## Testing the $Z\gamma H$ vertex at future linear colliders for intermediate Higgs masses\*

E. Gabrielli<sup>a</sup>, V.A. Ilyin<sup>b</sup> and B. Mele<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup> University of Notre Dame, IN, USA
 <sup>b</sup> Institute of Nuclear Physics, Moscow State University, Russia
 <sup>c</sup> INFN, Sezione di Roma 1 and Rome University "La Sapienza", Italy

## Abstract

Higgs production in  $e\gamma$  collisions, through the one-loop reaction  $e\gamma \to eH$  at large  $p_T$ , can provide a precise determination of the  $Z\gamma H$  vertex.

Among other couplings, the interactions of the Higgs scalar with  $\gamma$  and Z are particularly interesting, since they depend on the relation between the spontaneous symmetry breaking mechanism and the electroweak mixing of the two gauge groups SU(2) and U(1). In this respect, three vertices can be studied: ZZH,  $\gamma\gamma H$  and  $Z\gamma H$ . While in the SM the ZZH vertex stands at the tree level, the other two contribute only at one-loop. This means that the  $\gamma\gamma H$  and  $Z\gamma H$  couplings can be sensitive to the contributions of new particles circulating in the loop. For the Higgs masses discussed here,  $m_H \lesssim 140$ GeV, a measurement of the  $\gamma\gamma H$  coupling should be possible by the determination of the BR for the decay  $H \to \gamma \gamma$ , e.g. in the LHC Higgs discovery channel,  $gg \to H \to \gamma \gamma$ , or in  $\gamma\gamma \to H$  at future  $\gamma\gamma$  linear colliders. A chance of measuring the  $Z\gamma H$  vertex is given by collision processes, e.g. in  $e^+e^- \to \gamma H$ , ZH. However, in the ZH channel the  $Z\gamma H$  vertex contributes to the one-loop corrections, thus implying a large tree-level background. The reaction  $e^+e^- \to \gamma H$  has been extensively studied [1]. Unfortunately, it suffers from small rates,  $\approx 0.05 \div 0.001$  fb at  $\sqrt{s} \sim 500 \div 1500$  GeV, and (as we estimated) the main background  $e^+e^- \rightarrow \gamma b\bar{b}$  process has large cross sections:  $\approx 4 \div 0.8$ fb for  $m_{b\bar{b}} = 100 \div 140$  GeV, at  $\sqrt{s} \sim 500 \div 1500$  GeV, assuming reasonable kinematical cuts. Recently, the one-loop process  $e\gamma \to eH$  was analysed in details [2]. The total rate for this reaction is rather high, > 1 fb for  $m_H < 400$  GeV. The main strategy to enhance the  $Z\gamma H$  vertex effects consists in requiring a final electron tagged at large angle. E.g., for  $p_T^e > 100 \text{GeV}$ ,  $Z\gamma H$  is about 60% of the generally dominant  $\gamma\gamma H$  contribution. The main irreducible background comes from  $e\gamma \to eb\bar{b}$ . A further background is the charm production through  $e\gamma \to ec\bar{c}$ , when the c quarks are misidentified into b's. At  $\sqrt{s} = 500$ GeV the cut  $\theta_{b(c)} > 18^{\circ}$  (between each b(c) quark and the beams) makes the background comparable to the signal [2]. Resolved  $e\gamma(g) \to eb\bar{b}(ec\bar{c})$  production, where the photon interacts via its gluonic content, could also contribute but, as we found, it is quite small.

<sup>\*</sup>Contribution to the Proceedings of the Int. Europhysics Conference on High Energy Physics (Jerusalem, 19-26 August, 1997)

We studied polarization effects and found they are rather strong. E.g., for right handed electrons there is a strong destructive interference between the terms  $\gamma\gamma H$  and  $Z\gamma H$ .

Now we discuss the prospects of the  $e\gamma \to eH$  reaction in setting experimental bounds on a possible anomalous  $Z\gamma H$  coupling. We assume, that the anomalous  $\gamma\gamma H$  contributions have been well tested in some other experiment (e.g., through  $\gamma\gamma \to H$ ). Then, one would like to get limitations just on the anomalous  $Z\gamma H$  contributions. Anomalous CP-even and CP-odd operators contributing to  $e\gamma \to eH$  [3] are:

$$\mathcal{O}_{UW;UB} = \left(\frac{|\Phi|^2}{v^2} - \frac{1}{2}\right) \{WW; BB\} , \qquad \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{UW;UB} = \frac{|\Phi|^2}{v^2} \{W\tilde{W}; B\tilde{B}\} ,$$

where  $\mathcal{L}^{eff} = d \cdot \mathcal{O}_{UW} + d_B \cdot \mathcal{O}_{UB} + \bar{d} \cdot \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{UW} + \bar{d}_B \cdot \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{UB}$ . The corresponding  $Z\gamma H$  anomalous terms in the helicity amplitudes of  $e\gamma \to eH$  are

$$\frac{4\pi\alpha}{M_Z(M_Z^2-t)}\sqrt{-\frac{t}{2}}\left\{d_{\gamma Z}[(u-s)-\sigma\lambda(u+s)]-i\bar{d}_{\gamma Z}[\lambda(u-s)+\sigma(u+s)]\right\},\,$$

where s, t and u are the Mandelstam kinematical variables,  $\sigma/2$  and  $\lambda$  are the electron and photon helicities, and  $d_{\gamma Z} = d - d_B$ ,  $\bar{d}_{\gamma Z} = \bar{d} - \bar{d}_B$ .

At  $\sqrt{s} = 500$  GeV, for  $m_H = 120$  GeV, one can then constrain the CP-even coupling in the following way:  $-0.0025 < d_{\gamma Z} < 0.004$  in the unpolarized case,  $|d_{\gamma Z}| < 0.0015$  for left-handed and  $-0.007 < d_{\gamma Z} < 0.004$  for right-handed electrons. The corresponding bounds on the CP-odd coupling depends only slightly on the electron polarization, and are  $|\bar{d}_{\gamma Z}| \lesssim 0.006$ . Here we have taken into account the contributions for background from  $e\gamma \to eb\bar{b}(ec\bar{c})$ , assuming 10% of the c/b misidentifying, and from the resolved photons. The cuts  $\theta_{b(c)} > 18^{\circ}$ ,  $p_T^e > 100$  GeV and  $|m_{b\bar{b}(c\bar{c})} - m_H| < 3$  GeV are applied. The bounds presented have been computed by using the requirement that no deviation from the SM cross section is observed at the 95% CL, with an integrated luminosity 100 fb<sup>-1</sup>. If the anomalous terms appear as contributions of new particles in the  $Z\gamma H$  loop with the mass  $M_{new}$ , then one gets  $d_{\gamma Z}$ ,  $\bar{d}_{\gamma Z} \sim (v/M_{new})^2$ . By using this relation, one obtains the bounds  $M_{new} \gtrsim 6.2$  TeV in the CP-even case and  $M_{new} \gtrsim 3.5$  TeV in the CP-odd case. All the results presented here were obtained with the help of the CompHEP package [4].

## References

- [1] A. Barroso et al., Nucl. Phys. **B267** (1985) 509; **B272** (1986) 693.
  - A. Abbasabadi et al, Phys. Rev.  $\mathbf{D52}$  (1995) 3919.
  - A. Djouadi et al, Nucl. Phys. **B491** (1997) 68.
- [2] E. Gabrielli, V.A. Ilyin and B. Mele, Phys. Rev. **D56** (1997) 5945.
- [3] W. Buchmüller and D. Wyler, Nucl. Phys.  $\bf B268~(1986)~621.$ 
  - K. Hagiwara et al, Phys. Rev.  $\mathbf{D48}$  (1993) 2182.
  - G.J. Gounaris et al, Nucl. Phys.  $\mathbf{B459}$  (1996) 51.
- [4] P.A. Baikov et al, in: Proc. X Int. Workshop QFTHEP'95 (Zvenigorod, Sept. 1995),
  ed. B. Levtchenko and V. Savrin, MSU, Moscow, 1996, p.101, hep-ph/9701412;
  E.E Boos et al, SNUTP-94-116, 1994, hep-ph/9503280