

Production of doubly charged scalars from the decay of singly charged scalars in the Higgs Triplet Model

A.G. Akeroyd*

*NExT Institute and School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Southampton
Highfield, Southampton SO17 1BJ, United Kingdom*

Hiroaki Sugiyama†

Department of Physics, Ritsumeikan University, Kusatsu, Shiga 525-8577, Japan

(Dated: February 17, 2022)

Abstract

The existence of doubly charged Higgs bosons ($H^{\pm\pm}$) is a distinctive feature of the Higgs Triplet Model (HTM), in which neutrinos obtain tree-level masses from the vacuum expectation value of a neutral scalar in a triplet representation of $SU(2)_L$. We point out that a large branching ratio for the decay of a singly charged Higgs boson to a doubly charged Higgs boson via $H^\pm \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm}W^*$ is possible in a sizeable parameter space of the HTM. From the production mechanism $q'\bar{q} \rightarrow W^* \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm}H^\mp$ the above decay mode would give rise to pair production of $H^{\pm\pm}$, with a cross section which can be comparable to that of the standard pair-production mechanism $q\bar{q} \rightarrow \gamma^*, Z^* \rightarrow H^{++}H^{--}$. We suggest that the presence of a sizeable branching ratio for $H^\pm \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm}W^*$ could significantly enhance the detection prospects of $H^{\pm\pm}$ in the four-lepton channel. Moreover, the decays $H^0 \rightarrow H^\pm W^*$ and $A^0 \rightarrow H^\pm W^*$ from production of the neutral triplet scalars H^0 and A^0 would also provide an additional source of H^\pm , which can subsequently decay to $H^{\pm\pm}$.

PACS numbers: 14.80.Fd, 12.60.Fr, 14.60.Pq

*Electronic address: a.g.akeroyd@soton.ac.uk

†Electronic address: hiroaki@fc.ritsumeai.ac.jp

I. INTRODUCTION

The established evidence that neutrinos oscillate and possess small masses [1] necessitates physics beyond the Standard Model (SM), which could manifest itself at the CERN Large Hadron Collider (LHC) and/or in low energy experiments which search for the lepton flavour violation [2]. Consequently, models of neutrino mass generation which can be probed at present and forthcoming experiments are of great phenomenological interest.

Neutrinos may obtain mass via the vacuum expectation value (vev) of a neutral Higgs boson in an isospin triplet representation [3–7]. A particularly simple implementation of this mechanism of neutrino mass generation is the “Higgs Triplet Model” (HTM) in which the SM Lagrangian is augmented solely by Δ which is a $SU(2)_L$ triplet of scalar particles with hypercharge $Y = 2$ [3, 6, 7]. In the HTM, the Majorana neutrino mass matrix $m_{\ell\ell'}$ ($\ell, \ell' = e, \mu, \tau$) is given by the product of a triplet Yukawa coupling matrix $h_{\ell\ell'}$ and a triplet vev (v_Δ). Consequently, the direct connection between $h_{\ell\ell'}$ and $m_{\ell\ell'}$ gives rise to phenomenological predictions for processes which depend on $h_{\ell\ell'}$ because $m_{\ell\ell'}$ has been restricted well by neutrino oscillation measurements [1, 8–12]. A distinctive signal of the HTM would be the observation of doubly charged Higgs bosons ($H^{\pm\pm}$) whose mass ($m_{H^{\pm\pm}}$) may be of the order of the electroweak scale. Such particles can be produced with sizeable rates at hadron colliders in the processes $q\bar{q} \rightarrow \gamma^*, Z^* \rightarrow H^{++}H^{--}$ [13–17] and $q'\bar{q} \rightarrow W^* \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm}H^\mp$ [13, 18, 19]. The first searches for $H^{\pm\pm}$ at a hadron collider were carried out at the Fermilab Tevatron, assuming the production channel $q\bar{q} \rightarrow \gamma^*, Z^* \rightarrow H^{++}H^{--}$ and decay $H^{\pm\pm} \rightarrow \ell^\pm\ell'^\pm$. The mass limits $m_{H^{\pm\pm}} > 110 \rightarrow 150$ GeV [20, 21] were derived, with the strongest limits being for $\ell = e, \mu$ [20]. The branching ratios (BRs) for $H^{\pm\pm} \rightarrow \ell^\pm\ell'^\pm$ depend on $h_{\ell\ell'}$ and are predicted in the HTM in terms of the parameters of the neutrino mass matrix [19, 22, 23]. Detailed quantitative studies of $\text{BR}(H^{\pm\pm} \rightarrow \ell^\pm\ell'^\pm)$ in the HTM have been performed in [24–27] with particular emphasis given to their sensitivity to the Majorana phases and the absolute neutrino mass i.e. parameters which cannot be probed in neutrino oscillation experiments. A study on the relation between $\text{BR}(H^{\pm\pm} \rightarrow \ell^\pm\ell'^\pm)$ and the neutrinoless double beta decay can be seen in [28]. Simulations of the detection prospects of $H^{\pm\pm}$ at the LHC with $\sqrt{s} = 14$ TeV previously focussed on $q\bar{q} \rightarrow \gamma^*, Z^* \rightarrow H^{++}H^{--}$ only [29], but recent studies now include the mechanism $q'\bar{q} \rightarrow W^* \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm}H^\mp$ [27, 30, 31]. The first search for $H^{\pm\pm}$ at the LHC with $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV [32] has recently been performed for both production mechanisms $q\bar{q} \rightarrow \gamma^*, Z^* \rightarrow H^{++}H^{--}$ and $q'\bar{q} \rightarrow W^* \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm}H^\mp$, for the decay channels $H^{\pm\pm} \rightarrow \ell^\pm\ell'^\pm$ and $H^\pm \rightarrow \ell^\pm\nu_{\ell'}$.

In phenomenological studies of the HTM, for simplicity it is sometimes assumed that $H^{\pm\pm}$ and H^\pm are degenerate, with a mass M which arises from a bilinear term $M^2\text{Tr}(\Delta^\dagger\Delta)$ in the scalar potential. In this scenario the only possible decay channels for $H^{\pm\pm}$ are $H^{\pm\pm} \rightarrow \ell^\pm\ell'^\pm$ and $H^{\pm\pm} \rightarrow W^\pm W^\pm$, and the branching ratios are determined by the magnitude of v_Δ . However, quartic terms in the scalar potential break the degeneracy of $H^{\pm\pm}$ and H^\pm , and induce a mass splitting $\Delta M \equiv m_{H^{\pm\pm}} - m_{H^\pm}$, which can be of either sign. If $m_{H^{\pm\pm}} > m_{H^\pm}$ then a new decay channel becomes available for $H^{\pm\pm}$, namely $H^{\pm\pm} \rightarrow H^\pm W^*$. Some attention has been given to the decay $H^{\pm\pm} \rightarrow H^\pm W^*$, and it has been shown that it can be the dominant channel over a wide range of values of ΔM and v_Δ [19, 23, 27, 33], even for $\Delta M \ll m_W$.

Another scenario is the case of $m_{H^\pm} > m_{H^{\pm\pm}}$, which would give rise to a new decay channel for the singly charged scalar, namely $H^\pm \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm}W^*$. This possibility has been mentioned in the context of the HTM in [23] only. We will perform the first study of the

magnitude of its branching ratio, as well as quantify its contribution to the production of $H^{\pm\pm}$ at the LHC.¹ The decay rate for $H^\pm \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm}W^*$ is easily obtained from the corresponding expression for the decay rate for $H^{\pm\pm} \rightarrow H^\pm W^*$, and thus one expects that $H^\pm \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm}W^*$ will be sizeable over a wide range of values of ΔM and v_Δ . We point out for the first time that the decay $H^\pm \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm}W^*$ would give rise to an alternative way to produce $H^{\pm\pm}$ in pairs ($H^{++}H^{--}$), namely by the production mechanism $q'\bar{q} \rightarrow W^* \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm}H^\mp$ followed by $H^\mp \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm}W^*$. Production of $H^{++}H^{--}$ can give rise to a distinctive signature of four leptons ($\ell^+\ell^+\ell^-\ell^-$), and simulations and searches of this channel currently only assume production via the process $q\bar{q} \rightarrow \gamma^*, Z^* \rightarrow H^{++}H^{--}$.

Our work is organised as follows. In section II we describe the theoretical structure of the HTM. In section III the decay $H^\pm \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm}W^*$ is introduced. Section IV contains our numerical analysis of the magnitude of the cross section for $H^{++}H^{--}$ which originates from production via $q'\bar{q} \rightarrow W^* \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm}H^\mp$ followed by the decay $H^\pm \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm}W^*$. Conclusions are given in section V.

II. THE HIGGS TRIPLET MODEL

In the HTM [3, 6, 7] a $Y = 2$ complex $SU(2)_L$ isospin triplet of scalar fields is added to the SM Lagrangian. Such a model can provide Majorana masses for the observed neutrinos without the introduction of $SU(2)_L$ singlet neutrinos via the gauge invariant Yukawa interaction:

$$\mathcal{L} = h_{\ell\ell'} L_\ell^T C i\tau_2 \Delta L_{\ell'} + \text{h.c.} \quad (1)$$

Here $h_{\ell\ell'} (\ell, \ell' = e, \mu, \tau)$ is a complex and symmetric coupling, C is the Dirac charge conjugation operator, τ_i is the Pauli matrix, $L_\ell = (\nu_{\ell L}, \ell_L)^T$ is a left-handed lepton doublet, and Δ is a 2×2 representation of the $Y = 2$ complex triplet fields:

$$\Delta = \begin{pmatrix} \Delta^+/\sqrt{2} & \Delta^{++} \\ \Delta^0 & -\Delta^+/\sqrt{2} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2)$$

A non-zero triplet vacuum expectation value $\langle \Delta^0 \rangle$ gives rise to the following mass matrix for neutrinos:

$$m_{\ell\ell'} = 2h_{\ell\ell'} \langle \Delta^0 \rangle = \sqrt{2}h_{\ell\ell'} v_\Delta. \quad (3)$$

The necessary non-zero v_Δ arises from the minimisation of the most general $SU(2)_L \otimes U(1)_Y$ invariant Higgs potential [7, 35], which is written² as follows [22, 23] (with $\Phi = (\phi^+, \phi^0)^T$):

$$\begin{aligned} V = & m^2(\Phi^\dagger\Phi) + \lambda_1(\Phi^\dagger\Phi)^2 + M^2\text{Tr}(\Delta^\dagger\Delta) + \lambda_2[\text{Tr}(\Delta^\dagger\Delta)]^2 + \lambda_3\text{Det}(\Delta^\dagger\Delta) \\ & + \lambda_4(\Phi^\dagger\Phi)\text{Tr}(\Delta^\dagger\Delta) + \lambda_5(\Phi^\dagger\tau_i\Phi)\text{Tr}(\Delta^\dagger\tau_i\Delta) + \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\mu(\Phi^T i\tau_2 \Delta^\dagger\Phi) + \text{h.c.} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

¹ The decay $H^\pm \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm}W^*$ has also been briefly mentioned in [34] in the context of a model with an isospin 3/2 multiplet with hypercharge $Y = 3$, which also includes triply charged Higgs bosons.

² One may rewrite the potential in eq. (4) by using $2\text{Det}(\Delta^\dagger\Delta) = [\text{Tr}(\Delta^\dagger\Delta)]^2 - \text{Tr}[(\Delta^\dagger\Delta)^2]$ and $(\Phi^\dagger\tau_i\Phi)\text{Tr}(\Delta^\dagger\tau_i\Delta) = 2\Phi^\dagger\Delta\Delta^\dagger\Phi - (\Phi^\dagger\Phi)\text{Tr}(\Delta^\dagger\Delta)$.

Here $m^2 < 0$ in order to ensure $\langle \phi^0 \rangle = v/\sqrt{2}$ which spontaneously breaks $SU(2) \otimes U(1)_Y$ to $U(1)_Q$, and $M^2 (> 0)$ is the mass term for the triplet scalars. In the model of Gelmini-Roncadelli [35] the term $\mu(\Phi^T i\tau_2 \Delta^\dagger \Phi)$ is absent, which leads to spontaneous violation of lepton number for $M^2 < 0$. The resulting Higgs spectrum contains a massless triplet scalar (majoron, J) and another light scalar (H^0). Pair production via $e^+e^- \rightarrow H^0 J$ would give a large contribution to the invisible width of the Z and this model was excluded at the CERN Large Electron Positron Collider (LEP). The inclusion of the term $\mu(\Phi^T i\tau_2 \Delta^\dagger \Phi)$ [7] explicitly breaks lepton number $L\#$ when Δ is assigned $L\# = -2$, and eliminates the majoron. Thus the scalar potential in eq. (4) together with the triplet Yukawa interaction of eq. (1) lead to a phenomenologically viable model of neutrino mass generation. For small v_Δ/v , the expression for v_Δ resulting from the minimisation of V is:

$$v_\Delta \simeq \frac{\mu v^2}{2M^2 + (\lambda_4 + \lambda_5)v^2} . \quad (5)$$

For large M compared to v one has $v_\Delta \simeq \mu v^2/2M^2$, which is sometimes referred to as the ‘‘Type II seesaw mechanism’’ and would naturally lead to a small v_Δ . Recently there has been much interest in the scenario of light triplet scalars ($M \approx v$) within the discovery reach of the LHC, for which eq. (5) leads to $v_\Delta \approx \mu$. In extensions of the HTM the term $\mu(\Phi^T i\tau_2 \Delta^\dagger \Phi)$ may arise in various ways: i) it can be generated at tree level via the vev of a Higgs singlet field [36]; ii) it can arise at higher orders in perturbation theory [23]; iii) it can originate in the context of extra dimensions [22].

An upper limit on v_Δ can be obtained from considering its effect on the parameter $\rho (= M_W^2/M_Z^2 \cos^2 \theta_W)$. In the SM $\rho = 1$ at tree-level, while in the HTM one has (where $x = v_\Delta/v$):

$$\rho \equiv 1 + \delta\rho = \frac{1 + 2x^2}{1 + 4x^2} . \quad (6)$$

The measurement $\rho \approx 1$ leads to the bound $v_\Delta/v \lesssim 0.03$, or $v_\Delta \lesssim 8 \text{ GeV}$. Production mechanisms which depend on v_Δ (i.e. $pp \rightarrow W^{\pm*} \rightarrow W^\mp H^{\pm\pm}$ and fusion via $W^{\pm*}W^{\pm*} \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm}$ [17, 37, 38]) are not competitive with the processes $q\bar{q} \rightarrow \gamma^*, Z^* \rightarrow H^{++}H^{--}$ and $q'\bar{q} \rightarrow W^* \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm}H^\mp$ at the energies of the Fermilab Tevatron, but such mechanisms can be the dominant source of $H^{\pm\pm}$ at the LHC if $v_\Delta = \mathcal{O}(1) \text{ GeV}$ and $m_{H^{\pm\pm}} > 500 \text{ GeV}$. At the 1-loop level, v_Δ must be renormalised and explicit analyses lead to bounds on its magnitude similar to the above bound from the tree-level analysis, e.g. see [39].

The scalar eigenstates in the HTM are as follows: i) the charged scalars $H^{\pm\pm}$ and H^\pm ; ii) the CP-even neutral scalars h^0 and H^0 ; iii) a CP-odd neutral scalar A^0 . The doubly charged $H^{\pm\pm}$ is entirely composed of the triplet scalar field $\Delta^{\pm\pm}$, while the remaining eigenstates are in general mixtures of the doublet and triplet fields. However, such mixing is proportional to the triplet vev, and hence small *even if* v_Δ assumes its largest value of a few GeV.³ Therefore H^\pm, H^0, A^0 are predominantly composed of the triplet fields, while h^0 is predominantly composed of the doublet field and plays the role of the SM Higgs boson. The scale of squared masses of $H^{\pm\pm}, H^\pm, H^0, A^0$ are determined by $M^2 + \lambda_4 v^2/2$ with mass splittings of

³ A large mixing angle is possible in the CP-even sector provided that $m_{h^0} \sim m_{H^0}$ [40, 41].

order $\lambda_5 v^2$ [22, 23, 41]:

$$\begin{aligned} m_{H^{\pm\pm}}^2 &\simeq m_{H^\pm}^2 - \frac{\lambda_5}{2} v^2, \\ m_{H^\pm}^2 &\simeq M^2 + \frac{\lambda_4}{2} v^2, \\ m_{H^0, A^0}^2 &\simeq m_{H^\pm}^2 + \frac{\lambda_5}{2} v^2. \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

The degeneracy $m_{H^0} \simeq m_{A^0}$ can be understood by the fact that the Higgs potential is invariant under a global $U(1)$ for Δ ($L\#$ conservation) when one neglects the trilinear term proportional to μ .

The mass hierarchy $m_{H^{\pm\pm}} < m_{H^\pm} < m_{H^0, A^0}$ is obtained for $\lambda_5 > 0$, and the opposite hierarchy $m_{H^{\pm\pm}} > m_{H^\pm} > m_{H^0, A^0}$ is obtained for $\lambda_5 < 0$. In general, one would not expect degenerate masses for $H^{\pm\pm}, H^\pm, H^0, A^0$, but instead one of the above two mass hierarchies. The sign of λ_5 is not fixed by theoretical requirements of vacuum stability of the scalar potential [42], although $|\lambda_5| < 2m_{H^\pm}^2/v^2$ is necessary to ensure that $m_{H^{\pm\pm}}^2$ and m_{H^0, A^0}^2 in eq. (8) are positive. Therefore the decays channels $H^\pm \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm} W^*$ and $H^{\pm\pm} \rightarrow H^\pm W^*$ are possible in the HTM.

III. THE DECAY $H^\pm \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm} W^*$ AND PRODUCTION OF $H^{++} H^{--}$ FROM $q'\bar{q} \rightarrow W^* \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm} H^\mp$

The potential importance of the decay channel $H^\pm \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm} W^*$ (for $m_{H^\pm} > m_{H^{\pm\pm}}$) has not been quantified in the HTM. For this decay to be kinematically open [23] one needs the mass hierarchy where $H^{\pm\pm}$ is the lightest of the triplet scalars ($m_{H^{\pm\pm}} < m_{H^\pm} < m_{H^0, A^0}$), which is obtained for $\lambda_5 > 0$. For the opposite mass hierarchy with $\lambda_5 < 0$ ($m_{H^{\pm\pm}} > m_{H^\pm} > m_{H^0, A^0}$) the related decay $H^{\pm\pm} \rightarrow H^\pm W^*$ was shown to be important in the HTM in [19, 23, 27, 33]. The expression for the decay width of $H^\pm \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm} W^*$ is easily obtained from the expression for $H^{\pm\pm} \rightarrow H^\pm W^*$ by merely interchanging $m_{H^{\pm\pm}}$ and m_{H^\pm} . After summing over all fermion states for $W^* \rightarrow f'\bar{f}$, excluding the t quark, the decay rate is given by

$$\Gamma(H^\pm \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm} W^* \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm} f'\bar{f}) \simeq \frac{9G_F^2 m_W^4 m_{H^\pm}}{4\pi^3} \int_0^{1-\kappa_{H^{\pm\pm}}} dx_2 \int_{1-x_2-\kappa_{H^{\pm\pm}}}^{1-\frac{\kappa_{H^{\pm\pm}}}{1-x_2}} dx_1 F_{H^{\pm\pm} W}(x_1, x_2), \tag{8}$$

where $\kappa_{H^{\pm\pm}} \equiv m_{H^{\pm\pm}}/m_{H^\pm}$ and the analytical expression for $F_{ij}(x_1, x_2)$ can be found in [43] (see also [44]). Note that this decay mode does not depend on v_Δ . In eq. (8) we take f' and \bar{f} to be massless, which is a good approximation as long as the mass splitting between $m_{H^{\pm\pm}}$ and m_{H^\pm} is above the mass of the charmed hadrons (~ 2 GeV). In our numerical analysis we will be mostly concerned with sizeable mass splittings, $m_{H^\pm} - m_{H^{\pm\pm}} \gg 2$ GeV.

The other possible decays for H^\pm are $H^\pm \rightarrow \ell^\pm \nu_{\ell'}$, $H^\pm \rightarrow W^\pm Z$, $H^\pm \rightarrow W^\pm h^0$ (where h^0 is the SM-like scalar field) and $H^\pm \rightarrow \bar{t}b$. Explicit expressions for the decay widths of these channels can be found in the literature (e.g. [27, 37, 45]) and they are presented below. The decay width for $H^\pm \rightarrow \ell^\pm \nu_{\ell'}$ is given by

$$\Gamma(H^\pm \rightarrow \ell^\pm \nu) \equiv \sum_{\ell, \ell'} \Gamma(H^\pm \rightarrow \ell^\pm \nu_{\ell'}) \simeq \frac{m_{H^\pm} \sum_i m_i^2}{16\pi v_\Delta^2}. \tag{9}$$

Note that $\Gamma(H^\pm \rightarrow \ell^\pm \nu)$ has no dependence on the neutrino mixing angles because $\sum_{\ell, \ell'} |h_{\ell \ell'}|^2 = \sum_i m_i^2 / (2v_\Delta^2)$, where m_i ($i = 1-3$) are neutrino masses. The decay widths for the channels which are proportional to v_Δ^2 are expressed as follows:

$$\Gamma(H^\pm \rightarrow W^\pm Z) \simeq \frac{v_\Delta^2 G_F^2 m_{H^\pm}^3}{4\pi} [\beta(m_{H^\pm}, m_W, m_Z)]^3, \quad (10)$$

$$\Gamma(H^\pm \rightarrow W^\pm h^0) \simeq \frac{v_\Delta^2 G_F^2 m_{H^\pm}^3}{4\pi} \left(\frac{2m_{H^\pm}^2 - \lambda_4 v^2}{m_{H^\pm}^2 - m_h^2} - 1 \right)^2 [\beta(m_{H^\pm}, m_W, m_h)]^3, \quad (11)$$

$$\Gamma(H^\pm \rightarrow \bar{t}b) \simeq \frac{3v_\Delta^2 G_F^2 m_t^2 m_{H^\pm}}{2\pi} \left(1 - \frac{m_t^2}{m_{H^\pm}^2} \right)^2, \quad (12)$$

$$\beta(m_1, m_2, m_3) \equiv \sqrt{1 - \frac{(m_2 + m_3)^2}{m_1^2}} \sqrt{1 - \frac{(m_2 - m_3)^2}{m_1^2}}. \quad (13)$$

The decay $H^\pm \rightarrow W^\pm h^0$ is caused by two small mixings of scalar fields. One is the mixing angle $\theta_\pm \simeq \sqrt{2}v_\Delta/v$ between ϕ^\pm and Δ^\pm , and the other is the mixing angle $\theta_0 \simeq (2m_{H^\pm}^2 - \lambda_4 v^2)v_\Delta / ((m_{H^0}^2 - m_h^2)v)$ between $\text{Re}(\phi^0)$ and $\text{Re}(\Delta^0)$. If $M \gg v$, then one has $(2m_{H^\pm}^2 - \lambda_4 v^2)/(m_{H^0}^2 - m_h^2) \simeq 2$ in eq. (11). Since we are interested in the case where the exotic scalars have masses of the electroweak scale, we do not take a very large M . However, we assume $(2m_{H^\pm}^2 - \lambda_4 v^2)/(m_{H^0}^2 - m_h^2) \simeq 2$ for simplicity, which can be achieved by $\lambda_4 \simeq 2(m_{H^\pm}^2 - m_{H^0}^2 + m_h^2)/v^2$. The decay $H^\pm \rightarrow \bar{t}b$ is mediated by the small ϕ^\pm component of H^\pm through θ_\pm . For $m_{H^\pm} = \mathcal{O}(100)$ GeV, $\Gamma(H^\pm \rightarrow \bar{t}b) \propto m_t^2 m_{H^\pm}$ is comparable to $\Gamma(H^\pm \rightarrow W^\pm Z)$ and $\Gamma(H^\pm \rightarrow W^\pm h^0) \propto m_{H^\pm}^3$. These three decay widths in eq. (10)-(12) are greater than $\Gamma(H^\pm \rightarrow \ell \nu)$ for $v_\Delta \gtrsim 0.1$ MeV while $\Gamma(H^\pm \rightarrow \ell \nu)$ dominates for $v_\Delta \lesssim 0.1$ MeV.

It has already been shown that the decay $H^{\pm\pm} \rightarrow H^\pm W^*$ can be the dominant decay channel for the doubly charged scalar over a wide range of values of $\Delta M \equiv m_{H^{\pm\pm}} - m_{H^\pm}$ and v_Δ [19, 23, 27, 33], even for $\Delta M \ll m_W$. Hence we expect a similar result for the decay $H^\pm \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm} W^*$ for the singly charged scalar. The branching ratio $\text{BR}(H^\pm \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm} W^*)$ will be maximised with respect to v_Δ if $\Gamma(H^\pm \rightarrow \ell^\pm \nu) = \Gamma(H^\pm \rightarrow W^\pm Z) + \Gamma(H^\pm \rightarrow W^\pm h^0) + \Gamma(H^\pm \rightarrow \bar{t}b)$ which is achieved for $v_\Delta \simeq 0.1$ MeV. A numerical study of the magnitude of $\text{BR}(H^\pm \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm} W^*)$ is presented in the next section.

We now emphasise an important phenomenological difference between the distinct scenarios of a sizeable branching ratio for the decay channels $H^{\pm\pm} \rightarrow H^\pm W^*$ (for $\lambda_5 < 0$) and $H^\pm \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm} W^*$ (for $\lambda_5 > 0$). The decay $H^{\pm\pm} \rightarrow H^\pm W^*$ is expected to weaken the discovery potential of $H^{\pm\pm}$ at the LHC, because it would reduce the branching ratio of a channel like $H^{\pm\pm} \rightarrow \ell^\pm \ell'^\pm$ (which is otherwise the dominant channel for $v_\Delta \lesssim 0.1$ MeV, and enjoys low SM backgrounds). We note that there has been no simulation of the detection prospects of $H^{\pm\pm} \rightarrow H^\pm W^*$, and its signature would be different to that of the standard decay channels $H^{\pm\pm} \rightarrow \ell^\pm \ell'^\pm$ and $H^{\pm\pm} \rightarrow W^\pm W^\pm$.

In contrast, we point out that the decay $H^\pm \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm} W^*$ could actually *improve* the discovery potential of $H^{\pm\pm}$ at the LHC. From the production mechanism $q'\bar{q} \rightarrow W^* \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm} H^\mp$ the decay mode $H^\pm \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm} W^*$ would give rise to pair production ($H^{++}H^{--}$) of doubly charged Higgs bosons. We believe that this additional way to produce $H^{\pm\pm}$ has not been




FIG. 1: $\sum_{\ell, \ell'} \text{BR}(H^{\pm\pm} \rightarrow \ell^{\pm} \ell'^{\pm})$ with red solid lines and $\text{BR}(H^{\pm\pm} \rightarrow W^{\pm} W^{\pm})$ with blue dashed lines as a function of $m_{H^{\pm\pm}}$ ($\leq m_{H^{\pm}}$) for $v_{\Delta} = 0.1$ MeV (thin lines) and $v_{\Delta} = 0.2$ MeV (bold lines). For the neutrino masses we used $m_1 = 0.1$ eV with $\Delta m_{31}^2 > 0$.

discussed before. In this scenario $H^{\pm\pm}$ is the lightest of the triplet scalars, and its only possible decay channels are $H^{\pm\pm} \rightarrow \ell^{\pm} \ell'^{\pm}$ and $H^{\pm\pm} \rightarrow W^{\pm} W^{\pm}$, with branching ratios determined by the magnitude of v_{Δ} . These two branching ratios can be of the same order of magnitude for $v_{\Delta} \simeq 0.1$ MeV, as can be seen in Fig. 1 where we fix $v_{\Delta} = 0.1$ MeV and 0.2 MeV (similar figures can be found in [27]). In the range of $m_{H^{\pm\pm}} = 200 \rightarrow 500$ GeV, one has $\sum_{\ell, \ell'} \text{BR}(H^{\pm\pm} \rightarrow \ell^{\pm} \ell'^{\pm}) \simeq 100\%$ for $v_{\Delta} \lesssim 0.05$ MeV, while for $v_{\Delta} \gtrsim 0.4$ MeV one has $\text{BR}(H^{\pm\pm} \rightarrow W^{\pm} W^{\pm}) \simeq 100\%$.

In simulations of pair production of $H^{\pm\pm}$ it is assumed that the production channel $q\bar{q} \rightarrow \gamma^*, Z^* \rightarrow H^{++} H^{--}$ is the only mechanism. If $v_{\Delta} \lesssim 0.1$ MeV then the decay channel $H^{\pm\pm} \rightarrow \ell^{\pm} \ell'^{\pm}$ is dominant, and four-lepton signatures (4ℓ) would be possible. Studies have shown that the Standard Model background for the 4ℓ signature [29] is considerably smaller than that for the signature of 3ℓ [30, 31], and at present it is assumed that the 4ℓ signature can only arise from $q\bar{q} \rightarrow \gamma^*, Z^* \rightarrow H^{++} H^{--}$. The importance of the production mechanism $q'\bar{q} \rightarrow W^* \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm} H^{\mp}$ has been appreciated for the 3ℓ signature, in which the decay $H^{\mp} \rightarrow \ell^{\mp} \nu$ is assumed [19, 27, 30, 31, 46]. For the case of a sizeable branching ratio for $H^{\pm} \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm} W^*$ we point out that the production mechanism $q'\bar{q} \rightarrow W^* \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm} H^{\mp}$ can also contribute to the 4ℓ signature, which is the signature with lowest background. Searches for four leptons originating from $H^{++} H^{--}$ have already been performed by the Tevatron [21] and LHC [32]. If $\text{BR}(H^{\pm} \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm} W^*)$ were sizeable we would expect a strengthening of the derived limit on $m_{H^{\pm\pm}}$.

IV. NUMERICAL ANALYSIS

In this section we quantify the magnitude of the number of pair-produced $H^{++}H^{--}$ arising from the process $q'\bar{q} \rightarrow W^* \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm}H^\mp$ with decay $H^\pm \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm}W^*$, and make a comparison with the conventional mechanism $q\bar{q} \rightarrow \gamma^*, Z^* \rightarrow H^{++}H^{--}$.

The important parameters for our analyses are v_Δ , m_{H^\pm} , and $m_{H^{\pm\pm}}$. We take $m_{H^{\pm\pm}} = 200$ GeV or 500 GeV and show results as functions of v_Δ and m_{H^\pm} . The decay branching ratios of H^\pm also depend on two undetermined parameters, m_h and m_1 (one of the neutrino masses). These are fixed as $m_h = 120$ GeV and $m_1 = 0.1$ eV in our numerical analysis. Note that m_h only enters through the decay width for $H^\pm \rightarrow W^\pm h^0$. Neutrino oscillation experiments [8–12] provide a measurement of two neutrino mass differences, $\Delta m_{ij}^2 \equiv m_i^2 - m_j^2$, and we use the following values: $\Delta m_{21}^2 = 7.6 \times 10^{-5}$ eV, $|\Delta m_{31}^2| = 2.4 \times 10^{-3}$ eV. Although $\Delta m_{31}^2 > 0$ (referred to as “normal mass ordering”) is also assumed in our analysis, our results do not change significantly for $\Delta m_{31}^2 < 0$ because the neutrino masses are almost degenerate for $m_1 = 0.1$ eV.

The experimental bound $\text{BR}(\mu \rightarrow \bar{e}ee) < 1.0 \times 10^{-12}$ gives a stringent constraint on $|h_{e\ell}|$ and $m_{H^{\pm\pm}}$.⁴ Assuming naively $|m_{ee}| \simeq |m_{e\mu}| \simeq m_1$ for $m_1 = 0.1$ eV, the bound on $\text{BR}(\mu \rightarrow \bar{e}ee) = |m_{ee}|^2 |m_{e\mu}|^2 / (16G_F^2 v_\Delta^4 m_{H^{\pm\pm}}^4)$ can be translated into the constraint $v_\Delta m_{H^{\pm\pm}} \gtrsim 1.5 \times 10^4$ eV · GeV. Therefore, we use $v_\Delta \geq 100$ eV in order to satisfy this constraint for $m_{H^{\pm\pm}} = 200$ GeV.

In Fig. 2 we show the BRs of H^\pm decays into $H^{\pm\pm}W^*$ (red solid), $\ell\nu$ (blue dashed), $\bar{t}b$ (green dotted), WZ (magenta dot-dashed), and Wh^0 (cyan dot-dot-dashed) as a function of m_{H^\pm} for various values of v_Δ , fixing $m_{H^{\pm\pm}} = 200$ GeV and $m_{h^0} = 120$ GeV. The range of m_{H^\pm} in the figures corresponds to $0 \leq \lambda_5 \lesssim 1$, which easily satisfies the perturbative constraint $\lambda_5 < 4\pi$. Very large mass splittings (e.g. $\gg 100$ GeV) are constrained by measurements of electroweak precision observables, but the mass splittings in Fig. 2 are compatible with the analyses in [39] (which are for models with a $Y = 0$ triplet). In Fig. 2(a) we fix $v_\Delta = 100$ eV, for which $\sum_{\ell, \ell'} \text{BR}(H^{\pm\pm} \rightarrow \ell^\pm \ell'^\pm) \simeq 100\%$. One can see that $H^\pm \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm}W^*$ competes with $H^\pm \rightarrow \ell^\pm \nu$, with all other decay channels being negligible. For $|\Delta M| > 20$ GeV, $H^\pm \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm}W^*$ becomes the dominant decay channel. In Fig. 2(b) we fix $v_\Delta = 0.1$ MeV, and $H^\pm \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm}W^*$ becomes the dominant decay channel for much smaller mass splittings, $|\Delta M| > 2$ GeV. In Fig. 2(c) we fix $v_\Delta = 1$ GeV, for which the competing decays are $H^\pm \rightarrow tb$, $H^\pm \rightarrow WZ$ and $H^\pm \rightarrow Wh^0$. In this scenario the decay $H^\pm \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm}W^*$ becomes the dominant channel for $|\Delta M| > 30$ GeV.

In Fig. 3 we show contours of $\text{BR}(H^\pm \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm}W^*)$ in the plane $[m_{H^\pm}, v_\Delta]$. The red solid, green dashed, and blue dotted lines correspond to contours of $\text{BR}(H^\pm \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm}W^*) = 0.5, 0.9, \text{ and } 0.99$, respectively. The BR is maximised at around $v_\Delta = 0.1$ MeV, as expected. It is clear from Fig. 2 and Fig. 3 that the decay of H^\pm into $H^{\pm\pm}$ can be dominant in a wide region of the parameter space of the HTM even if the two-body decay into $H^{\pm\pm}W^\mp$ (for $m_{H^\pm} > m_{H^{\pm\pm}} + m_W$) is forbidden kinematically. Moreover, for $v_\Delta = 100$ eV (i.e. when the four-lepton signal arising from the decay of $H^{++}H^{--}$ is dominant) the magnitude of $\text{BR}(H^\pm \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm}W^*)$ becomes very large if $|\Delta M| \gtrsim 30$ GeV.

We now study the magnitude of the number of pair-produced $H^{++}H^{--}$ which originate from $pp \rightarrow W^* \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm}H^\mp$ followed by the decay $H^\pm \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm}W^*$. We define the variable

⁴ This stringent constraint can be avoided if $|m_{e\mu}| = 0$ [23] or $|m_{ee}| = 0$ [47]. See also [48].




FIG. 2: The BRs of H^\pm decays into $H^{\pm\pm}W^*$ (red solid line), $\ell\nu$ (blue dashed line), $t\bar{b}$ (green dotted line), WZ (magenta dot-dashed line), and Wh^0 (cyan dot-dot-dashed line) as a function of m_{H^\pm} . In all panels $m_{H^{\pm\pm}} = 200$ GeV and $m_{h^0} = 120$ GeV. In panels a), b) and c) we fix $v_\Delta = 100$ eV, 0.1 MeV and 1 GeV respectively. For the neutrino masses we used $m_1 = 0.1$ eV with $\Delta m_{31}^2 > 0$. In each panel the decay modes with a negligible BR are omitted.

X_1 as follows:

$$X_1 \equiv \left\{ \sigma(pp \rightarrow W^* \rightarrow H^{++}H^-) + \sigma(pp \rightarrow W^* \rightarrow H^{--}H^+) \right\} BR(H^\pm \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm}W^*). \quad (14)$$

In Fig. 4 we show the behaviour of $\sigma(H^{++}H^{--}) \equiv \sigma(pp \rightarrow \gamma^*, Z^* \rightarrow H^{++}H^{--}) + X_1$ with respect to m_{H^\pm} for several values of v_Δ . In Fig. 4a we take $m_{H^{\pm\pm}} = 200$ GeV and $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV, and in Fig. 4b we take $m_{H^{\pm\pm}} = 500$ GeV and $\sqrt{s} = 14$ TeV. We use CTEQ6L1 parton distribution functions [49]. The range of m_{H^\pm} in Fig. 4b corresponds to $0 \leq \lambda_5 \lesssim 2.5$. The horizontal dot-dashed line corresponds to the case of $X_1 = 0$, i.e. the magnitude of $\sigma(pp \rightarrow \gamma^*, Z^* \rightarrow H^{++}H^{--})$ alone. The red solid, green dashed, and blue dotted lines are the results with $v_\Delta = 100$ eV, 0.1 MeV, and 1 GeV, respectively. The red solid line (for which $\sum_{\ell, \ell'} BR(H^{\pm\pm} \rightarrow \ell^\pm \ell'^\pm) \simeq 100\%$) shows that the extra contribution from $H^\pm \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm}W^*$ can enhance the number of four-lepton events by a factor of 2 (at $m_{H^\pm} \simeq 230$ GeV in Fig. 4a) and 2.4 (at $m_{H^\pm} \simeq 540$ GeV in Fig. 4b). For $v_\Delta = 0.1$ MeV, around which $\sum_{\ell, \ell'} BR(H^{\pm\pm} \rightarrow \ell^\pm \ell'^\pm)$ can still be sizeable (See Fig. 1), the enhancement factor for pair-produced $H^{++}H^{--}$ can be as large as 2.6 in Fig. 4a and 2.8 in Fig. 4b. For $v_\Delta = 1$ GeV




FIG. 3: Contours of $\text{BR}(H^\pm \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm}W^*)$ in the plane (m_{H^\pm}, v_Δ) . We used $m_1 = 0.1 \text{ eV}$ with $\Delta m_{31}^2 > 0$. The red solid, green dashed, and blue dotted lines show contours of $\text{BR}(H^\pm \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm}W^*) = 0.5, 0.9$ and 0.99 , respectively.

the enhancement of pair-produced $H^{++}H^{--}$ is interpreted as an increase in the number of $W^+W^+W^-W^-$ events, because $\text{BR}(H^{\pm\pm} \rightarrow W^\pm W^\pm) \simeq 100\%$. The shape of the curves is caused by the different dependence of the cross section and BR on the mass splitting ΔM . As m_{H^\pm} increases, the cross section of $pp \rightarrow \gamma^*, Z^* \rightarrow H^{++}H^{--}$ is unaffected but the cross section of $pp \rightarrow W^* \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm}H^\mp$ decreases. However, a larger mass splitting is favourable from the point of view of the BR.

Finally, we note that a pair of $H^{\pm\pm}$ can also be produced from other production mechanisms, namely H^+H^- , $H^\pm H^0$, $H^\pm A^0$, and $H^0 A^0$. Although the contribution from $H^{\pm\pm}H^\mp$ in eq. (14) is the most important one because of the mass hierarchy $m_{H^{\pm\pm}} < m_{H^\pm} < m_{H^0, A^0}$ and its linear dependence on $\text{BR}(H^\pm \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm}W^*)$, the above mechanisms can give a significant contribution to the number of pair-produced $H^{\pm\pm}$, as will be described qualitatively below.

Naively, one would expect the next most important mechanism to be H^+H^- because its contribution to the production of $H^{++}H^{--}$ scales as BR^2 as follows:

$$X_2 \equiv \sigma(pp \rightarrow \gamma^*, Z^* \rightarrow H^+H^-) [\text{BR}(H^\pm \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm}W^*)]^2. \quad (15)$$

However, the couplings for γH^+H^- and $Z H^+H^-$ are about a half of those for $\gamma H^{++}H^{--}$ and $Z H^{++}H^{--}$, respectively. The interference between γ^* and Z^* is destructive for H^+H^- production while it is constructive for $H^{++}H^{--}$ production. Tables I and II show that $\sigma(pp \rightarrow \gamma^*, Z^* \rightarrow H^+H^-)$ is smaller than $\sigma(pp \rightarrow \gamma^*, Z^* \rightarrow H^{++}H^{--})$ by a factor of ~ 9.5 , even for $m_{H^\pm} = m_{H^{\pm\pm}}$ (see e.g. [50]). Moreover, X_2 is suppressed relative to X_1 by an extra factor of BR when $\text{BR}(H^\pm \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm}W^*) \neq 100\%$. Therefore the contribution from $\sigma(pp \rightarrow \gamma^*, Z^* \rightarrow H^+H^-)$ to the production of $H^{++}H^{--}$ is considerably less than the QCD K factor for $pp \rightarrow \gamma^*, Z^* \rightarrow H^{++}H^{--}$ (which is known to be around 1.25 at the LHC [15]).




FIG. 4: Behaviour of $\sigma(H^{++}H^{--}) \equiv \sigma(pp \rightarrow \gamma^*, Z^* \rightarrow H^{++}H^{--}) + X_1$ as a function of m_{H^\pm} . (a) for $m_{H^\pm} = 200$ GeV at the LHC with $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV. (b) for $m_{H^\pm} = 500$ GeV at the LHC with $\sqrt{s} = 14$ TeV. We used $m_h = 120$ GeV and $m_1 = 0.1$ eV with $\Delta m_{31}^2 > 0$. The red solid, green dashed, and blue dotted lines show results for $v_\Delta = 100$ eV, 0.1 MeV, and 1 GeV, respectively. The horizontal dot-dashed line shows $\sigma(pp \rightarrow \gamma^*, Z^* \rightarrow H^{++}H^{--})$.

It turns out that the production of $H^\pm H^0$ and $H^\pm A^0$ are numerically more important than H^+H^- , despite their contributions scaling as BR^3 . The narrow width approximation for contributions from H^0 and A^0 with $m_{H^0} \simeq m_{A^0}$ is rather complicated because of their interference. We define the variables X_3 and X'_3 as follows:

$$X_3 \equiv \left\{ \sigma(pp \rightarrow W^* \rightarrow H^+H^0) + \sigma(pp \rightarrow W^* \rightarrow H^-H^0) \right\} \times \text{BR}_+ [\text{BR}(H^\pm \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm}W^*)]^2, \quad (16)$$

$$X'_3 \equiv \left\{ \sigma(pp \rightarrow W^* \rightarrow H^+H^0) + \sigma(pp \rightarrow W^* \rightarrow H^-H^0) \right\} \times \text{BR}_- [\text{BR}(H^\pm \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm}W^*)]^2, \quad (17)$$

$$\text{BR}_\pm \equiv \text{BR}(H^0 \rightarrow H^\pm W^*) + \text{BR}(A^0 \rightarrow H^\pm W^*) \pm \frac{4\text{BR}(H^0 \rightarrow H^\pm W^*)\text{BR}(A^0 \rightarrow H^\pm W^*)}{\text{BR}(H^0 \rightarrow H^\pm W^*) + \text{BR}(A^0 \rightarrow H^\pm W^*)}, \quad (18)$$

where we used $\sigma(pp \rightarrow W^* \rightarrow H^\pm A^0) \simeq \sigma(pp \rightarrow W^* \rightarrow H^\pm H^0)$ because $m_{A^0} \simeq m_{H^0}$. The interesting point is that X'_3 is for the process which gives *same-sign* $H^{++}H^{++}$ (with $3(W^-)^*$) and $H^{--}H^{--}$ (with $3(W^+)^*$) while X_3 is for $H^{++}H^{--}$ production. Since X'_3 arises as the breaking effect of the lepton number (Δ has $L\# = -2$), it vanishes for $v_\Delta \rightarrow 0$, for which the total decay widths satisfy $\Gamma_{\text{tot}}(H^0) = \Gamma_{\text{tot}}(A^0)$, namely $\text{BR}(H^0 \rightarrow H^\pm W^*) = \text{BR}(A^0 \rightarrow H^\pm W^*)$. This means that the *same-sign* $H^{\pm\pm}H^{\pm\pm}$ would not give the *same-sign* 4ℓ signal because $\text{BR}(H^{\pm\pm} \rightarrow \ell^\pm \ell'^\pm)$ is small for a large v_Δ where X'_3 could be sizeable. A pair of $H^{\pm\pm}$ (*same-sign* or different sign) is provided by $X_3 + X'_3$, which is proportional to $2[\text{BR}(H^0 \rightarrow H^\pm W^*) + \text{BR}(A^0 \rightarrow H^\pm W^*)]$; the factor of 2 compensates the fact that the sum of the cross sections in eq. (16) is a half of the sum in eq. (14) for $m_{H^0, A^0} = m_{H^\pm} = m_{H^{\pm\pm}}$ as shown in Tables I and II. Although $\text{BR}(A^0 \rightarrow H^+W^*) = \text{BR}(A^0 \rightarrow H^-W^*)$ (likewise for H^0) and the maximum value of each is 50%, this is compensated by $\text{BR}(H^0 \rightarrow H^\pm W^*) + \text{BR}(A^0 \rightarrow H^\pm W^*)$ in $X_3 + X'_3$. Since the partial decay widths of H^0 and A^0 depend on the scalar masses and v_Δ in a way which is very similar to the partial decay widths of H^\pm (see e.g. [27]), the

$\sqrt{s} = 7 \text{ TeV}$	$\sigma(pp \rightarrow V^* \rightarrow H_1 H_2) [\text{fb}]$						
$m_{H^{\pm\pm}} = 200 \text{ GeV}$	$H^{++}H^{--}$	$H^{++}H^-$	$H^{--}H^+$	H^+H^-	H^+H^0 (or H^+A^0)	H^-H^0 (or H^-A^0)	H^0A^0
$m_{H^\pm} = 200 \text{ GeV}$	19	26	10	2.0	13	5.1	18
$m_{H^\pm} = 230 \text{ GeV}$	19	19	7.3	1.1	5.6	2.1	6.0
$m_{H^\pm} = 270 \text{ GeV}$	19	13	4.8	0.54	2.2	0.76	1.9

TABLE I: Production cross sections of a pair of exotic Higgs bosons ($H_1 H_2$) from off-shell gauge bosons (V^*) in the HTM at the LHC with $\sqrt{s} = 7 \text{ TeV}$. We take $m_{H^{\pm\pm}} = 200 \text{ GeV}$ and we use a relation $m_{H^0, A^0}^2 = 2m_{H^\pm}^2 - m_{H^{\pm\pm}}^2$; $m_{H^0, A^0} = 200, 257, 325 \text{ GeV}$ for $m_{H^\pm} = 200, 230, 270 \text{ GeV}$, respectively.

analogies of Fig. 3 for $\text{BR}(A^0 \rightarrow H^\pm W^*)$ and $\text{BR}(H^0 \rightarrow H^\pm W^*)$ would show a similar quantitative behaviour as Fig. 3.⁵ Thus the main difference between X_1 and $X_3 + X'_3$ would be the phase space factor because we take $m_{H^0, A^0} > m_{H^\pm}$. The contribution of $X_3 + X'_3$ to the production of a pair of $H^{\pm\pm}$ would be sizeable for $v_\Delta \simeq 0.1 \text{ MeV}$, where the relevant BRs in eq. (16) could be very large for a small mass splitting. Moreover, the contribution of $X_3 + X'_3$ would not be so small even for large mass splittings e.g. $m_{H^\pm} = 270 \text{ GeV}$ and $m_{H^{\pm\pm}} = 200 \text{ GeV}$ (which give $m_{H^0, A^0} = 325 \text{ GeV}$), for which the BRs in eq. (16) could be maximal.

The last mechanisms (which scale as BR^4) are

$$X_4 \equiv \sigma(pp \rightarrow Z^* \rightarrow H^0 A^0) \text{BR}_+^2 [\text{BR}(H^\pm \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm} W^*)]^2, \quad (19)$$

$$X'_4 \equiv \sigma(pp \rightarrow Z^* \rightarrow H^0 A^0) \text{BR}_+ \text{BR}_- [\text{BR}(H^\pm \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm} W^*)]^2, \quad (20)$$

$$X''_4 \equiv \sigma(pp \rightarrow Z^* \rightarrow H^0 A^0) \text{BR}_-^2 [\text{BR}(H^\pm \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm} W^*)]^2. \quad (21)$$

Note that X'_4 gives a pair of *same-sign* $H^{\pm\pm}$ (being proportional to BR_- , like X'_3) and its magnitude is negligible for small v_Δ . Although both of X_4 and X''_4 give $H^{++}H^{--}$, X''_4 also vanishes for $v_\Delta \rightarrow 0$ because it is sensitive to BR_-^2 i.e. it is quadratic in lepton number violation. The phase space suppression ($m_{H^{\pm\pm}} < m_{H^\pm} < m_{H^0, A^0}$) ensures that $\sigma(pp \rightarrow Z^* \rightarrow H^0 A^0)$ is much smaller than $\sigma(pp \rightarrow \gamma^*, Z^* \rightarrow H^{++}H^{--})$ for the case of a large mass splitting with $\sqrt{s} = 7 \text{ TeV}$. Therefore, for X_4 to be important a large mass splitting with $\sqrt{s} = 14 \text{ TeV}$ or a small mass splitting for $v_\Delta \simeq 0.1 \text{ MeV}$ are preferred.

We note that the detection efficiencies for the above mechanisms (X_1, X_2, X_3 and X_4) would in general be different from that of the well-studied mechanism $pp \rightarrow \gamma^*, Z^* \rightarrow H^{++}H^{--}$ because of the extra W^* . We defer a detailed study to a future work.

⁵ We note that the decays $A^0 \rightarrow H^\pm W^*$ and $H^0 \rightarrow H^\pm W^*$ were also mentioned as a source of H^\pm in [23].

$\sqrt{s} = 14 \text{ TeV}$ $m_{H^{\pm\pm}} = 500 \text{ GeV}$	$\sigma(pp \rightarrow V^* \rightarrow H_1 H_2) [\text{fb}]$						
	$H^{++}H^{--}$	$H^{++}H^-$	$H^{--}H^+$	H^+H^-	H^+H^0 (or H^+A^0)	H^-H^0 (or H^-A^0)	H^0A^0
$m_{H^\pm} = 500 \text{ GeV}$	1.7	2.3	0.83	0.18	1.1	0.42	1.5
$m_{H^\pm} = 540 \text{ GeV}$	1.7	1.9	0.69	0.13	0.69	0.24	0.78
$m_{H^\pm} = 570 \text{ GeV}$	1.7	1.7	0.60	0.097	0.49	0.17	0.50

TABLE II: Production cross sections of a pair of exotic Higgs bosons ($H_1 H_2$) from off-shell gauge bosons (V^*) in the HTM at the LHC with $\sqrt{s} = 14 \text{ TeV}$. We take $m_{H^{\pm\pm}} = 500 \text{ GeV}$ and we use a relation $m_{H^0, A^0}^2 = 2m_{H^\pm}^2 - m_{H^{\pm\pm}}^2$; $m_{H^0, A^0} = 500, 577, 632 \text{ GeV}$ for $m_{H^\pm} = 500, 540, 570 \text{ GeV}$, respectively.

V. CONCLUSIONS

Doubly charged Higgs bosons ($H^{\pm\pm}$), which arise in the Higgs Triplet Model (HTM) of neutrino mass generation, are being searched for at the Tevatron and at the LHC. We showed that $H^{\pm\pm}$ can be produced from the decay of a singly charged Higgs boson (H^\pm) via $H^\pm \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm}W^*$, which can have a large branching ratio in a wide region of the parameter space of the HTM. From the production mechanism $q'\bar{q} \rightarrow W^* \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm}H^\mp$, the above decay would give rise to pair production $H^{++}H^{--}$, with a number of events which can be comparable to that from the conventional mechanism $q\bar{q} \rightarrow \gamma^*, Z^* \rightarrow H^{++}H^{--}$. Current simulations and searches for $H^{++}H^{--}$ at the Tevatron/LHC assume production solely from $q\bar{q} \rightarrow \gamma^*, Z^* \rightarrow H^{++}H^{--}$. The contribution from $q'\bar{q} \rightarrow W^* \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm}H^\mp$ with decay $H^\pm \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm}W^*$ would be an additional source of pair-produced $H^{\pm\pm}$, which should enhance the detection prospects in this channel (e.g. four-lepton signatures if the decay mode $H^{\pm\pm} \rightarrow \ell^\pm \ell'^\pm$ is dominant). We also pointed out that production mechanisms involving the neutral triplet scalars (H^0, A^0) of the HTM can contribute to pair production $H^{++}H^{--}$ through the decay chain $H^0, A^0 \rightarrow H^\pm W^*$ followed by $H^\pm \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm}W^*$. We advocate dedicated simulations of $q'\bar{q} \rightarrow W^* \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm}H^\mp$ with the decay $H^\pm \rightarrow H^{\pm\pm}W^*$ (and the analogous mechanisms with neutral scalars), and a comparison with $q\bar{q} \rightarrow \gamma^*, Z^* \rightarrow H^{++}H^{--}$.

Acknowledgements

We thank Mayumi Aoki and Koji Tsumura for useful discussions. A.G.A was supported by a Marie Curie Incoming International Fellowship, FP7-PEOPLE-2009-IIF, Contract No. 252263. The work of H.S. was supported in part by the Sasakawa Scientific Research Grant from the Japan Science Society and Grant-in-Aid for Young Scientists (B) No. 23740210.

-
- [1] Y. Fukuda *et al.* [Super-Kamiokande Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 1562 (1998).
 - [2] Y. Kuno and Y. Okada, Rev. Mod. Phys. **73**, 151 (2001); M. Raidal *et al.*, Eur. Phys. J. C **57**, 13 (2008).

- [3] W. Konetschny and W. Kummer, Phys. Lett. B **70**, 433 (1977).
- [4] R. N. Mohapatra and G. Senjanovic, Phys. Rev. Lett. **44**, 912 (1980).
- [5] M. Magg and C. Wetterich, Phys. Lett. B **94**, 61 (1980); G. Lazarides, Q. Shafi and C. Wetterich, Nucl. Phys. B **181**, 287 (1981).
- [6] J. Schechter and J. W. F. Valle, Phys. Rev. D **22**, 2227 (1980).
- [7] T. P. Cheng and L. F. Li, Phys. Rev. D **22**, 2860 (1980).
- [8] B. T. Cleveland *et al.*, Astrophys. J. **496**, 505 (1998); W. Hampel *et al.* [GALLEX Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **447**, 127 (1999); J. N. Abdurashitov *et al.* [SAGE Collaboration], J. Exp. Theor. Phys. **95**, 181 (2002) [Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **122**, 211 (2002)]; J. Hosaka *et al.* [Super-Kamiokande Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **73**, 112001 (2006); B. Aharmim *et al.* [SNO Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 111301 (2008); C. Arpesella *et al.* [The Borexino Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 091302 (2008).
- [9] Y. Ashie *et al.* [Super-Kamiokande Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **71**, 112005 (2005); J. L. Raaf [Super-Kamiokande Collaboration], J. Phys. Conf. Ser. **136**, 022013 (2008).
- [10] M. H. Ahn *et al.* [K2K Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **74**, 072003 (2006); P. Adamson *et al.* [MINOS Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 131802 (2008).
- [11] M. Apollonio *et al.* [CHOOZ Collaboration], Eur. Phys. J. C **27**, 331 (2003).
- [12] S. Abe *et al.* [KamLAND Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 221803 (2008).
- [13] V. D. Barger, H. Baer, W. Y. Keung and R. J. N. Phillips, Phys. Rev. D **26**, 218 (1982).
- [14] J. F. Gunion, J. Grifols, A. Mendez, B. Kayser and F. I. Olness, Phys. Rev. D **40**, 1546 (1989); J. F. Gunion, C. Loomis and K. T. Pitts, eConf **C960625**, LTH096 (1996) [arXiv:hep-ph/9610237].
- [15] M. Muhlleitner and M. Spira, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 117701 (2003).
- [16] T. Han, B. Mukhopadhyaya, Z. Si and K. Wang, Phys. Rev. D **76**, 075013 (2007).
- [17] K. Huitu, J. Maalampi, A. Pietila and M. Raidal, Nucl. Phys. B **487**, 27 (1997).
- [18] B. Dion, T. Gregoire, D. London, L. Marleau and H. Nadeau, Phys. Rev. D **59**, 075006 (1999).
- [19] A. G. Akeroyd and M. Aoki, Phys. Rev. D **72**, 035011 (2005).
- [20] D. E. Acosta *et al.* [CDF Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 221802 (2004); V. M. Abazov *et al.* [D0 Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 141801 (2004); V. M. Abazov *et al.* [D0 Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 071803 (2008).
- [21] T. Aaltonen *et al.* [The CDF Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 121801 (2008).
- [22] E. Ma, M. Raidal and U. Sarkar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 3769 (2000); E. Ma, M. Raidal and U. Sarkar, Nucl. Phys. B **615**, 313 (2001).
- [23] E. J. Chun, K. Y. Lee and S. C. Park, Phys. Lett. B **566**, 142 (2003).
- [24] J. Garayoa and T. Schwetz, JHEP **0803**, 009 (2008).
- [25] A. G. Akeroyd, M. Aoki and H. Sugiyama, Phys. Rev. D **77**, 075010 (2008).
- [26] M. Kadastik, M. Raidal and L. Rebane, Phys. Rev. D **77**, 115023 (2008).
- [27] P. Fileviez Perez, T. Han, G. y. Huang, T. Li and K. Wang, Phys. Rev. D **78**, 015018 (2008).
- [28] S. T. Petcov, H. Sugiyama and Y. Takanishi, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 015005 (2009).
- [29] G. Azuelos, K. Benslama and J. Ferland, J. Phys. G **32**, 73 (2006); T. Rommerskirchen and T. Hebbeker, J. Phys. G **34**, N47 (2007).
- [30] F. del Aguila and J. A. Aguilar-Saavedra, Nucl. Phys. B **813**, 22 (2009).
- [31] A. G. Akeroyd, C. W. Chiang and N. Gaur, JHEP **1011**, 005 (2010).
- [32] CMS Collaboration, CMS PAS HIG-11-001 (March 2011).
- [33] S. Chakrabarti, D. Choudhury, R. M. Godbole and B. Mukhopadhyaya, Phys. Lett. B **434**, 347 (1998); J. F. Gunion, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A13**, 2277-2298 (1998).

- [34] K. S. Babu, S. Nandi and Z. Tavartkiladze, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 071702 (2009).
- [35] G. B. Gelmini and M. Roncadelli, Phys. Lett. B **99**, 411 (1981).
- [36] J. Schechter and J. W. F. Valle, Phys. Rev. D **25**, 774 (1982); M. A. Diaz, M. A. Garcia-Jareno, D. A. Restrepo and J. W. F. Valle, Nucl. Phys. B **527**, 44 (1998); A. G. Akeroyd, M. A. Diaz, M. A. Rivera and D. Romero, Phys. Rev. D **83**, 095003 (2011).
- [37] J. F. Gunion, R. Vega and J. Wudka, Phys. Rev. D **42**, 1673 (1990).
- [38] R. Vega and D. A. Dicus, Nucl. Phys. B **329**, 533 (1990); J. Maalampi and N. Romanenko, Phys. Lett. B **532**, 202 (2002).
- [39] T. Blank and W. Hollik, Nucl. Phys. B **514**, 113 (1998); M. C. Chen, S. Dawson and T. Krupovnickas, Phys. Rev. D **74**, 035001 (2006); P. H. Chankowski, S. Pokorski and J. Wagner, Eur. Phys. J. C **50**, 919 (2007); M. C. Chen, S. Dawson and C. B. Jackson, Phys. Rev. D **78**, 093001 (2008).
- [40] P. Dey, A. Kundu and B. Mukhopadhyaya, J. Phys. G **36**, 025002 (2009).
- [41] A. G. Akeroyd and C. W. Chiang, Phys. Rev. D **81**, 115007 (2010).
- [42] A. Arhrib, R. Benbrik, M. Chabab, G. Moultaka, M.C. Peyranere, L. Rahili, J.Ramadan arXiv:1105.1925 [hep-ph].
- [43] A. Djouadi, J. Kalinowski and P. M. Zerwas, Z. Phys. C **70**, 435 (1996).
- [44] S. Moretti, W. J. Stirling, Phys. Lett. **B347**, 291-299 (1995).
- [45] R. Godbole, B. Mukhopadhyaya and M. Nowakowski, Phys. Lett. B **352**, 388 (1995); K. m. Cheung, R. J. N. Phillips and A. Pilaftsis, Phys. Rev. D **51**, 4731 (1995); K. Huitu, J. Laitinen, J. Maalampi and N. Romanenko, Nucl. Phys. B **598**, 13 (2001).
- [46] A. G. Akeroyd and C. W. Chiang, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 113010 (2009).
- [47] A. G. Akeroyd, M. Aoki and H. Sugiyama, Phys. Rev. D **79**, 113010 (2009).
- [48] T. Fukuyama, H. Sugiyama and K. Tsumura, JHEP **1003**, 044 (2010).
- [49] J. Pumplin, D. R. Stump, J. Huston, H. L. Lai, P. M. Nadolsky and W. K. Tung, JHEP **0207**, 012 (2002); D. Stump, J. Huston, J. Pumplin, W. K. Tung, H. L. Lai, S. Kuhlmann and J. F. Owens, JHEP **0310**, 046 (2003).
- [50] S. M. Davidson and H. E. Logan, Phys. Rev. D **82**, 115031 (2010).