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Abstract

A search is performed for a new heavy resonance decaying to a Z boson and a light
resonance, where the light resonance decays to either a pair of bottom quarks or a
pair of tau leptons and the Z boson decays to two electrons or two muons. The search
exploits a data sample collected during 2012 by the CMS experiment at the center-
of-mass energy of $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV and corresponding to an integrated luminosity of $\mathcal{L} = 19.8$ fb$^{-1}$. No significant deviation from the standard model expectations is observed
and limits are set on benchmark production processes predicted in a model with two
Higgs doublets.
1 Introduction

The observation of a new particle with a mass of about 125 GeV was reported by the ATLAS and CMS experiments at the LHC in the WW, ZZ and γγ final states [1, 2]. Evidence of the decay of the particle to pairs of fermions (ττ and b¯b) was also reported later [3]. The measurements of mass, branching ratios, production rates, spin and parity are all consistent with the predictions of the standard model (SM), where a single doublet of Higgs fields is present. The existence of additional Higgs bosons is however predicted in simple extensions of the SM scalar sector, like models with two Higgs doublets (2HDM) [4]. These models predict the existence of five physical Higgs particles that arise as a consequence of the electroweak symmetry breaking mechanism: two neutral CP-even scalars (h, H), one neutral CP-odd pseudoscalar (A), and two charged scalars (H+, H−).

One important motivation for 2HDMs is that these models provide a way to explain the asymmetry between matter and anti-matter observed in the Universe [4, 5]. Another important motivation is Supersymmetry [6], which is a theory that falls in the broad class of 2HDMs. Axion models [7], which would explain how the strong interaction does not violate the CP symmetry, would give rise to an effective low-energy theory with two Higgs doublets. Finally, it has also been recently noted [8] that certain realizations of 2HDMs can accommodate the muon g−2 anomaly [9] without violating the present theoretical and experimental constraints.

In the most general case 14 parameters are necessary to describe the scalar sector in a 2HDM. However, only 6 free parameters remain once the so-called $Z_2$ symmetry is imposed to suppress flavor changing neutral currents, in agreement with experimental observations, and the values of the mass of the recently discovered Higgs boson (125 GeV) and the electroweak vacuum expectation value (246 GeV) are assumed. The compatibility of a 125 GeV SM-like Higgs boson with 2HDMs is possible in the so-called alignment limit. In such a limit, one of the CP-even scalars, h or H, is identified with the 125 GeV Higgs boson and the condition $\cos(\beta - \alpha) \approx 0$ or $\sin(\beta - \alpha) \approx 0$ is satisfied, where $\tan \beta$ and $\alpha$ are, respectively, the ratio of the vacuum expectation values, and the mixing angle of the two Higgs doublets. A recent theoretical study [5] has shown that, in this limit, a large mass splitting (>100 GeV) between the A and H bosons would favor the electroweak phase transition that would be at the origin of the baryogenesis process in the early Universe, thus explaining the currently observed matter-antimatter asymmetry in the Universe. In such a scenario, the most frequent decay mode of the pseudoscalar A boson would be $A \rightarrow ZH$.

In this document a search for a new resonance decaying to a Z boson and a lighter resonance is described. Two different searches are performed, targeting the decay of the lighter resonance in either a pair of tau leptons or a pair of b-quarks. In both cases the Z boson is identified via its decay into either a pair or electrons or a pair of muons. Since the analysis strategy adopted is independent from the assumed model and spin, the results can be also interpreted in the specular topology $H \rightarrow ZA$, where the expected 2HDM mass hierarchy is inverted and the pseudoscalar A is predicted to be light. Throughout the text, the symbol $\ell\ell$ refers to an electron or a muon. Concerning the $\ell\ell\tau\tau$ channel, the following leptonic and hadronic di-tau final states are considered: $e\mu$, $e\tau_h$, $\mu\tau_h$ and $\tau_h\tau_h$, where $\tau_h$ indicates a hadronically-decaying tau. The choice of $bb$ and $\tau\tau$ final states is motivated by the large branching fractions predicted in most of the 2HDM phase space.

The reconstruction and selection of the main physics objects involved in the final state is described in Section 4. The background estimation is based on data control regions whenever possible and is explained in Section 5. The evaluation of the experimental and theoretical systematic uncertainties relevant for this search is reported in Section 6. Finally, the results of the
2 The CMS detector

The central feature of the CMS apparatus is a superconducting solenoid of 6 m internal diameter, providing a magnetic field of 3.8 T. Within the superconducting solenoid volume a silicon pixel and strip tracker, a lead tungstate crystal electromagnetic calorimeter (ECAL), and a brass and scintillator hadron calorimeter (HCAL), each composed of a barrel and two endcap sections, are located in concentric layers. These layers provide coverage out to a pseudorapidity $|\eta| = 2.5$. Together with the magnet, the tracking system allows for tracks with transverse momentum $p_T$ as low as 100 MeV to be reconstructed, and give a $p_T$ resolution of 1% at 100 GeV. The ECAL electromagnetic transverse energy resolution is of about $3%/\sqrt{E_T/\text{GeV}}$, and the HCAL transverse hadronic energy resolution is of about $100%/\sqrt{E_T/\text{GeV}}$. Muons are measured in gas-ionization detectors embedded in the steel flux-return yoke outside the solenoid. Extensive forward calorimetry complements are provided by the barrel and endcap detectors up to $|\eta| < 5.2$. The first level (L1) of the CMS trigger system uses information from the calorimeters and muon detectors to select the most interesting events in a fixed time interval of less than 4 $\mu$s. The high-level trigger (HLT) processor farm further decreases the event rate from around 100 kHz to around 400 Hz before data storage. A more detailed description of the CMS detector, together with a definition of the coordinate system used and the relevant kinematic variables, can be found in Ref. [10].

3 Data and simulation samples

The data were collected during 2012 at the center-of-mass energy of $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV, for a total luminosity of $\mathcal{L} = 19.8$ fb$^{-1}$. The average number of interactions per bunch crossing (pileup) in the considered data sample was 21. Events are selected using di-electron and di-muon triggers [11, 12]. The di-lepton triggers have transverse momentum ($p_T$) thresholds of 17 and 8 GeV, and loose identification and isolation criteria. Simulated events corresponding to the main background processes, W/Z+jets, $t\bar{t}$+jets, diboson, are generated with MADGRAPH 5 [13] whereas PYTHIA 6 [14] was used for the parton showering. In addition for the $\tau\tau$ channel the SM background contribution from ZZ production via the $q\bar{q}$ initial states is generated at Next-to-Leading Order (NLO) with POWHEG [15]. The same is done for the single-top production process. The detector response is simulated using a detailed description of the CMS detector, based on the GEANT4 toolkit [16]. The simulated samples include a number of pileup collision events reflecting the distribution measured in the data. The “tag and probe“ technique [17] is used to correct the simulation results.

In the context of the 2HDM, two processes have been considered as signal: $H \to ZA$ and $A \to ZH$ where the pseudo-scalar $A$ and the scalar $H$, respectively, decay to $\tau\tau$ or $bb$, and the $Z$ decays to $\ell\ell$. The latest MADGRAPH 5 version, interfaced with PYTHIA 6 and TAUOLA [18], has been used to generate different signal processes according to different $M_A$ and $M_H$ combinations. The signal samples have been obtained using the full simulation and reconstruction chain within the CMSSW official framework. Considering the parameter space still allowed by direct searches, the chosen values for $\cos(\beta - \alpha)$ and $\tan \beta$ are 0.01 and 1.5, respectively. The lightest scalar has the same properties as the SM Higgs boson and its mass $M_h$ has been fixed at 125 GeV. The masses of the charged Higgs bosons ($M_{H^\pm}$) are set equal to the highest mass involved in the signal process ($M_H$ or $M_A$) in order to preserve the degeneracy $M_{H^\pm}^2 \sim M_H^2/A$. The production search are reported in Section 7.
cross section values, used in the normalization of the signal samples, are extracted from the SusHi program [19], which provides the Next-to-Next-to-Leading-Order (NNLO) predictions.
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Figure 1: (a) Cross section values and branching ratios for the processes H/A \( \rightarrow \) ZA/H \( \rightarrow \) ℓℓττ in fb normalized to NNLO SusHi predictions. (b) Widths of heavy H for some representative signal benchmark points for different mass values of the pseudo-scalar A decaying into a pair of b-jets. The chosen model parameters, \( \cos(\alpha - \beta) = 0.01 \) and \( \tan \beta = 1.5 \), are reported on both figures.

Figure 1a shows the NNLO theoretical cross-sections times branching ratios (\( \sigma \cdot BRs \)) in the plane \( M_H - M_A \) for the process \( H \rightarrow ZA \rightarrow \ell\ell\tau\tau \) in the upper left triangle, and the process \( A \rightarrow ZH \rightarrow \ell\ell\tau\tau \) in the bottom right triangle. The \( \sigma \cdot BRs \) for the signal samples used in the \( \ell\ell\tau\tau \) analysis correspond to values of \( M_H/A \) and \( M_A/H \) varying in the ranges [200,1000] GeV and [15,900] GeV, respectively, with the constraint \( M_H/A > M_A/H + M_Z \). The region where \( M_H \) is smaller than \( M_h \) is not allowed in the considered model. In the case of the \( A/H \rightarrow b\bar{b} \) decay channel, a homogeneous set of signal mass points in the \( M_H - M_A \) plane is also simulated to study the kinematics and the width of the resonant Higgs bosons. These specific mass points have been generated with MADGRAPH 5 and interfaced with the DELPHES [20] fast simulation framework, tuned for delivering with good approximation the CMS performance in the reconstruction of physics objects. The order of magnitude of the expected signal widths, for the mass range considered in this search, is shown in Fig. 1b.

4 Event reconstruction and selection

The search in both channels, \( \ell\ell b\bar{b} \) and \( \ell\ell\tau\tau \), is based on the standard CMS analysis framework [21].

The object reconstruction is based on the particle-flow (PF) algorithm [22–24], which combines information from all CMS subdetectors to identify and reconstruct individual particles in the event: muons, electrons, photons, charged and neutral hadrons. From the resulting particle list, taus decaying hadronically and missing transverse energy (\( E_T^{miss} \)), defined as the magnitude of the vector sum of the transverse momenta of all observed bodies, are clustered. In order to minimize the effect of the pileup interactions, particles are required to originate from
the primary vertex. The primary vertex, reconstructed with the Deterministic Annealing algorithm [25], is the one characterized by the largest quadratic sum of the $p_T$ of its constituent tracks.

Muons are identified by performing a combined fit to position measurements from both the inner tracker and the muon detectors [26]. Electrons are identified by combining tracks and electromagnetic calorimeter clusters, including the energy deposits from final state radiation [27]. Hadronically-decaying taus are reconstructed and identified using the “hadron-plus-strips” algorithm [28] which uses charged hadrons and photons to reconstruct the main decay modes of the tau lepton: one charged hadron, one charged hadron plus photons, and three charged hadrons. Electrons and muons misidentified as hadronic taus are suppressed using dedicated criteria based on the consistency between the measurements in the tracker, the calorimeters, and the muon detector.

To reject non-prompt or misidentified leptons, electrons, muons, and taus are required to satisfy isolation criteria based on either the absolute or relative isolation variables. The absolute lepton isolation is defined as:

$$I_{\text{abs}} = \sum_{CH} p_T + \max \left( \sum_{NH} p_T + \sum_{\gamma} p_T - 0.5 \cdot \sum_{CH,PU} p_T, 0 \right)$$

In this formula, $\sum_{CH} p_T$ is the scalar sum of the transverse momenta of the charged hadrons originating from the primary vertex and located in a cone of size $\Delta R = \sqrt{(\Delta \eta)^2 + (\Delta \phi)^2} = 0.4$ (0.3) with the axis centered on the muon (electron) direction. All the other sums in the formula, $\sum_{NH} p_T$ and $\sum_{\gamma} p_T$, represent the same quantity for neutral hadrons and photons, respectively. Concerning taus, the particles used in the reconstruction of the object are excluded from the sums. The term $\sum_{CH,PU} p_T$ is the contribution of pileup photons and neutral hadrons estimated by using the scalar sum of the transverse momenta of charged hadrons from pileup vertices in the cone. The factor 0.5 corresponds to an estimated average of neutral to charged particles produced in the hadronization process and is measured using simulated events. The relative isolation is defined as $I_{\text{rel}} = I_{\text{abs}} / p_T$, where $p_T$ is the lepton transverse momentum.

Jets are reconstructed using the FASTJET software package from all the particle flow candidates according to the AK5 algorithm [29] with a distance parameter of radius 0.5. As part of the jet clustering procedure, charged PF particles not associated with the primary vertex are excluded by means of the Charged Hadron Subtraction technique (CHS). The identification of b-tagged jets is done via the Combined Secondary Vertex (CSV) algorithm [30], which exploits observables related to the long lifetime of b hadrons. The $E_T^{\text{miss}}$, based on PF reconstructed quantities, contains azimuthal corrections of detector resolution effects.

Despite the same object definition is valid for both $\ell\ell\bb$ and the $\ell\ell\tau\tau$ final states, the baseline event selections are customized, given the very different backgrounds affecting each channel. The methods for reducing and estimating backgrounds are described separately in the following sections.

### 4.1 Baseline event selection for $\ell\ell\bb$

The Z decay leptons are selected by the following requirements, driven by trigger acceptance and spatial boundaries of the CMS subdetectors: $p_T > 20\text{ GeV}, |\eta| < 2.5$ for electrons and $p_T > 20\text{ GeV}, |\eta| < 2.4$ for muons. The isolation cone of the leptons is taken to be $\Delta R < 0.3$ for electrons and $\Delta R < 0.4$ for muons and the final relative isolation cut is set to $I_{\text{rel}} < 0.15$ for electrons and $I_{\text{rel}} < 0.2$ for muons. Jets are selected to be in the kinematic region $p_T > 30$
4.2 Baseline event selection for $\ell\ell\tau\tau$

In the reconstruction and selection of $\ell\ell$bb events, the presence of two same-flavor, opposite-sign, and reconstructed lepton candidates forming an invariant mass pair in the range [76,106] GeV is required. This allows to get rid of the contamination of non-resonant Drell-Yan+jets and $t\bar{t}$ background processes. In case of multiple candidates, the lepton pair with the closest invariant mass to the nominal Z mass is chosen [31].

At least two CSV b-tagged jets are required to be present in the event, in order to reduce the contribution of Z+light jets events: these candidates are selected as those with the highest value of the CSV discriminant. The chosen working point (WP) for the b-tagged jets identification is the medium one which corresponds to a b-tagging efficiency greater than 65% and to a misidentification probability of light-parton jets (jets originating from gluons or u, d and s quarks) equal to 1% [30]. The $E_T^{\text{miss}}$ significance ($E_T^{\text{miss, sig}}$) is used to suppress backgrounds originating from $t\bar{t}$ processes. As defined, the significance offers an event-by-event assessment of the likelihood that the observed $E_T^{\text{miss}}$ is consistent with zero given the reconstructed content of the event and known resolutions of the CMS detector. This variable is more discriminating against the $t\bar{t}$ process than the $E_T^{\text{miss}}$ itself and, at the same time, leads to smaller systematic uncertainties. The $E_T^{\text{miss}}$ significance is required to be less than 10.

4.2 Baseline event selection for $\ell\ell\tau\tau$

As for the $\ell\ell$bb channel, the Z decay leptons are selected by requiring $p_T > 20$ GeV, $|\eta| < 2.5$ for electrons and $p_T > 20$ GeV, $|\eta| < 2.4$ for muons. The isolation cut chosen for light leptons is $I_{\text{rel}} < 0.3$. The reconstructed invariant mass of the two leptons is required to be in the range [76,106] GeV. Additionally, a Z $p_T > 20$ GeV and a difference in the azimuthal angle between the Z and $E_T^{\text{miss}}$ greater than 1.5 are required to suppress the Z+jets background.

In addition to the two light leptons required to reconstruct the Z, two additional opposite sign and different flavour leptons ($e$, $\mu$ and $\tau$) are required to reconstruct the H/A candidate. The requirements on the pseudorapidity and the relative isolation for the light leptons are the same as for the Z decay leptons, while the $p_T$ is required to be greater than 10 GeV. Tau candidates with well reconstructed decay modes and fulfilling the criteria to reject electrons and muons reconstructed as hadronic taus are required to have $p_T > 20$ GeV and $|\eta| < 2.3$. The absolute tau isolation required is $I_{\text{abs}} < 2$ GeV. For all the mass points and channels, lepton isolation values have been set according to an optimization procedure aimed at maximizing the a priori expected significance.

The Z+jets background is further reduced by selecting events with high $L_T$, where $L_T$ indicates the scalar sum of the visible $p_T$ of the two objects coming from the decay of the $\tau\tau$ pair. Maximizing the a priori expected significance, the optimal requirement on the $L_T$ quantity is found for each mass point and for each final state independently, by scanning the cut threshold between 0 and 200 GeV with steps of 20 GeV.

Jets are required to have $p_T > 30$ GeV and $|\eta| < 4.7$. However, to reject the large $t\bar{t}$ background, all the events with at least on jet with $p_T > 20$ GeV and $|\eta| < 2.4$, and tagged as b-jet by passing the medium working point for the CSV discriminator are vetoed.

In order to exploit the visible and the invisible information related to the $\tau$ decays, the Secondary Vertex Fit algorithm (SVFit) [32] is used to calculate the di-tau mass. The SVFit algorithm is a likelihood-based method that combines the reconstructed $E_T^{\text{miss}}$ and its resolution with the momentum of the visible tau decay products in order to obtain a precise estimator of the mass of the parent particle.

Muon momentum scale corrections [12] and electron energy corrections [33] also applied to
5 Background estimation

5.1 The $\ell\ell bb$ channel

After the event selection described in Section 4 for reconstructing the $\ell\ell bb$ final state, a significant deviation of data from the MC predictions is observed in the distribution of the $M_{\ell\ell bb}$ mass, mostly localized in the region 400-700 GeV. A reweighting technique is therefore applied, in order to correct possible mis-modelling of the LO Drell-Yan sample used in the simulation, which might affect the final results. The ratio NLO/LO of the light and heavy flavor component of the $M_{\ell\ell jj}$ distribution is fit with a third order polynomial and separate reweighting for these two categories is performed. A systematic on this reweighting is also assigned, as discussed in Section 6.

The relevant sources of background for the $\ell\ell bb$ final state originate from $Z + b$-tagged jets processes, $t\bar{t}$ pair production, double vector bosons production, and vector boson associated production with a SM Higgs boson. Contributions like $ZZ$, $WW$, $WZ$, and $tW$ have been normalized to the CMS measurement [34–37]. The associated production of $Z$ with the Higgs-like scalar boson (Zh) is also accounted as a background and normalized to the expected theoretical cross section [38]. Beyond the kinematic correction described before, the Drell-Yan component is categorized according to the number of jets, namely exactly two jets (2-jets category) and three or more jets (3-jets category), in order to account for NLO effects related to the modeling of extra jets [39]. Data-driven correction factors are derived after a proper categorization of the background processes, based on the flavor of the reconstructed jet. Those coming from the hadronization of $b$-quarks are classified as 'b', while those coming from charm, light quarks and gluons are classified as 'x'. The following scale factor (SF) nomenclature is then adopted:

- ‘SF$_{Zbb}$’ rescales the $Z+bb$ contribution in the 2-jet category only, dominated by the $Z+bb$ process at leading order (i.e. without extra jets).
- ‘SF$_{Zb(b)x}$’ rescales the $Z+bb$ contribution in the 3-jet category, as well as the $Z+b+x$ contribution in both the 2-jet and 3-jet categories. All three contributions are dominated by NLO effects in the $Zbb$ final state.
- ‘SF$_{Zxx}$’ rescales the $Z+light$-jets contribution in both the 2-jet and 3-jet categories.
- ‘SF$_{tt}$’ rescales the $t\bar{t}$ contribution in both the 2-jet and 3-jet categories.

Scale factors for the background are left free to float in a two-dimensional fit to the shape of two observables, the product of the CSV discriminants of both selected jets and the invariant mass of the lepton pair from $Z$ boson decay in the range $60 < M_{\ell\ell} < 120$ GeV. This fit is performed simultaneously in the four different categories (electrons, muons, exactly two jets, and more than two jets), after requiring the presence of at least a pair of same flavor opposite sign leptons and two $b$-tagged jets in the event. The first observable is sensitive to the contribution from non-$b$ jets contamination, whereas the second variable is sensitive to the contamination of $t\bar{t}$ events. The variables used as input of the fit procedure are shown in Fig. 2. Given the negligible effect that a possible signal manifestation over the considered background fit range would bring, no specific control and signal regions have been defined for the derivation of the background scale factors. The SF$_{tt}$ is found to be compatible with one (1.04 $\pm$ 0.03), while the fact that SF$_{Zxx}$ (1.27 $\pm$ 0.10) and SF$_{Zb(b)x}$ (1.27 $\pm$ 0.05) are significantly larger than one indicates a possible underestimation of the mis-tag fraction in the simulation. The SF$_{Zbb}$ (1.16 $\pm$ 0.04) is found
5.2 The $\ell\ell\tau\tau$ channel

Methods based on data control samples and comparison with simulated events are used to estimate residual backgrounds after the selection described in Section 4. Normalizations and
Figure 3: The $M_{bb}$ and $M_{\ell\ell bb}$ observables after the baseline selection, background normalization, and shape correction for NLO effects. Distributions combine the electron and muon channel of the $H \rightarrow ZA \rightarrow \ell\ell bb$ analysis. The last bin in both distributions contains the overflow. In the data/simulation ratio, the yellow band shows the statistical uncertainty in the simulated yield.
shapes of the main irreducible backgrounds ($ZZ$ and SM $Zh \to \ell\ell\tau\tau$) are estimated from MC. Simulations are also used to estimate small contributions from the $WWZ$ process, where one $Z$ decays into a di-electron or di-muon pair and the $W$ bosons decay leptonically, and fully leptonic $t\bar{t}Z$ decays, for which about 4% passes the selection in the $e\mu$ channel despite the b-jet veto.

Production of $Z+$jets and $WZ+$jets constitute the main sources of background with at least one misidentified lepton. Misidentified light leptons ($\mu$ or $e$) arise from the semileptonic decays of heavy flavor quarks, decays in flight, misidentified hadrons, and electrons from photon conversions, while quark or gluon jets can be wrongly reconstructed as hadronic taus. A data-driven approach is used to estimate this background.

The lepton misidentification probability is the probability that a genuine jet satisfying loose identification criteria, also passes the identification criteria required for the lepton candidate in the signal region (“tight” lepton). This probability is measured for each lepton flavor using a data sample where a $Z$ candidate is selected, as explained in the Section 4, and an additional single lepton, electron, muon, or tau passes the loose identification requirements. By counting the number of these loose leptons that also pass the tight lepton identification criteria in bins of the $p_T$ of the reconstructed jet closest to the loose lepton, the misidentification probability $f(p_T)$ is then obtained. The contribution of genuine leptons arising from the non-negligible $WZ$ and $ZZ(\to 4\ell$ and $\to 2\ell 2\tau)$ production are subtracted.

Once the misidentification probabilities have been computed for each lepton flavor, three different control regions are defined where a $Z$ candidate and two opposite-charge leptons are required. These control regions are defined as follows:

- **Control Region 00** ($CR_{00}$): both leptons pass the loose identification criteria but not the tight ones;
- **Control Region 10** ($CR_{10}$): one lepton passes the tight identification requirements, the other passes only the loose ones (“loose” lepton). In this control region the loose lepton is the sub-leading tau in the $\tau_0 \tau_0$, the light lepton in the $\ell_0 \tau_0$ and the electron in the $e\mu$ final state;
- **Control Region 01** ($CR_{01}$): as in the control region $CR_{10}$, but in this case the loose lepton is the leading tau in the $\tau_0 \tau_0$, the tau in the $\ell_0 \tau_0$ and the muon in the $e\mu$ final state.

The estimate $N_{fake}$ of the background with at least one misidentified lepton is given by the following expression:

\[
N_{fake} = N_{10} \frac{f_1(p_T)}{1 - f_1(p_T)} + N_{01} \frac{f_2(p_T)}{1 - f_2(p_T)} - N_{00} \frac{f_1(p_T)f_2(p_T)}{(1 - f_1(p_T))(1 - f_2(p_T))}.
\]

(2)

where $N_{00}$, $N_{01}$, and $N_{10}$ denote the number of events in the $CR_{00}$, $CR_{01}$, and $CR_{10}$ control regions, respectively, and $f_1(p_T)$ and $f_2(p_T)$ indicate the misidentification probabilities of the loose leptons in the control regions, as defined above. The expression in Eq. 2 takes into account both the background with two misidentified leptons (mostly from $Z+$jets) and that from only one misidentified lepton (primarily $WZ+$jets). The contamination of genuine leptons in the control regions from the SM $Zh$, $WWZ$, $WZZ$, $ZZZ$, $t\bar{t}Z$ and $ZZ$ processes is estimated from simulation and is subtracted from $N_{00}$, $N_{01}$ and $N_{10}$. In some cases the subtraction process gives negative values, which are treated with the Feldman-Cousins (FC) approach [41], i.e. considering zero as the best measurement estimate and the FC 68%CL upper limit on the measurement as statistical error. The reducible background yields, relative to the cut-and-count analysis and
corresponding to have no requirements on the $L_T$ for all the channels, are reported in Table 2. These numbers are shown here for the sake of illustration only, as the reducible background estimate varies according to the $L_T$ requirement found to be optimal for each channel and for each mass point. The same procedure described above has also been applied in every bin of the histograms used in the shape analysis. In this case, both same-sign and opposite-sign di-lepton pairs have been considered, whereas the normalization of the histograms is obtained from just the opposite-sign events.

Table 2: Final reducible background yields for all the eight final states obtained from data using Eq. 2. Statistical uncertainties are also reported.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>channel</th>
<th>$N_{fake}$(Data)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$e^+e^-$</td>
<td>$0.15 \pm 1.85$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$e^+e^-$ $\tau^+_h$</td>
<td>$1.09 \pm 1.21$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$e^+\mu^-\tau^+_h$</td>
<td>$0.48 \pm 1.82$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$e^+e^-\tau^-_h$</td>
<td>$11.70 \pm 2.58$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu^-\mu^-\tau^-_h$</td>
<td>$0.25 \pm 1.90$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu^-\mu^-\tau^-_h$</td>
<td>$0.26 \pm 0.93$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu^-\mu^-\tau^-_h$</td>
<td>$3.24 \pm 1.18$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu^-\mu^-\tau^-_h$</td>
<td>$12.85 \pm 2.84$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A closure test, using the simulated samples of background with at least one misidentified lepton, has been performed. The data-driven method described above has been applied on these simulated samples and the resulting yield has been compared to the true yield in the signal region. The misidentification probabilities have also been obtained from the same simulated samples. This closure test allows to assess a systematic uncertainty of 40%, for all channels and all $L_T$ thresholds, in the estimates of the reducible backgrounds obtained with this method.

## 6 Systematic uncertainties

Systematic uncertainties affecting the normalization and the shape of signal and background processes can bias the outcome of the search. Those affecting both decay channels considered in this search have been identified in:

- Luminosity: The uncertainty in the luminosity recorded by CMS is estimated to be 2.6% in the 2012 dataset [42].
- Effect from pile-up: The total inelastic cross section used to infer the pile-up in data from the instantaneous luminosity is varied by $\pm 5\%$, thereby affecting the pile-up distribution used in simulation. The variation observed on the background and signal yields, through its effect on the lepton isolation requirements, is found to be between 1-3%.
- Di-lepton selection and trigger efficiencies: The systematic uncertainty of the scale factor per lepton, applied to MC events to compensate for data/MC differences and hereby affecting the estimate of the final yields, is obtained with the tag-and-probe method [12], and is found to be of the order of 1% for muons and 2% for electrons. This uncertainty is expected to affect in the same way both signal and background processes estimated from simulation. Also, the double muon and double electron trigger uncertainties are evaluated to be of 1% by specific studies on the $Z$ peak.
- Jet energy scale (JES) and resolution (JER): The uncertainty in the jet energy scale is taken from Ref. [43], and the values are varied up and down according to official recommendations. The effect on the background is estimated each time. The effect
on the signal is estimated to be 3–5% depending on the $p_T$ and $\eta$ of the jets. The uncertainty on the signal and background yields due to the imperfect knowledge of jet energy resolution in CMS detector is estimated to be of the order of 3%.

- B-tagging and mis-tag efficiency: the uncertainties affecting the b-tagging efficiencies are $p_T$-dependent and vary from 3% up to 12% (for $p_T < 30$ GeV). These uncertainties are propagated to the b-tagging data/MC scale factors, as described in Ref. [44, 45], and found to be of the order of 5% for the background and 4-6% for the signal for the $\ell\ell bb$ analysis, and of the order of 1% for the $\ell\ell \tau\tau$ one. The uncertainty on the mistagging rate, which enters the calculation of the event weight at second order, is found to have a negligible impact.

Specifically for the $\ell\ell bb$ and $\ell\ell \tau\tau$ final states a set of additional systematics has been evaluated and their impact on the extracted upper limits has been quantified.

Table 3: Summary of systematic uncertainties on event yields of signal and background processes. The last column quotes whether the source of uncertainty is assigned as rate (normalization) uncertainty or as a shape (probability distribution function) uncertainty in the analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>$H\rightarrow ZA \rightarrow \ell\ell \tau\tau$</th>
<th>$H\rightarrow ZA \rightarrow \ell\ell bb$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Uncertainty [%]</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luminosity</td>
<td>2.6 rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pile-up effects</td>
<td>1-3 shape</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lepton ID/Isolation/ES</td>
<td>2 rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lepton trigger efficiency</td>
<td>1 rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jet ES/resolution</td>
<td>3 shape</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tau ID/Iso</td>
<td>6 rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tau ES</td>
<td>3 shape</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducible bkg. estimate</td>
<td>40 rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-tagging and mis-tag efficiency</td>
<td>1 rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bkg. normalization (ZZ)</td>
<td>11 rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bkg. norm. (DY + jets and $t\bar{t}$)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bkg. norm. ($tW,WW,WZ$ and Zh)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drell-Yan bkg. modelling</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal efficiency extrapolation</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal modelling (PDF, scale)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Concerning the $\ell\ell bb$ final state, the uncertainty on the background normalization scale factors derived in Section 5 for DY+jets and $t\bar{t}$ has been quantified using statistical uncertainty from the fit. Additionally, a systematic associated to the modeling of $M_{\ell\ell bb}$ spectrum after the reweighting performed in Section 5 has also been assigned and found to be 5–30% depending on the $M_{\ell\ell bb}$ mass considered. For the remaining backgrounds, uncertainty of 11% is assigned to the ZZ normalization [34] and 6-7% for the other diboson processes (WW, WZ) [35][36]. The size of the systematics has been derived using the uncertainty on the CMS measured cross-section for these SM processes. For the other minor background $tW$ the uncertainty has been estimated to be around 23% from the measured cross section as well [37]. Uncertainty on the Zh process has been instead derived from the theoretical cross-section, and found to be of the order of 7% [38]. An uncertainty due to the extrapolation of the signal efficiency and acceptance for the different signal points in the $M_H-M_A$ plane has also been evaluated, which is close to 3% in most of the phase space and goes up to 50% at the boundaries of the sensitivity region. Systematic un-
certainty on the signal has been evaluated by varying the set of Parton Distribution Functions (PDF) used and the factorization and renormalization scale. An effect of 5-6% is estimated on the entire mass range.

Regarding the $\ell\ell\tau\tau$ final state, the hadronic tau identification uncertainty has been determined to be 6% by CMS using the tag-and-probe type measurement. The hadronic tau energy scale uncertainty is within 3% and it affects the final mass shapes. The systematic uncertainties estimated on light leptons, taus and jets energy scales, have been propagated on the $E_T^{\text{miss}}$ and, therefore, on the mass shapes. The propagation on the $E_T^{\text{miss}}$ estimator has been done, firstly, summing light leptons, taus and jets energy contributions and, secondly, subtracting the corresponding object collection contributions, once the nominal energy scale (or resolution) have been varied by $\pm 1\sigma$ (for leptons, taus and jets). One of the main systematic uncertainty is the one related to the non-prompt background estimation. This uncertainty, estimated to be 40%, has been evaluated in the context of the closure test as it has been described in the Section 5. Additionally, as for the $\ell\ell\tau\tau$ channel, 11% uncertainty is assigned to the ZZ normalization.

All the sources of systematic uncertainties are summarized in Table 3.

## 7 Results

Two moderate excesses are visible for the $\ell\ell\bb$ channel in the region around $(M_{\bb}, M_{\ell\ell\bb}) = (93,286)$ GeV and $(M_{\bb}, M_{\ell\ell\bb}) = (575,662)$ GeV. They have respectively local significance of 2.6 and 2.85 $\sigma$, which become globally 1.6 and 1.9 $\sigma$ once accounting for the Look Elsewhere Effect [46]. The CLs criterion [47, 48] is used to determine at 95% confidence level (CL) the upper limits on the signal cross section. The numerical values for the cross section upper limits and significance are derived with the asymptotic method reported in [49].

For the $\ell\ell\bb$ final state, results are obtained using a counting experiment approach. This approach has the advantage of being less model-dependent than a shape-based approach which relies on the shape of the expected signal. It can be then more easily reinterpreted in other theory models foreseeing the same final state. Results are reported in bins as a function of the $M_{\bb}$ and $M_{\ell\ell\bb}$ masses, ranging from 10 GeV up to 1 TeV for the $M_{\bb}$, and from 140 GeV up to 1 TeV for the $M_{\ell\ell\bb}$. In order to define the proper granularity of the binning, a study has been performed by using DELPHES simulation of few signal benchmark points and evaluating the width of the $M_{\bb}$ and $M_{\ell\ell\bb}$ peaks in the considered mass range. The average reconstructed width for $M_{\bb}$ and $M_{\ell\ell\bb}$ is found to be of the order of 15% of the mass considered (defined as $\sigma$). The amplitude of the bin has been therefore chosen to be $\pm 1.5\sigma$ around each considered mass point.

In order to interpret the results in terms of upper limits on the production cross section for a specific 2HDM type, the signal efficiencies, defined as the fraction of events reconstructed in the detector acceptance, are calculated using 13 representative signal points in the 2D plane. A realistic prediction of the efficiencies for the rest of the mass space is instead derived from DELPHES simulation of the signal mass points and combined with proper interpolation with the existing 13 reference points. A signal efficiency map, based on the convolution of a full and fast simulation, is shown in Fig. 4.

The final observed exclusion limit ranges from few fb
The efficiency map obtained from an hybrid generation of signal mass points (CMSSW simulation interpolated with DELPHES) for the ℓℓbb final state.

For \( M_H \) close to 1 TeV to 100 fb for \( M_H < 300 \text{ GeV} \). The validity of these results can be extended to models containing both A and H with a natural width smaller than 15% of their masses.

The expected (observed) upper limits on the signal cross section modifier \( \mu \) are shown in the right (left) plot of Fig. 6, assuming the benchmark models described in Section 3. This search is not able to exclude the high-mass region (\( M_A > 300 \text{ GeV} \)) due to the drop in the signal cross section when the t\( t \) channel opens (\( M_A > 2M_{\text{top}} \)). Furthermore, it can be noticed that, in the region where boosted topologies manifest (\( M_H \sim 10 \cdot M_A \)), the sensitivity is lower compared to the rest of the plane, mostly due to the inefficiency in the reconstruction of signal decay products in such regime. Still a significant portion of the phase space is excluded in the range [20-250] GeV for \( M_{\text{bb}} \) and [200-650] GeV for \( M_{\ell\ell\text{bb}} \) both considering the decay H\( \rightarrow \)ZA and A\( \rightarrow \)ZH (solid contour on right plot of Fig. 6). The region where \( M_{H/A} < M_{A/H} + M_Z \) is kinematically forbidden.

The limits on the cross section times branching ratio can also be visualized as a limit on tan\( \beta \) and \( \cos(\beta - \alpha) \) for a given pair of \( M_A \) and \( M_H \). This is illustrated in Fig. 7 where the limits on these two parameters is shown for the case \( M_H = 350 \text{ GeV} \) and \( M_A = 150 \text{ GeV} \). The dashed region in the center of this plot shows the parameter space which is currently excluded for the pair of masses chosen. The region around \( \cos(\beta - \alpha) \approx 0 \) is of particular interest as it is generally difficult to probe with other analyses. For this case, the region where tan\( \beta \) lies between 0.2 and 2 is excluded.

In the context of the ℓℓττ analysis, both a cut-and-count and a shape-based search, which uses the \( M_{\tau\tau} \) distribution, have been performed.

The cut-and-count approach, which uses only the number of signal and background events passing a selection depending on \( M_\ell \) and \( M_{\ell\ell\tau\tau} \), is less model dependent and less affected by systematic uncertainties than the shape-based approach, which is instead more sensitive to the benchmark signal model explored in this search. The shape-based search also yields expected upper limits on the signal cross section times branching ratios that are about 20-30% lower than those obtained with the cut-and-count approach in most of the \( M_H-M_A \) plane. The expected
Figure 5: Expected (a) and observed (b) upper limits on $\sigma_{H/A\rightarrow ZA/H\rightarrow\ell\ell bb}$ as a function of $M_A$ and $M_H$ after the convolution with efficiency and acceptance map for the $\ell\ell bb$ final state.

Figure 6: Expected (a) and observed (b) limits on the signal strength $\mu = \sigma_{\text{exp}}/\sigma_{\text{TH}}$ for the 2HDM benchmark considered for $\ell\ell bb$ final state. The cross section is normalized to the NNLO SusHi predictions. The dashed contour in both plots show the region which is expected to be excluded. In the right plot the solid contour shows the region which is excluded by data observation.
Figure 7: Expected (dashed line) and observed (solid line) 95%CL limits on \( \cos(\beta - \alpha) \) and \( \tan(\beta) \) for the 2HDM benchmark considered for \( \ell\ell b\bar{b} \) final state and for \( M_H = 350 \text{ GeV} \) and \( M_A = 150 \text{ GeV} \). The green and yellow bands correspond respectively to the 1 and 2 standard deviations from the expected limits. The dashed region corresponds to the zone that is excluded by this search.

Table 4: Expected number of signal and background events compared to the number of observed events in data for an integrated luminosity of 19.8 fb\(^{-1} \) at \( \sqrt{s} = 8 \text{ TeV} \) and after having applied the final signal selection. The signal \( M_H = 200 \text{ GeV} - M_A = 50 \text{ GeV} \) is normalized to \( \sigma \times \text{BR} = 1 \text{ fb} \). The yields correspond to \( L_T > 20 \text{ GeV} \) for \( e\mu, \mu\tau_h \) and \( \tau_h\tau_h \) and \( L_T > 40 \text{ GeV} \) for \( e\tau_h \). The statistical uncertainties are reported for all the signal and background processes, while only systematic uncertainties related to the reducible background estimated from data are shown. All the other systematic uncertainties affecting the rate, and listed in Table 3, are included in the final limit computation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channels</th>
<th>( e\tau_h )</th>
<th>( e\mu )</th>
<th>( \mu\tau_h )</th>
<th>( \tau_h\tau_h )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SM Zh</td>
<td>0.266 \pm 0.012</td>
<td>0.224 \pm 0.011</td>
<td>0.665 \pm 0.019</td>
<td>0.615 \pm 0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WZZ</td>
<td>0.0158 \pm 0.0054</td>
<td>0.0215 \pm 0.0064</td>
<td>0.0210 \pm 0.0061</td>
<td>0.0206 \pm 0.0062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZZZ</td>
<td>0.0032 \pm 0.0012</td>
<td>0.0037 \pm 0.0013</td>
<td>0.0095 \pm 0.0020</td>
<td>0.0067 \pm 0.0017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWZ</td>
<td>0.136 \pm 0.028</td>
<td>0.460 \pm 0.053</td>
<td>0.025 \pm 0.012</td>
<td>0.187 \pm 0.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tZ</td>
<td>0.022 \pm 0.022</td>
<td>0.217 \pm 0.067</td>
<td>0.021 \pm 0.021</td>
<td>0.062 \pm 0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZZ ( \rightarrow 4l )</td>
<td>0.309 \pm 0.020</td>
<td>0.660 \pm 0.0089</td>
<td>0.344 \pm 0.021</td>
<td>0.279 \pm 0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZZ ( \rightarrow 2l2\tau )</td>
<td>3.891 \pm 0.071</td>
<td>4.344 \pm 0.075</td>
<td>11.40 \pm 0.12</td>
<td>11.46 \pm 0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fakes</td>
<td>0.9 \pm 1.3</td>
<td>0.4 \pm 2.7 &amp; 24.5 \pm 3.8 &amp; 6.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total bkg.</td>
<td>5.8 \pm 1.3</td>
<td>5.7 \pm 2.7</td>
<td>37.0 \pm 3.8</td>
<td>16.3 \pm 2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>0.0326 \pm 0.0038</td>
<td>0.058 \pm 0.0050</td>
<td>0.1100 \pm 0.0069</td>
<td>0.1379 \pm 0.0077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>5 \pm 7 \pm 42</td>
<td>7 \pm 42</td>
<td>42 \pm 7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

number of signal and background events obtained at the end of the selection compared to those observed in data are summarized in Table 4 for only one mass pair selection for sake of illustration: \( M_H =200 \text{ GeV} - M_A = 50 \text{ GeV} \). For both analyses, the number of events observed is found compatible with the expected SM background.

In the shape-based analysis, non-constant mass bin widths have been adopted in order to account for the \( M_{\tau\tau} \) resolution. The \( M_{\tau\tau} \) shapes corresponding to the same reference selection
Figure 8: \( M_{\tau\tau} \) distributions for the signal \( M_H=200 \text{ GeV} \) and \( M_A=50 \text{ GeV} \). The distributions correspond to \( L_T > 20 \text{ GeV} \) for \( e\mu, \mu\tau_\ell \) and \( L_T > 40 \text{ GeV} \) for \( et\ell \) and \( \tau_\ell\tau_\ell \). Statistical uncertainty bars have extrema computed using the Garwood procedure [50]. The signal is normalized to \( \sigma \times \text{BR}=1 \text{ fb} \).

are reported in Fig. 8.

Fig. 9 shows the limit on the \( \sigma \times \text{BR} \) in the \( M_H-M_A \) plane: in particular, Fig. 9a and 9b show
Figure 9: Limits on $\sigma_{H/A\to ZA/H\to \ell\ell\tau\tau}$ as a function of $M_A$ and $M_H$ for the $\ell\ell\tau\tau$ final state. Expected and observed limits for the cut-and-count analysis are reported in (a) and (b), while the corresponding results for the shape-based analysis are shown in (c) and (d), respectively. On top of the plots, black dots, referring to the full simulated signal samples, are shown.
Figure 10: Limits on $\mu = \sigma_{95\%}/\sigma_{TH}$ for the $\ell\ell\tau\tau$ final state as function of the A and H boson masses. Expected and observed limits for the cut-and-count analysis are reported in (a) and (b), while the corresponding results for the shape-based analysis are shown in (c) and (d), respectively. The black dots refer to the full simulated signal samples. $\pm 1\sigma$ expected exclusion contours are drawn (dashed lines), together with the actual excluded regions delimited with solid lines.
the expected and observed limits, respectively, for the cut-and-count analysis, while Fig. 9c and 9d show the corresponding results for the shape-based analysis. Black dots indicate the signal samples that have been fully simulated. The limits at points in the rest of the plane have been obtained by interpolation. The limits in the lower-right triangle, which corresponds to the process $A \rightarrow ZH$, have been obtained by simply mirroring the results obtained in the higher-left triangle because signal selection efficiency for $H \rightarrow ZA$ and $A \rightarrow ZH$ is the same provided that the masses of the heavy and light bosons in the two processes are the same. The kinematically forbidden region is the one where $M_{H/A} < M_{A/H} + M_Z$ and is also reported in Fig. 10. As can be seen from the plot, a cross section of about 5 fb is excluded in the majority of the $M_{H/A}$ plane ($500 < M_{H/A} < 1000$ GeV and $90 < M_{A/H} < 400$ GeV) for both cut-and-count and shape-based analysis.

Limits on the signal strength $\mu = \sigma/\sigma_{TH}$, where the $\sigma_{TH}$ is the NNLO theoretical prediction for the cross section as given by SusHi, are shown in Fig. 10. Fig. 10a and 10b show the expected and observed limits, respectively, for the cut-and-count analysis, while Fig. 10c and 10d show the corresponding results for the shape-based analysis. The 95%CL expected excluded regions with 68% of probability, which are the same for both expected and observed limits, are delimited by dashed lines.

The excluded regions, different between expected and observed limits, are instead delimited by solid black lines. In the benchmark signal model scenario, the region where $M_{H/A} < M_h$ is forbidden. This kind of white regions are not reported in Fig. 9, instead, which shows model-independent results that may be reinterpreted in any other theoretical context.

As for the $\ell\ell bb$ final state, the visualization of the limits on the cross section times branching ratio in the $\tan\beta$ and $\cos(\beta - \alpha)$ parameter space is provided in Fig. 11, for both cut-and-count (left) and shape-based analysis (right). The mass pair considered is the same as for the $\ell\ell bb$ final state. Looking at the dashed region, which is the one currently excluded for the pair of masses chosen, it can be seen that, for $\cos(\beta - \alpha) \approx 0$, values of $\tan\beta$ roughly between 0.5 and 1.5 are excluded in the context of the shape-based analysis, while a smaller interval [0.5,1.3] is excluded for the cut-and-count one.
Figure 11: Expected (dashed line) and observed (solid line) 95%CL limits, in the context of the cut-and-count (a) and the shape-based analysis (b), on $\cos(\beta - \alpha)$ and $\tan(\beta)$ for the 2HDM benchmark considered for $\ell\ell\tau\tau$ final state and for $M_H = 350$ GeV and $M_A = 150$ GeV. The green and yellow bands correspond respectively to the 1 and 2 standard deviations from the expected limits. The dashed region corresponds to the zone that is currently excluded.
8 Summary

A search has been performed for a heavy resonance decaying to a Z boson and a light resonance, giving rise to $\ell\ell bb$ and $\ell\ell \tau\tau$ final states, where the light resonance decays to either a pair of bottom quarks or a pair of tau leptons and the Z boson decays to two electrons or two muons. No significant deviations from the expectations of the standard model are observed and upper limits on the cross section times branching fraction are set using a dataset corresponding to an integrated luminosity of $19.8 \text{ fb}^{-1}$ at $\sqrt{s} = 8 \text{ TeV}$ of proton–proton collisions. The search excludes cross sections times branching fractions as low as 1 fb (5 fb) for the $\ell\ell \tau\tau$ ($\ell\ell bb$) final state, depending on the light and heavy resonance masses.

Limits have also been set on type II 2HDM models, which predict the process $H/A \rightarrow ZA/H$, where $H$ and $A$ are CP-even and CP-odd scalar bosons, respectively. In particular the model considered corresponds to the parameters $\cos(\beta - \alpha) = 0.01$ and $\tan \beta = 1.5$.

Concerning the $\ell\ell bb$ final state, it has been shown that the considered 2HDM benchmark scenario is excluded in the range $[20,250] \text{ GeV}$ for $M_{A/H}$ and $[200,650] \text{ GeV}$ for $M_{H/A}$ for the processes $H/A \rightarrow ZA/H$. The search in the $\ell\ell \tau\tau$ final state excludes masses of the H boson in the ranges $[125,250]$ and $[300,400] \text{ GeV}$ and for the A boson in the range $[125,400] \text{ GeV}$.

Limits have been also derived as a function of $\tan \beta$ and $\cos(\beta - \alpha)$ parameters. It has been shown that, for some choices of $M_H$-$M_A$ values, some regions in the parameter space $\tan \beta$-$\cos(\beta - \alpha)$ can be excluded. In particular, for $M_H = 350 \text{ GeV}$ and $M_A = 150 \text{ GeV}$, for $\cos(\beta - \alpha) \approx 0$ a $\tan \beta$ range roughly between 0.2 and 2 can be excluded for the $\ell\ell bb$ channel. Considering the same mass point, for the $\ell\ell \tau\tau$ final state, both in the context of the cut-and-count and the shape-based analysis and for $\cos(\beta - \alpha) \approx 0$, the interval $0.5 < \tan \beta \leq 1.5$ is excluded.
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