

Models and Phenomenology of Maximal Flavor Violation

Shaouly Bar-Shalom^{a,*} and Arvind Rajaraman^{b,†}

^a *Physics Department, Technion-Institute of Technology, Haifa 32000, Israel*

^b *Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of California, Irvine, CA 92697, USA*

(Dated: February 9, 2022)

We consider models of maximal flavor violation (MxFV), in which a new scalar mediates large $q_3 \leftrightarrow q_1$ or $q_3 \leftrightarrow q_2$ flavor changing transitions (q_i is an i 'th generation quark), while $q_3 \leftrightarrow q_3$ transitions are suppressed, e.g., $\xi_{31}, \xi_{13} \sim V_{tb}$ and $\xi_{33} \sim V_{td}$, where ξ_{ij} are the new scalar couplings to quarks and V is the CKM matrix. We show that, contrary to the conventional viewpoint, such models are not ruled out by the existing low energy data on K^0 , B^0 and D^0 oscillations and rare K and B -decays. We also show that these models of MxFV can have surprising new signatures at the LHC and the Tevatron.

PACS numbers: 12.60.Fr, 11.30.Hv, 14.80.Cp, 13.75.Lb

Introduction: The hierarchy problem and the problem of dark matter imply that the Standard Model (SM) is incomplete. Models of new physics (NP) typically predict a large number of new particles at the TeV scale, and in particular, many models predict the existence of new scalars beyond the SM Higgs, which, in principle, can induce flavor violating (FV) currents through Yukawa-like interactions of the form $\xi_{ij}\Phi\bar{q}_iq_j$ [1, 2]. It is traditionally assumed that, to satisfy the precision data, the new particles that mediate FV have to be very heavy (i.e., ~ 10 TeV - somewhat in conflict with the solutions to the hierarchy problem and dark matter) or else their FV couplings have to be very small. In general, this leads to the “NP flavor puzzle” since if there is NP at the TeV scale, then there is no underlying principle that would forbid low energy FV signatures at large rates.

A popular solution to the flavor problem is to impose the minimal FV (MFV) ansatz, which states that the NP is “aligned” with the SM, such that all FV transitions are governed by the nearly diagonal CKM matrix V . For instance, since the CKM elements satisfy e.g. $V_{td}, V_{ts} \ll V_{tb}$, the MFV ansatz imposes the couplings of any new scalar to a pair of top+light quark to satisfy $\xi_{3i}, \xi_{i3} \ll \xi_{33}$ for $i = 1, 2$. As an example, the Minimal Supersymmetric SM (MSSM) soft breaking terms allow in general for $\mathcal{O}(1)$ FV sfermion mixings which can mediate unacceptably large contributions to FV processes in meson mixings and decays [3]. In this case sfermion-fermion alignment which leads to MFV is motivated since otherwise the sfermion masses have to be too heavy for addressing the fine-tuning problem.

In this note, we present a new class of scalar mediated FV models, which maximally depart from the MFV ansatz, (in the sense that $\xi_{31}, \xi_{32} \sim \mathcal{O}(1) \gg \xi_{33}$) and still satisfy all constraints from flavor physics even with a relatively light scalar $m_\Phi \sim m_W$. To emphasize the contrast with MFV models, we will describe these mod-

els as having Maximal FV (MxFV). We can further subdivide these MxFV models into MxFV₁ models where $\xi_{31}, \xi_{13} \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$ while $\xi_{32}, \xi_{23} \ll \mathcal{O}(1)$ and MxFV₂ models if $\xi_{32}, \xi_{23} \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$ while $\xi_{31}, \xi_{13} \ll \mathcal{O}(1)$, and in both cases $\xi_{33}, \xi_{ij} \sim 0$ $i, j = 1, 2$. We show that such models may be as viable as the MFV models.

We will begin by presenting a model independent setup where MxFV is mediated by a new scalar with a mass of a few hundred GeV. We then systematically analyze constraints on these models coming from precision data on meson mixing and decays and show that, contrary to expectations, we can indeed have electroweak scale extensions of the SM that fall into the MxFV categories. Finally, we show that such models of MxFV can have surprising new signatures at hadron colliders (LHC & Tevatron). We close with a discussion of future directions.

Models of Maximal Flavor Violation: In what follows, we will consider the more restrictive case (with respect to having tighter constraints from flavor physics) where the new scalar is a doublet of electroweak $SU(2)$. However, the analysis below can be applied to singlets as well.

Let Φ_{FV} be a new scalar doublet that potentially mediates MxFV through:

$$\mathcal{L}_{FV} = \xi_{ij}^u \bar{Q}_{iL} \tilde{\Phi}_{FV} u_{jR} + \xi_{ij}^d \bar{Q}_{iL} \Phi_{FV} d_{jR} + h.c. , \quad (1)$$

where i, j are generation indices. Now, flavor changing neutral interactions in the down-quark sector are severely constrained by meson-mixings [1], implying in general that $\xi^d \ll \xi^u$. We will therefore set $\xi^d \sim 0$ and consider only effects from $\xi^u \equiv \xi$. Defining $\Phi_{FV} = (H^+, H^0)$ (note that in general H^0 is complex) we can then re-write (1) as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{FV} \sim \xi_{ij} \cdot (H^0 \bar{u}_{iR} u_{jL} - H^+ \bar{u}_{iR} d_{jL}) + h.c. , \quad (2)$$

where e.g., ξ_{31} is the coupling of $H^+ td$ and by $SU(2)$ also of $H^0 tu$.

We wish to construct models where e.g., $\xi_{31}, \xi_{32} \gg \xi_{33}$. We can do that by imposing flavor symmetries. One simple example is a Z_2 symmetry under which the SM Higgs and the 1st and 2nd generation quarks are even

*Electronic address: shaouly@physics.technion.ac.il

†Electronic address: arajaram@uci.edu

while Φ_{FV} and the 3rd generation quarks are odd:

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_{SM} &\rightarrow \Phi_{SM}, \quad q_i \rightarrow q_i, \quad i = 1, 2, \\ \Phi_{FV} &\rightarrow -\Phi_{FV}, \quad q_3 \rightarrow -q_3,\end{aligned}\quad (3)$$

This symmetry suppresses the CKM elements $V_{td}, V_{ts}, V_{ub}, V_{cb}$ and simultaneously suppresses the new H^+tb and H^0tt interactions (ξ_{33}), therefore under this Z_2 symmetry we have

$$\xi \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \xi_{13} \\ 0 & 0 & \xi_{23} \\ \xi_{31} & \xi_{32} & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$
 (4)

If the Z_2 is broken weakly (e.g., by a very small Φ_{FV} condensate or by higher dimensional operators), then a small value for the CKM elements $V_{td}, V_{ts}, V_{ub}, V_{cb}$ as well as for all zero entries in (4) are generated. We then expect $\xi_{33} \sim V_{td}, V_{ts}$, while maintaining $\xi_{31}, \xi_{32} \sim V_{tb} \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$.

Another possibility is to have U(1) flavor symmetries. For example, if the three fermion generations have charges $\alpha, \alpha + 1, \beta$ respectively, and Φ_{FV} has a charge $\alpha - \beta$, then the only tree level coupling of the new Higgs is ξ_{31} while all the other couplings are suppressed. The SM Higgs has charge 0 under the U(1), thus allowing all diagonal mass terms. When the U(1) is weakly broken, we can expect all couplings to be generated, but we will still have $\xi_{31} \gg \xi_{33}$ and $V_{tb} \sim \xi_{31}, V_{td} \sim \xi_{33}$.

Here, we will not restrict ourselves to any model, and instead take a phenomenological approach towards the general MxFV case, where we assume non-zero $\xi_{31}, \xi_{32}, \xi_{13}, \xi_{23}$ and $\xi_{33} \sim 0$ as well as $\xi_{ij} \sim 0$ for $i, j = 1, 2$. We then consider the experimental constraints on such textures and show that while some products of the above couplings are bounded to be rather small, the MxFV_{1,2} scenarios are not ruled out.

The phenomenology of these models depends sensitively on the details of the scalar sector. In general one can have mixing terms between the SM Higgs and the new doublet e.g. a term like $\lambda D_\mu \Phi_{SM} D^\mu \Phi_{FV}$. After the SM Higgs develops a VEV this term can lead to interactions like $\sim \lambda m_W W^+ W^- H^0$, which make the phenomenology difficult to analyze without knowing the size of λ . We shall assume that such mixings terms are absent since we expect them to be very small; indeed, in the models discussed above, the flavor symmetries prohibit such terms, and when they are weakly broken we expect $\lambda \sim \xi_{33} \sim V_{td} \ll 1$. Note that a WWH^0 interaction term can also arise from the kinetic term $|D_\mu \Phi_{FV}|^2$, if the flavor symmetry is broken by a small VEV of Φ_{FV} . We shall also ignore the couplings of the new Higgs doublet to leptons.

Experimental Constraints: We now consider the existing experimental constraints on the MxFV scenarios described above. For simplicity we will assume that all the new FV couplings are real. We find that the most stringent constraints come from $F^0 - \bar{F}^0$ mixings, $F = K, B_d, B_s, D$ and from rare K -decays. Limits from B decays (semi-leptonic or hadronic) are either weaker or

depend on the couplings of Φ_{FV} to leptons. As will be shown below, the above observables constrain only the following combinations of couplings:

$$\begin{aligned}\eta_K &\equiv \xi_{31} \cdot \xi_{32}, & \eta_D &\equiv \xi_{13} \cdot \xi_{23}, \\ \eta_{B_d}^1 &\equiv \xi_{31} \cdot \xi_{23}, & \eta_{B_d}^2 &\equiv \xi_{31} \cdot \xi_{13}, \\ \eta_{B_s}^1 &\equiv \xi_{32} \cdot \xi_{23}, & \eta_{B_s}^2 &\equiv \xi_{32} \cdot \xi_{13}.\end{aligned}\quad (5)$$

$\frac{K^0 - \bar{K}^0}{\text{The } K^0 - \bar{K}^0}$

mass difference and measure of indirect CP-violation in the K system are given by (see e.g. [4]):

$$\Delta m_K = 2\text{Re}(M_{12}^K), \quad \epsilon_K \equiv \frac{\exp(i\pi/4)}{\sqrt{2}\Delta m_K} \text{Im}(M_{12}^K). \quad (6)$$

The MxFV contribution to the above observables arises from new WH and HH box diagrams (H stands for the charged scalar), where only the top-quark can propagate in the loops. These new box diagrams shift M_{12}^K by (the contribution of a generic new scalar to meson mixings can be found in [5]):

$$\begin{aligned}\delta M_{12}^{MxFV} &= \frac{m_K f_K^2 \hat{B}_K}{12\pi^2 m_W^2} \frac{\eta_2}{4r} \left(\frac{2\pi\alpha}{\sin^2 \theta_W} V_{td}^* V_{ts} \eta_K f(x_t, x_H) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{\eta_K^2}{8} g(x_t, x_H) \right),\end{aligned}\quad (7)$$

where (see e.g. [2]) we use $m_K = 0.498$ GeV, $f_K = 0.159$ GeV, $\hat{B}_K = 0.79$, $\eta_2 = 0.57$, $r = 0.985$ and

$$\begin{aligned}f(x_t, x_H) &= \frac{x_t}{x_t - x_H} \left(\frac{\log(x_t)}{x_t - 1} + \frac{x_H \log(x_H)}{(x_H - 1)(x_t - x_H)} \right), \\ g(x_t, x_H) &= \frac{1}{(x_t - x_H)^2} \left(x_H + 2x_t \log\left(\frac{x_t}{x_H}\right) \right),\end{aligned}\quad (8)$$

where $x_i \equiv m_i^2/m_W^2$.

In Fig. 1 we plot the allowed range in the $\eta_K - m_{H^+}$ plane demanding that (i) the contribution of $\text{Re}(\delta M_{12}^{MxFV})$ to Δm_K does not exceed the long distance contributions estimated to be less than $\sim 0.3\Delta m_K^{\text{exp}}$, where $\Delta m_K^{\text{exp}} = 0.005301 \text{ ps}^{-1}$ is the observed mass splitting [6], and (ii) the contribution of $\text{Im}(\delta M_{12}^{MxFV})$ to ϵ_K does not exceed $0.4\epsilon_K^{\text{exp}}$, where $\epsilon_K^{\text{exp}} = 2.232 \cdot 10^{-3}$ is the central measured value [6]. In particular, we have traded uncertainties in the theoretical input for ϵ_K for a generous 40% deviation from the central observed value. Note that $\text{Im}(\delta M_{12}^{MxFV}) \propto \text{Im}(V_{td}^* V_{ts})$ since we are taking all η_i in (5) to be real.

Rare K -decays:

The rare K -decays $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu_L^\ell \bar{\nu}_L^\ell$ and $K_L^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 \nu_L^\ell \bar{\nu}_L^\ell$ (and other $K \rightarrow \pi$ decays that go through the $(\bar{s}d)_{V-A}$ current) are mediated by the following effective Hamiltonian [4, 7]:

$$\mathcal{H}_{eff} = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{2\alpha}{\pi s_W^2} (X_{SM} + \delta X^{NP}) \cdot (\bar{s}_L \gamma_\mu d_L) (\bar{\nu}_L^\ell \gamma_\mu \nu_L^\ell) \quad (9)$$

where $X_{SM} \sim 8.3 \cdot 10^{-4}$ is the SM part and δX^{NP} is the new physics contribution. In the MxFV framework,

there are new Z-penguin 1-loop diagrams with $H^+ - t$ exchanged in the loops, which give:

$$\delta X^{Mx FV} = \eta_K \cdot \frac{s_W^2}{32\pi\alpha} \frac{y_t}{1-y_t} \left(1 + \frac{\log(y_t)}{1-y_t} \right), \quad (10)$$

where $y_t \equiv m_t^2/m_{H^+}^2$.

In Fig 1 we plot the allowed range in the $\eta_K - m_{H^+}$ plane by imposing $\delta X^{Mx FV} < X_{SM}$.

$B_q^0 - \bar{B}_q^0$:

Let us define ($q=d$ or s)

$$R_q \equiv \frac{\Delta m_q}{\Delta m_q^{SM}} \equiv 1 + \delta_q^{NP}, \quad (11)$$

where $\Delta m_q \equiv \Delta m_q^{SM} + \delta m_q^{NP}$ is the total $B_q^0 - \bar{B}_q^0$ mass splitting and $\delta_q^{NP} \equiv \delta m_q^{NP}/\Delta m_q^{SM}$ represents the portion of NP.

Taking the experimentally observed values $\Delta m_s^{exp} = 17.77 \pm 0.17 \text{ ps}^{-1}$ [8] and $\Delta m_d^{exp} = 0.507 \pm 0.004 \text{ ps}^{-1}$ [9], and the SM predictions (averaging between the two HP and JL groups [10] and adding the errors in quadrature) $\Delta m_s^{SM} = 18.7 \pm 4.3 \text{ ps}^{-1}$ and $\Delta m_d^{SM} = 0.69 \pm 0.14 \text{ ps}^{-1}$, we obtain $R_d = 0.74 \pm 0.15$ and $R_s = 0.95 \pm 0.22$. We then require that the MxFV contribution is within 1 standard deviation of the central values of $|R_q - 1|$:

$$|\delta_s^{Mx FV}| < 0.27 \quad \& \quad |\delta_d^{Mx FV}| < 0.41. \quad (12)$$

In the MxFV framework the $B_q^0 - \bar{B}_q^0$ mass splitting receives a contribution from new WH box diagrams with an exchange of either t and c or t and u quarks in the loop (there are no HH box diagrams within the MxFV setup), which give:

$$\delta_q^{Mx FV} = -\frac{s_W^2 r}{4\pi\alpha} \cdot \frac{V_{cq}\eta_{B_q}^1 \tilde{f}(x_c) + V_{uq}\eta_{B_q}^2 \tilde{f}(x_u)}{V_{tb}(V_{tq}^*)^2 S_0(x_t)}, \quad (13)$$

where $S_0(x_t) \simeq 2.46 \cdot [m_t/170 \text{ GeV}]^{1.52}$ and

$$\tilde{f}(x_i) \simeq \sqrt{x_t x_i} \left(\frac{\log(x_H)}{(x_H - 1)(x_H - x_t)} - \frac{\log(x_t)}{(x_t - 1)(x_H - x_t)} - \frac{x_i}{x_H x_t} \log(x_i) \right). \quad (14)$$

In Fig. 1 we plot the allowed range in the $\eta_{B_q}^i - m_{H^+}$ planes by imposing (12).

$D^0 - \bar{D}^0$:

In the case of D^0 oscillations there are two types of 1-loop box diagrams that contribute due to the new MxFV interaction Lagrangian in (2): the charged Higgs WH and HH boxes with b-quark exchanges and the neutral Higgs $H^0 H^0$ boxes with top-quark exchanges, where H^0 corresponds in general to any one of the two (CP-odd or CP-even) neutral Higgs components of Φ_{FV} . We find that the following expression is a good approximation for




FIG. 1: Portions of the $\eta_i - m_{H^+}$ planes and of the $\eta_i - m_{H^0}$ planes (when indicated by D^0 -mix (H^0)) excluded by the various K and B -physics low energy observables. In each sub-figure the relevant FV coupling product η_i is indicated on the upper right corner and the area below the curves is excluded.

the $D^0 - \bar{D}^0$ mass difference generated by these MxFV box diagrams:

$$\delta M_D^{Mx FV} \sim \frac{f_D^2 m_D}{16\pi^2} \frac{A_D}{m_W^2} \cdot \left(\delta^{WH} + \delta^{HH} + \delta_1^{H^0} + \delta_2^{H^0} \right) \quad (15)$$

where we have absorbed all non-perturbative \hat{B}_i parameters and additional numeric factors into A_D which is then of $\mathcal{O}(1)$ [11]. For the various δ 's we get:

$$\delta^{WH} \sim \eta_D V_{ub}^* V_{cb} \frac{2\pi\alpha}{s_W^2} \frac{x_b}{x_{H^+}} \left(\log(x_b) - \frac{\log(x_{H^+})}{1-x_{H^+}} \right) \quad (16)$$

$$\delta^{HH} \sim \frac{\eta_D^2}{8} \frac{1}{x_{H^+}} \left(1 + 2 \frac{x_b}{x_{H^+}} \log \left(\frac{x_b}{x_{H^+}} \right) \right), \quad (17)$$

and assuming that only one of the neutral components dominates the neutral Higgs exchanges (i.e., $H^0 = H_1^0$ and $m_{H_2^0} \gg m_{H_1^0}$) we have:

$$\delta_1^{H^0} \sim \frac{(\eta_{B_d}^1 + \eta_{B_s}^2)^2 x_t}{(x_t - x_{H^0})^2} \left(1 + \log \left(\frac{x_t}{x_{H^0}} \right) \right), \quad (18)$$

$$\delta_2^{H^0} \sim \frac{(\eta_K + \eta_D)^2 x_t}{(x_t - x_{H^0})^2} \left(\frac{x_{H^0}}{x_t} + 2 \log \left(\frac{x_t}{x_{H^0}} \right) \right), \quad (19)$$

In the case of the $D^0 - \bar{D}^0$ mass splitting the SM prediction is dominated by long distance effects. Therefore, in deriving the limits on the FV coupling products that enter D^0 oscillations, we require $\delta M_D^{Mx FV}$ not to exceed the measured value $\Delta m_D^{exp} = (14.5 \pm 5.6) \cdot 10^{-3} \text{ ps}^{-1}$ [12].

In Fig. 1 we plot the allowed range in the $\eta_D - m_{H^+}$ plane and $\eta_i - m_{H^0}$ planes (i.e., $\eta_i = \eta_{B_d^0}^1, \eta_{B_s^0}^2, \eta_K, \eta_D$ from H^0 exchanges) imposed by $\delta M_D^{Mx\text{FV}} < 20.1 \text{ ps}^{-1}$.

Results and Discussion: Our analysis leads to the following results;

1. Any MxFV model in which only one FV coupling is of $\mathcal{O}(1)$ while all others are ~ 0 is not constrained by meson flavor physics, regardless of $m_{\Phi_{FV}}$.

2. In MxFV₁ models where the new FV Higgs field couples only to the third and first generations, the only constraint comes from $B_d^0 - \bar{B}_d^0$ mixings. This constraint is, however, rather weak as it allows e.g., $m_{H^+}, m_{H^0} \sim 200 \text{ GeV}$ even with $\mathcal{O}(1)$ couplings, $\xi_{31} \sim \xi_{13} \sim 0.3$.

3. If $m_{H^+} \gtrsim 600 \text{ GeV}$, then both MxFV₁ and MxFV₂ models with the corresponding $\xi_{ij} \sim 1$ are not excluded even if $m_{H^0} \sim 100 \text{ GeV}$.

4. If H^0 decouples or Φ_{FV} is a charged singlet, then the constraints from H^0 -exchanges in $D^0 - \bar{D}^0$ mixing do not apply. In this case, MxFV models which have $\xi_{32} \sim \xi_{13} \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$ and $m_{H^+} \sim m_W$ are also viable.

This rather surprising window of allowed $\mathcal{O}(1)$ MxFV couplings can have very interesting phenomenological implications associated with Φ_{FV} production and decays at hadron colliders. Many aspects of this MxFV phenomenology can be understood by noting that in MxFV models there is an approximately conserved number $(-1)^{n_{\Phi_{FV}} + n_t + n_b}$ (similar to the b-parity of [13]), i.e., in any process involving Φ_{FV} the total number of the new FV Higgs particles and third generation quarks is conserved modulo 2 (this symmetry is broken by terms of order $\xi_{33} \sim V_{td} \ll 1$). It follows that Φ_{FV} particles are produced either in pairs, mainly through $q\bar{q} \rightarrow \Phi_{FV}\Phi_{FV}$ (q is a light quark), or in association with a single top or single b-quark via e.g., $gq \rightarrow \Phi_{FV}tq, gq \rightarrow \Phi_{FV}t, \Phi_{FV}b$, unless there is a b-quark in the initial state (see below).

Consider for example the MxFV₁ setup and assume $m_{H^0}, m_{H^+} > m_t$. In this case, the MxFV set of processes fall into 4 very well defined categories and are therefore very distinctive at hadron colliders:

1. $t\Phi_{FV}$ production

$$1a) \quad dg \rightarrow tH^- \rightarrow t\bar{t}j, tbj + h.c. \quad (20)$$

$$1b) \quad ug \rightarrow tH^0 \rightarrow ttj, t\bar{t}j + h.c. \quad (21)$$

where $j(=u \text{ or } d)$ is a light-quark jet.

2. $\Phi_{FV}\Phi_{FV}$ production

$$2a) \quad u\bar{u}, d\bar{d} \rightarrow H^+H^- \rightarrow t\bar{t}jj, tbjj, \bar{t}\bar{t}jj, b\bar{b}jj \quad (22)$$

$$2b) \quad u\bar{u} \rightarrow H^0H^0 \rightarrow ttjj, t\bar{t}jj, t\bar{t}jj \quad (23)$$

3. s-channel Φ_{FV} resonance

A very interesting feature of this class of MxFV models is the specific dynamics of resonance production of Φ_{FV} . In particular, within the class of MxFV models described in this paper, the neutral scalar component H^0 cannot be

produced on resonance at hadron colliders. On the other hand, H^+ can resonate via $u\bar{b} \rightarrow H^+$. This can lead to a resonance peak in the invariant mass of a tj pair or, more generally, to the following 1b or 2b-jets H^+ -production channels:

$$1b - tag: \quad u\bar{b} \rightarrow H^+ \rightarrow t\bar{d}, \bar{b}j + h.c. \quad (24)$$

$$2b - tag: \quad ug \rightarrow H^+b \rightarrow tbj, \bar{b}bj + h.c. \quad (25)$$

4. t-channel Φ_{FV} exchanges

$$3a) \quad uu \rightarrow tt + h.c. \quad (H^0 \text{ exchange}) \quad (26)$$

$$3b) \quad ud \rightarrow tb + h.c. \quad (H^+ \text{ exchange}) \quad (27)$$

$$3c) \quad u\bar{u}, d\bar{d} \rightarrow t\bar{t} \quad (H^+ \text{ \& } H^0 \text{ exchanges}) \quad (28)$$

$$3d) \quad u\bar{u} \rightarrow b\bar{b} \quad (H^+ \text{ exchanges}) \quad (29)$$

$$3e) \quad d\bar{b}(dg) \rightarrow t\bar{u}(t\bar{u}b) + h.c. \quad (H^+ \text{ exchange}) \quad (30)$$

$$3f) \quad ub(ug) \rightarrow ub(ub\bar{b}) + h.c. \quad (H^+ \text{ exchange}) \quad (31)$$

$$3g) \quad ug \rightarrow t\bar{t}u, t\bar{t}u + h.c. \quad (H^0 \text{ exchange}) \quad (32)$$

An interesting limit to study is $m_t < m_{H^0} \ll m_{H^+}$ such that H^+ decouples at energies relevant for the Tevatron and the LHC. In this case we expect a noticeable signal of same-sign top-quark pairs $pp, p\bar{p} \rightarrow tt + nj + X$, where n is the number of light-quark jets (j), from the hard processes in (21),(23),(26) and (32). When both top-quarks decay leptonically, the process $pp, p\bar{p} \rightarrow tt + nj + X$ has a striking low background signature of two same-sign leptons, missing energy and two b jets, see [14]. Note that, as opposed to the usual expectations, this new H^0 will not be seen on resonance.

The opposite case of $m_t < m_{H^+} \ll m_{H^0}$ with a decoupled H^0 can also have very interesting phenomenological implications (i.e., allowing $\xi_{32} \sim \xi_{13} \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$, see above). Attractive signatures of this limiting case will be enhanced production of tH^- pairs at the LHC via $dg \rightarrow tH^-$ [reaction (20)], and enhanced resonance production of H^- via the 1 b-tag and 2 b-tag processes in (24) and (25). For example, we find $\sigma(pp(dg) \rightarrow tH^- + X) \sim 100 \text{ [pb]}$ for $\xi_{31} \sim 1$ and $m_{H^-} = 200 \text{ GeV}$. This is an enhancement by a factor of about 50 compared to what is considered to be the conventional channel $bg \rightarrow tH^-$, e.g. in the MSSM. In the resonance H^- production channels we also expect a huge enhancement over e.g., the MSSM or "standard" multi Higgs models for which the leading resonance channels are $cs \rightarrow H^\pm, cb \rightarrow H^\pm$, with couplings $\frac{m_c}{m_W \tan \beta} V_{cs}, \frac{m_b \tan \beta}{m_W} V_{cb} \ll 1$.

It would be of great interest to analyse these signals in the existing Tevatron data, as well as the upcoming LHC data. We shall leave the detailed discussion and analysis of these signals to an upcoming work [14].

Acknowledgments: We thank D. Atwood, A. Soni and J. Feng for useful discussions. AR is supported in part by NSF Grants No. PHY-0354993 and PHY-0653656.

-
- [1] D. Atwood, L. Reina and A. Soni, Phys. Rev. **D55**, 3156 (1997).
- [2] E. Lunghi and A. Soni, JHEP **0709**, 053 (2007).
- [3] For a recent mini review see e.g., S. Jager, hep-ph/0710.5206.
- [4] A.J. Buras, hep-ph/9806471.
- [5] A.J. Buras *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. **B619**, 434 (2001).
- [6] W.-M. Yao *et al.* (Review of Particle Physics), J. Phys. **G33**, 1 (2006).
- [7] See e.g., C.Q. Geng and J.N Ng, Phys. Rev. **D38**, 2857 (1988); A.J. Buras *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. **B520**, 3 (1998).
- [8] A. Abulencia *et al.* (CDF Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 242003 (2006).
- [9] E. Barberio *et al.* (HFAG group), hep-ex/0603003.
- [10] E. Dalgic *et al.* (HPQCD collaboration), Phys. Rev. **D76**, 011501 (2007); S. Aoki *et al.* (LJQCD collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 212001 (2003); A summary of the SM predictions, using the input from the two groups, can be found in e.g., J.K. Parry, H. Zhang, arXiv:hep-ph/0710.5443.
- [11] see e.g., E. Golowich *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D76**, 095009 (2007).
- [12] M. Ciuchini *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B655**, 162 (2007).
- [13] S. Bar-Shalom and J. Wudka, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 3722 (2001).
- [14] S. Bar-Shalom, A. Rajaraman, D. Whiteson and F. Yu, arXiv:hep-ph/0803.3795.