

The constrained NMSSM: mSUGRA and GMSB¹

Ulrich Ellwanger

*Laboratoire de Physique Théorique²
Université de Paris XI, F-91405 Orsay Cedex, France*

Abstract. We review different constrained versions of the NMSSM: the fully constrained cNMSSM with universal boundary conditions for gauginos and all soft scalar masses and trilinear couplings, and the NMSSM with soft terms from Gauge Mediated Supersymmetry Breaking. Regarding the fully constrained cNMSSM, after imposing LEP constraints and the correct dark matter relic density, one single parameter is sufficient to describe the entire Higgs and sparticle spectrum of the model, which then contains always a singlino LSP. The NMSSM with soft terms from GMSB is phenomenologically viable if (and only if) the singlet is allowed to couple directly to the messenger sector; then various ranges in parameter space satisfy constraints from colliders and precision observables. Motivations for and phenomenological features of extra $U(1)^0$ gauge symmetries are briefly reviewed.

Keywords: Supersymmetry, NMSSM, Gauge Mediation

PACS: 12.60.Jv, 12.60.Fr, 12.10.-g

INTRODUCTION

The Next-to-Minimal Supersymmetric Standard Model (NMSSM) [1] solves in a natural and elegant way the so-called μ -problem [2] of the MSSM: Within any supersymmetric (SUSY) extension of the Standard Model (SM), a supersymmetric Higgs(ino) mass term $\mu H_u H_d$ > 100 GeV is necessary in order to satisfy the LEP constraints on chargino masses, but $\mu < M_{SUSY}$ is required in order that the effective potential develops a non-trivial minimum with $\langle H_u \rangle, \langle H_d \rangle \neq 0$. (Here M_{SUSY} denotes the order of magnitude of the soft SUSY breaking scalar masses as m_{H_u} and m_{H_d} .) The question is, why a supersymmetric mass parameter as μ happens to be of the same order as M_{SUSY} .

In the NMSSM, an (effective) μ -term is generated by the vacuum expectation value (VEV) of an additional gauge singlet superfield S and a corresponding Yukawa coupling, similarly to the way how quark and lepton masses are generated in the SM by the VEV of a Higgs field. To this end, the μ -term in the superpotential W of the MSSM, $W_{MSSM} = \mu H_u H_d + \dots$, has to be replaced by

$$W_{NMSSM} = \lambda S H_u H_d + \frac{1}{3} \kappa S^3 + \dots \quad (1)$$

and the soft SUSY breaking term $\mu B H_u H_d$ by

$$\lambda A_\lambda S H_u H_d + \frac{1}{3} \kappa A_\kappa S^3 : \quad (2)$$

Assuming that all soft SUSY breaking terms are of $\mathcal{O}(M_{SUSY})$, one obtains $\langle S \rangle = M_{SUSY} = \kappa$ and hence an effective μ -parameter $\mu_{eff} = \lambda \langle S \rangle = \lambda \kappa = \kappa M_{SUSY}$, which is of the desired order if $\lambda = \kappa = \mathcal{O}(1)$. Instead of the two parameters μ and B of the MSSM, the NMSSM contains four parameters $\lambda; \kappa; A_\lambda$ and A_κ , and the spectrum includes one additional CP-even Higgs scalar, one CP-odd Higgs scalar and one additional neutralino from the superfield S . Generally, these states mix with the Higgs scalars and neutralinos of the MSSM. Then, each of the neutralino/CP-even/CP-odd sectors can give rise to a phenomenology different from that of the MSSM:

a) The Lightest Supersymmetric Particle (LSP) can be dominantly singlino-like (consistent with WMAP constraints on Ωh^2 [3], if its mass is only a few GeV below the one of the Next-to-LSP (NLSP), see [4] and below) implying an additional contribution to sparticle decay chains; note that the NLSP could have a long life time leading to observable displaced vertices [5];

b) The SM-like CP-even Higgs scalar h_1 can be 15 GeV heavier than in the MSSM (at low $\tan\beta$!);

c) A CP-odd Higgs scalar a_1 can be (very) light (see also the talk by J. Gunion, these proceedings). A light CP-odd Higgs scalar can have an important impact on B physics (see the talk by M. Sanchis-Lozano, these proceedings), and can imply that the lightest CP-even scalar h_1 decays dominantly into $h_1 \rightarrow a_1 a_1$ [6, 7]. Then, LEP constraints on h_1 are less restrictive, but the search for h_1 at the LHC can become considerably more difficult.

Note that these are not “unavoidable” predictions of the NMSSM, but depend on the unknown parameters $\lambda, \kappa, A_\lambda, A_\kappa, \tan\beta$ and μ_{eff} . In the following we investigate, amongst others, the phenomenological consequences of particular boundary conditions on the param-

¹ Talk given at SUSY 08, Seoul, Korea, June 16-21, 2008

² Unité mixte de Recherche – CNRS – UMR 8627

eters of the NMSSM at a high scale like mSUGRA (universal boundary conditions for gauginos and all soft scalar masses and trilinear couplings at the GUT scale), and GMSB (Gauge Mediated Supersymmetry Breaking).

The subsequent results are obtained with the help of the Fortran code NMHDECAY/NMSSMTools [8], which computes the Higgs and sparticle spectra and Higgs branching ratios including radiative corrections for general/mSUGRA/GMSB boundary conditions, and checks for constraints from colliders/B-physics/(g-2) $_{\mu}$ /dark matter (the latter via MicrOMEGAs [4]).

THE CNMSSM

By definition, the soft SUSY breaking gaugino, scalar masses and trilinear couplings in the fully constrained cNMSSM – including the singlet sector – are assumed to be universal (equal to m_0 , $M_{1=2}$ and A_0 , respectively) at the scale $M_{GUT} = M_{Planck}$ as generated via mSUGRA, i.e. minimal supergravity with flavour-blind kinetic functions³. As a result, the number of unknown parameters is reduced to 4. In the convention where κ is implicitly determined by M_Z , these can be chosen as $M_{1=2}$, m_0 , A_0 and λ ; one of these parameters can still be replaced by $\tan\beta$. (A slightly less constrained version of the cNMSSM, where the SUSY breaking mass m_S of the singlet is allowed to differ from m_0 , has recently been studied in [10]; see also the talk by C. Balázs, these proceedings.)

First, it is useful to recall the constraints on these parameters which follow from a stable real (in order to avoid problems with CP-violating observables) VEV of S [11]: the numerically most relevant terms in the S -dependent part of the potential are

$$V(S) = m_S^2 S^2 + \frac{\kappa}{3} A_\kappa (S^3 + S^{\dagger 3}) + \kappa^2 S^4 + \dots; \quad (3)$$

hence $V(S)$ has a stable nontrivial minimum only if $m_S^2 < 1/9 A_\kappa^2$, where $\kappa A_\kappa \sin\beta < 0$. Since the parameters m_S and A_κ are hardly renormalized between M_{GUT} and M_{SUSY} (and $\kappa \sin\beta > 0$ for $\mu_{eff} > 0$, which is desired for the correct anomalous magnetic moment of the muon), one obtains the approximate inequalities

$$m_0 < \frac{1}{3} A_0 \lesssim A_0 < 0; \quad (4)$$

Additional constraints follow from the properties of the LSP (which will be the constituent of the dark matter), and the WMAP result [3] on the dark matter relic density:

First, for small values of m_0 (as the ones required by (4)), the lightest stau $\tilde{\tau}_1$ would be the LSP in the MSSM, which would be unacceptable due to its electric charge. In the NMSSM, the additional (singlet-like) neutralino $\tilde{\chi}_1$ (with a mass proportional to $A_\kappa \lesssim A_0$) is lighter than the $\tilde{\tau}_1$, if A_0 satisfies $A_0 < \frac{1}{3} M_{1=2}$. Then (4) gives

$$m_0 < \frac{1}{10} M_{1=2}; \quad (5)$$

which would lead to an unacceptable LSP within the MSSM.

Second, in order to allow for a sufficiently rapid $\tilde{\chi}_1$ annihilation in the early universe (such that its relic density complies with WMAP constraints), the $\tilde{\chi}_1 - \tilde{\tau}_1$ mass difference must be relatively small ($m_{\tilde{\tau}_1} - m_{\tilde{\chi}_1} \lesssim 8$ GeV), and both masses must not be too large (below 600 GeV). Together, these constraints imply

$$A_0 = \frac{1}{4} M_{1=2}; M_{1=2} < 2 - 3 \text{ TeV}; \quad (6)$$

Finally, the lower bound of ~ 100 GeV on $m_{\tilde{\tau}_1}$ from LEP requires

$$M_{1=2} > 400 \text{ GeV}; \quad (7)$$

Then we find that, for λ small enough (see below), the SM-like Higgs scalar H_{SM} has a mass $m_{H_{SM}} = 115 - 120$ GeV (increasing with $M_{1=2}$) in agreement with LEP constraints. However, for larger λ the mixing of H_{SM} with the singlet-like scalar increases leading to a decrease of its mass $m_{H_{SM}}$. Hence λ must be relatively small,

$$\lambda < 2 \cdot 10^{-2}; \quad (8)$$

(The NMSSM specific positive contribution to $m_{H_{SM}}^2$ proportional to λ^2 [1] is negligible here, since $\tan\beta$ turns out to be fairly large, see below.)

Hence, from (5) and (8), neither m_0 nor λ have an important effect on the Higgs- and sparticle spectrum; A_0 being determined by (6), the spectrum is practically completely fixed by $M_{1=2}$.

In Fig. 1 we show acceptable points in the $[M_{1=2}, A_0]$ plane for $m_0 = 0$ and $\lambda = 2 \cdot 10^{-3}$, which satisfy theoretical and collider constraints; the blue line corresponds to the additional satisfaction of WMAP constraints. For points above this line the dark matter relic density comes out (far) too large. Also indicated are lines of constant $\tan\beta$ (in red), which is seen to vary between 25 and ~ 38 (for $M_{1=2}$ below 1.5 TeV as required for a correct relic density for $m_0 = 0$).

Still for $m_0 = 0$ and $\lambda = 2 \cdot 10^{-3}$ (and A_0 along the blue line in Fig. 1), we show in Figs. 2 the Higgs, neutralino and stau spectrum as function of $M_{1=2}$. The

³ The results of this section have been obtained in collaboration with A. Djouadi and A. M. Teixeira in [9].




FIGURE 1. The viable cNMSSM region in the $[M_{1/2}; A_0]$ plane for $m_0 = 0$ and $\lambda = 2 \cdot 10^{-3}$, once theoretical, collider and cosmological constraints have been imposed.




FIGURE 2. The Higgs (left) and neutralino plus stau (right) mass spectra in GeV as a function of $M_{1/2}$ along the dark matter line; the values of A_0 are indicated in the upper axis.

squark and gluino masses are (except for the somewhat lighter stop masses) of the order $2 \cdot M_{1/2}$.

Note that, for $M_{1/2} < 640$ GeV, the lightest CP-even scalar h_1^0 is singlet-like; however, due to the small value of λ , its couplings to SM particles (as the Z-boson) are so small that its mass is not constraint by LEP and, likewise, it will be practically invisible at the LHC.

Actually, the parameter regions shown above satisfy all present collider- and B -physics constraints, but do not necessarily describe the deviation δa_μ of the anomalous magnetic moment $a_\mu = (g_\mu - 2)/2$ from its SM value observed by the E821 experiment at BNL [12]. In [13], the dependency of δa_μ on $M_{1/2}$ (which is practically independent from m_0 and λ) has been studied with the result shown in Fig. 3.

From Fig. 3 one can conclude that values for $M_{1/2} < 1$ TeV are favored by this observable, $M_{1/2} \approx 500$ GeV giving the best fit.

Finally we note that not all observables are practically independent from λ : recall that within the present scenario, all sparticle decays will proceed via the stau NLSP,




FIGURE 3. δa_μ^{SUSY} as function of $M_{1/2}$ together with the SM (experimental) 1σ and 2σ bounds.

since the couplings of the true (singlino-like) LSP are of the order of λ and hence small. Only at the end of each MSSM-like decay chain, the stau NLSP will decay into the singlino-like LSP, but its decay width can be tiny implying a possibly visible stau track length [5]. We find that this track length can be > 1 mm at the LHC, if $\lambda < 10^{-3}$; this phenomenon can thus represent a possible “smoking gun” for the cNMSSM.

THE NMSSM AND GMSB

Supersymmetric extensions of the SM with Gauge Mediated Supersymmetry Breaking always involve messenger supermultiplets ϕ_i with a (supersymmetric) mass M_{mess} , but whose CP-even and CP-odd scalar masses squared are split by m^2 . Possible origins of the SUSY breaking parameter m^2 are

- Dynamical SUSY Breaking (non-perturbative) in a hidden sector containing a SUSY Yang-Mills theory plus matter, and couplings of ϕ_i to the hidden sector [14];
- O’Raifeartaigh-type models [15];
- models based on No-Scale supergravity [16] with Giudice-Masiero-like terms [17] for ϕ_i in the Kähler potential [18].

Since the messenger fields ϕ_i carry $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)_Y$ gauge quantum numbers, they generate gaugino masses (at 1 loop) and masses for all non-singlet scalars (at 2 loops) of the order $M_{SUSY} \approx \frac{m^2}{16\pi^2 M_{mess}}$, but none of the phenomenologically required μ - or B -terms of the MSSM – hence the μ -problem is even more pressing in general GMSB-like models.

Again, the simplest solution of the problem is the introduction of a singlet S together with its coupling λ

to H_u and H_d ⁴. However, soft SUSY breaking terms in the potential for the singlet are necessary in order to generate a sufficiently large VEV of S . In order to generate such terms radiatively (of the desired order), it seems necessary to introduce a direct coupling $\eta S \phi \phi_i$ of S to the messenger sector.

Then, integrating out the messengers generates desired terms like m_S^2 and $A_\lambda = \frac{1}{3}A_\kappa$; possibly, however, also terms linear in S in the superpotential $W = \xi_F S$ and in the potential $V_{soft} = \xi_S S$, so-called “tadpole terms”. Such tadpole terms always trigger a non-vanishing $\langle S \rangle \neq 0$ but, if allowed at 1 loop order, the radiatively generated parameters ξ_F , ξ_S tend to be somewhat large; one finds [18]

$$\xi_F = \eta M_{mess} M_{SUSY}; \quad \xi_S = 16\pi^2 \eta M_{mess} M_{SUSY}^2; \quad (9)$$

and recall that we typically expect $M_{mess} > M_{SUSY}$. On the other hand, ξ_S should not be larger than M_{SUSY}^3 , which is the case if $\eta < \frac{M_{SUSY}}{16\pi^2 M_{mess}}$ typically implying $\eta < 10^{-5}$.

As investigated in [19], such models can be phenomenologically viable, if $\lambda > 0.5$ (and $\tan\beta < 2$); then the NMSSM specific contribution λ^2 to the scalar Higgs mass matrix squared [1] pushes the lightest Higgs mass m_{h_1} above the LEP bound. For the parameter choices $M_{mess} = 10^6$ GeV and $M_{SUSY} = 500$ GeV, we have varied the parameters $0.5 < \lambda < 0.6$ and $10^{-6} < \eta < 10^{-5}$; the resulting values for m_{h_1} are shown in Fig. 4 as function of $\tan\beta$.




FIGURE 4. m_{h_1} as function of $\tan\beta$ in the scenario with tadpole terms.

The other Higgs states are heavier than ~ 600 GeV, the bino, wino and slepton masses are in the range 110 to 290 GeV, and the squark and gluino masses in the range 640 to 890 GeV; hence the entire Higgs and sparticle spectrum satisfies all collider constraints for this class of models inspite of the presence of tadpole terms for S .

⁴ The results of this section have been obtained in collaboration with C.-C. Jean-Louis and A. M. Teixeira in [19].

Tadpole terms for S can also be forbidden by discrete symmetries, if the messenger sector is enlarged to $\phi_1, \bar{\phi}_1, \phi_2, \bar{\phi}_2$ [20] and the superpotential is chosen as

$$W = \eta S \bar{\phi}_1 \phi_2 + M_{mess} (\bar{\phi}_1 \phi_1 + \bar{\phi}_2 \phi_2) : \quad (10)$$

The soft terms $m_S^2 (< 0)$, A_κ ; A_λ are calculable in terms of η and M_{SUSY} as before. Phenomenologically viable regions in the parameter space $M_{SUSY}, M_{mess}, \eta, \lambda$ and $\tan\beta$ have been found in [21] (and confirmed in [19]) where, however, the sparticle spectrum turns out to be quite heavy: Bino, wino and slepton masses are in the range 450 to 1100 GeV, and the squark and gluino masses around 2 TeV.

In [19], we have also investigated scenarios where the soft terms A_κ ; A_λ are negligibly small at M_{mess} , i.e. where all soft terms for the singlet vanish at M_{mess} except for m_S^2 (a corresponding hidden sector remains to be constructed). Then, the scalar sector of the NMSSM has an R-symmetry (at M_{mess}), which is, however, broken by radiative corrections to A_κ, A_λ induced by the gaugino mass terms. Then, the explicit R-symmetry breaking at the weak scale by A_λ, A_κ a few GeV is small (if M_{mess} is not too large), and the spontaneous R-symmetry breaking by $\langle H_u \rangle, \langle H_d \rangle, \langle S \rangle \neq 0$ generates a pseudo Goldstone Boson, the lightest CP-odd Higgs scalar a_1 [6]. Consequently, the lightest Higgs scalar h_1 can decay via $h_1 \rightarrow a_1 a_1$ escaping LEP constraints if $m_{h_1} > 90$ GeV (depending on m_{a_1}) [22].

We have studied phenomenologically viable regions in the parameter space of such a scenario for $\lambda = 0.6$, 10^7 GeV $< M_{mess} < 5 \cdot 10^8$ GeV and 200 GeV $< M_{SUSY} < 280$ GeV as shown in Fig. 5 where, for $m_{h_1} < 114$ GeV, m_{a_1} is below $m_{h_1} = 2$.




FIGURE 5. m_{h_1} as function of $\tan\beta$ in the scenario with $A_\kappa, A_\lambda = 0$.

Here the bino, wino and slepton masses are $\sim 100 - 200$ GeV, the squark and gluino masses $\sim 450 - 600$ GeV, and the masses of the additional Higgs bosons above ~ 500 GeV. The blue points satisfy also the 2σ constraints on the muon anomalous magnetic moment.

Altogether a variety of NMSSM models with GMSB – with and without tadpole terms – is phenomenologically viable, provided that the singlet couples directly to the messengers such that destabilizing terms in the singlet potential can be radiatively generated.

EXTRA $U(1)^0$ GAUGE SYMMETRY

A natural question is the one for a possible origin of a SM singlet superfield like the S of the NMSSM. In fact, multiplets of large GUT gauge groups (like, e.g., E_6 [23]) typically contain singlets under the SM gauge groups which are, however, charged under one (or more) extra $U(1)^0$ gauge group(s) (see [24] for a recent review). Quarks, leptons as well as the MSSM doublets H_u and H_d carry such $U(1)^0$ charges as well, as a consequence of which the MSSM $\mu H_u H_d$ -term is forbidden and has to be generated by a VEV of S (and a coupling $\lambda S H_u H_d$) as before.

Due to the $U(1)^0$ charge of S , the κS^3 -term in the superpotential of the NMSSM is forbidden as well, but the S -dependent potential can still be stabilized for large $\langle S \rangle$ due to the $U(1)^0$ -D-term $g^2 \mathcal{F}_S^\dagger \mathcal{F}_S$. The $U(1)^0$ -D-term leads also to additional $g^2 \mathcal{H}_{u,d}^\dagger \mathcal{F}_S \mathcal{F}_S$ -terms in the scalar potential, which imply heavier (SM-like) physical Higgs scalars which satisfy more easily the lower LEP bound of 114 GeV.

However, the cancellation of all anomalies (at scales M_{SUSY}) usually requires additional exotic matter (and possibly several SM singlets) with masses of the order M_{SUSY} , as a consequence of which the unification of the SM gauge couplings at M_{GUT} is no longer “automatic” as in the MSSM or in the NMSSM.

The most evident phenomenological implication of such models is the presence of at least one extra Z^0 gauge boson; however, since it tends to mix with the Z boson of the SM, one obtains constraints on its mass and the quantum numbers of matter whose loops are responsible for this mixing. Also the neutralino sector is enlarged [25], involving extra states from both Z^0 - and SM singlet matter supermultiplets.

SUMMARY

Under the assumption that the SUSY breaking scale M_{SUSY} generates the weak scale M_Z , and no other dimensionful parameters are present in the effective Lagrangian below the GUT scale, the NMSSM is the most natural supersymmetric extension of the Standard Model.

If one adds the assumption of universal soft SUSY breaking terms $M_{1=2}$, m_0 and A_0 one finds that the phenomenologically viable range – satisfying all present

constraints from collider- and B -physics as well as the dark matter relic density – for $M_{1=2}$, m_0 and A_0 in the cNMSSM is very different from the cMSSM: it is characterized by $m_0 \sim M_{1=2}$ and $A_0 \sim \frac{1}{4} M_{1=2}$; the entire Higgs and sparticle spectrum can finally be parametrized by $M_{1=2}$ only. The most notable feature of this scenario is that the LSP is always singlino-like; depending on the Yukawa coupling λ , a large NLSP (stau) lifetime can lead to tracks of observable length at the end of sparticle decay chains at the LHC.

In the framework of models with Gauge Mediated Supersymmetry Breaking, the NMSSM allows to solve the μ -problem in a phenomenologically viable way, *provided S couples directly to the messenger sector*. Then, radiative corrections generate the soft SUSY breaking terms for S , which are required for a sufficiently large VEV $\langle S \rangle$. Tadpole terms are *not* dangerous if the coupling η of S to the messengers is sufficiently small. Different scenarios can be realized implying different phenomenologies in the Higgs and sparticle sectors; possible are, amongst others, light CP-odd scalars (pseudo Goldstone Bosons), or light CP-even scalars with a large singlet component.

Hopefully, we will know more about the scenario realized in nature within a few years from now.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is a pleasure to thank the organisers of SUSY 08 for a very inspiring and fruitful conference.

This talk is based on work in collaboration with A. Djouadi, C.-C. Jean-Louis, F. Domingo and A.M. Teixeira. We acknowledge support from the French ANR project PHYS@COL&COS.

REFERENCES

1. 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. Ellis *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **39** (1989) 844;
M. Drees, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **4** (1989) 3635.
2. J.E. Kim and H.P. Nilles, Phys. Lett. B **138** (1984) 150.
3. D. N. Spergel *et al.* [WMAP Collaboration], Astrophys. J. Suppl. **170** (2007) 377.
4. G. Belanger *et al.*, JCAP **0509** (2005) 001;
G. Belanger *et al.*, Comput. Phys. Commun. **174** (2006) 577;
C. Hugonie, G. Belanger and A. Pukhov, JCAP **0711** (2007) 009.
5. F. Franke and H. Fraas, Z. Phys. C **72** (1996) 309;
U. Ellwanger and C. Hugonie, Eur. Phys. J. C **5** (1998) 723 and Eur. Phys. J. C **13** (2000) 681;

- V. Barger, P. Langacker and G. Shaughnessy, Phys. Lett. B **644** (2007) 361 and Phys. Rev. D **75** (2007) 055013.
6. 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]; R. Dermisek and J. F. Gunion, Phys. Rev. D **75** (2007) 075019 [arXiv:hep-ph/0611142].
7. R. Dermisek and J. F. Gunion, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95** (2005) 041801 [arXiv:hep-ph/0502105] and Phys. Rev. D **73** (2006) 111701 [arXiv:hep-ph/0510322]; 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. Moretti, 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**, 092 (2008) [arXiv:0712.2466 [hep-ph]] J. R. Forshaw *et al.*, JHEP **0804**, 090 (2008) [arXiv:0712.3510 [hep-ph]]; Z. Heng *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **77**, 095012 (2008) [arXiv:0801.1169 [hep-ph]]; A. Djouadi *et al.*, JHEP **0807** (2008) 002 [arXiv:0801.4321 [hep-ph]]; A. Belyaev *et al.*, “The Scope of the 4 tau Channel in Higgs-strahlung and Vector Boson Fusion for the NMSSM No-Lose Theorem at the LHC,” arXiv:0805.3505 [hep-ph]; D. E. Morrissey and A. Pierce, “Modified Higgs Boson Phenomenology from Gauge or Gaugino Mediation in the NMSSM,” arXiv:0807.2259 [hep-ph].
8. U. Ellwanger, J. F. Gunion and C. Hugonie, JHEP **0502** (2005) 066; U. Ellwanger and C. Hugonie, Comput. Phys. Commun. **175** (2006) 290 and Comput. Phys. Commun. **177** (2007) 399; see also the web site <http://www.th.u-psud.fr/NMHDECAY/nmssmtools.html>.
9. A. Djouadi, U. Ellwanger and A. M. Teixeira, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101** (2008) 101802 [arXiv:0803.0253 [hep-ph]].
10. C. Balazs and D. Carter, “Discovery potential of the next-to-minimal supergravity motivated model,” arXiv:0808.0770 [hep-ph].
11. U. Ellwanger, M. Rausch de Traubenberg and C.A. Savoy, Phys. Lett. B **315** (1993) 331, Z. Phys. C **67** (1995) 665 and Nucl. Phys. B **492** (1997) 307.
12. G. W. Bennett *et al.* [Muon G-2 Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **73** (2006) 072003 [arXiv:hep-ex/0602035].
13. F. Domingo and U. Ellwanger, JHEP **0807**, 079 (2008) [arXiv:0806.0733 [hep-ph]].
14. I. Affleck, M. Dine and N. Seiberg, Nucl. Phys. B **241** (1984) 493, Phys. Lett. B **137** (1984) 187, Phys. Lett. B **140** (1984) 59 and Nucl. Phys. B **256** (1985) 557; Y. Meurice and G. Veneziano, Phys. Lett. B **141** (1984) 69; M. Dine and A. E. Nelson, Phys. Rev. D **48** (1993) 1277 [arXiv:hep-ph/9303230]; M. Dine, A. E. Nelson and Y. Shirman, Phys. Rev. D **51** (1995) 1362 [arXiv:hep-ph/9408384]; M. Dine, A. E. Nelson, Y. Nir and Y. Shirman, Phys. Rev. D **53** (1996) 2658 [arXiv:hep-ph/9507378]; K. Intriligator, N. Seiberg and D. Shih, JHEP **0604** (2006) 021 [arXiv:hep-th/0602239].
15. M. Dine and W. Fischler, Phys. Lett. B **110** (1982) 227, Nucl. Phys. B **204** (1982) 346; L. Alvarez-Gaume, M. Claudson and M. B. Wise, Nucl. Phys. B **207** (1982) 96; S. Dimopoulos and S. Raby, Nucl. Phys. B **219** (1983) 479.
16. A. B. Lahanas and D. V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Rept. **145**, 1 (1987); N. Dragon, U. Ellwanger and M. G. Schmidt, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **18** (1987) 1.
17. G. F. Giudice and A. Masiero, Phys. Lett. B **206** (1988) 480.
18. U. Ellwanger, Phys. Lett. B **349** (1995) 57 [arXiv:hep-ph/9501227].
19. U. Ellwanger, C. C. Jean-Louis and A. M. Teixeira, JHEP **0805**, 044 (2008) [arXiv:0803.2962 [hep-ph]].
20. G. F. Giudice and R. Rattazzi, Nucl. Phys. B **511** (1998) 25 [arXiv:hep-ph/9706540].
21. A. Delgado, G. F. Giudice and P. Slavich, Phys. Lett. B **653** (2007) 424 [arXiv:0706.3873 [hep-ph]].
22. S. Schael *et al.* [ALEPH, DELPHI, L3 and OPAL Collaborations], Eur. Phys. J. C **47** (2006) 547
23. S. F. King, S. Moretti and R. Nevzorov, Phys. Lett. B **634**, 278 (2006) [arXiv:hep-ph/0511256], Phys. Rev. D **73**, 035009 (2006) [arXiv:hep-ph/0510419]; R. Howl and S. F. King, JHEP **0801**, 030 (2008) [arXiv:0708.1451 [hep-ph]].
24. P. Langacker, “The Physics of Heavy Z’ Gauge Bosons,” arXiv:0801.1345 [hep-ph].
25. S. Y. Choi, H. E. Haber, J. Kalinowski and P. M. Zerwas, Nucl. Phys. B **778**, 85 (2007) [arXiv:hep-ph/0612218].