

UNIVERSIDAD DE GRANADA

1

Positivity bounds in the Standard Model EFT

Mikael Chala (Universidad de Granada)

2110.01624 and *2205.03301* and ongoing work

SMEFT-Tools 2022; September 14, 2022

Positivity bounds are restrictions on the Wilson coefficients of EFT operators implied by the unitarity and locality of the S-matrix

If positivity is violated

Positivity bounds are restrictions on the Wilson coefficients of EFT operators implied by the unitarity and locality of the S-matrix

Violation of positivity would imply the invalidity of the EFT or the breakdown of some of the fundamental principles of modern physics

More realistically, positivity bounds can be enforced as Bayesian priors in fits aiming at constraining the Wilson coefficients of the EFT

Deriving positivity

$$
\mathcal{A}(s) = \mathcal{A}(-s)
$$

$$
\mathcal{A}(s)=a_0+a_1s+a_2s^2+\cdots
$$

5

Adams et al '06

Application to the SMEFT

Murphy '20

$$
\mathcal{O}_{H^4D^4}^{(1)} (D_{\mu}H^{\dagger}D_{\nu}H)(D^{\nu}H^{\dagger}D^{\mu}H)
$$

$$
\mathcal{O}_{H^4D^4}^{(2)} (D_{\mu}H^{\dagger}D_{\nu}H)(D^{\mu}H^{\dagger}D^{\nu}H)
$$

$$
\mathcal{O}_{H^4D^4}^{(3)} (D_{\mu}H^{\dagger}D^{\mu}H)(D^{\nu}H^{\dagger}D_{\nu}H)
$$

٦

Remmen, Rodd '19

Positivity constraints

$$
c_2 \ge 0
$$

$$
c_1 + c_2 \ge 0
$$

$$
c_1 + c_2 + c_3 \ge 0
$$

$$
S \sim (1,1)_0 \longmapsto c_{H^4 D^4}^{(1,2,3)} \sim (0,0,1),
$$

\n
$$
\Xi \sim (1,3)_0 \longmapsto c_{H^4 D^4}^{(1,2,3)} \sim (2,0,-1),
$$

\n
$$
B \sim (1,1)_0 \longmapsto c_{H^4 D^4}^{(1,2,3)} \sim (-1,1,0),
$$

\n
$$
B_1 \sim (1,1)_1 \longmapsto c_{H^4 D^4}^{(1,2,3)} \sim (1,0,-1),
$$

\n
$$
W \sim (1,3)_0 \longmapsto c_{H^4 D^4}^{(1,2,3)} \sim (1,1,-2).
$$

$$
\int \frac{\mathcal{A}(s)}{s^3} = 2 \int_{m^2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{s^3} \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} [\mathcal{A}(s + i\epsilon) - \mathcal{A}(s - i\epsilon)]
$$

=
$$
2 \int_{m^2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{s^3} \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} [\mathcal{A}(s + i\epsilon) - \mathcal{A}(s + i\epsilon)^*] = 2i \int_{m^2}^{\infty} \frac{\sigma(s)}{s^2}
$$

$$
2i\int_{m^2}^{\infty} \frac{\sigma(s)}{s^2} = 2\pi i \operatorname{Res}[\frac{\mathcal{A}(s)}{s^3}, s = 0] = 2\pi i a_2
$$

 $\Rightarrow a_2 \geq 0$ Adams et al '06

Positivity with massless loops

Bellazzini '16

We can deform it by adding one mass *m* to regulate the IR. Caveats with spin 1, 2: new degrees of freedom, forward-limit singularities...

It can be tricky even for spin-0:

Arkani-Hamed et al '16

$$
\log \frac{\Lambda^2}{s} \to \log \frac{\Lambda^2}{s+m^2} \qquad ,
$$

Consider an UV completion that, at tree level, generates only **black**-**red** operators, so **black-black** scattering occurs first at one loop

running of dimension-8 **black-black** operator

¹¹

Consider an UV completion that, at tree level, generates only **black**-**red** operators, so **black-black** scattering occurs first at one loop

running of dimension-8 **black-black** operator

Consider an UV completion that, at tree level, generates only **black**-**red** operators, so **black-black** scattering occurs first at

$$
16\pi^{2}\beta_{H^{4}D^{4}}^{(1)} = \frac{8}{3}\bigg[-2(c_{H^{4}D^{2}}^{(1)})^{2} - \frac{11}{8}(c_{H^{4}D^{2}}^{(2)})^{2} + 4c_{H^{4}D^{2}}^{(1)}c_{H^{4}D^{2}}^{(2)}
$$

\n
$$
\frac{+3c_{Hd}^{2}}{\pm 2\pi} \frac{+c_{He}^{2}}{\pm 2(c_{Hl}^{(1)})^{2}} - 2(c_{Hl}^{(3)})^{2} + 6(c_{Hq}^{(1)})^{2} - 6(c_{Hq}^{(3)})^{2} + \frac{3c_{Hu}^{2}}{\pm 2c_{Hu}^{2}} - 3c_{Hud}^{2}\bigg],
$$

\n
$$
16\pi^{2}\beta_{H^{4}D^{4}}^{(2)} = \frac{8}{3}\bigg[-2(c_{H^{4}D^{2}}^{(1)})^{2} - \frac{5}{8}(c_{H^{4}D^{2}}^{(2)})^{2} - 2c_{H^{4}D^{2}}^{(1)}c_{H^{4}D^{2}}^{(2)}
$$

\n
$$
\frac{-3c_{Hd}^{2}}{\pm 2c_{He}^{2}} - \frac{2(c_{Hl}^{(1)})^{2}}{\pm 2c_{Hu}^{(2)}} - 2(c_{Hl}^{(3)})^{2} - 6(c_{Hq}^{(1)})^{2} - 6(c_{Hq}^{(3)})^{2} - 3c_{Hu}^{2}\bigg],
$$

\n
$$
16\pi^{2}\beta_{H^{4}D^{4}}^{(3)} = \frac{8}{3}\bigg[-5(c_{H^{4}D^{2}}^{(1)})^{2} + \frac{7}{8}(c_{H^{4}D^{2}}^{(2)})^{2} - 2c_{H^{4}D^{2}}^{(1)}c_{H^{4}D^{2}}^{(2)} + 4(c_{Hl}^{(3)})^{2} + 12(c_{Hq}^{(3)})^{2} + 3c_{Hud}^{2}\bigg]
$$

running of dimension-8 **black-black** operator

Example of RGE preserving positivity

a priori, it can be renormalised by several classes of operators $\frac{dN^{\mathcal{N}^{\vee}}}{d\mathcal{U}^{\prime}}c^{(1)}_{W^2\phi^2D^2}<0.$ terry Albert Company $-\frac{\psi^2 \phi^2 D^3}{X \phi^4 D^2}$ mmm

 $c_{W^2\phi^2D^2}^{(1)}(\tilde{\mu}) = c_{W^2\phi^2D^2}^{(1)}(\Lambda) - \frac{1}{16\pi^2} \dot{c}_{W^2\phi^2D^2}^{(1)}(\Lambda) \log \frac{\Lambda}{\tilde{\mu}} < 0$

Example of RGE preserving positivity

a priori, it can be renormalised by several classes of operators $\frac{dN^{\mathcal{N}^{\vee}}}{d\mathcal{U}^{\prime}}c^{(1)}_{W^2\phi^2D^2}<0$ $\frac{2}{D^3}$ and $\frac{1}{2}$ $\psi^2 \phi^2 D^3$
 $X \phi^4 D^2$ and ψ^2 and ψ^2

 $c_{W^2\phi^2D^2}^{(1)}(\tilde{\mu})=c_{W^2\phi^2D^2}^{(1)}(\Lambda)-\frac{1}{16\pi^2}\dot{c}_{W^2\phi^2D^2}^{(1)}(\Lambda)\log\frac{\Lambda}{\tilde{\mu}}<0$ $\left\{ \begin{array}{c} \displaystyle{c^{(1)}_{W^2\phi^2D^2}}\ \displaystyle{\left\{ \begin{array}{c} +\ \frac{1}{6}g_2^2(2c^{(1)}_{\phi^4}+3c^{(2)}_{\phi^4}+c^{(3)}_{\phi^4})\ \displaystyle{c^{(2)}_{\phi^4}+[c^{(1)}_{\phi^4}+c^{(2)}_{\phi^4}]+[c^{(1)}_{\phi^4}+c^{(2)}_{\phi^4}+c^{(3)}_{\phi^4}] \end{array} \right.} \ \displaystyle{\left. \begin{array}{c} \displaystyle{c^{(2)}_{\phi^4}+[c^{(1)}$

Example of RGE preserving positivity

a priori, it can be renormalised by several classes of operatorsmm $\mathcal{U}^{(1)}_{\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{U}_{A}}} c^{(1)}_{W^2\phi^2D^2} < 0$ hinn WWW $\psi^2\phi^2D^3$
 $X\phi^4D$ $\phi^4 D^4$ mon

$$
c_{W^2\phi^2D^2}^{(1)}(\tilde{\mu}) = c_{W^2\phi^2D^2}^{(1)}(\Lambda) - \frac{1}{16\pi^2} \dot{c}_{W^2\phi^2D^2}^{(1)}(\Lambda) \log \frac{\Lambda}{\tilde{\mu}} < 0
$$

$$
\dot{c}_{W^2\phi^2D^2}^{(1)} + \frac{1}{6} g_2^2 (2c_{\phi^4}^{(1)} + 3c_{\phi^4}^{(2)} + c_{\phi^4}^{(3)})
$$

$$
- \frac{8}{3} g_2^2 \left[c_{l^2\phi^2D^3}^{(1)} + c_{l^2\phi^2D^3}^{(2)} + 3(c_{q^2\phi^2D^3}^{(1)} + c_{q^2\phi^2D^3}^{(2)}) \right]_{16}
$$

Positivity breaking in matching

$$
\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}} = \kappa_S \mathcal{S} H^\dagger H
$$

$$
c_{H^4 D^4}^{(1) \text{ tree}} = c_{H^4 D^4}^{(2) \text{ tree}} = 0, \quad c_{H^4 D^4}^{(3) \text{ tree}} = 2 \frac{\kappa_S^2}{M^2}
$$

$$
c_{H^4 D^4}^{(1) \text{ loop}} = -\frac{39}{144\pi^2} \frac{\kappa_S^4}{M^4},
$$

$$
c_{H^4 D^4}^{(2) \text{ loop}} = -\frac{39}{144\pi^2} \frac{\kappa_S^4}{M^4},
$$

$$
c_{H^4 D^4}^{(3) \text{ loop}} = -\frac{187}{720\pi^2} \frac{\kappa_S^4}{M^4}.
$$

Positivity breaking in matching

$$
\mathcal{L}_{\Xi} = \kappa_{\Xi} H^{\dagger} \Xi^I \sigma^I H
$$

Positivity breaking in matching

Scalar quadruplets

First reflection: phenomenological relevance

Not clear to me that we are more sensitive to the tree-level operators, e.g.:

Zhang '21

In this section we consider a concrete example. We consider a vector-like $SU(2)$ singlet fermion F with hypercharge $-\frac{1}{3}$, which interacts with the SM left-handed quark doublet q and the Higgs boson H :

$$
\mathcal{L} = y(\bar{q}H)F + h.c.
$$
\n(6.29)

We see that the heavy F exchange generates an $HH^{\dagger}q\bar{q}$ amplitude already at the tree level, and therefore in practice its more realistic to study the $HH^{\dagger}q\bar{q}$ operators rather than the 4-Higgs operators that are loop-induced. This is in general true when mixed loops are present. The discussion in this section is therefore mostly for the completeness of the picture.

Second reflection: the role of tools

Not an easy task: one-loop matching/running to dimension 8

Fantastic phenomenological/theoretical scenario for **application** and **testing** of tools

$$
c_{\phi^4}^{(1)} \rightarrow c_{\phi^4}^{(1)} + c_{B^2 D^4} g_1^2 - c_{B\phi^2 D^4}^{(3)} g_1 - c_{W^2 D^4} g_2^2 + c_{W\phi^2 D^4}^{(3)} g_2,
$$

\n
$$
c_{\phi^4}^{(2)} \rightarrow c_{\phi^4}^{(2)} - c_{B^2 D^4} g_1^2 + c_{B\phi^2 D^4}^{(3)} g_1 - c_{W^2 D^4} g_2^2 + c_{W\phi^2 D^4}^{(3)} g_2,
$$

\n
$$
c_{\phi^4}^{(3)} \rightarrow c_{\phi^4}^{(3)} + 2c_{W^2 D^4} g_2^2 - 2c_{W\phi^2 D^4}^{(3)} g_2,
$$

Cross-checks with other tools

Criado '17

Tree-level results with MatchingTools

$$
\mathcal{L}^{(8)}_{\text{EFT}} = \frac{(g^{\phi}_{\mathcal{W}})^{2}}{m_{\mathcal{W}}^{4}} \Big[2(D_{\mu}\phi^{\dagger}D_{\nu}\phi)(D^{\mu}\phi^{\dagger}D^{\nu}\phi) + 4(D_{\nu}\phi^{\dagger}D^{\nu}D^{\mu}\phi)(D_{\mu}\phi^{\dagger}\phi) - 2(D_{\mu}\phi^{\dagger}D_{\nu}\phi)(\phi^{\dagger}D^{\mu}D^{\nu}\phi) \n- 4(D_{\mu}\phi^{\dagger}\phi)(D^{\mu}D_{\nu}\phi^{\dagger}D^{\nu}\phi) + 2(D_{\mu}\phi^{\dagger}D_{\nu}\phi)(D^{\mu}D^{\nu}\phi^{\dagger}\phi) - 4(D_{\mu}\phi^{\dagger}D^{\mu}\phi)(D_{\nu}\phi^{\dagger}D^{\nu}\phi) \n+ 2(D_{\mu}\phi^{\dagger}D_{\nu}\phi)(D^{\nu}\phi^{\dagger}D^{\mu}\phi) + \frac{1}{2}(\phi^{\dagger}D_{\mu}D_{\nu}\phi)(\phi^{\dagger}D^{\mu}D^{\nu}\phi) - 2(D_{\nu}D_{\rho}\phi^{\dagger}D^{\nu}D^{\rho}\phi)(\phi^{\dagger}\phi) \n+ (D_{\mu}D_{\nu}\phi^{\dagger}\phi)(\phi^{\dagger}D^{\mu}D^{\nu}\phi) - 4(\phi^{\dagger}D_{\rho}\phi)(D_{\nu}\phi^{\dagger}D^{\rho}D^{\nu}\phi) + 2(\phi^{\dagger}D_{\nu}D_{\mu}\phi)(D^{\mu}\phi^{\dagger}D^{\nu}\phi) \n+ \frac{1}{2}(D_{\mu}D_{\nu}\phi^{\dagger}\phi)(D^{\mu}D^{\nu}\phi^{\dagger}\phi) + 4(D_{\rho}D_{\nu}\phi^{\dagger}D^{\rho}\phi)(D^{\nu}\phi^{\dagger}\phi) - 2(D_{\nu}D_{\mu}\phi^{\dagger}\phi)(D^{\mu}\phi^{\dagger}D^{\nu}\phi) \n- \frac{1}{2}(\phi^{\dagger}D_{\nu}D_{\mu}\phi)(\phi^{\dagger}D^{\mu}D^{\nu}\phi) + 2(D_{\rho}D_{\nu}\phi^{\dagger}D^{\nu}D^{\rho}\phi)(\phi^{\dagger}\phi) - (D
$$

Cross-checks with other tools

Criado '17

Tree-level results with MatchingTools

 Export the Lagrangian to FeynRules Import in FeynArts + FormCalc Compute amplitudes off-shell to reduce to Green's basis, from where previous results can be used $\mathcal{L}_{\rm EFT}^{(8)} = \frac{(g_{\mathcal{W}}^{\phi})^2}{m_{\mathcal{W}}^4} \bigg[2\mathcal{O}_{\phi^4}^{(1)} + 2\mathcal{O}_{\phi^4}^{(2)} - 4\mathcal{O}_{\phi^4}^{(3)} - \frac{1}{4}g_2^2\mathcal{O}_{W^2\phi^4}^{(1)} + \frac{1}{2}g_1g_2\mathcal{O}_{W B\phi^4}^{(1)} \bigg]$ $\left. +\frac{3}{4} g_1^2 \mathcal{O}^{(1)}_{B^2\phi^4} -2 g_2 \mathcal{O}^{(1)}_{W\phi^4D^2} +6 g_1 \mathcal{O}^{(1)}_{B\phi^4D^2} +2 g_1 \mathcal{O}^{(3)}_{B\phi^4D^2} \right]$ 26

Cross-checks with other tools

Fuentes-Martin et al '20

Loop-level results with SuperTracer

After (huge) simplification:

rita = SuperSimplify[(rete /. CovD[a_, G[b__], c__] \rightarrow 0) // Tr] /. |Plus \rightarrow List

 $\sqrt{1-\frac{13}{3}}$ alpha⁴ \overline{H}^a H^b D_µD_vH^a D_vD_µ \overline{H}^b , $-\frac{97}{45}$ alpha⁴ \overline{H}^a H^a D_µD_vH^b D_vD_µ \overline{H}^b , $-\frac{13}{3}$ alpha⁴ \overline{H}^a \overline{H}^b D_µD_vH^b D_{*u*}D_vH^b D_{*u*}D_vH $-\frac{221}{45}$ alpha⁴ \overline{H}^a H^a D²H^b D² \overline{H}^b , $-\frac{5}{12}$ alpha⁴ \overline{H}^a H^b D²H^a, $-\frac{13}{3}$ alpha⁴ \overline{H}^a H^b D_µH^a D_µD² \overline{H}^b , $-\frac{233}{39}$ alpha⁴ \overline{H}^a H^a D_µH^b D_µ $1-\frac{103}{30}$ alpha⁴ H^a H^a D_µ H^b D_µ D^2H^b , $-\frac{29}{12}$ alpha⁴ H^a H^b D_µ H^a D_µ D^2H^b , $-\frac{319}{60}$ alpha⁴ H^a H^b D²D² H^b , $-\frac{37}{30}$ alpha⁴ H^a H^b D²D² H^a , $-\frac{23}{12}$ alph

$$
c^{(1)}_{H^4 D^4}=c^{(2)}_{H^4 D^4}=-\frac{13}{48\pi^2}\alpha^4
$$

It matches **matchmakereft**!

Automatising operator reduction?

Current results must be cross-checked.

Current results only for dimension-8 **bosonic** operators

Eventually, going beyond the SMEFT

Eventually, going beyond dimension-8 (maybe for formal aspects)

Strategy

Diagrammatically: Match redundant Lagrangian onto physical Lagrangian at **tree level** and **on-shell**

Strategy

Diagrammatically: Match redundant Lagrangian onto physical Lagrangian at **tree level** and **on-shell**

 $\mathcal{M}_{\text{phys+red}} = \mathcal{M}_{\text{phys}}$

Addressing the matching symbolically is hopeless...

final/. {Den[X_, y] \rightarrow 1/(x-y)}//Expand

 $\mathcal{M}_{\text{phys+red}} = \mathcal{M}_{\text{phys}}$

Let's simply give numbers to the kinematic invariants

final/. {Den[X_, y] \rightarrow 1/(x-y)}//Expand

 $\mathcal{M}_{\text{phys+red}} = \mathcal{M}_{\text{phys}}$

Let's simply give numbers to the kinematic invariants

Warning! The assignment must be compatible with on-shellness: **physical configuration** of momenta

$$
p_1 \rightarrow -(p_2 + \cdots + p_N)
$$

$$
p_1^2 = 0 \Rightarrow p_2 p_3 \to -(p_2 p_4 + p_2 p_5 + \dots + \dots + p_{N-1} p_N)
$$

2 Pair [k[2], k[3]] (-2 (Pair [k[1], k[5]] + Pair [k[1], k[6]]) + 2 Pair [k[5], k[6]]) i g1² rHDpdim6 Pair[k[3], $k[4]$]×Pair[k[5], $k[6]$] 2 Pair [k[2], k[3]] (-2 (Pair [k[1], k[5]] + Pair [k[1], k[6]]) + 2 Pair [k[5], k[6]]) i g1² rHDpdim6 Pair [k[3], k[4]] xPair [k[5], k[6]]

2 Pair [k[2], k[4]] (-2 (Pair [k[1], k[5]] + Pair [k[1], k[6]]) + 2 Pair [k[5], k[6]])

 $\mathcal{M}_{\text{phys+red}} = \mathcal{M}_{\text{phys}}$

Let's simply give numbers to the kinematic invariants

A NEW MONTE CARLO TREATMENT OF MULTIPARTICLE PHASE SPACE **AT HIGH ENERGIES**

R. KLEISS, W.J. STIRLING

CERN, Geneva, Switzerland

and

S.D. ELLIS^{*}

35

Dept. of Physics, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195, USA

```
For [yy = 1, yy \le numP + 2, yy++,polarizations = AppendTo[polarizations, givePol[momenta[[yy]]];
                    \mathbf{1}rule = Table[Pair[k[i], k[j]] → sprod4D[momenta[[i]], momenta[[j]] // Simplify, {i, 1, 2 + numP}, {j, 1, 2 + numP}];
                   AppendTo[Rules, Flatten[rule]];
                 1:Return[Rules];In[10]:= momenta[[6] // FullSimplify
               \frac{1843}{4683}, \frac{5014\sqrt{2}+\frac{358\,355}{\sqrt{9366}}}{9366+265\,\sqrt{4683}}, \frac{7150\,\sqrt{\frac{6}{1561}}+80\,\sqrt{2}}{9366+265\,\sqrt{4683}}, \frac{54\,833\,\sqrt{2}}{4683\,\sqrt{2}\,\,\left(265+2\,\sqrt{4683}\right)}Out[10]=ln[11]: createRules[4, 5]
\text{Out}[11] = \left\{ \left\{ \text{Pair}[k[1], k[1]] \rightarrow 0, \ \text{Pair}[k[1], k[2]] \rightarrow \frac{1}{2}, \ \text{Pair}[k[1], k[3]] \rightarrow \frac{2\,168\,652 + 463\,898\,\sqrt{127} - 106\,379\,\sqrt{254}\,\sqrt{127}\,\sqrt{127}\,\sqrt{127}\,\sqrt{127}\,\sqrt{127}\,\sqrt{127}\,\sqrt{127}\,\sqrt{127}\,\sqrt{127}\,\sqrt{127}\,\sqrt{127}\,\sqrt{127}\,\sqrt{127}\,\sqrt{12\begin{split} \mathsf{Pair}\left[ k[1] \text{ , } k[4]\right] \rightarrow \frac{6\,877\,812+1\,471\,238\,\sqrt{127}\, +346\,999\,\sqrt{254}}{36\,576\times \left(762+163\,\sqrt{127}\,\right)}\,, \text{ Pair}\left[ k[1] \text{ , } k[5]\right] \rightarrow \frac{4\,463\,796+954\,854\,\sqrt{127}\,-203\,801\,\sqrt{254}}{36\,576\times \left(762+163\,\sqrt{127}\,\right)} \endPair[k[1], k[6]] \rightarrow \frac{47244 + 10106 \sqrt{127} - 4091 \sqrt{254}}{4064 \sqrt{762 + 163 \sqrt{127}}}, Pair[k[2], k[1]] \rightarrow \frac{1}{2}, Pair[k[2], k[2]] \rightarrow 0,
```
Example of application

Current status

Almost everything working in matchmakereft (including masses), modulo some issues with fermions; important cross-checks from FeynArts+FormCalc

Current status

Almost everything working in matchmakereft (including masses), modulo some issues with fermions; important cross-checks from FeynArts+FormCalc

Conclusions

Positivity bounds are powerful constraints in the search for new physics, but they must be considered with care for loop operators.

Positivity studies benefit strongly from tools, which in turn are tested in a highly non-trivial context.

Two main obstacles for fully automatised matching/running: operators bases and redundancies.

We are addressing redundancies via tree-level on-shell matching within matchmakereft.

Thank you!