

Constraints from the Muon $g-2$ on the Parameter Space of the NMSSM

Florian Domingo and Ulrich Ellwanger
 Laboratoire de Physique Théorique
 Université de Paris XI, F-91405 Orsay Cedex, France

Abstract

We generalize the computation of supersymmetric contributions to the muon anomalous magnetic moment ($g-2$) to the NMSSM. In the presence of a light CP-odd Higgs scalar, these can differ considerably from the MSSM. We discuss the amount of these contributions in regions of the parameter space of the general NMSSM compatible with constraints from B physics. In the mSUGRA-like cNMSSM, constraints from ($g-2$) prefer regions in parameter space corresponding to a low SUSY breaking scale.

1 Introduction

The result of the measurement of the anomalous magnetic moment of the muon $a_\mu = (g-2)/2$ by the E821 experiment at the Brookhaven National Laboratory (BNL) [1] can be considered as a possible hint for physics beyond the Standard Model (SM). The determination of the SM contributions to a_μ requires { amongst others } to compute the leading order hadronic contribution $a_\mu^{\text{H LO}}$, which is the main source of the present SM uncertainty. Recent calculations of $a_\mu^{\text{H LO}}$ via hadronic e^+e^- data [2{6] are in good agreement, and lead to ~ 3 standard deviations between the experimental value for a_μ and the SM prediction.

Alternatively, $a_\mu^{\text{H LO}}$ can be determined from hadronic π -decays [7,8], leading to an agreement within one standard deviation between the experiment and the SM prediction for a_μ . However, a comparison of the $\pi \rightarrow e \nu$ branching fractions into pions with the corresponding e^+e^- spectral functions reveals a discrepancy of ~ 4.5 standard deviations [6] and requires assumptions on the pion form factor, isospin violating effects and vector meson mixings. Since e^+e^- data is more directly related to $a_\mu^{\text{H LO}}$, it is advocated to use the hadronic e^+e^- data only for a computation of $a_\mu^{\text{H LO}}$ [5].

Additional contributions to a_μ appear within supersymmetric extensions of the SM (see [9] for a recent review). One-loop [10{13] and two-loop [14{22] contributions have been evaluated within the Minimal Supersymmetric Extension of the Standard Model (MSSM). The conclusion is that the MSSM is able to explain the 3 standard deviations between the experiment and the SM, provided that the masses of the electroweakly interacting supersymmetric particles are not far above the electroweak scale [9,12,13,19,20]. On the other hand, the measured value for a_μ provides constraints on the parameter space of the MSSM such as the positivity of the supersymmetric Higgs mass parameter μ .

The purpose of the present paper is the study of constraints from the measured value for a_μ on the parameter space of the Next-to-Minimal Supersymmetric Extension of the Standard Model (NMSSM). First estimates of the contributions to a_μ in the NMSSM have been performed in [23] (see also [24] for a_μ in a similar $U(1)^0$ model), but subsequently we aim at an accuracy comparable to the one in the MSSM (limiting ourselves, however, to dominant logarithms at two-loop order). To this end, most of the corresponding formulas can be translated in a straightforward way from the MSSM to the NMSSM.

Nevertheless, the numerical results in the NMSSM can differ considerably from the ones in the MSSM: the NMSSM contains an additional gauge singlet superfield S , the vacuum expectation value of which generates the Higgs mass parameter μ of the MSSM [25]. The CP-even and CP-odd components of S will generally mix with the neutral components of the two (MSSM) Higgs doublets H_u and H_d . Depending on the parameters of the NMSSM, the lightest neutral CP-odd Higgs scalar can be quite light [26] and lead to numerous new phenomena [27]. Such a light neutral Higgs scalar can also have an important impact on a_μ [28]. In section 3 we will study possible effects of a light neutral CP-odd Higgs scalar on a_μ in regions of the parameter space of the NMSSM, which satisfy present bounds from LEP [29] and B-physics [30].

In the remaining part of the introduction we briefly review the various SM contributions to a_μ in order to clarify, which additional contribution would be desirable. The SM contributions to a_μ can be split into pure QED contributions a_μ^{QED} (known to four-loop order), leading order

hadronic contributions $a^{\text{H LO}}$, next-to-leading order hadronic contributions $a^{\text{H N LO}}$ (vacuum polarisation diagrams only) and $a^{\text{L B L}}$ (light-by-light contributions only), and electroweak effects $a^{\text{E W}}$. The sum is to be compared with the experimental result [1]

$$a^{\text{EXP}} = 11\,659\,208.0(5.4)(3.3) \cdot 10^{10} : \quad (1.1)$$

The QED contribution is [31]

$$a^{\text{QED}} = 11\,658\,471.8113(162) \cdot 10^{10} \quad (1.2)$$

(taking into account estimated five-loop contributions [32]) with an error well below the experimental one. The remaining difference is

$$a^{\text{EXP}} - a^{\text{QED}} = (736.2 \pm 6.3) \cdot 10^{10} : \quad (1.3)$$

Among the recent evaluations of the leading order hadronic contributions $a^{\text{H LO}}$ [2,6] (including the most recent data from SND, CMD-2 and BaBar) we use [2] in order to remain conservative [the largest estimate from [2,5], leading to the smallest deviation from the SM :

$$a^{\text{H LO}} = (692.1 \pm 5.6) \cdot 10^{10} \quad (1.4)$$

For $a^{\text{H N LO}}$ we use the same reference [2,5]:

$$a^{\text{H N LO}} = (-10.03 \pm 0.22) \cdot 10^{10} \quad (1.5)$$

The most recent determination of the hadronic light-by-light contribution [33] gives

$$a^{\text{L B L}} = (11.0 \pm 4.0) \cdot 10^{10} : \quad (1.6)$$

Adding all errors quadratically, one obtains

$$a^{\text{EXP}} - a^{\text{QED + H AD}} = (43.1 \pm 9.3) \cdot 10^{10} ; \quad (1.7)$$

the remaining discrepancy should be explained by electroweak effects and/or contributions beyond the SM as supersymmetry. Within the SM, the electroweak contributions are to two-loop order [34]

$$a^{\text{E W}} = (15.4 \pm 0.2) \cdot 10^{10} ; \quad (1.8)$$

which leads to the present discrepancy of about three standard deviations between the experiment and the SM :

$$a^{\text{EXP}} - a^{\text{SM}} = (27.7 \pm 9.3) \cdot 10^{10} \quad (1.9)$$

In the next chapter 2 we will review the supersymmetric contributions to a , and specify their dependency on the parameters of the NMSSM. Contributions to a which are very similar in the NMSSM and the MSSM (without possibly light CP-odd Higgs scalars), and contributions which involve the possibly light pseudoscalar of the NMSSM, are treated in separate subsections. The formulas of chapter 2 will be made public in the form of a Fortran code on the NMSSM Tools web page [35]. In chapter 3 we present numerical results for a in various regions of the parameter space of the NMSSM, amongst others regions with a light CP-odd neutral Higgs scalar in the spectrum, and in the cNMSSM (with universal soft terms at the GUT scale). At the end of chapter 3 we conclude with a short summary.

2 Supersymmetric Contributions to a_μ in the NMSSM

2.1 Contributions without pseudoscalars

The one-loop contributions to a_μ in supersymmetric models are known to consist in chargino/sneutrino or neutralino/smuon loops [10,13]. The corresponding expressions are the same in the MSSM and in the NMSSM, provided that the additional singlino state in the neutralino sector (which includes now ν states) is taken into account. Using the formulas in [11], the chargino/sneutrino and neutralino/smuon contributions to a_μ can be written as follows:

$$a_\mu^{1L} = \frac{m_\mu^2}{16\pi^2} \sum_k \frac{m_k}{12m_{\tilde{\nu}}^2} (\tilde{c}_k^L \tilde{f}_k^2 + \tilde{c}_k^R \tilde{f}_k^2) F_1^C(x_k) + \frac{2m_\mu}{3m_{\tilde{\nu}}^2} \text{Re}[\tilde{c}_k^L \tilde{c}_k^R] F_2^C(x_k) \quad (2.1)$$

$$a_\mu^{1L,0} = \frac{m_\mu^2}{16\pi^2} \sum_{i,m} \frac{m_i}{12m_{\tilde{\nu}_m}^2} (\tilde{n}_{im}^L \tilde{f}_i^2 + \tilde{n}_{im}^R \tilde{f}_i^2) F_1^N(x_{im}) + \frac{m_i}{3m_{\tilde{\nu}_m}^2} \text{Re}[\tilde{n}_{im}^L \tilde{n}_{im}^R] F_2^N(x_{im}) \quad (2.2)$$

Here $\tilde{c}_k^R$, $\tilde{c}_k^L$, $\tilde{n}_{im}^R$ and $\tilde{n}_{im}^L$ denote the couplings of the mass eigenstates of the charginos or neutralinos to the sneutrino or smuons and the muon, which depend on the corresponding mixing matrices described below:

$$\tilde{c}_k^R = h U_{k2} \quad (2.3)$$

$$\tilde{c}_k^L = p \frac{g V_{k1}}{2g_1 N_{i1} X_{m2} + h N_{i3} X_{m1}} \quad (2.4)$$

$$\tilde{n}_{im}^R = \frac{1}{2g_1 N_{i1} X_{m2} + h N_{i3} X_{m1}} \quad (2.5)$$

$$\tilde{n}_{im}^L = \frac{1}{2} (g_2 N_{i2} + g_1 N_{i1}) X_{m1} - h N_{i3} X_{m2} \quad (2.6)$$

The conventions for the mass matrices and the resulting mixing matrices are as in [11,35,37]:

The neutralino mass eigenstates $\tilde{\chi}_i^0$, $i = 1, \dots, 5$ in the NMSSM (ordered in increasing absolute mass) are given in terms of the interaction eigenstates $\tilde{\chi}_j^0 = (\tilde{\chi}_1^0; \tilde{\chi}_2^0; \tilde{\chi}_d^0; \tilde{\chi}_u^0; \tilde{\chi}_s^0)$ by $\tilde{\chi}_i^0 = N_{ij} \tilde{\chi}_j^0$.

The chargino mass eigenstates $\tilde{\chi}_k^\pm$, $k = 1, 2$, are related to the charged gaugino and higgsino interaction eigenstates $\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm = (\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm; \tilde{\chi}_u^\pm)$ and $\tilde{\chi}_2^\pm = (\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm; \tilde{\chi}_d^\pm)$ through the rotation matrices U, V : $\tilde{\chi}_k^\pm = V_{k1} \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm$, $\tilde{\chi}_k^\pm = U_{k1} \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm$.

The smuon mass eigenstates $\tilde{\nu}_m$, $m = 1, 2$, with masses $m_{\tilde{\nu}_m}$, result from the interaction eigenstates $\tilde{\nu}^I = (\tilde{\nu}_L; \tilde{\nu}_R)$ and the rotation $\tilde{\nu}_m = X_{m n} \tilde{\nu}_n^I$. In the following, this definition of the matrix $X_{m n}$ will be extended to all sfermions $\tilde{f}$, in which case it will be denoted as $X_{m n}^{\tilde{f}}$.

The sneutrino mass is written as $m_{\tilde{\nu}_i}$. x_{im} and x_k denote the following mass ratios: $x_{im} = m_{\tilde{\chi}_i^0}^2 / m_{\tilde{\nu}_m}^2$, $x_k = m_{\tilde{\chi}_k^\pm}^2 / m_{\tilde{\nu}}^2$. The functions $F_{1,2}^{C,N}$ are given in the appendix. h is the

muon Yukawa coupling: $h = \frac{m}{v_d}$, where v_d is the vacuum expectation value of the Higgs doublet which couples to down quarks and leptons.

Since contributions to a_μ require a chirality flip, the formulae (2.1, 2.2) involve terms (apart from the prefactor m_μ) which are proportional either to the muon mass (if the chirality flip occurs in the external legs) or to a chargino/neutralino mass (when it occurs in internal lines). In practice, the numerically dominant contributions usually originate from a chirality flip in the internal lines of the chargino/sneutrino contribution, i.e. the second term in (2.1). It is proportional to c_k^R , and hence to the Yukawa coupling $h = \cos\beta \tan\beta$ (for $\tan\beta > 1$).

An analysis of the chargino/sneutrino diagram reveals (see, e.g., [9]) that this contribution carries the sign of the Higgs mass parameter ($= m_{\text{eff}}$ in the NMSSM), hence a positive value for a_μ is phenomenologically favoured. The contribution decreases with increasing sneutrino mass. For positive μ , the chargino/sneutrino contribution can well resolve the discrepancy (1.9), provided the muon sneutrino is relatively light or $\tan\beta$ is large; see, e.g., Figs. 1-3 in section 3. (For a light sneutrino and large $\tan\beta$, this contribution can even be larger than desired.)

It has been pointed out in [11,12] that the neutralino/smuon contribution (2.2) could also explain the 3- σ discrepancy (1.9), if the bino is quite light and the smuon mass eigenstates are not too heavy. This bino/smuon contribution has the interesting property to be quite insensitive to $\tan\beta$.

In the NMSSM, a light neutralino could also be dominantly singlino-like. However, in this case its contribution to a_μ is suppressed because of the weak couplings of the singlino to the MSSM sector.

In addition to these one-loop diagrams, two-loop contributions to a_μ in the MSSM have been studied in [14,22]. First, we include large logarithms arising from QED corrections to one-loop diagrams as computed in [14]:

$$a^{\text{SUSY+QED}} = a^{\text{1L SUSY}} \left(1 + \frac{4}{3} \ln \frac{M_{\text{SUSY}}}{m} \right) \quad (2.7)$$

This leads to a reduction by a few percents of the LO contributions.

Additional bosonic electroweak two-loop diagrams were computed in [20], which can be written as

$$a^{\text{2L BosEW}} = \frac{5 G_F m^2}{24 \pi^2} \left(c_L^{\text{2L Bos}} \ln \frac{m^2}{M_W^2} + c_0^{\text{2L Bos}} \right) : \quad (2.8)$$

(Up to the more complicated Higgs sector of SUSY models, (2.8) contains two-loop electroweak SM contributions included in (1.8). We took care not to count the SM contribution twice.) Subsequently we confine ourselves to leading logarithmic contribution $c_L^{\text{2L Bos}}$, which reads [20]

$$c_L^{\text{2L Bos}} = \frac{1}{30} \left(h^2 + 9 c_L^h + 23 \right) - \frac{4}{3} \ln^2 \frac{m^2}{M_W^2} : \quad (2.9)$$

In the MSSM, the Higgs contribution c_L^h is of the form (see eq. (27) in [20])

$$c_L^h = \frac{\cos 2\beta}{\cos \beta} \frac{M_Z^2}{m_H^2} + \frac{\cos(\beta + \alpha)}{m_H^2} + \frac{\sin(\beta + \alpha)}{m_h^2} ; \quad (2.10)$$

where $m_{h,H}$ and α are the CP-even Higgs masses and the mixing angle in the MSSM. In order to generalize the Higgs contribution to the NMSSM, it is convenient to rewrite eq. (2.10) in terms of elements of the (inverse) CP-even Higgs mass matrix M_S^{-2} , here in the basis (H_u, H_d) :

$$c_L^h = \cos 2\alpha \frac{M_Z^2}{M_S^2} + \tan \alpha \frac{M_S^2}{M_S^2} \quad (2.11)$$

(Now it is straightforward to verify the sum rule $c_L^h = 1$ [20] with the help of the tree level mass matrix M_S^2 .)

Eq. (2.11) can be interpreted as the result of the evaluation of the Higgs-dependent two-loop diagrams, where Feynman rules in the interaction basis (H_u, H_d) have been used and mass insertions were treated perturbatively (this procedure reproduces the leading logarithms). Furthermore, in the interaction basis it is easy to identify the additional contributions from the singlet scalar of the NMSSM, which decouples from the muon as well as from gauge bosons. The only possible additional contributions arise from the coupling of the singlet to charged Higgs bosons (involving always at least one power of the Higgs singlet-doublet coupling λ), and the simultaneous presence of a mass insertion transforming a doublet into a singlet (also of $O(\lambda)$). Since the coefficient of c_L^h in (2.8) is only $2 \cdot 10^{11}$, we neglect subsequently effects of $O(\lambda^2 = g^2)$ in c_L^h . Then eq. (2.11) is equally valid in the NMSSM; all that remains to be done is to replace M_S^2 by the 3×3 mass matrix of the CP-even sector of the NMSSM. Returning, for convenience, to mass eigenstates, c_L^h is then of the form

$$c_L^h = \cos 2\alpha \frac{M_Z^2}{M_S^2} \sum_{i=1}^3 \frac{S_{i2} (S_{i2} \tan \alpha + S_{i1})}{m_{h_i}^2} : \quad (2.12)$$

Here, the conventions for the Higgs mixing matrices S_{ij} are as follows [35] (for convenience we discuss the complete Higgs sector here, which is useful for what follows below; note that H_u and H_d are exchanged w.r.t. the conventions in [36,37]):

The CP-even Higgs eigenstate h_i , $i=1,2,3$ (ordered in increasing mass) in the NMSSM are a mixture of the real parts of the neutral Higgs components $S^I = (H_{uR}; H_{dR}; S_R)$: $h_i = S_{ij} S_j^I$.

The CP-odd Higgs states a_i , $i=1,2$ in the NMSSM originate from the imaginary parts of the neutral Higgs components $P^I = (H_{uI}; H_{dI}; S_I)$ (after omission of the Goldstone boson $G^0 = \sin \alpha H_{uI} + \cos \alpha H_{dI}$): $a_i = P_{i1}^0 (\cos \alpha H_{uI} + \sin \alpha H_{dI}) + P_{i2}^0 S_I$.

The charged Higgs boson $H^\pm$ is obtained from the charged Higgs components H_u, H_d as $H^\pm = \cos \alpha H_u \pm \sin \alpha H_d$.

Two-loop diagrams involving closed fermion and chargino loops were studied in [18,19] and [20], respectively. The leading contributions (photonic Barr-Zee diagrams) can be found in [9,18] in the context of the MSSM and can be generalized to the NMSSM through a replacement of the corresponding couplings.

For the sfermionic diagrams we use the formula (5) of [18]:

$$a_{f\tilde{f}}^{2L} = \frac{G_F m_f^2}{4} \frac{X^3}{2^3} \sum_{i=1}^3 N_c^f Q_f^2 \frac{\text{Re}[h_i^f h_i^f]}{m_f^2} f_{f\tilde{f}} \frac{m_f^2}{m_{h_i}^2} \quad (2.13)$$

where N_c^f corresponds to the number of colors (3 for squarks, 1 for sleptons), Q_f is the electric charge, and the Higgs/sfermion couplings in the NMSSM are given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{h_i}{T_k} = & \frac{2^p \bar{M}_W}{g_2} h_t f A_t S_{i1} (sS_{i2} + v_d S_{i3}) g \text{Re}[X_{k1}^T X_{k2}^T] \\ & + h_t^2 v_u S_{i1} \frac{g_1^2}{3} (v_u S_{i1} - v_d S_{i2}) X_{k2}^{T^2} \\ & + h_t^2 v_u S_{i1} \frac{3g_2^2 - g_1^2}{12} (v_u S_{i1} - v_d S_{i2}) X_{k1}^{T^2} \end{aligned} \quad (2.14)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{h_i}{B_k} = & \frac{2^p \bar{M}_W}{g_2} h_b f A_b S_{i2} (sS_{i1} + v_u S_{i3}) g \text{Re}[X_{k1}^B X_{k2}^B] \\ & + h_b^2 v_d S_{i2} + \frac{g_1^2}{6} (v_u S_{i1} - v_d S_{i2}) X_{k2}^{B^2} \\ & + h_b^2 v_d S_{i2} + \frac{3g_2^2 + g_1^2}{12} (v_u S_{i1} - v_d S_{i2}) X_{k1}^{B^2} \end{aligned} \quad (2.15)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{h_i}{\tilde{\gamma}_k} = & \frac{2^p \bar{M}_W}{g_2} h_t f A_t S_{i2} (sS_{i1} + v_u S_{i3}) g \text{Re}[\tilde{X}_{k1} \tilde{X}_{k2}] \\ & + h_t^2 v_d S_{i2} + \frac{g_1^2}{2} (v_u S_{i1} - v_d S_{i2}) \tilde{X}_{k2}^2 \\ & + h_t^2 v_d S_{i2} + \frac{g_2^2 - g_1^2}{4} (v_u S_{i1} - v_d S_{i2}) \tilde{X}_{k1}^2 \end{aligned} \quad (2.16)$$

while the muon/Higgs couplings are simply $h_i = \frac{S_{i2}}{\cos\beta}$. v_u, v_d and s denote the vacuum expectation values of H_u, H_d and S , respectively, in the normalisation where $v_u^2 + v_d^2 = 1 = (2^p \bar{M}_W^2 / G_F)$. f is the Higgs singlet-doublet Yukawa coupling, and $A_{t,b,\tau}$ are the soft supersymmetry breaking Higgs-sfermion trilinear couplings for the third generation.

For the closed chargino loop, we employ the formula (63) of [9]:

$$a_{f\tilde{f}}^{2L} = \frac{G_F m_f^2}{4} \frac{X^2}{2^3} \sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{X^3}{4} \frac{\text{Re}[h_i^f h_i^f]}{m_k} f_S \frac{m_k^2}{m_{h_i}^2} + \sum_{i=1}^3 \frac{X^2}{m_k} \frac{\text{Re}[a_i^f a_i^f]}{m_k} f_{P_S} \frac{m_k^2}{m_{a_i}^2} \quad (2.17)$$

with the chargino/Higgs couplings of the NMSSM :

$$h_{ik} = \frac{p_{ik}}{2M_W} [U_{k2}V_{k2}S_{i3} + g_2 (U_{k1}V_{k2}S_{i1} + U_{k2}V_{k1}S_{i2})] \quad (2.18)$$

$$a_{ik} = \frac{p_{ik}}{2M_W} [U_{k2}V_{k2}P_{i2}^0 - g_2 (U_{k1}V_{k2}\cos\alpha + U_{k2}V_{k1}\sin\alpha)P_{i1}^0] \quad (2.19)$$

The functions $f_{\tilde{f}}$, f_S and f_{P_S} can be found in the appendix.

Among the missing contributions are one-loop diagrams with the exchange of a Higgs boson between the muons, and two-loop diagrams with a closed SM fermion loop involving Higgs bosons (and a photon). Since these can play a particular rôle in the NMSSM, they will be treated separately in the next subsection.

2.2 Contributions including pseudoscalars

Higgs effects are usually negligibly small in the SM or the MSSM because of the existing lower bounds on the Higgs masses. The SM one-loop Higgs/muon diagram is, indeed, about four orders of magnitude below the sensitivity of the BNL experiment for a SM Higgs mass above 114 GeV. However, this is not necessarily the case in the NMSSM: while the lightest CP-even Higgs boson mass cannot be far below the LEP bound unless it decouples from the SM sector, the lightest CP-odd boson a_1 can be as light as a few GeV [26,27]. Bounds from B-physics [30], especially from $B \rightarrow B_s \gamma$, can still be satisfied for low values of $\tan\beta$ or when the loop-induced $b \rightarrow s \gamma$ coupling is suppressed.

In the context of two-Higgs-doublet models, the impact of light (pseudo-) scalars on a_μ was already pointed out in [15,16,28]. In the NMSSM, a short analysis of a_μ has been performed in [23].

In the following we include contributions from the Higgs sector to a_μ up to the two-loop level. One-loop scalar/fermion diagrams have been known for quite a while; see, e.g., [38]. For completeness we detail all the SUSY Higgs contributions (CP-odd, even and charged):

$$a_\mu^{1L \text{ CP even}} = \frac{G_F m_\mu^2}{4} \frac{X^3}{2^2} \sum_{i=1} \frac{S_{i2}^2}{\cos^2\alpha} \int_0^1 \frac{x^2 (2-x) dx}{x^2 + \frac{m_{h_i}^2}{m^2} (1-x)} \quad (2.20)$$

$$a_\mu^{1L \text{ CP odd}} = \frac{G_F m_\mu^2}{4} \frac{X^2}{2^2} \sum_{i=1} P_{i1}^0 \tan^2\alpha \int_0^1 \frac{x^3 dx}{x^2 + \frac{m_{a_i}^2}{m^2} (1-x)} \quad (2.21)$$

$$a_\mu^{1L \text{ charged}} = \frac{G_F m_\mu^2}{4} \frac{X^2}{2^2} \tan^2\alpha \int_0^1 \frac{x(x-1) dx}{x^2 + \frac{m_{H^\pm}^2}{m^2} (1-x)} \quad (2.22)$$

For the two-loop Higgs diagrams involving a closed SM fermion loop (in contrast to closed sfermion/chargino loops considered in the previous subsection), we follow the analysis of [16]

and generalize it to the NM SSM :

$$a_{\text{CP even}}^{2\text{L}} = \frac{G}{4} \frac{m^2}{2^3} \sum_{i=1}^3 X^3 \frac{4}{3} \frac{S_{i1} S_{i2}}{\sin \cos} f_S \frac{m_t^2}{m_{h_i}^2} + \frac{1}{3} \frac{S_{i2}^2}{\cos^2} f_S \frac{m_b^2}{m_{h_i}^2} + \frac{S_{i2}^2}{\cos^2} f_S \frac{m^2}{m_{h_i}^2} \quad (2.23)$$

$$a_{\text{CP odd}}^{2\text{L}} = \frac{G}{4} \frac{m^2}{2^3} \sum_{i=1}^3 P_{i1}^0 \frac{4}{3} f_{PS} \frac{m_t^2}{m_{a_i}^2} + \tan^2 \frac{1}{3} f_{PS} \frac{m_b^2}{m_{a_i}^2} + f_{PS} \frac{m^2}{m_{a_i}^2} \quad (2.24)$$

where the functions f_S, f_{PS} are defined in the appendix.

As noticed in [28], one-loop and two-loop light Higgs contributions are of opposite signs and interfere, therefore, destructively. In the case of a CP-odd scalar, the one-loop contribution is negative and worsens the discrepancy (1.9) correspondingly. However, for a light CP-odd Higgs heavier than ~ 3 GeV, the positive two-loop contribution is numerically more important. The sum of both contributions is maximal around $m_{a_1} \sim 6$ GeV, though fairly constant in the range $4 - 10$ GeV (see Fig. 5 below). Both one- and two-loop contributions are proportional to the product of two muon Yukawa couplings, which leads to an enhancement quadratic in $\tan \beta$. They are also proportional to the square of the mixing of the light pseudoscalar to the doublet sector ($(P_{11}^0 \sin \beta)^2$, if we consider the dominant H_d component only). In spite of the appearance of P_{11}^0 , this coupling can be large enough to allow the light pseudoscalar contribution to reach the experimental 2σ range of a_μ by itself, provided that $\tan \beta > 30$. Hence, this contribution can alleviate the upper bound on slepton masses, which can be derived under the assumption that the chargino contribution (2.1) explains the deviation (1.9).

Finally, we estimate the theoretical uncertainty following the analysis of [9], allowing for a 2% error on the one-loop contributions and a relative error of 30% for the two-loop results. Except for the light pseudoscalar contributions, which we include in the error computation described above, we do not expect large sources of uncertainties different from the M SSM. Therefore, we use the same additional constant terms as [9] for the evaluation of the error.

3 Results

In this section we discuss a few phenomenological aspects of the supersymmetric contributions to a_μ discussed above. First we consider the $\tan \beta$ and slepton mass dependences in NM SSM scenarios without a light CP-odd scalar; as expected, these results are essentially the same as in the M SSM. Then we examine the case of a light pseudoscalar and show how relevant the Higgs contribution may become. Finally we study the cNM SSM (with universal soft terms at the GUT scale), and conclude with a short summary.

In Fig. 1, we plot the supersymmetric contribution a^{SUSY} as a function of $\tan \beta$ for various slepton (sneutrino/smuon) masses. Here we chose, for simplicity, universal soft slepton masses




Figure 1: The SUSY contribution to a_μ as a function of $\tan\beta$ for various slepton (sneutrino/smuon) masses.

M_{SL} at low energy. The gaugino soft terms are assumed to be hierarchical ($M_3 = 3M_2 = 6M_1 = 900 \text{ GeV}$) and a_{eff} is chosen such that the lighter chargino χ^+ has a mass of 175 GeV. The experimentally allowed 1 and 2 regions are indicated as an orange and a yellow band, respectively. The full violet, blue or red curves (corresponding to $a_{\text{eff}} > 0$) and dashed violet, blue or red curves (corresponding to $a_{\text{eff}} < 0$) include all SUSY contributions. Next to them we plot as dot-dashed lines the one-loop chargino/sneutrino contribution separately (corrected by large QED logarithms; for sneutrino/smuon masses of 1 TeV they differ hardly from the full SUSY contributions). As we mentioned in the previous section, the chargino/sneutrino contribution is proportional to the Yukawa coupling of the muon and thus to $\tan\beta$. Since this contribution obviously dominates the total SUSY contribution (the small difference is mainly due to the neutralino diagram), the total SUSY contribution is also roughly proportional to $\tan\beta$.

The chargino contribution to a_μ carries the same sign as the SUSY parameter a_{eff} (in the NMSSM). Hence, the case $a_{\text{eff}} < 0$ (dashed curves in Fig. 1) is disfavoured by the sign of the difference of the BNL result and the SM (1.9). When a_{eff} is positive (full curves in Fig. 1), the SUSY contribution to a_μ is able to account for the 3 deviation. When sleptons are heavy (the red curve), however, large values of $\tan\beta$ are necessary. On the other hand, for light sleptons

(violet curve) the chargino contribution can be large enough even for moderate values of $\tan\beta$, or even too important when $\tan\beta$ is large.




Figure 2: Exclusion plot in the $\tan\beta$ /slepton mass plane for a light chargino of 175 GeV.

In Fig. 2 we present an exclusion plot in the $\tan\beta$ /slepton mass plane for a light chargino of 175 GeV. In the red and yellow hatched domains the muon magnetic moment differs from the BNL result at the 2 and 1 level, respectively. (In the excluded dark hatched region a slepton would be the LSP, or violate constraints from its non-observation at LEP.) Two different domains are excluded by a :

In the bottom right-hand corner of Fig. 2, $\tan\beta$ is large and sleptons are light. In this case, the chargino/sneutrino contribution is strongly enhanced and becomes too large.

When sleptons are heavy and $\tan\beta$ is low (top and left-hand side of Fig. 2), the chargino contribution to a_μ is suppressed, and SUSY cannot explain the BNL result.

In order to see the impact of the chargino mass, we consider the case of a heavier chargino of 450 GeV in Fig. 3. Here we chose $M_3 = 3M_2 = 6M_1 = 1.5$ TeV. One sees that light sleptons and large values of $\tan\beta$ are required in order to account for the BNL result.




Figure 3: Exclusion plot in the $\tan \beta$ / slepton mass plane for a heavier chargino of 450 GeV.

These results confirm that the chargino/sneutrino contribution can explain the 3 σ deviation between a^{SM} and a^{EXP} in the NMSSM as well as in the MSSM, provided that the supersymmetric particles are sufficiently light or $\tan \beta$ is large.

Next we consider the NMSSM with a light pseudoscalar a_1 in the spectrum. From the formulae (2.21) and (2.24) one finds that its contribution to a_μ depends essentially on the pseudoscalar mass m_{a_1} and its coupling to (down) fermions $X_d = P_{11}^0 \tan \beta$, where P_{11}^0 describes the mixing of a_1 with the Higgs-doublet sector. Subsequently we chose parameters in the Higgs sector such that P_{11}^0 remains approximately constant ≈ 0.52 ; then X_d is entirely determined by $\tan \beta$.

In Fig. 4, we plot the contribution to a_μ which originates from the NMSSM Higgs sector only against $\tan \beta$ (lower axis) or X_d (upper axis) for $m_{a_1} = 6.5$ GeV; then the contributions in section 2.2 are dominated by the light pseudoscalar. We indicate separately the negative one-loop contribution (green curve), and the positive two-loop contribution (red curve). For $m_{a_1} = 6.5$ GeV the two-loop contribution dominates, so that the total result (black curve) has the same sign as the desired contribution (1.9). The contribution behaves as $\tan^2 \beta$ (or X_d^2) and we find that the Higgs contribution alone can reduce the discrepancy (1.9) below the 2 (1) level for $X_d > 15$ (22.5).

In Fig. 5 we show the contribution to a_μ from the NMSSM Higgs sector as a function of m_{a_1} for various values of X_d . As we mentioned in the previous section, the negative one-loop




Figure 4: Higgs contribution to a_μ as a function of $\tan\beta$ or X_d for $m_{a_1} = 6.5$ GeV.

contribution dominates below $m_{a_1} \approx 3$ GeV, while the two-loop diagram dominates for larger masses. Since both contributions decrease when the pseudoscalar becomes heavy, the total Higgs contribution becomes maximal around $m_{a_1} \approx 7$ GeV.

Constraints from B physics (essentially from $B_s \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ and M_{B_s}) depend mainly on the loop-induced $b \rightarrow s \gamma$ coupling [30], and are particularly strong for $m_{a_1} \approx M_{B_{d,s}} \approx 5$ GeV. For fixed X_d (and sfermion masses and trilinear couplings at 1 TeV, $\mu = 0.3$, $\mu_{\text{eff}} = 200$ GeV, and $M_3 = 3M_2 = 6M_1 = 1.2$ TeV) we varied the remaining parameters $\tan\beta$ and A in the Higgs sector of the NMSSM and obtained regions near $m_{a_1} \approx 5$ GeV, which are always excluded (these regions are indicated as dashed parts of the curves in Fig. 5). For larger X_d and corresponding larger values of $\tan\beta$, the forbidden regions are larger. For $X_d = 24$, the forbidden region extends up to $m_{a_1} \approx 6.5$ GeV. The region $m_{a_1} > 6.5$ GeV, where the total Higgs contribution can be relatively large, can be consistent with B physics constraints, however.

The previous results concern certain regions of the relatively large parameter space of the general (low energy) NMSSM. Next we consider the impact of a move to the cNMSSM with universal scalar and gaugino masses (m_0 and $M_{1=2}$) as well as universal trilinear couplings (A_0) at the GUT scale. Such a model is motivated by flavour-blind, supergravity-induced SUSY breaking scenarios.

A recent study of the cNMSSM parameter space spanned by μ , m_0 , $M_{1=2}$ and A_0 [39] showed




Figure 5: Higgs contribution to a_μ as a function of the pseudoscalar mass.

that LEP constraints on Higgs scalars and, notably, a dark matter relic density in agreement with WMAP constraints require $m_0 \leq M_{1=2}$ and that A_0 is determined in terms of $M_{1=2}$. Consequently, the complete Higgs and sparticle spectrum depends essentially only on $M_{1=2}$, which can a priori vary between 400 GeV and 2.3 TeV (where all other constraints on sparticle masses and from B-physics are satisfied; the lower limit on $M_{1=2}$ originates simultaneously from the lower experimental bound on stau masses and LEP constraints on Higgs scalars).

Using the most recent version of NMSSM Tools [35], we have computed the spectrum and the supersymmetric contributions to a_μ in the cNMSSM as a function of $M_{1=2}$, with the result shown in Fig. 6.

We see that the constraint from a_μ confines the allowed range of $M_{1=2}$ to $M_{1=2} < 1$ TeV at the 2σ level, and to $400 \text{ GeV} < M_{1=2} < 700 \text{ GeV}$ (where the sparticle spectrum is not too heavy) at the 1σ level. In fact, the present experimental value could be matched to arbitrarily high precision, and a more precise measurement of a_μ could determine $M_{1=2}$ completely.

In the cNMSSM, the leading SUSY contributions to a_μ originate from the MSSM-like one-loop diagrams. Besides the chargino/sneutrino loop, the bino/smuon contribution is also quite significant. On the other hand, contributions from the Higgs sector are always negligible in the cNMSSM, since the lightest pseudoscalar is not very light.

To summarize, the deviation (1.9) of the measured value of a_μ from the SM can be explained in the NMSSM as in the MSSM since { in the absence of a light CP-odd Higgs scalar { the




Figure 6: a_μ as a function of $M_{1/2}$ in the cNMSSM

corresponding contributions are practically the same. In the presence of a light CP-odd Higgs scalar the NMSSM specific contributions to a_μ are not negligible in general (depending on X_d and m_{a_1} , see Figs. 4 and 5) and, for $m_{a_1} > 3 \text{ GeV}$, can allow for a heavier particle spectrum. The mSUGRA-like cNMSSM is consistent with constraints from a_μ , which can help to constrain the remaining free parameter $M_{1/2}$.

Appendix: Loop functions

The functions appearing in the one-loop contributions (2.1, 2.2) are given in [11]:

$$\begin{aligned} F_1^N(x) &= \frac{2}{(1-x)^4} [1 - 6x + 3x^2 + 2x^3 - 6x^2 \ln x] \\ F_2^N(x) &= \frac{3}{(1-x)^3} [1 - x^2 + 2x \ln x] \\ F_1^C(x) &= \frac{2}{(1-x)^4} [2 + 3x - 6x^2 + x^3 + 6x \ln x] \\ F_2^C(x) &= \frac{3}{2(1-x)^3} [3 - 4x + x^2 + 2 \ln x] ; \end{aligned}$$

The functions appearing in the two-loop contributions (2.13, 2.17, 2.23, 2.24) are as in [9]:

$$\begin{aligned} f_F(z) &= \frac{z}{2} \int_0^1 \frac{x(1-x)}{x(1-x) - z} \ln \frac{x(1-x)}{z} dx = \frac{z}{2} [2 + \ln z - f_S(z)] \\ f_{FS}(z) &= z \int_0^1 \frac{1}{x(1-x) - z} \ln \frac{x(1-x)}{z} dx \\ &= \frac{2z}{1-4z} \operatorname{Li}_2\left(\frac{1}{2z}\right) - \frac{1}{2z} \left[\frac{1}{1-4z} \operatorname{Li}_2\left(\frac{1}{2z}\right) + \frac{1}{2z} \right] \\ f_S(z) &= z \int_0^1 \frac{1}{x(1-x) - z} \ln \frac{x(1-x)}{z} dx \\ &= (2z-1)f_S(z) - 2z(\ln z + 2) \end{aligned}$$

References

- [1] G. W. Bennett et al. [Muon G-2 Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D 73 (2006) 072003 [arXiv:hep-ex/0602035].
- [2] F. Jegerlehner, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. 162 (2006) 22 [arXiv:hep-ph/0608329].
- [3] K. Hagiwara, A. D. Martin, D. Nomura and T. Teubner, Phys. Lett. B 649 (2007) 173 [arXiv:hep-ph/0611102].
- [4] M. Davier, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. 169 (2007) 288 [arXiv:hep-ph/0701163].
- [5] F. Jegerlehner, Acta Phys. Polon. B 38 (2007) 3021 [arXiv:hep-ph/0703125].
- [6] Z. Zhang, "Muon g-2: a mini review," arXiv:0801.4905 [hep-ph].
- [7] R. Alkmann, M. Davier and A. Hocker, Eur. Phys. J. C 2, 123 (1998) [arXiv:hep-ph/9703220].

- [8] M . Davier, S. Eidelman, A . Hocker and Z. Zhang, Eur. Phys. J. C 31, 503 (2003) [[arXiv:hep-ph/0308213](#)].
- [9] D . Stockinger, J. Phys. G 34 (2007) R45 [[arXiv:hep-ph/0609168](#)].
- [10] P. Fayet, in Unification of the Fundamental Particles Interactions, eds. S. Ferrara, J. Ellis, P. van Nieuwenhuizen, (Plenum, NY, 1980), p. 587;
J. A. G rifols and A . M endez, Phys. Rev. D 26 (1982) 1809;
J. R. Ellis, J. S. Hagelin and D . V . Nanopoulos, Phys. Lett. B 116 (1982) 283;
R. Barbieri and L. M aiani, Phys. Lett. B 117 (1982) 203;
D . A . K osower, L. M . K rauss and N . Sakai, Phys. Lett. B 133 (1983) 305;
T. C. Yuan, R. A mow itt, A . H . Cham seddine and P. Nath, Z. Phys. C 26 (1984) 407;
J. C. Rom ao, A . Barroso, M . C. Bento and G . C. Branco, Nucl. Phys. B 250 (1985) 295;
I. Vendram in, Nuovo Cim . A 101 (1989) 731;
S. A . Abel, W . N. Cottingham and I. B. W hittingham , Phys. Lett. B 259 (1991) 307;
U. Chattopadhyay and P. Nath, Phys. Rev. D 53 (1996) 1648 [[arXiv:hep-ph/9507386](#)];
T. Mori, Phys. Rev. D 53 (1996) 6565 [Erratum-*ibid.* D 56 (1997) 4424] [[arXiv:hep-ph/9512396](#)].
- [11] S. P. M artin and J. D . W ells, Phys. Rev. D 64, 035003 (2001) [[arXiv:hep-ph/0103067](#)].
- [12] M . Byrne, C . Kolda and J. E. Lennon, Phys. Rev. D 67 (2003) 075004 [[arXiv:hep-ph/0208067](#)].
- [13] S. P. M artin and J. D . W ells, Phys. Rev. D 67 (2003) 015002 [[arXiv:hep-ph/0209309](#)].
- [14] G . D egrassi and G . F. G iudice, Phys. Rev. D 58, 053007 (1998) [[arXiv:hep-ph/9803384](#)].
- [15] D . Chang, W . F. Chang, C . H . Chou and W . Y. Keung, Phys. Rev. D 63 (2001) 091301 [[arXiv:hep-ph/0009292](#)].
- [16] K . M . Cheung, C . H . Chou and O . C. W . Kong, Phys. Rev. D 64, 111301 (2001) [[arXiv:hep-ph/0103183](#)].
- [17] C . H . Chen and C . Q . G eng, Phys. Lett. B 511 (2001) 77 [[arXiv:hep-ph/0104151](#)].
- [18] A . A rribas and S. Baek, Phys. Rev. D 65, 075002 (2002) [[arXiv:hep-ph/0104225](#)].
- [19] S. Heinem eyer, D . Stockinger and G . W eiglein, Nucl. Phys. B 690, 62 (2004) [[arXiv:hep-ph/0312264](#)].
- [20] S. Heinem eyer, D . Stockinger and G . W eiglein, Nucl. Phys. B 699, 103 (2004) [[arXiv:hep-ph/0405255](#)].
- [21] T. F. Feng, X . Q . Li, L. Lin, J. M aalampi and H . S. Song, Phys. Rev. D 73 (2006) 116001 [[arXiv:hep-ph/0604171](#)].

- [22] T.F.Feng, L.Sun and X.Y.Yang, "Electroweak and supersymmetric two-loop corrections to lepton anomalous magnetic and electric dipole moments," [arXiv:0805.1122 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [23] J. F. Gunion, D. Hooper and B. McElrath, *Phys. Rev. D* **73**, 015011 (2006) [[arXiv:hep-ph/0509024](#)].
- [24] V. Barger, C. Kao, P. Langacker and H. S. Lee, *Phys. Lett. B* **614** (2005) 67 [[arXiv:hep-ph/0412136](#)].
- [25] H.P.Nilles, M.Srednicki and D.Wyler, *Phys.Lett.B* **120** (1983) 346;
J.M.Frere, D.R.Jones and S.Raby, *Nucl.Phys.B* **222** (1983) 11;
J.P.Derendinger and C.A.Savoy, *Nucl.Phys.B* **237** (1984) 307;
J.R.Ellis, J.F.Gunion, H.E.Haber, L.Roszkowski and F.Zwimer, *Phys.Rev.D* **39** (1989) 844;
M.Drees, *Int.J.Mod.Phys.A* **4** (1989) 3635.
- [26] B.A.Dobrescu, G.Landsberg and K.T.Matchev, *Phys. Rev. D* **63** (2001) 075003 [[arXiv:hep-ph/0005308](#)];
B.A.Dobrescu and K.T.Matchev, *JHEP* **0009** (2000) 031 [[arXiv:hep-ph/0008192](#)].
- [27] U.Ellwanger, J.F.Gunion, C.Hugonie and S.Morette, [arXiv:hep-ph/0305109](#) (in "Physics interplay of the LHC and the ILC", G.Weglein et al. [LHC/LC Study Group], *Phys. Rept.* **426** (2006) 47); [arXiv:hep-ph/0401228](#) (in "The Higgs working group: Summary report 2003", K.A.Assamagan et al. [Higgs Working Group Collaboration], [arXiv:hep-ph/0406152](#));
R.Dermisek and J.F.Gunion, *Phys.Rev.Lett.* **95** (2005) 041801 [[arXiv:hep-ph/0502105](#)], *Phys.Rev.D* **73** (2006) 111701 [[arXiv:hep-ph/0510322](#)], *Phys.Rev.D* **75** (2007) 075019 [[arXiv:hep-ph/0611142](#)];
U.Ellwanger, J.F.Gunion and C.Hugonie, *JHEP* **0507** (2005) 041 [[arXiv:hep-ph/0503203](#)];
S.Chang, P.J.Fox and N.Weiner, *JHEP* **0608** (2006) 068 [[arXiv:hep-ph/0511250](#)];
P.W.Graham, A.Pierce and J.G.Wacker, "Four taus at the Tevatron," [arXiv:hep-ph/0605162](#);
S.Morette, S.Munir and P.Poulose, *Phys.Lett.B* **644** (2007) 241 [[arXiv:hep-ph/0608233](#)];
S.Chang, P.J.Fox and N.Weiner, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98** (2007) 111802 [[arXiv:hep-ph/0608310](#)];
T.Stelzer, S.Wiesenfeldt and S.Willenbrock, *Phys. Rev. D* **75** (2007) 077701 [[arXiv:hep-ph/0611242](#)];
U.Aglietti et al., "Tevatron-for-LHC report: Higgs," [arXiv:hep-ph/0612172](#);
E.Fullana and M.A.Sanchis-Lozano, *Phys.Lett.B* **653** (2007) 67 [[arXiv:hep-ph/0702190](#)];
K.Cheung, J.Song and Q.S.Yan, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99** (2007) 031801 [[arXiv:hep-ph/0703149](#)];
M.A.Sanchis-Lozano, "A light non-standard Higgs boson: to be or not to be at a (Super) B factory?," [arXiv:0709.3647 \[hep-ph\]](#);
M.Carena, T.Han, G.Y.Huang and C.E.M.Wagner, *JHEP* **0804** (2008) 092

- [arXiv:0712.2466 [hep-ph]];
 J.R. Forshaw, J.F. Gunion, L. Hodgkinson, A. Papaefstathiou and A.D. Pilkington, arXiv:0712.3510 [hep-ph];
 Z. Heng, R. J. Oakes, W. Wang, Z. Xiong and J.M. Yang, "B meson Dileptonic Decays in NMSSM with a Light CP-odd Higgs Boson," arXiv:0801.1169 [hep-ph];
 A. Djouadi et al., "Benchmark scenarios for the NMSSM", arXiv:0801.4321 [hep-ph];
 X.G. He, J. Tandean and G. Valencia, "Rare Decays with a Light CP-Odd Higgs Boson in the NMSSM," arXiv:0803.4330 [hep-ph].
- [28] M. Krawczyk, Acta Phys. Polon. B 33, 2621 (2002) [arXiv:hep-ph/0208076].
- [29] S. Schael et al. [ALEPH, DELPHI, L3 and OPAL Collaborations], Eur. Phys. J. C 47 (2006) 547
- [30] F. Domingo and U. Ellwanger, JHEP 0712 (2007) 090 [arXiv:0710.3714 [hep-ph]].
- [31] S. Laporta and E. Remiddi, Phys. Lett. B 379, 283 (1996) [arXiv:hep-ph/9602417], Phys. Lett. B 301, 440 (1993);
 T. Aoyama, M. Hayakawa, T. Kinoshita and M. Nio, Phys. Rev. Lett. 99, 110406 (2007) [arXiv:0706.3496 [hep-ph]];
 T. Kinoshita and M. Nio, Phys. Rev. D 70, 113001 (2004) [arXiv:hep-ph/0402206].
- [32] T. Kinoshita and M. Nio, Phys. Rev. D 73, 053007 (2006) [arXiv:hep-ph/0512330].
- [33] J. Bijnens and J. Prades, Mod. Phys. Lett. A 22 (2007) 767 [arXiv:hep-ph/0702170].
- [34] A. Czamecki, W. J. Marciano and A. Vainshtein, Phys. Rev. D 67 (2003) 073006 [Erratum – ibid. D 73 (2006) 119901] [arXiv:hep-ph/0212229].
- [35] U. Ellwanger, J. F. Gunion and C. Hugonie, JHEP 0502 (2005) 066 [arXiv:hep-ph/0406215];
 U. Ellwanger and C. Hugonie, Comput. Phys. Commun. 177 (2007) 399,
<http://www.th.u-psud.fr/NMHDECAY/nmssmtools.html>
- [36] P. Skands et al., JHEP 0407 (2004) 036 [arXiv:hep-ph/0311123].
- [37] B. Allanach et al., "SU(5) Les Houches Accord 2," arXiv:0801.0045 [hep-ph].
- [38] J. P. Leveille, Nucl. Phys. B 137 (1978) 63.
- [39] A. Djouadi, U. Ellwanger and A. M. Teixeira, "The constrained next-to-minimal supersymmetric standard model," arXiv:0803.0253 [hep-ph].