# NNLO QCD CORRECTIONS FOR HIGGS BOSON PRODUCTION IN ASSOCIATION WITH A W BOSON AT THE LHC

G. FERRERA

*Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Milano and INFN, Sezione di Milano, I-20133 Milan, Italy*

We consider QCD corrections to Standard Model Higgs boson production in association with a $W$ boson in hadron collisions. We present a fully exclusive perturbative computation at next-to-next-to-leading order (NNLO) including the decay of the Higgs boson into a $b\bar{b}$ pair at next-to-leading order (NLO). We consider the selection cuts that are typically applied in the LHC experimental analysis, and we compare perturbative fixed-order results with NLO parton shower predictions. We comment on such a comparison and we show some illustrative numerical results.

## 1 Introduction

The investigation of the origin of the electroweak symmetry breaking is one of the main goal for physics study at the Large Hadron Collider (LHC). For the above reason it is of primary importance to compare the theoretical predictions for the production of the Standard Model (SM) Higgs boson [1] with the experimental data collected by the ATLAS and CMS Collaborations [2].

One of the most important Higgs boson $H$ production mechanism is in association with a vector gauge boson $V$ ($V = W^{\pm}, Z$), with the Higgs boson decaying into a bottom-antibottom pair ($H \to b\bar{b}$) and the vector boson decaying leptonically ($V \to l_1 l_2$).

Due to the complicated experimental selection cuts required by this process, it is essential to have accurate theoretical prediction at the level of differential distributions. High precision demands in particular the computation of the higher-order QCD radiative corrections. The next-to-leading order (NLO) QCD corrections to $VH$ production are the same as those of the Drell–Yan process while at next-to-next-to-leading order (NNLO) the QCD corrections differ from those to the Drell–Yan process by contributions where the Higgs boson couples to the gluons through a heavy-quark loop.

We present the calculation of the NNLO Drell–Yan-like QCD radiative correction for $WH$ production [3] performed using the $q_T$ subtraction method [4,5]. The NNLO contribution that we neglected have been shown in [6] to give a marginal contribution (around 1% for $m_H \simeq 125\,\text{GeV}$).

Our fully-differential computation includes finite-width effects, the decay of the Higgs boson into a $b\bar{b}$ pair at next-to-leading order (NLO) QCD, and the leptonic decay of the $W$ boson with its spin correlations. We consider the selection cuts that are typically applied in the LHC experimental analysis, comparing the perturbative fixed-order results with the NLO parton shower predictions of the MC@NLO generator [7].

## 2 Phenomenological results

In the following we present an illustrative selection of numerical results for $WH$ production at the LHC at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ and 14 TeV. We consider a SM Higgs boson with mass $m_H = 125$ GeV and




Figure 1 – *Left panel: Transverse-momentum distribution of the b-jet pair computed at NLO with LO decay (red dot-dashes), NLO with NLO decay (blue solid), NNLO with NLO decay (cyan dashes) and with* MC@NLO *(magenta dots). The inset plot shows the region around $p_T^{bb} \sim 160$ GeV. Right panel: The same distributions normalized to the full NLO result.*

width $\Gamma_H = 4.070$ MeV [8], we use the so called $G_\mu$ scheme for the electroweak couplings and the NNPDF2.3 parton distribution function set [9] with $\alpha_S(m_Z) = 0.118$. We compute the $H \to b\bar{b}$ decay in NLO QCD including the effects of the non-vanishing $b$ mass and we normalize the $Hb\bar{b}$ Yukawa coupling such that $BR(H \to b\bar{b}) = 0.578$ [8]: this means that the prediction for the total cross-section of a *completely* inclusive quantity is insensitive to the higher-order corrections to the $H \to b\bar{b}$ decay. In the fixed order calculations the central values of the renormalization and factorization scales are fixed to the value $\mu_R = \mu_F = m_W + m_H$ while the central value of the renormalization scale for the $H \to b\bar{b}$ coupling is set to the value $\mu_r = m_H$. In the parton shower simulation the central scale is the default MC@NLO scale: the transverse mass of the *WH* system. The scale uncertainty band is obtained as follows: we vary $\mu_F = \mu_R$ and (in the fixed order case) independently $\mu_r$ by a factor of two around their central value.

We start the presentation of our results by considering *WH* production at the LHC at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV. We implement the following kinematical cuts [10]: the charged lepton is required to have transverse momentum $p_T^l > 20$ GeV and pseudorapidity $|\eta_l| < 2.4$; the missing transverse momentum of the event is required to be $p_T^\nu > 35$ GeV. The $W$ boson must have a transverse momentum $p_T^W > 160$ GeV and is required to be almost back-to-back with the Higgs boson candidate (the azimuthal separation of the $W$ boson with the $b\bar{b}$ pair must fulfil $|\Delta\phi_{W,bb}| > 3$). Jets are reconstructed with the anti-$k_T$ algorithm with $R = 0.4$ [11]. We also require events with exactly two $(R)$ separated $b$-jets each with $p_T^b > 30$ GeV and $|\eta_b| < 2.5$. In the fixed-order calculation a jet is considered a $b$-jet if it contains at least one $b$-quark while in the MC@NLO simulation we require that, after hadronization, the jet contains at least one $B$-hadron.

In Fig. 1 (left panel) we show the predictions for the transverse-momentum distribution of the $b$-jet pair $p_T^{b\bar{b}}$ at various level of fixed-order perturbative accuracy and from MC@NLO. In the right panel of Fig. 1 we plot the $p_T$ distributions normalized to the full NLO result (i.e. including NLO corrections to the $H \to b\bar{b}$ decay), with their scale uncertainty band. We observe from Fig. 1 that the hardest spectrum is the NLO one (with LO $H \to b\bar{b}$ decay) and that the inclusion of the NLO corrections to the $H \to b\bar{b}$ decay makes the spectrum softer and reduces the accepted cross section by 12%. The inclusion of the NLO corrections produces instabilities of Sudakov type [12] around the LO kinematical boundary $p_T^{b\bar{b}} > 160$ GeV. To solve these perturbative instabilities an all-order resummation of the soft-gluon contributions is needed, however the effects of soft-gluon




Figure 2 – *Left panel: Transverse-momentum distribution of the fat jet computed at NLO with LO decay (red dot-dashes), NLO with NLO decay (blue solid), NNLO with NLO decay (cyan dashes) and with* MC@NLO *(magenta dots). Right panel: The same distribution normalized to the full NLO result.*

resummation can be mimicked by considering a more inclusive observable with a larger size of the bins around the critical point (see the dashed line in the inset plot of Fig. 1). The effect of the NNLO corrections for the production is not negligible: the spectrum becomes softer and the accepted cross section is further reduced by 9%.

Comparing the fixed order predictions to the MC@NLO result we observe that the effect of the shower is quantitative very similar to the effect of the NNLO corrections for the production plus NLO for the Higgs boson decay. As expected, the shower algorithm permits a more reliable description of the region around the LO kinematical boundary: the MC@NLO prediction has a smooth behaviour, without the instabilities of the fixed order case.

The NLO scale uncertainties are $\mathcal{O}(\pm 10\%)$ in the region $p_T \lesssim 200$ GeV and then decrease to $\mathcal{O}(\pm 5\%)$ or smaller for higher values of $p_T$. From Fig. 1 (right panel) we conclude that the inclusion of NLO corrections to the Higgs boson decay is important to obtain a reliable shape of the $p_T$ spectrum. Nevertheless the MC@NLO prediction, even if it does not include the full NLO corrections to the decay, describes the shape of the spectrum rather well. The NNLO uncertainty band is larger than the NLO one, being at the $\pm 7-8\%$ level and marginally overlaps with the latter, while the NNLO and MC@NLO results are perfectly compatible within the uncertainties.

We now consider the case of $WH$ production at the LHC with $\sqrt{s} = 14$ TeV. We follow the selection strategy of Ref. [13]: the Higgs boson is selected at large transverse momenta through its decay into a collimated $b\bar{b}$ pair. We require the charged lepton to have $p_T^l > 30$ GeV and $|\eta_l| < 2.5$, and the missing transverse momentum of the event to fulfil $p_T^{\rm miss} > 30$ GeV. We also require the $W$ boson to have $p_T^W > 200$ GeV. Jets are reconstructed with the Cambridge/Aachen algorithm [14], with $R = 1.2$. One of the jets (*fat jet*) must have $p_T^J > 200$ GeV and $|\eta_J| < 2.5$ and must contain the $b\bar{b}$ pair. In the MC@NLO simulation, the fat jet is required to contain two $B$ hadrons. We also apply a veto on further light jets with $p_T^j > 20$ GeV and $|\eta_j| < 5$.

Our results for the $p_T$ distribution of the Higgs boson candidate in this *boosted* scenario are reported in Fig. 2. First of all we observe that the effect of NLO corrections for the decay is much smaller compared with the results of the $\sqrt{s} = 8\,\text{TeV}$ analysis, and essentially it is negligible for $p_T \gtrsim 300$ GeV. This is not unexpected: the (boosted) fat jet is essentially *inclusive* over QCD radiation and the impact of the QCD corrections to the decay is well accounted for by the inclusive QCD corrected $H \to b\bar{b}$ branching ratio. The NLO scale uncertainty is about $\pm 10\%$ at $p_T \gtrsim 200$ GeV, and it increases to about $\pm 20\%$ at $p_T \sim 500$ GeV. We also note that the MC@NLO prediction is in good agreement as well with the complete NLO result. The NNLO result is smaller than NLO by about 16%, and it is at the border of the band from scale variations. The NNLO scale uncertainty band overlaps with the NLO band, and is smaller in size. In summary, our results on the boosted scenario at $\sqrt{s} = 14$ TeV show that the shape of the $H$ $p_T$ spectrum is rather stable, with uncertainties at the few percent level. The normalization of the accepted cross section has instead larger uncertainties with respect to the analysis at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV. From Fig. 2 we estimate that these uncertainties are at the $10 - 15\%$ level.

## 3 Conclusions

We have studied the effect of QCD radiative corrections on the associated production of the Higgs boson with a $W$ boson in hadronic collisions, followed by the $W \to l\nu_l$ and the $H \to b\bar{b}$ decays. We performed a QCD calculation that includes the contributions up to NNLO for the $WH$ production and up to NLO for the $H \to b\bar{b}$ decay. Our computation is implemented in a parton level Monte Carlo numerical program that allows us to apply arbitrary kinematical cuts on the $W$ and $H$ decay products and on the accompanying QCD radiation.

We have compared the effects of the QCD radiative corrections at various level of accuracy with the results obtained with the MC@NLO event generator. We find that, in the analysis at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV, the NLO corrections to the $H \to b\bar{b}$ decay can be important to obtain a reliable $p_T$ spectrum of the Higgs boson, but that the final state radiation is well accounted for by the Monte Carlo parton shower.

In the boosted analysis at $\sqrt{s} = 14$ TeV with a jet veto the perturbative uncertainties are more sizeable. NNLO corrections to the production process decrease the cross section by an amount which depend on the detail of the applied cuts while they have a mild effect on the shape of the Higgs boson $p_T$ spectrum.

In summary, even if the effect of higher orders QCD corrections at the level of inclusive cross sections is modest, the impact on the accepted cross section and on the kinematical distributions can be quite important, in particular when severe selection cuts are applied, as it typically happens in Higgs boson analysis at the LHC.

## References


1. P.W. Higgs, Phys. Lett. **12** (1964) 132; F. Englert and R. Brout, Phys. Rev. Lett. **13** (1964) 321.
2. G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], Phys. Lett. **B716** (2012) 1; S. Chatrchyan *et al.* [CMS Collaboration], Phys. Lett. **B716** (2012) 30.
3. G. Ferrera, M. Grazzini and F. Tramontano, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107** (2011) 152003; JHEP **1404** (2014) 039.
4. S. Catani and M. Grazzini, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98** (2007) 222002.
5. S. Catani, L. Cieri, G. Ferrera, D. de Florian and M. Grazzini, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103** (2009) 082001.
6. O. Brein, R. Harlander, M. Wiesemann and T. Zirke, Eur. Phys. J. **C72** (2012) 1868.
7. S. Frixione and B.R. Webber, JHEP **0206** (2002) 029.
8. S. Dittmaier *et al.* [LHC Higgs Cross Section Working Group Coll.], arXiv:1101.0593.
9. R.D. Ball et al., Nucl. Phys. **B867** (2013) 244.
10. S. Chatrchyan *et al.*, [CMS Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **89** (2014) 012003.
11. M. Cacciari, G.P. Salam and G. Soyez, JHEP **0804** (2008) 063.
12. S. Catani and B. Webber, JHEP **9710** (1997) 005.
13. J.M. Butterworth *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100** (2008) 242001.
14. Y.L. Dokshitzer, G. Leder, S. Moretti and B. Webber, JHEP **9708** (1997) 001.