TIFR/TH/95-35

Sharpening up the Charged Higgs Boson Signature using Tau Polarization at LHC

Sreerup Raychaudhuri and D.P. Roy[1]

Theoretical Physics Group
Tata Institute of Fundamental Research
Homi Bhabha Road, Bombay - 400 005, India

Abstract

The opposite states of the τ polarization resulting from the charged Higgs boson and the W boson decays can be exploited to enhance the $H^{\pm}$ signal in the inclusive 1-prong hadronic decay channel of τ. We suggest practical methods of sharpening up the $H^{\pm}$ signature in the top quark decay at LHC using this idea. As a result one can carry on the charged Higgs boson search to within $\sim 20 GeV$ of the parent top quark mass over the full parameter space of the MSSM.

[1]E-mail: dproy@theory.tifr.res.in

1 INTRODUCTION

A direct top quark signal has been recently observed at the Tevatron collider [1] with

$$m_t \simeq 175\ GeV, \tag{1}$$

which also agrees with the indirect estimate of top quark mass from LEP [2]. One expects a couple of dozens of clearly identifiable top quark events at the end of the current Tevatron run, which would go up to a few hundred following the upgradation of its luminosity via the main injector. The corresponding number of identifiable top quark events at LHC is expected to be of the order of a million per year – i.e. similar to the rate of Z boson events at LEP. Thus the LHC is expected to serve as a top quark factory, which will enable us to make a detailed study of its decay and in particular to search for new particles in top quark decay. There has been a good deal of recent interest in the search for one such new particle, for which the top quark decay provides by far the best discovery limit – i.e. the charged Higgs boson $H^{\pm}$ of the supersymmetric standard model [3].

There have been several exploratory works on $H^{\pm}$ search in the top quark decay at Tevatron and LHC energies [4-7]. They are based on one of the two distictive properties of $H^{\pm}$ vis a vis the $W^{\pm}$ boson – (i) the preferential $H^{\pm}$ decay into the $\tau\nu$ channel relative to $e\nu$ or $\mu\nu$ [4,5], and (ii) the opposite states of τ polarization resulting from $H^{\pm}$ and $W^{\pm}$ decays [6,7]. In a recent work [8] we have suggested methods of sharpening up the $H^{\pm}$ signature in top quark decay by combining these two properties and applied them to $H^{\pm}$ search at Tevatron upgrade. Even with the best signature, however, the prospect of $H^{\pm}$ search at Tevatron upgrade was seen to be limited to a small part of the parameter space. In the present work we shall analyse the prospect of $H^{\pm}$ search in top quark decay at LHC using these ideas. We shall see below that in this case one gets a viable signature over practically the full parameter space of $H^{\pm}$ coupling. Moreover with a supplementary constraint on the accompanying hadronic jets the signature remains viable over most of the kinematically allowed range of $H^{\pm}$ mass.

2 CHARGED HIGGS SIGNAL IN TOP QUARK DECAY

We shall concentrate on the charged Higgs boson of the minimal supersymmetric standard model (MSSM). Its couplings to fermions are given by

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{g}{\sqrt{2}m_W} H^+ \Big\{ \cot\beta \; V_{ij} m_{u_i} \bar{u}_i d_{jL} \;\; + \;\; \tan\beta \; V_{ij} m_{d_j} \bar{u}_i d_{jR} + \;\; \tan\beta \; m_{\ell_j} \bar{\nu}_j \ell_{jR} \Big\} + H.c. \qquad (2)$$

where V_{ij} are the Kobayashi-Maskawa (KM) matrix elements and $\tan\beta$ is the ratio of the vacuum expectation values of the two Higgs doublets. The QCD corrections are taken into account in the leading log approximation by substituting the quark mass parameters by their running masses evaluated at the $H^\pm$ mass scale [5]. Perturbative limits on the tbH Yukawa couplings of Eq. (2), along with the constraints from the low energy processes like $b \to s\gamma$ and $B_d - \bar{B}_d$ mixing, imply the limits [9]

$$0.4 < \tan\beta < 120. \qquad (3)$$

In the most predictive form of MSSM, characterised by a common SUSY breaking mass term at the grand unification point, one gets stronger limits [10]

$$1 < \tan\beta < m_t/m_b. \qquad (4)$$

Such a lower bound also follows from requiring the perturbative limit on the tbH Yukawa coupling to hold upto the unification point [11]. However, we shall consider the full range (3) of the phenomenologically allowed $\tan\beta$ parameter.

In the diagonal KM matrix approximation, one gets the decay widths

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{t\to bW} &= \frac{g^2}{64\pi m_W^2 m_t} \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(1, \frac{m_b^2}{m_t^2}, \frac{m_W^2}{m_t^2}\right) \\ &\quad \Big[m_W^2(m_t^2 + m_b^2) + (m_t^2 - m_b^2)^2 - 2m_W^4\Big] \qquad (5) \\ \Gamma_{t\to bH} &= \frac{g^2}{64\pi m_W^2 m_t} \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(1, \frac{m_b^2}{m_t^2}, \frac{m_H^2}{m_t^2}\right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\left[(m_t^2 \cot^2\beta + m_b^2 \tan^2\beta)(m_t^2 + m_b^2 - m_H^2) - 4m_t^2 m_b^2\right] \quad (6)$$

$$\Gamma_{H\to\tau\nu} = \frac{g^2 m_H}{32\pi m_W^2} m_\tau^2 \tan^2\beta \quad (7)$$

$$\Gamma_{H\to c\bar{s}} = \frac{3g^2 m_H}{32\pi m_W^2}\left(m_c^2 \cot^2\beta + m_s^2 \tan^2\beta\right). \quad (8)$$

From these one can construct the relevant branching fractions

$$B_{t\to bH} = \Gamma_{t\to bH}/\left(\Gamma_{t\to bH} + \Gamma_{t\to bW}\right) \quad (9)$$

$$B_{H\to\tau\nu} = \Gamma_{H\to\tau\nu}/\left(\Gamma_{H\to\tau\nu} + \Gamma_{H\to c\bar{s}}\right). \quad (10)$$

It is the product of these two branching fractions that controls the size of the observable charged Higgs signal. The $t \to bH$ branching fraction has a pronounced dip at

$$\tan\beta = (m_t/m_b)^{\frac{1}{2}} \simeq 6, \quad (11)$$

where (6) has a minimum. Although this is partly compensated by a large value of the $H \to \tau\nu$ branching fraction, which is $\simeq 1$ for $\tan\beta > 2$, the product still has a significant dip at (11). Consequently the predicted charged Higgs signal will be very weak around this point as we shall see below.

The basic process of interest is $t\bar{t}$ pair production through gluon-gluon (or quark-antiquark) fusion followed by their decay into charged Higgs or W boson channels, i.e.

$$gg \to t\bar{t} \to b\bar{b}(H^+H^-, H^\pm W^\mp, W^+W^-). \quad (12)$$

The τ decay of one or both the charged bosons leads to a single τ, $\tau\tau$ or $\ell\tau$ final state, where ℓ denotes e and μ. Each of these final states is accompanied by several hadronic jets and a large missing-E_T (transverse energy) due to the neutrinos.

A brief discussion of the τ-identification at hadron colliders is in order here. Starting with a missing-E_T trigger, the UA1, UA2 and CDF experiments have been able to identify τ as a narrow jet in its hadronic decay mode [12,13]. In particular the CDF experiment has used the narrow jet cut to reduce the QCD jet background by an order of magnitude while retaining most of the hadronic τ events. Moreover, since the hadronic τ and QCD jet events dominantly populate the 1-prong and multi-prong channels respectively, the prong distribution of the narrow jets can be used to distinguish

the two. In particular restricting to 1-prong jets reduces the QCD background by another order of magnitude with very little loss to the hadronic τ signal. In this way the CDF group [13] has been able to reduce the QCD background to a few tens of events in a data sample of integrated luminosity $\sim 4pb^{-1}$, which could be subtracted out by extrapolation from higher prong channels. Consequently they were able to identify the $W \to \tau\nu$ events and test W universality as well as put some modest constraints on top and $H^{\pm}$ masses from the level of the residual $\tau\nu$ events. In the present case, however, one would be looking for a few tens of hadronic τ events in a data sample of over 1000 times higher integrated luminosity and 10 times higher QCD jet cross-section. So the QCD jet background cannot be controlled by the above method, even with b identification. Therefore one cannot use the single τ channel for the charged Higgs search and even the $\tau\tau$ channel can be at best marginal. The best charged Higgs signature is provided by the $\ell\tau$ channel. The largest background comes from $W \to \ell\nu$ accompanied by QCD jets, which can be easily controlled by the above mentioned jet angle and multiplicity cuts. Besides the hard isolated lepton ℓ provides a more robust trigger than the missing-E_T, particularly at the LHC. Therefore we shall concentrate mainly on the $\ell\tau$ channel.

The $\ell\tau$ and $\tau\tau$ channels correspond to the leptonic decay of both the charged bosons in (12), i.e.

$$\begin{array}{cccccccccc} H^+ & H^- & , & H^+ & W^- & , & H^- & W^+ & , & W^+ \quad W^-, \\ \downarrow & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \downarrow & & \downarrow \quad \downarrow \\ \tau_L^+ & \tau_R^- & & \tau_L^+ & \tau_L^-, \ell^- & & \tau_R^- & \tau_R^+, \ell^+ & & \tau_R^+, \ell^+ \quad \tau_L^-, \ell^- \end{array} \tag{13}$$

where L and R stand for left and right handed helicities of τ. By convention,

$$P_\tau \equiv P_{\tau^-} = -P_{\tau^+}, \quad P_{\tau^\pm} = \frac{\sigma_{\tau_R^\pm} - \sigma_{\tau_L^\pm}}{\sigma_{\tau_R^\pm} + \sigma_{\tau_L^\pm}}. \tag{14}$$

For the $\ell\tau$ channel of our interest the signal and the background come from the HW and WW terms respectively. They correspond to exactly opposite states of τ polarization, *i.e.*

$$P_\tau^H = +1, \quad P_\tau^W = -1. \tag{15}$$

Consequently the use of the tau polarization effect for enhancing the signal to background ratio is particularly simple in this case as we shall see below. It may be noted here that the $\tau\tau$ channel has a better signal to background ratio because of the HH contribution as well as the enhancement of WH relative to WW by a combinatorial factor of 2 [5]. On the other hand the polarization distinction is less simple. While both the τ's in the background have negative polarization one or both of them have positive polarization in the signal. Nonetheless the method of enhancing the signal to background ratio by the τ polarization effect discussed below can be extended to this channel, provided one can identify the $\tau\tau$ events from the QCD background.

3 TAU POLARIZATION EFFECT

We shall concentrate on the 1-prong hadronic decay channel of τ, which is best suited for τ identification. It accounts for 80% of hadronic τ decays and 50% of overall τ decays. The main contributors to the 1-prong hadronic τ decay are [2]

$$\tau^{\pm} \rightarrow \pi^{\pm}\nu_{\tau}\ (12.5\%) \tag{16}$$

$$\tau^{\pm} \rightarrow \rho^{\pm}\nu_{\tau} \rightarrow \pi^{\pm}\pi^{0}\nu_{\tau}\ (24\%) \tag{17}$$

$$\tau^{\pm} \rightarrow a_1^{\pm}\nu \rightarrow \pi^{\pm}\pi^{0}\pi^{0}\nu_{\tau}\ (7.5\%) \tag{18}$$

where the branching fractions for the π and ρ channels include the small contributions from the K and $K^{\star}$ channels respectively, since they have identical polarization effects. Note that only half the a_1 decay channel contributes to the 1-prong configuration. The masses and widths of ρ and a_1 are [2]

$$m_{\rho}(\Gamma_{\rho}) = 770(150)\ \text{MeV}, \quad m_{a_1}(\Gamma_{a_1}) = 1260(400)\ \text{MeV}. \tag{19}$$

One sees that the three decay processes (16,17,18) account for about 90% of the 1-prong hadronic decay of τ. Thus the inclusion of τ polarization effect in these processes will account for its effect in the inclusive 1-prong hadronic decay channel to a good approximation.

The formalism relating τ polarization to the momentum distribution of its decay particles in (16,17,18) has been widely discussed in the literature

[6,7,8,14,15]. We shall only discuss the main formulae relevant for our analysis. A more detailed account can be found in a recent paper by Bullock, Hagiwara and Martin [7], which we shall closely follow. For τ decay into π or a vector meson (ρ, a_1), one has

$$\frac{1}{\Gamma_\pi}\frac{d\Gamma_\pi}{d\cos\theta} = \frac{1}{2}(1 + P_\tau \cos\theta) \tag{20}$$

$$\frac{1}{\Gamma_v}\frac{d\Gamma_{vL}}{d\cos\theta} = \frac{\frac{1}{2}m_\tau^2}{m_\tau^2 + 2m_v^2}(1 + P_\tau \cos\theta) \tag{21}$$

$$\frac{1}{\Gamma_v}\frac{d\Gamma_{vT}}{d\cos\theta} = \frac{m_v^2}{m_\tau^2 + 2m_v^2}(1 - P_\tau \cos\theta) \tag{22}$$

where v stands for the vector meson and L, T denote its longitudinal and transverse polarization states. The angle θ measures the direction of the meson in the τ rest frame relative to the τ line of flight, which defines its polarization axis. It is related to the fraction x of the τ energy-momentum carried by the meson in the laboratory frame, *i.e.*

$$\cos\theta = \frac{2x - 1 - m_{\pi,v}^2/m_\tau^2}{1 - m_{\pi,v}^2/m_\tau^2}. \tag{23}$$

Here we have made the collinear approximation $m_\tau \ll p_\tau$, where all the decay products emerge along the τ line of flight in the laboratory frame.

The above distribution (20-22) can be simply understood in terms of angular momentum conservation. For $\tau^-_{R(L)} \to \nu_L\, \pi^-$, $v^-_{\lambda=0}$ it favours forward (backward) emission of π or longitudinal vector meson, while it is the other way round for transverse vector meson emission $\tau^-_{R(L)} \to \nu_L v^-_{\lambda=-1}$. Thus the $\pi^\pm$s coming from $H^\pm$ and $W^\pm$ decays peak at $x = 1$ and 0 respectively and $\langle x_\pi \rangle_H = 2\langle x_\pi \rangle_W = 2/3$. Although the clear separation between the signal and the background peaks disappears after convolution with the τ momentum, the relative size of the average π momenta remains unaffected, *i.e.*

$$\langle p_\pi^T \rangle_H \simeq 2\langle p_\pi^T \rangle_W \quad \text{for} \quad m_H \simeq m_W. \tag{24}$$

Thus the τ polarization effect (20) is reflected in a significantly harder $\pi^\pm$ momentum distribution for the charged Higgs signal compared to the W boson background. The same is true for the longitudinal vector mesons; but

the presence of the transverse component dilutes the polarization effect in the vector meson momentum distribution by a factor (see eqs. 21,22)

$$\frac{m_\tau^2 - 2m_v^2}{m_\tau^2 + 2m_v^2}. \tag{25}$$

Consequently the effect of τ polarization is reduced by a factor of $\sim 1/2$ in ρ momentum distribution and practically washed out in the case of a_1. Thus the inclusive 1-prong τ jet resulting from (16-18) is expected to be harder for the $H^\pm$ signal compared to the W boson background; but the presence of the transverse ρ and a_1 contributions makes the size of this difference rather modest. We shall see below that it is possible to suppress the transverse ρ and a_1 contributions and enhance the difference between the signal and the background in the 1-prong hadronic τ channel even without identifying the individual mesonic contributions to this channel.

The key feature of vector meson decay, relevant for the above purpose, is the correlation between its state of polarization and the energy sharing among the decay pions. The transverse ρ and a_1 decays favour even sharing of energy among the decay pions, while the longitudinal ρ and a_1 decays favour asymmetric configurations where the charged pion carries either very little or most of the vector meson energy. It is easy to derive this quantitatively for the ρ decay. But a_1 decay is more involved. One can show from general considerations that the $a_{1T(L)} \to 3\pi$ decay favours the plane of the 3 pions in the a_1 rest frame being normal to (coincident with) the a_1 line of flight [15]. This agrees qualitatively with the above pattern of energy sharing. But one has to assume a dynamical model for a_1 decay to get a more quantitative result. We shall follow the model of Kuhn and Santamaria, based on the chiral limit (conserved axial-vector current approximation), which provides a good description of the $a_1 \to 3\pi$ data [16]. One gets very similar pion energy distributions from the alternative model of Isgur et al [17], as shown in [7]. A detailed account of the ρ and a_1 decay formalisms can be found in [7,8] along with the prescriptions for incorporating the finite ρ and a_1 widths. We shall only summarise the results below.

Fig. 1 shows the ρ and a_1 decay distributions in the energy-momentum fraction x', carried by the charged pion. The distributions are shown for both longitudinal and transverse polarization states of the vector mesons. The transverse ρ and a_1 distributions are clearly seen to vanish at the end points and peak in the middle, reflecting equipartition of energy-momentum

among the decay pions. In contrast the longitudinal ρ distribution shows pronounced peaks near the end points $x' = 0$ and 1, and the longitudinal a_1 at the former point. Note also that the direct pionic decay of τ (16) can be formally looked upon as a delta function contribution at $x' = 1$ in this figure. Thus one can suppress the unwanted ρ_T and a_{1T} contributions while retaining the π and at least good fractions of ρ_L and a_{1L} by restricting to the regions $x' \simeq 0$ and 1. We shall see below how this can be achieved even without identifying the individual mesonic contributions in τ decay.

4 STRATEGY, RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

As mentioned earlier, we are interested in the inclusive 1-prong hadronic decay of τ, which is dominated by the $\pi^{\pm}$, $\rho^{\pm}$ and $a_1^{\pm}$ contributions (16,17,18). It results in a thin 1-prong hadronic jet (τ-jet) consisting of a charged pion along with $0, 1$ or 2 π^0's respectively. Since all the pions emerge in a collinear configuration, one can neither measure their invariant mass nor the number of π^0's. Thus it is not possible to identify the three mesonic states. But it is possible to measure the energy of the charged track and the accompanying neutral energy separately, either by measuring the momentum of the former in the tracking chamber and the total energy deposit in the electromagnetic and hadronic calorimeters serrounding it or from the showering profiles in these electromagnetic and hadronic calorimeters [18]. Thus one has to devise a strategy to suppress the transverse vector meson contributions using these two pieces of information. We shall consider two such strategies below. In either case a rapidity and a transverse energy cut of

$$|\eta| \; < \; 3 \quad \text{and} \quad E_T \; > \; 20 \; GeV \tag{26}$$

will be applied on the τ-jet as well as the tagging lepton ℓ, where E_T includes the neutral contribution to the former [18]. We shall also apply isolation cuts to ensure that there are no hadronic jets within a cone of radius $\Delta R = (\Delta\eta^2 + \Delta\phi^2)^{1/2} = 0.4$ around the τ-jet and the tagging lepton.

The first strategy is to impose a calorimetric isolation cut on the τ-jet, which requires the neutral E_T accompanying the charged track within a cone

of $\Delta R = 0.2$ to be less than $5GeV$,[2] i.e.

$$E_T^{ac} \equiv E_T^0 \ < \ 5 \ GeV. \tag{27}$$

As we see from Fig. 1, this cut eliminates the ρ_T and a_{1T} contributions along with the $x' \simeq 0$ peaks of ρ_L and a_{1L}. It retains only the π and the $x' \simeq 1$ peak of the ρ_L contribution. This results in a substantially harder signal cross-section relative to the background, but at the cost of a factor of ~ 2 drop in the signal size.

The second strategy is to plot the τ-jet events satisfying (26) as a function of

$$\Delta E_T = |E_T^{ch} - E_T^0|, \tag{28}$$

i.e. the difference between the E_T of the charged track and the accompanying neutral E_T instead of their sum. It is clear from Fig. 1 that the even sharing of the transverse ρ and a_1 energies among the decay pions imply a significantly softer ΔE_T distribution for ρ_T and a_{1T} relative to ρ_L and a_{1L}. This results in a substantially harder signal cross-section relative to the background when plotted against ΔE_T instead of E_T. Moreover this is achieved at no cost to the signal size unlike the previous case.

In comparing the two methods one notes that the first is easier to implement and besides it helps to suppress the level of QCD jet background as well. On the other hand the second method has the advantage of a factor of ~ 2 larger cross-section. While studying the $H^\pm$ signature at the Tevatron upgrade in [8], we had found the second method more viable in view of the limited size of the $t\bar{t}$ signal there. Since the size of this signal will be very large at the LHC, however, both the methods will be equally viable as we shall see below.

We have estimated $H^\pm$ signal and the $W^\pm$ background cross-sections at the LHC energy of

$$\sqrt{s} = 14 \ TeV \tag{29}$$

using a parton level Monte Carlo program with the recent structure functions of [19]. In stead of the differential cross-section in E_T (or ΔE_T), we have plotted the corresponding integrated cross-sections

$$\sigma(E_T) = \int_{E_T}^{\infty} \frac{d\sigma}{dE_T} dE_T \tag{30}$$

[2]Depending on the energy resolution of the calorimeters, this can be increased upto $10GeV$ without affecting the results significantly.

against the cut-off value of E_T (or ΔE_T). Fig. 2 shows these cross-sections for

$$\tan\beta = 3 \quad \text{and} \quad m_H = 120, 140\ GeV \tag{31}$$

(a) for the raw signal, (b) using the calorimetric isolation cut (27) and (c) using ΔE_T instead of E_T.

There is a clear hardening of the signal curves relative to the background as one goes from Fig. 2a to 2b or 2c. One could of course see a similar hardening in the corresponding differential cross-sections. But the present plots are better suited to compare the relative merits of the three methods in extracting the signal from the background. For this purpose the cut-off value of E_T (ΔE_T) is to be so chosen that one gets a viable signal to background ratio, i.e.

$$H^\pm \text{ signal}/W^\pm \text{ background } \geq 1. \tag{32}$$

The resulting signal cross-section, as given by the cross-over point between the signal and background curves, is a reasonable criterion for the merit of the method. One clearly sees that this point is reached at a much larger value of the cut-off in Fig. 2a, corresponding to a far greater sacrifice to the signal size, than in 2b or 2c. The resulting signal cross-sections for $m_H = 120$ and 140 GeV are ~ 20 fb and less than 1 fb in Fig. 2a, going up to ~ 300 and 50 fb respectively in Fig. 2b and about double these values in Fig. 2c. It is remarkable that a simple calorimetric isolation cut (27) can enhance the signal-background separation so much and increase the effective signal cross-section by over an order of magnitude. Of course the signal cross-section obtained via the ΔE_T distribution is still larger by a factor of ~ 2, as anticipated earlier.

To probe the $H^\pm$ discovery limits at LHC using the three methods, we have estimted the corresponding signal cross-sections, satisfying (32), as functions of $\tan\beta$. These are shown in Fig. 3a,b,c for a set of $H^\pm$ masses,

$$m_H = 80, 100, 120, 140, 150, 160\ GeV. \tag{33}$$

There is a clear dip at $\tan\beta \simeq 6$ as anticipated in (11). One sees a gap in the $\tan\beta$ space around this region where the raw signal of Fig. 3a is clearly not viable. But the improved signals obtained via the calorimetric isolation cut (Fig. 3b) or the ΔE_T distribution (Fig. 3c) remain $\gtrsim 100(1)$ fb for $m_H = 120(140)$ GeV throughout the $\tan\beta$ space. It may be noted here that

one expects an integrated luminosity of

$$\int L\ dt \sim 100\ fb^{-1} \tag{34}$$

from the high luminosity run of the LHC. For a signal size of $\sim 1\ fb$ satisfying (32), it corresponds to $H^{\pm}$ signal and $W^{\pm}$ background events of ~ 100 each. Since the latter can be predicted from the number of $t\bar{t}$ events in the dilepton ($\ell^+\ell^-$) channel using W universality, this will correspond to a $\sim 10\sigma$ signal for the $H^{\pm}$ boson. Thus a signal size of $\sim 1\ fb$ in Fig. 3 will constitute a viable signal for the high luminosity run of LHC. This means that the improved signatures for $H^{\pm}$ boson search at LHC are viable upto $m_H = 140\ GeV$ over the full $\tan\beta$ space.

It may appear from Fig. 3 that for extreme values of $\tan\beta$ ($\lesssim 1$ or $\gtrsim 50$), where the raw signal of 3a is already large, there is no advantage in going to 3b or 3c. It should be noted however that in this case the τ polarization effect can serve as an independent test for the $H^{\pm}$ signal. The hardening (softening) of the signal (background) cross-section of Fig. 2 or equivalently the corresponding differential cross-section [8], as one imposes the calorimetric isolation cut or goes to the ΔE_T variable, is a distinctive prediction of the τ polarization effect that holds independent of $\tan\beta$.

Finally, one can push the viability of these two signatures to still higher values of m_H with a suitable cut on the accompanying hadronic jets. For this purpose one exploits the fact that for $m_H \simeq m_t$ the accompanying b-jet in the $t \to bH(W) \to b\tau\nu$ decay is necessarily soft for the H signal but not the W background [5]. Thus the WW background can be suppressed without sacrificing the HW signal by imposing a kinematic cut of

$$E_T^{jet} \ < \ 30\ GeV \tag{35}$$

on all but one of the accompanying hadronic jets. Of course in the process one would be sacrificing both the signal and background events which are accompanied by a hard QCD jet, which implies a reduction of the signal size without affecting the signal to background ratio. But we do not expect this reduction factor to be very large. Moreover if there is reasonable b identification efficiency at the LHC, then one can by pass this problem by imposing this cut on one of the identified b-jets.

Fig. 4a,b,c shows the $\tan\beta$ distribution of the signal cross-sections satisfying (32), after this kinematic cut. The cross-sections are shown only for

the high values of m_H (140, 150 and 160 GeV), for which the cut is relevant. There is again a large gap in the $\tan\beta$ space where the raw signal is not viable (Fig. 4a). But the improved signals via the calorimetric isolation cut (Fig. 4b) or the ΔE_T distribution (Fig. 4c) remain $>$ 10(1) fb for m_H = 140(150) GeV throughout the $\tan\beta$ parameter space. Thus they provide unambiguous signatures for $H^\pm$ boson search upto m_H = 140 and 150 GeV at the low and high luminosity runs of LHC, corresponding to integrated luminosities of 10 and 100 fb^{-1} respectively. In fact for the high luminosity run the signatures remain viable over the full $\tan\beta$ space upto a $H^\pm$ mass of 155 GeV – i.e. within 20 GeV of the parent top quark mass.

In summary, we have explored the prospect of charged Higgs boson search in top quark decay at the LHC, taking advantage of the opposite states of τ polarization resulting from the $H^\pm$ and $W^\pm$ decays. We have concentrated on the most promising channel for $H^\pm$ search – i.e. the $\ell\tau$ channel, followed by the inclusive decay of τ into a 1-prong hadronic jet. Two practical methods of sharpening up the $H^\pm$ signature, using the τ polarization effect, have been studied. The resulting signatures are shown to be viable over the full parameter space of $\tan\beta$ upto m_H = 140 GeV. Moreover with a kinematic cut on the accompanying hadronic jets, one can stretch their viability upto $m_H = 150 - 155$ GeV – i.e. within 20 GeV of the parent top quark mass.

The work of SR is partially supported by a project (DO No. SR/SY/P-08/92) of the Department of Science and Technology, Government of India.

References

[1] CDF collaboration: F. Abe et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 74 (1995) 2626; D$\emptyset$ collaboration: S. Abachi et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 74 (1995) 2632.

[2] Review of Particles Properties, Phys. Rev. D50 (1994) 1173-1826.

[3] J.F. Gunion, H.E. Haber, G. Kane and S. Dawson, The Higgs Hunters' Guide, Addison Wesley, Reading, MA (1990).

[4] V. Barger and R.J.N. Phillips, Phys. Rev. D41 (1990) 884; A.C. Bawa, C.S. Kim and A.D. Martin, Z. Phys. C47 (1990) 75; R.M. Godbole and D.P. Roy, Phys. Rev. D43 (1991) 3640.

[5] M. Drees and D.P. Roy, Phys. Lett. B269 (1991) 155; D.P. Roy, Phys. Lett. B283 (1992) 403.

[6] R.M. Barnett et al., Proc. DPF Summer Study on High Energy Physics, Snowmass (1990); B.K. Bullock, K. Hagiwara and A.D. Martin, Phys. Rev. Lett. 67 (1991) 3055; D.P. Roy, Phys. Lett. B277 (1992) 183.

[7] B.K. Bullock, K. Hagiwara and A.D. Martin, Nucl. Phys. B395 (1993) 499.

[8] Sreerup Raychaudhuri and D.P. Roy, Phys. Rev. D (in press).

[9] V. Barger, J.L. Hewett and R.J.N. Phillips, Phys. Rev. D41 (1990) 3421; J.F. Gunion and B. Grzadkowski, Phys. Lett. B243 (1990) 301; A.J. Buras et al., Nucl. Phys. B337 (1990) 284.

[10] G. Ridolfi, G.G. Ross and F. Zwirner, Proc. ECFA-LHC Workshop, CERN 90-10, Vol. II, (1990) p. 608.

[11] J. Bagger, S. Dimopoulos and E. Masso, Phys. Rev. Lett. 55 (1985) 920.

[12] UA2 Collaboration: J. Alitti et al., Phys. Lett. B280 (1992) 137; UA1 Collaboration: C. Albajar et al., Phys. Lett. B251 (1991) 459.

[13] CDF Collaboration : F. Abe et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 72 (1994) 1977.

[14] Y.S. Tsai, Phys. Rev. D4 (1971) 2821; P. Aurenche and R. Kinnunen, Z. Phys. C28 (1985) 261; K. Hagiwara, A.D. Martin and D. Zeppenfeld, Phys. Lett. B235 (1990) 198.

[15] A. Rouge, Z. Phys. C48 (1990) 75.

[16] J.H. Kuhn and A. Santamaria, Z. Phys. C48 (1990) 445.

[17] N. Isgur, C. Morningstar and C. Reader, Phys. Rev. D39 (1989) 1357.

[18] See e.g. CMS Technical Proposal, CERN/LHCC 94-38 (15 Dec. 1994).

[19] A.D. Martin, R.G. Roberts and W.J. Stirling, Phys. Lett. B306 (1993) 145 and B309 (1993) 492.

Figure Captions

Fig. 1. Distributions of the $\rho^{\pm} \to \pi^{\pm}\pi^0$ and $a_1^{\pm} \to \pi^{\pm}\pi^0\pi^0$ decay widths in the energy fraction carried by the charged pion, shown separately for the transverse and longitudinal states of ρ and a_1 polarization.

Fig. 2. The integrated 1-prong hadronic τ-jet cross-sections are plotted against cut-off values of the jet E_T in (a) without and (b) with the isolation cut. They are plotted against the cutoff-value of ΔE_T of the jet in (c). The $H^{\pm}$ signal ($W^{\pm}$ background) contributions are shown as solid (dashed) lines for $m_H = 120\ GeV$ and dot-dashed (dotted) lines for $m_H = 140\ GeV$. We take $\sqrt{s} = 14\ TeV$ and $\tan\beta = 3$.

Fig. 3. The signal cross-sections of Fig. 2(a,b,c) satisfying a signal to background ratio ≥ 1 are shown as functions of $\tan\beta$ for $m_H = 80, 100, 120, 140, 150, 160$ GeV by solid, dashed, dot-dashed, double dot-dashed, dotted and multidot-dashed lines respectively.

Fig. 4. The signal cross-sections are shown as in Fig. 3, but with an additional cut of $E_T^{jet} < 30\ GeV$ on the second hardest accompanying jet, for $m_H = 140, 150, 160\ GeV$ by solid, dashed and dot-dashed lines respectively.