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Introduction

At the time of writing this thesis, the Standard Model of particle physics is the most fundamental well-established theory describing our universe on the smallest scales. Despite the phenomenal success the Standard Model has had in predicting experimentally confirmed high energy physics phenomena, there are a number of observed phenomena that it can not explain. Among the most stark of these shortcomings are

1. Neutrino oscillations
2. Baryon asymmetry of the universe
3. Dark matter
4. Inflation of the early universe
5. Dark energy
6. Gravity

In order to explain these phenomena, many extensions to the Standard Model have been forwarded. One of these with the potential to explain at least points 1–3 of the shortcomings listed above is the introduction of heavy neutral leptons.\(^1\)

There is currently a plethora of experimental efforts underway aiming at the discovery of this class of particles. While there are some theoretical considerations at what energy scales these ultra-weakly interacting particle could be produced, the parameter space is fairly unrestricted. As direct detection experiments are restricted in their maximal production energy, researchers are looking to processes in which heavy neutral leptons contribute or interact virtually. In such processes they hope to find traces of heavy neutral leptons with masses above the electroweak scale. One of such indirect processes is the equivalent of the neutrinoless double beta decay at high energy hadron colliders.

The goal of this thesis is to describe this process in a neutrino theory that can be reconciled with existing experimental neutrino data. Furthermore, it aims at highlighting the importance of assuming realistic neutrino scenarios when analysing indirect processes in general.

\(^1\)The \(\nu\)MSM discussed in Section 1.2.3 also promises to explain inflation with the Standard Model Higgs as the inflaton.
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1.1 Standard Model

Before diving into the theory behind heavy neutral leptons and how they fit into the Standard Model, this section is meant to give a brief summary of the framework in which this extension would be embedded. The following brief overview will take inspiration from much more profound introductions to the topic [1, 2].

1.1.1 General Structure

The Standard Model of particle physics (SM, also known as the Glashow-Weinberg-Salam model) was first formulated in the framework of quantum field theory in the 1960s [3–5]. With the discovery of the Higgs boson in 2011 [6, 7], all predicted particles of the SM have been experimentally confirmed, and predicted values have been met with exceptional accuracy. The SM is the result of decades of research in particle physics culminating in this description of all known forces — with the exception of gravity — in a quantum field gauge theory.

In a nutshell, the Standard Model can be divided into three subcategories:

- Fermionic matter content of quarks ($q_\alpha$), leptons ($\ell_\alpha$), neutrinos ($\nu_\ell$)
- Force mediating gauge bosons (gluon $g$, photon $\gamma$, weak force mediators $W, Z$)
- Higgs boson $h$ responsible for generating SM masses through Higgs mechanism

The well known graphic representation of this is shown on the left panel of Fig. 1.2.

Standard Model Lagrangian

More fundamentally, the model is described by the non-abelian (Yang-Mills [10]) $SU(3)_c \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ gauge group. The $SU(3)_c$ part describes quantum chromodynamics (QCD), while $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ describes the electroweak sector. The interaction — and self interaction — of the associated gauge fields in this theory are described by the Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{gauge}} = -\frac{1}{4} G_{\mu\nu}^a G^{a\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{4} W_{\mu\nu}^j W^{j\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{4} B_{\mu\nu} B^{\mu\nu},$$  \hspace{1cm} (1.1)

However, a few notable anomalies — that we will not cover in detail in this work — have been recently raised in the electroweak sector (namely $(g-2)_\mu$ at Fermilab [8] and $W$ mass at CDF [9]) further highlighting the fact that the model is not yet complete beyond doubt.

When necessary we will distinguish between up-like $u_\alpha \leftrightarrow (u, c, t)$ and down-like $d_\alpha \leftrightarrow (d, s, b)$ quarks.
with an implicit summation over $i$ and $j$. Here, $G^{\mu\nu}$ ($SU(3)_c$), $W^{\mu\nu}$ ($SU(2)_L$) and $B^{\mu\nu}$ ($U(1)_Y$) are the fields in the adjoint representation

$$
G^{\mu\nu} = \partial^\mu G^{\nu} - g_{\text{s}} f_{ijk} G^{i\mu} G^{k\nu}
$$

$$
W^{\mu\nu} = \partial^\mu W^{\nu} - g_{\varepsilon} f_{ijk} W^{i\mu} W^{k\nu}
$$

$$
B^{\mu\nu} = \partial^\mu B^{\nu} - \partial^\nu B^{\mu}
$$

with $G^{\mu}$, $W^{\mu}$ and $B^{\mu}$ being the fields in the fundamental representations, while $g_{\text{s}}$ ($f$) and $g$ ($\varepsilon$) are the respective coupling (structure) constants of strong ($SU(3)_c$) and electroweak ($SU(2)_L$) interactions. In addition to this, we add the fermionic matter content of

$$
\mathcal{L}_f = \sum_{\alpha=1,2,3} \left( \sum_{F=Q_L, L_L} \bar{\psi}_\alpha \gamma^5 \psi_{\alpha} + \sum_{F=u_R, d_R, \ell_R} \bar{\psi}_\alpha \gamma^5 \psi_{\alpha} \right),
$$

where the fermionic indices are implicit and $\alpha$ is used as a generation index. The $SU(2)_L$ doublets $Q_L = (u_L, d_L)$ and $L_L = (\ell_L, \nu_L)$ are the left-chiral projections $\psi_L = (1 - \gamma_5)/2 \psi$, while the right chiral fields $u_R, d_R, \ell_R$ are singlets under this transformation. We highlight, the absence of a right handed neutrino singlet $\nu_R$ in this model. Further, we have used the covariant derivative

$$
D_\mu = \partial_\mu + i g_{\text{s}} \frac{\lambda^i}{2} G_\mu^i + i g \frac{\sigma^j}{2} W_\mu^j + i g' q_Y B_\mu,
$$

with $g'$ being the coupling constant associated with $U(1)_Y$, $q_Y$ being the hypercharge and $\lambda^i (\sigma^i)$ the Gell-Mann (Pauli) matrices.

So far we have established a functioning massless gauge theory, describing matter content and interactions. In reality, however, particles are known to be massive. This is a crucial point in the formulation of the SM as the introduction of masses typically breaks gauge invariance. This problem is circumvented by the Higgs mechanism [11–13], which generates fermion and boson masses while preserving gauge invariance. Here, a complex scalar field $H$ is introduced transforming as a $SU(2)_L$ doublet $(H^+, H^0)$, so that we add

$$
\mathcal{L}_H = (D^\mu H)^\dagger D_\mu H - V(H)
$$

to the SM Lagrangian, where $V(H) = \mu^2 H^\dagger H + \lambda (H^\dagger H)^2$ is a Higgs potential.\footnote{Note that only for $\mu^2 < 0$ there will be spontaneous symmetry breaking, while $\lambda > 0$ is required by vacuum stability. We further note that this ad-hoc potential is often referred to as a tree level potential, and indeed higher order terms might be significant (e.g. [14, 15]). Further, the presence of heavy right-handed neutrinos can alter the shape of this potential in certain scenarios (see e.g. [16] for a review).}
field couples to left-right fermion pairs \((u, d, \ell)\) through Yukawa couplings \(F^{f}_{\alpha\beta}\)

\[
\mathcal{L}_{\text{Yuk}} = -\sum_{\alpha\beta} \left( F_{u \alpha\beta} (Q_{L\alpha}^{\dagger} \tilde{H}) u_{R\beta}^{\dagger} + F_{d \alpha\beta} (Q_{L\alpha}^{\dagger} H) d_{R\beta}^{\dagger} + F_{\ell \alpha\beta} (L_{\alpha}^{\dagger} H) \ell_{R\beta}^{\dagger} \right) + \text{h.c.} \quad (1.6)
\]

where \(\tilde{H} = \varepsilon H^{*}\) and again \(\alpha, \beta\) are generation indices. We note that since there is no right chiral neutrino component in the SM, neutrinos cannot attain a Yukawa coupling. Combining all the above Lagrangians, we can write out the full Standard Model Lagrangian

\[
\mathcal{L}_{\text{SM}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{gauge}} + \mathcal{L}_{f} + \mathcal{L}_{H} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{Yuk}}. \quad (1.7)
\]

**Higgs Mechanism - Spontaneous Symmetry Breaking**

As alluded to in the previous part, SM masses are generated by Spontaneous Symmetry Breaking of the electroweak sector (EWSB) — the Higgs Mechanism. In this process, the gauge invariance of \(SU(2)_{L} \times U(1)_{Y}\) is broken spontaneously, where the Higgs doublet assumes its non-zero vacuum expectation value (VEV) \(\langle H \rangle\). Formally, there exists more than one possible VEV, but as they can all be obtained from one another by a suitable gauge transformation, choosing a particular VEV corresponds to fixing a gauge. Most commonly, the chosen VEV corresponds to the unitary gauge, where

\[
H = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v + h \end{pmatrix}. \quad (1.8)
\]

Here, \(v = \sqrt{-\mu^{2} \lambda^{-1}}\) and \(h\) being a hermitian field — the physical Higgs scalar as we see it in detectors.

Under the above symmetry breaking we find

\[
\mathcal{L}_{H} \rightarrow m_{W}^{2} W^{+\mu} W_{\mu}^{-} + \frac{1}{2} m_{Z}^{2} Z^{\mu} Z_{\mu} + \text{h-terms}. \quad (1.9)
\]

Thus, EWSB successfully generates the massive gauge bosons \(W\) and \(Z\) with

\[
m_{W} = \frac{1}{2} g_{W} v, \quad m_{Z} = \frac{m_{W}}{\cos \theta_{W}}, \quad (1.10)
\]

where \(\theta_{W}\) is the Weinberg angle \(\tan^{-1}(g'/g_{W})\). Meanwhile, a third gauge field \(A\) remains massless, describing the interactions of quantum electrodynamics. Furthermore, we have

\[
\mathcal{L}_{\text{Yuk}} \rightarrow -\sum_{\alpha,\beta} \sum_{f=u,d,\ell} m_{f}^{f} \bar{f}_{R\alpha} f_{R\beta} + \text{h-terms} \quad (1.11)
\]
with — potentially non-diagonal — Dirac masses \( m'_{\alpha\beta} = \frac{v}{2} (F'_{\alpha\beta})^{*\frac{1}{2}} \). In this way, EWSB also generates the masses of the SM fermionic matter content.

### 1.1.2 Neutrinos

First proposed in Wolfgang Pauli’s famous 1930 letter to the “radioactive ladies and gentlemen” [19], and later named and described more thoroughly by Enrico Fermi in 1933 [20], it took until 1956 until the neutrino’s eventual discovery by Reines and Cowan Jr. [21]. Shortly after Wu [22] experimentally showed parity violation in the \( \beta \)-decay of \( ^{60}\text{CO} \). This, in combination with the consequent neutrino helicity measurements by Goldhaber [23], led people to believe that neutrinos are massless and left-helical.

It is for this reason that in the formulation of the SM neutrinos decidedly seem to be the “odd-one-out”, lacking a right chiral component. As we saw in Section 1.1.1, this means that in the Standard Model, neutrinos cannot attain mass through the Higgs mechanism. Indeed, precision experiments on \( \beta \)-decays [24] and cosmological bounds (see [25] and references therein) indicate that neutrino masses are smaller than \( \mathcal{O}(\text{eV}) \). However, there is reason to believe that they cannot be exactly 0, a phenomenon known as **neutrino oscillations**.

#### Neutrino Oscillations

When the flux of solar electron neutrinos was first observed in 1968 by the Homestake experiment [26], it was found that significantly fewer of them reached the earth from the sun than predicted by the standard solar model at the time [27]. More than 30 years later, the SNO experiment [28] definitively showed that the missing

---

\( ^5 \)The fact that mass and flavour basis do not necessarily align is well-established for quarks where the rotation between the bases is described by the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa (CKM) matrix [17, 18]. In weak interactions this leads to a possible conversion of quark flavour. As we will see in Section 1.1.2, this fact also plays an important role in our understanding of massive neutrinos.

\( ^6 \)Given that Pauli was concerned that he had “postulated a particle that could not be detected”, 20 years does not seem like an excessively long time. It should, however, give some perspective on what time scales to expect before we discover the even more elusive heavy neutral leptons experimentally.
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\[ \nu_3 \quad \nu_2 \quad \nu_1 \quad \nu_e \quad \nu_\mu \quad \nu_\tau \]

\[ m^2_{\nu_1} \quad m^2_{\nu_2} \quad m^2_{\nu_3} \]

\[ \Delta m^2_{\text{atm}} \quad \Delta m^2_{\text{sol}} \]

Figure 1.1: Schematic representation of neutrino mass splitting for normal (left) and inverted (right) hierarchy.

electron neutrinos had been transformed into muon and tau neutrinos.\footnote{It should be noted that oscillation of freely propagating neutrinos does not account for this deficit, but works hand in hand with the Mikheyev Smirnov Wolfenstein effect [29, 30] describing resonant flavour transitions inside the sun — also requiring small neutrino masses.} This, along with measurements on atmospheric neutrinos by the Superkamiokande in 1998 [31], provided experimental evidence for the phenomenon of neutrino oscillations, first proposed by Pontecorvo [32, 33]. Since then, many more experiments have observed neutrino flavour changes (see [16] for an overview), the common explanation for which is the \textit{standard-3-scenario} (S3S, see [34] for a review).

In the S3S, one assumes 3 massive neutrinos. Just like in the case of quarks, the neutrino mass term is not diagonal in the basis of weak interactions that the Standard Model neutrinos can undergo. Thus, these flavour eigenstates \( \nu_{\ell \ell} \) (again with \( \ell = \nu_e, \nu_\mu, \nu_\tau \)) are superpositions of the mass eigenstates \( \nu_i \) with masses \( m_{\nu_i} \).

The rotation between the two bases is described by the Pontecorvo-Maki-Nakagawa-Sakata (PMNS) matrix \( U_{\text{PMNS}} \) [33, 35]. If such a neutrino flavour package propagates with a given momentum, each non-degenerate mass eigenstate of its decomposition will have different energy, causing the individual wave function to oscillate with different frequencies. This causes a change in superposition of the mass eigenstates in time and, thus, along the neutrino packages trajectory.

To account for the oscillations measured, one needs two mass splittings in the neutrino mass basis. However (so far) experiments can only resolve the absolute value of these mass differences giving rise to two possible hierarchies of neutrino masses [36]. The mass splittings measured from atmospheric (\( \Delta m^2_{\text{atm}} \)) and solar (\( \Delta m^2_{\text{sol}} \)) neutrinos is shown schematically in Fig. 1.1 for normal and inverted hierarchy.
this also does not include information about the absolute mass scale of neutrinos.

Hence, it is imperative that neutrinos have mass to explain neutrino oscillations, but as we saw in Section 1.1.1, this is not possible in the Standard Model. Hence, in order to explain neutrino oscillations, the Standard Model has to be extended.\footnote{If light neutrinos are Majorana neutrinos one can also introduce them in an effective field theory approach through a Weinberg operator [37] without introducing new degrees of freedom to the Standard Model [34]. However, this does not yield a UV complete theory.} One natural way to this is by including a Right chiral counterpart to the Standard Model neutrino, giving rise to the theory of heavy neutral leptons.

1.2 Heavy Neutral Leptons

In the previous section we saw the necessity of extending the Standard Model to accommodate light neutrino masses with a non-zero mass splitting. The arguably simplest extension to the SM to allow for light neutrino masses is the introduction of right handed singlet states — the heavy neutral leptons (HNLs). In this section, we will discuss the mechanism responsible for light neutrino masses in such models — the type-I seesaw mechanism — introduce certain theoretical considerations and present some common models of the extended neutrino sector.\footnote{Given the name, it is obvious that this is not the only mechanism of its kind to explain neutrino masses. The type-II seesaw mechanism (c.f. [38]) considers the introduction of new scalars, while the type-III seesaw (c.f. [39]) extends the SM by \( SU(2)_L \) triplets.} Again, this introduction will be inspired by previous works on the subject [34, 40–42], while keeping a consistent naming convention throughout the thesis.

1.2.1 Type-I Seesaw Mechanism

We recall that the leptonic sector of the Standard Model contains three generations of left chiral \( SU(2)_L \) doublets \( L_{\alpha} \) and right chiral \( SU(2)_L \) singlets \( \ell_{R\alpha} \). In the type-I seesaw [43–46] this is extended by a set of \( N \) right handed singlets \( \nu_{R1} \). For these uncharged singlet states it is admissible to add Majorana mass terms \( M_I \) \cite{47}, where the mass scale is not fixed and can range from \( \sim eV \) to \( 10^{15} \) GeV.\footnote{This term is not profoundly motivated other than — as a dimension 3 — being a relevant term, and all other terms of this category being included in the Standard Model. It is arguably following the logic of “what is not forbidden must occur”.} The
Lagrangian before electroweak symmetry breaking reads
\begin{equation}
\mathcal{L}_{\text{seesaw}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{SM}} + \frac{i}{2} \bar{\nu}_{RI}^\dagger \sigma^\mu \partial_\mu \nu_{RI} - (F_{\alpha I})^* \left( L_\alpha \cdot \tilde{H} \right)^\dagger \nu_{RI} - \frac{M_I}{2} \nu_{RI}^T \nu_{RI} + h.c. \tag{1.12}
\end{equation}
Here, $I = 1, \ldots, N$, $L_\alpha = \left( \nu_\alpha^L \right)^T L$, where $\alpha = e, \mu, \tau$ and $\tilde{H}_a = \varepsilon_{ab} H_b^*$, where $H$ is the Higgs doublet. After EWSB, this can be written as $H = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v \end{pmatrix}$, where $v$ is the Higgs’ vacuum expectation value. And so $(L_\alpha \cdot \tilde{H}) = \frac{v}{\sqrt{2}} \nu_{L\alpha}$ after EWSB. The terms
\begin{equation}
\mathcal{L}_D = - (F_{\alpha I}^\nu)^* \frac{v}{\sqrt{2}} \nu_{L\alpha}^T \nu_{RI} + h.c. \tag{1.13}
\end{equation}
are equivalent to Dirac mass terms with $(m_D)_{\alpha I} = \frac{v}{\sqrt{2}} (F_{\alpha I})^*$, resulting in the non-diagonal, complex, symmetric Dirac-Majorana mass matrix
\begin{equation}
\mathcal{L}_{DM} = - \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} \nu_L^T & \nu_R^T \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & m_D^T \\ m_D & M_M \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \nu_L \\ \nu_R \end{pmatrix} + h.c., \tag{1.14}
\end{equation}
where $M_M = \text{diag}(M_1, \ldots, M_N)$. In the seesaw limit $m_D \ll M_M$ (in terms of their eigenvalues), the mass matrix in Eq. (1.14) can be brought into approximate block diagonal form with submatrices
\begin{equation}
m_{\alpha \beta} = - \sum_I \frac{(m_D)_{\alpha I} (m_D)_{\beta I}}{M_I}, \quad m_{IJ} = M_I \delta_{IJ}. \tag{1.15}
\end{equation}
Additionally diagonalising $m_{\alpha \beta}$ by unitary transformation and redefining fields, we can rewrite Eq. (1.14) as
\begin{equation}
\mathcal{L}_{DM} = - \frac{m_i}{2} \left( n_i^T n_i + n_i^T n_i^T \right), \tag{1.16}
\end{equation}
with $i = 1, \ldots 3 + N$, showcasing the existence of $3 + N$ Majorana states in this model — three light neutrino mass states $\nu_i$ with masses $m_{\nu i}$ and $N$ heavy mass states $N_I$ with masses $m_{NI}$.\footnote{The relationship between $m_{\alpha \beta}$ and $\text{diag}(m_{\nu 1}, m_{\nu 2}, m_{\nu 3})$ is given exactly by the PMNS matrix, which we use in writing out Eq. (1.18).} It is, furthermore, useful to define the mixing angle
\begin{equation}
V_{\alpha I} = F_{\alpha I} \frac{v}{M_I} = \frac{(m_D)_{\alpha I}}{m_{NI}}, \tag{1.17}
\end{equation}
as small parameter.\textsuperscript{12} Combining the relations above we find the \textit{seesaw formula}

\[
(U^\dagger \text{diag}(m_{\nu 1}, m_{\nu 2}, m_{\nu 3})U)_{\alpha \beta} = \sum_I V_{\alpha I} V_{\beta I} m_{NI},
\]  

(1.18)

with $U$ being the PMNS matrix introduced in Section 1.1.2 and $\alpha = (e, \mu, \tau)$.

In this framework, the minimal number of HNLs required to generate the two separate neutrino mass states necessary for neutrino oscillations is two [48].

**Remarks on Parameter Space Bounds**

Even though the seesaw relation in Eq. (1.18) is derived under the assumption

\[
\text{Type-I seesaw: } |V_{\alpha I}| < 1,
\]  

(1.19)

for large HNL masses, $m_{NI} \gtrsim v$, the requirement of perturbativity of the model described by Eq. (1.12), $|F_{\alpha I}| < 1$ becomes more restrictive than Eq. (1.19). Indeed, owing to Eq. (1.17) we get:

\[
\text{Perturbativity: } |V_{\alpha I}| < \frac{v}{M_I}.
\]  

(1.20)

The conditions in Eqs. (1.19) and (1.20) were used in Chapter 3 when deriving the maximal number of events produced at colliders Fig. 3.6.\textsuperscript{13}

It should also be noted that a type-I seesaw model produces light neutrino masses of the order $m \sim |V|^2 m_{N_1}$. This defines a minimal mixing angle, admissible for an HNL generating neutrinos compatible with neutrino oscillation data, commonly referred to as the \textit{seesaw line}

\[
|V|^2_{\text{seesaw}} = \frac{\sqrt{|\Delta m^2_{\text{atm}}|}}{m_N}.
\]  

(1.21)

\subsection*{1.2.2 Violation of Lepton Number}

By introducing the Majorana mass term in Eq. (1.12), breaking the SM lepton number becomes possible. This is due to Majorana neutrinos ($\nu^c_R$) being their own anti particle ($\nu^c_R$), and this term connecting the two at Lagrangian level. However, if there

\textsuperscript{12}To make the notation more readable, we will sometimes write $V_{NI}$ instead of $V_{\alpha I}$.

\textsuperscript{13}Notice that in a model as described in Section 2.2, this requirement will be imposed on the heavier of the two HNLs and entail a limit on $V_{\alpha I}$ through Eq. (1.23).
exists a correlation between the mixing of different $N_I$ with active neutrinos in order to account for small neutrino masses, non-trivial cancellations may suppress lepton number violating (LNV) with respect to lepton number conserving (LNC) processes [49–51]. In such models with approximate HNL mass degeneracy, there exists an approximate $U(1)$ symmetry relating the individual mixings and naturally allowing for mixing angles above the seesaw line [52–57]. In case of an exact symmetry (exact mass degeneracy), lepton number is exactly conserved. However, accidental breaking of this symmetry (potentially responsible for small neutrino masses\footnote{Other schemes include the classical low-scale seesaws (see Section 1.2.1) and neutrino masses generated as radiative corrections (see e.g. [58]).}) may lead to HNL oscillations, possibly implying significant fractions of LNV/LNC process rates (see e.g. [59–61]).

In a degenerate two HNL model, one may realise such a symmetry by imposing

$$V_{a1} = iV_{a2}. \quad (1.22)$$

In the limit of exact mass degeneracy (Dirac limit), the two HNLs will combine into a single Dirac particle and as described above, lepton number is exactly conserved. For a quasi-degenerate two HNL model ($m_{N1} \simeq m_{N2}$) the combination of two HNLs still behaves in many ways as a Dirac-particle and is hence known as a quasi-Dirac (or pseudo-Dirac) pair [51]. Manifestly, this scenario results in small neutrino masses (by virtue of the seesaw relation Eq. (1.18)). An exact cancellation can be parametrised by a mass ratio $r_N$ with

$$m_{N2} = r_N m_{N1} \quad \text{and} \quad V_{a1} = i r_N^{-1/2} V_{a2}. \quad (1.23)$$

We will refer to the class of models obeying this relation as quasi-Dirac-like (QDL). We note that for large $r_N$, radiative corrections to neutrino masses can be sizeable [50, 62–64] and that such cancellations arguably involve a high degree of fine tuning [63], making such models theoretically less appealing.

### 1.2.3 Neutrino Sector Models

In this section we will briefly introduce neutrino sector models established to address the unexplained phenomena in the introduction of this chapter. As the seesaw formula Eq. (1.18) leaves a great many degrees of freedom to the sterile neutrino parameters, theories have been put forward to explain multiple of the Standard
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Figure 1.2: Particles of the Standard Model (left) and the $\nu$MSM (right). This graphic was taken from Gninenko et al.’s motivation paper for the SHiP experiment[67] and slightly altered to include the measured value of Higgs mass [68].

Models observational shortcomings at the same time. One phenomenon many of these theories address is baryon asymmetry of the universe (BAU) — the fact that astronomical searches see more baryonic matter than antibaryonic matter in the observable universe.

Neutrino Minimal Standard Model

One such model of HNLs is the neutrino minimal standard model ($\nu$MSM [49, 65], see [66] for a review), which features $\mathcal{N} = 3$ sterile neutrinos. Arguably, introducing three right chiral neutrinos reestablishes symmetry between the quark and leptonic sector of the SM, which is shown in Fig. 1.2. As discussed above, three HNLs are capable of describing neutrino oscillations.

The lightest of the HNLs $N_1$ represents a dark matter candidate. The requirement here, is that it must not be too light (must be keV range or above), as dictated by the Tremaine-Gunn bound [69], and Pauli exclusion principle (applies to fermionic dark matter). Simultaneously, it must not be too heavy or strongly coupled, so that it can be stable — with respect to decays — on time scales comparable to the age of the universe. This greatly suppresses $N_1$’s contribution in the seesaw of Eq. (1.18), effectively decoupling it from this mechanism. In spite of its ultra weak coupling, $N_1$

---

In fact the number of free parameters in this theory are $7\mathcal{N} - 3$ (with $\mathcal{N}$ HNL generations), only $3 + 2n$ (with $2 \leq n \leq 3$ being the number of massive light neutrinos) are defined by the LHS. Further, only five of these (two mass splittings and three neutrino mixing angles) can be constrained with light neutrino oscillation data (see Fig. 1.1).
could have been generated resonantly [70] in sufficiently large quantities in the early universe.

The two heavier neutrinos $N_2$ and $N_3$ generate the lion’s share of the light neutrino masses similarly to a $qDl$ pair Eq. (1.23). Their mixing angles are sizeable, so that they decay quick enough not to undermine resonant dark matter production.\footnote{Indeed they can be seizable enough to be testable at LHC energies [71].} The masses $m_{N_{2,3}}$ lie in a range of 1–100 GeV to allow BAU to originate at the right temperatures which allow it to survive — i.e. circumventing washout [72]. Furthermore, these masses need to be highly degenerate in order to cause significant enough $CP$-violation to explain BAU through leptogenesis.\footnote{In the language of Eq. (1.23) this corresponds to $rN \sim 10^{-4}$ for $m_{N_{2,3}} = 100$ GeV [65].}

**Akhmedov-Rubakov-Smirnov Models**

If one drops the requirement of explaining dark matter through right handed neutrinos, the requirement on mass degeneracy of HNLs in order to explain BAU relaxes considerably. This class of models is commonly referred to as the Akhmedov-Rubakov-Smirnov (ARS) model [73–75]. Similarly to the $\nu$MSM, HNL mass degeneracy resonantly enhances leptogenesis in the ARS as well. However, due to this model being less restricted in terms of the exact sequence in which processes occur in the early universe, leptogenesis is also possible for non-degenerate HNLs [76]. Furthermore, such models can feature HNLs with masses up to 70 TeV [77].

### 1.3 Motivation for Same Sign Di-Lepton Searches

As discussed in Section 1.2.2, lepton number violation is possible if neutrinos (and/or HNLs) are of Majorana nature, making LNV signals the *smoking gun signature* of such models. Here, we will introduce one of the most extensively studied of such signatures, the neutrinoless double-$\beta$ decay ($0\nu\beta\beta$).

#### 1.3.1 Decay Measurements

In atoms, this LNV decay mode emits two leptons of the same charge, while simultaneously converting two neutrons into two protons (see Fig. 1.3). By studying the decay rate, one can draw conclusions on the Majorana particles, shown here with
n, enabling this process (see [78, 79] and [80, 81] for recent reviews). One of the main appeals of investigating $0\nu\beta\beta$ is that it is fully reconstructible. That is to say, there are no neutrinos in the final state, so that an event can be detected without further assumptions. Experiments have to reject background due to cosmic rays, environmental radioactivity and contamination of the potential $0\nu\beta\beta$ isotopes [82]. In principle, however, a single detection would manifest the Majorana nature of the neutrino. To the author’s knowledge, as of publication of this thesis, no detection has been reported, with measured lower bounds on half lives as large as $10^{26}$ yr. This puts strong bounds on the HNL parameter spectrum [83–85].

1.3.2 At Hadron Colliders

At $pp$ colliders, there exists a high energy equivalent to $0\nu\beta\beta$, namely $pp \to \ell^{\pm}\ell^{\pm}jj$. In this case the final QCD product is not stable and causes jet cascades in a detector. In the direct equivalent, the LNV is mediated by a Majorana particle in the $t$ (and $u$) channel (shown in Fig. 1.4a) which we will refer to as W boson fusion (WBF). This process has enjoyed some theoretical attention in the past [97–101], while it was only recently investigated experimentally [86]. There also exists a (Drell-Yan) process sharing the same $pp \to \ell^{\pm}\ell^{\pm}jj$ signature (see Fig. 1.4b and [102, 103]), which has been studied quite thoroughly experimentally [87–96]. Despite their same collider signature, the two processes do not add coherently as the quark initial and final states are different.

Due to the higher energy at colliders, $pp \to \ell^{\pm}\ell^{\pm}jj$ would be able to resolve the
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Figure 1.4: Two kinds of processes leading to same-sign leptons plus jets signatures in $pp$ collisions, where $n$ represents both light and heavy Majorana states. Vector boson fusion process with Majorana particles in $t$-channel is shown in panel (a). Drell-Yan process with Majorana particles in $s$-channel is shown in panel (b). The contribution from two processes add incoherently due to the antiquarks in the final state of process (b) compared to (a).

WBF process, reminiscent of $0\nu\beta\beta$ decay, used to interpret same-sign lepton searches in [86].

Drell-Yan process, used to interpret same-sign lepton searches in [87–96].

Effects of more massive HNLs than $0\nu\beta\beta$-decay experiments. Furthermore, also these processes do not have any missing energy and, thus, portray valuable candidates for HNL collider searches — which manifests itself in a wealth of past works on this subject. As in the Drell-Yan (DY) process, the HNL can go on-shell in the narrow width approximation [104, 105] — hence, interference between Majorana states does not occur at amplitude level — the results of such studies can admissibly be performed in the phenomenological HNL model [40, 106] with free parameters of a single HNL generation. In case of the WBF process, the Majorana states are necessarily off-shell as they only exist in the $t$ ($u$) channel of the process and thus, will interfere at amplitude level. Therefore, it is necessary to employ a neutrino sector model that is restricted by its predictions. In this study, we will be presenting results for models with one or two HNLs that result in small (tree level) neutrino masses. For one HNL, this corresponds to a mixing angle along the see-saw line and for an HNL pair we invoke a model with symmetry protected small neutrino masses.
As we will see, the latter can be well approximated by an HNL pair obeying the QDL conditions of Eq. (1.23).

1.4 Effective Vector Boson Approximation

In this thesis we will use the *effective vector boson approximation* (EVA) to generalise vector boson scattering cross sections to the case of hadron-hadron collisions at colliders. This is motivated by the fact that at interactions in the TeV range, the (polarised) gauge bosons of the Standard Model (see Section 1.1.1) can be viewed as part of a proton’s parton sea [107, 108]. In this way, the approximation is a generalisation of the well known parton distribution functions (PDFs) relying on the asymptotic freedom of QCD [109–111] (see e.g. [112] for a review) and equivalent to the better known effective photon (also known as Weizsäcker-Williams) approximation [113, 114]. We will give a brief sketch of the derivation and an overview here, taking inspiration from literature on the subject [108, 115–117].

1.4.1 Quark Level

In analogy to the Weizsäcker-Williams Approximation which derives the effective number of photons in an electron, we start by deriving the *effective number of polarised vector bosons* in a quark. To this effect, we consider the amplitude of a polarised massive vector boson (MVB, $V$) to scatter off a quark with energy $E_q$ to form a final state $X$. For transversal polarisation, this is

$$A_T(V_T + q \rightarrow X) = \epsilon_i \cdot M \sqrt{E_q}, \text{ with } i = 1, 2,$$

(1.24)

the MVB polarisation vector $\epsilon_{\mu}^i$, $M_{\mu}$ describing the effective coupling of the $V-q-X$ vertex. In the lab frame of the quark, where $k_{V0}$ is the MVB energy, this leads to the polarised differential cross section

$$d\sigma_T(V_T + q \rightarrow X) = \frac{1}{16k_{V0} \eta} \sum_{i=1}^{2} |\epsilon^i \cdot M|^2 d\Gamma,$$

(1.25)

where $d\Gamma$ is the Lorentz-invariant phase space element, and $\eta = \sqrt{1 - m_V^2 k_V^{-2}}$. Generalising this to the process

$$q_1 + q_2 \rightarrow V \rightarrow q'_1 + X,$$

(1.26)
with polarisation $\lambda$ and neglecting the longitudinal contributions to this process leads to

$$
\begin{align*}
  iA_T(q_1 + q_2 \rightarrow V_T \rightarrow q_1' + X) \\
  = \sum_{i=1}^{2} \bar{u}(p') (C_V + C_A \gamma_5) \varepsilon_i u(p) \varepsilon_i \cdot M \sqrt{E_q} \left( \frac{1}{(p - p')^2 - m_{V}^2} \right),
\end{align*}
$$

(1.27)

where the $p$ is the incoming momentum of $q_1$ and $p'$ the outgoing momentum of $q'$. For

$$
V = W \quad C_V = -C_A = g/2\sqrt{2},
$$

and for $V = Z \quad C_V = (g/\cos \theta_w) \left( \frac{1}{2} T_3 L - Q \sin^2 \theta_w \right),
$$

$$
C_A = - (g/\cos \theta_w) \left( \frac{1}{2} T_3 L \right),
$$

(1.28)

where $\theta_w$ is the Weinberg angle, $g = \alpha/\sin \theta_w$, $T_3$ the third component of weak isospin of $q_1$, and $\alpha$ the electric charge.

Averaging over spin and azimuthal angle, one can find the transversally polarised cross section

$$
\sigma_T(q_1 + q_2 \rightarrow V_T \rightarrow q' + X) = \int \frac{d^3p'}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{C_V^2 + C_A^2}{8E E'} \frac{d\Gamma}{(k_V M_T^2)^2} \left( \sin^2 \theta' \frac{E^2 E'^2}{|k|^2} - \frac{k^2}{2} \right) \sum_{i=1}^{2} |\varepsilon_i \cdot M|^2,
$$

(1.29)

where $E$ ($E'$) denotes the energy of $q_1$ ($q'$). The main approximation now consists in replacing the transverse current $|\varepsilon_i \cdot M|^2$ and the phase space element $d\Gamma$ by their values at $k_V^2 \rightarrow m_T^2$ and $\theta' \rightarrow 0$. This makes the EVA a small-angle approximation. In this approximation we can rewrite Eq. (1.29) as

$$
\sigma_T(q_1 + q_2 \rightarrow V_T \rightarrow q' + X) = \frac{C_V^2 + C_A^2}{2\pi^2} \int k_{V0} d\theta' \sin \theta' \frac{k_{V0} E' \eta}{E(k^2 - m_T^2)^2} \sigma_T(V_T + q_2 \rightarrow X),
$$

(1.30)

with $k^2 = 2EE' (\cos \theta' - 1)$, and $\sigma_T(V_T + q_2 \rightarrow X)$ from Eq. (1.25).

Now, Eq. (1.30) has the form of a parton folding function if we define the distribution function $f_{V/q}^{\text{Trans}}$ such that

$$
\sigma_T(q_1 + q_2 \rightarrow V_T \rightarrow q' + X) = \int_{x_{\text{min}}}^{1} dx f_{V/q}^{\text{Trans}}(x) \sigma_T(V_T + q_2 \rightarrow X).
$$

(1.31)

\footnote{For a detailed explanation of these couplings and their relationships see section 21.4 of [118].}
Here, we have changed the integration variable to the Björken-\(x\), which is the partonic momentum fraction \(x = k_V/p_1\). This quark level transversal distribution function is written as

\[
f_{V/q}^{\text{Trans}}(x) = \frac{C_A^2 + C_V^2}{8 \pi^2 x} \left[ \frac{-x^2}{1 + m_V^2/(4E_q^2(1 - x))} + \frac{2x^2(1 - x)}{m_V^2/E_q^2 - x^2} \right]
\]

\[
+ \left( x^2 + \frac{x^4(1 - x)}{(m_V^2/E_q^2 - x^2)^2} \left( 2 + \frac{m_V^2}{E_q^2(1 - x)} \right) - \frac{x^2}{(m_V^2/E_q^2 - x^2)^2} \frac{m_V^4}{2E_q^4} \right) \times \log \left( \frac{1 + \frac{4E_q^2(1 - x)}{m_V^2}}{\frac{m_V^2}{E_q^2 - x^2}} \right) + x^4 \left( \frac{2 - x}{m_V^2/E_q^2 - x^2} \right)^2 \log \frac{x}{2 - x} \right] \eta,
\]

with \(\eta = \sqrt{1 - \frac{m_V^2}{x^2E_q^2}}\),

(1.32)

quark sub-energy \(E_q\), and coefficients \(C_A, C_V\) as given in Eq. (1.28).

Under the same approximations, one can analogously derive a quark level distribution function for longitudinally polarised MVB

\[
f_{V/q}^{\text{Long}}(x) = \frac{C_A^2 + C_V^2}{\pi^2} \frac{1 - x}{x} \frac{\eta}{(1 + \eta)^2}\]

\[
\times \left\{ \frac{1 - x - m_V^2}{(1 - x + m_V^2/E_q^2)^2} \frac{1}{4E_q^2(1 - x)} + \frac{2(1 - x)^2}{m_V^2(4E_q^2)^{-1} m_V^2/E_q^2 - x^2} \right. \]

\[
- \frac{m_V^2}{4E_q^2} \frac{x^2}{2(1 - x)(x^2 - m_V^2/E_q^2)^2} \left[ (2 - x)^2 \log \frac{x}{2 - x} \right. \]

\[
- \left( \frac{x - m_V^2}{E_q^2x} \right)^2 \left( 2(1 - x) + x^2 \right) \log \left( \frac{1 + \frac{4E_q^2(1 - x)}{m_V^2}}{m_V^2} \right) \right] \]

\[
- \frac{m_V^2}{8E_q^2 \sqrt{x^2 - m_V^2/E_q^2}} \left( \frac{2}{x^2 - m_V^2/E_q^2} + \frac{1}{1 - x} \right) \times \left[ \log \frac{2 - x - \sqrt{x^2 - m_V^2/E_q^2}}{2 - x + \sqrt{x^2 - m_V^2/E_q^2}} - \log \frac{x - \sqrt{x^2 - m_V^2/E_q^2}}{x + \sqrt{x^2 - m_V^2/E_q^2}} \right],
\]

(1.33)

using the same notation as in Eq. (1.32).
1.4.2 Proton Level

Equipped with the polarised quark level distribution functions for the massive vector bosons (VDF) as given in Eqs. (1.32) and (1.33), we can now extend this to find the corresponding proton level parton distribution functions for MVB. To this end, we fold the quark level VDFs with the PDFs \( f_{q/p} \) of the relevant quarks \( q_{\text{rel}} \) for the MVB’s production, yielding

\[
f_{V/p}(x) = \sum_{q_{\text{rel}}} \int_{\xi_{\text{min}}}^{1} \frac{d\xi}{\xi} f_{q/p}(\xi) f_{V/q}(x/\xi),
\]

where \( \lambda = L, T \) is the MVB polarisation.

Due to the approximations taken, the MVB in the EVAs are real particles. Thus, we find a first limit on \( \xi \), namely \( m_{V} E_{q}^{-1} < \xi \). As the MVB can, further, carry maximally the full momentum of its mother-quark, another lower limit is given by \( x < \xi \). The maximum of these two limits determines \( \xi_{\text{min}} \) in Eq. (1.34).

**Factorisation Theorem**

Let us consider \( pp \) a scattering sub-process

\[
a + b \rightarrow X
\]

of two massive partons \( a, b \) with masses \( m_{a}, m_{b} \). We will denote the centre of mass energy as \( M_{ab}^{2} = (p_{a} + p_{b})^{2} \) and the minimal invariant mass for \( X \) to occur as \( m_{X}^{2} \). As \( a \) is a parton of \( p \), Process (1.35) can be generalised to

\[
a + p \rightarrow X + Y.
\]

Given proton level PDFs \( f_{a/p} \) we can write\(^{19}\)

\[
\sigma_{ap \rightarrow X + Y} = \int_{x_{\text{min}}}^{1} \sigma_{ab} \cdot d\sigma_{a/p}(x).
\]

Since

\[
M_{ab}^{2} = (p_{a} + p_{b})^{2} = m_{a}^{2} + m_{b}^{2} + x s_{ap},
\]

we find a minimum value

\[
x_{\text{min}} = \frac{M_{ab}^{2} - m_{a}^{2} - m_{b}^{2}}{s_{ap}} \quad \text{and} \quad s_{ap}^{\text{min}} = m_{X}^{2} + m_{Y}^{2}.
\]

\(^{19}\)Of course this is only valid in case \( pb \rightarrow X + Y \) does not add coherently with other parton channels.
If the intermediate particles of the PDFs have to be allowed to go on shell we have \( s_{\text{ap}}^{\text{min}} = \max(m_X^2 + m_Y^2, 2m_b^2) \).

Extending this again to

\[ pp \rightarrow X + Y + Z, \]

we find the lower bounds

\[
\begin{align*}
    x_1^{\text{min}} &= \frac{s_{\text{ap}}^{\text{min}}}{s_{pp}} = \frac{\max(m_X^2 + m_Y^2, 2m_b^2)}{s_{pp}}, \\
    x_2^{\text{min}} &= \frac{\max(m_X^2, m_a^2)}{s_{bp}} = \frac{\max(m_X^2 + m_Z^2, 2m_a^2)}{x_1 s_{pp}},
\end{align*}
\]

assuming on-shell partons. As the assignment of the partons \( a, b \) to the individual protons is arbitrary, we find

\[
\sigma_{pp \rightarrow X+Y+Z}(s) = \int_{x_1^{\text{min}}}^{1} \int_{x_2^{\text{min}}}^{1} dx_1 dx_2 f_{a/p}(x_1) f_{b/p}(x_2) \sigma_{ab \rightarrow X} + (a \leftrightarrow b)
\]

which is known as the factorisation theorem.\(^{20}\) This theorem establishes a simple way of calculating approximate \( pp \)-scattering cross sections from those of its partonic subprocesses.

**Parton Distribution Functions of the Effective W Approximation**

As they will be of importance to this work, we present the parton distribution functions for polarised \( W^+ \) bosons at the relevant centre of mass energies in Fig. 1.5. The underlying quark level WDFs are Eqs. (1.32) and (1.33). These are folded with the quarks’ recommended PDFs for the LHC by Martin et al. \([119]\) according to Eq. (1.34).

\(^{20}\) Note that this is a slightly adjusted version of the theorem presented by Ruiz \([117]\), to accommodate parton masses \( m_{a,b} \).
Figure 1.5: Parton distribution functions for polarised $W^+$ in the effective $W$ approximation as prescribed by Dawson [108] at LHC (a) and expected FCC centre of mass energy (b). The underlying quark parton distribution functions used were taken from Martin et al. [119].
Same Sign WW Scattering

In order to study more complicated processes like $W$ boson fusion in $pp \rightarrow \ell^\pm \ell^\pm jj$ scattering, it is imperative to first understand the lepton number violating process at its heart, $W^\pm W^\pm \rightarrow \ell^\pm \ell^\pm$ scattering. In the following we will study the interplay of light and heavy contributions in this process for the case of one (Section 2.1) and two (Section 2.3) heavy neutral leptons. We will also discuss the process in the quasi-Dirac-like approximation of the two HNL case (Section 2.2), which we will rely on for further analysis.

As a standard value for the centre of mass energy for this chapter, we will choose the expectation value of the invariant mass of the $WW$ system in WBF at LHC energy $\sqrt{s_{\text{LHC}}} = 13$ TeV. Using the parton distribution functions of the effective $W$ approximation (see Fig. 1.5). We find for the longitudinal case

$$E[M_{WW}^2] = \frac{s_{\text{LHC}} \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \! dx_1 dx_2 (x_1 + x_2)^2 f_{p/W}^{\text{long}}(x_1)f_{p/W}^{\text{long}}(x_2)}{4 \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \! dx_1 dx_2 f_{p/W}^{\text{long}}(x_1)f_{p/W}^{\text{long}}(x_2)}$$

which is well in agreement with typical values for $M_{WW}$ in the Montecarlo simulation of WBF by Fuks et al. [101]. At this energy, the results are applicable to all $\ell = e, \mu, \tau$, since for all generations the lepton masses $m_\ell$ will always be small compared to the typical energies off the process ($m_\ell^2 \ll |t|_{\text{min}}, M_{WW}^2$). The lepton mass can thus safely be set to 0 for the following discussion.

$$= 490^2 \text{ GeV}^2,$$
2.1 Single Heavy Neutral Lepton Model

A common model employed in phenomenological searches for HNLs is the phenomenological type-I seesaw \[106, 40\]. This model features a single isolated HNL, where mixing angle and HNL mass are treated as free parameters. In the following, we will investigate what the single HNL case looks like in a model, where this HNL is the generation mechanism of the light neutrino masses. This will occur inevitably by the seesaw relation Eq. (1.18). To this end we will employ a toy model, where we will approximate the light mass states as a single light mass state with PMNS-like mixing of 1.\footnote{In the single HNL case all generated light neutrino masses will be the same, so that we can choose to use a PMNS-like mixing of 1 with a single light mass state without loss of generality.} As a requirement we set that the light neutrino mass be 1\,eV, which is roughly compatible with recent upper limits on neutrino masses from measurements on $\beta$ decays \[24\]. To this end, we set the mixing angle

$$|V_{\ell N}| = \left|\frac{m_\nu}{m_N}\right| = \frac{1\,\text{eV}}{m_N}$$

(2.2)

guaranteeing the above requirement through Eq. (1.18).

2.1.1 Amplitude Level

The Feynman diagram of the process $W^+W^+ \rightarrow \ell^+\ell^+$ is given by Fig. 2.1. The Feynman rules for lepton number violating processes involving Majorana fermions are well documented \[120–122\]. According to the algorithmic process established by Denner et al. \[121\], the partial amplitude associated with the Feynman diagram shown in Fig. 2.1 is given by

$$iA_{n,p^2} = -\frac{i}{2} g^2 U_{\ell n}^2 \left( \bar{u}_f \gamma^\alpha P_R \frac{p^\beta + m_n}{p^2 - m_n^2} \gamma^\beta P_L v_1 \right) \epsilon_{1,\alpha} \epsilon_{12,\beta},$$

(2.3)
where $p$ is the momentum associated with the Majorana propagator and $\frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}gU_{\ell n}P_L$ is the $W\ell n$ vertex value. It is useful to define

$$J^{\alpha\beta}(p^2, m) = \gamma^\alpha P_R \frac{\not{p} + m}{p^2} \gamma^\beta P_L$$

$$= \gamma^\alpha \frac{m}{p^2} \gamma^\beta P_L,$$

where in the last step we used the configuration of chiral projectors cancelling $\not{p}$ in the numerator. At tree level, this structure is universal to all lepton number violating processes facilitated by a Majorana fermion and we will thus refer to it from now on as the LNV current.

The full amplitude of the scattering process then is given by

$$iA = -\frac{i}{2}g^2 \varepsilon_{i1,\alpha} \varepsilon_{i2,\beta} \bar{u}_{f2} \left( V_{\ell N}^2 J^{\alpha\beta}(t, m_N) + J^{\alpha\beta}(t, m_{\nu}) \right) v_{f1}$$

$$+ (t \leftrightarrow u, f1 \leftrightarrow f2)$$

$$= -\frac{i}{2}g^2 \varepsilon_{i1,\alpha} \varepsilon_{i2,\beta} \bar{u}_{f2} \left( V_{\ell N}^2 J^{\alpha\beta}(t, m_N) + J^{\alpha\beta}(t, -V_{\ell N}^2 m_N) \right) v_{f1}$$

$$+ (t \leftrightarrow u, f1 \leftrightarrow f2).$$

In case $V_{\ell N}^2 m_N^2 \ll |p^2|$, we see that

$$V_{\ell N}^2 J^{\alpha\beta}(p^2, m_N) + J^{\alpha\beta}(p^2, -V_{\ell N}^2 m_N)$$

$$= -V_{\ell N}^2 \frac{m_N^2}{p^2} \left( J^{\alpha\beta}(p^2, m_N) - \gamma^\alpha \gamma^\beta P_L \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left( -\frac{V_{\ell N}^4 m_N^2}{p^2} \right)^n \right)$$

$$= -V_{\ell N}^2 \frac{m_N^2}{p^2} J^{\alpha\beta}(p^2, m_N) + O \left( \left( \frac{V_{\ell N}^2 m_N^2}{p^2} \right)^2 \right).$$

This approximation corresponds to the first order expansion in $V_{\ell N}$ in the flavour basis (see Fig. E.2).

As it is explicitly proportional to the light neutrino mass according to the seesaw relation Eq. (1.18), the amplitude disappears for vanishing light neutrino masses as described by Kersten-Smirnov [50]. However, we see that there exists a regime $(V_{\ell N}^4 m_N^2 \ll |p^2| \ll m_N^2)$, where the light neutrino contribution to the amplitude dominates that of the HNL.
For $m_{N}^{2} \ll |p^{2}|$ we find
\[ V_{\ell N}^{2} J^{\alpha \beta}(p^{2}, m_{N}) + J^{\alpha \beta}(p^{2}, -V_{\ell N}^{2} m_{N}) \]
\[ = -V_{\ell N}^{2} \frac{m_{N}}{p^{2}} \gamma^{\alpha} \gamma^{\beta} P_{L} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (1 + (-V_{\ell N}^{4})^{n}) \left( \frac{m_{N}^{2}}{p^{2}} \right)^{n} \]
\[ = -V_{\ell N}^{2} \frac{m_{N}}{m_{N}^{2}} \left( \frac{m_{N}^{2}}{p^{2}} \right)^{2} \gamma^{\alpha} \gamma^{\beta} P_{L} + \mathcal{O} \left( \left( \frac{m_{N}^{2}}{p^{2}} \right)^{3}, V_{\ell N}^{6} \right), \]
which vanishes significantly faster for large $p^{2}$ than the isolated HNL
\[ V_{\ell N}^{2} J^{\alpha \beta}(p^{2}, m_{N}) = \frac{V_{\ell N}^{2} m_{N}^{2}}{m_{N}^{2}} \frac{m_{N}^{2}}{p^{2}} \gamma^{\alpha} \gamma^{\beta} P_{L} + \mathcal{O} \left( \left( \frac{m_{N}^{2}}{p^{2}} \right)^{2} \right). \]
This means that at large $p^{2}$ the LNV current $J^{\alpha \beta}$ is suppressed by the cancellation of light and heavy mass states.\(^{(2)}\) As shown in Appendix C this inherent cancellation does not occur for lepton flavour violating processes.

2.1.2 Observables

To better understand what this means in practice, let us now look at the physical observables of this process. To avoid ambiguity, we will limit ourselves to the case of $W^{+}W^{+} \to e^{+}e^{+}$ scattering. However, the results should be applicable to all combinations of $\ell^{+}\ell^{+}$ final states given that the relevant parameters ($m_{\ell}$, $m_{\nu\ell}$) are negligible when compared to the other parameters of the process ($m_{N}$, $M_{WW}$, $t$).

It should be noted here that we will be using the first flavour basis expansion (see Eq. (2.7)) to calculate the observables of the full theory. This is motivated by the fact that the assumed light neutrino mass will fulfil the requirement of $m_{\nu}^{2} \ll |p^{2}|$ in all cases, since
\[ 1 \text{eV}^{2} \gtrsim m_{\nu}^{2} \ll |t|_{\min} = \frac{m_{W}^{4}}{M_{WW}^{2}} + \mathcal{O} \left( \left( \frac{m_{W}^{2}}{M_{WW}^{2}} \right)^{2} \right) \]
\[ = 13^{2} \text{GeV}^{2} \quad \text{for} \quad \sqrt{M_{WW}^{2}} = 490 \text{GeV}. \]

We stress that this approximation needs to be handled with care, as it produces unphysical results when the expansion in Eq. (2.6) does not hold.

\(^{(2)}\)This seems to suggest that it is impossible to observe LNV processes in the s-channel at high energies. However as mentioned in Section 1.2.2, HNL oscillations of a quasi-Dirac HNL pair potentially allow for sizeable lepton number violation.
Differential Cross Section

Figure 2.2 shows the differential cross section of $W^\pm W^\pm \to \ell^\pm \ell^\pm$ scattering as a function of the Mandelstam variable $-t$ for $m_N = 150$ GeV (for other HNL masses find Fig. E.3). In the logarithmic representation it is not easy to see, but all differential cross section contributions are symmetric under $t \mapsto t_{\text{max}} - t$, as this corresponds to an exchange from $t$- to $u$-channel.

In this simple model, for any $m_N$ the light mass state contribution (green dash-dotted) is larger than that of the heavy mass state (orange dashed).\footnote{Strictly speaking this is only true for $m_\nu < m_N$, but in this limit the seesaw expansion is already invalid.} This is because in this simple model the amplitudes of light and heavy neutrino are identical safe for an extra suppression of $t/(|t| + m_N^2)$ for the latter. The blue solid line shows the full differential cross section in the approximation of Eq. (2.7). As can be seen, the combined differential cross section follows the light neutrino divergence towards small values of $t$ ($u$). Toward the centre of the $t$-range, the cancellation between the two contributions is the strongest, as here $t \simeq u$, so that simultaneously both the $t$ and $u$ channel propagator denominators are dominated by $t$ or $u$ respectively. From a phenomenological point of view it is interesting to note that unlike the more evenly distributed differential cross section of the single heavy mass state, the combined differential cross section in this model shows a clear tendency toward back-to-back scattering. On this note it should be mentioned that for $m_N^2 < \frac{1}{4}(1 + \sqrt{5})m_W^2$ the gradient of the HNL contribution itself flips sign and we get a convex shaped differential cross section approaching that of the light neutrino for decreasing $m_N$ (see for example Figs. E.3b and E.3c).

With increasing $m_N$, the heavy state contribution is suppressed by $m_N^2$ in the LNV current denominator (see Fig. E.3d). This means that the differential cross section of the isolated heavy mass state vanishes and the combined differential cross section converges toward that of the isolated light mass state. With decreasing $m_N$ the HNL propagator becomes divergent in the limit of $(-t)_{\text{min}} (u_{\text{min}})$, cancelling that of the light neutrino, so that the divergence in the combined cross section becomes less prominent.

Cross Section

Integrating the differential cross section with respect to $t$ we find the total cross section. This is shown as a function of the HNL mass $m_N$ at a center of mass energy
Figure 2.2: Differential cross section of $W^\pm W^\pm \to \ell^\pm \ell^\pm$ scattering in the case of a single HNL as a function the Mandelstam variable $\sqrt{-t}$ at a centre of mass energy of $\sqrt{M_{WW}^2} = 490\text{ GeV}$ and for HNL mass $m_N = 100\text{ GeV}$. The mixing angle here is a function of the HNL mass as well, such that $|V_{\nu N}^2| = 1\text{ eV} \gtrsim m_{\nu e}$. The orange dashed (green dash-dotted) line represents the differential cross section if only the heavy (light) mass states contributed to the process. The blue solid line shows the full differential cross section in the approximation of Eq. (2.7).

$\sqrt{M_{WW}^2} = 490\text{ GeV}$. The mixing angle $V_N$ in this plot is a function of $m_N$ to keep the generated light mass state (shown in dash-dotted green) constant.

We see that the cross section of the isolated heavy mass state (shown in dashed orange) for $m_N \sim \text{few GeV}$ is indistinguishable from that of the light mass state on the scales of the plot. As can also be seen in Fig. E.3, the differential cross section only starts to differ from that of the light mass state, when $m_N$ becomes comparable to $\sqrt{(-t)_{\text{min}}} \simeq 13\text{ GeV}$ at $M_{WW} = 490\text{ GeV}$. For $\sqrt{(-t)_{\text{min}}} < m_N < \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}M_{WW}^2}$ we see that the cross section of the isolated heavy mass state drops as $m_N^{-2}$. This is because for increasingly large parts of the phase space the LNV current denominator is dominated by $m_N^2$, so that the cross section scales to leading order as $|V_{\nu N}^2|^4 m_N^0$. Under the condition of Eq. (2.2) this yields a dependence of $m_N^{-2}$ as observed. For $M_{WW}^2 \ll m_N^2$ the LNV current denominator is dominated by $m_N^2$ for the entirety of the available phase space. Following a similar reasoning as above, we observe a dependence of the isolated heavy state cross section as $m_N^{-6}$.

The full cross section (shown in blue) is described by the destructive interference between heavy and light mass state. Thus, we see a nearly mirrored dependence on the HNL mass $m_N$ when compared to the isolated heavy mass state, where the cross
Figure 2.3: Cross section of $W^\pm W^\pm \rightarrow \ell^\pm \ell^\pm$ scattering in the case of a single HNL as a function of the HNL mass at a centre of mass energy of 490 GeV. The mixing angle here is a function of the HNL mass as well, such that $|V_{N}^2| m_N \approx m_{\nu_e}$. The orange dashed (green dash-dotted) line represents the cross section if only the heavy (light) mass states contributed to the process. The blue solid line shows the full cross section in the approximation of Eq. (2.7).

section vanishes for $m_N \rightarrow 0$ and asymptotically approaches the numerical value of the isolated light state for $M_{ww} \ll m_N^2$.

We note that $m_{\nu} = 1$ eV is only an upper bound, while realistic mixing angles could be as low as the seesaw line (see Section 1.2.1). As the scale of the observables shown is determined by $m_{\nu}$, they could be even smaller than shown here.

2.2 Quasi-Dirac-Like Heavy Neutral Lepton Pair

In a model with at least two HNLs it is possible to arrange the mixing angles in such a way that the individual contributions to the light neutrino masses cancel

$$0 \equiv m_{\ell\ell'} = \sum_{I=1}^{N} V_{\ell I} V_{\ell' I} m_{N I}. \quad (2.10)$$
In the context of two HNLs this can be achieved under the prescription of Eq. (1.23) with a real $V_{\ell 1}$, without loss of generality. If we require our two HNLs to fulfil Eq. (1.23), we can allow ourselves to be agnostic about the origin of light neutrino masses. If on top of that we require the light neutrinos to be Dirac particles, we can attribute the observation of Majorana effects solely to the HNLs.

In the following we will discuss, what effects the condition Eq. (1.23) has on $W^\pm W^\pm \rightarrow \ell^\pm \ell^\pm$ and LNV processes in general.

### 2.2.1 Amplitude Level

In the above described scenario, using the LNV current $J^{\alpha \beta}(p^2,m)$ as defined in Eq. (2.4), we can write the amplitude of $W^\pm W^\pm \rightarrow \ell^\pm \ell^\pm$ in the mass basis (see Fig. 2.1) as

\[
iA = -\frac{i}{2}g^2 \varepsilon_{1,\alpha} \varepsilon_{2,\beta} \bar{\nu}_f (V^2_{\ell 1} J^{\alpha \beta}(t,m_{N1}) + V^2_{\ell 2} J^{\alpha \beta}(t,m_{N2})) \nu_f + (t \leftrightarrow u, f1 \leftrightarrow f2).
\]

(2.11)

We notice that under Eq. (1.23)

\[
V^2_{\ell 1} J^{\alpha \beta}(t,m_{N1}) + V^2_{\ell 2} J^{\alpha \beta}(t,m_{N2}) = V^2_{\ell 1} J^{\alpha \beta}(t,m_{N1}) \left(1 - \frac{t - m^2_{N1}}{t - r^2_N m^2_{N1}}\right),
\]

(2.12)

where $r_N = \frac{m_{N2}}{m_{N1}}$ is the mass ratio. From now on we will drop the index on $N_I$, where $N$ is implicitly the lighter mass state $N_1$ unless stated explicitly.

As mentioned in Section 1.2.2, in case of $r_N \approx 1$ the two Majorana HNLs combine to form a quasi Dirac pair. We see that in the exact limit, the LNV current and thus all off-shell LNV processes, vanish.

In case of large $r_N$ so that $|t|_{\text{max}} \ll r^2_N m^2_{N1}$, the second term is suppressed as $r_N^{-2}$ and we reach a decoupling limit. In this limit the amplitude reduces to that of a single HNL while the light neutrino masses, and thus their contribution to LNV effects, remain exactly cancelled. This converging behaviour can be seen in the (differential)
cross section in (Fig. 2.4) Fig. 2.5 of the $W^\pm W^\pm \rightarrow \ell^\pm \ell^\pm$ process. However, it is important to note that $r_N \rightarrow \infty$ is not a physical limit. Not only do concerns like the running of light neutrino masses play a role here, but under Eq. (1.23) the heavier HNL will breach a perturbativity limit in the Yukawa couplings (see Section 1.2.1), thus breaking the assumption of weak Yukawa coupling in the deduction of the theory.

2.2.2 Observables

Differential Cross Section

In the limit of $M_{ww}^2 \ll m_N^2$, the $t$ ($u$) dependence of the amplitude will always be overshadowed by the HNL masses. This results in differential cross sections which are essentially constant with respect to $t$. For larger mass ratios $r_N$ the cancellation between the two HNL contributions becomes less significant. Hence, the numerical value of the differential cross section goes from 0 in the fully degenerate case to that of a single HNL with growing $r_N$. This behaviour is shown in Figs. E.4c and E.4d.

More interesting effects can be observed, when both $m_{N1}^2, m_{N2}^2 \lesssim M_{ww}^2$. We will investigate only a region around small values of $|t|$. The rest of the curve follows mainly from mirror symmetry and absence of divergences. In order to investigate this region we will parametrise $-t$ around its minimal value as

$$t = \lambda(-t)_{\text{min}} = -\lambda \theta_{W/N} m_N^2,$$

with $1 \leq \lambda \sim$ few as a dimensionless parameter, and $\theta_{W/N} = \frac{m_{\ell}^2}{m_N^2 M_{ww}^2} \ll 1$ as a small parameter. The differential cross section can be expanded as

$$\frac{d\sigma}{dt} = \frac{|V_{\ell N}|^4 G_F^2 (r_N^2 - 1)^2 \theta_{W/N}}{9\pi r_N^4} + \mathcal{O}(\theta_{W/N}^2).$$

Close to the Dirac-limit $r_N \rightarrow 1$, the differential cross section vanishes as $d\sigma/dt \propto (r_N - 1)^2$. Further, we notice that all $\lambda$ dependence is at least suppressed as $\theta_{W/N}^2$, resulting in slowly varying functions. Taking the gradient with respect to $\lambda$ we find this suppression more explicitly as

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \frac{d\sigma}{dt} = \frac{|V_{\ell N}|^4 G_F^2 (r_N^2 - 1)^2}{9\pi m_W^2} \frac{m_N^2 - 2m_W^2 (1 + r_N^{-2})}{r_N^4} \theta_{W/N}^2 + \mathcal{O}(\theta_{W/N}^3).$$

\[\text{Formally, this could be extended to } 1 \leq \lambda \leq \frac{M_{ww}^4}{m_w^4}, \text{ but we will limit the discussion here to the extreme point of } \lambda \rightarrow 1.\]
As expected from the amplitude discussion above, the $t$-dependence is strongly suppressed for large $m_N$. However, from this explicit form we can see that the $m_N$ suppression already takes place for $m_W^2 \ll m_N^2$ rather than only from $M_{ww}^2 \ll m_N^2$. We also find that the gradient flips sign at

$$r_{N, \text{crit.}} = \frac{\sqrt{2} m_W}{\sqrt{m_N^2 - 2m_W^2}}. \quad (2.16)$$

This can be observed in Fig. 2.4, which shows the differential cross section of the $W^\pm W^\pm \rightarrow \ell^\pm \ell^\pm$ process as a function of the Mandelstam variable $\sqrt{-t}$ for the lighter HNL mass $m_N = 150 \text{ GeV}$ (Fig. 2.4a), and $m_N = 1500 \text{ GeV}$ (Fig. 2.4b) for different mass ratios $r_N$.

For $m_N = 150 \text{ GeV}$ we find at leading order $r_{N, \text{crit.}} = 1.16$, which agrees with the numerical values shown in the plot, where the extremal gradient flips sign between $r_N = 1.1$ and $r_N = 2$. However, the plot importantly also shows that higher order corrections flip the gradient for larger values of $\lambda$, resulting in a non-trivial angular distribution.

For $m_N = 1500 \text{ GeV}$ there is no solution $r_{N, \text{crit.}} > 1$, so that the cross section is concave for all $r_N$. We furthermore note that any angular dependence is strongly suppressed, just as Eq. (2.14) suggests.

For small $m_N$ ($\sim 13 \text{ GeV}$ for $M_{ww} = 490 \text{ GeV}$) the above expansion breaks down. Expanding instead in $\varrho_{W/N}^{-1}$ we find

$$\frac{d\sigma}{dt} = \frac{|V_{\ell N}|^4 G_F^2}{9\pi} \frac{(r_N^2 - 1)^2 m_N^{12} (m_N^2 (r_N^2 + 1) - 2m_W^2)^2 \varrho_{W/N}^{-3}}{\lambda^4 m_W^{16}} + \mathcal{O}(\varrho_{W/N}^{-4}), \quad (2.17)$$

with a gradient of

$$\frac{d\sigma}{dt} = -4|V_{\ell N}|^4 G_F^2 \frac{(r_N^2 - 1)^2 m_N^{12} (m_N^2 (r_N^2 + 1) - 2m_W^2)^2 \varrho_{W/N}^{-3}}{\lambda^5 m_W^{16}} + \mathcal{O}(\varrho_{W/N}^{-4}). \quad (2.18)$$

Importantly, in this expansion, there is no possible sign flip of the gradient, so that the curves for all $r_N$ follow the $\lambda^{-4}$ shape. An example for this can be seen for $m_N = 10 \text{ GeV}$ in Fig. E.4a.

**Cross Section**

Figure 2.5 shows the total cross section of $W^\pm W^\pm \rightarrow \ell^\pm \ell^\pm$ as a function of $m_N$ for different mass ratios $r_N$ at a center of mass energy $\sqrt{M_{ww}^2} = 490 \text{ GeV}$. We see
that the $(r_N - 1)^2$ dependence of the differential cross section directly translates to the total cross section, in that for $r_N \approx 1$, the numerical value increases by about two orders of magnitude for every order of magnitude we move away from 1. All of the curves tend toward 0 for $m_N \to 0$ in accordance with the indistinguishability-theorem. As expected from the amplitude level, and as can be seen from Eq. (2.14), for $M_{ww}^2 \ll m_N^2$ the cross section vanishes as $m_N^{-2}$. With growing $r_N$, the maximum of the curve shifts from around $m_N = \sqrt{M_{ww}^2}$ toward $\sqrt{1/2} M_{ww}^2$. In the limit of $r_N \to \infty$, 

\[ \frac{d\sigma}{d\sqrt{t}}(W^\pm W^\pm \to \ell^\pm \ell^\pm) \]

\[ V_{\ell 1}^{-4} \text{ in fb GeV}^{-2} \]

Figure 2.4: Total differential cross section of $W^\pm W^\pm \to \ell^\pm \ell^\pm$ for a qDL HNL pair with a mass ratio $r_N = \frac{m_{N2}}{m_{N1}}$. The mixing angle of the first HNL $V_{\ell 1}$ factors out of the observable, while $V_{\ell 2}$ is adjusted to account for the exact cancellation. The lighter of the two HNL masses $m_{N1} = 150$ GeV (a), and $m_{N1} = 1500$ GeV (b). The centre of mass energy is 490 GeV.
Figure 2.5: Total cross section of $W^±W^± \rightarrow ℓ^±ℓ^±$ scattering for a qDl HNL pair with a mass ratio $r_N = \frac{m_{N2}}{m_{N1}}$. The mixing angle of the first HNL $V_{ℓ1}$ factors out of the observable, while $V_{ℓ2}$ is adjusted to account for the exact cancellation. The centre of mass energy is 490 GeV.

we find the completely decoupled case of a single HNL (shown in dashed orange), where already for $r_N = 100$ the two curves become indistinguishable at the scales shown.

2.3 Full Four Majorana State Model

A very convenient formulation to ensure that mixing angles $V$ generate light neutrino mass states compatible with neutrino oscillation data for any choice of $m_N$ is the Casas-Ibarra parametrisation [123, 124]

$$V^{CI} = iU\text{diag}(m_{ν1}, m_{ν2}, m_{ν3})^{1/2}\Omega\text{diag}(m_{N1}, ..., m_{NN})^{-1/2}. \quad (2.19)$$

Here $Ω$ is an orthogonal $3 \times N$ matrix holding all degrees of freedom of the model that are not fixed by the PMNS matrix $U$, the heavy mass states $m_{νi}$, and the light mass states $m_{νj}$. To account for neutrino oscillations with two HNLs, we require the lightest neutrino mass state to be massless. The most general explicit form of $Ω$ in case of normal hierarchy (NH) or inverted hierarchy (IH) is given by

$$Ω = \begin{pmatrix}
0 & 0 & 0 \\
cos ω & sin ω & 0 \\
−ξ sin ω & ξ cos ω & 0
\end{pmatrix} (NH), \quad \begin{pmatrix}
cos ω & sin ω \\
−ξ sin ω & ξ cos ω & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0
\end{pmatrix} (IH), \quad (2.20)$$
with $\xi = \pm 1$, and $\omega \in \mathbb{C}$. The parity $\xi$ can be chosen by simultaneous redefinition of the fields and $\omega$ so that we will choose $\xi = +1$ without loss of generality. Given that recent data indicates a preference for normal ordering (νFIT at 2.7σ [125], see [126] for discussion), in the following we present the case of normal hierarchy.

In the case of two HNLs and NH, we can write the two mixing angles of this parametrisation explicitly as

$$V^{CI}_{\ell_1} = i \frac{U_{\ell_2} \sqrt{m_{\nu_2}} \cos \omega - U_{\ell_3} \sqrt{m_{\nu_3}} \sin \omega}{\sqrt{m_{N_1}}}$$

$$V^{CI}_{\ell_2} = i \frac{U_{\ell_2} \sqrt{m_{\nu_2}} \sin \omega + U_{\ell_3} \sqrt{m_{\nu_3}} \cos \omega}{\sqrt{m_{N_2}}}.$$  \hfill (2.21)

For a small discussion of what changes when considering the inverted hierarchy case see Appendix B.

### 2.3.1 Amplitude Level

In this scenario, the amplitude of the $W^\pm W^\pm \rightarrow \ell^\pm \ell^\pm$ $t$-channel will be proportional to

$$iA_t \propto \sum_I V^2_{\ell I} J^{\alpha \beta} (t, m_{N_I}) + \sum_i U^2_{\ell i} J^{\alpha \beta} (t, m_{\nu_i}),$$  \hfill (2.22)

where $V_{\ell I}$ are the mixing angles, $U_{\ell i}$ is the PMNS matrix, and $J^{\alpha \beta}$ the LNV current (see Eq. (2.4)). Using the Casas-Ibarra parametrisation we get

$$iA_t \propto \left( \frac{U_{\ell_2} \sqrt{m_{\nu_2}} \cos \omega - U_{\ell_3} \sqrt{m_{\nu_3}} \sin \omega}{m_{N_1}} \right)^2 J^{\alpha \beta} (t, m_{N_1})$$

$$+ \left( \frac{U_{\ell_2} \sqrt{m_{\nu_2}} \sin \omega + U_{\ell_3} \sqrt{m_{\nu_3}} \cos \omega}{m_{N_2}} \right)^2 J^{\alpha \beta} (t, m_{N_2}) - U^2_{\ell_2} J^{\alpha \beta} (t, m_{\nu_2}) - U^2_{\ell_2} J^{\alpha \beta} (t, m_{\nu_3}).$$  \hfill (2.23)

In the limit of $m_{\nu_i}^2 \ll |t|_{\text{min}}$ and after some tedious algebra, we again find an expression like we get from the first flavour basis expansion (see Fig. E.2)

$$iA_t \propto \frac{m_{N_1}^2}{t} \left( \frac{U_{\ell_2} \sqrt{m_{\nu_2}} \cos \omega - U_{\ell_3} \sqrt{m_{\nu_3}} \sin \omega}{m_{N_1}} \right)^2 J^{\alpha \beta} (t, m_{N_1})$$

$$+ \frac{m_{N_2}^2}{t} \left( \frac{U_{\ell_2} \sqrt{m_{\nu_2}} \sin \omega + U_{\ell_3} \sqrt{m_{\nu_3}} \cos \omega}{m_{N_2}} \right)^2 J^{\alpha \beta} (t, m_{N_2}).$$  \hfill (2.24)
As we operate in the normal hierarchy and set the smallest neutrino mass to 0, we have $m_{\nu_1} = 8.6 \text{ meV}$ and $m_{\nu_1} = 50 \text{ meV}$ [125], so that the expansion condition is even better met than in the case discussed in Eq. (2.7).

Reintroducing the mass ratio $r_N$ and dropping indices on $m_{NJ}$ with $m_N = m_{N1}$, this reads

$$iA_t \propto \frac{m_N}{t} \left( (U_{e2} \sqrt{m_{\nu_2} \cos \omega} - U_{e3} \sqrt{m_{\nu_3} \sin \omega})^2 ight.$$

$$+ (U_{e2} \sqrt{m_{\nu_2} \sin \omega} + U_{e3} \sqrt{m_{\nu_3} \cos \omega})^2 \frac{t - m_N^2}{r_N^2 t - m_N^2} \bigg) J^{\alpha \beta} (t, m_N). \tag{2.25}$$

In the degeneracy limit of $r_N \to 1$ this becomes

$$iA_t \propto \frac{m_N}{t} \left( m_{\nu_2} U_{e2}^2 + m_{\nu_3} U_{e3}^2 ight.$$

$$+ 2(r_N - 1)t \left( \sqrt{m_{\nu_2}} U_{e2} \sin \omega + \sqrt{m_{\nu_3}} U_{e3} \cos \omega \right)^2 \frac{t - m_N^2}{t - m_N^2} \bigg)$$

$$+ \mathcal{O} \left( (r_N - 1)^2 \right) J^{\alpha \beta} (t, m_N), \tag{2.26}$$

so that any possible enhancement of the amplitude is suppressed as $\mathcal{O}(r_N - 1)$. However, we note that unlike in the quasi-Dirac limit (see 2.2.1), in the degeneracy limit of the Casas-Ibarra parametrisation we do not obtain a necessarily vanishing amplitude. Rather, it reduces to the case of a single HNL (see Eq. (2.6)) with a mixing angle of

$$\left( V_{CI,r_N \rightarrow 1} \right)^2 = \frac{m_{\nu_2} U_{e2}^2 + m_{\nu_3} U_{e3}^2}{m_N}, \tag{2.27}$$

at the seesaw line, similar to the condition used in our single HNL analysis in Section 2.1.

In the strongly hierarchical limit of $r_N \to \infty$ this becomes

$$iA_t \propto \frac{m_N}{t} \left( (U_{e2} \sqrt{m_{\nu_2} \cos \omega} - U_{e3} \sqrt{m_{\nu_3} \sin \omega})^2 ight.$$

$$- (U_{e2} \sqrt{m_{\nu_2} \sin \omega} + U_{e3} \sqrt{m_{\nu_3} \cos \omega})^2 \frac{t - m_N^2}{m_N^2} \bigg) + \mathcal{O} \left( r_N^{-2} \right) J^{\alpha \beta} (t, m_N). \tag{2.28}$$
This corresponds to the case of a single, potentially enhanced HNL and the two light mass states, the contribution of which can also be enhanced. We note that for \( M_{WW}^2 \ll m_N^2 \) this becomes

\[
iA_t \propto \frac{mN}{t} \left( m_{\nu_2} U_{\ell 2}^2 + m_{\nu_3} U_{\ell 3}^2 \right) J^{\alpha \beta}(t, m_N^2) + O \left( \frac{r_N^2, M_{WW}^2}{m_N^2} \right),
\]

(2.29)

where all possible enhancement \( \text{Im} \omega \) is suppressed as well.

### 2.3.2 Observables

Using \( \nu \text{FIT} \) data [127, 125] for the numerical values of the PMNS matrix \( U \), as well as the light neutrino mass splitting, we can now numerically evaluate the physical observables. The exact numerical values used will again be those \( W^+ W^+ \rightarrow e^+ e^+ \), while we stress that the numerical values for other leptons \( \ell \) will yield the same results up to ratios of their PMNS entries \( (U_{\ell i}/U_{e i})^4 \).

#### Differential Cross Section

In the same parametrisation of \( t \) as used above (Eq. (2.13)), we again expand the differential cross section in \( g_{W/N} = \frac{m_W}{m_N M_{WW}} \). In order to shorten the notation, we define \( m_\nu = U_{\ell 2}^2 m_{\nu_2} + U_{\ell 3}^2 m_{\nu_3} \) and \( \Delta m_\nu = U_{\ell 2}^2 m_{\nu_2} - U_{\ell 3}^2 m_{\nu_3} \). Assuming a purely imaginary \( \omega \) this yields\(^7\)

\[
\frac{d\sigma}{dt} = \frac{G_F^2 m_\nu^2}{9 \pi g_{W/N} \lambda^2 m_N^2} \cdot (\lambda + 3) r_N^2 m_N^2 - \lambda (r_N^2 + 1) m_W^2) + \frac{G_F^2 (2 \Delta m_\nu m_\nu \cosh(2 \text{Im} \omega))}{9 \pi \lambda r_N^2 m_N^2} + O \left( g_{W/N} \right).
\]

(2.30)

We note that the dependence at \( \lambda \rightarrow 1 \) is quadratic in \( t^{-1} \) at leading order. Meanwhile, for large values of \( \text{Im} \omega \) last term in Eq. (2.30) becomes dominant, yielding a constant \( t \) dependence. The effect of this is more evident when taking the gradient

\(^7\)As explained above, \( \text{Im} \omega \) controls the scale of the mixing angle, so that effects caused by \( \text{Re}(\omega) \) become secondary for large \( \text{Im} \omega \).
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with respect to $\lambda$ at the lower extremal value of $|t|$, which yields

$$
\frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \frac{d\sigma}{dt} = - \frac{2G_F^2 m_{\nu}^2}{9\pi \lambda^3 \theta_{W/N} m_N^2} 
- \frac{G_F^2 m_{\nu}^2 ((\lambda + 6)r_N^2 m_N^2 - \lambda (r_N^2 + 1) m_W^2)}{9\pi \lambda^3 r_N^2 m_N^2 m_W^2} 
+ \frac{G_F^2 ((r_N^2 - 1) \cosh(2 \text{Im} \omega) \Delta m_\nu m_\nu)}{9\pi \lambda^2 r_N^2 m_N^2} + O \left( \theta_{W/N} \right). 
$$

(2.31)

We, thus, expect the gradient to flip for a mass ratio of

$$
\frac{r_N^2}{r_N^2 - 1} \approx \cosh(\text{Im} \omega) \lambda \theta_{W/N} \frac{\Delta m_\nu}{m_\nu}. 
$$

(2.32)

We note that this can only be fulfilled for $1 < \cosh(\text{Im} \omega) \lambda \theta_{W/N} \Delta m_\nu$, resulting in a minimal enhancement $\text{Im} \omega$ required to observe this effect (see for example Fig. E.6).

In the limit of $\theta_{W/N} \ll 1$ this becomes instead

$$
\frac{d\sigma}{dt} = \frac{m_{N1}^9 G_F^2}{36\pi \lambda^4 m_W^{16}} \left( (r_N^2 - 1) \cosh(2 \text{Im} \omega) \left( m_N^2 (r_N^2 + 1) - 2 m_W^2 \right) \Delta m_\nu 
- \left( m_N^2 (r_N^4 + 1) - 2 (r_N^2 + 1) m_W^2 \right) m_\nu \right)^2 \theta_{W/N}^3 + O \left( \theta_{W/N} \right)^{-4}, 
$$

(2.33)

which is manifestly convex for any $\text{Im} \omega$ or $r_N$. An example of this can be seen in Fig. E.5a, where also the $N_1$-contribution is convex as explained above.

Figure 2.6a shows the differential cross section of $W^\pm W^\pm \rightarrow \ell^\pm \ell^\pm$ in the Casas-Ibarra parametrisation of the Mixing angles as a function of the Mandelstam variable $t$ for different mass ratios $r_N$ at $\omega = 0$, $m_{N1} = 150$ GeV and $\sqrt{M_{WW}} = 490$ GeV. As expected from the discussion above, for all mass ratios $r_N$ (shown in dark purple to yellow) the differential cross section is divergent towards the extremal values of $t$. Furthermore, in the absence of any enhancement $\text{Im} \omega$ the process is dominated by the contribution of the light neutrino mass states (dash-dotted in dark green). The share of $U_{\ell\nu} \sqrt{m_{\ell\nu}}$ are assigned to the $N_i$ depend on the choice of $\text{Re}(\omega)$ (see Eq. (2.19)). Thus, the two graphs for $N_1$ and $N_2$ (dashed orange and dashed red respectively) should be understood as extremal values of a band in which to expect the individual contribution of the lighter of the two heavy mass states.

Figure 2.6b also shows the differential cross section of $W^\pm W^\pm \rightarrow \ell^\pm \ell^\pm$ in the Casas-Ibarra parametrisation, but with a mixing enhancement of $\omega = 5i$. We see
that for almost degenerate HNLs the differential cross section is convex, while for more hierarchical HNLs (from $r_N \simeq 2$) the curve approaches that of the single HNL case. The differences between $N_1$ and $N_2$ due to the choice of $\text{Re}(\omega)$ are vanishingly small on the scales shown here.

For even stronger enhancement, the effects due to light neutrinos become negligible and the curves become qualitatively similar to those of the QDL case (c.f. Section 2.2 and Fig. 2.4a).
Figure 2.7: Total cross section of $W^\pm W^\pm \rightarrow \ell^\pm \ell^\pm$ scattering using the Casas-Ibarra parametrisation of the HNL mixing angles for different real (a) and imaginary (b) Casas-Ibarra parameters. The mass ratio $r_N = \frac{m_{N2}}{m_{N1}} = 2$ and the centre of mass energy is 490 GeV.

Cross Section

Figure 2.7a shows the total cross section of $W^\pm W^\pm \rightarrow \ell^\pm \ell^\pm$ using the Casas-Ibarra parametrisation (Eq. (2.19)) for a mass ratio of $r_N = 2$, varying the Casas-Ibarra parameter $\omega$ for a range of real values. For all values of $\omega$, we observe a convergence with the numerical value determined by the light mass states for large masses ($m_N > 1000 \simeq 2M_{ww}$). Furthermore, we note a cancellation between light and heavy mass states for small $m_N$ similar to the case of a single HNL (see Fig. 2.3). The splitting for smaller values of $m_N$ is due to the way $\omega$ distributes the $U_{\nu\ell}\sqrt{m_\nu}$ in the mixing of non-degenerate ($r_N = 2$) HNLs, giving smaller or larger weight to the heavier — and therefore more suppressed — $N_2$. However, for $m_N \rightarrow m_\nu$ the cross section vanishes.
Figure 2.8: Comparison of $W^\pm W^\pm \rightarrow \ell^\pm \ell^\pm$ cross sections between qDL and fully realistic two HNL neutrino sector model. The data is shown at a maximally admissible mixing angle $V_{\ell 1}$ according to Section 1.2.1.

for all values of $\omega$. The portrayed dependence on $\text{Re}(\omega)$ is $\pi$-periodic, as can also be seen from Eq. (2.19).

By contrast, Fig. 2.7b shows the total cross section of $W^\pm W^\pm \rightarrow \ell^\pm \ell^\pm$ for a range of purely imaginary $\omega$s permitted by the limit of $|V_{\ell N}| < 1$. Again all curves will eventually meet the numerical value determined by the light mass states for large values of $m_{N1}$. However, the range at which the heavy mass states dominate is greatly extended depending on the enhancement factor $\text{Im} \omega$. This behaviour is due to the constant enhancement by $\text{Im} \omega$ becoming suppressed by very large $m_N$ as prescribed by the Casas-Ibarra parametrisation (see Eq. (2.19)). We can also observe some non-trivial interference between the enhanced HNL contributions for $m_{N1} \approx m_W = 80 \text{ GeV}$. The interference is especially non trivial, as $m_{N2}$ is right at the minimum centre of mass energy $2m_W$ due to the chosen mass ratio $r_N$, potentially making terms significant that can otherwise be neglected.

In the limit of large $V_{\ell 1}$, the cross sections of the qDL model and in Casas-Ibarra parametrisation become indistinguishable (see Fig. 2.8) to the precision of this analysis. This means that for large mixing angles, $m_{N1} m_{\nu}^{-1} \ll \cosh(2 \text{Im} \omega)$, the qDL model is a good approximation of a more realistic neutrino sector model.
Extension to Same Sign Di-Lepton Signal at Colliders

In this chapter we will translate our findings from Chapter 2 to the specific case of $W$ boson fusion in $pp \rightarrow \ell^\pm \ell^\pm jj$ scattering (see Fig. 1.4a). To mark the $pp$ level cross sections we will mark them with $pp \rightarrow \ell^\pm \ell^\pm jj$. However, this does not include contributions coming from the Drell-Yan process, which shares the same signature (see Fig. 1.4b). Unlike in Chapter 2, where the $\pm$ in $W^+W^- \rightarrow \ell^\pm \ell^\pm$ signified that both possibilities lead to equally sized cross sections, $pp \rightarrow \ell^\pm \ell^\pm jj$ will denote that we add both contributions to a combined cross section. This does not correspond to a simple factor of 2, as the parton structure of the proton favours the “++” over the “−−” process.

After explaining the methodology of obtaining our proton-proton level cross sections (Section 3.1), we will analyse the detection prospects at current (Large Hadron Collider, LHC, Section 3.2) and future (Future Circular Collider in the hadron-hadron stage, FCC-hh, Section 3.3) colliders. Both of these colliders are/will be circular synchrotron accelerators capable of high energy $pp$ collisions. The experimental parameters of these machines constitute the best chance for the potential observation of $pp \rightarrow \ell^\pm \ell^\pm jj$ for the foreseeable future.$^\dagger$

---

$^\dagger$The current timeline predicts that after the high luminosity upgrade to the LHC, it will reach its target integrated luminosity some time around 2040 [128]. Meanwhile the FCC-hh is scheduled to become operational in 2062, reaching its predicted integrated luminosity after 25 years [129].
3.1 Methodology

As already mentioned in Section 1.3.2, the $W$ boson fusion (Fig. 1.4a) process is distinct from the Drell-Yan process (Fig. 1.4b), due to the antiquarks in initial and final state of DY. We can thus safely ignore DY in our calculations, even though they share the same collider signature $pp \rightarrow \ell^\pm \ell^\pm jj$.

As we saw in Section 2.3, a QDl model becomes a good approximation of a neutrino sector model involving light neutrino masses compatible with oscillation and cosmological data for large mixing angles ($m_{N1}m_{\nu}^{-1} \ll \cosh(2 \Im \omega)$). As we will see, at currently proposed hadron colliders only those mixing angles are within reach. Therefore, we will limit ourselves to the QDl model for the following estimates, as it is inherently numerically simpler. For $pp$ level cross sections in the case of one HNL and two HNLs in the Casas-Ibarra parametrisation find Appendices A and B.

An accurate description of QCD effects involved in the WBF process is beyond the scope of this thesis. Instead we will use the effective $W$ approximation (see Section 1.4).

In order to use this approximation, the cross section has to be decomposed into longitudinal and transversal components. This is implemented at amplitude level using the corresponding sum relations on the polarisation vectors. Subsequently, the polarised cross sections are folded with effective PDFs $f_{\lambda W/p}$ as described in Section 1.4. These relate a $W$’s energy to that of its respective mother-proton in the $pp$ collision through the momentum fraction $x_i$.

In the case of WBF we have (in the notation of Section 1.4.2)

$$m_a = m_b = m_W, \quad \text{and} \quad m_X^2 + m_Y^2 + m_Z^2 = 4m_\ell^2 + \sum_i m_{ji}^{2\min},$$

with $m_{ji}^{2\min}$ being the minimal invariant mass of of the $i$th jet. If we do not apply any cuts on the jets minimal invariant mass, we have $4m_W^2 > 4m_\ell^2 + m_{j1}^{2\min} + m_{j2}^{2\min}$ for all lepton generations $\ell$. Under a change of variables ($x_1x_2 \rightarrow \tau, x_1 \rightarrow \xi$) and summing over the polarisation states described in Section 1.4.1, we write Eq. (1.42) for WBF in the simple form

$$\sigma_{pp \rightarrow \ell^\pm \ell^\pm jj}(s) = 2 \sum_{\lambda,\lambda' = \{T, L\}} \int_1^{m_W} d\tau \int_\tau^{m_W} d\xi f_{\lambda W/p}(\tau) f_{\lambda' W/p}(\xi) \sigma_{W^\pm W^\pm \rightarrow \ell^\pm \ell^\pm}(\tau\xi),$$

where $\sum_{\lambda,\lambda' = \{T, L\}} f_{\lambda W/p}(\tau) f_{\lambda' W/p}(\xi)$ is the cross section for the $W$ boson to be produced in a $W$ polarisation state with equal probability for $T$ and $L$. The cuts Eq. (3.5) imposed on in the detector simulation demand that the transverse momentum $p_T^{\ell^\pm} > 20$ GeV, so that this relation still holds.
where the sum over polarisations $\lambda$ includes longitudinal (L) and transversal (T) polarisations, the sum over $W$ electric charges $\kappa$ includes + and −, and $\tau_{\text{min}} = 4m_W^2s_{pp}$. 

In Section 3.1.1 we show a decomposition by polarisation as mentioned in the paragraphs above, along with a discussion of the EWA. We show that the EWA can only be safely applied for $m_{N1} \gtrsim$ several 100 GeV.

We then compare the resulting $pp$ level cross sections for the case of a single HNL in the phenomenological type-I seesaw model to those derived in MadGraph5_aMC at NLO (MG5aMC) analogously to the NLO study of WBF in this framework by Fuks et al. [101]. We find good agreement for HNL masses $m_N \gtrsim$ few TeV, but larger discrepancies for smaller masses in the 100 GeV range. To extend the meaningful range of our results, we will use this comparison to rescale the EWA results. This has the added benefit of applying detector motivated cuts on the jets of the signal, excluding too large pseudorapidities.

Using the thus derived $pp$ level cross sections, we will give an estimate for maximal collider event rates and parameter reach in the QDL framework.

This workflow employed in calculating $pp$ level quantities can be summarised in the following way:

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{c}
\hline
Polarised amplitudes \\
Polarised cross sections \\
Folding with EWA PDFs \\
Rescaling with MG5aMC detector level results \\
Event rate and parameter reach estimates \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

3.1.1 Effective $W$ Approximation

**Polarisation Decomposition of a quasi-Dirac-like HNL pair**

In this section, we present the polarised cross sections of $W^\pm W^\pm \rightarrow \ell^\pm \ell^\pm$ that go into the effective $W$ approximation. The decompositions were performed using the
polarisation sum relations (in unitary gauge)

\[ \sum_k \varepsilon_k^\alpha \varepsilon_k^\beta = -\eta^{\alpha\beta} \quad \text{(transversal)} \]  
\[ \sum_k \varepsilon_k^\alpha \varepsilon_k^\beta = \frac{k^\alpha k^\beta}{m_W^2} \quad \text{(longitudinal)} \]

for the \( W \) polarisation vectors \( \varepsilon_k \) with momentum \( k \) to obtain polarised squared amplitudes.

Using this decomposition, we can identify the interaction of the two HNLs in a qDL pair at polarised \( WW \) cross section level. This is shown in Fig. 3.1 for a mass ratio \( r_N = 2 \) with the lighter HNL \( N_1 \) having a mass \( m_{N1} = 150 \) GeV (Figs. 3.1a and 3.1b) and \( m_{N1} = 1500 \) GeV (Figs. 3.1c and 3.1d) as a function of \( WW \) centre of mass energy \( \sqrt{M_{ww}} \). The individual cases \( N_I \) are polarised single HNL cross sections with parameters corresponding to their values in the qDL pair. The combined case is the polarised cross section of this same qDL pair.

We see that in the transversally polarised case (Figs. 3.1a and 3.1c), the individual HNL contributions drop with increasing \( \sqrt{M_{ww}} \). Furthermore, the mass ratio causes a split between the cross sections for all centre of mass energies. This split is more significant when the HNL masses are comparable to \( \sqrt{M_{ww}} \) and approaches a constant factor (\( \sim 1 \) order of magnitude difference for \( r_N = 2 \)) between the individual contributions, as \( \sqrt{M_{ww}} \) becomes large compared to the HNL masses. As the combined qDL cross section is generated by negative interference between the two mass states — and the \( N_2 \) contribution is suppressed by the mixing angle as prescribed by Eq. (1.23) — the \( N_1 \) curve always lies above the combined case. For hierarchical HNLs, this suppression is strong enough for the combined cross section to be larger than the \( N_2 \) contribution (see also Figs. E.7e and E.7g for \( r_N = 10 \), where the combined cross sections is in good approximation equal to that of the lighter single HNL). This is not the case for degenerate HNLs (see Figs. E.7a and E.7c for \( r_N = 1.1 \)), where the negative interference is much stronger due to comparable individual contributions.

In the longitudinal case (Figs. 3.1b and 3.1d), the individual HNL contributions grow with increasing \( \sqrt{M_{ww}} \). Contrary to the transversal case, there is a constant factor between individual contributions when the centre of mass energy is small or of comparable size to the HNL masses. This split vanishes when \( \sqrt{M_{ww}} \) becomes large compared to \( m_{N1} \). As the \( N_2 \) contribution approaches that of \( N_1 \), the negative interference between the two causes the combined cross section to drop. This behaviour is reproduced both in the more degenerate (\( r_N = 1.1 \), Figs. E.7b and E.7d) and more
Figure 3.1: Polarised cross sections of $W^\pm W^\pm \rightarrow \ell^\pm \ell^\pm$ scattering as decompositions in the $WW$ polarisations as Transversal $\leftrightarrow \sigma^{TT}$ and Longitudinal $\leftrightarrow \sigma^{LL}$. The cross sections are given as a function of the centre of mass energy $\sqrt{M_{WW}^2}$. The data is given for the lighter HNL mass $m_{N1} = 150 \text{GeV}$ (upper) and $m_{N1} = 1500 \text{GeV}$ (lower) with the second HNL having a mass according to the mass ratio $r_N = 2$. For different values of $r_N$ see Fig. E.7.

The hierarchical case ($r_N = 10$, Figs. E.7f and E.7h). Here, the splitting is also smaller in the degenerate and larger in the hierarchical case, due to the same reasoning as in the transversal case.

We note that at small $WW$ centre of mass energies, the transversal and longitudinal contributions are comparable, while at large $\sqrt{M_{WW}^2}$ the longitudinal contributions dominate.
Validity of the Effective $W$ Approximation

In the deduction of the effective $W$ approximation’s PDFs, one formally assumes decoherence between the polarisation states of individual $W$ “partons” (see Section 1.4.1). This means that if contributions due to different polarisation states are on a similar scale — and thus the decoherence assumption is no longer valid — the results at $pp$ level potentially underestimate by a factor of few.\footnote{This is due to the error occurring in both $p$ involved in the $pp \rightarrow \ell^\pm \ell^\pm jj$ process.}

To investigate the validity of the approximation we will thus compare the doubly longitudinally polarised (LL) $WW$ cross section to the doubly transversally polarised (TT) case. As the folding with PDFs involves an integration over different energy regimes, this is important at all relevant centre of mass energies determined by the PDFs in Fig. 1.5. Figure 3.2 shows this for a centre of mass energy on the lower end of the PDF spectrum ($M^2_{WW} = 16m^2_W$, Figs. 3.2a and 3.2b), on the upper end of LHC energies ($M^2_{WW} = s_{\text{LHC}}/100$, Figs. 3.2c and 3.2d), and upper end of FCC energies ($M^2_{WW} = s_{\text{FCC}}/100$, Figs. 3.2e and 3.2f). We note that for low end energies, the LL cross section becomes comparable with the TT cross section for $m_{N1} \gtrsim 100$–200 GeV, while at larger energies this is the case for $m_{N1} \gtrsim 10$–100 GeV. As $pp$ level validity is determined by validity at all relevant sub energies, only a region of general LL dominance fully meets the assumptions of the effective $W$ approximation. Hence, we expect the results to become more accurate for larger HNL masses, while we expect to underestimate the $pp$ level cross section for smaller $m_{N1}$. Validity due to this restriction is expected to be reached for $m_{N1} \gtrsim$ several 100 GeV.

It has been, furthermore, pointed out in past literature that in order to achieve numerical stability, the lower limit of the integration has to be set above a certain threshold, rather than to account for minimal production energy [130]. We investigate this by varying the lower limit on $\tau_{\text{min}}$ (see Eq. (3.2)). This is shown in Fig. 3.3, where we have plotted the cross section of a single isolated HNL for different values of $M_{WW}^{\text{min}} = \sqrt{M_{WW}^{\text{min}}}$ at $\sqrt{s_{\text{LHC}}} = 13$ TeV. For small HNL masses $m_N \lesssim 100$ GeV, there is a noticeable dependence on the lower cut-off. We note that the cross section for $M_{WW}^{\text{min}} = 320$–500 GeV is largest in this regime, even though we removed part of the integration interval for positive definite functions with respect to e.g. $M_{WW}^{\text{min}} = 200$ GeV. The lines of $M_{WW}^{\text{min}} = 320$ GeV and $M_{WW}^{\text{min}} = 500$ GeV coincide for all mass values $m_{N1}$. For $m_N \gtrsim$ several 100 GeV, the numerical values are identical for all $M_{WW}^{\text{min}} < 750$ GeV, while the curve of $M_{WW}^{\text{min}} = 750$ GeV lies slightly below the others. The curve representing $M_{WW}^{\text{min}} = 1$ TeV lies below the others by a factor of $\mathcal{O}(10\%)$ for lower $m_N$ converging with the rest at $m_N \simeq$ few TeV.
Figure 3.2: Polarised cross sections of $W^\pm W^\pm \rightarrow \ell^\pm \ell^\pm$. The polarisation $\lambda_1$, $\lambda_2$ are both longitudinal (L, L; left panels) or transversal (T, T; right panels), while the centre of mass energy is $4m_W = 225$ GeV (top panels), $\sqrt{s_{\text{fcc}}}/10 = 1.3$ TeV (middle panels) and $\sqrt{s_{\text{fcc}}}/10 = 10$ TeV (bottom panels). We assume a QDL model with mass ratio $r_N$.

Overall the effect of the cut-off is only significant in the regime of $m_N \lesssim 100$ GeV. As the focus of this work lies on the regime of $m_N \simeq$ several $100$–few $1000$ GeV, the influence is marginal. Nevertheless, we set the lower limit $M_{WW}^{\min} = 4m_W \simeq 320$ GeV as a benchmark for this work, which corresponds to twice the minimal production energy and is already in a numerically stable regime according to Fig. 3.3.
Figure 3.3: Single isolated HNL $pp$ level WBF cross section at $\sqrt{s}_{LHC} = 13$ TeV as a function of HNL mass $m_N$. This is shown for different lower bounds on the integration parameters of the effective $W$ approximation determined by $M_{WW}$ (according to $\tau_{\text{min}} = M_{WW}^2 s_{pp}^{-1}$).

Figure 3.4: WBF at $pp$ level cross section for a single isolated HNL ($W^\pm W^\pm$ combined). Comparison of MG5aMC detector simulation prescribed by Fuks et al. [101] (dashed orange) and effective $W$ approximation (purple), shown at LHC (a) and FCC (b) centre of mass energy.

3.1.2 Rescaling for Small Heavy Neutral Lepton Masses

For the case of a single HNL in a phenomenological type-I seesaw, Fig. 3.4 compares the WBF cross section deduced using the EWA without any detector motivated cuts with that including such cuts on the jets using the Montecarlo event generator MG5aMC.
Extension to Same Sign Di-Lepton Signal at Colliders

Methodology

As prescribed by Fuks et al., we employ generator level cuts for the LHC on the jets’ transverse momentum $p_T^{j}$ and pseudorapidities $\eta^{j}$

$$p_T^{j} > 20 \text{ GeV} \quad \text{and} \quad |\eta^{j}| < 5.5.$$  \hfill (3.4)

As the FCC is expected to have a larger pseudorapidity acceptance [131], we adjust the cuts to

$$p_T^{j} > 20 \text{ GeV} \quad \text{and} \quad |\eta^{j}| < 6.$$  \hfill (3.5)

In both cases we impose the restriction on QCD partons to be sequentially clustered according to the anti-$k_T$ algorithm [132] with $R = 0.4$, and the standard DELPHES ATLAS parameter card [133] for all other values. The MG5aMC simulations were performed only at LO in QCD, due to unknown errors occurring in the NLO simulation and time restriction on this thesis.

For LHC centre of mass energy (see Fig. 3.4a), we see that in the EWA applicability regime according to Section 3.1.1, the two curves differ by a factor of $\sim 1.8$, while the difference is significant at smaller $m_N$ ($\sim 20$). This discrepancy could be due to neglecting terms scaling as $O\left(p_T^2 M_{WW}^2\right)$, $O\left(m_W^2 M_{WW}^2\right)$, as the EWA is formulated as a small angle approximation (see Section 1.4). These are known shortcomings of the EWA [130] usually resulting in errors up to order 1.

For FCC centre of mass energy (see Fig. 3.4b), we see a similar behaviour to the LHC case. In the low mass regime of $m_{N1} < 1 \text{ TeV}$ we find a large discrepancy $\sim 20$, which vanishes in the large mass regime. Here, we find that the EWA slightly overestimates the detector cross section. This is because — as larger centre of mass energy leads to larger pseudorapidities — even the FCC adjusted cuts likely decrease the overall cross section more significantly than in the LHC case. Meanwhile in the EWA, we do not consider any cuts on the signal, leading to a slight overestimation. As the terms mentioned in the paragraph above scale with $M_{WW}^2$, we expect the EWA to be more accurate in this regard for the FCC case.

By comparing the two curves, we can generate a rescaling function for our $pp$ level cross sections derived in the EWA for a given centre of mass energy. This approach allows us to investigate the effect of complex mixing angles — as demanded by Eq. (1.23), and which is not yet possible in MG5aMC — for an extended range of HNL masses $m_{N1}$, while respecting detector geometries as given by Eqs. (3.4) and (3.5). We expect this scaling to be directly translatable to all $r_N$ showing the same $WW$ level differential cross section. According to Eq. (2.16) this is the case for all $r_N$ if $m_{N1} > 2m_W = 160 \text{ GeV}$. 

48
Figure 3.5: Cross section of $pp \to \ell^+\ell^+ jj$ as calculated in the effective $W$ approximation in the model with two HNLs whose mass ratio is equal to $r_N$. The mass of the lighter HNL is shown as the x-axis, while another one is $r_N$ times heavier. Notations are the same as in Fig. 2.5. The dependence on the mixing angle $|V_{\ell 1}|^4$ is factored out. Contribution of the light neutrinos is neglected (see Section 2.3 for details). The centre of mass energy is assumed to be $\sqrt{s_{\text{LHC}}} = 13$ TeV.

3.2 Large Hadron Collider

3.2.1 pp Level Cross Section

Figure 3.5 shows the expected total cross section of $pp \to \ell^+\ell^+ jj$ for a centre of mass energy $\sqrt{s_{\text{LHC}}} = 13$ TeV. We see that the polarisation decomposition, folding with PDFs, and subsequent rescaling increases the difference in relative maximum with respect to the mass ratio $r_N$. The highly hierarchical case approaches that of the independent single HNL at $m_{N_1} \sim 450$ GeV, while for the degenerate case the maximum shifts from around $m_{N_1} \sim 600$ TeV at $WW$ level to $m_{N_1} \sim 1$ TeV. Importantly, the $pp$ cross section is about four orders of magnitude smaller than the $WW$ cross section at $M_{WW} = 490$ GeV. Beyond this, the general characteristics of the $WW$-scattering case directly translate into the $pp$ case.

3.2.2 Theoretically Accessible Mass Ranges

Using the $pp$ cross sections in Fig. 3.5, we can estimate how many events could be expected at the LHC. To this end, we multiply the cross section by the maximal
Figure 3.6: The maximal number of WBF events as calculated in the effective $W$ approximation in the model with two HNLs with mass ratio $r_N$. The mixing angle $|V_{\ell I}|$ is maximised, according to Eq. (3.6). Notice that for $m_{N2} = r_N m_{N1} > v$, it is the condition on the mixing angle $|V_{\ell 2}|$ that dominates. Efficiency of the detector is assumed 100%. The centre of mass energy is $\sqrt{s_{\text{LHC}}} = 13$ TeV and the luminosity $3 \text{ ab}^{-1}$.

Theoretically admissible values of the mixing angles $|V_{\ell I}|$ (see Eq. (3.6) for details). This means that both $V_{\ell 1}$ and $V_{\ell 2}$ should obey the condition

$$|V_{\ell I}| \leq \begin{cases} 
1, & m_{NI} < v \\
\frac{v}{m_{NI}}, & m_{NI} > v 
\end{cases}$$

(3.6)

for their respective masses.\footnote{Strictly speaking, the actual perturbativity limit is of course $\ll 1$. However, setting a limit of exactly 1 arguably removes a degree of arbitrariness.} Here, $v$ is the Higgs’ vacuum expectation value. Notice that for $m_{N2} > v$ and $r_N > 1$, the perturbativity condition of the HNL $N_2$ provides the most stringent theoretical upper bound on $|V_{\ell 1}|$ (under the assumption of Eq. (1.23)).\footnote{This, in particular, demonstrates that decoupling of one of the HNLs, while keeping neutrino masses small, is not possible. The condition for the theory to remain perturbative imposes constraints on the mixings of non-decoupled lighter HNLs.}

Figure 3.6 shows the expected maximal amount of events $N_{\text{max}}$ at the HL-LHC with an integrated luminosity of $3000 \text{ fb}^{-1} \equiv 3 \text{ ab}^{-1}$ [134] as a function of the lighter of two HNL masses $m_{N1}$ for different mass ratios $r_N$, as well as for a single HNL case (dashed orange). The number of events reaches its maximum at $m_{N1} \sim r_N^{-1/2} \text{ vev}$. For models with $m_{N1} < 100 \text{ GeV}$, $N_{\text{max}}$ is the largest for $r_N \gtrsim \mathcal{O}(10)$, while for $m_{N1} > 100 \text{ GeV}$, $N_{\text{max}}$ is largest for $r_N \sim \text{ few}$. Notice that for $r_N \geq 2$ — and for
masses $m_{N1} \gtrsim \text{few } 100\text{ GeV}$ in general — the differential cross section predicted for a QDL HNL pair looks similar to that of the free parameter single HNL. Therefore, efficiencies of cuts will be similar to those estimated in [101]. We stress that, for all mass ratios $m_{N1} \geq 2\text{ TeV}$, $N_{\text{max}} < 1$. As the actual perturbativity limit would be smaller than $F = 1$, this means that the process $pp \rightarrow \ell^{\pm}\ell^{\pm}jj$ is not suitable for probing HNLs in the TeV mass range at the LHC.

### 3.2.3 Mixing-Mass Exclusion Regions

Nevertheless, using the cross sections shown in Fig. 3.5, we can give an estimate 95\% CL exclusion in the $(V_{N1}, r_{N}, m_{N})$ parameter space. We present our results for $r_{N} = 2$ and $r_{N} = 10$, as they represent the most promising mass ratio regime of $\mathcal{O}$(few–several) according to Fig. 3.6. Bounds for $r_{N} < 2$ become an order of magnitude weaker for every order of magnitude in $|r_{N} - 1| \rightarrow 0$. For $r_{N} > 10$ the bounds remain the same, while the Yukawa excluded region grows. This can be observed in Fig. E.8 where we compare exclusion regions for $r_{N} \in \{1.1, 2, 10, 100\}$. The mass ratios $r_{N} = 2$ and $r_{N} = 10$ are chosen, as only in this $r_{N}$ range any signal could be expected in the $m_{N1} \sim \text{TeV}$ range interesting for indirect searches.

In a model with $r_{N} \sim \text{few } (\text{Fig. 3.7a})$, for a near perfect detector and negligible background ($\epsilon \sim 1, \text{ yellow}$), we find that a WBF search at the HL-LHC can probe HNL masses $m_{N1}$ up to 1.5 TeV. This mass range is limited to $m_{N1} \lesssim 850\text{ GeV}$ for
a lower detector efficiency ($\epsilon \sim 0.1$, dashed-dotted grey), and $m_{N1} \lesssim 450\text{ GeV}$ for a low efficiency ($\epsilon \sim 0.01$, dashed blue).

In a model with $r_N \sim \mathcal{O}(10)$ (Fig. 3.7b) the cross section per $|V_{\ell 1}|^4$ is higher, but the range of accessible masses is smaller due to the perturbativity condition of Eq. (3.6). As a result the maximally probed HNL mass is $m_{N1} \lesssim 850\text{ GeV}$. This limit drops to $m_{N1} \lesssim \text{several } 100\text{ GeV}$ for more realistic efficiencies.²

3.3 Future Circular Collider

Sensitivity of the WBF process is maximal for $\sqrt{M_{WW}} \sim m_{N1}$. With larger centre of mass energy of $pp$ collisions, this factor increases accordingly. Therefore, the process under consideration can be expected to be more efficient at Future Circular Collider (FCC-hh), where the anticipated collision centre of mass energy $\sqrt{s_{\text{fcc}}} = 100\text{ TeV}$ [135]. To the authors best knowledge, a WBF investigation with FCC-hh parameters has not yet been performed in past literature.

3.3.1 $pp$ Level Cross Section

Using the projected centre of mass energy and machinery developed in this work, we can estimate the WBF cross section of the $pp \rightarrow \ell^\pm \ell^\pm jj$ process, shown in Fig. 3.8. We find that the cross section reaches its maximum at $m_{N1} \simeq 1.5\text{ TeV}$ for a highly hierarchical QDL pair and at up to $m_{N1} \simeq 5\text{ TeV}$ in the highly degenerate case. It is, furthermore, about two orders of magnitude larger at FCC compared to LHC energies and reaches $\sim 1\text{ pb}$ for a hierarchical HNL pair.

3.3.2 Theoretically Accessible Mass Ranges

With a target integrated luminosity $30\text{ ab}^{-1}$ [131], this corresponds to a maximal theoretically admissible event number $N_{\text{max}}$ as shown in Fig. 3.9. Again, we see that for $m_{N1} > r_N^{-1/2}\text{ vev}$ Yukawa perturbativity becomes the main theoretical constraint on the mixing angle $V_{\ell 1}$, resulting in $r_N \sim \text{few}$ to yield the largest $N_{\text{max}}$. Nevertheless, at FCC parameters, the mass range for $m_{N1}$ in a QDL pair with $1.01 < r_N < 100$ extends into the TeV range.

²Fuks et al. report a maximal efficiency of around 40% for $m_N \sim \mathcal{O}\text{ (TeV)}$ for the free parameter single HNL case, which drops for smaller masses.
Figure 3.8: Cross section of $pp \rightarrow \ell^+\ell^-jj$ as calculated in the effective $W$ approximation in the model with two HNLs whose mass ratio is equal to $r_N$. The mass of the lighter HNL is shown as the x-axis, while another one is $r_N$ times heavier. Notations are the same as in Fig. 2.5. The dependence on the mixing angle $|V_{\ell 1}|^4$ is factored out. Contribution of the light neutrinos is neglected (see Section 2.3 for details). The centre of mass energy is assumed to be $\sqrt{s_{\text{FCC}}} = 100$ TeV.

Figure 3.9: The maximal number of WBF events as calculated in the effective $W$ approximation in the model with two HNLs with mass ratio $r_N$. The mixing angle $|V_{\ell 1}|^4$ is maximised, according to Eq. (3.6). Efficiency of the detector is assumed 100%. The centre of mass energy is $\sqrt{s_{\text{FCC}}} = 100$ TeV and the luminosity $30 \text{ ab}^{-1}$.

3.3.3 Mixing-Mass Exclusion Regions

Due to the significantly larger cross section and higher integrated luminosity, the relevant $(V_{\ell N}, r_N, m_N)$ parameter space covered by $pp \rightarrow \ell^\pm\ell^\pm jj$ at the FCC-hh opens
Figure 3.10: The exclusion limits on the N\textsubscript{1} parameters by WBF events as calculated in the effective W approximation in the model with two HNLs with mass ratio r\textsubscript{N}. The limits are obtained for 95\% CL exclusions assuming zero background. The assumed detector efficiency is \(\epsilon\), the centre of mass energy \(\sqrt{s_{\text{fcc}}} = 100\) TeV and the luminosity \(30\) ab\(^{-1}\).

up as seen in the previous section. For both \(r_{N} = 2\) and \(r_{N} = 10\) (see Figs. 3.10a and 3.10b respectively), physically relevant mixing angles \(V_{N}\) are within reach for a qDl HNL pair with \(m_{N1} \sim \text{few TeV}\) and \(m_{N1} \sim \text{few TeV}\) assuming a detection efficiency \(\epsilon \geq 0.1\). See Fig. E.8 for exclusion plots for further values of \(r_{N}\), where we find that for \(r_{N} = 1.1\) and \(r_{N} = 100\) the detection of a qDl pair with \(m_{N1}\) in the TeV range is only possible for a highly efficient detector. The relative difference between different values of \(r_{N}\) are as discussed in the LHC case in Section 3.2.
Discussion and Conclusion

4.1 Discussion

4.1.1 WW Level Results

The results derived at WW level are fully analytical. Therefore, the numerical values and expansions presented in Chapter 2 are effectual barring the following caveats.

As mentioned in Section 2.1, the chosen light neutrino mass scale in case of the single HNL model corresponds to an experimental upper bound. As the actual light neutrino mass scale can be anywhere between the $\sqrt{\Delta m_{\text{atm}}^2}$ and this upper bound (see Section 1.1.2), the numerical values presented for this model are very optimistic.

As mentioned in Section 2.3, the exact results in the Casas-Ibarra parametrisation Eq. (2.21) are strictly only valid for $W^\pm W^\pm \rightarrow e^\pm e^\pm$ scattering for a normal neutrino mass hierarchy, as they rely on direct input of the PMNS matrix entries and light neutrino masses. However, this matters only if the light mass states contribute significantly to the cross section. For mixing angles with significant $\text{Im} \omega$ enhancement (where this is not the case), the same cross sections can be recovered in other scenarios by adjusting $\text{Im} \omega$ to the corresponding $U_{2\ell}^2 m_{\nu i}$ ratios (c.f. Appendix B).

4.1.2 pp Level Results

In the deduction of pp level results we employed the effective $W$ approximation (see Sections 1.4 and 3.1.1 for details). As we saw in Section 3.1.1, we expected the EWA results to be less reliable for $m_{N1} \lesssim \text{few 100 GeV}$. This was confirmed by the direct comparison of EWA results with a full $2 \rightarrow 4$ simulation for a phenomenological type-I seesaw HNL in Fig. 3.4. The consequent rescaling remedies this mismatch for QDL pairs with large mass ratios $r_N$, as the WW level differential cross sections — and consequently the WW system behaviour in the $2 \rightarrow 4$ process — are very similar (see Fig. E.4). In the case of near degeneracy with masses $m_{N1} < \text{few 100 GeV}$ this is not the case. Here we expect that deviations in this regime should be expected when considering a full Montecarlo simulation. However, as this parameter combination will unlikely lead to WBF detector discovery even at FCC energies (see Fig. E.8e), giving only a rough estimate for that parameter space is justified.
The rescaling cross sections in this thesis were derived at LO in QCD due to unknown errors occurring in the NLO simulations and time restrictions. At the LHC the $k$ factor $k = \sigma_{NLO} \sigma_{LO}^{-1}$ lies in the range 1–1.4. Due to higher energies at the FCC we expect the influence of NLO QCD to be even stronger. Therefore, our cross section and subsequent bounds on HNL parameters likely underestimate the actual detector signal strength.

On the other hand, all $pp$ level results in this thesis were derived without considering background motivated detector cuts, so that no cuts were applied on the signal outside of the bounds on the jets. Fuks et al. report a relatively stable 40% efficiency for a phenomenological type-I seesaw HNL with $m_{N1} \sim \text{few TeV}$. However, due to the higher centre of mass energy — and associated forward shift in signal — these efficiencies are not easily translated to the FCC. This leads to an overestimation of the signal strength.

At the LHC, these two effects nearly compensate one another in the mass range of interest ($m_{N1} \simeq 1 \text{ TeV}$), however without a full detector level study, it is not possible to predict how this translates to FCC energies. Therefore, we will limit ourselves to giving an estimate on the potential reach on the HNL parameters of the process for a given centre of mass energy, rather than actual exclusion limits by a potential detector experiment.

4.2 Conclusion

In this work we analysed the collider probe for Majorana particles with masses ranging from $\sim 50 \text{ GeV}$ to $\sim 5 \text{ TeV}$. The process that we considered is a direct analog of the $0\nu\beta\beta$ decay — $pp \rightarrow \ell^+\ell^- jj$ (Section 1.3.2). Compared to previous works on the subject (c.f. [97–101]) we concentrated on models where HNLs are solely responsible for generating neutrino masses. All Majorana particles — HNLs and active neutrinos — contribute to the process in question and we analysed their interference. We demonstrated that such an interference is necessarily destructive as a consequence of smallness of neutrino masses compared to other relevant energy scales. There are two regimes determined by whether HNLs’ mixing angles $|V_{\ell N}|$ are comparable or much larger than the naive “seesaw limit” $|V|_{\text{seesaw}}^2 = m_{\nu} m_{N}^{-1}$ (see text around Eq. (1.21)).

1. For $|V_{\ell N}| \sim |V|_{\text{seesaw}}$ and HNL masses comparable to the sub process energy scale, cancellation between light states and heavy mass states occurs. For heavy HNL masses (above the sub process energy scale) the HNL contribution
can become suppressed with respect to that of the light neutrino states. In both cases the cross section is limited by its proportionality to $m_\nu^2$.

2. For $|V_{\nu N}| \gg |V|_{\text{seesaw}}$ (while still keeping neutrino masses small, as experimentally observed) the situation is quite different. The contribution of active neutrinos is negligible, but cancellation occurs between HNL states (similarly to the way it happens in the neutrino mass matrix). On one hand, the cross section is always smaller than that of an isolated single HNL with the same mixing. On the other hand, the cross section can become enhanced compared to the naive scaling of $\sigma \propto m_\nu^2$ which would be suggested by the Weinberg operator per se (c.f. [136]). This enhancement corresponds roughly to a factor of $|V_{\nu N}|^4 |V|_{\text{seesaw}}^4$ and occurs only if HNLs are sufficiently far from the quasi-Dirac limit and was found to be most effective for $m_{N2}m_{N1}^{-1} = r_N \gtrsim \text{few}$.

3. Lastly, large mass splitting $r_N \gg 1$ allows to recovering the limit of a single HNL (as considered, e.g. in [101]) only with considerable limitations. Naively, in this case the heavier HNL $N_2$ and its contribution to $pp \rightarrow \ell^\pm \ell^\pm jj$ disappears. This is not necessarily the case in our realistic (and UV-complete) model (type-I seesaw with 2 HNLs), as perturbativity demands that all Yukawa couplings are smaller than 1. For HNLs heavier than the Higgs’ vacuum expectation value, this condition together with the requirement of the neutrino mass smallness caps not only the value of the mixing angle $|V_{12}|$ but by extension also $|V_{11}|$.

As a result, the largest sensitivity occurs in models with $r_N \sim \text{few}$ at $m_{N1} \sim 0.5$–1 TeV.\footnote{Contributions of hierarchical HNLs to the $0\nu\beta\beta$ process have been studied recently [83–85].} Even in this case, the cross section for the process $pp \rightarrow \ell^\pm \ell^\pm jj$ is about 1 order of magnitude smaller than that of a single HNL with the same mixing angle. Figure 4.1 compares the single event sensitivity for these parameters to other searches for the case of $V_{11}$ mixing. The solid thick lines correspond to a mass ratio $r_N = 2$, and the dashed thick lines to $r_N = 10$. We present this for $V_{11}$ mixing, as the $\mu^\pm \mu^\pm$ final state involves a smaller implicit background than $e^\pm e^\pm$ [101], and unlike $\tau^\pm \tau^\pm$ does not require decay reconstruction.

At the HL-LHC, the best exclusion limit obtainable for such mass ratios reaches $|V_{11}|^2 \sim 0.01$–0.03 (assuming a background-free search, 100% detector efficiency and a luminosity of $3 \text{ab}^{-1}$). These limits are not competitive with those coming from the electroweak precision tests (EWPT) [137] or from non-observations of charged lepton flavour violating (cLFV) processes involving charged leptons [138] coming from non-observation of $\mu \rightarrow 3e$ decays or $\mu-e$ conversions under the assumption
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**Figure 4.1:** Single event sensitivity to the HNL mixing parameter \( V_{\mu 1} \) from \( W \) boson fusion in \( pp \rightarrow \ell^{\pm} \ell^{\pm} j j \) at future collider experiments for an HNL pair with selected mass ratios \( r_N \) for an assumed detector efficiency of 100%. The \( W\gamma + \text{CCDY} \) limits are an extrapolation of a previous CMS tri-lepton search [140] based on the findings of [141] (light blue) and a MG5aMC simulation at FCC energy [139] (yellow-grey). Indirect limits come from electroweak precision tests [137] (light grey), and non-observation of charged Lepton Flavour Violation [138] (light pink). The end points of these curves correspond to a Yukawa coupling reaching a non-perturbative limit, in the theory employed for deriving the \( V^2 \)-bounds. For further information see Chapters 2 and 3.

of \( |V_{e1}|^2 : |V_{\mu 1}|^2 : |V_{\tau 1}|^2 \equiv 0.06 : 0.46 : 0.48 \).

At the FCC-hh (again assuming a background-free search and 100% detector efficiency, but at a luminosity of 30 ab\(^{-1}\)) the exclusion limit could be as low as \( |V_{\ell 1}|^2 \sim (3-5) \times 10^{-4} \) for \( r_N \sim \text{few} \) in a mass range of \( m_{N1} \sim \text{few TeV} \). These bounds are competitive with EWPT exclusion. Further, in the TeV range, they are expected to improve on bounds by \( \text{DY} + W\gamma \) [139]. The exclusion coming from cLFV is expected to be stronger for all masses \( m_{N1} \). Nevertheless, exclusions derived from cLFV necessarily assume a hierarchy between an HNL’s mixing angles to different leptons. Therefore, comparable mixing exclusions from searches like WBF are important as they serve as a more direct way of accessing this parameter space.

We note again that the Fuks et al. analysis [101] for a phenomenological type-I seesaw HNL showed large implicit backgrounds for \( m_N < 1 \text{ TeV} \), while giving a signal efficiency of \( \sim 40\% \) in the TeV range. This corresponds to a correction factor of \((0.4)^{-0.5} = 1.6\) to the effective reach concerning \( |V_{\ell 1}|^2 \).
4.2.1 Perspective of $W$ Boson Fusion Detector Discovery

In this thesis, we explored the potential of the $W$ Boson Fusion at high energy proton-proton colliders. We concluded that — for the planned HL-LHC parameters — it can only contribute meaningful mixing bounds in a quasi-Dirac-like HNL model with HNL mass $m_{N1} < 1 \text{ TeV}$ and mass $m_{N2}$ corresponding to a mass ratio $r_N \sim 2$–10. For FCC parameters, the mass range can be extended to $m_{N1} \sim \text{few TeV}$ yielding competitive limits for such mass ratios (see Fig. 4.1).

The already existing bounds derived from the WBF process [86] can be reinterpreted as bounds on a two HNL model in the highly hierarchical limit.\(^2\) It is important to note that this does not correspond to a decoupling in the traditional sense, as the “decoupled” and “non-decoupled” HNLs’ mixing angles are explicitly related by the requirement that neutrino masses remain as observed experimentally.\(^3\)

Many theoretical considerations point to neutrino sector models featuring degenerate HNL (see Section 1.2). As shown in Figs. E.8a and E.8e, WBF — unlike its decay experiment equivalent $0\nu\beta\beta$ [142, 143] — could not contribute any meaningful exclusion on mixing bounds.\(^4\) However, in models such as the ARS (see Section 1.2.3), the relevant parameter space considered in this work is compatible with HNL induced leptogenesis.

For an HNL pair with mixing angles at the “seesaw line”, there is little hope of detector discovery in the foreseeable future Appendices A and B, as the cross sections are $\sim 20$ orders of magnitude below those with mixings near 1.

4.2.2 General Implications

The general considerations of cancellations in the lepton number violating current (see Chapter 2) apply to all indirect LNV searches. This means that if an HNL is not allowed to go on-shell — resulting in HNL oscillations in degenerate models [60, 61] — such an amplitude level suppression will occur. As the requirement of on-shell HNLs greatly limits the accessible HNL mass range by the experiments energy, it

\(^2\)With the caveat of the perturbativity bound (Eq. (1.20)) for heavy HNLs limiting the applicable mass range.

\(^3\)Unless motivated more fundamentally, such a requirement presents the “theoretical impurity” of large fine tuning between parameters.

\(^4\)For even stronger degeneracy the plot would look the same but with an order of magnitude weaker bounds per order of magnitude in degeneracy according to Eq. (2.14).
is unlikely that lepton number violating processes will be observable at colliders for HNLs with masses above few TeV.

We saw that it is imperative for indirect searches to be conducted in a meaningful neutrino sector model in order to obtain meaningful observables. The quasi-Dirac-like model (see Section 2.2) proved to be a good approximation of the minimal neutrino model required to explain neutrino oscillations (see Section 2.3). Therefore, and due to its easy implementation — even compared to the Casas-Ibarra parametrisation — such a model would be a natural choice for searches with HNL mixings above the "seesaw line" $|V^2| = m_\nu m_N^{-1}$.

### 4.3 Outlook

A natural next step in furthering this analysis would be to consider the case of three HNLs. As this greatly opens up the available parameter space, the single HNL case would not hold as an upper limit. One parameterisation for the mixing angles $V_\ell I$ inspired by the qDL condition (Eq. (1.23)) could for example be

$$V_{\ell 1} = \sqrt{r_{N12}} V_{\ell 2} = i \sqrt{\frac{r_{N13}}{2}} V_{\ell 3},$$

with mass ratios $r_{NIJ}$. Such a parametrisation would increase the cross section by a factor of eight in the limit of $r_{N12} = 1$, $r_{N13} \gg 1$. To restrict the available parameter space, one could conduct the search respecting bounds set by baryon asymmetry of the universe (see Section 1.2.3).

It has been pointed out in past literature [50] that unlike lepton number violating processes, lepton number conserving but lepton flavour violating processes (LFV) do not suffer from intrinsic amplitude level suppression. However, it is known that a degenerate HNL pair combines to form a Dirac particle (c.f. [144] and Appendix C). Therefore, when considering models relying on a degenerate HNL pair (see Section 1.2.3), also LFV searches — at least when considered as an indirect search — are not likely going to lead to collider based HNL discovery.\footnote{This is especially true as larger implicit backgrounds have to be considered for such a study.} We note that this cancellation does not generalise to the three HNL case.

It will also be worthwhile to consider a similar analysis to the one conducted here $2 \to 4$ in a MG5AMC simulation. One important aspect to investigate is the question of how a tendency toward front-back scattering in the $WW$ system for smaller mass ratios translates into angular distributions of the full $pp$ scattering.
This will need to be investigated in a full $2 \to 4$ simulation of the process as this phenomenon only occurs for $m_{N_1}$ regime outside the full validity of the EWA, while all angular dependence is strongly suppressed for HNLs with $m_{N_1} \gtrsim \text{few TeV}$. If indeed front-to-back scattering translates into large lepton pseudorapidities at $pp$ level, the drop off for smaller $r_N$ with respect to realistic detection prospects could be even more severe than anticipated. However, due to the detection limits at the (HL-)LHC, this question is more relevant for searches at FCC energy. To this end, existing HEAVYN UFO libraries would have to be extended to accommodate complex mixing angles, which, unfortunately, was not possible due to time restrictions.\footnote{If such a library were implemented, this would also greatly facilitate a three HNL study of the process.}

As, demonstrated by Fuks et. al, NLO effects in QCD can have an impact on the exact numerical values $\mathcal{O}(10\%)$. It remains to be seen if loop-order corrections to the $W^\pm W^\pm \to \ell^\pm \ell^\pm$ system could potentially alter the expected signal more significantly. Especially penguin corrections to the $WN\ell$ vertices (see Fig. E.1b), which have been shown to contribute for large HNL masses [138], and corrections to the Majorana propagator — similar to those responsible for running of light neutrino masses shown in Fig. E.1d — could be of interest here.
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Appendix

A More on the Single Heavy Neutral Lepton Model

Polarisation Decomposition

All data presented in this section is generated for the case of a single HNL with a mass of $m_N = 150$ GeV with a mixing angle $V_{FN}$ such that $|V_{FN}^2 m_N| = 1$ eV $\simeq m_{\nu_{\text{upper}}}$ (see Section 2.1). The resulting cross section decompositions are presented in Fig. A.1. They are shown as generated considering only contributions of the heavy mass state (Fig. A.1a), the light mass state (Fig. A.1b), and the combined contributions in the first flavour expansion (Fig. A.1c). The coincidence of the cross section generated with full polarisation vector summation rules and the sum of all polarised cross sections verifies the decomposition factors.

We see that for the heavy mass state contribution, the transversally polarised cross section dominates for very small centre of mass energies $\sqrt{M_{ww}^2} \sim 2m_W$, but dies out quickly with growing $\sqrt{M_{ww}^2}$. Meanwhile, the longitudinal polarisation grows with increasing $\sqrt{M_{ww}^2}$, quickly dominating the overall cross section. For the light mass state contribution, the transversally polarised cross section is always the dominant contribution. Both transversal and longitudinal cross section become constant for large $\sqrt{M_{ww}^2}$. The combined cross section is the result of destructive interference between heavy and light mass state. This can be easily seen from Fig. A.2, which shows the same data as presented in Fig. A.1, but ordered by polarisations. Here, Fig. A.2a compares the transversal cross sections of the light and heavy mass state in isolation and that of the combined cross section, while Fig. A.1c does the same for the longitudinal cross sections.
Appendix A - More on the Single Heavy Neutral Lepton Model

Figure A.1: Cross sections of $W^\pm W^\pm \to \ell^\pm \ell^\pm$ scattering as decompositions in the $WW$ polarisations as Transversal $\leftrightarrow \sigma^{TT}$, Mixed $\leftrightarrow \sigma^{LT}$, and Longitudinal $\leftrightarrow \sigma^{LL}$. The cross sections are given as a function of the centre of mass energy $\sqrt{M^2_{WW}}$ for an HNL of mass 150 GeV. The average curve represents the cross section derived from the square amplitude with full massive vector boson polarisation sum rules, while the combined cross section is the sum of all polarised cross sections.

Figure A.2: Polarised cross sections of $W^\pm W^\pm \to \ell^\pm \ell^\pm$ scattering as decompositions in the $WW$ polarisations as Transversal $\leftrightarrow \sigma^{TT}$ and Longitudinal $\leftrightarrow \sigma^{LL}$. The cross sections are given as a function of the centre of mass energy $\sqrt{M^2_{WW}}$ for an HNL of mass 150 GeV.
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Figure A.3: Total cross section of $pp \to l^+ l^- jj$ scattering as calculated in the effective $W$ approximation. The mixing angle $V_{\ell N}$ here is a function of the HNL mass as well, such that $|V_{\ell N}^2 m_N| = 1 \text{eV} \sim m_{\nu_e}$.

In this representation, it is easy to see that for large $\sqrt{M_{ww}^2}$, the longitudinal components of the light and heavy mass state cancel so that the combined longitudinal cross section vanishes. The transversal cross section of the heavy mass state vanishes for large $\sqrt{M_{ww}^2}$ while that of the light mass state remains constant. Therefore, the combined transversal cross section becomes asymptotically constant for large $\sqrt{M_{ww}^2}$ as it approaches the value of the light mass state.

**pp Level Cross Section**

Figure A.3 shows the total cross section of $pp \to \ell^\pm \ell'^\pm jj$ as calculated in the effective $W$ approximation. The underlying neutrino sector model is that of a single HNL generating a light neutrino mass of 1 eV (see Section 2.1). We will not apply any rescaling to these cross sections as

i. the differential cross sections of this model compared to the phenomenological $N_1$ are substantially different (compare $N$ Fig. E.3 and $N_2$ in Fig. E.4),

ii. the absolute value of this cross section would not change greatly — which is the main point of this plot.

The relative differences between the individual contributions are analogous to those of the $W^\pm W^\pm \to \ell^\pm \ell'^\pm$ case (shown in Fig. 2.3). We see that also in the $pp$ scattering
case the full cross section (shown in blue) is always smaller than that of the light neutrino contribution (dash-dotted green). The most significant difference occurs for the single HNL case (dashed orange) for $m_N \sim 10^{1.5} - 10^{2.5}$ GeV, where the curve describes a dent before eventually falling for growing $m_N$. This behaviour is due to the transversally polarised cross section (which dominates for small $m_N$) falling quicker for growing $m_N$ than the longitudinally polarised cross section (dominant at larger $m_N$).\footnote{For a brief discussion of this find Section 3.1.1.} Since the numerical values in the PDF of the transversally polarised cross section are larger than that of the longitudinal equivalent, the regime in which the dominant polarisation changes presents itself as a dent in the curve. The absolute value of the cross section has decreased by about 4 orders of magnitude with respect to the $W^\pm W^\pm \rightarrow \ell^\pm\ell^\pm$ case. Given the scale of $10^{-23} - 10^{-21}$ fb of this cross section, there is no hope for detector discovery — assuming a single N model reconciled with light neutrino mass scales — in the foreseeable future.

## B More on the Four Majorana State Model

### Inverted hierarchy

In case of inverted hierarchy among the light neutrino mass states, the Casas-Ibarra Parametrisation (see Eq. (2.20)) for two HNLs yields

\[
\begin{align*}
V_{\ell 1}^{\text{CI}} &= i \frac{U_{\ell 1} \sqrt{m_{\nu 1}} \cos \omega - U_{\ell 2} \sqrt{m_{\nu 2}} \sin \omega}{\sqrt{m_{N1}}} \\
V_{\ell 2}^{\text{CI}} &= i \frac{U_{\ell 1} \sqrt{m_{\nu 1}} \sin \omega + U_{\ell 2} \sqrt{m_{\nu 2}} \cos \omega}{\sqrt{m_{N2}}}. 
\end{align*}
\] (B.1)

Here we have assumed the third neutrino mass state to be massless. With $\nu$-fit data [125], this yields $U_{\ell 1}^2 m_{\nu 1} = 33$ meV and $U_{\ell 2}^2 m_{\nu 2} = 12$ meV. If we compare this to $U_{\ell 2}^2 m_{\nu 2} = 2.5$ meV and $U_{\ell 3}^2 m_{\nu 3} = 1.1$ meV in the normal hierarchy case, we expect the observables to be qualitatively the same, and the absolute scale being separated by a factor of $33^2 / 2.5^2 = 175$. This conversion factor stems from the fact that observables scale as $V^4 \propto U^4 m^2$. 

Figure B.1 compares the differential cross sections derived for normal and inverted hierarchy (NH and IH respectively) at the seesaw line ($\omega = 0i$) and in the case of strong enhancement ($\omega = 9i$). We see, that the above naive scaling translates into
**Figure B.1:** Cross Section of $W^\pm W^\pm \rightarrow \ell^\pm \ell^\pm$ in case of normal (NH) and inverted (IH) light neutrino mass state hierarchy with two HNLs with mass ratio $r_N$. The mixing angles $V_{\ell N}$ are given in the Casas-Ibarra parametrisation with $\omega$ as indicated. The centre of mass energy is 490 TeV. In case $\omega = 9i$, the $\nu_s$ curve is orders of magnitude below the combined curves, and was left out for illustration purposes.

The observables, where all curves in the IH values are larger by about a factor of $\sim 175$, while the relative differences within the plots are the same in very good approximation. Importantly, in the large $\text{Im} \omega$ limit, relevant for collider searches, only the absolute scale changes with $\text{Im} \omega$, while the qualitative details of the differential cross section remain the same (see Fig. E.6). In this limit, the cross section scales with $\cosh(2 \text{Im} \omega) \simeq \frac{1}{2} \exp(2 \text{Im} \omega)$, so that the IH case can be recovered from the NH by appropriate rescaling

$$\text{Im} \omega^{\text{NH}} \simeq \text{Im} \omega^{\text{IH}} + \frac{1}{2} \log(175) = \text{Im} \omega^{\text{IH}} + 1.1.$$  \hspace{1cm} (B.2)

**pp Level Cross Section**

The Figures in this section show the $pp \rightarrow \ell^\pm \ell^\pm jj$ cross section in a neutrino model where light neutrino masses are generated as perturbation of an HNL internal sym-
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Figure B.2: Cross Section of $pp \rightarrow \ell^\pm \ell^\pm jj$ as calculated in the effective $W$ approximation propagated by two HNLs with mass ratio $r_N$. The mixing angles $\nu_{\ell N}$ are given in the Casas-Ibarra parametrisation with $\omega$ as indicated. The centre of mass energy is $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV. In case $\omega = 0$ ($\omega = 9i$), the $N_I$ curves ($\nu_s$ curve) are orders of magnitude below the combined curves, and were left out for illustration purposes.

Figure B.2 compares the cross section as a function of the lighter HNL mass $m_N$ for different enhancement factors $\text{Im} \omega$. As in the $\text{WW}$ case, for no enhancement the cross section is always dominated by the light neutrino contributions (Fig. B.2a). Here, the combined cross section converges with the light state cross section for very heavy $N$s from below.

In the case of strong enhancement (Figs. B.2c and B.2d), the combined cross section is dominated by the heavy mass state contributions for significant parts of the shown $m_N$-range. For all shown mass ratios $r_N$ we find that the combined cross section lies above the light mass state line with an upper limit determined by the heavy mass states, which is reached by highly hierarchical HNLs ($r_N \sim 10$). As can be seen explicitly in Fig. B.2c, for any $\omega$ there exists a critical mass $m_N$, where the
Figure B.3: Cross Section of $pp \rightarrow \ell^+\ell^-jj$ as calculated in the effective $W$ approximation propagated by two HNLs with mass ratio $r_N$. The mixing angles $V_{\ell N}$ are given in the Casas-Ibarra parametrisation with $\omega = 15i$. The centre of mass energy is $\sqrt{s} = 13\text{ TeV}$.

heavy mass state contribution falls below the light mass states'. For a constant $\omega$, the cross section will consequently always converge with the light mass state line for very $m_\nu$. In case of light enhancement (Fig. B.2b) we note that the combined cross section lies above the single HNL case ($N_{1,2}$) and the light neutrino case ($\nu_s$) for $m_{N1} = 35\text{ TeV}$, which is likely due to non-trivial cancellations between all four Majorana states involved. However, due to this only happening for mixings at the seesaw line, this curiosity is not relevant for the WBF process.

In Fig. B.3 we see the same cross section for an enhancement factor of $Im(\omega) = 15$. On the $m_N$ scales shown here, the plot looks exactly identical to Fig. B.2d, while the absolute scale is about 10 orders of magnitude higher in the $\omega = 15i$ case.

All cases presented in Fig. B.2 have cross sections orders of magnitude below what would be observable at the HL-LHC ($\mathcal{L} = 3\text{ ab}^{-1}$) or indeed at the FCC ($\mathcal{L} = 30\text{ ab}^{-1}$). Only a strongly enhanced and sufficiently hierarchical HNL pair in the Casas-Ibarra parametrisation (see Fig. B.3) shows detection prospects. However, as described in Section 2.3, in this limit we enter the regime of the QDL approximation, the analysis of which is presented in Chapter 3.
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C Lepton Flavour Violating Amplitudes

As highlighted in this work, lepton number conserving (LNC) but lepton flavour violating (LFV) — unlike lepton number violating (LNV) — processes do not suffer from an intrinsic amplitude suppression. The LFV case, corresponding to the LNV process $W^\pm W^\pm \rightarrow \ell^\pm \ell^\pm$, would be $W^\pm W'^\mp \rightarrow \ell^\pm \ell'^\mp$. We will briefly present the argument in the following.

Case of a Single Heavy Neutral Lepton

For a single HNL, and single light mass state, the LNC current analog to $J^{\alpha\beta}$ in Section 2.1 is

$$K^{\alpha\beta}(p, m_2^2) = \gamma^\alpha P_L \frac{\not{p} + m}{p^2 - m_2^2} \gamma^\beta P_L = \gamma^\alpha \frac{\not{p} \gamma^\beta P_L}{p^2 - m_2^2}. \tag{C.1}$$

Which for LFV in the scenario including the neutrino with mass $-V_{\ell N} V'_{\ell N} m_N$ becomes

$$V_{\ell N} V'_{\ell N} K^{\alpha\beta}(\not{p}, m_N) + K^{\alpha\beta}(\not{p}, -V_{\ell N} V'_{\ell N} m_N)$$

$$= \gamma^\alpha \frac{\not{p}}{m_N^2} \gamma^\beta P_L \left( \frac{V_{\ell N} V'_{\ell N} \not{p}}{1 - \left( \frac{p}{m_N} \right)^2} \right. - \frac{1}{1 - \left( V_{\ell N} V'_{\ell N} \frac{p}{m_N} \right)^2} \left. \right)$$

$$= \gamma^\alpha \frac{\not{p}}{m_N^2} \gamma^\beta P_L \left( 1 + \frac{V_{\ell N} V'_{\ell N} \not{p}}{1 - \left( \frac{p}{m_N} \right)^2} \right) + O \left( \left( V^2 \left( \frac{p}{m_N} \right)^2 \right)^2 \right). \tag{C.2}$$

To first order, such a process is, thus, independent of even the mixing angle, as the numerator of the light neutrino contribution is not suppressed by the light neutrino mass. An HNL around $p^2 \approx m_N^2$ could become the dominant contribution to this process. Furthermore, for an appropriate complex phase of $\pi$ between $V_{\ell N}$ and $V'_{\ell N}$, the two terms in the last line of Eq. (C.2) add constructively. On the downside, one cannot easily factor out the mixing angle — as commonly done in literature and also in this work — due to non-trivial scaling with $VV'$ (not necessarily clear order between $0, 1, 2$ in $|\mathcal{M}|^2$). It is important to note, that for very large $p$ this expansion breaks down, so that the amplitude does not grow indefinitely as Eq. (C.2) naively suggests.
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Case of a Quasi-Dirac-Like Heavy Neutral Lepton Pair

In the case of a QDL HNL pair, the LNC current is

\[ V_{\ell N} V_{\ell N}^* K^{\alpha\beta} \left( \frac{p}{m_N} \right) + \frac{V_{\ell N} V_{\ell N}^*}{r_N} K^{\alpha\beta} \left( \frac{p}{r_N m_N} \right) = \gamma^\alpha \frac{p}{m_N} \gamma^\beta P_L V_{\ell N} V_{\ell N}^* \left( \frac{1}{\left( \frac{p}{m_N} \right)^2 - 1} + \frac{1}{r_N \left( \left( \frac{p}{m_N} \right)^2 - r_N^2 \right)} \right) \]

\[ \rightarrow \text{isolated 1 HNL case, for } r_N \gg 1 \]

\[ \rightarrow 2 \times \text{isolated 1 HNL case, for } r_N \simeq 1. \]  

Naively, this seems to suggest that in the Dirac-limit, LFV is allowed. However, it is a well known fact that in this limit SM lepton flavour is conserved due to more subtle cancellations. This can for example be derived by rewriting the seesaw Lagrangian combining the degenerate HNL pair into Dirac particles (c.f. \cite{144}). This means that SM lepton flavour is conserved and deviations can be expected similarly to those in the LNV case.

D Software Usage

The physical observables in this thesis were calculated using the following workflow. The HEAVYN package \cite{145, 146} was used as an input for FeynRules \cite{147}. The underlying Lagrangian was then translated into the relevant Feynman diagrams by the FeynArts Mathematica application and translated into an amplitude using the FeynCalc \cite{148–150} application. The consequent manipulations of the amplitude were performed using Mathematica.

The reference cross sections for \(pp\) level rescaling were generated using the standard HEAVYN FeynRules UFO libraries for MadGraph5_AMC at NLO \cite{151, 152}.

The Feynman diagrams in this thesis were drawn using the Feynman Diagrams with TikZ package \cite{153}.
Supplementary Feynman Diagrams

Figure E.1: Feynman diagrams of $W^\pm W^\pm \rightarrow \ell^\pm \ell^\pm$ in the mass basis at 1-loop order. Here we have omitted trivial symmetry variations of the given diagrams. The fermion number directionality on the black plain lines is implicit. Further, all $Z$-boson propagators can also be mediated by a higgs.
Figure E.2: Feynman Diagram of the two same sign $W$-bosons to two same sign leptons in the flavour basis to first order in $V^2$. The crosses mark an oscillation from standard model neutrino to right handed heavy neutral lepton, where the coupling is the Dirac mass $(m_D)_{\ell N}$.

Observables for Different Parameters

Figure E.3: Differential cross section of $W^\pm W^\pm \rightarrow \ell^\pm \ell^\pm$ scattering in the case of a single HNL at a centre of mass energy of $\sqrt{\mathcal{M}_{WW}^2} = 490$ GeV and for HNL masses $m_N$. The mixing angle here is a function of the HNL mass as well, such that $|V^2_{\ell N} m_N| = 1$ eV. For further information see Section 2.1.
Figure E.4: Total differential cross section of $W^\pm W^\pm \rightarrow \ell^\pm \ell^\pm$ scattering with qDiL HNL pair with mass ratio $r_N$. at a centre of mass energy is 490 GeV. For further information see Section 2.2.
**Figure E.5:** Total differential cross section of $W^\pm W^\pm \rightarrow \ell^\pm \ell^\pm$ scattering, using Casas-Ibarra parametrisation of the mixing angle in case of two HNLs with mass ratio $r_N$ for different lighter masses $m_{N1}$. The centre of mass energy is 490 TeV. For further information see Section 2.2.
Figure E.6: Total differential cross section of $W^+W^- \rightarrow \ell^+\ell^-$ scattering, using Casas-Ibarra parametrisation of the mixing angle in case of two HNLs with mass ratio $r_N$ for different Casas-Ibarra parameters $\text{Im}(\omega)$. The lighter HNL mass $m_{N_1} = 150$ GeV, and centre of mass energy 490 TeV. For further information see Section 2.2.
Figure E.7: Polarised cross sections of $W^\pm W^\pm \rightarrow \ell^\pm \ell'^\pm$ scattering as decompositions in the $WW$ polarisations as Trans. ↔ $\sigma^{TT}$ and Long. ↔ $\sigma^{LL}$. The cross sections are given as a function of the centre of mass energy $\sqrt{M_{WW}}$. The data is given for the lighter HNL mass $m_{N1} = 150$ GeV (upper) and $m_{N1} = 1500$ GeV (lower) with the second HNL having a mass according to the mass ratios $r_N$. 
Figure E.8: Optimistic exclusion limits on the $N_1$ parameters via VBF-mediated $pp \to \ell^+\ell^-jj$ events in the model with two HNLs with mass ratio $r_N$. The exclusion limits are 95% CL assuming zero background. In the upper (lower) plots, the centre of mass energy is $\sqrt{s_{\text{LHC}}} = 13$ TeV ($\sqrt{s_{\text{LHC}}} = 13$ TeV) and the luminosity $3 \text{ ab}^{-1}$ ($30 \text{ ab}^{-1}$).