Search for the Standard Model Higgs Boson in $ZH \to \ell^+\ell^- b\bar{b}$ Production with the D0 Detector in 9.7 $fb^{-1}$ of $p\bar{p}$ Collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 1.96$ TeV
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We present a search for the standard model (SM) Higgs boson produced in association with a Z boson in 9.7 fb$^{-1}$ of $p\bar{p}$ collisions collected with the D0 detector at the Fermilab Tevatron Collider at $\sqrt{s} = 1.96$ TeV. Selected events contain one reconstructed $Z \rightarrow e^+e^-$ or $Z \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$ candidate and at least two jets, including at least one jet identified as likely to contain a $b$ quark. To validate the search procedure, we also measure the cross section for $ZZ$ production in the same final state. It is found to be consistent with its SM prediction. We set upper limits on the $H$ boson mass at the 95% C.L for Higgs boson masses $90 \leq M_H \leq 150$ GeV. The observed (expected) limit for $M_H = 125$ GeV is 7.1 (5.1) times the SM cross section.

The D0 detector [14,15] consists of a central tracking system within a 2 T superconducting solenoidal magnet and surrounded by a preshower detector, three liquid-argon sampling calorimeters, and a muon spectrometer with a 1.8 T iron toroidal magnet. In the intercryostat regions (ICRs) between the central and end calorimeter cryostats, plastic scintillator detectors enhance the calorimeter coverage. The analyzed events were acquired predominantly with triggers that select electron and muon candidates online. However, events satisfying any trigger requirement are considered in this analysis.

The event selection requires a $p \bar{p}$ interaction vertex that has at least three associated tracks. Selected events must contain a $Z \rightarrow \ell^+ \ell^-$ candidate. The analysis is conducted in four separate channels. The dimuon ($\mu \mu$) and dielectron ($ee$) channels include events with at least two fully reconstructed muons or electrons. In addition, muon-plus-track ($\mu \mu_{\text{trk}}$) and electron-plus-ICR electron ($ee_{\text{ICR}}$) channels are designed to recover events in which one of the leptons points to a poorly instrumented region of the detector.

The $\mu \mu$ event selection requires at least two muons identified in the muon system, both matched to central tracks with transverse momenta $p_T > 10$ GeV. At least one muon must have $|\eta| < 1.5$, where $\eta$ is the pseudorapidity, and $p_T > 15$ GeV. At least one of the muons must be separated from any jet with $p_T > 20$ GeV and $|\eta| < 2.5$ by $\Delta R = \sqrt{\Delta \eta^2 + \Delta \phi^2} > 0.5$, from other tracks, and from energy deposited in the calorimeter. We also apply isolation requirements based on the ratios of the calorimeter energy and the sum of $p_T$ of tracks near the lepton to the lepton $p_T$ in this analysis.

The $\mu \mu_{\text{trk}}$ event selection requires exactly one muon with $|\eta| < 1.5$ and $p_T > 15$ GeV that is isolated both in the tracker and in the calorimeter. In addition, a second isolated track reconstructed in the tracker with $|\eta| < 2$ and $p_T > 20$ GeV must be present. Its distance $\Delta R$ from the muon and from any jet of $p_T > 15$ GeV and $|\eta| < 2.5$ must be greater than 0.1 and 0.5, respectively. For the $\mu \mu$ and $\mu \mu_{\text{trk}}$ channels, the two muon-associated tracks must have opposite charge.

The $ee$ event selection requires at least two electrons with transverse energy $E_T > 15$ GeV that pass selection requirements based on the energy deposition and shower shape in the calorimeter and the preshower detector. Both electrons are required to be isolated in the tracker and the calorimeter. At least one electron must be identified in the region $|\eta| < 1.1$. The electrons in $|\eta| < 1.1$ must match central tracks or a set of hits in the tracker consistent with that of an electron trajectory.

The $ee_{\text{ICR}}$ event selection requires exactly one electron in the calorimeter with $E_T > 15$ GeV and a track pointing toward one of the ICRs, $1.1 < |\eta| < 1.5$. The track must be isolated, be matched to a calorimeter energy deposit with $E_T > 10$ GeV, and have $p_T > 15$ GeV. For the $ee$ and $ee_{\text{ICR}}$ selections, electrons must be separated from all jets by $\Delta R > 0.5$.

Jets are reconstructed in the calorimeter by using the iterative midpoint cone algorithm [16] with a cone of radius 0.5 in rapidity and azimuthal angle. The jet identification efficiency is $\approx 95\%$ at $p_T = 20$ GeV and reaches $99\%$ at $p_T = 50$ GeV. Jets are denoted as “taggable” if the associated tracks meet criteria that algorithms to identify jets as likely to contain $b$ quarks operate efficiently. The taggability efficiency is at least $90\%$ for most of the jets in this analysis. We use “inclusive” to denote the event sample selected by requiring the presence of two leptons and use “pretag” for the event sample that meets the additional requirements of having at least two taggable jets with $p_T > 20$ GeV and $|\eta| < 2.5$ and a dilepton invariant mass $70 < m_{\ell\ell} < 110$ GeV [17].

Jets are identified as likely to contain $b$ quarks ($b$-tagged) if they pass “loose” or “tight” requirements on the output of a multivariate discriminant trained to separate $b$ jets from light jets. This discriminant is an improved version of the neural network $b$-tagging discriminant described in Ref. [18]. For taggable jets in $|\eta| < 1.1$ and with $p_T = 50$ GeV, the $b$-tagging efficiency for $b$ jets and the misidentification probability of light (ud$s$ or gluon) jets are, respectively, 72% and 6.7% for loose $b$ tags and 47% and 0.4% for tight $b$ tags. Events with at least one tight and one loose $b$ tag are classified as double-tagged (DT). Events not in the DT sample that contain a single tight $b$ tag are classified as single-tagged (ST).

The dominant background process is the production of a $Z$ boson in association with jets, with the $Z$ decaying to dileptons ($Z + \text{jets}$). The light-flavor component ($Z + \text{LF}$) includes jets from only light quarks or gluons. The heavy-flavor component ($Z + \text{HF}$) includes $Z + b\bar{b}$, which has the same final state as the signal, and $Z + c\bar{c}$ production. The remaining backgrounds are from $t\bar{t}$ production; WW, WZ, and ZZ (diboson) production; and multijet (MJ) events with nonprompt muons or with jets misidentified as electrons.

We simulate $ZH$ and diboson production with PYTHIA [19]. In the ZH samples, we consider the contributions to the signal from the $\ell^+\ell^- b\bar{b}$, $\ell^+\ell^- c\bar{c}$, and $\ell^+\ell^- \tau^+\tau^-$ final states. The $\ell^+\ell^- b\bar{b}$ accounts for 99% (97%) of the signal yield in the DT (ST) sample. The $Z + \text{jets}$ and $t\bar{t}$ processes are simulated with ALPGEN [20], followed by PYTHIA for parton showering and hadronization [21]. All simulated samples are generated by using the CTEQ6L1 [22] leading-order parton distribution functions. We process all samples by using a detector simulation program based on GEANT3 [23] and the same offline reconstruction algorithms used for data. We overlay events from randomly chosen beam crossings with the same instantaneous luminosity distribution as data on the generated events to model the effects of multiple $p\bar{p}$ interactions and detector noise.
We take the cross sections and branching ratios for signal from Refs. [11,24]. For the diboson processes, we use next-to-leading-order (NLO) cross sections from the Monte Carlo program MCFM [25]. We scale the $t\bar{t}$ cross section to approximate next-to-NLO [26] and the inclusive $Z$ boson cross section to next-to-NLO [27] and apply additional NLO heavy-flavor corrections to the $Z + b\bar{b}$ and $Z + c\bar{c}$ samples, calculated from MCFM to be 1.52 and 1.67, respectively.

To improve the modeling of the $p_T$ distribution of the $Z$ boson, we reweight simulated $Z +$ jets events to be consistent with the measured $p_T$ spectrum of $Z$ bosons in the data [28]. We correct the energies of simulated jets to reproduce the resolution and energy scale observed in the data [29]. We apply the trigger efficiencies, measured in the data, as event weights to the simulated $\mu\mu$, $\mu\mu_{trk}$, and $ee_{ICR}$ events. In the $ee$ channel, we have verified that the trigger efficiency is consistent with 100% for our selection. We apply scale factors to account for differences in reconstruction efficiency between the data and simulation. Motivated by a comparison with the data [30] and the SHERPA generator [31], we reweight the $Z +$ jets events to improve the ALCGEN modeling of the distributions of the $\eta$ of the two jets.

We estimate the MJ backgrounds from control samples in data obtained by inverting some of the lepton selection requirements, e.g., the lepton isolation requirements in the $\mu\mu$ channel and the shower shape requirements in the $ee$ channel. We adjust the normalizations of the MJ background and all simulated samples by scale factors determined from a simultaneous fit to the $m_{\ell\ell}$ distributions in the 0-jet, 1-jet, and $\geq 2$-jet samples of each lepton selection. The inclusive sample constrains the lepton trigger and identification efficiencies, while the pretag sample, which includes jet requirements, is used to correct the $Z +$ jets cross section. The total event yields after applying all corrections and normalization factors are shown in Table I. The observed event yields are consistent with the expected background.

To exploit the fully constrained kinematics of the $ZH \rightarrow \ell^+\ell^- b\bar{b}$ process, we adjust the energies of the candidate leptons and jets within their experimental resolutions by using a likelihood fit that constrains $m_{\ell\ell}$ to the mass and width of the $Z$ boson and constrains the $p_T$ of the $\ell^+\ell^- b\bar{b}$ system to zero with an expected width determined from $ZH$ Monte Carlo events. This kinematic fit improves the dijet mass resolution by 10%–15%, depending on $M_H$. The dijet mass resolution for $M_H = 125$ GeV is $\approx 15$ GeV with the kinematic fit [17].

We use a two-step multivariate analysis strategy based on random forest (RF, an ensemble classifier that consists of many decision trees) discriminants [32], as implemented in the TMVA software package [33], to improve the separation of the signal from the background [17]. We choose well modeled kinematic variables that are sensitive to the $ZH$ signal as inputs for the analysis. These include the $p_T$ of the two $b$-jet candidates and the dijet mass, before and after the jet energies are adjusted by the kinematic fit. In the first step, we train a dedicated RF ($t\bar{t}$ RF) that takes $t\bar{t}$ as the only background and $ZH$ as the signal. This approach takes advantage of the characteristic signature of the $t\bar{t}$ background, for instance, the presence of large missing transverse energy. In the second step, we use the $t\bar{t}$ RF to define two independent regions: a $t\bar{t}$ enriched region ($t\bar{t}$ RF < 0.5) and a $t\bar{t}$ depleted region ($t\bar{t}$ RF ≥ 0.5). The $t\bar{t}$ depleted region contains 94% (93%) of the DT (ST) signal contribution and 55% (82%) of DT (ST) background events. In each region, we train a global RF to separate the $ZH$ signal from all backgrounds. In both steps we consider ST and DT events separately and train the discriminants for each assumed value of $M_H$ in 5 GeV steps from 90 to 150 GeV.

We assess systematic uncertainties resulting from the background normalization for the MJ contribution, typically 10%. The normalization of the $Z +$ jets sample to the pretag data constrains that sample to the statistical uncertainty, <1%, of the pretag data. Because this sample is dominated by the $Z +$ LF background, the normalization of the $t\bar{t}$, diboson, and ZH samples acquires a sensitivity to the inclusive $Z$ cross section, for which we assess a 6% uncertainty [27]. We assign this uncertainty to these samples as a common uncertainty. For $Z +$ HF, a cross section uncertainty of 20% is determined from Ref. [25]. For other backgrounds, the uncertainties are 6%–10% [25,26]. For the signal, the cross section uncertainty is 6% [24]. Sources of systematic uncertainty affecting the shapes of the final discriminant distributions are the jet energy scale, 1%–3%; jet energy resolution, 2%–4%; jet

<p>| TABLE I. | Expected and observed event yields for all lepton channels combined after requiring two leptons (inclusive), after also requiring at least two jets (pretag), and after requiring exactly one (ST) or at least two (DT) $b$ tags. The $ZH$ signal yields are for $M_H = 125$ GeV. The uncertainties quoted on the total background for ST and DT and signal include the statistical and systematic uncertainties. |
|----------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Total background</th>
<th>MJ</th>
<th>$Z +$ LF</th>
<th>$Z +$ HF</th>
<th>Diboson</th>
<th>$t\bar{t}$</th>
<th>$ZH$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive</td>
<td>1845 610</td>
<td>1841 683</td>
<td>160 746</td>
<td>1630 391</td>
<td>46 462</td>
<td>2914</td>
<td>1170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretag</td>
<td>25 849</td>
<td>25 658</td>
<td>1284</td>
<td>19 253</td>
<td>4305</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>824 ± 102</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>366 ± 39</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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identification efficiency, \( \approx 4\% \); and \( b \)-tagging efficiency, \( 4\%–6\% \). Other sources include trigger efficiency, \( 4\%–6\% \); parton distribution function uncertainties [34], \( <1\% \); data-determined corrections to the model for \( Z + \text{jets} \), \( 3\%–4\% \); modeling of the underlying event, \( <1\% \); and from varying the factorization and renormalization scales for the \( Z + \text{jets} \) simulation, \( <1\% \).

The global RF distributions from the four samples (ST and DT in the \( t\bar{t} \) depleted and \( t\bar{t} \) enriched regions) in each channel along with the corresponding systematic uncertainties are used for the statistical analysis of the data.

![Fig. 1 (color online). Distributions of the global RF discriminant in the \( t\bar{t} \) depleted region, assuming \( M_H = 125 \text{ GeV} \), after the fit to the background-only model for the data (points with statistical error bars) and background (histograms) for (a) single-tagged events and (b) double-tagged events. (c) Background-subtracted distribution for (b). The signal distribution is shown with the SM cross section scaled by a factor of 5. The blue lines indicate the uncertainty from the fit.](image)

We set 95% C.L. upper limits on the \( ZH \) cross section times branching ratio for \( H \to b\bar{b} \) with a modified frequentist (CLs) method that uses the log likelihood ratio of the signal + background (S + B) hypothesis to the background-only (B) hypothesis [35]. To minimize the effect of systematic uncertainties, we maximize the likelihoods of the B and S + B hypotheses by independent fits that allow the sources of systematic uncertainty to vary within their Gaussian priors [36].

To validate the search procedure, we search for \( ZZ \) production in the \( c\bar{s}\ell^+\ell^- \) final state. We collectively refer to these as \( VZ \) production. Using the same modified frequentist method as for the \( ZH \) search and fitting the RF distributions to the S + B hypothesis, we measure a \( VZ \) cross section of \( 0.8 \pm 0.4(\text{stat}) \pm 0.4(\text{syst}) \) times that of the SM prediction with a significance of 1.5 standard deviations (s.d.) and an expected significance of 1.9 s.d. This result is consistent with the recent D0 \( ZZ + WZ \) cross section measurement obtained in fully leptonic decay channels [37].

The output of the RF trained to separate signal events with \( M_H = 125 \text{ GeV} \) from background is shown in Fig. 1 for ST and DT events separately in the \( t\bar{t} \) depleted region, after the background-only fit. Also shown is the background-subtracted RF distribution for DT events in the data. The upper limit on the cross section times the branching ratio for \( H \to b\bar{b} \), expressed as a ratio to the SM prediction, is presented as a function of \( M_H \) in Table II and Fig. 2.

![Fig. 2 (color online). Expected and observed 95% C.L. cross section upper limits on the \( ZH \) cross section times branching ratio for \( H \to b\bar{b} \), expressed as a ratio to the SM prediction.](image)

### Table II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( M_H ) (GeV)</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>95</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>105</th>
<th>110</th>
<th>115</th>
<th>120</th>
<th>125</th>
<th>130</th>
<th>135</th>
<th>140</th>
<th>145</th>
<th>150</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At $M_H = 125$ GeV, the observed (expected) limit on this ratio is 7.1 (5.1). The expected limits are $\approx 20\%$ lower than those anticipated from the increase in data because of the analysis improvements described above.

In summary, we have searched for SM Higgs boson production in association with a $Z$ boson in the final state of two charged leptons (electrons or muons) and two $b$-quark jets by using a 9.7 $fb^{-1}$ data set of $p\bar{p}$ collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 1.96$ TeV. We also measure the cross section for $VZ$ production in the same final state with the result of $0.8 \pm 0.4({stat}) \pm 0.4({syst})$ times its SM prediction. We set an upper limit on the $ZH$ production cross section times the branching ratio for $H \to bb$ as a function of $M_H$. The observed (expected) limit for $M_H = 125$ GeV is 7.1 (5.1) times the SM cross section.
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