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Abstract

We review the program \textit{HiggsBounds} that tests theoretical predictions of models with arbitrary Higgs sectors against the exclusion bounds obtained from the Higgs searches at LEP and the Tevatron. We explicitly list the bounds that have been added after the first release of \textit{HiggsBounds}.
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INTRODUCTION

The search for Higgs bosons is a major cornerstone of the physics programs of past, present and future high energy colliders. The LEP and Tevatron experiments, in particular, turned the non-observation of Higgs bosons into constraints on the Higgs sector, which can be very useful in reducing the available parameter space of particle physics models. Such constraints will continue to be important far into the LHC era as they will need to be taken into account in the interpretation of any new physics scenario.

The constraints are provided by experiments in the form of limits on cross sections of individual signal topologies (such as \(e^+e^- \rightarrow hZ \rightarrow b\bar{b}Z\) or \(p\bar{p} \rightarrow hZ \rightarrow b\bar{b}l^+l^-\)) or in the form of combined limits for a specific model, such as the SM. The latter type of analyses include detailed knowledge of the overlap between the individual experimental searches, and therefore have a high sensitivity, whereas the former can be used to test a wide class of models.

Comparing the predictions of a particular model with the existing experimental bounds on the various search topologies can be quite a tedious task as it involves the implementation of experimental results that are distributed over many different publications and combining these results requires a procedure to ensure the correct statistical interpretation of the exclusion bounds obtained on the parameter space of the model.

The program HiggsBounds [1] is a tool designed to facilitate the above task so that wide classes of models can easily be checked against the state-of-the-art results from Higgs searches. This should be useful for applications in Higgs phenomenology and model building (see, e.g., [2, 3]). HiggsBounds takes theoretical Higgs sector predictions, e.g. for a particular parameter scenario of a model beyond the SM, as input. It determines which Higgs search analysis has the highest exclusion power according to a list of expected exclusion limits from LEP and the Tevatron (an expected limit...
corresponds to the bound that one would obtain in the hypothetical case of an observed
distribution that agrees precisely with the background expectation). In order to ensure
the correct statistical interpretation of the obtained exclusion bound as a 95% CL, the
comparison of the model with the experimental limits has to be restricted to the single
channel that possesses the highest statistical sensitivity. For this channel, the program
then compares the theoretical prediction for the Higgs production cross section times
decay branching ratio with the actual experimental limit and determines whether or not
the considered parameter point of the model is excluded at 95% CL.

THE CODE HIGGSBOUNDS

The code roughly works as follows. The user provides the Higgs sector predictions of
the model (point in the parameter space) under consideration. For each neutral Higgs
boson \( h_i \) \( (i = 1, \ldots, n_{\text{Higgs}}) \) in the model, this will usually include the mass, total decay
width, branching ratios and Higgs production cross sections:

\[
M_{h_i}, \Gamma_{\text{tot}}(h_i), \text{BR}_{\text{model}}(h_i \rightarrow \ldots), \frac{\sigma_{\text{model}}(P)}{\sigma_{\text{ref}}(P)}.
\] (1)

Where it exists, \( \sigma^{\text{SM}}(P) \) is used as the reference cross section. Variations on this input
format are offered. As an example, the branching ratios and production cross section
can be replaced by the effective couplings of the Higgs boson(s) to SM particles. More
details are given in the HiggsBounds manual [1].

A complete list of the experimental analyses included in the first release of
HiggsBounds is given in [1]. The included results from LEP and the Tevatron
consist of tables of expected (based on MC simulations with no signal) and observed
95% CL cross section limits, with a variety of normalizations. The set mainly consists
of analyses for which model-independent limits were published. However, we also
included some dedicated analyses carried out for the case of the SM. These analyses are
only taken into account as a possible exclusion bound if the Higgs boson in question
would appear sufficiently ‘SM-like’ to this analysis. Roughly speaking, this requires
that the ratios of all involved couplings to the SM couplings are approximately equal.

For each Higgs process \( X \) (here, we treat each combination of Higgs bosons in each
experimental analysis as a separate \( X \)), HiggsBounds uses the input to calculate the
quantity \( Q_{\text{model}}(X) \), which, up to a normalization factor, is the predicted cross section
times branching ratio for \( X \). In order to ensure the correct statistical interpretation of the
results, it is crucial to only consider the experimentally observed limit for one particular
\( X \). Therefore, HiggsBounds must first determine \( X_0 \), which is defined as the process \( X \)
with the highest statistical sensitivity for the model point under consideration. In order to
do this, the program uses the tables of expected experimental limits to obtain a quantity
\( Q_{\text{expec}} \) corresponding to each \( X \). The process with the largest value of \( Q_{\text{model}}/Q_{\text{expec}} \)
is chosen as \( X_0 \). HiggsBounds then determines a value for \( Q_{\text{obs}} \) for this process \( X_0 \),
using the appropriate table of experimentally observed limits. If

\[
Q_{\text{model}}(X_0)/Q_{\text{obs}}(X_0) > 1,
\] (2)

HiggsBounds concludes that this particular parameter point is excluded at 95 % CL.
The HiggsBounds package (current version 1.2.0) can be obtained from http://www.ippp.dur.ac.uk/HiggsBounds

The code has both a Fortran 77 and Fortran 90 version. It can be operated in a command line mode that can process input files in a variety of formats, as a subroutine suitable for inclusion in user applications, and as an online version, available at its home page. The package includes sample programs which demonstrate how HiggsBounds can be used in conjunction with the widely used MSSM Higgs sector programs FeynHiggs [4, 5, 6, 7] and CPsuperH [8].

NEWLY IMPLEMENTED AND UPDATED BOUNDS

After the first release of HiggsBounds more search channels from LEP [9, 10, 11, 12] and the Tevatron [13, 14, 15, 17, 31] have been implemented on top of what is described in [1]. These newly implemented bounds are summarized in Tab. 1.

| Search Channel | Reference |
|---------------|-----------|
| $e^+e^- \rightarrow h_k Z \rightarrow X + Z$ | [11] |
| $e^+e^- \rightarrow h_k Z \rightarrow \gamma \gamma Z$ | [12] |
| $p\bar{p} \rightarrow h_k V \rightarrow b\bar{b} + \text{missing } E_T$ | [13, 14] |
| $p\bar{p} \rightarrow h_k + X \rightarrow WW + X$ | [15, 16] |
| $p\bar{p} \rightarrow h_k b \rightarrow \tau^+ \tau^- b$ | [17] |
| $p\bar{p} \rightarrow h_k + X$ (SM combined) | [18, 19, 20, 21] |

The code is constantly kept up-to-date by the inclusion of updated results published by the Tevatron experiments. This is illustrated in Tab. 2 where we list the search channels that have been updated since the initial release.

| Search Channel | Reference |
|---------------|-----------|
| $p\bar{p} \rightarrow h_k Z \rightarrow b\bar{b} l\bar{l}$ | [22, 23, 24] |
| $p\bar{p} \rightarrow h_k W \rightarrow b\bar{b} l\bar{l}$ | [25, 26, 27, 28] |
| $p\bar{p} \rightarrow h_k W \rightarrow WW \rightarrow l\bar{l} l\bar{l} + X$ | [29, 30] |
| $p\bar{p} \rightarrow H + X \rightarrow \gamma \gamma + X$ | [31, 32] |
| $p\bar{p} \rightarrow h_k \rightarrow \tau^+ \tau^-$ | [33, 34, 35] |

Still missing are the bounds on charged Higgs bosons from both LEP and the Tevatron. They will be implemented into HiggsBounds in the near future.
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