

Search for the Standard Model Higgs Boson Produced in Association with Top Quarks Using the Full CDF Data Set

T. Aaltonen,²¹ B. Álvarez González,^{9,aa} S. Amerio,^{40a} D. Amidei,³² A. Anastassov,^{15,y} A. Annovi,¹⁷ J. Antos,¹² G. Apollinari,¹⁵ J. A. Appel,¹⁵ T. Arisawa,⁵⁴ A. Artikov,¹³ J. Asaadi,⁴⁹ W. Ashmanskas,¹⁵ B. Auerbach,⁵⁷ A. Aurisano,⁴⁹ F. Azfar,³⁹ W. Badgett,¹⁵ T. Bae,²⁵ A. Barbaro-Galtieri,²⁶ V. E. Barnes,⁴⁴ B. A. Barnett,²³ P. Barria,^{42a,42c} P. Bartos,¹² M. Baucé,^{40a,40b} F. Bedeschi,^{42a} S. Behari,²³ G. Bellettini,^{42a,42b} J. Bellinger,⁵⁶ D. Benjamin,¹⁴ A. Beretvas,¹⁵ A. Bhatti,⁴⁶ D. Bisello,^{40a,40b} I. Bizjak,²⁸ K. R. Bland,⁵ B. Blumenfeld,²³ A. Bocci,¹⁴ A. Bodek,⁴⁵ D. Bortoletto,⁴⁴ J. Boudreau,⁴³ A. Boveia,¹¹ L. Brigliadori,^{6a,6b} C. Bromberg,³³ E. Brucken,²¹ J. Budagov,¹³ H. S. Budd,⁴⁵ K. Burkett,¹⁵ G. Busetto,^{40a,40b} P. Bussey,¹⁹ A. Buzatu,³¹ A. Calamba,¹⁰ C. Calancha,²⁹ S. Camarda,⁴ M. Campanelli,²⁸ M. Campbell,³² F. Canelli,^{11,15} B. Carls,²² D. Carlsmith,⁵⁶ R. Carosi,^{42a} S. Carrillo,^{16,n} S. Carron,¹⁵ B. Casal,^{9,l} M. Casarsa,^{50a} A. Castro,^{6a,6b} P. Catastini,²⁰ D. Cauz,^{50a} V. Cavaliere,²² M. Cavalli-Sforza,⁴ A. Cerri,^{26,g} L. Cerrito,^{28,t} Y. C. Chen,¹ M. Chertok,⁷ G. Chiarelli,^{42a} G. Chlachidze,¹⁵ F. Chlebana,¹⁵ K. Cho,²⁵ D. Chokheli,¹³ W. H. Chung,⁵⁶ Y. S. Chung,⁴⁵ M. A. Ciocci,^{42a,42c} A. Clark,¹⁸ C. Clarke,⁵⁵ G. Compostella,^{40a,40b} J. Connors,³⁶ M. E. Convery,¹⁵ J. Conway,⁷ M. Corbo,¹⁵ M. Cordelli,¹⁷ C. A. Cox,⁷ D. J. Cox,⁷ F. Crescioli,^{42a,42b} J. Cuevas,^{9,aa} R. Culbertson,¹⁵ D. Dagenhart,¹⁵ N. d'Ascenzo,^{15,x} M. Datta,¹⁵ P. de Barbaro,⁴⁵ M. Dell'Orso,^{42a,42b} L. Demortier,⁴⁶ M. Deninno,^{6a} F. Devoto,²¹ M. d'Errico,^{40a,40b} A. Di Canto,^{42a,42b} B. Di Ruzza,¹⁵ J. R. Dittmann,⁵ M. D'Onofrio,²⁷ S. Donati,^{42a,42b} P. Dong,¹⁵ M. Dorigo,^{50a} T. Dorigo,^{40a} K. Ebina,⁵⁴ A. Elagin,⁴⁹ A. Eppig,³² R. Erbacher,⁷ S. Errede,²² N. Ershaidat,^{15,ee} R. Eusebi,⁴⁹ S. Farrington,³⁹ M. Feindt,²⁴ J. P. Fernandez,²⁹ R. Field,¹⁶ G. Flanagan,^{15,v} R. Forrest,⁷ M. J. Frank,⁵ M. Franklin,²⁰ J. C. Freeman,¹⁵ Y. Funakoshi,⁵⁴ I. Furic,¹⁶ M. Gallinaro,⁴⁶ J. E. Garcia,¹⁸ A. F. Garfinkel,⁴⁴ P. Garosi,^{42a,42c} H. Gerberich,²² E. Gerchtein,¹⁵ S. Giagu,^{47a} V. Giakoumopoulou,³ P. Giannetti,^{42a} K. Gibson,⁴³ C. M. Ginsburg,¹⁵ N. Giokaris,³ P. Giromini,¹⁷ G. Giurgiu,²³ V. Glagolev,¹³ D. Glenzinski,¹⁵ M. Gold,³⁵ D. Goldin,⁴⁹ N. Goldschmidt,¹⁶ A. Golossanov,¹⁵ G. Gomez,⁹ G. Gomez-Ceballos,³⁰ M. Goncharov,³⁰ O. González,²⁹ I. Gorelov,³⁵ A. T. Goshaw,¹⁴ K. Goulianos,⁴⁶ S. Grinstein,⁴ C. Grosso-Pilcher,¹¹ R. C. Group,^{53,15} J. Guimaraes da Costa,²⁰ S. R. Hahn,¹⁵ E. Halkiadakis,⁴⁸ A. Hamaguchi,³⁸ J. Y. Han,⁴⁵ F. Happacher,¹⁷ K. Hara,⁵¹ D. Hare,⁴⁸ M. Hare,⁵² R. F. Harr,⁵⁵ K. Hatakeyama,⁵ C. Hays,³⁹ M. Heck,²⁴ J. Heinrich,⁴¹ M. Herndon,⁵⁶ S. Hewamanage,⁵ A. Hocker,¹⁵ W. Hopkins,^{15,h} D. Horn,²⁴ S. Hou,¹ R. E. Hughes,³⁶ M. Hurwitz,¹¹ U. Husemann,⁵⁷ N. Hussain,³¹ M. Hussein,³³ J. Huston,³³ G. Introzzi,^{42a} M. Iori,^{47a,47b} A. Ivanov,^{7,q} E. James,¹⁵ D. Jang,¹⁰ B. Jayatilaka,¹⁴ E. J. Jeon,²⁵ S. Jindariani,¹⁵ M. Jones,⁴⁴ K. K. Joo,²⁵ S. Y. Jun,¹⁰ T. R. Junk,¹⁵ T. Kamon,^{25,49} P. E. Karchin,⁵⁵ A. Kasmi,⁵ Y. Kato,^{38,p} W. Ketchum,¹¹ J. Keung,⁴¹ V. Khotilovich,⁴⁹ B. Kilminster,¹⁵ D. H. Kim,²⁵ H. S. Kim,²⁵ J. E. Kim,²⁵ M. J. Kim,¹⁷ S. B. Kim,²⁵ S. H. Kim,⁵¹ Y. K. Kim,¹¹ Y. J. Kim,²⁵ N. Kimura,⁵⁴ M. Kirby,¹⁵ S. Klimenko,¹⁶ K. Knoepfel,¹⁵ K. Kondo,^{54,a} D. J. Kong,²⁵ J. Konigsberg,¹⁶ A. V. Kotwal,¹⁴ M. Kreps,²⁴ J. Kroll,⁴¹ D. Krop,¹¹ M. Kruse,¹⁴ V. Krutelyov,^{49,d} T. Kuhr,²⁴ M. Kurata,⁵¹ S. Kwang,¹¹ A. T. Laasanen,⁴⁴ S. Lami,^{42a} S. Lammel,¹⁵ M. Lancaster,²⁸ R. L. Lander,⁷ K. Lannon,^{36,z} A. Lath,⁴⁸ G. Latino,^{42a,42c} T. LeCompte,² E. Lee,⁴⁹ H. S. Lee,^{11,r} J. S. Lee,²⁵ S. W. Lee,^{49,cc} S. Leo,^{42a,42b} S. Leone,^{42a} J. D. Lewis,¹⁵ A. Limosani,^{14,u} C.-J. Lin,²⁶ M. Lindgren,¹⁵ E. Lipeles,⁴¹ A. Lister,¹⁸ D. O. Litvintsev,¹⁵ C. Liu,⁴³ H. Liu,⁵³ Q. Liu,⁴⁴ T. Liu,¹⁵ S. Lockwitz,⁵⁷ A. Loginov,⁵⁷ D. Lucchesi,^{40a,40b} J. Lueck,²⁴ P. Lujan,²⁶ P. Lukens,¹⁵ G. Lungu,⁴⁶ J. Lys,²⁶ R. Lysak,^{12,f} R. Madrak,¹⁵ K. Maeshima,¹⁵ P. Maestro,^{42a,42c} S. Malik,⁴⁶ G. Manca,^{27,b} A. Manousakis-Katsikakis,³ F. Margaroli,^{47a} C. Marino,²⁴ M. Martínez,⁴ P. Mastrandrea,^{47a} K. Matera,²² M. E. Mattson,⁵⁵ A. Mazzacane,¹⁵ P. Mazzanti,^{6a} K. S. McFarland,⁴⁵ P. McIntyre,⁴⁹ R. McNulty,^{27,k} A. Mehta,²⁷ P. Mehtala,²¹ C. Mesropian,⁴⁶ T. Miao,¹⁵ D. Mietlicki,³² A. Mitra,¹ H. Miyake,⁵¹ S. Moed,¹⁵ N. Moggi,^{6a} M. N. Mondragon,^{15,n} C. S. Moon,²⁵ R. Moore,¹⁵ M. J. Morello,^{42a,42d} J. Morlock,²⁴ P. Movilla Fernandez,¹⁵ A. Mukherjee,¹⁵ Th. Muller,²⁴ P. Murat,¹⁵ M. Mussini,^{6a,6b} J. Nachtman,^{15,o} Y. Nagai,⁵¹ J. Naganoma,⁵⁴ I. Nakano,³⁷ A. Napier,⁵² J. Nett,⁴⁹ C. Neu,⁵³ M. S. Neubauer,²² J. Nielsen,^{26,e} L. Nodulman,² S. Y. Noh,²⁵ O. Normiella,²² L. Oakes,³⁹ S. H. Oh,¹⁴ Y. D. Oh,²⁵ I. Oksuzian,⁵³ T. Okusawa,³⁸ R. Orava,²¹ L. Ortolan,⁴ S. Pagan Griso,^{40a,40b} C. Pagliarone,^{50a} E. Palencia,^{9,g} V. Papadimitriou,¹⁵ A. A. Paramonov,² J. Patrick,¹⁵ G. Pauletta,^{50a,50b} M. Paulini,¹⁰ C. Paus,³⁰ D. E. Pellett,⁷ A. Penzo,^{50a} T. J. Phillips,¹⁴ G. Piacentino,^{42a} E. Pianori,⁴¹ J. Pilot,³⁶ K. Pitts,²² C. Plager,⁸ L. Pondrom,⁵⁶ S. Poprocki,^{15,h} K. Potamianos,⁴⁴ F. Prokoshin,^{13,dd} A. Pranko,²⁶ F. Ptohos,^{17,i} G. Punzi,^{42a,42b} A. Rahaman,⁴³ V. Ramakrishnan,⁵⁶ N. Ranjan,⁴⁴ I. Redondo,²⁹ P. Renton,³⁹ M. Rescigno,^{47a} T. Riddick,²⁸ F. Rimondi,^{6a,6b} L. Ristori,^{42a,15} A. Robson,¹⁹ T. Rodrigo,⁹ T. Rodriguez,⁴¹ E. Rogers,²² S. Rolli,^{52,j} R. Roser,¹⁵ F. Ruffini,^{42a,42c} A. Ruiz,⁹ J. Russ,¹⁰ V. Rusu,¹⁵ A. Safonov,⁴⁹ W. K. Sakumoto,⁴⁵ Y. Sakurai,⁵⁴ L. Santi,^{50a,50b} K. Sato,⁵¹ V. Saveliev,^{15,x} A. Savoy-Navarro,^{15,bb} P. Schlabach,¹⁵ A. Schmidt,²⁴ E. E. Schmidt,¹⁵ T. Schwarz,¹⁵

L. Scodellaro,⁹ A. Scribano,^{42a,42c} F. Scuri,^{42a} S. Seidel,³⁵ Y. Seiya,³⁸ A. Semenov,¹³ F. Sforza,^{42a,42b} S. Z. Shalhout,⁷ T. Shears,²⁷ P. F. Shepard,⁴³ M. Shimojima,^{51,w} M. Shochet,¹¹ I. Shreyber-Tecker,³⁴ A. Simonenko,¹³ P. Sinervo,³¹ K. Sliwa,⁵² J. R. Smith,⁷ F. D. Snider,¹⁵ A. Soha,¹⁵ V. Sorin,⁴ H. Song,⁴³ P. Squillacioti,^{42a,42c} M. Stancari,¹⁵ R. St. Denis,¹⁹ B. Stelzer,³¹ O. Stelzer-Chilton,³¹ D. Stentz,^{15,y} J. Strologas,³⁵ G. L. Strycker,³² Y. Sudo,⁵¹ A. Sukhanov,¹⁵ I. Suslov,¹³ K. Takemasa,⁵¹ Y. Takeuchi,⁵¹ J. Tang,¹¹ M. Tecchio,³² P. K. Teng,¹ J. Thom,^{15,h} J. Thome,¹⁰ G. A. Thompson,²² E. Thomson,⁴¹ D. Toback,⁴⁹ S. Tokar,¹² K. Tollefson,³³ T. Tomura,⁵¹ D. Tonelli,¹⁵ S. Torre,¹⁷ D. Torretta,¹⁵ P. Totaro,^{40a} M. Trovato,^{42a,42d} F. Ukegawa,⁵¹ S. Uozumi,²⁵ A. Varganov,³² F. Vázquez,^{16,n} G. Velev,¹⁵ C. Vellidis,¹⁵ M. Vidal,⁴⁴ I. Vila,⁹ R. Vilar,⁹ J. Vizán,⁹ M. Vogel,³⁵ G. Volpi,¹⁷ P. Wagner,⁴¹ R. L. Wagner,¹⁵ T. Wakisaka,³⁸ R. Wallny,⁸ S. M. Wang,¹ A. Warburton,³¹ D. Waters,²⁸ W. C. Wester III,¹⁵ D. Whiteson,^{41,c} A. B. Wicklund,² E. Wicklund,¹⁵ S. Wilbur,¹¹ F. Wick,²⁴ H. H. Williams,⁴¹ J. S. Wilson,³⁶ P. Wilson,¹⁵ B. L. Winer,³⁶ P. Wittich,^{15,h} S. Wolbers,¹⁵ H. Wolfe,³⁶ T. Wright,³² X. Wu,¹⁸ Z. Wu,⁵ K. Yamamoto,³⁸ D. Yamato,³⁸ T. Yang,¹⁵ U. K. Yang,^{11,s} Y. C. Yang,²⁵ W.-M. Yao,²⁶ G. P. Yeh,¹⁵ K. Yi,^{15,o} J. Yoh,¹⁵ K. Yorita,⁵⁴ T. Yoshida,^{38,m} G. B. Yu,¹⁴ I. Yu,²⁵ S. S. Yu,¹⁵ J. C. Yun,¹⁵ A. Zanetti,^{50a} Y. Zeng,¹⁴ C. Zhou,¹⁴ and S. Zucchelli^{6a,6b}

(CDF Collaboration)^{ff}

¹*Institute of Physics, Academia Sinica, Taipei, Taiwan 11529, Republic of China*

²*Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, Illinois 60439, USA*

³*University of Athens, 157 71 Athens, Greece*

⁴*Institut de Física d'Altes Energies, ICREA, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, E-08193, Bellaterra (Barcelona), Spain*

⁵*Baylor University, Waco, Texas 76798, USA*

^{6a}*Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare Bologna, I-40127 Bologna, Italy*

^{6b}*University of Bologna, I-40127 Bologna, Italy*

⁷*University of California, Davis, Davis, California 95616, USA*

⁸*University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California 90024, USA*

⁹*Instituto de Física de Cantabria, CSIC-University of Cantabria, 39005 Santander, Spain*

¹⁰*Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213, USA*

¹¹*Enrico Fermi Institute, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois 60637, USA*

¹²*Comenius University, 842 48 Bratislava, Slovakia; Institute of Experimental Physics, 040 01 Kosice, Slovakia*

¹³*Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, RU-141980 Dubna, Russia*

¹⁴*Duke University, Durham, North Carolina 27708, USA*

¹⁵*Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, Batavia, Illinois 60510, USA*

¹⁶*University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida 32611, USA*

¹⁷*Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati, Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, I-00044 Frascati, Italy*

¹⁸*University of Geneva, CH-1211 Geneva 4, Switzerland*

¹⁹*Glasgow University, Glasgow G12 8QQ, United Kingdom*

²⁰*Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138, USA*

²¹*Division of High Energy Physics, Department of Physics, University of Helsinki and Helsinki Institute of Physics, FIN-00014, Helsinki, Finland*

²²*University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois 61801, USA*

²³*The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland 21218, USA*

²⁴*Institut für Experimentelle Kernphysik, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, D-76131 Karlsruhe, Germany*

²⁵*Center for High Energy Physics: Kyungpook National University, Daegu 702-701, Korea;*

Seoul National University, Seoul 151-742, Korea; Sungkyunkwan University, Suwon 440-746, Korea;

Korea Institute of Science and Technology Information, Daejeon 305-806, Korea;

Chonnam National University, Gwangju 500-757, Korea; Chonbuk National University, Jeonju 561-756, Korea

²⁶*Ernest Orlando Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, California 94720, USA*

²⁷*University of Liverpool, Liverpool L69 7ZE, United Kingdom*

²⁸*University College London, London WC1E 6BT, United Kingdom*

²⁹*Centro de Investigaciones Energéticas Medioambientales y Tecnológicas, E-28040 Madrid, Spain*

³⁰*Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139, USA*

³¹*Institute of Particle Physics: McGill University, Montréal, Québec H3A 2T8, Canada;*

Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, British Columbia V5A 1S6, Canada; University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario M5S 1A7, Canada;

and TRIUMF, Vancouver, British Columbia V6T 2A3, Canada

³²*University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109, USA*

³³*Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48824, USA*

³⁴*Institution for Theoretical and Experimental Physics, ITEP, Moscow 117259, Russia*

³⁵*University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico 87131, USA*

- ³⁶The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio 43210, USA
³⁷Okayama University, Okayama 700-8530, Japan
³⁸Osaka City University, Osaka 588, Japan
³⁹University of Oxford, Oxford OX1 3RH, United Kingdom
^{40a}Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, Sezione di Padova-Trento, I-35131 Padova, Italy
^{40b}University of Padova, I-35131 Padova, Italy
⁴¹University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104, USA
^{42a}Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare Pisa, I-56127 Pisa, Italy
^{42b}University of Pisa, I-56127 Pisa, Italy
^{42c}University of Siena, I-56127 Pisa, Italy
^{42d}Scuola Normale Superiore, I-56127 Pisa, Italy
⁴³University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15260, USA
⁴⁴Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana 47907, USA
⁴⁵University of Rochester, Rochester, New York 14627, USA
⁴⁶The Rockefeller University, New York, New York 10065, USA
^{47a}Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, Sezione di Roma 1, I-00185 Roma, Italy
^{47b}Sapienza Università di Roma, I-00185 Roma, Italy
⁴⁸Rutgers University, Piscataway, New Jersey 08855, USA
⁴⁹Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas 77843, USA
^{50a}Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare Trieste/Udine, I-34100 Trieste, Italy
^{50b}University of Udine, I-33100 Udine, Italy
⁵¹University of Tsukuba, Tsukuba, Ibaraki 305, Japan
⁵²Tufts University, Medford, Massachusetts 02155, USA
⁵³University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia 22906, USA
⁵⁴Waseda University, Tokyo 169, Japan
⁵⁵Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan 48201, USA
⁵⁶University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin 53706, USA
⁵⁷Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut 06520, USA
(Received 14 August 2012; published 2 November 2012)

A search is presented for the standard model Higgs boson produced in association with top quarks using the full Run II proton-antiproton collision data set, corresponding to 9.45 fb^{-1} , collected by the Collider Detector at Fermilab. No significant excess over the expected background is observed, and 95% credibility-level upper bounds are placed on the cross section $\sigma(t\bar{t}H \rightarrow \text{lepton} + \text{missing transverse energy} + \text{jets})$. For a Higgs boson mass of $125 \text{ GeV}/c^2$, we expect to set a limit of 12.6 and observe a limit of 20.5 times the standard model rate. This represents the most sensitive search for a standard model Higgs boson in this channel to date.

DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.109.181802](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.109.181802)

PACS numbers: 14.80.Bn, 13.85.Rm

The mechanism of electroweak symmetry breaking [1] in the standard model (SM) [2] predicts the existence of a massive particle called the Higgs boson. The CDF and D0 Collaborations have reported evidence for a particle consistent with the SM Higgs boson with a mass between 120 and $135 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ produced in association with a W or Z boson with decays to two b quarks [3]. The CMS and ATLAS Collaborations have reported the observation of a particle consistent with the SM Higgs boson with a mass of approximately $125 \text{ GeV}/c^2$, which decays to two photons, two W bosons, or two Z bosons [4]. Many other predicted couplings of the SM Higgs boson are currently neither observed nor excluded. In the SM, the fermion masses are generated by Yukawa couplings between the Higgs and the fermion fields with coupling strength proportional to the fermion masses. As the most massive known fermion, the top quark is predicted to couple most strongly to the Higgs boson. Higgs bosons may then be produced with a top-quark pair

($t\bar{t}H$) via radiation or top-quark fusion [5,6]. Samples of top-quark pair events with a few percent-level contamination from other processes can be selected at CDF, offering smaller background uncertainties than in searches for the SM Higgs boson produced in association with a vector boson [7]. Hence, the top-quark pair associated production channel provides an important contribution to SM Higgs boson physics. Furthermore, proposed extensions to the SM could significantly enhance the rate of $t\bar{t}H$ production [8]. This enhancement might allow the observation of a non-SM Higgs boson in this search before reaching sensitivity to a SM Higgs boson and could help to distinguish a candidate Higgs boson in other searches from the SM Higgs boson.

This Letter reports a search for the SM Higgs boson produced in association with top quarks. We utilize the full data set recorded with the CDF II detector. The data set consists of proton-antiproton collisions at a center-of-mass energy of $\sqrt{s} = 1.96 \text{ TeV}$ and corresponds to an integrated

luminosity of 9.45 fb^{-1} . The analysis described in this Letter extends and enhances a previous CDF search which used 319 pb^{-1} [9], through a vastly increased data set, greater signal acceptance, and improved background discrimination.

The CDF II detector is a general-purpose particle detector described in Ref. [10]. It consists of a combined silicon and drift chamber tracking system with a large volume immersed in the 1.4 T field of a solenoid magnet [11,12], lead- and iron-scintillator sampling calorimeters [13,14], and charged particle detectors outside the calorimeter, which are used to identify muons [15]. A right-handed cylindrical coordinate system is used with the origin in the center of the detector, with θ and ϕ denoting the polar and azimuthal angles, respectively. Pseudorapidity is defined as $\eta \equiv -\text{Intan}(\theta/2)$, and transverse energy and momentum are $E_T \equiv E \sin\theta$ and $p_T \equiv p \sin\theta$, where E and p are the energy and momentum, respectively.

The decay of a pair of top quarks is expected to generate almost exclusively two W bosons and two b quarks. The W bosons may then decay to lepton-neutrino pairs or pairs of quarks. We select events consistent with one leptonic and one hadronic W boson decay by requiring the presence of a single reconstructed lepton (electron or muon), missing transverse energy (\cancel{E}_T) [16], and four or more calorimeter energy clusters (jets). The details of the online selection, lepton identification, and jet identification are identical to those described in Ref. [7]. At least two of the jets in each event are required to be consistent with the fragmentation of a b quark (b -tagged) [7]. Because a low-mass ($m_H \leq 135 \text{ GeV}/c^2$) SM Higgs boson is expected to decay mostly to pairs of b quarks, or pairs of W bosons, that will decay predominantly to pairs of u , d , s , or c quarks, large b -tag and jet multiplicities are requested by the selection. Approximately 90% of the selected search sample is composed of top-quark pairs, with the remainder consisting of W

or Z bosons accompanied by jets ($W/Z + \text{jets}$), single-top quarks, dibosons, and strong force mediated (QCD) multijets. Table I shows the expected composition of the data sample.

To select events during data taking, we require the presence of a charged lepton (electron e or muon μ) candidate with transverse momentum $p_T \geq 18 \text{ GeV}/c$. We further require that the lepton candidate satisfies identification quality requirements, as in Ref. [17]. We require that \cancel{E}_T be greater than 10, 20, or 25 GeV in events containing a muon candidate, an electron candidate satisfying $|\eta| \leq 1.1$, and an electron candidate satisfying $|\eta| > 1.1$, respectively. These \cancel{E}_T requirements are chosen to optimize the signal selection efficiency and the rejection of instrumental backgrounds, which differ in the three samples. Jets are reconstructed using a cone-based clustering algorithm, with a cone radius [$R = \sqrt{(\Delta\phi)^2 + (\Delta\eta)^2}$] of 0.4 [18]. Jet energies are corrected for instrumental effects [19], and the corrected jets are required to have $E_T > 20 \text{ GeV}$ and $|\eta| < 2.0$. We also reconstruct lower energy clusters ($12 < E_T < 20 \text{ GeV}$) but do not define them as jets. We use two different algorithms to tag b jets, as in Ref. [7]. One algorithm relies on the reconstruction of secondary decay vertices from long-lived hadrons within the jet cone [20], while the other estimates the likelihood that not all tracks in the jet cone intersect the beam line [21]. Jets identified by either algorithm are considered as tagged, offering higher tagging efficiency than obtained by the use of one algorithm alone.

We model the various backgrounds using a combination of Monte Carlo simulation and data. We simulate the $t\bar{t}$, diboson, $W/Z + \text{jets}$, and single-top backgrounds using the POWHEG [22], PYTHIA [23], ALPGEN [24], and MADEVENT [25] generators, respectively. We model the QCD multijet background using a data-driven model [17]. For backgrounds involving top quarks, we have

TABLE I. Expected number of events from the various processes composing our data sample, requiring two or more b tags, with background rates and uncertainties taken from the posterior likelihoods. N.B., all uncertainties are correlated. Signal yields are quoted assuming $m_H = 125 \text{ GeV}/c^2$. The corresponding theoretical uncertainties are taken as 10%, derived from that computed in Ref. [5], accounting for the updated uncertainty due to the measurement of the top-quark mass [17].

Process	4 jets	5 jets	≥ 6 jets
$t\bar{t} + \text{jets}$	962 ± 89	294 ± 27	77 ± 7.1
$t\bar{t} + b\bar{b}$	32 ± 27	17 ± 14	8.2 ± 6.9
$W/Z + \text{jets}$	105 ± 32	26 ± 8.0	7.1 ± 2.2
Multijet	31 ± 16	0.0 ± 1.0	0.0 ± 1.0
Single top	19 ± 2.2	3.7 ± 0.43	0.61 ± 0.070
Diboson	5.2 ± 0.44	1.2 ± 0.11	0.25 ± 0.025
Total background	1150 ± 106	340 ± 33	93 ± 11
Observed	1133	368	114
$t\bar{t}H$	0.65 ± 0.075	1.1 ± 0.13	1.2 ± 0.14
WH	0.52 ± 0.061	0.07 ± 0.008	Negligible
ZH	0.09 ± 0.011	0.02 ± 0.002	Negligible

used $m_t = 172.5 \text{ GeV}/c^2$. Signal models are generated by PYTHIA, with Higgs boson masses in $5 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ increments in the range $100 \leq m_H \leq 150 \text{ GeV}/c^2$. The signal samples are normalized to their next-to-leading-order cross section, as described in Ref. [5]. The CTEQ5L parton-distribution functions [26] and a detailed simulation of the response of the CDF II detector using GEANT3 [27] are employed in all Monte Carlo samples.

The search sample is subdivided into independent categories of different expected signal-to-background ratio and background composition to maximize the search sensitivity [28]. Under the selection requirements described above, the reconstructed jet-multiplicity spectrum in $t\bar{t}H$ events peaks at five jets, while the reconstructed jet-multiplicity spectrum for $t\bar{t}$ peaks at four jets. Hence, we separate events with four, five, or six or more jets. The jet-multiplicity samples are then separated by b -tag multiplicity. The events with six or more jets, at least three of which are b -tagged, feature the largest expected signal-to-background ratio and provide the most sensitivity for a low-mass Higgs boson.

After defining our search sample, we enhance the isolation of a SM Higgs signal using artificial neural networks (NNs) [29]. Each neural network is trained to separate simulated Higgs signal events from background, with individual networks optimized for each Higgs boson mass hypothesis in each of the previously described event categories. Each network uses 18 input variables to discriminate the Higgs boson signal from the backgrounds. These variables are missing transverse energy, maximum jet E_T , second-largest jet E_T , third-largest jet E_T , maximum E_T among b -tagged jets, mean jet E_T , invariant mass of the combination of all objects (jets, leptons, \cancel{E}_T), vector sum of the transverse energies of all objects, scalar sum of the transverse energies of all objects, scalar sum of the transverse energies of all jets, number of energy clusters with E_T between 12 and 20 GeV, minimum separation in η - ϕ space between b -tagged jets, separation in azimuth between the lepton and the missing transverse energy, transverse mass of the lepton and missing transverse energy [30], mass of the vector sum of the lepton and nearest jet in η - ϕ space, minimum mass of the vector sum of any pair of jets, mass of the vector sum of the two non- b -tagged jets with the largest E_T , and mass of the vector sum of the two b -tagged jets with the largest E_T . The modeling of the input distributions has been validated in the subset of the data with only four jets and only two b tags, which is expected to contain a negligible number of signal events relative to the background yield. This region is used to constrain the various systematic uncertainties *in situ*. Two of these distributions can be seen in Figs. 1 and 2, and the output of the discriminant trained to identify a Higgs boson of mass $125 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ is shown in Fig. 3. A more detailed presentation of the modeling of these distributions is contained in Ref [28].

We consider several sources of systematic uncertainty that affect the rate of the involved processes and the shape




FIG. 1 (color online). Invariant mass of the two jets without b tags, in events containing exactly four jets and exactly two b tags. The peak of the distribution is consistent with hadronic decays of the W boson. The effect of systematic uncertainties is not shown. In the signal model shown, a Higgs boson of $m_H = 125 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ is assumed.

of the discriminant distributions. Because of the high jet and b -tag multiplicities considered, the dominant systematic uncertainties are associated with estimates of the b -tag efficiency and the jet-energy scale. These affect both the rates and the discriminant shapes, and we estimate the effects by independently varying the estimated b -tag




FIG. 2 (color online). The mass of the vector sum of the four-momenta of the identified charged lepton, the neutrino, and all reconstructed jets in events with exactly five jets and at least two b tags. The effect of systematic uncertainties is not shown. In the signal model shown, a Higgs boson of $m_H = 125 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ is assumed.




FIG. 3 (color online). The output distribution for the discriminant optimized for the $m_H = 125 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ hypothesis, for events with six or more jets and three or more b tags. The effect of systematic uncertainties is not shown. In the signal model shown, a Higgs boson of $m_H = 125 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ is assumed.

efficiency and the jet-energy scale within 1 standard deviation. These variations in jet-energy scale and tagging efficiency alter the expected acceptance for signal and background by between 1 and 20%, depending on the selection category. In addition, to account for uncertainties on the theoretical cross sections of background processes, we assume the following systematic uncertainties on the normalization of simulated backgrounds: 6% for diboson production, 6% for single-top-quark production, 10% for inclusive $t\bar{t}$ production, and 40% for $W/Z + \text{jets}$ [31–34]. Smaller uncertainties include those on the amount of initial- and final-state radiation, parton-distribution function choice, the probability to b -tag light-quark jets, and a 6% uncertainty on the measurement of the integrated luminosity [28,35]. The total theoretical uncertainty on the signal samples is estimated to be 10%, as derived from that computed in Ref. [5], but accounting for a reduced uncertainty due to the measurement of the top-quark mass [17].

No measurement is available of the cross section for top-quark production with additional b quarks generated from QCD radiation. The next-to-leading-order corrections to leading-order calculations of the production rate of top-quark pairs with additional b quarks have been estimated to be on the order of a factor of 2 in some regions of phase space [36]. To account for this unknown and potentially large systematic uncertainty, inclusive $t\bar{t}$ simulated events were separated into subsamples with additional b quarks generated from QCD radiation ($t\bar{t} + b\bar{b}$) and without ($t\bar{t} + \text{jets}$). We assume an uncertainty of 10% on the normalization of the $t\bar{t} + \text{jets}$ component and assume an uncertainty of 100% on the normalization of the $t\bar{t} + b\bar{b}$ component. We estimate the effect of individual systematic




FIG. 4 (color online). Expected and observed 95% C.L. upper limit as a function of Higgs boson mass for $100 \leq m_H \leq 150 \text{ GeV}/c^2$.

uncertainties by calculating the expected exclusion sensitivity considering all uncertainties and then comparing this value to that derived by considering all but one uncertainty. The uncertainty due to the jet-energy scale, b -tag efficiency, inclusive top pair cross section, and potential next-to-leading-order effects for $t\bar{t} + b\bar{b}$ individually degrade the expected exclusion sensitivity of the analysis by 7.8%, 5.4%, 6.9%, and 9.0%, respectively.

We compare the distribution of discriminant output observed in data to that of the expected background model. Observing no evidence for Higgs boson production in the discriminant distributions, we calculate a Bayesian 95% credibility-level (C.L.) limit for each mass hypothesis using the combined binned likelihood of the NN output distributions. Each of the three jet-multiplicity categories is subdivided into five independent tagging categories. A posterior density is obtained by multiplying this likelihood by Gaussian prior densities for the background normalizations and systematic uncertainties, leaving the cross section $\sigma(t\bar{t}H \rightarrow \ell + \cancel{E}_T + \text{jets})$ with a uniform prior density, with priors truncated to prevent negative predictions. A 95% C.L. limit is determined such that 95% of the posterior density for the cross section accumulates below the limit [37]. The expected limits with one and two standard deviation uncertainty bands and the observed limits are shown as a function of assumed Higgs boson mass in Fig. 4. Because none of the discriminant function input variables act as an estimator for the reconstructed Higgs boson mass, the upper limits at different candidate Higgs boson masses are strongly correlated. An excess in the data produces an observed limit that exceeds the expected limit at all masses, at a level of approximately 1 standard deviation compared to the background-only hypotheses.

In conclusion, we have presented a search for a SM Higgs boson produced in association with a pair of top

quarks, in a final state involving a lepton, missing transverse energy, jets, and b -tagged jets. For a Higgs boson mass of $125 \text{ GeV}/c^2$, we expect a limit of 12.6 and observe a limit of 20.5 times the SM rate, which represents agreement with the background-only prediction at the level of approximately 1 standard deviation. The introduction of neural networks and other improvements to the techniques employed in this analysis produce a factor of 17 improvement in sensitivity over the previous search in this channel at CDF [9] and make this analysis the most sensitive search for $t\bar{t}H$ to date.

We thank the Fermilab staff and the technical staffs of the participating institutions for their vital contributions. This work was supported by the U.S. Department of Energy and National Science Foundation; the Italian Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare; the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology of Japan; the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada; the National Science Council of the Republic of China; the Swiss National Science Foundation; the A.P. Sloan Foundation; the Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung, Germany; the Korean World Class University Program and the National Research Foundation of Korea; the Science and Technology Facilities Council and the Royal Society, U.K.; the Russian Foundation for Basic Research; the Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación and the Programa Consolider-Ingenio 2010, Spain; the Slovak R&D Agency; the Academy of Finland; and the Australian Research Council (ARC).

^aDeceased

^bVisitor from Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, Sezione di Cagliari, 09042 Monserrato (Cagliari), Italy.

^cVisitor from University of California, Irvine, Irvine, CA 92697, USA.

^dVisitor from University of California, Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, CA 93106, USA.

^eVisitor from University of California, Santa Cruz, Santa Cruz, CA 95064, USA.

^fVisitor from Institute of Physics, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, Prague 182 21, Czech Republic.

^gVisitor from CERN, CH-1211 Geneva, Switzerland.

^hVisitor from Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853, USA.

ⁱVisitor from University of Cyprus, Nicosia CY-1678, Cyprus.

^jVisitor from Office of Science, US Department of Energy, Washington, DC, 20585, USA.

^kVisitor from University College Dublin, Dublin 4, Ireland.

^lVisitor from ETH, 8092 Zurich, Switzerland.

^mVisitor from University of Fukui, Fukui City, Fukui Prefecture, 910-0017, Japan.

ⁿVisitor from Universidad Iberoamericana, Mexico, Distrito Federal, 01219, Mexico.

^oVisitor from University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA 52242, USA.

^pVisitor from Kinki University, Higashi-Osaka City 577-8502, Japan.

^qVisitor from Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS 66506, USA.

^rVisitor from Ewha Womans University, Seoul, 120-750, Korea.

^sVisitor from University of Manchester, Manchester M13 9PL, United Kingdom.

^tVisitor from Queen Mary, University of London, London, E1 4NS, United Kingdom.

^uVisitor from University of Melbourne, Victoria 3010, Australia.

^vVisitor from Muons, Inc., Batavia, IL 60510, USA.

^wVisitor from Nagasaki Institute of Applied Science, Nagasaki 851-0193, Japan.

^xVisitor from National Research Nuclear University, Moscow 115409, Russia.

^yVisitor from Northwestern University, Evanston, IL 60208, USA.

^zVisitor from University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN 46556, USA.

^{aa}Visitor from Universidad de Oviedo, E-33007 Oviedo, Spain.

^{bb}Visitor from CNRS-IN2P3, Paris, F-75205, France.

^{cc}Visitor from Texas Tech University, Lubbock, TX 79609, USA.

^{dd}Visitor from Universidad Tecnica Federico Santa Maria, 110v Valparaiso, Chile.

^{ee}Visitor from Yarmouk University, Irbid 211-63, Jordan.

^{ff}<http://www-cdf.fnal.gov>

- [1] F. Englert and R. Brout, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **13**, 321 (1964); P. W. Higgs, *ibid.* **13**, 508 (1964); G. S. Guralnik, C. R. Hagen, and T. W. B. Kibble, *ibid.* **13**, 585 (1964).
- [2] S. Glashow, *Nucl. Phys.* **22**, 579 (1961); S. Weinberg, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **19**, 1264 (1967); A. Salam, *Elementary Particle Theory*, edited by N. Svartholm (Almqvist and Wiksells, Stockholm, 1968), p. 367.
- [3] T. Aaltonen *et al.* (CDF Collaboration and D0 Collaboration), [arXiv:1207.6436](https://arxiv.org/abs/1207.6436) [*Phys. Rev. Lett.* (to be published)].
- [4] S. Chatrchyan *et al.* (CMS Collaboration), *Phys. Lett. B* **716**, 30 (2012); G. Aad *et al.* (ATLAS Collaboration), *ibid.* **716**, 1 (2012).
- [5] L. Reina, S. Dawson, and D. Wackerroth, *Phys. Rev. D* **65**, 053017 (2002).
- [6] W. Beenakker, S. Dittmaier, M. Krämer, B. Plümper, M. Spira, and P. M. Zerwas, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87**, 201805 (2001).
- [7] T. Aaltonen *et al.* (CDF Collaboration), *Phys. Rev. D* **85**, 072001 (2012).
- [8] B. A. Dobrescu, K. Kong, and R. Mahbubani, *J. High Energy Phys.* **06** (2009) 001.
- [9] S. Lai, Ph.D. thesis, University of Toronto, (Report No. FERMILAB-THESIS-2006-83, 2006).
- [10] D. E. Acosta *et al.* (CDF Collaboration), *Phys. Rev. D* **71**, 032001 (2005).
- [11] A. Sill *et al.*, *Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A* **447**, 1 (2000); A. Affolder *et al.*, *ibid.* **453**, 84 (2000); C. S. Hill *et al.*, *ibid.* **511**, 118 (2003).

- [12] A. Affolder *et al.*, *Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A* **526**, 249 (2004).
- [13] L. Balka *et al.*, *Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A* **267**, 272 (1988); M.G. Albrow *et al.*, *ibid.* **480**, 524 (2002).
- [14] S. Bertolucci *et al.*, *Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A* **267**, 301 (1988).
- [15] G. Ascoli, L.E. Holloway, I. Karliner, U.E. Kruse, R.D. Sard, V.J. Simaitis, D.A. Smith, and T.K. Westhusing, *Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A* **268**, 33 (1988).
- [16] The calorimeter missing E_T [$\cancel{E}_T(\text{cal})$] is defined by the sum over calorimeter towers, $\cancel{E}_T(\text{cal}) = -\sum_i E_T^i \hat{n}_i$, where i is the calorimeter tower number with $|\eta| < 3.6$ and \hat{n}_i is a unit vector perpendicular to the beam axis and pointing at the i th calorimeter tower. The reconstructed missing transverse energy, \cancel{E}_T , is derived by subtracting from $\cancel{E}_T(\text{cal})$ components of the event not registered by the calorimeter, such as muons and jet-energy adjustments. \cancel{E}_T is the scalar magnitude of \cancel{E}_T .
- [17] CDF and D0 Collaborations and Tevatron Electroweak Working Group, [arXiv:1207.1069](https://arxiv.org/abs/1207.1069).
- [18] F. Abe *et al.* (CDF Collaboration), *Phys. Rev. D* **45**, 1448 (1992).
- [19] A. Bhatti *et al.*, *Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A* **566**, 375 (2006).
- [20] D. Acosta *et al.* (CDF Collaboration), *Phys. Rev. D* **71**, 052003 (2005).
- [21] A. Abulencia *et al.* (CDF Collaboration), *Phys. Rev. D* **74**, 072006 (2006).
- [22] S. Frixione, P. Nason, and G. Ridolfi, *J. High Energy Phys.* **09** (2007) 126.
- [23] T. Sjöstrand, S. Mrenna, and P. Skands, *J. High Energy Phys.* **05** (2006) 026. We use PYTHIA version 6.216 to generate the Higgs boson signals.
- [24] M. Mangano, M. Moretti, F. Piccinini, R. Pittau, and A. Polosa, *J. High Energy Phys.* **07** (2003) 001.
- [25] J. Alwall, P. Demin, S. de Visscher, R. Frederix, M. Herquet, F. Maltoni, T. Plehn, D. Rainwater, and T. Stelzer, *J. High Energy Phys.* **09** (2007) 028.
- [26] H.L. Lai, J. Huston, S. Kuhlmann, J. Morfin, F. Olness, J.F. Owens, J. Pumplin, and W.K. Tung (CTEQ Collaboration), *Eur. Phys. J. C* **12**, 375 (2000).
- [27] R. Brun *et al.*, CERN Report No. CERN-DD/EE/84-1, 1987.
- [28] J.S. Wilson, Ph.D. thesis, The Ohio State University (Report No. FERMILAB-THESIS-2011-44, 2011).
- [29] C. Peterson, T. Rognvaldsson, and L. Lonnblad, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **81**, 185 (1994).
- [30] J. Smith, W.L. van Neerven, and J.A.M. Vermaseren, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **50**, 1738 (1983).
- [31] J. Campbell and R.K. Ellis, *Phys. Rev. D* **65**, 113007 (2002).
- [32] T. Aaltonen *et al.* (CDF Collaboration), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104**, 131801 (2010).
- [33] M. Cacciari, S. Frixione, G. Ridolfi, M.L. Mangano, and P. Nason, *J. High Energy Phys.* **04** (2004) 068.
- [34] B.W. Harris, E. Laenen, L. Phaf, Z. Sullivan, and S. Weinzierl, *Phys. Rev. D* **66**, 054024 (2002).
- [35] D. Acosta *et al.*, *Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A* **494**, 57 (2002).
- [36] A. Bredenstein, A. Denner, S. Dittmaier, and S. Pozzorini, *Nucl. Phys. B, Proc. Suppl.* **205**, 80 (2010).
- [37] K. Nakamura *et al.* (Particle Data Group), *J. Phys. G* **37**, 075021 (2010).