# **New-Physics Search** in $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow t\bar{t}$

Univ. of Tokushima  $\rm Zenr\bar{o}$  HIOKI  $^*$ 

- 1. Introduction
- 2. Basic Framework
- 3. Optimal-Observable Analyses
- 4. Summary

# 1. Introduction

Discovery of Top-quark

 $\Downarrow$ 

We have now all the SM-fermions,

but  $\cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot$ 

- Is the 3rd generation a copy of the 1st & 2nd.?
- Isn't there any New-Physics in top-quark couplings?



<sup>\*</sup>Based on collaboration with B. Grządkowski (Warsaw U), K.Ohkuma (Fukui U. Thechnology) and J. Wudka (UC Riverside).

So far, we have studied

 $e^+e~
ightarrow~tar{t}$ 

to explore possible non-SM top-quark couplings.

Here we perform a similar analysis in

 $\gamma\gamma 
ightarrow tar{t}$ 

### 2. Basic Framework

What we aim to do is "A Model-Independent Analysis".

For this purpose, what terms must be taken into account?

• In the case of  $e\bar{e} \rightarrow t\bar{t}$ :

We are able to write down

"the most general covariant  $t\bar{t}\gamma/Z$  amplitude."

$$\Gamma_v^{\mu} = \frac{g}{2}\bar{u}(p_t) \left[ \gamma^{\mu}(A_v - B_v\gamma_5) + \frac{(p_t - p_{\bar{t}})^{\mu}}{2m_t} (C_v - D_v\gamma_5) \right] v(p_t).$$
(1)
$$(v = \gamma \text{ or } Z)$$

However in  $\gamma \gamma \rightarrow t \bar{t}$ , t or  $\bar{t}$  in  $t \bar{t} \gamma$  coupling is virtual.

Т	н	
. I	L	
٦	r	

Those which were dropped in  $e\bar{e} \rightarrow t\bar{t}$  thanks to the on-shell condition can contribute

– 2 –

Take

as an example. If  $\psi$  and  $\overline{\psi}$  are both on-shell,

$$\bar{\psi}F(\Box)\psi \implies \bar{\psi}F(m^2)\psi$$

So they are all equivalent to  $\bar{\psi}\psi$ . However if  $\psi$  is virtual, we have infinite numbers of

$$\bar{u}F(q^2)S_F(q)\cdots$$

in an amplitude since F can be arbitrary.

We decided to perform an analysis in the framework of

#### Effective Operator Approach à la Buchmüller & Wyler

#### **Basic assumption**

- New Physics with Energy scale  $\Lambda$
- $\bullet$  Below  $\varLambda$  , we have only SM particles

The leading non-SM interactions are dim.-6 operators:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{O}_{uB} &= i\bar{u}\gamma_{\mu}D_{\nu}uB^{\mu\nu} & \mathcal{O}_{qB} &= i\bar{q}\gamma_{\mu}D_{\nu}qB^{\mu\nu} \\
\mathcal{O}_{qW} &= i\bar{q}\tau^{i}\gamma_{\mu}D_{\nu}qW^{i\,\mu\nu} & \mathcal{O}'_{uB} &= (\bar{q}\sigma^{\mu\nu}u)\tilde{\varphi}B_{\mu\nu} \\
\mathcal{O}_{uW} &= (\bar{q}\sigma^{\mu\nu}\tau^{i}u)\tilde{\varphi}W_{i\,\mu\nu} & \mathcal{O}_{\varphi\tilde{W}} &= (\varphi^{\dagger}\varphi)\tilde{W}^{i}_{\mu\nu}W^{i\,\mu\nu} \\
\mathcal{O}_{\varphi\tilde{B}} &= (\varphi^{\dagger}\varphi)\tilde{B}_{\mu\nu}B^{\mu\nu} & \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{W}B} &= (\varphi^{\dagger}\tau^{i}\varphi)\tilde{W}^{i}_{\mu\nu}B^{\mu\nu} \\
\mathcal{O}_{\varphi W} &= (\varphi^{\dagger}\varphi)W^{i}_{\mu\nu}W^{i\,\mu\nu} & \mathcal{O}_{\varphi B} &= (\varphi^{\dagger}\varphi)B_{\mu\nu}B^{\mu\nu} \\
\mathcal{O}_{WB} &= (\varphi^{\dagger}\tau^{i}\varphi)W^{i}_{\mu\nu}B^{\mu\nu} \\
\mathcal{L} &= \mathcal{L}_{\rm SM} + \left[\frac{1}{\Lambda^{2}}\sum_{i}\alpha_{i}\mathcal{O}_{i} + (h.c.)\right]
\end{aligned}$$
(2)

– 3 –

One new discovery:

$$\mathcal{O}_{uB}, \quad \mathcal{O}_{qB}, \quad \mathcal{O}_{qW}$$

are not independent of the others

$$\mathcal{O}_{uB} = -ig_u \mathcal{O}'_{uB} + [-ig_u \mathcal{O}'_{uB}]^{\dagger} + \cdots$$
$$\mathcal{O}_{qB} = ig_u \mathcal{O}'_{uB} + [ig_u \mathcal{O}'_{uB}]^{\dagger} + \cdots$$
$$\mathcal{O}_{qW} = ig_u \mathcal{O}_{uB} + [ig_u \mathcal{O}'_{uB}]^{\dagger} + \cdots$$

via some equations of motion

Independent operators lead to the following **Feynman rules**.

(1) CP-conserving  $t\bar{t}\gamma$  vertex

$$\frac{\sqrt{2}}{\Lambda^2} v \alpha_{\gamma 1} \, k \gamma_{\mu},\tag{3}$$

(2) CP-violating  $t\bar{t}\gamma$  vertex

$$i\frac{\sqrt{2}}{\Lambda^2}v\alpha_{\gamma 2}\,k\gamma_{\mu}\gamma_5,\tag{4}$$

(3) CP-conserving  $\gamma\gamma H$  vertex

$$-\frac{4}{\Lambda^2} v \alpha_{h1} \left[ (k_1 k_2) g_{\mu\nu} - k_{1\nu} k_{2\mu} \right], \tag{5}$$

(4) *CP*-violating  $\gamma\gamma H$  vertex

$$\frac{8}{\Lambda^2} v \alpha_{h2} k_1^{\rho} k_2^{\sigma} \epsilon_{\rho \sigma \mu \nu}, \qquad (6)$$

Here , k &  $k_{1,2}$  are incoming photon momenta,  $\alpha_{\gamma 1,\gamma 2,h1,h2}$  are defined as

$$\alpha_{\gamma 1} \equiv \sin \theta_W \operatorname{Re}(\alpha_{uW}) + \cos \theta_W \operatorname{Re}(\alpha'_{uB}), \tag{7}$$

$$\alpha_{\gamma 2} \equiv \sin \theta_W \text{Im}(\alpha_{uW}) + \cos \theta_W \text{Im}(\alpha'_{uB}), \tag{8}$$

$$\alpha_{h1} \equiv \sin^2 \theta_W \operatorname{Re}(\alpha_{\varphi W}) + \cos^2 \theta_W \operatorname{Re}(\alpha_{\varphi B}) - 2 \sin \theta_W \cos \theta_W \operatorname{Re}(\alpha_{WB}), \qquad (9)$$

$$\alpha_{h1} \equiv \sin^2 \theta_W \operatorname{Re}(\alpha_{\varphi \tilde{W}}) + \cos^2 \theta_W \operatorname{Re}(\alpha_{\varphi \tilde{B}}) - \sin \theta_W \cos \theta_W \operatorname{Re}(\alpha_{\tilde{W}B}).$$
(10)

On the other hand, the general amplitude for  $t \to bW$  can be written as

$$\Gamma^{\mu}_{Wtb} = -\frac{g}{\sqrt{2}} \,\bar{u}(p_b) \Big[ \gamma^{\mu} P_L - \frac{i\sigma^{\mu\nu} k_{\nu}}{M_W} f_2^R P_R \Big] u(p_t), \tag{11}$$

where  $P_{L,R} \equiv (1 \pm \gamma_5)/2$  and  $f_2^R$  is

$$f_2^R = \frac{1}{\Lambda^2} \Big[ -\frac{4M_W v}{g} \alpha_{uW} - \frac{M_W v}{2} \alpha_{Du} \Big].$$
(12)

for  $m_b = 0$  and on-shell W approximation.

Using them, we calculated the cross section of  $\gamma \gamma \to \ell^{\pm} X$  via **FORM**. **HOWEVER**, the result is too long to show here. Sorry!

# 3. Optimal-Observable Analysis

How can we determine several unknown parameters simultaneously?

#### $\implies$ Optimal-observable method

Brief summary of this method: Suppose we have a distribution

$$\frac{d\sigma}{d\phi} (\equiv \Sigma(\phi)) = \sum_{i} c_i f_i(\phi)$$

where  $f_i(\phi)$  are calculable functions, and  $c_i$  are the parameters we try to determine.

Determining  $c_i$ 

 $\implies$  We make weighting functions  $w_i(\phi)$  which satisfies :

$$\int w_i(\phi) \Sigma(\phi) d\phi = c_i$$

The one which minimizes the statistical uncertainty of  $c_i$  is

$$w_i(\phi) = \sum_j X_{ij} f_j(\phi) / \Sigma(\phi) ,$$

where X is the inverse matrix of

$$M_{ij} \equiv \int \frac{f_i(\phi) f_j(\phi)}{\Sigma(\phi)} d\phi$$

This X gives

$$\Delta c_i = \sqrt{X_{ii} \, \sigma_T / N} \,,$$

where  $\sigma_T \equiv \int (d\sigma/d\phi) d\phi$ ,  $N = L_{\text{eff}} \sigma_T$  is the total number of the events,  $L_{\text{eff}}$  is the product of the **integrated luminosity** and **detection efficiency**.

We applied this procedure to the angular & energy distribution of  $\gamma\gamma \to t\bar{t} \to \ell^+ X \, :$ 

$$\frac{d\sigma}{dE_{\ell}d\cos\theta_{\ell}} = f_{\rm SM}(E_{\ell},\cos\theta_{\ell}) + \alpha_{\gamma 1}f_{\gamma 1}(E_{\ell},\cos\theta_{\ell}) + \alpha_{\gamma 2}f_{\gamma 2}(E_{\ell},\cos\theta_{\ell}) + \alpha_{h1}f_{h1}(E_{\ell},\cos\theta_{\ell}) + \alpha_{h2}f_{h2}(E_{\ell},\cos\theta_{\ell}) + \alpha_{d}f_{d}(E_{\ell},\cos\theta_{\ell})$$
(13)

in  $e\bar{e}\text{-}\mathrm{CM}$  frame, where

- $f_{SM}$  is the SM contribution,
- $f_{\gamma 1,\gamma 2}$  are *CP*-conserving- & *CP*-violating- $t\bar{t}\gamma$ -vertices contribution,
- $f_{h1,h2}$  are CP-conserving- & CP-violating- $\gamma\gamma H$ -vertices contribution, and
- $f_d$  is from the anomalous tbW-vertex

$$\alpha_d = \operatorname{Re}(f_2^R).$$

$$-7-$$

#### **Parameters**

Higgs mass :  $m_H = 100$  ,300 ,500  ${\rm GeV}$  ,

Polarizations of  $e~\&~\bar{e}$  :  $P_e=P_{\bar{e}}=1$  ,

Polarization of the Laser:

(1) Linear Polarization

$$P_e = P_{\bar{e}} = 1, P_t = P_{\tilde{t}} = P_{\gamma} = P_{\tilde{\gamma}} = 1/\sqrt{2} \text{ and } \chi (\equiv \varphi_1 - \varphi_2) = \pi/4$$

(2) Circular Polarization

 $P_e = P_{\bar{e}} = P_{\gamma} = P_{\tilde{\gamma}} = 1.$ 

#### Problems

It turned out that our results for  $X_{ij}$  are very unstable:

even a tiny fluctuation of  $M_{ij}$  changes  $X_{ij}$  significantly.

 $\Downarrow$ 

Some of  $f_i$  have similar shapes?

The only option in such a case is to refrain from determining all the couplings at once through this process alone.

₩

We assumed some parameters can be determined in other processes:

#### **Result** :

We found several sets of solution in two-parameter analysis

– 8 –

#### 1) Linear polarization

 $\bullet$  Independent of  $m_H$ 

$$\Delta \alpha_{\gamma 2} = 73/\sqrt{N_{\ell}}, \qquad \Delta \alpha_d = 1.9/\sqrt{N_{\ell}}, \tag{14}$$

•  $m_H = 100 \text{ GeV}$ 

$$\Delta \alpha_{h2} = 107/\sqrt{N_{\ell}}, \qquad \Delta \alpha_d = 1.6/\sqrt{N_{\ell}}, \tag{15}$$

•  $m_H = 300 \text{ GeV}$ 

$$\Delta \alpha_{h1} = 3.4/\sqrt{N_{\ell}}, \qquad \Delta \alpha_d = 3.2/\sqrt{N_{\ell}}, \tag{16}$$

Here  $\sqrt{N_{\ell}} \simeq 63$  for  $L_{e\bar{e}}^{\text{eff}} = 500 \text{ fb}^{-1}$ .

- 2) Circular polarization
- $m_H = 100 \text{ GeV}$

$$\Delta \alpha_{h1} = 9.0/\sqrt{N_{\ell}}, \qquad \Delta \alpha_d = 3.0/\sqrt{N_{\ell}}, \tag{17}$$

•  $m_H = 300 \text{ GeV}$ 

$$\Delta \alpha_{h1} = 3.5/\sqrt{N_{\ell}}, \qquad \Delta \alpha_d = 3.0/\sqrt{N_{\ell}}, \tag{18}$$

$$\Delta \alpha_{h2} = 35/\sqrt{N_{\ell}}, \qquad \Delta \alpha_d = 3.1/\sqrt{N_{\ell}}, \tag{19}$$

•  $m_H = 500 \text{ GeV}$ 

$$\Delta \alpha_{h1} = 7.7 / \sqrt{N_{\ell}}, \qquad \Delta \alpha_d = 2.8 / \sqrt{N_{\ell}}, \tag{20}$$

– 9 –

$$\Delta \alpha_{h2} = 10/\sqrt{N_{\ell}}, \qquad \Delta \alpha_d = 2.8/\sqrt{N_{\ell}}, \tag{21}$$

Here  $\sqrt{N_{\ell}} \simeq 48$  for  $L_{e\bar{e}}^{\text{eff}} = 500 \text{ fb}^{-1}$ .

#### \*\*\*\*\*

We also performed a similar analysis using

$$\gamma\gamma \to t\bar{t} \to bX$$

Isn't it harder to study *b*-quark distribution?

₩

*b*-quark tagging must be done to distinguish  $t\bar{t}$  events from possible background (WW production).

- 1) Linear polarization
- Independent of  $m_H$

$$\Delta \alpha_{\gamma 2} = 29/\sqrt{N_b}, \qquad \Delta \alpha_d = 2.6/\sqrt{N_b}, \tag{22}$$

•  $m_H = 100 \text{ GeV}$ 

$$\Delta \alpha_{h2} = 38/\sqrt{N_b}, \qquad \Delta \alpha_d = 2.4/\sqrt{N_b}, \tag{23}$$

– 10 –

•  $m_H = 300 \text{ GeV}$ 

$$\Delta \alpha_{\gamma 2} = 24/\sqrt{N_b}, \qquad \Delta \alpha_{h1} = 2.4/\sqrt{N_b}, \tag{24}$$

$$\Delta \alpha_{h1} = 5.4/\sqrt{N_b}, \qquad \Delta \alpha_d = 4.9/\sqrt{N_b}, \tag{25}$$

•  $m_H = 500 \text{ GeV}$ 

$$\Delta \alpha_{\gamma 2} = 23/\sqrt{N_b}, \qquad \Delta \alpha_{h1} = 5.0/\sqrt{N_b}, \tag{26}$$

$$\Delta \alpha_{h1} = 18/\sqrt{N_b}, \qquad \Delta \alpha_{h2} = 22/\sqrt{N_b}, \tag{27}$$

$$\Delta \alpha_{h1} = 8.0 / \sqrt{N_b}, \qquad \Delta \alpha_d = 3.3 / \sqrt{N_b}, \tag{28}$$

where  $\sqrt{N_b} \simeq 140$  for  $L_{e\bar{e}}^{\text{eff}} = 500 \text{ fb}^{-1}$ .

- 2) Circular polarization
- $m_H = 100 \text{ GeV}$

$$\Delta \alpha_{h1} = 14/\sqrt{N_b}, \quad \Delta \alpha_d = 5.2/\sqrt{N_b}, \tag{29}$$

•  $m_H = 500 \text{ GeV}$ 

$$\Delta \alpha_{h1} = 10/\sqrt{N_b}, \qquad \Delta \alpha_d = 4.2/\sqrt{N_b}, \tag{30}$$

where  $\sqrt{N_b} \simeq 100$  for  $L_{e\bar{e}}^{\text{eff}} = 500 \text{ fb}^{-1}.^{\sharp 1}$ 

The above results are for  $\Lambda = 1$  TeV. When one takes the new-physics

– 11 –

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>#1</sup> We used the tree-level SM formula for computing  $N_b$ , so that we have the same  $N_b$  for different  $m_H$ .

scale to be  $\Lambda' = \lambda \Lambda$ , then all the above results  $(\Delta \alpha_i)$  are replaced with  $\Delta \alpha_i / \lambda^2$ , which means that the right-hand sides of eqs. (14)–(30) are multiplied by  $\lambda^2$ .

#### Comparing two results

The following parameter sets are measurable in

- (1) Lepton analysis
  - $(\alpha_{\gamma 2}, \alpha_d), (\alpha_{h1}, \alpha_d), (\alpha_{h2}, \alpha_d)$
- (2) *b*-quark analysis

 $(\alpha_{\gamma 2}, \alpha_{h1}), (\alpha_{\gamma 2}, \alpha_{d}), (\alpha_{h1}, \alpha_{h2}), (\alpha_{h1}, \alpha_{d}), (\alpha_{h2}, \alpha_{d})$ 

### 4. Summary

- In order to explore possible anomalous top-quark couplings, we studied  $t\bar{t}$  production/decay in  $\gamma\gamma$  collisions.
- We assumed a New-Physics with an energy-scale Λ, and we have only the SM particles below Λ.
- All leading non-SM interactions are given in terms of dimension-6 effective operators à la Buchmüller & Wyler.
- We found some new "Equation-of-motion relations" among several operators, which reduced the number of operators necessary in our

- 12 -

analysis.

- We found it impossible to determine all the parameters in this process alone, but also found some stable solutions in two-parameter analysis.
- If we encounter phenomena which cannot be described in our framework, it will be an indication of some New-Physics beyond B& W scenario.

#### References

- B.Grzadkowski, Z.Hioki, K.Ohkuma and J.Wudka, hep-ph/0310159 (to appear in Nucl. Phys. B).
- (2) B.Grzadkowski, Z.Hioki, K.Ohkuma and J.Wudka, hep-ph/0403174 (to appear in *Phys. Lett.* B).

– 13 –