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## INTRODUCTION

- $S U(2)_{\llcorner } \times U(1)_{y}$ symmetry hidden at low energies, but restored in the UV
- tree-level relations among weak couplings and masses corrected by finite and calculable loop corrections
- precision measurements of masses and couplings
- test the quantum structure of the SM
- probe NP through its virtual effects


## SYMMETRIES OF THE SM HIGGS SECTOR

In the SM, one Higgs doublet $\varphi$ w. potential

$$
V(\varphi)=-\frac{\mu^{2}}{2}|\varphi|^{2}+\frac{\lambda}{4}|\varphi|^{4}=-\frac{\mu^{2}}{2} \operatorname{Tr}\left(\Phi^{\dagger} \Phi\right)+\frac{\lambda}{4} \operatorname{Tr}\left(\Phi^{\dagger} \Phi\right)^{2}
$$

with $\Phi \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\begin{array}{cc}\varphi_{0}^{*} & \varphi_{+} \\ -\varphi_{+}^{*} & \varphi_{0}\end{array}\right)$, invariant under $\Phi \rightarrow U_{L} \Phi U_{R}^{\dagger}$ where $S U(2)\llcorner$ coincides with gauge $S U(2)$, while $Y$ with the third component of $S \cup(2)_{R}$. The charge-conserving $\langle\Phi\rangle \equiv \frac{1}{2}\left(\begin{array}{ll}v & 0 \\ 0 & v\end{array}\right)$ leaves the diagonal $S U(2)_{v}$ unbroken, ensuring $M_{W_{1}}=M_{W_{2}}=M_{W_{3}}$ and $\rho \equiv \frac{M_{W}^{2}}{M_{Z}^{2} \cos ^{2} \theta_{W}}=1$

## SYMMETRIES OF THE SM HIGGS SECTOR

- Promoting right-handed quarks to $\operatorname{SU}(2)_{R}$ doublets, one can write Yukawa couplings in the form

$$
\bar{Q}_{L} \Phi\left(\begin{array}{cc}
Y_{u} & 0 \\
0 & Y_{d}
\end{array}\right) Q_{R}
$$

which would be $S U(2)_{R}$-invariant for $\mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{u}}=\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{d}}$. Therefore, the tree-level prediction $\rho=1$ gets loop corrections proportional to $G_{F} m_{t}{ }^{2}$.

## EXPERIMENTAL INPUTS

- SM input parameters:
- $G_{F}, \alpha, M_{Z}, M_{H}, m_{+}, \alpha_{s}\left(M_{Z}\right), \Delta \alpha_{h a d}{ }^{(5)}$
- For $\Delta \alpha_{\text {had }}{ }^{(5)}$ we use lattice QCD in the Euclidean + perturbative running
- For $m_{t}$, "standard" average completely dominated by very recent CMS l+jets measurement: $m_{+}=171.77 \pm 0.38 \mathrm{GeV}$. However, there is a $3.5 \sigma$ tension with the TeVatron average $m_{+}=174.34 \pm 0.64 \mathrm{GeV}$, so consider also "conservative" average with error inflated to 1 GeV . Notice: PDG recipe would give a "ultra-conservative" 1.7 GeV error.


## Mw: New Exp. Average

- Also for $M_{w}$, "standard" average completely dominated by very recent CDF measurement.
- Taking systematic errors fully correlated, we obtain $M_{w}=80413.3 \pm 8.0 \mathrm{MeV}$.
- However, also in this case there are tensions between LHC, TeVatron and LEP measurements, so consider also "conservative" average with error inflated à la PDG to 15 MeV


## $M_{w}: S M$ vs EXPERIMENT

| Model | Pred. $M_{W}[\mathrm{GeV}] \quad$ Pull <br> standard average | Pred. $M_{W}[\mathrm{GeV}]$ <br> conservative average |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SM | $80.3499 \pm 0.0056 \quad 6.5 \sigma$ | $80.3505 \pm 0.0077$ | $3.7 \sigma$ |

- The SM prediction is obtained omitting the experimental information on Mw. Previously, the tension was $1.8 \sigma$. Current theory error on $M_{w}$ in the SM is 4 MeV Awramiketal, 'o3
- In the "ultra-conservative" scenario for $m_{+}$, the pull is slightly reduced to $3.4 \sigma$


## INTERPLAY OF $M_{w}$ WITH OTHER OBSERVABLES
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## LOCAL vs GLOBAL SIGNIFICANCE

- Considering the whole set of EWPO, what is the global agreement with the SM?
- Compute global $p$-value of the "full prediction", taking into account experimental and theoretical correlations:
- $p=2.4510^{-5}$, i.e. $4.2 \sigma$ (standard scenario)
- $p=0.10$, i.e. $1.6 \sigma$ (conservative scenario)
- $p=0.18$, i.e. $1.4 \sigma$ (ultra-conservative scenario)


## $M_{w}$ BEYOND THE SM

- Add heavy NP that decouples, leaving its virtual footprints:
- dominantly in gauge Boson propagators: "oblique" NP
- an interesting example: $\mathrm{Y}=0$ Higgs triple $\dagger$
- in the complete set of gauge-invariant dimension six operators (SMEFT)
- For more models (Z', composite Higgs, etc.) see e.g. Strumia '22


## OBLIQUE NP

- Assume NP dominant contribution is in gauge Boson prodaaators:

$$
\begin{aligned}
S & =-16 \pi \Pi_{30}^{\mathrm{NP}}(0)=16 \pi\left[\Pi_{33}^{\mathrm{NP}}(0)-\Pi_{3 Q}^{\mathrm{NP}}(0)\right] \\
T & =\frac{4 \pi}{s_{W}^{2} c_{W}^{2} M_{Z}^{2}}\left[\Pi_{11}^{\mathrm{NP}}(0)-\Pi_{33}^{\mathrm{NP}}(0)\right], \\
U & =16 \pi\left[\Pi_{11}^{\mathrm{NP}^{\prime}}(0)-\Pi_{33}^{\mathrm{NP}^{\prime}}(0)\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

- EWPO are modified as follows:
$-\delta \Gamma$ z $\propto \quad-10\left(3-8 s_{W}^{2}\right) S+\left(63-126 s_{W}^{2}-40 s_{W}^{4}\right) T$
$-\delta M_{W}, \delta \Gamma{ }_{W} \propto \quad S-2 c_{W}^{2} T-\frac{\left(c_{W}^{2}-s_{W}^{2}\right) U}{2 s_{W}^{2}}$
- all other observables: $S-4 c_{W}^{2} s_{W}^{2} T$


## OBLIQUE NP: U=0

## standard
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## OBLIQUE NP: RESULTS

- Compare models using the Information Criterion:

$$
I C \equiv-2 \overline{\log \mathcal{L}}+4 \sigma_{\log \mathcal{L}}^{2}
$$

|  | Result | Correlation | Result | Correlation |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\left(\mathrm{IC}_{\mathrm{ST}} / \mathrm{IC}_{\mathrm{SM}}=25.0 / 80.2\right)$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{IC}_{\mathrm{STU}} / \mathrm{IC}\right.$ |  |  |
| $S$ | $0.100 \pm 0.073$ | 1.00 |  | $0.005 \pm 0.096$ | 1.00 |
| $T$ | $0.202 \pm 0.056$ | 0.93 | 1.00 | $0.040 \pm 0.120$ | 0.91 |
| $U$ | - | - | - | $0.134 \pm 0.087$ | -0.65 |

- No significant gain in IC for $U \neq 0$

| Model | Pred. $M_{W}[\mathrm{GeV}]$ <br> standard average | Pred. $M_{W}[\mathrm{GeV}]$ <br> conservative average |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SM | $80.3499 \pm 0.0056$ | $6.5 \sigma$ | $80.3505 \pm 0.0077$ | $3.7 \sigma$ |
| ST | $80.366 \pm 0.029$ | $1.6 \sigma$ | $80.367 \pm 0.029$ | $1.4 \sigma$ |
| STU | $80.32 \pm 0.54$ | $0.2 \sigma$ | $80.32 \pm 0.54$ | $0.2 \sigma$ |

## The Higgs Triplet Model

- Adding a Higgs Triplet with hypercharge $Y=0$ breaks custodial symmetry at tree level.
- Denoting by H the SM Higgs doublet and by $\Phi=\tau^{a} \phi^{a} / 2$ the triplet, the tree-level masses are $M_{Z}^{2}=\frac{1}{4}\left(g_{2}^{2}+g_{y}^{2}\right) v_{H}^{2}$ and $M_{W}^{2}=\frac{1}{4} g_{2}^{2} v_{H}^{2}+g_{2}^{2} v_{\phi}^{2}$
- Current data require $v_{\phi} \sim 3 \mathrm{GeV}$


## The Higgs Triplet Model

- Most general Higgs potential is

$$
\begin{gathered}
V=m_{H}^{2} H^{\dagger} H+\frac{\lambda_{H}}{4}\left(H^{\dagger} H\right)^{2}+m_{\phi}^{2} \operatorname{tr}\left(\Phi^{2}\right)+\frac{\lambda_{\phi}}{4}\left(\operatorname{tr} \Phi^{2}\right)^{2} \\
+\kappa H^{\dagger} H \operatorname{tr}\left(\Phi^{2}\right)+\mu H^{\dagger} \Phi H
\end{gathered}
$$

- For large $m_{\phi}$, at tree-level the triplet vev is

$$
\frac{v_{\phi}}{v_{H}}=\frac{\mu v_{H}}{4 m_{\phi}^{2}}
$$

- for $\mu \ll m_{\phi}$, decoupling limit: tree-level and loop contributions suppressed by $1 / m_{\phi}{ }^{2}$; e.g. for $\mu \sim v_{H}$ one needs $m_{\phi} \sim \mathrm{TeV}$


## The Higgs Triplet Model

- for $\mu \sim m_{\phi}$ non-decoupling induced by the dimensionful coupling $\mu$ : everything vanishes as $1 / m_{\phi}{ }^{2}$ except for the loop corrections to the triplet vev, which induce a nonvanishing $v_{\phi}$, i.e. a nonvanishing $T$ and nothing else!
- Notice: this (non)decoupling becomes evident only in a "hybrid" scheme in which one uses as input $\alpha, G_{F}$ and $M_{z}$ and computes all other observables in terms of $v_{\phi}$
- Unitarity of WW scattering gives an upper bound on triplet masses:

$$
m_{\phi} \lesssim \frac{2 \sqrt{\pi} v_{H}^{2}}{v_{\phi}} \sim 70 \mathrm{TeV}
$$

## THE SMEFT

- Most general gauge-invariant Lagrangian built with SM fields up to dimension $d$ (here $d=6$ )
- Some relevant operators in the "Warsaw basis":

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{O}_{\phi W B}=\left(\phi^{\dagger} \sigma_{i} \phi\right) W_{\mu \nu}^{i} B^{\mu \nu}, \quad \rightarrow \text { S } \\
& \mathcal{O}_{\phi D}=\left(\phi^{\dagger} D^{\mu} \phi\right)^{*}\left(\phi^{\dagger} D_{\mu} \phi\right), \rightarrow \top \\
& \mathcal{O}_{l l}=\left(\overline{l_{L}} \gamma^{\mu} l_{L}\right)\left(\overline{l_{L}} \gamma^{\mu} l_{L}\right) \\
& \mathcal{O}_{\phi l}^{(1)}=\left(\phi^{\dagger} i \overleftrightarrow{D}_{\mu} \phi\right)\left(\bar{l}_{L} \gamma^{\mu} l_{L}\right), \\
& \mathcal{O}_{\phi l}^{(3)}=\left(\phi^{\dagger} i \overleftrightarrow{D}_{\mu}^{i} \phi\right)\left(\bar{l}_{L} \sigma_{i} \gamma^{\mu} l_{L}\right), \\
& \mathcal{O}_{\phi e}=\left(\phi^{\dagger} i \overleftrightarrow{D}_{\mu} \phi\right)\left(\bar{e}_{R} \gamma^{\mu} e_{R}\right), \\
& \mathcal{O}_{\phi q}^{(1)}=\left(\phi^{\dagger} i \overleftrightarrow{D}_{\mu} \phi\right)\left(\bar{q}_{L} \gamma^{\mu} q_{L}\right), \\
& \mathcal{O}_{\phi q}^{(3)}=\left(\phi^{\dagger} i \overleftrightarrow{D}_{\mu}^{i} \phi\right)\left(\bar{q}_{L} \sigma_{i} \gamma^{\mu} q_{L}\right), \\
& \mathcal{O}_{\phi u}=\left(\phi^{\dagger} i \overleftrightarrow{D}_{\mu} \phi\right)\left(\bar{u}_{R} \gamma^{\mu} u_{R}\right), \\
& \mathcal{O}_{\phi d}=\left(\phi^{\dagger} i \overleftrightarrow{D}_{\mu} \phi\right)\left(\bar{d}_{R} \gamma^{\mu} d_{R}\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

## $M_{w}$ IN THE SMEFT

- Eight independent combinations of dim. 6 operators contribute to EWPO. In the Warsaw basis: $\quad \hat{o}_{\varphi f}^{(1)}=O_{\varphi f}^{(1)}-\frac{Y_{f}}{2} C_{\varphi D}, \quad f=l, q, e, u, d$,

$$
\begin{align*}
\hat{C}_{\varphi f}^{(3)} & =C_{\varphi f}^{(3)}+\frac{c_{w}^{2}}{4 s_{w}^{2}} C_{\varphi D}+\frac{c_{w}}{s_{w}} C_{\varphi W B}, \quad f=l, q,  \tag{7}\\
\hat{C}_{l l} & =\frac{1}{2}\left(\left(C_{l l}\right)_{1221}+\left(C_{l l}\right)_{2112}\right)=\left(C_{l l}\right)_{1221},
\end{align*}
$$

- Again, one independent combination enters only $M_{w}$ and $\Gamma_{w}$, namely: $\hat{c}_{p_{r}^{(a)}}^{\left(\hat{c}_{\omega} / 2\right.}$; very loose prediction for $M_{w}$ from $\Gamma_{w}$

| Model | Pred. $M_{W}[\mathrm{GeV}]$ Pull <br> standard average | Pred. $M_{W}[\mathrm{GeV}]$ <br> conservative average |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SMEFT | $80.66 \pm 1.68$ | $-0.1 \sigma$ | $80.66 \pm 1.68$ | $-0.1 \sigma$ |

## SMEFT: FIT RESULTS

| $\hat{C}_{\varphi l}^{(1)}$ | $-0.007 \pm 0.011$ | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\hat{C}_{\varphi l}^{(3)}$ | $-0.042 \pm 0.015$ | -0.68 | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\hat{C}_{\varphi e}$ | $-0.017 \pm 0.009$ | 0.48 | 0.04 | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |
| $\hat{C}_{\varphi q}^{(1)}$ | $-0.018 \pm 0.044$ | -0.02 | -0.06 | -0.13 | 1.00 |  |  |  |
| $\hat{C}_{\varphi q}^{(3)}$ | $-0.113 \pm 0.043$ | -0.03 | 0.04 | -0.16 | -0.37 | 1.00 |  |  |
| $\hat{C}_{\varphi u}$ | $0.090 \pm 0.150$ | 0.06 | -0.04 | 0.04 | 0.61 | -0.77 | 1.00 |  |
| $\hat{C}_{\varphi d}$ | $-0.630 \pm 0.250$ | -0.13 | -0.05 | -0.30 | 0.40 | 0.58 | -0.04 | 1.00 |
| $\hat{C}_{l l}$ | $-0.022 \pm 0.028$ | -0.80 | 0.95 | -0.10 | -0.06 | -0.01 | -0.04 | -0.05 |

standard
averages

- Cirigliano et al. noted that a combination of these operators also contributes to first-row CKM unitarity violation. This effect can be compensated by $C^{(3)}{ }_{l q}$ which does not enter EWPO. However, $C^{(3)}{ }^{\text {q }}$ can be constrained by LHC e.g. in pp $\rightarrow$ II.


## EWPO BEYOND THE SM

|  | Measurement | ST | STU | SMEFT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $M_{W}[\mathrm{GeV}]$ | $80.413 \pm 0.015$ | $80.403 \pm 0.013$ | $80.413 \pm 0.015$ | $80.413 \pm 0.015$ |
| $\Gamma_{W}[\mathrm{GeV}]$ | $2.085 \pm 0.042$ | $2.0916 \pm 0.0011$ | $2.0925 \pm 0.0012$ | $2.0778 \pm 0.0070$ |
| $\sin ^{2} \theta_{\mathrm{eff}}^{\text {lept }}\left(Q_{\mathrm{FB}}^{\mathrm{had}}\right)$ | $0.2324 \pm 0.0012$ | $0.23143 \pm 0.00014$ | $0.23147 \pm 0.00014$ | - |
| $P_{\tau}^{\mathrm{pol}}=\mathcal{A}_{\ell}$ | $0.1465 \pm 0.0033$ | $0.1478 \pm 0.0011$ | $0.1474 \pm 0.0011$ | $0.1488 \pm 0.0014$ |
| $\Gamma_{Z}[\mathrm{GeV}]$ | $2.4955 \pm 0.0023$ | $2.4976 \pm 0.0012$ | $2.4951 \pm 0.0022$ | $2.4955 \pm 0.0023$ |
| $\sigma_{h}^{0}[\mathrm{nb}]$ | $41.480 \pm 0.033$ | $41.4909 \pm 0.0077$ | $41.4905 \pm 0.0077$ | $41.482 \pm 0.033$ |
| $R_{\ell}^{0}$ | $20.767 \pm 0.025$ | $20.7507 \pm 0.0084$ | $20.7512 \pm 0.0084$ | $20.769 \pm 0.025$ |
| $A_{\mathrm{FB}}^{0, \ell}$ | $0.0171 \pm 0.0010$ | $0.01637 \pm 0.00023$ | $0.01630 \pm 0.00024$ | $0.01660 \pm 0.00032$ |
| $\mathcal{A}_{\ell}(\mathrm{SLD})$ | $0.1513 \pm 0.0021$ | $0.1478 \pm 0.0011$ | $0.1474 \pm 0.0011$ | $0.1488 \pm 0.0014$ |
| $R_{b}^{0}$ | $0.21629 \pm 0.00066$ | $0.21591 \pm 0.00011$ | $0.21591 \pm 0.00011$ | $0.21632 \pm 0.00065$ |
| $R_{c}^{0}$ | $0.1721 \pm 0.0030$ | $0.172199 \pm 0.000055$ | $0.172199 \pm 0.000055$ | $0.17160 \pm 0.00099$ |
| $A_{\mathrm{F}}^{0, b}$ | $0.0996 \pm 0.0016$ | $0.10359 \pm 0.00075$ | $0.10337 \pm 0.00077$ | $0.1009 \pm 0.0014$ |
| $A_{\mathrm{FB}}^{0, c}$ | $0.0707 \pm 0.0035$ | $0.07403 \pm 0.00059$ | $0.07385 \pm 0.00059$ | $0.0735 \pm 0.0022$ |
| $\mathcal{A}_{b}$ | $0.923 \pm 0.020$ | $0.934807 \pm 0.000097$ | $0.934779 \pm 0.000100$ | $0.903 \pm 0.013$ |
| $\mathcal{A}_{c}$ | $0.670 \pm 0.027$ | $0.66811 \pm 0.00052$ | $0.66797 \pm 0.00053$ | $0.658 \pm 0.020$ |
| $\mathcal{A}_{s}$ | $0.895 \pm 0.091$ | $0.935705 \pm 0.000096$ | $0.935677 \pm 0.000097$ | $0.905 \pm 0.012$ |
| $\mathrm{BR}_{W}$ | $0.10860 \pm 0.00090$ | $0.108385 \pm 0.000022$ | $0.108380 \pm 0.000022$ | $0.10900 \pm 0.00038$ |
| $\sin ^{2} \theta_{\mathrm{eff}}^{\mathrm{lept}}(\mathrm{HC})$ | $0.23143 \pm 0.00025$ | $0.23143 \pm 0.00014$ | $0.23147 \pm 0.00014$ | - |
| $R_{u c}$ | $0.1660 \pm 0.0090$ | $0.172221 \pm 0.000034$ | $0.172221 \pm 0.000034$ | $0.17162 \pm 0.00099$ |

## Conclusions

- Remarkable experimental progress in $m_{+}$and $M_{w}$, but tensions among measurements present in both cases
- Taken at face value, Mw implies a local (global) discrepancy at the $6.5 \sigma(4.2 \sigma)$ level, calling for NP
- Oblique/decoupling NP can accommodate the tension for scales close to the EW scale if loop-mediated, or at the TeV scale if tree-level/strongly interacting.
- If a more conservative averaging procedure is followed, the tension becomes much milder and the implications on NP much softer.
- Independent measurements of $M_{W}\left(\right.$ and $\left.m_{+}\right)$crucial!


## BACKUP

## NP fits in the conservative scenario

|  | Result | Correlation | Result | Correlation |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\left(\mathrm{IC}_{\mathrm{ST}} / \mathrm{IC}_{\mathrm{SM}}=24.5 / 37.1\right)$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{IC}_{\mathrm{STU}} / \mathrm{IC}\right.$ |  |  |
| $S$ | $0.086 \pm 0.077$ | 1.00 |  | $0.004 \pm 0.096$ | 1.00 |
| $T$ | $0.177 \pm 0.070$ | 0.89 | 1.00 | $0.040 \pm 0.120$ | 0.90 |
| $U$ | - | - | - | 1.00 |  |
|  |  | $0.134 \pm 0.095$ | -0.60 | -0.81 | 1.00 |



# NP fits in the conservative 

 scenario|  | Measurement | ST | STU | SMEFT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $M_{W}[\mathrm{GeV}]$ | $80.413 \pm 0.015$ | $80.403 \pm 0.013$ | $80.413 \pm 0.015$ | $80.413 \pm 0.015$ |
| $\Gamma_{W}[\mathrm{GeV}]$ | $2.085 \pm 0.042$ | $2.0916 \pm 0.0011$ | $2.0925 \pm 0.0012$ | $2.0778 \pm 0.0070$ |
| $\sin ^{2} \theta_{\text {eff }}^{\text {lept }}\left(Q_{\mathrm{FB}}^{\mathrm{had}}\right)$ | $0.2324 \pm 0.0012$ | $0.23143 \pm 0.00014$ | $0.23147 \pm 0.00014$ | - |
| $P_{\tau}^{\mathrm{pol}}=\mathcal{A}_{\ell}$ | $0.1465 \pm 0.0033$ | $0.1478 \pm 0.0011$ | $0.1474 \pm 0.0011$ | $0.1488 \pm 0.0014$ |
| $\Gamma_{Z}[\mathrm{GeV}]$ | $2.4955 \pm 0.0023$ | $2.4976 \pm 0.0012$ | $2.4951 \pm 0.0022$ | $2.4955 \pm 0.0023$ |
| $\sigma_{h}^{0}[\mathrm{nb}]$ | $41.480 \pm 0.033$ | $41.4909 \pm 0.0077$ | $41.4905 \pm 0.0077$ | $41.482 \pm 0.033$ |
| $R_{\ell}^{0}$ | $20.767 \pm 0.025$ | $20.7507 \pm 0.0084$ | $20.7512 \pm 0.0084$ | $20.769 \pm 0.025$ |
| $A_{\mathrm{FB}}^{0, \ell}$ | $0.0171 \pm 0.0010$ | $0.01637 \pm 0.00023$ | $0.01630 \pm 0.00024$ | $0.01660 \pm 0.00032$ |
| $\mathcal{A}_{\ell}(\mathrm{SLD})$ | $0.1513 \pm 0.0021$ | $0.1478 \pm 0.0011$ | $0.1474 \pm 0.0011$ | $0.1488 \pm 0.0014$ |
| $R_{b}^{0}$ | $0.21629 \pm 0.00066$ | $0.21591 \pm 0.00011$ | $0.21591 \pm 0.00011$ | $0.21632 \pm 0.00065$ |
| $R_{\mathrm{c}}^{0}$ | $0.1721 \pm 0.0030$ | $0.172199 \pm 0.000055$ | $0.172199 \pm 0.000055$ | $0.17160 \pm 0.00099$ |
| $A_{\mathrm{FB}}^{0, b}$ | $0.0996 \pm 0.0016$ | $0.10359 \pm 0.00075$ | $0.10337 \pm 0.00077$ | $0.1009 \pm 0.0014$ |
| $A_{\mathrm{FB}}^{0,, c}$ | $0.0707 \pm 0.0035$ | $0.07403 \pm 0.00059$ | $0.07385 \pm 0.00059$ | $0.0735 \pm 0.0022$ |
| $\mathcal{A}_{b}$ | $0.923 \pm 0.020$ | $0.934807 \pm 0.000097$ | $0.934779 \pm 0.000100$ | $0.903 \pm 0.013$ |
| $\mathcal{A}_{c}$ | $0.670 \pm 0.027$ | $0.66811 \pm 0.00052$ | $0.66797 \pm 0.00053$ | $0.658 \pm 0.020$ |
| $\mathcal{A}_{s}$ | $0.895 \pm 0.091$ | $0.935705 \pm 0.000096$ | $0.935677 \pm 0.000097$ | $0.905 \pm 0.012$ |
| $\mathrm{BR}_{W \rightarrow \ell \bar{\nu}_{\ell}}$ | $0.10860 \pm 0.00090$ | $0.108385 \pm 0.000022$ | $0.108380 \pm 0.000022$ | $0.10900 \pm 0.00038$ |
| $\sin ^{2} \theta_{\text {eff }}^{\text {lept }}(\mathrm{HC})$ | $0.23143 \pm 0.00025$ | $0.23143 \pm 0.00014$ | $0.23147 \pm 0.00014$ | - |
| $R_{u c}$ | $0.1660 \pm 0.0090$ | $0.172221 \pm 0.000034$ | $0.172221 \pm 0.000034$ | $0.17162 \pm 0.00099$ |

