

Direct bounds on Left-Right gauge boson masses at LHC Run 2

Sergio Ferrando Solera^a, Antonio Pich^a, and Luiz Vale Silva^a

^aDepartament de Física Teòrica, Instituto de Física Corpuscular,
Universitat de València – Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas,
Parc Científic, Catedrático José Beltrán 2, E-46980 Paterna, Valencia, Spain

Abstract. While the third run of the Large Hadron Collider (LHC) is ongoing, the underlying theory that extends the Standard Model remains so far unknown. Left-Right Models (LRMs) introduce a new gauge sector, and can restore parity symmetry at high enough energies. If LRMs are indeed realized in nature, the mediators of the new weak force can be searched for in colliders via their direct production. We recast existing experimental bounds from LHC Run 2 on the heavy LRM gauge boson masses. As a novelty, we discuss the effect of the LRM scalar content on the total width of the new gauge bosons, obtaining model-independent bounds within the specific realizations of the LRM scalar sectors analysed here. These bounds avoid the need to detail the spectrum of the scalar sector, and apply in the general case where no discrete symmetry is enforced. Moreover, we emphasize the effect of the structure of the quark right-handed mixing matrix on the charged LRM gauge boson production at LHC. We find that W_R and Z_R masses are constrained to lie above 2 TeV and 4 TeV, respectively.

1 Introduction

Having access to increasingly higher energies, physicists were able to observe the spectrum of fundamental particles portrayed by what became the Standard Model (SM). After more than a decade of operation of the LHC, no Beyond the Standard Model (BSM) particles have been discovered so far. Together with previous collider data, this can set important bounds on many BSM models, in particular those models introducing new particles in the TeV range or below. In many cases, such direct bounds compete or are better than indirect bounds derived from low-energy observables, for instance, processes involving the change of quark or lepton flavor that so often probe very high-energy scales. LHC will keep pushing the energy frontier to unprecedented levels during its new runs, and the possibility of unveiling new particles (scalars, spin-1/2 fermions, vectors, or else) remains surely exciting. The mediators of new fundamental forces could then be produced, and their discovery could hint at a deeper unification of particle physics interactions. Left-Right Models (LRMs) could be one step towards such ultimate unification, and on the other hand are an interesting candidate for BSM physics on their own.

The starting point is the existence of new gauged interactions, extending the set of SM local symmetries to [1, 2]

$$G_{LR} = SU(3)_{\text{QCD}} \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \times U(1)_X \quad (1.1)$$

where the quantum number associated with the Abelian symmetry $U(1)_X$ is baryon minus lepton numbers $B - L$.¹ The gauge couplings g_L, g_R and g_X of respectively $SU(2)_L, SU(2)_R$ and $U(1)_X$, will be assumed here to be perturbatively small for all purposes. This larger symmetry group allows for the restoration of parity symmetry at some large energy scale [3, 4] (note that different definitions of parity symmetry are possible [5, 6]), which moreover can provide new avenues for solving the strong \mathcal{CP} problem [7–10]; alternatively, charge-conjugation symmetry could be restored at high energies, see Ref. [11] for a phenomenological discussion. The Left-Right gauge group of Eq. (1.1) can be embedded into a larger and more fundamental gauge group [12–16]; the restoration of a discrete symmetry could then be pushed towards higher energy scales, implying in particular that $g_L \neq g_R$ at the characteristic energy scale v_R associated with LRMs, see also e.g. Ref. [17]. At the latter energy scale, lying much above the EW scale, the extra local symmetries are spontaneously broken, similarly to the Brout-Englert-Higgs mechanism of the SM, resulting then in the known gauge structure $SU(3)_{\text{QCD}} \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$; embedded in the larger group of symmetries of Eq. (1.1), the hypercharge quantum number results being $Y = T_{3R} + (B - L)/2$, where T_{3R} is the third generator of $SU(2)_R$, giving an origin for the particular values of hypercharge found in the SM.

The Spontaneous-Symmetry-Breaking (SSB) pattern $SU(2)_R \times U(1)_X \rightarrow U(1)_Y$, followed by $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y \rightarrow U(1)_{\text{EM}}$, can be realized in multiple ways. Hereafter, we discuss two scenarios of SSB, triggered (partially at least, as discussed in the next paragraph) by doublet $(\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2})_{1/2}$ and $(\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2}, \mathbf{1})_{1/2}$ [1–3, 12, 18, 19], or by triplet $(\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{3})_1$ and $(\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{3}, \mathbf{1})_1$ [20, 21], scalar fields, where the charge in subscript is $(B - L)/2$.

As in the case of Left-Handed (LH) fermions, Right-Handed (RH) quark and lepton fields fill doublet irreducible representations, which requires in the latter case the introduction of RH neutrinos. This means that weak interactions treat quarks and leptons on an equal footing, and neutrinos can acquire a mass from renormalizable interactions. For instance, the different fermions can acquire masses via Yukawa interactions with a bi-doublet scalar field $(\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2}, \mathbf{2})_0$. On top of that, in the triplet scenario, Majorana mass terms for the neutrinos become possible [20, 21] (see e.g. Refs. [22, 23] for a discussion about light neutrino mass stability). The bi-doublet scalar also participates in the pattern of SSB, and to avoid large BSM contributions to the EW ρ -parameter already at the tree level² the vacuum expectation value (VEV) of the triplet scalar charged under $SU(2)_L$ is set to a value much below the EW scale (again, for the stability of this condition, see e.g. Refs. [22, 23]), in which case the bi-doublet becomes the only responsible for the EW-SSB in the triplet scenario. In the doublet scenario, however, it is possible that the EW transition is triggered mostly by the doublet scalar charged under $SU(2)_L$ [24], see also [25]. The SM-like Higgs particle h^0 results as an admixture of the scalar field content aforementioned. For various theoretical reasons, larger scalar sectors have also been considered, e.g., to separate the restoration of the Left-Right gauge group from that of parity-symmetry as mentioned above [14, 15]. It is worth pointing out an interesting alternative for the mechanism of fermion mass generation, in which vector-like fermions (whose mass terms do not depend on the scalar sector, nor their scale must be related to the EW scale) are considered in such a way that the masses of SM-like fermions are generated via Yukawa terms with doublet scalar fields [7, 8, 26–34]; several recent papers have discussed phenomenological implications of this possibility, e.g., Refs. [35–40].

¹Coincidentally, this is an Abelian symmetry that, along with the SM gauge group, leads to an anomaly-free theory in the presence of new SM-neutral fermions that carry a $B - L$ quantum number, such as right-handed neutrinos.

²At the tree level in the SM $\rho := M_W^2/(M_Z^2 \cos^2 \theta_W) = 1$, θ_W being the weak angle with $\cos^2 \theta_W = g_L^2/(g_L^2 + g_Y^2)$.

As in the SM, the diagonalization of the quark mass matrix introduces a SM-like CKM matrix manifesting in charged-currents of LH quarks, together with a counterpart matrix manifesting in charged-currents of RH quarks; a similar comment also holds for the leptonic sector. These matrices can be related if a discrete symmetry is enforced, see e.g. Refs. [41–43]. However, we will not consider that such a symmetry is realized at the Left-Right (LR) spontaneous-breaking energy scale, and will thus not assume a particular structure for the RH mixing matrices. Such matrices can be constrained by flavour observables [44–47], such as neutral meson mixing [48, 49], which are not in the scope of the present work.

A lot of attention has been dedicated to the search of new heavy vector Z', W' bosons of different origins. Past collider experiments such as LEP-II and Tevatron searched for the direct production of these new states, excluding the parameter space of heavy gauge boson masses somewhat at EW scales (for SM-like new gauge-coupling values) [50]. These past collider bounds have been improved by LHC, of which we highlight the following searches: Z' decaying to a lepton pair [51–53]; dijet resonances [54, 55]; diboson decay modes [56–59]; and W' leptonic decays [60–63]. Some collider bounds apply directly to the so-called Sequential Standard Model (SSM) [64], that serves as a benchmark for the sensitivity of direct searches in discovering new gauge bosons. On the other hand, there are bounds that apply directly to LRMs in the presence of heavy RH neutrinos [65–68], or a $t\bar{b}$ quark pair in the final state (with subsequently $t \rightarrow W^+b$, with $W^+ \rightarrow \nu_\ell\bar{\ell}$ or $W^+ \rightarrow q\bar{q}'$, where ν_ℓ is a light mostly LH neutrino) [69–73], see also Refs. [74, 75]. Note that the latter bound strongly depends on the specific coupling of the charged LRM gauge boson to $t\bar{b}$, while the values of RH neutrino masses are in principle unknown. It is worth stressing the intensive research program for scrutinizing the parameter space of LRMs having massive neutrinos in colliders, that resulted in fruitful proposals, e.g., Refs. [76, 77]. For a recent reference on prospects for a future collider candidate, see Ref. [78].

In this article, we explore direct bounds that can be set on $Z' := Z_R$ and $W' := W_R$ masses, which are the heavy LRM counterparts of the SM-like $Z := Z_L$ and $W := W_L$ gauge bosons.³ Bounds on SSM cannot be directly interpreted in terms of LRMs, but also existing direct searches of LRM heavy gauge bosons do not entirely reflect the freedom in the parameter space of LRMs, in particular it is often assumed that the new gauge sector coupling or the RH mixing matrix in the quark sector are equal to their SM counterparts, or yet that the new gauge bosons do not couple to scalar or vector bosons in searches involving fermions in the final state. Given the variety of ways in which the scalar sector of LRMs can be realized, we focus on final states consisting of fermion pairs, for which the particular scalar sector manifests only in the total width of the new gauge bosons, while the couplings of the latter to fermions maintain the same structure (the fermion mixing matrices may change however according to the case analysed). We then exploit experimental results valid for different total widths of the decaying heavy particles; in the cases discussed hereafter, we find widths as large as $\lesssim 10\%$ of the heavy gauge boson masses. Interference effects of the W_L with the W_R are mixing suppressed, or chiral suppressed at production and/or decay since the W_R couples predominantly to RH fermions; for a discussion of interference terms in the context of the SSM, see Refs. [79, 80], and references therein. We neglect interference terms of the Z_R with the SM neutral gauge bosons, which is valid as long as we remain close enough to the resonance peak; for discussions, see Refs. [81, 82] and also Refs. [53, 83].

We illustrate the impact of the scalar sector by providing bounds for the following

³Note that from this point on the SM-like gauge bosons will be called Z_L and W_L , while the new gauge bosons will be denoted Z_R and W_R .

specific realizations: (i) a model with two doublets and a bi-doublet; (ii) a model with two triplets and a bi-doublet; and (iii) an effective model with two doublets and no bi-doublet, in which fermion masses are generated via non-renormalizable dimension-five operators (as mentioned above, we need the bi-doublet in the triplet scenario to trigger EW-SSB). For the only sake of avoiding to detail the specific realization of the scalar sector any further, when calculating the total widths of the new heavy gauge bosons we consider the limit in which the extended scalar sector is light, i.e., kinematically accessible in decays of the heavy gauge bosons; this allows then to establish model-independent bounds in scenarios (i)-(iii). This procedure, which translates into the largest total widths in these three scenarios for a fixed g_R coupling, also leads to the less constraining lower bounds on the heavy gauge boson masses, mainly because branching ratios into fermion pairs become smaller. This strategy does not alleviate much the lower bounds obtained with respect to the limits quoted by the experimental collaborations. We also discuss how the bounds depend on the coupling g_R of the new gauge sector, and the structure of the RH counterpart of the CKM matrix. We focus in the extreme case of light neutrinos, which is also a possibility for the specific realizations (ii) and (iii), and reserve the discussion of the mixing matrix in the neutrino sector to future work, as in the case of RH quarks.

This article is organized as follows: in Sec. 2 we provide details about the LRMs considered; in Sec. 3 we establish bounds on distinct versions of LRMs, Z_R and W_R being the main focus of subsections 3.1 and 3.2, respectively, while Sec. 3.3 discusses the bounds that can be derived from the use of the relation between these two masses, and bounds on the LR energy scale v_R according to the scalar sector realization; conclusions are found in Sec. 4. In App. A we give the scalar potentials in scenarios (i) and (ii); the relevant couplings are collected in App. B; finally, App. C contains a more detailed discussion about Z_R and W_R decays into two bosons.

2 The models

We first discuss some generic aspects of the LRMs that will be studied here. In the weak sector, we have two charged and three neutral gauge bosons, apart from three different coupling constants. Typically, in LRMs we find a mixing between the W_L and W_R , and between the Z_L and Z_R gauge bosons. Defining $W_{1,2}^{-\mu} := (W_{L,R}^{1\mu} + iW_{L,R}^{2\mu})/\sqrt{2}$, the mass eigenstates $W_L^{-\mu}$ and $W_R^{-\mu}$ are obtained using the unitary transformation

$$\begin{pmatrix} W_L^{-\mu} \\ W_R^{-\mu} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \xi & -e^{-i\lambda} \sin \xi \\ e^{i\lambda} \sin \xi & \cos \xi \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} W_1^{-\mu} \\ W_2^{-\mu} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2.1)$$

where λ and ξ are fixed by the VEVs of the scalar fields. On the other hand, for the neutral gauge bosons we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} Z_L^\mu \\ Z_R^\mu \\ A^\mu \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} c_\alpha & -s_\alpha & 0 \\ s_\alpha & c_\alpha & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} c_{\theta_W} & 0 & -s_{\theta_W} \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ s_{\theta_W} & 0 & c_{\theta_W} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & c_\gamma & -s_\gamma \\ 0 & s_\gamma & c_\gamma \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} W_L^{3\mu} \\ W_R^{3\mu} \\ W_X^\mu \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2.2)$$

where $c_\alpha \equiv \cos \alpha$, etc. The mixing parameters $\sin \xi$ and $\sin \alpha$ will depend on the particular SSB mechanism in use. Nonetheless, they are usually proportional to v_{EW}^2/v_R^2 , and thus small.

In the breaking of $SU(2)_R \times U(1)_X$ into $U(1)_Y$ we needed to introduce in Eq. (2.2) a mixing angle γ between the W_X and W_R^3 fields completely analogous to the weak angle

θ_W in the SM. Then, if we want to reproduce the phenomenology of the EW theory at low energies we need to impose the condition

$$e = g_L \sin \theta_W = g_R \sin \gamma \cos \theta_W = g_X \cos \gamma \cos \theta_W. \quad (2.3)$$

From the previous equation we can set bounds on the allowed values of the angle γ . Assume that we want to stay in the perturbative regime, namely, we take $g_R, g_X < 1$. Then, we arrive at the condition

$$\sqrt{1 - \frac{e^2}{\cos^2 \theta_W}} > \sin \gamma > \frac{e}{\cos \theta_W}. \quad (2.4)$$

Therefore, $70^\circ \gtrsim \gamma \gtrsim 20^\circ$. The parity symmetric scenario $g_L = g_R$ corresponds to $\sin \gamma = \tan \theta_W$, so $\gamma \approx 33^\circ$. Nevertheless, as we have pointed out in the introduction, LRMs can be embedded in theories with a larger gauge group, and in general we will not assume neither \mathcal{P} nor \mathcal{C} symmetry in this work. Then, the running of the coupling constants produces a difference between g_L and g_R at the LR scale v_R , and we will then have different values for γ satisfying the perturbativity constraints above. We will not discuss possible such embeddings that would result in a particular value of γ .

The matter content of the LRMs considered here consists of the doublets $q_{L,R}^m := (u_{L,R}^m, d_{L,R}^m)^\top$ and $\ell_{L,R}^m := (\nu_{L,R}^m, e_{L,R}^m)^\top$, where we use the index m for the three different families of fermions. They transform as $q_L^m \sim (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{2}, \mathbf{1})_{1/6}$, $q_R^m \sim (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2})_{1/6}$, $\ell_L^m \sim (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2}, \mathbf{1})_{-1/2}$ and $\ell_R^m \sim (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2})_{-1/2}$ under the gauge group G_{LR} . The covariant derivatives of the fermions are

$$D^\mu f_{L,R}^m := \left\{ \partial^\mu + i g_{L,R} \frac{\sigma^k}{2} W_{L,R}^{k\mu} + i g_X \frac{B-L}{2} W_X^\mu \right\} f_{L,R}^m, \quad (2.5)$$

where σ^k are the Pauli matrices and $f = q, \ell$.

2.1 The bi-doublet field

To start the discussion of the SSB of the LR gauge group, we introduce a bi-doublet field $\Phi \sim (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2}, \mathbf{2})_0$, together with its conjugated $\tilde{\Phi} := \sigma^2 \Phi^* \sigma^2 \sim (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2}, \mathbf{2})_0$. With the charge operator $\mathcal{Q} := (\sigma^3/2)_L + (\sigma^3/2)_R + (B-L)/2$, the bi-doublet can be written in terms of its components as

$$\Phi = \begin{pmatrix} \phi_1^0 & \phi_1^+ \\ \phi_2^- & \phi_2^0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.6)$$

Its VEV takes the form

$$\langle \Phi \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} \kappa_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \kappa_2 \end{pmatrix} \quad (2.7)$$

where $\kappa_{1,2}$ carry in principle complex phases [45]. Being neutral under $U(1)_X$, we will need to introduce other fields to break the LR gauge group into the low-energy gauge group $SU(3)_{\text{QCD}} \times U(1)_{\text{EM}}$, and to set a large gap between the LR and EW scales.

Besides SSB, fermion mass terms can be generated. The Yukawa term for quarks is simply

$$\mathcal{L}_Y^q = - \sum_{m,n} \bar{q}_L^m \left(r_{mn} \Phi + s_{mn} \tilde{\Phi} \right) q_R^n + \text{h.c.}, \quad (2.8)$$

where r and s are two completely general complex matrices. Under $\mathcal{P} : \Phi \rightarrow \Phi^\dagger$, and thus imposing parity symmetry would imply that r and s are hermitian matrices, while under $\mathcal{C} : \Phi \rightarrow \Phi^*$, and charge-conjugation invariance would imply that they are real.

In order to diagonalize the mass matrices of quarks we need to introduce the unitary matrices V_L^{CKM} and V_R^{CKM} . We have the following Lagrangian for the charged currents mediated by the W bosons:

$$\mathcal{L}_{CC}^q = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \bar{u} \gamma_\mu \left(g_L W_1^{+\mu} V_L^{\text{CKM}} \mathcal{P}_L + g_R W_2^{+\mu} V_R^{\text{CKM}} \mathcal{P}_R \right) d + \text{h.c.}, \quad (2.9)$$

where $u := (u, c, t)^\text{T}$ and $d := (d, s, b)^\text{T}$. We can make a redefinition of the fields in order to write V_L^{CKM} in the same way as the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa matrix of the SM. On the other hand, V_R^{CKM} will remain a completely general unitary matrix. (Nonetheless, if we impose \mathcal{CP} symmetry, $V_L^{\text{CKM}} = V_R^{\text{CKM}}$.)

The Yukawa term of Eq. (2.8) generates FCNCs mediated by tree-level scalar exchanges. We note that this does not occur in the gauge sector when the mechanism for generating fermion masses is the one above, since fermions come in sequential generations of identical quantum numbers [84] (such would not be the case when having vector-like fermions as in Refs. [35, 38, 39]). Explicitly, the interaction Lagrangian among quarks and the Z_R boson is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{RNC}^q &= \frac{1}{12} \frac{e}{\cos \theta_W} \tan \gamma Z_R^\mu \bar{u} \gamma_\mu \left\{ (2 - 3 \cot^2 \gamma) - (3 \cot^2 \gamma) \gamma_5 \right\} u \\ &+ \frac{1}{12} \frac{e}{\cos \theta_W} \tan \gamma Z_R^\mu \bar{d} \gamma_\mu \left\{ (2 + 3 \cot^2 \gamma) + (3 \cot^2 \gamma) \gamma_5 \right\} d \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

neglecting the $Z_L - Z_R$ mixing; the couplings among quarks and the Z_L gauge boson are then the ones of the SM.

2.2 A model with one bi-doublet, plus two doublet fields

In order to break spontaneously $SU(2)_R \times U(1)_X$ into $U(1)_Y$ at a high-energy scale much above the EW scale we still need to add more scalar degrees of freedom. The most common choices are either two doublets, or two triplets (although since we are not focused in restoring parity symmetry at the LRM scale v_R we could consider the case where we simply add one doublet, or one triplet). Using doublets we introduce $\chi_L \sim (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2})_{1/2}$ and $\chi_R \sim (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2}, \mathbf{1})_{1/2}$. They are written in terms of their components as

$$\chi_{L,R} = \begin{pmatrix} \chi_{L,R}^+ \\ \chi_{L,R}^0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (2.11)$$

whose VEVs are

$$\langle \chi_{L,R} \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v_{L,R} \end{pmatrix} \quad (2.12)$$

where $v_{L,R}$ carry in principle complex phases [45]. For phenomenological reasons we need to impose the condition $|v_R| \gg |\kappa_1|, |\kappa_2|$ and $|v_L|$. At leading order in v_{EW}^2/v_R^2 the masses of the gauge bosons are

$$\begin{aligned} M_{W_L}^2 &= \frac{1}{4} g_L^2 \left\{ |\kappa_1|^2 + |\kappa_2|^2 + |v_L|^2 \right\}, & M_{W_R}^2 &= \frac{1}{4} g_R^2 |v_R|^2, \\ M_{Z_L}^2 &= \frac{g_L^2 g_R^2 + g_L^2 g_X^2 + g_R^2 g_X^2}{4(g_X^2 + g_R^2)} \left\{ |\kappa_1|^2 + |\kappa_2|^2 + |v_L|^2 \right\}, & M_{Z_R}^2 &= \frac{1}{4} (g_R^2 + g_X^2) |v_R|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (2.13)$$

As we pointed out in the introduction, in these models $v_{EW}^2 = |\kappa_1|^2 + |\kappa_2|^2 + |v_L|^2$ and, at leading order in v_{EW}^2/v_R^2 , $\rho = M_{W_L}^2/(M_{Z_L}^2 \cos^2 \theta_W) = 1$.

In the present case we have six neutral and two singly charged physical scalar fields. Only one of the neutral fields has a mass proportional to the EW scale, which corresponds to the Higgs boson of the SM.

We cannot use doublets to produce Yukawa terms of dimension four. Thus, the mass term for leptons is completely analogous to the one of quarks in Eq. (2.8). Consequently, we also need to introduce the 3×3 unitary matrices V_L^{PMNS} and V_R^{PMNS} . Again, we can make a redefinition of the fields to write V_L^{PMNS} as in the SM (i.e., the mixing matrix measured in neutrino oscillation experiments), while V_R^{PMNS} is a completely general unitary matrix. Charged current interactions of leptons mediated by the W bosons are described by

$$\mathcal{L}_{CC}^{\ell} = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \bar{\nu} \gamma_{\mu} \left(g_L W_1^{+\mu} V_L^{\text{PMNS}} \mathcal{P}_L + g_R W_2^{+\mu} V_R^{\text{PMNS}} \mathcal{P}_R \right) e + \text{h.c.} \quad (2.14)$$

On the other hand, the interaction Lagrangian for the Z_R boson and leptons is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{RNC}^{\ell} = & -\frac{1}{4 \cos \theta_W} \frac{e}{\tan \gamma} Z_R^{\mu} \bar{e} \gamma_{\mu} \left\{ (2 - \cot^2 \gamma) - (\cot^2 \gamma) \gamma_5 \right\} e \\ & - \frac{1}{2 \cos \theta_W} \frac{e}{\tan \gamma} Z_R^{\mu} \bar{\nu}_L \gamma_{\mu} \nu_L - \frac{1}{2 \cos \theta_W} \frac{e}{\tan \gamma} (1 + \cot^2 \gamma) Z_R^{\mu} \bar{\nu}_R \gamma_{\mu} \nu_R. \end{aligned} \quad (2.15)$$

2.3 A model with one bi-doublet, plus two triplet fields

The model with doublets does not explain why LH neutrinos are so much lighter than the other fermions. In order to give an answer to this problem a model with triplets can be proposed instead. Here we introduce $\Delta_L \sim (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{3}, \mathbf{1})_1$ and $\Delta_R \sim (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{3})_1$, whose expressions in terms of their components can be put under the form

$$\Delta_{L,R} = \begin{pmatrix} \delta_{L,R}^+/\sqrt{2} & \delta_{L,R}^{++} \\ \delta_{L,R}^0 & -\delta_{L,R}^+/\sqrt{2} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.16)$$

Their VEVs are

$$\langle \Delta_{L,R} \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ v_{L,R} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (2.17)$$

where $v_{L,R}$ carry in principle complex phases [45]. The masses of the gauge bosons are

$$\begin{aligned} M_{W_L}^2 &= \frac{1}{4} g_L^2 \left\{ |\kappa_1|^2 + |\kappa_2|^2 + 2 |v_L|^2 \right\}, & M_{W_R}^2 &= \frac{1}{2} g_R^2 |v_R|^2, \\ M_{Z_L}^2 &= \frac{g_L^2 g_R^2 + g_L^2 g_X^2 + g_R^2 g_X^2}{4 (g_X^2 + g_R^2)} \left\{ |\kappa_1|^2 + |\kappa_2|^2 + 4 |v_L|^2 \right\}, & M_{Z_R}^2 &= (g_R^2 + g_X^2) |v_R|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (2.18)$$

If we want to preserve the condition $\rho \approx 1$ it is necessary to assume that $|v_R|^2 \gg |\kappa_1|^2 + |\kappa_2|^2 \gg |v_L|^2$.

The models with triplets contain six neutral, two singly charged and two doubly charged scalars. Only one of the neutral fields has a mass proportional to the EW scale, again corresponding to the Higgs boson of the SM.

As previously announced, when having triplet fields we can introduce the following Majorana mass term for leptons

$$\mathcal{L}_M = - \sum_{m,n} \{ \bar{\ell}_R^{cm} (h_R)_{mn} i\sigma^2 \Delta_R \ell_R^n + \bar{\ell}_L^{cm} (h_L)_{mn} i\sigma^2 \Delta_L \ell_L^n \} + \text{h.c.} \quad (2.19)$$

Therefore, the masses of the LH neutrinos can be explained via a seesaw mechanism, namely, the masses of the heavy neutrinos ν_h are proportional to the LR scale v_R while the masses of the light ones ν_l are proportional to v_{EW}^2/v_R . In the limit $M_{\nu_h} \gg M_{\nu_l}$ we can diagonalize their mass matrices introducing the 3×3 unitary matrices V_l^{PMNS} and V_h^{PMNS} . Since lepton number is not a conserved quantity anymore due to the interaction term Eq. (2.19), the matrix V_l^{PMNS} will contain two additional free parameters (the Majorana phases) when compared to V_L^{CKM} . In this limit $\nu_l \approx \nu_L$, $\nu_h \approx \nu_R$ and the charged and neutral currents are given by the Lagrangians in Eqs. (2.14) and (2.15), changing $V_{L,R}^{\text{PMNS}}$ and $\nu_{L,R}$ by $V_{l,h}^{\text{PMNS}}$ and $\nu_{l,h}$, respectively.

2.4 An effective model with two doublet fields

The scalar potentials for both doublets and triplets are shown in App. A. As seen therein, these theories contain a huge amount of free parameters. We can still study another LRM whose scalar sector is extremely simple, that we shall refer to as the $\chi_L + \chi_R$ Effective LR Model. In this case the leading picture of SSB consists of $SU(2)_R \times U(1)_X$ being broken into $U(1)_Y$ by the doublet χ_R and $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ being broken into $U(1)_{\text{EM}}$ by χ_L . We can always work in the unitary gauge, where

$$\chi_{L,R} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v_{L,R} + \chi_{L,R}^{0r} \end{pmatrix} \quad (2.20)$$

with $v_{L,R}$ being two real parameters and $\chi_{L,R}^{0r}$ two hermitian fields. The scalar self-interaction is described by

$$V = -\mu_L^2 \chi_L^\dagger \chi_L - \mu_R^2 \chi_R^\dagger \chi_R + \lambda_L (\chi_L^\dagger \chi_L)^2 + \lambda_R (\chi_R^\dagger \chi_R)^2 + \lambda_{LR} (\chi_L^\dagger \chi_L) (\chi_R^\dagger \chi_R). \quad (2.21)$$

All of the parameters above must be real in order to have a hermitian potential. Imposing that it must be bounded below we get that $\lambda_L > 0$, $\lambda_R > 0$ and $4\lambda_L \lambda_R - \lambda_{LR}^2 > 0$. The VEVs are obtained from solving

$$\begin{cases} v_L (-\mu_L^2 + \lambda_L v_L^2 + \lambda_{LR} v_R^2/2) = 0 \\ v_R (-\mu_R^2 + \lambda_R v_R^2 + \lambda_{LR} v_L^2/2) = 0 \end{cases}. \quad (2.22)$$

In contrast to the other two cases, if we want the condition $v_R \gg v_L \neq 0$ to be satisfied, we cannot impose parity symmetry in the potential.⁴

In this non-renormalizable model there is no mixing between the W_L and W_R bosons at the tree level, a mixing being generated at one loop. They are then mass eigenstates at the order of trees. The masses of the gauge fields are

$$\begin{aligned} M_{W_L} &= \frac{1}{2} g_L v_L, & M_{Z_L}^2 &= \frac{g_L^2 g_R^2 + g_L^2 g_X^2 + g_R^2 g_X^2}{4(g_X^2 + g_R^2)} v_L^2, \\ M_{W_R} &= \frac{1}{2} g_R v_R, & M_{Z_R}^2 &= \frac{1}{4} (g_R^2 + g_X^2) v_R^2. \end{aligned} \quad (2.23)$$

⁴Note that the (explicit) breaking of parity can be achieved with soft terms.

The EW scale is just v_L at this order. Conversely, there is a mixing between the Z_L and Z_R gauge bosons given by the angle

$$\tan(2\alpha) = \frac{2g_X^2 \sqrt{g_L^2 g_X^2 + g_R^2 g_X^2 + g_R^2 g_L^2} v_L^2}{(g_R^2 + g_X^2)^2 v_R^2 - (g_L^2 g_X^2 + g_R^2 g_X^2 + g_R^2 g_L^2 - g_X^4) v_L^2}. \quad (2.24)$$

The physical Higgs fields h and H are obtained using the transformation

$$\begin{pmatrix} H \\ h \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta & -\sin \theta \\ \sin \theta & \cos \theta \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \chi_R^{0r} \\ \chi_L^{0r} \end{pmatrix} \quad (2.25)$$

with

$$\tan(2\theta) = \frac{v_L v_R \lambda_{LR}}{\lambda_L v_L^2 - \lambda_R v_R^2}. \quad (2.26)$$

At leading order in v_L^2/v_R^2 , their masses are given by

$$M_H^2 \approx 2\lambda_R v_R^2, \quad M_h^2 \approx \frac{4\lambda_L \lambda_R - \lambda_{LR}^2}{2\lambda_R} v_L^2. \quad (2.27)$$

It is clear that we cannot use dimension-four operators to generate mass terms for fermions using only doublets. Instead, in this model their masses can be generated by effective operators of dimension five; for instance, since LRMs can be embedded in theories with extended gauge groups of associated energy scales much higher than v_R , they could provide a completion for such non-renormalizable operators. Defining $\tilde{\chi}_{L,R} := i\sigma^2 \chi_{L,R}^*$, we have the following mass terms for quarks and leptons:

$$\mathcal{L}_Y^q = -\frac{1}{\Lambda} C_d^{ij} \bar{q}_L^i \chi_L \chi_R^\dagger q_R^j - \frac{1}{\Lambda} C_u^{ij} \bar{q}_L^i \tilde{\chi}_L \tilde{\chi}_R^\dagger q_R^j + \text{h.c.}, \quad (2.28)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_Y^\ell = & -\frac{1}{\Lambda} C_e^{ij} \bar{\ell}_L^i \chi_L \chi_R^\dagger \ell_R^j - \frac{1}{\Lambda} C_{\nu D}^{ij} \bar{\ell}_L^i \tilde{\chi}_L \tilde{\chi}_R^\dagger \ell_R^j \\ & -\frac{1}{\Lambda} C_{\nu L,M}^{ij} \bar{\ell}_L^i \tilde{\chi}_L \tilde{\chi}_L^\dagger \ell_L^j - \frac{1}{\Lambda} C_{\nu R,M}^{ij} \bar{\ell}_R^i \tilde{\chi}_R^* \tilde{\chi}_R^\dagger \ell_R^j + \text{h.c.}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.29)$$

with Λ the scale of physics beyond LRM. We have introduced a Majorana mass term for neutrinos. Indeed, the complete mass term is

$$\mathcal{L}_m = -\sum_{f=u,d,e} \bar{f}_L M_f f_R - \frac{1}{2} (\bar{\nu}_L \bar{\nu}_R^c) \begin{pmatrix} M_{\nu L,M} & M_{\nu D} \\ M_{\nu D}^\dagger & M_{\nu R,M} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \nu_L^c \\ \nu_R \end{pmatrix} + \text{h.c.}, \quad (2.30)$$

where the mass matrices are given by

$$M_f := \frac{1}{2} \frac{v_L v_R}{\Lambda} C_f, \quad M_{\nu D} := \frac{1}{2} \frac{v_L v_R}{\Lambda} C_{\nu D}, \quad M_{\nu L,M} := \frac{v_L^2}{\Lambda} C_{\nu L,M}, \quad M_{\nu R,M} := \frac{v_R^2}{\Lambda} C_{\nu R,M}. \quad (2.31)$$

For comparable Dirac and Majorana Wilson coefficients, the masses of the heavy neutrinos are proportional to v_R^2/Λ , while the masses of the light ones to v_L^2/Λ . The masses of the

other fermions are proportional to $v_L v_R / \Lambda$.⁵ The interaction between scalar fields and charged fermions is described by

$$\mathcal{L}_{u,d,e}^Y = - \left(1 + \frac{\chi_L^{0r}}{v_L}\right) \left(1 + \frac{\chi_R^{0r}}{v_R}\right) \sum_{f=u,d,e} \bar{f} \mathcal{M}_f f, \quad (2.32)$$

where \mathcal{M}_f is their diagonalized mass matrix. Note that in this model there are no FCNCs in the hadronic sector induced by scalar fields. Again, since fermions come in sequential generations of identical quantum numbers, there are no FCNCs in the gauge sector at the tree level [84].

3 Production bounds from LHC Run 2

3.1 Production of Z_R

We now study direct searches involving Z_R decaying into a pair of leptons $\ell^+ \ell^-$. This is a more straightforward way of putting bounds on the LR scale since there is no dependence on the mixing matrices at the tree level in this process. Thus, as it will be made clear later, the only unknown parameters are the angle γ and the mass of the Z_R boson.

We study the case in which the gauge boson Z_R is produced on-shell after the collision of two protons. In particular, we want to calculate the cross section of the process $pp \rightarrow Z_R X \rightarrow \ell^+ \ell^- X$ where X represents an arbitrary state. All of the couplings needed are summarized in App. B. The interaction Lagrangian of the Z_R and two fermions can be written in the following two equivalent ways

$$\mathcal{L}_{Z_R}^{ff} = \frac{1}{2} Z_R^\mu \bar{f} \gamma_\mu \left(g_V^f - g_A^f \gamma_5 \right) f = Z_R^\mu \bar{f} \gamma_\mu \left(g_L^f \mathcal{P}_L + g_R^f \mathcal{P}_R \right) f. \quad (3.1)$$

In the context of Z_R searches it is common to define the functions

$$c_q^f := \frac{1}{2} \left(g_V^{q2} + g_A^{q2} \right) \text{Br} (Z_R \rightarrow f \bar{f}) = \left(g_L^{q2} + g_R^{q2} \right) \text{Br} (Z_R \rightarrow f \bar{f}) \quad (3.2)$$

because for narrow resonances we have (more details will be provided in the next section when discussing W_R^\pm production) [50, 85]

$$\sigma (pp \rightarrow Z_R X \rightarrow f \bar{f} X) \approx \frac{\pi}{6s} \sum_q c_q^f \omega_q (s, M_{Z_R}^2) \quad (3.3)$$

where s is the square of the center-of-mass energy and the $\omega_q (s, M_{Z_R}^2)$ contain all of the information about the Parton Distribution Functions (PDFs) of the quarks inside the proton (see the analogous Eq. (3.14) below for the case of charged currents), and are much larger for the up and down quarks, $q = u, d$. Since the couplings of the Z_R are generation-independent we only need to calculate c_u^ℓ and c_d^ℓ . Note that, although $g_{V,A}$ or $g_{L,R}$ do not depend on the specific realization of the scalar sector, $c_{u,d}^\ell$ do depend.

We now calculate $\text{Br} (Z_R \rightarrow \ell^+ \ell^-)$, for which the total width of the Z_R boson Γ_{Z_R} is needed. All calculations in this paper are performed at the tree level. The possible

⁵At tree level, the top mass is controlled by $v_L \times (C^{(5)} v_R) / \Lambda$ (since v_L sets the EW scale, $\Lambda \sim C^{(5)} v_R$), where $C^{(5)}$ is the Wilson coefficient of the operator of dimension five (with flavour indices omitted) and $\Lambda \gg v_R$ is the energy scale beyond LRM. A one-loop correction goes as $\sim v_L \times (C^{(5)} v_R)^3 / (16 \pi^2 \Lambda^3)$, and is thus suppressed by $1/(16 \pi^2)$.

Mode	Eqs.	Comments
$Z_R \rightarrow f\bar{f}$	(3.4)	
$Z_R \rightarrow W_L^+ W_L^-$	(3.5) to (3.7)	Equivalence Theorem
$Z_R \rightarrow Z_L h^0$	(3.5) to (3.7)	Equivalence Theorem
$Z_R \rightarrow Z_L H^0$	(3.5) to (3.7)	“Light new scalars”, Equiv. Theo.
$Z_R \rightarrow W_L^\pm H^\mp$	(3.5) to (3.7)	“Light new scalars”, Equiv. Theo.
$Z_R \rightarrow h^0 H^0$	(3.5) to (3.7)	“Light new scalars”
$Z_R \rightarrow W_L^\pm W_R^\mp$	–	Negligible
$Z_R \rightarrow H_1 H_2$	(3.5) to (3.7)	“Light new scalars”
$Z_R \rightarrow W_R^\pm H^\mp$	–	Negligible
$Z_R \rightarrow W_R^+ W_R^-$	(3.8) and (3.9)	
$W_R^\pm \rightarrow f\bar{f}'$	(3.15)	
$W_R^\pm \rightarrow W_L^\pm Z_L$	(3.16) and (3.17)	Equivalence Theorem
$W_R^\pm \rightarrow W_L^\pm h^0$	(3.16) and (3.17)	Equivalence Theorem
$W_R^\pm \rightarrow W_L^\pm H^0$	(3.16) and (3.17)	“Light new scalars”, Equiv. Theo.
$W_R^\pm \rightarrow H^\pm Z_L$	(3.16) and (3.17)	“Light new scalars”, Equiv. Theo.
$W_R^\pm \rightarrow H^\pm h^0$	(3.16) and (3.17)	“Light new scalars”
$W_R^\pm \rightarrow W_L^\mp H^{\pm\pm}$	–	Negligible
$W_R^\pm \rightarrow H^\pm A$	–	No contribution
$W_R^\pm \rightarrow H_1 H_2$	(3.16) and (3.17)	“Light new scalars”

Table 1: Set of Z_R and W_R two-body decays discussed here; the masses of the Z_R and W_R are assumed to lay much above the EW scale (which is corroborated by, e.g., the present analysis), and $M_{W_R} \leq M_{Z_R}$ in the models analysed here. The masses of the RH neutrinos are discussed in the text. The notation is as follows: h^0, f, Z_L, W_L^\pm are the SM-like Higgs, fermions, neutral and charged weakly-coupled massive gauge bosons, respectively, while A stands for the photon; Z_R, W_R^\pm are the new neutral and charged weakly-coupled gauge bosons, respectively; H represents the new physical scalar sector (neutral, singly or doubly charged), where we do not make explicit their \mathcal{CP} nature in the case of neutral scalars (we also generally omit in this table an indexing when multiple scalars of the same charge are possible). The last column gives the ingredients used to set upper bounds on the partial widths of the Z_R and W_R gauge bosons, that translate into a more model-independent bound on their masses, where considering the limit of light new scalars is used only to determine the maximum of the heavy gauge boson widths.

two-body contributions are displayed in Tab. 1.⁶ The explicit calculation of the processes that involve scalars requires diagonalizing their mass matrices. The spectrum depends on the scalar potential, which involves a large number of parameters even when discrete symmetries are enforced. As it will be discussed in details in the following, in order to avoid this inconvenience we put an upper bound on those partial widths, which ultimately results in a model-independent bound on the mass of the Z_R boson.

⁶Higher multiplicity decays are comparatively suppressed by the allowed phase space, and by powers of the weak couplings; also, there should be no enhancement by factors of $M_{heavy}^{n+1}/M_{light}^n \sim v_R^{n+1}/v_{EW}^n$, $n \geq 1$, where M_{light} is the mass of an SM-like boson, since the massless limit $M_{light} \rightarrow 0^+$ should be continuous in a theory with SSB (for an example in which the gauge coupling of the spontaneously broken symmetry is vanishingly small, see Ref. [86]).

We start by calculating the partial width into fermion pairs. It is easy to show that if $M_{Z_R} \gg m_f$, then

$$\Gamma(Z_R \rightarrow f\bar{f}) \approx N_C^f \frac{M_{Z_R}}{48\pi} (g_V^{f2} + g_A^{f2}) = N_C^f \frac{M_{Z_R}}{24\pi} (g_L^{f2} + g_R^{f2}) \quad (3.4)$$

where N_C^f represents the number of colors of the fermion f . Considering the mass of the fermions leads to corrections of order $(m_f/M_{Z_R})^2$, e.g., for $M_{Z_R} \sim 1$ TeV we have for the top quark $(m_t/M_{Z_R})^2 \sim 0.03$, and thus these effects for the SM-like fermions are totally negligible. Nonetheless, such kinematic correction in the case of RH neutrinos might be important because their mass can be proportional to the LR scale. To avoid introducing new unknown parameters we can consider the following two limiting cases. First of all, very heavy RH neutrinos, namely, in which case the process $Z_R \rightarrow \nu_R \bar{\nu}_R$ is forbidden. The other case consists of light RH neutrinos; if we neglect their mass then we have the maximum possible value of the total width Γ_{Z_R} . This corresponds to the minimum value of $\text{Br}(Z_R \rightarrow \ell^+ \ell^-)$, leading to less constraining bounds on the Z_R mass.

We now consider processes that involve at least one light gauge boson in the final state. For $Z_R \rightarrow W_L^+ W_L^-$ and $Z_R \rightarrow Z_L h^0$ the masses of the particles in the final states are completely negligible compared to their energy, since the Z_R is much heavier. In the decays $Z_R \rightarrow H^\pm W_L^\mp$ and $H^0 Z_L$ either the mass difference between the heavy states is small and the partial widths are suppressed by the phase space, or the mass difference is enough to allow the light particle to have a high energy compared to its own mass. Since we want to set an upper bound on the partial width of these processes, we consider the second case, in which we have light particles in the final state carrying a large momentum. Consequently, the dominant contribution to the partial widths will come from cases in which the gauge bosons in the final states have longitudinal polarization. Thus, we can calculate the amplitudes substituting the spin-1 fields by their associated Goldstone bosons using the equivalence theorem [87, 88], and therefore these processes will be collectively called $Z_R \rightarrow 2$ Scalars. In applying this theorem, we neglect the v_{EW}^2/v_R^2 corrections from the transverse degrees of freedom.

The masses of the scalar sector also determine whether the channels $Z_R \rightarrow h^0 H^0, H_1 H_2$ are allowed. In App. C we show that we can set an upper bound on the total width of Z_R using the limit where the mass of all scalars is set to zero. Once more, this translates into the least constraining lower bounds on the mass of the Z_R . Let us stress that when considering “light” scalars we avoid to detail the specific realization of the scalar sector any further, i.e., in particular whether a discrete symmetry is enforced in the scalar potential. Finally, we get for doublets and triplets

$$\Gamma_D(Z_R \rightarrow 2 \text{ Scalars}) < \frac{M_{Z_R}}{96\pi} \frac{e^2}{\cos^2 \theta_W} \{2 \tan^2 \gamma + 3 \cot^2 \gamma\}, \quad (3.5)$$

$$\Gamma_T(Z_R \rightarrow 2 \text{ Scalars}) < \frac{M_{Z_R}}{16\pi} \frac{e^2}{\cos^2 \theta_W} \{\cot^2 \gamma + 2 \tan^2 \gamma\}. \quad (3.6)$$

Among the previous processes, the only ones we have to consider in the Effective LR Model are $Z_R \rightarrow Z_L h^0, Z_L H^0, h^0 H^0$ and $W_L^+ W_L^-$. The first three decays can be taken into account by putting a bound on $\Gamma_{\text{Eff}}(Z_R \rightarrow 2 \text{ Neutral Scalars})$ as we did for the other two models. We can compute exactly the partial width of $Z_R \rightarrow W_L^+ W_L^-$ using the Feynman rule in Eq. (B.9)




Figure 1: Parametric plot of the functions c_d^ℓ and c_u^ℓ depending on the angle γ . Varying γ in the range $[20^\circ, 70^\circ]$, the plotted curves are transited counterclockwise. The points used for setting the bounds on the mass of Z_R are the ones marked with a star, see Fig. 2. They correspond to values of γ around 40° and 41° .

$$\begin{aligned} & \Gamma_{\text{Eff}}(Z_R \rightarrow 2 \text{ Neutral Scalars}) + \Gamma_{\text{Eff}}(Z_R \rightarrow W_L^+ W_L^-) \\ & < \frac{M_{Z_R}}{192\pi} \frac{e^2}{\cos^2 \theta_W} \{2 + \cot^2 \gamma + 3 \tan^2 \gamma\}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

We still need to study the decays $Z_R \rightarrow W_R^\pm W_L^\mp$, $H^\pm W_R^\mp$ and $W_R^+ W_R^-$. In App. C we show that the contribution of the first two is negligible since the partial width is, at most, proportional to v_{EW}^2/v_R . Finally, the exact value of the partial width for the process $Z_R \rightarrow W_R^+ W_R^-$ can be written as

$$\Gamma_D(Z_R \rightarrow W_R^+ W_R^-) = \frac{M_{Z_R}}{192\pi} \left(\frac{e}{\cos \theta_W} \right)^2 \frac{(1 - 4 \cos^2 \gamma)^{3/2}}{\sin^2 \gamma \cos^2 \gamma} \{1 + 20 \cos^2 \gamma + 12 \cos^4 \gamma\}, \quad (3.8)$$

$$\Gamma_T(Z_R \rightarrow W_R^+ W_R^-) = \frac{M_{Z_R}}{48\pi} \left(\frac{e}{\cos \theta_W} \right)^2 \frac{(1 - 2 \cos^2 \gamma)^{3/2}}{\sin^2 \gamma \cos^2 \gamma} \{1 + 10 \cos^2 \gamma + 3 \cos^4 \gamma\}. \quad (3.9)$$

Obviously, Eq. (3.8) also applies to the effective LR model with only doublet scalars. This process gives a contribution only if $\gamma \in [60^\circ, 70^\circ]$ or $\gamma \in [45^\circ, 70^\circ]$ in the models with doublets or triplets, respectively, given the requirement $M_{Z_R} > 2M_{W_R}$, and the fact that we want to stay in the perturbative regime (which means $70^\circ \gtrsim \gamma \gtrsim 20^\circ$).

We want to remark that all partial widths are proportional to M_{Z_R} , with no further explicit dependence on this quantity. Thus, both c_u^ℓ and c_d^ℓ will only depend on γ . This




Figure 2: Total width of the Z_R as a function of the angle γ . The points marked with a star are the ones used for setting the bounds on the mass M_{Z_R} , see Fig. 1.

dependence is displayed in Fig. 1 for the three LR models considered. The lowest cross sections are obtained when c_d^ℓ reaches its minimum possible value allowed by the particular model; this is also very close to the minimum of c_u^ℓ , which shows a flatter dependence on γ compared to c_d^ℓ . Thus, when comparing to the experimental data, the three points marked with a star in Fig. 1 will give the less constraining lower bound on the Z_R mass. It turns out that they are close to the LR limit $g_L = g_R$. It is important to notice that, for the values of γ for which we set the bounds on the mass of Z_R , the values of the total width over the mass of the Z_R gauge boson are below 3%, as shown in Fig. 2. Consequently, using the narrow resonance regime approximation is justified.

We dispose of the following searches for two charged leptons in the final state: CMS ($\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV) [53], in the di-electron (137 fb^{-1}) and di-muon (140 fb^{-1}) channels; ATLAS ($\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV, 139 fb^{-1}) [52], in the di-electron and di-muon channels; ATLAS ($\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV, 36.1 fb^{-1}) [51], in the di-tau channel. They achieve very similar bounds on the Z_R mass in the former two cases (i.e., di-electron and di-muon searches), which are better than in the third case (i.e., di-tau searches, of lower statistics); we will not attempt at combining results from ATLAS and CMS in this article. We observe a modest impact of the total width of the Z_R on the bounds on its mass in the experimental searches of Refs. [52, 53], for values of the mass $M_{Z_R} \gtrsim 4$ TeV, and when $\Gamma_{Z_R} \lesssim 10\%$. Theoretical uncertainties result from PDF uncertainties and higher-orders, and grow with the invariant mass, reaching about 20% at scales of many TeV. Based on Ref. [53] for the combination of di-electron and di-muon modes, we achieve the bounds shown in Tab. 2.

There are also available di-jet searches, CMS ($\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV, 137 fb^{-1}) [55] and ATLAS ($\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV, 139 fb^{-1}) [54], and searches based on the diboson decay modes $Z_R \rightarrow W_L^+ W_L^-$ and $Z_R \rightarrow Z_L h^0$, Refs. [56–59]. Better bounds, however, are achieved from the previous di-lepton searches, see also Refs. [89, 90].

Our very conservative lower bounds on the Z_R mass remain valid even if we relax the condition $g_R, g_X \leq 1$ because, for values of γ smaller than 20° or greater than 70° , we would get larger values for both c_d^ℓ and c_u^ℓ , as shown in Fig. 1. Of course, with

larger predicted cross sections one could get stronger bounds, but they would be model dependent. Instead, we are adopting the more pessimistic scenario (minimum values of c_d^ℓ) in order to obtain a robust model-independent lower limit on M_{Z_R} .

3.2 Production of W_R

We now discuss searches involving the production and decay to a pair of fermions of the W_R boson in colliders. In this case we have more free parameters because the elements of the mixing matrix V_R^{CKM} appear explicitly. We want to calculate the cross section of the process $pp \rightarrow W_R^\pm X \rightarrow f\bar{f}'X$. The general expression in the s-channel and at leading order in α_s is the following [85]:

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(pp \rightarrow W_R^\pm X \rightarrow f\bar{f}'X) &= \frac{2\pi}{3} \frac{\Gamma_{W_R}}{M_{W_R}} \alpha_R \sum_{ij} |(V_R^{\text{CKM}})_{ij}|^2 \\ &\times \int_0^1 dx_1 dx_2 [u_i(x_1, \mu) \bar{d}_j(x_2, \mu) + \bar{u}_i(x_2, \mu) d_j(x_1, \mu)] \frac{\hat{s} \text{Br}(W_R^\pm \rightarrow f\bar{f}')}{(\hat{s} - M_{W_R}^2)^2 + M_{W_R}^2 \Gamma_{W_R}^2} \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

where $\hat{s} := x_1 x_2 s$. For narrow resonances, substitute⁷

$$\frac{1}{(\hat{s} - M_{W_R}^2)^2 + M_{W_R}^2 \Gamma_{W_R}^2} \rightarrow \frac{\pi}{M_{W_R} \Gamma_{W_R}} \delta(\hat{s} - M_{W_R}^2) \quad (3.11)$$

leading to:

$$\sigma(pp \rightarrow W_R^\pm X \rightarrow f\bar{f}'X) \approx \sigma(pp \rightarrow W_R^\pm X) \text{Br}(W_R^\pm \rightarrow f\bar{f}') \quad (3.12)$$

after integration over \hat{s} . The W_R^\pm production cross section is [50]

$$\sigma(pp \rightarrow W_R^\pm X) \approx \frac{2\pi^2}{3s} \alpha_R \sum_{ij} |(V_R^{\text{CKM}})_{ij}|^2 \omega_{ij}(M_{W_R}^2/s, M_{W_R}), \quad (3.13)$$

where s is the square of the center-of-mass energy, $\alpha_R := g_R^2/(4\pi)$ and the functions $\omega_{ij}(z, \mu)$ are given by

$$\omega_{ij}(z, \mu) = \int_z^1 \frac{dx}{x} [u_i(x, \mu) \bar{d}_j(z/x, \mu) + \bar{u}_i(x, \mu) d_j(z/x, \mu)], \quad (3.14)$$

with $q_i(x, \mu)$ the PDF of the quark q_i inside the proton at factorization scale μ and parton momentum fraction x (we discuss later in this section sub-leading effects in α_s). Note that there is an explicit dependence on the elements of the matrix V_R^{CKM} in Eq. (3.13). Feynman rules for fermion pairs are found in Eqs. (B.11) and (B.12).

As can be derived from Eq. (3.10), not restricting the W_R to be produced with an invariant mass close to its resonance peak largely enhances the total cross section for large values of M_{W_R} compared to the narrow width approximation when M_{W_R} approaches \sqrt{s} : indeed, in this case ω_{ij} in Eq. (3.14) approaches 0 since z approaches 1, while non-vanishing values are achieved from the original expression Eq. (3.10) when not restricting the value of \hat{s} . Conversely, at the same time the SM background increases when allowing for small values of \hat{s} , so one loses in sensitivity to signal events.

⁷Equivalently, for numerical purposes consider \hat{s} in the integration range $[(M_{W_R} - \Delta)^2, (M_{W_R} + \Delta)^2]$ (together with requiring $\hat{s} \leq xs$, x being the other integration variable), where $\Gamma_{W_R} \ll \Delta \ll M_{W_R}$.

We now calculate the decay width of the W_R boson Γ_{W_R} at leading order in g_R . At tree level, the relevant processes are listed in Tab. 1. Considering that the fermions in the final state have a mass much smaller than the one of the W_R boson it is easy to obtain

$$\Gamma(W_R \rightarrow f_i \bar{f}_j) \approx \frac{\alpha_R}{12} |(V_R)_{ij}|^2 N_C^f M_{W_R}, \quad (3.15)$$

where N_C^f represents the number of colors of the fermion f and $V_R = V_R^{\text{CKM}}$ or $V_R = V_R^{\text{PMNS}}$ for quarks and for leptons, respectively. Once again, to avoid the introduction of new free parameters we can consider the two limiting cases for the masses of the RH neutrinos. If they are extremely heavy only the quark decay modes are kinematically open and we have $\Gamma(W_R \rightarrow f \bar{f}') := \sum_{ij} \Gamma(W_R \rightarrow f_i \bar{f}_j) \approx (3/4)\alpha_R M_{W_R}$, while for light neutrinos we get $\Gamma(W_R \rightarrow f \bar{f}') \approx \alpha_R M_{W_R}$. The less stringent bound on the mass of the W_R results from the second case.

As before, using the equivalence theorem [87, 88] it is easy to see that we can set a bound on the sum of partial widths of the decays $W_R^\pm \rightarrow W_L^\pm Z_L$, $W_R^\pm h^0$, $W_L^\pm H^0$, $H^\pm Z_L$, $H^\pm h^0$, $H^\pm H^0$ and $H^{\pm\pm} H^\mp$, by calculating a bound on $\Gamma(W_R \rightarrow 2 \text{ Scalars})$. The contribution of the process $W_R^\pm \rightarrow W_L^\mp H^{\pm\pm}$ for the models with triplets is negligible. The decay $W_R^\pm \rightarrow H^\pm A$ is forbidden at the tree level. The details are given in App. C. Thus, adding all fermionic and bosonic final states, we get the following bounds on the total width of the W_R boson for the doublet and triplet models:

$$\Gamma_{W_R}^D < \frac{9}{8} \alpha_R M_{W_R}, \quad (3.16)$$

$$\Gamma_{W_R}^T < \frac{5}{4} \alpha_R M_{W_R}. \quad (3.17)$$

The non-fermionic processes $W_R^\pm \rightarrow W_L^\pm Z_L$, $W_L^\pm h^0$ and $W_L^\pm H^0$ are not allowed in the Effective LR Model because there is no mixing between the W_L and the W_R gauge bosons. Thus, we have the following bound obtained by considering light RH neutrinos:

$$\Gamma_{W_R}^{\text{Eff}} < \alpha_R M_{W_R}. \quad (3.18)$$

The recasted bound on the mass of the W_R boson obtained from direct searches in colliders depends on the specific structure of the V_R^{CKM} matrix. For instance, we can find the values of the matrix elements $|(V_R^{\text{CKM}})_{ij}|$ that minimize the cross section in Eq. (3.13). The functions ω_{ij} are shown in Fig. 3, and have been obtained using the NNPDF23LO PDF set [91] (at a factorization scale of 6 TeV, and for $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV). It is then clear that the main contributions come from ω_{ud} and ω_{us} ; then, take $(V_R^{\text{CKM}})_{ud} = (V_R^{\text{CKM}})_{us} = 0$. After the previous two terms, the one proportional to ω_{ub} is dominant; in this case we cannot take $(V_R^{\text{CKM}})_{ub} = 0$ because the matrix V_R^{CKM} must be unitary. The following leading term in the W_R production is the one proportional to ω_{cd} , for which we then can set $(V_R^{\text{CKM}})_{cd} = 0$. Taking into account the fact that the matrix V_R^{CKM} is unitary we arrive at the following structure:

$$V_R^{\text{CKM}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (3.19)$$

where complex phases are irrelevant for our purposes. This anti-diagonal matrix is associated with the minimum possible value of the cross section in the s-channel, and we get from it the less stringent bounds on M_{W_R} from di-jet and di-lepton searches that we




Figure 3: The quantity $w_{ij}(M_{W_R}^2/s, M_{W_R})$ for up and down type quarks of various generations as a function of the $W' := W_R$ mass. Figure extracted from Ref. [24].

discuss in the following sections, see Figs. 4 and 5 and Tab. 2. These bounds can be somewhat improved by the consideration of NLO corrections in QCD, namely, associated production of the W_R with a bottom-quark, that is phase-space suppressed and suppressed by the small value of the strong coupling at the high perturbative scales relevant for the process, but depends on the PDF of the gluon. In contrast, we also provide in Figs. 4 and 5 and Tab. 2 bounds for a diagonal structure of the RH quark mixing matrix, for which the latter associated W_R production, like the t-channel production, is negligible compared to the dominant s-channel production [74].

3.2.1 Di-jet decay mode

We now discuss in details the dijet decay mode of the W_R boson. This channel has the advantage of not depending on the characteristics of the leptonic sector, namely, neutrino masses and lepton RH mixing matrix. In order to obtain the cross section of the process $pp \rightarrow W_R \rightarrow j_1 j_2$ we need to calculate $\Gamma(W_R \rightarrow q_1 \bar{q}_2)$. Looking at Eq. (3.15), we get

$$\Gamma(W_R \rightarrow q_1 \bar{q}_2) \approx \frac{\alpha_R}{4} M_{W_R} \sum_{i=u,c,t} \sum_{j=d,s,b} \left| (V_R^{\text{CKM}})_{ij} \right|^2 = \frac{3}{4} \alpha_R M_{W_R}. \quad (3.20)$$

Consequently, we obtain the following lower bounds on the branching fractions:

$$\text{Br}(W_R \rightarrow j_1 j_2)_{\text{Eff}} > \frac{3}{4}, \quad (3.21)$$

$$\text{Br}(W_R \rightarrow j_1 j_2)_D > \frac{2}{3}, \quad (3.22)$$

$$\text{Br}(W_R \rightarrow j_1 j_2)_T > \frac{3}{5}. \quad (3.23)$$

In the hadronic W_R^\pm decay width we have neglected the QCD correction factor $\delta_{\text{QCD}} \approx 1 + \frac{\alpha_s}{\pi} \geq 1$, which is small at the high scale $\mu = M_{W_R}$; since it would increase the branching fractions, these lower bounds are even more conservative.




Figure 4: Comparison between the theoretical prediction of the cross section times the branching fraction of the process $W_R \rightarrow jj$ for different LR symmetric models and the experimental bound obtained by ATLAS [54] in the narrow resonance regime.

For a given mixing matrix V_R^{CKM} , the minimum value of the production cross section corresponds to the minimum value of $\alpha_R = \alpha/(\sin^2 \gamma \cos^2 \theta_W)$, for which we have $\Gamma_{W_R}^D/M_{W_R} < 1.2\%$, $\Gamma_{W_R}^T/M_{W_R} < 1.3\%$ and $\Gamma_{W_R}^{\text{Eff}}/M_{W_R} < 1.1\%$, which are clearly in the narrow resonance regime. We dispose of data from CMS ($\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV, 139 fb^{-1}) [55, 92] and ATLAS ($\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV, 139 fb^{-1}) [54, 93]. They achieve very similar bounds on the total cross section up to $\lesssim 4$ TeV; as previously stated, we will not attempt at combining results from ATLAS and CMS in this article. Note that in Eq. (3.20) we have included the top flavour, which is highly boosted and explicitly included in the simulation of signal events in Ref. [54], but is also present to some extent in the final dijet mode of Ref. [55, 94]. The results are shown in Fig. 4 and Tab. 2 for Ref. [54], where the acceptance from Ref. [93] for the W' model has been taken into account. In the comparison to data, we employ a K factor of 1.3 [55, 74].

3.2.2 Leptonic decay mode

If the masses of the RH neutrinos are negligible compared to the mass of the W_R we can also consider the leptonic decay modes $W_R \rightarrow \ell_i \bar{\nu}_R$, $\ell_i = e, \mu, \tau$, where the RH neutrinos are stable (we omit their flavours). In this case, adding the contributions from the different neutrinos, one gets $\Gamma(W_R \rightarrow \ell_i \bar{\nu}_R) \approx \alpha_R M_{W_R}/12$. Therefore, the bounds on the branching fractions are

$$\text{Br}(W_R \rightarrow \ell_i \bar{\nu}_R)_{\text{Eff}} \gtrsim \frac{1}{12}, \quad (3.24)$$

$$\text{Br}(W_R \rightarrow \ell_i \bar{\nu}_R)_D > \frac{2}{27}, \quad (3.25)$$

$$\text{Br}(W_R \rightarrow \ell_i \bar{\nu}_R)_T > \frac{1}{15}. \quad (3.26)$$




Figure 5: Comparison between the theoretical prediction of the cross section times the branching fraction of the process $W_R \rightarrow \ell_i \bar{\nu}_R$ for different LR symmetric models, and the experimental bound obtained by ATLAS [60] combining the data from the decays to $e\bar{\nu}_R$ and $\mu\bar{\nu}_R$ in the narrow resonance regime. The data corresponds to the case $m_{\ell\nu} > 0.3 M_{W_R}$.

From the experimental side, we dispose of data on light lepton modes, ATLAS ($\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV, 139 fb^{-1}) [60, 95] and CMS ($\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV, 138 fb^{-1}) [61, 96], and the tauonic mode, ATLAS ($\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV, 139 fb^{-1}) [62] and CMS ($\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV, 35.9 fb^{-1}) [63]. They achieve very similar bounds on the W_R mass in the combined light lepton case, which are better than in the latter tauonic mode. We take the combined data of $W_R \rightarrow e\bar{\nu}_R$ and $W_R \rightarrow \mu\bar{\nu}_R$ from Ref. [60]. Theoretical uncertainties from PDFs and higher-orders are small. We employ a constant K factor of 1.3, valid for $M_{W_R} \simeq 3.0$ TeV [61]. The results of the bound on M_{W_R} are shown in Fig. 5. We employ the experimental data of the fiducial case $m_{\ell\nu} > 0.3 M_{W_R}$, which is very close to the on-shell limit. The less constraining bound is achieved for the case with the minimum value of α_R , which is shown therein. These bounds are better than the ones produced by searches of the $W_R^\pm \rightarrow W_L^\pm h^0$ (which depends on the realization of the scalar sector) and $W_R^\pm \rightarrow W_L^\pm Z_L$ decay modes, see Ref. [50] and references therein; note that both channels are not present in the Effective LR Model.

Relaxing the condition $g_R, g_X \leq 1$ in the direct searches of the W_R gauge boson has an impact in the bound on its mass. This is due to the fact that, if we allow g_X to take greater values, then g_R could be smaller and consequently we would get a smaller cross section.

3.3 Exploiting the relation between the masses M_{Z_R} and M_{W_R}

We now perform a detailed discussion of indirect bounds derived from the use of Eqs. (2.13), (2.18) and (2.23) as a function of the couplings of the theory. As seen from these expressions, the masses of the W_R and Z_R gauge bosons are related by $\cos \gamma$, where γ is defined in Eq. (2.3). Consequently, from the bound on one of them we can set bounds on the mass of the other gauge boson as a function of γ , considering the range of values of γ allowed




Figure 6: Bounds on the doublet (upper panels) and triplet models (lower panels), on the M_{Z_R} (left panels) and M_{W_R} (right panels) gauge boson masses; the corresponding plots for the effective model are very similar to the doublet cases. The solid blue curves correspond to the bounds on the M_{Z_R} (M_{W_R}) mass derived from the direct searches to the Z_R (respectively, W_R) gauge boson; instead, the dotted orange lines are the bounds on the M_{Z_R} (M_{W_R}) mass derived from the direct searches to the W_R (respectively, Z_R) gauge boson, based on the relation between the two heavy gauge boson masses in the LRM realizations under discussion.

by perturbativity considerations. In scenarios (i)-(iii), we have that $M_{W_R} \leq M_{Z_R}$.⁸

We illustrate the use of these relations in Fig. 6; they correspond, as in the remaining of this section, to data from the $W_R \rightarrow jj$ mode, which is independent of the neutrino sector, and an anti-diagonal RH mixing matrix, for which less constraining bounds apply. Fig. 6 shows that for lower (higher) values of γ , bounds better by about 50% on the M_{W_R} (respectively, M_{Z_R}) gauge boson mass are achieved by searches of the Z_R (respectively, W_R) gauge boson, showing the complementarity of the two strategies in the Doublet, Triplet and Effective LR models. Note that the expression relating the masses M_{Z_R} and M_{W_R} depends on the specific scenario analysed, see Eqs. (2.13), (2.18) and (2.23), reason why the indirect constraint depends on the doublet or triplet realizations of the scalar sector. Depending of the value of γ inside the perturbative region, the bounds on the gauge boson masses from searches in colliders can vary by as much as a factor of 2. In particular, this is the case for the LR symmetric scenario ($\gamma \approx 33^\circ$) for the mass of the W_R boson in the model with doublets.

⁸As such, Eqs. (2.13), (2.18) or (2.23) would not hold, for instance, under the breaking pattern $SU(2)_R \times U(1)_X \rightarrow U(1)_{3R} \times U(1)_X \rightarrow U(1)_Y$ [23], not considered in this work. In the latter case, one could still exploit that $M_{W_R} > M_{Z_R}$, see also Ref. [22].




Figure 7: Bounds on the LR scale for the models with doublets (left panel) and triplets (right panel) with respect to the mixing angle γ ; the corresponding plot for the effective model is very similar to the one for the doublets.

We have used the data corresponding to the narrow width approximation for all of the values of γ . As stated in Sec. 3.1, considering different values of the width of the Z_R gauge boson in the range that corresponds to our case (Γ_{Z_R}/M_{Z_R} between 2% and 10%) has little impact on the bounds on its mass. On the other hand, $\Gamma_{W_R}/M_{W_R} \lesssim 5\%$ in the range $\gamma > 30^\circ$ and we will find little discrepancies with respect to the narrow width approximation for smaller values of the mixing angle. However, the bounds for small values of γ are dominated by the indirect bounds derived from Z_R production.

Given the values of the lower bounds on the gauge boson masses as a function of γ , and the perturbativity requirement on the gauge couplings, we extract lower bounds on the LR energy scale

$$|v_R|_D \gtrsim 10 \text{ TeV}, \quad |v_R|_T \gtrsim 4.9 \text{ TeV}, \quad (3.27)$$

while the bound for the effective case is similar to the Doublet model; see Fig. 7. These lowest lower bounds on the LR scale correspond to the value of the mixing angle $\gamma = 20^\circ$.

3.4 Summary

Hereby we summarize the bounds achieved in the previous sections. The values in Tab. 2 result from the less stringent constraints in scenarios (i)-(iii), i.e., masses are excluded below these values with a high significance, of around 95% CL. In finding these results, we adjust the new coupling constants according to the expressions derived in the main text regarding Z_R branching ratios; also, we minimize the W_R production, assuming a perturbative theory.

The masses are constrained to lie above a few TeV in both cases. The most important bounds on the W_R mass result from the leptonic decay mode, which however depends on the assumption that RH neutrinos are light enough. The bounds on the W_R mass from dijet final states are independent of this assumption. Note that the consideration of different structures of the mixing matrix for RH quarks leads to differences of $\lesssim 1$ TeV in the recasted bounds. The bounds are very similar across the three LRMs that we discussed in this work, which differ in their scalar content, implying that collider searches based on fermions in the final state are mostly blind to this feature.

The discussion so far is model independent in the sense that the bounds on the gauge boson masses and the characteristic LR energy scale are obtained by considering the value of γ such that the lowest lower bounds are obtained. Sec. 3.3 discusses bounds for different values of γ .

Channel	Refs.		(i) $\Phi + \chi_{L,R}$	(ii) $\Phi + \Delta_{L,R}$	(iii) $\chi_{L,R}$
$Z_R \rightarrow \ell_i \bar{\ell}_i$	[53]	$M_{Z_R} [\text{TeV}]$	4.3	4.2	4.3
$W_R \rightarrow jj$, anti-diag.	[54]	$M_{W_R} [\text{TeV}]$	2.1	2.0	2.1
$W_R \rightarrow \ell_i \bar{\nu}_R$, anti-diag.	[60]		4.3	4.2	4.3
$W_R \rightarrow jj$, diag.	[54]	$M_{W_R} [\text{TeV}]$	2.9	2.7	3.0
$W_R \rightarrow \ell_i \bar{\nu}_R$, diag.	[60]		5.1	5.0	5.1

Table 2: Summary of the bounds on the new gauge boson masses M_{Z_R} or M_{W_R} , according to the case indicated in the first column. Two specific structures of the RH quark mixing matrix are considered, namely, a diagonal (i.e., CKM-like) and an anti-diagonal structures. The case $W_R \rightarrow \ell_i \bar{\nu}_R$ concerns light RH neutrinos. Bounds combine information from electronic and muonic modes.

4 Conclusions

LRMs provide the possibility of restoring discrete symmetries at high energies, giving an explanation for their violation at low energies. Different realizations of their scalar sectors are possible, which involve a large number of new parameters in the scalar potential. Moreover, apart from a new gauge coupling, the model introduces new fermion mixing matrices.

We illustrate the impact of the scalar sector by considering three scenarios: (i) a model with two doublets and a bi-doublet; (ii) a model with two triplets and a bi-doublet; and (iii) an effective model with two doublets and no bi-doublet. The latter allows a straightforward analysis of LRMs by introducing the minimal scalar content necessary for the SSB of the new gauged symmetries. Based on the use of the equivalence theorem, relating longitudinal vector boson degrees of freedom to would-be Goldstone modes in the large boosted regime, the total widths from two-body decays of the new heavy gauge bosons for a fixed $SU(2)_R$ gauge coupling are maximized; this procedure has the advantage of achieving bounds that do not depend any further on the details of the specific scalar realizations. We also consider more general structures of the mixing matrix in the right-handed quark sector, which affects the production mechanism of the heavy charged gauge boson, due to the different PDFs of the constituent partons of the colliding protons at LHC. The anti-diagonal texture of the right-handed mixing matrix leads to the less constraining bound on the mass of the W_R ; for comparison, we also provide bounds for the diagonal structure. By also considering the value of the new gauge coupling, adjusted to minimize the production cross section while satisfying perturbativity constraints, we get the model independent bounds summarized in Tab. 2 for Z_R and W_R , which consist of the less constraining limits on their masses. As seen therein, masses are constrained to lie above 2 – 5 TeV. Bounds for distinct values of the LRM gauge couplings are provided in Fig. 6.

In the future, we plan to address electroweak precision bounds for different LRM realizations, which are also independent of the mixing matrices for quarks and leptons, and flavour observables, in order to further constrain distinct versions of LRMs.

Acknowledgements. We thank Prasanna Kumar Dhani, Andreas Hinzmann, Greg Landsberg, Jeongeun Lee, Emanuela Musumeci, and José Zurita for useful discussions and communication.

This work has been supported by MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033, grant PID2020-

114473GB-I00; by Generalitat Valenciana, grant PROMETEO/2021 /071 and by Ministerio de Universidades (Gobierno de España), grant FPU20/04279. This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No 101031558. LVS is grateful for the hospitality of the CERN-TH group where part of this research was executed.

A Scalar potentials

Here we display the explicit form of the scalar potentials in the most general case where no additional discrete symmetry is imposed to the theory. The only difference with respect to the LR symmetric scenario is that some of the parameters of the potential are no longer real. Thus, they are sources of \mathcal{CP} violation. For the models with doublets and triplets we have, respectively:

$$\begin{aligned}
V_D = & -\mu_1^2 \text{tr} \left\{ \Phi \Phi^\dagger \right\} + \left(-\mu_2^2 \text{tr} \left\{ \tilde{\Phi} \Phi^\dagger \right\} + \text{h.c.} \right) - \mu_L^2 \chi_L^\dagger \chi_L - \mu_R^2 \chi_R^\dagger \chi_R \\
& + \lambda_1 \text{tr} \left\{ \Phi \Phi^\dagger \right\}^2 + \lambda_2 \text{tr} \left\{ \tilde{\Phi} \Phi^\dagger \right\} \text{tr} \left\{ \Phi \Phi^\dagger \right\} \\
& + \left(\lambda_3 \text{tr} \left\{ \tilde{\Phi} \Phi^\dagger \right\}^2 + \lambda_4 \text{tr} \left\{ \Phi \Phi^\dagger \right\} \text{tr} \left\{ \tilde{\Phi} \Phi^\dagger \right\} + \text{h.c.} \right) \\
& + \lambda_L \left(\chi_L^\dagger \chi_L \right)^2 + \lambda_R \left(\chi_R^\dagger \chi_R \right)^2 + \lambda_{LR} \left(\chi_L^\dagger \chi_L \right) \left(\chi_R^\dagger \chi_R \right) \\
& + \left(\mu'_1 \chi_L^\dagger \Phi \chi_R + \mu'_2 \chi_L^\dagger \tilde{\Phi} \chi_R + \text{h.c.} \right) \\
& + \alpha_{1,L} \text{tr} \left\{ \Phi \Phi^\dagger \right\} \chi_L^\dagger \chi_L + \left(\alpha_{2,L} \text{tr} \left\{ \tilde{\Phi} \Phi^\dagger \right\} \chi_L^\dagger \chi_L + \text{h.c.} \right) \\
& + \alpha_{3,L} \chi_L^\dagger \Phi \Phi^\dagger \chi_L + \alpha_{4,L} \chi_L^\dagger \tilde{\Phi} \Phi^\dagger \chi_L \\
& + \alpha_{1,R} \text{tr} \left\{ \Phi \Phi^\dagger \right\} \chi_R^\dagger \chi_R + \left(\alpha_{2,R} \text{tr} \left\{ \tilde{\Phi} \Phi^\dagger \right\} \chi_R^\dagger \chi_R + \text{h.c.} \right) \\
& + \alpha_{3,R} \chi_R^\dagger \Phi \Phi^\dagger \chi_R + \alpha_{4,R} \chi_R^\dagger \tilde{\Phi} \Phi^\dagger \chi_R,
\end{aligned} \tag{A.1}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
V_T = & -\mu_1^2 \text{tr} \left\{ \Phi \Phi^\dagger \right\} - \left(\mu_2^2 \text{tr} \left\{ \tilde{\Phi} \Phi^\dagger \right\} + \text{h.c.} \right) - \mu_L^2 \text{tr} \left\{ \Delta_L \Delta_L^\dagger \right\} - \mu_R^2 \text{tr} \left\{ \Delta_R \Delta_R^\dagger \right\} \\
& + \lambda_1 \text{tr} \left\{ \Phi \Phi^\dagger \right\}^2 + \lambda_2 \text{tr} \left\{ \tilde{\Phi} \Phi^\dagger \right\} \text{tr} \left\{ \Phi \Phi^\dagger \right\} \\
& + \left(\lambda_3 \text{tr} \left\{ \tilde{\Phi} \Phi^\dagger \right\}^2 + \lambda_4 \text{tr} \left\{ \Phi \Phi^\dagger \right\} \text{tr} \left\{ \tilde{\Phi} \Phi^\dagger \right\} + \text{h.c.} \right) \\
& + \rho_{1,L} \text{tr} \left\{ \Delta_L \Delta_L^\dagger \right\}^2 + \rho_{2,L} \text{tr} \left\{ \Delta_L \Delta_L \right\} \text{tr} \left\{ \Delta_L^\dagger \Delta_L^\dagger \right\} \\
& + \rho_{1,R} \text{tr} \left\{ \Delta_R \Delta_R^\dagger \right\}^2 + \rho_{2,R} \text{tr} \left\{ \Delta_R \Delta_R \right\} \text{tr} \left\{ \Delta_R^\dagger \Delta_R^\dagger \right\} \\
& + \rho_3 \text{tr} \left\{ \Delta_L \Delta_L^\dagger \right\} \left\{ \Delta_R \Delta_R^\dagger \right\} + \left(\rho_4 \text{tr} \left\{ \Delta_L \Delta_L \right\} \left\{ \Delta_R^\dagger \Delta_R^\dagger \right\} + \text{h.c.} \right) \\
& + \alpha_{1,L} \text{tr} \left\{ \Phi \Phi^\dagger \right\} \text{tr} \left\{ \Delta_L \Delta_L^\dagger \right\} + \left(\alpha_{2,L} \text{tr} \left\{ \tilde{\Phi} \Phi^\dagger \right\} \text{tr} \left\{ \Delta_L \Delta_L^\dagger \right\} + \text{h.c.} \right) \\
& + \alpha_{1,R} \text{tr} \left\{ \Phi \Phi^\dagger \right\} \text{tr} \left\{ \Delta_R \Delta_R^\dagger \right\} + \left(\alpha_{2,R} \text{tr} \left\{ \tilde{\Phi} \Phi^\dagger \right\} \text{tr} \left\{ \Delta_R \Delta_R^\dagger \right\} + \text{h.c.} \right) \\
& + \alpha_{3,L} \text{tr} \left\{ \Phi \Phi^\dagger \Delta_L \Delta_L^\dagger \right\} + \alpha_{3,R} \text{tr} \left\{ \Phi^\dagger \Phi \Delta_R \Delta_R^\dagger \right\} \\
& + \left(\beta_1 \text{tr} \left\{ \Phi \Delta_R \Phi^\dagger \Delta_L^\dagger \right\} + \beta_2 \text{tr} \left\{ \tilde{\Phi} \Delta_R \Phi^\dagger \Delta_L^\dagger \right\} + \beta_3 \text{tr} \left\{ \Phi \Delta_R \tilde{\Phi}^\dagger \Delta_L^\dagger \right\} + \text{h.c.} \right),
\end{aligned} \tag{A.2}$$

where all of the parameters are real if the addition of the hermitian conjugate for the associated term is not indicated.

The fact that $\tilde{\Phi} \Phi^\dagger$ is diagonal was used to simplify the potentials. In the potential V_T single-trace terms with four triplet fields have been eliminated with the $SU(2)$ algebraic identity ($x = x^i \sigma^i$; $x = a, b, c, d$)

$$2 \text{tr} \{abcd\} = \text{tr} \{ab\} \text{tr} \{cd\} - \text{tr} \{ac\} \text{tr} \{bd\} + \text{tr} \{ad\} \text{tr} \{bc\}. \tag{A.3}$$

B Summary of couplings

Here we display all of the terms of the Lagrangian that we have used to calculate the widths and cross sections of the different $1 \rightarrow 2$ processes. We have decomposed the fields as $\chi_{L,R}^0 := (v_{L,R} + \chi_{L,R}^{0r} + i\chi_{L,R}^{0i})/\sqrt{2}$, $\delta_{L,R}^0 := (v_{L,R} + \delta_{L,R}^{0r} + i\delta_{L,R}^{0i})/\sqrt{2}$ and $\phi_{1,2}^0 := (\kappa_{1,2} + \phi_{1,2}^{0r} \pm i\phi_{1,2}^{0i})/\sqrt{2}$. All of the couplings are given at leading order in powers of v_{EW}/v_R .

- Z_R with two fermions:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{12 \cos \theta_W} e \tan \gamma Z_R^\mu \bar{u} \gamma_\mu \{ (2 - 3 \cot^2 \gamma) - (3 \cot^2 \gamma) \gamma_5 \} u \\
& + \frac{1}{12 \cos \theta_W} e \tan \gamma Z_R^\mu \bar{d} \gamma_\mu \{ (2 + 3 \cot^2 \gamma) + (3 \cot^2 \gamma) \gamma_5 \} d \\
& - \frac{1}{4 \cos \theta_W} e \tan \gamma Z_R^\mu \bar{e} \gamma_\mu \{ (2 - \cot^2 \gamma) - (\cot^2 \gamma) \gamma_5 \} e \\
& - \frac{1}{2 \cos \theta_W} e \tan \gamma Z_R^\mu \bar{\nu}_L \gamma_\mu \nu_L - \frac{1}{2 \cos \theta_W} e \tan \gamma (1 + \cot^2 \gamma) Z_R^\mu \bar{\nu}_R \gamma_\mu \nu_R.
\end{aligned} \tag{B.1}$$

- Z_R with two neutral scalars in the models with doublets:

$$\begin{aligned}
& Z_R^\mu \left\{ \frac{1}{2} g_R \cos \gamma [\phi_1^{0i} \partial_\mu \phi_1^{0r} - \phi_1^{0r} \partial_\mu \phi_1^{0i} + \phi_2^{0i} \partial_\mu \phi_2^{0r} - \phi_2^{0r} \partial_\mu \phi_2^{0i}] \right. \\
& + \frac{1}{2} g_X \sin \gamma [\chi_L^{0i} \partial_\mu \chi_L^{0r} - \chi_L^{0r} \partial_\mu \chi_L^{0i}] \\
& \left. + \frac{1}{2} (g_R \cos \gamma + g_X \sin \gamma) [\chi_R^{0i} \partial_\mu \chi_R^{0r} - \chi_R^{0r} \partial_\mu \chi_R^{0i}] \right\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{B.2}$$

- Z_R with two neutral scalars in the models with triplets:

$$\begin{aligned}
& Z_R^\mu \left\{ \frac{1}{2} g_R \cos \gamma [\phi_1^{0i} \partial_\mu \phi_1^{0r} - \phi_1^{0r} \partial_\mu \phi_1^{0i} + \phi_2^{0i} \partial_\mu \phi_2^{0r} - \phi_2^{0r} \partial_\mu \phi_2^{0i}] \right. \\
& + g_X \sin \gamma [\delta_L^{0i} \partial_\mu \delta_L^{0r} - \delta_L^{0r} \partial_\mu \delta_L^{0i}] \\
& \left. + (g_R \cos \gamma + g_X \sin \gamma) [\delta_R^{0i} \partial_\mu \delta_R^{0r} - \delta_R^{0r} \partial_\mu \delta_R^{0i}] \right\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{B.3}$$

- Z_R with two singly charged scalars in the models with doublets:

$$\begin{aligned}
& i Z_R^\mu \left\{ \frac{1}{2} g_R \cos \gamma [\phi_1^+ \partial_\mu \phi_1^- - \phi_1^- \partial_\mu \phi_1^+ + \phi_2^+ \partial_\mu \phi_2^- - \phi_2^- \partial_\mu \phi_2^+] \right. \\
& + \frac{1}{2} g_X \sin \gamma [\chi_L^- \partial_\mu \chi_L^+ - \chi_L^+ \partial_\mu \chi_L^-] \\
& \left. + \frac{1}{2} (g_R \cos \gamma - g_X \sin \gamma) [\chi_R^+ \partial_\mu \chi_R^- - \chi_R^- \partial_\mu \chi_R^+] \right\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{B.4}$$

- Z_R with two singly charged scalars in the models with triplets:

$$\begin{aligned}
& i Z_R^\mu \left\{ \frac{1}{2} g_R \cos \gamma [\phi_1^+ \partial_\mu \phi_1^- - \phi_1^- \partial_\mu \phi_1^+ + \phi_2^+ \partial_\mu \phi_2^- - \phi_2^- \partial_\mu \phi_2^+] \right. \\
& \left. + g_X \sin \gamma [\delta_L^- \partial_\mu \delta_L^+ - \delta_L^+ \partial_\mu \delta_L^- + \delta_R^- \partial_\mu \delta_R^+ - \delta_R^+ \partial_\mu \delta_R^-] \right\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{B.5}$$

- Z_R with two doubly charged scalars:

$$i Z_R^\mu \left\{ (g_R \cos \gamma - g_X \sin \gamma) [\delta_R^{++} \partial_\mu \delta_R^{--} - \delta_R^{--} \partial_\mu \delta_R^{++}] - g_X \sin \gamma [\delta_L^{++} \partial_\mu \delta_L^{--} - \delta_L^{--} \partial_\mu \delta_L^{++}] \right\}. \quad (\text{B.6})$$

- Z_R with W_R and a singly charged scalar in the models with doublets:

$$-\frac{e}{\cos \theta_W} \sin \gamma M_{Z_R} \chi_R^- W_{R,\mu}^+ Z_R^\mu + \text{h.c.} \quad (\text{B.7})$$

- Z_R with W_R and a singly charged scalar in the models with triplets:

$$-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{e}{\cos \theta_W} \sin \gamma (2 + \cot^2 \gamma) M_{Z_R} \delta_R^- W_{R,\mu}^+ Z_R^\mu + \text{h.c.} \quad (\text{B.8})$$

- Z_R with two W_L bosons:

$$ie \cot \theta_W \sin \alpha \left\{ (\partial^\mu W_L^{-\nu})(W_{L,\mu}^+ Z_{R,\nu} - W_{L,\nu}^+ Z_{R,\mu}) + (\partial^\mu W_L^{+\nu})(W_{L,\nu}^- Z_{R,\mu} - W_{L,\mu}^- Z_{R,\nu}) + (\partial^\mu Z_R^\nu)(W_{L,\mu}^- W_{L,\nu}^+ - W_{L,\nu}^- W_{L,\mu}^+) \right\}, \quad (\text{B.9})$$

where $\sin \alpha = \frac{\tan \gamma \tan \theta_W}{\cos \theta_W} \frac{M_{W_L}^2}{M_{Z_R}^2}$ results from the mixing of the massive neutral gauge bosons in the $\chi_L + \chi_R$ Effective LR Model.

- Z_R with two W_R bosons:

$$i \frac{e}{\cos \theta_W} \cot \gamma \left\{ (\partial^\mu W_R^{-\nu})(W_{R,\mu}^+ Z_{R,\nu} - W_{R,\nu}^+ Z_{R,\mu}) + (\partial^\mu W_R^{+\nu})(W_{R,\nu}^- Z_{R,\mu} - W_{R,\mu}^- Z_{R,\nu}) + (\partial^\mu Z_R^\nu)(W_{R,\mu}^- W_{R,\nu}^+ - W_{R,\nu}^- W_{R,\mu}^+) \right\}. \quad (\text{B.10})$$

- W_R with two fermions (Dirac neutrinos):

$$-\frac{g_R}{\sqrt{2}} W_R^{+\mu} \left\{ \bar{u} \gamma_\mu V_R^{\text{CKM}} \mathcal{P}_R d + \bar{\nu} \gamma_\mu V_R^{\text{PMNS}} \mathcal{P}_R e \right\} + \text{h.c.} \quad (\text{B.11})$$

- W_R with two fermions (Majorana neutrinos):

$$-\frac{g_R}{\sqrt{2}} W_R^{+\mu} \left\{ \bar{u} \gamma_\mu V_R^{\text{CKM}} \mathcal{P}_R d + \bar{\nu}_h \gamma_\mu V_h^{\text{PMNS}} \mathcal{P}_R e \right\} + \text{h.c.} \quad (\text{B.12})$$

- W_R with a singly charged and a neutral scalar in the models with doublets:

$$\frac{g_R}{2} W_R^{+\mu} \left\{ \phi_1^{0i} \partial_\mu \phi_1^- - \phi_1^- \partial_\mu \phi_1^{0i} + \phi_2^- \partial_\mu \phi_2^{0i} - \phi_2^{0i} \partial_\mu \phi_2^- + \chi_R^- \partial_\mu \chi_R^{0i} - \chi_R^{0i} \partial_\mu \chi_R^- \right. \\ \left. + i [\phi_1^- \partial_\mu \phi_1^{0r} - \phi_1^{0r} \partial_\mu \phi_1^- + \phi_2^{0r} \partial_\mu \phi_2^- - \phi_2^- \partial_\mu \phi_2^{0r} + \chi_R^{0r} \partial_\mu \chi_R^- - \chi_R^- \partial_\mu \chi_R^{0r}] \right\} + \text{h.c.} \quad (\text{B.13})$$

- W_R with a singly charged and a neutral scalar in the models with triplets:

$$\frac{g_R}{2} W_R^{+\mu} \left\{ \phi_1^{0i} \partial_\mu \phi_1^- - \phi_1^- \partial_\mu \phi_1^{0i} + \phi_2^- \partial_\mu \phi_2^{0i} - \phi_2^{0i} \partial_\mu \phi_2^- + \sqrt{2} (\delta_R^- \partial_\mu \delta_R^{0i} - \delta_R^{0i} \partial_\mu \delta_R^-) \right. \\ \left. + i [\phi_1^- \partial_\mu \phi_1^{0r} - \phi_1^{0r} \partial_\mu \phi_1^- + \phi_2^{0r} \partial_\mu \phi_2^- - \phi_2^- \partial_\mu \phi_2^{0r} + \sqrt{2} (\delta_R^{0r} \partial_\mu \delta_R^- - \delta_R^- \partial_\mu \delta_R^{0r})] \right\} + \text{h.c.} \quad (\text{B.14})$$

- W_R with a doubly and a singly charged scalars:

$$ig_R W_R^{+\mu} \{ \delta_R^{--} \partial_\mu \delta_R^+ - \delta_R^+ \partial_\mu \delta_R^{--} \} + \text{h.c.} \quad (\text{B.15})$$

- W_R with W_L and a doubly charged scalar:

$$\sqrt{2} g_R^2 v_R e^{i\lambda} \sin \xi \cos \xi W_R^{-\mu} W_{L\mu}^- \delta_R^{++} + \text{h.c.} \quad (\text{B.16})$$

- W_R with a singly charged scalar and a photon in the model with a bidoublet and two doublets (exact result up to $W_L - W_R$ mixing coefficients):

$$\frac{1}{2} e g_R W_R^{+\mu} A_\mu \{ v_R \chi_R^- + \kappa_2^* \phi_2^- - \kappa_1 \phi_1^- \} + \text{h.c.} \quad (\text{B.17})$$

- W_R with a singly charged scalar and a photon in the model with a bidoublet and two triplets (exact result up to $W_L - W_R$ mixing coefficients):

$$\frac{1}{2} e g_R W_R^{+\mu} A_\mu \left\{ \sqrt{2} v_R \delta_R^- + \kappa_2^* \phi_2^- - \kappa_1 \phi_1^- \right\} + \text{h.c.} \quad (\text{B.18})$$

- W_R with scalars in the model with a bidoublet and two doublets (exact result up to $W_L - W_R$ mixing coefficients):

$$\frac{i}{2} g_R W_R^{+\mu} \partial_\mu \{ v_R \chi_R^- + \kappa_2^* \phi_2^- - \kappa_1 \phi_1^- \} + \text{h.c.} \quad (\text{B.19})$$

- W_R with scalars in the model with a bidoublet and two triplets (exact result up to $W_L - W_R$ mixing coefficients):

$$\frac{i}{2} g_R W_R^{+\mu} \partial_\mu \left\{ \sqrt{2} v_R \delta_R^- + \kappa_2^* \phi_2^- - \kappa_1 \phi_1^- \right\} + \text{h.c.} \quad (\text{B.20})$$

Eqs. (B.19) and (B.20) are used to identify the combinations of scalar degrees of freedom that result being the Goldstone bosons, see App. C.

There is no interaction vertex between W_R , W_L and A at the tree level; we do have couplings of the form $W_1 W_1 A$ and $W_2 W_2 A$ (while $W_1 W_2 A$ is not possible) but when we apply the transformation in Eq. (2.1) the terms that contain the vertex $W_L W_R A$ cancel each other due to the unitarity of the mixing matrix.

Neither cubic nor quartic interaction vertices among only neutral gauge bosons can be present. Indeed, the gauge self-interactions are generated by terms proportional to $\text{tr} \{ \partial^\mu W^\nu [W_\mu, W_\nu] \}$ and $\text{tr} \{ [W^\mu, W^\nu] [W_\mu, W_\nu] \}$, but the commutator $[W_\mu, W_\nu]$ does not contain products of the form $W_\mu^3 W_\nu^3$ since $[\sigma^3, \sigma^3] = 0$.

C Non-fermionic decays of the Z_R and W_R gauge bosons

Here we show the details of the calculation of the bounds on the partial widths of the non-fermionic decays of the W_R and Z_R gauge bosons. We start with the latter. First of all, let us calculate the partial width of the process Z_R decaying to two particular neutral scalars. The Lagrangian of the interaction can be written as

$$\mathcal{L} = Z_R^\mu \sum_{a,b} C_{ab} \{ \psi_a \partial_\mu \psi_b - \psi_b \partial_\mu \psi_a \}, \quad (\text{C.1})$$

where the C_{ab} are the coupling constants and $\{\psi_a\}_{a=1}^8$ is just a basis of the neutral fields. Looking at Eqs. (B.2) and (B.3) we see that Eq. (C.1) can be used to describe both the cases of doublets and triplets with the bi-doublet. In the interaction basis the non-vanishing couplings are $C_{12}^D = C_{12}^T = C_{34}^D = C_{34}^T = \frac{1}{2}g_R \cos \gamma$, $C_{56}^D = \frac{1}{2}C_{56}^T = \frac{1}{2}g_X \sin \gamma$ and $C_{78}^D = \frac{1}{2}C_{78}^T = \frac{1}{2}(g_R \cos \gamma + g_X \sin \gamma)$. Now, we have to make a rotation into the basis of the physical fields $\{\psi'_a\}_{a=1}^8$. We use the transformation $\psi_a = \sum_i \mathbb{R}_{ai} \psi'_i$. Then, defining the matrix $C' := \mathbb{R}^T C \mathbb{R}$ we can write

$$\mathcal{L} = Z_R^\mu \sum_{i,j} C'_{ij} \{ \psi'_i \partial_\mu \psi'_j - \psi'_j \partial_\mu \psi'_i \}. \quad (\text{C.2})$$

Therefore, the partial width of the process $Z_R \rightarrow \psi'_i \psi'_j$ is just

$$\Gamma(Z_R \rightarrow \psi'_i \psi'_j) = \frac{M_{Z_R}}{48\pi} (C'_{ij} - C'_{ji})^2 \left[1 - 2(x_i + x_j) + (x_i - x_j)^2 \right]^{3/2}, \quad (\text{C.3})$$

where $x_i := m_i^2/M_{Z_R}^2$. It is not difficult to show that the maximum possible value of the partial width is achieved when $x_i = x_j = 0$, i.e., in the massless case. Thus, we put the following bound:

$$\Gamma(Z_R \rightarrow 2 \text{ Neutral Scalars}) < \frac{M_{Z_R}}{48\pi} \sum_{j>i} (C'_{ij} - C'_{ji})^2 = \frac{M_{Z_R}}{48\pi} \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \{ (C' - C'^T) (C'^T - C') \}. \quad (\text{C.4})$$

Using the properties of the trace and the definition of C' it is also not difficult to show that

$$\Gamma(Z_R \rightarrow 2 \text{ Neutral Scalars}) < \frac{M_{Z_R}}{48\pi} \sum_{a,b} C_{ab}^2. \quad (\text{C.5})$$

We can do exactly the same for the decay to charged scalars. From Eqs. (B.4) and (B.5) we see that we can write the interaction Lagrangian of the Z_R and 2 singly charged scalars as

$$\mathcal{L} = i Z_R^\mu \sum_a C_a \{ \psi_a^+ \partial_\mu \psi_a^- - \psi_a^- \partial_\mu \psi_a^+ \}. \quad (\text{C.6})$$

In this case, in the interaction basis we have $C_1^D = C_1^T = C_2^D = C_2^T = \frac{1}{2}g_R \cos \gamma$, $C_3^D = \frac{1}{2}C_3^T = \frac{1}{2}C_4^T = -\frac{1}{2}g_X \sin \gamma$ and $C_4^D = \frac{1}{2}(g_R \cos \gamma - g_X \sin \gamma)$. Now, we make the transformation into the physical basis $\psi_a^- = \sum_i U_{ai} \psi'_i$ where U is a unitary matrix. Using the same arguments as in the previous case we can find that

$$\Gamma(Z_R \rightarrow 2 \text{ Singly Charged Scalars}) < \frac{M_{Z_R}}{48\pi} \sum_{i,j} |C_{ij}|^2, \quad (\text{C.7})$$

where $C_{ij} := \sum_a C_a U_{ai}^* U_{aj}$. Therefore, it is not difficult to prove that

$$\Gamma(Z_R \rightarrow 2 \text{ Singly Charged Scalars}) < \frac{M_{Z_R}}{48\pi} \sum_a C_a^2. \quad (\text{C.8})$$

If we want to calculate the bound on the partial width of the decay of the Z_R to two bosons we only need to add the contribution of $Z_R \rightarrow$ Doubly Charged Scalars in the

case of the model with triplets. From Eq. (B.6) it is easy to see that this calculation is completely analogous to the one for singly charged scalars.

Now we will show that the partial width of the decay $Z_R \rightarrow W_R^\pm W_L^\mp$ is negligible. The Feynman rule of the interaction of three gauge bosons is given by a function of the form $\eta_{\mu\nu}(q-p)_\lambda + \eta_{\lambda\mu}(p-r)_\nu + \eta_{\nu\lambda}(r-q)_\mu$ with p , q and r the incoming momenta of the particles. Then, the dependence on the mass of the partial width of the decay of one gauge boson with mass M into other two with masses m_1 and m_2 is given by

$$f(M, m_1, m_2) = \frac{M^5}{m_1^2 m_2^2} \left[1 - 2 \frac{m_1^2 + m_2^2}{M^2} + \left(\frac{m_1^2 - m_2^2}{M^2} \right)^2 \right]^{3/2} \times \left\{ 1 + 10 \frac{m_1^2 + m_2^2}{M^2} + \frac{m_1^4 + m_2^4 + 10m_1^2 m_2^2}{M^4} \right\}. \quad (\text{C.9})$$

In our case we can neglect the mass of the W_L boson and write

$$f(M_{Z_R}, M_{W_R}, M_{W_L}) \approx \frac{M_{Z_R}^5}{M_{W_L}^2 M_{W_R}^2} \left(1 - \frac{M_{W_R}^2}{M_{Z_R}^2} \right)^3 \left[1 + 10 \left(\frac{M_{W_R}}{M_{Z_R}} \right)^2 + \left(\frac{M_{W_R}}{M_{Z_R}} \right)^4 \right]. \quad (\text{C.10})$$

The process $Z_R \rightarrow W_R^\pm W_L^\mp$ can only occur at the tree level if there is a mixing between the W_L and the W_R bosons. The amplitude is proportional to $\sin \xi$, so that we have

$$\Gamma(Z_R \rightarrow W_R^\pm W_L^\mp) \sim \frac{M_{Z_R}^5}{M_{W_L}^2 M_{W_R}^2} \sin^2 \xi \sim \frac{v_{EW}^2}{v_R}. \quad (\text{C.11})$$

Consequently, this term can be neglected in the calculation of the width of the Z_R .

We can also prove that the partial width of the decay $Z_R \rightarrow H^\pm W_R^\mp$ is negligible. The process is absent in the $\chi_L + \chi_R$ Effective LR Model since there are no physical charged scalars. On the other hand, as we can see in Eqs. (B.7) and (B.8), the scalars that mediate the decay in the interaction eigenstates basis in the models with a bidoublet and two doublets or two triplets are χ_R^\pm and δ_R^\pm , respectively. Looking at Eqs. (B.19) and (B.20) we can see that the linear combinations $v_R \chi_R^- + \kappa_2^* \phi_2^- - \kappa_1 \phi_1^-$, $\sqrt{2} v_R \delta_R^- + \kappa_2^* \phi_2^- - \kappa_1 \phi_1^-$ and their hermitian conjugates are proportional to a Goldstone boson (i.e., this interacting term can be cancelled by an appropriate choice of gauge-fixing Lagrangian). Consequently, the mixing of the fields χ_R^\pm and δ_R^\pm with physical scalars is $\mathcal{O}(v_{EW}/v_R)$. Thus, the partial width is, at most, proportional to v_{EW}^2/v_R so it can be neglected.

Finally, we have to calculate the partial width of the decay $Z_R \rightarrow W_R^+ W_R^-$. Using the coupling shown in Eq. (B.10) we can see that

$$\Gamma(Z_R \rightarrow W_R^+ W_R^-) = \frac{M_{Z_R}}{192\pi} \left(\frac{e}{\cos \theta_W} \right)^2 \frac{\cot^2 \gamma}{x_w^2} (1 - 4x_w)^{3/2} \{1 + 20x_w + 12x_w^2\}. \quad (\text{C.12})$$

We now shift to the non-fermionic decays of the W_R boson. As we have pointed out in the text, we can set a bound on the partial widths of these processes by calculating the upper bound on $\Gamma(W_R \rightarrow 2 \text{ Scalars})$. We start with the contributions with a neutral and a singly charged scalar, whose interaction Lagrangians are shown in Eqs. (B.13) and (B.14). We can write them as

$$\mathcal{L} = W_R^+ \sum_{ij} C_{ij} \left\{ \psi_i^0 \partial_\mu \psi_j^- - \psi_j^- \partial_\mu \psi_i^0 \right\} + \text{h.c.} \quad (\text{C.13})$$

We make the transformations into the mass eigenstates $\psi_i^0 = \sum_k \mathbb{R}_{ik} \psi_k^{\prime 0}$ and $\psi_j^- = \sum_l \mathbb{U}_{jl} \psi_l^{\prime -}$. Then, we have

$$\mathcal{L} = W_R^+ \sum_{ij} C'_{ij} \left\{ \psi_i^{\prime 0} \partial_\mu \psi_j^{\prime -} - \psi_j^{\prime -} \partial_\mu \psi_i^{\prime 0} \right\} + \text{h.c.}, \quad (\text{C.14})$$

where $C' := \mathbb{R}^T C \mathbb{U}$. Again, the upper bound on the partial width corresponds to the case in which the particles in the final state have a negligible mass compared to the one of the W_R boson:

$$\Gamma(W_R^\pm \rightarrow \psi^{\prime 0} \psi^{\prime \pm}) < \frac{M_{W_R}}{48\pi} \sum_{ij} |C'_{ij}|^2 = \frac{M_{W_R}}{48\pi} \text{tr} \left\{ \mathbb{R}^T C \mathbb{U} \mathbb{U}^\dagger C^\dagger \mathbb{R} \right\} = \frac{M_{W_R}}{48\pi} \sum_{ij} C_{ij}^2. \quad (\text{C.15})$$

The calculation for the case with a singly and a doubly charged scalars Eq. (B.15) is completely analogous. We can also show that the contribution of $W_R^\pm \rightarrow W_L^\mp H^{\pm\pm}$ in the models with triplets is negligible. At tree level this process is mediated by the coupling term in Eq. (B.16). It can be written as

$$\mathcal{L} = C W_R^{-\mu} W_{L\mu}^- \delta_R^{++} + \text{h.c.} \quad (\text{C.16})$$

Since $\sin \xi \sim v_{EW}^2/v_R^2$, then $|C| \sim v_{EW}^2/v_R$. Now, we make a transformation into the mass eigenstates $\delta_R^{++} = \sum_i \mathbb{U}_{2i} \psi_i^{++}$, where \mathbb{U} is a unitary transformation. Thus, we find that

$$\mathcal{L} = C W_R^{-\mu} W_{L\mu}^- \sum_i \mathbb{U}_{2i} \psi_i^{++} + \text{h.c.} \quad (\text{C.17})$$

Then, it can be shown that the partial width of the process $W_R^\pm \rightarrow W_L^\mp \psi_i^{\pm\pm}$ is

$$\Gamma(W_R^\pm \rightarrow W_L^\mp \psi_i^{\pm\pm}) \approx \frac{1}{24\pi} \frac{|C|^2}{M_{W_R}^3} |\mathbb{U}_{2i}|^2 (M_{W_R}^2 - M_i^2) \left\{ 1 + \frac{(M_{W_R}^2 - M_i^2)^2}{8M_{W_L}^2 M_{W_R}^2} \right\}, \quad (\text{C.18})$$

where M_i is the mass of $\psi_i^{\pm\pm}$ and we have made the approximation $M_{W_R} \gg M_{W_L}$. Since $|\mathbb{U}_{2i}|^2 \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$ at most, then $\Gamma(W_R^\pm \rightarrow W_L^\mp \psi_i^{\pm\pm}) \sim v_{EW}^2/v_R$. Consequently, the partial width $\Gamma(W_R^\pm \rightarrow W_L^\mp H^{\pm\pm})$ is negligible.

Finally, we show that the process $W_R^\pm \rightarrow H^\pm A$ is forbidden at tree level. Since there are no physical charged scalars in the $\chi_L + \chi_R$ Effective LR model the result is straightforward in this case. The important interaction vertices in the models with a bidoublet and two doublets or two triplets are presented in Eqs. (B.17) and (B.18), respectively. Nonetheless, looking at Eqs. (B.19) and (B.20), it is easy to see that those combinations of scalars correspond to Goldstone bosons. This is so because of gauge invariance of the electromagnetic interaction, i.e., a vertex of the form $W_R^{\pm\mu} A_\mu H^\mp$ with physical fields would break gauge invariance. Consequently, there are no Feynman rules for this process with physical Higgses at tree level.

References

- [1] Rabindra N. Mohapatra and Jogesh C. Pati. Left-Right Gauge Symmetry and an Isoconjugate Model of CP Violation. *Phys. Rev. D*, 11:566–571, 1975. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.11.566.
- [2] R. N. Mohapatra and Jogesh C. Pati. A Natural Left-Right Symmetry. *Phys. Rev. D*, 11:2558, 1975. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.11.2558.
- [3] G. Senjanovic and Rabindra N. Mohapatra. Exact Left-Right Symmetry and Spontaneous Violation of Parity. *Phys. Rev. D*, 12:1502, 1975. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.12.1502.
- [4] Goran Senjanovic. Spontaneous Breakdown of Parity in a Class of Gauge Theories. *Nucl. Phys. B*, 153:334–364, 1979. doi:10.1016/0550-3213(79)90604-7.
- [5] G. Ecker, W. Grimus, and W. Konetschny. Analysis of Horizontal Symmetries in a Minimal $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \times U(1)$ Gauge Theory. *Nucl. Phys. B*, 177:489–508, 1981. doi:10.1016/0550-3213(81)90183-8.
- [6] G. C. Branco and L. Lavoura. Natural CP Breaking in Left-right Symmetric Theories. *Phys. Lett. B*, 165:327–332, 1985. doi:10.1016/0370-2693(85)91239-0.
- [7] K. S. Babu and Rabindra N. Mohapatra. A Solution to the Strong CP Problem Without an Axion. *Phys. Rev. D*, 41:1286, 1990. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.41.1286.
- [8] K. S. Babu and Rabindra N. Mohapatra. CP Violation in Seesaw Models of Quark Masses. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 62:1079, 1989. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.62.1079.
- [9] Stephen M. Barr, D. Chang, and G. Senjanovic. Strong CP problem and parity. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 67:2765–2768, 1991. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.67.2765.
- [10] L. Lavoura. Solution of the strong CP problem. *Phys. Lett. B*, 391:441–445, 1997. arXiv:hep-ph/9611266, doi:10.1016/S0370-2693(96)01488-8.
- [11] Alessio Maiezza, Miha Nemevsek, Fabrizio Nesti, and Goran Senjanovic. Left-Right Symmetry at LHC. *Phys. Rev. D*, 82:055022, 2010. arXiv:1005.5160, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.82.055022.
- [12] Jogesh C. Pati and Abdus Salam. Lepton Number as the Fourth Color. *Phys. Rev. D*, 10:275–289, 1974. [Erratum: *Phys.Rev.D* 11, 703–703 (1975)]. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.10.275.
- [13] Harald Fritzsch and Peter Minkowski. Unified Interactions of Leptons and Hadrons. *Annals Phys.*, 93:193–266, 1975. doi:10.1016/0003-4916(75)90211-0.
- [14] D. Chang, R. N. Mohapatra, and M. K. Parida. Decoupling Parity and $SU(2)$ -R Breaking Scales: A New Approach to Left-Right Symmetric Models. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 52:1072, 1984. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.52.1072.
- [15] D. Chang, R. N. Mohapatra, and M. K. Parida. A New Approach to Left-Right Symmetry Breaking in Unified Gauge Theories. *Phys. Rev. D*, 30:1052, 1984. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.30.1052.

- [16] D. Chang, R. N. Mohapatra, J. Gipson, R. E. Marshak, and M. K. Parida. Experimental Tests of New SO(10) Grand Unification. *Phys. Rev. D*, 31:1718, 1985. [doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.31.1718](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.31.1718).
- [17] Frank F. Deppisch, Lukas Graf, Suchita Kulkarni, Sudhanwa Patra, Werner Rodejohann, Narendra Sahu, and Utpal Sarkar. Reconciling the 2 TeV excesses at the LHC in a linear seesaw left-right model. *Phys. Rev. D*, 93(1):013011, 2016. [arXiv:1508.05940](https://arxiv.org/abs/1508.05940), [doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.93.013011](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.93.013011).
- [18] Rabindra N. Mohapatra and Deepinder P. Sidhu. Implications for Gauge Theories If Search for Parity Violation in Atomic Physics Fails. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 38:667, 1977. [doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.38.667](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.38.667).
- [19] Rabindra N. Mohapatra, Frank E. Paige, and D. P. Sidhu. Symmetry Breaking and Naturalness of Parity Conservation in Weak Neutral Currents in Left-Right Symmetric Gauge Theories. *Phys. Rev. D*, 17:2462, 1978. [doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.17.2462](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.17.2462).
- [20] Rabindra N. Mohapatra and Goran Senjanovic. Neutrino Mass and Spontaneous Parity Nonconservation. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 44:912, 1980. [doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.44.912](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.44.912).
- [21] Rabindra N. Mohapatra and Goran Senjanovic. Neutrino Masses and Mixings in Gauge Models with Spontaneous Parity Violation. *Phys. Rev. D*, 23:165, 1981. [doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.23.165](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.23.165).
- [22] R. N. Mohapatra. *UNIFICATION AND SUPERSYMMETRY. THE FRONTIERS OF QUARK - LEPTON PHYSICS: The Frontiers of Quark-Lepton Physics*. Springer, Berlin, 1986. [doi:10.1007/978-1-4757-1928-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4757-1928-4).
- [23] R. N. Mohapatra and P. B. Pal. *Massive neutrinos in physics and astrophysics. Second edition*, volume 60. 1998.
- [24] Véronique Bernard, Sébastien Descotes-Genon, and Luiz Vale Silva. Constraining the gauge and scalar sectors of the doublet left-right symmetric model. *JHEP*, 09:088, 2020. [arXiv:2001.00886](https://arxiv.org/abs/2001.00886), [doi:10.1007/JHEP09\(2020\)088](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP09(2020)088).
- [25] Siddhartha Karmakar, Jai More, Akhila Kumar Pradhan, and S. Uma Sankar. Constraints on the doublet left-right symmetric model from Higgs data. *JHEP*, 03:168, 2023. [arXiv:2211.08445](https://arxiv.org/abs/2211.08445), [doi:10.1007/JHEP03\(2023\)168](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP03(2023)168).
- [26] Aharon Davidson and Kameshwar C. Wali. Universal Seesaw Mechanism? *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 59:393, 1987. [doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.59.393](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.59.393).
- [27] S. Rajpoot. Seesaw Masses for Quarks and Leptons in an Ambidextrous Electroweak Interaction Model. *Phys. Lett. B*, 191:122–126, 1987. [doi:10.1016/0370-2693\(87\)91332-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0370-2693(87)91332-3).
- [28] S. Rajpoot. See-saw masses for quarks and leptons in an ambidextrous electroweak interaction model. *Mod. Phys. Lett. A*, 2(5):307–315, 1987. [Erratum: *Mod.Phys.Lett.A* 2, 541 (1987)]. [doi:10.1142/S0217732387000422](https://doi.org/10.1142/S0217732387000422).
- [29] Darwin Chang and Rabindra N. Mohapatra. Small and Calculable Dirac Neutrino Mass. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 58:1600, 1987. [doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.58.1600](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.58.1600).

- [30] Rabindra N. Mohapatra. Left-right Symmetry and Finite One Loop Dirac Neutrino Mass. *Phys. Lett. B*, 201:517–524, 1988. doi:10.1016/0370-2693(88)90610-7.
- [31] K. S. Babu and X. G. He. DIRAC NEUTRINO MASSES AS TWO LOOP RADIATIVE CORRECTIONS. *Mod. Phys. Lett. A*, 4:61, 1989. doi:10.1142/S0217732389000095.
- [32] B. S. Balakrishna. Fermion Mass Hierarchy From Radiative Corrections. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 60:1602, 1988. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.60.1602.
- [33] B. S. Balakrishna, A. L. Kagan, and R. N. Mohapatra. Quark Mixings and Mass Hierarchy From Radiative Corrections. *Phys. Lett. B*, 205:345–352, 1988. doi:10.1016/0370-2693(88)91676-0.
- [34] B. S. Balakrishna and R. N. Mohapatra. Radiative Fermion Masses From New Physics at TeV Scale. *Phys. Lett. B*, 216:349–352, 1989. doi:10.1016/0370-2693(89)91129-5.
- [35] K. S. Babu, Bhaskar Dutta, and Rabindra N. Mohapatra. A theory of $R(D^*, D)$ anomaly with right-handed currents. *JHEP*, 01:168, 2019. arXiv:1811.04496, doi:10.1007/JHEP01(2019)168.
- [36] K. S. Babu, Xiao-Gang He, Mingxian Su, and Anil Thapa. Naturally light Dirac and pseudo-Dirac neutrinos from left-right symmetry. *JHEP*, 08:140, 2022. arXiv:2205.09127, doi:10.1007/JHEP08(2022)140.
- [37] Atri Dey, Rafiqul Rahaman, and Santosh Kumar Rai. Fatjet signatures of heavy neutrinos and heavy leptons in a left-right model with universal seesaw at the HL-LHC. 7 2022. arXiv:2207.06857.
- [38] K. S. Babu and Ritu Dcruz. Resolving \mathbf{W} Boson Mass Shift and CKM Unitarity Violation in Left-Right Symmetric Models with Universal Seesaw. 12 2022. arXiv:2212.09697.
- [39] Ritu Dcruz. Flavor Physics Constraints on Left-Right Symmetric Models with Universal Seesaw. 1 2023. arXiv:2301.10786.
- [40] K. S. Babu, Rabindra N. Mohapatra, and Nobuchika Okada. Parity Solution to the Strong CP Problem and a Unified Framework for Inflation, Baryogenesis, and Dark Matter. 7 2023. arXiv:2307.14869.
- [41] Yue Zhang, Haipeng An, Xiangdong Ji, and R. N. Mohapatra. Right-handed quark mixings in minimal left-right symmetric model with general CP violation. *Phys. Rev. D*, 76:091301, 2007. arXiv:0704.1662, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.76.091301.
- [42] Goran Senjanović and Vladimir Tello. Right Handed Quark Mixing in Left-Right Symmetric Theory. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 114(7):071801, 2015. arXiv:1408.3835, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.114.071801.
- [43] Goran Senjanović and Vladimir Tello. Restoration of Parity and the Right-Handed Analog of the CKM Matrix. *Phys. Rev. D*, 94(9):095023, 2016. arXiv:1502.05704, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.94.095023.

- [44] Paul Langacker and S. Uma Sankar. Bounds on the Mass of W(R) and the W(L)-W(R) Mixing Angle ξ in General SU(2)-L x SU(2)-R x U(1) Models. *Phys. Rev. D*, 40:1569–1585, 1989. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.40.1569.
- [45] Yue Zhang, Haipeng An, Xiangdong Ji, and Rabindra N. Mohapatra. General CP Violation in Minimal Left-Right Symmetric Model and Constraints on the Right-Handed Scale. *Nucl. Phys. B*, 802:247–279, 2008. arXiv:0712.4218, doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2008.05.019.
- [46] Monika Blanke, Andrzej J. Buras, Katrin Gemmler, and Tillmann Heidsieck. Delta F = 2 observables and $B \rightarrow X_q \gamma$ decays in the Left-Right Model: Higgs particles striking back. *JHEP*, 03:024, 2012. arXiv:1111.5014, doi:10.1007/JHEP03(2012)024.
- [47] Wouter Dekens, Lorenzo Andreoli, Jordy de Vries, Emanuele Mereghetti, and Femke Oosterhof. A low-energy perspective on the minimal left-right symmetric model. *JHEP*, 11:127, 2021. arXiv:2107.10852, doi:10.1007/JHEP11(2021)127.
- [48] Stefano Bertolini, Alessio Maiezza, and Fabrizio Nesti. Present and Future K and B Meson Mixing Constraints on TeV Scale Left-Right Symmetry. *Phys. Rev. D*, 89(9):095028, 2014. arXiv:1403.7112, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.89.095028.
- [49] Véronique Bernard, Sébastien Descotes-Genon, and Luiz Vale Silva. Short-distance QCD corrections to $K^0 \bar{K}^0$ mixing at next-to-leading order in Left-Right models. *JHEP*, 08:128, 2016. arXiv:1512.00543, doi:10.1007/JHEP08(2016)128.
- [50] R. L. Workman and Others. Review of Particle Physics. *PTEP*, 2022:083C01, 2022. doi:10.1093/ptep/ptac097.
- [51] Morad Aaboud et al. Search for additional heavy neutral Higgs and gauge bosons in the ditau final state produced in 36 fb⁻¹ of pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV with the ATLAS detector. *JHEP*, 01:055, 2018. arXiv:1709.07242, doi:10.1007/JHEP01(2018)055.
- [52] Georges Aad et al. Search for high-mass dilepton resonances using 139 fb⁻¹ of pp collision data collected at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV with the ATLAS detector. *Phys. Lett. B*, 796:68–87, 2019. arXiv:1903.06248, doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2019.07.016.
- [53] Albert M Sirunyan et al. Search for resonant and nonresonant new phenomena in high-mass dilepton final states at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV. *JHEP*, 07:208, 2021. arXiv:2103.02708, doi:10.1007/JHEP07(2021)208.
- [54] Georges Aad et al. Search for new resonances in mass distributions of jet pairs using 139 fb⁻¹ of pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV with the ATLAS detector. *JHEP*, 03:145, 2020. arXiv:1910.08447, doi:10.1007/JHEP03(2020)145.
- [55] Albert M Sirunyan et al. Search for high mass dijet resonances with a new background prediction method in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV. *JHEP*, 05:033, 2020. arXiv:1911.03947, doi:10.1007/JHEP05(2020)033.
- [56] Georges Aad et al. Search for diboson resonances in hadronic final states in 139 fb⁻¹ of pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV with the ATLAS detector. *JHEP*, 09:091, 2019. [Erratum: *JHEP* 06, 042 (2020)]. arXiv:1906.08589, doi:10.1007/JHEP09(2019)091.

- [57] Georges Aad et al. Search for heavy diboson resonances in semileptonic final states in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV with the ATLAS detector. *Eur. Phys. J. C*, 80(12):1165, 2020. [arXiv:2004.14636](#), [doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-020-08554-y](#).
- [58] Albert M Sirunyan et al. Search for a heavy vector resonance decaying to a Z boson and a Higgs boson in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV. *Eur. Phys. J. C*, 81(8):688, 2021. [arXiv:2102.08198](#), [doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-021-09348-6](#).
- [59] Armen Tumasyan et al. Search for heavy resonances decaying to WW, WZ, or WH boson pairs in the lepton plus merged jet final state in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV. *Phys. Rev. D*, 105(3):032008, 2022. [arXiv:2109.06055](#), [doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.105.032008](#).
- [60] Georges Aad et al. Search for a heavy charged boson in events with a charged lepton and missing transverse momentum from pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV with the ATLAS detector. *Phys. Rev. D*, 100(5):052013, 2019. [arXiv:1906.05609](#), [doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.100.052013](#).
- [61] Armen Tumasyan et al. Search for new physics in the lepton plus missing transverse momentum final state in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV. *JHEP*, 07:067, 2022. [arXiv:2202.06075](#), [doi:10.1007/JHEP07\(2022\)067](#).
- [62] ATLAS Collaboration, ATLAS-CONF-2021-025. Search for high-mass resonances in final states with a tau lepton and missing transverse momentum with the ATLAS detector. 6 2021.
- [63] Albert M Sirunyan et al. Search for a W' boson decaying to a τ lepton and a neutrino in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV. *Phys. Lett. B*, 792:107–131, 2019. [arXiv:1807.11421](#), [doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2019.01.069](#).
- [64] Guido Altarelli, B. Mele, and M. Ruiz-Altaba. Searching for New Heavy Vector Bosons in $p\bar{p}$ Colliders. *Z. Phys. C*, 45:109, 1989. [Erratum: *Z.Phys.C* 47, 676 (1990)]. [doi:10.1007/BF01556677](#).
- [65] Albert M Sirunyan et al. Search for heavy neutrinos and third-generation leptoquarks in hadronic states of two τ leptons and two jets in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV. *JHEP*, 03:170, 2019. [arXiv:1811.00806](#), [doi:10.1007/JHEP03\(2019\)170](#).
- [66] Morad Aaboud et al. Search for a right-handed gauge boson decaying into a high-momentum heavy neutrino and a charged lepton in pp collisions with the ATLAS detector at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV. *Phys. Lett. B*, 798:134942, 2019. [arXiv:1904.12679](#), [doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2019.134942](#).
- [67] Armen Tumasyan et al. Search for a right-handed W boson and a heavy neutrino in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV. *JHEP*, 04:047, 2022. [arXiv:2112.03949](#), [doi:10.1007/JHEP04\(2022\)047](#).
- [68] Georges Aad et al. Search for heavy Majorana or Dirac neutrinos and right-handed W gauge bosons in final states with charged leptons and jets in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV with the ATLAS detector. 4 2023. [arXiv:2304.09553](#).
- [69] Morad Aaboud et al. Search for $W' \rightarrow tb$ decays in the hadronic final state using pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV with the ATLAS detector. *Phys. Lett. B*, 781:327–348, 2018. [arXiv:1801.07893](#), [doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2018.03.036](#).

- [70] Morad Aaboud et al. Search for vector-boson resonances decaying to a top quark and bottom quark in the lepton plus jets final state in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV with the ATLAS detector. *Phys. Lett. B*, 788:347–370, 2019. [arXiv:1807.10473](#), [doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2018.11.032](#).
- [71] Georges Aad 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. 8 2023. [arXiv:2308.08521](#).
- [72] Albert M Sirunyan et al. Search for W' bosons decaying to a top and a bottom quark at $s=13\text{TeV}$ in the hadronic final state. *Phys. Lett. B*, 820:136535, 2021. [arXiv:2104.04831](#), [doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2021.136535](#).
- [73] CMS Collaboration, CMS-PAS-B2G-20-012. Search for W' bosons decaying to a top and a bottom quark in leptonic final states at $\sqrt{s} = 13\text{TeV}$. 2023.
- [74] Zack Sullivan. Fully Differential W' Production and Decay at Next-to-Leading Order in QCD. *Phys. Rev. D*, 66:075011, 2002. [arXiv:hep-ph/0207290](#), [doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.66.075011](#).
- [75] Daniel Duffy and Zack Sullivan. Model independent reach for W -prime bosons at the LHC. *Phys. Rev. D*, 86:075018, 2012. [arXiv:1208.4858](#), [doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.86.075018](#).
- [76] Wai-Yee Keung and Goran Senjanovic. Majorana Neutrinos and the Production of the Right-handed Charged Gauge Boson. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 50:1427, 1983. [doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.50.1427](#).
- [77] Miha Nemevšek, Fabrizio Nesti, and Goran Popara. Keung-Senjanović process at the LHC: From lepton number violation to displaced vertices to invisible decays. *Phys. Rev. D*, 97(11):115018, 2018. [arXiv:1801.05813](#), [doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.97.115018](#).
- [78] Miha Nemevšek and Fabrizio Nesti. Left-right symmetry at an FCC-hh. *Phys. Rev. D*, 108(1):015030, 2023. [arXiv:2306.12104](#), [doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.108.015030](#).
- [79] Thomas G. Rizzo. The Determination of the Helicity of W' Boson Couplings at the LHC. *JHEP*, 05:037, 2007. [arXiv:0704.0235](#), [doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2007/05/037](#).
- [80] Elena Accomando, Diego Becciolini, Stefania De Curtis, Daniele Dominici, Luca Fedeli, and Claire Shepherd-Themistocleous. Interference effects in heavy W' -boson searches at the LHC. *Phys. Rev. D*, 85:115017, 2012. [arXiv:1110.0713](#), [doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.85.115017](#).
- [81] Elena Accomando, Alexander Belyaev, Luca Fedeli, Stephen F. King, and Claire Shepherd-Themistocleous. Z' physics with early LHC data. *Phys. Rev. D*, 83:075012, 2011. [arXiv:1010.6058](#), [doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.83.075012](#).
- [82] Elena Accomando, Diego Becciolini, Alexander Belyaev, Stefano Moretti, and Claire Shepherd-Themistocleous. Z' at the LHC: Interference and Finite Width Effects in Drell-Yan. *JHEP*, 10:153, 2013. [arXiv:1304.6700](#), [doi:10.1007/JHEP10\(2013\)153](#).

- [83] Morad Aaboud et al. Search for new high-mass phenomena in the dilepton final state using 36 fb^{-1} of proton-proton collision data at $\sqrt{s} = 13 \text{ TeV}$ with the ATLAS detector. *JHEP*, 10:182, 2017. [arXiv:1707.02424](#), [doi:10.1007/JHEP10\(2017\)182](#).
- [84] S. L. Glashow, J. Iliopoulos, and L. Maiani. Weak Interactions with Lepton-Hadron Symmetry. *Phys. Rev. D*, 2:1285–1292, 1970. [doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.2.1285](#).
- [85] R. Keith Ellis, W. James Stirling, and B. R. Webber. *QCD and collider physics*, volume 8. Cambridge University Press, 2 2011. [doi:10.1017/CB09780511628788](#).
- [86] Steven Weinberg. *The quantum theory of fields. Vol. 2: Modern applications*. Cambridge University Press, August, 2013.
- [87] John M. Cornwall, David N. Levin, and George Tiktopoulos. Derivation of Gauge Invariance from High-Energy Unitarity Bounds on the s Matrix. *Phys. Rev. D*, 10:1145, 1974. [Erratum: *Phys.Rev.D* 11, 972 (1975)]. [doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.10.1145](#).
- [88] Benjamin W. Lee, C. Quigg, and H. B. Thacker. Weak Interactions at Very High-Energies: The Role of the Higgs Boson Mass. *Phys. Rev. D*, 16:1519, 1977. [doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.16.1519](#).
- [89] P. Osland, A. A. Pankov, and I. A. Serenkova. Updated constraints on Z' and W' bosons decaying into bosonic and leptonic final states using the run 2 ATLAS data. *Phys. Rev. D*, 103(5):053009, 2021. [arXiv:2012.13930](#), [doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.103.053009](#).
- [90] P. Osland, A. A. Pankov, and I. A. Serenkova. Bounds on the mass and mixing of Z' and W' bosons decaying into different pairings of W , Z , or Higgs bosons using CMS data at the LHC. 6 2022. [arXiv:2206.01438](#).
- [91] Richard D. Ball et al. Parton distributions with LHC data. *Nucl. Phys. B*, 867:244–289, 2013. [arXiv:1207.1303](#), [doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2012.10.003](#).
- [92] <https://cms-results.web.cern.ch/cms-results/public-results/publications/EXO-19-012/> (CMS supplementary material).
- [93] <http://atlas.web.cern.ch/Atlas/GROUPS/PHYSICS/PAPERS/EXOT-2019-03/> (ATLAS supplementary material).
- [94] Andreas Hinzmann. Private communication.
- [95] <https://atlas.web.cern.ch/Atlas/GROUPS/PHYSICS/PAPERS/EXOT-2018-30/> (ATLAS supplementary material).
- [96] <https://cms-results.web.cern.ch/cms-results/public-results/publications/EXO-19-017/> (CMS supplementary material).