Vector like leptons with extended Higgs sector

Sumit K. Garg,^a C.S. Kim,^a

E-mail: sumit@yonsei.ac.kr, cskim@yonsei.ac.kr

ABSTRACT: We examined the influence of additional scalar doublet on the parameter space of the Standard Model supplemented with a generation of new vector like leptons. In particular we identified the viable regions of parameter space by inspecting various constraints especially electroweak precision (S, T and U) parameters. We demonstrated that the additional scalar assists in alleviating the tension of electroweak precision constraints and thus permitting larger Yukawa mixing and mass splittings among vector like species. We also compared and contrasted the regions of parameter space pertaining to the latest LHC Higgs to diphoton channel results in this scenario with vector like leptons in single Higgs doublet and pure two Higgs doublet model case.

Contents

Introduction	1
General Setup	3
Constraints on Parameter Space	4
3.1 Perturbativity	4
3.2 Vacuum Stability	4
3.3 Unitarity	4
3.4 Electroweak Precision Constraints	4
Higgs to gamma gamma ($h ightarrow \gamma\gamma$)	5
Numerical analysis	6
Results and Discussion	11
Loop Functions	13
S, T and U parameters	13
B.1 Doublet Contribution	13
B.2 Vector like Fermion Contribution	13
	IntroductionGeneral SetupConstraints on Parameter Space 3.1 Perturbativity 3.2 Vacuum Stability 3.3 Unitarity 3.4 Electroweak Precision ConstraintsHiggs to gamma gamma $(h \rightarrow \gamma \gamma)$ Numerical analysisResults and DiscussionLoop FunctionsS, T and U parametersB.1 Doublet ContributionB.2 Vector like Fermion Contribution

1 Introduction

ATLAS [1] and CMS [2] collaborations at the CERN Large Hadron Collider (LHC) reported the observation of much awaited scalar resonance with mass of discovered field hovering around ~ 126 GeV. Now with analysis of around $25 fb^{-1}$ of collider data, the LHC almost confirmed [3] the new state to be a Higgs boson. However, still much remains to be seen when the experimentally observed properties of new state will confront with the predictions of highly celebrated Standard Model (SM). Thus any reported deviation from its expected SM properties could signal the presence of physics beyond the SM (BSM).

Among innumerable extensions of the SM that can modify Higgs physics, supplementing the SM with additional fermions serves as one of the phenomenologically interesting and much investigated scenarios of physics BSM. Here new fermionic fields by circulating in loops related to production and decay of Higgs can significantly alter the predictions of the SM. Much studied cases of the SM with chiral 4th generation [4], vector like fermions [5, 6] etc. come under these category of models. These kind of scenarios are also studied extensively within extended Higgs sector like two Higgs doublet model (2HDM) [7], which not only provides rich phenomenology testable at the LHC but also provide implications which are completely different from single Higgs case.

Motivated from these observations we will investigate here one such possibility. We will take up the case of vector like leptons [8–12] in 2HDM scenario. The similar studies for supersymmetric case are abundantly discussed [13] in literature. The recent implications of these scenarios are also studied [14] with much interest. Since additional states do not carry any strong color charge so they will only contribute into the decay loops of Higgs and thus can act as much sensitive probe of new physics. Here for simplicity we will introduce one complete generation of vector like leptons in addition to the SM fermionic fields. Regarding scalar sector, various versions of 2HDM were introduced in literature depending on the coupling of Higgs to fermions. Since newly discovered resonance looks more like the SM state so we will consider the simplest case of inert doublet model [15]. In this model there is no mixing between two doublets, and thus the lightest CP even state plays the role of the SM Higgs.

The new states will contribute in self energy diagrams of electroweak gauge bosons and thus are constrained from electroweak precision observables. These effects on electroweak precision parameters can be parametrized by three gauge self-energy parameters (S, T, U) introduced by Peskin and Takeuchi [16]. As we will discuss in numerical section with additional doublet it is possible to have cancellations between scalar and fermionic contributions and thus alleviating these constraints. This will in turn permit larger Yukawa mixing and mass splittings among vector like states. Apart from this the parameter space is also constrained by theoretical constraints like vacuum stability, perturbativity and unitarity which come into picture due to extended scalar sector.

Among various properties of newly discovered scalar field, its loop induced decays can serve as a much sensitive probe of new physics. Here BSM fields that couple to Higgs can challenge the expectations of the SM by circulating in its loop decay diagrams. In this scenario, the charged fermionic and scalar fields contribute in the loop induced decays of Higgs and thus can give the signatures which are completely different from single Higgs doublet case. In particular we have chosen the process Higgs to gamma gamma as a signature of BSM physics. ATLAS and CMS reported an excess in this channel [17, 18] with signal strength around 1.5. However, these results were updated at Moriond Conference by analyzing around 25 fb^{-1} of collider data. ATLAS reported an excess [19] in this channel with signal strength $\sigma/\sigma_{SM} = 1.65 \pm 0.24(stat)^{+0.25}_{-0.18}(syst)$ while CMS number comes down [20] from $\sigma/\sigma_{SM} = 1.56 \pm 0.43$ to $\sigma/\sigma_{SM} = 1.11 \pm 0.31$ with cut based events, and 0.78 ± 0.27 with selected and categorized events. Thus results in this channel are not entirely consistent with the SM and need further data analysis. In this work we investigated the situation of Higgs to gamma gamma in allowed parameter space and contrasted it with vector like leptons in single Higgs doublet and 2HDM case. A complete analysis for all the channels in this kind of scenario is deferred for future publication.

The paper is organized as follows. In the next section we will introduce the general setup of the model including field content and various interactions. Electroweak precision tests and other theoretical constraints are explained in Sec. 3 while Higgs to gamma gamma decay rate is analyzed in Sec. 4. In Sec. 5 we present the numerical results of our study and

finally we conclude with summary and discussion of our results in Sec. 6. Main formulae related to this study are presented in the appendix.

2 General Setup

In addition to the SM fermionic and gauge fields we have two scalar doublets (Φ, Φ_I) and vector like leptons which have following transformation properties under $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$:

$$\Phi = (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2}, 1/2), \qquad \Phi_I = (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2}, 1/2), \qquad L_4 = (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2}, -1/2), L_4^c = (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2}, -1/2), \qquad E_4^c = (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}, -1), \qquad E_4 = (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}, -1).$$
(2.1)

Here we consider the scenario where only doublet Φ , not Φ_I , couples to all fermions and vector like species while its counterpart remains inert w.r.t Yukawa interactions. this inert doublet model [15] does have gauge interactions. This task can be achieved by assuming Z_2 symmetry under which Φ_I is odd while Φ is even.

The scalar potential that can be formed using these two Higgs doublets is given by [21, 22]

$$V = \mu^{2} \Phi^{\dagger} \Phi + \mu_{I}^{2} \Phi_{I}^{\dagger} \Phi_{I} + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_{1} \left(\Phi^{\dagger} \Phi \right)^{2} + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_{2} \left(\Phi_{I}^{\dagger} \Phi_{I} \right)^{2} + \lambda_{3} \left(\Phi^{\dagger} \Phi \right) \left(\Phi_{I}^{\dagger} \Phi_{I} \right) + \lambda_{4} \left(\Phi^{\dagger} \Phi_{I} \right) \left(\Phi_{I}^{\dagger} \Phi \right) + \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \lambda_{5} \left(\Phi^{\dagger} \Phi_{I} \right)^{2} + \text{h.c.} \right\}.$$

$$(2.2)$$

The part describing the interaction of new vector like leptons is given by [8, 9]

$$-\mathcal{L} = y_4 \bar{E}_4^c L_4 \tilde{\Phi} + y_4 \bar{L}_4^c E_4 \Phi + m_{L_4} \bar{L}_4^c L_4 + m_{E_4} \bar{E}_4^c E_4 + h.c$$

where $\tilde{\Phi} = i\tau_2 \Phi^*$, y_4 is the yukawa coupling to the Higgs and $\{m_{L_4}, m_{E_4}\}$ are vector like mass parameters. Here we neglect any mixing between the SM fermions and new vector like leptons in order to avoid any additional constraints from flavor violation. The electroweak gauge symmetry is broken when Higgs field attains a vacuum expectation value and thus the scalar doublets can be expressed in terms of physical fields as

$$\Phi = \begin{pmatrix} \phi^+ \\ \frac{\nu + h + i\chi}{\sqrt{2}} \end{pmatrix} \quad , \quad \Phi_I = \begin{pmatrix} \phi_I^+ \\ \frac{(S + iA)}{\sqrt{2}} \end{pmatrix} . \tag{2.3}$$

Thus the scalar spectrum of this model consists of two CP even neutral scalars (h, S) one CP odd neutral scalar (A) along with a pair of charged scalars (H^{\pm}) . Here h plays the role of the SM Higgs Boson.

The fermion mass matrix for vector like states becomes of the form

$$\mathcal{M} = (\bar{E}_4^c \ \bar{L}_4^{c^+}) \begin{pmatrix} m_{E_4} \ \frac{y_4 v}{\sqrt{2}} \\ \frac{y_4 v}{\sqrt{2}} \ m_{L_4} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} E_4 \\ L_4^- \end{pmatrix}.$$
(2.4)

The mass matrix \mathcal{M} can be diagonalized by the transformation $\mathcal{M}_D = U_L \mathcal{M} U_R^{\dagger}$ with the eigenstates

$$l \equiv \begin{pmatrix} l_1 \\ l_2 \end{pmatrix} = U_R \begin{pmatrix} E_4 \\ L_4^- \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{pmatrix} \bar{l}_1 \\ \bar{l}_2 \end{pmatrix} = U_L^* \begin{pmatrix} \bar{E}_4^c \\ \bar{L}_4^{c+} \end{pmatrix} , \qquad (2.5)$$

where $U_{L,R}$ are unitary matrices. Thus spectrum consists of mass eigenstates l_1 , l_2 in charged sector and N_4 in neutral sector with masses

$$M_{l_1,l_2} = \frac{1}{2} \left[(m_{L_4} + m_{E_4}) \mp \sqrt{(m_{L_4} - m_{E_4})^2 + 2y_4^2 v^2} \right] \quad \text{and} \quad M_{N_4} = m_{L_4}.$$
(2.6)

3 Constraints on Parameter Space

The parameter space of theory can be constrained by enforcing various theoretical and experimental constraints. We imposed the following restrictions in our parameter scan.

3.1 Perturbativity

We demand perturbativity of all quartic couplings by imposing condition

$$|\lambda_i| \le 4\pi$$

3.2 Vacuum Stability

The requirement of positivity of the potential enforces the following conditions on the quartic couplings [23]

$$\lambda_{1,2} > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_3 + \lambda_4 - |\lambda_5| + \sqrt{\lambda_1 \lambda_2} > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_3 + \sqrt{\lambda_1 \lambda_2} > 0 .$$
 (3.1)

3.3 Unitarity

Here one can obtain constraints on model parameters by requiring the tree level unitarity for the scattering of Higgs bosons and longitudinal parts of the EW gauge bosons [24, 25]. In 2HDM the necessary and sufficient conditions for the S-matrix to be unitarity in terms of its eigenvalues are derived in [26]. The eigenvalues of S-matrix are given by

$$L_{1,2} = \lambda_3 \pm \lambda_4 \quad , \quad L_{3,4} = \lambda_3 \pm \lambda_5 \; , \tag{3.2}$$

$$L_{5,6} = \lambda_3 + 2\lambda_4 \pm 3\lambda_5 \quad , \quad L_{7,8} = \frac{1}{2} \{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 \pm \sqrt{(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)^2 + 4\lambda_4^2}\} \quad , \qquad (3.3)$$

$$L_{9,10} = \frac{1}{2} \{ 3\lambda_1 + 3\lambda_2 \pm \sqrt{9(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)^2 + 4(2\lambda_3 + \lambda_4)^2} \} , \qquad (3.4)$$

$$L_{11,12} = \frac{1}{2} \{ \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 \pm \sqrt{(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)^2 + 4\lambda_5^2} \} .$$
(3.5)

We impose perturbative unitarity constraint on all eigenvalues L_i 's by requiring:

$$|L_i| \le 8\pi , \forall \ i = 1, ..., 12.$$
(3.6)

3.4 Electroweak Precision Constraints

Apart from setting the direct detection limits on new physics models, physics beyond the SM can also be constrained through its effect on electroweak precision observables. In other words any new physics model should confront with the tremendous success of the SM. The new physics fields mark their presence through the contribution to the vacuum polarization diagrams of the electroweak gauge bosons [16, 27]. These effects on electroweak precision

parameters can be parametrized by three gauge self-energy parameters (S, T, U) introduced by Peskin and Takeuchi [16]:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha(M_Z^2) \, S^{\rm NP} &= \frac{4s_W^2 c_W^2}{M_Z^2} \left[\Pi_{ZZ}^{\rm NP}(M_Z^2) - \Pi_{ZZ}^{\rm NP}(0) - \Pi_{\gamma\gamma}^{\rm NP}(M_Z^2) - \frac{c_W^2 - s_W^2}{c_W s_W} \Pi_{\gamma Z}^{\rm NP}(M_Z^2) \right], \\ \alpha(M_Z^2) \, T^{\rm NP} &= \frac{\Pi_{WW}^{\rm NP}(0)}{M_W^2} - \frac{\Pi_{ZZ}^{\rm NP}(0)}{M_Z^2}, \\ \alpha(M_Z^2) \, U^{\rm NP} &= 4s_W^2 \left[\frac{\Pi_{WW}^{\rm NP}(M_W^2) - \Pi_{WW}^{\rm NP}(0)}{M_W^2} - c_W^2 \left(\frac{\Pi_{ZZ}^{\rm NP}(M_Z^2) - \Pi_{ZZ}^{\rm NP}(0)}{M_Z^2} \right) - 2s_W c_W \, \frac{\Pi_{\gamma Z}^{\rm NP}(M_Z^2)}{M_Z^2} - s_W^2 \, \frac{\Pi_{\gamma\gamma}^{\rm NP}(M_Z^2)}{M_Z^2} \right], \end{aligned}$$
(3.7)

where s_W is the sine of weak mixing angle θ_W , M_Z and M_W are, respectively, the Z boson and W boson masses. For a reference Higgs mass of $m_{h,ref} = 126 \text{ GeV}$ and a top quark mass of $m_{t,ref} = 173 \text{ GeV}$, and the following fitted values are obtained [28] when compared with theory predictions

$$\Delta S = S - S_{\rm SM} = 0.03 \pm 0.10,$$

$$\Delta T = T - T_{\rm SM} = 0.05 \pm 0.12,$$

$$\Delta U = U - U_{\rm SM} = 0.03 \pm 0.10,$$
(3.8)

with the associated correlation matrix

$$V = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & +0.891 & -0.540 \\ +0.891 & 1 & -0.803 \\ -0.540 & -0.803 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$
 (3.9)

In our study we will confront these constraints to our model parameter space by minimizing the χ^2_{STU} function which is defined as

$$\chi^2_{STU} = \sum_{i,j} (O_i^{\rm NP} - O_i) (\sigma^2)_{ij}^{-1} (O_j^{\rm NP} - O_j), \qquad (3.10)$$

where $O_i = \Delta S, \Delta T, \Delta U$, are the fitted values of the oblique parameters with their corresponding uncertainties σ_i defined in Eq. (3.8), $O_i^{\text{NP}} = S^{\text{NP}}, T^{\text{NP}}, U^{\text{NP}}$ are the contributions of new physics states and $\sigma_{i,j}^2 \equiv \sigma_i V_{ij} \sigma_j$. Here $\Delta \chi^2_{STU} = (3.53, 7.81, 11.3)$ correspond to the (68%, 95%, 99%) Confidence Limit (CL) in a three-parameter fit.

4 Higgs to gamma gamma $(h \rightarrow \gamma \gamma)$

The new charged fields (l_1, l_2, H^{\pm}) make contribution to Higgs decay width at one loop level. Thus Higgs to diphoton decay can be written in terms of the couplings to the particles in the loop as [10, 22, 29-31]

$$\Gamma(h \to \gamma \gamma) = \frac{\alpha^2 m_h^3}{1024\pi^3} \left| \frac{2}{v} V_1(x_W) + \frac{8}{3v} F_{1/2}(x_t) + \sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{\sqrt{2} y_{hf_i \bar{f}_i}}{m_{f_i}} F_{1/2}(x_{f_i}) + \frac{C_{hH^+H^-}}{m_{H^+}^2} C_0(x_{H^+}) \right|^2$$

$$\tag{4.1}$$



Figure 1. S-T scatter plot for vector like leptons with single doublet (left Fig.) and within two Higgs doublet (right Fig.) case. The blue, green and red curves correspond to 68%, 95% and 99% CL contours.

where $x_j \equiv (2m_j/m_h)^2$, $j = W, t, f, H^+$, m_h is the Higgs mass which is fixed to be 126 GeV in our study, and $y_{hf\bar{f}}$ ($C_{hH^+H^-}$) are the coupling of Higgs to vector like fermions (charged Higgs) with mass m_f (m_{H^+}), respectively. The loop functions $V_1, F_{1/2}$ and C_0 are defined in the Appendix A.

The major loop contributions in the SM come from the top quark and W gauge boson with a loop factor of $V_1(x_W) \rightarrow -8.3$ and $F_{1/2}(x_t) \rightarrow +1.8$ for $m_h = 126$ GeV. Thus to enhance/suppress $h \rightarrow \gamma \gamma$ decay width one requires constructive/destructive interference between the dominant W boson and new physics sector. Here scalar and fermionic contributions can also nullify the effect of each other and thus making the decay rate to be completely consistent with the SM value.

Since new states don't contribute in Higgs production channel so we can define following ratio of decay width which can point out the enhancement/suppression in $h \to \gamma \gamma$ channel

$$R_{\gamma\gamma} = \frac{\sigma(pp \to h)}{\sigma_{SM}(pp \to h)} \frac{\Gamma(h \to \gamma\gamma)}{\Gamma_{SM}(h \to \gamma\gamma)} = \frac{\Gamma(h \to \gamma\gamma)}{\Gamma_{SM}(h \to \gamma\gamma)} .$$
(4.2)

Thus $R_{\gamma\gamma} < 1$ will correspond to suppression while $R_{\gamma\gamma} > 1.0$ enhancement in this channel.

5 Numerical analysis

In this section we will discuss the numerical results of our study. First we divulge the constraints from electroweak precision tests and then identify various parameter regions pertaining to different values of $R_{\gamma\gamma}$. All other previously mentioned theoretical constraints are already included while scanning for the viable model parameter space. The random number generator for the scanning subroutine is taken from the publicly available code SUSEFLAV[32]. Since it is possible to express quartic couplings λ_i in terms of physical scalar masses and $\mu_{12}[30]$ so we taken $\{m_A, m_{H^{\pm}}, m_S\}$ and $\{\lambda_2, \mu_{12}\}$ as our independent parameters. We varied our model parameters in the following ranges: $\{m_{L_4}, m_{E_4}\} \in [70, 800] \text{ GeV}, y_4 \in [0, 2], \lambda_2 \in [0, 4\pi]$, Higgs scalar masses[30] $\{m_A, m_{H^{\pm}}, m_S\} \in [70, 800] \text{ GeV}$ and $\mu_{12} \in [-500, 500] \text{ GeV}$. We also imposed a constraint of $M_{l_1} > 80 \text{ GeV}$ to satisfy the direct limit constraints[10] from the LEP on charged vector like fermions.



Figure 2. Scatter plot of allowed region over $\Delta M_4 (= (m_{L_4} - m_{E_4})/(m_{L_4} + m_{E_4}))$ vs y_4 plane for vector like leptons with single doublet (left Fig.) and within two Higgs doublet (right Fig.) case.

In Fig. 1¹ we presented the scatter plot in S-T parameter space for pure vector like (left Fig.) and the case with additional scalar (right Fig.), respectively. The blue, green and red curves correspond to 68%, 95% and 99% CL contours. Similar plots for U parameter are not presented here as this parameter doesn't impose any additional constraint and thus generally neglected in new physics scenarios. As evident from the figures, the pure vector like case prefers positive values of S and T while the contribution of additional scalar shifts the overall region towards central point of the contours and thus making it far easier to satisfy electroweak precision data (EWPD) constraints in this case. This is happening due to the cancellations among scalar and fermionic contributions of these parameters.

To study the effects of additional scalar on Yukawa mixing and mass splittings between vector like species we present the scatter plot of allowed region ($\chi^2 < 11.3$) over $\Delta M_4(=(m_{L_4} - m_{E_4})/(m_{L_4} + m_{E_4}))$ vs. y_4 plane in Fig. 2 for pure vector like (left Fig.) and with additional doublet (right Fig.) case. The viable region prefers smaller Yukawa mixing (y_4) and $m_{L_4} \approx m_{E_4}$ (maximum around 5%) among SU(2) states in vector like case. Here one can also draw an upper bound of $y_4 < 1.6$ in pure vector like case. However, all these conclusions of pure vector like case get substantially modified under presence of new scalar doublet. Now the parameter space allows almost all values of Yukawa mixing and much greater splittings (maximum around 15%) among vector like states. Finally in Fig. 3 we present the results corresponding to χ^2_{STU} over $m_{L_4} - y_4$ plane. The much tighter constraints of 68% CL can be satisfied all over $m_{L_4} - y_4$ plane in additional doublet case while they are restricted only to some particular ranges of model parameter values in pure vector like case. However density of viable points do decreases in additional Higgs doublet case as the contributions can also generate addditive effect which will offset them from permissible ranges.

Now we will investigate the situation with Higgs to diphoton rate in allowed parameter space. Here we imposed the condition $\chi^2_{STU} < 11.3$ on parameter space which pertains to the 99% CL on S, T and U parameters. In Fig. 4 we present the $R_{\gamma\gamma}$ plot over m_{L_4}

¹SKG would like to thank Daisuke Harada for help in this figure.



Figure 3. Scatter plot of χ^2_{STU} over m_{L_4} vs y_4 plane for vector like leptons with single doublet (left Fig.) and within two Higgs doublet (right Fig.) case. The light green, blue and red dots correspond to 68%, 95% and 99% Confidence Limit (CL).

parameter for both cases. In pure vector like case, $R_{\gamma\gamma} > 1.4$ can be obtained only in the range around $m_{L_4} \in [150, 500]$ GeV, while for its corresponding case with additional doublet similar enhancement is possible for even higher values of m_{L_4} parameter. The another noticeable difference here is that in the case with additional doublet it is also possible to generate cancellations between charged Higgs and fermionic contributions. Thus one can also get $R_{\gamma\gamma} < 1$ in some region of parameter space which will support CMS result. However, now parameter space will be much tighter compared to enhanced case. The similar plots for y_4 are given in Fig. 5. As expected large enhancement prefers larger values of Yukawa mixing while EWPD especially T parameter prefers it to be small. However, with two Higgs doublet case enhancement is possible even for all values of mixing values since now EWPD are easily satisfied here. Finally in Fig. 6 we presented $R_{\gamma\gamma}$ enhanced regions for two cases. Here red points correspond to lower enhancements $(1.4 > R_{\gamma\gamma} > 1.2)$, blue correspond to $2.0 > R_{\gamma\gamma} > 1.4$ and light green are for $R_{\gamma\gamma} > 2$. In single doublet case enhanced $R_{\gamma\gamma}$ region is confined to narrow regions of model parameter values while with additional doublet the enhancement can be achieved in much larger parameter space. Thus the role of additional doublet is two fold here. It brings almost all the parameter space under 68% CL of electroweak precision parameters and secondly it can also generate cancellations between two contributions in Higgs to gamma gamma channel and thus providing the possiblity to supress the decay rate.

As discussed in many recent studies [22, 30, 31] for Type I 2HDM it is difficult to get larger enhancement consistent with ATLAS result due to stronger theoretical constraints. But vector like leptons can impart a significant contribution on 2HDM parameter space. Thus now we will briefly comment on the effects of vector like leptons in 2HDM parameter space pertaining to $R_{\gamma\gamma}$ enhancement. In Fig. 7 we presented the $R_{\gamma\gamma}$ vs $m_{H^{\pm}}$ plot for 2HDM case and with vector like leptons case. In 2HDM case it's possible to have large enhancement only for lighter charged Higgs mass ($\approx 100 \text{ GeV}$). Indeed one can draw an upper bound on charged Higgs mass i.e. $m_{H^{\pm}} < 125 \text{ GeV}$ for $R_{\gamma\gamma} > 1.4$. However, with vector like leptons this enhancement can be stretched to all values of charged Higgs mass.



Figure 4. $R_{\gamma\gamma}$ vs m_{L_4} plot for vector like leptons with single doublet (left Fig.) and within two Higgs doublet (right Fig.) case. Here red points correspond to $R_{\gamma\gamma} < 1.0$, blue to $1.0 < R_{\gamma\gamma} < 1.4$ and light green to $R_{\gamma\gamma} > 1.4$.



Figure 5. $R_{\gamma\gamma}$ vs y_4 plot for vector like leptons with single doublet (left Fig.) and within two Higgs doublet (right Fig.) case. Here red points correspond to $R_{\gamma\gamma} < 1.0$, blue to $1.0 < R_{\gamma\gamma} < 1.4$ and light green to $R_{\gamma\gamma} > 1.4$.

In Fig. 8 we presented the $R_{\gamma\gamma}$ vs μ_I for both cases. The plots are symmetric under change of sign of μ_I as it the square of this parameter which enters into hH^+H^- coupling. Moreover larger enhancement can be achieved for all values of μ_I in 2HDM with vector like leptons unlike pure 2HDM case where it is confined to very narrow ranges in μ_I .

In Fig. 9 we presented the $R_{\gamma\gamma}$ vs. λ_3 for both cases. In pure 2HDM case enhancement can be obtained only for $\lambda_3 < 0$ which corresponds to the constructive interference between W boson and charged Higgs (H^{\pm}) contributions. However with vector like leptons enhancement is even permitted for $\lambda_3 > 0$ since contribution of vector like leptons becomes dominant in decay rate. Finally in Fig. 10 we presented the $R_{\gamma\gamma}$ over $m_{H^{\pm}} - m_A$ plane for both cases. Here red points corresponds to $R_{\gamma} < 1$, blue points $R_{\gamma} \in [1, 1.4]$ while light green to $R_{\gamma} > 1.4$. As elaborated earlier it is difficult to get larger enhancement in 2HDM unless charged Higgs becomes very light while with vector like leptons it can be achieved all over this plane.



Figure 6. Scattered plot of $R_{\gamma\gamma}$ over $m_{L_4} - y_4$ plane for vector like leptons with single doublet (left Fig.) and within two Higgs doublet (right Fig.) case. Here red points correspond to $1.2 < R_{\gamma\gamma} < 1.4$, blue to $1.4 < R_{\gamma\gamma} < 2.0$ and light green to $R_{\gamma\gamma} > 2.0$.



Figure 7. $R_{\gamma\gamma}$ vs $m_{H^{\pm}}$ plot in 2HDM without (left Fig.) and with (right Fig.) vector like leptons. Here red points correspond to $R_{\gamma\gamma} < 1.0$, blue to $1.0 < R_{\gamma\gamma} < 1.4$ and light green to $R_{\gamma\gamma} > 1.4$.



Figure 8. $R_{\gamma\gamma}$ vs μ_I plot in 2HDM without (left Fig.) and with (right Fig.) vector like leptons. Here red points correspond to $R_{\gamma\gamma} < 1.0$, blue to $1.0 < R_{\gamma\gamma} < 1.4$ and light green to $R_{\gamma\gamma} > 1.4$.



Figure 9. $R_{\gamma\gamma}$ vs λ_3 plot in 2HDM without (left Fig.) and with (right Fig.) vector like leptons. Here red points correspond to $R_{\gamma\gamma} < 1.0$, blue to $1.0 < R_{\gamma\gamma} < 1.4$ and light green to $R_{\gamma\gamma} > 1.4$.



Figure 10. $R_{\gamma\gamma}$ scattered plot over $m_{H^{\pm}} - m_A$ plane in 2HDM without (left Fig.) and with (right Fig.) vector like leptons. Here red points correspond to $R_{\gamma\gamma} < 1$, blue to $1.0 < R_{\gamma\gamma} < 1.4$ and light green to $R_{\gamma\gamma} > 1.4$.

6 Results and Discussion

In this work motivated by the rich phenomenology of additional fermions in extended Higgs sector we studied the influence of additional doublet on the SM supplemented with vector like leptons. The similar studies for supersymmetric case are extensively discussed [13] in literature. In particular we investigated the case of the SM with one complete generation of vector like leptons in context of inert doublet model [15]. The two doublets do not mix with each other and the lightest CP even state plays the role of the SM Higgs. This will also be in accordance with the latest LHC results which show consistency with the SM Higgs boson.

Here first we studied the effects of new fermionic and scalar states on electroweak precision observables which are defined in terms of Peskin and Takeuchi [16] parameters (S, T, U). We scanned the parameter space of this model by imposing various constraints like vacuum stability, perturbativity, unitarity along with these precision parameters. We showed with additional doublet it is possible to have cancellations between scalar and fermionic contributions and thus alleviating these constraints. This will in turn permit larger Yukawa mixing and mass splittings among vector like states.

Among various properties of newly discovered scalar resonance, its loop induced decays serves as a much sensitive probe of new physics. Here BSM fields that couple to Higgs can challenge the expectations of the SM by circulating in its loop decay diagrams. In this study we focused on Higgs to gamma gamma channel as signature of BSM physics. ATLAS reported an excess in this channel with signal strength $\sigma/\sigma_{SM} = 1.65 \pm 0.24(stat)^{+0.25}_{-0.18}(syst)$ while CMS number comes down from its previous results $\sigma/\sigma_{SM} = 1.56 \pm 0.43$ to $\sigma/\sigma_{SM} = 1.11 \pm 0.31$ with cut based events and 0.78 ± 0.27 with selected and categorized events. Thus results in this channel doesn't seem to be entirely consistent with the SM and thus provide ample space for new physics.

In this scenario, the charged fermionic and scalar fields contribute in the loop induced decays of Higgs and thus can give signatures which are different from single Higgs doublet case. We identified various regions corresponding to Higgs to gamma gamma decay in allowed parameter space. We also compared and contrasted them with vector like leptons in single Higgs doublet and two Higgs doublet model (2HDM) case. As discussed in numerical section the role of additional doublet is two fold here. It brings almost all the parameter space under 68% CL of electroweak precision parameters unlike single doublet case where only a very constrained region comes under these stricter constraints. Moreover it can also generate cancellations between new fermionic and scalar contribution of Higgs to gamma gamma channel. This will in turn even help in suppressing $R_{\gamma\gamma}$ as indicated by CMS. However, the enhancement regions consistent with ATLAS in this model are now stretched to much larger range of model parameters. Moreover in vice versa case vector like leptons can have significant effect on 2HDM where excess in $R_{\gamma\gamma}$ consistent with ATLAS can only obtained for very narrow ranges of model parameters. Now the enhancement can be obtained for almost all values of 2HDM parameters. A more detailed analysis of all channels in this model will be presented somewhere else. Thus in conclusion additional doublet impart significant effect on the parameter space of the SM with vector like leptons. These scenarios not only provide rich phenomenology but also have implications quite different from simple cases.

Acknowledgements

We thank Ardy Mustafa for collaborating in the initial stages of this work. The work of SKG and CSK is supported by the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF) grant funded by Korea government of the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (MEST) (Grant No. 2011-0017430 and Grant No. 2011-0020333).

A Loop Functions

The various 1-loop functions which appear in the calculation of decay width $\Gamma(h \to \gamma \gamma)$ are given as:

$$V_1(x) = 2 + 3x + 3x(2 - x)f(x),$$

$$F_{1/2}(x) = -2x[1 + (1 - x)f(x)],$$

$$C_0(x) = x[1 - xf(x)]$$
(A.1)

with

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} [\sin^{-1}(1/\sqrt{x})]^2, & x \ge 1\\ -\frac{1}{4}[\ln(\eta_+/\eta_-) - i\pi]^2, & x < 1 \end{cases}$$
(A.2)

and

$$x_i = 4m_i^2/m_h^2, \qquad \eta_{\pm} = 1 \pm \sqrt{1-x}.$$
 (A.3)

B S, T and U parameters

Here we are giving the contribution of scalar and fermionic sector which is already available in literature.

B.1 Doublet Contribution

The one loop contribution to the oblique parameters (S and T) in inert doublet model is given by [28, 33]:

$$T = \frac{1}{16\pi^2 \alpha v^2} \left[F(m_{H^{\pm}}^2, m_A^2) + F(m_{H^{\pm}}^2, m_S^2) - F(m_A^2, m_S^2) \right],$$
(B.1)

and

$$S = \frac{1}{2\pi} \left[\frac{1}{6} \log(\frac{m_S^2}{m_{H^{\pm}}^2}) - \frac{5}{36} + \frac{m_S^2 m_A^2}{3(m_A^2 - m_S^2)^2} + \frac{m_A^4(m_A^2 - 3m_S^2)}{6(m_A^2 - m_S^2)^3} \log(\frac{m_A^2}{m_S^2}) \right], \quad (B.2)$$

where the function F is defined by

$$F(x,y) = \begin{cases} \frac{x+y}{2} - \frac{xy}{x-y} \log(\frac{x}{y}), & x \neq y. \\ 0, & x = y. \end{cases}$$
(B.3)

B.2 Vector like Fermion Contribution

The contributions to the gauge boson two point functions from fermion loops parametrized by the interaction

$$\mathcal{L} = \overline{f}_1 \left(g_{LX}^{f_1 f_2} P_L + g_{RX}^{f_1 f_2} P_R \right) \gamma_\mu f_2 V^\mu \,, \tag{B.4}$$

for $V = W, Z, \gamma$ is given by [5]

$$\Pi_{XY}(p^2, m_1^2, m_2^2) = -\frac{N_c}{16\pi^2} \Biggl\{ \frac{2}{3} \Biggl(g_{LX}^{f_1f_2} g_{LY}^{f_1f_2} + g_{RX}^{f_1f_2} g_{RY}^{f_1f_2} \Biggr) \Biggl[m_1^2 + m_2^2 - \frac{p^2}{3} - \Biggl(A_0(m_1^2) + A_0(m_2^2) \Biggr) + \frac{m_1^2 - m_2^2}{2p^2} \Biggl(A_0(m_1^2) - A_0(m_2^2) \Biggr) + \frac{2p^4 - p^2(m_1^2 + m_2^2) - (m_1^2 - m_2^2)^2}{2p^2} B_0(p^2, m_1^2, m_2^2) \Biggr] + 2m_1 m_2 \Biggl(g_{LX}^{f_1f_2} g_{RY}^{f_1f_2} + g_{RX}^{f_1f_2} g_{LY}^{f_1f_2} \Biggr) B_0(p^2, m_1^2, m_2^2) \Biggr\}.$$
(B.5)

Here N_c is the number of color degrees of freedom. In the limit of zero external momentum two point function goes to

$$\Pi_{XY}(0, m_1^2, m_2^2) = -\frac{N_c}{16\pi^2} \Biggl\{ \frac{2}{3} \Biggl(g_{LX}^{f_1f_2} g_{LY}^{f_1f_2} + g_{RX}^{f_1f_2} g_{RY}^{f_1f_2} \Biggr) \Biggl[m_1^2 + m_2^2 - \Biggl(A_0(m_1^2) + A_0(m_2^2) \Biggr) - \frac{m_1^2 + m_2^2}{2} B_0(0, m_1^2, m_2^2) - \frac{(m_1^2 - m_2^2)^2}{2} B_0'(0, m_1^2, m_2^2) \Biggr] + 2m_1 m_2 \Biggl(g_{LX}^{f_1f_2} g_{RY}^{f_1f_2} + g_{RX}^{f_1f_2} g_{LY}^{f_1f_2} \Biggr) B_0(0, m_1^2, m_2^2) \Biggr\},$$
(B.6)

where

$$A_{0}(m^{2}) = \left(\frac{4\pi\mu^{2}}{m^{2}}\right)^{\epsilon} \Gamma(1+\epsilon) \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}+1\right) m^{2},$$

$$B_{0}(p^{2},m_{1}^{2},m_{2}^{2}) = \left(\frac{4\pi\mu^{2}}{m_{2}^{2}}\right)^{\epsilon} \Gamma(1+\epsilon) \left[\frac{1}{\epsilon}-f_{1}(p^{2},m_{1}^{2},m_{2}^{2})\right],$$

$$B_{0}'(p^{2},m_{1}^{2},m_{2}^{2}) = \frac{\partial}{\partial p^{2}} B_{0}(p^{2},m_{1}^{2},m_{2}^{2}),$$
(B.7)

and

$$f_1(p^2, m_1^2, m_2^2) = \int_0^1 dx \log\left(x + \frac{m_1^2(1-x) - p^2x(1-x)}{m_2^2}\right).$$
 (B.8)

Using above expressions one can easily calculate S, T and U parameters from Eq. (3.7) for vector like fermions.

References

- ATLAS Collaboration Collaboration, G. Aad et al., Combined search for the Standard Model Higgs boson using up to 4.9 fb-1 of pp collision data at sqrt(s) = 7 TeV with the ATLAS detector at the LHC, Phys.Lett. B710 (2012) 49–66, [arXiv:1202.1408].
- [2] CMS Collaboration Collaboration, S. Chatrchyan et al., Combined results of searches for the standard model Higgs boson in pp collisions at sqrt(s) = 7 TeV, Phys.Lett. B710 (2012) 26-48, [arXiv:1202.1488].
- The Atlas Collaboration, ATLAS-CONF-2013-029, http://cds.cern.ch/record/1527124/files/ATLAS-CONF-2013-029.pdf; The Atlas Collaboration, ATLAS-CONF-2013-013, http://cds.cern.ch/record/1523699/files/ATLAS-CONF-2013-013.pdf;

The Atlas Collaboration, ATLAS-CONF-2013-031, http://cds.cern.ch/record/1527127/files/ATLAS-CONF-2013-031.pdf; The CMS Collaboration, HIG-13-002-pas, http://cds.cern.ch/record/1523767/files/HIG-13-002-pas.pdf; The CMS Collaboration, HIG-13-003-pas, http://cds.cern.ch/record/1523673/files/HIG-13-003-pas.pdf

- [4] P. H. Frampton, P. Q. Hung and M. Sher, Phys. Rept. **330**, 263 (2000) [hep-ph/9903387];
 B. Holdom, W. S. Hou, T. Hurth, M. L. Mangano, S. Sultansoy and G. Unel, PMC Phys. A **3**, 4 (2009) [arXiv:0904.4698 [hep-ph]]; J. Erler and P. Langacker, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 031801 (2010) [arXiv:1003.3211 [hep-ph]]; C. Anastasiou, R. Boughezal and E. Furlan, JHEP **1006**, 101 (2010) [arXiv:1003.4677 [hep-ph]]; C. Anastasiou, S. Buehler, E. Furlan, F. Herzog and A. Lazopoulos, Phys. Lett. B **702**, 224 (2011) [arXiv:1103.3645 [hep-ph]]; O. Eberhardt, G. Herbert, H. Lacker, A. Lenz, A. Menzel, U. Nierste and M. Wiebusch, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 241802 (2012) [arXiv:1209.1101 [hep-ph]].
- [5] M. -C. Chen and S. Dawson, Phys. Rev. D 70, 015003 (2004) [hep-ph/0311032]; G. Cynolter and E. Lendvai, Eur. Phys. J. C 58, 463 (2008) [arXiv:0804.4080 [hep-ph]]; S. Dawson and E. Furlan, Phys. Rev. D 86, 015021 (2012) [arXiv:1205.4733 [hep-ph]].
- [6] G. Cacciapaglia, A. Deandrea, D. Harada and Y. Okada, JHEP 1011, 159 (2010)
 [arXiv:1007.2933 [hep-ph]]; G. Cacciapaglia, A. Deandrea, L. Panizzi, N. Gaur, D. Harada and Y. Okada, JHEP 1203, 070 (2012) [arXiv:1108.6329 [hep-ph]]; C. Arina,
 R. N. Mohapatra and N. Sahu, Phys. Lett. B 720, 130 (2013) [arXiv:1211.0435 [hep-ph]];
 R. Dermisek and A. Raval, arXiv:1305.3522 [hep-ph].
- [7] S. Bar-Shalom, S. Nandi and A. Soni, Phys. Rev. D 84, 053009 (2011) [arXiv:1105.6095 [hep-ph]]; S. Bar-Shalom, S. Nandi and A. Soni, Phys. Lett. B 709, 207 (2012) [arXiv:1112.3661 [hep-ph]]; N. Chen and H. -J. He, JHEP 1204, 062 (2012) [arXiv:1202.3072 [hep-ph]]; L. Bellantoni, J. Erler, J. J. Heckman and E. Ramirez-Homs, Phys. Rev. D 86, 034022 (2012) [arXiv:1205.5580 [hep-ph]]; S. Bar-Shalom, M. Geller, S. Nandi and A. Soni, arXiv:1208.3195 [hep-ph]; M. Geller, S. Bar-Shalom, G. Eilam and A. Soni, Phys. Rev. D 86, 115008 (2012) [arXiv:1209.4081 [hep-ph]].
- [8] C. Englert and M. McCullough, arXiv:1303.1526 [hep-ph].
- [9] J. Kearney, A. Pierce and N. Weiner, Phys. Rev. D 86, 113005 (2012) [arXiv:1207.7062 [hep-ph]].
- [10] L. G. Almeida, E. Bertuzzo, P. A. N. Machado and R. Z. Funchal, JHEP **1211**, 085 (2012) [arXiv:1207.5254 [hep-ph]].
- [11] A. Joglekar, P. Schwaller and C. E. M. Wagner, JHEP **1212**, 064 (2012) [arXiv:1207.4235 [hep-ph]].
- [12] N. Arkani-Hamed, K. Blum, R. T. D'Agnolo and J. Fan, JHEP 1301, 149 (2013) [arXiv:1207.4482 [hep-ph]].
- [13] K. S. Babu, I. Gogoladze, M. U. Rehman and Q. Shafi, Phys. Rev. D 78, 055017 (2008)
 [arXiv:0807.3055 [hep-ph]]; S. P. Martin, Phys. Rev. D 81, 035004 (2010) [arXiv:0910.2732
 [hep-ph]]; S. P. Martin, Phys. Rev. D 82, 055019 (2010) [arXiv:1006.4186 [hep-ph]];
 S. P. Martin, Phys. Rev. D 83, 035019 (2011) [arXiv:1012.2072 [hep-ph]].
- [14] W. -Z. Feng and P. Nath, arXiv:1303.0289 [hep-ph]; A. Joglekar, P. Schwaller and C. E. M. Wagner, arXiv:1303.2969 [hep-ph].

- [15] N. G. Deshpande and E. Ma, Phys. Rev. D 18, 2574 (1978); Q. -H. Cao, E. Ma and G. Rajasekaran, Phys. Rev. D 76, 095011 (2007) [arXiv:0708.2939 [hep-ph]]; A. Goudelis, B. Herrmann and O. Stal, arXiv:1303.3010 [hep-ph].
- [16] M. E. Peskin and T. Takeuchi, Phys. Rev. D 46, 381 (1992).
- [17] G. Aad et al. [ATLAS Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B 716, 1 (2012) [arXiv:1207.7214 [hep-ex]].
- [18] S. Chatrchyan *et al.* [CMS Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **716**, 30 (2012) [arXiv:1207.7235 [hep-ex]].
- The Atlas Collaboration, ATLAS-CONF-2013-012, http://cds.cern.ch/record/1523698/files/ATLAS-CONF-2013-012.pdf
- [20] The CMS Collaboration, Hig13001TWiki, https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/genpdf/CMSPublic/Hig13001TWiki
- [21] J. F. Gunion and H. E. Haber, Phys. Rev. D 67, 075019 (2003) [hep-ph/0207010].
- [22] P. Posch, Phys. Lett. B 696, 447 (2011) [arXiv:1001.1759 [hep-ph]].
- [23] N. G. Deshpande and E. Ma, Phys. Rev. D 18, 2574 (1978); M. Sher, Phys. Rept. 179, 273 (1989).
- [24] B. W. Lee, C. Quigg and H. B. Thacker, Phys. Rev. D 16, 1519 (1977); R. Casalbuoni,
 D. Dominici, R. Gatto and C. Giunti, Phys. Lett. B 178, 235 (1986); R. Casalbuoni,
 D. Dominici, F. Feruglio and R. Gatto, Nucl. Phys. B 299, 117 (1988).
- [25] H. Huffel and G. Pocsik, Z. Phys. C 8, 13 (1981); J. Maalampi, J. Sirkka and I. Vilja, Phys. Lett. B 265, 371 (1991); S. Kanemura, T. Kubota and E. Takasugi, Phys. Lett. B 313, 155 (1993) [hep-ph/9303263]; A. G. Akeroyd, A. Arhrib and E. -M. Naimi, Phys. Lett. B 490, 119 (2000) [hep-ph/0006035].
- [26] I. F. Ginzburg and I. P. Ivanov, Phys. Rev. D 72, 115010 (2005) [hep-ph/0508020]; J. Horejsi and M. Kladiva, Eur. Phys. J. C 46, 81 (2006) [hep-ph/0510154].
- [27] G. Altarelli and R. Barbieri, Phys. Lett. B 253, 161 (1991).
- [28] M. Baak, M. Goebel, J. Haller, A. Hoecker, D. Kennedy, R. Kogler, K. Moenig and M. Schott *et al.*, Eur. Phys. J. C **72**, 2205 (2012) [arXiv:1209.2716 [hep-ph]].
- [29] A. Djouadi, Phys. Rept. 457 (2008) 1 [arXiv:hep-ph/0503172]; A. Djouadi, Phys. Rept., 459, 2008, pages 1-241, arXiv:hep-ph/0503173.
- [30] A. Arhrib, R. Benbrik and N. Gaur, Phys. Rev. D 85, 095021 (2012) [arXiv:1201.2644 [hep-ph]].
- [31] B. Swiezewska and M. Krawczyk, arXiv:1212.4100 [hep-ph].
- [32] D. Chowdhury, R. Garani and S. K. Vempati, Comput. Phys. Commun. 184, 899 (2013) [arXiv:1109.3551 [hep-ph]].
- [33] R. Barbieri, L. J. Hall and V. S. Rychkov, Phys. Rev. D 74, 015007 (2006) [hep-ph/0603188].