

GMCALC: a calculator for the Georgi-Machacek model*

Katy Hartling, Kunal Kumar, Heather E. Logan[†] and Andrea D. Peterson
*Ottawa-Carleton Institute for Physics, Carleton University,
1125 Colonel By Drive, Ottawa K1S 5B6 Canada*

Version 1.2.1: June 20, 2016

Abstract

The Georgi-Machacek model adds scalar triplets to the Standard Model Higgs sector in such a way as to preserve custodial $SU(2)$ symmetry in the scalar potential. This allows the triplets to have a non-negligible vacuum expectation value while satisfying constraints from the ρ parameter. Depending on the parameters, the 125 GeV neutral Higgs particle can have couplings to WW and ZZ larger than in the Standard Model due to mixing with the triplets. The model also contains singly- and doubly-charged Higgs particles that couple to vector boson pairs at tree level (WZ and like-sign WW , respectively).

GMCALC is a self-contained FORTRAN program that, given a set of input parameters, calculates the particle spectrum and tree-level couplings in the Georgi-Machacek model, checks theoretical and indirect constraints, and computes the branching ratios and total widths of the scalars. It also generates a `param.card.dat` file for MadGraph5 or MadGraph5_aMC@NLO to be used with the corresponding FeynRules model implementation.

*Code available from <http://people.physics.carleton.ca/~logan/gmcalc/> .

[†]`logan@physics.carleton.ca`

Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Georgi-Machacek model	3
2.1	Scalar potential	3
2.2	Electroweak symmetry breaking and physical spectrum	4
2.3	Yukawa sector	6
3	Theoretical constraints	7
3.1	Tree-level unitarity	7
3.2	Bounded-from-below requirement on the potential	7
3.3	Absence of deeper custodial symmetry-breaking minima	7
4	Indirect experimental constraints	8
4.1	S parameter	8
4.2	$b \rightarrow s\gamma$	9
4.3	$B_s^0 \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$	10
5	Decays	11
5.1	$H \rightarrow f\bar{f}$	11
5.2	$H \rightarrow V_1^* V_2^*$	12
5.3	$H_1 \rightarrow V H_2$	13
5.4	$H_1 \rightarrow H_2 H_3$	13
5.5	$H \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$	14
5.6	$H \rightarrow gg$	14
5.7	$H \rightarrow Z\gamma$	15
6	Using the GMCALC program	16
6.1	Sample main programs provided with the code	16
6.2	Setting the model parameters	17
6.3	Checking consistency and computing the spectrum	17
6.4	Computing couplings and decays	18
6.5	Outputs	18
6.6	Parameter scans	19
6.7	Standard Model inputs	19

1 Introduction

The Georgi-Machacek (GM) model [1, 2] is an extension of the Standard Model (SM) Higgs sector containing additional scalars in the triplet representation of $SU(2)_L$. The particle content is such that an additional global $SU(2)_R$ symmetry can be imposed by hand on the scalar potential. This ensures that the custodial $SU(2)$ symmetry, which fixes $\rho \equiv M_W^2/M_Z^2 \cos^2 \theta_W = 1$ at tree level in the SM, is preserved after electroweak symmetry breaking.

Without the stringent constraint from the ρ parameter, the vacuum expectation value (vev) of the triplets can be large, leading to interesting phenomenology. In particular, depending on the parameters, the 125 GeV neutral Higgs particle can have couplings to WW and ZZ larger than in the SM due to mixing with the triplets. The model also contains singly- and doubly-charged Higgs particles that couple to vector boson pairs at tree level, leading to $H_5^+ \rightarrow W^+Z$ and like-sign $H_5^{++} \rightarrow W^+W^+$ signatures. Such an H^+W^-Z coupling is absent at tree level in two Higgs doublet models (2HDMs), and the $H^{++}W^-W^-$ coupling is severely suppressed in triplet models without custodial symmetry in which the triplet vev is forced to be very small by the experimental constraint from the ρ parameter.

This manual describes the FORTRAN code GMCALC. Given a set of model parameters, GMCALC calculates the mass spectrum and relevant mixing angles in the scalar sector, as well as the tree-level couplings of the scalars. It also checks that theoretical constraints from perturbative unitarity of the quartic scalar couplings, bounded-from-below-ness of the scalar potential, and the absence of deeper custodial-symmetry-breaking minima are satisfied. The code also checks consistency of the parameter point with indirect experimental constraints from the S parameter, $b \rightarrow s\gamma$, and $B_s^0 \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$. Finally, it computes the branching ratios and total widths of the scalars. Most of the code is based on our work in Refs. [3, 4].

GMCALC includes a routine to generate a `param_card.dat` file for MadGraph5 to be used with the corresponding FeynRules [6] model implementation. The FeynRules implementation for the Georgi-Machacek model, as well as a Universal FeynRules Output (UFO) [5] file for use with the MadGraph5_aMC@NLO framework [7] including automatic calculation of the next-to-leading order QCD corrections, can be downloaded from the model database at <http://feynrules.irmp.ucl.ac.be/wiki/GeorgiMachacekModel>.

This manual is organized as follows. In Sec. 2 we give a brief description of the GM model and set our notation. In Sec. 3 we review the theoretical constraints and their implementation. In Sec. 4 we describe the indirect experimental constraints that are implemented in the code. In Sec. 5 we summarize the computation of the decay partial widths of the scalars and specify the approximations made in the code. Finally in Sec. 6 we give instructions for using the GMCALC code.

2 Georgi-Machacek model

2.1 Scalar potential

The scalar sector of the Georgi-Machacek model consists of the usual complex doublet (ϕ^+, ϕ^0) with hypercharge¹ $Y = 1$, a real triplet (ξ^+, ξ^0, ξ^-) with $Y = 0$, and a complex triplet $(\chi^{++}, \chi^+, \chi^0)$ with $Y = 2$. The doublet is responsible for the fermion masses as in the SM. In order to make the global $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ symmetry explicit, we write the doublet in the form of a bi-doublet Φ and combine the triplets to form a bi-triplet X :

$$\Phi = \begin{pmatrix} \phi^{0*} & \phi^+ \\ -\phi^{+*} & \phi^0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (1)$$

$$X = \begin{pmatrix} \chi^{0*} & \xi^+ & \chi^{++} \\ -\chi^{+*} & \xi^0 & \chi^+ \\ \chi^{++*} & -\xi^{+*} & \chi^0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2)$$

¹We use $Q = T^3 + Y/2$.

The vevs are defined by $\langle \Phi \rangle = \frac{v_\phi}{\sqrt{2}} \mathbb{1}_{2 \times 2}$ and $\langle X \rangle = v_\chi \mathbb{1}_{3 \times 3}$, where the Fermi constant constrains

$$v_\phi^2 + 8v_\chi^2 \equiv v^2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}G_F} \approx (246 \text{ GeV})^2. \quad (3)$$

Note that the two triplet fields χ^0 and ξ^0 must obtain the same vev in order to preserve custodial SU(2). Furthermore we will decompose the neutral fields into real and imaginary parts according to

$$\phi^0 \rightarrow \frac{v_\phi}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{\phi^{0,r} + i\phi^{0,i}}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad \chi^0 \rightarrow v_\chi + \frac{\chi^{0,r} + i\chi^{0,i}}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad \xi^0 \rightarrow v_\chi + \xi^0, \quad (4)$$

where we note that ξ^0 is already a real field.

Using the notation of Ref. [3], the most general gauge-invariant scalar potential involving these fields that conserves custodial SU(2) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} V(\Phi, X) = & \frac{\mu_2^2}{2} \text{Tr}(\Phi^\dagger \Phi) + \frac{\mu_3^2}{2} \text{Tr}(X^\dagger X) + \lambda_1 [\text{Tr}(\Phi^\dagger \Phi)]^2 + \lambda_2 \text{Tr}(\Phi^\dagger \Phi) \text{Tr}(X^\dagger X) \\ & + \lambda_3 \text{Tr}(X^\dagger X X^\dagger X) + \lambda_4 [\text{Tr}(X^\dagger X)]^2 - \lambda_5 \text{Tr}(\Phi^\dagger \tau^a \Phi \tau^b) \text{Tr}(X^\dagger t^a X t^b) \\ & - M_1 \text{Tr}(\Phi^\dagger \tau^a \Phi \tau^b) (U X U^\dagger)_{ab} - M_2 \text{Tr}(X^\dagger t^a X t^b) (U X U^\dagger)_{ab}. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

(A translation table to other notations used in the literature is given in the appendix of Ref. [3].) Here the SU(2) generators for the doublet representation are $\tau^a = \sigma^a/2$ with σ^a being the Pauli matrices, the generators for the triplet representation are

$$t^1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad t^2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i & 0 \\ i & 0 & -i \\ 0 & i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad t^3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (6)$$

and the matrix U , which rotates X into the Cartesian basis, is given by

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \\ -\frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 & -\frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (7)$$

We note that all the operators in Eq. (5) are manifestly Hermitian, so that the parameters in the scalar potential must all be real. Explicit CP violation is thus not possible in the Georgi-Machacek model.

2.2 Electroweak symmetry breaking and physical spectrum

Minimizing the scalar potential yields the following constraints:

$$0 = \frac{\partial V}{\partial v_\phi} = v_\phi \left[\mu_2^2 + 4\lambda_1 v_\phi^2 + 3(2\lambda_2 - \lambda_5) v_\chi^2 - \frac{3}{2} M_1 v_\chi \right], \quad (8)$$

$$0 = \frac{\partial V}{\partial v_\chi} = 3\mu_3^2 v_\chi + 3(2\lambda_2 - \lambda_5) v_\phi^2 v_\chi + 12(\lambda_3 + 3\lambda_4) v_\chi^3 - \frac{3}{4} M_1 v_\phi^2 - 18M_2 v_\chi^2. \quad (9)$$

Inserting $v_\phi^2 = v^2 - 8v_\chi^2$ [Eq. (3)] into Eq. (9) yields a cubic equation for v_χ in terms of v , μ_3^2 , λ_2 , λ_3 , λ_4 , λ_5 , M_1 , and M_2 . With v_χ (and hence v_ϕ) in hand, Eq. (8) can be used to eliminate μ_2^2 in terms of the parameters in the previous sentence together with λ_1 . We illustrate below how λ_1 can also be eliminated in favor of one of the custodial singlet Higgs masses m_h or m_H [see Eq. (21)].

The physical field content is as follows. The Goldstone bosons are given by

$$\begin{aligned} G^+ &= c_H \phi^+ + s_H \frac{(\chi^+ + \xi^+)}{\sqrt{2}}, \\ G^0 &= c_H \phi^{0,i} + s_H \chi^{0,i}, \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where

$$c_H \equiv \cos \theta_H = \frac{v_\phi}{v}, \quad s_H \equiv \sin \theta_H = \frac{2\sqrt{2}v_\chi}{v}. \quad (11)$$

The physical fields can be organized by their transformation properties under the custodial SU(2) symmetry into a fiveplet, a triplet, and two singlets. The fiveplet and triplet states are given by

$$\begin{aligned} H_5^{++} &= \chi^{++}, \\ H_5^+ &= \frac{(\chi^+ - \xi^+)}{\sqrt{2}}, \\ H_5^0 &= \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}\xi^0 - \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}\chi^{0,r}, \\ H_3^+ &= -s_H\phi^+ + c_H \frac{(\chi^+ + \xi^+)}{\sqrt{2}}, \\ H_3^0 &= -s_H\phi^{0,i} + c_H\chi^{0,i}. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Within each custodial multiplet, the masses are degenerate at tree level. Using Eqs. (8–9) to eliminate μ_2^2 and μ_3^2 , the fiveplet and triplet masses can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} m_5^2 &= \frac{M_1}{4v_\chi}v_\phi^2 + 12M_2v_\chi + \frac{3}{2}\lambda_5v_\phi^2 + 8\lambda_3v_\chi^2, \\ m_3^2 &= \frac{M_1}{4v_\chi}(v_\phi^2 + 8v_\chi^2) + \frac{\lambda_5}{2}(v_\phi^2 + 8v_\chi^2) = \left(\frac{M_1}{4v_\chi} + \frac{\lambda_5}{2}\right)v^2. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Note that the ratio M_1/v_χ is finite in the limit $v_\chi \rightarrow 0$, as can be seen from Eq. (9) which yields

$$\frac{M_1}{v_\chi} = \frac{4}{v_\phi^2} [\mu_3^2 + (2\lambda_2 - \lambda_5)v_\phi^2 + 4(\lambda_3 + 3\lambda_4)v_\chi^2 - 6M_2v_\chi]. \quad (14)$$

The two custodial SU(2) singlets are given in the gauge basis by

$$\begin{aligned} H_1^0 &= \phi^{0,r}, \\ H_1^{0'} &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}\xi^0 + \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}\chi^{0,r}. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

These states mix by an angle α to form the two custodial-singlet mass eigenstates h and H , defined such that $m_h < m_H$:

$$\begin{aligned} h &= \cos \alpha H_1^0 - \sin \alpha H_1^{0'}, \\ H &= \sin \alpha H_1^0 + \cos \alpha H_1^{0'}. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

The mixing is controlled by the 2×2 mass-squared matrix

$$\mathcal{M}^2 = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{M}_{11}^2 & \mathcal{M}_{12}^2 \\ \mathcal{M}_{12}^2 & \mathcal{M}_{22}^2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (17)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_{11}^2 &= 8\lambda_1v_\phi^2, \\ \mathcal{M}_{12}^2 &= \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}v_\phi [-M_1 + 4(2\lambda_2 - \lambda_5)v_\chi], \\ \mathcal{M}_{22}^2 &= \frac{M_1v_\phi^2}{4v_\chi} - 6M_2v_\chi + 8(\lambda_3 + 3\lambda_4)v_\chi^2. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

The mixing angle is fixed by

$$\begin{aligned}\sin 2\alpha &= \frac{2\mathcal{M}_{12}^2}{m_H^2 - m_h^2}, \\ \cos 2\alpha &= \frac{\mathcal{M}_{22}^2 - \mathcal{M}_{11}^2}{m_H^2 - m_h^2},\end{aligned}\tag{19}$$

and is chosen to be in the range $\alpha \in (-\pi/2, \pi/2]$, so that $\cos \alpha \geq 0$. The masses are given by

$$m_{h,H}^2 = \frac{1}{2} \left[\mathcal{M}_{11}^2 + \mathcal{M}_{22}^2 \mp \sqrt{(\mathcal{M}_{11}^2 - \mathcal{M}_{22}^2)^2 + 4(\mathcal{M}_{12}^2)^2} \right].\tag{20}$$

It is convenient to use the measured mass of the observed SM-like Higgs boson as an input parameter. The coupling λ_1 can be eliminated in favor of this mass by inverting Eq. (20):

$$\lambda_1 = \frac{1}{8v_\phi^2} \left[m_h^2 + \frac{(\mathcal{M}_{12}^2)^2}{\mathcal{M}_{22}^2 - m_h^2} \right].\tag{21}$$

Note that in deriving this expression for λ_1 , the distinction between m_h and m_H is lost. This means that, depending on the values of μ_3^2 and the other parameters, this (unique) solution for λ_1 will correspond to either the lighter or the heavier custodial singlet having a mass equal to the observed SM-like Higgs mass.

2.3 Yukawa sector

Fermion masses are generated through couplings to the complex doublet $\phi \equiv (\phi^+, \phi^0)$ in the same way as in the SM. We neglect neutrino masses. The relevant Lagrangian terms are

$$\mathcal{L} \supset - \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{j=1}^3 \left[y_{ij}^u \bar{u}_{Ri} \tilde{\phi}^\dagger Q_{Lj} + y_{ij}^d \bar{d}_{Ri} \phi^\dagger Q_{Lj} \right] + y_i^\ell \bar{\ell}_{Ri} \phi^\dagger L_{Li} + \text{h.c.},\tag{22}$$

where i, j run over the three generations and $\tilde{\phi} \equiv i\sigma^2 \phi^*$. The custodial singlets and triplet contain an admixture of ϕ , and so couple to fermions. The custodial fiveplet states do not couple to fermions.

The Feynman rules for neutral scalars coupling to fermion pairs are given as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}h\bar{f}f : & \quad -i \frac{m_f}{v} \frac{\cos \alpha}{\cos \theta_H}, & H\bar{f}f : & \quad -i \frac{m_f}{v} \frac{\sin \alpha}{\cos \theta_H}, \\ H_3^0 \bar{u}u : & \quad \frac{m_u}{v} \tan \theta_H \gamma_5, & H_3^0 \bar{d}d : & \quad -\frac{m_d}{v} \tan \theta_H \gamma_5.\end{aligned}\tag{23}$$

Here f denotes any charged fermion, u stands for any up-type quark, and d stands for any down-type quark or charged lepton.

The Feynman rules for the vertices involving a charged scalar and two fermions are given as follows, with all particles incoming:

$$\begin{aligned}H_3^+ \bar{u}d : & \quad -i\sqrt{2}V_{ud} \tan \theta_H \left(\frac{m_u}{v} P_L - \frac{m_d}{v} P_R \right), \\ H_3^{+*} \bar{d}u : & \quad -i\sqrt{2}V_{ud}^* \tan \theta_H \left(\frac{m_u}{v} P_R - \frac{m_d}{v} P_L \right), \\ H_3^+ \bar{\nu}\ell : & \quad i\sqrt{2} \tan \theta_H \frac{m_\ell}{v} P_R, \\ H_3^{+*} \bar{\ell}\nu : & \quad i\sqrt{2} \tan \theta_H \frac{m_\ell}{v} P_L.\end{aligned}\tag{24}$$

Here V_{ud} is the appropriate element of the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa matrix and the projection operators are defined as $P_{R,L} = (1 \pm \gamma_5)/2$.

3 Theoretical constraints

3.1 Tree-level unitarity

We implement the conditions for unitarity of tree-level $2 \rightarrow 2$ scalar particle scattering amplitudes computed in Refs. [8, 3]. These were computed by imposing $|\text{Re } a_0| < 1/2$ on the eigenvalues of the zeroth partial wave amplitude coupled-channel matrix, and read

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{(6\lambda_1 - 7\lambda_3 - 11\lambda_4)^2 + 36\lambda_2^2} + |6\lambda_1 + 7\lambda_3 + 11\lambda_4| &< 4\pi, \\ \sqrt{(2\lambda_1 + \lambda_3 - 2\lambda_4)^2 + \lambda_5^2} + |2\lambda_1 - \lambda_3 + 2\lambda_4| &< 4\pi, \\ |2\lambda_3 + \lambda_4| &< \pi, \\ |\lambda_2 - \lambda_5| &< 2\pi. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

3.2 Bounded-from-below requirement on the potential

We implement the conditions that ensure the scalar potential is bounded from below as computed in Ref. [3]. They read as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_1 &> 0, \\ \lambda_4 &> \begin{cases} -\frac{1}{3}\lambda_3 & \text{for } \lambda_3 \geq 0, \\ -\lambda_3 & \text{for } \lambda_3 < 0, \end{cases} \\ \lambda_2 &> \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}\lambda_5 - 2\sqrt{\lambda_1(\frac{1}{3}\lambda_3 + \lambda_4)} & \text{for } \lambda_5 \geq 0 \text{ and } \lambda_3 \geq 0, \\ \omega_+(\zeta)\lambda_5 - 2\sqrt{\lambda_1(\zeta\lambda_3 + \lambda_4)} & \text{for } \lambda_5 \geq 0 \text{ and } \lambda_3 < 0, \\ \omega_-(\zeta)\lambda_5 - 2\sqrt{\lambda_1(\zeta\lambda_3 + \lambda_4)} & \text{for } \lambda_5 < 0, \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

where

$$\omega_{\pm}(\zeta) = \frac{1}{6}(1 - B) \pm \frac{\sqrt{2}}{3} \left[(1 - B) \left(\frac{1}{2} + B \right) \right]^{1/2}, \quad (27)$$

with

$$B \equiv \sqrt{\frac{3}{2} \left(\zeta - \frac{1}{3} \right)} \in [0, 1]. \quad (28)$$

The last two conditions for λ_2 in Eq. (26) must be satisfied for all values of $\zeta \in [\frac{1}{3}, 1]$. We implement this through a 1000-point scan over ζ in the specified range.

3.3 Absence of deeper custodial symmetry-breaking minima

Finally, we implement a check that the scalar potential possesses no custodial symmetry-breaking minima that are deeper than the desired custodial symmetry-preserving minimum, following the procedure described in Ref. [3]. We write the scalar potential as

$$V = \frac{\mu_2^2}{2}a^2 + \frac{\mu_3^2}{2}b^2 + \lambda_1a^4 + \lambda_2a^2b^2 + \zeta\lambda_3b^4 + \lambda_4b^4 - \omega\lambda_5a^2b^2 - \sigma M_1a^2b - \rho M_2b^3, \quad (29)$$

where $a^2 = \text{Tr}(\Phi^\dagger\Phi)$ and $b^2 = \text{Tr}(X^\dagger X)$ and the dimensionless coefficients ζ , ω , σ , and ρ vary with varying triplet field configurations. The minimum of V is always traced out by the path [3]

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta &= \frac{1}{2} \sin^4 \theta + \cos^4 \theta, \\ \omega &= \frac{1}{4} \sin^2 \theta + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sin \theta \cos \theta, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma &= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} \sin \theta + \frac{1}{4} \cos \theta, \\
\rho &= 3 \sin^2 \theta \cos \theta,
\end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

with $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$. Our desired electroweak-breaking and custodial SU(2)-preserving vacuum corresponds to $\theta = \cos^{-1}(1/\sqrt{3})$. The vacuum $\theta = \pi + \cos^{-1}(1/\sqrt{3})$ is also acceptable; it corresponds to negative b . The depths of these vacua are determined by applying the minimization conditions and solving the resulting cubic and quadratic equations to determine the values of a and b that minimize the potential, then evaluating V at this minimum.

This procedure is then repeated for other values of θ [corresponding to vacua that spontaneously break custodial SU(2)] using a 1000-point scan over $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$. Parameter points fail this check if any vacuum solution exists in which V is lower than the value in the desired vacuum.

4 Indirect experimental constraints

Indirect constraints from the S parameter, $b \rightarrow s\gamma$, and $B_s^0 \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$ are implemented in the code. A detailed physics description is given in Ref. [4]. Currently the constraint from $b \rightarrow s\gamma$ is stronger than that from $B_s^0 \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$, but that may change in the next several years as more data is collected at the CERN Large Hadron Collider.

4.1 S parameter

When the new physics is not light compared to M_Z , the S parameter can be written in terms of the derivatives $\Pi'(0) \equiv d\Pi(p^2)/dp^2|_{p^2=0}$ of the gauge boson self-energies as

$$S = \frac{4s_W^2 c_W^2}{\alpha_{EM}} \left[\Pi'_{ZZ}(0) - \frac{c_W^2 - s_W^2}{s_W c_W} \Pi'_{Z\gamma}(0) - \Pi'_{\gamma\gamma}(0) \right]. \tag{31}$$

The new physics contribution in the GM model, relative to the SM for a reference Higgs mass m_h^{SM} , is [4]

$$\begin{aligned}
S &= \frac{s_W^2 c_W^2}{e^2 \pi} \left\{ -\frac{e^2}{12s_W^2 c_W^2} (\log m_3^2 + 5 \log m_5^2) + 2|g_{ZH H_3^0}|^2 f_1(m_h, m_3) \right. \\
&\quad + 2|g_{ZH H_3^0}|^2 f_1(m_H, m_3) + 2 \left(|g_{ZH_5^0 H_3^0}|^2 + 2|g_{ZH_5^+ H_3^{+*}}|^2 \right) f_1(m_5, m_3) \\
&\quad + |g_{ZZh}|^2 \left[\frac{f_1(M_Z, m_h)}{2M_Z^2} - f_3(M_Z, m_h) \right] + |g_{ZZH}|^2 \left[\frac{f_1(M_Z, m_H)}{2M_Z^2} - f_3(M_Z, m_H) \right] \\
&\quad + |g_{ZZH_5^0}|^2 \left[\frac{f_1(M_Z, m_5)}{2M_Z^2} - f_3(M_Z, m_5) \right] \\
&\quad + 2|g_{ZW+H_5^{+*}}|^2 \left[\frac{f_1(M_W, m_5)}{2M_W^2} - f_3(M_W, m_5) \right] \\
&\quad \left. - |g_{ZZh}^{\text{SM}}|^2 \left[\frac{f_1(M_Z, m_h^{\text{SM}})}{2M_Z^2} - f_3(M_Z, m_h^{\text{SM}}) \right] \right\}, \tag{32}
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
f_1(m_1, m_2) &= \frac{5(m_2^6 - m_1^6) + 27(m_1^4 m_2^2 - m_1^2 m_2^4) + 12(m_1^6 - 3m_1^4 m_2^2) \log m_1 + 12(3m_1^2 m_2^4 - m_2^6) \log m_2}{36(m_1^2 - m_2^2)^3}, \\
f_3(m_1, m_2) &= \frac{m_1^4 - m_2^4 + 2m_1^2 m_2^2 (\log m_2^2 - \log m_1^2)}{2(m_1^2 - m_2^2)^3}. \tag{33}
\end{aligned}$$

For numerical stability we use an expansion in $\epsilon \equiv \frac{m_2^2}{m_1^2} - 1$ when $m_1^2 \simeq m_2^2$ to within a part in 10^{-4} ,

$$f_1(m_1, m_2) \simeq \frac{1}{6} \log m_1^2 + \frac{\epsilon}{12}, \quad f_3(m_1, m_2) \simeq \frac{1}{6m_1^2} - \frac{\epsilon}{12m_1^2}. \quad (34)$$

The couplings that appear in Eq. (32) are given by [3]

$$\begin{aligned} g_{ZhH_3^0} &= -i\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \frac{e}{s_W c_W} \left(s_\alpha \frac{v_\phi}{v} + \sqrt{3} c_\alpha \frac{v_\chi}{v} \right), & g_{ZHH_3^0} &= i\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \frac{e}{s_W c_W} \left(c_\alpha \frac{v_\phi}{v} - \sqrt{3} s_\alpha \frac{v_\chi}{v} \right), \\ g_{ZH_5^0 H_3^0} &= -i\sqrt{\frac{1}{3}} \frac{e}{s_W c_W} \frac{v_\phi}{v}, & g_{ZH_5^+ H_3^{+*}} &= \frac{e}{2s_W c_W} \frac{v_\phi}{v}, \\ g_{ZZh} &= \frac{e^2}{2s_W^2 c_W^2} \left(c_\alpha v_\phi - \frac{8}{\sqrt{3}} s_\alpha v_\chi \right), & g_{ZZH} &= \frac{e^2}{2s_W^2 c_W^2} \left(s_\alpha v_\phi + \frac{8}{\sqrt{3}} c_\alpha v_\chi \right), \\ g_{ZZH_5^0} &= -\sqrt{\frac{8}{3}} \frac{e^2}{s_W^2 c_W^2} v_\chi, & g_{ZW^+ H_5^{+*}} &= -\frac{\sqrt{2} e^2}{c_W s_W^2} v_\chi, \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

and the SM coupling g_{ZZh}^{SM} is given by

$$g_{ZZh}^{\text{SM}} = \frac{e^2 v}{2s_W^2 c_W^2}. \quad (36)$$

We use $s_\alpha \equiv \sin \alpha$, $c_\alpha \equiv \cos \alpha$, and similarly for the sine and cosine of the weak mixing angle.

For a reference SM Higgs mass of $m_h^{\text{SM}} = 125$ GeV and setting $U = 0$, the global electroweak fit yields [9]

$$S_{\text{exp}} = 0.06 \pm 0.09, \quad T_{\text{exp}} = 0.10 \pm 0.07, \quad (37)$$

with a correlation $\rho_{ST} = +0.91$. These values (**MHREF**, **SEXP**, **DSEXP**, **TEXP**, **DTEXP**, and **RHOST**, respectively) are hard-coded in the subroutine **INITINDIR** in `/src/gmindir.f`.

We compute the χ^2 according to

$$\chi^2 = \frac{1}{(1 - \rho_{ST}^2)} \left[\frac{(S - S_{\text{exp}})^2}{(\Delta S_{\text{exp}})^2} + \frac{(T - T_{\text{exp}})^2}{(\Delta T_{\text{exp}})^2} - \frac{2\rho_{ST}(S - S_{\text{exp}})(T - T_{\text{exp}})}{\Delta S_{\text{exp}} \Delta T_{\text{exp}}} \right], \quad (38)$$

where ΔS_{exp} and ΔT_{exp} are the 1σ experimental uncertainties.

It is well known that the one-loop calculation of the T parameter in the GM model yields a divergent result due to the explicit breaking of the custodial symmetry by hypercharge gauge interactions [10]. In a proper treatment T acquires a counterterm, which must be set, e.g., by specifying the energy scale at which the custodial symmetry in the scalar potential is exact. Here we take the conservative approach of marginalizing over T , which amounts to setting

$$T = T_{\text{exp}} + \rho_{ST}(S - S_{\text{exp}}) \frac{\Delta T_{\text{exp}}}{\Delta S_{\text{exp}}}. \quad (39)$$

We set the flag **SPAROK** = 1 if the GM prediction for the S parameter yields $\chi^2 \leq 4$, and **SPAROK** = 0 otherwise.

4.2 $b \rightarrow s\gamma$

The current world average experimental measurement of $\text{BR}(\bar{B} \rightarrow X_s \gamma)$, for a photon energy $E_\gamma > 1.6$ GeV, is [11]

$$\text{BR}(\bar{B} \rightarrow X_s \gamma)_{\text{exp}} = (3.55 \pm 0.24 \pm 0.09) \times 10^{-4}. \quad (40)$$

To evaluate the constraint from this observable, we calculated the GM model predictions for a grid of (m_3, v_χ) values by adapting the implementation for the Type-I 2HDM in the code **SuperIso v3.3** [12]

(which makes use of the code 2HDMC v1.6.4 [13]). Our choice of input parameters yields a prediction in the limit $v_\chi \rightarrow 0$ or $m_3 \rightarrow \infty$ of

$$\text{BR}(\bar{B} \rightarrow X_s \gamma)_{\text{SM limit}} = (3.11 \pm 0.23) \times 10^{-4}, \quad (41)$$

where the theoretical uncertainty is taken from Ref. [14]. We scale the theoretical uncertainty by the ratio $\text{BR}(\bar{B} \rightarrow X_s \gamma)_{\text{GM}}/\text{BR}(\bar{B} \rightarrow X_s \gamma)_{\text{SM limit}}$ before combining it in quadrature with the experimental uncertainties.

The two data files /src/bsgtight.data and /src/bsgloose.data contain two sets of points (m_3, v_χ) corresponding to the contour at which $\text{BR}(\bar{B} \rightarrow X_s \gamma)_{\text{GM}} = 2.88 \times 10^{-4}$ (“tight” constraint) and 2.48×10^{-4} (“loose” constraint), respectively. These correspond to a 2σ deviation from the experimental central value (“tight”) and a value 2σ “worse” than the SM prediction (“loose”). For further explanation, see Ref. [4]. Model points are checked for consistency with these constraints by linearly interpolating the upper bound on v_χ to the appropriate mass m_3 . For $m_3 < 10$ GeV the limit on v_χ for $m_3 = 10$ GeV is used, and for $m_3 > 1000$ GeV the limit on v_χ for $m_3 = 1000$ GeV is used. (This latter limiting value falls outside the parameter range allowed by theoretical constraints, and so is irrelevant in practice.)

We set the flag `BSGAMTIGHTOK` = 1 if the GM prediction for $\text{BR}(\bar{B} \rightarrow X_s \gamma)$ satisfies the “tight” 2σ constraint, and `BSGAMTIGHTOK` = 0 otherwise. Similarly, we set the flag `BSGAMLOOSEOK` = 1 if the GM prediction for $\text{BR}(\bar{B} \rightarrow X_s \gamma)$ satisfies the “loose” 2σ constraint, and `BSGAMLOOSEOK` = 0 otherwise.

4.3 $B_s^0 \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$

The time-averaged branching ratio for $B_s^0 \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$, normalized to its Standard Model value, is given to an excellent approximation by the ratio of Z -penguin contributions [4, 15]

$$\text{RBSMM} \equiv \frac{\overline{\text{BR}}(B_s^0 \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-)}{\text{BR}(B_s^0 \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-)_{\text{SM}}} \simeq \left| \frac{C_{10}^{\text{SM}} + C_{10}^{\text{GM}}}{C_{10}^{\text{SM}}} \right|^2, \quad (42)$$

where [15]

$$C_{10}^{\text{SM}} = -0.9380 \left[\frac{M_t}{173.1 \text{ GeV}} \right]^{1.53} \left[\frac{\alpha_s(M_Z)}{0.1184} \right]^{-0.09} \quad (43)$$

and [4, 15]

$$C_{10}^{\text{GM}} = C_{10}^{\text{SM}} + \tan^2 \theta_H \frac{x_{tW}}{8} \left[\frac{x_{t3}}{1 - x_{t3}} + \frac{x_{t3} \log x_{t3}}{(1 - x_{t3})^2} \right], \quad (44)$$

with $x_{tW} = \overline{m}_t^2(M_t)/M_W^2$ and $x_{t3} = \overline{m}_t^2(M_t)/m_3^2$.² For numerical stability we use an expansion in $\delta \equiv x_{t3} - 1$ when $x_{t3} \simeq 1$ to within a part in 10^{-4} ,

$$\left[\frac{x_{t3}}{1 - x_{t3}} + \frac{x_{t3} \log x_{t3}}{(1 - x_{t3})^2} \right] \simeq -\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\delta}{6} \quad (\delta \equiv x_{t3} - 1 \rightarrow 0). \quad (45)$$

The corresponding SM prediction and its uncertainty are [15]

$$\overline{\text{BR}}(B_s^0 \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-)_{\text{SM}} = (3.67 \pm 0.25) \times 10^{-9} \left| \left[\frac{M_t}{173.1 \text{ GeV}} \right]^{1.53} \left[\frac{\alpha_s(M_Z)}{0.1184} \right]^{-0.09} \right|^2. \quad (46)$$

We calculate the prediction in the GM model by scaling this prediction and its uncertainty by `RBSMM`.

The current world average experimental value (from CMS and LHCb) is [16]

$$\overline{\text{BR}}(B_s^0 \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-)_{\text{expt}} = (2.9 \pm 0.7) \times 10^{-9}. \quad (47)$$

²The calculation of the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ running top quark mass $\overline{m}_t(\mu)$ is described in Sec. 5.1. M_t is the pole mass.

The experimental central value (BMEXP) and its uncertainty (DBMEXP) are hard-coded in the subroutine INITINDIR in /src/gmindir.f.

Combining the theoretical and experimental uncertainties in quadrature, this measured value is about 1σ below the SM prediction. The GM prediction is always higher than the SM prediction (in worse agreement with experiment) and depends only on the parameters m_3 and $\tan\theta_H$.

We set the flag BSMMOK = 1 if the GM prediction for $\overline{\text{BR}}(B_s^0 \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-)$ is within 2σ of the experimental value, and BSMMOK = 0 otherwise.

5 Decays

Starting from the tree-level masses and couplings, the code calculates the decay widths of the Higgs bosons into various final states. At tree level the Higgs bosons can decay into pairs of fermions, pairs of massive gauge bosons, a gauge boson and a lighter Higgs boson, and two lighter Higgs bosons. Decays of the neutral Higgs bosons into gg , $\gamma\gamma$, and $Z\gamma$ are induced at one loop.

5.1 $H \rightarrow f \bar{f}'$

The custodial singlet states h and H and the custodial triplet states H_3^0 and H_3^\pm can decay to pairs of fermions. The custodial fiveplet states do not couple to fermions.

The Feynman rule for a scalar coupling to $f \bar{f}'$ is parameterized as $i(g^S + g^P \gamma_5)$, where g^S is the scalar part and g^P is the pseudoscalar part. g^S and g^P can be simultaneously nonzero only for charged Higgs couplings to fermions.

The decay width to fermions is given by (the number of colors $N_c = 3$ for quarks and 1 for leptons)

$$\Gamma(H \rightarrow f \bar{f}') = \frac{N_c m_H}{8\pi} \{ [1 - (x_1 + x_2)^2] |g^S|^2 + [1 - (x_1 - x_2)^2] |g^P|^2 \} \lambda^{1/2}(x_1^2, x_2^2), \quad (48)$$

where $x_1 = m_f/m_H$, $x_2 = m_{f'}/m_H$, and the kinematic function λ is given by

$$\lambda(x, y) = (1 - x - y)^2 - 4xy. \quad (49)$$

For scalar decays to quarks, we incorporate the QCD corrections as follows. First, we incorporate the leading QCD corrections by replacing $m_q \rightarrow \overline{m}_q(M_H)$ in the Yukawa couplings g^S and g^P , where $\overline{m}_q(M_H)$ is the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ running quark mass evaluated at the scale of the parent Higgs particle's mass. We compute the running quark masses using [17]

$$\overline{m}_q(\mu) = \overline{m}_q(M_q) \frac{c[\alpha_s(\mu)/\pi]}{c[\alpha_s(M_q)/\pi]}, \quad (50)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} c(x) &= \left(\frac{25}{6}x\right)^{12/25} (1 + 1.014x + 1.389x^2), & M_c < \mu < M_b \\ c(x) &= \left(\frac{23}{6}x\right)^{12/23} (1 + 1.175x + 1.501x^2), & M_b < \mu. \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

The running strong coupling constant is computed using [17]

$$\alpha_s^{(N_f)}(\mu) = \frac{12\pi}{(33 - 2N_f) \log(\mu^2/\Lambda_{N_f}^2)} \left[1 - 6 \frac{(153 - 19N_f)}{(33 - 2N_f)^2} \frac{\log \log(\mu^2/\Lambda_{N_f}^2)}{\log(\mu^2/\Lambda_{N_f}^2)} \right]. \quad (52)$$

We implement matching at the bottom quark threshold by requiring continuity of α_s . Above the top threshold we continue to use the five-flavor scheme for consistency with HDECAY [20].

Second, for decays of neutral CP-even scalars to $b\bar{b}$ or $c\bar{c}$ we incorporate the finite QCD corrections by multiplying the partial width given above by the factor [17]

$$[\Delta_{QCD} + \Delta_t], \quad (53)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{QCD} &= 1 + 5.67 \frac{\alpha_s(M_H)}{\pi} + (35.94 - 1.36 N_f) \left(\frac{\alpha_s(M_H)}{\pi} \right)^2, \\ \Delta_t &= \left(\frac{\alpha_s(M_H)}{\pi} \right)^2 \left[1.57 - \frac{2}{3} \log(M_H^2/M_t^2) + \frac{1}{9} \log^2(\bar{m}_q^2(M_H)/M_H^2) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

The relevant SM inputs to GMCALC are

$$\text{ALSMZ} = \alpha_s(M_Z), \quad \text{MTPOLE} = M_t, \quad \text{MBMB} = \bar{m}_b(m_b), \quad \text{MCMC} = \bar{m}_c(m_c). \quad (55)$$

The values are set in `INITIALIZE_SM` in `/src/gminit.f`. The b and c quark pole masses, and the running top quark mass, are obtained using the $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s)$ relation [17]

$$\bar{m}_q(M_q) = M_q/[1 + 4\alpha_s/3\pi]. \quad (56)$$

5.2 $H \rightarrow V_1^* V_2^*$

The custodial singlet states h and H , as well as the neutral custodial fiveplet state H_5^0 , can decay to W^+W^- and ZZ . The charged custodial fiveplet state H_5^+ can decay to W^+Z . The doubly-charged custodial fiveplet state H_5^{++} can decay to W^+W^+ . The custodial triplet states do not couple to pairs of massive vector bosons.

The Feynman rule for a scalar coupling to massive vector bosons $V_1^\mu V_2^\nu$ is parameterized as $ig_{H_i V_1 V_2} g^{\mu\nu}$.

We compute the widths for $H_i \rightarrow V_1 V_2$, allowing both vector bosons to be off-shell, using [18, 19]

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma(H_i \rightarrow V_1^* V_2^*) &= \frac{1}{\pi^2} \int_0^{m_{H_i}^2} dQ_1^2 \int_0^{(m_{H_i} - Q_1)^2} dQ_2^2 \\ &\times \frac{Q_1^2 \Gamma_{V_1}/M_{V_1}}{(Q_1^2 - M_{V_1}^2)^2 + M_{V_1}^2 \Gamma_{V_1}^2} \frac{Q_2^2 \Gamma_{V_2}/M_{V_2}}{(Q_2^2 - M_{V_2}^2)^2 + M_{V_2}^2 \Gamma_{V_2}^2} \Gamma^{H_i V_1 V_2}(Q_1^2, Q_2^2), \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

where Γ_{V_i} is the measured total width of gauge boson V_i , Q_i^2 is the square of the four-momentum of V_i , and $\Gamma^{H_i V_1 V_2}(Q_1^2, Q_2^2)$ is the on-shell decay width for $H_i \rightarrow V_1 V_2$ with the squared-masses of the gauge bosons V_1 and V_2 replaced by Q_1^2 and Q_2^2 . This on-shell width is given by

$$\Gamma^{H_i V_1 V_2}(Q_1^2, Q_2^2) = S_V \frac{|g_{H_i V_1 V_2}|^2 m_{H_i}^3}{64\pi Q_1^2 Q_2^2} [1 - 2k_1 - 2k_2 + 10k_1 k_2 + k_1^2 + k_2^2] \lambda^{1/2}(k_1, k_2), \quad (58)$$

where $k_1 = Q_1^2/m_{H_i}^2$ and $k_2 = Q_2^2/m_{H_i}^2$. Here S_V is a symmetry factor given by $S_V = 1$ if V_1 and V_2 are distinct bosons (e.g., W^+W^- or ZW^+) and $S_V = 1/2$ if V_1 and V_2 are identical bosons (e.g., ZZ or W^+W^+). The kinematic function λ is defined in Eq. (49).

We evaluate the doubly off-shell decay width using numerical integration, after making the change of variables

$$\rho_i = \frac{1}{\pi} \tan^{-1} \left[\frac{Q_i^2 - M_{V_i}^2}{M_{V_i} \Gamma_{V_i}} \right] \quad (59)$$

to flatten the Breit-Wigners. The number of integration points is optimized for efficiency above and below the $H_i \rightarrow V_1 V_2$ threshold, while keeping the numerical precision within 1% of the value computed by HDECAY 6.42 [20].

We have not taken into account the interference effects in same-flavor decays due to crossed diagrams.

5.3 $H_1 \rightarrow VH_2$

The custodial singlet states h and H can decay to a vector boson plus a custodial triplet scalar. The custodial triplet states H_3^0 and H_3^\pm can decay to a vector boson plus a custodial singlet state, or to a vector boson plus a custodial fiveplet state. The custodial fiveplet states H_5^0 , H_5^\pm , and $H_5^{\pm\pm}$ can decay to a vector boson plus a custodial triplet state.

The Feynman rule for the $H_1 H_2^* V_\mu^*$ coupling (all particles and momenta incoming) is parameterized as $ig_{V^* H_1 H_2^*}(p_1 - p_2)_\mu$, where p_1 (p_2) is the incoming momentum of the scalar H_1 (H_2^*).

The on-shell two-body decay width into one vector and one lighter scalar is given by

$$\Gamma(H_1 \rightarrow VH_2) = \frac{|g_{V^* H_1 H_2^*}|^2 M_V^2}{16\pi m_{H_1}} \lambda \left(\frac{m_{H_1}^2}{M_V^2}, \frac{m_{H_2}^2}{M_V^2} \right) \lambda^{1/2} \left(\frac{M_V^2}{m_{H_1}^2}, \frac{m_{H_2}^2}{m_{H_1}^2} \right). \quad (60)$$

Here V denotes one of the gauge bosons Z , W^+ , or W^- , such that the decays $H^0 \rightarrow W^+ H^-$ and $H^0 \rightarrow W^- H^+$ are distinct.

We also implement $H_1 \rightarrow V^* H_2$ decays (with the gauge boson off-shell) when the H_1 mass is below threshold for the on-shell two-body decay. Following Ref. [21],

$$\Gamma(H_1 \rightarrow V^* H_2) = \delta_V \frac{3|g_{V^* H_1 H_2^*}|^2 M_V^2 m_{H_1}}{16\pi^3 v^2} G_{H_2 V}, \quad (61)$$

where again V denotes one of the gauge bosons Z , W^+ , or W^- , such that the decays $H^0 \rightarrow W^+ H^-$ and $H^0 \rightarrow W^- H^+$ are distinct. δ_W and δ_Z are given by³

$$\delta_W = \frac{3}{2}, \quad \delta_Z = 3 \left(\frac{7}{12} - \frac{10}{9} s_W^2 + \frac{40}{27} s_W^4 \right). \quad (62)$$

The kinematic function G_{ij} is defined as follows (here we fix a typing error in Ref. [21] as pointed out in Ref. [22]: the last term is $+2\lambda_{ij}/k_j$ rather than $-2\lambda_{ij}/k_j$):

$$G_{ij} = \frac{1}{4} \left\{ 2(-1 + k_j - k_i) \sqrt{\lambda_{ij}} \left[\frac{\pi}{2} + \arctan \left(\frac{k_j(1 - k_j + k_i) - \lambda_{ij}}{(1 - k_i) \sqrt{\lambda_{ij}}} \right) \right] \right. \\ \left. + (\lambda_{ij} - 2k_i) \log k_i + \frac{1}{3} (1 - k_i) \left[5(1 + k_i) - 4k_j + \frac{2\lambda_{ij}}{k_j} \right] \right\}, \quad (63)$$

where $k_i \equiv k_{H_2} = m_{H_2}^2/m_{H_1}^2$, $k_j \equiv k_V = M_V^2/m_{H_1}^2$, and

$$\lambda_{ij} = -1 + 2k_i + 2k_j - (k_i - k_j)^2. \quad (64)$$

5.4 $H_1 \rightarrow H_2 H_3$

The custodial singlet states h and H can decay into a pair of custodial triplet states or a pair of custodial fiveplet states. Furthermore H can decay into hh . The custodial fiveplet states H_5^0 , H_5^\pm , and $H_5^{\pm\pm}$ can decay into a pair of custodial triplet states. The custodial triplet states cannot decay into pairs of scalars due to a combination of custodial SU(2) invariance and Bose symmetry.

The Feynman rule for the $H_1 H_2^* H_3^*$ coupling (all particles incoming) is parameterized as $-ig_{123}$.

The decay width for H_1 into two lighter scalars $H_2 H_3$ is

$$\Gamma(H_1 \rightarrow H_2 H_3) = S_H \frac{|g_{123}|^2}{16\pi m_{H_1}} \lambda^{1/2}(X_2, X_3), \quad (65)$$

where $X_2 = m_{H_2}^2/m_{H_1}^2$ and $X_3 = m_{H_3}^2/m_{H_1}^2$, and S_H is a symmetry factor given by $S_H = 1$ if H_2 and H_3 are distinct bosons and $S_H = 1/2$ if H_2 and H_3 are identical bosons.

³We absorb the factor of c_W^4 that appears in the denominator of δ_Z in Eq. (36) of Ref. [21] into the coupling. We also separate out a symmetry factor of 2 from δ_W for convenience.

5.5 $H \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$

Neutral scalar decays into two photons proceed through a loop of charged particles. The width is given by [23]

$$\Gamma(H \rightarrow \gamma\gamma) = \frac{\alpha_{EM}^2 m_H^3}{256\pi^3 v^2} |\mathcal{A}_H^{\gamma\gamma}|^2, \quad (66)$$

where α_{EM} is the electromagnetic fine-structure constant, $v = (\sqrt{2}G_F)^{-1/2} \simeq 246$ GeV is the SM Higgs vacuum expectation value, and $\mathcal{A}_H^{\gamma\gamma}$ represents the sum of the loop amplitudes for initial particle H .

For an initial scalar ($S = h, H$, or H_5^0), the amplitude receives contributions from fermions, W bosons, and charged Higgs bosons (H_3^+ , H_5^+ , and H_5^{++}) in the loop, and is given by

$$\mathcal{A}_S^{\gamma\gamma} = \kappa_f^S \sum_f N_{cf} Q_f^2 F_{1/2}(\tau_f) + \kappa_W^S F_1(\tau_W) + \sum_s \beta_s^S Q_s^2 F_0(\tau_s). \quad (67)$$

For the fermion loops, N_{cf} and Q_f are the number of colors and electric charge in units of e , respectively, for fermion f , and κ_f^S is the scaling factor for the coupling of S to fermions relative to the corresponding coupling of the SM Higgs boson, defined in such a way that the Feynman rule for the $Sf\bar{f}$ coupling is $-i(m_f/v)\kappa_f^S$. The custodial fiveplet does not couple to fermions, so $\kappa_f^{H_5^0} = 0$.

For the W loop, κ_W^S is the scaling factor for the coupling of S to W pairs relative to the corresponding coupling of the SM Higgs boson, defined so that the $SW_\mu^+ W_\nu^-$ Feynman rule is $i\kappa_W^S (2M_W^2/v)g_{\mu\nu}$.

For the scalar loops, the sum over s runs over all electrically charged scalars in the GM model (H_3^+ , H_5^+ , and H_5^{++}). Q_s is the electric charge of scalar s in units of e , and $\beta_s^S = g_{Sss^*}v/2m_s^2$. The coupling g_{Sss^*} is defined in such a way that the corresponding interaction Lagrangian term is $\mathcal{L} \supset -g_{Sss^*}Sss^*$.

The loop factors are given in terms of the usual functions [23],

$$\begin{aligned} F_1(\tau) &= 2 + 3\tau + 3\tau(2 - \tau)f(\tau), \\ F_{1/2}(\tau) &= -2\tau[1 + (1 - \tau)f(\tau)], \\ F_0(\tau) &= \tau[1 - \tau f(\tau)], \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

where

$$f(\tau) = \begin{cases} \left[\sin^{-1} \left(\sqrt{\frac{1}{\tau}} \right) \right]^2 & \text{if } \tau \geq 1, \\ -\frac{1}{4} \left[\log \left(\frac{\eta_+}{\eta_-} \right) - i\pi \right]^2 & \text{if } \tau < 1, \end{cases} \quad (69)$$

with $\eta_{\pm} = 1 \pm \sqrt{1 - \tau}$. The argument is $\tau_i \equiv 4m_i^2/m_h^2$.

For an initial pseudoscalar ($A = H_3^0$), the amplitude receives contributions only from fermions in the loop, and is given by

$$\mathcal{A}_A^{\gamma\gamma} = \kappa_f^A \sum_f N_{cf} Q_f^2 F_{1/2}^A(\tau_f) \quad (70)$$

where the Feynman rule for the $Af\bar{f}$ coupling is defined as $-(m_f/v)\kappa_f^A\gamma_5$ and the loop function is

$$F_{1/2}^A(\tau) = -2\tau f(\tau). \quad (71)$$

5.6 $H \rightarrow gg$

Neutral scalar decays to two gluons proceed through a loop of colored particles. In the GM model, the only colored particles are the SM quarks. Therefore this decay occurs only for h, H , and H_3^0 (the custodial fiveplet does not couple to fermions).

The width is given by [23]

$$\Gamma(H \rightarrow gg) = \frac{\alpha_s^2 m_H^3}{128\pi^3 v^2} |\mathcal{A}_H^{gg}|^2, \quad (72)$$

where \mathcal{A}_H^{gg} represents the sum of the loop amplitudes for initial particle H .

For an initial scalar ($S = h$ or H), the amplitude is

$$\mathcal{A}_S^{gg} = \kappa_f^S \sum_f F_{1/2}(\tau_f). \quad (73)$$

For an initial pseudoscalar ($A = H_3^0$), the amplitude is

$$\mathcal{A}_A^{gg} = \kappa_f^A \sum_f F_{1/2}^A(\tau_f). \quad (74)$$

We incorporate the QCD corrections as follows. First, we evaluate α_s in the leading-order amplitude at the scale of the parent particle's mass. Second, for the decays of CP-even neutral scalars, we multiply the leading order amplitude by the factor [17]

$$\left[1 + E^{N_f} \alpha_s^{(N_f)} / \pi\right], \quad (75)$$

where

$$E^{N_f} = \frac{95}{4} - \frac{7}{6} N_f + \frac{33 - 2N_f}{6} \log(\mu^2 / M_H^2), \quad (76)$$

and we use $N_f = 5$ throughout, consistent with **NF-GG** = 5 in HDECAY [20].

5.7 $H \rightarrow Z\gamma$

Neutral scalar decays to Z plus a photon proceed through a loop of charged particles. The width is given by [23]

$$\Gamma(H \rightarrow Z\gamma) = \frac{\alpha_{EM}^2 m_H^3}{128\pi^3 v^2} |\mathcal{A}_H^{Z\gamma}|^2 \left(1 - \frac{M_Z^2}{m_H^2}\right)^3, \quad (77)$$

where $\mathcal{A}_H^{Z\gamma}$ represents the sum of the loop amplitudes for initial particle H .

For an initial scalar ($S = h, H$, or H_5^0), the amplitude is⁴

$$\mathcal{A}_S^{Z\gamma} = \kappa_f^S A_f + \kappa_V^S A_W + \frac{v}{2} A_s, \quad (78)$$

where the contributions from fermions, W bosons, and scalars are given by [23]

$$\begin{aligned} A_f &= \sum_f N_{cf} \frac{-2Q_f (T_f^{3L} - 2Q_f \sin^2 \theta_W)}{\sin \theta_W \cos \theta_W} [I_1(\tau_f, \lambda_f) - I_2(\tau_f, \lambda_f)], \\ A_W &= -\cot \theta_W \left\{ 4(3 - \tan^2 \theta_W) I_2(\tau_W, \lambda_W) + \left[\left(1 + \frac{2}{\tau_W}\right) \tan^2 \theta_W - \left(5 + \frac{2}{\tau_W}\right) \right] I_1(\tau_W, \lambda_W) \right\}, \\ A_s &= \sum_s 2 \frac{g_{hss^*} C_{Zss^*} Q_s}{m_s^2} I_1(\tau_s, \lambda_s). \end{aligned} \quad (79)$$

Here $T_f^{3L} = \pm 1/2$ is the third component of isospin for the left-handed fermion f . The scalar amplitude depends on the coupling $C_{Zss^*} \equiv g_{Zss^*}/e$ of the scalar to the Z boson, defined in such a way that the corresponding coupling of the scalar to the photon is $C_{\gamma ss^*} \equiv g_{\gamma ss^*}/e = Q_s$.

⁴Decays of $H_5^0 \rightarrow Z\gamma$ may also receive a contribution from mixed loops containing both H_5^+ and W^+ . These contributions have not been implemented yet.

The loop factors are given in terms of the functions [23]

$$\begin{aligned} I_1(a, b) &= \frac{ab}{2(a-b)} + \frac{a^2b^2}{2(a-b)^2} [f(a) - f(b)] + \frac{a^2b}{(a-b)^2} [g(a) - g(b)], \\ I_2(a, b) &= -\frac{ab}{2(a-b)} [f(a) - f(b)], \end{aligned} \quad (80)$$

where the function $f(\tau)$ was given in Eq. (69) and

$$g(\tau) = \begin{cases} \sqrt{\tau-1} \sin^{-1} \left(\sqrt{\frac{1}{\tau}} \right) & \text{if } \tau \geq 1, \\ \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{1-\tau} \left[\log \left(\frac{\eta_+}{\eta_-} \right) - i\pi \right] & \text{if } \tau < 1, \end{cases} \quad (81)$$

with η_{\pm} defined as for $f(\tau)$. The arguments of the functions are $\tau_i \equiv 4m_i^2/m_h^2$ as before and $\lambda_i \equiv 4m_i^2/M_Z^2$. For an initial pseudoscalar ($A = H_3^0$), the amplitude is

$$\mathcal{A}_A^{Z\gamma} = \kappa_f^A \sum_f N_{cf} \frac{-2Q_f (T_f^{3L} - 2Q_f \sin^2 \theta_W)}{\sin \theta_W \cos \theta_W} [-I_2(\tau_f, \lambda_f)]. \quad (82)$$

6 Using the GMCALC program

The GMCALC code package is available for download as a .tar.gz file from the web page

<http://people.physics.carleton.ca/~logan/gmcalc/>

The package includes this manual. Feature requests and bug reports should be sent to Heather Logan at logan@physics.carleton.ca.

6.1 Sample main programs provided with the code

Three sample main programs are provided with the code. These can be used as-is, or as templates for the user to write their own programs. The command

```
$ make sample
```

compiles the program sample.f into an executable sample.x using gfortran. The executable is run using

```
$ ./sample.x
```

The sample programs are as follows:

- **gmpoint.f** performs the full set of available calculations for a single parameter point and outputs the spectrum, couplings, and decay tables to the terminal.
- **gmscan.f** performs a scan over the allowed parameter ranges using the approach described in Sec. 6.6. For each scan point allowed by theoretical and indirect experimental constraints, it writes a selection of observables to a file scan_output.data.
- **gmmg5.f** generates the files param_card-LO.dat and param_card-NLO.dat for use with the leading-order (LO) and next-to-leading order (NLO) Universal FeynRules Object (UFO) model files, respectively. The NLO UFO model file can be used with the MadGraph5_aMC@NLO framework to automatically generate Monte Carlo samples at NLO accuracy in QCD. The corresponding FeynRules model files are available at <http://feynrules.irmp.ucl.ac.be/wiki/GeorgiMachacekModel>.

6.2 Setting the model parameters

There are currently five choices of input parameters implemented in GMCALC:

- **INPUTSET = 1** uses the primary inputs μ_3^2 , λ_1 , λ_2 , λ_3 , λ_4 , λ_5 , M_1 , and M_2 . The parameter μ_2^2 is set using the constraint on $v_\phi^2 + 8v_\chi^2$ in terms of G_F .
- **INPUTSET = 2** uses the primary inputs μ_3^2 , m_h , λ_2 , λ_3 , λ_4 , λ_5 , M_1 , and M_2 . The parameter μ_2^2 is again set using the constraint on $v_\phi^2 + 8v_\chi^2$ in terms of G_F .
- **INPUTSET = 3** uses the primary inputs m_h , m_H , m_3 , m_5 , $\sin\theta_H$, $\sin\alpha$, M_1 , and M_2 . G_F is also used to set μ_2^2 .
- **INPUTSET = 4** uses the primary inputs m_h , m_5 , $\sin\theta_H$, λ_2 , λ_3 , λ_4 , M_1 , and M_2 . G_F is also used to set μ_2^2 .
- **INPUTSET = 5** uses the primary inputs m_h , m_H , $\sin\theta_H$, $\sin\alpha$, λ_2 , λ_3 , λ_4 , and λ_5 . G_F is also used to set μ_2^2 .

These inputs can be hand-coded in the sample programs (indicated by **INPUTMODE = 0**). Alternatively, the program can be run in interactive mode (**INPUTMODE = 1**) in which case the user will be prompted to enter the inputs at the terminal. In either case, the subroutine **LOAD_INPUTS** processes the inputs and computes the remaining potential parameters. **LOAD_INPUTS** sets a flag **INPUTOK = 1** if the specified inputs yield an acceptable scalar potential.

6.3 Checking consistency and computing the spectrum

Before computing the physical spectrum, the scalar potential should be checked for consistency with theoretical constraints. This is accomplished by the subroutine **THYCHECK**, which returns three flags: **UNIOK = 1** indicates that the perturbative unitarity constraints on λ_{1-5} are satisfied; **BFBOK = 1** indicates that the scalar potential is bounded from below; and **MINOK = 1** indicates that the desired electroweak-breaking vacuum is the global minimum of the potential.

The physical masses, vevs, and custodial-singlet mixing angle α can then be computed by the subroutine **CALCPHYS**. Results are passed via the common block

```
COMMON/PHYSPARAMS/MHL,MHH,MH3,MH5,ALPHA,VPHI,VCHI.
```

They can be accessed directly by adding this common block declaration in one of the sample programs; alternatively, they can be output to the terminal by the subroutine **PRINT_RESULTS** (see Sec. 6.5).

With the physical spectrum computed, the indirect constraints can be checked by calling the subroutine **CALCINDIR**. This returns a series of flags which, if set to 1, indicate that the model point satisfies the corresponding indirect constraint. The flags are: **BSMMOK** ($B_s^0 \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$), **SPAROK** (oblique S parameter), **BSGAMLOOSEOK** (“loose” constraint on $b \rightarrow s\gamma$), and **BSGAMTIGHTOK** (“tight” constraint on $b \rightarrow s\gamma$). These can be accessed directly by including the common block

```
COMMON/INDIR/RBSMM,SPARAM,BSMMOK,SPAROK,BSGAMLOOSEOK,BSGAMTIGHTOK.
```

They are also output to the terminal by the subroutine **PRINT_RESULTS** (see Sec. 6.5). The double precision variables **RBSMM** and **SPARAM** in this common block contain the ratio of $\overline{\text{BR}}(B_s^0 \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-)$ to its SM value and the value of the S parameter for this model point, respectively.

6.4 Computing couplings and decays

Once `CALCPHYS` has been called, we are ready to compute Higgs couplings and/or decay branching ratios. There are three subroutines that can be called independently of each other:

- `HLCOUPS` computes the kappa factors κ_i^h (i.e., the couplings normalized to their SM values) of h . These are output to the terminal in a tidy form by `PRINT_HCOUPS`, but can also be accessed through the common block

COMMON/KAPPASL/KVL,KFL,KGAML,KZGAML,DKGAML,DKZGAML.

- HHCoups does the same but for H . These are output to the terminal by PRINT_HCOUPS, but can also be accessed through the common block

COMMON/KAPPASH/KVH,KFH,KGAMH,KZGAMH,DKGAMH,DKZGAMH.

- **CALCDECAYS** performs the full set of partial width calculations (see Sec. 5) for all the scalar particles in the model, as well as for the top quark, which can decay to $H_3^+ b$ if kinematically allowed. The resulting branching ratios and total widths are output to the terminal in a tidy form by **PRINT_DECAYS**, but can also be accessed through the series of common blocks for each particle as follows:

h : COMMON/HLBRS/HLBRB, HLBRTA, HLBRMU, HLBRG, HLBRT, HLBRG, HLBRZGA, HLBRW, HLBRZ, HLBRWH3P, HLBRZH3N, HLBRH3N, HLBRH3P, HLBRH5N, HLBRH5P, HLBRH5PP, HLWDTH
 H : COMMON/HHBRS/HHBRB, HHBRTA, HHBRMU, HHBRS, HHBRC, HHBRT, HHBRG, HHBRGA, HHBRZGA, HHBRW, HHBRZ, HHBRWH3P, HHBRZH3N, HHBRHL, HHBRH3N, HHBRH3P, HHBRH5N, HHBRH5P, HHBRH5PP, HHWDTH
 H_3^0 : COMMON/H3NBRS/H3NBRB, H3NBRTA, H3NBRMU, H3NBRS, H3NBRC, H3NBRT, H3NBRZHL, H3NBRZHH, H3NBRZH5N, H3NBRWH5P, H3NBRG, H3NBRGA, H3NBRZGA, H3NWDTH
 H_3^+ : COMMON/H3PBRs/H3PBRBC, H3PBRTA, H3PBRMU, H3PBRsU, H3PBRCS, H3PBRTB, H3PBRBU, H3PBRWHL, H3PBRWHH, H3PBRZH5P, H3PBRWH5N, H3PBRWH5PP, H3PWDTH
 H_5^0 : COMMON/H5NBRS/H5NBRGA, H5NBRZGA, H5NBRW, H5NBRZ, H5NBRZH3N, H5NBRWH3P, H5NBRH3N, H5NBRH3P, H5NWDTH
 H_5^+ : COMMON/H5PBRs/H5PBRWZ, H5PBRZH3P, H5PBRWH3N, H5PBRH3PN, H5PWDTH
 H_5^{++} : COMMON/H5PPBRs/H5PPBRWW, H5PPBRWH3, H5PPBRH3P, H5PPWDTH
 t : COMMON/TOBRS/TOBRW, TOBRH3P, TOPWDTH

6.5 Outputs

There are three subroutines dedicated to printing results to the terminal:

- `PRINT_RESULTS` prints the Lagrangian parameters, the flags indicating theoretical consistency and consistency with indirect experimental constraints, and the physical masses, vevs, and custodial-singlet mixing angle. These must have been previously computed by calls to `LOAD_INPUTS`, `THYCHECK`, `CALCPHYS` and `CALCINDIR` (in that order).
- `PRINT_HCOUPS` prints the kappa factors for h and H . These must have been previously computed by calls to the subroutines `HLCOUPS` and `HHCUPS`.
- `PRINT_DECAYS` prints out the decay branching ratios and total widths of all the scalars in the model, as well as those of the top quark. These must have been previously computed by a call to the subroutine `CALCDECAYS`.

6.6 Parameter scans

To perform scans over the model parameters in an efficient way, the following strategy can be adopted. Setting m_h equal to the observed Higgs boson mass ~ 125 GeV and setting μ_2^2 using G_F , the seven free parameters are (`INPUTSET = 2`)

$$\mu_3^2, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4, \lambda_5, M_1, \text{ and } M_2. \quad (83)$$

The parameters λ_3 and λ_4 are mainly constrained by the unitarity and bounded-from-below conditions. The allowed range of λ_3 is

$$-\frac{1}{2}\pi < \lambda_3 < \frac{3}{5}\pi. \quad (84)$$

The allowed range of λ_4 is then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{For } \lambda_3 < 0 : \quad & -\lambda_3 < \lambda_4 < \left(-\frac{7}{11}\lambda_3 + \frac{2}{11}\pi\right), \\ \text{For } \lambda_3 \geq 0 : \quad & -\frac{1}{3}\lambda_3 < \lambda_4 < \left(-\frac{7}{11}\lambda_3 + \frac{2}{11}\pi\right). \end{aligned} \quad (85)$$

The parameter λ_2 is constrained by the first of the unitarity constraints in Eq. (25). Since we don't know λ_1 until the rest of the parameters are set, we allow it to vary to obtain the least stringent constraint (which occurs when $\lambda_1 = 0$),

$$|\lambda_2| < \frac{1}{3}\sqrt{4\pi^2 - 2\pi(7\lambda_3 + 11\lambda_4)}. \quad (86)$$

Note that $0 < (7\lambda_3 + 11\lambda_4) < 2\pi$. Implementing a lower bound on the scan range for λ_2 from the bounded-from-below constraint does not dramatically improve the code's efficiency.

The last of the unitarity constraints in Eq. (25) then constrains

$$(-2\pi + \lambda_2) < \lambda_5 < (2\pi + \lambda_2). \quad (87)$$

The dimensionful parameters μ_3^2 , M_1 , and M_2 are constrained by the requirement that there be an acceptable electroweak symmetry breaking vacuum. We find that the following ranges capture all allowed parameter points:

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_3^2 &> -(200 \text{ GeV})^2, \\ M_1 &< \max\left(3500 \text{ GeV}, 3.5\sqrt{|\mu_3^2|}\right), \\ |M_2| &< \max\left(250 \text{ GeV}, 1.3\sqrt{|\mu_3^2|}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (88)$$

Note that M_1 can be chosen positive with no loss of generality, so that $0 \leq M_1$. M_2 takes either sign. There is no upper bound on μ_3^2 ; the limit $\mu_3^2 \gg v^2$ is the decoupling limit, in which the masses-squared of the predominantly-triplet states approach μ_3^2 .

6.7 Standard Model inputs

The Standard Model input parameters are initialized by the subroutine `INITIALIZE_SM`, which must be called before anything else. The parameter values are hard-coded in `/src/gmunit.f`.

The primary electroweak inputs are [24]

$$G_F = 1.1663787 \times 10^{-5} \text{ GeV}^{-2}, \quad M_Z = 91.1876 \text{ GeV}, \quad M_W = 80.385 \text{ GeV}. \quad (89)$$

The SM Higgs vev is computed as $v = (\sqrt{2}G_F)^{-1/2}$.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada. K.H. was also supported by the Government of Ontario through an Ontario Graduate Scholarship.

References

- [1] H. Georgi and M. Machacek, Nucl. Phys. B **262**, 463 (1985).
- [2] M. S. Chanowitz and M. Golden, Phys. Lett. B **165**, 105 (1985).
- [3] K. Hartling, K. Kumar and H. E. Logan, Phys. Rev. D **90**, 015007 (2014) [arXiv:1404.2640 [hep-ph]].
- [4] K. Hartling, K. Kumar and H. E. Logan, arXiv:1410.5538 [hep-ph].
- [5] C. Degrande, C. Duhr, B. Fuks, D. Grellscheid, O. Mattelaer and T. Reiter, Comput. Phys. Commun. **183** (2012) 1201 [arXiv:1108.2040 [hep-ph]].
- [6] A. Alloul, N. D. Christensen, C. Degrande, C. Duhr and B. Fuks, Comput. Phys. Commun. **185** (2014) 2250 [arXiv:1310.1921 [hep-ph]].
- [7] J. Alwall *et al.*, JHEP **1407** (2014) 079 [arXiv:1405.0301 [hep-ph]].
- [8] M. Aoki and S. Kanemura, Phys. Rev. D **77**, 095009 (2008) [arXiv:0712.4053 [hep-ph]]; erratum Phys. Rev. D **89**, 059902 (2014).
- [9] M. Baak, J. Cuth, J. Haller, A. Hoecker, R. Kogler, K. Moenig, M. Schott and J. Stelzer, arXiv:1407.3792 [hep-ph].
- [10] J. F. Gunion, R. Vega and J. Wudka, Phys. Rev. D **43**, 2322 (1991).
- [11] J. Beringer *et al.* [Particle Data Group Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **86**, 010001 (2012).
- [12] F. Mahmoudi, Comput. Phys. Commun. **178**, 745 (2008) [arXiv:0710.2067 [hep-ph]]; Comput. Phys. Commun. **180**, 1579 (2009) [arXiv:0808.3144 [hep-ph]]; Comput. Phys. Commun. **180**, 1718 (2009).
- [13] D. Eriksson, J. Rathsmann and O. Stal, Comput. Phys. Commun. **181**, 189 (2010) [arXiv:0902.0851 [hep-ph]]; Comput. Phys. Commun. **181**, 833 (2010).
- [14] M. Misiak, H. M. Asatrian, K. Bieri, M. Czakon, A. Czarnecki, T. Ewerth, A. Ferroglia and P. Gambino *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 022002 (2007) [hep-ph/0609232].
- [15] X.-Q. Li, J. Lu and A. Pich, JHEP **1406**, 022 (2014) [arXiv:1404.5865 [hep-ph]].
- [16] CMS and LHCb Collaborations, CMS-PAS-BPH-13-007, available from <http://cds.cern.ch>.
- [17] A. Djouadi, M. Spira and P. M. Zerwas, Z. Phys. C **70**, 427 (1996) [hep-ph/9511344].
- [18] J. C. Romao and S. Andringa, Eur. Phys. J. C **7**, 631 (1999) [hep-ph/9807536].
- [19] R. Contino, M. Ghezzi, C. Grojean, M. Mhlleitner and M. Spira, Comput. Phys. Commun. **185**, 3412 (2014) [arXiv:1403.3381 [hep-ph]].
- [20] A. Djouadi, J. Kalinowski and M. Spira, Comput. Phys. Commun. **108**, 56 (1998) [hep-ph/9704448].
- [21] A. Djouadi, J. Kalinowski and P. M. Zerwas, Z. Phys. C **70**, 435 (1996) [hep-ph/9511342].
- [22] A. G. Akeroyd, Nucl. Phys. B **544**, 557 (1999) [hep-ph/9806337].

- [23] J. F. Gunion, H. E. Haber, G. L. Kane, and S. Dawson, *The Higgs Hunter's Guide* (Westview, Boulder, Colorado, 2000).
- [24] A. Denner, S. Dittmaier, M. Grazzini, R. V. Harlander, R. S. Thorne, M. Spira, and M. Steinhauser, LHCHSWG-INT-2015-006, available from <https://cds.cern.ch/record/2047636>.