arXiv:1304.5937v1 [hep-ph] 22 Apr 2013

A LIGHT DYNAMICAL SCALAR BOSON

R. Alonso[1], M.B. Gavela[1,2], L. Merlo[1,2,*], S. Rigolin[3], J. Yepes[1]

[1] *Instituto de Física Teórica UAM/CSIC and Departamento de Física Teórica, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Cantoblanco, 28049 Madrid, Spain*
[2] *CERN, Department of Physics, Theory Division CH-1211 Geneva 23, Switzerland*
[3] *Dipartimento di Fisica "G. Galilei", Università di Padova and INFN, Sezione di Padova, Via Marzolo 8, I-35131 Padua, Italy*

[*] *Speaker.* *Talk given at the XLVIIIth Rencontres de Moriond session devoted to ELECTROWEAK INTERACTIONS AND UNIFIED THEORIES, La Thuile (Italy), 2-9 March 2013*

With the discovery of a scalar resonance at ATLAS and CMS, the understanding of the electroweak symmetry breaking origin seems a much closer goal. A strong dynamics at relatively low scales is still a good candidate. In this talk, the complete effective Lagrangian up to $d \leq 5$ will be presented, both for the gauge and the flavour sectors. Interesting features in the flavour phenomenology will be discussed.

1 Framework

With the new resonance at the Electroweak (EW) scale discovered at LHC [1,2], we can now hope to have hints to understand the origin of the EW symmetry breaking (EWSB) mechanism. The data indicate that the new particle is looking more and more like the Standard Model (SM) scalar boson [3–5] with mass around 125 GeV, but other possibilities are still viable. In particular, the case of a strong dynamics at the TeV scale Λ_s responsible for the EWSB is still attractive. In the original technicolor ansatz [6–8], only the three SM would-be-Goldstone bosons (GBs) are retained and are responsible of giving mass to the weak gauge bosons. Given the present discovery, a more attractive scenario is the so-called composite Higgs model, originally introduced in Ref. [9–14]. In this context, the theory is based on the spontaneous breaking of a large global symmetry, that gives rise to the appearance of several GBs: a realistic model then accounts for three GBs corresponding to the SM ones, and for at least one more GB that takes the role of the scalar boson. The latter is then a composite scalar degree of freedom that arises as massless and gets mass due to an explicit breaking of the symmetry. With respect to the technicolor context, here there are four relevant scales: Λ_s typical of the strong resonances; $f \leq 4\pi\Lambda_s$ that characterises the GBs energy scale; $v = 246$ GeV defined through the W mass, $M_W = gv/2$; and $\langle h \rangle$ that is the vacuum expectation value (VEV) of the scalar particle, providing the EWSB, and that is in general distinct from v. To measure the degree of non-linearity of these schemes, it is customary to introduce the parameter $\xi \equiv (v/f)^2$ that parametrises the impact of the strong dynamics at low-energy.

Without entering into details of a specific model, it is possible to describe the NP effects due to the TeV strong dynamics by making use of an effective Lagrangian approach, dealing with only the SM fields. The SM GBs can be described by a dimensionless unitary matrix:

$$\mathbf{U}(x) = e^{i\sigma_a \pi^a(x)/v}\,, \qquad\qquad \mathbf{U}(x) \to L\,\mathbf{U}(x)R^\dagger\,,$$

with L, R denoting respectively the $SU(2)_{L,R}$ global transformations of the scalar potential. The adimensionality of $\mathbf{U}(x)$ is the technical key to understand why the dimension of the leading low-energy operators describing the dynamics of the scalar sector differs for a non-linear regime [15–19] and a purely linear regime [20, 21]. In the former, non-renormalisable operators containing extra powers of a light h are weighted by powers of h/f [13], and the GB contributions encoded in $\mathbf{U}(x)$ do not exhibit any scale suppression. In the linear regime, instead, the light h and the three SM GBs are encoded into the scalar doublet H, with mass dimension one: therefore any extra insertion of H is suppressed by a power of the cutoff.

It is becoming customary to parametrise the Lagrangian describing a light dynamical scalar particle h by means of the following ansatz [22, 23] :

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{L}_h = \;& \frac{1}{2}(\partial_\mu h)(\partial^\mu h)\,(1 + c_H\,\xi\,\mathcal{F}_H(h)) \;-\; V(h) \;-\left(\frac{v}{2\sqrt{2}}\bar{Q}_L\mathbf{U}(x)\,\mathbf{Y}\;Q_R\,\mathcal{F}_Y(h) + \text{h.c.}\right) + \\ & - \frac{v^2}{4}\text{Tr}\left[\mathbf{V}^\mu\mathbf{V}_\mu\right]\,\mathcal{F}_C(h) \;+\; c_T\,\xi\,\frac{v^2}{4}\,\text{Tr}\left[\mathbf{T}\mathbf{V}^\mu\right]\text{Tr}\left[\mathbf{T}\mathbf{V}_\mu\right]\mathcal{F}_T(h) \;+\; \dots\,, \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where dots stand for higher order terms in the (linear) expansion in h/f, and $\mathbf{V}_\mu \equiv (\mathbf{D}_\mu\mathbf{U})\,\mathbf{U}^\dagger$ ($\mathbf{T} \equiv \mathbf{U}\sigma_3\mathbf{U}^\dagger$) is the vector (scalar) chiral field transforming in the adjoint of $SU(2)_L$. The covariant derivative reads

$$\mathbf{D}_\mu\mathbf{U}(x) \equiv \partial_\mu\mathbf{U}(x) + \frac{ig}{2}W^a_\mu(x)\sigma_a\mathbf{U}(x) - \frac{ig'}{2}B_\mu(x)\mathbf{U}(x)\sigma_3\,,$$

with W^a_μ (B_μ) denoting the $SU(2)_L$ ($U(1)_Y$) gauge bosons and g (g') the corresponding gauge coupling. In the equations above, $V(h)$ denotes the effective scalar potential describing the breaking of the EW symmetry. The first line in Eq. (1) includes the SMS kinetic term, its scalar potential and the Yukawa-like interactions for quarks, while the second line describes the W and Z masses and their interactions with h, as well as the usual custodial symmetry breaking term labeled by c_T.

The functions $\mathcal{F}_H(h)$, $\mathcal{F}_C(h)$, $\mathcal{F}_T(h)$ and $\mathcal{F}_Y(h)$ above, as well as all $\mathcal{F}(h)$ functions to be used below, encode the generic dependence on $(\langle h\rangle + h)$ and are model-dependent. Each $\mathcal{F}(h)$ function can be expanded in powers of ξ, $\mathcal{F}(h) = g_0(h,v) + \xi g_1(h,v) + \xi^2 g_2(h,v) + \dots$, where $g(h,v)$ are model-dependent functions of h and of v, once $\langle h\rangle$ is expressed in terms of ξ and v. For not too small ξ the whole series may need to be considered.

The above Lagrangian can be very useful to describe an extended class of "Higgs" models, ranging from the SM scenario with a linear Higgs sector (for $\langle h\rangle = v$, $a = b = c = 1$ and neglecting the higher order terms in h), to the technicolor-like ansatz (for $f \sim v$ and omitting all terms in h) and intermediate situations with a light scalar h (in general for $f \neq v$) as in composite/holographic Higgs models [9–14, 24–26] up to dilaton-like scalar frameworks. Note that in concrete models electroweak corrections imply $\xi < 0.2 - 0.4$ [27], but we will leave the ξ parameter free here and account for the constraints on custodial symmetry through limits on the $d = 2$ and higher-dimensional chiral operator coefficients.

In what follows, the complete basis of independent operators up to dimension 5 will be reported, both in the gauge and in the flavour sectors, providing the complete list of interactions of a light h [28–30]. This analysis enlarges and completes the operator basis previously considered in Refs. [15–19, 22, 23] and represents a fundamental tool in order to characterise the emerging phenomenology at LHC and investigating on the EWSB origin.

2 The effective Lagrangian in the gauge sector

All CP-even gauge operators appropriate to the non-linear regime will be included in this section, up to mass dimension 5. In the absence of a light h, no pure gauge or gauge-h $d=5$ operator exists, and it is thus a good guideline to start from the basis of $d=4$ pure gauge chiral operators and complete it up to $d=5$ with suitable insertions of h. The connection to the linear regime will be made manifest exploiting the operator dependence on ξ. The Lagrangian can be decomposed as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{L}^{d\leq 5}_{gauge-h} =& \mathscr{L}_h - \frac{g_s^2}{4} G^a_{\mu\nu} G_a^{\mu\nu}\, \mathcal{F}_G(h) - \frac{g^2}{4} W^a_{\mu\nu} W_a^{\mu\nu}\, \mathcal{F}_W(h) - \frac{g'^2}{4} B_{\mu\nu} B^{\mu\nu}\, \mathcal{F}_B(h) + \\ &+ \xi \sum_{i=1}^{5} c_i\, \mathcal{P}_i(h) \,+\, \xi^2 \sum_{i=6}^{20} c_i\, \mathcal{P}_i(h) + \xi^3 \sum_{i=21}^{23} c_i\, \mathcal{P}_i(h) + \xi^4\, c_{24}\, \mathcal{P}_{24}(h)\,.\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

The first line of Eq. (2) contains the kinetic terms for the gauge bosons, with $W_{\mu\nu}$, $B_{\mu\nu}$ and $G_{\mu\nu}$ denoting the $SU(2)_L$, $U(1)_Y$ and $SU(3)_C$ field strengths, respectively. The second line of Eq. (2) contains the following 24 CP-even operators, ordered by their ξ dependence [29]:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{P}_1(h) &= g\, g'\, B_{\mu\nu} \mathrm{Tr}\left(\mathbf{T}\, W^{\mu\nu}\right)\, \mathcal{F}_1(h) & \mathcal{P}_4(h) &= i\, g' B_{\mu\nu} \mathrm{Tr}(\mathbf{T}\mathbf{V}^\mu)\, \partial^\nu \mathcal{F}_4(h) \\ \mathcal{P}_2(h) &= i\, g'\, B_{\mu\nu} \mathrm{Tr}\left(\mathbf{T}\, [\mathbf{V}^\mu, \mathbf{V}^\nu]\right)\, \mathcal{F}_2(h) & \mathcal{P}_5(h) &= i\, g\, \mathrm{Tr}(W_{\mu\nu}\mathbf{V}^\mu)\, \partial^\nu \mathcal{F}_5(h) \\ \mathcal{P}_3(h) &= i\, g\, \mathrm{Tr}\left(W_{\mu\nu}\, [\mathbf{V}^\mu, \mathbf{V}^\nu]\right)\, \mathcal{F}_3(h)\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{P}_6(h) &= \left(\mathrm{Tr}\left(\mathbf{V}_\mu\, \mathbf{V}^\mu\right)\right)^2\, \mathcal{F}_6(h) & \mathcal{P}_{14}(h) &= i\, g\, \mathrm{Tr}(\mathbf{T}W_{\mu\nu})\mathrm{Tr}(\mathbf{T}\mathbf{V}^\mu)\, \partial^\nu \mathcal{F}_{14}(h) \\ \mathcal{P}_7(h) &= \left(\mathrm{Tr}\left(\mathbf{V}_\mu\, \mathbf{V}_\nu\right)\right)^2\, \mathcal{F}_7(h) & \mathcal{P}_{15}(h) &= \mathrm{Tr}(\mathbf{T}\, [\mathbf{V}_\mu, \mathbf{V}_\nu])\mathrm{Tr}(\mathbf{T}\mathbf{V}^\mu)\, \partial^\nu \mathcal{F}_{15}(h) \\ \mathcal{P}_8(h) &= g^2\, \left(\mathrm{Tr}\left(\mathbf{T}\, W^{\mu\nu}\right)\right)^2\, \mathcal{F}_8(h) & \mathcal{P}_{16}(h) &= \mathrm{Tr}(\mathbf{V}_\nu\, \mathcal{D}_\mu \mathbf{V}^\mu)\, \partial^\nu \mathcal{F}_{16}(h) \\ \mathcal{P}_9(h) &= i\, g\, \mathrm{Tr}\left(\mathbf{T}\, W_{\mu\nu}\right) \mathrm{Tr}\left(\mathbf{T}\, [\mathbf{V}^\mu, \mathbf{V}^\nu]\right)\, \mathcal{F}_9(h) & \mathcal{P}_{17}(h) &= \mathrm{Tr}(\mathbf{T}\, \mathcal{D}_\mu \mathbf{V}^\mu)\mathrm{Tr}(\mathbf{T}\mathbf{V}_\nu)\, \partial^\nu \mathcal{F}_{17}(h) \\ \mathcal{P}_{10}(h) &= g\, \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\lambda} \mathrm{Tr}\left(\mathbf{T}\mathbf{V}_\mu\right) \mathrm{Tr}\left(\mathbf{V}_\nu\, W_{\rho\lambda}\right)\, \mathcal{F}_{10}(h) & \mathcal{P}_{18}(h) &= \mathrm{Tr}\left(\mathbf{V}_\mu\, \mathbf{V}^\mu\right)\, \partial_\nu \partial^\nu \mathcal{F}_{18}(h) \\ \mathcal{P}_{11}(h) &= \mathrm{Tr}\left((\mathcal{D}_\mu \mathbf{V}^\mu)^2\right)\, \mathcal{F}_{11}(h) & \mathcal{P}_{19}(h) &= \mathrm{Tr}\left(\mathbf{V}_\mu\, \mathbf{V}_\nu\right)\, \partial^\mu \mathcal{F}_{19}(h) \partial^\nu \mathcal{F}'_{19}(h) \\ \mathcal{P}_{12}(h) &= \mathrm{Tr}(\mathbf{T}\, \mathcal{D}_\mu \mathbf{V}^\mu)\, \mathrm{Tr}(\mathbf{T}\, \mathcal{D}_\nu \mathbf{V}^\nu)\, \mathcal{F}_{12}(h) & \mathcal{P}_{20}(h) &= \mathrm{Tr}\left(\mathbf{T}\mathbf{V}_\mu\right) \mathrm{Tr}\left(\mathbf{T}\mathbf{V}_\nu\right)\, \partial^\mu \mathcal{F}_{20}(h) \partial^\nu \mathcal{F}'_{20}(h) \\ \mathcal{P}_{13}(h) &= \mathrm{Tr}([\mathbf{T}\,, \mathbf{V}_\nu]\, \mathcal{D}_\mu \mathbf{V}^\mu)\, \mathrm{Tr}(\mathbf{T}\mathbf{V}^\nu) \mathcal{F}_{13}(h)\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{P}_{21}(h) &= \mathrm{Tr}\left(\mathbf{V}_\mu \mathbf{V}^\mu\right) \left(\mathrm{Tr}\left(\mathbf{T}\mathbf{V}_\nu\right)\right)^2 \mathcal{F}_{21}(h) & \mathcal{P}_{23}(h) &= \left(\mathrm{Tr}\left(\mathbf{T}\, \mathbf{V}_\mu\right)\right)^2 \partial_\nu \partial^\nu \mathcal{F}_{23}(h) \\ \mathcal{P}_{22}(h) &= \mathrm{Tr}\left(\mathbf{V}_\mu \mathbf{V}_\nu\right) \mathrm{Tr}\left(\mathbf{T}\mathbf{V}^\mu\right) \mathrm{Tr}\left(\mathbf{T}\mathbf{V}^\nu\right) \mathcal{F}_{22}(h) & & \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

$$\mathcal{P}_{24}(h) = \left(\mathrm{Tr}\left(\mathbf{T}\mathbf{V}_\mu\right) \mathrm{Tr}\left(\mathbf{T}\mathbf{V}_\nu\right)\right)^2\, \mathcal{F}_{24}(h)\,. \tag{6}$$

The 24 constant parameters c_i are model-dependent coefficients. The powers of ξ, factorized out in the second line of Eq. (2), do not reflect an expansion in ξ, but a reparametrisation that facilitates the tracking to the lowest dimension at which a "sibling" operator appears in the linear expansion. By sibling we mean an operator written in terms of the scalar doublet H, that includes the pure gauge part of the couplings $\mathcal{P}_{1-24}(h)$. It may happen that an operator listed in Eqs. (3)-(6) corresponds to a specific combination of siblings with different dimensions. This is the case, for instance, of $\mathcal{P}_{13}(h)$, whose siblings are of dimension 8 and 10.

For $\xi \ll 1$ the weight of the operators which are accompanied by powers of ξ is scale suppressed compared to that of SM renormalisable couplings. In this limit the Lagrangian above would encode a consistent linear expansion up to $d=6$ operators, if only the terms of zero and first order in ξ are kept: indeed, operators $\mathcal{P}_6(h)$ to $\mathcal{P}_{24}(h)$ would correspond to $d=8$ or higher-dimension siblings in the linear expansion. In contrast, in the non-linear regime, that is for $\xi \approx 1$, no such suppression appears and *all* operators in Eqs. (3)-(6) include $d \leq 5$ couplings

and should be considered on equal footing. The leading terms of the linear and non-linear expansions do not match.

The different operators defined in Eqs. (3)-(6) correspond to three major categories: pure gauge and gauge-h operators (in blue) which result from a direct extension of the original Appelquist-Longhitano chiral Higgsless basis; operators containing the contraction $\mathcal{D}_\mu \mathbf{V}^\mu$ and no derivatives of $\mathcal{F}(h)$ (in green); operators with one or two derivatives of $\mathcal{F}(h)$ (in red).

3 The effective Lagrangian in the flavour sector

The core of the flavour problem in NP theories consists in explaining the high level of suppression that must be encoded in most of the theories beyond the SM in order to pass flavour changing neutral current (FCNC) observability tests. Minimal Flavour Violation (MFV) [31–41] emerged in the last years as one of the most promising working frameworks to this end[a]: the MFV ansatz dictates that flavour in the SM and beyond is described at low-energies uniquely in terms of the known fermion mass hierarchies and mixings. An outcome is that the energy scale of the NP may be as low as few TeV in several distinct contexts [60–64], while in general it should be larger than hundreds of TeV [65].

In Ref. [33], the complete basis of gauge-invariant 6-dimensional FCNC operators has been constructed for the case of a linearly realized SM Higgs sector, in terms of the SM fields and the Y_U and Y_D spurions. Operators of dimension $d > 6$ are usually neglected due to the additional suppression in terms of the cut-off scale. In what follow we present the corresponding analysis in the case of a strong dynamics at the TeV scale and discuss some phenomenological features.

3.1 $d = 4$ chiral operators

In the non-linear regime a chiral expansion is pertinent, and this results in a different set of operators at leading order than in the case of the linear regime. A total of four independent $d = 4$ chiral operators containing LH fermion fields can be constructed [28, 66–68], namely:

$$\mathscr{L}^f_{\chi=4} = \xi \sum_{i=1,2,3} \hat{a}_i \, \mathcal{O}_i(h) + \xi^2 \hat{a}_4 \, \mathcal{O}_4(h) \tag{7}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}_1(h) &= \frac{i}{2} \bar{Q}_L \, \lambda_F \, \gamma^\mu \, \{\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{V}_\mu\} \, Q_L \, \mathcal{F}_1(h) \,, & \mathcal{O}_2(h) &= i \, \bar{Q}_L \, \lambda_F \, \gamma^\mu \, \mathbf{V}_\mu \, Q_L \, \mathcal{F}_2(h) \,, \\ \mathcal{O}_3(h) &= i \, \bar{Q}_L \, \lambda_F \, \gamma^\mu \, \mathbf{T} \, \mathbf{V}_\mu \, \mathbf{T} \, Q_L \, \mathcal{F}_3(h) \,, & \mathcal{O}_4(h) &= \frac{1}{2} \, \bar{Q}_L \, \lambda_F \, \gamma^\mu \, [\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{V}_\mu] \, Q_L \, \mathcal{F}_4(h) \,, \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where the parameter λ_F remembers the MFV ansatz,

$$\lambda_F \equiv Y_U \, Y_U^\dagger + Y_D \, Y_D^\dagger = V^\dagger \mathbf{y}_U^2 V + \mathbf{y}_D^2 . \tag{9}$$

Out of these $\mathcal{O}_1(h) - \mathcal{O}_3(h)$ are CP-even while $\mathcal{O}_4(h)$ is intrinsically CP-odd [28]. The powers of ξ in Eq. (7) facilitate the identification of the lowest dimension at which a sibling operator appears in the linear regime. The lowest-dimension siblings of $\mathcal{O}_1(h) - \mathcal{O}_3(h)$ arise at $d = 6$, while that of $\mathcal{O}_4$ appears at $d = 8$ [28].

Operators $\mathcal{O}_1(h) - \mathcal{O}_3(h)$ induce tree-level contributions to $\Delta F = 1$ processes mediated by the Z boson and are severely constrained. Due to the MFV structure of the coefficients, sizable

[a] Notice that the MFV should be consider just a counting rule and not a model of flavour as there is no explanation of the origin of fermion masses and mixing, or equivalently there is no explanation of the background values of the Yukawa spurions [28, 41]. With this respect, more successful contexts have been constructed dealing with symmetries smaller than the MFV one [42–55]. It turns out that also for these models, the scale of NP can be lowered down to the TeV scale [56–59].

flavour-changing effects may only be expected in the down quark sectors, with data on K and B transitions providing the strongest constraints on a_Z^d,

$$-0.044 < a_Z^d < 0.009 \qquad \text{at } 95\% \text{ of C.L.} \tag{10}$$

from $K^+ \to \pi^+ \bar{\nu}\nu$, $B \to X_s \ell^+ \ell^-$ and $B \to \mu^+ \mu^-$ data.

Furthermore, operators $\mathcal{O}_2(h) - \mathcal{O}_4(h)$ induce corrections to the fermion-W couplings, and thus to the the CKM matrix. This in turn induces modifications [28] on the strength of meson oscillations (at loop level), on $B^+ \to \tau^+ \nu$ decay and on the B semileptonic CP-asymmetry, among others; more specifically the following process have been taken into account in Ref. [28]:

- The CP-violating parameter ϵ_K of the $K^0 - \bar{K}^0$ system and the mixing-induced CP asymmetries $S_{\psi K_S}$ and $S_{\psi\phi}$ in the decays $B_d^0 \to \psi K_S$ and $B_s^0 \to \psi\phi$. Possible large deviations from the values predicted by the SM are only allowed in the K system.

- The ratio among the meson mass differences in the B_d and B_s systems, $R_{\Delta M_B} \equiv \Delta M_{B_d}/\Delta M_{B_s}$. Deviations from the SM prediction for this observable are negligible.

- The ratio among the $B^+ \to \tau^+ \nu$ branching ratio and the B_d mass difference, $R_{BR/\Delta M} \equiv BR(B^+ \to \tau^+ \nu)/\Delta M_{B_d}$. This observable is clean from theoretical hadronic uncertainties.

- The $\bar{B} \to X_s \gamma$ branching ratio that benefits of good experimental and theoretical precision.

Since only small deviations from the SM prediction for $S_{\psi K_S}$ are allowed, only values close to the exclusive determination for $|V_{ub}|$ are favoured. Moreover, it is possible to constrain the $|V_{ub}| - \gamma$ parameter space, with γ being one of the angles of the unitary triangle, requiring that both $S_{\psi K_S}$ and $R_{\Delta M_B}$ observables are inside the 3σ experimental determination.

Once this reduced parameter space is identified, it is illustrative to choose one of its points as reference point, in order to present the features of this MFV scenario; for instance for the values $(|V_{ub}|, \gamma) = (3.5 \times 10^{-3}, 66^\circ)$, $S_{\psi K_S}$, $R_{\Delta M_B}$ and $|V_{ub}|$ are all inside their own 1σ values, and the predicted SM values for ϵ_K and $R_{BR/\Delta M}$ are


$$\epsilon_K = 1.88 \times 10^{-3}\,, \qquad\qquad R_{BR/\Delta M} = 1.62 \times 10^{-4}\,. \tag{11}$$

The errors on these quantities are $\sim 15\%$ and $\sim 8\%$, estimated considering the uncertainties on the input parameters and the analysis performed in Ref. [69]. Fig. 1 shows the correlation between ϵ_K and $R_{BR/\Delta M}$ (left panel) and the $a_{CP} - a_W$ parameter space (right panel), requiring that ϵ_K and $R_{BR/\Delta M}$ lie inside their own 3σ experimental determination. In the latter, the gray areas correspond to the bounds from the $BR(\bar{B} \to X_s\gamma)$. Finally, for those points in the $a_{CP} - a_W$ parameter space that pass all the previous constraints, the predictions for $S_{\psi\phi}$ and the B semileptonic CP-asymmetry turned out to be close to the SM determination, in agreement with the recent LHCb measurements [70].

Fig. 1 on the right shows that a_{CP}, the overall coefficient of the genuinely CP-odd coupling $\mathcal{O}_4(h)$ is still loosely constrained by low-energy data. This has an interesting phenomenological consequence on Higgs physics prospects, since it translates into correlated exotic Higgs-fermion couplings, which for instance at leading order in h read:

$$\delta\mathscr{L}^h_{\chi=4} \supset a_{CP} \left(1 + \beta_{CP} \frac{h}{v}\right) \mathcal{O}_4\ . \tag{12}$$

These are encouraging results in the sense of allowing short-term observability. In a conservative perspective, the operator coefficients of the $d = 4$ non-linear expansion should be expected to be $\mathcal{O}(1)$. Would this be the case, the possibility of NP detection would be delayed until both low-energy flavour experiments and LHC precision on h-fermion couplings nears the $\mathcal{O}(10^{-2})$ level, which for LHC means to reach at least its 3000 fb^{-1} running regime. Notwithstanding this, a steady improvement of the above bounds should be sought.



(a) Correlation plot between ε_K and $R_{BR/\Delta M}$. $a_W, a_{CP} \in [-1, 1]$, $a_Z^d \in [-0.1, 0.1]$

(b) $a_W - a_{CP}$ parameter space for the observables on the left panel inside their 3σ error ranges and $a_Z^d \in [-0.044, 0.009]$.

Figure 1: Results for the reference point $(|V_{ub}|, \gamma) = (3.5 \times 10^{-3}, 66^\circ)$. See the text for details.

3.2 $d = 5$ chiral operators

Gauge invariant $d = 5$ operators relevant for flavour can be classified in three main groups:

i) dipole-type operators:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{X}_1 &= g'\,\bar{Q}_L\,\sigma^{\mu\nu}\,\mathbf{U}\,Q_R\,B_{\mu\nu}\,, & \mathcal{X}_2 &= g'\,\bar{Q}_L\,\sigma^{\mu\nu}\,\mathbf{T}\,\mathbf{U}\,Q_R\,B_{\mu\nu}\,,\\
\mathcal{X}_3 &= g\,\bar{Q}_L\,\sigma^{\mu\nu}\,\sigma_i\mathbf{U}\,Q_R\,W^i_{\mu\nu}\,, & \mathcal{X}_4 &= g\,\bar{Q}_L\,\sigma^{\mu\nu}\,\sigma_i\mathbf{T}\,\mathbf{U}\,Q_R\,W^i_{\mu\nu}\,,\\
\mathcal{X}_5 &= g_s\,\bar{Q}_L\,\sigma^{\mu\nu}\,\mathbf{U}\,Q_R\,G_{\mu\nu}\,, & \mathcal{X}_6 &= g_s\,\bar{Q}_L\,\sigma^{\mu\nu}\,\mathbf{T}\,\mathbf{U}\,Q_R\,G_{\mu\nu}\,,\\
\mathcal{X}_7 &= g\,\bar{Q}_L\,\sigma^{\mu\nu}\,\mathbf{T}\,\sigma_i\,\mathbf{U}\,Q_R\,W^i_{\mu\nu}\,, & \mathcal{X}_8 &= g\,\bar{Q}_L\,\sigma^{\mu\nu}\,\mathbf{T}\,\sigma_i\mathbf{T}\,\mathbf{U}\,Q_R\,W^i_{\mu\nu}\,;
\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

ii) operators containing the rank-2 antisymmetric tensor $\sigma^{\mu\nu}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{X}_9 &= \bar{Q}_L\,\sigma^{\mu\nu}\,[\mathbf{V}_\mu, \mathbf{V}_\nu]\,\mathbf{U}\,Q_R\,, & \mathcal{X}_{10} &= \bar{Q}_L\,\sigma^{\mu\nu}\,[\mathbf{V}_\mu, \mathbf{V}_\nu]\,\mathbf{T}\,\mathbf{U}\,Q_R\,,\\
\mathcal{X}_{11} &= \bar{Q}_L\,\sigma^{\mu\nu}\,[\mathbf{V}_\mu\,\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{V}_\nu\,\mathbf{T}]\,\mathbf{U}\,Q_R\,, & \mathcal{X}_{12} &= \bar{Q}_L\,\sigma^{\mu\nu}\,[\mathbf{V}_\mu\,\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{V}_\nu\,\mathbf{T}]\,\mathbf{T}\,\mathbf{U}\,Q_R\,;
\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

iii) other operators containing the chiral vector fields $\mathbf{V}_\mu$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{X}_{13} &= \bar{Q}_L\,\mathbf{V}_\mu\,\mathbf{V}^\mu\,\mathbf{U}\,Q_R\,, & \mathcal{X}_{14} &= \bar{Q}_L\,\mathbf{V}_\mu\,\mathbf{V}^\mu\,\mathbf{T}\,\mathbf{U}\,Q_R\,,\\
\mathcal{X}_{15} &= \bar{Q}_L\,\mathbf{V}_\mu\,\mathbf{T}\,\mathbf{V}^\mu\,\mathbf{U}\,Q_R\,, & \mathcal{X}_{16} &= \bar{Q}_L\,\mathbf{V}_\mu\,\mathbf{T}\,\mathbf{V}^\mu\,\mathbf{T}\,\mathbf{U}\,Q_R\,,\\
\mathcal{X}_{17} &= \bar{Q}_L\,\mathbf{T}\,\mathbf{V}_\mu\,\mathbf{T}\,\mathbf{V}^\mu\,\mathbf{U}\,Q_R\,, & \mathcal{X}_{18} &= \bar{Q}_L\,\mathbf{T}\,\mathbf{V}_\mu\,\mathbf{T}\,\mathbf{V}^\mu\,\mathbf{T}\,\mathbf{U}\,Q_R\,.
\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

The chiral Lagrangian containing the 18 fermionic flavour-changing $d = 5$ operators can thus be written as

$$\mathscr{L}^f_{\chi=5} = \sqrt{\xi}\sum_{i=1}^{8} b_i\,\frac{\mathcal{X}_i}{\Lambda_s} + \xi\sqrt{\xi}\sum_{i=9}^{18} b_i\,\frac{\mathcal{X}_i}{\Lambda_s}\,. \tag{16}$$

where Λ_s is the scale of the strong dynamics and b_i are arbitrary $\mathcal{O}(1)$ coefficients. It is worth to underline that for the analysis of $d = 5$ operators in the non-linear regime, the relevant scale is Λ_s and not f as for the analysis in the previous section. Indeed, f is associated to light Higgs insertions, while Λ_s refers to the characteristic scale of the strong resonances that, once integrated out, give rise to the operators listed in Eqs. (13)-(15). In the limit of small ξ, $\mathcal{X}_{1-6}$

correspond to $d = 6$ operators in the linear expansion, while $\mathcal{X}_7$ and $\mathcal{X}_8$ result from combinations of $d = 6$ and $d = 8$ siblings. Moreover, $\mathcal{X}_{9-18}$ have linear siblings of $d = 8$, but $\mathcal{X}_{17}$ and $\mathcal{X}_{18}$ that are combinations of $d = 8$ and $d = 10$ operators in the linear regime.

The phenomenological impact of these contributions can be best identified through the low-energy Lagrangian written in the unitary gauge: in the following we will concentrate only on the dipole operators

$$e\frac{d_F^d}{\Lambda_s}\bar{D}_L\,\sigma^{\mu\nu}D_R F_{\mu\nu}\,, \qquad\qquad +g_s\frac{d_G^d}{\Lambda_s}\bar{D}_L\,\sigma^{\mu\nu}D_R G_{\mu\nu}\,, \tag{17}$$

that have an interesting impact on $BR(\bar{B}\to X_s\gamma)$ (a complete discussion can be found in Ref. [30]). Considering the experimental determination and the theoretical prediction for $BR(\bar{B}\to X_s\gamma)$, it is possible to constrain the $b_F^d - b_G^d$ parameter space and the result are shown in Fig. 2, where the two narrow bands depict the two allowed regions.




Figure 2: *The $BR(\bar{B}\to X_s\gamma)$ 3σ-allowed bands in the $b_F^d - b_G^d$ parameter space.*

Analogously to the case of $\mathcal{O}_1(h)\ldots\mathcal{O}_4(h)$ operators discussed in the previous subsection, a correlation would hold between a low-energy signal from these $d = 5$ couplings and the detection of exotic fermionic couplings at LHC, upon considering their extension to include h-dependent insertions.

Acknowledgments

We acknowledge partial support by European Union FP7 ITN INVISIBLES (Marie Curie Actions, PITN-GA-2011-289442), CiCYT through the project FPA2009-09017, CAM through the project HEPHACOS P-ESP-00346, European Union FP7 ITN UNILHC (Marie Curie Actions, PITN-GA-2009-237920), MICINN through the grant BES-2010-037869 and the Juan de la Cierva programme (JCI-2011-09244), Italian Ministero dell'Università e della Ricerca Scientifica through the COFIN program (PRIN 2008) and the contracts MRTN-CT-2006-035505 and PITN-GA-2009-237920 (UNILHC). Finally we thank the organizers of the Moriond EW conference for the kind invitation and for their efforts in organizing this enjoyable meeting.

References

1. Georges Aad et al. Observation of a New Particle in the Search for the Standard Model Higgs Boson with the ATLAS Detector at the LCH. *Phys.Lett.*, B716:1–29, 2012.
2. Serguei Chatrchyan et al. Observation of a New Boson at a Mass of 125 GeV with the CMS Experiment at the LHC. *Phys.Lett.*, B716:30–61, 2012.

3. F. Englert and R. Brout. Broken Symmetry and the Mass of Gauge Vector Mesons. *Phys.Rev.Lett.*, 13:321–323, 1964.
4. Peter W. Higgs. Broken Symmetries and the Masses of Gauge Bosons. *Phys.Rev.Lett.*, 13:508–509, 1964.
5. Peter W. Higgs. Broken Symmetries, Massless Particles and Gauge Fields. *Phys.Lett.*, 12:132–133, 1964.
6. Leonard Susskind. Dynamics of Spontaneous Symmetry Breaking in the Weinberg-Salam Theory. *Phys. Rev.*, D20:2619–2625, 1979.
7. Savas Dimopoulos and Leonard Susskind. Mass without Scalars. *Nucl. Phys.*, B155:237–252, 1979.
8. Savas Dimopoulos and John Preskill. Massless Composites with Massive Constituents. *Nucl.Phys.*, B199:206, 1982.
9. David B. Kaplan and Howard Georgi. $SU(2) \times U(1)$ Breaking by Vacuum Misalignment. *Phys.Lett.*, B136:183, 1984.
10. David B. Kaplan, Howard Georgi, and Savas Dimopoulos. Composite Higgs Scalars. *Phys. Lett.*, B136:187, 1984.
11. Tom Banks. Constraints on $SU(2) \times U(1)$ Breaking by Vacuum Misalignment. *Nucl.Phys.*, B243:125, 1984.
12. Howard Georgi, David B. Kaplan, and Peter Galison. Calculation of the Composite Higgs Mass. *Phys.Lett.*, B143:152, 1984.
13. Howard Georgi and David B. Kaplan. Composite Higgs and Custodial $SU(2)$. *Phys.Lett.*, B145:216, 1984.
14. Michael J. Dugan, Howard Georgi, and David B. Kaplan. Anatomy of a Composite Higgs Model. *Nucl. Phys.*, B254:299, 1985.
15. Thomas Appelquist and Claude W. Bernard. Strongly Interacting Higgs Bosons. *Phys. Rev.*, D22:200, 1980.
16. Anthony C. Longhitano. Heavy Higgs Bosons in the Weinberg-Salam Model. *Phys. Rev.*, D22:1166, 1980.
17. Anthony C. Longhitano. Low-Energy Impact of a Heavy Higgs Boson Sector. *Nucl. Phys.*, B188:118, 1981.
18. F. Feruglio. The Chiral Approach to the Electroweak Interactions. *Int.J.Mod.Phys.*, A8:4937–4972, 1993.
19. Thomas Appelquist and Guo-Hong Wu. The Electroweak Chiral Lagrangian and New Precision Measurements. *Phys.Rev.*, D48:3235–3241, 1993.
20. G. F. Giudice, C. Grojean, A. Pomarol, and R. Rattazzi. The Strongly-Interacting Light Higgs. *JHEP*, 06:045, 2007.
21. Ian Low, Riccardo Rattazzi, and Alessandro Vichi. Theoretical Constraints on the Higgs Effective Couplings. *JHEP*, 1004:126, 2010.
22. Roberto Contino, Christophe Grojean, Mauro Moretti, Fulvio Piccinini, and Riccardo Rattazzi. Strong Double Higgs Production at the LHC. *JHEP*, 1005:089, 2010.
23. Aleksandr Azatov, Roberto Contino, and Jamison Galloway. Model-Independent Bounds on a Light Higgs. *JHEP*, 1204:127, 2012.
24. Kaustubh Agashe, Roberto Contino, and Alex Pomarol. The Minimal Composite Higgs Model. *Nucl.Phys.*, B719:165–187, 2005.
25. Roberto Contino, Leandro Da Rold, and Alex Pomarol. Light Custodians in Natural Composite Higgs Models. *Phys.Rev.*, D75:055014, 2007.
26. Ben Gripaios, Alex Pomarol, Francesco Riva, and Javi Serra. Beyond the Minimal Composite Higgs Model. *JHEP*, 0904:070, 2009.
27. Roberto Contino. The Higgs as a Composite Nambu-Goldstone Boson. 2010.
28. R. Alonso, M.B. Gavela, L. Merlo, S. Rigolin, and J. Yepes. Minimal Flavour Violation

with Strong Higgs Dynamics. *JHEP*, 1206:076, 2012.
29. R. Alonso, M.B. Gavela, L. Merlo, S. Rigolin, and J. Yepes. The Effective Chiral Lagrangian for a Light Dynamical 'Higgs'. 2012.
30. R. Alonso, M.B. Gavela, L. Merlo, S. Rigolin, and J. Yepes. Flavour with a Light Dynamical 'Higgs'. 2012.
31. R. Sekhar Chivukula and Howard Georgi. Composite Technicolor Standard Model. *Phys.Lett.*, B188:99, 1987.
32. L. J. Hall and Lisa Randall. Weak Scale Effective Supersymmetry. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 65:2939–2942, 1990.
33. G. D'Ambrosio, G.F. Giudice, G. Isidori, and A. Strumia. Minimal Flavor Violation: an Effective Field Theory Approach. *Nucl.Phys.*, B645:155–187, 2002.
34. Vincenzo Cirigliano, Benjamin Grinstein, Gino Isidori, and Mark B. Wise. Minimal Flavor Violation in the Lepton Sector. *Nucl.Phys.*, B728:121–134, 2005.
35. Sacha Davidson and Federica Palorini. Various Definitions of Minimal Flavour Violation for Leptons. *Phys.Lett.*, B642:72–80, 2006.
36. Alexander L. Kagan, Gilad Perez, Tomer Volansky, and Jure Zupan. General Minimal Flavor Violation. *Phys. Rev.*, D80:076002, 2009.
37. M.B. Gavela, T. Hambye, D. Hernandez, and P. Hernandez. Minimal Flavour Seesaw Models. *JHEP*, 0909:038, 2009.
38. Thorsten Feldmann, Martin Jung, and Thomas Mannel. Sequential Flavour Symmetry Breaking. *Phys.Rev.*, D80:033003, 2009.
39. R. Alonso, M.B. Gavela, L. Merlo, and S. Rigolin. On the Scalar Potential of Minimal Flavour Violation. *JHEP*, 1107:012, 2011.
40. Rodrigo Alonso, Gino Isidori, Luca Merlo, Luis Alfredo Munoz, and Enrico Nardi. Minimal Flavour Violation Extensions of the Seesaw. *JHEP*, 1106:037, 2011.
41. R. Alonso, M.B. Gavela, D. Hernandez, and L. Merlo. On the Potential of Leptonic Minimal Flavour Violation. *Phys.Lett.*, B715:194–198, 2012.
42. Guido Altarelli and Ferruccio Feruglio. Tri-Bimaximal Neutrino Mixing from Discrete Symmetry in Extra Dimensions. *Nucl. Phys.*, B720:64–88, 2005.
43. Guido Altarelli and Ferruccio Feruglio. Tri-Bimaximal Neutrino Mixing, A_4 and the Modular Symmetry. *Nucl.Phys.*, B741:215–235, 2006.
44. Ferruccio Feruglio, Claudia Hagedorn, Yin Lin, and Luca Merlo. Tri-Bimaximal Neutrino Mixing and Quark Masses from a Discrete Flavour Symmetry. *Nucl. Phys.*, B775:120–142, 2007.
45. Federica Bazzocchi, Luca Merlo, and Stefano Morisi. Fermion Masses and Mixings in a S_4-Based Model. *Nucl. Phys.*, B816:204–226, 2009.
46. Federica Bazzocchi, Luca Merlo, and Stefano Morisi. Phenomenological Consequences of See-Saw in S_4 Based Models. *Phys.Rev.*, D80:053003, 2009.
47. Guido Altarelli, Ferruccio Feruglio, and Luca Merlo. Revisiting Bimaximal Neutrino Mixing in a Model with S_4 Discrete Symmetry. *JHEP*, 0905:020, 2009.
48. Guido Altarelli and Davide Meloni. A Simplest A_4 Model for Tri-Bimaximal Neutrino Mixing. *J. Phys.*, G36:085005, 2009.
49. Reinier de Adelhart Toorop, Federica Bazzocchi, and Luca Merlo. The Interplay Between GUT and Flavour Symmetries in a Pati-Salam $\times S_4$ Model. *JHEP*, 1008:001, 2010.
50. Davide Meloni. Bimaximal Mixing and Large Theta13 in a SUSY $SU(5)$ Model Based on S4. *JHEP*, 10:010, 2011.
51. Ivo de Medeiros Varzielas and Luca Merlo. Ultraviolet Completion of Flavour Models. *JHEP*, 02:062, 2011.
52. Guido Altarelli, Ferruccio Feruglio, Luca Merlo, and Emmanuel Stamou. Discrete Flavour Groups, θ_{13} and Lepton Flavour Violation. *JHEP*, 1208:021, 2012.

53. Guido Altarelli, Ferruccio Feruglio, and Luca Merlo. Tri-Bimaximal Neutrino Mixing and Discrete Flavour Symmetries. 2012.
54. Federica Bazzocchi and Luca Merlo. Neutrino Mixings and the S_4 Discrete Flavour Symmetry. 2012.
55. Guido Altarelli, Ferruccio Feruglio, Isabella Masina, and Luca Merlo. Repressing Anarchy in Neutrino Mass Textures. *JHEP*, 1211:139, 2012.
56. Ferruccio Feruglio, Claudia Hagedorn, Yin Lin, and Luca Merlo. Lepton Flavour Violation in Models with A_4 Flavour Symmetry. *Nucl.Phys.*, B809:218–243, 2009.
57. Ferruccio Feruglio, Claudia Hagedorn, and Luca Merlo. Vacuum Alignment in SUSY A_4 Models. *JHEP*, 1003:084, 2010.
58. Ferruccio Feruglio, Claudia Hagedorn, Yin Lin, and Luca Merlo. Lepton Flavour Violation in a Supersymmetric Model with A_4 Flavour Symmetry. *Nucl.Phys.*, B832:251–288, 2010.
59. Luca Merlo, Stefano Rigolin, and Bryan Zaldivar. Flavour Violation in a Supersymmetric T' Model. *JHEP*, 11:047, 2011.
60. Zygmunt Lalak, Stefan Pokorski, and Graham G. Ross. Beyond MFV in Family Symmetry Theories of Fermion Masses. *JHEP*, 1008:129, 2010.
61. A. Liam Fitzpatrick, Gilad Perez, and Lisa Randall. Flavor from Minimal Flavor Violation: a Viable Randall-Sundrum Model. *Phys.Rev.Lett.*, 100:171604, 2008.
62. Benjamin Grinstein, Michele Redi, and Giovanni Villadoro. Low Scale Flavor Gauge Symmetries. *JHEP*, 1011:067, 2010.
63. Andrzej J. Buras, Maria Valentina Carlucci, Luca Merlo, and Emmanuel Stamou. Phenomenology of a Gauged $SU(3)^3$ Flavour Model. *JHEP*, 1203:088, 2012.
64. Laura Lopez-Honorez and Luca Merlo. Dark Matter Within the Minimal Flavour Violation Ansatz. 2013.
65. Gino Isidori, Yosef Nir, and Gilad Perez. Flavor Physics Constraints for Physics Beyond the Standard Model. *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.*, 60:355, 2010.
66. Thomas Appelquist, Mark J. Bowick, Eugene Cohler, and Avi I. Hauser. The Breaking of Isospin Symmetry in Theories with a Dynamical Higgs Mechanism. *Phys. Rev.*, D31:1676, 1985.
67. Gorazd Cvetič and Reinhart Kogerler. Fermionic Couplings in an Electroweak Theory with Nonlinear Spontaneous Symmetry Breaking. *Nucl. Phys.*, B328:342, 1989.
68. D. Espriu and J. Manzano. CP Violation and Family Mixing in the Effective Electroweak Lagrangian. *Phys.Rev.*, D63:073008, 2001.
69. Joachim Brod and Martin Gorbahn. Next-to-Next-to-Leading-Order Charm-Quark Contribution to the CP Violation Parameter ϵ_K and ΔM_K. *Phys.Rev.Lett.*, 108:121801, 2012.
70. R. Aaij et al. Measurement of the CP-Violating Phase Φ_S in the Decay $B_s^0 \to J/\Psi\Phi$. *Phys.Rev.Lett.*, 108:101803, 2012.