

Parameter inference from final-state entanglement in Higgs boson decays

Jia Liu^{1,2,*} Masanori Tanaka^{1,2,†} Xiao-Ping Wang^{3,‡} Jing-Jun Zhang^{1,§} and Zifan Zheng^{1,||}

¹*School of Physics and State Key Laboratory of Nuclear Physics and Technology, Peking University, Beijing 100871, China*

²*Center for High Energy Physics, Peking University, Beijing 100871, China*

³*School of Physics, Beihang University, Beijing 100083, China*



(Received 26 November 2025; accepted 25 June 2026; published 23 July 2026)

The decay out states of unstable Standard Model (SM) particles provide a natural, well-defined quantum-information probe of the SM parameter space. We use Higgs boson decays as a test case: After tracing out kinematics, we compute entanglement among final-state spins and colors across all decay channels and investigate a near-maximal entanglement-entropy criterion. This criterion turns out to be informative about fundamental parameters. Within the SM, we find that the entanglement entropy exhibits a global maximum close to the observed Higgs boson mass and the measured W mass, the latter being equivalent to the $SU(2)_L$ gauge coupling. In a two-parameter kappa framework, applying the same criterion is consistent with an SM-like balance between Higgs boson couplings to vector bosons and to fermions, providing sensitivity to the ratio of the sector-wide rescalings. These results suggest that entanglement extremality may serve as a complementary handle on fundamental parameters.

DOI: 10.1103/jynb-w9kq

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum-information ideas are increasingly applied to particle physics. Since Bell's proposal of experimentally testable entanglement [1], the possibility of probing quantum correlations in fundamental interactions has been widely explored [2]. Observations of spin entanglement in top-quark pairs at the LHC [3,4] have opened a possibility that colliders can probe entanglement directly, establishing quantum-information observables as a viable probe in high-energy physics [5–7].

Recent studies probe whether quantum-information extrema encode Standard Model (SM) parameters. Examples include maximal helicity entanglement in lepton annihilation and scattering yielding $\sin^2 \theta_W = 1/4$ [8], minimized entanglement in neutrino oscillations constraining the Pontecorvo–Maki–Nakagawa–Sakata (PMNS) CP phase [9], and minimized flavor-entanglement power providing insight into Cabibbo–Kobayashi–Maskawa (CKM) and

PMNS mixing [10]. Magic-based QED criteria further refine θ_W inferences [11]. Related studies link entanglement to symmetries and dynamics [12–28].

The Higgs boson underlies electroweak symmetry (EW) breaking and the origin of particle masses. While its properties have been extensively measured at colliders [29,30], its mass remains a free SM parameter without a universally accepted theoretical explanation. Several approaches aim to explain it: Asymptotic-safety arguments in the SM coupled to gravity suggest $m_h \simeq 126$ GeV [31], criticality of the Higgs boson potential yields $m_h \sim 135 \pm 9$ GeV [32], and Planck-scale mass sum rules predict $m_h \sim 135$ GeV [33]. Additionally, maximization of the product of Higgs boson decay probabilities gives $m_h \simeq 125$ GeV [34]. An extension of this analysis, using a maximal classical multinomial entropy constructed from the Higgs boson decay branching ratios, yields $m_h = 125.04 \pm 0.25$ GeV [35].

In this work, we explore how the decays of unstable particles can be informative about SM parameters. Complementary to scattering analyses, which require a specified center-of-mass energy, scattering angle, and a two-particle in state, decays are kinematically fixed in the parent's rest frame and start from a single-particle in state determined by the SM spectrum. This makes decay out states a natural and well-defined quantum-information probe in particle physics.

We focus on Higgs boson decays as a test case, analyzing kinematics and evaluating final-state entanglement in spin and color. The Higgs boson decays provide a natural setting

*Contact author: jialiu@pku.edu.cn

†Contact author: tanaka@pku.edu.cn

‡Contact author: hcwangxiaoping@buaa.edu.cn

§Contact author: zhang_jingjun@stu.pku.edu.cn

||Contact author: zifanzheng@pku.edu.cn

for quantum-information tests, with studies of Bell inequalities and entanglement signatures across multiple channels [36–54]. By considering all accessible decay channels rather than a single exclusive mode, we link our observable directly to the Higgs boson mass, EW gauge couplings, and Yukawa couplings. A near-maximal entropy criterion then provides insights into these parameters: Within the SM, it points to Higgs boson and W masses close to their observed values. In a two-parameter κ framework, it favors an approximately SM-like balance between Higgs boson couplings to vector bosons and to fermions. This method is broadly applicable, directly tied to measurable decay patterns, and can, in principle, be applied to other unstable particles beyond the Higgs boson.

II. THE DECAY OUT STATE OF UNSTABLE PARTICLES

An unstable particle such as the Higgs boson is prepared in a one-particle in state. At the rest frame, it is given by

$$|\text{in}\rangle = \mathcal{N}^{-1} |\mathbf{p}_{\text{in}}\rangle |\lambda_{\text{in}}\rangle, \quad (1)$$

where $|\mathbf{p}_{\text{in}}\rangle$ denotes a one-particle momentum eigenstate and $|\lambda_{\text{in}}\rangle$ collects intrinsic quantum numbers (spin or helicity and gauge charges). The normalization factor $\mathcal{N} = (2E_{\text{in}}\mathcal{V})^{1/2}$ ensures $\langle \text{in} | \text{in} \rangle = 1$ with $\langle \mathbf{p} | \mathbf{p}' \rangle = 2E_{\text{in}}(2\pi)^3 \delta^{(3)}(\mathbf{p}_{\text{in}} - \mathbf{p}'_{\text{in}})$ and the box normalization $(2\pi)^3 \delta^{(3)}(\mathbf{0}) = \mathcal{V}$. For a scalar field, the spin label λ_{in} is absent. After the decay, the out state is

$$|\text{out}\rangle = i\hat{T}|\text{in}\rangle, \quad (2)$$

with $\hat{T}$ the transition operator. We neglect the trivial identity piece in the S matrix, $S = 1 + i\hat{T}$, since we focus on the entanglement specifically generated *by the decay*.

For two-body decays, the T -matrix element is related to the invariant amplitude $\mathcal{M}$ by

$$\langle \mathbf{p}_1 \mathbf{p}_2; s_1 s_2; c_1 c_2; ij | i\hat{T} | \mathbf{p}_{\text{in}}, \lambda_{\text{in}} \rangle = (2\pi)^4 \delta^4(p_{\text{in}} - p_1 - p_2) i \mathcal{M}_{s_1 s_2}^{c_1 c_2; ij}(p_{\text{in}} \rightarrow p_1 p_2), \quad (3)$$

where $|s_\alpha\rangle$ and $|c_\alpha\rangle$ ($\alpha = 1, 2$) label spin or helicity and color states and $|i, j\rangle$ labels the particle species in the final state. For Higgs boson decays, the initial particle carries neither color nor spin. Color conservation implies $c_2 = \bar{c}_1$, so we use $\mathcal{M}_{s_1 s_2}^{c_1 c_2; ij} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{s_1 s_2}^{c_1; ij}$ below. The out state can then be written in terms of amplitudes as

$$|\text{out}\rangle = \frac{1}{\mathcal{N}} \sum_{i,j} \sum_{s_1 s_2} \sum_c \int d\Pi_1 d\Pi_2 (2\pi)^4 \delta^4(p_{\text{in}} - p_1 - p_2) \times \mathcal{M}_{s_1 s_2}^{c; ij}(p_{\text{in}} \rightarrow p_1 p_2) |\mathbf{p}_1 \mathbf{p}_2; s_1 s_2; c\bar{c}; ij\rangle, \quad (4)$$

with $d\Pi_i \equiv d^3\mathbf{p}_i/[2E_i(2\pi)^3]$. From Eq. (4), the normalized density matrix of the final state is

$$\rho_f = \frac{|\text{out}\rangle \langle \text{out}|}{\langle \text{out} | \text{out} \rangle}, \quad (5)$$

with

$$\langle \text{out} | \text{out} \rangle = \frac{(2\pi)^4 \delta^4(0)}{\mathcal{N}^2} 2m_{\text{in}} \Gamma_{\text{tot}} = T \Gamma_{\text{tot}}, \quad (6)$$

where $\delta(0)$ is the delta function reflecting the plane-wave normalization for momentum eigenstates, m_{in} is the mass of the decaying particle, and Γ_{tot} is its total decay width. Here, we use the standard box-normalization replacement $(2\pi)\delta(0) \rightarrow T$.

III. ENTANGLEMENT ENTROPY FROM DECAYS

We quantify entanglement in the decay out state using the entanglement entropy (EE), following the formulations in Refs. [55,56]. We take the bipartition of final states as $\mathcal{H}_{\text{tot}} = \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$, with

$$\mathcal{H}_A = \mathcal{H}_{\text{spin}}^a \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\text{color}}^a \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\text{particle}}^a, \quad (7)$$

$$\mathcal{H}_B = \mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}}^a \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}}^b \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\text{spin}}^b \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\text{color}}^b \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\text{particle}}^b, \quad (8)$$

where $\mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}}^i$, $\mathcal{H}_{\text{spin}}^i$, $\mathcal{H}_{\text{color}}^i$, and $\mathcal{H}_{\text{particle}}^i$ ($i = a, b$) denote the momentum, spin, color, and particle-type Hilbert spaces, respectively, for particles i . The reduced density matrix can be got from the total density matrix ρ by tracing out $\mathcal{H}_B$:

$$\rho_R = \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_B}[\rho], \quad (9)$$

and we adopt the linear entropy (Tsallis-2) as our measure of entanglement [57,58]:

$$\text{EE}(\rho_R) = 1 - \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_A}[\rho_R^2]. \quad (10)$$

Applying ρ_f given in Eq. (5) to Eq. (9), the reduced density matrix becomes

$$\rho_R = \sum_i \sum_{s_1 s'_1 s_2} \sum_c \frac{\Gamma_{s_1 s_2 s'_1 s_2}^{cc; ii}}{\Gamma_{\text{tot}}} |s_1, c, i\rangle \langle s'_1, c, i|, \quad (11)$$

where

$$\Gamma_{s_1 s_2 s_3 s_4}^{c_1 c_2; ij} \equiv \int \frac{d\Phi_2(p_1, p_2)}{2m_{\text{in}}} \sum_k \mathcal{M}_{s_1 s_2}^{c_1; ik} (\mathcal{M}_{s_3 s_4}^{c_2; jk})^*, \quad (12)$$

with $d\Phi_2(p_1, p_2) \equiv d\Pi_1 d\Pi_2 (2\pi)^4 \delta^4(p_{\text{in}} \rightarrow p_1, p_2)$. Note that ρ_R is block diagonal in color and particle type.

Consequently, the linear EE takes the simple form

$$\text{EE}(\rho_R) = 1 - \sum_i \frac{\mathcal{P}_i}{N_c^i} \text{BR}_i^2, \quad (13)$$

where N_c^i and BR_i are the color multiplicity and the branching ratio (BR) for species i . Thus, EE includes a $1/N_c$ color suppression, $1/3$ for quarks and $1/8$ for gluons. The spin factor $\mathcal{P}_i$ is

$$\mathcal{P}_i = \frac{\sum_{s_1 s_2 s_3 s_4} \Gamma_{s_1 s_2; s_3 s_4}^{cc; ii} \Gamma_{s_3 s_4; s_1 s_2}^{cc; ii}}{(\sum_{s_1 s_2} \Gamma_{s_1 s_2; s_1 s_2}^{cc; ii})^2}. \quad (14)$$

For Higgs boson decays into fermions, this yields $\mathcal{P}_i = 1/2$.

We emphasize that the EE in Eq. (13) includes contributions from not only the quantum correlation, but also the classical correlation. The effect of quantum entanglement introduces the additional factors $\mathcal{P}_i$ and N_c^i into the classical entropy formula as shown in Eq. (13). As we discuss later, these weight factors play an important role in reproducing the SM-like EW sector.

IV. HIGGS BOSON DECAYS IN TWO- AND THREE-BODY CHANNELS

We apply the decay-based entanglement framework to Higgs boson decays. In the SM, there are 14 Higgs boson decay channels:

$$h \rightarrow q\bar{q}, \ell\bar{\ell}, WW, ZZ, gg, \gamma\gamma, Z\gamma, \quad (15)$$

where $q = u, d, c, s, t, b$ and $\ell = e, \mu, \tau$ [59].

When $m_h < 2m_V$, we use the notation V^* indicates an off-shell gauge boson. The VV^* channel is nontrivial for the EE calculation, as it yields a three-body final state. Consider $h(p_{\text{in}}) \rightarrow V(p_1)V^*(q) \rightarrow V(p_1)f(p_2)\bar{f}'(p_3)$, with $q = p_2 + p_3$ and $V = W/Z$. The corresponding out state is

$$|\text{out}\rangle \ni \mathcal{N}^{-1} \sum_{\{ff'\}} \sum_{\lambda_1, s_2, s_3} \int d\Phi_3 \mathcal{M}_{\lambda_1 s_2 s_3}^{ff', V}(p_1, p_2, p_3) \times |\mathbf{p}_1, \lambda_1\rangle_V |\mathbf{p}_2, s_2, f\rangle |\mathbf{p}_3, s_3, f'\rangle, \quad (16)$$

where $d\Phi_3 = d\Pi_1 d\Pi_2 d\Pi_3 (2\pi)^4 \delta^4(p_{\text{in}} - p_1 - p_2 - p_3)$ is the three-body phase space and $\mathcal{M}_{\lambda_1 s_2 s_3}^{ff', V}(p_1, p_2, p_3)$ is the amplitude, with λ_1 and $s_{2,3}$ parametrizing the helicity states of the on-shell V boson and the fermions [60].

The calculation proceeds analogously to the two-body case. We trace over $\mathcal{H}_B$ defined in Eq. (8), now with the understanding that “particle b ” encompasses both f and f' . This contributes to the reduced density matrix as

$$\rho_R \ni \sum_{\lambda_1, \lambda'_1} \frac{\Gamma_{\lambda_1 \lambda'_1}^{VV}}{\Gamma_{\text{tot}}} |\lambda_1\rangle_V \langle \lambda'_1|_V \quad (V = W, Z), \quad (17)$$

where λ_1 and λ'_1 are the helicities of the on-shell V and

$$\Gamma_{\lambda_1 \lambda'_1}^{VV} = \sum_{\{ff'\}} \sum_{s_2, s_3} \int d\Phi_3 \mathcal{M}_{\lambda_1 s_2 s_3}^{ff', V} (\mathcal{M}_{\lambda'_1 s_2 s_3}^{ff', V})^*. \quad (18)$$

Thus, the reduced density matrix for the process $h \rightarrow VV^*$ has the same structure as in the two-body case, and the subsequent EE analysis can be carried out similarly.

The spin factor $\mathcal{P}_{VV}^{3\text{-body}}$ then follows from Eq. (14) (see Appendix A for details):

$$\mathcal{P}_{VV}^{3\text{-body}} = \frac{2F_T^2(\epsilon_V) + F_L^2(\epsilon_V)}{[2F_T(\epsilon_V) + F_L(\epsilon_V)]^2}, \quad (19)$$

where F_T and F_L encode the transverse and longitudinal helicity contributions, respectively,

$$F_T(\epsilon_V) = \int_0^{y_{\text{max}}} dy \frac{y}{(y-1)^2} \sqrt{Y-4y}, \quad (20)$$

$$F_L(\epsilon_V) = \int_0^{y_{\text{max}}} dy \frac{1}{4(y-1)^2} Y \sqrt{Y-4y}, \quad (21)$$

with $\epsilon_V = m_h/m_V \in [1, 2]$, $Y = (\epsilon_V^2 - 1 - y)^2$, and $y_{\text{max}} = (\epsilon_V - 1)^2$. Note that $\mathcal{P}_{VV}$ has the same form for the WW and ZZ channels, as the couplings cancel in the ratio. When $m_h \geq 2m_V$, the decay $h \rightarrow VV$ is two-body and the spin factor is

$$\mathcal{P}_{VV}^{2\text{-body}} = \frac{2 + r_L^2}{(2 + r_L)^2}, \quad (22)$$

with $r_L = (1 - \epsilon_V^2/2)^2$ from the longitudinal contribution.

The spin factor for each decay channel is shown in Fig. 1. For $m_h < 2m_V$, $\mathcal{P}_{VV}$ is smaller than $1/2$, which reduces its weight compared to fermion channels. At the threshold $m_h = 2m_V$, the two- and three-body descriptions coincide and yield $\mathcal{P}_{VV} = 1/3$. Near threshold, the vector bosons are nonrelativistic, suppressing helicity information and equalizing contributions from all three helicities. In the




FIG. 1. Spin factors $\mathcal{P}_i$ for each Higgs boson decay channel as a function of m_h .




FIG. 2. Entanglement entropy of Higgs boson decays as a function of the Higgs boson mass (left) and m_W (right). The gray band marks the experimentally observed SM values (1σ), the red band shows the $EE_{\max}$ yield with its 1σ uncertainty from SM inputs and theory, and the green band (dashed lines) indicates the near-maximal-EE region with $\Delta EE/EE_{\max} < 0.1\%$ (0.05%).

heavy-Higgs boson limit, the vector bosons are highly boosted, and the longitudinal polarization dominates, so $\mathcal{P}_{VV} \rightarrow 1$. The channels to $f\bar{f}$, gg , $\gamma\gamma$, and $Z\gamma$ have $\mathcal{P}_i = 1/2$, since these particles carry two helicities, whereas the longitudinal mode of Z does not contribute.

V. NEAR-MAXIMAL EE IN HIGGS BOSON DECAYS

With the spin factors $\mathcal{P}_i$ determined, we calculate the EE for fixed SM inputs. Higgs boson BRs are taken from HDECAY [61,62], including only to the three-body modes for VV^* . We also get an independent analytic calculation of partial widths (Appendix B) which gives consistent EE results (Appendix C).

In Fig. 2, the left panel shows the dependence of the EE on the Higgs boson mass, with other couplings and the SM vacuum expectation value fixed. A global maximum EE globally gives

$$m_h = 126.08 \pm 0.28 \text{ GeV}, \quad (23)$$

where the uncertainty is obtained from a Monte Carlo scan over all other SM parameters within their 1σ uncertainties [63] and the theoretical uncertainty for BRs [65,66]. This is within $3.2\text{--}3.3\sigma$ of the latest ATLAS result, 125.11 ± 0.11 GeV [67], and CMS result, 125.08 ± 0.12 GeV [68]. Introducing a tolerance for the maximum EE point characterized by

$$\frac{\Delta EE}{EE_{\max}} \equiv \frac{|EE(\rho_R) - EE_{\max}|}{EE_{\max}}, \quad (24)$$

the observed Higgs boson mass lies within this region with $\Delta EE/EE_{\max} \leq 0.05\%$.

The right panel in Fig. 2 shows the EE as a function of m_W , with other parameters [including $U(1)_Y$ coupling g'] fixed. Equivalently, the EE can be viewed as a function of the $SU(2)_L$ coupling g or the weak mixing angle $\sin \theta_W$. The global maximum EE selects

$$m_W = 80.506 \pm 0.376 \text{ GeV}, \quad (25)$$

where the error again reflects the uncertainties in the inputs. The inferred W boson mass value differs from the measured m_W within 0.36σ . The corresponding near-maximal-EE band for m_W is considerably broader than input uncertainties.

In Table I, we summarize the inferred Higgs and W boson mass ranges from the near-maximal EE requirement with each tolerance. Since the slight change in the maximal EE point significantly affects the predicted values of m_h and m_W , the difference between our result about m_h and its measured value may be explained by considering effects of new physics on Higgs boson decays.

In Fig. 3, we use the two-parameter κ framework [69] to probe the impact of Higgs-coupling deviations, representative of beyond-SM scenarios such as two-Higgs-doublet models [70]. We rescale the SM Higgs boson couplings as $g_{hVV} \rightarrow \kappa_V \times g_{hVV}^{\text{SM}}$ and $g_{hff} \rightarrow \kappa_f \times g_{hff}^{\text{SM}}$, keeping fermion and vector-boson masses fixed. The figure shows the EE in

TABLE I. Inferred Higgs and W boson mass ranges for each tolerance of the maximal EE point.

$\Delta EE/EE_{\max}$	m_h [GeV]	m_W [GeV]
$<0.01\%$	(125.51, 126.76)	(79.738, 80.883)
$<0.05\%$	(124.51, 127.51)	(79.160, 82.041)
$<0.1\%$	(123.76, 128.26)	(78.581, 82.619)
$<0.5\%$	(120.51, 130.77)	(76.267, 86.669)




FIG. 3. EE in the $\kappa_f - \kappa_V$ plane. Green and cyan dotted curves show contours of $\Delta EE/EE_{\max} = 0.5\%$ and 0.1% , respectively. The magenta star marks the maximal-EE point, and the white cross denotes the SM point.

the (κ_f, κ_V) plane with all other parameters at their SM values. Assuming a tolerance within $\Delta EE/EE_{\max} \leq 0.1\%$, we obtain

$$\frac{\kappa_V}{\kappa_f} = 1.00^{+0.08}_{-0.06}. \quad (26)$$

Thus, the maximal-EE criterion prefers an approximately SM-like balance between hVV and hff couplings. As expected for observables built from BRs, the result is largely insensitive to an overall common rescaling of the couplings. In other words, our results give an interpretation that new physics models with extended Higgs boson sectors should satisfy $\kappa_V \simeq \kappa_f$ to keep the maximal entropy in the SM-like Higgs boson decays. This offers a new insight into which extended Higgs boson theories are preferred from the perspective of quantum-information theory.

VI. DISCUSSIONS

We now clarify several conceptual and practical choices in our analysis. First, as a comparison we also tested an EE constructed from a purely diagonal “branching-ratio density matrix” $\rho_{\text{br}} = \sum_i \text{BR}_i |i\rangle\langle i|$, with i running over all decay channels. This gives $EE(\rho_{\text{br}}) = 1 - \sum_i \text{BR}_i^2$ and leads to $m_h \sim 135$ GeV, an incorrect $m_W \sim 72$ GeV, and $\kappa_V/\kappa_f \sim 1.6$, as shown in Fig. 5 in Appendix D. These values are different from the observed SM results, indicating that BR-only information is not sufficient and that the spin- and color-derived weights $\mathcal{P}_i/N_c^i$ play a crucial role.

Second, as another baseline, we evaluate the asymptotic Gibbs-Shannon entropy $S_\infty \sim \sum_i \log \text{BR}_i$ of the classical multinomial distribution of Higgs boson decay counts used in Refs. [34,35]. We cross-checked that it selects $m_h \sim 126.52 \pm 0.09$ GeV and $m_W \sim 81.86 \pm 0.15$ GeV, close

but not fully consistent with the SM value, together with a sizable deviation in $\kappa_V/\kappa_f = 1.3^{+0.2}_{-0.2}$, as shown in Fig. 6 in Appendix E. Since we include only three-body decays for the VV channels, m_h differs from the ~ 125 GeV found in Refs. [34,35]. When the four-body off-shell VV decays are included via HDECAY, we obtain $m_h \simeq 125.4$ GeV, which agrees with Ref. [35]. However, we obtain $m_W \simeq 82.9 \pm 0.1$ GeV and $\kappa_V/\kappa_f \simeq 1.23$, which deviate from the measured values. For S_∞ , the negligible $\text{BR}(h \rightarrow e^+e^-)$ contributes to the κ_f variation on a similar footing as the dominant $\text{BR}(h \rightarrow b\bar{b})$, which is counterintuitive: An essentially unobservable channel should not appreciably affect the inferred results. Since this construction uses only classical branching ratios, we regard it as a complementary cross-check rather than a full replacement for our entanglement-based approach.

Third, we performed a preliminary study of W and Z decays with unpolarized initial states. For W decays, the $SU(2)_L$ gauge coupling drops out of the EE, leaving only CKM factors and fermion masses; the extremum is essentially flat and does not provide a clear inference. For Z decays, the EE does depend on $\sin \theta_W$, but the preferred value is noticeably shifted from the SM one, as shown in Fig. 7 in Appendix F. By contrast, Higgs boson decays appear more informative, since they simultaneously probe the scalar self-coupling, gauge couplings, and Yukawa couplings. Taken together, these observations tentatively suggest that EE in decay processes may be most powerful when it captures *global* information across different sectors and may be less discriminating within a single sector alone; alternative quantum-information measures beyond EE might be needed there.

Fourth, we deliberately trace out all kinematics at the outset rather than assigning $\mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}}^a$ to $\mathcal{H}_A$ for a “symmetric” bipartition. With plane-wave states, a symmetric split leaves explicit box-normalization factors $\mathcal{V}$ from $\delta^{(3)}(\mathbf{0})$ and T from $\delta(0)$ in the EE. In practice, the volume or time dependence differs between two-body decays ($\propto T/\mathcal{V}$) and three-body decays ($\propto 1/\mathcal{V}$). Thus, the EE diverges or vanishes as $T, \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \infty$, and “normalizing” procedures [22] does not cure the mismatch. By tracing out kinematics, the reduced density matrix ρ_R is finite dimensional (spin, color, species), and the EE is free of $\mathcal{V}$ and T . Thus, this bipartition is a well-posed choice. Actually, we have numerically checked that this bipartite system can give only a good prediction for the structure of the EW sector.

Finally, we note that full off-shell four-body decays, $h \rightarrow V^*V^* \rightarrow 4f$, are not included in our main analysis. Their omission is not due to phenomenological irrelevance but because a consistent inclusion would require an unambiguous Hilbert-space partition for the four-fermion final state, including the assignment of fermions to the intermediate vector-boson branches, as well as a treatment of identical-fermion and possible WW/ZZ interference effects. In addition, our numerical setup is based on HDECAY, while a

dedicated treatment of $h \rightarrow 4f$ decays would require a tool such as PROPHECY4F [71]. We, therefore, treat these modes as a limitation of the present analysis and estimate their possible quantitative impact in Appendix E.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

We explore the decay out states of unstable particles as a natural quantum-information probe of the SM parameter space, formulating an entanglement-entropy quantity and applying it to SM Higgs boson decays. With spin- and color-entanglement weights included, a near-maximal-EE criterion selects a Higgs boson mass and W mass close to their measured values, and in a two-parameter κ framework it favors an approximately SM-like balance $\kappa_V/\kappa_f \sim 1$. Comparisons with purely branching-ratio-based constructions and with multinomial Shannon entropy show that entanglement weights play a crucial role in obtaining phenomenologically viable inferences. Preliminary W/Z studies further suggest that decay EE may be most informative when it probes *global* scalar-gauge-Yukawa structure and may be less discriminating within a single sector alone. Taken together, these results indicate that the entanglement extremality in decay out states can act as a compact, data-adjacent probe of SM couplings, and they motivate exploring complementary quantum-information measures beyond the EE when extending this program to other unstable particles.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors thank Yuxin He and Jian Wang for helpful discussions. The work of J. L. is supported by the National

Science Foundation of China under Grants No. 12235001 and No. 12475103 and State Key Laboratory of Nuclear Physics and Technology under Grant No. NPT2025ZX11. The work of X.-P. W. is supported by the National Science Foundation of China, under Grant No. 12375095, and the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities. The work of J.-J. Z. is supported by the National Science Foundation of China under Grants No. 11635001 and No. 11875072. J. L. and X.-P. W. also thank Asia Pacific Center for Theoretical Physics (APCTP), Pohang, Korea, for their hospitality during the focus program [APCTP-2025-F01], from which this work greatly benefited. The authors gratefully acknowledge the valuable discussions and insights provided by the members of the Collaboration of Precision Testing and New Physics.

J. L., M. T., X.-P. W., J.-J. Z., and Z. Z. contributed equally to this work.

DATA AVAILABILITY

The data are not publicly available. The data are available from the authors upon reasonable request.

APPENDIX A: THE SPIN FACTOR IN THE OFF-SHELL DECAY $h \rightarrow VV^*$

We here describe the detail of the derivation of Eq. (17). For the process $h(p_{\text{in}}) \rightarrow W(p_1)W^*(q) \rightarrow V(p_1)f(p_2)\bar{f}(p_3)$, the final state can be written as

$$|\text{out}\rangle|_{h \rightarrow WW^*} = \sum_f \sum_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, s_2, s_3} \int d\Phi_3(p_{\text{in}}, p_1, p_2, p_3) \mathcal{M}_{\lambda_1 \lambda_2 s_2 s_3}^{f, W}(p_1, p_2, p_3) |\mathbf{p}_1, \lambda_1\rangle_V |\mathbf{p}_2, s_2, f\rangle |\mathbf{p}_3, s_3, \bar{f}\rangle, \quad (\text{A1})$$

where the amplitude is given by [60]

$$\mathcal{M}_{\lambda_1 \lambda_2 s_2 s_3}^{f, W}(p_1, p_2, p_3) = \mathcal{M}_{\lambda_1 \lambda_2}^{h \rightarrow WW^*}(p_1, q) \frac{1}{q^2 - m_W^2 + im_W \Gamma_W} \mathcal{M}_{\lambda_2 s_2 s_3}^{W^* \rightarrow f\bar{f}}(p_2, p_3), \quad (\text{A2})$$

$$\mathcal{M}_{\lambda_1 \lambda_2}^{h \rightarrow WW^*}(p_1, q) = i \frac{2m_W^2}{v} g^{\mu\nu} \epsilon_\mu^*(p_1, \lambda_1) \epsilon_\nu^*(q, \lambda_2), \quad (\text{A3})$$

$$\mathcal{M}_{\lambda_2 s_2 s_3}^{W^* \rightarrow f\bar{f}}(p_2, p_3) = -ig_2 \epsilon_\rho(q, \lambda_2) \bar{u}_f(p_2, s_2) \gamma^\rho \left(\frac{1 - \gamma_5}{2} \right) v_f(p_3, s_3), \quad (\text{A4})$$

where $\epsilon(p, \lambda)$ is the polarization vector and u_f and v_f are the fermion spinors. Although we explicitly keep the helicity state of the off-shell W^* boson labeled by λ_2 , the expression can be simplified by using the well-known replacement $\sum_{\lambda_2} \epsilon_\rho(q, \lambda_2) \epsilon_\nu^*(q, \lambda_2) \rightarrow -g_{\rho\nu} + q_\rho q_\nu / q^2$. Using this replacement, the amplitude simplifies as $\sum_{\lambda_2} \mathcal{M}_{\lambda_1 \lambda_2 s_2 s_3}^{f, W} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\lambda_1 s_2 s_3}^{f, W}$, as shown in Eq. (17).

In deriving the reduced density matrix given in Eq. (9), we trace over the full fermionic final states as

$$\rho_R \ni \sum_{\tilde{f}} \sum_{s'_1, s'_2} \int d\Pi_1 d\Pi_2 d\Pi_3 \langle \mathbf{p}_1 |_W \langle \mathbf{p}_2, \mathbf{p}_3; s'_1, s'_2, \tilde{f} |_\rho | \mathbf{p}_1 \rangle_W | \mathbf{p}_2, \mathbf{p}_3; s'_1, s'_2, \tilde{f} \rangle. \quad (\text{A5})$$

Performing the summations and integrals in Eq. (A5), we obtain

$$\rho_R \ni \frac{1}{2m_h \Gamma_{\text{tot}}} \sum_{\lambda_1, \lambda'_1} \sum_{s_1, s_2} \int d\Phi_3(p_{\text{in}}, p_1, p_2, p_3) \mathcal{M}_{\lambda_1 s_1 s_2}^{f, W} (\mathcal{M}_{\lambda'_1 s_1 s_2}^{f, W})^* |\lambda_1\rangle_W \langle \lambda'_1|_W = \sum_{\lambda_1, \lambda'_1} \frac{\Gamma_{\lambda_1 \lambda'_1}^{WW}}{\Gamma_{\text{tot}}} |\lambda_1\rangle_W \langle \lambda'_1|_W, \quad (\text{A6})$$

which is the same as Eq. (17) with $V = W$. An analogous calculation for the $h \rightarrow ZZ^*$ decay process leads to the same conclusion.

We then derive the expression of the spin factor $\mathcal{P}_i$ for the three-body decay process $h \rightarrow V f \bar{f}$. For this decay process, $\mathcal{P}_i$ is given by

$$\mathcal{P}_i = \frac{\sum_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2} \Gamma_{\lambda_1 \lambda_2}^{VV} \Gamma_{\lambda_2 \lambda_1}^{VV}}{(\sum_{\lambda_1} \Gamma_{\lambda_1 \lambda_1}^{VV})^2}. \quad (\text{A7})$$

Therefore, we need to evaluate the decay width $\Gamma_{\lambda_1 \lambda_2}^{VV}$ for

each helicity state of the V boson. In the following, we derive the explicit expression of $\Gamma_{\lambda_1 \lambda_2}^{VV}$.

For the three-body phase-space measure, we can use the decomposition

$$d\Phi_3(p_{\text{in}}, p_1, p_2, p_3) = \frac{dx}{2\pi} d\Phi_2(p_{\text{in}} \rightarrow p_1, q) d\Phi_2(q \rightarrow p_2, p_3), \quad (\text{A8})$$

with $x = q^2$. Then, the decay width $\Gamma_{\lambda_1 \lambda_2}^{VV}$ can be expressed as

$$\Gamma_{\lambda_1 \lambda_3}^{VV} = \frac{1}{2m_h} \sum_f \sum_{\lambda_2, \lambda'_2, s_2, s_3} \int \frac{dx}{2\pi} d\Phi_2(p_1, q) \frac{\mathcal{M}_{\lambda_1 \lambda_2}^{h \rightarrow VV^*} (\mathcal{M}_{\lambda'_2 \lambda_2}^{h \rightarrow VV^*})^*}{(q^2 - m_V^2)^2 + m_V^2 \Gamma_V^2} \int d\Phi_2(q \rightarrow p_2, p_3) \mathcal{M}_{\lambda_2 s_2 s_3}^{V^* \rightarrow f \bar{f}} (\mathcal{M}_{\lambda'_2 s_2 s_3}^{V^* \rightarrow f \bar{f}})^* \quad (\text{A9})$$

$$= \frac{1}{2m_h} \sum_f \int \frac{dx}{2\pi} d\Phi_2 \frac{k_V m_V^2}{(q^2 - m_V^2)^2 + m_V^2 \Gamma_V^2} \epsilon_\mu^*(\lambda_1) \epsilon_\nu(\lambda_3) \left(g^{\mu\rho} - \frac{q^\mu q^\rho}{q^2} \right) \left(g^{\nu\sigma} - \frac{q^\nu q^\sigma}{q^2} \right) \int d\Phi_2 J_\rho^f J_\sigma^f, \quad (\text{A10})$$

where $J_\mu^f = \bar{u}_f(c_V^f - c_A^f \gamma^5) v_f$ and k_V is a constant which depends on the type of V boson. For the last integral, we can use the following useful relation:

$$\sum_f \int d\Phi_2(q \rightarrow p_2, p_3) J_\rho^f J_\sigma^f = x A_T^V \left(-g_{\rho\sigma} + \frac{q_\rho q_\sigma}{q^2} \right), \quad (\text{A11})$$

with

$$A_T^W \simeq \sum_f \frac{N_c^f}{12\pi}, \quad A_T^Z = \sum_f \frac{N_c^f [(c_V^f)^2 + (c_A^f)^2]}{12\pi}. \quad (\text{A12})$$

As a result, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{\lambda_1 \lambda_2}^{VV} &= \frac{1}{2m_h} \int \frac{dx}{2\pi} \int d\Phi_2(p_{\text{in}} \rightarrow p_1, q) \frac{k_V m_V^2}{(q^2 - m_V^2)^2 + m_V^2 \Gamma_V^2} x A_T^V \left[-\epsilon^*(\lambda_1) \cdot \epsilon(\lambda_2) + \frac{(\epsilon^*(\lambda_1) \cdot q)(\epsilon(\lambda_2) \cdot q)}{q^2} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2m_h} \int \frac{dx}{2\pi} \frac{k_V m_V^2}{(x - m_V^2)^2 + m_V^2 \Gamma_V^2} x A_T^V \frac{\lambda^{1/2}(m_h^2, m_W^2, x)}{16\pi m_h^2} \Xi_{\lambda_1 \lambda_2}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A13})$$

where

$$\lambda(a, b, c) = a^2 + b^2 + c^2 - 2ab - 2bc - 2ca. \quad (\text{A14})$$

The quantity $\Xi_{\lambda_1 \lambda_2}$ satisfies the following equations for each helicity state:

$$\Xi_{\pm\pm} = 1, \quad \Xi_{00} = r_V(x) = \frac{(m_h^2 - m_V^2 - x)^2}{4m_V^2 x}, \quad \Xi_{ij} = 0 \quad (i \neq j). \quad (\text{A15})$$

For simplicity, we ignore the decay width in the denominator in Eq. (A13). This assumption is reasonable in the SM because $m_V \gg \Gamma_V$ [64]. Then, the spin factor $\mathcal{P}_i$ for the $h \rightarrow VV^*$ can be expressed as a function of the V boson mass and the Higgs boson mass:

$$\mathcal{P}_{VV}^{3\text{-body}} = \frac{2F_T^2(\epsilon_V) + F_L^2(\epsilon_V)}{[2F_T(\epsilon_V) + F_L(\epsilon_V)]^2}, \quad (\text{A16})$$

where

$$F_T(\epsilon_V) = \int_0^{f_{\max}} df \frac{f}{(f-1)^2} \sqrt{(\epsilon_V^2 - 1 - f)^2 - 4f}, \quad (\text{A17})$$

$$F_L(\epsilon_V) = \int_0^{f_{\max}} df \frac{1}{4(f-1)^2} (\epsilon_V^2 - 1 - f)^2 \sqrt{(\epsilon_V^2 - 1 - f)^2 - 4f}, \quad (\text{A18})$$

with $\epsilon_V = m_h/m_V > 1$ and $f_{\max} = (\epsilon_V - 1)^2$. Using the above result, we can confirm that $\lim_{\epsilon_V \rightarrow 2} \mathcal{P}_{VV}^{3\text{-body}} \rightarrow 1/3$, which corresponds to the threshold limit.

When the Higgs boson mass satisfies $m_h > 2m_V$, the on-shell decay process $h(p_{\text{in}}) \rightarrow V(p_1)V(p_2)$ is allowed. In this case, the decay width is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{\lambda_1 \lambda_2}^{VV} &= \frac{2m_V^4}{m_h v^2} \int d\Phi_2(p_{\text{in}}, p_1, p_2) \left[-\epsilon^*(\lambda_1) \cdot \epsilon(\lambda_2) + \frac{(\epsilon^*(\lambda_1) \cdot p_2)(\epsilon(\lambda_2) \cdot p_2)}{p_2^2} \right] \\ &= \frac{m_V^4}{8\pi m_h^3 v^2} \lambda^{1/2}(m_h^2, m_V^2, m_V^2) \Xi_{\lambda_1 \lambda_2}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A19})$$

Therefore, the spin factor is given by

$$\mathcal{P}_{VV}^{2\text{-body}} = \frac{2\Xi_{++}^2 + \Xi_{00}^2}{(2\Xi_{++} + \Xi_{00})^2} \Big|_{x=m_V^2} = \frac{2 + r_V^2(m_V^2)}{[2 + r_V(m_V^2)]^2}. \quad (\text{A20})$$

Since $r_V(m_V^2) = 1$ in the case with $m_h = 2m_V$, we obtain $\mathcal{P}_{VV}^{2\text{-body}} = \mathcal{P}_{VV}^{3\text{-body}} = 1/3$ at the threshold point.

APPENDIX B: THE ANALYTICAL FORMULAE FOR HIGGS BOSON DECAY PARTIAL WIDTHS

The following formulas for Higgs boson decay widths are based on Ref. [72] (for recent progress on higher-order corrections, see Refs. [66,73]).

(i) $h \rightarrow q\bar{q}$ except for top quarks [72]:

$$\Gamma(h \rightarrow q\bar{q}) = \frac{3m_h}{8\pi v^2} \bar{m}_q^2(m_h) [1 + \Delta_{qq} + \Delta_h^2], \quad (\text{B1})$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{qq} &= 5.67 \frac{\bar{\alpha}_S}{\pi} + (35.94 - 1.36N_f) \left(\frac{\bar{\alpha}_S}{\pi} \right)^2 \\ &\quad + (164.17 - 25.77N_f + 0.26N_f^2) \left(\frac{\bar{\alpha}_S}{\pi} \right)^3, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B2})$$

$$\Delta_h^2 = \left(\frac{\bar{\alpha}_S}{\pi} \right)^2 \left[1.57 - \frac{2}{3} \log \frac{m_h^2}{m_t^2} + \frac{1}{9} \log^2 \left(\frac{\bar{m}_q^2(m_h)}{m_h^2} \right) \right], \quad (\text{B3})$$

where $\bar{m}_q(\mu)$, m_t , N_f , and $\bar{\alpha}_S = \alpha_S(m_h)$ are the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ quark mass of flavor q at the scale μ , the top-quark mass, quark generation numbers, and the strong coupling constant at m_h , respectively. The state-of-the-art QCD corrections at α_S^3 , including full quark-mass dependence, have recently been computed [74]. For the bottom quark, its mass at the Higgs boson mass scale has been measured at the LHC with a relatively large uncertainty [75]. In our analysis, we employ the renormalization group evolution for quark masses discussed in Ref. [76] with the following input values [64]:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{m}_b(\bar{m}_b) &= 4.18 \pm 0.03 \text{ GeV}, \\ \bar{m}_c(\bar{m}_c) &= 1.280 \pm 0.025 \text{ GeV}, \\ \bar{m}_s(2 \text{ GeV}) &= 93.5 \pm 0.8 \text{ MeV}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B4})$$

For the renormalization group evolution of α_S , it is described at the three-loop level by [77,78]

$$\frac{\partial \alpha_S}{\partial \ln \mu^2} = -\beta_0 \alpha_S^2 - \beta_1 \alpha_S^3 - \beta_2 \alpha_S^4, \quad (\text{B5})$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_0 &= 11 - \frac{2}{3} N_f, & \beta_1 &= 102 - \frac{38}{3} N_f, \\ \beta_2 &= \frac{2857}{2} - \frac{5033}{18} N_f + \frac{325}{54} N_f^2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B6})$$

For the input value in Eq. (B5), we use $\alpha_S(m_Z) = 0.1180 \pm 0.0009$ [64].
(ii) $h \rightarrow t\bar{t}$ [72]:

$$\Gamma(h \rightarrow t\bar{t}) = \frac{3m_h}{8\pi v^2} m_t^2 \beta_t^3 \left[1 + \frac{4}{3} \frac{\alpha_S}{\pi} \Delta_H^t(\beta_t) \right], \quad (\text{B7})$$

where $\beta_i = \sqrt{1 - 4m_i^2/m_h^2}$ and

$$\Delta_H^t(\beta) = \frac{1}{\beta} A(\beta) + \frac{1}{16\beta^3} (3 + 34\beta^2 - 13\beta^4) \log\left(\frac{1+\beta}{1-\beta}\right) + \frac{3}{8\beta^2} (7\beta^2 - 1). \quad (\text{B8})$$

The function $A(\beta)$ is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} A(\beta) &= (1 + \beta^2) \left[4\text{Li}_2\left(\frac{1-\beta}{1+\beta}\right) + 2\text{Li}_2\left(-\frac{1-\beta}{1+\beta}\right) - 3 \log\left(\frac{1+\beta}{1-\beta}\right) \log\left(\frac{2}{1+\beta}\right) - 2 \log\left(\frac{1+\beta}{1-\beta}\right) \log \beta \right] \\ &\quad - 3\beta \log\left(\frac{4}{1-\beta^2}\right) - 4\beta \log \beta. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B9})$$

where Li_2 is the Spence function.

(iii) $h \rightarrow \ell\bar{\ell}$ [79]:

$$\Gamma(h \rightarrow \ell\bar{\ell}) = \frac{m_h}{8\pi v^2} m_\ell^2 \beta_\ell^3. \quad (\text{B10})$$

(iv) $h \rightarrow WW$ (on shell) [80]:

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma(h \rightarrow WW) &= \frac{g_2^2 m_h^3}{64\pi m_W^2} \sqrt{1 - \frac{4m_W^2}{m_h^2}} \\ &\quad \times \left(1 - \frac{4m_W^2}{m_h^2} + 12 \frac{m_W^4}{m_h^4} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B11})$$

Radiative corrections in this process require inclusion of the soft-photon bremsstrahlung contribution to avoid infrared divergences [81]. Since tracing out the soft-photon states is nontrivial, we employ the above formula in our analysis in the region $m_h > 2m_W$.

(v) $h \rightarrow WW^*$ (off shell) [60]:

$$\Gamma(h \rightarrow WW^*) = \frac{3g_2^4 m_h}{512\pi^3} F\left(\frac{m_W}{m_h}\right), \quad (\text{B12})$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} F(x) &= \frac{3(1 - 8x^2 + 20x^4)}{\sqrt{4x^2 - 1}} \arccos\left(\frac{3x^2 - 1}{2x^3}\right) \\ &\quad - (1 - x^2) \left(\frac{47}{2} x^2 - \frac{13}{2} + \frac{1}{x^2} \right) \\ &\quad - \frac{3}{2} (1 - 6x^2 + 4x^4) \ln x^2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B13})$$

In addition to the decay process $h \rightarrow VV^*$, the Higgs boson can also decay via two off-shell gauge bosons, $h \rightarrow V^*V^*$ [82]. These processes can modify $\text{BR}(h \rightarrow VV)$ by a few percent [72,82]. This effect is neglected in our analyses since it is numerically subdominant, HDECAY does not include the full WW/ZZ and identical-fermion interference, and our $\mathcal{P}_i$ construction would mix the WW and ZZ channels in ρ_R and introduce an ambiguous choice of fermion partition for four-body final states.

In addition, we treat the final-state fermions as massless. This is an excellent approximation in the SM: Helicity-flip terms in the $V^* \rightarrow f\bar{f}'$ current are proportional to m_f , so both rate and polarization effects enter only at $O(m_f^2/m_V^2)$. For the bottom quark case, we obtain $(m_b/m_W)^2 \simeq 2.7 \times 10^{-3}$ with all other fermions much smaller, and phase-space corrections from finite m_f are of similar size. Since these effects are well below the quoted input-parameter uncertainties, $\Delta m_b/\bar{m}_b(\bar{m}_b) \sim 0.7\%$, the massless approximation is justified.

(vi) $h \rightarrow ZZ$ (on shell) [80]:

$$\Gamma(h \rightarrow ZZ) = \frac{g_2^2 m_h^3}{128\pi m_Z^2} \sqrt{1 - \frac{4m_Z^2}{m_h^2}} \left(1 - \frac{4m_Z^2}{m_h^2} + 12 \frac{m_Z^4}{m_h^4} \right). \quad (\text{B14})$$

(vii) $h \rightarrow ZZ^*$ (off shell) [60]:

$$\Gamma(h \rightarrow ZZ^*) = \frac{g_2^4 m_h}{2048\pi^3 \cos \theta_W^4} \left(7 - \frac{40}{3} \sin^2 \theta_W + \frac{160}{9} \sin^4 \theta_W \right) F\left(\frac{m_Z}{m_h}\right). \quad (\text{B15})$$

(viii) $h \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ [79,83]:

$$\Gamma(h \rightarrow \gamma\gamma) = \frac{\alpha_{\text{EM}}^2}{256\pi^3 v^2} m_h^3 \left| \sum_f N_c^f Q_f^2 A_{1/2}(\tau_f) + A_1(\tau_W) \right|^2, \quad (\text{B16})$$

where N_c^f is the color degrees of freedom for the fermion f and

$$A_1(x) = 2 + 3x + 3x(2-x)f(x), \quad A_{1/2}(x) = -2x[1 + (1-x)f(x)], \quad (\text{B17})$$

with $\tau_X = 4m_X^2/m_h^2$ and

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} \arcsin^2(x^{-1/2}) & (x \leq 1), \\ -\frac{1}{4} \left[\log\left(\frac{1+\sqrt{1-x}}{1-\sqrt{1-x}}\right) - i\pi \right]^2 & (x > 1). \end{cases} \quad (\text{B18})$$

(ix) $h \rightarrow Z\gamma$ [84]:

$$\Gamma(h \rightarrow Z\gamma) = \frac{m_W^2 \alpha_{\text{EM}} m_h^3}{128v^4 \pi^4} \left(1 - \frac{m_Z^2}{m_h^2} \right)^3 \left| \sum_f N_c^f \frac{Q_f \hat{v}_f}{c_W} A_{1/2}(\tau_f, \lambda_f) + A_1(\tau_W, \lambda_W) \right|^2, \quad (\text{B19})$$

where $\lambda_i \equiv 4m_i^2/m_Z^2$, $\hat{v}_f = 2T_f^3 - 4Q_f s_W^2$, and

$$A_{1/2}(x, y) = I_1(x, y) - I_2(x, y), \quad (\text{B20})$$

$$A_1(x, y) = c_W \left[4 \left(3 - \frac{s_W^2}{c_W^2} \right) I_2(x, y) + \left\{ \left(1 + \frac{2}{x} \right) \frac{s_W^2}{c_W^2} - \left(5 + \frac{2}{x} \right) \right\} I_1(x, y) \right], \quad (\text{B21})$$

with

$$I_1(x, y) = \frac{xy}{2(x-y)} + \frac{x^2 y^2}{2(x-y)^2} [f(x^{-1}) - f(y^{-1})] + \frac{x^2 y}{(x-y)^2} [g(x^{-1}) - g(y^{-1})], \quad (\text{B22})$$

$$I_2(x, y) = -\frac{xy}{2(x-y)} [f(x^{-1}) - f(y^{-1})], \quad (\text{B23})$$

$$g(x) = \begin{cases} \sqrt{x^{-1}-1} \arcsin \sqrt{x} & (x \geq 1), \\ \frac{\sqrt{1-x^{-1}}}{2} [\log(\frac{1+\sqrt{1-x^{-1}}}{1-\sqrt{1-x^{-1}}}) - i\pi] & (x < 1). \end{cases} \quad (\text{B24})$$

(x) $h \rightarrow gg$ [85]:

$$\Gamma(h \rightarrow gg) = \frac{\alpha_s^2 m_h^3}{72 v^2 \pi^3} \left| \frac{3}{4} \sum_q A_{1/2}(\tau_q) \right|^2. \quad (\text{B25})$$

APPENDIX C: NUMERICAL RESULTS FROM ANALYTIC DECAY WIDTHS

To check consistency, we compare the EE obtained from HDECAY with that from the analytic expressions for the Higgs boson decay widths summarized in Appendix B.

In the upper panels in Fig. 4, the m_h and m_W dependence of the EE is shown. As seen in Fig. 4, there is a discrepancy between the HDECAY results (black solid line) and those from the analytic expressions for the Higgs boson decay widths (orange dashed line) due to higher-order corrections

[62]. From the EE obtained using the analytic expressions for the Higgs boson decay widths, the predicted Higgs and W boson masses are, respectively,

$$m_W = 79.726 \pm 0.148 \text{ GeV}, \quad m_h = 126.54 \pm 0.28 \text{ GeV}. \quad (\text{C1})$$

Comparing Eqs. (23) and (25), we conclude that higher-order corrections to the Higgs boson decay widths are important for obtaining precise predictions for the Higgs and W boson masses from the EE. In the lower panel in Fig. 4, the SM point (white cross) and the contour with $\kappa_f = \kappa_V$ (black dashed line) lie in the near-maximal EE domain satisfying $\Delta EE/EE_{\max} \leq 0.1\%$. This is consistent with the result shown in Fig. 3.




FIG. 4. Distributions of the entanglement entropy using analytical formulas for the Higgs boson decay widths. Upper left: dependence of the EE on the Higgs boson mass m_h . The black solid line shows results from HDECAY, while the orange dashed line represents the EE calculated using analytical formulas. The orange band indicates $EE_{\max}$ with its 1σ uncertainty from SM inputs and theoretical uncertainties. Other colored codes follow the same definition as in Fig. 2. Upper right: dependence of the EE on the W boson mass m_W . Bottom: EE distribution in the (κ_f, κ_V) plane.

APPENDIX D: NUMERICAL RESULTS FOR $EE = 1 - \sum_i BR_i^2$

We here show predicted SM parameters by maximizing the following simple EE:

$$EE = 1 - \sum_i BR_i^2. \quad (D1)$$

This follows from the assumption that the reduced density matrix that traced out a certain partial state for the final state is given by

$$\rho_{br} = \sum_i BR_i |i\rangle\langle i|. \quad (D2)$$

It should be noted that the density matrix in Eq. (D2) is of the block diagonal structure for each decay channel. Then,

the purity is given by $\text{tr}[\rho_{br}^2] = \sum_i BR_i^2$. Therefore, the linear entropy given in Eq. (10) can be expressed by Eq. (D1).

In Fig. 5, the parameter dependence of the EE given in Eq. (D1) is shown. Our analysis yields predicted Higgs and W boson masses, respectively, below:

$$m_W = 72.497 \pm 0.313 \text{ GeV}, \quad m_h = 135.18 \pm 0.31 \text{ GeV}. \quad (D3)$$

Comparing Eqs. (23) and (25), it is concluded that Eq. (D1) does not yield plausible predictions for the Higgs and W boson masses. Furthermore, the bottom panel in Fig. 5 shows that the SM point does not lie in a region of near-maximal EE. Based on these findings, we conclude that the EE defined by Eq. (D1) is not applicable to the Higgs boson sector.




FIG. 5. Entanglement-entropy distribution for Standard Model parameters using $EE = 1 - \sum_i BR_i^2$. Upper left: EE as a function of Higgs boson mass m_h . Upper right: EE as a function of W boson mass m_W . Bottom: EE distribution in the (κ_f, κ_V) plane. Color coding follows the same convention as in Fig. 2.


APPENDIX E: RESULTS WITH THE GIBBS-SHANNON ENTROPY

In our analysis, we have used the EE defined in Eq. (13) to calculate physical parameters such as the Higgs boson mass. In Ref. [35], it was demonstrated that the maximal classical multinomial entropy (Gibbs-Shannon entropy) provides a precise prediction for the Higgs boson mass. Here, we briefly explain their analysis and the differences from our approach.

In classical information theory, probability distributions play a fundamental role. In Ref. [35], the decay branching ratios of the SM Higgs boson are treated as probabilities p_k for each channel labeled by k ($k = 1, \dots, m$), and the Gibbs-Shannon entropy is evaluated. For N Higgs bosons, the Gibbs-Shannon entropy is given by [35]

$$S_N = \sum_{\{n\}} -P(\{n_k\}_{k=1}^m) \ln [P(\{n_k\}_{k=1}^m)], \quad (\text{E1})$$

with



$$\sum_{\{n\}} \equiv \sum_{n_1=0}^N \cdots \sum_{n_m=0}^N \delta\left(N - \sum_{i=1}^m n_i\right),$$

$$P(\{n_k\}_{k=1}^m) \equiv \frac{N!}{n_1! \cdots n_m!} \prod_{k=1}^m (p_k)^{n_k}, \quad (\text{E2})$$

where n_i indicates the number of Higgs bosons decaying into the channel i . The authors of Ref. [35] showed that S_N approaches a simple expression in the large- N limit (verified for $N > 10^7$):

$$S_\infty = \frac{1}{2} \ln \left[(2\pi N e)^{m-1} \prod_{k=1}^m p_k \right] + O\left(\frac{1}{N}\right). \quad (\text{E3})$$

This implies that S_∞ is maximized when the decay processes are democratic ($p_1 = \cdots = p_m$), a property shared by the EE in Eq. (D1).

The upper two panels in Fig. 6 show the dependence of the Gibbs-Shannon entropy on the Higgs and W boson masses. Following Ref. [35], we use $N = 10^9$ in our





FIG. 6. Gibbs-Shannon entropy [Eq. (E3)] as a function of Standard Model parameters. Upper left: dependence on the Higgs boson mass m_h . Upper right: dependence on the W boson mass m_W . Bottom: distribution in the (κ_f, κ_V) plane. Color coding follows the same definition as in Fig. 2.

numerical calculations. We define the near-maximal entropy region (green domain) by $|S_\infty^{\max} - S_\infty|/S_\infty^{\max} \equiv \Delta S_\infty/S_\infty^{\max} \leq 0.1\%$. Maximizing S_∞ yields the following predictions for m_h and m_W , respectively:

$$m_h = 126.52 \pm 0.09 \text{ GeV}, \quad m_W = 81.856 \pm 0.148 \text{ GeV}. \quad (\text{E4})$$

The predicted Higgs boson mass deviates from the measured value by within 1.1%, consistent with our result in Eq. (23). The predicted W boson mass deviates approximately 1.9% from the measured value. The bottom panel in Fig. 6 shows the Gibbs-Shannon entropy as a function of κ_f and κ_V . This figure reveals that the SM point and the contour $\kappa_f = \kappa_V$ lie outside the near-maximal entropy domain, despite the relatively accurate mass predictions shown in the upper panels. These findings suggest that the Gibbs-Shannon entropy in Eq. (E3) cannot fully characterize the Higgs boson sector. Therefore, we conclude that the EE in Eq. (13) is more effective for determining Higgs boson properties and the structure of electroweak interactions.

We note that the predictions in Eq. (E4) do not include full four-body decay channels, such as $h \rightarrow V^*V^* \rightarrow 4f$. This omission is not because such contributions are phenomenologically irrelevant but because their consistent incorporation into the present entropy construction is nontrivial. In our framework, the entropy is defined from a reduced density matrix obtained after specifying a Hilbert-space bipartition and tracing over the states in $\mathcal{H}_B$. For the two-body and single-off-shell three-body channels included in the main analysis, this prescription gives a well-defined reduced density matrix and spin factor. For full four-body final states, however, an unambiguous extension would require specifying how the observed fermions are assigned to the two intermediate vector-boson branches after the kinematic degrees of freedom are traced out. In addition, identical-fermion interference and, in the full four-fermion final state, possible WW/ZZ interference effects can contribute. Therefore, the corresponding $\mathcal{P}_i$ would no longer be associated with a unique and straightforward channel partition in the density matrix ρ_R within our present setup.

There is also a practical issue. The numerical analysis in this work follows the same computational setup as Ref. [35], based on HDECAY. While HDECAY provides an approximate treatment of off-shell four-body modes, a dedicated and consistent description of $h \rightarrow 4f$ decays would require a specialized tool such as PROPHECY4F [71], which was not used either in our analysis or in the reference study.

To estimate the possible size of the effect, we nevertheless considered the *ad hoc* four-body off-shell contribution

implemented in HDECAY. With this simplified prescription, we find $m_h \simeq 125.4 \text{ GeV}$, in agreement with Ref. [35]. However, the same treatment gives $m_W \simeq 82.9 \pm 0.1 \text{ GeV}$ and $\kappa_V/\kappa_f \simeq 1.23$, which deviate from the measured values. We, therefore, interpret this exercise only as an estimate of the possible quantitative impact of four-body effects rather than as a fully consistent incorporation of four-body final states into the entropy observable. A precision-level treatment of these effects would require a revised Hilbert-space partition and a dedicated treatment of four-fermion interference effects, which we leave for future work.

APPENDIX F: THE IMPLICATION OF EE IN Z BOSON DECAY

We now apply our framework to Z boson decays. The Z boson decays into 11 channels: $Z \rightarrow f\bar{f}$ ($f = q, \ell, \nu_e, \nu_\mu, \nu_\tau$) except for top quarks. For an unpolarized initial Z boson, the leading-order decay width is given by [86]

$$\Gamma(Z \rightarrow f\bar{f}) = \frac{N_c^f g^2 m_Z}{48\pi \cos^2 \theta_W} \left[c_V^2 + c_A^2 + 2(c_V^2 - 2c_A^2) \frac{m_f^2}{m_Z^2} \right] \times \sqrt{1 - \frac{4m_f^2}{m_Z^2}}, \quad (\text{F1})$$

where c_V and c_A are the vector and axial-vector couplings, respectively, in the Zff vertex $-\frac{ig}{2\cos\theta_W}(c_V - c_A\gamma^5)$. Since the EE in Eq. (13) depends on branching ratios, it exhibits minimal dependence on the Z boson mass due to $m_f^2/m_Z^2 \ll 1$. We, therefore, investigate whether the EE for Z boson decays can predict the weak mixing angle $\sin\theta_W$.

To compute the EE in Eq. (13), we must determine the spin factor $\mathcal{P}_f$ for $Z \rightarrow f\bar{f}$. We begin by expressing the Zff vertex for each fermion as

$$-\frac{ig}{2\cos\theta_W}(c_V^f - c_A^f\gamma^5) = -\frac{ig}{\cos\theta_W}(g_L^f P_L + g_R^f P_R), \quad (\text{F2})$$

where $c_{V,A}^f = g_L^f \pm g_R^f$ and $P_{L,R}$ are the chiral projection operators. From this vertex, we compute the decay width $\Gamma_{ij}^{\lambda_Z, f}$ for $Z \rightarrow f_i \bar{f}_j$, where λ_Z and i/j parametrize the polarization of the Z boson ($\lambda_Z = 0, \pm$) and helicity for fermions ($i, j = \pm$), respectively. The spin factor is then given by

$$\mathcal{P}_f^{\lambda_Z} = \frac{\sum_{ij} \Gamma_{ij}^{\lambda_Z, f} \Gamma_{ji}^{\lambda_Z, f}}{(\sum_{i,j} \Gamma_{ij}^{\lambda_Z, f})^2}, \quad (\text{F3})$$

which can be expressed in terms of $g_{L/R}^f$ as

$$\mathcal{P}_f^\pm = \frac{(1 - 8x_f^4)[(g_L^f)^4 + (g_R^f)^4] + 2x_f^2(5 - 12x_f^2)(g_L^f g_R^f)^2 - 4x_f^2(1 - 4x_f^2)g_L^f g_R^f[(g_L^f)^2 + (g_R^f)^2]}{[(g_L^f)^2 + (g_R^f)^2]^2}, \quad (\text{F4})$$

$$\mathcal{P}_f^0 = \frac{(1 - 8x_f^4)[(g_L^f)^4 + (g_R^f)^4] + 16x_f^2(1 - 3x_f^2)(g_L^f g_R^f)^2 + 8x_f^2(1 - 4x_f^2)g_L^f g_R^f[(g_L^f)^2 + (g_R^f)^2]}{[(g_L^f)^2 + (g_R^f)^2]^2}, \quad (\text{F5})$$

where $x_f = m_f/m_Z$. In the chiral limit ($x_f \rightarrow 0$), the spin factor is of the same form for all initial helicity: $\mathcal{P}_f^\pm = \mathcal{P}_f^0 = [(g_L^f)^4 + (g_R^f)^4]/[(g_L^f)^2 + (g_R^f)^2]^2$.

Figure 7 shows the dependence of the EE on the weak mixing angle. The requirement of near-maximal EE yields

$$\sin \theta_W = 0.615_{-0.056}^{+0.067}, \quad (\text{F6})$$

which deviates from the measured value $\sin^2 \theta_W(m_Z) = 0.231$ by approximately 28% [64]. We also performed a similar analysis for W boson decays but found no meaningful results due to cancellations in the gauge coupling dependence of the EE. These findings suggest that decay processes involving global information in multiple sectors, such as Higgs boson decays, may be unique as the quantum-information probes.




FIG. 7. Dependence of the entanglement entropy on the weak mixing angle for Z boson decays. Color regions follow the same convention as in Fig. 2.

- [1] J. S. Bell, On the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen paradox, *Phys. Phys. Fiz.* **1**, 195 (1964).
- [2] A. J. Barr, M. Fabbrichesi, R. Floreanini, E. Gabrielli, and L. Marzola, Quantum entanglement and Bell inequality violation at colliders, *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **139**, 104134 (2024).
- [3] ATLAS Collaboration, Observation of quantum entanglement with top quarks at the ATLAS detector, *Nature (London)* **633**, 542 (2024).
- [4] CMS Collaboration, Observation of quantum entanglement in top quark pair production in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV, *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **87**, 117801 (2024).
- [5] Y. Afik *et al.*, Quantum information meets high-energy physics: Input to the update of the European strategy for particle physics, *Eur. Phys. J. Plus* **140**, 855 (2025).
- [6] J. Lykken, Quantum information for particle theorists, *Proc. Sci. TASI2020 (2021)* 010 [arXiv:2010.02931].
- [7] Y. Afik and J. R. M. de Nova, Quantum information with top quarks in QCD, *Quantum* **6**, 820 (2022).
- [8] A. Cervera-Lierta, J. I. Latorre, J. Rojo, and L. Rottoli, Maximal entanglement in high energy physics, *SciPost Phys.* **3**, 036 (2017).
- [9] G. M. Quinta, A. Sousa, and Y. Omar, Predicting leptonic CP violation via minimization of neutrino entanglement, arXiv:2207.03303.
- [10] J. Thaler and S. Trifinopoulos, Flavor patterns of fundamental particles from quantum entanglement?, *Phys. Rev. D* **111**, 056021 (2025).
- [11] Q. Liu, I. Low, and Z. Yin, A quantum computational determination of the weak mixing angle in the standard model, arXiv:2509.18251.
- [12] S. R. Beane, D. B. Kaplan, N. Klco, and M. J. Savage, Entanglement suppression and emergent symmetries of strong interactions, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 102001 (2019).
- [13] I. Low and T. Mehen, Symmetry from entanglement suppression, *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, 074014 (2021).
- [14] Q. Liu, I. Low, and T. Mehen, Minimal entanglement and emergent symmetries in low-energy QCD, *Phys. Rev. C* **107**, 025204 (2023).
- [15] M. Carena, I. Low, C. E. M. Wagner, and M.-L. Xiao, Entanglement suppression, enhanced symmetry, and a standard-model-like Higgs boson, *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, L051901 (2024).
- [16] Q. Liu and I. Low, Hints of entanglement suppression in hyperon-nucleon scattering, *Phys. Lett. B* **856**, 138899 (2024).
- [17] T.-R. Hu, S. Chen, and F.-K. Guo, Entanglement suppression and low-energy scattering of heavy mesons, *Phys. Rev. D* **110**, 014001 (2024).

- [18] S. Chang and G. Jacobo, Consequences of minimal entanglement in bosonic field theories, *Phys. Rev. D* **110**, 096020 (2024).
- [19] K. Kowalska and E. M. Sessolo, Entanglement in flavored scalar scattering, *J. High Energy Phys.* **07** (2024) 156.
- [20] N. McGinnis, Symmetry, entanglement, and the S -matrix, [arXiv:2504.21079](#).
- [21] G. Busoni, J. Gargalionis, E. N. V. Wallace, and M. J. White, Emergent symmetry in a two-Higgs-doublet model from quantum information and nonstabilizerness, *Phys. Rev. D* **112**, 035022 (2025).
- [22] J. Liu, M. Tanaka, X.-P. Wang, J.-J. Zhang, and Z. Zheng, Scattering entanglement entropy and its implications for electroweak phase transitions, *Phys. Rev. D* **112**, 015028 (2025).
- [23] M. Carena, G. Coloretti, W. Liu, M. Litzmann, I. Low, and C. E. M. Wagner, Entanglement maximization and mirror symmetry in two-Higgs-doublet models, *J. High Energy Phys.* **08** (2025) 016.
- [24] T.-R. Hu, K. Sone, F.-K. Guo, T. Hyodo, and I. Low, Entanglement suppression, quantum statistics and symmetries in spin-3/2 baryon scatterings, [arXiv:2506.08960](#).
- [25] C. Núñez, M. Pardina, M. Asorey, J. I. Latorre, and A. Cervera-Lierta, Gauge invariance from quantum information principles, [arXiv:2511.04358](#).
- [26] K.-F. Lyu, R. Muralidharan, and K. Sinha, Entanglement, Yang-Mills, and the scattering matrix as an $SU(N)$ -equivariant kernel, [arXiv:2511.09623](#).
- [27] N. McGinnis, Quantum computational structure of $SU(N)$ scattering, [arXiv:2511.10550](#).
- [28] N. McGinnis, Crossing symmetry and entanglement, [arXiv:2511.10559](#).
- [29] ATLAS Collaboration, A detailed map of Higgs boson interactions by the ATLAS experiment ten years after the discovery, *Nature (London)* **607**, 52 (2022).
- [30] CMS Collaboration, A portrait of the Higgs boson by the CMS experiment ten years after the discovery, *Nature (London)* **607**, 60 (2022).
- [31] M. Shaposhnikov and C. Wetterich, Asymptotic safety of gravity and the Higgs boson mass, *Phys. Lett. B* **683**, 196 (2010).
- [32] C. D. Froggatt and H. B. Nielsen, Standard model criticality prediction: Top mass 173 ± 5 -GeV and Higgs mass 135 ± 9 -GeV, *Phys. Lett. B* **368**, 96 (1996).
- [33] G. Degrandi, S. Di Vita, J. Elias-Miro, J. R. Espinosa, G. F. Giudice, G. Isidori, and A. Strumia, Higgs mass and vacuum stability in the standard model at NNLO, *J. High Energy Phys.* **08** (2012) 098.
- [34] D. d'Enterria, On the Gaussian peak of the product of decay probabilities of the standard model Higgs boson at a mass $m_H \sim 125$ GeV, [arXiv:1208.1993](#).
- [35] A. Alves, A. G. Dias, and R. da Silva, Maximum entropy principle and the Higgs boson mass, *Physica A (Amsterdam)* **420**, 1 (2015).
- [36] A. J. Barr, Testing Bell inequalities in Higgs boson decays, *Phys. Lett. B* **825**, 136866 (2022).
- [37] M. Fabbrichesi, R. Floreanini, and E. Gabrielli, Constraining new physics in entangled two-qubit systems: Top-quark, tau-lepton and photon pairs, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **83**, 162 (2023).
- [38] J. A. Aguilar-Saavedra, A. Bernal, J. A. Casas, and J. M. Moreno, Testing entanglement and Bell inequalities in $H \rightarrow ZZ$, *Phys. Rev. D* **107**, 016012 (2023).
- [39] J. A. Aguilar-Saavedra, Laboratory-frame tests of quantum entanglement in $H \rightarrow WW$, *Phys. Rev. D* **107**, 076016 (2023).
- [40] R. Ashby-Pickering, A. J. Barr, and A. Wierzychucka, Quantum state tomography, entanglement detection and Bell violation prospects in weak decays of massive particles, *J. High Energy Phys.* **05** (2023) 020.
- [41] M. M. Altakach, P. Lamba, F. Maltoni, K. Mawatari, and K. Sakurai, Quantum information and CP measurement in $H \rightarrow \tau^+ \tau^-$ at future lepton colliders, *Phys. Rev. D* **107**, 093002 (2023).
- [42] M. Fabbrichesi, R. Floreanini, E. Gabrielli, and L. Marzola, Bell inequalities and quantum entanglement in weak gauge boson production at the LHC and future colliders, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **83**, 823 (2023).
- [43] A. Bernal, P. Caban, and J. Rembieliński, Entanglement and Bell inequalities violation in $H \rightarrow ZZ$ with anomalous coupling, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **83**, 1050 (2023).
- [44] K. Ma and T. Li, Testing Bell inequality through $h \rightarrow \tau\tau$ at CEPC*, *Chin. Phys. C* **48**, 103105 (2024).
- [45] J. A. Aguilar-Saavedra, Tripartite entanglement in $H \rightarrow ZZ, WW$ decays, *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, 113004 (2024).
- [46] R. A. Morales, Tripartite entanglement and Bell non-locality in loop-induced Higgs boson decays, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **84**, 581 (2024).
- [47] A. Bernal, P. Caban, and J. Rembieliński, Entanglement and Bell inequality violation in vector diboson systems produced in decays of spin-0 particles, *Sci. Rep.* **15**, 23410 (2025).
- [48] M. Grossi, G. Pelliccioli, and A. Vicini, From angular coefficients to quantum observables: A phenomenological appraisal in di-boson systems, *J. High Energy Phys.* **12** (2024) 120.
- [49] M. Del Gratta, F. Fabbri, P. Lamba, F. Maltoni, and D. Pagani, Quantum properties of $H \rightarrow VV^*$: Precise predictions in the SM and sensitivity to new physics, *J. High Energy Phys.* **09** (2025) 013.
- [50] D. Gonçalves, A. Kaladharan, F. Krauss, and A. Navarro, Quantum entanglement is quantum: ZZ production at the LHC, [arXiv:2505.12125](#).
- [51] D. Gonçalves, A. Kaladharan, and A. Navarro, Higher-order corrections to quantum observables in $h \rightarrow WW^*$, [arXiv:2506.19951](#).
- [52] P. Bechtle, C. Breuning, H. K. Dreiner, and C. Duhr, A critical appraisal of tests of locality and of entanglement versus non-entanglement at colliders, [arXiv:2507.15947](#).
- [53] S. A. Abel, H. K. Dreiner, R. Sengupta, and L. Ubaldi, Colliders are testing neither locality via Bell's inequality nor entanglement versus non-entanglement, [arXiv:2507.15949](#).
- [54] M. Del Gratta, F. Fabbri, M. Grossi, F. Maltoni, D. Pagani, G. Pelliccioli *et al.*, Z-boson quantum tomography at next-to-leading order, [arXiv:2509.20456](#).
- [55] L. Lello, D. Boyanovsky, and R. Holman, Entanglement entropy in particle decay, *J. High Energy Phys.* **11** (2013) 116.
- [56] S. Seki, I. Y. Park, and S.-J. Sin, Variation of entanglement entropy in scattering process, *Phys. Lett. B* **743**, 147 (2015).

- [57] P. Zanardi, C. Zalka, and L. Faoro, Entangling power of quantum evolutions, *Phys. Rev. A* **62**, 030301 (2000).
- [58] I. Low and Z. Yin, Elastic cross section is entanglement entropy, *Phys. Rev. D* **111**, 065027 (2025).
- [59] All channels involve the same type particle pair except the $Z\gamma$ mode. The $Z\gamma$ channel would introduce cross-channel interference terms in Eq. (13). Since $\text{BR}_{Z\gamma}$ is negligible, we ignore these terms and treat Eq. (13) as exact.
- [60] W.-Y. Keung and W. J. Marciano, Higgs scalar decays: $H \rightarrow W^\pm X$, *Phys. Rev. D* **30**, 248 (1984).
- [61] A. Djouadi, J. Kalinowski, and M. Spira, HDECAY: A program for Higgs boson decays in the standard model and its supersymmetric extension, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **108**, 56 (1998).
- [62] HDECAY Collaboration, HDECAY: Twenty₊₊ years after, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **238**, 214 (2019).
- [63] In our analysis, we performed the parameter scan by changing quark masses, lepton masses, strong gauge coupling, W and Z boson masses, Weinberg angle, and Fermi constant. We used their central values and corresponding ambiguities summarized in Ref. [64] as the input values. The theoretical uncertainty in the estimation of BRs is also taken into account [65,66]. For the parameter scan, we assumed that each input parameter takes any value within the uncertainty range with equal probability and obtained parameter points at which EE is maximized using input values randomly selected within the experimentally allowed range. The uncertainty of the inferred Higgs and W boson masses is obtained from the central 68% interval of the resulting distribution of the entropy maximum points.
- [64] Particle Data Group, Review of particle physics, *Phys. Rev. D* **110**, 030001 (2024).
- [65] LHC Higgs Cross Section Working Group Collaboration, Handbook of LHC Higgs cross sections: 4. Deciphering the nature of the Higgs sector, *CERN Yellow Rep. Monogr.* **2**, 1 (2017).
- [66] E. Bagnaschi, L. Biermann, and M. Spira, Higgs-boson decays: Updates, [arXiv:2510.24658](https://arxiv.org/abs/2510.24658).
- [67] ATLAS Collaboration, Combined measurement of the Higgs boson mass from the $H \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ and $H \rightarrow ZZ^* \rightarrow 4\ell$ decay channels with the ATLAS detector using $s = 7, 8$, and 13 TeV pp collision data, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **131**, 251802 (2023).
- [68] CMS Collaboration, Measurement of the Higgs boson mass and width using the four-lepton final state in proton-proton collisions at $s = 13$ TeV, *Phys. Rev. D* **111**, 092014 (2025).
- [69] LHC Higgs Cross Section Working Group Collaboration, Handbook of LHC Higgs cross sections: 3. Higgs properties, [arXiv:1307.1347](https://arxiv.org/abs/1307.1347).
- [70] G. C. Branco, P. M. Ferreira, L. Lavoura, M. N. Rebelo, M. Sher, and J. P. Silva, Theory and phenomenology of two-Higgs-doublet models, *Phys. Rep.* **516**, 1 (2012).
- [71] A. Denner, S. Dittmaier, and A. Mück, PROPHECY4F 3.0: A Monte Carlo program for Higgs-boson decays into four-fermion final states in and beyond the Standard Model, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **254**, 107336 (2020).
- [72] A. Djouadi, The anatomy of electro-weak symmetry breaking. I: The Higgs boson in the standard model, *Phys. Rep.* **457**, 1 (2008).
- [73] M. Spira, Higgs boson production and decay at hadron colliders, *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **95**, 98 (2017).
- [74] J. Wang, X. Wang, and Y. Wang, Analytic decay width of the Higgs boson to massive bottom quarks at order α_s^3 , *J. High Energy Phys.* **03** (2025) 163.
- [75] J. Aparisi *et al.*, mb at mH: The running bottom quark mass and the Higgs boson, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **128**, 122001 (2022).
- [76] J. A. M. Vermaseren, S. A. Larin, and T. van Ritbergen, The 4-loop quark mass anomalous dimension and the invariant quark mass, *Phys. Lett. B* **405**, 327 (1997).
- [77] S. A. Larin and J. A. M. Vermaseren, The three loop QCD beta function and anomalous dimensions, *Phys. Lett. B* **303**, 334 (1993).
- [78] T. van Ritbergen, J. A. M. Vermaseren, and S. A. Larin, The four loop beta function in quantum chromodynamics, *Phys. Lett. B* **400**, 379 (1997).
- [79] J. R. Ellis, M. K. Gaillard, and D. V. Nanopoulos, A phenomenological profile of the Higgs boson, *Nucl. Phys. B* **106**, 292 (1976).
- [80] B. 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).
- [81] B. A. Kniehl, Radiative corrections for $H \rightarrow W^+W^- (\gamma)$ in the standard model, *Nucl. Phys. B* **357**, 439 (1991).
- [82] A. Bredenstein, A. Denner, S. Dittmaier, and M. M. Weber, Precise predictions for the Higgs-boson decay $H \rightarrow WW/ZZ \rightarrow 4$ leptons, *Phys. Rev. D* **74**, 013004 (2006).
- [83] M. A. Shifman, A. I. Vainshtein, M. B. Voloshin, and V. I. Zakharov, Low-energy theorems for Higgs boson couplings to photons, *Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.* **30**, 711 (1979).
- [84] R. N. Cahn, M. S. Chanowitz, and N. Fleishon, Higgs particle production by $Z \rightarrow H\Gamma$, *Phys. Lett.* **82B**, 113 (1979).
- [85] T. G. Rizzo, Gluon final states in Higgs boson decay, *Phys. Rev. D* **22**, 178 (1980).
- [86] J. F. Donoghue, E. Golowich, and B. R. Holstein, *Dynamics of the Standard Model* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 2014), Vol. 2, [10.1017/CBO9780511524370](https://arxiv.org/abs/10.1017/CBO9780511524370).