

Constraints on the off-shell Higgs boson signal strength in the high-mass ZZ and WW final states with the ATLAS detector (Postprint)

Authors: Aad, Georges and others

Date: 2016-09-09T00:00:00+00:00

Abstract

Measurements of the ZZ and WW final states in the mass range above the $2m_Z$ and $2m_W$ thresholds provide a unique opportunity to measure the off-shell coupling strength of the Higgs boson. This paper presents constraints on the off-shell Higgs boson event yields normalised to the Standard Model prediction (signal strength) in the $ZZ \rightarrow 4\ell$, $ZZ \rightarrow 2\ell 2\nu$ and $WW \rightarrow e\nu\mu\nu$ final states. The result is based on pp collision data collected at a collision energy of $\sqrt{s} = 8\text{ TeV}$. Using the CL method, the observed 95% ZZ and $gg \rightarrow WW$ background K -factor from higher-order QCD corrections between half and twice the value of the known signal K -factor. Assuming the relevant Higgs boson couplings are independent of the energy scale of the Higgs production, a shell measurement yields an observed (expected) 95% CL upper limit on Γ_H/Γ_{SMH} in the range $4.5 - 7.5$ ($6.5 - 11.2$) using the same variation of the background K -factor. Assuming that the unknown $gg \rightarrow VV$ background K -factor is equal to the signal K -factor, this translates into an observed (expected) 95% CL upper limit on the Higgs boson total width of 22.7 (33.0) MeV.

Full Text

Constraints on the Off-Shell Higgs Boson Signal Strength in the High-Mass ZZ and WW Final States with the ATLAS Detector

The ATLAS Collaboration

Abstract

Measurements of the ZZ and WW final states in the mass range above the $2m_Z$ and $2m_W$ thresholds provide a unique opportunity to measure the off-shell coupling strength of the Higgs boson. This paper presents constraints on the off-shell Higgs boson event yields normalized to the Standard Model prediction

(signal strength) in the $ZZ \rightarrow 4$, $ZZ \rightarrow 22$, and $WW \rightarrow e\mu$ final states. The result is based on pp collision data collected by the ATLAS experiment at the LHC, corresponding to an integrated luminosity of 20.3 fb^{-1} at a collision energy of $\sqrt{s} = 8 \text{ TeV}$. Using the CLs method, the observed 95% confidence level (CL) upper limit on the off-shell signal strength is in the range 5.1–8.6, with an expected range of 6.7–11.0. In each case the range is determined by varying the unknown $gg \rightarrow ZZ$ and $gg \rightarrow WW$ background K-factor from higher-order QCD corrections between half and twice the value of the known signal K-factor. Assuming the relevant Higgs boson couplings are independent of the energy scale of the Higgs production, a combination with the on-shell measurements yields an observed (expected) 95% CL upper limit on $\Gamma_H/\Gamma_H^{\text{SM}}$ in the range 4.5–7.5 (6.5–11.2) using the same variations of the background K-factor. Assuming that the unknown $gg \rightarrow VV$ background K-factor is equal to the signal K-factor, this translates into an observed (expected) 95% CL upper limit on the Higgs boson total width of 22.7 (33.0) MeV.

1. Introduction

The observation of a new particle in the search for the Standard Model (SM) Higgs boson at the LHC, reported by the ATLAS [?] and CMS [?] Collaborations, is a milestone in the quest to understand electroweak symmetry breaking. Precision measurements of the properties of the new boson are of critical importance. Among its key properties are the couplings to each of the SM fermions and bosons, for which ATLAS and CMS presented results in Refs. [?, ?], and spin/CP properties, studied by ATLAS and CMS in Refs. [?, ?].

The studies in Refs. [7–10] have shown that the high-mass off-peak regions beyond $2m_V$ ($V = Z, W$), well above the measured resonance mass of about 125 GeV [?, ?], in the $H \rightarrow ZZ$ and $H \rightarrow WW$ channels are sensitive to Higgs boson production through off-shell and background interference effects. This presents a novel way of characterizing the properties of the Higgs boson in terms of the off-shell event yields, normalized to the SM prediction (referred to as signal strength μ), and the associated off-shell Higgs boson couplings. Such studies provide sensitivity to new physics that alters the interactions between the Higgs boson and other fundamental particles in the high-mass region [12–18]. This approach was used by the CMS Collaboration [?] to set an indirect limit on the Higgs boson total width. The analysis presented in this paper is complementary to direct searches for Higgs boson to invisible decays [?, ?] and to constraints coming from the Higgs boson coupling tests [?, ?].

This paper presents an analysis of the off-shell signal strength in the $ZZ \rightarrow 4$, $ZZ \rightarrow 22$, and $WW \rightarrow e\mu$ final states ($= e, \mu$). It is structured as follows: Section 2 discusses the key theoretical considerations and the simulation of the main signal and background processes. Sections 3, 4, and 5 give details for the analysis in the $ZZ \rightarrow 4$, $ZZ \rightarrow 22$, and $WW \rightarrow e\mu$ final states, respectively. The dominant systematic uncertainties are discussed in Section 6. Finally, the results of the individual analyses and their combination are presented in Section

7.

The ATLAS detector is described in Ref. [?]. The present analysis is performed on pp collision data corresponding to an integrated luminosity of 20.3 fb^{-1} at a collision energy of $\sqrt{s} = 8 \text{ TeV}$.

2. Theoretical Predictions and Simulated Samples

The cross-section $\sigma_{\{gg \rightarrow H^* \rightarrow VV\}}$ for the off-shell Higgs boson production through gluon fusion with subsequent decay into vector-boson pairs, as illustrated by the Feynman diagram in Fig. 1 (Figure 1: see original paper), is proportional to the product of the Higgs boson couplings squared for production and decay. However, unlike the on-shell Higgs boson production, $\sigma_{\{gg \rightarrow H^* \rightarrow VV\}}$ is independent of the total Higgs boson decay width Γ_H [?, ?].

Using the framework for Higgs boson coupling deviations as described in Ref. [?], the off-shell signal strength in the high-mass region selected by the analysis described in this paper at an energy scale \hat{s} , $\mu_{\{\text{off}\}\text{-shell}}(\hat{s})$, can be expressed as:

$$\mu_{\{\text{off}\}\text{-shell}}(\hat{s}) = \frac{\sigma_{\{gg \rightarrow H^* \rightarrow VV\}}^{\{\text{off}\}\text{-shell}}(\hat{s})}{\sigma_{\{gg \rightarrow H^* \rightarrow VV\}}^{\{\text{off}\}\text{-shell, SM}}(\hat{s})} = \frac{\kappa_{g, \text{off-shell}}^2(\hat{s}) \cdot \kappa_{V, \text{off-shell}}^2(\hat{s})}{\Gamma_H^{\{\text{SM}\}} / \Gamma_H}$$

where $\kappa_{g, \text{off-shell}}(\hat{s})$ and $\kappa_{V, \text{off-shell}}(\hat{s})$ are the off-shell coupling scale factors associated with the $gg \rightarrow H^*$ production and the $H^* \rightarrow VV$ decay. Due to the statistically limited sensitivity of the current analysis, the off-shell signal strength and coupling scale factors are assumed in the following to be independent of \hat{s} in the high-mass region selected by the analysis. The off-shell Higgs boson signal cannot be treated independently from the $gg \rightarrow VV$ background, as sizeable negative interference effects appear [?]. The interference term is proportional to $\mu_{\{\text{off}\}\text{-shell}} = \kappa_{g, \text{off-shell}} \cdot \kappa_{V, \text{off-shell}}$.

In contrast, the cross-section for on-shell Higgs boson production allows a measurement of the signal strength:

$$\mu_{\{\text{on}\}\text{-shell}} = \frac{\sigma_{\{gg \rightarrow H \rightarrow VV\}}^{\{\text{on}\}\text{-shell}}}{\sigma_{\{gg \rightarrow H \rightarrow VV\}}^{\{\text{on}\}\text{-shell, SM}}} = \frac{\kappa_{g, \text{on-shell}}^2 \cdot \kappa_{V, \text{on-shell}}^2 \cdot (\Gamma_H^{\{\text{SM}\}} / \Gamma_H)}{\Gamma_H^{\{\text{SM}\}} / \Gamma_H}$$

which depends on the total width Γ_H . Assuming identical on-shell and off-shell Higgs boson coupling scale factors, the ratio of $\mu_{\{\text{off}\}\text{-shell}}$ to $\mu_{\{\text{on}\}\text{-shell}}$ provides a measurement of the total width of the Higgs boson.

This assumption is particularly relevant to the running of the effective coupling $\kappa_g(\hat{s})$ for the loop-induced $gg \rightarrow H$ production process, as it is sensitive to new physics that enters at higher mass scales and could be probed in the high-mass $m_{\{VV\}}$ signal region of this analysis. More details are given in Refs. [12-16].

With the current sensitivity of the analysis, only an upper limit on the total width Γ_H can be determined, for which the weaker assumption $\kappa_{g, \text{on-shell}}^2 \cdot$

$\mu_{V,\text{on-shell}}^2 \leq \mu_{g,\text{off-shell}}^2 \cdot \mu_{V,\text{off-shell}}^2$, that the on-shell couplings are no larger than the off-shell couplings, is sufficient. It is also assumed that any new physics which modifies the off-shell signal strength $\mu_{\text{off-shell}}$ and the off-shell couplings $\mu_{i,\text{off-shell}}$ does not modify the predictions for the backgrounds. Further, neither are there sizeable kinematic modifications to the off-shell signal nor new, sizeable signals in the search region of this analysis unrelated to an enhanced off-shell signal strength [?, ?].

While higher-order quantum chromodynamics (QCD) and electroweak (EW) corrections are known for the off-shell signal process $gg \rightarrow H^* \rightarrow ZZ$ [?], which are also applicable to $gg \rightarrow H^* \rightarrow WW$, no higher-order QCD calculations are available for the $gg \rightarrow VV$ background process, which is evaluated at leading order (LO). Therefore the results are given as a function of the unknown K-factor for the $gg \rightarrow VV$ background. QCD corrections for the off-shell signal processes have only been calculated inclusively in the jet multiplicity. The experimental analyses are therefore performed inclusively in jet observables and the event selections are designed to minimise the dependence on the boost of the VV system, which is sensitive to the jet multiplicity.

The dominant processes contributing to the high-mass signal region in the $ZZ \rightarrow 4$, $ZZ \rightarrow 2\gamma$, and $WW \rightarrow e\mu$ final states are: the $gg \rightarrow H^* \rightarrow VV$ off-shell signal, the $gg \rightarrow VV$ continuum background, the interference between them, VV production in association with two jets through VBF and VH-like production modes $pp \rightarrow VV + 2j$ (s-, t- and u-channel), and the $\bar{q}q \rightarrow VV$ background. The LO Feynman diagrams for the $gg \rightarrow H^* \rightarrow VV$ signal, the continuum $gg \rightarrow VV$ background, and the dominant irreducible $\bar{q}q \rightarrow VV$ background are depicted in Fig. 1 [Figure 1: see original paper]. The $WW \rightarrow e\mu$ channel also receives sizeable background contributions from $\bar{t}t$ and single-top production. In the following, a Higgs boson mass of $m_H = 125.5$ GeV, close to the ATLAS-measured Higgs boson mass of 125.36 GeV [?], is assumed for the off-shell signal processes. This small difference has a negligible impact on the predicted off-shell production yields.

Figure 2 [Figure 2: see original paper] illustrates the size and kinematic properties of the gluon-induced signal and background processes by showing the four-lepton invariant mass ($m_{4\ell}$) distribution for the $gg \rightarrow (H^* \rightarrow)ZZ \rightarrow 2e2\mu$ processes after applying the event selections in the $ZZ \rightarrow 4$ channel (see Section 3) on generator-level quantities. The process $gg \rightarrow (H^* \rightarrow)ZZ \rightarrow 2e2\mu$ is shown for the SM $\mu_{\text{off-shell}} = 1$ case and for an increased off-shell signal with $\mu_{\text{off-shell}} = 10$. For low masses $m_{ZZ} < 2m_Z$, the off-shell signal is negligible, while it becomes comparable to the continuum $gg \rightarrow ZZ$ background for masses above the $2m_t$ threshold. The interference between the $gg \rightarrow H^* \rightarrow ZZ$ signal and the $gg \rightarrow ZZ$ background is negative over the whole mass range. A very similar relation between the $gg \rightarrow H^* \rightarrow VV$ signal and the $gg \rightarrow VV$ background is also seen for the $gg \rightarrow (H^* \rightarrow)ZZ \rightarrow 2\gamma$ and $gg \rightarrow (H^* \rightarrow)WW \rightarrow e\mu$ processes.

The detector simulation for most generated Monte Carlo (MC) event samples

is performed using Geant4 [?, ?]. Some background MC samples in the $WW \rightarrow e\mu$ analysis for processes with large cross-sections are simulated with the fast detector simulation package Atlfast-II [?].

2.1. Simulation of $gg \rightarrow (H^* \rightarrow)VV$

To generate the $gg \rightarrow H^* \rightarrow VV$ and $gg \rightarrow VV$ processes, including the interference, the LO MC generators gg2VV [?, ?] and MCFM [?, ?] together with PYTHIA8 [?] and SHERPA+OpenLoops [30-33] are used. The QCD renormalisation and factorisation scales are set to $m_{\{VV\}}/2$ [?]. The CT10 next-to-next-to-leading-order (NNLO) PDF set [?] is used, as the LO $gg \rightarrow VV$ process is part of the NNLO calculation for $pp \rightarrow VV$. The default parton showering and hadronisation option for the events processed with the full detector simulation is PYTHIA8 with the “power shower” parton shower option [?].

For the $gg \rightarrow H^* \rightarrow VV$ signal, a NNLO/LO K-factor including the next-to-leading-order (NLO) electroweak corrections, $K_{H^{\{gg\}} \rightarrow H \rightarrow VV}$, is applied. The K-factor and associated uncertainties are calculated in Ref. [?] as a function of the Higgs boson virtuality $m_{\{VV\}}$ for $m_H = 125.5$ GeV, using the MSTW2008 PDF set [?]. Additional corrections are used to re-weight the predictions to the CT10 NNLO PDF set used in the simulation.

For the $gg \rightarrow VV$ background and the interference with the $gg \rightarrow H^* \rightarrow VV$ signal, no higher-order QCD calculations are available. However, these corrections are studied for the WW final state in Ref. [?] in the soft-collinear approximation, which is considered suitable for high-mass Higgs boson production. In this approximation, the signal K-factor is found to provide a reliable estimate for the higher-order QCD corrections to the signal-background interference term.

The K-factor for the $gg \rightarrow VV$ background process, $K(gg \rightarrow VV)$, remains unknown. Therefore, the results in this note are given as a function of the unknown K-factor ratio between the $gg \rightarrow VV$ background and the $gg \rightarrow H^* \rightarrow VV$ signal, defined as:

$$R_{B \rightarrow H^*} = K(gg \rightarrow VV)/K(gg \rightarrow H^* \rightarrow VV) = K_B(m_{\{VV\}})/K_{H^{\{gg\}}}(m_{\{VV\}})$$

where $K_B(m_{\{VV\}})$ is the unknown mass-dependent K-factor for the $gg \rightarrow VV$ background, and $K_{H^{\{gg\}}}(m_{\{VV\}})$ is the gluon-initiated K-factor [?] for the signal as motivated by the soft-collinear approximation in Ref. [?]. Because the K-factor $K_{H^{\{gg\}}}(m_{\{VV\}})$ changes by less than 10% as a function of $m_{\{VV\}}$ in the relevant region of phase space, no mass dependence on $R_{B \rightarrow H^*}$ is assumed. The range 0.5-2 is chosen for the variation of the K-factor ratio $R_{B \rightarrow H^*}$. With respect to the LO $gg \rightarrow VV$ process, this corresponds to an absolute variation in the approximate range 1-4.

Using the K-factors discussed above, the cross-section for the $gg \rightarrow (H^* \rightarrow)VV$ process with any off-shell Higgs boson signal strength $\mu_{\text{off-shell}}$ can be parameterised as:

$$\sigma\{gg\rightarrow(H\rightarrow)VV\}(\mu_{\text{off-shell}}, m_{\{VV\}}) = K_{H\{gg\}}(m_{\{VV\}}) \cdot \mu_{\text{off-shell}} \cdot \sigma\{SM\}^{\{gg\}\rightarrow H\rightarrow VV}(m_{\{VV\}}) + K_{H\{gg\}}(m_{\{VV\}}) \cdot R_{B\hat{H}^*} \cdot \sqrt{\mu_{\text{off-shell}}} \cdot \sigma\{SM\}^{\{gg\}\rightarrow VV, Interference}(m_{\{VV\}}) + K_{H\{gg\}}(m_{\{VV\}}) \cdot R_{B\hat{H}} \cdot \sigma\{gg\}\rightarrow VV, cont(m_{\{VV\}})$$

More details are given in Appendix A.1.

In addition, higher-order QCD corrections to the transverse momentum p_T and the rapidity y of the VV system are studied using SHERPA+OpenLoops, which includes matrix-element calculations for the first hard jet emission. A difference of order 20% in the ratio of the p_T of the VV system in the relevant kinematic region is observed when comparing the LO generators with parton shower to SHERPA+OpenLoops, while the difference in the rapidity y of the VV system is small. This difference in the p_T of the VV system can modify the kinematic observables used in the analyses, leading to variations in both the kinematic shapes and acceptance which are not covered by the $m_{\{VV\}}$ dependent systematic uncertainties derived in Ref. [?]. To account for these effects, the LO generators are re-weighted to SHERPA+OpenLoops in the p_T of the VV system. Due to the different jet emission mechanisms in the signal and the background processes, different re-weighting functions are derived for the $gg \rightarrow H^* \rightarrow VV$ signal, the $gg \rightarrow VV$ background, and the total $gg \rightarrow (H^* \rightarrow)VV$, respectively. The impact of the re-weighting on the acceptance is below 1% for the signal and at the level of 4-6% for the background. In the $ZZ \rightarrow 4$ channel, the re-weighting procedure is only used to account for the acceptance effects, as the matrix-element-based discriminant is insensitive to the p_T of the ZZ system. For the $ZZ \rightarrow 2 2$ channel, the re-weighting is used in both the transverse mass shape and acceptance as the m_T depends on the p_T of the ZZ system. For the $WW \rightarrow e \mu$ channel, the re-weighting affects only the acceptance.

2.2. Simulation of Electroweak VV Production through VBF and VH-like Processes

The electroweak $pp \rightarrow VV + 2j$ processes contain both VBF-like events and VH-like events, which are simulated using MadGraph5 [?] and cross-checked using PHANTOM [?]. The QCD renormalisation and factorisation scales are set to m_W following the recommendation in Ref. [?] and the CTEQ6L1 PDF set [?] is used. PYTHIA6 [?] is used for parton showering and hadronisation.

The high-mass range selected by this analysis includes Higgs boson signal events arising from: - The off-shell VBF $H \rightarrow VV$ process, which scales with $\mu_{V, \text{off-shell}}^4$ and is independent of Γ_H - VBF-like VV processes with a t -channel Higgs boson exchange, which scales with $\mu_{V, \text{off-shell}}^4$ and are independent of Γ_H - WH and ZH processes with an on-shell Higgs boson, with decays $Z \rightarrow 2$ or $W \rightarrow 2$ and $H \rightarrow 2 2j$ or $H \rightarrow 2j$, which scale with $\mu_{V, \text{on-shell}}^4/\Gamma_H$

where we assume the same coupling strength $\mu_{V, \text{off-shell}}$ in the two VBF-like contributions, although the energy scale of the Higgs boson propagator is

different between the two cases. Due to the different Γ_H dependence, the on-shell and off-shell Higgs boson production processes are separated in the analysis by requiring that the generated Higgs boson mass satisfies $|m_{H^{\text{gen}}} - 125.5 \text{ GeV}| < 1 \text{ GeV}$. This requirement is fully efficient in selecting the on-shell VH process. The NNLO QCD corrected cross-section in Ref. [?] is used for the on-shell VH production process. The cross-section $\sigma\{pp \rightarrow VV+2j\}(\mu_{\text{off-shell}})$ for the electroweak $pp \rightarrow VV + 2j$ process for any off-shell Higgs boson signal strength $\mu_{\text{off-shell}}$ is parameterised in the same way as for the $gg \rightarrow (H^* \rightarrow)VV$ process. Details are given in Appendix A.2.

2.3. Simulation of $\bar{q}q \rightarrow ZZ, WW, \text{ and } WZ$ Backgrounds

The $\bar{q}q \rightarrow ZZ, \bar{q}q \rightarrow WW, \text{ and } \bar{q}q \rightarrow WZ$ backgrounds are simulated at NLO in QCD using POWHEG-BOX [?] with dynamic QCD renormalisation and factorisation scales of $m_{\{VV\}}$ and the CT10 NLO PDF set. In addition, SHERPA is used as a cross-check for the $\bar{q}q \rightarrow WZ$ background. Parton showering and hadronisation are done with PYTHIA8 for $\bar{q}q \rightarrow VZ$ and PYTHIA6 for $\bar{q}q \rightarrow WW$. The interference between the $\bar{q}q \rightarrow WW$ and $\bar{q}q \rightarrow ZZ$ processes for the 2×2 final state is negligible [?] and thus not considered.

The cross-sections for the $\bar{q}q \rightarrow ZZ$ and $\bar{q}q \rightarrow WW$ processes are calculated in Ref. [?] and Ref. [?], respectively, for two on-shell Z or W bosons in the final state at NNLO QCD accuracy. As these calculations include the $gg \rightarrow VV$ processes as part of the NNLO calculation, a different K-factor is provided by the authors of Refs. [?, ?] excluding the $gg \rightarrow VV$ component and using a QCD renormalisation and factorisation scale μ_{QCD} of $m_{\{VV\}}/2$ in order to consistently match the simulation of the $gg \rightarrow (H^* \rightarrow)VV$ process:

$$K_{\bar{q}q}(m_{\{VV\}}) = [\sigma\{NNLO\}^{\bar{q}q \rightarrow VV}(m_{\{VV\}}, \mu_{\text{QCD}} = m_{\{VV\}}/2) - \sigma\{LO\}^{\bar{q}q \rightarrow VV}(m_{\{VV\}}, \mu_{\text{QCD}} = m_{\{VV\}}/2)] / \sigma\{LO\}^{\bar{q}q \rightarrow VV}(m_{\{VV\}}, \mu_{\text{QCD}} = m_{\{VV\}})$$

Electroweak higher-order corrections are not included in POWHEG-BOX. These corrections are calculated in Refs. [?, ?] for on-shell outgoing vector bosons and found to be about -10% in the high-mass VV region of this analysis. To account for these corrections, the POWHEG-BOX events are re-weighted using a procedure comparable to the one described in Ref. [?], based on the kinematics of the diboson system and the initial state quarks.

2.4. Simulation of Top-Quark Backgrounds

In the $WW \rightarrow e\mu$ channel, the $\bar{t}t$ and single-top (s-channel and Wt) backgrounds are simulated with POWHEG-BOX [?, ?] with parton showering and hadronisation done with PYTHIA6, using the CT10 NLO PDF set. The t-channel single-top background is simulated using AcerMC [?]+PYTHIA6 and uses the CTEQ6LI PDF set. The relative rates of $\bar{t}t$ and single-top production are evaluated with Top++2.0 [?] and the calculations in Refs. [52-54] respectively.

3. Analysis of the $ZZ \rightarrow 4$ Final State

The analysis for the $ZZ \rightarrow 4$ final state closely follows the Higgs boson measurements in the same final state described in Ref. [?], with the same physics object definitions, trigger and event selections, and background estimation methods. A matrix-element-based discriminant (ME-based discriminant) is constructed to enhance the separation between the $gg \rightarrow H^* \rightarrow ZZ$ signal and the $gg \rightarrow ZZ$ and $\bar{q}q \rightarrow ZZ$ backgrounds, and is subsequently used in a binned maximum-likelihood fit for the final result.

3.1. Event Selection

To minimise the dependence of the $gg \rightarrow ZZ$ kinematics on higher-order QCD effects, the analysis is performed inclusively, ignoring the number of jets in the events. The analysis is split into four lepton channels ($2\mu 2e$, $2e 2\mu$, $4e$, 4μ) as in Ref. [?]. Each electron (muon) must satisfy $E_T > 7$ GeV ($p_T > 6$ GeV) and be measured in the pseudorapidity range $|\eta| < 2.47$ ($|\eta| < 2.7$). The highest- p_T lepton in the quadruplet must satisfy $p_T > 20$ GeV, and the second (third) lepton in p_T order must satisfy $p_T > 15$ GeV ($p_T > 10$ GeV). Lepton pairs are formed from same-flavour opposite-charge leptons. For each channel, the lepton pair with the mass closest to the Z boson mass is referred to as the leading dilepton pair and its invariant mass, m_{12} , is required to be between 50 GeV and 106 GeV. The second (subleading) pair is chosen from the remaining leptons (more than four leptons are allowed per event) as the pair closest in mass to the Z boson and in the range of $50 \text{ GeV} < m_{34} < 115$ GeV. The off-peak region is defined to include the range from $220 \text{ GeV} < m_4 < 1000$ GeV.

Figure 3: see original paper shows the observed and expected distributions of m_4 combining all lepton channels in the full off-peak region. The data are in agreement with the SM predictions, with a small deficit of the order of one standard deviation (1σ). Table 1 shows the expected and observed number of events in the signal-enriched region, $400 \text{ GeV} < m_4 < 1000$ GeV, combining all lepton channels. This mass region was chosen since it is optimal for a m_4 cut-based analysis.

3.2. Matrix-Element-Based Kinematic Discriminant

The matrix-element kinematic discriminant fully exploits the event kinematics in the centre-of-mass frame of the 4 system, based on eight observables: $\{m_4, m_{12}, m_{34}, \cos \theta_1, \cos \theta_2, \phi, \cos^*, \phi_1\}$, defined in Refs. [?, ?]. These observables are used to create the four-momenta of the leptons and incoming partons, which are then used to calculate matrix elements for different processes, provided by the MCFM program [?]. The following matrix elements are calculated for each event in the mass range $220 \text{ GeV} < m_4 < 1000$ GeV:

- $P_{\bar{q}q}$: matrix element squared for the $\bar{q}q \rightarrow ZZ \rightarrow 4$ process
- P_{gg} : matrix element squared for the $gg \rightarrow (H^* \rightarrow)ZZ \rightarrow 4$ process

including the Higgs boson ($m_H = 125.5$ GeV) with SM couplings, continuum background and their interference

- P_H : matrix element squared for the $gg \rightarrow H^* \rightarrow ZZ \rightarrow 4$ process ($m_H = 125.5$ GeV)

The kinematic discriminant is defined as in Ref. [?]:

$$ME = \log_{10}(P_{gg} + c \cdot P_{\bar{q}q})$$

where $c = 0.1$ is an empirical constant, to approximately balance the overall cross-sections of the $\bar{q}q \rightarrow ZZ$ and $gg \rightarrow (H^* \rightarrow)ZZ$ processes. The value of c has a very small effect on the analysis sensitivity.

Figure 3(b) shows the observed and expected distributions of the ME-based discriminant combining all lepton final states. Events with the ME-based discriminant value between -4.5 and 0.5 are selected with a signal efficiency of > 99%. A relative $gg \rightarrow ZZ$ background K-factor of $R_{B^*H^*} = 1.0$ is assumed. The Z+jets and top-quark backgrounds are barely visible in the plot since they are very small (<1% of the total background).

In addition, an alternative multivariate discriminant based on a boosted decision tree (BDT) algorithm was studied to further separate the $gg \rightarrow H^* \rightarrow ZZ$ signal and the main $\bar{q}q \rightarrow ZZ$ background, by exploiting additional kinematic information (p_T and η) of the ZZ system. The analysis sensitivity improves very little (2%) compared to the ME-based discriminant alone. Due to the dependence on the p_T of the ZZ system, the BDT-based discriminant introduces additional systematic uncertainties from the higher-order QCD corrections. For these reasons, the BDT-based discriminant is not used for the final result.

4. Analysis of the $ZZ \rightarrow 2\ell 2\ell$ Final State

The analysis of the $ZZ \rightarrow 2\ell 2\ell$ channel follows strategies similar to those used in the invisible Higgs boson search in the ZH channel [?]. The definitions of the reconstructed physics objects (electrons, muons, jets, and missing transverse momentum) are identical, but some of the kinematic cuts were optimised for the current analysis.

4.1. Event Selection

As the neutrinos in the final state do not allow for a kinematic reconstruction of m_{ZZ} , the transverse mass $m_{T^{\perp}}\{ZZ\}$ and the magnitude of the missing transverse momentum ($E_{T^{\perp}}\{\text{miss}\}$) reconstructed from the transverse momentum of the dilepton system ($p_{T^{\perp}}\{\ell\ell\}$) are used as discriminating variables to enhance sensitivity to the $gg \rightarrow H^* \rightarrow ZZ$ signal. The transverse mass is defined as:

$$m_{T^{\perp}}\{ZZ\} = \sqrt{(\sqrt{(p_{T^{\perp}}\{\ell\ell\})^2 + m_{\ell}^2} + E_{T^{\perp}}\{\text{miss}\})^2 - |p_{T^{\perp}}\{\ell\ell\} + E_{T^{\perp}}\{\text{miss}\}|^2}$$

The selection criteria are optimised to maximise the signal significance with respect to the main backgrounds, which are ZZ, WZ, WW, top-quark, and W/Z+jets events, as described in Section 4.2. The impact of the background uncertainty is considered in the significance calculation.

First, events with two oppositely charged electron or muon candidates in the Z mass window $76 \text{ GeV} < m_{\ell\ell} < 106 \text{ GeV}$ are selected. Events with a third lepton (e or μ) identified using looser identification criteria for the electrons and a lower p_{T} threshold of 7 GeV are rejected. A series of selection requirements are necessary to suppress the Drell-Yan background, including: $E_{\text{T}}^{\text{miss}} > 180 \text{ GeV}$; $380 \text{ GeV} < m_{\text{T}}^{\text{ZZ}} < 1000 \text{ GeV}$; the azimuthal angle between the transverse momentum of the dilepton system and the missing transverse momentum $\Delta\phi(p_{\text{T}}^{\ell\ell}, E_{\text{T}}^{\text{miss}}) < 0.3$; and $|E_{\text{T}}^{\text{miss}} - p_{\text{T}}^{\ell\ell}|/p_{\text{T}}^{\ell\ell} > 2.5$. Events with a b-jet with $p_{\text{T}} > 20 \text{ GeV}$ and $|b| < 2.5$, identified by the MV1 algorithm [?, ?] with 70% tagging efficiency, are rejected to suppress the top-quark background. Finally, the selection on the azimuthal angle between the two leptons $\Delta\phi_{\ell\ell} < 1.4$ is applied to select events with boosted Z bosons to further discriminate the signal from the background.

4.2. Background Estimation

The dominant background is $\bar{q}q \rightarrow ZZ$ production, followed by $\bar{q}q \rightarrow WZ$ production. Background contributions from events with a genuine isolated lepton pair, not originating from a $Z \rightarrow ee$ or $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ decay, arise from the WW, $\bar{t}t$, Wt, and $Z \rightarrow \tau\tau$ processes. The remaining backgrounds are from $Z \rightarrow ee$ or $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$ decays with poorly reconstructed $E_{\text{T}}^{\text{miss}}$, and from events with at least one misidentified electron or muon coming from W+jets, semileptonic top decays ($\bar{t}t$ and single top), and multi-jet events.

The $\bar{q}q \rightarrow ZZ$ background is estimated in the same way as for the $ZZ \rightarrow 4$ analysis using the POWHEG-BOX simulation as described in Section 2.3. The WZ background is also estimated with the simulation (described in Section 2.3) and validated with data in a three-lepton control region. The observed number of events in the control region for $E_{\text{T}}^{\text{miss}} > 180 \text{ GeV}$ (300 GeV) is 30 (3), whereas the predicted event yield is 22.9 ± 0.8 (3.4 ± 0.3). No significant difference is observed between the data and simulation.

The WW, $\bar{t}t$, Wt, and $Z \rightarrow \tau\tau$ backgrounds are inclusively estimated with data assuming lepton flavour symmetry in an $e\mu$ control region using a relaxed selection. The following equations show how these backgrounds in the signal region can be estimated with $e\mu$ events:

$$N_{\text{bkg}}^{\text{ee}} = (1/2) \times N_{\text{data}, \text{sub}}^{\text{e}\mu} \times \alpha N_{\text{bkg}}^{\mu\mu} = (1/2) \times N_{\text{data}, \text{sub}}^{\text{e}\mu} \times (1/\alpha)$$

where $N_{\text{bkg}}^{\text{ee}}$ and $N_{\text{bkg}}^{\mu\mu}$ are the number of dielectron and dimuon events in the signal region. $N_{\text{data}, \text{sub}}^{\text{e}\mu}$ is the number of events in the $e\mu$ control region with WZ, ZZ, and other small backgrounds

(W +jets, $t\bar{t}V$, and triboson) subtracted using simulation. The different e and μ efficiencies are taken into account using the α variable, which is an efficiency correction factor determined from the ratio of dielectron to dimuon event yields after the inclusive Z mass requirement ($76 \text{ GeV} < m_{\ell\ell} < 106 \text{ GeV}$). The measured value of α is 0.942 with a systematic uncertainty of 0.004 and a negligible statistical uncertainty. This scale factor is applied to the MC predictions. The other source of systematic uncertainty comes from the subtraction of WZ , ZZ , and other small backgrounds in the $e\mu$ control region using the simulation. As no data event remains after applying the full selection, a scale factor of 1.4 ± 0.3 is derived by comparing the event yields from the data-driven and MC predictions with a relaxed selection applying the $E_{T^{\text{miss}}}$ requirements but no further cuts. Experimental systematic uncertainties are considered for the MC predictions.

Imperfect modelling of detector non-uniformities and $E_{T^{\text{miss}}}$ response could lead to an incorrect estimate of the Z boson background in the signal region. The Z boson background is estimated with data using the two-dimensional sideband regions constructed by reversing one or both of the $\Delta\phi(p_{T^{\text{miss}}}, E_{T^{\text{miss}}})$ and $\Delta\phi_{\ell}$ selections [?]. The main uncertainty on the mis-measured Z boson background arises from the differences in shape of the $E_{T^{\text{miss}}}$ distributions in the signal and sideband regions and the small correlation between these two variables. Other systematic uncertainties originate from the subtraction of the non- Z boson backgrounds in the sideband regions.

The W +jets and multi-jet backgrounds are estimated from data using the fake-factor method [?]. The predicted background with a looser $E_{T^{\text{miss}}}$ selection applied at 100 GeV, and without the $m_{T^{\text{ZZ}}}$ selection, is 0.04 ± 0.01 events. No event remains after applying the full event selection for both the data-driven method and MC samples, and hence this background is estimated to be negligible.

The predicted signals and backgrounds with statistical and systematic uncertainties are summarised in Table 1. The observed event yields agree with the total predicted ones from the SM within the uncertainties. Figure 4[Figure 4: see original paper] shows the distributions of $m_{T^{\text{ZZ}}}$ for the ee and $\mu\mu$ channels in the signal region, compared to the predicted contributions from the SM as well as to a Higgs boson with $\mu_{\text{off-shell}} = 10$.

5. Analysis of the $WW \rightarrow e\mu$ Final State

The analysis of the $WW \rightarrow e\mu$ channel closely follows the Higgs boson measurements in the oppositely charged electron-muon pair final state in Ref. [?]. This selection ensures orthogonality with the $ZZ \rightarrow 22$ final state. The same object identification and selection as in Ref. [?] is used in this analysis. Additionally, an event selection identical to that used for the gluon fusion initial states in $H \rightarrow WW \rightarrow e\mu$ is used, up to and including a requirement on missing

transverse momentum: leading lepton $p_{T} > 22$ GeV, subleading lepton $p_{T} > 10$ GeV, $m_{\ell\ell} > 10$ GeV, and $p_{T}^{\text{miss,track}} > 20$ GeV, the magnitude of the missing transverse momentum, with a track-based soft term. The signal region (SR) and background estimations were revised for the high-mass region used in this analysis. Contrary to the base analysis [?], events are not binned by the number of jets. Top-quark events and SM WW production remain the largest expected backgrounds.

5.1. Event Selection

As with the $ZZ \rightarrow 2\ell 2\nu$ channel, the neutrinos in the final state do not allow for a kinematic reconstruction of $m_{\ell\nu}$. Thus a transverse mass (m_{T}^{WW}) is calculated from the dilepton system transverse energy ($E_{T}^{\ell\ell}$), the vector sum of lepton transverse momenta ($\vec{p}_{T}^{\ell\ell}$), and the vector sum of neutrino transverse momenta ($\vec{p}_{T}^{\text{miss,track}}$), measured with $p_{T}^{\text{miss,track}}$:

$$m_{T}^{\text{WW}} = \sqrt{(E_{T}^{\ell\ell} + p_{T}^{\text{miss,track}})^2 - |\vec{p}_{T}^{\ell\ell} + \vec{p}_{T}^{\text{miss,track}}|^2}$$

where $E_{T}^{\ell\ell} = \sqrt{(\vec{p}_{T}^{\ell\ell})^2 + (m_{\ell\ell})^2}$. The transverse mass is modified compared to the definition in Eq. (8) as the neutrinos do not come from the same parent particle, and there is no m_{Z} constraint.

In order to isolate the off-shell Higgs boson production while minimising the impact of higher-order QCD effects on $gg \rightarrow WW$ kinematics, a new variable, R_8 , is introduced:

$$R_8 = \sqrt{(m_{\ell\ell})^2 + (a \cdot m_{T}^{\text{WW}})^2}$$

Both the coefficient $a = 0.8$ and the requirement $R_8 > 450$ GeV are optimised for off-shell signal sensitivity while also rejecting on-shell Higgs boson events, which have relatively low values of $m_{\ell\ell}$ and m_{T}^{WW} . The predicted on-shell signal contamination is 0.04 ± 0.03 (stat.) events. The MV1 algorithm, at 85% efficiency, is used to reject b-jets with $p_{T} > 20$ GeV and $|\eta| < 2.4$ in order to reject backgrounds containing top quarks. A more efficient working point for b-jet tagging is used compared to the $ZZ \rightarrow 2\ell 2\nu$ analysis because of the need to reject a substantially larger top-quark background. A requirement on the separation between leptons, $\Delta_{\ell\ell} < 1.2$, suppresses $\bar{q}q$ -initiated WW production relative to gg -initiated production. The b-jet veto and $\Delta_{\ell\ell}$ requirement are found to have a minimal impact on the WW-system kinematics and jet multiplicity in the $gg \rightarrow (H^* \rightarrow)WW$ processes. Table 1 contains the predicted and observed event yields in the signal region, 90 ± 4 and 82 respectively, in agreement with the SM with a small deficit in data. The distribution of the R_8 variable in the signal region is shown in Fig. 5. Figure 5: see original paper for the SM expectation and for a Higgs boson with $\mu_{\text{off-shell}} = 10$.

5.2. Background Estimation

The dominant backgrounds arise from processes with real W bosons in the final state. The two backgrounds with the largest expected event yield are top-quark

and $\bar{q}q \rightarrow WW$ production. Dedicated control regions (CRs) are constructed to normalise these two backgrounds in the signal region with a simultaneous fit. Uncertainties on the extrapolation from the CRs to the signal region are described in Sections 6.2 and 6.3.

The top-quark background predictions in the signal and WW control region are both normalised from the same top CR. A sample of top-quark events is obtained by starting from the signal region and reversing the b-jet veto by requiring exactly one b-tagged jet. This is closer in phase space to the b-jet-vetoed signal region than requiring at least one b-tag and results in a smaller uncertainty. The statistical error on the top-quark background normalisation is reduced by expanding the top CR down to $R_8 > 160$ GeV and dropping the Δ_0 requirement. The impact of these changes is discussed in Section 6.3. An event yield of 13498 events is observed in the top CR (Fig. 5(a)), resulting in a fit normalisation factor of 1.03 ± 0.04 , where the uncertainty includes all systematic sources, including extrapolation uncertainties described in Section 6.3. The top CR is approximately 96% pure in top-quark events.

The $\bar{q}q \rightarrow WW$ background is normalised to data using an additional CR. The region $160 \text{ GeV} < R_8 < 450 \text{ GeV}$ without the Δ_0 requirement is used because it has a large WW contribution with negligible on-shell Higgs boson contamination and is adjacent to the signal region. A b-jet veto is applied to reject part of the substantial top-quark contamination. An event yield of 8007 events is observed in the WW CR (Fig. 5(b)), resulting in a fit normalisation factor of 1.03 ± 0.11 , including all of the uncertainties as above. This CR is approximately 46% pure in $\bar{q}q \rightarrow WW$, while the leading background of top-quark events contributes 39%. The gg-initiated WW background is estimated from MC simulation, as discussed in Section 2.1.

The remaining background predictions, except for W+jets and multi-jet production, are taken from MC simulation, as described in Ref. [?]. The predicted fraction of the total background in the signal region arising from $gg \rightarrow WW$, W+jets, and $W\gamma/W\gamma^*/WZ/ZZ$ events is approximately 4% each, while for Z+jets it is 2%. The W+jets and multi-jet backgrounds are estimated by applying a data-driven extrapolation factor to CRs with lepton candidates failing the nominal lepton identification and isolation, while passing a loosened requirement [?].

6. Systematic Uncertainties

The largest systematic uncertainties for this analysis arise from theoretical uncertainties on the $gg \rightarrow H^* \rightarrow VV$ signal process, the $gg/\bar{q}q \rightarrow VV$ background processes, and the interference between the $gg \rightarrow VV$ signal and background processes. The electroweak ($H^* \rightarrow VV$) processes in association with two jets contribute about 10-30% of the total signal. The associated theoretical uncertainties due to the missing higher-order corrections and PDF variations are small for VH-like and VBF-like processes $pp \rightarrow ZZ + 2j$, and are therefore not included in the analysis. Compared to the theoretical uncertainties, the experi-

mental uncertainties are small in the $ZZ \rightarrow 2\gamma$ and $WW \rightarrow e\mu$ analyses and close to negligible in the $ZZ \rightarrow 4\ell$ analysis. In the $ZZ \rightarrow 2\gamma$ and $WW \rightarrow e\mu$ analyses, uncertainties on the extrapolations from the control regions to the signal regions are included.

6.1. Systematic Uncertainties on $gg \rightarrow (H^* \rightarrow)VV$

The uncertainty from missing higher-order QCD and EW corrections to the off-shell $gg \rightarrow H^* \rightarrow VV$ signal is estimated in Ref. [?] as a function of the Higgs boson virtuality, $m_{\{VV\}}$, and adopted for this analysis. The uncertainty is 20-30% for the high-mass region used in this analysis. The PDF uncertainty for the $gg \rightarrow (H^* \rightarrow)VV$ process as a function of $m_{\{VV\}}$ is found to be 10-20% in the high-mass region used in this analysis. This is consistent with an earlier study at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV [?].

For the $gg \rightarrow VV$ background, higher-order QCD calculations are not available. As discussed in Section 2.1, the gluon-induced part of the signal K-factor $K_{H^* \rightarrow VV}(m_{\{VV\}})$ is applied to the background and results are then given as a function of the unknown K-factor ratio $R_{B \rightarrow H}$ between background and signal. The uncertainty on $K_{H^* \rightarrow VV}(m_{\{VV\}})$ is larger than the uncertainty on $K_{gg \rightarrow VV}(m_{\{VV\}})$ because some contributions to the full signal NNLO QCD K-factor are not present in $K_{H^* \rightarrow VV}(m_{\{VV\}})$. Therefore, the following correlation treatment of uncertainties is applied: the uncertainty on the signal K-factor $K_{H^* \rightarrow VV}(m_{\{VV\}})$ is applied as a correlated uncertainty to $K_{gg \rightarrow VV}(m_{\{VV\}})$, while the difference in quadrature between the uncertainty on $K_{H^* \rightarrow VV}(m_{\{VV\}})$ and $K_{gg \rightarrow VV}(m_{\{VV\}})$ is added as an uncorrelated uncertainty component only to $K_{H^* \rightarrow VV}(m_{\{VV\}})$.

The interference between $gg \rightarrow H^* \rightarrow VV$ and $gg \rightarrow VV$ is calculated at LO only. In Ref. [?], a soft-collinear approximation is used to calculate the cross-section for the sum of a heavy Higgs boson ($gg \rightarrow H \rightarrow WW$) and its interference with the background. The uncertainty on this calculation is estimated to be about 10%, which leads to about 30% uncertainty on the interference alone. Within the ansatz of using an unknown K-factor ratio between background and signal (see Eq. (5)), this additional uncertainty of roughly 30% on the interference term can be represented by an approximately 60% variation of the K-factor ratio $R_{B \rightarrow H^*}$ for the background around the nominal value of 1.0. Therefore the variation of $R_{B \rightarrow H^*}$ from 0.5 to 2.0 should cover both the leading corrections and uncertainties for the interference and the background component taken individually.

However, there is a large cancellation between the background and the negative interference at the expected 95% confidence level upper limit value of $\mu_{\text{off-shell}}$, shown in Tables 3 and 4. This leads to a large artificial cancellation in the uncertainties of the $gg \rightarrow ZZ$ background and the interference, when treated as correlated. To account for additional uncertainties on the interference component that are not covered by the soft-collinear approximation, the 30%

uncertainty on the interference derived in Ref. [?] is applied to the interference component in addition to, and uncorrelated with, other uncertainties.

The systematic uncertainties associated with SHERPA-based re-weighting in p_T of the VV system are assessed by varying the renormalisation, factorisation, and resummation scales in SHERPA. The larger value between the scale variations in SHERPA and 50% of the difference between SHERPA and $gg2VV+PYTHIA8$ is assigned as the systematic uncertainty. This conservative approach is chosen to consider potential uncertainties not accounted for by the scale variations. The impact of the PDF uncertainties is found to be negligible.

6.2. Systematic Uncertainties on $\bar{q}q \rightarrow VV$

The missing-higher-order and PDF uncertainties for the $\bar{q}q \rightarrow ZZ$ background, as a function of m_{ZZ} , are taken from Ref. [?], based on NLO 7 TeV calculations using a fixed scale of m_Z . Slightly smaller systematic uncertainties are found for 8 TeV using a dynamic scale of $m_{ZZ}/2$, hence applying the uncertainties from Ref. [?] can be considered a conservative choice. Both the QCD scale uncertainty and the PDF uncertainty are 5-10% for the high-mass region used in this analysis. The NNLO calculation in Ref. [?] does not yield a significantly reduced QCD scale systematic uncertainty. An evaluation of the PDF uncertainty correlations shows that the $\bar{q}q \rightarrow ZZ$ background PDF uncertainties are anti-correlated with the PDF uncertainties for the $gg \rightarrow (H^* \rightarrow)ZZ$ process, and this is taken into account in the analysis.

Acceptance uncertainties on the $\bar{q}q \rightarrow ZZ$ background are evaluated by comparing PYTHIA8 and HERWIG6 [?] samples and found to be negligible. The PDF, QCD scale, and EW correction uncertainties for the $\bar{q}q \rightarrow WZ$ process are considered in the same way as for the $\bar{q}q \rightarrow ZZ$ process. Both the QCD scale uncertainty and the PDF uncertainty are estimated to be 5-10% for the high-mass region used in this analysis.

Extrapolation uncertainties on the $\bar{q}q \rightarrow WW$ process in the $WW \rightarrow e\mu$ channel are evaluated using the method described in Ref. [?]. Uncertainties due to missing higher-order corrections are estimated by varying the renormalisation and factorisation scales independently by factors of one-half and two, keeping the ratio of the scales between one-half and two. Parton shower and matrix-element uncertainties are estimated by comparing POWHEG-BOX+PYTHIA8 with POWHEG-BOX+HERWIG6 and POWHEG-BOX+HERWIG6 with aMC@NLO [?]+HERWIG6, respectively. PDF uncertainties are estimated by taking the largest difference between the nominal CT10 [?] and either the MSTW2008 [?] or the NNPDF2.1 [?] PDF set and adding this in quadrature with the CT10 error eigenvectors (following the procedure described in Ref. [?]). The extrapolation uncertainties from the WW control region to the signal region are summarised in Table 2.

The EW corrections for the $\bar{q}q \rightarrow VV$ process described in Section 2.3 are strictly valid only for the LO QCD $\bar{q}q \rightarrow VV$ process above the diboson production

threshold when both vector bosons are on shell. This is the case for all three analyses after final selections. The EW corrections are computed at LO QCD because the mixed QCD-EW corrections have not yet been calculated. In events with high QCD activity, an additional systematic uncertainty is considered by studying the variable $\alpha = (p_T^{\text{jet}})/(p_T^i + E_T^{\text{miss}})$ introduced in Eq. (4.4) of Ref. [?] (here p_T^i represents the transverse momentum of the lepton i from vector boson decays). A phase space region with $\alpha < 0.3$ is selected, where the NLO QCD event kinematics resembles the LO event kinematics in being dominated by recoiling vector bosons and therefore the corrections are applicable without additional uncertainty. For events with $\alpha > 0.3$ the correction is applied with a 100% systematic uncertainty to account for the missing mixed QCD-EW corrections which are expected to be of the same order of magnitude. The applied corrections are partial in that they include only virtual corrections, and do not include polarisation effects. The sum of both of these effects is estimated to be $O(1\%)$ [?] and is neglected in this analysis.

While the EW corrections and uncertainties directly affect the predicted size of the $\bar{q}q \rightarrow ZZ$ and $\bar{q}q \rightarrow WZ$ backgrounds in the $ZZ \rightarrow 4\ell$ and $ZZ \rightarrow 2\ell 2\gamma$ analyses, only the extrapolation of the $\bar{q}q \rightarrow WW$ background from the control region to the signal region is affected in the $WW \rightarrow e\mu$ analysis.

6.3. Systematic Uncertainties on Top-Quark Events

Theory uncertainties on extrapolating top-quark processes from the control region to the signal region in the $WW \rightarrow e\mu$ channel are also evaluated using methods similar to those of Ref. [?]. For the evaluation of the extrapolation uncertainties, the signal region requirements are relaxed to increase the sample size; the region is extended down to $R_8 > 160$ GeV and the Δ_{tag} requirement is dropped. The extra uncertainty from this extension is checked in a separate sample with at least one b-tagged jet, again defined so as to reduce the statistical uncertainties, which is simultaneously re-weighted in Δ_{tag} and R_8 to match the b-vetoed region. With this b-tagged sample, the extra uncertainty from the removal of the Δ_{tag} requirement, and from extending the range in R_8 , is found to be 3.5%.

The method described in Section 6.2 is used to evaluate the systematic uncertainties on top-quark processes. Since the extended signal region covers the WW CR, the same systematic uncertainties are valid for the extrapolation from the top CR to the WW CR. These uncertainties, summarised in Table 2, are applied to both $t\bar{t}$ and single-top processes, which make up approximately 22% of the top background in the signal region. A 20% uncertainty is assigned to the single-top processes in order to take into account the uncertainty on the single-top fraction; the impact on the result is negligible.

6.4. Experimental Systematic Uncertainties

For the $ZZ \rightarrow 4$ analysis, the same sources of experimental uncertainty as in Ref. [?] are evaluated. In the off-shell Higgs boson region, the leptons come from the decay of on-shell Z bosons; hence the lepton-related systematic uncertainties are small compared to those for the leptons from on-shell Higgs boson production. The leading, but still very small, experimental systematic uncertainties are due to the electron and muon reconstruction efficiency uncertainties.

Similarly, for the 22 channel, the same sources of experimental uncertainty as in Ref. [?] are evaluated. The electron energy scale, electron identification efficiency, muon reconstruction efficiency, jet energy scale, and systematic uncertainties from the data-driven Z background estimates are the main sources of the experimental systematic uncertainties. These experimental uncertainties affect the expected sensitivity of the μ_{off} -shell measurement only at the percent level.

Finally, for the $WW \rightarrow e\mu$ channel, the same sources of experimental uncertainty as in Ref. [?] are evaluated. The uncertainty on the electron energy scale, followed by the uncertainty on the rate for mis-tagged light-flavour jets as b-jets, and the uncertainty on the jet energy scale and resolution, are the dominant experimental sources of uncertainty. The remaining experimental sources are significantly smaller than the theoretical uncertainties.

The uncertainty on the integrated luminosity is 2.8%. It is derived, following the same methodology as that detailed in Ref. [?], from a preliminary calibration of the luminosity scale derived from beam-separation scans performed in November 2012.

7. Results

In this section the results for the $ZZ \rightarrow 4$, $ZZ \rightarrow 22$, and $WW \rightarrow e\mu$ analyses are presented and translated into limits on the off-shell signal strength μ_{off} for the individual analyses and for the combination of all three channels. In a second step, the off-shell analyses are combined with the on-shell $ZZ^* \rightarrow 4$ [?] and $WW^* \rightarrow$ [?] analyses based on the 8 TeV data taken in 2012. In combining the ZZ and WW channels it is assumed that the ratio of the ZZ cross-section $\sigma_{\text{gg} \rightarrow H^* \rightarrow ZZ(\hat{s})}$ to the WW cross-section $\sigma_{\text{gg} \rightarrow H^* \rightarrow WW(\hat{s})}$ (and similarly for VBF) is as predicted in the SM for both the on- and off-shell processes.

Two different off-shell combinations are presented based on different assumptions. First, a single off-shell signal strength parameter is applied for all production modes. This is equivalent to assuming that the ratio of the off-shell production rates via the process $gg \rightarrow H$ to those via the VBF process are as predicted in the SM. In a second combination, only the off-shell signal strength of the $gg \rightarrow H^* \rightarrow VV$ production process is considered while the VBF production process is fixed to the SM prediction. In this case the combined signal

strength $\mu_{\{gg\} \rightarrow H \rightarrow VV}$ can be interpreted as a constraint on the off-shell coupling strength $\mu_{g, \text{off-shell}}$ associated with the $gg \rightarrow H$ production mode.

The combination with the on-shell analyses is also performed under two assumptions that correspond to different interpretations of the results. The first is performed using different signal strengths for the $gg \rightarrow H()$ and the VBF production modes. The parameter of interest is described by the ratio of the off-shell to the on-shell signal strengths, which can be interpreted as the Higgs boson total width normalised to its SM prediction: $\mu_{\text{off-shell}}/\mu_{\text{on-shell}} = \Gamma_H/\Gamma_H^{\text{SM}}$. This interpretation requires that the off- and on-shell couplings are the same for both $gg \rightarrow H()$ and VBF production modes (i.e., $\mu_{g, \text{on-shell}} = \mu_{g, \text{off-shell}}$ and $\mu_{V, \text{on-shell}} = \mu_{V, \text{off-shell}}$). In a second combination, the coupling scale factors $\mu_V = \mu_{V, \text{on-shell}} = \mu_{V, \text{off-shell}}$ associated with the on- and off-shell VBF production and the $H() \rightarrow VV$ decay are assumed to be the same and fitted to the data (profiled). In this case the parameter of interest, $R_{\{gg\}} = \mu_{\{gg\} \rightarrow H^{\text{off-shell}}}/\mu_{\{gg\} \rightarrow H^{\text{on-shell}}}$, can be interpreted as the ratio of the off-shell to the on-shell gluon couplings: $R_{\{gg\}} = \mu_{g, \text{off-shell}}^2/\mu_{g, \text{on-shell}}^2$. This also assumes that the total width is equal to the SM prediction.

In the $ZZ \rightarrow 4$ channel, a binned maximum-likelihood fit to the ME-based discriminant distribution is performed to extract the limits on the off-shell Higgs boson signal strength. The fit model accounts for signal and background processes, including $gg \rightarrow (H^* \rightarrow)ZZ$, $\text{VBF}(H^* \rightarrow)ZZ$, and $\bar{q}q \rightarrow ZZ$. The probability density functions (pdf) of the signal-related processes $gg \rightarrow (H^* \rightarrow)ZZ$ and $\text{VBF}(H^* \rightarrow)ZZ$ are parameterised as a function of both the off-shell Higgs boson signal strength $\mu_{\text{off-shell}}$ and the unknown background K-factor ratio $R_{B \rightarrow H^*}$ as given in Eqs. (15) and (19). Normalisation and shape systematic uncertainties on the signal and background processes are taken into account as described in Section 6.1, with correlations between different components and processes as indicated therein.

In the $ZZ \rightarrow 22$ channel, a similar maximum-likelihood fit to the transverse mass ($m_{T\{ZZ\}}$) is performed, comparing the event yield in the signal-enriched region in data with the predictions. The fit model accounts for the signal and all background processes mentioned in Table 1. The modelling of the dominant signal and background processes is the same as in the $ZZ \rightarrow 4$ channel.

In the $WW \rightarrow e\mu$ channel, a maximum-likelihood fit is performed using the event yields in the signal region and the two control regions. As in the ZZ channels, the fit model accounts for the parameterised signal and all background processes mentioned in Section 5.2. Unconstrained strength parameters common among fit regions for the $\bar{q}q \rightarrow WW$ and top-quark processes allow the control regions to constrain the predicted event yields in the signal region.

The likelihood is a function of a parameter of interest μ and nuisance parameters. Hypothesis testing and confidence intervals are based on the profile likelihood.

ratio [?]. The parameters of interest are different in the various tests, while the remaining parameters are profiled. Hypothesised values for a parameter of interest μ are tested with a statistic $\Lambda(\mu) = L(\mu, \hat{(\mu)}) / L(\hat{\mu}, \hat{(\mu)})$, where the single circumflex denotes the unconditional maximum-likelihood estimate of a parameter and the double circumflex denotes the conditional maximum-likelihood estimate (e.g., of μ) for fixed values of μ . This test statistic extracts the information on the parameters of interest from the full likelihood function.

All 95% confidence level (CL) upper limits are derived using the CLs method [?], based on the following ratio of one-sided p-values: $CLs(\mu) = p_{\mu} / (1 - p_1)$ where p_{μ} is the p-value for testing a given $\mu = \mu_{\text{off-shell}}$ or $\mu = \Gamma_H / \Gamma_H^{\text{SM}}$ (the non-SM hypothesis) and p_1 is the p-value derived from the same test statistic under the SM hypothesis of $\mu_{\text{off-shell}} = 1$ in the first case and $\Gamma_H / \Gamma_H^{\text{SM}} = \mu_{\text{on-shell}} = 1$ in the second case. The 95% CLs upper limit is found by solving for $CLs(\mu_{95\%}) = 5\%$. Values $\mu > \mu_{95\%}$ are regarded as excluded at 95% CL. A detailed description of the implementation of the CLs procedure can be found in Ref. [?].

The results presented in this paper rely on the asymptotic approximation [?] for the test statistic $\Lambda(\mu)$. This approximation was cross-checked with Monte Carlo ensemble tests that confirm its validity in the range of the parameters for which the 95% CL limits are derived. Deviations appear close to the boundary of $\mu_{\text{off-shell}} \geq 0$ imposed by Eq. (5) and hence the 1σ uncertainties can only be seen as approximate.

While the final 95% CL limits are given as a function of the unknown background K-factor ratio R_{B^*H} , *comparisons between the data and the MC predictions, and values in other figures and tables, are given assuming $R_{B^*H} = 1$.*

7.1. Results of the Individual Off-Shell Analyses

The scan of the negative log-likelihood, $-2 \ln \Lambda$, as a function of $\mu_{\text{off-shell}}$ for data and the expected curve for an SM Higgs boson for the three individual off-shell analyses is illustrated in Fig. 6 [Figure 6: see original paper]. The observed and expected 95% CL upper limits on $\mu_{\text{off-shell}}$ as a function of R_{B^*H} are shown in Fig. 7 [Figure 7: see original paper] and are summarised in Table 3. The $ZZ \rightarrow 4$ and $ZZ \rightarrow 2 2$ analyses have a very similar expected sensitivity. The $ZZ \rightarrow 4$ analysis is statistics limited, while the sensitivity in the $ZZ \rightarrow 2 2$ analysis is significantly reduced by the theoretical systematic uncertainties as can be seen in Fig. 6. The similar expected CLs limits for the two channels for $R_{B^*H} = 0.5$ and 1.0 in Table 3 is a coincidence, caused by the different statistical and systematic uncertainty components.

The typical off-shell mass scales tested by the analyses are in the range $400 \text{ GeV} < m_{\{VV\}} < 1000 \text{ GeV}$, with a small fraction of the expected $H^* \rightarrow WW$ signal extending to substantially higher mass scales. This is illustrated in Fig. 8 [Figure 8: see original paper], which shows the generated $m_{\{VV\}}$ mass for the $gg \rightarrow H^* \rightarrow VV$ and the VBF $H^* \rightarrow VV$ signal processes weighted by the

expected S/B ratio in each bin of the final discriminant for the $ZZ \rightarrow 4$ and $ZZ \rightarrow 2\gamma 2e$ analyses and for all signal events in the signal region for the $WW \rightarrow e\mu$ analysis.

7.2. Combination of the Off-Shell ZZ and WW Analyses

The analyses described in the previous sections are combined to obtain a limit on $\mu_{\text{off-shell}}$. In combining the off-shell results the main systematic uncertainties related to the theory uncertainties on the $gg \rightarrow (H^* \rightarrow)VV$ (including signal and interference contributions) and $\bar{q}q \rightarrow VV$ processes are treated as correlated between the different channels. The same K-factor ratio $R_{B \rightarrow H^*}$ is assumed for the $gg \rightarrow ZZ$ and $gg \rightarrow WW$ backgrounds. Where appropriate, the experimental systematic uncertainties are also treated as correlated. However, they are found to have a very small impact on the final combined limit.

The limits on $\mu_{\text{off-shell}}$ are obtained under two different assumptions:
 - Determination of the signal strength $\mu_{\text{off-shell}}$ when fixing the ratio of the signal strength in $gg \rightarrow H^*$ and VBF to the SM prediction, namely $\mu_{\{gg\} \rightarrow H^*}^{\text{off-shell}} / \mu_{\text{VBF}}^{\text{off-shell}}$ - *Determination of the signal strength $\mu_{\{gg\} \rightarrow H^*}^{\text{off-shell}}$ when fixing the VBF off-shell signal strength to the SM prediction, i.e., $\mu_{\text{VBF}}(H^* \rightarrow VV)^{\text{off-shell}} = 1$*

The scan of the negative log-likelihood, $-2 \ln \Lambda$, as a function of $\mu_{\text{off-shell}}$ for data and the expected curve for an SM Higgs boson for the two cases above are shown in Fig. 9 [Figure 9: see original paper]. The limits on $\mu_{\text{off-shell}}$ and $\mu_{\{gg\} \rightarrow H^*}^{\text{off-shell}}$ are computed with the CLs method, assuming for the alternative hypothesis that all the off-shell rates are at their SM predictions. They are derived as a function of the $gg \rightarrow VV$ background K-factor ratio $R_{B \rightarrow H^*}$. These results are reported in Table 4 and shown in Fig. 10 [Figure 10: see original paper], assuming either one common scale factor for both the $gg \rightarrow H^*$ and VBF processes or using a scale factor for the $gg \rightarrow H^*$ process and fixing the VBF production to the SM prediction.

The impact of the various systematic uncertainties on the combined expected limit in the off-shell fit are listed in Table 5 when fixing the ratio of the signal strength in $gg \rightarrow H^*$ and VBF to the SM prediction. The values in this table were derived by fixing all the nuisance parameters associated with the systematic uncertainties to the values derived from the SM-conditional fit to the data, with the exception of the one under study.

7.3. Combination of the Off-Shell and On-Shell ZZ and WW Analyses

In this section, the off-shell results reported above are combined with the on-shell $H \rightarrow ZZ^* \rightarrow 4$ [?] and $H \rightarrow WW^* \rightarrow$ [?] analyses based on the 8 TeV data taken in 2012. In these analyses a Higgs boson mass value of 125.36 GeV [?] is assumed. For the on-shell ZZ and WW combination the main common sources of theoretical and experimental systematic uncertainties are treated as

correlated [?]. The uncertainties from the impact of higher-order QCD corrections on the $gg \rightarrow H^{(*)}$ and $qq \rightarrow VV$ processes are considered correlated between the on-shell and off-shell measurements. The PDF uncertainties are treated as uncorrelated between on-shell and off-shell analyses. The correlations between the PDF uncertainties for the on-shell and off-shell analyses are expected to be small with the exception of the ones for the $\bar{q}q \rightarrow VV$ process, which have negligible impact on the on-shell results.

The results reported in the following are based on two different assumptions:
 - Determination of $\Gamma_H/\Gamma_H^{\text{SM}}$ when profiling the coupling scale factors κ_g and κ_V associated with the on- and off-shell $gg \rightarrow H^{(*)}$ and VBF production and the $H^{(*)} \rightarrow VV$ decay, assuming $\kappa_g = \kappa_{g,\text{on-shell}} = \kappa_{g,\text{off-shell}}$ and $\kappa_V = \kappa_{V,\text{on-shell}} = \kappa_{V,\text{off-shell}}$
 - Determination of $R_{gg} = \kappa_{g,\text{off-shell}}^2 / \kappa_{g,\text{on-shell}}^2$ when profiling the coupling scale factor $\kappa_V = \kappa_{V,\text{on-shell}} = \kappa_{V,\text{off-shell}}$ associated with the on- and off-shell VBF production and the $H^{(*)} \rightarrow VV$ decay. The ratio $\Gamma_H/\Gamma_H^{\text{SM}} = 1$ is fixed to the SM prediction. The parameter R_{gg} is sensitive to possible modifications of the gluon couplings in the high-mass range with respect to the on-shell value.

The negative log-likelihood scans for the above-defined fitting configurations as well as the combined upper limit at 95% CL on $\Gamma_H/\Gamma_H^{\text{SM}}$ and R_{gg} are illustrated in Figs. 11[Figure 11: see original paper] and 12[Figure 12: see original paper] and the corresponding limits are listed in Table 6. The limits are all computed with the CLs method, taking the SM values as the alternative hypothesis.

The limit on $\Gamma_H/\Gamma_H^{\text{SM}}$ can be translated into a limit on the total width of the Higgs boson under the assumptions reported above, out of which the most important is that the relevant Higgs boson coupling scale factors are independent of the energy scale of the Higgs boson production. Assuming a value of $R_{B^*H^*} = 1$, this translates into an observed (expected) 95% CL upper limit on the Higgs boson total width of 22.7 (33.0) MeV.

8. Conclusion

The measurement of the ZZ and WW final states in the mass range above the $2m_Z$ and $2m_W$ thresholds provides a unique opportunity to measure the off-shell coupling strengths of the observed Higgs boson. In this paper constraints on the off-shell Higgs boson signal strengths in the $ZZ \rightarrow 4\ell$, $ZZ \rightarrow 2\ell 2\gamma$, and $WW \rightarrow e\mu$ final states and their combination are presented. The result is based on pp collision data collected by the ATLAS experiment at the LHC, corresponding to an integrated luminosity of 20.3 fb^{-1} at a collision energy of $\sqrt{s} = 8 \text{ TeV}$.

Using the CLs method, the observed 95% confidence level (CL) upper limit on the off-shell signal strength is in the range 5.1–8.6, with an expected range of 6.7–11.0. In each case the range is determined by varying the unknown $gg \rightarrow ZZ$ and $gg \rightarrow WW$ background K-factor from higher-order QCD corrections between half and twice the value of the known signal K-factor.

Assuming the relevant Higgs boson couplings are independent of the energy scale of the Higgs boson production, a combination with the on-shell measurements of ZZ and WW in the same dataset yields an observed (expected) 95% CL upper limit on $\Gamma_H/\Gamma_H^{\text{SM}}$ in the range 4.5-7.5 (6.5-11.2) under the same variations of the background K-factor. Assuming the value of $R_{B^*H} = 1$ and under the assumptions reported above, this translates into an observed (expected) 95% CL upper limit on the Higgs boson total width of 22.7 (33.0) MeV.

Assuming that the total width of the Higgs boson is as expected in the SM, the same combination can be interpreted as a limit on the ratio of the off-shell to the on-shell couplings to gluons $R_{\{gg\}} = \frac{\sigma_{\text{off-shell}}}{\sigma_{\text{on-shell}}}$. An observed (expected) 95% CL upper limit on $R_{\{gg\}}$ in the range 4.7-8.6 (7.1-13.4) under the same variations of the background K-factor is found.

Acknowledgments

We are very thankful to M. Bonvini, J. Campbell, S. Forte, F. Krauss, K. Melnikov, G. Passarino, and M. Spannowsky for their essential input in the estimation of uncertainties in the theoretical predictions for the signal and background processes and their interference.

We thank CERN for the very successful operation of the LHC, as well as the support staff from our institutions without whom ATLAS could not be operated efficiently.

We acknowledge the support of ANPCyT, Argentina; YerPhI, Armenia; ARC, Australia; BMWF and FWF, Austria; ANAS, Azerbaijan; SSTC, Belarus; CNPq and FAPESP, Brazil; NSERC, NRC and CFI, Canada; CERN; CONICYT, Chile; CAS, MOST and NSFC, China; COLCIENCIAS, Colombia; MSMT CR, MPO CR and VSC CR, Czech Republic; DNRF, DNSRC and Lundbeck Foundation, Denmark; EPLANET, ERC and NSRF, European Union; IN2P3-CNRS, CEA-DSM/IRFU, France; GNSF, Georgia; BMBF, DFG, HGF, MPG and AvH Foundation, Germany; GSRT and NSRF, Greece; RGC, Hong Kong SAR, China; ISF, MINERVA, GIF, I-CORE and Benozziyo Center, Israel; INFN, Italy; MEXT and JSPS, Japan; CNRST, Morocco; FOM and NWO, Netherlands; BRF and RCN, Norway; MNiSW and NCN, Poland; GRICES and FCT, Portugal; MNE/IFA, Romania; MES of Russia and NRC KI, Russian Federation; JINR; MSTD, Serbia; MSSR, Slovakia; ARRS and MIZŠ, Slovenia; DST/NRF, South Africa; MINECO, Spain; SRC and Wallenberg Foundation, Sweden; SER, SNSF and Cantons of Bern and Geneva, Switzerland; NSC, Taiwan; TAEK, Turkey; STFC, the Royal Society and Leverhulme Trust, United Kingdom; DOE and NSF, United States of America.

The crucial computing support from all WLCG partners is acknowledged gratefully, in particular from CERN and the ATLAS Tier-1 facilities at TRIUMF (Canada), NDGF (Denmark, Norway, Sweden), CC-IN2P3 (France),

KIT/GridKA (Germany), INFN-CNAF (Italy), NL-T1 (Netherlands), PIC (Spain), ASGC (Taiwan), RAL (UK) and BNL (USA) and in the Tier-2 facilities worldwide.

Appendix

A. Monte Carlo and PDF Scaling to Arbitrary $\mu_{\text{off-shell}}$

The known dependence of the off-shell Higgs boson signal process, the background process, and the interference term on the off-shell signal strength $\mu_{\text{off-shell}}$ can be used to construct MC samples for arbitrary values of $\mu_{\text{off-shell}}$ from three basic samples generated at different fixed values of $\mu_{\text{off-shell}}$.

A.1. Dependence of the $gg \rightarrow (H^* \rightarrow)VV$ Off-Shell Cross-Sections on the Signal Strength An event sample $\sigma\{gg\} \rightarrow (H \rightarrow)VV(\mu_{\text{off-shell}})$ for the $gg \rightarrow (H \rightarrow)VV$ process with an arbitrary value of the off-shell Higgs boson signal strength $\mu_{\text{off-shell}}$ can be constructed from the MC sample for the SM Higgs boson signal $gg \rightarrow H^* \rightarrow VV$ ($\sigma_{\text{SM}}\{gg\} \rightarrow H \rightarrow VV$), the $gg \rightarrow VV$ continuum background MC sample ($\sigma\{gg\} \rightarrow VV, \text{cont}$), and a full SM Higgs boson signal plus background $gg \rightarrow (H^* \rightarrow)VV$ MC sample ($\sigma\{SM\}\{gg\} \rightarrow (H \rightarrow)VV$) using the following weighting function:

$$\sigma\{gg\} \rightarrow (H \rightarrow)VV(\mu_{\text{off-shell}}, m\{VV\}) = K_{H^*}\{gg\}(m\{VV\}) \cdot \mu_{\text{off-shell}} \cdot \sigma\{SM\}\{gg\} \rightarrow H \rightarrow VV(m\{VV\}) + K_{H^*}\{gg\}(m\{VV\}) \cdot R_{B^*H^*} \cdot \sqrt{\mu_{\text{off-shell}}} \cdot \sigma\{SM\}\{gg\} \rightarrow VV, \text{Interference}(m\{VV\}) + K_{H^*}\{gg\}(m\{VV\}) \cdot R_{B^*H^*} \cdot \sigma\{gg\} \rightarrow VV, \text{cont}(m\{VV\})$$

$$\text{where } \sigma\{SM\}\{gg\} \rightarrow VV, \text{Interference}(m\{VV\}) = \sigma_{\text{SM}}\{SM\}\{gg\} \rightarrow (H^* \rightarrow)VV(m\{VV\}) - \sigma_{\text{SM}}\{SM\}\{gg\} \rightarrow H^* \rightarrow VV(m\{VV\}) - \sigma\{gg\} \rightarrow VV, \text{cont}(m\{VV\}).$$

As a direct simulation of an interference MC sample is not possible, Eq. (14) and $R_{B^*H^*}$ are used to obtain:

$$\sigma_{\text{SM}}\{gg\} \rightarrow (H^* \rightarrow)VV(\mu_{\text{off-shell}}, m\{VV\}) = [\sqrt{\mu_{\text{off-shell}}} - R_{B^*H^*} \cdot (\mu_{\text{off-shell}} - \sqrt{\mu_{\text{off-shell}}})] \cdot \sigma_{\text{SM}}\{SM\}\{gg\} \rightarrow H^* \rightarrow VV(m\{VV\}) + [R_{B^*H^*} \cdot \mu_{\text{off-shell}} + R_{B^*H^*} \cdot (1 - \sqrt{\mu_{\text{off-shell}}})] \cdot \sigma_{\text{SM}}\{SM\}\{gg\} \rightarrow (H^* \rightarrow)VV(m\{VV\}) + [R_{B^*H^*} \cdot (1 - \sqrt{\mu_{\text{off-shell}}})] \cdot \sigma\{gg\} \rightarrow VV, \text{cont}(m\{VV\})$$

A.2. Dependence of the $jjVV$ Off-Shell Signal and Background Interference on the Signal Strength An MC event sample for the EW $pp \rightarrow (H^* + 2j \rightarrow)VV + 2j$ process with an arbitrary value of the off-shell Higgs boson signal strength $\mu_{\text{off-shell}}$ can be constructed from a pure $pp \rightarrow VV + 2j$ continuum background MC sample, a full SM Higgs boson signal plus background $pp \rightarrow (H^* + 2j \rightarrow)VV + 2j$ MC sample, and a third Higgs boson signal plus background $pp \rightarrow (H^* + 2j \rightarrow)VV + 2j$ MC sample with $\mu_{\text{off-shell}} = 10$. Using $\Gamma_H/\Gamma_H\{SM\} = 10$ for the last sample ensures that the on-shell VH events are generated with SM-like signal strength.

The following weighting function is used:

$$\sigma_{\{pp\} \rightarrow (H^* + 2j \rightarrow) VV + 2j}(\mu_{\text{off-shell}}) = \mu_{\text{off-shell}} \cdot \sigma_{\{SM\} \wedge \{pp\} \rightarrow H^* + 2j \rightarrow VV + 2j} + \sqrt{\mu_{\text{off-shell}}} \cdot \sigma_{\{pp\} \rightarrow VV + 2j, Interference} + \sigma_{\{pp\} \rightarrow VV + 2j, cont}$$

where $pp \rightarrow (H^* + 2j \rightarrow) VV + 2j$ MC sample interference signal samples are implicitly defined through:

$$\sigma_{\{pp\} \rightarrow (H^* + 2j \rightarrow) VV + 2j} = \sigma_{\{SM\} \wedge \{pp\} \rightarrow H^* + 2j \rightarrow VV + 2j} + \sigma_{\{pp\} \rightarrow VV + 2j, Interference} + \sigma_{\{pp\} \rightarrow VV + 2j, cont}$$

and a $\mu_{\text{off-shell}} = 10$ MC sample:

$$\sigma_{\{pp\} \rightarrow (H^* + 2j \rightarrow) VV + 2j} = 10 \cdot \sigma_{\{SM\} \wedge \{pp\} \rightarrow H^* + 2j \rightarrow VV + 2j} + 10 \cdot \sigma_{\{pp\} \rightarrow VV + 2j, Interference} + \sigma_{\{pp\} \rightarrow VV + 2j, cont}$$

Solving for the generated MC samples yields:

$$\sigma_{\{pp\} \rightarrow (H^* + 2j \rightarrow) VV + 2j}(\mu_{\text{off-shell}}) = (\mu_{\text{off-shell}}/9 - 10\sqrt{\mu_{\text{off-shell}}}/9 + 1) \cdot \sigma_{\{SM\} \wedge \{pp\} \rightarrow H^* + 2j \rightarrow VV + 2j} + (10\sqrt{\mu_{\text{off-shell}}}/9 - \mu_{\text{off-shell}}/9) \cdot \sigma_{\{pp\} \rightarrow (H^* + 2j \rightarrow) VV + 2j} + (1 - \sqrt{\mu_{\text{off-shell}}}/9) \cdot \sigma_{\{pp\} \rightarrow VV + 2j, cont}$$

References

- [1] ATLAS Collaboration, Observation of a new particle in the search for the Standard Model Higgs boson with the ATLAS detector at the LHC, Phys. Lett. B 716 (2012) 1, arXiv:1207.7214 [hep-ex].
- [2] CMS Collaboration, Observation of a new boson at a mass of 125 GeV with the CMS experiment at the LHC, Phys. Lett. B 716 (2012) 30, arXiv:1207.7235 [hep-ex].
- [3] ATLAS Collaboration, Measurements of Higgs boson production and couplings in diboson final states with the ATLAS detector at the LHC, Phys. Lett. B 726 (2013) 88, arXiv:1307.1427 [hep-ex].
- [4] CMS Collaboration, Precise determination of the mass of the Higgs boson and tests of compatibility of its couplings with the standard model predictions using proton collisions at 7 and 8 TeV, Eur. Phys. J. C 75 (2015) 212, arXiv:1412.8662 [hep-ex].
- [5] ATLAS Collaboration, Evidence for the spin-0 nature of the Higgs boson using ATLAS data, Phys. Lett. B 726 (2013) 120, arXiv:1307.1432 [hep-ex].
- [6] CMS Collaboration, Constraints on the spin-parity and anomalous HVV couplings of the Higgs boson in proton collisions at 7 and 8 TeV, arXiv:1411.3441 [hep-ex].
- [7] N. Kauer and G. Passarino, Inadequacy of zero-width approximation for a light Higgs boson signal, JHEP 08 (2012) 116, arXiv:1206.4803 [hep-ph].

- [8] F. Caola and K. Melnikov, Constraining the Higgs boson width with ZZ production at the LHC, *Phys. Rev. D* 88 (2013) 054024, arXiv:1307.4935 [hep-ph].
- [9] J. M. Campbell, R. K. Ellis, and C. Williams, Bounding the Higgs width at the LHC using full analytic results for $gg \rightarrow e^-e^+\mu^-\mu^+$, *JHEP* 04 (2014) 060, arXiv:1311.3589 [hep-ph].
- [10] J. M. Campbell, R. K. Ellis, and C. Williams, Bounding the Higgs width at the LHC: complementary results from $H \rightarrow WW$, *Phys. Rev. D* 89 (2014) 053011, arXiv:1312.1628 [hep-ph].
- [11] ATLAS Collaboration, Measurement of the Higgs boson mass from the $H \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ and $H \rightarrow ZZ^* \rightarrow 4$ channels with the ATLAS detector using 25 fb⁻¹ of pp collision data, *Phys. Rev. D* 90 (2014) 052004, arXiv:1406.3827 [hep-ex].
- [12] C. Englert and M. Spannowsky, Limitations and Opportunities of Off-Shell Coupling Measurements, *Phys. Rev. D* 90 (2014) 053003, arXiv:1405.0285 [hep-ph].
- [13] G. Cacciapaglia, A. Deandrea, G. D. La Rochelle, and J.-B. Flament, Higgs couplings: disentangling New Physics with off-shell measurements, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 113 (2014) 201802, arXiv:1406.1757 [hep-ph].
- [14] A. Azatov, C. Grojean, A. Paul, and E. Salvioni, Taming the off-shell Higgs boson, *JETP* 147 (3) (2015), arXiv:1406.6338 [hep-ph].
- [15] M. Ghezzi, G. Passarino, and S. Uccirati, Bounding the Higgs Width Using Effective Field Theory, *PoS LL2014 072* (2014), arXiv:1405.1925 [hep-ph].
- [16] M. Buschmann, D. Goncalves, S. Kuttimalai, M. Schonherr, F. Krauss, et al., Mass Effects in the Higgs-Gluon Coupling: Boosted vs Off-Shell Production, *JHEP* 02 (2015) 038, arXiv:1410.5806 [hep-ph].
- [17] J. S. Gainer, J. Lykken, K. T. Matchev, S. Mrenna, and M. Park, Beyond Geolocating: Constraining Higher Dimensional Operators in $H \rightarrow 4$ with Off-Shell Production and More, *Phys. Rev. D* 91 no. 3, (2015) 035011, arXiv:1403.4951 [hep-ph].
- [18] C. Englert, Y. Soreq, and M. Spannowsky, Off-Shell Higgs Coupling Measurements in BSM scenarios, *JHEP* 05 (2015) 145, arXiv:1410.5440 [hep-ph].
- [19] CMS Collaboration, Constraints on the Higgs boson width from off-shell production and decay to Z-boson pairs, *Phys. Lett. B* 736 (2014) 64, arXiv:1405.3455 [hep-ex].
- [20] ATLAS Collaboration, Search for Invisible Decays of a Higgs Boson Produced in Association with a Z Boson in ATLAS, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 112 (2014) 201802, arXiv:1402.3244 [hep-ex].
- [21] CMS collaboration, Search for invisible decays of Higgs bosons in the vector boson fusion and associated ZH production modes, *Eur. Phys. J. C* 74 (2014)

2980, arXiv:1404.1344 [hep-ex].

[22] ATLAS Collaboration, The ATLAS experiment at the CERN Large Hadron Collider, JINST 3 (2008) S08003.

[23] LHC Higgs Cross Section Working Group, S. Heinemeyer, C. Mariotti, G. Passarino, and R. Tanaka (Eds.), Handbook of LHC Higgs Cross Sections: 3. Higgs Properties, arXiv:1307.1347 [hep-ph].

[24] H. E. Logan, Hiding a Higgs width enhancement from off-shell $gg \rightarrow h^* \rightarrow ZZ$ measurements, arXiv:1412.7577 [hep-ph].

[25] G. Passarino, Higgs CAT, Eur. Phys. J. C 74 (2014) 2866, arXiv:1312.2397 [hep-ph].

[26] S. Agostinelli et al., Geant4, a simulation toolkit, Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A 506 (2003) 250.

[27] ATLAS Collaboration, The ATLAS simulation infrastructure, Eur. Phys. J. C 70 (2010) 823, arXiv:1005.4568 [hep-ph].

[28] N. Kauer, Interference effects for $H \rightarrow WW/ZZ \rightarrow$ searches in gluon fusion at the LHC, JHEP 12 (2013) 082, arXiv:1310.7011 [hep-ph].

[29] T. Sjostrand, S. Mrenna, and P. Z. Skands, A Brief Introduction to PYTHIA 8.1, Comput. Phys. Commun. 178 (2008) 852–867, arXiv:0710.3820 [hep-ph].

[30] F. Cascioli et al., Precise Higgs-background predictions: merging NLO QCD and squared quark-loop corrections to four-lepton + 0,1 jet production, JHEP 01 (2014) 046, arXiv:1309.0500 [hep-ph].

[31] T. Gleisberg et al., Event generation with SHERPA 1.1, JHEP 02 (2009) 007, arXiv:0811.4622 [hep-ph].

[32] F. Cascioli, P. Maierhöfer, and S. Pozzorini, Scattering Amplitudes with Open Loops, Phys. Rev. Lett. 108 (2012) 111601, arXiv:1111.5206 [hep-ph].

[33] A. Denner, S. Dittmaier, and L. Hofer, COLLIER - A fortran-library for one-loop integrals, PoS LL2014 (2014) 071, arXiv:1407.0087 [hep-ph].

[34] J. Gao et al., The CT10 NNLO Global Analysis of QCD, Phys. Rev. D 89 (2014) 033009, arXiv:1302.6246 [hep-ph].

[35] A. Martin, W. Stirling, R. Thorne, and G. Watt, Parton distributions for the LHC, Eur. Phys. J. C 63 (2009) 189–285, arXiv:0901.0002 [hep-ph].

[36] M. Bonvini, F. Caola, S. Forte, K. Melnikov, and G. Ridolfi, Signal-background interference effects for $gg \rightarrow H \rightarrow W+W-$ beyond leading order, Phys. Rev. D 88 (2013) 034032, arXiv:1304.3053 [hep-ph].

[37] J. Alwall et al., The automated computation of tree-level and next-to-leading order differential cross sections, and their matching to parton shower simulations, JHEP 07 (2014) 079, arXiv:1405.0301 [hep-ph], optimised by the authors for the production of VBF ($H^* \rightarrow$)VV.

- [38] A. Ballestrero, A. Belhouari, G. Bevilacqua, V. Kashkan, and E. Maina, PHANTOM: A Monte Carlo event generator for six parton final states at high energy colliders, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* 180 (2009) 401–417, arXiv:0801.3359 [hep-ph], extended by the authors to include the production of the VBF $H^* \rightarrow VV$ signal process.
- [39] LHC Higgs Cross Section Working Group, S. Dittmaier, C. Mariotti, G. Passarino, and R. Tanaka (Eds.), *Handbook of LHC Higgs Cross Sections: 2. Differential distributions*, CERN-2012-002 (CERN, Geneva, 2012), arXiv:1201.3084 [hep-ph].
- [40] J. Pumplin et al., New generation of parton distributions with uncertainties from global QCD analysis, *JHEP* 07 (2002) 012, arXiv:hep-ph/0201195 [hep-ph].
- [41] T. Sjostrand et al., PYTHIA 6.4 physics and manual, *JHEP* 05 (2006) 026.
- [42] T. Melia, P. Nason, R. Röntsch, and G. Zanderighi, $W+W-$, WZ and ZZ production in the POWHEG BOX, *JHEP* 11 (2011) 078, arXiv:1107.5051 [hep-ph].
- [43] F. Cascioli et al., ZZ production at hadron colliders in NNLO QCD, *Phys. Lett. B* 735 (2014) 311, arXiv:1405.2219 [hep-ph], extended by the authors to provide NNLO/NLO K-factors as a function of m_{ZZ} .
- [44] T. Gehrmann et al., $W+W-$ production at hadron colliders in NNLO QCD, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 113 (2014) 212001, arXiv:1408.5243 [hep-ph], extended by the authors to provide NNLO/NLO K-factors as a function of m_{WW} .
- [45] A. Bierweiler, T. Kasprzik, and J. H. Kühn, Vector-boson pair production at the LHC to $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^3)$ accuracy, *JHEP* 12 (2013) 071, arXiv:1305.5402 [hep-ph].
- [46] J. Baglio, L. D. Ninh, and M. M. Weber, Massive gauge boson pair production at the LHC: a next-to-leading order story, *Phys. Rev. D* 88 (2013) 113005, arXiv:1307.4331.
- [47] S. Gieseke, T. Kasprzik, and J. H. Kühn, Vector-boson pair production and electroweak corrections in HERWIG++, *Eur. Phys. J. C* 74 (2014) 2988.
- [48] S. Alioli, S.-O. Moch, and P. Uwer, Hadronic top-quark pair-production with one jet and parton showering, *JHEP* 1201 (2012) 137, arXiv:1110.5251 [hep-ph].
- [49] S. Alioli, P. Nason, C. Oleari, and E. Re, NLO single-top production matched with shower in POWHEG: s- and t-channel contributions, *JHEP* 0909 (2009) 111, arXiv:0907.4076 [hep-ph].
- [50] B. P. Kersevan and E. Richter-Was, The Monte Carlo event generator AcerMC version 2.0 with interfaces to PYTHIA 6.2 and HERWIG 6.5, arXiv:hep-ph/0405247.
- [51] M. Czakon and A. Mitov, Top++: A program for the calculation of the top-pair cross-section at hadron colliders, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* 185 no.

11, (2014) 2930 -2938.

[52] N. Kidonakis, Next-to-next-to-leading logarithm resummation for s-channel single top quark production, *Phys. Rev. D* 81 (2010) 054028.

[53] N. Kidonakis, Next-to-next-to-leading-order collinear and soft gluon corrections for t-channel single top quark production, *Phys. Rev. D* 83 (2011) 091503.

[54] N. Kidonakis, Two-loop soft anomalous dimensions for single top quark associated production with a W^- or H^- , *Phys. Rev. D* 82 (2010) 054018.

[55] ATLAS Collaboration, Measurements of Higgs boson production and couplings in the four-lepton channel in pp collisions at center-of-mass energies of 7 and 8 TeV with the ATLAS detector, *Phys. Rev. D* 91 (2015) 012006, arXiv:1408.5191 [hep-ex].

[56] ATLAS Collaboration, Calibration of b-tagging using dileptonic top pair events in a combinatorial likelihood approach with the ATLAS experiment, ATLAS-CONF-2014-004 (2014).

[57] ATLAS Collaboration, Calibration of the performance of b-tagging for c and light-flavour jets in the 2012 ATLAS data, ATLAS-CONF-2014-046 (2014).

[58] ATLAS Collaboration, Observation and measurement of Higgs boson decays to WW^* with the ATLAS detector, arXiv:1412.2641 [hep-ex].

[59] G. Corcella et al., HERWIG 6: An Event generator for hadron emission reactions with interfering gluons (including supersymmetric processes), *JHEP* 01 (2001) 010.

[60] H.-L. Lai et al., New parton distributions for collider physics, *Phys. Rev. D* 82 (2010) 074024.

[61] R. D. Ball et al., Impact of heavy quark masses on parton distributions and LHC phenomenology, *Nucl. Phys. B* 849 (2011) 296, arXiv:1101.1300 [hep-ph].

[62] M. Botje et al., The PDF4LHC Working Group Interim Recommendations, arXiv:1101.0538 [hep-ph].

[63] ATLAS Collaboration, Improved luminosity determination in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV using the ATLAS detector at the LHC, *Eur. Phys. J. C* 73 (2013) 2518, arXiv:1302.4393 [hep-ex].

[64] G. Cowan, K. Cranmer, E. Gross, and O. Vitells, Asymptotic formulae for likelihood-based tests of new physics, *Eur. Phys. J. C* 71 (2011) 1554, arXiv:1007.1727 [physics.data-an].

[65] A. L. Read, Presentation of search results: The CLs technique, *J. Phys. G* 28 (2002) 2693.

[66] ATLAS Collaboration, Combined search for the Standard Model Higgs boson in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s}=7$ TeV with the ATLAS detector, *Phys. Rev. D* 86 (2012) 032003, arXiv:1207.0319 [hep-ex].

The ATLAS Collaboration

G. Aad⁸⁵, B. Abbott¹¹³, J. Abdallah¹⁵², O. Abdinov¹¹, R. Aben¹⁰⁷, M. Abolins⁹⁰, O.S. AbouZeid¹⁵⁹, H. Abramowicz¹⁵⁴, H. Abreu¹⁵³, R. Abreu³⁰, Y. Abulaiti^{147a,147b}, B.S. Acharya^{165a,165b,a}, L. Adamczyk^{38a}, D.L. Adams²⁵, J. Adelman¹⁰⁸, S. Adomeit¹⁰⁰, T. Adye¹³¹, A.A. Affolder⁷⁴, T. Agatonovic-Jovin¹³, J.A. Aguilar-Saavedra^{126a,126f}, M. Agustoni¹⁷, S.P. Ahlen²², F. Ahmadov^{65,b}, G. Aielli^{134a,134b}, H. Akerstedt^{147a,147b}, T.P.A. Åkesson⁸¹, G. Akimoto¹⁵⁶, A.V. Akimov⁹⁶, G.L. Alberghi^{20a,20b}, J. Albert¹⁷⁰, S. Albrand⁵⁵, M.J. Alconada Verzini⁷¹, M. Aleksa³⁰, I.N. Aleksandrov⁶⁵, C. Alexa^{26a}, G. Alexander¹⁵⁴, T. Alexopoulos¹⁰, M. Alhroob¹¹³, G. Alimonti^{91a}, L. Alio⁸⁵, J. Alison³¹, S.P. Alkire³⁵, B.M.M. Allbrooke¹⁸, P.P. Allport⁷⁴, A. Aloisio^{104a,104b}, A. Alonso³⁶, F. Alonso⁷¹, C. Alpigiani⁷⁶, A. Altheimer³⁵, B. Alvarez Gonzalez⁹⁰, D. Álvarez Piqueras¹⁶⁸, M.G. Alviggi^{104a,104b}, K. Amako⁶⁶, Y. Amaral Coutinho^{24a}, C. Amelung²³, D. Amidei⁸⁹, S.P. Amor Dos Santos^{126a,126c}, A. Amorim^{126a,126b}, S. Amoroso⁴⁸, N. Amram¹⁵⁴, G. Amundsen²³, C. Anastopoulos¹⁴⁰, L.S. Ancu⁴⁹, N. Andari³⁰, T. Andeen³⁵, C.F. Anders^{58b}, G. Anders³⁰, K.J. Anderson³¹, A. Andreazza^{91a,91b}, V. Andrei^{58a}, S. Angelidakis⁹, I. Angelozzi¹⁰⁷, P. Anger⁴⁴, A. Angerami³⁵, F. Anghinolfi³⁰, A.V. Anisenkov^{109,c}, N. Anjos¹², A. Annovi^{124a,124b}, M. Antonelli⁴⁷, A. Antonov⁹⁸, J. Antos^{145b}, F. Anulli^{133a}, M. Aoki⁶⁶, L. Aperio Bella¹⁸, G. Arabidze⁹⁰, Y. Arai⁶⁶, J.P. Araque^{126a}, A.T.H. Arce⁴⁵, F.A. Arduh⁷¹, J-F. Arguin⁹⁵, S. Argyropoulos⁴², M. Arik^{19a}, A.J. Armbruster³⁰, O. Arnaez³⁰, V. Arnal⁸², H. Arnold⁴⁸, M. Arratia²⁸, O. Arslan²¹, A. Artamonov⁹⁷, G. Artoni²³, S. Asai¹⁵⁶, N. Asbah⁴², A. Ashkenazi¹⁵⁴, B. Åsman^{147a,147b}, L. Asquith¹⁵⁰, K. Assamagan²⁵, R. Astalos^{145a}, M. Atkinson¹⁶⁶, N.B. Atlay¹⁴², B. Auerbach⁶, K. Augsten¹²⁸, M. Auroousseau^{146b}, G. Avolio³⁰, B. Axen¹⁵, M.K. Ayoub¹¹⁷, G. Azuelos^{95,d}, M.A. Baak³⁰, A.E. Baas^{58a}, C. Bacci^{135a,135b}, H. Bachacou¹³⁷, K. Bachas¹⁵⁵, M. Backes³⁰, M. Backhaus³⁰, E. Badescu^{26a}, P. Bagiacchi^{133a,133b}, P. Bagnaia^{133a,133b}, Y. Bai^{33a}, T. Bain³⁵, J.T. Baines¹³¹, O.K. Baker¹⁷⁷, P. Balek¹²⁹, T. Balestri¹⁴⁹, F. Balli⁸⁴, E. Banas³⁹, Sw. Banerjee¹⁷⁴, A.A.E. Bannoura¹⁷⁶, H.S. Bansil¹⁸, L. Barak³⁰, S.P. Baranov⁹⁶, E.L. Barberio⁸⁸, D. Barberis^{50a,50b}, M. Barbero⁸⁵, T. Barillari¹⁰¹, M. Barisonzi^{165a,165b}, T. Barklow¹⁴⁴, N. Barlow²⁸, S.L. Barnes⁸⁴, B.M. Barnett¹³¹, R.M. Barnett¹⁵, Z. Barnovska⁵, A. Baroncelli^{135a}, G. Barone⁴⁹, A.J. Barr¹²⁰, F. Barreiro⁸², J. Barreiro Guimarães da Costa⁵⁷, R. Bartoldus¹⁴⁴, A.E. Barton⁷², P. Bartos^{145a}, A. Bassalat¹¹⁷, A. Basye¹⁶⁶, R.L. Bates⁵³, S.J. Batista¹⁵⁹, J.R. Batley²⁸, M. Battaglia¹³⁸, M. Bauce^{133a,133b}, F. Bauer¹³⁷, H.S. Bawa^{144,e}, J.B. Beacham¹¹¹, M.D. Beattie⁷², T. Beau⁸⁰, P.H. Beauchemin¹⁶², R. Beccherle^{124a,124b}, P. Bechtel²¹, H.P. Beck^{17,f}, K. Becker¹²⁰, M. Becker⁸³, S. Becker¹⁰⁰, M. Beckingham¹⁷¹, C. Becot¹¹⁷, A.J. Beddall^{19c}, A. Beddall^{19c}, V.A. Bednyakov⁶⁵, C.P. Bee¹⁴⁹, L.J. Beemster¹⁰⁷, T.A. Beermann¹⁷⁶, M. Begel²⁵, J.K. Behr¹²⁰, C. Belanger-Champagne⁸⁷, W.H. Bell⁴⁹, G. Bella¹⁵⁴, L. Bellagamba^{20a}, A. Bellerive²⁹, M. Bellomo⁸⁶, K. Belotskiy⁹⁸, O. Beltramello³⁰, O. Benary¹⁵⁴, D. Benchekroun^{136a}, M. Bender¹⁰⁰, K.

Bendtz147a,147b, N. Benekos10, Y. Benhammou154, E. Benhar Noccioli49, J.A. Benitez Garcia160b, D.P. Benjamin45, J.R. Bensinger23, S. Bentvelsen107, L. Beresford120, M. Beretta47, D. Berge107, E. Bergeaas Kuutmann167, N. Berger5, F. Berghaus170, J. Beringer15, C. Bernard22, N.R. Bernard86, C. Bernius110, F.U. Bernlochner21, T. Berry77, P. Berta129, C. Bertella83, G. Bertoli147a,147b, F. Bertolucci124a,124b, C. Bertsche113, D. Bertsche113, M.I. Besana91a, G.J. Besjes106, O. Bessidskaia Bylund147a,147b, M. Bessner42, N. Besson137, C. Betancourt48, S. Bethke101, A. Bevan76, W. Bhimji46, R.M. Bianchi125, L. Bianchini23, M. Bianco30, O. Biebel100, S.P. Bieniek78, M. Biglietti135a, J. Bilbao De Mendizabal49, H. Bilokon47, M. Bindi54, S. Binet117, A. Bingul19c, C. Bini133a,133b, C.W. Black151, J.E. Black144, K.M. Black22, D. Blackburn139, R.E. Blair6, J.-B. Blanchard137, J.E. Blanco77, T. Blazek145a, I. Bloch42, C. Blocker23, W. Blum83,*, U. Blumenschein54, G.J. Bobbink107, V.S. Bobrovnikov109,c, S.S. Bocchetta81, A. Bocci45, C. Bock100, M. Boehler48, J.A. Bogaerts30, A.G. Bogdanchikov109, C. Bohm147a, V. Boisvert77, T. Bold38a, V. Boldea26a, A.S. Boldyrev99, M. Bomben80, M. Bona76, M. Boonekamp137, A. Borisov130, G. Borissov72, S. Borroni42, J. Bortfeldt100, V. Bortolotto60a,60b,60c, K. Bos107, D. Boscherini20a, M. Bosman12, J. Boudreau125, J. Bouffard2, E.V. Bouhova-Thacker72, D. Boumediene34, C. Bourdarios117, N. Bousson114, S. Boutouill136d, A. Boveia30, J. Boyd30, I.R. Boyko65, I. Bozic13, J. Bracinik18, A. Brandt8, G. Brandt15, O. Brandt58a, U. Bratzler157, B. Brau86, J.E. Brau116, H.M. Braun176,*, S.F. Brazzale165a,165c, K. Brendlinger122, A.J. Brennan88, L. Brenner107, R. Brenner167, S. Bressler173, K. Bristow146c, T.M. Bristow46, D. Britton53, D. Britzger42, F.M. Brochu28, I. Brock21, R. Brock90, J. Bronner101, G. Brooijmans35, T. Brooks77, W.K. Brooks32b, J. Brosamer15, E. Brost116, J. Brown55, P.A. Bruckman de Renstrom39, D. Bruncko145b, R. Bruneliere48, A. Bruni20a, G. Bruni20a, M. Bruschi20a, L. Bryngemark81, T. Buanes14, Q. Buat143, P. Buchholz142, A.G. Buckley53, S.I. Buda26a, I.A. Budagov65, F. Buehrer48, L. Bugge119, M.K. Bugge119, O. Bulekov98, H. Burckhart30, S. Burdin74, B. Burghgrave108, S. Burke131, I. Burmeister43, E. Busato34, D. Büscher48, V. Büscher83, P. Bussey53, C.P. Buszello167, J.M. Butler22, A.I. Butt3, C.M. Buttar53, J.M. Butterworth78, P. Butti107, W. Buttinger25, A. Buzatu53, R. Buzykaev109,c, S. Cabrera Urbán168, D. Caforio128, O. Cakir4a, P. Calafiura15, A. Calandri137, G. Calderini80, P. Calfayan100, L.P. Caloba24a, D. Calvet34, S. Calvet34, R. Camacho Toro49, S. Camarda42, D. Cameron119, L.M. Caminada15, R. Caminal Armadans12, S. Campana30, M. Campanelli78, A. Campoverde149, V. Canale104a,104b, A. Canepa160a, M. Cano Bret76, J. Cantero82, R. Cantrill126a, T. Cao40, M.D.M. Capeans Garrido30, I. Caprini26a, M. Caprini26a, M. Capua37a,37b, R. Caputo83, R. Cardarelli134a, T. Carli30, G. Carlino104a, L. Carminati91a,91b, S. Caron106, E. Carquin32a, G.D. Carrillo-Montoya8, J.R. Carter28, J. Carvalho126a,126c, D. Casadei78, M.P. Casado12, M. Casolino12, E. Castaneda-Miranda146b, A. Castelli107, V. Castillo Gimenez168, N.F. Castro126a,g, P. Catastini57, A. Catinaccio30, J.R. Catmore119, A. Cattai30, J. Caudron83, V. Cavaliere166, D. Cavalli91a, M. Cavalli-Sforza12, V. Cavasinni124a,124b, F. Ceradini135a,135b,

B.C. Cerio45, K. Cerny129, A.S. Cerqueira24b, A. Cerri150, L. Cerrito76, F. Cerutti15, M. Cerv30, A. Cervelli17, S.A. Cetin19b, A. Chafaq136a, D. Chakraborty108, I. Chalupkova129, P. Chang166, B. Chapleau87, J.D. Chapman28, D.G. Charlton18, C.C. Chau159, C.A. Chavez Barajas150, S. Cheatham153, A. Chegwiddden90, S. Chekanov6, S.V. Chekulaev160a, G.A. Chelkov65,h, M.A. Chelstowska89, C. Chen64, H. Chen25, K. Chen149, L. Chen33d,i, S. Chen33c, X. Chen33f, Y. Chen67, H.C. Cheng89, Y. Cheng31, A. Cheplakov65, E. Cheremushkina130, R. Cherkaoui El Moursli136e, V. Chernyatin25,*, E. Cheu7, L. Chevalier137, V. Chiarella47, J.T. Childers6, G. Chiodini73a, A.S. Chisholm18, R.T. Chislett78, A. Chitan26a, M.V. Chizhov65, K. Choi61, S. Chouridou9, B.K.B. Chow100, V. Christodoulou78, D. Chromek-Burckhart30, M.L. Chu152, J. Chudoba127, A.J. Chuinard87, J.J. Chwastowski39, L. Chytka115, G. Ciapetti133a,133b, A.K. Ciftci4a, D. Cinca53, V. Cindro75, I.A. Cioara21, A. Ciocio15, Z.H. Citron173, M. Ciubancan26a, A. Clark49, B.L. Clark57, P.J. Clark46, R.N. Clarke15, W. Cleland125, C. Clement147a,147b, Y. Coadou85, M. Cobal165a,165c, A. Coccaro139, J. Cochran64, L. Coffey23, J.G. Cogan144, B. Cole35, S. Cole108, A.P. Colijn107, J. Collot55, T. Colombo58c, G. Compostella101, P. Conde Muiño126a,126b, E. Coniavitis48, S.H. Connell146b, I.A. Connelly77, S.M. Consonni91a,91b, V. Consorti48, S. Constantinescu26a, C. Conta121a,121b, G. Conti30, F. Conventi104a,j, M. Cooke15, B.D. Cooper78, A.M. Cooper-Sarkar120, K. Copic15, T. Cornelissen176, M. Corradi20a, F. Corriveau87,k, A. Corso-Radu164, A. Cortes-Gonzalez12, G. Cortiana101, G. Costa91a, M.J. Costa168, D. Costanzo140, D. Côté8, G. Cottin28, G. Cowan77, B.E. Cox84, K. Cranmer110, G. Cree29, S. Crépe-Renaudin55, F. Crescioli80, W.A. Cribbs147a,147b, M. Crispin Ortuzar120, M. Cristinziani21, V. Croft106, G. Crosetti37a,37b, T. Cuhadar Donszelmann140, J. Cummings177, M. Curatolo47, C. Cuthbert151, H. Czirr142, P. Czodrowski3, S. D' Auria53, M. D' Onofrio74, M.J. Da Cunha Sargedas De Sousa126a,126b, C. Da Via84, W. Dabrowski38a, A. Dafinca120, T. Dai89, O. Dale14, F. Dallaire95, C. Dallapiccola86, M. Dam36, J.R. Dandoy31, A.C. Daniells18, M. Danninger169, M. Dano Hoffmann137, V. Dao48, G. Darbo50a, S. Darmora8, J. Dassoulas3, A. Dattagupta61, W. Davey21, C. David170, T. Davidek129, E. Davies120,l, M. Davies154, P. Davison78, Y. Davygora58a, E. Dawe88, I. Dawson140, R.K. Daya-Ishmukhametova86, K. De8, R. de Asmundis104a, S. De Castro20a,20b, S. De Cecco80, N. De Groot106, P. de Jong107, H. De la Torre82, F. De Lorenzi64, L. De Nooij107, D. De Pedis133a, A. De Salvo133a, U. De Sanctis150, A. De Santo150, J.B. De Vivie De Regie117, W.J. Dearnaley72, R. Debbe25, C. Debenedetti138, D.V. Dedovich65, I. Deigaard107, J. Del Peso82, T. Del Prete124a,124b, D. Delgove117, F. Deliot137, C.M. Delitzsch49, M. Deliyergiyev75, A. Dell' Acqua30, L. Dell' Asta22, M. Dell' Orso124a,124b, M. Della Pietra104a,j, D. della Volpe49, M. Delmastro5, P.A. Delsart55, C. Deluca107, D.A. DeMarco159, S. Demers177, M. Demichev65, A. Demilly80, S.P. Denisov130, D. Derendarz39, J.E. Derkaoui136d, F. Derue80, P. Dervan74, K. Desch21, C. Deterre42, P.O. Deviveiros30, A. Dewhurst131, S. Dhaliwal107, A. Di Ciaccio134a,134b, L. Di Ciaccio5, A. Di Domenico133a,133b, C. Di Donato104a,104b, A. Di Girolamo30,

B. Di Girolamo30, A. Di Mattia153, B. Di Micco135a,135b, R. Di Nardo47, A. Di Simone48, R. Di Sipio159, D. Di Valentino29, C. Diaconu85, M. Diamond159, F.A. Dias46, M.A. Diaz32a, E.B. Diehl89, J. Dietrich16, S. Diglio85, A. Dimitrievska13, J. Dingfelder21, P. Dita26a, S. Dita26a, F. Dittus30, F. Djama85, T. Djobava51b, J.I. Djuvslund58a, M.A.B. do Vale24c, D. Dobos30, M. Dobre26a, C. Doglioni49, T. Dohmae156, J. Dolejsi129, Z. Dolezal129, B.A. Dolgoshein98,* , M. Donadelli24d, S. Donati124a,124b, P. Dondero121a,121b, J. Donini34, J. Dopke131, A. Doria104a, M.T. Dova71, A.T. Doyle53, E. Drechsler54, M. Dris10, E. Dubreuil34, E. Duchovni173, G. Duckeck100, O.A. Ducu26a,85, D. Duda176, A. Dudarev30, L. Duflot117, L. Duguid77, M. Dührssen30, M. Dunford58a, H. Duran Yildiz4a, M. Düren52, A. Durglishvili51b, D. Duschinger44, M. Dwuznik38a, M. Dyndal38a, C. Eckardt42, K.M. Ecker101, W. Edson2, N.C. Edwards46, W. Ehrenfeld21, T. Eifert30, G. Eigen14, K. Einsweiler15, T. Ekelof167, M. El Kacimi136c, M. Ellert167, S. Elles5, F. Ellinghaus83, A.A. Elliot170, N. Ellis30, J. Elmsheuser100, M. Elsing30, D. Emel'yanov131, Y. Enari156, O.C. Endner83, M. Endo118, R. Engelmann149, J. Erdmann43, A. Ereditato17, G. Ernis176, J. Ernst2, M. Ernst25, S. Errede166, E. Ertel83, M. Escalier117, H. Esch43, C. Escobar125, B. Esposito47, A.I. Etienvre137, E. Etzion154, H. Evans61, A. Ezhilov123, L. Fabbri20a,20b, G. Facini31, R.M. Fakhruddinov130, S. Falciano133a, R.J. Falla78, J. Faltoval29, Y. Fang33a, M. Fanti91a,91b, A. Farbin8, A. Farilla135a, T. Farooque12, S. Farrell15, S.M. Farrington171, P. Farthouat30, F. Fassi136e, P. Fassnacht30, D. Fassouliotis9, A. Favareto50a,50b, L. Fayard117, P. Federic145a, O.L. Fedin123,m, W. Fedorko169, S. Feigl30, L. Feligioni85, C. Feng33d, E.J. Feng6, H. Feng89, A.B. Fenyuk130, P. Fernandez Martinez168, S. Fernandez Perez30, S. Ferrag53, J. Ferrando53, A. Ferrari167, P. Ferrari107, R. Ferrari121a, D.E. Ferreira de Lima53, A. Ferrer168, D. Ferrere49, C. Ferretti89, A. Ferretto Parodi50a,50b, M. Fiascaris31, F. Fiedler83, A. Filipčić75, M. Filipuzzi42, F. Filthaut106, M. Fincke-Keeler170, K.D. Finelli151, M.C.N. Fiolhais126a,126c, L. Fiorini168, A. Firan40, A. Fischer2, C. Fischer12, J. Fischer176, W.C. Fisher90, E.A. Fitzgerald23, M. Flechl48, I. Fleck142, P. Fleischmann89, S. Fleischmann176, G.T. Fletcher140, G. Fletcher76, T. Flick176, A. Floderus81, L.R. Flores Castillo60a, M.J. Flowerdew101, A. Formica137, A. Forti84, D. Fournier117, H. Fox72, S. Fracchia12, P. Francavilla80, M. Franchini20a,20b, D. Francis30, L. Franconi119, M. Franklin57, M. Fraternali121a,121b, D. Freeborn78, S.T. French28, F. Friedrich44, D. Froidevaux30, J.A. Frost120, C. Fukunaga157, E. Fullana Torregrosa83, B.G. Fulson144, J. Fuster168, C. Gabaldon55, O. Gabizon176, A. Gabrielli20a,20b, A. Gabrielli133a,133b, S. Gadatsch107, S. Gadomski49, G. Gagliardi50a,50b, P. Gagnon61, C. Galea106, B. Galhardo126a,126c, E.J. Gallas120, B.J. Gallop131, P. Gallus128, G. Galster36, K.K. Gan111, J. Gao33b,85, Y. Gao46, Y.S. Gao144,e, F.M. Garay Walls46, F. Garberson177, C. García168, J.E. García Navarro168, M. Garcia-Sciveres15, R.W. Gardner31, N. Garelli144, V. Garonne119, C. Gatti47, A. Gaudiello50a,50b, G. Gaudio121a, B. Gaur142, L. Gauthier95, P. Gauzzi133a,133b, I.L. Gavrilenko96, C. Gay169, G. Gaycken21, E.N. Gazis10, P. Ge33d, Z. Gecse169, C.N.P. Gee131, D.A.A. Geerts107,

Ch. Geich-Gimbel21, M.P. Geisler58a, C. Gemme50a, M.H. Genest55, S. Gentile133a,133b, M. George54, S. George77, D. Gerbaudo164, A. Gershon154, H. Ghazlane136b, N. Ghodbane34, B. Giacobbe20a, S. Giagu133a,133b, V. Giangiobbe12, P. Giannetti124a,124b, B. Gibbard25, S.M. Gibson77, M. Gilchriese15, T.P.S. Gillam28, D. Gillberg30, G. Gilles34, D.M. Gingrich3,d, N. Giokaris9, M.P. Giordani165a,165c, F.M. Giorgi20a, F.M. Giorgi16, P.F. Giraud137, P. Giromini47, D. Giugni91a, C. Giuliani48, M. Giulini58b, B.K. Gjelsten119, S. Gkaitatzis155, I. Gkialas155, E.L. Gkoukousis117, L.K. Gladilin99, C. Glasman82, J. Glatzer30, P.C.F. Glaysher46, A. Glazov42, M. Goblirsch-Kolb101, J.R. Goddard76, J. Godlewski39, S. Goldfarb89, T. Golling49, D. Golubkov130, A. Gomes126a,126b,126d, R. Gonçalo126a, J. Goncalves Pinto Firmino Da Costa137, L. Gonella21, S. González de la Hoz168, G. Gonzalez Parra12, S. Gonzalez-Sevilla49, L. Goossens30, P.A. Gorbounov97, H.A. Gordon25, I. Gorelov105, B. Gorini30, E. Gorini73a,73b, A. Gorišek75, E. Gornicki39, A.T. Goshaw45, C. Gössling43, M.I. Gostkin65, D. Goujdami136c, A.G. Goussiou139, N. Govender146b, H.M.X. Grabas138, L. Graber54, I. Grabowska-Bold38a, P. Grafström20a,20b, K-J. Grahn42, J. Gramling49, E. Gramstad119, S. Grancagnolo16, V. Grassi149, V. Gratchev123, H.M. Gray30, E. Graziani135a, Z.D. Greenwood79,n, K. Gregersen78, I.M. Gregor42, P. Grenier144, J. Griffiths8, A.A. Grillo138, K. Grimm72, S. Grinstein12,o, Ph. Gris34, J.-F. Grivaz117, J.P. Grohs44, A. Grohsjean42, E. Gross173, J. Grosse-Knetter54, G.C. Grossi79, Z.J. Grout150, L. Guan33b, J. Guenther128, F. Guescini49, D. Guest177, O. Gueta154, E. Guido50a,50b, T. Guillemin117, S. Guindon2, U. Gul53, C. Gumpert44, J. Guo33e, S. Gupta120, P. Gutierrez113, N.G. Gutierrez Ortiz53, C. Gutschow44, C. Guyot137, C. Gwenlan120, C.B. Gwilliam74, A. Haas110, C. Haber15, H.K. Hadavand8, N. Haddad136e, P. Haefner21, S. Hageböck21, Z. Hajduk39, H. Hakobyan178, M. Haleem42, J. Haley114, D. Hall120, G. Halladjian90, G.D. Hallowell85, K. Hamacher176, P. Hamal115, K. Hamano170, M. Hamer54, A. Hamilton146a, S. Hamilton162, G.N. Hamity146c, P.G. Hamnett42, L. Han33b, K. Hanagaki118, K. Hanawa156, M. Hance15, P. Hanke58a, R. Hanna137, J.B. Hansen36, J.D. Hansen36, M.C. Hansen21, P.H. Hansen36, K. Hara161, A.S. Hard174, T. Harenberg176, F. Hariri117, S. Harkusha92, R.D. Harrington46, P.F. Harrison171, F. Hartjes107, M. Hasegawa67, S. Hasegawa103, Y. Hasegawa141, A. Hasib113, S. Hassani137, S. Haug17, R. Hauser90, L. Hauswald44, M. Havranek127, C.M. Hawkes18, R.J. Hawkings30, A.D. Hawkins81, T. Hayashi161, D. Hayden90, C.P. Hays120, J.M. Hays76, H.S. Hayward74, S.J. Haywood131, S.J. Head18, T. Heck83, V. Hedberg81, L. Heelan8, S. Heim122, T. Heim176, B. Heinemann15, L. Heinrich110, J. Hejbal127, L. Helary22, S. Hellman147a,147b, D. Hellmich21, C. Helsens30, J. Henderson120, R.C.W. Henderson72, Y. Heng174, C. Hengler42, A. Henrichs177, A.M. Henriques Correia30, S. Henrot-Versille117, G.H. Herbert16, Y. Hernández Jiménez168, R. Herrberg-Schubert16, G. Herten48, R. Hertenberger100, L. Hervas30, G.G. Hesketh78, N.P. Hessey107, J.W. Hetherly40, R. Hickling76, E. Higón-Rodríguez168, E. Hill170, J.C. Hill28, K.H. Hiller42, S.J. Hillier18, I. Hinchliffe15, E. Hines122, R.R. Hinman15, M. Hirose158, D. Hirschbuehl176,

J. Hobbs149, N. Hod107, M.C. Hodgkinson140, P. Hodgson140, A. Hoecker30, M.R. Hoferkamp105, F. Hoenig100, M. Hohlfeld83, D. Hohn21, T.R. Holmes15, T.M. Hong122, L. Hooft van Huysduynden110, W.H. Hopkins116, Y. Horii103, A.J. Horton143, J-Y. Hostachy55, S. Hou152, A. Hoummada136a, J. Howard120, J. Howarth42, M. Hrabovsky115, I. Hristova16, J. Hrivnac117, T. Hryn' ova5, A. Hrynevich93, C. Hsu146c, P.J. Hsu152,p, S.-C. Hsu139, D. Hu35, Q. Hu33b, X. Hu89, Y. Huang42, Z. Hubacek30, F. Hubaut85, F. Huegging21, T.B. Huffman120, E.W. Hughes35, G. Hughes72, M. Huhtinen30, T.A. Hülsing83, N. Huseynov65,b, J. Huston90, J. Huth57, G. Iacobucci49, G. Iakovidis25, I. Ibragimov142, L. Iconomidou-Fayard117, E. Ideal177, Z. Idrissi136e, P. Iengo30, O. Igonkina107, T. Iizawa172, Y. Ikegami66, K. Ike-matsu142, M. Ikeno66, Y. Ilchenko31,q, D. Iliadis155, N. Ilic159, Y. Inamaru67, T. Ince101, P. Ioannou9, M. Iodice135a, K. Iordanidou9, V. Ippolito57, A. Irlés Quiles168, C. Isaksson167, M. Ishino68, M. Ishitsuka158, R. Ishmukhame-tov111, C. Issever120, S. Istin19a, J.M. Iturbe Ponce84, R. Iuppa134a,134b, J. Ivarsson81, W. Iwanski39, H. Iwasaki66, J.M. Izen41, V. Izzo104a, S. Jabbar3, B. Jackson122, M. Jackson74, P. Jackson1, M.R. Jaekel30, V. Jain2, K. Jakobs48, S. Jakobsen30, T. Jakoubek127, J. Jakubek128, D.O. Jamin152, D.K. Jana79, E. Jansen78, R.W. Jansky62, J. Janssen21, M. Janus171, G. Jarlskog81, N. Javadov65,b, T. Javůrek48, L. Jeanty15, J. Jejelava51a,r, G.-Y. Jeng151, D. Jennens88, P. Jenni48,s, J. Jentzsch43, C. Jeske171, S. Jézéquel5, H. Ji174, J. Jia149, Y. Jiang33b, S. Jiggins78, J. Jimenez Pena168, S. Jin33a, A. Jinaru26a, O. Jinnouchi158, M.D. Joergensen36, P. Johansson140, K.A. Johns7, K. Jon-And147a,147b, G. Jones171, R.W.L. Jones72, T.J. Jones74, J. Jongmanns58a, P.M. Jorge126a,126b, K.D. Joshi84, J. Jovicevic160a, X. Ju174, C.A. Jung43, P. Jussel62, A. Juste Rozas12,o, M. Kaci168, A. Kaczmarska39, M. Kado117, H. Kagan111, M. Kagan144, S.J. Kahn85, E. Kajomovitz45, C.W. Kalderon120, S. Kama40, A. Kamenshchikov130, N. Kanaya156, M. Kaneda30, S. Kaneti28, V.A. Kantserov98, J. Kanzaki66, B. Kaplan110, A. Kapliy31, D. Kar53, K. Karakostas10, A. Karamaoun3, N. Karastathis10,107, M.J. Kareem54, M. Karnevskiy83, S.N. Karpov65, Z.M. Karpova65, K. Karthik110, V. Kartvelishvili72, A.N. Karyukhin130, L. Kashif174, R.D. Kass111, A. Kastanas14, Y. Kataoka156, A. Katre49, J. Katzy42, K. Kawagoe70, T. Kawamoto156, G. Kawamura54, S. Kazama156, V.F. Kazanin109,c, M.Y. Kazarinov65, R. Keeler170, R. Kehoe40, J.S. Keller42, J.J. Kempster77, H. Keoshkerian84, O. Kepka127, B.P. Kerševan75, S. Kersten176, R.A. Keyes87, F. Khalil-zada11, H. Khandanyan147a,147b, A. Khanov114, A.G. Kharlamov109,c, T.J. Khoo28, V. Khovanskiy97, E. Khramov65, J. Khubua51b,t, H.Y. Kim8, H. Kim147a,147b, S.H. Kim161, Y. Kim31, N. Kimura155, O.M. Kind16, B.T. King74, M. King168, R.S.B. King120, S.B. King169, J. Kirk131, A.E. Kiryunin101, T. Kishimoto67, D. Kisie

Note: Figure translations are in progress. See original paper for figures.

Source: ChinaXiv – Machine translation. Verify with original.