NATURAL SCIENCES TRIPOS: Part III Physics MASTER OF ADVANCED STUDY IN PHYSICS NATURAL SCIENCES TRIPOS: Part III Astrophysics

Tuesday 16 January 2018: 14:00 to 16:00

MAJOR TOPICS Paper 1/PP (Particle Physics)

Answer **two** questions only. The approximate number of marks allocated to each part of a question is indicated in the right-hand margin where appropriate. The paper contains four sides including this one and is accompanied by a book giving values of constants and containing mathematical formulae which you may quote without proof.

You should use a separate Answer Book for each question.

STATIONERY REQUIREMENTS 2x20-page answer books Rough workpad SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS Mathematical Formulae Handbook Approved calculator allowed

You may not start to read the questions printed on the subsequent pages of this question paper until instructed that you may do so by the Invigilator.

1 Suppose that in an extension of the Standard Model there is a fourth generation of heavy leptons comprising a charged lepon, L^- , with a mass of 3.0 TeV, and a heavy neutrino, v_L , with a mass of 500 GeV. You may assume that these fourth generation leptons have the same couplings to the W, Z and γ as the first three generations.

(a) The L^- would decay via the weak interaction, i.e. $L^- \rightarrow e^- v_L \bar{v}_e$. Draw the leading order Feynman diagram(s) for this decay and, by considering the other possible decays of the *W*-boson, estimate the branching fraction for $L^- \rightarrow v_L$ + hadrons.

The requested diagram would have an L^- coming in from the left, splitting into a v_L and a W^- , with the W^- then itself decaying to $e^-\bar{v}_e$. Since the W^- will have all of its usual decay modes open to it, the branching fraction of $L^- \rightarrow v_L$ + hadrons should be the same as the branching fraction for $W^- \rightarrow$ hadrons. **BOOKWORK**[In lectures and handouts the students saw an explanation for why $BR(W \rightarrow q\bar{q}) = 6BR(W \rightarrow ev)$. They may either state this, or re-prove it.] From that they can go on to show that since $BR(W \rightarrow ev) = BR(W \rightarrow \mu v) = BR(W \rightarrow \tau v)$ then the branching fraction for $W^- \rightarrow$ hadrons must be $\frac{6}{6+3} = \frac{2}{3}$.

(b) Heavy charged leptons could be produced in proton-proton collisions via the Drell-Yan process, i.e. the production of L^+L^- through the annihilation of a quark and anti-quark into a photon. Draw the leading order Feynman diagram(s) for this interaction and explain why the cross section is non-zero for proton-proton collisions.

This diagram should show $q\bar{q} \rightarrow \gamma \rightarrow L^+L^-$ with it somehow clearly indicated that the \bar{q} must be some kind of sea-quark within the proton. The non-absence of sea-quarks in the proton is why this cross section is non-zero for proton-proton collisions.

(c) If the squared centre-of-mass energy of the proton-proton collision is *s*, show that the squared centre-of-mass energy of the qq system is $\hat{s} = x_1x_2s$, where x_1 and x_2 are the fractional momenta carried by the partons involved in the collision.

[3]

[3]

[6]

$$\hat{s} = (x_1 p_1 + x_2 p_2)^2 \tag{1}$$

$$= 2x_1 x_2 p_1^{\mu} p_{2\mu} + x_1^2 p_1^{\mu} p_{1\mu} + x_2^2 p_2^{\mu} p_{2\mu}$$
(2)

$$= 2x_1 x_2 p_1^{\mu} p_{2\mu} \qquad \text{(since quarks have negligible mass here)} \tag{3}$$

$$= x_1 x_2 \left(2p_1^{\mu} p_{2\mu} + 0 + 0 \right) \tag{4}$$

$$= x_1 x_2 \left(2p_1^{\mu} p_{2\mu} + p_1^{\mu} p_{1\mu} + p_2^{\mu} p_{2\mu} \right)$$
(5)

$$= x_1 x_2 (p_1 + p_2)^2 \tag{6}$$

$$= x_1 x_2 s \qquad \text{Q.E.D.}. \tag{7}$$

(d) The QED cross section for $qq \rightarrow l^+l^-$, where l is a charged lepton, is given by

$$\sigma = \frac{4\pi}{3} \frac{\alpha^2}{s} e_q^2 \times f(s, m_l),$$

where e_q is the quark charge (i.e. $e_u = +2/3$ and $e_d = -1/3$) and $f(s, m_l)$ is a kinematic factor that depends on the lepton mass. Assuming that the \bar{u} and \bar{d} parton distribution functions can be described by a single function, S(x), and neglecting the strange quark contribution, show that the parton model prediction for the $pp \rightarrow L^+L^-X$ differential cross section can be written

$$\frac{d^2\sigma}{dx_1dx_2} = f(sx_1x_2, m_L)\frac{2\pi\alpha^2}{81x_1x_2s} \left[9u_V(x_1)S(x_2) + 9u_V(x_2)S(x_1) + 20S(x_1)S(x_2)\right],$$

where $u_V(x)$ is the valence up-quark parton distribution function. Clearly state any assumptions you have made.

[10]

The parton model allows us to re-purpose the QED cross section given above as a partonic cross section, so long as we (a) replace *s* with the partonic centre of mass energy $\hat{s} = x_1x_2s$, (b) multiply it by an appropriate parton density function (times $p(x_1)dx_1$ and $p(x_2)dx_2$) to account for how many of each parton species is in the proton, and (c) sum the resulting quantity over each type of parton species we wish to assume the proton contains. The resulting answer is expressed as a differential cross section by taking the dx_1dx_2 to the denominator of the LHS.

The proton has two valence up quarks and one valence down quark, each in one of three colours. We will assume that $u_v(x) = 2d_v(x)$, i.e. that at any value of x there are always twice as many valence u quarks as d quarks. Since photons carry no colour, we only get interactions when red meets anti-red or green meets anti-green, etc.. Colour therefore, contributes another factor of $\frac{1}{3}$ to the above the QED form of the cross section, as this is the change that a quark and an anti-quark, chosen at random, have the right colours to annihilate into a photon. Furthermore, when we take a valence quark from one proton we will need a sea-quark to provide the anti-quark on the other side. We will also get sea-anti-sea collisions. Since the photon is neutral and cannot change flavour, we will need always u opposite \bar{u} and d opposite \bar{d} .

(TURN OVER

4

Putting all the above together, we therfore expect that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^{2}\sigma}{dx_{1}dx_{2}} &= \frac{1}{3} \times \frac{4\pi}{3} \frac{\alpha^{2}}{x_{1}x_{2}s} f(x_{1}x_{2}s, m_{L}) \begin{cases} e_{q}^{2} \times \text{pdf products for:} \begin{pmatrix} \text{(i) valence } u \text{ sea } \bar{u} \\ \text{(ii) valence } d \text{ sea } \bar{d} \\ \text{(ii) valence } d \text{ sea } \bar{d} \\ \text{(ii) valence } d \text{ sea } \bar{d} \\ \text{(ii) valence } d \text{ sea } \bar{d} \\ \text{(iv) valence } d \text{ sea } d \\ \text{(iv) valence } d \text{ sea } d \\ \text{(iv) valence } d \text{ sea } d \\$$

as required.

(e) Draw a diagram showing the region of x_1 versus x_2 that contributes to the cross section for $pp \rightarrow L^+L^-X$ at the LHC operating at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV.

[2]

The region of x_1 and x_2 that contributes to $pp \rightarrow L^+L^-X$ production will be that subset of the unit square in which the partonic centre of mass energy exceeds $2m_L$ as this is the kinematic boundary for production of two *L* particles. This constraint can be written as $\hat{s} \ge (2m_L)^2$ or equivalently $sx_1x_2 \ge 4m_L^2$. The allowed region has a hyperbolic boundary, symmetric under $x_1 \leftrightarrow x_2$ and passing through $x_1 = x_2 = 2m_L/\sqrt{s}$. Despite the existence of the last two sentences, I have been asked to include an actual picture of the diagram just described. Look about and it will be somewhere near here, wherever LaTeX



deigns to place it.

In principle, any physical values of x_1 and x_2 on the correct (upper) side of that hyperbola can contribute, however in practice it is likely that only values of x near the kinematic boundary will be significant, as pdfs will fall steeply as either x value increases. Those up near $x_1 = 1$ or $x_2 = 1$ are unlikely to be used much.

(f) Explaining your reasoning, which of the terms $20S(x_1)S(x_2)$ or $[9u_V(x_1)S(x_2) + 9u_V(x_2)S(x_1)]$, would you expect to dominate in this region?

Sea quark distributions peak at low values of x. For LLX production we need the product of x_1 and x_2 must be large, so it is unlikely that $20S(x_1)S(x_2)$ will contribute significantly. The majority of our LLX production will come from the valence-quark meets anti-sea production term: $9u_V(x_1)S(x_2) + 9u_V(x_2)S(x_1)$.

(g) In the relevant regions of x, the parton distribution functions can be taken to have the approximate forms, $u_V(x) \approx a x^{-\lambda}$ and $S(x) \approx b x^{-\lambda}$. Taking $f(sx_1x_2, m_L) = 1$, and by performing the appropriate integration over x_1 and x_2 , obtain an approximate expression for the Drell-Yan cross section for heavy lepton production in terms of α , a, b, λ , m_L and s.

$$\sigma = \int_{sx_1x_2 \ge 4m_L^2, 0 \le x_1, x_2 \le 1} \frac{2\pi\alpha^2}{81x_1x_2s} \left(9ax_1^{-\lambda}bx_2^{-\lambda} + 9ax_2^{-\lambda}bx_1^{-\lambda} + 20bx_1^{-\lambda}bx_2^{-\lambda}\right) dx_1 dx_2 \quad (14)$$

$$= (18a + 20b) \frac{2\pi\alpha^2 b}{81s} \int_{sx_1x_2 \ge 4m_L^2, 0 \le x_1, x_2 \le 1} \frac{1}{x_1x_2} (x_1x_2)^{-\lambda} dx_1 dx_2$$
(15)

$$= \left(18ab + 20b^2\right) \frac{2\pi\alpha^2}{81s} \int_{sx_1x_2 \ge 4m_L^2, 0 \le x_1, x_2 \le 1} (x_1x_2)^{-\lambda - 1} dx_1 dx_2 \tag{16}$$

$$= \left(18ab + 20b^2\right) \frac{2\pi\alpha^2}{81s} \int_{x_1 = \frac{4m_L^2}{s}}^1 \int_{x_2 = \frac{4m_L^2}{sx_1}}^1 (x_1 x_2)^{-\lambda - 1} dx_1 dx_2$$
(17)

$$= \left(18ab + 20b^2\right) \frac{2\pi\alpha^2}{81s} \frac{1}{\lambda^2} \left(1 - \left(\frac{s}{4m_L^2}\right)^\lambda \left(1 + \lambda \log\left(\frac{4m_L^2}{s}\right)\right)\right). \tag{18}$$

(TURN OVER

V7.4

[2]

[4]

- 2 Write detailed notes on **one** of the following topics:
 - (a) parton distribution functions, **or** [30]
 - (b) SU(3) colour symmetry.

[30]

There are many things a candidate could write about parton distribution functions. This exam does not intend to be prescriptive on exactly what topics should or should not be included. The main goal of the examiner, on reading the answers provided, will be to gauge the degree to which each candidate appears to understand and communicate his/her understanding of the topic mentoned. The bullet points listed below are not specimen answers. They are not a minimal set of topics that need to be covered, nor are they a maximal set of topics outlining the scope of the question. Instead they are a list of topics that the examiner has been required to provide, as part of the examination review process. for reasons that are not entirely clear to the examiner. Somewhat grudgingly, with those caveats, here are some lists of topics:

- (a) Parton distribution functions,
 - •A parton distribution function (pdf) is often denoted p(x) for short, though full specificiation would require saying what sort of parton is being distributed (e.g. up-quark vs gluon) within what sort of hadron (e.g. proton or neutron).
 - •By definition, p(x)dx is number of partons of some type, in some kind of hadron, with Bjorken x between x and x + dx.
 - •In the case of electron-proton scattering, Bjorken x is $Q^2/(2p_2.q)$ with $Q^2 = -q^2$ and q^{μ} being the being the momentum transfer $q = p_3 p_1$, with p_1 and p_3 the incoming and outgoing electron momenta (respectively) and p_2 the initial proton momentum.
 - •Bjorken *x* is also the fraction of the momentum that is carried by the struct object, if computed in the infinite momentum frame.
 - •Isospin symmetry between the neutron and the proton (or between the *u* and *d* quarks) is expressable in terms of pdfs as an approximate equivalence between the manitude of the up pdf of a proton and the down pdf of a neutron, etc. $u_p(x) \approx d_n(x)$.
 - •Our knowledge of pdfs comes exclusively from experiments and techniques that have been used to measure them, and demonstrate self-consistency within the parton model. It's therefore relevant to talk about the aspects of deep inelastic scattering that are relevant ... e.g.
 - •Hera and its measurements
 - •The relevant parts of the Quark Parton Model (see images below)
 - •Differences between neutrino scattering and electron scattering e.g. how one provides direct access to the quark vs antiquark content of hadrons, while the other provides access to the up and down fractions
 - •Necessity of Use in LHC production.



(TURN OVER







(TURN OVER



V7.4

 $C(i\bar{k} \rightarrow j\bar{l}) \equiv \frac{1}{4} \sum_{a=1}^{8} \lambda_{ji}^{a} \lambda_{kl}^{a}$

 $C(i\bar{k} \rightarrow j\bar{l}) \equiv \frac{1}{4} \sum_{a=1}^{8} \lambda_{ki}^{a} \lambda_{jl}^{a}$

 $C(r\overline{r} \to g\overline{g}) = \tfrac{1}{2}$ $C(r\bar{r} \rightarrow r\bar{r}) = \frac{1}{2}$

 $C(r\overline{g} \rightarrow r\overline{g}) = \frac{1}{2}$

 $C(r\overline{r} \to g\overline{g}) = - \tfrac{1}{6}$

•For $qq \rightarrow qq$ $r \rightarrow rr_{r}$, $rb \rightarrow rb_{r}$, $rb \rightarrow br_{r}$,

 $\langle |C|^2 \rangle = \frac{1}{9} \left[3 \times \left(\frac{1}{3}\right)^2 + 6 \times \left(-\frac{1}{6}\right)^2 + 6 \times \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^2 \right]$

 $=\frac{2}{9}$



3 The vertex factor for the interaction between a Higgs boson and a fermion is

$$-i\frac{g_W m_f}{2m_W},$$

where g_W is the weak decay constant, and m_W and m_f are the masses of the W-boson and the fermion f, respectively. Write down the matrix element for the decay $H \to f\bar{f}$. [3]

Up to an overall modulus-one conventional factor,

$$M_{ij} = -i\frac{g_W m_f}{2m_W} \bar{u}_i v_j \tag{19}$$

$$= -i\frac{g_W m_f}{2m_W} u_i^{\dagger} \gamma^0 v_j \tag{20}$$

$$= -i\frac{g_W m_f}{2m_W} \left(u_i^{\dagger} \gamma^0 v_j \right) \tag{21}$$

where *i* and *j* each take a label in $\{\uparrow, \downarrow\}$.

Consider the decay of the Higgs boson in its rest frame where the fermion is produced with polar angle θ and azimuthal angle ϕ . Assuming $m_H \gg m_f$, evaluate the $H \rightarrow f \bar{f}$ matrix elements for all four possible combinations of particle and anti-particle helicities and comment on your results.

The supplied Dirac spinors are:

$$u_{\uparrow} = \sqrt{E} \begin{pmatrix} c \\ e^{i\phi}s \\ c \\ e^{i\phi}s \end{pmatrix}, u_{\downarrow} = \sqrt{E} \begin{pmatrix} -s \\ e^{i\phi}c \\ s \\ -e^{i\phi}c \end{pmatrix}, v_{\uparrow} = \sqrt{E} \begin{pmatrix} s \\ -e^{i\phi}c \\ -s \\ e^{i\phi}c \end{pmatrix}, v_{\downarrow} = \sqrt{E} \begin{pmatrix} c \\ e^{i\phi}s \\ c \\ e^{i\phi}s \end{pmatrix},$$

however we will want our *u* and *v* spinors to use different values of θ and ϕ compared to each other. Specifically, if we let the 'vanilla' values of θ and ϕ refer to the direction of the particle in the Higgs rest frame, then the anti-particle will have $\theta' = \pi - \theta$ and $\phi' = \phi + \pi$. Accordingly

$$s' = \sin(\theta'/2) = \sin((\pi - \theta)/2) = \cos(\theta/2) = c$$

(TURN OVER

[8]

V7.4

A

and

$$c' = \cos(\theta'/2) = \cos((\pi - \theta)/2) = \sin(\theta/2) = s$$

while

$$e^{i\phi'} = e^{i\phi + i\pi} = -e^{i\phi}.$$

For this reason we must use the following spinors:

$$u_{\uparrow} = \sqrt{E} \begin{pmatrix} c \\ e^{i\phi}s \\ c \\ e^{i\phi}s \end{pmatrix}, u_{\downarrow} = \sqrt{E} \begin{pmatrix} -s \\ e^{i\phi}c \\ s \\ -e^{i\phi}c \end{pmatrix}, v_{\uparrow}' = \sqrt{E} \begin{pmatrix} c \\ e^{i\phi}s \\ -c \\ -e^{i\phi}s \end{pmatrix}, v_{\downarrow}' = \sqrt{E} \begin{pmatrix} s \\ -e^{i\phi}c \\ s \\ -e^{i\phi}c \end{pmatrix}.$$

Hermitian conjugating the *u*-spinors these gives:

$$u_{\uparrow}^{\dagger} = \sqrt{E} \left(c, e^{-i\phi} s, c, e^{-i\phi} s \right), u_{\downarrow}^{\dagger} = \sqrt{E} \left(-s, e^{-i\phi} c, s, -e^{-i\phi} c \right), v_{\uparrow}' = \sqrt{E} \begin{pmatrix} c \\ e^{i\phi} s \\ -c \\ -e^{i\phi} s \end{pmatrix}, v_{\downarrow}' = \sqrt{E} \begin{pmatrix} s \\ -e^{i\phi} c \\ s \\ -e^{i\phi} c \end{pmatrix}$$

and pre-multiplying the *v*-spinors by γ^0 gives

$$u_{\uparrow}^{\dagger} = \sqrt{E} \left(c, e^{-i\phi}s, c, e^{-i\phi}s \right), u_{\downarrow}^{\dagger} = \sqrt{E} \left(-s, e^{-i\phi}c, s, -e^{-i\phi}c \right), \gamma^{0}v_{\uparrow}' = \sqrt{E} \begin{pmatrix} c \\ e^{i\phi}s \\ c \\ e^{i\phi}s \end{pmatrix}, \gamma^{0}v_{\downarrow}' = \sqrt{E} \begin{pmatrix} s \\ -e^{i\phi}c \\ -s \\ e^{i\phi}c \end{pmatrix}$$

from which, if we define $K = -i\frac{g_W m_f}{2m_W}$, we can read off:

$$M_{\uparrow\uparrow} = 2KE \tag{22}$$

$$M_{\uparrow\downarrow} = 0 \tag{23}$$

$$M_{\downarrow\uparrow} = 0 \tag{24}$$

$$M_{\downarrow\downarrow} = -2KE. \tag{25}$$

This answer makes a lot of sense: the higgs as a scalar particle has spin-0, and so must decay to a particle and an anti-particle each having the same helicity. Were this not the case, i.e. were opposite helicity possible, then the final state would have one plus or minus unit of spin in the direction parallel to the outgoing particles, contradicting the spin-0 of the Higgs. Furthermore, we should not be surprised that the magnitude of $M_{\uparrow\uparrow}$ and $M_{\downarrow\downarrow}$ agree since the Higgs vertex is not partiy-violating (dies not favour one helicity over another).

Given the expression for the decay rate:

$$\frac{d\Gamma}{d\Omega} = \frac{p^*}{32\pi^2 m_H^2} \left\langle |M_{fi}|^2 \right\rangle,$$

where p^* is the centre-of-mass momentum of either final state particle, show that the partial decay width for the Higgs boson to $\tau^+\tau^-$ is

$$\Gamma_{\tau} = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{m_{\tau}^2 m_H}{4\pi}.$$

First let us calculate p^* . Since we are neglecting final state particla masses, $2p^* = m_H$ so $p^* = m_H/2$.

Second we need $\langle |M_{fi}|^2 \rangle$. This should be an average over possible input states of this Higgs and a sum over relevant final states. The Higgs has only one initial state – so we can ignore that averaging part. Instead we just sum over final states:

$$\left\langle \left| M_{fi} \right|^2 \right\rangle = \left| M_{\uparrow\uparrow} \right|^2 + \left| M_{\uparrow\downarrow} \right|^2 + \left| M_{\downarrow\uparrow} \right|^2 + \left| M_{\downarrow\downarrow} \right|^2 \tag{26}$$

$$= 4|K|^2 E^2 + 0 + 0 + 4|K|^2 E^2$$
(27)

$$= 8|K|^2 E^2$$
 (28)

$$=8|K|^2(p^*)^2,$$
(29)

and so

$$\left\langle |M_{fi}|_{\tau}^{2} \right\rangle = 8 \frac{g_{W}^{2} m_{\tau}^{2}}{4 m_{W}^{2}} \left(\frac{m_{H}}{2}\right)^{2}$$
(30)

$$=\frac{g_W^2 m_\tau^2 m_H^2}{2m_W^2}.$$
 (31)

Putting these into the differential decay rate gives:

$$\frac{d\Gamma_{\tau}}{d\Omega} = \frac{m_H/2}{32\pi^2 m_H^2} \frac{g_W^2 m_{\tau}^2 m_H^2}{2m_W^2}$$
(32)

$$=\frac{g_W^2 m_\tau^2 m_H}{128\pi^2 m_W^2}$$
(33)

therefore

$$\Gamma_{\tau} = \int \frac{d\Gamma_{\tau}}{d\Omega} d\Omega \tag{34}$$

$$=4\pi \frac{d\Gamma_{\tau}}{d\Omega}$$
(35)

$$=4\pi \frac{g_W^2 m_\tau^2 m_H}{128\pi^2 m_W^2}$$
(36)

$$=\frac{g_W^2}{8m_W^2}\frac{\pi m_\tau^2 m_H}{4\pi^2}$$
(37)

$$=\frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{m_\tau^2 m_H}{4\pi} \tag{38}$$

as desired.

V7.4

Assuming $m_H = 125$ GeV, and neglecting decays to $\nu \bar{\nu}$, e^+e^- , $\mu^+\mu^-$, $u\bar{u}$, $d\bar{d}$ and $s\bar{s}$, obtain values for the total decay width of the Higgs boson, Γ_H and the branching fraction for $H \rightarrow b\bar{b}$.

(TURN OVER

А

[5]

We have just found that

$$\Gamma_{\tau} = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{m_{\tau}^2 m_H}{4\pi}$$

By the same argument

$$\Gamma_{\mu} = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{m_{\mu}^2 m_H}{4\pi},$$
$$\Gamma_c = 3 \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{m_c^2 m_H}{4\pi}$$

and

$$\Gamma_b = 3 \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{m_b^2 m_H}{4\pi}$$

where the 3 accounts or the number of colours. Γ_t is not something that needs to be considered as Higgs decay to $t\bar{t}$ is not kinematically possible. The total width (neglecting the requested modes) is therefore given by

$$\Gamma = \Gamma_{\tau} + \Gamma_c + \Gamma_b \tag{39}$$

$$= \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{m_H}{4\pi} \left(m_\tau^2 + 3m_c^2 + 3m_b^2 \right)$$
(40)

$$\approx \frac{1.66 \times 10^{-5}}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{125}{4\pi} \left(1.8^2 + 3 \times 1.5^2 + 3 \times 4.5^2 \right) \text{ GeV}$$
(41)

$$\approx 0.0082 \text{ GeV}$$
 (42)

and furthermore

$$BR(H \to \mu\bar{\mu}) = \frac{\Gamma_{\mu}}{\Gamma} \approx \frac{m_{\mu}^2}{m_{\tau}^2 + 3m_c^2 + 3m_b^2} \approx 1.6 \times 10^{-4}$$
(43)

$$BR(H \to \tau\bar{\tau}) = \frac{\Gamma_{\tau}}{\Gamma} \approx \frac{m_{\tau}^2}{m_{\tau}^2 + 3m_c^2 + 3m_b^2} \approx 0.045$$
(44)

$$BR(H \to c\bar{c}) = \frac{\Gamma_c}{\Gamma} \approx \frac{3m_c^2}{m_\tau^2 + 3m_c^2 + 3m_b^2} \approx 0.10$$
(45)

$$BR(H \to b\bar{b}) = \frac{\Gamma_b}{\Gamma} \approx \frac{3m_b^2}{m_\tau^2 + 3m_c^2 + 3m_b^2} \approx 0.86.$$
(46)

(The question only requests the last of these branching ratios.)

At a future muon collider operating at the Higgs boson resonance (assumed to be $\sqrt{s} = 125$ GeV), compare the cross section for the process $\mu^+\mu^- \rightarrow H \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ to the cross section for the QED process $\mu^+\mu^- \rightarrow \gamma \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ which is $\sigma_{QED} = 4\pi\alpha^2/(9s)$. Comment on the possible advantages and disadvantages of a muon collider compared to an electron-positron collider.

[6]

To estimate the cross section for $\mu^+\mu^- \to H \to b\bar{b}$ we can use the supplied relativistic Breit-Wigner formula for a resonance of mass *m* and spin *J*:

$$\sigma = \frac{4\pi(2J+1)}{m^2} \frac{s\Gamma_i\Gamma_f}{(s-m^2)^2 + m^2\Gamma^2}$$

where Γ_i , Γ_f and Γ are the appropriate partial decay widths and the total decay width. Based on our earlier computations, and knowledge that J = 0 for the Higgs, we have:

$$\sigma_{\mu^+\mu^- \to H \to b\bar{b}}^{s=m_H^2} = \frac{4\pi}{m_H^2} \frac{m_H^2 \Gamma_\mu \Gamma_b}{(m_H^2 - m_H^2)^2 + m_H^2 \Gamma_H^2}$$
(47)

$$=\frac{4\pi}{m_H^2}\frac{\Gamma_{\mu}\Gamma_b}{\Gamma_H^2} \tag{48}$$

$$\approx \frac{4\pi}{s} \times (1.6 \times 10^{-4}) \times (0.86) \tag{49}$$

$$\approx \frac{4\pi}{s} \times (3.8 \times 10^{-4}). \tag{50}$$

We can compare this to the supplied QED cross section of

$$\sigma_{QED} = \frac{4\pi}{s} \frac{\alpha^2}{9} \tag{51}$$

$$\approx \frac{4\pi}{s} \frac{1}{137 \times 137 \times 9} \tag{52}$$

$$\approx \frac{4\pi}{s} \times (5.9 \times 10^{-6}). \tag{53}$$

We thus note that the cross section for $b\bar{b}$ production via Higgs at this machine is nearly two orders of magnitude bigger (380/5.9 \approx 58) than for production via QCD.

For the same amount of synchrotron radiation, a circular muon collider should theoretically reach higher energy than a circular electron collider. Put another way, at the same energy a muon collider would have less synchroton losses than an electron collider and so would have less demand for powwer. There are strong disadvantages to muon colliders, however, namely that the source particles (muons) are unstabe and much harder than electrons to manufacture in large quantities – this means that muon beams would have much shorter lifetimes than electron beams (though time dilation at energy would suppress this) and correspondingly one might imagine large beam backgrounds from in-beam decays. For Higgs production specifically, one would expect far more Higgs bosons (by a factor of order $\frac{m_{\mu}^2}{m_e^2}$ at a muon collider than an electron collider, on account of the nature of the Higgs-fermion-fermion interaction discussed in this question. This would potentially lead to a much larger number of Higgs events available for analysis, if the cross section gain were not offset by the other disadvantages of a muon collider.

Assuming that a muon collider could operate with fully polarised beams where the helicities of the μ^+ and μ^- can be chosen, explain how one could distinguish between (i) a Higgs boson with a Standard Model scalar coupling to fermions, and (ii) an exotic Higgs boson with 'scalar minus pseudo-scalar' $(1 - \gamma^5)$ couplings. Briefly discuss whether it would be possible to distinguish a Standard Model Higgs boson from one with a pure pseudo-scalar (γ^5) coupling.

(TURN OVER

[4]

A standard model Higgs boson is spinless and so can only couple to spin zero initial states – e.g. it could be made from $\mu_L \bar{\mu}_L$ or $\mu_R \bar{\mu}_R$ but not from $\mu_L \bar{\mu}_R$ or $\mu_R \bar{\mu}_L$. These characteristics could be seen by running the collider in each of those states and then measuring the Higgs boson cross section in each case. If, instead, the higgs coupling took the form $(1 - \gamma^5)$ then we recognise this as (up to a factor of 2) a Left projection operator P_L ... meaning that it would wipe out right handed spinor placed to its right. Consequently a scalar-minus-pseudoscalar Higgs would only couple to one of the two helicity combinations allowed to the standard model Higgs (and a scalar-plus-pseudoscalar Higgs would couple to the other). A pure pseudoscalar Higgs has a γ^5 coupling. We can write $\gamma^5 = (1 + \gamma^5)/2 - (1 - \gamma^5)/2 = P_R - P_L$ so both right and left spinors to the right of γ^5 are preseserved (though one gets a negative sign compared to the other). The negative sign for one helicity will disappear on squaring the matrix element for the leading order diagram, however, meaning that the pseudoscalar Higgs would look just like the scalar Higgs. An answer that stops here would be sufficient to gain full marks. This said, it would not hurt to remark that there ought, nonetheless, to exist ways of telling the difference between the two forms of Higgs – the relative sign that is introduced between the L and R amplitudes could have an observable effect if allowed to interfere with somehting else. In a sense, the change in signature that we saw when moving from scalar to scalar-minus-pseudoscalar Higgs can itself be thought of as a consequence of an interference between two diagrams that both achieve $f\bar{f} \to f\bar{f}$ but one via a scalar and the other by a pseudoscalar. Therefore one way to distinguish a pure scalar from a pure pseudoscalar Higgs would be to look at Higgs events an environment where the Higgs is not alone in mediating the process, i.e. in context where there is some level of significant interference from another well understood process with the same initial and final state.

You may make use of the following information: In the limit $E \gg m$ the Dirac spinors for the helicity eigenstates are

$$u_{\uparrow} = \sqrt{E} \begin{pmatrix} c \\ e^{i\phi}s \\ c \\ e^{i\phi}s \end{pmatrix}, u_{\downarrow} = \sqrt{E} \begin{pmatrix} -s \\ e^{i\phi}c \\ s \\ -e^{i\phi}c \end{pmatrix}, v_{\uparrow} = \sqrt{E} \begin{pmatrix} s \\ -e^{i\phi}c \\ -s \\ e^{i\phi}c \end{pmatrix}, v_{\downarrow} = \sqrt{E} \begin{pmatrix} c \\ e^{i\phi}s \\ c \\ e^{i\phi}s \end{pmatrix},$$

where $c = cos(\theta/2)$ and $s = sin(\theta/2)$. The Dirac matrices are given by

$$\gamma^{0} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \gamma^{1} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \gamma^{2} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & -i \\ 0 & 0 & i & 0 \\ 0 & i & 0 & 0 \\ -i & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$
$$\gamma^{3} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \gamma^{5} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

 $G_F/\sqrt{2} = g_W^2/(8m_W^2)$. The second and third generation fermion masses are $m_{\mu} = 0.106 \text{ GeV}$, $m_{\tau} = 1.777 \text{ GeV}$, $m_s = 0.1 \text{ GeV}$, $m_c = 1.5 \text{ GeV}$, $m_b = 4.5 \text{ GeV}$, and $m_t = 175 \text{ GeV}$. The Fermi constant takes the numerical value $G_F = 1.166 \times 10^{-5} \text{ GeV}^{-2}$. The relativistic Breit-Wigner formula for a resonance of mass m and spin J is

$$\sigma = \frac{4\pi(2J+1)}{m^2} \frac{s\Gamma_i\Gamma_f}{(s-m^2)^2 + m^2\Gamma^2},$$

where Γ_i , Γ_f and Γ are the appropriate partial decay widths and the total decay width.

A