

Anomalies in Particle Physics

Andreas Crivellin^{1,2,*} and Bruce Mellado^{3,4,**}

¹Physik-Institut, Universität Zürich, Winterthurerstrasse 190, CH–8057 Zürich, Switzerland

²Paul Scherrer Institut, CH–5232 Villigen PSI, Switzerland

*e-mail: andreas.crivellin@psi.ch

³School of Physics and Institute for Collider Particle Physics, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, Wits 2050, South Africa

⁴iThemba LABS, National Research Foundation, PO Box 722, Somerset West 7129, South Africa

**e-mail: bmellado@mail.cern.ch

ABSTRACT

The currently accepted mathematical description of the fundamental constituents and interactions of matter is the Standard Model of particle physics. Its last missing particle, the famous Higgs boson, was observed at the Large Hadron Collider at CERN in 2012. However, it is clear that the Standard Model cannot be the ultimate theory of Nature, and, e.g., cannot account for Dark Matter or non-vanishing neutrino masses (and does not include gravity). In fact, searches for physics beyond the SM have been intensified since the Higgs boson discovery. In this article, we review the hints for new physics, called “anomalies”, obtained in particle physics experiments within the last years. We consider both direct high-energy searches for new resonances at the LHC and indirect low-energy precision experiments. These anomalies range from the nuclear scale (approximately the mass of the proton) to the electroweak scale (i.e. the mass of the Higgs boson) to the TeV scale (the highest scale directly accessible at the LHC), therefore spanning over four orders of magnitude. After discussing the experimental and theoretical status of the anomalies, we summarize possible explanations in terms of new particles and new interactions. In particular, new Higgs bosons and leptoquarks are promising candidates. Discovery prospects and implications for future colliders are discussed.

Key points:

- The Standard Model of Particle Physics is the currently accepted mathematical theory describing the fundamental constituents of matter as well as their interactions, and was completed by the discovery of the Higgs particle at the Large Hadron Collider at CERN in 2012.
- The Standard Model cannot account for the existence of Dark Matter or non-vanishing neutrino masses and must therefore be extended, however, a plethora of viable options exist.
- In recent years, several interesting deviations from the Standard Model predictions, called “anomalies”, were found, both in high-energy searches at the LHC and in low-energy precision observables.
- These anomalies range from precision measurements of properties of the muon, to hints for new scalar bosons at the electroweak scale, to the existence of heavy TeV scale resonances.
- The anomalies can be explained by supplementing the Standard Model with new particles and new interactions, in particular, additional Higgs bosons, new fermions and new strongly interacting particles.
- While the data of the third run of the Large Hadron Collider will already be able to establish the existence of some of these new particles if one or more of the anomalies are actually due to new physics, the high luminosity LHC and future colliders, like FCC-ee, ILC, CEPC or CLIC, as well as new precision experiments, are needed for a comprehensive and precise study of their properties.

Website summary:

The Standard Model of particle physics is the currently accepted theory of the fundamental constituents of matter and their interactions. We review the status of experimental hints for new physics, which, if confirmed, would require the extension of the Standard Model by new particles and new interactions.




Figure 1. Particle content of the Standard Model: Fermions consisting of quarks (grey) and leptons (green). The forces are mediated by the gauge bosons (red) and the Higgs particle (blue) gives masses to the W and Z bosons as well as to all quarks and leptons.

1 Introduction

The Standard Model (SM) of particle physics is the currently accepted mathematical description of the fundamental constituents of matter and their interactions (excluding gravity). More specifically, matter consists of quarks and leptons which are fermions (spin 1/2 particles whose wave functions are invariant under spatial rotation of 4π). A proton contains two up-quarks (u with electric charge $+2/3$) and one down-quark (d with charge $-1/3$), while a neutron consists of one up-quark and two down-quarks. Electrons (e) constitute the atomic shell. Together with the nearly mass-less and very weakly interacting neutrinos (ν), they form the class called leptons. All fermions appear in three copies, called generations or flavours, that only differ in mass.¹ The electron is accompanied by its heavy cousins the muon (μ) and the even heavier tau (τ). The more massive versions of the up-quark are called charm (c) and top (t) while strange (s) and bottom quark (b sometimes also called “beauty”) are the heavier copies of the down-quark. The masses of the charged fermions range from ≈ 0.0005 GeV for the electron to ≈ 174 GeV for the top.² Only first-generation fermions are stable, while the heavier generations are short-lived and decay to lighter flavours.

The forces between the fermions are mediated by “gauge interactions”. They are based on ‘local’ symmetries, meaning that they hold independently at any point in space-time. The corresponding gauge group of the SM is $SU(3)_c \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$, which corresponds to rotations in 3, 2 and 1-dimensional (external) complex spaces. Due to quantization, i.e. the wave/particle duality of quantum mechanics, these interactions result in force particles, the gauge bosons with spin one. The electromagnetic force is mediated by the photon (γ), the weak force (corresponding to the $SU(2)_L$ factor) by the charged W and the neutral Z gauge bosons³ and the strong force ($SU(3)_c$) by eight gluons (g). While neutrinos only feel the weak force, the charged leptons (electron, muon and tau) also have electromagnetic interactions and quarks are charged in addition under the strong force and thus interact with gluons. Importantly, all flavour violation in the SM is induced by the couplings of the W boson to up-type and down-type quarks via the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa (CKM) matrix which accounts for the corresponding coupling strength.

Finally, we have the famous Higgs particle^{1,2} (h), which was discovered at the Large Hadron Collider at CERN in 2012^{3,4}. It is the first and only (so far) fundamental scalar particle (spin 0) and the field from which the Higgs boson originates spontaneously breaks $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ to the electromagnetic gauge group ($U(1)_{EM}$) with the mass-less photon. At the same time, it gives masses to the W (≈ 80 GeV) and Z bosons (≈ 90 GeV) as well as to all (fundamental) fermions and the Higgs boson itself (≈ 125 GeV). The full particle content of the SM is summarized in Fig. 1.

While the SM is now complete, it cannot be the ultimate fundamental theory of Nature: In addition to many theoretical arguments for the existence of beyond the SM (BSM) physics, the SM e.g. cannot account for the observations of Dark Matter (DM) established at cosmological scales (since it does not contain a weakly interacting particle with the right relic abundance), nor for the non-vanishing neutrino masses⁴ required by neutrino oscillations, because in the SM neutrinos are necessarily

¹To be more precise, all differences between the different generations of fermions are induced by the mass terms originating from their couplings to the Higgs particle. However, in the mass eigenbasis, this leads, in addition to the different mass eigenvalues, to flavour-specific couplings of the W boson to quarks.

²Note that a giga-electronvolt (GeV) is approximately the mass of a proton and thus of a hydrogen atom. While the up and down quark masses are very small compared to the proton mass, most of it is due to the binding energy of the strong interactions.

³To be more precise, the photon and the Z boson are linear combinations of the $U(1)_Y$ boson and the neutral component of $SU(2)_L$ gauge field.

⁴Here we define the SM with the minimal particle content as given in Fig. 1 such that the neutrinos are exactly massless. While neutrino masses can be

massless due to the absence of a right-handed partner.

Unfortunately, no right-handed neutrinos have been observed, Dark Matter direct detection experiments did not see any signal⁵. Thus, there are many options for how SM can be extended, spanning a very large mass range (from several keV to the scale of Grand Unification at around 10^{15} GeV), to account for Dark Matter and neutrino masses. Therefore, more experimental information on physics beyond the SM, preferably deviations from its predictions (in the best case in the form of new resonances) is imperative to make progress towards a theory superseding the SM.

The SM of particle physics has been extensively tested⁶ and the search for new physics (NP) continued in the last decade, both in high-energy searches (mainly at the LHC) and in precision experiments testing new particles. High-energy experiments try to produce new particles directly in the form of resonances, i.e. peaks in kinematic distributions and, thus, are able to measure directly the mass of the new states. Precision experiments look for the effect of new particles via quantum fluctuations and can determine the ratio of the new physics coupling over the mass scales squared but not the mass itself. However, indirect searches for many NP models are able to test higher scales than what can be accessed directly at the LHC (which is limited by a bit less than half the center of mass energy, i.e. ≈ 6 TeV for the LHC).

In fact, an increasing number of hints for new physics, i.e. deviations from the SM predictions called “anomalies”, have been reported. They span over a huge energy range and include precision measurements of muon properties (the anomalous magnetic moment of the muon), over semi-leptonic B meson (quark anti-quark bound states containing a b quark) decays, the measurement of the W boson mass, to direct LHC searches and even non-resonant searches for particles too heavy to be produced directly at the LHC.

While probability theory and statistics tell us that one cannot expect that all these anomalies will be confirmed in the future, it is also unlikely that all of them are just statistical flukes or due to experimental errors. Therefore, it is important to assess the strengths and weaknesses of these anomalies and to assess to which extensions of the SM they point for predicting other signals for future verification or falsification. In this article, we will review the status of these anomalies, give an overview of how they can be explained by BSM physics and provide an outlook on their future implications.

2 Anomalies and New Physics

An anomaly is generally defined as a deviation from the common rule. In particle physics, this entails a discrepancy between the experimental data and the corresponding SM prediction. An objective selection criterion is essential to choose which of the many presently existing anomalies should be considered for further scrutiny. Here we employ the following criteria:

- The combined global statistical significance should be at least three standard deviations (3σ), after the application of trial factors and look-elsewhere effects. As such, we allow for the combination of several channels or measurements if they are related to the same effective interactions or simplified model parameters.
- The experimental signature should include more than a single channel (or observable) or be measured (maybe with lower significance) by more than one independent experiment.
- The deviation should be described by a theoretically robust model that does not contradict the wealth of existing constraints from other measurements in particle physics.

In general, the discovery threshold in particle physics is taken to be 5σ . This means that the probability of a statistical fluctuation is about one in 3.5 million. However, estimating the systematic uncertainty is often very difficult and the probability of a human error is not included in the statistical significance. Therefore, this definition is only applied if the situation is “clear”. This means that the measurement is to some extent predicted by a well-established model. This was e.g. the case for the top quark or the Higgs boson where the SM required their existence. However, for “unexpected” measurements one usually requires very high standards concerning the systematic uncertainties (both on the experimental and the theoretical side) and independent confirmation by another experiment or channel.

For direct and indirect searches the analysis of an anomaly proceeds differently. For low-energy precision observables, one can often assume that the scale of new physics is higher than the energy scale of the experiment. One can then evaluate the consistency and significance of several measurements in an effective field theory (EFT) approach. In this setup, the interactions parametrizing the NP effects are required to respect fundamental symmetries like charge conservation and Lorentz invariance. In a later step, one can then assess which NP model can give rise to the desired effective interactions while at the same time avoiding the constraints from other observables which are not directly connected within the effective setup but only arise once the new particle content is known.

For direct searches, an EFT approach is not possible because one is aiming at the production of new particles. Therefore, they are dynamic degrees of freedom and cannot be integrated out to obtain effective interactions. However, in many cases,

induced in a minimal way by adding right-handed neutrinos, we consider this as beyond the SM physics.

one can study what is called “simplified models”. This means that one does not aim at constructing a UV complete model but only considers adding a single new field with the relevant couplings to the SM. Nonetheless, one can still combine different measurements if the consistency of the suggested masses is given. Furthermore, by assuming specific coupling structures, like that a new Higgs is SM-like, one can reduce the number of free parameters.

Importantly, if any anomaly in direct or indirect searches were confirmed beyond a reasonable doubt, this would inevitably imply the breakdown of the SM and require its extensions by new particles and new interactions.

2.1 Extensions of the Standard Model

Top-down approaches based on principles like supersymmetry, compositeness or extra-dimensions have not received experimental confirmation so far. Therefore, it might well be that fundamental physics has an unorthodox structure, suggesting that a data-driven bottom-up approach could be more successful.

For a consistent renormalizable extension of the SM, only scalars bosons (spin 0), fermions (spin 1/2) and vectors bosons (spin 1) are at our disposal, provided that in the latter case a Higgs-like mechanism of spontaneous symmetry-breaking exists to generate their masses. Here we will focus on the following extensions of the SM:

- Leptoquarks (LQs): Scalar or vector bosons that carry color and couple quarks directly to leptons^{7,8}. These particles were first proposed in the context of quark-lepton unification at high energies, namely the Pati-Salam model⁹ and Grand Unified Theories (GUTs)¹⁰. Furthermore, in the R-parity violating MSSM (see e.g. Ref.¹¹ for a review) the supersymmetric partners of quarks can have the properties of LQs.
- Di-quarks (DQs): Scalar bosons that are either triplets or sextets of $SU(3)_c$ and couple to a quark and an anti-quark. They are predicted by GUTs based on the E_6 symmetry group¹² and appear in the R-parity violating MSSM.
- Z' bosons: Neutral heavy vector bosons. They can be singlets under $SU(2)_L$ but also the neutral component of an $SU(2)_L$ multiplet. These particles can be resonances of the SM Z , e.g. Kaluza-Klein excitations of the SM W in composite¹³ or extra-dimensional models¹⁴, or originate from an abelian symmetry (like $B - L$ ⁹) or gauged flavour symmetries¹⁵.
- W' bosons: Electrically charged but QCD neutral vector particles. They can have similar origins as Z' bosons but also come for a left-right symmetry¹⁶.
- Vector-like Quarks (VLQs): For vector-like fermions in general left-handed and right-handed fields have the same quantum numbers under the SM gauge group (unlike SM fermions) and can thus have masses independently of electroweak (EW) symmetry breaking, meaning that they can be arbitrarily heavy. They appear in GUTs¹⁷, as resonances of SM fermions in composite or extra-dimensional models¹⁸ and as the supersymmetric partners of SM vectors and scalars¹⁹.
- Vector-like Leptons (VLLs): These particles can have similar origins as VLQs. In addition, they are involved in the type I^{20,21} and type III²² seesaw mechanisms used for giving masses to the light active neutrinos as required by neutrino oscillations.
- New scalars (S): Scalars could be supersymmetric partners of SM fermions¹⁹, but also scalar fields of different representations under the SM gauge group can be added. Most commonly, a copy of the SM Higgs, an $SU(2)_L$ doublet with hypercharge 0, leading to a two-Higgs doublet model^{23,24}. Note that we do not include coloured scalars with the properties of DQs or LQs here.
- Heavy gluons (G'): Heavy gluons are similar to Z' bosons but charged under QCD. They can arise from the breaking of a larger gauge group down to $SU(3)_c$ or be excitations of the SM gluons.

3 Status, Explanations and Prospects of the Anomalies

Let us now review the status of these anomalies, how they can be explained by NP and what the future prospects are. We will present them in increasing order of the corresponding energy scale.

3.1 Anomalous magnetic moment of the muon (a_μ)

While the Dirac equation predicts that the gyromagnetic-ratio (the g -factor) of any fundamental fermion is exactly 2, the famous prediction of Quantum Electrodynamics (the quantum field theory of electromagnetism) by Schwinger²⁵ was a positive shift of $a_\ell = (g - 2)_\ell/2 = \alpha/(2\pi)$ (see left diagram in Fig. 2 a)). Nowadays, the accuracy has dramatically increased. The combined value of the 2006 result of the Brookhaven E821 experiment²⁶ and the recent $g - 2$ experiment at Fermilab^{27,28} deviate from the SM prediction of the $g - 2$ theory initiative²⁹ by 5.1σ . However, this SM prediction is based on measurements of

$e^+e^- \rightarrow \text{hadrons}$ ^{530–32} and does not include newer results from lattice simulations of Quantum Chromodynamics (the quantum field theory describing the strong interactions)³³ nor the latest measurement of $e^+e^- \rightarrow \text{hadrons}$ by the CMD 3 collaboration³⁴ which would render the SM prediction closer to the measurement³⁵. Since these tensions between the different SM predictions are not understood yet, one can only say that a positive shift in a_μ of the order of 10^{-9} is preferred but a reliable estimate of the significance is not possible at the moment.

Since the anomalous magnetic moment of the electron is measured and predicted much more precisely than a_μ , the resulting bounds on NP are stringent^{36–38}. Therefore, the effect in a_e must be smaller than in a_μ , unlike the famous Schwinger term, and thus violate lepton flavour universality³⁹ (see Ref.⁴⁰ for a recent overview on NP in a_μ). Furthermore, because the deviation from the SM prediction is as large as its EW contribution, new physics must be quite light, e.g. a light Z' boson coupling to muons but not to electrons with a mass below the muon threshold (≈ 0.2 GeV) to avoid limits from $e^+e^- \rightarrow 4\mu$ from Babar⁴¹ and Belle⁴² is a viable option^{43,44}. Alternatively, if NP is heavy (at the TeV scale) it must possess an enhancement factor. This can be provided via the mechanism of chiral enhancement, meaning that the chirality flip does not originate from the small muon Yukawa coupling (like for the SM contribution to a_μ) but from a larger coupling of other particles to the SM Higgs. In the MSSM, this factor is $\tan\beta$, the ratio of the two vacuum expectation values of the two Higgs fields^{45,46} but also models with generic new scalars and fermions can explain a_μ ^{47–50}. Furthermore, there are two scalar LQs (S_1 and S_2) that address a_μ via a m_t/m_μ enhancement^{39,51,52} (see Fig. 2 a)). This top mass enhancement also leads to interesting predictions for $h \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$ ⁵³ and $Z \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$ ⁵⁴ that can be measured at future colliders.

While the experimental situation concerning the direct measurement seems settled, there will be updates on $e^+e^- \rightarrow \text{hadrons}$ e.g. by Belle-II⁵⁵ and the MUonE⁵⁶ experiment aims at an independent determination of the disputed SM contribution with a completely different method. Furthermore, lattice QCD simulations will deliver improved results within the next years. While the anomalous magnetic moment of the tau is in principle very sensitive to NP, its measurement is very difficult. In fact, recent determinations are not even sensitive to the Schwinger term^{57,58} and the currently only realistic option for reaching a sensitivity that is constraining NP seems to be τ pair production at Belle-II with polarized beams⁵⁹.

3.2 The 17 MeV Anomaly in excited nuclei decays (X17)

An experiment conducted at the Atomki laboratory (Debrecen, Hungary) studied the nuclear reaction ${}^7\text{Li}(p, e^+e^-){}^8\text{Be}$ ⁶⁰. The experiment consisted of a proton capture process of Lithium and measuring the relative angle between the positron-electron pair emitted in the decay of the excited state to the ground state of Beryllium. Subsequently, similar excesses also emerged in the decays of excited ${}^4\text{He}$ and ${}^{12}\text{C}$ nuclei^{61,62}. The statistical significance exceeds 6σ in all cases. While previously similar excesses⁶³ measured by the same collaboration disappeared later⁶⁴, the current one has been checked with different experimental setups, position-sensitive detectors, and varying beam energies and appears at different angles with different target nuclei. However, the possibility of a SM effect is still not excluded⁶⁵. A recent review of experimental and theoretical aspects of the anomaly can be found in Ref.⁶⁶.

Concerning NP explanation, a particle with a mass of ≈ 17 MeV is consistent with the angular measurements of both ${}^8\text{Be}$ and ${}^4\text{He}$. From parity consideration (in the case of CP conservation) only vector, axial-vector or pseudo-scalar states are possible. Interestingly, it is possible that the hypothetical X17 boson could be related to $g-2$ of the muon⁶⁷ or the neutron lifetime puzzle⁶⁸ (to be discussed next).

There is an effort to explore the X17 anomaly at various facilities. The resonant production of X17 with an electron-positron beam at the Positron Annihilation into Dark Matter Experiment (PADME) in Frascati has been discussed⁶⁹. A search for a new vector boson in the same mass range is planned at the Mu3e experiment at the Paul Scherrer Institute⁷⁰. The New Judicious Experiments for Dark Sector Investigations (New JEDI) project has launched experiments at the ANDROMEDE facility at Orsay, and the iThemba LABS accelerator and the half-AFRODITE detectors in Cape Town also plan investigations of X17⁷¹. Measurements are also possible at other facilities, such as CERN, JLAB, Novosibirsk and Mainz⁶⁶.

3.3 Anomalies in electron neutrino appearance and disappearance (ν_e)

Neutrino appearance anomalies revolve around excesses in the quasi-elastic production of electrons from accelerator neutrinos reported by LSND⁷² and MiniBooNE⁷³. In particular, the MiniBooNE experiment observed an excess in the neutrino energy range $200 < E_\nu < 1250$ MeV with a significance of 4.8σ ⁷⁴. However, a reanalysis of the theoretical uncertainties leads to a smaller tension with the SM prediction⁷⁵. The MicroBooNE experiment began operating in 2015⁷⁶ and results indicate that the MiniBooNE excess cannot be explained entirely by electron neutrino appearance⁷⁷.

A first combined analysis of the MiniBooNE and MicroBooNE data within the SM plus a single sterile neutrino⁶ finds a preference over the SM of 4.6σ for MiniBooNE alone while the addition of the MicroBooNE exclusive (inclusive) electron-neutrino data reduces the significance to 4.3σ (3.4σ)⁷⁸. Furthermore, once constraints from MINOS⁷⁹ and IceCube⁸⁰ are

⁵Hadrons are bound states of quarks which form due to the confining nature of QCD (i.e. because the coupling increases at low energies).

⁶A sterile neutrino is a fermion which is a singlet under the SM gauge group and mixes with the SM neutrino via a Yukawa coupling to the SM Higgs.

included, the preference for sterile-active neutrino mixing is further diminished⁸¹. Therefore, more exotic NP options like energy-dependent mixing parameters have been considered⁸² (see Ref.⁸³ for a review).

Anomalies suggesting the disappearance of ν_e and $\bar{\nu}_e$ are observed in reactor neutrino experiments^{84–86} and the Gallium radioactive source experiments GALLEX^{87,88} and SAGE⁸⁹. The latter experiments use intense ^{51}Cr and ^{37}Ar radioactive sources inside the detectors and search for the inverse beta reaction $\nu_e + {}^{71}\text{Ga} \rightarrow {}^{71}\text{Ge} + e^-$. The results indicate less ${}^{71}\text{Ge}$ occurrences than expected. The significance of the deficit is about 5σ and is referred to as the Gallium anomaly^{90,91}. Ref.⁹² critically evaluated the assumptions underlying the Gallium anomaly and found several possible caveats (like the Gallium lifetime or neutrino flux) that could account for the excess without the involvement of NP.

A straightforward explanation in terms of active-sterile neutrino oscillations is excluded by solar and reactor neutrino experiments^{93,94}. Therefore, one again has to resort to more exotic options like a parametric resonance⁹⁵ (see Ref.⁹²) for a review.

The proposed explanations of the Gallium anomalies can be tested by measurements with a different neutrino source, like ${}^{65}\text{Zn}$ at the BEST experiment⁹⁶, and/or other detection material (e.g. ${}^{37}\text{Cl}$). Furthermore, DUNE⁹⁷ and the Short Baseline Neutrino program at Fermilab⁹⁸ will scrutinize our understanding of neutrino oscillations.

3.4 β -Decay Anomalies (β)

The CKM matrix V is by construction unitary⁹⁹, therefore, as required, conserving probability. We know from experiments that it has a hierarchical structure; while the size of the diagonal elements is close to unity, the off-diagonal elements are small. One can test the SM prediction $\sum_j V_{ij}V_{jk}^* = \delta_{ik}$ experimentally. In this context, the Cabibbo angle¹⁰⁰, which parametrizes the mixing between the first two quark generations, is particularly interesting as it dominates the first and second row and column relations. In fact, a deficit in first-row and first-column CKM unitarity, which can be traced back to the fact that V_{ud} extracted from beta decays^{101,102} (see left diagram in Fig. 2 b)) does not agree with V_{us} (V_{cd}) determined from kaon⁷ and tau decays (D decays), when comparing them via CKM unitarity. Furthermore, there is also a disagreement between the determinations of V_{us} from $K \rightarrow \mu\nu$ ¹⁰³ and $K \rightarrow \pi\ell\nu$ ¹⁰⁴ decays. The significance of these deviations crucially depends on the radiative (quantum) corrections to beta decays^{102,105,106} and on the treatment of the tensions between kaon^{107–109} and tau decays¹¹⁰. In summary, both tensions are slightly below the 3σ level.

A sub-permille effect suffices to explain these tensions. The disagreement between the two determinations of V_{us} can only be explained via a right-handed quark current pointing towards VLQs (see Fig. 2 b)). The deficit in first-row and first-column CKM unitarity can be explained via left-handed (i.e. SM-like) NP in beta decays. Both an effect in beta decays or in the Fermi constant (determined from muon decay, i.e. $\mu \rightarrow e\nu\nu$), which is needed to extract V_{ud} , is possible. Therefore, we have four options¹¹¹: 1) a direct (tree-level) modification of beta decays 2) a direct (tree-level) modification of muon decay 3) a modified W - μ - ν coupling entering muon decay 4) a modified W - u - d coupling entering beta decays (the effect of a modified W - w - ν drops out). Option 1) could in principle be realized by a W' ¹¹² or a LQ¹¹³, however, in the latter case, stringent bounds from other flavour observables arise. Possibility 2) can be achieved by adding a singly charged $SU(2)_L$ singlet scalar¹¹⁴, a W' ¹¹² or Z' boson with flavour violating couplings¹¹⁵. Option 3) and 4) can be achieved by vector-like leptons^{116,117} and VLQs^{118–121}, respectively. However, without a compensating effect¹²², explaining the CAA via a modification of G_F increases the tension in the W mass.

There is also a significant tension ($\approx 4\sigma$) between the neutron lifetime (and thus V_{ud}) determined from beam and bottle experiments. The average of the beam values is $\tau_n = 888.2 \pm 2.0$ s^{123,124} while the best determination from bottle experiments is $\tau_n = 877.75 \pm 0.28_{\text{stat}} + 0.22 / - 0.16_{\text{syst}}$ s¹²⁵.

To understand possible NP explanations, it is important to note that while in bottle experiments the remaining neutrons are counted, beam experiments count the decay protons. Therefore, if the branching ratio of neutrons to final states with protons is not 100%, the lifetime measured in beam experiments would be larger than the real neutron lifetime. However, the beam/bottle discrepancy cannot be explained within an effective field theory setup, i.e. with heavy NP since this would lead to proton decay which is very tightly constrained. However, neutron decay to light dark matter particles could result in a stable proton for very fine-tuned mass configurations¹²⁶. Alternatively, neutron oscillations into mirror neutrons have been proposed as an explanation¹²⁷.

Improved measurements and theory calculations of beta decays will be available within the next years¹²⁸. Furthermore, NA62 could measure $(K \rightarrow \mu\nu)/(K \rightarrow \pi\mu\nu)$ to assess the possibility of right-handed currents¹⁰⁹ and the PIONEER experiment will measure pion beta decay¹²⁹ to determine V_{us} , which is theoretically accurately predicted. The neutron anti-neutron explanation of the lifetime puzzle can be tested at the PSI ultracold neutron source¹³⁰.

⁷Kaons are made of a light anti-quark (up or down) and a strange quark. A ϕ is a strange anti-strange bound state and a “*” refers to an excited bound state.

3.5 Hadronic meson decays ($M \rightarrow mm'$)

Several anomalies in the decay of mesons into two lighter ones have been observed. This includes CP -violation⁸ in $b \rightarrow s$ transitions and D meson decays, which is known to be very suppressed in the SM, and total branching for charged current B decays.

The improved SM predictions for the total branching ratios $\bar{B} \rightarrow D^{(*)}K$ and $\bar{B}_s \rightarrow D_s^{(*)}\pi$ ¹³¹ based on QCD factorization¹³² deviate from the corresponding measurements⁶ by a combined significance of 5.6σ . However, since the anomaly is observed in total rates no cancellation or suppression of QCD uncertainties occurs and Ref.¹³³ challenged the accuracy of the SM values. Since these are charged current processes, i.e. mediated at tree-level in the SM, a NP explanation is particularly challenging taking into account that a $O(50\%)$ effect is needed. Therefore, both W' models¹³⁴ and di-quark explanations are stringently constrained by LHC searches¹³⁵.

The first evidence for CP violation in D decays was observed in 2011 by LHCb¹³⁶ and the discovery level was reached in 2019 with the differences of CP asymmetries between $D \rightarrow KK$ and $D \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ given by $\Delta A_{CP}^{\text{LHCb}} = (-15.4 \pm 2.9) \times 10^{-4}$ ¹³⁷. This has to be compared to the estimate of the SM prediction, which is notoriously difficult for charm physics, of $|\Delta A_{CP}^{\text{LHCb}}| < 3.6 \times 10^{-4}$ ¹³⁸. Furthermore, Ref.¹³⁹ determined directly the CP asymmetry in $D \rightarrow K^+K^-$ which allows for a test of U -spin symmetry⁹ of the SM and shows indications of a violation of it¹⁴⁰.

An overview of NP explanations of CP asymmetries in D decays was already given in Ref.¹⁴¹, including Z' bosons and di-quarks. Already at that time, the solutions were under pressure from LHC searches and the corresponding limits got much more stringent in the meantime.

There are also hints of BSM CP violation in hadronic B meson decays with $b \rightarrow s$ transitions. This includes the long-standing $B \rightarrow K\pi$ puzzle¹⁴² which was confirmed by LHCb¹⁴³. While here the theory predictions within the SM seem to be more reliable as they use isospin relations¹⁴⁴ the significance is around 3σ but supported by $B_s \rightarrow KK$ measurements¹⁴⁵. Finally, even though not CP -violating, there are indications of U -spin violation in polarization observables¹⁴⁶. For explaining these hints for BSM CP violation, somehow smaller NP effects are required than for the total branching ratios or the polarization observables, making an explanation via Z' bosons or heavy gluons easier but still not straightforward¹⁴⁷ while the constraints on di-quark models are expected to be less stringent.

Progress on the SM side does not seem easy. However, a lot of forthcoming data is expected by Belle-II and LHCb. Furthermore, the hints for CP violation in B and D decays could be related to direct CP violation in the Kaon system (ϵ'/ϵ)¹⁴⁸ (see Ref.¹⁴⁹ for an overview on the recent status of ϵ'/ϵ) and U -spin violation¹⁵⁰.

3.6 Charged current tauonic B decays ($R(D^{(*)})$)

These charged current transitions, mediated at tree-level by a W boson in the SM (see left diagram in Fig. 2 c)), have significant branching ratios (up to $\mathcal{O}(10^{-2})$). With light leptons, they are used to extract the CKM element V_{cb} ¹⁰ and the result is consistent with the global CKM fit^{153,154}. However, the ratios (of branching ratios) $R(D^{(*)}) = \text{Br}(B \rightarrow D^{(*)}\tau\nu) / \text{Br}(B \rightarrow D^{(*)}\ell\nu)$, are measured to be bigger than the SM predictions by approximately 20%, resulting in a $\gtrsim 3\sigma$ significance¹¹⁰ for NP related to tau leptons.¹¹

This transition occurs at tree-level in the SM. Therefore, also a tree-level NP effect is necessary to obtain the needed effect of $O(10)\%$ w.r.t. the SM (assuming heavy NP with perturbative couplings). Therefore, charged Higgses^{165–167}, W' bosons¹⁶⁸ (with or without right-handed neutrinos) or LQs^{52,169–171} are candidates. While there is a small region in parameter space left that can account for $R(D^{(*)})$ with charged Higgses^{172,173}, LHC searches constrain W' solutions^{168,174}, leaving LQ as the probably best solutions (see Fig. 2 c)). However, also for LQs constraints from $B_s - \bar{B}_s$ mixing, $B \rightarrow K^{(*)}\nu\nu$ and LHC searches must be respected such that the $SU(2)_L$ singlet vector LQ^{175–181} or the singlet-triplet model^{182–184} are particularly interesting.

Concerning future prospects, $R(D^{(*)})$ and related ratios can be measured at Belle-II⁵⁵, by LHCb with Run 3 data and the parked B data from CMS¹⁸⁵. Furthermore, polarization observables will be measured so precisely that they can distinguish between different NP models and an improvement in the form-factors from lattice QCD is expected.

3.7 Flavour changing neutral current semi-leptonic B decays ($b \rightarrow s\ell^+\ell^-$)

Like all flavour changing neutral current processes, $b \rightarrow s\ell^+\ell^-$ transitions are loop suppressed (i.e. by the small probability that two particles are produced via quantum fluctuations and annihilate again) within the SM (see left diagram in Fig. 2

⁸ CP is the combined application of charge conjugation in parity transformation (mirroring). In the SM CP is conserved by all interactions except transitions involving the single complex phase phase of the CKM matrix. Therefore, CP is only induced via the W boson and thus very small within the SM.

⁹Isospin symmetry used the fact that for the strong interactions up and down quarks are too a good approximation indistinguishable as they are very light. For U -spin symmetry, this concept is extended to include the strange quarks. However, since the strange is much more massive than first-generation quarks, the symmetry is more strongly broken and the resulting predictions are less reliable.

¹⁰Note that there is also a long-lasting tension in the inclusive vs exclusive determination of V_{cb} ¹⁵¹ (and V_{ub}) where $B \rightarrow D^{(*)}\ell\nu$ is involved. However, it has been shown that this anomaly cannot be explained by NP¹⁵².

¹¹The analysis by BaBar^{155,156}, Belle^{157–161} and LHCb^{162–164} used different tag and tau reconstruction methods. The interested reader is referred to the online update of Ref.¹¹⁰ for an overview.

d) for an example) since only the couplings of the charged W can violate quark flavour. This results in small branching ratios, up to a few times 10^{-6} . While the previous hints¹⁸⁶ for lepton flavour universality violation in the ratios $R(K^{(*)}) = \text{Br}(B \rightarrow K^{(*)}\mu^+\mu^-)/\text{Br}(B \rightarrow K^{(*)}e^+e^-)$ were not confirmed¹⁸⁷ and $B_s \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$ ^{188,189} now agrees quite well with the SM prediction^{190,191}, there are several $b \rightarrow s\mu^+\mu^-$ observables that significantly deviate from the SM predictions. This includes the angular observable P_5' ^{192,193}, the total branching ratio $\text{Br}(B \rightarrow K\mu^+\mu^-)$ ^{194,195}, $\text{Br}(B_s \rightarrow \phi\mu^+\mu^-)$ ^{196,197} and also semi-inclusive observables¹⁹⁸. As a result, global fits find a preference for NP at the 5σ level^{199–201}. Recently, the Belle-II collaboration reported an 2.8σ excess over the SM hypothesis in the closely related $B \rightarrow K^*v\bar{v}$ decay²⁰².

The new measurements of $R(K^{(*)})$ require dominantly lepton flavour universal NP and $B_s \rightarrow \mu\mu$ constrains axial couplings to leptons. Such a NP effect at the required level of $O(20\%)$ (w.r.t. the SM) can be most naturally obtained via²⁰³: 1) A Z' boson with lepton flavour universal but flavour-violating couplings to bottom and strange quarks^{204,205} (see Fig. 2 d)). However, due to the bounds from $B_s - \bar{B}_s$ mixing²⁰⁶, the LHC (see e.g.²⁰⁷), and LEP²⁰⁸ a full explanation requires some tuning in $B_s - \bar{B}_s$ mixing by a right-handed sb coupling²⁰⁹ or a cancellation with Higgs contributions²¹⁰. Furthermore, $K^0 - \bar{K}^0$ and $D^0 - \bar{D}^0$ mixing require an approximate global $U(2)$ flavour symmetry¹⁴⁷. 2) τ or charm loop effect via an off-shell photon penguin²¹¹. The LQ representations which can give such a tau loop are S_2 LQ²¹², the U_1 LQ²¹³ or the combination of $S_1 + S_3$ ¹⁸³. The 2HDM with generic flavour structure²¹⁴ can generate the desired effect via a charm loop C_9^U ^{215,216}. Alternatively, a DQ solution is possible²¹⁷.

The best hope to solve the bottleneck concerning the SM predictions is to improve lattice calculations over the full q^2 range, like performed in Ref.¹⁹⁵, and to combine them with other non-perturbative methods like dispersion relations²¹⁸. Or the experimental side, again Belle-II, LHCb and the parked B program of CMS will help to resolve the situation.

3.8 W boson mass (m_W)

In general, three parameters are sufficient to parameterise completely (at tree level) the EW sector of the SM. They are usually taken to be the Fermi constant G_F , the fine-structure constant α and the Z boson mass since these are measured most precisely. In this input scheme, the W mass is not a free parameter but can be calculated as a function of G_F , α and m_Z (and the Higgs and the top mass which enter at the loop-level). The CDF II result²¹⁹ shows a very strong 7σ tension with the SM prediction. However, LHC^{220–223} and LEP results²²⁴ are closer to the SM with a tension of only 1.8σ and thus in tension with CDF II value. Therefore, employing a conservative error estimate, following the Particle Data Group recommendation⁶, that increases the uncertainty finds a tension of 3.7σ ^{225,12}. Within the EW fit, there are also tensions due to the forward-backward asymmetry measurement in $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ ²²⁷ ($\approx 2\sigma$) and in the lepton asymmetry parameter A_ℓ ²²⁵, mainly due to the electron channel.

The tension in the W mass is most easily explained by a tree-level effect, e.g. an $SU(2)_L$ scalar triplet that acquires a vacuum expectation value²²⁸ or via $Z - Z'$ mixing (see Fig. 2 e) in case Z' is an $SU(2)_L$ singlet²²⁹. However, loop effects of new particles with masses below or at the TeV scale are possible as well²³⁰, such as VLQs²³¹ or LQs²³².

Since with increased instantaneous luminosity, like at the high-luminosity LHC, the measurement of the W mass at a hadron collider becomes more difficult. However, very precise results would be possible with a future electron-positron collider like ILC²³³, CLIC^{234,235}, FCC-ee^{236,237} or CEPC^{238,239} which would also improve significantly on the precision of the input parameters for the EW fit. Nonetheless, LHCb could help to solve the puzzle since it does not use the full LHC luminosity.

3.9 LHC Multi-Lepton Anomalies ($e\mu(+b)$)

The “multi-lepton anomalies”, are LHC processes with two or more leptons in the final state (see Ref.²⁴⁰ for a review), with and without b -jets¹³, where statistically significant disagreements with the SM predictions have been observed^{241–246}. Some of the excesses already emerged with run-1 data (2011–2012) of ATLAS and CMS^{241,242}. They were confirmed by independent and larger data sets taken during run 2^{243,244,247} leading to disagreements with the SM, exceeding the 5σ threshold:

Final state	Characteristics	SM backgrounds	Significance
$\ell^+\ell^- + (b\text{-jets})$ ^{243,246,247}	$m_{\ell\ell} < 100$ GeV	$t\bar{t}, Wt$	$> 5\sigma$
$\ell^+\ell^- + (\text{no jet})$ ^{242,248}	$m_{\ell\ell} < 100$ GeV	W^+W^-	$\approx 3\sigma$
$\ell^\pm\ell^\pm, 3\ell + (b\text{-jets})$ ^{245,249,250}	Moderate H_T	$t\bar{t}W^\pm, t\bar{t}\bar{t}$	$\approx 3\sigma$
$\ell^\pm\ell^\pm, 3\ell, (\text{no } b\text{-jet})$ ^{244,251,252}	In association with h	$W^\pm h(125), WWW$	$\approx 4\sigma$
$Z(\rightarrow \ell\ell)\ell, (\text{no } b\text{-jet})$ ^{243,253}	$p_T^Z < 100$ GeV	ZW^\pm	$> 3\sigma$

The fact that the leptons in these channels are non-resonant, i.e. no peak in the invariant mass spectrum is observed, shows that, at least within the SM, they are related to leptonic W decays.

¹²This average does not include the latest ATLAS result²²⁶ superseding Ref.²²⁰, which however has a small impact on the fit.

¹³Since quarks and gluons are confined at low energies, they do not appear as free particles in a detector but rather hadronize and give signatures called jets (j). A b -jet is such an experimental signature containing a bottom quark.




Figure 2. Feynman diagrams showing some of the processes where anomalies are observed. The left diagrams depict the SM process, while the right-handed ones show a possible NP explanation. *a)* Schwinger term contribution to a_μ and LQ explanation *b)* Leading β -decay contribution in the SM and modification via a vector-like quark *c)* W contribution to $R(D^{(*)})$ and LQ effect *d)* W box contribution to $b \rightarrow s\ell^+\ell^-$ in the SM and Z' effect *e)* $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ and its modification via vector-like quarks *f)* top pair production and decay in the SM and new Higgses “polluting” the measurement *g)* di-di-jet production in the SM and NP contribution via DQs *h)* $pp \rightarrow e^+e^-$ in the SM and LQ contribution.

These excesses correspond to Higgs-like signatures (i.e. $h \rightarrow WW$), which are experimentally robust and on the theoretical side higher-order QCD and EW corrections have been calculated for the main SM backgrounds. Most prominently, next-to-next-to-leading order QCD corrections are available for leptonic observables in $t\bar{t}$ distributions²⁵⁴, non-resonant W^+W^- ^{255–259}, $ZW^{\pm 260}$, Wh ^{261–263}, and $t\bar{t}W^{\pm 264}$ production. Electroweak corrections are also available at next-to-leading order and found to be small for Higgs-like signals^{265–269}. Furthermore, the description of the data by the SM outside these Higgs-like regions is within the residual errors.

A particularly significant disagreement is observed in differential lepton distributions in $t\bar{t}$ measurements^{243,246} (see left diagram in Fig. 2 f)). For all SM simulations used, ATLAS finds such a high χ^2 value that they conclude²⁴⁷: “No model (SM simulation) can describe all measured distributions within their uncertainties.” While this effect warrants further investigation of the SM predictions, it is important to note that excesses also appear in WW signatures without jets (where SM $t\bar{t}$ production is strongly suppressed) and in $Wh/3W$, $t\bar{t}W$, $t\bar{t}t\bar{t}$ and ZW production with low Z -boson transverse momentum (p_T^Z), which indicates that the excess is likely not due to a mismodelling of the SM $t\bar{t}$ production and decay.¹⁴

The multi-lepton anomalies can be explained by the associated production of new scalars (i.e. via the decay of a heavier scalar into two lighter ones). In particular, the deviations from the SM predictions in the differential distributions of leptons in the measurements of $t\bar{t}$ decays can be resolved by the production of a new neutral Higgs, H , that decays into two lighter ones S and S' which subsequently decay to W bosons and b quarks, respectively²⁴⁶ (see Fig. 2 f)). This setup is preferred over the SM hypothesis by more than 5σ and points towards $m_S \approx 150\text{ GeV}$. Similarly, the excess in $h \rightarrow WW$ can be described by a new Higgs boson decaying to WW ^{242,271} and the same sign lepton signals with b jets by the associated production of H with top quarks where again $H \rightarrow SS' \rightarrow WWbb$ ²⁴³.

Given the very large statistical significance of many channels of the multi-lepton anomalies (more than 8σ for the simplified model of Ref.²⁴³) achieved with the run-2 data, the focus of studies with run-3 data (2022–2025) will shift to the signatures that are currently statistically limited. For instance, the study of the differential $\ell^+\ell^-$ distributions with a full jet veto or $\ell^\pm\ell^\pm$ with and without a b -jet would profit from more data. On the theory side, merging full next-to-next-to-leading order calculation²⁵⁴ and including off-shell effects²⁷² with parton showers at the same accuracy would significantly improve the SM simulations.

3.10 Higgs-like resonant signals ($YY = \gamma\gamma, \tau\tau, WW, ZZ$)

New particles that are directly produced at colliders show up as bumps in the otherwise continuous invariant mass spectrum of the corresponding decay products. For scalar bosons, di-photon distributions are very sensitive: Even though they have in general small rates because they are loop-suppressed, the experimental signature is very clear. In fact, there are several hints for di-photon resonances at 95 GeV ^{273,274}, $\approx 152\text{ GeV}$ ^{275,15} and also $\approx 680\text{ GeV}$ ^{276,277}. The hint at 95 GeV is supported by a di-taus excess reported by CMS²⁷⁸ (however, not confirmed by ATLAS²⁷⁹), a ZH signal (with $H \rightarrow b\bar{b}$) by LEP²⁸⁰ as well as the WW channel^{242,271}. The $\gamma\gamma$ (plus missing energy) hint at 152 GeV is supported by several signals in associated production^{275,281}, including WW +missing energy²⁷¹. Combining all channels, global significances of 3.8σ and 3.9σ are found for 95 GeV ²⁸² and 152 GeV ²⁸³, respectively, if for the latter, a simplified model with $pp \rightarrow H \rightarrow SS^*$ is assumed.¹⁶

There are also hints for a new scalar in di-photon and di- Z searches with a mass around 680 GeV ^{277,284} (around 3σ each²⁸⁵). Taking into account the resolution, this is compatible with the 3.8σ (2.8σ) local (global) excess in $bb\gamma\gamma$ at around 650 GeV ²⁸⁶ (where the $b\bar{b}$ invariant mass is compatible with 95 GeV) and the WW excess²⁸⁷ in vector-boson fusion category.¹⁷ Furthermore, ATLAS seems an excess in $A \rightarrow H + Z$ with $H \rightarrow b\bar{b}, t\bar{t}$ at $m_A \approx 650\text{ GeV}$ and $m_H \approx 450\text{ GeV}$, with a local (global) significance of 2.85σ (2.35σ). However, the $bb\gamma\gamma$ is diminished by the non-observation of an excess in $\tau\tau\gamma\gamma$ ²⁸⁸ and the WW excess cannot be fully explained within a model²⁸⁹.

These hints for resonances point towards the extension of the Higgs sector of the SM because only scalars can decay to photons. For the 95 GeV excess, at least an $SU(2)_L$ doublet²⁹⁰, triplet²⁹¹ or even a more complex scalar sector is needed²⁹². If one aims at also addressing the di-Higgs excess (i.e. $650\text{ GeV} \rightarrow b\bar{b}(90\text{ GeV}) + \gamma\gamma(125\text{ GeV})$)¹⁸, the resonant pair production of the SM Higgs and a new scalar is required²⁹³. To account for the 152 GeV excess an even larger scalar sector is necessary since the bulk of the signal is in associated production. In fact, not only are the most significant excesses related to missing energy, the WW signal can also be explained for $m_S \approx 150\text{ GeV}$, i.e. the decay chain $pp \rightarrow H \rightarrow (S \rightarrow \gamma\gamma, WW) + (S' \rightarrow \text{invisible})$ describes data well. In general, a quite complicated scalar sector is suggested, like an extended Georgi-Machacek model^{294,295} or excitations of the SM Higgs²⁹⁶.

Given the current strength of the excesses, LHC Run 3, but at the latest the high-luminosity LHC²⁹⁷, should suffice to verify or falsify the existence of these particles. However, to fully explore their properties, a e^+e^- accelerator could be required.

¹⁴In addition, there is a hint for a resonant $t\bar{t}$ excess at around 400 GeV ²⁷⁰ with a local (global) significance of 3.5σ (1.9σ).

¹⁵The mass of this excess is consistent with invariant mass of di-leptons in the multi-lepton anomalies.

¹⁶Ref.²⁸² updated the results of Ref.²⁸³ by including additional new excesses, further increasing the significance of the narrow excess at around 152 GeV .

¹⁷Vector-boson fusion means that the new scalar is radiated from a Z or W pair. At the LHC, this leads to the presence of two forward jets which are thus close to the beam-line axis.

¹⁸The values in the brackets refer to the masses of the resonances which decay to the corresponding final states, i.e. 125 GeV stands for the SM Higgs.




Figure 3. Compilation of various anomalies ordered according to the corresponding energy scale.

3.11 (di-)di-jet resonances ($jj(-jj)$)

A particle decaying into two quarks (or two gluons) results in a di-jet event at the LHC. ATLAS²⁹⁸ observed a weaker limit than expected if there were no NP signal in resonant di-jet searches slightly below 1 TeV. Furthermore, CMS²⁹⁹ found hints for the (non-resonant) pair production of di-jet resonances with a mass of ≈ 950 GeV with a local (global) significance of 3.6σ (2.5σ). This compatibility suggests that both excesses might be due to the same new particle X , once directly (resonantly) produced in proton-proton collisions ($pp \rightarrow X \rightarrow jj$), once pair produced via a new state Y ($pp \rightarrow Y^{(*)} \rightarrow XX \rightarrow (jj)(jj)$). In fact, Ref.³⁰⁰ finds a global 3.2σ significance at $m_Y \approx 3.6$ TeV. In the latest analysis, ATLAS finds a di-di-jet excesses³⁰¹ at ≈ 3.3 TeV with a di-jet mass of 850 GeV which could be compatible with the CMS one once the quite poor jet energy resolution is taken into account. Furthermore, there is a slight excess in tb searches at ≈ 3.5 TeV³⁰².

As explanations, two options come to mind³⁰⁰: two scalar DQ (see Fig. 2 g)) or new massive gluons seem to be the most plausible candidates³⁰⁰. While the first one could explain the tb excess, a specific realization of the latter is based on an $SU(3)_1 \times SU(3)_2 \times SU(3)_3$ gauge group, broken down to $SU(3)$ colour via two bi-triplets.

3.12 Non-resonant di-electrons ($q\bar{q} \rightarrow e^+e^-$)

If the mass of a particle exceeds the energy reach of a collider, its impact can still be seen by looking at the high-energetic end of the spectrum of a distribution where such effects are most relevant because they possess a relative enhancement w.r.t. the SM (see left-diagram in Fig. 2 h)). In such a non-resonant search for high-energetic oppositely charged leptons, CMS and ATLAS observe more electrons than expected in the SM^{303,304}.¹⁹ Because the number of observed muons is compatible with the SM prediction, this is a sign of lepton flavour universality violation and the ratio of muons over electrons provided by CMS has the advantage of reduced theoretical uncertainties³⁰⁵. Performing a model-independent fit, one finds the NP at a scale of 10 TeV with order one couplings can improve over the SM hypothesis by $\approx 3\sigma$ ³⁰⁶.

As this analysis involves non-resonant electrons that do not originate from the on-shell production of a new particle, NP must be heavier than the energy scale of the LHC (or be produced non-resonantly like LQs). This can be achieved with NP at the 10 TeV scale with order one coupling to first-generation quarks and electrons¹²¹. Therefore, Z' bosons³⁰⁷ or LQs¹¹³ (see Fig. 2 h)) have the potential to explain the CMS measurement. LHC Run 3 should suffice to determine the validity of these excesses.

4 Comparison, conclusions and outlook

The anomalies observed in particle physics are summarized in Fig. 3, together with their corresponding energy scale, showing that they range over at least five orders of magnitude. While one cannot expect that all anomalies will be confirmed, it is also statistically unlikely that all will disappear. Therefore, it is important to investigate their implications for NP in order to assess possible correlations among them and identify signatures for future verification (or falsification).

Let us now compare the anomalies concerning their experimental and theoretical features:²⁰

- Anomalous magnetic moment of the muon (a_μ):
 - + Precise and confirmed direct measurements
 - Standard Model prediction plagued by hadronic uncertainties
 - Tensions within $e^+e^- \rightarrow$ hadrons measurements and with lattice QCD
 - Quite large NP effect needed; model building is challenging
- The 17 MeV Anomaly in excited nuclei decays (X17)
 - + High statistical significance
 - Only observed by a single experiment (despite different setting)
 - Possibility of not understood nuclear effects

¹⁹Similarly significant excesses have been observed in the corresponding resonant searches. However, here the look-elsewhere effect reduces the significance which is not the case for non-resonant searches.

²⁰Please note that even though we try to be objective here, the impact of personal opinion is unavoidable.




Figure 4. Summary of the anomalies together with the implications for extending the SM with new particles: Leptoquarks (LQ), vector-like leptons (VLL), vector-like quarks (VLQ) electrically neutral scalars (S), neutral gauge bosons (Z'), charged gauge bosons (W') and di-quarks (DQ).

- Anomalies in electron appearance and disappearance (ν_e)
 - + High statistical significance
 - + Observed by different experiments
 - Theory errors might be underestimated
 - Explanation via sterile neutrino mixing excluded by other experiments
- Beta-decay Anomalies (β):
 - + Natural place to search for NP since only sub-permille effect w.r.t. the SM is needed
 - Only one (competitive) measurement of $K \rightarrow \mu \nu$ available
 - Beta decays need hadronic theory input to extract V_{ud}
 - Lifetime difference can only be explained by exotic NP
- Hadronic meson decays ($M \rightarrow mm'$):
 - + Many different channels
 - SM plagued by hadronic effects
 - NP explanations challenged by LHC searches
- Flavour changing neutral current B decays ($b \rightarrow s\ell^+\ell^-$)
 - + Many different observables measured
 - + Consistent picture
 - + Large significance
 - + Possible connection to $b \rightarrow c\tau\nu$
 - Sensitive to form factors and other hadronic input

- Charged current tauonic B decays ($R(D^{(*)})$)
 - + Measurements from different collaborations
 - + Small theory uncertainty
 - + Possible connection to $b \rightarrow s\ell^+\ell^-$
 - Difficult measurement
 - Limited significance
 - Large effect needed; challenging model building
- W mass (m_W)
 - + Theoretically clean
 - + Statistically significant
 - + Very sensitive to NP; many natural NP explanations
 - Tensions among the measurements
- LHC Multi-lepton anomalies ($e\mu(+b)$):
 - + Statistically very significant
 - + Large multiplicity of signatures
 - + Coherent picture
 - + Consistent with the Higgs-like signals
 - Some of the SM predictions can be difficult
 - Complex SM extension needed
- Higgs-like signal (YY)
 - + Statistically significant
 - + Many different channels
 - + Motivated by the multi-lepton anomalies
 - Possible look-elsewhere effect
- (di-)di-jet ($jj(-jj)$)
 - + Agreement between different measurements
 - Poor mass resolution
 - Challenging theory explanation
- Non-resonant di-electrons ($q\bar{q} \rightarrow e^+e^-$):
 - + Agreement between ATLAS and CMS
 - + Ratio theoretically clean
 - Limited statistics
 - Electrons are difficult LHC signatures

The anomalies are also compared in Table 1 w.r.t. several criteria which try to answer the following questions:

- Experimental signature: Is the experimental environment clean? Is the signal well separated from the background?
- Experimental consistency: Do multiple independent measurements exist? Are they in agreement with each other?
- Standard Model prediction: How accurate and reliable is the SM prediction? Are the conflicting results?
- Statistical significance: How sizable are the deviations from the SM predictions?
- NP explanation: Are there models that can naturally account for the excess? Are they in conflict with other observables?
- Consistent connection: Are there connections to other anomalies via the same new particle or model? How direct is this connection?

Here, + reflects a positive assessment, - a negative one and 0 means neutral, i.e. positive and negative aspects compensate to a good approximation.

The anomalies discussed above, together with the extensions of the SM to which they point, are shown in Fig. 4. One can see that many extensions point towards new Higgs-like scalars. In particular, the agreement between the mass of the scalar suggested by the multi-lepton anomalies and the $\gamma\gamma$ excess around 152 GeV is striking. LQ are also interesting candidates and, in particular, allow for a combined and correlated explanation of $b \rightarrow c\tau\nu$ and $b \rightarrow s\ell^+\ell^-$ via the tau-loop^{308,309}. Finally,

	Exp. signature	Exp. consistency	SM prediction	statistical significance	NP explanation	consistent connection
a_μ	+	0 ²¹	-	+	0	-
$X17$	+	0	-	+	0	0
ν_e	-	0	-	+	-	-
β	+	0	0	-	+ (-) ²²	+
$M \rightarrow mm'$	0	+	-	0	-	0
$b \rightarrow s\ell\ell$	+	+	0	+	0	+
$R(D^{(*)})$	-	+	+	-	-	+
m_W	0	-	+	+	+	+
$e\mu(+b)$	0	+	0	+	0	+
YY	+	+	+	0	+	+
$jj(-jj)$	0	+	+	0	0	-
$pp \rightarrow ee$	0	+	+	-	0	-

Table 1. Comparison of the different anomalies in particle physics in terms of various features. See main text for details.

$Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$, m_W and the CAA could be explained by VLQ. Of course, in a UV complete model, many more possible connections exist, as can be seen from Fig. 4. This offers interesting open research directions.

Particle physics is currently a very exciting area of research. While the SM has been consolidated over the last five decades, hints of new particles and new interactions are emerging. Despite originating from very different experiments and ranging over five orders of magnitude in energy, the task is to find combined explanations to verify or falsify the predictions of the anomalies in the future. However, one has to take into account that most likely not all anomalies will be confirmed by ongoing and forthcoming experimental efforts. Nonetheless, already establishing one of these hints beyond a reasonable doubt would lead particle physics into a new era, the BSM age.

References

1. Higgs, P. W. Broken symmetries, massless particles and gauge fields. *Phys. Lett.* **12**, 132–133, DOI: [10.1016/0031-9163\(64\)91136-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0031-9163(64)91136-9) (1964).
2. Englert, F. & Brout, R. Broken Symmetry and the Mass of Gauge Vector Mesons. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **13**, 321–323, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.13.321](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.13.321) (1964).
3. Aad, G. *et al.* Observation of a new particle in the search for the Standard Model Higgs boson with the ATLAS detector at the LHC. *Phys. Lett. B* **716**, 1–29, DOI: [10.1016/j.physletb.2012.08.020](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2012.08.020) (2012). [1207.7214](https://arxiv.org/abs/1207.7214).
4. Chatrchyan, S. *et al.* Observation of a New Boson at a Mass of 125 GeV with the CMS Experiment at the LHC. *Phys. Lett. B* **716**, 30–61, DOI: [10.1016/j.physletb.2012.08.021](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2012.08.021) (2012). [1207.7235](https://arxiv.org/abs/1207.7235).
5. Aalbers, J. *et al.* First Dark Matter Search Results from the LUX-ZEPLIN (LZ) Experiment. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **131**, 041002, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.131.041002](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.131.041002) (2023). [2207.03764](https://arxiv.org/abs/2207.03764).
6. Workman, R. L. *et al.* Review of Particle Physics. *PTEP* **2022**, 083C01, DOI: [10.1093/ptep/ptac097](https://doi.org/10.1093/ptep/ptac097) (2022).
7. Buchmuller, W., Ruckl, R. & Wyler, D. Leptoquarks in Lepton - Quark Collisions. *Phys. Lett. B* **191**, 442–448, DOI: [10.1016/0370-2693\(87\)90637-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0370-2693(87)90637-X) (1987). [Erratum: *Phys.Lett.B* 448, 320–320 (1999)].
8. Doršner, I., Fajfer, S., Greljo, A., Kamenik, J. F. & Košnik, N. Physics of leptoquarks in precision experiments and at particle colliders. *Phys. Rept.* **641**, 1–68, DOI: [10.1016/j.physrep.2016.06.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physrep.2016.06.001) (2016). [1603.04993](https://arxiv.org/abs/1603.04993).
9. Pati, J. C. & Salam, A. Lepton Number as the Fourth Color. *Phys. Rev. D* **10**, 275–289, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.10.275](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.10.275) (1974). [Erratum: *Phys.Rev.D* 11, 703–703 (1975)].
10. Georgi, H. & Glashow, S. L. Unity of All Elementary Particle Forces. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **32**, 438–441, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.32.438](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.32.438) (1974).
11. Barbier, R. *et al.* R-parity violating supersymmetry. *Phys. Rept.* **420**, 1–202, DOI: [10.1016/j.physrep.2005.08.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physrep.2005.08.006) (2005). [hep-ph/0406039](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0406039).
12. Hewett, J. L. & Rizzo, T. G. Low-Energy Phenomenology of Superstring Inspired $E(6)$ Models. *Phys. Rept.* **183**, 193, DOI: [10.1016/0370-1573\(89\)90071-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0370-1573(89)90071-9) (1989).

13. Weinberg, S. Elementary particle theory of composite particles. *Phys. Rev.* **130**, 776–783, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRev.130.776](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRev.130.776) (1963).
14. Randall, L. & Sundrum, R. A Large mass hierarchy from a small extra dimension. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 3370–3373, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.83.3370](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.83.3370) (1999). [hep-ph/9905221](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/9905221).
15. Froggatt, C. D. & Nielsen, H. B. Hierarchy of Quark Masses, Cabibbo Angles and CP Violation. *Nucl. Phys. B* **147**, 277–298, DOI: [10.1016/0550-3213\(79\)90316-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0550-3213(79)90316-X) (1979).
16. Mohapatra, R. N. & Pati, J. C. A Natural Left-Right Symmetry. *Phys. Rev. D* **11**, 2558, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.11.2558](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.11.2558) (1975).
17. Langacker, P. Grand Unified Theories and Proton Decay. *Phys. Rept.* **72**, 185, DOI: [10.1016/0370-1573\(81\)90059-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0370-1573(81)90059-4) (1981).
18. Antoniadis, I. A Possible new dimension at a few TeV. *Phys. Lett. B* **246**, 377–384, DOI: [10.1016/0370-2693\(90\)90617-F](https://doi.org/10.1016/0370-2693(90)90617-F) (1990).
19. Haber, H. E. & Kane, G. L. The Search for Supersymmetry: Probing Physics Beyond the Standard Model. *Phys. Rept.* **117**, 75–263, DOI: [10.1016/0370-1573\(85\)90051-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0370-1573(85)90051-1) (1985).
20. Minkowski, P. $\mu \rightarrow e\gamma$ at a Rate of One Out of 10^9 Muon Decays? *Phys. Lett. B* **67**, 421–428, DOI: [10.1016/0370-2693\(77\)90435-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0370-2693(77)90435-X) (1977).
21. Lee, B. W. & Shrock, R. E. Natural Suppression of Symmetry Violation in Gauge Theories: Muon - Lepton and Electron Lepton Number Nonconservation. *Phys. Rev. D* **16**, 1444, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.16.1444](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.16.1444) (1977).
22. Foot, R., Lew, H., He, X. G. & Joshi, G. C. Seesaw Neutrino Masses Induced by a Triplet of Leptons. *Z. Phys. C* **44**, 441, DOI: [10.1007/BF01415558](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01415558) (1989).
23. Chanowitz, M. S. & Golden, M. Higgs Boson Triplets With $M_W = M_Z \cos \theta \omega$. *Phys. Lett. B* **165**, 105–108, DOI: [10.1016/0370-2693\(85\)90700-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0370-2693(85)90700-2) (1985).
24. Branco, G. C. *et al.* Theory and phenomenology of two-Higgs-doublet models. *Phys. Rept.* **516**, 1–102, DOI: [10.1016/j.physrep.2012.02.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physrep.2012.02.002) (2012). [1106.0034](https://arxiv.org/abs/1106.0034).
25. Schwinger, J. S. On Quantum electrodynamics and the magnetic moment of the electron. *Phys. Rev.* **73**, 416–417, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRev.73.416](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRev.73.416) (1948).
26. Bennett, G. W. *et al.* Final Report of the Muon E821 Anomalous Magnetic Moment Measurement at BNL. *Phys. Rev. D* **73**, 072003, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.73.072003](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.73.072003) (2006). [hep-ex/0602035](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ex/0602035).
27. Abi, B. *et al.* Measurement of the Positive Muon Anomalous Magnetic Moment to 0.46 ppm. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **126**, 141801, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.126.141801](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.126.141801) (2021). [2104.03281](https://arxiv.org/abs/2104.03281).
28. Aguillard, D. P. *et al.* Measurement of the Positive Muon Anomalous Magnetic Moment to 0.20 ppm. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **131**, 161802, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.131.161802](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.131.161802) (2023). [2308.06230](https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.06230).
29. Aoyama, T., Kinoshita, T. & Nio, M. Theory of the Anomalous Magnetic Moment of the Electron. *Atoms* **7**, 28, DOI: [10.3390/atoms7010028](https://doi.org/10.3390/atoms7010028) (2019).
30. Colangelo, G., Hoferichter, M. & Stoffer, P. Two-pion contribution to hadronic vacuum polarization. *JHEP* **02**, 006, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP02\(2019\)006](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP02(2019)006) (2019). [1810.00007](https://arxiv.org/abs/1810.00007).
31. Davier, M., Hoecker, A., Malaescu, B. & Zhang, Z. A new evaluation of the hadronic vacuum polarisation contributions to the muon anomalous magnetic moment and to $\alpha(m_Z^2)$. *Eur. Phys. J. C* **80**, 241, DOI: [10.1140/epjc/s10052-020-7792-2](https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-020-7792-2) (2020). [Erratum: *Eur.Phys.J.C* 80, 410 (2020)], [1908.00921](https://arxiv.org/abs/1908.00921).
32. Keshavarzi, A., Nomura, D. & Teubner, T. $g - 2$ of charged leptons, $\alpha(M_Z^2)$, and the hyperfine splitting of muonium. *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, 014029, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.101.014029](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.101.014029) (2020). [1911.00367](https://arxiv.org/abs/1911.00367).
33. Borsanyi, S. *et al.* Leading hadronic contribution to the muon magnetic moment from lattice QCD. *Nature* **593**, 51–55, DOI: [10.1038/s41586-021-03418-1](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-021-03418-1) (2021). [2002.12347](https://arxiv.org/abs/2002.12347).
34. Ignatov, F. V. *et al.* Measurement of the $e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ cross section from threshold to 1.2 GeV with the CMD-3 detector (2023). [2302.08834](https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.08834).
35. Colangelo, G., Hoferichter, M. & Stoffer, P. Puzzles in the hadronic contributions to the muon anomalous magnetic moment. In *21st Conference on Flavor Physics and CP Violation* (2023). [2308.04217](https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.04217).

36. Hanneke, D., Fogwell, S. & Gabrielse, G. New Measurement of the Electron Magnetic Moment and the Fine Structure Constant. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 120801, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.100.120801](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.100.120801) (2008). [0801.1134](https://arxiv.org/abs/0801.1134).
37. Aoyama, T., Kinoshita, T. & Nio, M. Revised and Improved Value of the QED Tenth-Order Electron Anomalous Magnetic Moment, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.97.036001](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.97.036001) (2018). [1712.06060](https://arxiv.org/abs/1712.06060).
38. Laporta, S. High-precision calculation of the 4-loop contribution to the electron $g - 2$ in QED. *Phys. Lett. B* **772**, 232–238, DOI: [10.1016/j.physletb.2017.06.056](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2017.06.056) (2017). [1704.06996](https://arxiv.org/abs/1704.06996).
39. Crivellin, A., Hoferichter, M. & Schmidt-Wellenburg, P. Combined explanations of $(g - 2)_{\mu,e}$ and implications for a large muon EDM. *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, 113002, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.98.113002](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.98.113002) (2018). [1807.11484](https://arxiv.org/abs/1807.11484).
40. Athron, P. *et al.* New physics explanations of a_μ in light of the FNAL muon $g - 2$ measurement. *JHEP* **09**, 080, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP09\(2021\)080](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP09(2021)080) (2021). [2104.03691](https://arxiv.org/abs/2104.03691).
41. Lees, J. P. *et al.* Search for a muonic dark force at BABAR. *Phys. Rev. D* **94**, 011102, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.94.011102](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.94.011102) (2016). [1606.03501](https://arxiv.org/abs/1606.03501).
42. Czank, T. *et al.* Search for $Z' \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ in the $L_\mu - L_\tau$ gauge-symmetric model at Belle. *Phys. Rev. D* **106**, 012003, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.106.012003](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.106.012003) (2022). [2109.08596](https://arxiv.org/abs/2109.08596).
43. Ma, E., Roy, D. P. & Roy, S. Gauged $L_\mu - L_\tau$ with large muon anomalous magnetic moment and the bimaximal mixing of neutrinos. *Phys. Lett. B* **525**, 101–106, DOI: [10.1016/S0370-2693\(01\)01428-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0370-2693(01)01428-9) (2002). [hep-ph/0110146](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0110146).
44. Baek, S., Deshpande, N. G., He, X. G. & Ko, P. Muon anomalous $g - 2$ and gauged $L_\mu - L_\tau$ models. *Phys. Rev. D* **64**, 055006, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.64.055006](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.64.055006) (2001). [hep-ph/0104141](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0104141).
45. Everett, L. L., Kane, G. L., Rigolin, S. & Wang, L.-T. Implications of muon $g - 2$ for supersymmetry and for discovering superpartners directly. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 3484–3487, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.86.3484](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.86.3484) (2001). [hep-ph/0102145](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0102145).
46. Feng, J. L. & Matchev, K. T. Supersymmetry and the anomalous magnetic moment of the muon. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 3480–3483, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.86.3480](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.86.3480) (2001). [hep-ph/0102146](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0102146).
47. Czarnecki, A. & Marciano, W. J. The Muon anomalous magnetic moment: A Harbinger for 'new physics'. *Phys. Rev. D* **64**, 013014, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.64.013014](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.64.013014) (2001). [hep-ph/0102122](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0102122).
48. Kannike, K., Raidal, M., Straub, D. M. & Strumia, A. Anthropic solution to the magnetic muon anomaly: the charged see-saw. *JHEP* **02**, 106, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP02\(2012\)106](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP02(2012)106) (2012). [Erratum: *JHEP* 10, 136 (2012)], [1111.2551](https://arxiv.org/abs/1111.2551).
49. Kowalska, K. & Sessolo, E. M. Expectations for the muon $g - 2$ in simplified models with dark matter. *JHEP* **09**, 112, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP09\(2017\)112](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP09(2017)112) (2017). [1707.00753](https://arxiv.org/abs/1707.00753).
50. Crivellin, A. & Hoferichter, M. Consequences of chirally enhanced explanations of $(g - 2)_\mu$ for $h \rightarrow \mu\mu$ and $Z \rightarrow \mu\mu$. *JHEP* **07**, 135, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP07\(2021\)135](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP07(2021)135) (2021). [Erratum: *JHEP* 10, 030 (2022)], [2104.03202](https://arxiv.org/abs/2104.03202).
51. Djouadi, A., Kohler, T., Spira, M. & Tutas, J. (e b), (e t) TYPE LEPTOQUARKS AT e p COLLIDERS. *Z. Phys. C* **46**, 679–686, DOI: [10.1007/BF01560270](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01560270) (1990).
52. Bauer, M. & Neubert, M. Minimal Leptoquark Explanation for the $R_{D^{(*)}}$, R_K , and $(g - 2)_\mu$ Anomalies. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 141802, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.116.141802](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.116.141802) (2016). [1511.01900](https://arxiv.org/abs/1511.01900).
53. Crivellin, A., Mueller, D. & Saturnino, F. Correlating $h \rightarrow \mu\mu$ to the Anomalous Magnetic Moment of the Muon via Leptoquarks. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127**, 021801, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.127.021801](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.127.021801) (2021). [2008.02643](https://arxiv.org/abs/2008.02643).
54. Coluccio Leskow, E., D'Ambrosio, G., Crivellin, A. & Müller, D. $(g - 2)_\mu$, lepton flavor violation, and Z decays with leptoquarks: Correlations and future prospects. *Phys. Rev. D* **95**, 055018, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.95.055018](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.95.055018) (2017). [1612.06858](https://arxiv.org/abs/1612.06858).
55. Altmannshofer, W. *et al.* The Belle II Physics Book. *PTEP* **2019**, 123C01, DOI: [10.1093/ptep/ptz106](https://doi.org/10.1093/ptep/ptz106) (2019). [Erratum: *PTEP* 2020, 029201 (2020)], [1808.10567](https://arxiv.org/abs/1808.10567).
56. Abbiendi, G. *et al.* Measuring the leading hadronic contribution to the muon $g - 2$ via μe scattering. *Eur. Phys. J. C* **77**, 139, DOI: [10.1140/epjc/s10052-017-4633-z](https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-017-4633-z) (2017). [1609.08987](https://arxiv.org/abs/1609.08987).
57. Aad, G. *et al.* Observation of the $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \tau\tau$ Process in Pb+Pb Collisions and Constraints on the τ -Lepton Anomalous Magnetic Moment with the ATLAS Detector. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **131**, 151802, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.131.151802](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.131.151802) (2023). [2204.13478](https://arxiv.org/abs/2204.13478).
58. Haisch, U., Schnell, L. & Weiss, J. LHC tau-pair production constraints on a_τ and d_τ . *SciPost Phys.* **16**, 048, DOI: [10.21468/SciPostPhys.16.2.048](https://doi.org/10.21468/SciPostPhys.16.2.048) (2024). [2307.14133](https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.14133).

59. Crivellin, A., Hoferichter, M. & Roney, J. M. Toward testing the magnetic moment of the tau at one part per million. *Phys. Rev. D* **106**, 093007, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.106.093007](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.106.093007) (2022). [2111.10378](https://arxiv.org/abs/2111.10378).
60. Krasznahorkay, A. J. *et al.* Observation of Anomalous Internal Pair Creation in Be8 : A Possible Indication of a Light, Neutral Boson. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 042501, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.116.042501](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.116.042501) (2016). [1504.01527](https://arxiv.org/abs/1504.01527).
61. Krasznahorkay, A. J. *et al.* New anomaly observed in He4 supports the existence of the hypothetical X17 particle. *Phys. Rev. C* **104**, 044003, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevC.104.044003](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.104.044003) (2021). [2104.10075](https://arxiv.org/abs/2104.10075).
62. Krasznahorkay, A. J. *et al.* New anomaly observed in C12 supports the existence and the vector character of the hypothetical X17 boson. *Phys. Rev. C* **106**, L061601, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevC.106.L061601](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.106.L061601) (2022). [2209.10795](https://arxiv.org/abs/2209.10795).
63. de Boer, F. W. N. *et al.* A deviation in internal pair conversion. *Phys. Lett. B* **388**, 235–240, DOI: [10.1016/S0370-2693\(96\)01311-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0370-2693(96)01311-1) (1996).
64. de Boer, F. W. N. *et al.* Further search for a neutral boson with a mass around 9-MeV/c². *J. Phys. G* **27**, L29, DOI: [10.1088/0954-3899/27/4/102](https://doi.org/10.1088/0954-3899/27/4/102) (2001). [hep-ph/0101298](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0101298).
65. Aleksejevs, A., Barkanova, S., Kolomensky, Y. G. & Sheff, B. A Standard Model Explanation for the “ATOMKI Anomaly” (2021). [2102.01127](https://arxiv.org/abs/2102.01127).
66. Alves, D. S. M. *et al.* Shedding light on X17: community report. *Eur. Phys. J. C* **83**, 230, DOI: [10.1140/epjc/s10052-023-11271-x](https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-023-11271-x) (2023).
67. Nomura, T. & Sanyal, P. Explaining Atomki anomaly and muon $g - 2$ in $U(1)_X$ extended flavour violating two Higgs doublet model. *JHEP* **05**, 232, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP05\(2021\)232](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP05(2021)232) (2021). [2010.04266](https://arxiv.org/abs/2010.04266).
68. Tien Du, P., Ai Viet, N. & Van Dat, N. Decay of neutron with participation of the light vector boson X17. *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **1506**, 012004, DOI: [10.1088/1742-6596/1506/1/012004](https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1506/1/012004) (2020).
69. Darmé, L., Mancini, M., Nardi, E. & Raggi, M. Resonant search for the X17 boson at PADME. *Phys. Rev. D* **106**, 115036, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.106.115036](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.106.115036) (2022). [2209.09261](https://arxiv.org/abs/2209.09261).
70. Echenard, B., Essig, R. & Zhong, Y.-M. Projections for Dark Photon Searches at Mu3e. *JHEP* **01**, 113, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP01\(2015\)113](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP01(2015)113) (2015). [1411.1770](https://arxiv.org/abs/1411.1770).
71. Bastin, B. *et al.* Investigation of a light Dark Boson existence: The New JEDI project. *EPJ Web Conf.* **275**, 01012, DOI: [10.1051/epjconf/202327501012](https://doi.org/10.1051/epjconf/202327501012) (2023).
72. Aguilar, A. *et al.* Evidence for neutrino oscillations from the observation of $\bar{\nu}_e$ appearance in a $\bar{\nu}_\mu$ beam. *Phys. Rev. D* **64**, 112007, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.64.112007](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.64.112007) (2001). [hep-ex/0104049](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ex/0104049).
73. Aguilar-Arevalo, A. A. *et al.* Significant Excess of ElectronLike Events in the MiniBooNE Short-Baseline Neutrino Experiment. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **121**, 221801, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.121.221801](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.121.221801) (2018). [1805.12028](https://arxiv.org/abs/1805.12028).
74. Aguilar-Arevalo, A. A. *et al.* Updated MiniBooNE neutrino oscillation results with increased data and new background studies. *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 052002, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.103.052002](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.103.052002) (2021). [2006.16883](https://arxiv.org/abs/2006.16883).
75. Brdar, V. & Kopp, J. Can standard model and experimental uncertainties resolve the MiniBooNE anomaly? *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, 115024, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.105.115024](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.105.115024) (2022). [2109.08157](https://arxiv.org/abs/2109.08157).
76. Acciarri, R. *et al.* Design and Construction of the MicroBooNE Detector. *JINST* **12**, P02017, DOI: [10.1088/1748-0221/12/02/P02017](https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/12/02/P02017) (2017). [1612.05824](https://arxiv.org/abs/1612.05824).
77. Abratenko, P. *et al.* Search for an Excess of Electron Neutrino Interactions in MicroBooNE Using Multiple Final-State Topologies. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **128**, 241801, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.128.241801](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.128.241801) (2022). [2110.14054](https://arxiv.org/abs/2110.14054).
78. Aguilar-Arevalo, A. A. *et al.* MiniBooNE and MicroBooNE Combined Fit to a 3+1 Sterile Neutrino Scenario. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **129**, 201801, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.129.201801](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.129.201801) (2022). [2201.01724](https://arxiv.org/abs/2201.01724).
79. Adamson, P. *et al.* Search for sterile neutrinos in MINOS and MINOS+ using a two-detector fit. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 091803, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.122.091803](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.122.091803) (2019). [1710.06488](https://arxiv.org/abs/1710.06488).
80. Aartsen, M. G. *et al.* eV-Scale Sterile Neutrino Search Using Eight Years of Atmospheric Muon Neutrino Data from the IceCube Neutrino Observatory. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **125**, 141801, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.125.141801](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.125.141801) (2020). [2005.12942](https://arxiv.org/abs/2005.12942).
81. Dentler, M. *et al.* Updated Global Analysis of Neutrino Oscillations in the Presence of eV-Scale Sterile Neutrinos. *JHEP* **08**, 010, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP08\(2018\)010](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP08(2018)010) (2018). [1803.10661](https://arxiv.org/abs/1803.10661).
82. Babu, K. S., Brdar, V., de Gouvêa, A. & Machado, P. A. N. Addressing the short-baseline neutrino anomalies with energy-dependent mixing parameters. *Phys. Rev. D* **107**, 015017, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.107.015017](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.107.015017) (2023). [2209.00031](https://arxiv.org/abs/2209.00031).

83. Acero, M. A. *et al.* White Paper on Light Sterile Neutrino Searches and Related Phenomenology (2022). [2203.07323](#).
84. Declais, Y. *et al.* Search for neutrino oscillations at 15-meters, 40-meters, and 95-meters from a nuclear power reactor at Bugey. *Nucl. Phys. B* **434**, 503–534, DOI: [10.1016/0550-3213\(94\)00513-E](#) (1995).
85. Apollonio, M. *et al.* Search for neutrino oscillations on a long baseline at the CHOOZ nuclear power station. *Eur. Phys. J. C* **27**, 331–374, DOI: [10.1140/epjc/s2002-01127-9](#) (2003). [hep-ex/0301017](#).
86. Mention, G. *et al.* The Reactor Antineutrino Anomaly. *Phys. Rev. D* **83**, 073006, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.83.073006](#) (2011). [1101.2755](#).
87. Hampel, W. *et al.* Final results of the Cr-51 neutrino source experiments in GALLEX. *Phys. Lett. B* **420**, 114–126, DOI: [10.1016/S0370-2693\(97\)01562-1](#) (1998).
88. Kaether, F., Hampel, W., Heusser, G., Kiko, J. & Kirsten, T. Reanalysis of the GALLEX solar neutrino flux and source experiments. *Phys. Lett. B* **685**, 47–54, DOI: [10.1016/j.physletb.2010.01.030](#) (2010). [1001.2731](#).
89. Abdurashitov, J. N. *et al.* Measurement of the solar neutrino capture rate with gallium metal. III: Results for the 2002–2007 data-taking period. *Phys. Rev. C* **80**, 015807, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevC.80.015807](#) (2009). [0901.2200](#).
90. Acero, M. A., Giunti, C. & Laveder, M. Limits on $\nu(e)$ and anti- $\nu(e)$ disappearance from Gallium and reactor experiments. *Phys. Rev. D* **78**, 073009, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.78.073009](#) (2008). [0711.4222](#).
91. Giunti, C. & Laveder, M. Statistical Significance of the Gallium Anomaly. *Phys. Rev. C* **83**, 065504, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevC.83.065504](#) (2011). [1006.3244](#).
92. Brdar, V., Gehrlein, J. & Kopp, J. Towards resolving the gallium anomaly. *JHEP* **05**, 143, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP05\(2023\)143](#) (2023). [2303.05528](#).
93. Giunti, C., Li, Y. F., Ternes, C. A. & Xin, Z. Reactor antineutrino anomaly in light of recent flux model refinements. *Phys. Lett. B* **829**, 137054, DOI: [10.1016/j.physletb.2022.137054](#) (2022). [2110.06820](#).
94. Berryman, J. M., Coloma, P., Huber, P., Schwetz, T. & Zhou, A. Statistical significance of the sterile-neutrino hypothesis in the context of reactor and gallium data. *JHEP* **02**, 055, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP02\(2022\)055](#) (2022). [2111.12530](#).
95. Losada, M., Nir, Y., Perez, G., Savoray, I. & Shpilman, Y. Parametric resonance in neutrino oscillations induced by ultra-light dark matter and implications for KamLAND and JUNO. *JHEP* **03**, 032, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP03\(2023\)032](#) (2023). [2205.09769](#).
96. Barinov, V. V. *et al.* Search for electron-neutrino transitions to sterile states in the BEST experiment. *Phys. Rev. C* **105**, 065502, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevC.105.065502](#) (2022). [2201.07364](#).
97. Acciarri, R. *et al.* Long-Baseline Neutrino Facility (LBNF) and Deep Underground Neutrino Experiment (DUNE): Conceptual Design Report, Volume 2: The Physics Program for DUNE at LBNF (2015). [1512.06148](#).
98. Fava, A. FNAL SBL Program Status. *PoS NuFACT2018*, 011, DOI: [10.22323/1.341.0011](#) (2019).
99. Kobayashi, M. & Maskawa, T. CP Violation in the Renormalizable Theory of Weak Interaction. *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **49**, 652–657, DOI: [10.1143/PTP.49.652](#) (1973).
100. Cabibbo, N. Unitary Symmetry and Leptonic Decays. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **10**, 531–533, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.10.531](#) (1963).
101. Czarnecki, A., Marciano, W. J. & Sirlin, A. Neutron Lifetime and Axial Coupling Connection. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **120**, 202002, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.120.202002](#) (2018). [1802.01804](#).
102. Hardy, J. C. & Towner, I. S. Superallowed $0^+ \rightarrow 0^+$ nuclear β decays: 2020 critical survey, with implications for V_{ud} and CKM unitarity. *Phys. Rev. C* **102**, 045501, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevC.102.045501](#) (2020).
103. Ambrosino, F. *et al.* Measurement of the absolute branching ratio for the $K^+ \rightarrow \mu^+ \nu(\gamma)$ decay with the KLOE detector. *Phys. Lett. B* **632**, 76–80, DOI: [10.1016/j.physletb.2005.11.008](#) (2006). [hep-ex/0509045](#).
104. Ambrosino, F. *et al.* Measurement of the charged kaon lifetime with the KLOE detector. *JHEP* **01**, 073, DOI: [10.1088/1126-6708/2008/01/073](#) (2008). [0712.1112](#).
105. Marciano, W. J. & Sirlin, A. Improved calculation of electroweak radiative corrections and the value of V_{ud} . *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 032002, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.96.032002](#) (2006). [hep-ph/0510099](#).
106. Seng, C.-Y., Gorchtein, M., Patel, H. H. & Ramsey-Musolf, M. J. Reduced Hadronic Uncertainty in the Determination of V_{ud} . *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **121**, 241804, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.121.241804](#) (2018). [1807.10197](#).

107. Moulson, M. Experimental determination of V_{us} from kaon decays. *PoS CKM2016*, 033, DOI: [10.22323/1.291.0033](https://doi.org/10.22323/1.291.0033) (2017). [1704.04104](https://arxiv.org/abs/1704.04104).
108. Seng, C.-Y., Galviz, D., Marciano, W. J. & Meißner, U.-G. Update on $|V_{us}|$ and $|V_{us}/V_{ud}|$ from semileptonic kaon and pion decays. *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, 013005, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.105.013005](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.105.013005) (2022). [2107.14708](https://arxiv.org/abs/2107.14708).
109. Cirigliano, V., Crivellin, A., Hoferichter, M. & Moulson, M. Scrutinizing CKM unitarity with a new measurement of the $K_{\mu 3}/K_{\mu 2}$ branching fraction. *Phys. Lett. B* **838**, 137748, DOI: [10.1016/j.physletb.2023.137748](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2023.137748) (2023). [2208.11707](https://arxiv.org/abs/2208.11707).
110. Amhis, Y. S. *et al.* Averages of b -hadron, c -hadron, and τ -lepton properties as of 2021. *Phys. Rev. D* **107**, 052008, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.107.052008](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.107.052008) (2023). [2206.07501](https://arxiv.org/abs/2206.07501).
111. Crivellin, A., Hoferichter, M. & Manzari, C. A. Fermi Constant from Muon Decay Versus Electroweak Fits and Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa Unitarity. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127**, 071801, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.127.071801](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.127.071801) (2021). [2102.02825](https://arxiv.org/abs/2102.02825).
112. Capdevila, B., Crivellin, A., Manzari, C. A. & Montull, M. Explaining $b \rightarrow s\ell^+\ell^-$ and the Cabibbo angle anomaly with a vector triplet. *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 015032, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.103.015032](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.103.015032) (2021). [2005.13542](https://arxiv.org/abs/2005.13542).
113. Crivellin, A., Müller, D. & Schnell, L. Combined constraints on first generation leptoquarks. *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 115023, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.103.115023](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.103.115023) (2021). [Addendum: *Phys.Rev.D* 104, 055020 (2021)], [2104.06417](https://arxiv.org/abs/2104.06417).
114. Crivellin, A., Kirk, F., Manzari, C. A. & Panizzi, L. Searching for lepton flavor universality violation and collider signals from a singly charged scalar singlet. *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 073002, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.103.073002](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.103.073002) (2021). [2012.09845](https://arxiv.org/abs/2012.09845).
115. Buras, A. J., Crivellin, A., Kirk, F., Manzari, C. A. & Montull, M. Global analysis of leptophilic Z' bosons. *JHEP* **06**, 068, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP06\(2021\)068](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP06(2021)068) (2021). [2104.07680](https://arxiv.org/abs/2104.07680).
116. Coutinho, A. M., Crivellin, A. & Manzari, C. A. Global Fit to Modified Neutrino Couplings and the Cabibbo-Angle Anomaly. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **125**, 071802, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.125.071802](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.125.071802) (2020). [1912.08823](https://arxiv.org/abs/1912.08823).
117. Kirk, M. Cabibbo anomaly versus electroweak precision tests: An exploration of extensions of the Standard Model. *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 035004, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.103.035004](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.103.035004) (2021). [2008.03261](https://arxiv.org/abs/2008.03261).
118. Belfatto, B., Beradze, R. & Berezhiani, Z. The CKM unitarity problem: A trace of new physics at the TeV scale? *Eur. Phys. J. C* **80**, 149, DOI: [10.1140/epjc/s10052-020-7691-6](https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-020-7691-6) (2020). [1906.02714](https://arxiv.org/abs/1906.02714).
119. Branco, G. C., Penedo, J. T., Pereira, P. M. F., Rebelo, M. N. & Silva-Marcos, J. I. Addressing the CKM unitarity problem with a vector-like up quark. *JHEP* **07**, 099, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP07\(2021\)099](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP07(2021)099) (2021). [2103.13409](https://arxiv.org/abs/2103.13409).
120. Belfatto, B. & Berezhiani, Z. Are the CKM anomalies induced by vector-like quarks? Limits from flavor changing and Standard Model precision tests. *JHEP* **10**, 079, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP10\(2021\)079](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP10(2021)079) (2021). [2103.05549](https://arxiv.org/abs/2103.05549).
121. Crivellin, A., Kirk, M., Kitahara, T. & Mescia, F. Global fit of modified quark couplings to EW gauge bosons and vector-like quarks in light of the Cabibbo angle anomaly. *JHEP* **03**, 234, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP03\(2023\)234](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP03(2023)234) (2023). [2212.06862](https://arxiv.org/abs/2212.06862).
122. Crivellin, A., Kirk, F., Manzari, C. A. & Montull, M. Global Electroweak Fit and Vector-Like Leptons in Light of the Cabibbo Angle Anomaly. *JHEP* **12**, 166, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP12\(2020\)166](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP12(2020)166) (2020). [2008.01113](https://arxiv.org/abs/2008.01113).
123. Byrne, J. & Dawber, P. G. A Revised Value for the Neutron Lifetime Measured Using a Penning Trap. *EPL* **33**, 187, DOI: [10.1209/epl/i1996-00319-x](https://doi.org/10.1209/epl/i1996-00319-x) (1996).
124. Yue, A. T. *et al.* Improved Determination of the Neutron Lifetime. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111**, 222501, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.111.222501](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.111.222501) (2013). [1309.2623](https://arxiv.org/abs/1309.2623).
125. Gonzalez, F. M. *et al.* Improved neutron lifetime measurement with UCN τ . *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127**, 162501, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.127.162501](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.127.162501) (2021). [2106.10375](https://arxiv.org/abs/2106.10375).
126. Fornal, B. & Grinstein, B. Dark Matter Interpretation of the Neutron Decay Anomaly. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **120**, 191801, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.120.191801](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.120.191801) (2018). [Erratum: *Phys.Rev.Lett.* 124, 219901 (2020)], [1801.01124](https://arxiv.org/abs/1801.01124).
127. Berezhiani, Z. Neutron lifetime puzzle and neutron–mirror neutron oscillation. *Eur. Phys. J. C* **79**, 484, DOI: [10.1140/epjc/s10052-019-6995-x](https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-019-6995-x) (2019). [1807.07906](https://arxiv.org/abs/1807.07906).
128. Brodeur, M. *et al.* Nuclear β decay as a probe for physics beyond the Standard Model (2023). [2301.03975](https://arxiv.org/abs/2301.03975).
129. Altmannshofer, W. *et al.* PIONEER: Studies of Rare Pion Decays (2022). [2203.01981](https://arxiv.org/abs/2203.01981).

130. Ayres, N. J. *et al.* Improved Search for Neutron to Mirror-Neutron Oscillations in the Presence of Mirror Magnetic Fields with a Dedicated Apparatus at the PSI UCN Source. *Symmetry* **14**, 503, DOI: [10.3390/sym14030503](https://doi.org/10.3390/sym14030503) (2022). [2111.02794](https://arxiv.org/abs/2111.02794).
131. Bordone, M., Gubernari, N., Huber, T., Jung, M. & van Dyk, D. A puzzle in $\bar{B}_{(s)}^0 \rightarrow D_{(s)}^{(*)+} \{\pi^-, K^-\}$ decays and extraction of the f_s/f_d fragmentation fraction. *Eur. Phys. J. C* **80**, 951, DOI: [10.1140/epjc/s10052-020-08512-8](https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-020-08512-8) (2020). [2007.10338](https://arxiv.org/abs/2007.10338).
132. Beneke, M., Buchalla, G., Neubert, M. & Sachrajda, C. T. QCD factorization in $B \rightarrow \pi K, \pi\pi$ decays and extraction of Wolfenstein parameters. *Nucl. Phys. B* **606**, 245–321, DOI: [10.1016/S0550-3213\(01\)00251-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0550-3213(01)00251-6) (2001). [hep-ph/0104110](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0104110).
133. Piscopo, M. L. & Rusov, A. V. Non-factorisable effects in the decays $\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow D_s^+ \pi^-$ and $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^+ K^-$ from LCSR. *JHEP* **10**, 180, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP10\(2023\)180](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP10(2023)180) (2023). [2307.07594](https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.07594).
134. Iguro, S. & Kitahara, T. Implications for new physics from a novel puzzle in $\bar{B}_{(s)}^0 \rightarrow D_{(s)}^{(*)+} \{\pi^-, K^-\}$ decays. *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, 071701, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.102.071701](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.102.071701) (2020). [2008.01086](https://arxiv.org/abs/2008.01086).
135. Bordone, M., Greljo, A. & Marzocca, D. Exploiting dijet resonance searches for flavor physics. *JHEP* **08**, 036, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP08\(2021\)036](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP08(2021)036) (2021). [2103.10332](https://arxiv.org/abs/2103.10332).
136. Aaij, R. *et al.* Evidence for CP violation in time-integrated $D^0 \rightarrow h^- h^+$ decay rates. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, 111602, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.108.111602](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.108.111602) (2012). [1112.0938](https://arxiv.org/abs/1112.0938).
137. Aaij, R. *et al.* Observation of CP Violation in Charm Decays. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 211803, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.122.211803](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.122.211803) (2019). [1903.08726](https://arxiv.org/abs/1903.08726).
138. Chala, M., Lenz, A., Rusov, A. V. & Scholtz, J. Δ_{CP} within the Standard Model and beyond. *JHEP* **07**, 161, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP07\(2019\)161](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP07(2019)161) (2019). [1903.10490](https://arxiv.org/abs/1903.10490).
139. Aaij, R. *et al.* Measurement of the Time-Integrated CP Asymmetry in $D^0 \rightarrow K^- K^+$ Decays. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **131**, 091802, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.131.091802](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.131.091802) (2023). [2209.03179](https://arxiv.org/abs/2209.03179).
140. Bause, R. *et al.* U-spin-CP anomaly in charm. *Phys. Rev. D* **108**, 035005, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.108.035005](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.108.035005) (2023). [2210.16330](https://arxiv.org/abs/2210.16330).
141. Altmannshofer, W., Primulando, R., Yu, C.-T. & Yu, F. New Physics Models of Direct CP Violation in Charm Decays. *JHEP* **04**, 049, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP04\(2012\)049](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP04(2012)049) (2012). [1202.2866](https://arxiv.org/abs/1202.2866).
142. Buras, A. J., Fleischer, R., Recksiegel, S. & Schwab, F. $B \rightarrow \pi\pi$, new physics in $B \rightarrow \pi K$ and implications for rare K and B decays. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 101804, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.92.101804](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.92.101804) (2004). [hep-ph/0312259](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0312259).
143. Aaij, R. *et al.* Measurement of CP Violation in the Decay $B^+ \rightarrow K^+ \pi^0$. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **126**, 091802, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.126.091802](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.126.091802) (2021). [2012.12789](https://arxiv.org/abs/2012.12789).
144. Fleischer, R., Jaarsma, R. & Vos, K. K. Towards new frontiers with $B \rightarrow \pi K$ decays. *Phys. Lett. B* **785**, 525–529, DOI: [10.1016/j.physletb.2018.09.015](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2018.09.015) (2018). [1712.02323](https://arxiv.org/abs/1712.02323).
145. Aaij, R. *et al.* Measurement of CP asymmetries in two-body $B_{(s)}^0$ -meson decays to charged pions and kaons. *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, 032004, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.98.032004](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.98.032004) (2018). [1805.06759](https://arxiv.org/abs/1805.06759).
146. Algueró, M., Crivellin, A., Descotes-Genon, S., Matias, J. & Novoa-Brunet, M. A new B-flavour anomaly in $B_{d,s} \rightarrow K^{*0} \bar{K}^{*0}$: anatomy and interpretation. *JHEP* **04**, 066, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP04\(2021\)066](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP04(2021)066) (2021). [2011.07867](https://arxiv.org/abs/2011.07867).
147. Calibbi, L., Crivellin, A., Kirk, F., Manzari, C. A. & Vernazza, L. Z' models with less-minimal flavour violation. *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, 095003, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.101.095003](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.101.095003) (2020). [1910.00014](https://arxiv.org/abs/1910.00014).
148. Crivellin, A., Gross, C., Pokorski, S. & Vernazza, L. Correlating ϵ'/ϵ to hadronic B decays via $U(2)^3$ flavour symmetry. *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, 015022, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.101.015022](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.101.015022) (2020). [1909.02101](https://arxiv.org/abs/1909.02101).
149. Buras, A. J. ϵ'/ϵ in the Standard Model and Beyond: 2021. In *11th International Workshop on the CKM Unitarity Triangle* (2022). [2203.12632](https://arxiv.org/abs/2203.12632).
150. Bhattacharya, B., Kumbhakar, S., London, D. & Payot, N. U-spin puzzle in B decays. *Phys. Rev. D* **107**, L011505, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.107.L011505](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.107.L011505) (2023). [2211.06994](https://arxiv.org/abs/2211.06994).
151. Gambino, P., Jung, M. & Schacht, S. The V_{cb} puzzle: An update. *Phys. Lett. B* **795**, 386–390, DOI: [10.1016/j.physletb.2019.06.039](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2019.06.039) (2019). [1905.08209](https://arxiv.org/abs/1905.08209).
152. Crivellin, A. & Pokorski, S. Can the differences in the determinations of V_{ub} and V_{cb} be explained by New Physics? *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **114**, 011802, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.114.011802](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.114.011802) (2015). [1407.1320](https://arxiv.org/abs/1407.1320).
153. Charles, J. *et al.* CP violation and the CKM matrix: Assessing the impact of the asymmetric B factories. *Eur. Phys. J. C* **41**, 1–131, DOI: [10.1140/epjc/s2005-02169-1](https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s2005-02169-1) (2005). [hep-ph/0406184](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0406184).

154. Bona, M. *et al.* The 2004 UTfit collaboration report on the status of the unitarity triangle in the standard model. *JHEP* **07**, 028, DOI: [10.1088/1126-6708/2005/07/028](https://doi.org/10.1088/1126-6708/2005/07/028) (2005). [hep-ph/0501199](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0501199).
155. Lees, J. P. *et al.* Evidence for an excess of $\bar{B} \rightarrow D^{(*)} \tau^- \bar{\nu}_\tau$ decays. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 101802, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.109.101802](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.109.101802) (2012). [1205.5442](https://arxiv.org/abs/1205.5442).
156. Lees, J. P. *et al.* Measurement of an Excess of $\bar{B} \rightarrow D^{(*)} \tau^- \bar{\nu}_\tau$ Decays and Implications for Charged Higgs Bosons. *Phys. Rev. D* **88**, 072012, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.88.072012](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.88.072012) (2013). [1303.0571](https://arxiv.org/abs/1303.0571).
157. Huschle, M. *et al.* Measurement of the branching ratio of $\bar{B} \rightarrow D^{(*)} \tau^- \bar{\nu}_\tau$ relative to $\bar{B} \rightarrow D^{(*)} \ell^- \bar{\nu}_\ell$ decays with hadronic tagging at Belle. *Phys. Rev. D* **92**, 072014, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.92.072014](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.92.072014) (2015). [1507.03233](https://arxiv.org/abs/1507.03233).
158. Sato, Y. *et al.* Measurement of the branching ratio of $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+} \tau^- \bar{\nu}_\tau$ relative to $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+} \ell^- \bar{\nu}_\ell$ decays with a semileptonic tagging method. *Phys. Rev. D* **94**, 072007, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.94.072007](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.94.072007) (2016). [1607.07923](https://arxiv.org/abs/1607.07923).
159. Hirose, S. *et al.* Measurement of the τ lepton polarization and $R(D^*)$ in the decay $\bar{B} \rightarrow D^* \tau^- \bar{\nu}_\tau$. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **118**, 211801, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.118.211801](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.118.211801) (2017). [1612.00529](https://arxiv.org/abs/1612.00529).
160. Hirose, S. *et al.* Measurement of the τ lepton polarization and $R(D^*)$ in the decay $\bar{B} \rightarrow D^* \tau^- \bar{\nu}_\tau$ with one-prong hadronic τ decays at Belle. *Phys. Rev. D* **97**, 012004, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.97.012004](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.97.012004) (2018). [1709.00129](https://arxiv.org/abs/1709.00129).
161. Caria, G. *et al.* Measurement of $\mathcal{R}(D)$ and $\mathcal{R}(D^*)$ with a semileptonic tagging method. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **124**, 161803, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.124.161803](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.124.161803) (2020). [1910.05864](https://arxiv.org/abs/1910.05864).
162. Aaij, R. *et al.* Measurement of the ratio of branching fractions $\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+} \tau^- \bar{\nu}_\tau) / \mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+} \mu^- \bar{\nu}_\mu)$. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115**, 111803, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.115.111803](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.115.111803) (2015). [Erratum: *Phys.Rev.Lett.* 115, 159901 (2015)], [1506.08614](https://arxiv.org/abs/1506.08614).
163. Aaij, R. *et al.* Measurement of the ratio of the $B^0 \rightarrow D^{*-} \tau^+ \nu_\tau$ and $B^0 \rightarrow D^{*-} \mu^+ \nu_\mu$ branching fractions using three-prong τ -lepton decays. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **120**, 171802, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.120.171802](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.120.171802) (2018). [1708.08856](https://arxiv.org/abs/1708.08856).
164. Aaij, R. *et al.* Test of Lepton Flavor Universality by the measurement of the $B^0 \rightarrow D^{*-} \tau^+ \nu_\tau$ branching fraction using three-prong τ decays. *Phys. Rev. D* **97**, 072013, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.97.072013](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.97.072013) (2018). [1711.02505](https://arxiv.org/abs/1711.02505).
165. Crivellin, A., Greub, C. & Kokulu, A. Explaining $B \rightarrow D \tau \nu$, $B \rightarrow D^* \tau \nu$ and $B \rightarrow \tau \nu$ in a 2HDM of type III. *Phys. Rev. D* **86**, 054014, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.86.054014](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.86.054014) (2012). [1206.2634](https://arxiv.org/abs/1206.2634).
166. Fajfer, S., Kamenik, J. F., Nisandzic, I. & Zupan, J. Implications of Lepton Flavor Universality Violations in B Decays. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 161801, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.109.161801](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.109.161801) (2012). [1206.1872](https://arxiv.org/abs/1206.1872).
167. Celis, A., Jung, M., Li, X.-Q. & Pich, A. Sensitivity to charged scalars in $B \rightarrow D^{(*)} \tau \nu_\tau$ and $B \rightarrow \tau \nu_\tau$ decays. *JHEP* **01**, 054, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP01\(2013\)054](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP01(2013)054) (2013). [1210.8443](https://arxiv.org/abs/1210.8443).
168. Bhattacharya, B., Datta, A., London, D. & Shivashankara, S. Simultaneous Explanation of the R_K and $R(D^{(*)})$ Puzzles. *Phys. Lett. B* **742**, 370–374, DOI: [10.1016/j.physletb.2015.02.011](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2015.02.011) (2015). [1412.7164](https://arxiv.org/abs/1412.7164).
169. Sakaki, Y., Tanaka, M., Tayduganov, A. & Watanabe, R. Testing leptoquark models in $\bar{B} \rightarrow D^{(*)} \tau \bar{\nu}$. *Phys. Rev. D* **88**, 094012, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.88.094012](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.88.094012) (2013). [1309.0301](https://arxiv.org/abs/1309.0301).
170. Freytsis, M., Ligeti, Z. & Ruderman, J. T. Flavor models for $\bar{B} \rightarrow D^{(*)} \tau \bar{\nu}$. *Phys. Rev. D* **92**, 054018, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.92.054018](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.92.054018) (2015). [1506.08896](https://arxiv.org/abs/1506.08896).
171. Fajfer, S. & Košnik, N. Vector leptoquark resolution of R_K and $R_{D^{(*)}}$ puzzles. *Phys. Lett. B* **755**, 270–274, DOI: [10.1016/j.physletb.2016.02.018](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2016.02.018) (2016). [1511.06024](https://arxiv.org/abs/1511.06024).
172. Iguro, S. Revival of H^- interpretation of $R(D^{(*)})$ anomaly and closing low mass window. *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, 095011, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.105.095011](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.105.095011) (2022). [2201.06565](https://arxiv.org/abs/2201.06565).
173. Blanke, M., Iguro, S. & Zhang, H. Towards ruling out the charged Higgs interpretation of the $R_{D^{(*)}}$ anomaly. *JHEP* **06**, 043, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP06\(2022\)043](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP06(2022)043) (2022). [2202.10468](https://arxiv.org/abs/2202.10468).
174. Greljo, A., Isidori, G. & Marzocca, D. On the breaking of Lepton Flavor Universality in B decays. *JHEP* **07**, 142, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP07\(2015\)142](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP07(2015)142) (2015). [1506.01705](https://arxiv.org/abs/1506.01705).
175. Calibbi, L., Crivellin, A. & Ota, T. Effective Field Theory Approach to $b \rightarrow s \ell \ell^{(\prime)}$, $B \rightarrow K^{(*)} \nu \bar{\nu}$ and $B \rightarrow D^{(*)} \tau \nu$ with Third Generation Couplings. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115**, 181801, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.115.181801](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.115.181801) (2015). [1506.02661](https://arxiv.org/abs/1506.02661).
176. Barbieri, R., Murphy, C. W. & Senia, F. B -decay Anomalies in a Composite Leptoquark Model. *Eur. Phys. J. C* **77**, 8, DOI: [10.1140/epjc/s10052-016-4578-7](https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-016-4578-7) (2017). [1611.04930](https://arxiv.org/abs/1611.04930).
177. Di Luzio, L., Greljo, A. & Nardecchia, M. Gauge leptoquark as the origin of B -physics anomalies. *Phys. Rev. D* **96**, 115011, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.96.115011](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.96.115011) (2017). [1708.08450](https://arxiv.org/abs/1708.08450).

178. Calibbi, L., Crivellin, A. & Li, T. Model of vector leptoquarks in view of the B -physics anomalies. *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, 115002, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.98.115002](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.98.115002) (2018). [1709.00692](https://arxiv.org/abs/1709.00692).
179. Bordone, M., Cornella, C., Fuentes-Martin, J. & Isidori, G. A three-site gauge model for flavor hierarchies and flavor anomalies. *Phys. Lett. B* **779**, 317–323, DOI: [10.1016/j.physletb.2018.02.011](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2018.02.011) (2018). [1712.01368](https://arxiv.org/abs/1712.01368).
180. Blanke, M. & Crivellin, A. B Meson Anomalies in a Pati-Salam Model within the Randall-Sundrum Background. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **121**, 011801, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.121.011801](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.121.011801) (2018). [1801.07256](https://arxiv.org/abs/1801.07256).
181. King, S. F. Twin Pati-Salam theory of flavour with a TeV scale vector leptoquark. *JHEP* **11**, 161, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP11\(2021\)161](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP11(2021)161) (2021). [2106.03876](https://arxiv.org/abs/2106.03876).
182. Crivellin, A., Muller, D. & Ota, T. Simultaneous explanation of $R(D)$ and $b \rightarrow s\mu^+\mu^-$: the last scalar leptoquarks standing. *JHEP* **09**, 040, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP09\(2017\)040](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP09(2017)040) (2017). [1703.09226](https://arxiv.org/abs/1703.09226).
183. Crivellin, A., Müller, D. & Saturnino, F. Flavor Phenomenology of the Leptoquark Singlet-Triplet Model. *JHEP* **06**, 020, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP06\(2020\)020](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP06(2020)020) (2020). [1912.04224](https://arxiv.org/abs/1912.04224).
184. Gherardi, V., Marzocca, D. & Venturini, E. Low-energy phenomenology of scalar leptoquarks at one-loop accuracy. *JHEP* **01**, 138, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP01\(2021\)138](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP01(2021)138) (2021). [2008.09548](https://arxiv.org/abs/2008.09548).
185. Bainbridge, R. Recording and reconstructing 10 billion unbiased b hadron decays in CMS. *EPJ Web Conf.* **245**, 01025, DOI: [10.1051/epjconf/202024501025](https://doi.org/10.1051/epjconf/202024501025) (2020).
186. Aaij, R. *et al.* Tests of lepton universality using $B^0 \rightarrow K_s^0 \ell^+ \ell^-$ and $B^+ \rightarrow K^{*+} \ell^+ \ell^-$ decays. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **128**, 191802, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.128.191802](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.128.191802) (2022). [2110.09501](https://arxiv.org/abs/2110.09501).
187. Aaij, R. *et al.* Test of lepton universality in $b \rightarrow s \ell^+ \ell^-$ decays. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **131**, 051803, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.131.051803](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.131.051803) (2023). [2212.09152](https://arxiv.org/abs/2212.09152).
188. Combination of the ATLAS, CMS and LHCb results on the $B_{(s)}^0 \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ decays (2020).
189. Tumasyan, A. *et al.* Measurement of the $B_s^0 \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ decay properties and search for the $B^0 \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ decay in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV. *Phys. Lett. B* **842**, 137955, DOI: [10.1016/j.physletb.2023.137955](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2023.137955) (2023). [2212.10311](https://arxiv.org/abs/2212.10311).
190. Hermann, T., Misiak, M. & Steinhauser, M. Three-loop QCD corrections to $B_s \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$. *JHEP* **12**, 097, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP12\(2013\)097](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP12(2013)097) (2013). [1311.1347](https://arxiv.org/abs/1311.1347).
191. Beneke, M., Bobeth, C. & Szafron, R. Enhanced electromagnetic correction to the rare B -meson decay $B_{s,d} \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **120**, 011801, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.120.011801](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.120.011801) (2018). [1708.09152](https://arxiv.org/abs/1708.09152).
192. Descotes-Genon, S., Matias, J., Ramon, M. & Virto, J. Implications from clean observables for the binned analysis of $B \rightarrow K^* \mu^+ \mu^-$ at large recoil. *JHEP* **01**, 048, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP01\(2013\)048](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP01(2013)048) (2013). [1207.2753](https://arxiv.org/abs/1207.2753).
193. Aaij, R. *et al.* Measurement of CP -Averaged Observables in the $B^0 \rightarrow K^{*0} \mu^+ \mu^-$ Decay. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **125**, 011802, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.125.011802](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.125.011802) (2020). [2003.04831](https://arxiv.org/abs/2003.04831).
194. Aaij, R. *et al.* Differential branching fractions and isospin asymmetries of $B \rightarrow K^{(*)} \mu^+ \mu^-$ decays. *JHEP* **06**, 133, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP06\(2014\)133](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP06(2014)133) (2014). [1403.8044](https://arxiv.org/abs/1403.8044).
195. Parrott, W. G., Bouchard, C. & Davies, C. T. H. Standard Model predictions for $B \rightarrow K \ell^+ \ell^-$, $B \rightarrow K \ell_1^- \ell_2^+$ and $B \rightarrow K \nu \nu$ using form factors from $N_f=2+1+1$ lattice QCD. *Phys. Rev. D* **107**, 014511, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.107.014511](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.107.014511) (2023). [Erratum: *Phys.Rev.D* 107, 119903 (2023)], [2207.13371](https://arxiv.org/abs/2207.13371).
196. Aaij, R. *et al.* Branching Fraction Measurements of the Rare $B_s^0 \rightarrow \phi \mu^+ \mu^-$ and $B_s^0 \rightarrow f_2'(1525) \mu^+ \mu^-$ Decays. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127**, 151801, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.127.151801](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.127.151801) (2021). [2105.14007](https://arxiv.org/abs/2105.14007).
197. Gubernari, N., Reboud, M., van Dyk, D. & Virto, J. Improved theory predictions and global analysis of exclusive $b \rightarrow s \mu^+ \mu^-$ processes. *JHEP* **09**, 133, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP09\(2022\)133](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP09(2022)133) (2022). [2206.03797](https://arxiv.org/abs/2206.03797).
198. Isidori, G., Polonsky, Z. & Tinari, A. Semi-inclusive $b \rightarrow s \ell^- \ell$ transitions at high q^2 . *Phys. Rev. D* **108**, 093008, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.108.093008](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.108.093008) (2023). [2305.03076](https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.03076).
199. Buras, A. J. Standard Model predictions for rare K and B decays without new physics infection. *Eur. Phys. J. C* **83**, 66, DOI: [10.1140/epjc/s10052-023-11222-6](https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-023-11222-6) (2023). [2209.03968](https://arxiv.org/abs/2209.03968).
200. Ciuchini, M. *et al.* Constraints on lepton universality violation from rare B decays. *Phys. Rev. D* **107**, 055036, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.107.055036](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.107.055036) (2023). [2212.10516](https://arxiv.org/abs/2212.10516).
201. Algueró, M. *et al.* To (b)e or not to (b)e: no electrons at LHCb. *Eur. Phys. J. C* **83**, 648, DOI: [10.1140/epjc/s10052-023-11824-0](https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-023-11824-0) (2023). [2304.07330](https://arxiv.org/abs/2304.07330).

202. Recent semileptonic results from Belle II. <https://indico.cern.ch/event/1204084/contributions/5298272/> (2023).
203. Algueró, M., Matias, J., Capdevila, B. & Crivellin, A. Disentangling lepton flavor universal and lepton flavor universality violating effects in $b \rightarrow s\ell^+\ell^-$ transitions. *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, 113007, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.105.113007](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.105.113007) (2022). [2205.15212](https://arxiv.org/abs/2205.15212).
204. Buras, A. J. & Girschbach, J. Left-handed Z' and Z FCNC quark couplings facing new $b \rightarrow s\mu^+\mu^-$ data. *JHEP* **12**, 009, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP12\(2013\)009](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP12(2013)009) (2013). [1309.2466](https://arxiv.org/abs/1309.2466).
205. Gauld, R., Goertz, F. & Haisch, U. On minimal Z' explanations of the $B \rightarrow K^*\mu^+\mu^-$ anomaly. *Phys. Rev. D* **89**, 015005, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.89.015005](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.89.015005) (2014). [1308.1959](https://arxiv.org/abs/1308.1959).
206. Di Luzio, L., Kirk, M. & Lenz, A. Updated B_s -mixing constraints on new physics models for $b \rightarrow s\ell^+\ell^-$ anomalies. *Phys. Rev. D* **97**, 095035, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.97.095035](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.97.095035) (2018). [1712.06572](https://arxiv.org/abs/1712.06572).
207. Allanach, B., Queiroz, F. S., Strumia, A. & Sun, S. Z' models for the LHCb and $g-2$ muon anomalies. *Phys. Rev. D* **93**, 055045, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.93.055045](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.93.055045) (2016). [Erratum: *Phys.Rev.D* 95, 119902 (2017)], [1511.07447](https://arxiv.org/abs/1511.07447).
208. Electroweak, t. S. A Combination of preliminary electroweak measurements and constraints on the standard model (2003). [hep-ex/0312023](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ex/0312023).
209. Crivellin, A. *et al.* Lepton-flavour violating B decays in generic Z' models. *Phys. Rev. D* **92**, 054013, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.92.054013](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.92.054013) (2015). [1504.07928](https://arxiv.org/abs/1504.07928).
210. Crivellin, A., D'Ambrosio, G. & Heeck, J. Addressing the LHC flavor anomalies with horizontal gauge symmetries. *Phys. Rev. D* **91**, 075006, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.91.075006](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.91.075006) (2015). [1503.03477](https://arxiv.org/abs/1503.03477).
211. Bobeth, C., Haisch, U., Lenz, A., Pecjak, B. & Tetlalmatzi-Xolocotzi, G. On new physics in $\Delta\Gamma_d$. *JHEP* **06**, 040, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP06\(2014\)040](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP06(2014)040) (2014). [1404.2531](https://arxiv.org/abs/1404.2531).
212. Crivellin, A., Fuks, B. & Schnell, L. Explaining the hints for lepton flavour universality violation with three S_2 leptoquark generations. *JHEP* **06**, 169, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP06\(2022\)169](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP06(2022)169) (2022). [2203.10111](https://arxiv.org/abs/2203.10111).
213. Crivellin, A., Greub, C., Müller, D. & Saturnino, F. Importance of Loop Effects in Explaining the Accumulated Evidence for New Physics in B Decays with a Vector Leptoquark. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 011805, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.122.011805](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.122.011805) (2019). [1807.02068](https://arxiv.org/abs/1807.02068).
214. Crivellin, A., Kokulu, A. & Greub, C. Flavor-phenomenology of two-Higgs-doublet models with generic Yukawa structure. *Phys. Rev. D* **87**, 094031, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.87.094031](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.87.094031) (2013). [1303.5877](https://arxiv.org/abs/1303.5877).
215. Crivellin, A., Müller, D. & Wiegand, C. $b \rightarrow s\ell^+\ell^-$ transitions in two-Higgs-doublet models. *JHEP* **06**, 119, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP06\(2019\)119](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP06(2019)119) (2019). [1903.10440](https://arxiv.org/abs/1903.10440).
216. Iguro, S. Conclusive probe of the charged Higgs solution of P'_5 and $R(D^{(*)})$ discrepancies. *Phys. Rev. D* **107**, 095004, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.107.095004](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.107.095004) (2023). [2302.08935](https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.08935).
217. Crivellin, A. & Kirk, M. Diquark explanation of $b \rightarrow s\ell^+\ell^-$. *Phys. Rev. D* **108**, L111701, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.108.L111701](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.108.L111701) (2023). [2309.07205](https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.07205).
218. Gubernari, N., Reboud, M., van Dyk, D. & Virto, J. Dispersive analysis of $B \rightarrow K^{(*)}$ and $B_s \rightarrow \phi$ form factors. *JHEP* **12**, 153, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP12\(2023\)153](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP12(2023)153) (2023). [2305.06301](https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.06301).
219. Aaltonen, T. *et al.* High-precision measurement of the W boson mass with the CDF II detector. *Science* **376**, 170–176, DOI: [10.1126/science.abk1781](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abk1781) (2022).
220. Aaboud, M. *et al.* Measurement of the W -boson mass in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV with the ATLAS detector. *Eur. Phys. J. C* **78**, 110, DOI: [10.1140/epjc/s10052-017-5475-4](https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-017-5475-4) (2018). [Erratum: *Eur.Phys.J.C* 78, 898 (2018)], [1701.07240](https://arxiv.org/abs/1701.07240).
221. Chatrchyan, S. *et al.* Measurement of the weak mixing angle with the Drell-Yan process in proton-proton collisions at the LHC. *Phys. Rev. D* **84**, 112002, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.84.112002](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.84.112002) (2011). [1110.2682](https://arxiv.org/abs/1110.2682).
222. Aaij, R. *et al.* Measurement of the forward-backward asymmetry in $Z/\gamma^* \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$ decays and determination of the effective weak mixing angle. *JHEP* **11**, 190, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP11\(2015\)190](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP11(2015)190) (2015). [1509.07645](https://arxiv.org/abs/1509.07645).
223. Aaij, R. *et al.* Measurement of the W boson mass. *JHEP* **01**, 036, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP01\(2022\)036](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP01(2022)036) (2022). [2109.01113](https://arxiv.org/abs/2109.01113).
224. Schael, S. *et al.* Electroweak Measurements in Electron-Positron Collisions at W -Boson-Pair Energies at LEP. *Phys. Rept.* **532**, 119–244, DOI: [10.1016/j.physrep.2013.07.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physrep.2013.07.004) (2013). [1302.3415](https://arxiv.org/abs/1302.3415).
225. de Blas, J., Pierini, M., Reina, L. & Silvestrini, L. Impact of the Recent Measurements of the Top-Quark and W -Boson Masses on Electroweak Precision Fits. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **129**, 271801, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.129.271801](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.129.271801) (2022). [2204.04204](https://arxiv.org/abs/2204.04204).

226. Improved W boson Mass Measurement using 7 TeV Proton-Proton Collisions with the ATLAS Detector (2023).
227. Schael, S. *et al.* Precision electroweak measurements on the Z resonance. *Phys. Rept.* **427**, 257–454, DOI: [10.1016/j.physrep.2005.12.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physrep.2005.12.006) (2006). [hep-ex/0509008](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ex/0509008).
228. Konetschny, W. & Kummer, W. Nonconservation of Total Lepton Number with Scalar Bosons. *Phys. Lett. B* **70**, 433–435, DOI: [10.1016/0370-2693\(77\)90407-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0370-2693(77)90407-5) (1977).
229. Algueró, M., Matias, J., Crivellin, A. & Manzari, C. A. Unified explanation of the anomalies in semileptonic B decays and the W mass. *Phys. Rev. D* **106**, 033005, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.106.033005](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.106.033005) (2022). [2201.08170](https://arxiv.org/abs/2201.08170).
230. Strumia, A. Interpreting electroweak precision data including the W -mass CDF anomaly. *JHEP* **08**, 248, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP08\(2022\)248](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP08(2022)248) (2022). [2204.04191](https://arxiv.org/abs/2204.04191).
231. Crivellin, A., Kirk, M., Kitahara, T. & Mescia, F. Large $t \rightarrow cZ$ as a sign of vectorlike quarks in light of the W mass. *Phys. Rev. D* **106**, L031704, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.106.L031704](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.106.L031704) (2022). [2204.05962](https://arxiv.org/abs/2204.05962).
232. Crivellin, A., Müller, D. & Saturnino, F. Leptoquarks in oblique corrections and Higgs signal strength: status and prospects. *JHEP* **11**, 094, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP11\(2020\)094](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP11(2020)094) (2020). [2006.10758](https://arxiv.org/abs/2006.10758).
233. The International Linear Collider Technical Design Report - Volume 2: Physics (2013). [1306.6352](https://arxiv.org/abs/1306.6352).
234. Physics and Detectors at CLIC: CLIC Conceptual Design Report, DOI: [10.5170/CERN-2012-003](https://doi.org/10.5170/CERN-2012-003) (2012). [1202.5940](https://arxiv.org/abs/1202.5940).
235. Charles, T. K. *et al.* The Compact Linear Collider (CLIC) - 2018 Summary Report, DOI: [10.23731/CYRM-2018-002](https://doi.org/10.23731/CYRM-2018-002) (2018). [1812.06018](https://arxiv.org/abs/1812.06018).
236. Abada, A. *et al.* FCC-ee: The Lepton Collider: Future Circular Collider Conceptual Design Report Volume 2. *Eur. Phys. J. ST* **228**, 261–623, DOI: [10.1140/epjst/e2019-900045-4](https://doi.org/10.1140/epjst/e2019-900045-4) (2019).
237. Abada, A. *et al.* FCC Physics Opportunities: Future Circular Collider Conceptual Design Report Volume 1. *Eur. Phys. J. C* **79**, 474, DOI: [10.1140/epjc/s10052-019-6904-3](https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-019-6904-3) (2019).
238. Dong, M. *et al.* CEPC Conceptual Design Report: Volume 2 - Physics & Detector (2018). [1811.10545](https://arxiv.org/abs/1811.10545).
239. An, F. *et al.* Precision Higgs physics at the CEPC. *Chin. Phys. C* **43**, 043002, DOI: [10.1088/1674-1137/43/4/043002](https://doi.org/10.1088/1674-1137/43/4/043002) (2019). [1810.09037](https://arxiv.org/abs/1810.09037).
240. Fischer, O. *et al.* Unveiling hidden physics at the LHC. *Eur. Phys. J. C* **82**, 665, DOI: [10.1140/epjc/s10052-022-10541-4](https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-022-10541-4) (2022). [2109.06065](https://arxiv.org/abs/2109.06065).
241. von Buddenbrock, S. *et al.* Phenomenological signatures of additional scalar bosons at the LHC. *Eur. Phys. J. C* **76**, 580, DOI: [10.1140/epjc/s10052-016-4435-8](https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-016-4435-8) (2016). [1606.01674](https://arxiv.org/abs/1606.01674).
242. von Buddenbrock, S. *et al.* Multi-lepton signatures of additional scalar bosons beyond the Standard Model at the LHC. *J. Phys. G* **45**, 115003, DOI: [10.1088/1361-6471/aae3d6](https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6471/aae3d6) (2018). [1711.07874](https://arxiv.org/abs/1711.07874).
243. Buddenbrock, S. *et al.* The emergence of multi-lepton anomalies at the LHC and their compatibility with new physics at the EW scale. *JHEP* **10**, 157, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP10\(2019\)157](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP10(2019)157) (2019). [1901.05300](https://arxiv.org/abs/1901.05300).
244. Hernandez, Y. *et al.* The anomalous production of multi-lepton and its impact on the measurement of Wh production at the LHC. *Eur. Phys. J. C* **81**, 365, DOI: [10.1140/epjc/s10052-021-09137-1](https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-021-09137-1) (2021). [1912.00699](https://arxiv.org/abs/1912.00699).
245. von Buddenbrock, S., Ruiz, R. & Mellado, B. Anatomy of inclusive $t\bar{t}W$ production at hadron colliders. *Phys. Lett. B* **811**, 135964, DOI: [10.1016/j.physletb.2020.135964](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2020.135964) (2020). [2009.00032](https://arxiv.org/abs/2009.00032).
246. Banik, S., Coloretti, G., Crivellin, A. & Mellado, B. Uncovering New Higgses in the LHC Analyses of Differential $t\bar{t}$ Cross Sections (2023). [2308.07953](https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.07953).
247. Aad, G. *et al.* Inclusive and differential cross-sections for dilepton $t\bar{t}$ production measured in $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV pp collisions with the ATLAS detector. *JHEP* **07**, 141, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP07\(2023\)141](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP07(2023)141) (2023). [2303.15340](https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.15340).
248. Aaboud, M. *et al.* Measurement of fiducial and differential W^+W^- production cross-sections at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV with the ATLAS detector. *Eur. Phys. J. C* **79**, 884, DOI: [10.1140/epjc/s10052-019-7371-6](https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-019-7371-6) (2019). [1905.04242](https://arxiv.org/abs/1905.04242).
249. Aad, G. *et al.* Observation of four-top-quark production in the multilepton final state with the ATLAS detector. *Eur. Phys. J. C* **83**, 496, DOI: [10.1140/epjc/s10052-023-11573-0](https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-023-11573-0) (2023). [2303.15061](https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.15061).
250. Hayrapetyan, A. *et al.* Observation of four top quark production in proton-proton collisions at $s=13$ TeV. *Phys. Lett. B* **847**, 138290, DOI: [10.1016/j.physletb.2023.138290](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2023.138290) (2023). [2305.13439](https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.13439).
251. Measurement of Higgs boson production in association with a W or Z boson in the $H \rightarrow WW$ decay channel (2021).

252. Aad, G. *et al.* Observation of WWW Production in pp Collisions at $\sqrt{s}=13$ TeV with the ATLAS Detector. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **129**, 061803, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.129.061803](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.129.061803) (2022). [2201.13045](https://arxiv.org/abs/2201.13045).
253. Tumasyan, A. *et al.* Measurements of the Higgs boson production cross section and couplings in the W boson pair decay channel in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s}=13$ TeV. *Eur. Phys. J. C* **83**, 667, DOI: [10.1140/epjc/s10052-023-11632-6](https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-023-11632-6) (2023). [2206.09466](https://arxiv.org/abs/2206.09466).
254. Czakon, M., Mitov, A. & Poncelet, R. NNLO QCD corrections to leptonic observables in top-quark pair production and decay. *JHEP* **05**, 212, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP05\(2021\)212](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP05(2021)212) (2021). [2008.11133](https://arxiv.org/abs/2008.11133).
255. Gehrmann, T. *et al.* W^+W^- Production at Hadron Colliders in Next to Next to Leading Order QCD. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 212001, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.113.212001](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.113.212001) (2014). [1408.5243](https://arxiv.org/abs/1408.5243).
256. Grazzini, M., Kallweit, S., Pozzorini, S., Rathlev, D. & Wiesemann, M. W^+W^- production at the LHC: fiducial cross sections and distributions in NNLO QCD. *JHEP* **08**, 140, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP08\(2016\)140](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP08(2016)140) (2016). [1605.02716](https://arxiv.org/abs/1605.02716).
257. Hamilton, K., Melia, T., Monni, P. F., Re, E. & Zanderighi, G. Merging WW and WW +jet with MINLO. *JHEP* **09**, 057, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP09\(2016\)057](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP09(2016)057) (2016). [1606.07062](https://arxiv.org/abs/1606.07062).
258. Re, E., Wiesemann, M. & Zanderighi, G. NNLOPS accurate predictions for W^+W^- production. *JHEP* **12**, 121, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP12\(2018\)121](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP12(2018)121) (2018). [1805.09857](https://arxiv.org/abs/1805.09857).
259. Caola, F., Melnikov, K., Röntsch, R. & Tancredi, L. QCD corrections to W^+W^- production through gluon fusion. *Phys. Lett. B* **754**, 275–280, DOI: [10.1016/j.physletb.2016.01.046](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2016.01.046) (2016). [1511.08617](https://arxiv.org/abs/1511.08617).
260. Grazzini, M., Kallweit, S., Rathlev, D. & Wiesemann, M. $W^\pm Z$ production at the LHC: fiducial cross sections and distributions in NNLO QCD. *JHEP* **05**, 139, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP05\(2017\)139](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP05(2017)139) (2017). [1703.09065](https://arxiv.org/abs/1703.09065).
261. Brein, O., Djouadi, A. & Harlander, R. NNLO QCD corrections to the Higgs-strahlung processes at hadron colliders. *Phys. Lett. B* **579**, 149–156, DOI: [10.1016/j.physletb.2003.10.112](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2003.10.112) (2004). [hep-ph/0307206](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0307206).
262. Ferrera, G., Grazzini, M. & Tramontano, F. Associated WH production at hadron colliders: a fully exclusive QCD calculation at NNLO. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107**, 152003, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.107.152003](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.107.152003) (2011). [1107.1164](https://arxiv.org/abs/1107.1164).
263. Campbell, J. M., Ellis, R. K. & Williams, C. Associated production of a Higgs boson at NNLO. *JHEP* **06**, 179, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP06\(2016\)179](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP06(2016)179) (2016). [1601.00658](https://arxiv.org/abs/1601.00658).
264. Buonocore, L. *et al.* Precise Predictions for the Associated Production of a W Boson with a Top-Antitop Quark Pair at the LHC. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **131**, 231901, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.131.231901](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.131.231901) (2023). [2306.16311](https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.16311).
265. Ciccolini, M. L., Dittmaier, S. & Kramer, M. Electroweak radiative corrections to associated WH and ZH production at hadron colliders. *Phys. Rev. D* **68**, 073003, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.68.073003](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.68.073003) (2003). [hep-ph/0306234](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0306234).
266. Denner, A., Dittmaier, S., Kallweit, S. & Muck, A. Electroweak corrections to Higgs-strahlung off W/Z bosons at the Tevatron and the LHC with HAWK. *JHEP* **03**, 075, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP03\(2012\)075](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP03(2012)075) (2012). [1112.5142](https://arxiv.org/abs/1112.5142).
267. Denner, A. & Pellen, M. NLO electroweak corrections to off-shell top-antitop production with leptonic decays at the LHC. *JHEP* **08**, 155, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP08\(2016\)155](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP08(2016)155) (2016). [1607.05571](https://arxiv.org/abs/1607.05571).
268. Biedermann, B. *et al.* Next-to-leading-order electroweak corrections to $pp \rightarrow W^+W^- \rightarrow 4$ leptons at the LHC. *JHEP* **06**, 065, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP06\(2016\)065](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP06(2016)065) (2016). [1605.03419](https://arxiv.org/abs/1605.03419).
269. Dittmaier, S., Knippen, G. & Schwan, C. Next-to-leading-order QCD and electroweak corrections to triple- W production with leptonic decays at the LHC. *JHEP* **02**, 003, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP02\(2020\)003](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP02(2020)003) (2020). [1912.04117](https://arxiv.org/abs/1912.04117).
270. Sirunyan, A. M. *et al.* Search for heavy Higgs bosons decaying to a top quark pair in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s}=13$ TeV. *JHEP* **04**, 171, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP04\(2020\)171](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP04(2020)171) (2020). [Erratum: *JHEP* **03**, 187 (2022)], [1908.01115](https://arxiv.org/abs/1908.01115).
271. Coloretti, G., Crivellin, A., Bhattacharya, S. & Mellado, B. Searching for low-mass resonances decaying into W bosons. *Phys. Rev. D* **108**, 035026, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.108.035026](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.108.035026) (2023). [2302.07276](https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.07276).
272. Ježo, T., Lindert, J. M. & Pozzorini, S. Resonance-aware NLOPS matching for off-shell $t\bar{t} + tW$ production with semileptonic decays. *JHEP* **10**, 008, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP10\(2023\)008](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP10(2023)008) (2023). [2307.15653](https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.15653).
273. Search for a standard model-like Higgs boson in the mass range between 70 and 110 GeV in the diphoton final state in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s}=13$ TeV (2023).
274. Search for diphoton resonances in the 66 to 110 GeV mass range using 140 fb^{-1} of 13 TeV pp collisions collected with the ATLAS detector (2023).

275. Aad, G. *et al.* Search for dark matter in events with missing transverse momentum and a Higgs boson decaying into two photons in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV with the ATLAS detector. *JHEP* **10**, 013, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP10\(2021\)013](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP10(2021)013) (2021). [2104.13240](https://arxiv.org/abs/2104.13240).
276. Sirunyan, A. M. *et al.* Measurements of properties of the Higgs boson decaying into the four-lepton final state in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV. *JHEP* **11**, 047, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP11\(2017\)047](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP11(2017)047) (2017). [1706.09936](https://arxiv.org/abs/1706.09936).
277. Aad, G. *et al.* Search for resonances decaying into photon pairs in 139 fb^{-1} of pp collisions at $\sqrt{s}=13$ TeV with the ATLAS detector. *Phys. Lett. B* **822**, 136651, DOI: [10.1016/j.physletb.2021.136651](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2021.136651) (2021). [2102.13405](https://arxiv.org/abs/2102.13405).
278. Tumasyan, A. *et al.* Searches for additional Higgs bosons and for vector leptoquarks in $\tau\tau$ final states in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV. *JHEP* **07**, 073, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP07\(2023\)073](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP07(2023)073) (2023). [2208.02717](https://arxiv.org/abs/2208.02717).
279. Aad, G. *et al.* Measurements of Higgs boson production cross-sections in the $H \rightarrow \tau^+ \tau^-$ decay channel in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV with the ATLAS detector. *JHEP* **08**, 175, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP08\(2022\)175](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP08(2022)175) (2022). [2201.08269](https://arxiv.org/abs/2201.08269).
280. Barate, R. *et al.* Search for the standard model Higgs boson at LEP. *Phys. Lett. B* **565**, 61–75, DOI: [10.1016/S0370-2693\(03\)00614-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0370-2693(03)00614-2) (2003). [hep-ex/0306033](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ex/0306033).
281. Aad, G. *et al.* Model-independent search for the presence of new physics in events including $H \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ with $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV pp data recorded by the ATLAS detector at the LHC. *JHEP* **07**, 176, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP07\(2023\)176](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP07(2023)176) (2023). [2301.10486](https://arxiv.org/abs/2301.10486).
282. Bhattacharya, S. *et al.* Growing Excesses of New Scalars at the Electroweak Scale (2023). [2306.17209](https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.17209).
283. Crivellin, A. *et al.* Accumulating evidence for the associated production of a new Higgs boson at the LHC. *Phys. Rev. D* **108**, 115031, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.108.115031](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.108.115031) (2023). [2109.02650](https://arxiv.org/abs/2109.02650).
284. Aad, G. *et al.* Search for heavy resonances decaying into a pair of Z bosons in the $\ell^+ \ell^- \ell'^+ \ell'^-$ and $\ell^+ \ell^- \nu\bar{\nu}$ final states using 139 fb^{-1} of proton–proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV with the ATLAS detector. *Eur. Phys. J. C* **81**, 332, DOI: [10.1140/epjc/s10052-021-09013-y](https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-021-09013-y) (2021). [2009.14791](https://arxiv.org/abs/2009.14791).
285. Consoli, M., Cosmai, L. & Fabbri, F. Second resonance of the Higgs field: more signals from the LHC experiments (2022). [2208.00920](https://arxiv.org/abs/2208.00920).
286. Search for a new resonance decaying to two scalars in the final state with two bottom quarks and two photons in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV (2022).
287. Search for high mass resonances decaying into W^+W^- in the dileptonic final state with 138 fb^{-1} of proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV (2022).
288. Tumasyan, A. *et al.* Search for a heavy Higgs boson decaying into two lighter Higgs bosons in the $\tau\tau bb$ final state at 13 TeV. *JHEP* **11**, 057, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP11\(2021\)057](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP11(2021)057) (2021). [2106.10361](https://arxiv.org/abs/2106.10361).
289. Le Yaouanc, A. & Richard, F. As a consequence of $H(650) \rightarrow W^+W^-/ZZ$, one predicts $H^{++} \rightarrow W^+W^+$ and $H^+ \rightarrow ZW^+$, as indicated by LHC data. In *2nd ECFA Workshop on e+e- Higgs/EW/Top Factories* (2023). [2308.12180](https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.12180).
290. Haisch, U. & Malinauskas, A. Let there be light from a second light Higgs doublet. *JHEP* **03**, 135, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP03\(2018\)135](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP03(2018)135) (2018). [1712.06599](https://arxiv.org/abs/1712.06599).
291. Ashanujjaman, S. *et al.* SU(2)_L triplet scalar as the origin of the 95 GeV excess? *Phys. Rev. D* **108**, L091704, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.108.L091704](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.108.L091704) (2023). [2306.15722](https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.15722).
292. Biekotter, T., Heinemeyer, S. & Weiglein, G. Excesses in the low-mass Higgs-boson search and the W-boson mass measurement. *Eur. Phys. J. C* **83**, 450, DOI: [10.1140/epjc/s10052-023-11635-3](https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-023-11635-3) (2023). [2204.05975](https://arxiv.org/abs/2204.05975).
293. Banik, S., Crivellin, A., Iguro, S. & Kitahara, T. Asymmetric di-Higgs signals of the next-to-minimal 2HDM with a $U(1)$ symmetry. *Phys. Rev. D* **108**, 075011, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.108.075011](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.108.075011) (2023). [2303.11351](https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.11351).
294. Georgi, H. & Machacek, M. DOUBLY CHARGED HIGGS BOSONS. *Nucl. Phys. B* **262**, 463–477, DOI: [10.1016/0550-3213\(85\)90325-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0550-3213(85)90325-6) (1985).
295. Kundu, A., Le Yaouanc, A., Mondal, P. & Richard, F. Searches for scalars at LHC and interpretation of the findings. In *2022 ECFA Workshop on e+e- Higgs/EW/Top factories* (2022). [2211.11723](https://arxiv.org/abs/2211.11723).
296. Consoli, M. & Cosmai, L. A resonance of the Higgs field at 700 GeV and a new phenomenology (2020). [2007.10837](https://arxiv.org/abs/2007.10837).
297. Cid Vidal, X. *et al.* Report from Working Group 3: Beyond the Standard Model physics at the HL-LHC and HE-LHC. *CERN Yellow Rep. Monogr.* **7**, 585–865, DOI: [10.23731/CYRM-2019-007.585](https://doi.org/10.23731/CYRM-2019-007.585) (2019). [1812.07831](https://arxiv.org/abs/1812.07831).

298. Aaboud, M. *et al.* Search for low-mass dijet resonances using trigger-level jets with the ATLAS detector in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **121**, 081801, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.121.081801](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.121.081801) (2018). [1804.03496](https://arxiv.org/abs/1804.03496).
299. Tumasyan, A. *et al.* Search for resonant and nonresonant production of pairs of dijet resonances in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV. *JHEP* **07**, 161, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP07\(2023\)161](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP07(2023)161) (2023). [2206.09997](https://arxiv.org/abs/2206.09997).
300. Crivellin, A., Manzari, C. A., Mellado, B. & Dahbi, S.-E. Consistency and interpretation of the LHC dijet excesses. *Phys. Rev. D* **107**, 054045, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.107.054045](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.107.054045) (2023). [2208.12254](https://arxiv.org/abs/2208.12254).
301. Aad, G. *et al.* Pursuit of paired dijet resonances in the Run 2 dataset with ATLAS. *Phys. Rev. D* **108**, 112005, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.108.112005](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.108.112005) (2023). [2307.14944](https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.14944).
302. Aad, G. *et al.* Search for vector-boson resonances decaying into a top quark and a bottom quark using pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV with the ATLAS detector. *JHEP* **12**, 073, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP12\(2023\)073](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP12(2023)073) (2023). [2308.08521](https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.08521).
303. Sirunyan, A. M. *et al.* Search for resonant and nonresonant new phenomena in high-mass dilepton final states at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV. *JHEP* **07**, 208, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP07\(2021\)208](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP07(2021)208) (2021). [2103.02708](https://arxiv.org/abs/2103.02708).
304. Aad, G. *et al.* Search for new non-resonant phenomena in high-mass dilepton final states with the ATLAS detector. *JHEP* **11**, 005, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP11\(2020\)005](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP11(2020)005) (2020). [Erratum: *JHEP* 04, 142 (2021)], [2006.12946](https://arxiv.org/abs/2006.12946).
305. Greljo, A. & Marzocca, D. High- p_T dilepton tails and flavor physics. *Eur. Phys. J. C* **77**, 548, DOI: [10.1140/epjc/s10052-017-5119-8](https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-017-5119-8) (2017). [1704.09015](https://arxiv.org/abs/1704.09015).
306. Crivellin, A., Manzari, C. A. & Montull, M. Correlating nonresonant di-electron searches at the LHC to the Cabibbo-angle anomaly and lepton flavor universality violation. *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, 115016, DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.104.115016](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.104.115016) (2021). [2103.12003](https://arxiv.org/abs/2103.12003).
307. Crivellin, A., Hoferichter, M., Kirk, M., Manzari, C. A. & Schnell, L. First-generation new physics in simplified models: from low-energy parity violation to the LHC. *JHEP* **10**, 221, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP10\(2021\)221](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP10(2021)221) (2021). [2107.13569](https://arxiv.org/abs/2107.13569).
308. Fernández Navarro, M. & King, S. F. B-anomalies in a twin Pati-Salam theory of flavour including the 2022 LHCb $R_{K^{(*)}}$ analysis. *JHEP* **02**, 188, DOI: [10.1007/JHEP02\(2023\)188](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP02(2023)188) (2023). [2209.00276](https://arxiv.org/abs/2209.00276).
309. Aebischer, J., Isidori, G., Pesut, M., Stefanek, B. A. & Wilsch, F. Confronting the vector leptoquark hypothesis with new low- and high-energy data. *Eur. Phys. J. C* **83**, 153, DOI: [10.1140/epjc/s10052-023-11304-5](https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-023-11304-5) (2023). [2210.13422](https://arxiv.org/abs/2210.13422).

Acknowledgements

The work of A.C. is supported by a professorship grant from the Swiss National Science Foundation (No. PP00P2_211002). B.M. gratefully acknowledges the South African Department of Science and Innovation through the SA-CERN program, the National Research Foundation, and the Research Office of the University of the Witwatersrand for various forms of support. The authors want to thank William Murray for pointing to excess in the Zhh final state and Lindsay Donaldson for assistance with the prospects of investigating the $X17$ anomaly.

Author contributions

The main part of the writing was done by A.C. while B.M. contributed to the part concerning the definition of anomalies, multi-lepton anomalies, the $X17$ excess, the di-di-jet excesses and the Higgs-like signals.