

## Search for the neutral Higgs bosons of the Standard Model and the MSSM in $e^+e^-$ collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 189$ GeV

R. Barate, D. Decamp, P. Ghez, C. Goy, S. Jezequel, J P. Lees, F. Martin, E. Merle, M N. Minard, B. Pietrzyk, et al.

### ► To cite this version:

R. Barate, D. Decamp, P. Ghez, C. Goy, S. Jezequel, et al.. Search for the neutral Higgs bosons of the Standard Model and the MSSM in  $e^+e^-$  collisions at  $\sqrt{s} = 189$  GeV. European Physical Journal C: Particles and Fields, Springer Verlag (Germany), 2000, 17, pp.223-240. in2p3-00005331

**HAL Id: in2p3-00005331**

**<http://hal.in2p3.fr/in2p3-00005331>**

Submitted on 16 Nov 2000

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# Search for the neutral Higgs bosons of the Standard Model and the MSSM in $e^+e^-$ collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 189$ GeV

The ALEPH Collaboration\*)

## Abstract

Neutral Higgs bosons of the Standard Model and of the MSSM are searched for in the data collected at a centre-of-mass energy of 188.6 GeV by the ALEPH experiment at LEP, with an integrated luminosity of  $176 \text{ pb}^{-1}$ . No evidence for a signal is found. A lower limit of  $92.9 \text{ GeV}/c^2$  at 95% confidence level is set on the mass of the Standard Model Higgs boson. In the MSSM, for  $\tan\beta \geq 0.7$  and for benchmark parameter choices, lower limits of  $82.5 \text{ GeV}/c^2$  and  $82.6 \text{ GeV}/c^2$  are derived for the masses of the neutral Higgs bosons h and A, respectively. An update of the general MSSM parameter scan is also presented.

*(To be submitted to Eur. Phys. J. C)*

---

\*) See next pages for the list of authors

# The ALEPH Collaboration

R. Barate, D. Decamp, P. Ghez, C. Goy, S. Jezequel, J.-P. Lees, F. Martin, E. Merle, M.-N. Minard, B. Pietrzyk

*Laboratoire de Physique des Particules (LAPP), IN<sup>2</sup>P<sup>3</sup>-CNRS, F-74019 Annecy-le-Vieux Cedex, France*

R. Alemany, S. Bravo, M.P. Casado, M. Chmeissani, J.M. Crespo, E. Fernandez, M. Fernandez-Bosman, Ll. Garrido,<sup>15</sup> E. Graugés, A. Juste, M. Martinez, G. Merino, R. Miquel, Ll.M. Mir, P. Morawitz, A. Pacheco, I. Riu, H. Ruiz

*Institut de Física d'Altes Energies, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, E-08193 Bellaterra (Barcelona), Spain<sup>7</sup>*

A. Colaleo, D. Creanza, M. de Palma, G. Iaselli, G. Maggi, M. Maggi, S. Nuzzo, A. Ranieri, G. Raso, F. Ruggieri, G. Selvaggi, L. Silvestris, P. Tempesta, A. Tricomi,<sup>3</sup> G. Zito

*Dipartimento di Fisica, INFN Sezione di Bari, I-70126 Bari, Italy*

X. Huang, J. Lin, Q. Ouyang, T. Wang, Y. Xie, R. Xu, S. Xue, J. Zhang, L. Zhang, W. Zhao

*Institute of High Energy Physics, Academia Sinica, Beijing, The People's Republic of China<sup>8</sup>*

D. Abbaneo, G. Boix,<sup>6</sup> O. Buchmüller, M. Cattaneo, F. Cerutti, G. Davies, G. Dissertori, H. Drevermann, R.W. Forty, M. Frank, F. Gianotti, T.C. Greening, A.W. Halley, J.B. Hansen, J. Harvey, P. Janot, B. Jost, M. Kado, O. Leroy, P. Maley, P. Mato, A. Minten, A. Moutoussi, F. Ranjard, L. Rolandi, D. Schlatter, M. Schmitt,<sup>20</sup> O. Schneider,<sup>2</sup> P. Spagnolo, W. Tejessy, F. Teubert, E. Tournefier, A. Valassi, J.J. Ward, A.E. Wright

*European Laboratory for Particle Physics (CERN), CH-1211 Geneva 23, Switzerland*

Z. Ajaltouni, F. Badaud, G. Chazelle, O. Deschamps, S. Dessagne, A. Falvard, C. Ferdi, P. Gay, C. Guicheney, P. Henrard, J. Jousset, B. Michel, S. Monteil, J-C. Montret, D. Pallin, J.M. Pascolo, P. Perret, F. Podlyski

*Laboratoire de Physique Corpusculaire, Université Blaise Pascal, IN<sup>2</sup>P<sup>3</sup>-CNRS, Clermont-Ferrand, F-63177 Aubière, France*

J.D. Hansen, J.R. Hansen, P.H. Hansen,<sup>1</sup> B.S. Nilsson, A. Wäänänen

*Niels Bohr Institute, 2100 Copenhagen, DK-Denmark<sup>9</sup>*

G. Daskalakis, A. Kyriakis, C. Markou, E. Simopoulou, A. Vayaki

*Nuclear Research Center Demokritos (NRCD), GR-15310 Attiki, Greece*

A. Blondel,<sup>23</sup> J.-C. Brient, F. Machefert, A. Rougé, M. Swynghedauw, R. Tanaka  
H. Videau

*Laboratoire de Physique Nucléaire et des Hautes Energies, Ecole Polytechnique, IN<sup>2</sup>P<sup>3</sup>-CNRS, F-91128 Palaiseau Cedex, France*

E. Focardi, G. Parrini, K. Zachariadou

*Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Firenze, INFN Sezione di Firenze, I-50125 Firenze, Italy*

A. Antonelli, G. Bencivenni, G. Bologna,<sup>4</sup> F. Bossi, P. Campana, G. Capon, V. Chiarella, P. Laurelli, G. Mannocchi,<sup>1,5</sup> F. Murtas, G.P. Murtas, L. Passalacqua, M. Pepe-Altarelli

*Laboratori Nazionali dell'INFN (LNF-INFN), I-00044 Frascati, Italy*

M. Chalmers, J. Kennedy, J.G. Lynch, P. Negus, V. O'Shea, B. Raeven, D. Smith, P. Teixeira-Dias, A.S. Thompson

*Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Glasgow, Glasgow G12 8QQ, United Kingdom<sup>10</sup>*

R. Cavanaugh, S. Dhamotharan, C. Geweniger,<sup>1</sup> P. Hanke, V. Hepp, E.E. Kluge, G. Leibenguth, A. Putzer, K. Tittel, S. Werner,<sup>19</sup> M. Wunsch<sup>19</sup>

*Kirchhoff-Institut für Physik, Universität Heidelberg, D-69120 Heidelberg, Germany<sup>16</sup>*

R. Beuselinck, D.M. Binnie, W. Cameron, P.J. Dornan, M. Girone, S. Goodsir, N. Marinelli, E.B. Martin, J. Nash, J. Nowell, H. Przysiezniak,<sup>1</sup> A. Sciabà, J.K. Sedgbeer, J.C. Thompson,<sup>14</sup> E. Thomson, M.D. Williams

*Department of Physics, Imperial College, London SW7 2BZ, United Kingdom<sup>10</sup>*

V.M. Ghete, P. Girtler, E. Kneringer, D. Kuhn, G. Rudolph

*Institut für Experimentalphysik, Universität Innsbruck, A-6020 Innsbruck, Austria<sup>18</sup>*

C.K. Bowdery, P.G. Buck, D.P. Clarke, G. Ellis, A.J. Finch, F. Foster, G. Hughes, R.W.L. Jones, N.A. Robertson, M. Smizanska

*Department of Physics, University of Lancaster, Lancaster LA1 4YB, United Kingdom<sup>10</sup>*

I. Giehl, F. Hölldorfer, K. Jakobs, K. Kleinknecht, M. Kröcker, A.-S. Müller, H.-A. Nürnbergger, G. Quast, B. Renk, E. Rohne, H.-G. Sander, S. Schmeling, H. Wachsmuth C. Zeitnitz, T. Ziegler

*Institut für Physik, Universität Mainz, D-55099 Mainz, Germany<sup>16</sup>*

A. Bonissent, J. Carr, P. Coyle, A. Ealet, D. Fouchez, P. Payre, D. Rousseau, A. Tilquin

*Centre de Physique des Particules, Faculté des Sciences de Luminy, IN<sup>2</sup>P<sup>3</sup>-CNRS, F-13288 Marseille, France*

M. Aleppo, M. Antonelli, S. Gilardoni, F. Ragusa

*Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Milano e INFN Sezione di Milano, I-20133 Milano, Italy.*

V. Büscher, H. Dietl, G. Ganis, K. Hüttmann, G. Lütjens, C. Mannert, W. Männer, H.-G. Moser, S. Schael, R. Settles,<sup>1</sup> H. Seywerd, H. Stenzel, W. Wiedenmann, G. Wolf

*Max-Planck-Institut für Physik, Werner-Heisenberg-Institut, D-80805 München, Germany<sup>16</sup>*

P. Azzurri, J. Boucrot,<sup>1</sup> O. Callot, S. Chen, M. Davier, L. Duflot, J.-F. Grivaz, Ph. Heusse, A. Jacholkowska,<sup>1</sup> J. Lefrançois, L. Serin, J.-J. Veillet, I. Videau,<sup>1</sup> J.-B. de Vivie de Régie, D. Zerwas

*Laboratoire de l'Accélérateur Linéaire, Université de Paris-Sud, IN<sup>2</sup>P<sup>3</sup>-CNRS, F-91898 Orsay Cedex, France*

G. Bagliesi, T. Boccali, C. Bozzi,<sup>12</sup> G. Calderini, V. Ciulli, R. Dell'Orso, I. Ferrante, A. Giassi, A. Gregorio, F. Ligabue, P.S. Marrocchesi, A. Messineo, F. Palla, G. Rizzo, G. Sanguinetti, G. Sguazzoni, R. Tenchini,<sup>1</sup> A. Venturi, P.G. Verdini

*Dipartimento di Fisica dell'Università, INFN Sezione di Pisa, e Scuola Normale Superiore, I-56010 Pisa, Italy*

G.A. Blair, J. Coles, G. Cowan, M.G. Green, D.E. Hutchcroft, L.T. Jones, T. Medcalf, J.A. Strong

*Department of Physics, Royal Holloway & Bedford New College, University of London, Surrey TW20 OEX, United Kingdom<sup>10</sup>*

R.W. Clift, T.R. Edgecock, P.R. Norton, I.R. Tomalin

*Particle Physics Dept., Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Chilton, Didcot, Oxon OX11 0QX, United Kingdom<sup>10</sup>*

B. Bloch-Devaux, P. Colas, B. Fabbro, G. Faïf, E. Lançon, M.-C. Lemaire, E. Locci, P. Perez, J. Rander, J.-F. Renardy, A. Rosowsky, P. Seager,<sup>13</sup> A. Trabelsi,<sup>21</sup> B. Tuchming, B. Vallage

*CEA, DAPNIA/Service de Physique des Particules, CE-Saclay, F-91191 Gif-sur-Yvette Cedex, France<sup>17</sup>*

S.N. Black, J.H. Dann, C. Loomis, H.Y. Kim, N. Konstantinidis, A.M. Litke, M.A. McNeil, G. Taylor

*Institute for Particle Physics, University of California at Santa Cruz, Santa Cruz, CA 95064, USA<sup>22</sup>*

C.N. Booth, S. Cartwright, F. Combley, P.N. Hodgson, M. Lehto, L.F. Thompson

*Department of Physics, University of Sheffield, Sheffield S3 7RH, United Kingdom<sup>10</sup>*

K. Affholderbach, A. Böhler, S. Brandt, C. Grupen, J. Hess, A. Misiejuk, G. Prange, U. Sieler  
*Fachbereich Physik, Universität Siegen, D-57068 Siegen, Germany*<sup>16</sup>

C. Borean, G. Giannini, B. Gobbo  
*Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Trieste e INFN Sezione di Trieste, I-34127 Trieste, Italy*

J. Putz, J. Rothberg, S. Wasserbaech, R.W. Williams  
*Experimental Elementary Particle Physics, University of Washington, WA 98195 Seattle, U.S.A.*

S.R. Armstrong, P. Elmer, D.P.S. Ferguson, Y. Gao, S. González, O.J. Hayes, H. Hu, S. Jin, J. Kile, P.A. McNamara III, J. Nielsen, W. Orejudos, Y.B. Pan, Y. Saadi, I.J. Scott, J. Walsh, J.H. von Wimmersperg-Toeller, Sau Lan Wu, X. Wu, G. Zobernig  
*Department of Physics, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI 53706, USA*<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Also at CERN, 1211 Geneva 23, Switzerland.

<sup>2</sup>Now at Université de Lausanne, 1015 Lausanne, Switzerland.

<sup>3</sup>Also at Centro Siciliano di Fisica Nucleare e Struttura della Materia, INFN Sezione di Catania, 95129 Catania, Italy.

<sup>4</sup>Also Istituto di Fisica Generale, Università di Torino, 10125 Torino, Italy.

<sup>5</sup>Also Istituto di Cosmo-Geofisica del C.N.R., Torino, Italy.

<sup>6</sup>Supported by the Commission of the European Communities, contract ERBFMBICT982894.

<sup>7</sup>Supported by CICYT, Spain.

<sup>8</sup>Supported by the National Science Foundation of China.

<sup>9</sup>Supported by the Danish Natural Science Research Council.

<sup>10</sup>Supported by the UK Particle Physics and Astronomy Research Council.

<sup>11</sup>Supported by the US Department of Energy, grant DE-FG0295-ER40896.

<sup>12</sup>Now at INFN Sezione di Ferrara, 44100 Ferrara, Italy.

<sup>13</sup>Supported by the Commission of the European Communities, contract ERBFMBICT982874.

<sup>14</sup>Also at Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Chilton, Didcot, UK.

<sup>15</sup>Permanent address: Universitat de Barcelona, 08208 Barcelona, Spain.

<sup>16</sup>Supported by the Bundesministerium für Bildung, Wissenschaft, Forschung und Technologie, Germany.

<sup>17</sup>Supported by the Direction des Sciences de la Matière, C.E.A.

<sup>18</sup>Supported by the Austrian Ministry for Science and Transport.

<sup>19</sup>Now at SAP AG, 69185 Walldorf, Germany

<sup>20</sup>Now at Harvard University, Cambridge, MA 02138, U.S.A.

<sup>21</sup>Now at Département de Physique, Faculté des Sciences de Tunis, 1060 Le Belvédère, Tunisia.

<sup>22</sup>Supported by the US Department of Energy, grant DE-FG03-92ER40689.

<sup>23</sup>Now at Département de Physique Corpusculaire, Université de Genève, 1211 Genève 4, Switzerland.

# 1 Introduction

At LEP2, Standard Model Higgs boson production is dominated by the Higgsstrahlung process,  $e^+e^- \rightarrow HZ$ , with smaller contributions from the WW- and ZZ-fusion processes to the  $H\nu\bar{\nu}$  and  $H e^+e^-$  final states. In the framework of the Minimal Supersymmetric Standard Model (MSSM) neutral Higgs bosons are produced via two complementary reactions: the Higgsstrahlung process  $e^+e^- \rightarrow hZ$  and the associated pair production  $e^+e^- \rightarrow hA$ . The cross section of the Higgsstrahlung process is proportional to  $\sin^2(\beta - \alpha)$ , where  $\tan\beta$  is the ratio of the vacuum expectation values of the two Higgs doublets and  $\alpha$  is the mixing angle in the CP-even Higgs sector. The hA cross section is proportional to  $\cos^2(\beta - \alpha)$ . In the mass range of interest for LEP2 searches, the main H decay channel is  $H \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ ; the  $\tau^+\tau^-$  decay mode is also relevant. The same decay modes are dominant for h and A when  $\tan\beta > 1$ . The searches described in this paper cover most of the topologies arising from the HZ process, with  $H \rightarrow b\bar{b}$  or  $\tau^+\tau^-$  and  $Z \rightarrow e^+e^-, \mu^+\mu^-, \tau^+\tau^-, \nu\bar{\nu}$  or  $q\bar{q}$ , and also from the hA process, with h and A decaying to  $b\bar{b}$  or  $\tau^+\tau^-$ . In the following, h denotes both the Standard Model Higgs boson and the lighter CP-even neutral Higgs boson of the MSSM.

Searches for neutral Higgs bosons have already been performed by ALEPH up to a centre-of-mass energy of 184 GeV. No evidence for a signal was found and a lower limit of 87.9 GeV/ $c^2$  was set at the 95% confidence level (CL) on the Standard Model Higgs boson mass [1, 2]. In the MSSM, masses of h and A lower than 72.2 GeV/ $c^2$  and 76.1 GeV/ $c^2$  respectively were excluded at the 95% CL for benchmark choices of the MSSM parameters [3, 4].

A total integrated luminosity of  $176.2 \pm 0.9 \text{ pb}^{-1}$  was recorded by ALEPH in 1998 at a centre-of-mass energy of 188.6 GeV. This higher centre-of-mass energy and integrated luminosity substantially increase the experimental sensitivity for the detection of Higgs bosons.

This paper is organised as follows. The main features of the ALEPH detector are summarised in Section 2. Monte Carlo simulations of signal and background processes are presented in Section 3. An overview of the search strategy is given in Section 4. The event selections for each of the signal final states are described in Sections 5, with emphasis on features that are new with respect to previously published analyses. Systematic uncertainties are discussed in Section 6. The results from individual channels and their combinations are presented in Section 7. The MSSM parameter scan beyond the benchmark scenarios, initiated in Ref. [4], is updated in Section 8. Conclusions follow in Section 9.

## 2 The ALEPH detector

This section summarises the components and performance of the ALEPH detector which are most relevant for the analyses presented here. A more detailed description can be found in Refs. [5] and [6].

Three tracking devices are immersed in an homogeneous magnetic field of 1.5 T. The vertex detector (VDET) [7] consists of two cylindrical layers of silicon wafers situated at average radii of 6.3 and 11.0 cm. Charged particles with a polar angle in the range  $|\cos\theta| < 0.88$  (0.95) traverse two (one) VDET layers. The VDET is surrounded by an inner tracking wire chamber (ITC) which provides up to eight r- $\phi$  hits between radii of 16 and 26 cm. Outside the ITC is the main tracking detector, a large time projection chamber (TPC) which measures up to 21

three-dimensional coordinates per charged particle between radii 31 and 180 cm.

The electromagnetic calorimeter (ECAL) is also situated inside the superconducting coil. It is finely segmented into projective towers of  $0.9^\circ \times 0.9^\circ$ , allowing the identification of electrons and photons within jets. Luminosity calorimeters of similar construction to ECAL are installed between the endcaps and the beam pipe and are treated as an extension of the calorimeter. A silicon-tungsten sampling calorimeter completes the electromagnetic calorimeter coverage down to 34 mrad.

Outside the coil the hadron calorimeter (HCAL) measures the hadronic energy and acts as a filter for the identification of muons. The outermost detectors are two double layers of muon chambers. Muons are identified as charged particles with a characteristic hit pattern as they traverse the HCAL or with associated hits in the outer chambers.

Charged particle tracks reconstructed with at least four hits in the TPC and originating from within a cylinder of 2 cm radius and 20 cm length centred on the nominal interaction point are called *good tracks*. The tracking achieves a momentum resolution  $\sigma(p_T)/p_T$  of  $6 \times 10^{-4} p_T \oplus 0.005$ , with  $p_T$  in GeV/ $c$ . The resolution on the three-dimensional impact parameter of tracks can be parametrised as  $(34 + 70/p)(1 + 1.6 \cos^4 \theta) \mu\text{m}$ , with  $p$  in GeV/ $c$ .

The measurements of charged particle tracks and of energy depositions in the calorimeters, combined with the identification of photons, electrons, and muons, are used to produce a list of charged and neutral *energy flow particles*. Hadronic jets are clustered from these objects with a resolution approximately described by  $\sigma(E) = (0.60\sqrt{E} + 0.6)(1 + \cos^2 \theta)$ , where  $E$  is the jet energy in GeV and  $\theta$  is its polar angle. The resolution on the jet angles is approximately 20 mrad in both  $\theta$  and  $\phi$ .

### 3 Signal and background simulation

High statistics Monte Carlo samples for the signal and backgrounds are produced with full simulation of the ALEPH detector, to estimate the signal efficiency and the background level from each relevant Standard Model process. The HZHA generator [8] is used for all the calculations in the Higgs boson sector, with radiative corrections from Ref. [9], to produce expected signal cross sections and final state branching ratios for both the hZ and hA processes. For the hZ process, Higgs boson masses are generated in 5 GeV/ $c^2$  steps from 60 GeV/ $c^2$  to 100 GeV/ $c^2$ ; for the hA process  $m_h$  is varied between 75 GeV/ $c^2$  and 95 GeV/ $c^2$  with  $m_h = m_A$ .

The PYTHIA Monte Carlo generator [10] is used to simulate the  $e^+e^- \rightarrow q\bar{q}(\gamma)$  process. For the  $h\nu\bar{\nu}$  channel, which is sensitive to initial state radiation modelling, the KORALZ generator [11] is also used to determine the  $q\bar{q}$  background level. The difference between the two generators is taken as the theoretical uncertainty.

The Standard Model four-fermion processes are simulated with PYTHIA for  $e^+e^- \rightarrow ZZ, Z\gamma^*$ , and the KORALW generator [12] for  $e^+e^- \rightarrow WW$ . Since the contribution of electrons emitted close to the beam axis in the  $We\nu$  and  $Zee$  processes is not included in KORALW, additional samples for these processes are generated with PYTHIA. The small contribution from the  $Z\nu\bar{\nu}$  process is simulated with a private generator ZNNB [13]. The available statistics of the background Monte Carlo samples are given in Table 1, while for the signal Monte Carlo a sample size corresponding to at least 50 times the collected luminosity is used in the analyses at each Higgs boson mass.

Table 1: Statistics of the simulated samples for Standard Model background processes.

Standard Model process	Generator	Cross section (pb)	Simulated luminosity ( $10^3 \text{ pb}^{-1}$ )
$e^+e^- \rightarrow q\bar{q}(\gamma)$	PYTHIA	99.4	5
$e^+e^- \rightarrow ZZ, Z\gamma^*$	PYTHIA	2.76	36
$e^+e^- \rightarrow WW$	KORALW	16.5	15
$e^+e^- \rightarrow W\ell\nu$	PYTHIA	0.66	23
$e^+e^- \rightarrow Zee$	PYTHIA	6.84	36
$e^+e^- \rightarrow Z\nu\bar{\nu}$	ZNNB	0.011	910

## 4 Search strategy

The main new features of the search with respect to the previous ALEPH analyses [1–4] are the following:

- i) full background subtraction is now performed when calculating the limits;
- ii) the likelihood ratio test statistic is adopted for limit setting;
- iii) the hZ and hA selections are combined taking into account their overlaps.

The previously developed event selections for the various topologies arising from the hZ process, addressing the  $h\ell^+\ell^-$  channel (where  $\ell$  denotes either an electron or a muon), the  $h\nu\bar{\nu}$  channel, the  $hq\bar{q}$  channel, the  $h\tau^+\tau^-$  channel and the  $\tau^+\tau^-q\bar{q}$  channel, which complements the  $hq\bar{q}$  channel when h decays to a  $\tau^+\tau^-$  pair, are upgraded. Neural Network (NN) and/or cut based event selections are used, as summarised in Table 2. Dedicated selections are applied to the  $b\bar{b}b\bar{b}$  and  $b\bar{b}\tau^+\tau^-$  channels arising from the hA pair production process.

In the  $h\ell^+\ell^-$  selection, new cuts are designed to improve the rejection of the  $W\ell\nu$  and  $Z\gamma^*$  background events. In final states with  $\tau$  leptons, the new selection exclusively classifies an event as either an  $h\tau^+\tau^-$  or  $\tau^+\tau^-q\bar{q}$  final state. In the  $h\nu\bar{\nu}$  channel, a new preselection is applied, and a new NN-based event selection complementing the previous one is developed. The  $hq\bar{q}$  event selection previously based on two neural networks is simplified to a single neural network. The b quark content of jets is evaluated with a NN b tag as in Ref. [2], except in the search for the  $b\bar{b}b\bar{b}$  final state, where a new NN b tag is designed. In this paper,  $\eta_i$  refers to the b tag NN output of jet  $i$ ;  $\eta_i$  has a value close to one for b jets, and close to zero for udsc jets.

The likelihood ratio test statistic [14, 15] is used to evaluate CLs. This test statistic is optimal in the two-hypothesis situation (signal + background *vs.* background only) addressed here and provides a straightforward procedure for the combination of results in different channels. An analytic method based on fast Fourier transformation is used to calculate the CLs, both for the individual search channels and for the combination of different channels [16].

As in Ref. [2], the reconstructed Higgs boson mass is used as a discriminating variable in the calculation of the CLs for all final states. In the NN-based  $hq\bar{q}$  channel, the neural network



Table 2: Final states addressed by each event selection. The crosses indicate which types of event selection are used.

Event selection	Decay modes	NN-based	Cut-based
$h\bar{q}q$	$h \rightarrow b\bar{b}$	×	×
$h\nu\bar{\nu}$	$h \rightarrow b\bar{b}$	×	×
$h\ell^+\ell^-$	$h \rightarrow b\bar{b}, \tau^+\tau^-$		×
$h\tau^+\tau^-$	$h \rightarrow b\bar{b}, \tau^+\tau^-$	×	
$\tau^+\tau^-\bar{q}q$	$h \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-$	×	
$b\bar{b}b\bar{b}$	$h/A \rightarrow b\bar{b}$		×
$b\bar{b}\tau^+\tau^-$	$h/A \rightarrow b\bar{b}, \tau^+\tau^-$	×	

output is used as an additional discriminating variable. Similarly, the b quark content is used in the  $h\ell^+\ell^-$  and  $b\bar{b}b\bar{b}$  channels.

The various hZ selections are optimised for a Higgs boson of mass  $95 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ , which is near the expected experimental sensitivity. The hA selections are optimised for  $m_h = m_A = 85 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ . The cut values on the most relevant selection variables are determined by minimizing the average CL of the “signal + background” hypothesis which is expected when only background is present [17]. For the optimisation procedure, the irreducible backgrounds (ZZ,  $Z\nu\bar{\nu}$  and Zee) are fully subtracted, but only 80% of the reducible ones. To derive the final results, full subtraction of all backgrounds is performed according to Ref. [18], and systematic uncertainties, both for the signal and the backgrounds, are included in the CL calculation according to Ref. [19].

In the  $h\nu\bar{\nu}$  channel, two NN-based analyses are combined with the “AND-and-EXCLUSIVES” method described in Ref. [2]. This consists in splitting two overlapping analyses into three statistically independent branches, one containing the overlap and the other two the exclusive contributions of the two analyses. The same approach is followed to combine the hZ with the hA selections in the four-jet and the  $b\bar{b}\tau^+\tau^-$  topologies. Many background events are common to the hZ and hA selections and it therefore becomes necessary to remove any double counting when background subtraction is performed. For the combination with hA the NN-based hZ analyses are chosen as they give a slightly better overall expected performance. A more general combination including the alternative cut-based hZ analyses is also performed.

## 5 Event selection

### 5.1 The leptonic final state

The  $h\ell^+\ell^-$  channel represents 6.7% of the Higgsstrahlung cross section. The same final state is produced by the ZZ-fusion process, which has a negative interference with the  $s$ -channel process [20]. The signal events are characterised by two energetic leptons with an invariant mass close to  $m_Z$  and a recoil mass equal to the Higgs boson mass. Although the branching ratio of this channel is small, the experimental signature is very clear and the Higgs boson mass can be reconstructed with good resolution.

The event selection follows closely that of Ref. [2]. The selection procedure attempts to reconstruct the Z boson by finding pairs of leptons. Charged particles are considered as lepton candidates if they are identified as electrons or muons [6] or if they are isolated from other particles by more than  $10^\circ$ . All accepted combinations of oppositely charged lepton candidates must have at least one identified lepton; e- $\mu$  pairs are not considered. The resolution on the Higgs boson mass, calculated as the recoil mass to the lepton pair, is improved by including any recorded final state radiation photons from the Z boson decay products.

The other selection criteria remain unchanged with respect to those published in Ref. [2] with the following exceptions. The background from  $WW \rightarrow q\bar{q}'\ell\nu$  events is rejected by explicitly reconstructing the two W bosons when one of the lepton candidates is identified and the other is an unidentified but isolated charged particle. The identified lepton and the missing four-momentum attributed to the neutrino are assigned to the leptonic W decay, while the remaining energy flow particles are assigned to the hadronic W decay; events with  $m_W^{\text{hadr}} + m_W^{\text{lept}} > 150 \text{ GeV}/c^2$  and  $m_W^{\text{hadr}} - m_W^{\text{lept}} < 20 \text{ GeV}/c^2$  are then rejected. This modification reduces the remaining WW contribution by an additional 30%, leaving the signal unaffected. A new selection cut is introduced to eliminate  $Z\gamma^*$  events where the low mass  $\gamma^*$  decays to leptons. Backgrounds from these events occur when one lepton from the  $\gamma^*$  decay is selected along with an unidentified but isolated charged particle from the Z decay. They are eliminated by finding the other identified lepton of the  $\gamma^*$  decay and requiring that the sum of this lepton pair's invariant mass and its recoil mass be greater than  $115 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ . To remove any potential background from  $\ell^+\ell^-\gamma\gamma$  events, both jets of the recoil system are required to contain at least one charged particle. Finally the requirement on the reconstructed Z boson mass is reoptimised from  $m_{\ell^+\ell^-(\gamma)} \geq 82.75 \text{ GeV}/c^2$  to  $m_{\ell^+\ell^-(\gamma)} \geq 77.0 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ . With these cuts, a 79.5% efficiency is obtained for a Higgs boson of  $95 \text{ GeV}/c^2$  mass; 14 events are selected from the data, to be compared with 14.0 expected from Standard Model backgrounds, dominated by ZZ production.

## 5.2 The missing energy final state

The channel in which the Z decays invisibly to two neutrinos accounts for 20% of the Higgsstrahlung production cross section. The WW-fusion process, which interferes positively with the Higgsstrahlung for high mass of the Higgs boson, enhances the number of expected events. Its relative importance increases with the Higgs boson mass, amounting to 20% of the total  $h\nu\bar{\nu}$  final states for a Higgs boson of  $95 \text{ GeV}/c^2$  mass [20].

Higgsstrahlung events in which the Z decays to  $\nu\bar{\nu}$  are characterised by a missing mass  $M$  consistent with  $m_Z$  and two b-tagged jets from the h decay. Three different analyses have been developed, which share a new preselection. The first one employs a set of cuts on kinematic variables; the other two use neural networks. For b tagging, jets are clustered with the Durham algorithm [21] using  $y_{\text{cut}} = 0.015$ . The neural network b tag is applied to each jet. If there are more than two jets in an event, the two jets with the highest b tag outputs are chosen.

### 5.2.1 Preselection

For all three analyses, the preselection begins with a selection of hadronic events having five or more reconstructed charged particles and a total energy from all charged particles greater than

10%  $\sqrt{s}$ . Events are divided into two hemispheres by a plane perpendicular to the thrust axis. Both hemispheres must have a non zero energy.

To reduce the number of events from  $\gamma\gamma$  processes, events must have  $E_{30^\circ} > 25\% \sqrt{s}$  or  $\not{p}_T > 5\% \sqrt{s}$ , where  $E_{30^\circ}$  is the energy deposited more than  $30^\circ$  away from the beam axis and  $\not{p}_T$  is the transverse component of the missing momentum. The longitudinal component of the missing momentum  $\not{p}_z$  must be small,  $|\not{p}_z| < 50 \text{ GeV}/c$ , and the missing mass  $\cancel{M}$  must be large,  $\cancel{M} > 50 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ .

After all cuts, the preselection is 85% efficient for a Higgs boson of mass  $95 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ ;  $e^+e^- \rightarrow WW$  and  $e^+e^- \rightarrow q\bar{q}$  give the largest contributions to the background.

### 5.2.2 Cut analysis

Most of the  $q\bar{q}$  events remaining after preselection contain one or more unmeasured photons from initial state radiation (ISR). Much of this background is removed by requiring that the missing momentum point away from the beam axis,  $\theta_{\cancel{p}} > 35^\circ$ . Compared to these  $q\bar{q}$  events, a large fraction of the Higgs signal events have acoplanar jets. The modified acoplanarity  $\tilde{A}$ , defined as  $\tilde{A} = (\hat{j}_1 \times \hat{j}_2) \cdot \hat{z}$  (where  $\hat{j}_i, \hat{z}$  are unit vectors along the jets and beam directions), must be greater than 0.08.

The  $WW$  background after the preselection consists essentially of events in which one  $W$  decays into hadrons and the other one into a  $\tau$  and a neutrino. Such events can be recognised if the  $\tau$  is well isolated and either decays leptonically or is sufficiently isolated and energetic. Two cuts specifically reject this background:  $E_{\text{iso}} > 8 \text{ GeV}$  and  $\alpha_{\text{iso}} < 25^\circ$ ;  $E_{\text{iso}}$  is the sum of the energy within  $30^\circ$  of the most energetic identified lepton, and the isolation angle  $\alpha_{\text{iso}}$  is the angle from the most energetic track to its nearest neighbour. To reject  $W e \nu$  and  $Z e e$  events with an energetic electron deflected at a low angle into the detector, the energy deposited within a cone of  $12^\circ$  half angle around the beam axis is required to be small,  $E_{12^\circ} < 1.2\% \sqrt{s}$ .

The missing mass is required to be greater than  $70 \text{ GeV}/c^2$  and the sum of the two  $b$  tag NN outputs greater than 1.3. The latter cut also sharply reduces all of the other backgrounds.

After the selection cuts, 7.3 events are expected from Standard Model processes, compared to the eight observed. About 50% of the background comes from  $ZZ \rightarrow b\bar{b}\nu\bar{\nu}$ , with the rest split between  $q\bar{q}$ ,  $WW$ , and  $W e \nu$ . The efficiency is 35% for a Higgs boson of mass  $95 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ .

### 5.2.3 The single-neural-network analysis (A)

This neural network based selection is similar to that used at  $\sqrt{s} = 183 \text{ GeV}$  [2]. The neural network uses seven variables in common with the preselection and the cut selection:  $E_{30^\circ}$ ,  $|\not{p}_z|$ ,  $\cancel{M}$ ,  $\theta_{\cancel{p}}$ ,  $\tilde{A}$ ,  $E_{12^\circ}$ ,  $\eta_1 + \eta_2$ , and five additional ones. The additional variables include the fraction  $f_{\text{wedge}}$  of the centre-of-mass energy within a  $\pm 30^\circ$  azimuthal wedge centred on the missing momentum direction, the acollinearity  $A$  of the jets, the energy  $E_\tau$  of the most isolated minijet, *i.e.* a jet with invariant mass less than  $2 \text{ GeV}/c^2$  as expected for taus, and a combination of the  $b$  tagging variables,  $\log_{10}((1 - \eta_1)(1 - \eta_2))$ . The reconstructed Higgs boson mass  $M_{\text{rec}}$  is also included as an input.

This NN, with a 12-20-3 structure, is trained to discriminate the signal from the  $WW$  and  $q\bar{q}$  backgrounds. Figure 1a shows the neural network output distribution. The result of the optimisation procedure leads to a NN cut value of 0.966. A signal efficiency of 33% is obtained

for  $m_h = 95 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ , with a predicted background of 3.9 events. Five candidates are selected from the data.

### 5.2.4 The three-neural-network analysis (B)

This new analysis treats independently the two main backgrounds,  $q\bar{q}$  and WW, allowing valuable cross checks to be performed on the systematic uncertainties implied by the background subtraction. Each of the backgrounds,  $q\bar{q}$  and WW, is addressed by a set of cuts and by a dedicated NN involving only kinematic variables. To discriminate the signal from all Standard Model backgrounds, a third neural network is used, with four input variables: the two aforementioned dedicated NN outputs and the b tag NN outputs for the two best b-tagged jets.

The few remaining non-radiative  $q\bar{q}$  events after the general preselection are eliminated by the cut  $\cancel{M} > M_{\text{vis}} - 50 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ , where  $M_{\text{vis}}$  is the visible mass. This cut results in a loss of 0.4% in signal efficiency. A seven-variable NN, with a 7-5-3-2 structure, is then trained to discriminate the signal and the  $q\bar{q}$  background. The input variables are similar, although not identical, to those used in the cut-based and single-NN approaches. The variables chosen are  $\cancel{M}$ ;  $\theta_{\cancel{p}}$ ;  $\cancel{p}_T$ ;  $f_{30^\circ}$ ;  $f_{\text{wedge}}$ ;  $\Delta\phi$ , the azimuthal angle between the two hemisphere momenta;  $s'/s$ , reconstructed from the jet directions as defined in Ref. [22].

Half of the WW background remaining after the preselection is removed by the requirements  $E_{\text{iso}} > 5 \text{ GeV}$  and  $E_\tau < 10 \text{ GeV}$ . These cuts reduce the signal efficiency by 1.4%. A three-variable NN, with a 3-5-3-2 structure, is then trained to discriminate the signal and the WW background. The input variables are the missing mass  $\cancel{M}$ , the jet acollinearity  $A$ , and the total missing momentum  $\cancel{p}$ .

To further discriminate the signal from the  $q\bar{q}$  and WW backgrounds, and also to reduce the other Standard Model background sources, the b hadron content of the two best b-tagged jets is used. Therefore, the two b tag NN outputs ordered by increasing values, and the outputs of the anti- $q\bar{q}$  and anti-WW NNs described above, are input to a four variables NN, with a 4-5-3-2 structure. Furthermore, the background training sample is composed of all the relevant Standard Model processes ( $q\bar{q}$ , WW,  $W\nu$ , Zee, and ZZ), except for the irreducible  $ZZ \rightarrow b\bar{b}\nu\bar{\nu}$  background, in proportion to their cross sections. Figure 1b shows the neural network output distribution. Finally, after investigation of the level of beam related background in the data, the cut  $E_{12^\circ} < 3.5\% \sqrt{s}$  is applied.

The optimisation procedure results in a cut value on the NN output of 0.921. With this cut value, a signal efficiency of 40% is obtained for  $m_h = 95 \text{ GeV}/c^2$  and 5.5 events are expected from background processes. Nine candidate events are selected from the data, of which five are in common with the single NN selection, and seven with the cut-based analysis.

## 5.3 The four-jet final state

The  $hq\bar{q}$  final state accounts for 64.6% of the Higgsstrahlung cross section. The four-jet topology is selected by cut- and NN-based analyses which share common event preselection criteria. Events are required to have at least eight good tracks satisfying  $|\cos\theta| \leq 0.95$ . Radiative returns to the Z resonance are rejected when the initial state photon is observed in the apparatus as well as when it escapes down the beam pipe as described in Ref. [1]. The events are then forced to four jets with the Durham jet-clustering algorithm [21]. The  $y_{\text{cut}}$  value  $y_{34}$  at which




Figure 1: Distributions of (a) the 12-variable NN output and (b) the 4-variable NN output used to select  $h\nu\bar{\nu}$  events, for the data (dots with error bars) and simulated backgrounds (histograms). The expected Higgs boson signal for  $m_h = 95 \text{ GeV}/c^2$  is also shown as dashed histograms with arbitrary normalisation. The arrows indicate the cuts above which events are selected.

the transition from four to three jets occurs must be larger than 0.004. Each jet is required to contain at least one good track. The jet four-momenta are rescaled to comply with energy-momentum conservation, keeping the jet angles and velocities to their measured values.

### 5.3.1 Event selection with cuts

The event selection is an update of that described in Ref. [2]. The sum  $\Theta$  of the four smallest interjet angles in the event is required to be larger than  $350^\circ$ . The sensitivity of the selection is designed to be close to the  $hZ$  production threshold and therefore the  $WW$  and  $q\bar{q}gg$  backgrounds can be reduced by requiring that events have two pairs of nearly back-to-back jets. In practice, this topology is selected by requiring  $\gamma = \min(\cos\theta_{ij} + \cos\theta_{kl}) < -1.30$ , with minimisation over all permutations of jet indices  $ijkl$ .

In events with four jets there are six different ways of assigning one di-jet to the Higgs candidate and the other di-jet to the  $Z$  candidate. The following selection criteria are applied to all such pairings. The selection is subdivided into two parts, (a) and (b) defined below, designed to select  $hZ \rightarrow b\bar{b}q\bar{q}$  and  $b\bar{b}b\bar{b}$  events, respectively. An event is selected if at least one jet pairing passes all the above cuts as well as either (a) or (b).

In order to select  $hZ \rightarrow b\bar{b}q\bar{q}$  events, four well-separated jets are required, and additional cuts are applied to the invariant masses of the Higgs and  $Z$  boson di-jet candidates, as well as to the  $b$  quark content of the Higgs candidate jets:

- (a) •  $y_{34} > 0.008$ ;  
 •  $m_{12} > 64 \text{ GeV}/c^2$  ( $Z$  candidate jets);

- $m_{34} > 55 \text{ GeV}/c^2$  (Higgs candidate jets);
- $\min(\eta_3, \eta_4) > 0.40$  (Higgs candidate jets);
- $(1 - \eta_3)(1 - \eta_4) < 7.6 \times 10^{-3}$  (Higgs candidate jets).

The  $hZ \rightarrow b\bar{b}b\bar{b}$  selection is based on a linear combination of the b tag information for the four jets and the information about the separation between the jets:

(b)  $9.5y_{34} + \sum_{i=1}^4 \eta_i > 3$ .

The above selection criteria are applied to all six jet pairings in the event. In the overwhelming majority of cases, for events passing the cuts (a) only one jet pairing is selected. The linear discriminating variable in (b) is independent of the choice of jet pairing. For events passing selection (b) all six pairings are kept.

If more than one jet pairing is selected for a given event, one pairing must be chosen for use in the discriminating variable — the reconstructed Higgs boson mass  $m_h = m_{12} + m_{34} - m_Z$  — which is required for the calculation of the CLs. One possible criterion [2] is to choose the pairing for which  $m_{12}$  is closest to the nominal Z boson mass. For type (b) events, this method has a non-negligible probability of selecting an incorrect pairing and thus reduces the discriminating power of  $m_h$ . Given that most of the signal events selected by cuts (b) are  $hZ \rightarrow b\bar{b}b\bar{b}$ , one cannot improve the choice of pairing by using the b tagging information of the jets. The choice of pairing is improved with respect to Ref. [2] by using the decay angles of the Z and Higgs boson di-jet candidates ( $\alpha_{12}$  and  $\alpha_{34}$ , respectively) instead of  $m_{12}$ . A probability density function  $P(\alpha_{12}, \alpha_{34})$ , that reflects the differences between the correct signal pairing and the incorrect pairings (for signal and backgrounds), is built. The pairing with the largest probability is selected. This has the effect of increasing the reach in  $m_h$  of the four-jet selection by  $\sim 0.5 \text{ GeV}/c^2$  with respect to the previously used pairing choice.

With the set of cuts derived through the optimisation procedure, the signal efficiency is 39.4% for a Higgs boson of  $95 \text{ GeV}/c^2$  mass. Twenty-four candidates are selected from the data, to be compared with 19.0 events expected from Standard Model processes.

### 5.3.2 Event selection with a neural network

A neural network is trained to identify the  $hZ \rightarrow b\bar{b}q\bar{q}$  signal while rejecting the  $q\bar{q}$  and WW background processes. This approach represents a simplification with respect to that followed in Ref. [2]; the two NNs, one anti- $q\bar{q}$  and one anti-WW, have been merged into a single NN with a 17-30-1 structure which leads to comparable performances with respect to that in Ref. [2].

The general NN features remain similar to those used in Ref. [2]. For the training phase, the NN is presented with up to six different di-jet pairings per background event, and only one, the correct pairing, per signal event. The training uses only events surviving the preselection described in Section 5.3, complemented with the requirement  $\sum_{i=1}^4 \eta_i > 1$ . In addition, di-jet pairings with  $m_{34} < 45 \text{ GeV}/c^2$  are discarded. A mixture of Monte Carlo signal events with  $m_h = 80, 85, 90$  and  $95 \text{ GeV}/c^2$  is used to achieve good performance over the range of masses relevant for the MSSM, while for the background the WW and  $q\bar{q}$  processes are used. The inputs to the neural network include several of the selection variables used in the cut-based analysis:  $y_{34}$ ,  $\gamma$ ,  $m_{12}$ ,  $\Theta$ ,  $\min(\eta_3, \eta_4)$ ,  $(1 - \eta_3)(1 - \eta_4)$ , and  $\sum_{i=1}^4 \eta_i$ .

Additional kinematic variables are included in the NN. An event broadening observable  $B$ , described in Ref. [2], offers discriminating power between signal and background events. Other




Figure 2: Distributions of the NN output used to select four-jet  $hZ$  candidates for data (dots with error bars), simulated background (histogram), and simulated Higgs signal for  $m_h = 95 \text{ GeV}/c^2$  (dashed histogram). The signal histogram has an arbitrary normalisation. The arrow shows the cut value above which events are selected.

kinematic variables, such as the largest jet energy  $E_{\text{max}}$  and the two smallest jet energies  $E_{\text{min}}$  and  $E_{\text{min}2}$ , are also included. Several observables offer discriminating power between light quark and gluon jets for the two  $Z$  candidate jets. The boosted sphericity calculated in the rest frame of the jet and the multiplicity of tracks with rapidity larger than 1.6 with respect to the jet axis are included as well as the two minimum jet masses.

Distributions of the NN output are shown in Fig. 2 for signal, background, and data.

An event is selected if at least one of its jet pairings has a NN output greater than 0.951. If more than one di-jet combination in an event passes this criterion, the combination with the highest NN output is chosen. The resulting signal detection efficiency for a Higgs boson signal with mass  $95 \text{ GeV}/c^2$  is 46.0%. The expected number of background events is 21.4 (6.2 from  $q\bar{q}$ , 4.2 from  $WW$ , and 11.0 from  $ZZ$ ); 28 candidate events are selected in the data. Among them, 19 are in common with those selected by the cut-based analysis described in Section 5.3.1, in agreement with expectations from the simulation.

## 5.4 The four-b final state

The  $b\bar{b}b\bar{b}$  final state arising from the  $hA$  production is characterised by a four-jet topology and a high  $b$  quark content. The preselection is unchanged with respect to Ref. [4]. At this level the main contributions to the background come from the  $ZZ$ ,  $WW$ , and  $q\bar{q}$  processes. The  $b$  tag information is essential for the rejection of these backgrounds and a new four-variable  $b$  tag NN is used in this channel. Three of the variables are the same as in the NN used in Ref. [4]: the confidence level  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{uds}}$  of a jet being a light quark jet based upon impact parameters




Figure 3: Distribution of the  $\mathcal{F}$  variable for data (dots with error bars), simulated background (histogram), and simulated Higgs signal for  $m_h = m_A = 85 \text{ GeV}/c^2$  (dashed histogram) at the preselection level. The signal histogram has an arbitrary normalisation. The arrow indicates the cut value below which events are selected.

of tracks in the jet, the  $\chi^2$  difference  $\Delta\chi_{\text{svx}}^2$  between a fit assuming that all tracks in the jet originate from the primary vertex and a fit assuming that a secondary vertex exists, and the transverse momentum  $p_T$  of identified leptons with respect to the jet axis. The fourth variable is the scaled inclusive  $X_E$ , defined as the fraction of the jet energy carried by the most energetic particles which have a total invariant mass smaller than  $2.1 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ . This b tag NN achieves, at 55% signal efficiency, a 20% improvement on the background rejection with respect to the previous three-variable neural network.

The final event selection is based upon the combination  $\mathcal{F}$  of the minimum di-jet angle,  $\theta_{ij}^{\text{min}}$ , and the b quark content, defined as

$$\mathcal{F} = 300 \times \left(4 - \sum_{j=1}^4 \eta_j\right) - \theta_{ij}^{\text{min}}.$$

The  $\mathcal{F}$  distribution is shown in Fig. 3. The discrepancy between data and simulation for high values of  $\mathcal{F}$  is also observed in other ALEPH analyses [23]. The data distribution is broader than the simulated one; this is understood to be due to slight inadequacies in the b tag simulation, as discussed in Section 6.1. The optimisation procedure leads to the cut  $\mathcal{F} < 266$ , corresponding to a signal efficiency of 49.1% for  $m_h = m_A = 85 \text{ GeV}/c^2$  and a background expectation of 4.8 events (2.7  $q\bar{q}$ , 2.0 ZZ, 0.1 WW). Seven candidates are selected in the data.

## 5.5 Final states with $\tau$ leptons

The  $h\tau^+\tau^-$  final state corresponds to 3.4% of the total Higgsstrahlung process, and  $h \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-$ ,  $Z \rightarrow q\bar{q}$  corresponds to an additional 5.5%. In the case of  $e^+e^- \rightarrow hA$ , about 15.5% of the



final states are  $\tau^+\tau^-\bar{b}b$ . The event topology consists of two hadronic jets and two oppositely charged, low multiplicity jets with missing energy due to the neutrinos from the  $\tau$  decays. The  $h \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-$ ,  $Z \rightarrow \ell^+\ell^-$  final state is covered in the  $h\ell^+\ell^-$  analysis.

### 5.5.1 Preselection and $\tau$ lepton identification

Hadronic events are selected by requiring at least eight good charged tracks and a total energy from all charged particles greater than  $20\%\sqrt{s}$ . WW and ZZ backgrounds are suppressed by rejecting those events having an identified lepton with energy greater than  $25\%\sqrt{s}$ . Radiative returns to the Z peak, characterized by high missing energy  $\cancel{E}$  and high missing longitudinal momentum  $\cancel{p}_z$ , are rejected by requiring  $|\cancel{p}_z| + \cancel{E} < 1.8\gamma_{\text{peak}}$  where  $\gamma_{\text{peak}} \equiv \sqrt{s}/2 - m_Z^2/(2\sqrt{s})$  is the most likely energy of an initial state radiation photon. To further suppress radiative returns,  $|\cancel{p}_z| < 60\%\gamma_{\text{peak}}$  is also required.

Events passing the preselection cuts are clustered into minijets with invariant mass smaller than  $2.7\text{GeV}/c^2$ , consistent with the  $\tau$  hypothesis. The  $\tau$  candidates are selected from these minijets using a series of quality cuts based on multiplicity, isolation and momentum as described in Ref. [4].

Only events with at least two  $\tau$  candidates are considered further. The rest of the event is clustered into two jets using the Durham algorithm. All four jets in the event are rescaled using a kinematic consistency fit in which the jet directions are fixed and the minijet masses are set to  $m_\tau$ . The fit estimator  $\chi^2$  is calculated from energy-momentum conservation, hadronic jet resolutions, and the compatibility of the di-jet invariant masses with the assumed final state. In the case of  $e^+e^- \rightarrow hZ$ , two different fit terms are constructed for the two  $hZ \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-q\bar{q}$  decay modes. In the  $h\tau^+\tau^-$  fit, the invariant mass of the  $\tau$  minijets is compared with  $m_Z$ , whereas in the  $\tau^+\tau^-Z$  fit, the invariant mass of the hadronic jets is compared to  $m_Z$ . For  $e^+e^- \rightarrow hA$ , assuming that h and A have almost equal masses, the fit term compares the invariant masses of the hadronic and the  $\tau^+\tau^-$  systems. In no case are the hadronic jets allowed to rescale to less than 75% of their measured momenta. Events failing the kinematic fit are rejected. A typical event may have several possible combinations of potential  $\tau$  minijet candidates; only the combination with the smallest kinematic  $\chi^2$  is considered further.

### 5.5.2 hZ final states

To discriminate between  $h\tau^+\tau^-$  events,  $\tau^+\tau^-q\bar{q}$  events and background events, two NNs are employed. Both NNs take as input the following variables: the kinematic fit estimator  $\chi^2$ , the event transverse momentum  $p_T$ , the sum of the two  $\tau$  minijet isolation angles, defined as the half-angle of the largest cone around the minijet direction containing no more than 5% of the total event energy outside the cone, and the sum of the fitted transverse momenta  $P_T^{\text{jet}}$  of the  $\tau$  minijets with respect to the nearest hadronic jet.

To take advantage of the large probability for h to decay to  $b\bar{b}$ , the  $h\tau^+\tau^-$  NN uses the sum of the NN b tagging outputs of the two hadronic jets as a fifth input variable. The neural networks are trained to discriminate the signal from the  $q\bar{q}$ , WW and ZZ background processes. The signal events include Higgs bosons with masses of 85, 90 and 95 GeV/ $c^2$ .

Some events, especially those with reconstructed Higgs boson masses near  $m_Z$ , may be selected by more than one NN selection. A new selection extension based on the NN outputs exclusively classifies an event as either  $h\tau^+\tau^-$  or  $\tau^+\tau^-q\bar{q}$ . Both NN outputs are calculated for




Figure 4: Distributions of the NN outputs (a) used in the selection of the  $hZ$  final states with  $\tau$  leptons and (b) used in the selection of the  $hA \rightarrow b\bar{b}\tau^+\tau^-$  final state for the data (dots with error bars) and the simulated background (histogram). Also shown by the dashed histograms with arbitrary normalisation are the simulated  $hZ$  signal for  $m_h = 95 \text{ GeV}/c^2$  in (a), and the  $hA$  signal for  $m_h = m_A = 85 \text{ GeV}/c^2$  in (b). The arrows indicate the cut values above which events are selected.

each event, and the higher output determines the event classification. If the sum of the two NN outputs is greater than 1.8, the difference between the outputs is small, and the kinematic fit estimator  $\chi^2$  is used to distinguish the two signal classes. A slight offset in the  $\chi^2$  cut favours classification as  $h\tau^+\tau^-$  because the event must have a high  $b$  content in order to have two high NN output values. If  $\chi_{h\tau\tau}^2 - 1 > \chi_{\tau\tau q\bar{q}}^2$ , the event is classified as  $h\tau^+\tau^-$ ; otherwise it is classified as  $\tau^+\tau^-q\bar{q}$ .

In principle, the cut values on the two NN outputs could be varied independently; however it has been found that a single cut, applied to both NN outputs, gives nearly the same selection performance as two independent cuts. To calculate CLs, the expected number of signal events and the shapes of the reconstructed Higgs boson mass distributions are entered separately for the  $h\tau^+\tau^-$  and  $\tau^+\tau^-q\bar{q}$  classifications. The distribution of the selected NN output is shown in Fig. 4a.

The optimisation procedure leads to a NN cut value of 0.965. For this cut value and assuming  $m_h = 95 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ , 0.3  $h\tau^+\tau^-$  events and 0.4  $\tau^+\tau^-q\bar{q}$  events are expected, corresponding to signal efficiencies of 29.5% and 17.4%, respectively. The total Standard Model background expectation is 2.5 events. Two candidates are selected from the data.

### 5.5.3 $hA$ final state

A five-variable NN is also used with the same variables as for the  $h\tau^+\tau^-$  selection. The only difference is that the  $hA$  signal Monte Carlo is used for the NN training, with  $m_A = m_h = 85 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ . The distribution of the NN output is shown in Fig. 4b.

The optimisation procedure results in a cut on the neural network output of 0.826. A signal efficiency of 42.0% for  $m_A = m_h = 85 \text{ GeV}/c^2$  is obtained, and 2.5 events are expected from Standard Model processes. Three candidates are selected from the data, of which one is shared with the hZ event selection.

## 6 Systematic uncertainties

Systematic errors stem from uncertainties and inaccuracies in the Monte Carlo simulation. Those concerning b tagging performance and jet energy and direction reconstruction affect all channels and are discussed first. Systematic uncertainties pertaining specifically to each channel are reported afterwards. Whenever possible, systematic errors are extracted from about  $2 \text{ pb}^{-1}$  of data taken at the Z peak during the same year.

### 6.1 b-tag-related systematic errors

A disagreement between data and Monte Carlo simulation in the tagging efficiency for b jets would affect the acceptance for signal and most background processes. Using the single and double tag method as for the ALEPH  $R_b$  analysis [24], the efficiencies for b jets ( $\epsilon_b$ ) and udsc jets ( $\epsilon_{\text{udsc}}$ ) are measured directly from two-jet hadronic events collected in 1998 at the Z peak. These efficiencies are compared with those obtained from Monte Carlo simulation; their ratios are displayed in Fig. 5 as a function of the NN b tag output. The discrepancy between data and Monte Carlo indicates that udsc jets are 10% more likely to be identified as b jets in the data than in the Monte Carlo simulation. This is confirmed by a study of the effect of b tagging on semileptonic WW events and radiative Z returns in data taken at  $\sqrt{s} = 189 \text{ GeV}$ .

For the signal and the ZZ and  $q\bar{q}$  backgrounds, the Higgs candidate jets after selection come primarily from b quarks. The main source of b tag related systematic errors is the imperfect simulation of the b tag efficiency. These are evaluated by reweighting the Higgs candidate jets in the Monte Carlo based on their NN b tag outputs according to Fig. 5a. The resulting changes to the selection efficiencies for signal and background processes with respect to the unweighted efficiencies are taken as systematic uncertainties. For the WW and  $W e\nu$  backgrounds, the Higgs candidate jets are udsc jets mistagged as b jets. To estimate the systematics from imperfect simulation of this mistag rate, the Higgs candidate jets are similarly reweighted according to Fig. 5b.

As a cross check, tracking parameters are smeared to bring the Monte Carlo simulation of the b tagging closer to the data. The changes in signal and background efficiencies are similar to those obtained by the reweighting method. In a conservative way, discrepancies in b tagging between data and Monte Carlo are included as systematic errors, and not corrected.

### 6.2 Systematic errors related to jet energy and angle

The systematic errors related to the simulation of jet energies and directions are also evaluated from the sample of hadronic events collected at the Z peak in 1998. These studies are done both on jets with and without flavour selection, in order to separately evaluate the systematic uncertainties related to those jets originating from b quarks. To avoid possible biases from the




Figure 5: Comparisons of (a) b tag efficiency and (b) mistag rate between Z peak data and Monte Carlo as a function of the b tagging NN output.

jet shape variables, which enter the NN b tag, the flavour selection criterion is based on the probability of the jet to be a light quark jet based on signed impact parameters ( $\mathcal{P}_{uds} < 10^{-3}$ ).

The energy resolution and calibration are first investigated. Inhomogeneities of the detector response are taken into account by studying separately the barrel ( $|\cos\theta| \leq 0.8$ ) and endcap ( $|\cos\theta| > 0.8$ ) regions. To bring data and Monte Carlo into better agreement, the Monte Carlo jet energies  $E_{sim}$  are modified according to the relation  $E_{smear} = (1 + c)(1 + G(\sigma))E_{sim}$ , where  $G(\sigma)$  is a Gaussian random variable of width  $\sigma$ . For generic jets (b jets), the calibration coefficient  $c$  is 0.2% (0.8%) in the barrel and 2.1% (2.2%) in the endcaps. A smearing of  $\sigma = 2\%$  (3%) is applied in the endcaps. No such smearing is necessary in the barrel. The jet masses and momenta are corrected in the same way, keeping the velocities unchanged.

A comparison of the data and Monte Carlo shows that the resolution on the azimuthal and polar angles is systematically too good in the simulation. To improve the agreement,  $G(\sigma_\theta)$  and  $G(\sigma_\phi)/\sin\theta_{sim}$  smearing terms are added to the polar and azimuthal angles of each Monte Carlo jet respectively. The difference between data and Monte Carlo is minimised for  $\sigma_\phi = 0.15^\circ$  (0.3°) and  $\sigma_\theta = 0.2^\circ$  (0.3°).

In addition to correcting the simulation, a systematic uncertainty on the selection efficiencies amounting to half of the corrections is adopted.

### 6.3 The leptonic final state

Potential sources of systematic uncertainties including lepton identification, lepton isolation, and energy and momentum reconstruction are investigated as in Ref. [2]. The total relative systematic uncertainties are 0.6%, 2.6%, 7.5% on the signal efficiency and on the ZZ and Zee backgrounds, respectively. The systematic uncertainties on all the other background processes,

WW,  $We\nu$  and  $q\bar{q}$ , are dominated by the statistics of the Monte Carlo samples and are smaller than 30% for each of these backgrounds.

## 6.4 The missing energy final state

Systematic effects related to b tagging and to jet energy and angle measurements are estimated as described in Sections 6.1 and 6.2. The  $E_{12^\circ}$  variable is sensitive to beam related background, which is not simulated. The energy distribution of this background is measured with events triggered at random beam crossings. Additional energy depositions at angles below  $12^\circ$  are randomly added to all Monte Carlo events according to this energy distribution. Half of the correction is taken as systematic uncertainty. The three-neural-network analysis, which treats independently the main background contributions, is used as described in Ref. [25] in order to cross check the evaluation of the systematic uncertainties pertaining to reducible backgrounds such as  $q\bar{q}$  with two ISR photons, WW and  $We\nu$ . The relative uncertainty in the total selection efficiency is typically 5% for the signal and 10% for ZZ, and it is between 30% and 100% for the other background processes.

## 6.5 The four-jet and four-b final states

In addition to the common systematic effects described in Sections 6.1 and 6.2, additional sources of systematic uncertainties affecting the signal and background selection efficiencies are studied. Possible inaccuracies in the simulation of the selection variables ( $y_{34}, \gamma, \Theta, m_{12}, m_{34}$ ), obtained from a bin-by-bin comparison of distributions in the data and simulation, are taken into account using a reweighting technique as for the evaluation of b tag systematic uncertainties. The  $g \rightarrow b\bar{b}$  splitting rate is corrected to its measured value [26] with a 50% uncertainty. A 5% uncertainty on the strong interaction coupling constant  $\alpha_s$  is included for the  $q\bar{q}$  background.

For the  $b\bar{b}b\bar{b}$  final state, the systematic uncertainty related to the signal amounts to 4.2% and is dominated by the b tag. The  $q\bar{q}$  background uncertainty is dominated by the uncertainty on the rate of gluon splitting to heavy quarks, which amounts to 30% of the accepted  $q\bar{q}$  background. The ZZ background is affected by the same systematic error as the signal, resulting in a 10% uncertainty. The small WW contribution ( $0.1 \pm 0.1$  events) to the background has a large statistical error, and a systematic uncertainty of 100% is assigned to this process.

For the  $b\bar{b}q\bar{q}$  final state, the relative uncertainties on the selection efficiencies are estimated in a similar way to be 3% for the signal, 10% for ZZ, 15% for WW, and 15% for  $q\bar{q}$ .

## 6.6 Final states with $\tau$ leptons

A systematic effect in the  $\tau^+\tau^-$  selections is the uncertainty on the jet angles and therefore on the calculated invariant masses. This effect is studied by applying the procedure described in Section 6.2. The effect of the b tagging uncertainty is estimated as explained in Section 6.1. For the backgrounds, the dominant uncertainty comes from the limited Monte Carlo statistics used to calculate efficiencies.

Altogether, the systematic uncertainties are smaller than 5% for the signal, 10% for the ZZ background, 20% for WW and 50% for  $q\bar{q}$ .

Table 3: Expected numbers of signal events ( $n_s$ ) for a Higgs boson of  $95 \text{ GeV}/c^2$  mass, and background events ( $n_b$ ) from Standard Model processes for the relevant channels of the hZ search. The numbers of events selected in the data ( $n_{\text{obs}}$ ) are also given. For the NN-based selections in the  $h\nu\bar{\nu}$  channel, the information is given for the three statistically independent branches of the “AND-and-EXCLUSIVES” method.

	$h\ell^+\ell^-$	$h\nu\bar{\nu}$				$hq\bar{q}$		$h\tau^+\tau^- / \tau^+\tau^-\text{q}\bar{q}$
		NN(A)+NN(B)	NN(A)	NN(B)	Cuts	NN	Cuts	
$n_s$	1.5	2.0	0.3	0.7	2.6	8.5	7.3	0.7
$n_b$	14.0	3.1	0.7	2.4	7.3	21.4	19.0	2.5
$n_{\text{obs}}$	14	5	0	4	8	28	24	2

## 7 Combination and results

As mentioned in Section 4, two sets of selections, NN- and cut-based, are used. To cover all hZ final states, the  $h\ell^+\ell^-$  analysis is included in the NN-based selection while the  $h\tau^+\tau^-/\tau^+\tau^-\text{q}\bar{q}$  analyses are also used in the cut-based selection. Altogether, 48 (53) events are selected in the data by the hZ selections performed with the cut-based (NN-based) selections, in agreement with the expectation of 42.8 (44.1) events from Standard Model processes. Table 3 summarises, for each set of selections, the expected number of signal events, the expected number of background events, and the number of events selected in the data. Figures 6 (a) and (b) show the reconstructed Higgs boson mass distributions for the selected candidates and the background expectations from the simulation. These figures combine channels with rather different mass resolutions and are given for illustration purposes only; in particular the b quark content of individual events is not reflected in the mass plot.

The hA selection yields ten candidate events, of which five are in common with the hZ selection, to be compared with 7.5 background events expected from Standard Model processes.

No significant excess of candidate events is observed. The analyses are therefore used to set 95% CL mass lower limits. In the absence of signal, the mass lower limits expected for the Standard Model Higgs boson are  $95.4 \text{ GeV}/c^2$  for the cut-based combination and  $95.8 \text{ GeV}/c^2$  for the NN-based combination. Since the NN-based combination yields a slightly better expected limit for hZ searches, it is used in the hZ/hA combination to produce limits in the MSSM plane  $[m_h, \sin^2(\beta - \alpha)]$ . Furthermore the Standard Model limit, which is effectively obtained for  $\sin^2(\beta - \alpha)=1$ , benefits from the combination of the hZ and hA selections.

The hZ and hA selections are combined with the “AND-and-EXCLUSIVES” method, taking into account the overlaps in the four-jet and tau analyses, and compared with signals expected from either or both hZ and hA production. The information about the statistically independent branches is summarised in Table 4. An additional complication arises from the use of different discriminating variables in the CL computation. The variable chosen for the overlap branch is the one giving the best expected exclusion CL, and can vary in different regions of the  $[m_h, \sin^2(\beta - \alpha)]$  plane. For example, in the four-jet selections, at  $\sin^2(\beta - \alpha) = 1$  the  $hZ \rightarrow hq\bar{q}$  variables are used everywhere, while at  $\sin^2(\beta - \alpha) = 0$  the  $hA \rightarrow b\bar{b}b\bar{b}$  variables are used for  $m_h \leq 86 \text{ GeV}/c^2$  and the  $hZ \rightarrow hq\bar{q}$  variables for  $m_h > 86 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ .

Table 4: Expected signal, Standard Model background and observed candidate events in the statistically independent branches of the combined four-jet and  $b\bar{b}\tau^+\tau^-$  analyses;  $m_h = 95 \text{ GeV}/c^2$  and  $m_h = m_A = 85 \text{ GeV}/c^2$  are assumed for the hZ and hA processes, respectively.

Analysis		Expected events			Observed candidates
		hZ	hA	SM background	
hq $\bar{q}$	hZ only	6.6	1.0	18.8	24
	hZ+hA	1.9	2.8	2.6	4
	hA only	0.1	0.4	2.2	3
$b\bar{b}\tau^+\tau^-$	hZ only	0.2	0.0	1.1	1
	hZ+hA	0.4	0.4	1.4	1
	hA only	0.1	0.1	1.1	2

The result obtained with this method is displayed in Fig. 7 for the Standard Model Higgs boson. All Standard Model Higgs boson masses below  $92.9 \text{ GeV}/c^2$  are excluded at the 95% CL. The average limit expected in the absence of signal is  $95.9 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ . With such an expected limit, the probability that an equal or lower limit be observed is 4%. (The observed and expected limits obtained with the cut-based combination of hZ analyses would be  $93.9 \text{ GeV}/c^2$  and  $95.4 \text{ GeV}/c^2$  respectively.) The procedure is repeated for the hZ process varying  $\sin^2(\beta - \alpha)$ , assuming branching ratios of the Standard Model Higgs boson. The resulting excluded domain is displayed in Fig. 9 (hZ curve).

The expected and observed CLs for the hA process are displayed in Fig. 8, for  $m_h = m_A$  and  $\sin^2(\beta - \alpha) = 0$ . With such assumptions, all Higgs boson masses below  $82.5 \text{ GeV}/c^2$  are excluded at the 95% CL while the average limit expected in the absence of signal is  $83.1 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ . Varying  $\sin^2(\beta - \alpha)$  while maintaining  $m_h = m_A$  leads to the excluded domain shown in Fig. 9 (hA curve). Combining these results with those pertaining to the hZ channel, the combined exclusion shown in Fig. 9 is obtained. Independent of  $\sin^2(\beta - \alpha)$ , all Higgs boson masses  $m_h$  below  $82.5 \text{ GeV}/c^2$  are excluded at more than 95% CL.

These results can also be interpreted in the  $[m_h, \tan\beta]$  plane, as displayed in Fig. 10. Here, benchmark choices of the MSSM parameters are used, as suggested in Ref. [27]: the quadratic mean  $M_{SUSY}$  of the stop masses is set to  $1 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ , the gaugino mass  $M_2$  to  $1.6 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ , the CP-odd Higgs boson mass is varied up to  $400 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ , and two configurations of stop mixing are considered, with minimal and maximal impact on  $m_h$ ; furthermore the top mass is fixed at  $175 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ . If  $\tan\beta$  is restricted to values greater than 0.7, a lower limit of  $82.6 \text{ GeV}/c^2$  is derived for  $m_A$ .

The combination of the experimental and theoretical exclusions shown in Fig. 10 excludes at 95% CL  $\tan\beta$  values in the range [1.0,1.4], even when stop mixing has maximal impact. However, as emphasized in Ref. [28], such  $\tan\beta$  exclusions are very sensitive both to the details of the calculations of the radiative corrections in the Higgs sector and to the choice of the top quark mass and MSSM parameter values. The above result is obtained using the calculations of Ref. [9] (*i.e.*, in the renormalization group improved one-loop effective potential approach), with a  $175 \text{ GeV}/c^2$  top mass; no exclusion range remains if a top mass of  $180 \text{ GeV}/c^2$  is used instead, or if additional genuine two-loop corrections are included as advocated in Ref. [29].




Figure 6: Distributions of the reconstructed Higgs boson mass for the data events (dots with error bars) selected in the hZ searches by (a) the NN- and (b) the cut-based sets of selections. The histograms show the Standard Model background expectation.

In the above CL computations, all systematic uncertainties have been included according to the prescription of Ref. [19]. Their effect results in decreasing the mass lower limits by 200 MeV/c<sup>2</sup>. As explained in Section 6.1, the background level is known to be underestimated in the Monte Carlo due to b tag systematic uncertainties. The consequence of such an underestimation, when performing full background subtraction, is a conservative observed limit and a slightly optimistic expected limit. This underestimation of the background does not fully explain the difference between observed and expected limits seen in Fig. 7. If, instead of using the method of Ref. [19], the reducible background levels had been decreased by one standard deviation, the mass lower limits would be decreased by no more than 400 MeV/c<sup>2</sup>.

A more general hZ/hA combination is also performed in which the NN-based hZ analyses are combined with the cut-based analyses. The missing energy channel does not overlap with any hA analysis, but a combination of the two neural network analyses and the cut-based analysis is also performed. With three analyses, the most general division is into seven branches: three exclusives, three overlaps of two analyses and one overlap of three analyses. To reduce the complexity of the problem, some branches are joined together leaving in both cases only five branches. The information about these branches is summarised in Table 5. The expected limits obtained with these more general combinations are 83.1 GeV/c<sup>2</sup> and 95.8 GeV/c<sup>2</sup> at  $\sin^2(\beta - \alpha)=0$  and 1, respectively. Since the expected results are similar to those from the simplest combination, the latter is used to derive the final results.






Figure 7: Expected (dashed) and observed (solid) CL curves, in the signal hypothesis (a) and in the background hypothesis (b), as a function of the assumed Standard Model Higgs boson mass; the intersections of the horizontal line at 5% with the curves in (a) define the expected and observed 95% CL lower limits on the Higgs boson mass.




Figure 8: Expected (dashed) and observed (solid) CL curves for the  $hA$  pair-production process with  $m_h = m_A$  and  $\sin^2(\beta - \alpha) = 0$  as a function of the common mass, in the signal hypothesis (a) and in the background hypothesis (b).




Figure 9: Regions excluded at the 95% CL in the  $[m_h, \sin^2(\beta - \alpha)]$  plane by the hZ and hA searches (dash-dotted curves) and their combination (solid curve). The dashed curve displays the expected 95% CL limit of the combination.




Figure 10: Expected (dashed) and observed (solid) 95% CL curves in the  $[m_h, \tan \beta]$  plane of the MSSM in the case of maximal stop mixing; the dark regions are not allowed theoretically. The theoretically forbidden region is also indicated for the case of no stop mixing (dash-dotted curve).

Table 5: Expected numbers of signal event ( $n_s$ ), Standard Model background events ( $n_b$ ) and observed data candidates ( $n_{\text{obs}}$ ), in the statistically independent branches of the four-jet and missing energy channels. The signals are evaluated assuming  $m_h = 95 \text{ GeV}/c^2$  for hZ and  $m_h = m_A = 85 \text{ GeV}/c^2$  for hA.

hq $\bar{q}$					
	hA only	hA and hZ	hZ only		
			NN	NN+Cuts	Cuts
$n_s$ hZ	0.1	1.9	1.6	5.0	0.6
$n_s$ hA	0.4	2.8	0.4	0.6	0.4
$n_b$	2.3	2.6	8.4	10.7	6.2
$n_{\text{obs}}$	3	4	9	15	4

h $\nu\bar{\nu}$					
	Cuts only	Cuts and NN	NN only		
			NN(A)	NN(A)+NN(B)	NN(B)
$n_s$	0.3	2.4	0.2	0.2	0.4
$n_b$	3.4	4.0	0.6	0.4	1.4
$n_{\text{obs}}$	1	7	0	1	1

## 8 Beyond the benchmark

It can be seen in Fig. 10 that low values of  $\tan\beta$  are excluded by the present data in the benchmark scans for most configurations of stop mixing. In order to assess the robustness of this result with respect to variations of the MSSM parameters, an update of the parameter scan presented in Ref. [4] has been performed.

As in Ref. [4], the value  $\tan\beta = \sqrt{2}$  is chosen as representative of the low  $\tan\beta$  regime. In the “fine logarithmic” scan performed using the data collected up to 184 GeV, 352 869 sets of  $\{m_0, m_{1/2}, \mu, A_t\}$  values were explored. Out of those, 36% were declared unphysical, due to tachyonic stops for example, and 52% were excluded irrespective of the value of  $m_A$ . The 41 352 (12%) remaining sets were not excluded for all values of  $m_A$ . For most of them, the  $m_h$  limit obtained in the benchmark scans held true. Only 28 (namely a fraction smaller than  $10^{-4}$ ) “pathological” sets remained with a mass limit significantly degraded because of either too small an hZ production cross section ( $\sin^2(\beta - \alpha) \sim 0$ ), or of a vanishing branching ratio for  $h \rightarrow b\bar{b}$  ( $\sin\alpha \sim 0$ ). The 41 352 sets remaining unexcluded for some  $m_A$  values are reconsidered here in light of the improved Higgs limits reported in Section 7.

For the 41 324 parameter sets where the limit on  $m_h$  was found in Ref. [4] to be as high as in the benchmark scans, the hZ searches played the major rôle in the vicinity of the limit. With the updated exclusion in the  $[m_h, \sin^2(\beta - \alpha)]$  plane (Fig. 9), 35 753 of these can now be excluded irrespective of  $m_A$ , while the limit obtained for the 5 571 other sets is essentially equal to the Standard Model one. No new pathological situations are encountered.

For most of the 28 pathological sets revealed in [4], the mass of the heavier CP-even Higgs




Figure 11: Region in the  $[m_h, \sin^2(\beta - \alpha)]$  plane excluded at the 95% CL by the  $h\nu\bar{\nu}$  search for a Higgs boson decaying into hadrons with no b tagging applied.

boson H is relatively low, below  $80 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ , for the  $m_A$  value for which the  $m_h$  limit was set. The results from the  $hZ$  searches shown in Fig. 9 can therefore be used for  $HZ$  with the appropriate coupling modifications. This allows 22 sets to become excluded irrespective of the  $m_A$  value, leaving at this point six sets for which the mass limit is degraded.

For two of those sets (actually almost identical due to the approximate symmetry  $A_t \rightarrow -A_t$ ,  $\mu \rightarrow -\mu$ ), the limit on  $m_h$  is  $\sim 6.5 \text{ GeV}/c^2$  with  $\sin^2(\beta - \alpha) \sim 0$ . However, H is rather light ( $\sim 73 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ ), but with a decay branching ratio into  $hh$  of 86%, rendering b tagging ineffective. The main h decay mode is  $h \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-$ , with a branching ratio of 77%.

The process  $(H \rightarrow hh)(Z \rightarrow \nu\bar{\nu})$  leads to a topology consisting of two low multiplicity acoplanar jets when  $h \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-$ . A search for such final states has therefore been developed. The selection begins with the anti- $\gamma\gamma$  preselection of the 4J-L chargino analysis [30]. Only events with at most six charged tracks are considered. The events are divided into two hemispheres by a plane perpendicular to the thrust axis. Each hemisphere is required to contain two or four good charged tracks, and to have a mass smaller than  $10 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ . The efficiency of this search is 31% for  $m_H = 73 \text{ GeV}/c^2$  and  $m_h = 6.5 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ , while the expected background is 0.3 events. No events are selected in the 189 GeV data. With the inclusion of this result in the scan, these two sets become excluded irrespective of the  $m_A$  value.

In the four remaining sets, the lower limit on  $m_h$  lies between 60 and  $75 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ , because of a too small branching fraction of h into  $b\bar{b}$ . A search for h produced in association with a Z boson decaying into  $\nu\bar{\nu}$  could be sensitive to these rather low  $m_h$  values, although no tagging of b hadrons can be used here to disentangle signal and background. An analysis has therefore been developed, along the lines of the three-neural-network analysis described in Section 5.2.4.

In this case, since no b tagging can be applied, the preselection is tightened: events with less than seven charged particles are rejected, and the minimum hemisphere energy is required

to exceed  $5\%\sqrt{s}$ . Each of the two main backgrounds,  $q\bar{q}$  and  $WW$ , is addressed by a dedicated neural network trained on a  $75 \text{ GeV}/c^2$  mass signal. Cuts on both NN outputs are determined using the same optimisation procedure as for all the searches reported above. Finally, the cut  $E_{12} < 3.5\%\sqrt{s}$  is applied. The signal efficiency is 50%, while the background level is estimated to be 14.3 events. Twelve candidate events are selected in the 189 GeV data.

This search, based on the  $h\nu\bar{\nu}$  process only, results in the upper limit on  $\sin^2(\beta - \alpha)$  as a function of  $m_h$  shown in Fig. 11. This limit is valid in the case of a Higgs boson decaying into any hadrons. When added to the other constraints, the result of this search is sufficient to exclude the four remaining pathological sets, irrespective of  $m_A$ .

In the end, among the 224 875 physically acceptable sets of  $\{m_0, m_{1/2}, \mu, A_t\}$  values investigated for  $\tan\beta = \sqrt{2}$ , no configurations were found for which the Higgs boson mass limit is significantly degraded with respect to the benchmark scans. In addition, an exploration of the parameter space in the vicinity of some typical pathological sets of Ref. [4] has been performed, which did not reveal any configuration leading to a degraded limit. In the low  $\tan\beta$  regime of the MSSM, the limit from the benchmark scans can therefore be regarded as robust at the  $10^{-5}$  level, at worst. This statement will remain true, in the event of no discovery, for the results obtained at higher LEP energies.

The above conclusions are affected neither by the choice of the top quark mass nor by the inclusion of recently calculated higher order radiative corrections [29]. Such modifications do not introduce any new pathologies, and simply change the relative proportions of parameter sets excluded irrespective of  $m_A$  and of sets for which the  $m_h$  limit is essentially the Standard Model one.

## 9 Conclusions

Searches for neutral Higgs bosons in  $e^+e^-$  collisions at a centre-of-mass energy of 188.6 GeV have been carried out with the ALEPH detector. The major event topologies expected from the  $hZ$  and  $hA$  processes have been analysed. The previously published search algorithms have been improved and complemented with new event selections. In the collected data sample, which corresponds to an integrated luminosity of  $176.2 \text{ pb}^{-1}$ , the selected events are compatible with expectations from Standard Model processes. From this observation, a 95% CL lower limit on the mass of the Standard Model Higgs boson is set at  $92.9 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ . In the MSSM, lower limits of  $82.5 \text{ GeV}/c^2$  and  $82.6 \text{ GeV}/c^2$  are derived for the masses of the neutral Higgs bosons  $h$  and  $A$ , respectively, for all values of  $\tan\beta \geq 0.7$ . Other collaborations at LEP have reported similar results [31]. The robustness of these results in the low  $\tan\beta$  regime has been assessed by a scan of the MSSM parameter space.

## Acknowledgements

We wish to congratulate our colleagues from the accelerator divisions for the very successful operation of LEP at high energy. We are indebted to the engineers and technicians in all our institutions for their contribution to the excellent performance of ALEPH. Those of us from non-member countries thank CERN for its hospitality.

## References

- [1] ALEPH Collaboration, *Search for the Standard Model Higgs boson in  $e^+e^-$  collisions at  $\sqrt{s} = 161, 170$  and  $172$  GeV*, Phys. Lett. **B412** (1997) 155.
- [2] ALEPH Collaboration, *Search for the Standard Model Higgs Boson at the LEP2 collider near  $\sqrt{s} = 183$  GeV*, Phys. Lett. **B447** (1999) 336.
- [3] ALEPH Collaboration, *Search for the neutral Higgs bosons of the MSSM in  $e^+e^-$  collisions at  $\sqrt{s}$  from  $130$  to  $172$  GeV*, Phys. Lett. **B412** (1997) 173.
- [4] ALEPH Collaboration, *Searches for the Neutral Higgs Bosons of the MSSM in  $e^+e^-$  collisions at centre-of-mass energies of  $181$ - $184$  GeV*, Phys. Lett. **B440** (1998) 419.
- [5] ALEPH Collaboration, *ALEPH: A detector for electron-positron annihilations at LEP*, Nucl. Instrum. Methods **A294** (1990) 121.
- [6] ALEPH Collaboration, *Performance of the ALEPH detector at LEP*, Nucl. Instrum. Methods **A360** (1995) 481.
- [7] D. Creanza et al., *The New ALEPH Vertex Detector*, Nucl. Instrum. Methods **A409** (1998) 157.
- [8] P. Janot, *The HZHA generator*, in “Physics at LEP”, Eds. G. Altarelli, T. Sjöstrand and F. Zwirner, CERN 96-01 (1996) Vol. 2, p. 309.
- [9] M. Carena, M. Quiros and C. Wagner, *Effective potential methods and the Higgs mass spectrum in the MSSM*, Nucl. Phys. **B461** (1996) 405.
- [10] T. Sjöstrand, *High-energy-physics event generation with PYTHIA 5.7 and JETSET 7.4*, Comput. Phys. Commun. **82** (1994) 74.
- [11] S. Jadach, B.F.L. Ward and Z. Wąs, *The Monte Carlo program KORALZ version 4.0 for the lepton or quark pair production at LEP/SLC energies*, Comput. Phys. Commun. **79** (1994) 503.
- [12] M. Skrzypek et al., *Monte Carlo program KORALW 1.02 for W-pair production at LEP2/NLC energies with Yennie-Frautschi-Suura exponentiation*, Comput. Phys. Commun. **94** (1996) 216.
- [13] This generator is based on the differential cross section published in S. Ambrosanio and B. Mele, *Anomalous WWZ couplings at future  $e^+e^-$  colliders*, Nucl. Phys. **B374** (1992) 3.
- [14] W.T. Eadie et al., *Statistical Methods in Experimental Physics*, North-Holland Publishing Company, 1971.
- [15] DELPHI Collaboration, *Search for neutral Higgs bosons in  $e^+e^-$  collisions at  $\sqrt{s} = 183$  GeV*, submitted to E. Phys. J. C.

- [16] H. Hu and J. Nielsen, *Analytic Confidence Level Calculations using Likelihood Ratio and Fourier Transform*, physics/9806010, to be published in High Energy Phys. and Nucl. Phys. (English edition).
- [17] P. Janot and F. Le Diberder, *Optimally combined confidence limits*, Nucl. Instrum. Methods **A411** (1998) 449.
- [18] S. Jin and P. McNamara, *The Signal Estimator Limit Setting Method*, hep-ph/9812030, submitted to Nucl. Instrum. Methods A.
- [19] R.D. Cousins and V.L. Highland, *Incorporating systematic uncertainties into an upper limit*, Nucl. Instrum. Methods **A320** (1992) 331.
- [20] W. Kilian, M. Kramer and P.M. Zerwas, *Higgsstrahlung and  $W W$  fusion in  $e^+e^-$  collisions*, Phys. Lett. **B373** (1996) 135;  
*Higgsstrahlung and vector boson fusion in  $e^+e^-$  collisions*, hep-ph/9605437.
- [21] W. J. Stirling, *Hard QCD Working Group—Theory Summary*, J. Phys. **G17** (1991) 1567.
- [22] ALEPH Collaboration, *Measurement of hadron and lepton-pair production from  $e^+e^-$  annihilation at centre-of-mass energies of 130 and 136 GeV*, Phys. Lett. **B378** (1996) 373.
- [23] ALEPH Collaboration, *Measurement of  $W$ -pair production in  $e^+e^-$  collisions at 189 GeV*, ALEPH 99/017 CONF 99/012, contributed paper to HEP-99, Tampere, #6\_045.
- [24] ALEPH Collaboration, *A precise measurement of  $\Gamma_{Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}}/\Gamma_{Z \rightarrow \text{hadrons}}$* , Phys. Lett. **B313** (1993) 535.
- [25] ALEPH Collaboration, *Search for an invisibly decaying Higgs boson in  $e^+e^-$  collisions at 189 GeV*, Phys. Lett. **B466** (1999) 50.
- [26] ALEPH Collaboration, *A measurement of the gluon splitting rate to  $b\bar{b}$  pairs in hadronic  $Z$  decays*, Phys. Lett. **B434** (1998) 437.
- [27] M. Carena, P.M. Zerwas (Convenors), *Higgs Physics*, in Physics at LEP2, Eds. G. Altarelli, T. Sjöstrand, F. Zwirner, CERN 96-01 (1996) p. 351.
- [28] S. Heinemeyer, W. Hollik and G. Weiglein, *Constraints on  $\tan\beta$  in the MSSM from the Upper Bound on the Mass of the Lightest Higgs Boson*, DESY 99-120, KA-TP-12-1999 and hep-ph/9909540.
- [29] M. Carena, S. Heinemeyer, C.E.M. Wagner and G. Weiglein, *Suggestions for Improved Benchmark Scenarios for Higgs-Boson Searches at LEP2*, CERN-TH/99-134, DESY 99-186 and hep-ph/9912223.
- [30] ALEPH Collaboration, *Search for Charginos and Neutralinos in  $e^+e^-$  Collisions at Centre-of-Mass Energies near 183 GeV and Constraints on the MSSM Parameter Space*, CERN-EP/99-014, to be published in Eur. Phys. J. C.

- [31] L3 Collaboration, *Search for the Standard Model Higgs boson in  $e^+e^-$  interactions at  $\sqrt{s} = 189$  GeV*, CERN-EP/99-080, submitted to Phys. Lett. B.
- OPAL Collaboration, *Search for Neutral Higgs Bosons in  $e^+e^-$  Collisions at  $\sqrt{s} \approx 189$  GeV*, CERN-EP/99-096, submitted to Eur. Phys. J. C.