is taken as  $B_{H^+ \rightarrow \tau\nu} = 1$ . We obtain the selection efficiencies  $\epsilon_{\text{sel}}^\tau$  by requiring the presence of two same-sign tau leptons with  $p_T^\tau > 20$  GeV and  $|\eta^\tau| < 2.5$  as well as a larger rapidity separation between the leading jets. The efficiencies for the signal are 0.90–0.96 (0.80–0.93) for  $m_{H^\pm} = 200$ –1000 GeV with  $|\Delta\eta_{jj}| > 2.5$  (4.5) at  $\sqrt{s} = 14$  TeV, while the efficiency for the background is 0.57 (0.26). Those values are similar at  $\sqrt{s} = 27$  TeV. We also take into account  $\epsilon_\tau = 0.65 \times 0.6$  as the hadronic-tau branching ratio [9] and the efficiency of the identification [27].

Second, signature for the signal  $pp \rightarrow H^\pm H^\pm jj$  with  $H^\pm \rightarrow tb$  is a same-sign top-quark pair plus two forward jets. The main SM background would be four top-quark ( $tt\bar{t}\bar{t}$ ) production, whose cross section was recently measured at the LHC [28]. To identify the electric charge of the top quarks, we consider the leptonic decay of top quarks and the hadronic decay of anti-top quarks. We estimate the event numbers as

$$\begin{aligned} s &= L \sigma_{pp \rightarrow H^+ H^+ jj}^{\text{VBF}} (B_{H^+ \rightarrow t\bar{b}})^2 (B_{t \rightarrow b\ell^+ \nu})^2 \epsilon_{\text{sel}}^t (\epsilon_b)^2, \\ b &= L \sigma_{pp \rightarrow t\bar{t}\bar{t}\bar{t}} (B_{t \rightarrow b\ell^+ \nu})^2 (B_{\bar{t} \rightarrow \bar{b}jj})^2 \epsilon_{\text{sel}}^t (\epsilon_b)^2, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\ell = e$  or  $\mu$ . The four-top cross section at  $\sqrt{s} = 14$  (27) TeV is estimated at NLO as 16 (144) fb [29].  $B_{H^+ \rightarrow t\bar{b}} = 1$  is taken. In addition to the VBF baseline selection for jets, we require two same-sign leptons with  $p_T^\ell > 20$  GeV and  $|\eta^\ell| < 2.5$ . Moreover, to suppress other




FIG. 3: Signal significance of  $pp \rightarrow H^+ H^+ jj$  for  $H^+ \rightarrow \tau^+ \nu$  (left) and  $H^+ \rightarrow t \bar{b}$  (right).

backgrounds such as from multi-boson production, we also require the scalar sum of the transverse momenta of all jets to be  $H_T > 300$  GeV and at least two  $b$ -tagged jets with the tagging efficiency  $\epsilon_b = 0.65$  [28]. The selection efficiency  $\epsilon_{\text{sel}}^t$  for the signal is 0.56–0.91 (0.49–0.88) for  $m_{H^\pm} = 200$ –1000 GeV with  $|\Delta\eta_{jj}| > 2.5$  (4.5) at  $\sqrt{s} = 14$  TeV, while that for the background is 0.031 (0.004).

Finally, in Fig. 3, we show signal significances of  $pp \rightarrow H^+ H^+ jj$  with the  $H^+ \rightarrow \tau^+ \nu$  decay (left) and those with the  $H^+ \rightarrow t \bar{b}$  decay (right) as a function of  $m_{H^\pm}$ , where  $\Delta m = 200$  GeV is taken. The significances with the VBF baseline selection plus a larger rapidity separation cut are shown by dashed and solid lines, respectively, at the 14TeV LHC with  $L = 0.3$  and  $3 \text{ ab}^{-1}$  as well as at a future collider ( $\sqrt{s} = 27$  TeV) with  $L = 3$  and  $15 \text{ ab}^{-1}$ . For simplicity, we use the same kinematical cuts, and

assume the same efficiencies of the hadronic tau and the  $b$ -jet identifications for the collider with  $\sqrt{s} = 27$  TeV. The shaded regions are excluded by unitarity bounds [30]. The sensitivities can be significant for smaller  $m_{H^\pm}$ .

In summary, we discussed the new interesting process  $pp \rightarrow W^{\pm*} W^{\pm*} jj \rightarrow H^\pm H^\pm jj$  in THDMs, which is timely and useful to explore the global symmetry structure of the Higgs potential. We evaluated the sensitivities for  $H^\pm \rightarrow \tau \nu$  and  $H^\pm \rightarrow t b$  decays at the LHC and future higher-energy colliders. We found that the process can be feasible. The details are given elsewhere [31].

The authors would like to thank H. E. Haber for useful discussions. This work was supported, in part, by MEXT Grants No. 16H06492 and No. 18H04587, and JSPS Grant No. 18K03648.

- 
- [1] G. Aad *et al.* (ATLAS, CMS), JHEP **08**, 045 (2016).
  - [2] J. F. Gunion, H. E. Haber, G. L. Kane, and S. Dawson, Front. Phys. **80**, 1 (2000).
  - [3] A. M. Sirunyan *et al.* (CMS), Phys. Rev. Lett. **120**, 081801 (2018).
  - [4] M. Aaboud *et al.* (ATLAS), (2019), arXiv:1906.03203 [hep-ex].
  - [5] N. G. Deshpande and E. Ma, Phys. Rev. **D18**, 2574 (1978).
  - [6] A. Pomarol and R. Vega, Nucl. Phys. **B413**, 3 (1994).
  - [7] H. E. Haber and D. O’Neil, Phys. Rev. **D83**, 055017 (2011).
  - [8] A. Pilaftsis, Phys. Lett. **B706**, 465 (2012).
  - [9] M. Tanabashi *et al.* (Particle Data Group), Phys. Rev. **D98**, 030001 (2018).
  - [10] S. L. Glashow and S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. **D15**, 1958 (1977).
  - [11] P. Sikivie, L. Susskind, M. B. Voloshin, and V. I. Zakharov, Nucl. Phys. **B173**, 189 (1980).
  - [12] J. F. Gunion and H. E. Haber, Phys. Rev. **D67**, 075019 (2003).
  - [13] P. S. Bhupal Dev and A. Pilaftsis, JHEP **12**, 024 (2014), [Erratum: JHEP11,147(2015)].
  - [14] J. M. Cornwall, D. N. Levin, and G. Tiktopoulos, Phys. Rev. **D10**, 1145 (1974). [Erratum: Phys. Rev. D11,972(1975)].
  - [15] G. Abbiendi *et al.* (ALEPH, DELPHI, L3, OPAL, LEP), Eur. Phys. J. **C73**, 2463 (2013).
  - [16] M. Aaboud *et al.* (ATLAS), JHEP **09**, 139 (2018).
  - [17] A. G. Akeroyd *et al.*, Eur. Phys. J. **C77**, 276 (2017).
  - [18] A. Arbey, F. Mahmoudi, O. Stal, and T. Stefaniak, Eur. Phys. J. **C78**, 182 (2018).
  - [19] A. Arhrib, R. Benbrik, H. Harouiz, S. Moretti, and A. Rouchad, (2018), arXiv:1810.09106 [hep-ph].
  - [20] M. Aoki, S. Kanemura, K. Tsumura, and K. Yagyu, Phys. Rev. **D80**, 015017 (2009).
  - [21] M. Misiak and M. Steinhauser, Eur. Phys. J. **C77**, 201 (2017).

- [22] J. Haller, A. Hoecker, R. Kogler, K. Mönig, T. Peiffer, and J. Stelzer, *Eur. Phys. J.* **C78**, 675 (2018).
- [23] C. Degrande, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **197**, 239 (2015).
- [24] J. Alwall, *et al.*, *JHEP* **07**, 079 (2014).
- [25] K. Hagiwara, Q. Li, and K. Mawatari, *JHEP* **07**, 101 (2009).
- [26] G. Cowan, K. Cranmer, E. Gross, and O. Vitells, *Eur. Phys. J.* **C71**, 1554 (2011), [Erratum: *Eur. Phys. J.* **C73**, 2501(2013)].
- [27] A. M. Sirunyan *et al.* (CMS), *JINST* **13**, P10005 (2018).
- [28] A. M. Sirunyan *et al.* (CMS), *Eur. Phys. J.* **C78**, 140 (2018).
- [29] R. Frederix, D. Pagani, and M. Zaro, *JHEP* **02**, 031 (2018).
- [30] S. Kanemura, T. Kubota, and E. Takasugi, *Phys. Lett.* **B313**, 155 (1993).
- [31] M. Aiko, S. Kanemura, and K. Mawatari, in preparation.