

# Erratum: Bounds on Invisible Higgs boson Decays from $t\bar{t}H$ Production

Ning Zhou,<sup>1</sup> Zepoor Khechadorian,<sup>1</sup> Daniel Whiteson,<sup>1</sup> and Tim M.P. Tait<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of California, Irvine, CA 92697*

Bounds on invisible decays of the Higgs boson from  $t\bar{t}H$  production were inferred from a CMS search for stop quarks decaying to  $t\bar{t} + E_T^{\text{miss}}$ . Limits on the production of  $t\bar{t}H$  relied on the efficiency of the CMS selection for  $t\bar{t}H$ , as measured in a simulated sample. An error in the generation of the simulated sample lead to a significant overestimate of the selection efficiency. Corrected results are presented.

PACS numbers:

In a recent Letter [1], we recast a CMS search for supersymmetric stop quarks ( $\tilde{t} \rightarrow bW + E_T^{\text{miss}}$ ) [2] to set bounds on  $t\bar{t}H$  production where the Higgs boson decays invisibly.

The result relies on the measurement of the efficiency of the CMS selection for  $t\bar{t}H$  events, as measured in simulated samples generated with Madgraph5 [3], showering and hadronization with Pythia [4] and detector response simulated by Delphes [5]. The event generation used a model which included a  $H\chi\bar{\chi}$  vertex to describe the invisible decay  $H \rightarrow \chi\bar{\chi}$ . Inadvertantly, the contribution from diagrams containing a  $ggH$  effective vertex was overestimated. These diagrams tend to give larger transverse momentum to the Higgs boson, leading to larger measured  $E_T^{\text{miss}}$  and a significant overestimate of the selection efficiency. Figure 1 shows a comparison of the original flawed sample and a new, correct sample. Figure 2 shows a comparison of the kinematics of the corrected  $t\bar{t}H$  sample to the primary sources of background, top quark pair production.

For the corrected sample, we again apply the results of the CMS  $\tilde{t}$  search to invisible Higgs boson decays by calculating the expected yield of  $t\bar{t}H$  in each




FIG. 1: Distribution of missing transverse momentum  $t\bar{t}H$  with  $H \rightarrow \text{invisible}$  for the simulated sample in the original paper as well as the corrected simulated sample. Distributions are shown after requiring exactly one lepton, at least four jets and one  $b$ -tag.




FIG. 2: Kinematics of  $t\bar{t}H$  with  $H \rightarrow \text{invisible}$  and all  $t\bar{t}$  decay modes, compared to the two dominant backgrounds, SM top quark production with either single lepton ( $\ell\nu b\ell'\nu b$ ) or di-lepton ( $\ell\nu b\ell'\nu b$ ) decay modes. Distributions are shown of  $M_T$ , the transverse mass;  $M_{T2}^W$ , as defined in Ref. [10];  $\chi_{\text{had}}^2$ , the consistency of the  $j\bar{j}b$  system with a top quark hadronic decay; and  $\min(\Delta\phi[\text{MET}, \text{jet}])$ , the minimum angle between the  $E_T^{\text{miss}}$  and any jet. Distributions are shown after requiring exactly one lepton, at least four jets and one  $b$ -tag.

of the signal regions. We calculate upper bounds on  $\sigma(t\bar{t}H) \times BF(H \rightarrow \text{inv.})$  using a one-sided profile likelihood and the CLs technique [6, 7], evaluated using the asymptotic approximation [8]. For each of the sixteen signal regions, we calculate the median expected limit on  $\sigma(t\bar{t}H) \times BF(H \rightarrow \text{inv.})$ . As with the original sample, the region with the strongest expected limit is that targeting  $\tilde{t} \rightarrow t\tilde{\chi}$  in the high- $\Delta M$  regime, with  $E_T^{\text{miss}} > 250$  GeV. This region has the additional requirements of  $\min(\Delta\phi[E_T^{\text{miss}}, j]) > 0.8$ ,  $M_{T2}^W > 200$  GeV and  $\chi_{\text{had}}^2 < 5.0$ . The expected background is reported to be  $9.5 \pm 2.8$ . With our simulated sample, we calculate an expected  $t\bar{t}H$  yield of 2.1 events if  $BF(H \rightarrow \text{inv.}) = 1.0$  (compare to 11.4 events for the incorrect sample). The




FIG. 3: Top pane gives 95% CL upper limits on  $\sigma(ttH) \times BF(H \rightarrow inv.)$ , including both expected and observed limits. Also shown is the SM rate of  $\sigma(ttH)$  [9]. The bottom pane shows the ratio of the constraint to the SM  $\sigma(ttH)$  cross section.

efficiency of this selection for  $tt\bar{H} \rightarrow tt\chi\bar{\chi}$  events with  $m_H = 125$  GeV is 0.085% (compare to 0.45% for the incorrect sample).

In this particular signal region, the data have fluctuated quite low,  $N_{\text{obs}} = 3$  events, giving an observed upper bound considerably stronger than the median expected results; see Fig. 3. Dividing by the predicted rate of  $tt\bar{H}$  production in the SM [9] gives a limit on  $BF(H \rightarrow inv)$ ; the observed (expected) result is  $< 1.9$  (3.0) at 95% CL for  $m_H = 125$  GeV.

This result is significantly weaker than the previous. For this reason, we do not perform a combination with other channels nor provide an interpretation in terms of the Higgs portal model.

- 
- [1] N. Zhou, Z. Khechadorian, D. Whiteson, and T. M. Tait, Phys.Rev.Lett. **113**, 151801 (2014), 1408.0011.
  - [2] S. Chatrchyan et al. (CMS Collaboration), Eur.Phys.J. **C73**, 2677 (2013), 1308.1586.
  - [3] J. Alwall, M. Herquet, F. Maltoni, O. Mattelaer, and T. Stelzer, JHEP **1106**, 128 (2011), 1106.0522.
  - [4] T. Sjostrand, S. Mrenna, and P. Z. Skands, JHEP **0605**, 026 (2006), hep-ph/0603175.
  - [5] J. de Favereau et al. (DELPHES 3), JHEP **1402**, 057 (2014), 1307.6346.
  - [6] A. L. Read, J.Phys. **G28**, 2693 (2002).
  - [7] T. Junk, Nucl.Instrum.Meth. **A434**, 435 (1999), hep-ex/9902006.
  - [8] G. Cowan, K. Cranmer, E. Gross, and O. Vitells, Eur.Phys.J. **C71**, 1554 (2011), 1007.1727.
  - [9] S. Heinemeyer et al. (LHC Higgs Cross Section Working Group) (2013), 1307.1347.
  - [10] Y. Bai, H.-C. Cheng, J. Gallicchio, and J. Gu, JHEP **1207**, 110 (2012), 1203.4813.