


Project Notes


1 Replicating results

- Here are my plots for replicating what we did in first term:





- Like Oliver, the main difference seems to be with $b \rightarrow s \gamma$ where it fits higher than before – **the combined fit yields $m_{H^+} \gtrsim 890 \text{ GeV}$ at 2σ compared to $m_{H^+} \gtrsim 500 \text{ GeV}$ in my previous fits**
- *Note: all the plots here are showing contours for $1, 2\sigma$*
- This is using the higher order $b \rightarrow s \gamma$ expressions from [Crivellin 1903.10440](#)

- I have modified the SM value in flavio for $b \rightarrow s\gamma$ to fit the current result of $(3.40 \pm 0.17)e^{-4}$
- The difference from our old work seems like it could be down to how flavio fits, but we would need to confirm this
- I have also included the fit for B mixing from higher-order expressions in [Crivellin 1903.10440](#) to show the difference – the gap we find around $m_{H^+} \sim m_t(m_t)$ is due to divergences in the loop functions for this value
- Adding in $B_{s,d} \rightarrow \mu\mu$ and $\mathcal{R}(D^{(*)})$ yields similar results to what I had before



- $\mathcal{R}(D)$ and $\mathcal{R}(D^*)$ are fitting simultaneously it seems right now, which wasn't what we had before, so looking at individual plots:





- It appears that both of them do fit individually which is not what we had before – I'm not quite sure why this is the case currently
- For $B_{s,d} \rightarrow \mu\mu$, the left diagram is approximating $m_{H^+} \sim m_{H^0}$ which is the rough limit James has from the obliques, and the right diagram is fixing $m_{H^0} = 1500$ GeV
- Using the convention from 1903.10440 for the trilinear couplings means that instead of using $M = m_{12}/(\sin\beta\cos\beta)$ as I did previously, you use λ_3 from the 2HDM potential
- The two trilinear couplings we have to consider are



$$\lambda_{h^0 H^+ H^-} = v \sin(\beta - \alpha) \lambda_3,$$

$$\lambda_{H^0 H^+ H^-} = v \cos(\beta - \alpha) \lambda_3$$

- In the alignment limit which I have been using so far for these, $\sin(\beta - \alpha) = 1$, so we only have to consider $\lambda_{h^0 H^+ H^-}$
- Using the updated values from Y Amhis at ICHEP 2020 and some code updates:



- These seem to preserve the overall shapes of the plots, but with slightly bigger regions
- The contributions from the trilinear coupling seems to be minimal anyway, varying λ_3 from $0.01 \rightarrow 2$ doesn't change the results to any noticeable level, so for now I have set $\lambda_3 = 0.1$
- The coupling only contributes to C_S and C_P operators so far which only impact $B \rightarrow \mu\mu$
- Checking the combined fit for all these observables to compare to my overall project work (bar the inclusion of James' obliques):



- Left is approximating $m_{H^+} \sim m_{H^0}$ as above for $B \rightarrow \mu\mu$ (can't compare to project directly as didn't use this limit); right is fixing $m_{H^0} = 1500$ GeV
- For the left, we have $m_{H^+} \gtrsim 1080$ GeV
- For the right, we have $m_{H^+} \gtrsim 980$ GeV, $\tan\beta \lesssim 6.8$; in my project for this, I had $m_{H^+} \gtrsim 500$ GeV and $\tan\beta \lesssim 21$


2 New Observables and To Do

- Also started looking at the tree-level semileptonic decays
- For semileptonics and leptonics, I think the WC contributions work out the same, e.g. for $b \rightarrow u\mu\nu_\mu$ (using the subscript convention from [flavio's WET basis](#))


$$\mathcal{O}_{SR} = -\frac{4G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{ub}(\bar{u}_L b_R)(\bar{\mu}_R \nu_{\mu L}) \rightarrow C_{SR} = \frac{m_u}{m_{H^+}^2}$$

$$\mathcal{O}_{SL} = -\frac{4G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{ub}(\bar{u}_R b_L)(\bar{\mu}_L \nu_{\mu R}) \rightarrow C_{SL} = \frac{m_b \tan^2 \beta}{m_{H^+}^2}$$

- For the tree-level leptonic, this transforms to r_H from [0907.5135](#), and looks to give the right results for semileptonic (including being used for the $\mathcal{R}(D)$ s above)
- So providing the SM calculations for the semileptonic are fine, it's quite simple to fit these too:



- The next thing is to look at R_K and $R_{K^{*0}}$
- From [1704.05340](#), the operators needed for the R_K s are $C_7, C'_7, C_9, C'_9, C_{10}, C'_{10}$ for both $bs\mu\mu$ and $bsee$ – I think we also need to consider C_8, C'_8 so these are also calculated and included in my fits
- All these can be taken from [1903.10440](#) – the only new WCs are C_9, C'_9 as the others are included in $b \rightarrow s\gamma$ and $B \rightarrow \mu\mu$
- So far, we get essentially no constraint in our parameter space from R_K and $R_{K^{*0}}$:



- There still needs to be more checks in case I've missed something, but so far we see a small region excluded at 1σ in the left of the plot and that's it
- I want to check in literature for the R_K s in 2HDM Type II to see if there's any fits that include these to see what results have been found historically to give some at least a rough idea of what should be expected
- I have looked at the fit for the R_K s in [2007.11942](#) and it's not the easiest to compare to, but it looks like they've found only a small constraint from R_K s near what would be along the left axis of our plots, which is roughly similar to where we're beginning to see a constraint here
- I need to do the fits including $B \rightarrow \mu\mu$ in the wrong sign limit too and compare to my previous results