

# Boson Fusion and Higgs production at the LHC in six fermion final states with one charged lepton pair.

---

**E. Accomando, A. Ballestrero, A. Belhouari, E. Maina**

*INFN, Sezione di Torino, Italy*

*Dipartimento di Fisica Teorica, Università di Torino, Italy \**

**ABSTRACT:** Boson boson scattering and Higgs production in boson boson fusion will be actively investigated at the LHC. We have performed a parton level study of all processes of the type  $q_1 q_2 \rightarrow q_3 q_4 q_5 q_6 l^+ l^-$  using for the first time a full fledged six fermion Monte Carlo event generator which employs exact matrix elements at  $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_{em}^6)$ . We have examined Higgs production in vector boson fusion followed by the decay chain  $H \rightarrow ZZ \rightarrow l^+ l^- jj$ , including exactly all electroweak irreducible backgrounds. In the high mass region we have compared the case of a relatively light Higgs with the no-Higgs case. The integrated cross section for the latter case is about twice that in the former for a minimum invariant mass of the  $ZV$  pair of about 900 GeV. Summing the muon and the electron channels, about 50 events are expected in the light Higgs case for  $L=100 \text{ fb}^{-1}$ .

---

\*E.A. is supported by the Italian Ministero dell'Istruzione, dell'Università e della Ricerca (MIUR) under contract Decreto MIUR 26-01-2001 N.13 "Incentivazione alla mobilità di studiosi stranieri ed italiani residenti all'estero".

Work supported by MIUR under contract 2004021808\_009.

---

## Contents

<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. Classification and calculation</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3. Physical processes</b>	<b>4</b>
3.1 Higgs production in PHANTOM	7
3.2 The high mass region	8
<b>4. Conclusions</b>	<b>13</b>

---

## 1. Introduction

The Standard Model (SM) provides the simplest and most economical explanation of Electro-Weak Symmetry Breaking (EWSB)<sup>1</sup>. The only missing ingredient is the Higgs boson. The fit of precision EW data to the SM currently gives an upper limit on the Higgs mass of about 200 GeV [5] while direct searches have established a lower limit  $M(H) > 114.4$  GeV.


In the SM the Higgs is essential to the renormalizability of the theory and is also crucial to ensure that perturbative unitarity bounds are not violated in high energy reactions. Scattering processes between longitudinally polarized vector bosons ( $V_L$ ) are particularly sensitive in this regard. Without a Higgs the  $V_L$ 's interact strongly at high energy, violating perturbative unitarity at about one TeV [6]. If, on the contrary, a relatively light Higgs exists then they are weakly coupled. In the strong scattering case one is led to expect the presence of resonances in  $V_L V_L$  interactions. Unfortunately the mass, spin and even number of these resonances are not uniquely determined [7]. If a Higgs particle is discovered it will nonetheless be necessary to verify that indeed longitudinally polarized vector bosons are weakly coupled at high energy by studying boson boson scattering in full detail.

At the LHC no beam of on shell EW bosons will be available. Incoming quarks will emit spacelike virtual bosons which will then scatter among themselves and finally decay. These processes have been scrutinized since a long time [8, 9]. All previous studies of boson boson scattering at high energy hadron colliders, with the exception of [13], have resorted to some approximation, either the Equivalent Vector Boson Approximation (EVBA) [10], or a production times decay approach, supplementing a calculation of

$$q_1 q_2 \rightarrow q_3 q_4 V_1 V_2 \tag{1.1}$$

---

<sup>1</sup>Detailed reviews and extensive bibliographies can be found in Refs.[1, 2, 3, 4].



**Figure 1:** Vector boson fusion processes.


processes with the on shell decay of the two vector bosons. There are however issues that cannot be tackled without a full six fermion calculation like exact spin correlations between the decays of different heavy particles, the effect of the non resonant background, the relevance of offshellness of boson decays, the question of interferences between different subamplitudes. Without a complete calculation it will be impossible to determine the accuracy of approximate results.

Recently PHASE a full fledged six fermion Monte Carlo has become available [11]. It describes at  $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_{em}^6)$ , using exact tree level matrix elements, all processes of the form  $PP \rightarrow q_1 q_2 \rightarrow q_3 q_4 q_5 q_6 l \nu$  (where  $q_i$  stands for a generic (anti)quark) which can take place at the LHC [12, 13]. The range of interesting reactions is however much wider. Processes in which both vector bosons decay leptonically have been extensively studied both for Higgs detection and for boson boson scattering and top physics. Besides, in order to obtain a full coverage of all semileptonic processes it is necessary to include all reactions with a charged lepton pair in the final state. This has required the calculation of additional amplitudes and an extensive improvement of the routines which pilot the integration and the generation of unweighted events. The result is a new code called PHANTOM [14] which, at present, includes all processes with six fermions in the final state at  $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_{em}^6)$


$$PP \rightarrow q_1 q_2 \rightarrow f_1 f_2 f_3 f_4 f_5 f_6. \quad (1.2)$$

The accuracy of tree level calculations can be sensibly improved. PHASE is being continued also in this direction. A new code PHAST\_NLO [15] will address six fermion physics at NLO. Both PHANTOM and PHAST\_NLO are based on the methods of Refs. [16, 17] and adopt the iterative-adaptive multichannel strategy developed in [11]. In the following we present results obtained with PHANTOM.

Since in addition to VV scattering many other subprocesses are in general present in the full set of diagrams, as partially shown in Figs. 1–3, it is not a trivial task to separate boson boson scattering from the EW irreducible background. In practice one has to deal also with other types of background to which QCD interactions contribute, but which however do not include any boson boson scattering term. We will refer to these processes as QCD background even though in general they will be a mixture of QCD and EW interactions. In this paper we are neglecting QCD backgrounds. It is clear that obtaining a good signal over EW irreducible background ratio is a prerequisite to any attempt at dealing with the QCD one.



**Figure 2:** Non fusion and non doubly resonant two vector boson production. Three vector boson production.



**Figure 3:** Higgs boson production via vector boson fusion and Higgstrahlung.

## 2. Classification and calculation

For a complete analysis one needs to include all processes which contribute to final states with one charged lepton pair. Taking into account one lepton type, charge conjugation and the symmetry between first and second quark family, the number of reactions can be reduced to 163. A given reaction, its charge-conjugate, and the ones related by family exchange can be indeed described by the same matrix element; they differ by the convolution with Parton Distribution Functions. All processes which share the same total particle content, with all eight partons taken to be outgoing, can be described by a single master amplitude. As a consequence, all reactions can be classified into 24 groups which are enumerated in Tab. 1. By selecting two initial quarks in each particle group, one obtains all possible processes.

The calculation can be further simplified examining more closely the full set of Feynman diagrams. In some processes, fermions can be paired only into neutral currents (4Z), while in other cases they can form two charged and two neutral currents (2Z2W). Mixed processes are described by a combination of the two sets (2Z2W+4Z).

The 4Z amplitude was not previously available. The three basic topologies in which the Feynman diagrams appearing in the 4Z amplitude can be classified are shown in Fig. 4. The numbers N1/N2/N3/N4/N5 under each topology indicate the number of Feynman diagrams described by this topology if 4/3/2/1/0 fermion pairs are taken to be massive, namely to have non zero interaction with the Higgs boson. The flavour of all four fermion pairs are assumed to be different. The complete set of diagrams is eventually generated by

Group	Type	diagrams	Group	Type	diagrams
$u\bar{u} c\bar{c} b\bar{b} l^- l^+$	4Z	615	$u\bar{u} u\bar{u} u\bar{u} l^- l^+$	4Z	3474
$u\bar{u} u\bar{u} b\bar{b} l^- l^+$	4Z	1230	$u\bar{u} u\bar{u} c\bar{c} l^- l^+$	4Z	1158
$u\bar{u} u\bar{u} s\bar{s} l^- l^+$	4Z	1158	$u\bar{u} c\bar{c} d\bar{d} l^- l^+$	4Z+2W2Z	821
$u\bar{u} b\bar{b} b\bar{b} l^- l^+$	4Z	1606	$u\bar{u} u\bar{u} d\bar{d} l^- l^+$	4Z+2W2Z	2126
$u\bar{u} s\bar{s} s\bar{s} l^- l^+$	4Z	1158	$u\bar{u} d\bar{d} b\bar{b} l^- l^+$	4Z+2W2Z	880
$u\bar{u} s\bar{s} b\bar{b} l^- l^+$	4Z	615	$u\bar{u} d\bar{d} s\bar{s} l^- l^+$	4Z+2W2Z	821
$d\bar{d} d\bar{d} d\bar{d} l^- l^+$	4Z	3474	$u\bar{u} d\bar{d} d\bar{d} l^- l^+$	4Z+2W2Z	2126
$b\bar{b} b\bar{b} b\bar{b} l^- l^+$	4Z	7506	$u\bar{d} s\bar{c} u\bar{u} l^- l^+$	2W2Z	484
$d\bar{d} d\bar{d} s\bar{s} l^- l^+$	4Z	1158	$u\bar{d} s\bar{c} c\bar{c} l^- l^+$	2W2Z	484
$d\bar{d} d\bar{d} b\bar{b} l^- l^+$	4Z	1230	$u\bar{d} s\bar{c} d\bar{d} l^- l^+$	2W2Z	484
$d\bar{d} b\bar{b} b\bar{b} l^- l^+$	4Z	1606	$u\bar{d} s\bar{c} s\bar{s} l^- l^+$	2W2Z	484
$d\bar{d} s\bar{s} b\bar{b} l^- l^+$	4Z	615	$u\bar{d} s\bar{c} b\bar{b} l^- l^+$	2W2Z	265

**Table 1:** 4Z, 4Z+2W2Z and 2W2Z process classification.


exchange of identical particles.

Each rectangle on both sides of the central boson topology is the sum of several subdiagrams representing all possible decays of an off shell  $Z$ ,  $\gamma$  or Higgs boson to four outgoing particles as shown in Fig. 5. These sets of subdiagrams are evaluated only once, with a substantial efficiency gain, and then combined together in the end.


### 3. Physical processes

Boson boson scattering and Higgs production in boson boson fusion produce intermediate states with two bosons and two quarks as shown in Fig. 1. In this study we have only considered final states in which one  $Z$  boson decays leptonically to  $\mu^+ \mu^-$  and the other (either  $Z$  or  $W$ ) hadronically. If both bosons decay hadronically the signal cannot be distinguished from the QCD non resonant background whose cross section is much larger. Final states where both vectors decay leptonically have a smaller rate and have been left for future studies.

A number of event samples representative of all possible processes in Eq.(1.2) have been produced with PHANTOM. In order to comply with typical acceptance and trigger requirements, the cuts in Tab. 2 have been applied. We have used the CTEQ5L [18] PDF



**Figure 4:** Fundamental topologies associated to 4Z processes. Total number of diagrams 2263/1251/803/615/579



**Figure 5:** Decays of the off shell neutral bosons  $Z, \gamma, H$


set with scale

$$Q^2 = M_W^2 + \frac{1}{6} \sum_{i=1}^6 p_{Ti}^2. \quad (3.1)$$

where  $p_{Ti}$  denotes the transverse momentum of the  $i$ -th final state particle.

Many subprocesses (i.e.  $ZW \rightarrow ZW$ ,  $WW \rightarrow ZZ$ ,  $ZZ \rightarrow ZZ$ ,  $qb \rightarrow qtV$ ) will in general contribute to a specific six fermion reaction.  $t\bar{t}$  processes will not contribute to the  $4ql^+l^-$  channels but single top production with an additional neutral boson emission will be present.

It is impossible to separate and compute individually the cross section due to a single subprocess, since there are large interference effects between the different contributions. We



**Figure 6:** Invariant mass distribution of the two charged leptons and the two most central quarks, for different sets of processes. In the upper part with the set of cuts described in the text, in the lower part after vetoing top production.

can however select all complete  $2 \rightarrow 6$  processes which include a specific set of subdiagrams.

For instance,  $ZW \rightarrow ZW$  with on shell bosons is described by four Feynman diagrams.

$E(\text{lepton}) > 20 \text{ GeV}$
$p_T(\text{lepton}) > 10 \text{ GeV}$
$ \eta(\text{lepton})  < 3$
$E(\text{quarks}) > 20 \text{ GeV}$
$p_T(\text{quarks}) > 10 \text{ GeV}$
$ \eta(\text{quark})  < 6.5$
$M(l^+l^-) > 20 \text{ GeV}$
$M(qq) > 20 \text{ GeV}$

**Table 2:** Standard acceptance cuts applied in all results. Any pair of colored fermions must have mass larger than 20 GeV.

These same diagrams, with the two incoming external vector bosons connected to the initial fermion lines and the two final ones connected to their decay products, constitute the  $ZW \rightarrow ZW$  set of  $2 \rightarrow 6$  diagrams. Several sets can contribute to a single process and therefore the same process can appear in different groups. The upper part of Fig. 6 shows the invariant mass distribution of the two most central quarks (when ordered in pseudorapidity  $\eta$ ) and of the two leptons for all reactions which contain the different subprocesses as well as the distribution for the complete set of processes. We assumed  $M(H)=150 \text{ GeV}$ . It should be clear that the total cross section in Fig. 6 is smaller than the sum of the cross sections for the various groups. Notice that the Higgs peak is present in the  $ZW \rightarrow ZW$  curve. This is due to processes that in addition to the  $ZW \rightarrow ZW$  set of diagrams include also diagrams describing Higgs production.

The group comprising top diagrams has a large cross section. The lower part of Fig. 6 shows the same distributions after top subtraction. Top candidates are identified requiring a b-quark and two other quarks in the final state of the right flavour combination to be produced in a W decay, with a total invariant mass between 160 and 190 GeV.

If no Higgs is present, all SM scattering processes between on shell weak vector bosons grow linearly with the center of mass energy squared, with the exception of  $ZZ \rightarrow ZZ$  which in this case is zero. This behaviour is in agreement with the low energy theorem (LET) [19]. The lower part of Fig. 6 shows that the  $ZZ \rightarrow ZZ$  component is relatively small compared with the total distribution and as a consequence does not represent too serious a background to searches for new physics signals. The group including the  $ZW \rightarrow ZW$  set of diagrams gives the largest contribution.

### 3.1 Higgs production in PHANTOM

Higgs production in VV fusion followed by Higgs decay to WW or ZZ is the second most abundant production channel over almost the full range of Higgs masses which will be explored at the LHC. It is regarded as the channel with the highest statistical significance for an intermediate mass Higgs [20, 21]. PHANTOM is capable of simulating Higgs production in VV fusion together with all its EW irreducible background for any Higgs mass and is particularly useful in the intermediate mass range, below the WW threshold where the production



times decay approach cannot be used<sup>2</sup>. Previous analyses have concentrated mainly on the WW channel. For an intermediate mass Higgs the dilepton final state  $H \rightarrow WW^{(*)} \rightarrow l\nu l\nu$  is slightly favoured with respect to the  $H \rightarrow WW^{(*)} \rightarrow l\nu jj$  channel because of the  $W + nj$  background which affects the latter. In both cases the main background comes from  $t\bar{t}$  production followed in importance by EW  $WWjj$  production which is estimated to be about 10%, much larger than QCD  $WWjj$  production. The latter can be reduced with a central jet veto which does not affect the former. It should be mentioned that EW  $WWjj$  production is described exactly in PHANTOM, including its interference with the signal. The production channel  $qq \rightarrow qqH$ ,  $H \rightarrow ZZ \rightarrow l^+l^-jj$  has been examined in [22] while the channels  $qq \rightarrow qqH$ ,  $H \rightarrow ZZ \rightarrow l^+l^-\nu\nu$  and  $ZZ \rightarrow l^+l^-l^+l^-$  have been considered in [21]. The  $l^+l^-jj$  and  $l^+l^-l^+l^-$  channels are particularly interesting because they allow a direct reconstruction of the Higgs mass which in  $l\nu jj$  final states must be extracted from the transverse mass distribution.

The four body invariant mass distribution of the  $\mu^+\mu^-$  pair and the two most central quarks in  $4q\mu^+\mu^-$  final states in the neighborhood of the Higgs peak is shown in Fig. 7 for  $M(H)=150$  GeV and  $M(H)=200$  GeV. The EW irreducible background amounts to about 10%. The main reducible background is QCD  $Z + jets$  production. Assuming that the effect of acceptance cuts are similar in the WW and in the ZZ channel, one can estimate the ratio of the significancies  $S$  in the two cases as

$$\frac{S(l^+l^-jj)}{S(l\nu jj)} \approx \frac{\sigma_{qqH} \cdot BR(H \rightarrow ZZ) \cdot BR(ZZ \rightarrow l^+l^-jj)}{\sigma_{qqH} \cdot BR(H \rightarrow WW) \cdot BR(WW \rightarrow l\nu jj)} \times \frac{\sqrt{\sigma_{l\nu 4j}}}{\sqrt{\sigma_{l^+l^-4j}}} \quad (3.2)$$

Since  $\sigma_{l\nu 4j}/\sigma_{l^+l^-4j} \approx 10$  [23] and  $BR(ZZ \rightarrow l^+l^-jj)/BR(WW \rightarrow l\nu jj) \approx 1/3$  we are left with

$$\frac{S(l^+l^-jj)}{S(l\nu jj)} \approx \frac{BR(H \rightarrow ZZ)}{BR(H \rightarrow WW)} \quad (3.3)$$

For  $M(H) > 200$  GeV the ratio of the two branching ratios is about 0.5 and on the basis of the studies of the ATLAS [20] and CMS [21] collaborations for the WW channel, one expects a good statistical significance, of order five, for  $qqH$ ,  $H \rightarrow ZZ$ ,  $ZZ \rightarrow l^+l^-jj$ . This naive estimate is in rough agreement with the analysis of [22] which obtains significancies slightly below four in the mass range  $200 < M(H) < 300$  GeV.


Below the  $ZZ$  threshold, the Higgs branching ratio to  $ZZ$  reaches about 0.08 at  $M(H) \approx 150$  GeV. For a luminosity of  $30 \text{ fb}^{-1}$  of the order of 400  $H \rightarrow l^+l^-jj$ ,  $l = e, \mu$  events are expected. Only a complete analysis including all backgrounds and full detector simulation could tell whether this is enough for establishing a Higgs signal in this range of masses.

### 3.2 The high mass region


In the absence of firm predictions in the strong scattering regime, trying to gauge the possibilities of discovering signals of new physics at the LHC requires the somewhat arbitrary definition of a model of  $V_L V_L$  scattering beyond the boundaries of the SM. Some of these

---

<sup>2</sup>PHASE has the same capability for  $4ql\nu$  processes.




**Figure 7:** Distribution of the invariant mass  $M(VZ)$  of the two candidate vector bosons for a Higgs mass of 150 GeV and 200 GeV.



**Figure 8:** Invariant mass distribution for  $M(VZ) > 800$  GeV. The full line refers to the no-Higgs case, the dashed one to  $M(H)=200$  GeV. The upper two curves present the results for our signal definition. For the two lower ones we have further required  $|\eta(Z_u)| < 2$  and  $|\eta(q_c)| < 2$ .

models predict the formation of spectacular resonances which will be easily detected. For some other set of parameters in the models only rather small effects are expected [7].

The simplest approach is to consider the SM in the presence of a very heavy Higgs. While this entails the violation of perturbative unitarity, the linear rise of the cross section with the invariant mass squared in the hard  $VV$  scattering will be swamped by the decrease of the parton luminosities at large momentum fractions and, as a consequence, will be particularly challenging to detect. At the LHC, the offshellness of the incoming vector



**Figure 9:**  $M(ZZ)$  (left) and  $M(WZ)$  (right) invariant mass distribution for  $M(VZ) > 800$  GeV. The full line refers to the no-Higgs case, the dashed one to  $M(H)=200$  GeV. The black curves present the results for our signal definition. For the red ones we have further required  $|\eta(Z_u)| < 2$  and  $|\eta(q_c)| < 2$ .

bosons will further increase the difference between the expectations based on the behaviour of on shell VV scattering and the actual results. For  $M_H > 10$  TeV, all Born diagrams with Higgs propagators become completely negligible in the Unitary gauge, and the expectations for all processes in Eq.(1.2) reduce to those in the  $M_H \rightarrow \infty$  limit. In this section we will compare this minimalistic definition of physics beyond the Standard Model with the predictions of the SM for Higgs masses within the reach of the LHC.

An analysis of selection cuts capable to increase the difference between the no-Higgs case and the case of Higgs masses compatible with the SM constraints could provide some guidance for the search of signals of new physics in boson boson scattering.

As already mentioned, in the absence of the Higgs, all SM scattering processes between on shell weak vector bosons grow linearly with the center of mass energy squared, with the exception of  $ZZ \rightarrow ZZ$ . Therefore all possible reactions,  $ZW \rightarrow ZW$ ,  $WW \rightarrow ZZ$ ,  $ZZ \rightarrow ZZ$ , should be carefully investigated.

An interesting possibility is to investigate whether there exist or not an elementary Higgs boson by measuring the VV cross section at large  $M(VV)$ . Previous studies [13], have shown that kinematical distributions are quite insensitive to the value of the Higgs mass provided it is much smaller than the invariant mass of the VV system.


In order to isolate the VV fusion process, and more generally two vector boson production, from all other six fermion final states and investigate EWSB, different kinematical cuts have been applied to the simulated events.

First of all, single top production is vetoed as discussed in Sect. 3. Second, the invariant mass of the two charged leptons has to reconstruct the mass of a Z, and is required to be in the range  $M_Z \pm 10$  GeV. In VV fusion an additional W or a Z decaying hadronically is expected to be present. Therefore events are required to contain two quarks with the correct flavours to be produced in W or Z decay, with an invariant mass of  $\pm 10$  GeV around the central value of the appropriate EW bosons. If more than one combination of

two quarks satisfies these requirements, the one closest to the corresponding central mass value is selected. This combination will in the following be assumed to originate from the decay of an EW vector boson.


In a third step, in order to reject events which can be identified with the production of three vector bosons, the flavour content and the invariant mass of the two remaining quarks is compared with a W and a Z. If compatible within 10 GeV with either, the event is rejected. The events satisfying all these constraints will constitute the “signal” sample.

In Fig. 8 we present the invariant mass distribution of the two charged leptons and the two jets associated with the vector boson decay for  $M(H)=200$  GeV (dashed lines) and for the no-Higgs case (full lines). A number of selection cuts have been studied in order to increase the difference between the two Higgs hypotheses. Simple requirements of centrality of the lepton pair and of the candidate second vector boson have proved to be the most effective. The pseudorapidity distribution of the charged lepton pair in the two cases is shown in Fig. 10. The two lower distributions in Fig. 8 we have been obtained with the additional constraints that  $|\eta(Z_U)| < 2$  and  $|\eta(q_V)| < 2$ , where  $q_V$  refers to the quarks which are associated with the vector boson decay. The corresponding distributions for the ZW and ZZ final states are presented in Fig. 9. As expected, the cross section for  $qqZW$  production is larger, however the discrepancy between the no-Higgs case and the  $M(H)=200$  GeV is larger for the  $qqZZ$  final state.



**Figure 10:** Pseudorapidity distribution of the lepton pair for the no-Higgs case (full) and for  $M(H)=200$  GeV (dashed). All events satisfy  $M(ZV) > 800$  GeV.

In Tab. 3 we present the number of events as a function of the minimum invariant mass of the  $\mu^+\mu^-jj$  system for  $L=100$   $fb^{-1}$ . In brackets we also give the separate results for the ZW and ZZ final states. The number of events is smaller than the expected yield



**Figure 11:** Pseudorapidity distribution of the lepton pair in  $qqZZ$  final states (left) and  $qqZW$  final states (right). The full line refers to the no-Higgs case, the dashed one to  $M(H)=200$  GeV. In all cases  $M(VZ) > 800$  GeV.

in the  $4q\mu\nu$  channel [13] but the differences between the two Higgs hypotheses are larger. In fact, similar ratios are obtained with comparable number of events.

$M_{cut}$	NoHiggs		M(H)=200 GeV		Ratio
800 GeV	72	(42,30)	39	(27,12)	1.84
900 GeV	54	(31,23)	26	(18,8)	2.07
1.0 TeV	42	(24,18)	18	(13,5)	2.33
1.1 TeV	32	(18,14)	13	((9,4)	2.46
1.2 TeV	26	(15,11)	10	(7,3)	2.60
1.3 TeV	20	(11,9)	7	(5,2)	2.85
1.4 TeV	16	(9,7)	5	(4,1)	3.20
1.5 TeV	13	(7,6)	4	(3,1)	3.25

**Table 3:** Number of events as a function of the minimum invariant mass of the  $ZV$  pair. All events satisfy  $|\eta(Z_u)| < 2$  and  $|\eta(q_v)| < 2$ . In brackets we show the contribution of the (ZW,ZZ) final states.


At the LHC, the expected mass resolution for vector bosons decaying to dijets is about  $5 \div 10$  GeV, depending on the boson transverse momentum [3]. This makes it quite difficult to separate  $ZZ \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-jj$  from  $ZW \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-jj$  final states on the basis of the invariant mass of the jet pair. It is therefore of interest to explore alternative means of separating the two final states. The low energy theorem [19] predicts that  $A(W^+W^- \rightarrow ZZ) = s/v^2$  where  $A$  is the scattering amplitude,  $s$  is the usual Mandelstam variable and  $v$  is the coupling strength of the gauge current to the Goldstone boson, which in the SM coincides with the vacuum expectation value of the Higgs field. As a consequence of crossing symmetry then  $A(WZ \rightarrow WZ) = t/v^2$ . Therefore, averaging between the two orientation of the incoming ZW system, and neglecting vector boson masses, one expects, in the reaction center of mass,  $d\sigma/d\cos\theta \sim \text{const}$  for  $W^+W^- \rightarrow ZZ$  and  $d\sigma/d\cos\theta \sim (1 + \cos\theta^2)$  for  $WZ \rightarrow WZ$ .

This has led us to study the pseudorapidity distribution of the lepton pair in  $qqZZ$  and  $qqZW$  final states separately, as shown in Fig. 11. Despite the fact that we are not in the center of mass of the  $VZ$  system, that the incoming vector bosons are not on their mass shell and that we are plotting the distribution of an angular variable which is not the cosine of the center of mass scattering angle, the general prediction that the two final states have different distributions is verified. The  $ZW$  final state peaks in the forward and backward direction, as suggested by the LET, while the  $ZZ$  final state peaks at zero rapidity. It is somewhat surprising, but quite welcome, that this behaviour is more prominent when a light Higgs boson is present in the spectrum as expected in the SM. It should be mentioned that the angular distribution depends on the vector boson pair invariant mass. The plot for  $M(VZ) > 300$  GeV, which we do not show, displays a similar, rather central, behaviour for the two final states.

The selection procedure employed for Fig. 8 and Tab. 3 is not fully realistic: no flavour information will be available for light quarks and b's will be tagged only in the central part of the detector. At this stage we want to isolate as much as possible the  $VV$  fusion signal from all other production channels, with the aim to identify a possible signal definition which could play the role which was played by CC03 at LEP2, capturing the essence of the physical phenomena under investigation and allowing comparisons between the results from different collaborations. It is however of interest to investigate whether the relevant distributions are sensitive to the details of the selection cuts. In Fig. 12 we compare the invariant mass distribution of the two charged leptons and the two quarks associated with the vector boson obtained with two different methods. In the first case we select only quark pairs that have the correct flavour content to be produced in  $W$  or  $Z$  decay while in the second we consider all quark pairs. In the more realistic setting the top veto is applied to any triplet of quarks with a total invariant mass between 160 and 190 GeV. In both cases we identify the candidate vector boson with the quark pair whose mass is closest to the nominal vector boson mass. The two distributions agree quite nicely, particularly at large invariant masses, showing that our results based on Monte Carlo level flavour information are not seriously degraded when selection procedures closer to the actual experimental practice are adopted.

## 4. Conclusions

In this paper we have studied all  $q_1q_2 \rightarrow q_3q_4q_5q_6l^+l^-$  processes at order  $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_{em}^6)$  at the LHC using for the first time a full fledged six fermion Monte Carlo event generator. We have studied Higgs production in vector boson fusion followed by the decay chain  $H \rightarrow ZZ \rightarrow l^+l^-jj$ , including exactly all electroweak irreducible backgrounds and in particular the interference of EW  $ZZ + 2j$  and  $ZW + 2j$  production with the signal. The EW irreducible background in the neighborhood of the Higgs peak amounts to about 10%. We have examined how simple kinematical cuts can be applied at generator level to extract the  $VV$  signal from the irreducible background. In the high mass region we have compared the case of a relatively light Higgs with the no-Higgs case. The integrated cross section for the latter case is about twice that in the former for a minimum invariant mass of the  $ZV$



**Figure 12:** Invariant mass distribution of the lepton pair and the two jets from boson decay for the no-Higgs case.

pair of about 900 GeV. Summing the muon and the electron channels, about 50 events are expected in the light Higgs case for  $L=100 \text{ fb}^{-1}$ .

## References

- [1] Proceedings of the Large Hadron Collider Workshop, Aachen 1990, CERN Report 90-10, G. Jarlskog and D. Rein (eds.).
- [2] A. Djouadi, *The Anatomy of Electro-Weak Symmetry Breaking. Tome I: The Higgs in the Standard Model*, [hep-ph/0503172].
- [3] ATLAS Collaboration, *Detector and Physics Performance Technical Design Report*, Vols. 1 and 2, CERN-LHCC-99-14 and CERN-LHCC-99-15.
- [4] K.A. Assamagan, M. Narain, A. Nikitenko, M. Spira, D. Zeppenfeld (conv.) *et al.*, Report of the Higgs Working Group, Proceedings of the Les Houches Workshop on “Physics at TeV Colliders”, 2003, [hep-ph/0406152].
- [5] The LEP Collaborations (ALEPH, DELPHI, L3 and OPAL), the LEP Electroweak Working Group and the SLD Heavy Flavour Group, *A combination of preliminary Electroweak measurements and constraints on the Standard Model*, [hep-ex/0412015]; <http://lepewwg.web.cern.ch/LEPEWWG>.
- [6] M.S. Chanowitz, *Strong WW scattering at the end of the 90’s: theory and experimental prospects*. In *Zuoz 1998, Hidden symmetries and Higgs phenomena* 81-109. [hep-ph/9812215]
- [7] J. Bagger *et al.*, *Phys. Rev.* **D52** (1995) 3878; A. Dobado, M.J. Herrero, J.R. Peláez and E. Ruiz Morales, *Phys. Rev.* **D62** (2000) 055011, [hep-ph/9912224]; J.M. Butterworth, B.E. Cox and J.R. Forshaw, *Phys. Rev.* **D65** (2002) 96014. [hep-ph/0201098]

- [8] M.J. Duncan, G.L. Kane and W.W. Repko, *Nucl. Phys.* **B272** (1986) 517; D.A. Dicus and R. Vega, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **57** (1986) 1110; J.F. Gunion, J. Kalinowski and A. Tofighi-Niaki, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **57** (1986) 2351.
- [9] R.N. Cahn, S.D. Ellis, R. Kleiss and W.J. Stirling, *Phys. Rev.* D35 (1987) 1626; V. Barger, T. Han and R. Phillips, *Phys. Rev.* D37 (1988) 2005 and D36 (1987) 295; R. Kleiss and J. Stirling, *Phys. Lett.* 200B (1988) 193; V. Barger *et al.*, *Phys. Rev.* D42 (1990) 3052; *ibid.* *Phys. Rev.* D44 (1991) 1426; *ibid.* *Phys. Rev.* D46 (1992) 2028; D. Froideveaux, in Ref. [1] Vol II, p. 444; M. H. Seymour, *ibid.*, p. 557; U. Baur and E.W.N. Glover, *Phys. Lett.* B252 (1990) 683; D. Dicus, J. Gunion and R. Vega, *Phys. Lett.* B258 (1991) 475; D. Dicus, J. Gunion, L. Orr and R. Vega, *Nucl. Phys.* B377 (1991) 31; J. Bagger *et al.*, *Phys. Rev.* **D49** (1994) 1246; V. Barger, R. Phillips and D. Zeppenfeld, *Phys. Lett.* **B346** (1995) 106; J. Bagger *et al.*, *Phys. Rev.* **D52** (1995) 3878; K. Iordanidis and D. Zeppenfeld, *Phys. Rev.* **D57** (1998) 3072; R. Rainwater and D. Zeppenfeld, *Phys. Rev.* **D60** (1999) 113004; erratum *ibid* D61 (2000) 099901.
- [10] M.S. Chanowitz and M.K. Gaillard, *Nucl. Phys.* **B261** (1985) 379. M.S. Chanowitz and M.K. Gaillard, *Phys. Lett.* 142B, 85 (1984) and ref. 1; G. Kane, W. Repko, B. Rolnick, *Phys. Lett.* B148, 367 (1984); S. Dawson, *Nucl. Phys.* **B29** (1985) 42.
- [11] E. Accomando, A. Ballestrero, E. Maina, *JHEP* **0507** (2005) 016, [hep-ph/0504009].
- [12] E. Accomando, A. Ballestrero, E. Maina, Talk given at 9th International Workshop on Advanced Computing and Analysis Techniques in Physics Research (ACAT 03), Tsukuba, Japan, 1-5 Dec 2003. *Nucl.Instrum.Meth.*A534:265-268,2004, [hep-ph/0404236]; E. Accomando, A. Ballestrero, E. Maina, Proceedings of 18th International Workshop on High-Energy Physics and Quantum Field Theory (QFTHEP 2004), St. Petersburg, Russia, 17-23 Jun 2004. [hep-ph/0505225]
- [13] E. Accomando, A. Ballestrero, S. Bolognesi, E. Maina and C. Mariotti, [hep-ph/0512219].
- [14] A. Ballestrero, A. Belhouari, G. Bevilacqua and E. Maina, in preparation.
- [15] E. Accomando, in preparation.
- [16] A. Ballestrero and E. Maina, *Phys. Lett.* **B350** (1995) 225, [hep-ph/9403244].
- [17] A. Ballestrero, PHACT 1.0 - *Program for Helicity Amplitudes Calculations with Tau matrices* [hep-ph/9911318] in *Proceedings of the 14th International Workshop on High Energy Physics and Quantum Field Theory (QFTHEP 99)*, B.B. Levchenko and V.I. Savrin eds. (SINP MSU Moscow), pg. 303.
- [18] CTEQ Coll.(H.L. Lai *et al.*) *Eur. Phys. J.* **C12** (2000) 375.
- [19] S. Weinberg, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **17** (1966) 616. M.S. Chanowitz, M. Golden and H.M. Georgi, *Phys. Rev.* **D36** (1987) 1490; *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **57** (1986) 2344.
- [20] S. Asai *et al.*, *Eur.Phys.J.*C32S2:19-54,2004, [hep-ph/0402254].
- [21] S. Abdulin *et al.*, CMS Note 2003/033.
- [22] K. Crammer *et al.*, [hep-ph/0401148].
- [23] M. L. Mangano, M. Moretti, F. Piccinini, R. Pittau and A. D. Polosa, *JHEP* **0307**, 001 (2003), [hep-ph/0206293].