1 Introduction

A major open question in particle physics is the nature of the astrophysically-motivated dark matter. An attractive strategy for incorporating dark matter into the Standard Model (SM) is through a hidden sector, decoupled from known SM fields except for some ‘portal’ interaction [1–11]. A concrete realization of this is the Hidden Abelian Higgs Model...
Figure 1: Exotic decay of the Higgs boson into four leptons induced by intermediate dark vector bosons via the Higgs portal, where $s$ is a dark Higgs boson [5]. The $Z_d$ gauge boson decays into SM particles through kinetic mixing with the hypercharge field (with branching ratios that are nearly independent of $\epsilon$). The $HZ_dZ_d$ vertex factor is proportional to $\kappa$.

(HAHM) [5–10], in which a new $U(1)_d$ dark gauge field kinetically mixes with the SM $U(1)_Y$ hypercharge gauge field with some strength $\epsilon$ [12–14]. This gives rise to a new Higgs-like dark scalar $S$ along with the gauge boson of the new field, $Z_d$, or ‘dark photon’. The scalar $S$ mixes with the SM Higgs boson with strength $\kappa$, allowing decays of the SM Higgs boson into pairs of $Z_d$ bosons via mixing with the $S$ scalar. For $\epsilon \ll 1$, the decays of the $Z_d$ boson are largely determined by the gauge couplings. Over the range $1 \text{ GeV} < m_{Z_d} < 60 \text{ GeV}$, the branching fraction of the $Z_d$ boson into pairs of electrons or muons could be 10%–15% [5]. These decays would be prompt for $\epsilon \gtrsim 10^{-5}$.

This note explores the prospects for a search for $H \rightarrow Z_dZ_d$ at the ILC with $\sqrt{s} = 250 \text{ GeV}$, with the $Z_d$ bosons decaying promptly to $4\ell$ ($\ell \equiv e, \mu$), as illustrated in Fig. 1, as well as $2\ell 2j$ and $4j$. For the $4\ell$ final state, it follows closely the analysis of ATLAS at the LHC with $\sqrt{s} = 13 \text{ TeV}$ and an integrated luminosity of $139 \text{ fb}^{-1}$ [15]. Other similar searches, including searches for pairs of light bosons decaying into muons, $\tau$-leptons, photons, and/or jets, as well as searches for a single light boson decaying into a pair of muons, using both $\sqrt{s} = 8 \text{ TeV}$ and $13 \text{ TeV}$ data, have been performed by ATLAS [16–20], CMS [21–24], and LHCb [25]. Searches for long-lived signatures at ATLAS and CMS are reported in Refs. [26–34], while further searches for a SM Higgs boson decaying into undetected particles are reported in Refs. [35, 36].

The following section describes how the event samples used for these analyses were simulated and reconstructed. This is followed by a description of the $H \rightarrow Z_dZ_d \rightarrow 4\ell$, $2\ell 2j$, and $4j$ analyses, including the event selection, a discussion of quarkonia backgrounds, and expected limits. The note ends with a summary and discussion of possible future work.
2 Event simulation and reconstruction

The $ee \rightarrow ZH \rightarrow ffZ_dZ_d$ signal was generated according to the HAHM [5, 6, 9, 10] implementation in MadGraph5 amC@NLO version 2.8.2 [37], with the Higgs boson mass set to $m_H = 125$ GeV and $\epsilon$ and $\kappa$ both set to $10^{-4}$. The $e^-$ beam polarization was set to $-80\%$ and $e^+$ to $+30\%$. Leptonically decaying $Z_d$ bosons were forced to decay to either a $ee$ or $\mu\mu$ pair. Final states with $\tau$-leptons were not included. In the similar LHC analysis [15], the change in signal region yield due to the omission of these decays was below $1\%$ and thus neglected. Decays of $Z_d$ bosons to jets were allowed to be inclusive. Other Higgs boson production mechanisms, which are much smaller at the ILC with $\sqrt{s} = 250$ GeV, were also omitted. Showering was performed via MadGraph5 amC@NLO’s built-in interface to Pythia 8.244 [38]. Events in the $4\ell$ final state were generated at $m_Z = 1$ GeV, every 2 GeV in the range $2 \mathrm{GeV} \leq m_Z \leq 12$ GeV, and every 5 GeV in the range $15 \mathrm{GeV} \leq m_Z \leq 60$ GeV. Signal samples with $2\ell 2j$ and $4j$ final states were produced at $m_Z = 20$ GeV, 40 GeV, and 60 GeV. Each signal sample was generated with 20,000 events per $m_Z$ value and per final state.

The $ee \rightarrow X + H \rightarrow X + 4\ell$ background was generated using Whizard 2.8.5 [39, 40] along with its internal version of Pythia 6.4 [41], with parameters set corresponding to the OPAL tune provided in [42]. The $e^-$ beam polarization was set to $-80\%$ and $e^+$ to $+30\%$, and the provided 1lc250 Circe2 parameterization was used. The Higgs boson was forced to decay into either a $4e$, $2e2\mu$, or $4\mu$ final state. For this background, 20,000 events were generated.

The non-resonant $ee \rightarrow 4e, 2e2\mu, 4\mu$ background was also generated with Whizard, using the same settings as described previously. To remove divergences, the final state leptons were restricted to be within $20^\circ < \theta < 160^\circ$; further, each pair of final state leptons had to have an invariant mass greater than 1 GeV. For this background, 250,000 events were generated.

The generated events were processed through the full iLCSoft simulation and reconstruction chain [43] using the o2_V03 version of the SiD [44] geometry. The electrons and muons used in the analysis were identified by IsolatedLeptonTaggingProcessor [45]. This, however, relies on a cone-based isolation algorithm that rejects leptons from $Z_d \rightarrow \ell\ell$ decay if $m_{Z_d} \lesssim 4$ GeV. In order extend the analysis to smaller values of $m_{Z_d}$, the isolation algorithm is modified. When summing the particle flow objects inside an isolation cone around an electron or muon candidate, the highest-energy same-flavor opposite-sign lepton candidate is ignored. This recovers efficiency for $Z_d \rightarrow \ell\ell$ at low $m_{Z_d}$ with no significant increase in background for this analysis (as estimated from a $b\bar{b}$ sample generated with Whizard).

The $2\ell 2j$ and $4j$ final states rely on inclusive $ee \rightarrow ZH$ and $ee \rightarrow ZZ$ samples from the SiD collaboration [46]. These were generated using Whizard 2.6.4 using nominal ILC Technical Design Report polarization fractions of 80% polarized electrons and 30% polarized positrons. However the study is limited to samples with $-80\%$ and $e^+$ to $+30\%$ polarization to match electron beam polarization of the signal samples, and has not been approved by the SiD consortium.
3  $H \rightarrow Z_d Z_d \rightarrow 4\ell$ event selection

The event selection closely follows that of the ATLAS $H \rightarrow Z_d Z_d \rightarrow 4\ell$ analysis [15], with a few modifications for the ILC environment, such as removing detector-specific particle-identification requirements and changing requirements on $p_T$ and $\eta$ to $E$ and $\theta$. Although each signal event contains a $Z$ boson decay in addition to the Higgs boson decay, no explicit requirements are made for the $Z$ boson decay. Two sets of selections are used. The first, called the high-mass (HM) selection is designed for $15\text{ GeV} < m_{Z_d} < 60\text{ GeV}$, and the second, low-mass (LM), selection is designed for $1\text{ GeV} < m_{Z_d} < 15\text{ GeV}$. In this latter region, the angular separation between the two leptons from $Z_d \rightarrow \ell\ell$ decay becomes small. For the ATLAS analysis [15], the LM analysis used only the $4\mu$ final state, due to a decreased efficiency for identifying closely-spaced electrons. Simulated ILC events do not show such a drop in efficiency, so here all final states are used for the LM analysis.

Electrons and muons must satisfy $E > 7\text{ GeV}$ and $0.35 < \theta < \pi - 0.35$. Such leptons are formed into quadruplets consisting of two same-flavor opposite-sign (SFOS) lepton pairs, giving $4e, 2e2\mu, \text{ and } 4\mu$ final states. If there are more than two such pairs, multiple quadruplets are formed from all possible SFOS combinations. The invariant masses of the two pairs are denoted by $m_{12}$ and $m_{34}$, with $m_{12}$ taken to be the one closest to the mass of the $Z$ boson: $|m_{12} - m_Z| < |m_{34} - m_Z|$.

If all four leptons in a quadruplet have the same flavor, then one can also define alternate pairings. The invariant mass $m_{14}$ is defined from the positively charged lepton of the $m_{12}$ pair and the negatively charged lepton of the $m_{34}$ pair. The other alternative pairing $m_{23}$ is defined similarly.

For all quadruplets, the three highest-energy leptons must satisfy $E_1 > 20\text{ GeV}, E_2 > 15\text{ GeV}, \text{ and } E_3 > 10\text{ GeV}$. For the HM analysis only, the angular separation between all same-flavor leptons must satisfy $\Delta R(\ell, \ell') > 0.1$ and for different-flavor leptons $\Delta R(\ell, \ell') > 0.2$, where $(\Delta R)^2 = (\Delta \eta)^2 + (\Delta \phi)^2$ and $\eta$ is the pseudorapidity*. Events are required to have at least one such quadruplet. If there is more than one, the quadruplet with the smallest $\Delta m_{\ell\ell} = |m_{12} - m_{34}|$ is used.

For the HM event selection, the invariant mass of the four leptons must be consistent with that of the SM Higgs boson: $115\text{ GeV} < m_{4\ell} < 130\text{ GeV}$. The quadruplet must also not be consistent with the decay of $Z$ bosons ($Z$-veto): $10\text{ GeV} < m_{12,34} < 64\text{ GeV}$. For the $4e$ and $4\mu$ channels, it is possible that the leptons are mispaired, so for these channels there is also a requirement on the alternative lepton pairings: $5\text{ GeV} < m_{14,23} < 75\text{ GeV}$. Events with lepton pairs consistent with $J/\psi$ or $\Upsilon$ decay are also rejected. Events are rejected if any of $m_{12,34,14,23}$ are in the ranges $(m_{J/\psi} - 0.25\text{ GeV}) \text{ to } (m_{J/\psi} + 0.30\text{ GeV}) \text{ or } (m_{\Upsilon(2S)} - 0.70\text{ GeV}) \text{ to } (m_{\Upsilon(3S)} + 0.75\text{ GeV})$, where the quarkonia masses are taken to be $m_{J/\psi} = 3.096\text{ GeV}, m_{\psi(2S)} = 3.686\text{ GeV}, m_{\psi(1S)} = 9.461\text{ GeV}, \text{ and } m_{\Upsilon(3S)} = 10.355\text{ GeV}$ [47]. Finally, a requirement $m_{34}/m_{12} > 0.85$ ensures that the two pairs have similar invariant masses.

*Although an analysis in an $e^- e^+$ environment would more naturally use $\theta$ than $\eta$, the use of $\Delta R$ is retained here for consistency with the ATLAS analysis.
Table 1: Summary of event selection requirements for the HM and LM analyses.

|                          | High-mass (HM) analysis                                                                 | Low-mass (LM) analysis                                                                 |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Mass range               | $15 \text{ GeV} < m_X < 60 \text{ GeV}$                                                | $1 \text{ GeV} < m_X < 15 \text{ GeV}$                                                |
| Leptons                  | Four isolated electrons or muons with $E > 7 \text{ GeV}$ and $0.35 < \theta < \pi - 0.35$ | Four isolated electrons or muons with $E > 7 \text{ GeV}$ and $0.35 < \theta < \pi - 0.35$ |
| Quadruplet selection     | $e^+ e^- e^+ e^-, e^+ e^- \mu^+ \mu^-$ or $\mu^+ \mu^- \mu^+ \mu^-$;                | Define pairs $m_{12}$ and $m_{34}$ such that $|m_{12} - m_Z| < |m_{34} - m_Z|$           |
|                          | $\Delta R(\ell, \ell') > 0.10$ (0.20) for same-flavor (different-flavor) $\ell, \ell'$ | $\Delta R(\ell, \ell') > 0.10$ (0.20) for same-flavor (different-flavor) $\ell, \ell'$ |
| Quadruplet ranking       | Select quadruplet with smallest $\Delta m_{4\ell} = |m_{12} - m_{34}|$               | Select quadruplet with smallest $\Delta m_{4\ell} = |m_{12} - m_{34}|$               |
| Event selection          | $m_{4\ell}$                                                                            | $m_{4\ell}$                                                                            |
|                          | $115 \text{ GeV} < m_{4\ell} < 130 \text{ GeV}$                                       | $120 \text{ GeV} < m_{4\ell} < 130 \text{ GeV}$                                       |
| Z-veto                   | $10 \text{ GeV} < m_{12,34} < 64 \text{ GeV}$                                        |                                                      |
|                          | For 4e and 4$\mu$ channels:                                                            |                                                      |
|                          | $5 \text{ GeV} < m_{14,23} < 75 \text{ GeV}$                                         |                                                      |
| Heavy-flavor veto        | Reject event if $m_{12,34,14,23}$ in:                                                 | Reject event if $m_{14,23}$ in:                                                           |
|                          | $(m_{J/\psi} - 0.25 \text{ GeV})$ to                                                  | $(m_{J/\psi} - 0.25 \text{ GeV})$ to                                                    |
|                          | $(m_{\psi(2S)} + 0.30 \text{ GeV})$, or                                              | $(m_{\psi(2S)} + 0.30 \text{ GeV})$, or                                                  |
|                          | $(m_{Y(1S)} - 0.70 \text{ GeV})$ to                                                   | $(m_{Y(1S)} - 0.70 \text{ GeV})$ to                                                      |
|                          | $(m_{Y(3S)} + 0.75 \text{ GeV})$                                                     | $(m_{Y(3S)} + 0.75 \text{ GeV})$                                                        |
| Signal region            | $m_{34}/m_{12} > 0.85$                                                                 | $0.8 \text{ GeV} < m_{12,34} < 20 \text{ GeV}$                                          |
|                          | $m_{34}/m_{12} > 0.85$                                                                 | $m_{34}/m_{12} > 0.85$                                                                  |

For the LM event selection, the pair invariant masses are required to be in the range $0.8 \text{ GeV} < m_{12,34} < 20 \text{ GeV}$. The requirement on the overall invariant mass is tightened to $120 \text{ GeV} < m_{4\ell} < 130 \text{ GeV}$ due to smaller radiative tails in this regime. The Z-veto requirement is not applied, and only the alternate lepton pairings are used for the quarkonia vetoes (see Section 4). The final requirement $m_{34}/m_{12} > 0.85$ is the same as for the HM analysis.

Both event selections are summarized in Table 1.

The main backgrounds are from SM $H \rightarrow ZZ^* \rightarrow 4\ell$ decay and also from nonresonant $4\ell$ production, with the latter source dominating. These are estimated using the simulated samples described in Section 2. Backgrounds in which jets are misidentified as leptons are assumed to be negligible. Estimated backgrounds for a data sample of 2000 fb$^{-1}$ are shown in Table 2.
Table 2: Estimated backgrounds for the $H \rightarrow Z_dZ_d \rightarrow 4\ell$ analyses for a data sample of 2000 fb$^{-1}$. No simulated events for the non-resonant background pass the LM selection, so a limit is given based on the background represented by one simulated event.

| Selection       | $4e$     | $2e2\mu$ | $4\mu$ | All     |
|-----------------|----------|----------|--------|---------|
| $H \rightarrow ZZ^* \rightarrow 4\ell$ | $0.37 \pm 0.04$ | $0.39 \pm 0.04$ | $0.46 \pm 0.04$ | $1.22 \pm 0.07$ |
| Non-resonant    | $3.05 \pm 1.15$ | $2.62 \pm 1.07$ | $0.44 \pm 0.44$ | $6.10 \pm 1.63$ |
| Total           | $3.42 \pm 1.15$ | $3.00 \pm 1.07$ | $0.90 \pm 0.44$ | $7.32 \pm 1.63$ |

| Selection       | $4e$     | $2e2\mu$ | $4\mu$ | All     |
|-----------------|----------|----------|--------|---------|
| $H \rightarrow ZZ^* \rightarrow 4\ell$ | $0.04 \pm 0.01$ | $< 0.01$  | $0.03 \pm 0.01$ | $0.07 \pm 0.02$ |
| Non-resonant    | $< 0.44$ | $< 0.44$ | $< 0.44$ | $< 0.44$ |
| Total           | $< 0.47$ | $< 0.44$ | $< 0.47$ | $< 0.51$ |

4 Quarkonia backgrounds to $H \rightarrow Z_dZ_d \rightarrow 4\ell$ final states

The ATLAS $H \rightarrow Z_dZ_d \rightarrow 4\ell$ analysis [15] has no sensitivity in the regions $2$ GeV $< m_{Z_d} < 4.4$ GeV and $8$ GeV $< m_{Z_d} < 12$ GeV due to the presence of large backgrounds from quarkonia production. However, at the ILC, hadronic backgrounds such as this will be much smaller, and the excellent lepton momentum resolution of the ILC detectors may reduce the size of the $m_{Z_d}$ ranges affected by these backgrounds. Unfortunately, there is no reliable, general-purpose simulation of quarkonia production at the ILC. But one can still estimate these backgrounds, as described below.

First, consider direct, non-resonant production of $J/\psi$ and $\Upsilon$ pairs. These processes were estimated using HELAC-Onia version 2.0.1 [48, 49]. This can calculate processes such as $e^-e^+ \rightarrow J/\psi J/\psi$ and $e^-e^+ \rightarrow J/\psi J/\psi + q\bar{q}$, and similarly for $\Upsilon$. The quarkonia can be produced as either color singlets or color octets. For the purpose of this study, excited quarkonia states are not considered. The initial beams are set to $e^-e^+$ with beam energies of 125 GeV each, with initial-state radiation disabled. (HELAC-Onia does not implement beam polarization effects, and enabling initial-state radiation caused the subsequent showering step to fail.) For the processes with the largest cross sections, generated events were then showered and hadronized with PYTHIA 8.244, with the quarkonia forced to decay to either $e^-e^+$ or $\mu^-\mu^+$. The quarkonia decay branching ratios were taken to be $\text{BR}(J/\psi \rightarrow \ell\ell) = 0.119$ and $\text{BR}(\Upsilon \rightarrow \ell\ell) = 0.049$ [47]. Events were then passed through the detector simulation and analysis, yielding estimates of these quarkonia backgrounds after the LM selection, shown in Table 3. These estimates are all much smaller than other backgrounds for this selection.

Another possibility is the decay of a $Z$ boson into a quarkonia pair, or two $Z$ bosons decaying to the same quarkonium state. Backgrounds from these processes were estimated using current experimental limits/measurements for such decays [47]:
Table 3: Quarkonia production processes calculated with HELAC-Onia. The superscripts denote color-singlet and color-octet states, respectively. For the processes with larger cross sections, the number of expected events passing the LM selection for a data sample of 2000 fb$^{-1}$ is shown. This is shown as a limit for cases where no simulated events pass the selection.

| Process                  | Cross section (ab) | Expected background |
|--------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| $J/\psi^1 J/\psi^1$     | 8.3                | $<5.7 \times 10^{-6}$ |
| $J/\psi^8 J/\psi^8$     | $2.9 \times 10^{-6}$ |
| $J/\psi^1 J/\psi^1 + d\bar{d}$ | 0.0033         |
| $J/\psi^8 J/\psi^8 + d\bar{d}$ | 11              | $<0.0018$          |
| $J/\psi^1 J/\psi^1 + u\bar{u}$ | 0.0017         |
| $J/\psi^8 J/\psi^8 + u\bar{u}$ | 45              | $<0.0034$          |
| $J/\psi^1 J/\psi^1 + s\bar{s}$ | 0.0033         |
| $J/\psi^8 J/\psi^8 + s\bar{s}$ | 11              | $<0.0018$          |
| $J/\psi^1 J/\psi^1 + c\bar{c}$ | 0.057           |
| $J/\psi^8 J/\psi^8 + c\bar{c}$ | 41              | $6.3 \times 10^{-4}$ |
| $J/\psi^1 J/\psi^1 + b\bar{b}$ | 0.0022           |
| $J/\psi^8 J/\psi^8 + b\bar{b}$ | 8.3              | $1.0 \times 10^{-4}$ |
| $J/\psi^1 J/\psi^1 + gg$   | 0.012             |
| $J/\psi^8 J/\psi^8 + gg$   | 1.6 a             |
| $J/\psi^1 J/\psi^1 + g$    | 0.060             |
| $\Upsilon^1 \Upsilon^1$  | $0.18$            | $<1.3 \times 10^{-7}$ |
| $\Upsilon^8 \Upsilon^8$  | $6.5 \times 10^{-11}$ |
| $\Upsilon^1 \Upsilon^1 + d\bar{d}$ | $8.1 \times 10^{-4}$ |
| $\Upsilon^8 \Upsilon^8 + d\bar{d}$ | $1.0 \times 10^{-5}$ |
| $\Upsilon^1 \Upsilon^1 + u\bar{u}$ | 0.0034           |
| $\Upsilon^8 \Upsilon^8 + u\bar{u}$ | $4.0 \times 10^{-5}$ |
| $\Upsilon^1 \Upsilon^1 + s\bar{s}$ | $8.1 \times 10^{-4}$ |
| $\Upsilon^8 \Upsilon^8 + s\bar{s}$ | $1.0 \times 10^{-5}$ |
| $\Upsilon^1 \Upsilon^1 + c\bar{c}$ | 0.0031           |
| $\Upsilon^8 \Upsilon^8 + c\bar{c}$ | $3.9 \times 10^{-5}$ |
| $\Upsilon^1 \Upsilon^1 + b\bar{b}$ | 0.0022           |
| $\Upsilon^8 \Upsilon^8 + b\bar{b}$ | $8.4 \times 10^{-6}$ |
| $\Upsilon^1 \Upsilon^1 + gg$   | $4.7 \times 10^{-5}$ |
| $\Upsilon^8 \Upsilon^8 + gg$   | $8.0 \times 10^{-5}$ |
| $\Upsilon^1 \Upsilon^1 + g$    | $2.9 \times 10^{-7}$ |

aHELAC-Onia failed to generate events for this process.
\begin{align*}
&\text{BR}(Z \to J/\psi + X) = 5.1 \times 10^{-3} \\
&\text{BR}(Z \to J/\psi J/\psi) < 2.2 \times 10^{-6} \\
&\text{BR}(Z \to \Upsilon + X) = 1.0 \times 10^{-4} \\
&\text{BR}(Z \to \Upsilon \Upsilon) < 1.5 \times 10^{-6}
\end{align*}

**WHIZARD** was used to generate a sample of \( e^- e^+ \to f \bar{f} Z \), where \( f \) is any fermion, configured as described in Section 2, except that the **PYTHIA** showering was set to force the \( Z \) boson to decay as either \( Z \to J/\psi J/\psi \to 4\ell \) or \( Z \to \Upsilon \Upsilon \to 4\ell \). Events were then passed through the detector simulation and LM selection. The total cross section calculated by **WHIZARD** for \( f \bar{f} Z \) was \( 7.1 \times 10^3 \) fb. Taking into account the branching ratios above and the efficiency of the LM selection, the expected background for a 2000 fb\(^{-1} \) data sample is \(< 2.2 \times 10^{-5} \) for \( Z \to J/\psi J/\psi \) and \( 1.2 \times 10^{-5} \) for \( Z \to \Upsilon \Upsilon \).

Similarly, **WHIZARD** was also used to generate a sample of \( e^- e^+ \to ZZ \), where here each \( Z \) boson was forced to decay as either \( Z \to J/\psi c \bar{c} \) or \( Z \to \Upsilon b \bar{b} \). The total **WHIZARD** cross section for this process was \( 1.8 \times 10^3 \) fb. Again, taking into account branching ratios and efficiencies, the expected background for a 2000 fb\(^{-1} \) data sample is 0.0029 for \( ZZ \to J/\psi J/\psi + c \bar{c} c \bar{c} \) and \( 4.3 \times 10^{-7} \) for \( ZZ \to \Upsilon \Upsilon + b \bar{b} b \bar{b} \).

A final possibility is \( H \to J/\psi J/\psi \) or \( H \to \Upsilon \Upsilon \). Such a background would be particularly concerning since it could not be removed by the requirement that the overall invariant mass be consistent with that of the SM Higgs boson. However, calculations give \( \text{BR}(H \to J/\psi J/\psi) = 5.9 \times 10^{-10} \) and \( \text{BR}(H \to \Upsilon \Upsilon) = 4.3 \times 10^{-10} \) [50, 51], which are much smaller than the \( H \to Z_d Z_d \) branching ratio to which the LM analysis is sensitive.

Although this does not exhaust all possibilities for quarkonia background processes, it should be a representative sample. All processes examined result in backgrounds that are much smaller than the other (already-small) backgrounds to the LM selection. Therefore, quarkonia production is unlikely to be a significant background to this analysis. However, evaluating this with more confidence would likely require improved codes for calculating quarkonia processes.

Further, the invariant mass distributions of dilepton decays of quarkonia are shown in Fig. 2. These events were generated by **HELAC-Onia** +**PYTHIA** and processed with the full detector simulation. (**HELAC-Onia** sets the quarkonia masses to be exactly the sum of the masses of the constituent quarks, so the positions of the peaks are shifted from the true quarkonia masses.) These peaks are very narrow, especially for the \( \mu^- \mu^+ \) decays. Therefore, even if quarkonia backgrounds were to be significant, they could be effectively suppressed by rejecting a much smaller range in \( mz_d \) than was done in the ATLAS analysis.

### 5 \( H \to Z_d Z_d \to 4\ell \) expected limits

Expected limits are set based on the distribution of the average of the invariant masses of the two lepton pairs in a quadruplet, \( \langle m_{\ell \ell} \rangle = \frac{1}{2} (m_{12} + m_{34}) \). The likelihood function
Figure 2: Invariant mass distributions for quarkonia decays to lepton pairs as generated by HELAC-Onia + Pythia: (a) $J/\psi \rightarrow e^-e^+$; (b) $J/\psi \rightarrow \mu^-\mu^+$; (c) $\Upsilon \rightarrow e^-e^+$; (d) $\Upsilon \rightarrow \mu^-\mu^+$. Note that HELAC-Onia sets the quarkonia masses to be exactly the sum of the constituent quark masses; hence, the peaks are shifted from the true quarkonia masses.
Figure 3: (a) Model-independent per-channel efficiencies for the fiducial volumes described in Table 4. (b) Model-dependent per-channel acceptances for the $H \rightarrow Z_d Z_d \rightarrow 4\ell$ process. The discontinuities at $m_{Z_d} = 15$ GeV are due to the change from the LM to HM selection.

Describing the data for a channel $j$ consists of a Poisson factor for each histogram bin $i$:

$$\mathcal{L}(N) = \prod_i \text{Pois}(N_{ij}; \mu S_{ij}(m_{Z_d}) + B_{ij}),$$

where $S$ and $B$ are the predicted numbers of signal and background events for each bin and channel and $\mu$ is the signal strength. For this study, systematic uncertainties are assumed to be negligible. The signal shape as a function of $m_{Z_d}$ is found by fitting a Gaussian to the simulated signal at each generated mass point and then interpolating in the fit mean and width as a function of $m_{Z_d}$. Background histograms are smoothed using the RooKeysPdf class of RooFit [52, 53], except that if there are less than ten simulated events surviving in a channel, the background is taken to be flat with respect to $m_{Z_d}$.

Following [15], a set of generator-level fiducial requirements, described in Table 4, are used to factorize the event selection into a largely model-independent ‘efficiency’ and a model-dependent ‘acceptance’. For the purpose of these selections, the four-momenta of photons close to a lepton ($\Delta R < 0.1$) are added to that of the lepton. This accounts for the effects of quasi-collinear electromagnetic radiation from the leptons [54]. The efficiency for a channel is defined as the fraction of events passing the generator-level fiducial selection that also passes the full event selection, while the acceptance is defined as the fraction of generator-level events that pass the fiducial selection. The efficiency and acceptance for the analyses described here are shown in Fig. 3. For the HM selection, the acceptance falls for low $m_{Z_d}$ for the $4e$ and $4\mu$ channels due to the alternate pair requirement of the Z-veto. (Similar behavior was seen in the ATLAS analysis [15].)

The efficiencies are used to compute expected 95% CL upper limits on the cross sections within the fiducial region, using the CL$_s$ frequentist formalism [55] with the profile-
Table 4: Summary of the fiducial phase-space definitions for the HM and LM analyses. Objects are considered at generator-level, with photons nearby leptons summed with those leptons.

|                          | High-mass (HM) analysis | Low-mass (LM) analysis |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
|                          | $H \to Zd\bar{Z}d \to 4\ell\ (\ell = e,\mu)$ | $H \to Zd\bar{Z}d \to 4\ell\ (\ell = e,\mu)$ |
| Mass range               | $15 \text{ GeV} < m_X < 60 \text{ GeV}$ | $1 \text{ GeV} < m_X < 15 \text{ GeV}$ |
| Leptons                  | $E > 7 \text{ GeV}$ and $0.35 < \theta < \pi - 0.35$ | $0.8 \text{ GeV} < m_{12,34} < 20 \text{ GeV}$ |
| Quadruplet               | $\Delta R(\ell,\ell') > 0.10 \ (0.20)$ for same-flavor (different-flavor) $\ell,\ell'$ | $m_{34}/m_{12} > 0.85$ |
|                          | $10 \text{ GeV} < m_{12,34} < 64 \text{ GeV}$ | $0.8 \text{ GeV} < m_{12,34} < 20 \text{ GeV}$ |
|                          | For 4e and 4$\mu$ channels: $5 \text{ GeV} < m_{14,23} < 75 \text{ GeV}$ |                                |
| Reject event if $m_{12,34,14,23}$ in: | $(m_{J/\psi} - 0.25 \text{ GeV})$ to $(m_{\psi(2S)} + 0.30 \text{ GeV})$, or $(m_{\Upsilon(1S)} - 0.70 \text{ GeV})$ to $(m_{\Upsilon(3S)} + 0.75 \text{ GeV})$ | Reject event if $m_{14,23}$ in: $(m_{J/\psi} - 0.25 \text{ GeV})$ to $(m_{\psi(2S)} + 0.30 \text{ GeV})$, or $(m_{\Upsilon(1S)} - 0.70 \text{ GeV})$ to $(m_{\Upsilon(3S)} + 0.75 \text{ GeV})$ |

likelihood-ratio test statistic \[56\], and are shown in Fig. 4, assuming a total integrated luminosity of 2000 fb$^{-1}$. Incorporating the acceptance and combining the channels, this can be converted into an upper limit on the product of the total cross section and the decay branching ratio for the model considered, $\sigma(e^+e^- \to H + X \to Zd\bar{Z}d + X \to 4\ell + X)$, shown in Fig. 5a. Using the model-dependent branching ratio $\text{BR}(Zd \to 2\ell)$, this can be converted into a limit on $\text{BR}(H \to Zd\bar{Z}d)$, shown in Fig. 5b.

Compared to limits from the similar ATLAS analysis with 139 fb$^{-1}$ of data and $\sqrt{s} = 13 \text{ TeV}$, the expected branching ratio limits here are a factor of 5–10 higher. This is not unexpected: since the background is quite small, even at the LHC, the sensitivity is driven mainly by the total number of Higgs bosons produced, which was about ten times larger at the LHC than would be expected in 2000 fb$^{-1}$ of ILC data at $\sqrt{s} = 250 \text{ GeV}$. The exception is in the mass ranges $2 \text{ GeV} < m_{Z_d} < 4.4 \text{ GeV}$ and $8 \text{ GeV} < m_{Z_d} < 12 \text{ GeV}$, where the ATLAS analysis has no sensitivity due to quarkonia backgrounds.

6 $H \to Zd\bar{Z}d \to 2\ell2j, \ 4j$ event selection

The event selection for the 2$\ell2j$ and 4$j$ final states proceeds in two steps, beginning with a cut-based preselection followed by a selection based on boosted decision trees (BDT).

The 2$\ell2j$ final state requires at least one pair of opposite-sign electrons or muons along with four jets formed from particle flow objects (PFO) not associated with isolated leptons
Figure 4: Per-channel expected upper limits at 95% CL on the fiducial cross sections for the $H \rightarrow Z_d Z_d \rightarrow 4\ell$ process, for the (a) 4e, (b) 4\mu, and (c) 2e2\mu final states. The discontinuities at $m_{Z_d} = 15\text{ GeV}$ are due to the change from the LM to HM selection.
Figure 5: (a) Expected upper limit at 95% CL for the cross section of the $e^+e^- \rightarrow H + X \rightarrow Z_dZ_d + X \rightarrow 4\ell + X$ process, assuming SM Higgs boson production. (b) Expected upper limit at 95% CL for the cross section times the model-dependent branching ratio divided by the SM Higgs boson production cross section (319 fb) for the $H \rightarrow Z_dZ_d$ process for the benchmark HAHM. In both cases, all final states are combined. The discontinuities at $m_{Z_d} = 15$ GeV are due to the change from the LM to HM selection.

or photons. If there are multiple eligible lepton pairs, the one with invariant mass closest to the $Z$-boson mass $m_Z$ is selected as the $Z$ or $Z_d$ candidate. The $4j$ final state has no requirement on the number of isolated leptons, but requires six jets from non-isolated PFO objects. Either case uses the standard jet reconstruction to four or six jets, respectively.

For both final states, all possible jet pairs are constructed. The invariant masses of the jet pairs, along with the dilepton’s invariant mass in the $2\ell 2j$ final state, are compared against $m_Z$ and the pair with the invariant mass closest to $m_Z$ is selected as the $Z$-boson candidate. If in the $2\ell 2j$ final state preselection a jet pair is selected as the $Z$-candidate, the remaining jet and lepton pairs are selected as the $Z_d$ candidates. In all other cases all possible jet pairs from the remaining four jets are constructed and the two jet pairs with invariant mass closest to each other, i.e. minimizing $|m_{j_1j_2} - m_{j_3j_4}|$, are selected as the two $Z_d$ candidates.

The jets, as well as leptons in the $2\ell 2j$ case, must satisfy the requirement on their polar angle $|\cos(\theta)| < 0.9$.

The final requirement for the preselection is that the four fermions constituting the two $Z_d$ candidates have a total invariant mass broadly consistent with that of the Higgs boson: $90 \text{ GeV} < m_{ffff} < 160 \text{ GeV}$.

The preselection efficiency $\times$ acceptance for the signal samples is around 31% for the $4j$ final state and 24% for the $2\ell 2j$ one. For the background samples the efficiencies $\times$
Table 5: Selection efficiencies × acceptance for the 4j and 2ℓ2j signal regions after preselection and boosted decision tree selection.

|                | signal efficiency × acceptance | background efficiency × acceptance |
|----------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
|                | m_{Z_d} | 20 GeV  | 40 GeV  | 60 GeV  | 20 GeV  | 40 GeV  | 60 GeV  |
| 4j final state |   9.4%  |   5.2%  |   4.7%  |   0.02% |       0 |
| 2ℓ2j final state |  24%    |   22%   |   24%   |   0.6%  |       0 |

Table 6: Expected signal region event yields for the 2ℓ2j and 4j final states. Both are scaled to an integrated luminosity of 2000 fb\(^{-1}\). The signal yields assume a H → Z_dZ_d → 2ℓ2j, 4j cross section of 1 fb.

|                | signal yields | background yield |
|----------------|---------------|------------------|
|                | m_{Z_d} | 20 GeV  | 40 GeV  | 60 GeV  | 20 GeV  | 40 GeV  | 60 GeV  |
| 4j final state |   187   |   103   |    93   |  8400   |       0 |
| 2ℓ2j final state | 484      |  448    |  487    |  131    |       0 |

acceptances are 17% and 2% for the 4j and 2ℓ2j final states, respectively.

The signal regions are defined by boosted decision trees individually trained for each final state. Half of the generated events for both the background and signal samples are randomly assigned for training, while the remainder are used for evaluation. The input variables for the BDT are:

- The transverse momentum, total energy, invariant mass, and cos(θ) for each Z-boson and Z_d-boson candidate;
- the \(\Delta R\) between each possible boson candidate pair;
- and the transverse momentum, total energy, invariant mass of the Higgs boson candidate.

The efficiencies after the preselection and the BDT selection for the signals and background are shown in Table 5, and Table 6 shows the signal region event yields assuming an integrated luminosity of 2000 fb\(^{-1}\) and an H → Z_dZ_d → 2ℓ2j, 4j cross section of 1 fb.

7  \(H \rightarrow Z_dZ_d \rightarrow 2\ell2j,\ 4j\) expected limits

The likelihood function describing the data for the 4j and 2ℓ2j final states follows Eq. (1). Both final state channels are fitted concurrently so the model in this case is given by:

\[
\mathcal{L}(N) = \prod_{j=4j,2\ell2j} \prod_i \text{Pois}(N_{ij} ; \mu_{S_{ij}(m_{Z_d})} + B_{ij}).
\]
The distributions used to evaluate the likelihood are the average $Z_d$ mass: $\langle m_{Z_d} \rangle = \frac{1}{2} (m_{Z_d1} + m_{Z_d2})$. The limits on the total cross section for the combined $4j$ and $2\ell 2j$ branching ratio are shown in Fig. 6a.

Fig. 6b shows that the $2\ell 2j$ and $4j$ final states do not yield a stricter expected limit on BR$(H \rightarrow Z_d Z_d)$ than the $4\ell$ final state, despite the more favorable BR$(Z_d \rightarrow 2j)$ branching ratio [6].

8 Summary and future work

Expected limits have been presented for a search for dark photons in the $H \rightarrow Z_d Z_d \rightarrow 4\ell$, $2\ell 2j$, and $4j$ final states. It is seen that compared to the LHC, searches for these channels are not competitive at the ILC, except for $Z_d$ masses close to the $J/\psi$ and $\Upsilon$ quarkonia resonances. The LHC analysis does not have sensitivity in those region due to large hadronic backgrounds, but it should be possible to derive limits in those regions at the ILC where such backgrounds are much smaller. Doing this reliably, however, will likely require progress in theoretical calculations of decays involving quarkonia states.
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