Prepared for submission

# Constraining CP-phases in SUSY: an interplay of muon/electron $g-2$ and electron EDM

**Song Li,**[a,b] **Yang Xiao,**[a,b] **Jin Min Yang**[a,b]

[a] *CAS Key Laboratory of Theoretical Physics, Institute of Theoretical Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China*

[b] *School of Physics Sciences, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, China*

*E-mail:* lisong@itp.ac.cn, xiaoyang@itp.ac.cn, jmyang@itp.ac.cn

Abstract: The minimal supersymmetric standard model (MSSM) with complex parameters can contribute sizably to muon/electron anomalous magnetic dipole momemnt $(g-2)$ and electric dipole moment (EDM). The electron $g-2$ interplays with electron EDM; the muon $g-2$ can also interplay with electron EDM assuming the universality between smuon and selectron masses, either of which can constrain the relevant CP-phases in the MSSM. In this work, we first use such an interplay to derive an approximate analytical upper limit on the relevant CP-phase. Then we extensively scan the parameter space to obtain more accurate upper limits. We obtain the following observations: (i) The muon $g-2$ in the $2\sigma$ range combined with the electron EDM upper limit (assuming the universality between smuon and selectron masses) typically constrains the relevant CP-phase under $1.9\times10^{-5}$(rad); (ii) The electron $g-2$ in the $2\sigma$ range (Berkeley) interplays with the electron EDM upper limit (without assuming the universality between smuon and selectron masses) constrains the relevant CP-phase under $3.9\times10^{-6}$(rad) (also requiring muon $g-2$ in the allowed $2\sigma$ range). We also find some special cancellations in the parameter space which can relax the constraints by a couple of orders. Such stringent limits on CP-phases may pose a challenge for model building of SUSY, i.e., how to naturally suppress these phases.

arXiv:2108.00359v2 [hep-ph] 2 Dec 2021

## Contents


**1 Introduction** **1**

**2 Muon/electron $g-2$ and EDM in the MSSM** **3**
- 2.1 Muon/electron $g-2$ in the MSSM 3
- 2.2 Electron EDM in the MSSM 4

**3 Upper limits on CP-phases in the MSSM** **5**
- 3.1 CP-phase upper limits with flavor universality 5
- 3.2 CP-phase upper limits without flavor universality 7

**4 Conclusions** **9**

**Acknowledgments** **10**

**References** **10**


## 1 Introduction

The latest measurement of muon $g-2$ from Fermilab [1] gave a value that exceeds the Standard Model (SM) prediction (see [2] and refs therein) by $4.2\sigma$ after combining with the BNL result [3]:

$$\Delta a_\mu^{\text{Exp}-\text{SM}} = a_\mu^{\text{Exp}} - a_\mu^{\text{SM}} = (2.51 \pm 0.59) \times 10^{-9}. \tag{1.1}$$

For electron $g-2$, if we deduce it from the fine structure constant $\alpha_{\text{em}}$ measured by Berkeley using $^{133}$Cs atoms [4], we will find that the experimental value [5] is $2.4\sigma$ below the SM prediction [6]:

$$\Delta a_e^{\text{Exp}-\text{SM}} = a_e^{\text{Exp}} - a_e^{\text{SM}}(\text{Cs}) = (-8.8 \pm 3.6) \times 10^{-13}. \tag{1.2}$$

However, the $\alpha_{\text{em}}$ measurement by Laboratoire Kastler Brossel (LKB) [7, 8] using $^{87}$Rb leads to a prediction value of electron $g-2$ that agrees well with the experimental value. So far the reason that caused the deviation between the two experiments is unkown.

In the minimal supersymmetric standard model (MSSM), a simultaneous explanation of the muon $g-2$ and the LKB electron $g-2$ is not hard (since no SUSY effects are needed for the LKB electron $g-2$), while a simultaneous explanation of the muon $g-2$ and the Berkeley electron $g-2$ is rather challenging within the MSSM since this requires a positive contribution to the muon $g-2$ and a negative contribution to the electron $g-2$ [9–13] (in this work we restrain ourselves in the minimal framework of supersymmetry (SUSY), whereas in some extensions of the MSSM like the B-L SSM and an extended next-to-MSSM, or in some falvor models or 2HDM+S, a joint explanation is not so hard [14–17]).

The current upper limit of the electron EDM is [18]

$$|d_e| < 1.1 \times 10^{-29} \text{e cm (90\% C.L.)}. \tag{1.3}$$

This experimental upper limit strictly constrains the CP-phases of the new physics. In the MSSM, the CP-phases should be present since they are not forbidden by any fundamental symmetry, just as the CP-phases in the SM. Although such CP-phases cannot explain the baryon asymmetry of the universe through the electroweak baryogenesis mechanism, phenomenologically we need to know the limits on these CP-phases from current experiments, and these limits may provide us some enlightenment for the UV completion of the MSSM. Note that in the MSSM the $g-2$ and EDM receive contributions from the same loops. Therefore, the muon/electron $g-2$ and the electron EDM limit can be jointly used to constrain the CP-phasese in the MSSM. In [19], assumming the universality for the first and second generation sleptons, the muon $g-2$ and the electron EDM limit are found to set an upper bound of $\sim 10^{-5}$ on the relevant CP-phasese in the MSSM. In this work, we will perform a more comprehensive research, considering the following two situations within the MSSM:

1. Adopting the electron $g-2$ result of LKB, we will take the popular assumption that SUSY is universal for the first and second generation sleptons. In this case, the muon $g-2$ can be easily explained in the MSSM [20], which, combined with the electron electric dipole moment (EDM) limits, can set constraints on the CP-phases of the relevant parameters. This scenario was considered in [19]. But we will perform an intensice scan and our results typically agree with [19] (i.e. obtain an upper bound of $\sim 10^{-5}$ on the relevant CP-phasese in the MSSM) except that we find in some special cancellation cases the upper bound can be weakened by a couple of orders;

2. Adopting the electron $g-2$ result of Berkeley, we will assume that SUSY is not universal for the first and second generation sleptons. In this case, the MSSM parameter space for a joint explanation of the muon $g-2$ and the Berkeley electron $g-2$ [11, 12], combined with the electron EDM limits, can set rather strong constraints on the CP-phases of the relevant parameters (the upper bound is found to be typically $\sim 10^{-6}$).

Note that in [21] various SUSY explanations for the tiny electron EDM were listed, e.g., heavy sparticles [22–26], accidental cancellations [27–37], flavour off-diagonal CP-phases [38] and lepton flavour violation [39] (for some more recent attempts, see, e.g., [40–43]). In this work, we do not discuss which explanation is most suitable. Instead, we only study the upper limits on the CP-phases from the phenomenological view using the experimental results of muon/electron $g-2$ and the electron EDM limit. We do not consider the dark matter relic density and the collider constraints since they have little connection with the CP-phases.

This work is organized as follows. In Sec. 2, we describe the MSSM contributions to the muon/electron $g-2$ and electron EDM. In Sec. 3, we investigate the upper limits on the CP-phases in the MSSM. Finally, we conclude in Sec. 4.

## 2 Muon/electron $g-2$ and EDM in the MSSM

### 2.1 Muon/electron $g-2$ in the MSSM

In the MSSM, the contribution of the supersymmetric particles to the lepton $g-2$ consists of two parts [20]:

$$\delta a_\ell^{\chi^0} = \frac{m_\ell}{16\pi^2}\sum_{i,m}\left\{-\frac{m_\ell}{12m^2_{\tilde{\ell}_m}}(|n^L_{im}|^2+|n^R_{im}|^2)F_1^N(x_{im})+\frac{m_{\chi_i^0}}{3m^2_{\tilde{\ell}_m}}\mathrm{Re}[n^L_{im}n^R_{im}]F_2^N(x_{im})\right\}, \tag{2.1}$$

$$\delta a_\ell^{\chi^\pm} = \frac{m_\ell}{16\pi^2}\sum_{k}\left\{\frac{m_\ell}{12m^2_{\tilde{\nu}_\ell}}(|c^L_k|^2+|c^R_k|^2)F_1^C(x_k)+\frac{2m_{\chi_k^\pm}}{3m^2_{\tilde{\nu}_\ell}}\mathrm{Re}[c^L_k c^R_k]F_2^C(x_k)\right\}, \tag{2.2}$$

where $i=1,2,3,4$, $m=1,2$ and $k=1,2$ label respectively the neutralinos, sleptons and charginos in mass eigenstates, and $x_{im}=m^2_{\chi_i^0}/m^2_{\tilde{\ell}_m}$, $x_k=m^2_{\chi_k^\pm}/m^2_{\tilde{\nu}_\ell}$,

$$n^R_{im} = \sqrt{2}g_1N_{i1}X_{m2}+y_\ell N_{i3}X_{m1}, \tag{2.3}$$

$$n^L_{im} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(g_2N_{i2}+g_1N_{i1})X^*_{m1}-y_\ell N_{i3}X^*_{m2}, \tag{2.4}$$

$$c^R_k = y_\ell U_{k2}, \tag{2.5}$$

$$c^L_k = -g_2V_{k1}, \tag{2.6}$$

with $y_\ell = g_2m_\ell/(\sqrt{2}m_W\cos\beta)$ being the lepton Yukawa coupling, $N$ and $(U,V)$ and $X$ being the mixing matrices for the neutralinos, charginos and sleptons, respectively. These matrices satisfy

$$N^*M_{\chi^0}N^\dagger = \mathrm{diag}(m_{\chi_1^0},m_{\chi_2^0},m_{\chi_3^0},m_{\chi_4^0}), \tag{2.7}$$

$$U^*M_{\chi^\pm}V^\dagger = \mathrm{diag}(m_{\chi_1^\pm},m_{\chi_2^\pm}), \tag{2.8}$$

$$XM^2_{\tilde{\ell}}X^\dagger = \mathrm{diag}(m^2_{\tilde{\ell}_1},m^2_{\tilde{\ell}_2}). \tag{2.9}$$

The chargino mass matrix $M_{\chi^\pm}$, the neutralino mass matrix $M_{\chi^0}$, the slepton mass matrix $M^2_{\tilde{\ell}}$, and the definitions of $F_{1,2}^{N,C}$ in Eq. (2.1) and Eq. (2.2) can be found in [20].

Furthermore, we can calculate $\delta a_\ell^{\mathrm{SUSY}}$ with high-loop corrections

$$\delta a_\ell^{\mathrm{SUSY}} = \left(1-\frac{4\alpha}{\pi}\ln\frac{M_{\mathrm{SUSY}}}{m_\ell}\right)\left(\frac{1}{1+\Delta_\ell}\right)\delta a_\ell^{\mathrm{SUSY,\,1L}}. \tag{2.10}$$

The detailed information of these corrections and the definition of $\Delta_l$ can be found in [44–46]. For the calculation of the EDM in the following, we will also consider similar high-loop corrections. On the other hand, the definition of $\Delta_l$ involves a loop function containing false singularities. We use the technique in [12] to avoid these false singularities.

### 2.2 Electron EDM in the MSSM

In the MSSM, the electron EDM comes from the same loops as in $g-2$, which also consists of two parts [47, 48]

$$\frac{d_e^{\chi^0}}{\mathrm{e}} = -\frac{1}{16\pi^2}\sum_{i,m}\frac{m_{\chi_i^0}}{6m_{\tilde{e}_m}^2}\mathrm{Im}[n_{im}^L n_{im}^R]F_2^N(x_{im}), \tag{2.11}$$

$$\frac{d_e^{\chi^\pm}}{\mathrm{e}} = -\frac{1}{16\pi^2}\sum_{k}\frac{m_{\chi_k^\pm}}{3m_{\tilde{\nu}_e}^2}\mathrm{Im}[c_k^L c_k^R]F_2^C(x_k), \tag{2.12}$$

with e being the electric charge of the positron. We need to clarify the CP-phases involved in the electron EDM. The neutralino mass matrix and its Takagi decomposition is

$$M_{\chi^0} = \begin{pmatrix} M_1 & 0 & -m_Z c_\beta s_W & m_Z s_\beta s_W \\ 0 & M_2 & m_Z c_\beta c_W & -m_Z s_\beta c_W \\ -m_Z c_\beta s_W & m_Z c_\beta c_W & 0 & -\mu \\ m_Z s_\beta s_W & -m_Z s_\beta c_W & -\mu & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{2.13}$$

$$N^* M_{\chi^0} N^\dagger = \mathrm{diag}(m_{\chi_1^0}, m_{\chi_2^0}, m_{\chi_3^0}, m_{\chi_4^0}), \tag{2.14}$$

where $c_\beta = \cos\beta$, $s_\beta = \sin\beta$, $c_W = \cos\theta_W$ and $s_W = \sin\theta_W$ with $\theta_W$ being the weak mixing angle. We assume $\mu = |\mu|e^{i\varphi_\mu}$, $D = \mathrm{diag}(e^{-i\varphi_\mu/2}, e^{-i\varphi_\mu/2}, e^{i\varphi_\mu/2}, e^{i\varphi_\mu/2})$, and

$$M'_{\chi^0} = \begin{pmatrix} M_1 e^{i\varphi_\mu} & 0 & -m_Z c_\beta s_W & m_Z s_\beta s_W \\ 0 & M_2 e^{i\varphi_\mu} & m_Z c_\beta c_W & -m_Z s_\beta c_W \\ -m_Z c_\beta s_W & m_Z c_\beta c_W & 0 & -|\mu| \\ m_Z s_\beta s_W & -m_Z s_\beta c_W & -|\mu| & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.15}$$

Hence we have $D M'_{\chi^0} D^{\mathrm{T}} = M_{\chi^0}$. Defining $\tilde{N}^* = N^* D$, we obtain

$$\tilde{N}^* M'_{\chi^0} \tilde{N}^\dagger = \mathrm{diag}(m_{\chi_1^0}, m_{\chi_2^0}, m_{\chi_3^0}, m_{\chi_4^0}). \tag{2.16}$$

$M'_{\chi^0}$ (and thus $\tilde{N}$) only contains two phases, $\mathrm{Arg}(\mu M_1)$ and $\mathrm{Arg}(\mu M_2)$. And we know

$$N = \tilde{N}D = \tilde{N}\begin{pmatrix} e^{-i\varphi_\mu/2} & & & \\ & e^{-i\varphi_\mu/2} & & \\ & & e^{i\varphi_\mu/2} & \\ & & & e^{i\varphi_\mu/2} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.17}$$

Similarly, for the slepton mass matrix, we can obtain the matrix $\tilde{X}$ containing only the phase $\mathrm{Arg}(\mu A_e)$, and

$$X = \tilde{X}\begin{pmatrix} e^{-i\varphi_\mu/2} & \\ & e^{i\varphi_\mu/2} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.18}$$

Now from Eq.(2.3) and Eq.(2.4) we know that the phases which $n_{im}^R$ and $n_{im}^L$ depend on are $\mathrm{Arg}(\mu M_1)$, $\mathrm{Arg}(\mu M_2)$ and $\mathrm{Arg}(\mu A_e)$, hence $d_e^{\chi^0}/\mathrm{e}$ also depends on these three phase combinations [47, 48]. However, the influence of $\mathrm{Arg}(\mu A_e)$ in the electron EDM will be less significant than the other two phase combinations due to the small electron mass. After a similar derivation, we will find that $d_e^{\chi^\pm}/\mathrm{e}$ depends on the phase $\mathrm{Arg}(\mu M_2)$ [47, 48].

## 3 Upper limits on CP-phases in the MSSM

Comparing the formulas of $g-2$ in Eq.(2.1) and Eq.(2.2) and the formulas of the electron EDM in Eq.(2.11) and Eq.(2.12), we can find

$$\frac{\delta a_\ell}{m_\ell} = D_\ell + B_\ell \cos\varphi, \tag{3.1}$$

$$\frac{d_e}{\mathrm{e}} = -\frac{1}{2} B_e \sin\varphi, \tag{3.2}$$

where $D_\ell$ and $B_\ell$ have the same order of magnitude, and $\varphi$ is the dominant CP phase in $d_e/\mathrm{e}$. In this work, we take the CP phase in $(-\pi/2, \pi/2)$. Because of the term $D_\ell$, the value range of $\delta a_\ell$ is not greatly affected by the phase. Especially when the phase is small, $\delta a_\ell/m_\ell \approx D_\ell + B_\ell \approx 2B_\ell$, $d_e/\mathrm{e} \approx -B_e\varphi/2$. Therefore, through $\delta a_\ell$, one can constrain the range of $D_\ell$ and $B_\ell$. One can also get an upper limit on the phase according to the experimental value of $d_e$ if $B_e$ has a proportional relationship with one of $B_\ell (\ell = e, \mu)$. Assuming the lepton flavor universality in the MSSM, we then have [49]

$$\delta a_\ell \propto \left(\frac{m_\ell}{M_{\mathrm{SUSY}}}\right)^2. \tag{3.3}$$

Therefore,

$$\delta a_\ell \sim \left(\frac{m_\ell}{m_e}\right)^2 \delta a_e \sim 2\frac{m_\ell^2}{m_e} B_e, \tag{3.4}$$

$$|d_e| \sim \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{e}|B_e||\varphi| \lesssim d_e^{\mathrm{lim}}, \tag{3.5}$$

where $d_e^{\mathrm{lim}}$ represents the experimental upper limit on the electron EDM. Combining these two formulas, we obtain

$$|\varphi| \lesssim \frac{4m_\ell^2}{m_e|\delta a_\ell|}\frac{d_e^{\mathrm{lim}}}{\mathrm{e}}. \tag{3.6}$$

This result allows us to estimate the upper limits on the CP-phase from the values of $d_e^{\mathrm{lim}}$ and $\delta a_\ell$ $(\ell = e, \mu)$.

### 3.1 CP-phase upper limits with flavor universality

We calculate the phase limits from the interplay of $\delta a_\mu$ and the upper limit of the electron EDM, assuming the lepton flavor universality. In this scenario we take the LKB value for the electron $g-2$ which agrees with the SM prediction [7, 8]. Since no SUSY effects are needed, the electron $g-2$ $2\sigma$-constraint can be trivially satisfied in this scenario. Using Eq.(3.6) to estimate the limit of the corresponding phase, we obtain

$$|\varphi| \lesssim \frac{4m_\mu^2}{m_e\delta a_\mu}\frac{d_e^{\mathrm{lim}}}{\mathrm{e}} \sim 2\times 10^{-5}(\mathrm{rad}), \tag{3.7}$$

where we take the central value in Eq.(1.1) for $\delta a_\mu$ and the upper bound in Eq.(1.3) for $d_e^{\mathrm{lim}}$. From the following results of a parameter scan, we will find that this estimate is quite accurate for the dominant phase.

Now we perform a scan over the parameter space. In order to highlight the dominant phase effects, we need to decouple the unnecessary phases. For the situation where $\mathrm{Arg}(\mu M_2)$ dominates, we choose the following parameter scenario [19]:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&100\ \mathrm{GeV} < (|\mu|, |M_2|, M_{E1} = M_{E2}, M_{L1} = M_{L2}) < 2\ \mathrm{TeV},\\
&|M_1| = 5\ \mathrm{TeV},\\
&2 < \tan\beta < 50,\\
&\mathrm{Arg}(\mu M_1) = \mathrm{Arg}(\mu A_e) = 0,\\
&-\frac{\pi}{2} < \mathrm{Arg}(\mu M_2) < \frac{\pi}{2},\\
&A\ \text{parameters} = 0.
\end{aligned}
$$

Here we set $|M_1| = 5$ TeV to decouple $M_1$ from $\delta a_\mu$ and $d_e$. In this case, the SUSY contributions to the muon $g-2$ and the electron EDM mainly come from the wino-higgsino-slepton loops, and thus the impact of $\mathrm{Arg}(\mu M_1)$ and $\mathrm{Arg}(\mu A_e)$ on electron EDM becomes unimportant. So we set these two phases to 0 and focus on the impact of the dominant phase $\mathrm{Arg}(\mu M_2)$. The tri-linear $A$ parameters for the smuon and selectron are usually assumed to be very small in magnitude, which are set to 0 in our scan. The lower bound 100 GeV in the first line and the lower bound $2 < \tan\beta$ in the third line mainly come from the LEP2 constraints.

For the situation where $\mathrm{Arg}(\mu M_1)$ and $\mathrm{Arg}(\mu A_e)$ dominate, we give $|\mu|$ a relatively large value so that the left-right-slepton-bino loop becomes the main contribution of $\delta a_\mu$ and $d_e$. Again we set the unimportant phase $\mathrm{Arg}(\mu M_2)$ to 0. However, $|A_e|$ can be as small as 0, and thus $\mathrm{Arg}(\mu A_e)$ will be completely unrestricted. In order to highlight the key information about $\mathrm{Arg}(\mu A_e)$, we will consider two cases with $A_e/\exp(i\mathrm{Arg}(A_e)) = \pm 500$ GeV and $A_e/\exp(i\mathrm{Arg}(A_e)) = \pm 1000$ GeV (note that $A_e/\exp(i\mathrm{Arg}(A_e))$ can be negative because we take the CP phase $\mathrm{Arg}(A_e)$ in $(-\pi/2, \pi/2)$). The parameter region is

$$
\begin{aligned}
&100\ \mathrm{GeV} < (|M_1|, |M_2|, M_{E1} = M_{E2}, M_{L1} = M_{L2}) < 2\ \mathrm{TeV},\\
&5\ \mathrm{TeV} < |\mu| < 10\ \mathrm{TeV},\\
&2 < \tan\beta < 50,\\
&\mathrm{Arg}(\mu M_2) = 0,\\
&-\frac{\pi}{2} < \mathrm{Arg}(\mu M_1), \mathrm{Arg}(\mu A_e) < \frac{\pi}{2},\\
&A_e/\exp(i\mathrm{Arg}(A_e)) = \pm 500\ \mathrm{GeV} \quad \text{or} \quad \pm 1000\ \mathrm{GeV}.
\end{aligned}
$$

The scan results are shown in Fig. 1. The phase upper limit curves shown in the figures are obtained by projecting the high-dimensional exclusion surface to two-dimensional planes, which represent the most conservative exclusion limits. In the right panel we considered the $2\sigma$ constraint of $\delta a_\mu$. When $\mathrm{Arg}(\mu M_2)$ dominates, the upper limit of $\mathrm{Arg}(\mu M_2)$ is $1.8 \times 10^{-5}$(rad) for $\delta a_\mu$ within $2\sigma$ range and $1.3 \times 10^{-5}$(rad) for $\delta a_\mu$ within $1\sigma$ range. If $d_e^{\mathrm{lim}}$ is lowered by one order in the future, the upper limit of the corresponding phase is also lowered by an order. From the right panel we see that there exist an accidental





**Figure 1**. The exclusion curves obtained from the interplay of the electron EDM limit and the muon $g-2$, assuming the lepton flavor universality. In the left panel the region below each curve is the allowed region, while in the right panel the region surrounded by the two branches of each curve is the allowed region. The curves labelled by $d_e$(EXP limit) are obtained by using the current electron EDM experimental limit in Eq.(1.3). The $2\sigma$ constraint on $\delta a_\mu$ is considered in the right panel.

cancellation for the CP-phase effects. When this accidental cancellation occurs, even if the phases are rather large, they can still provide a sufficiently small EDM for the electron. Of course, such an accidental cancellation needs a fine-tuning of the relevant parameters, which may indicate some unknown symmetry. Without accidental cancellations, the upper limit of $\mathrm{Arg}(\mu M_1)$ is $1.9\times10^{-5}$ while the upper limit of $\mathrm{Arg}(\mu A_e)$ is $1.1\times10^{-2}$ for $A_e/\exp(i\mathrm{Arg}(A_e)) = \pm500$ GeV and $5.0\times10^{-3}$ for $A_e/\exp(i\mathrm{Arg}(A_e)) = \pm1000$ GeV. We see that limit on $\mathrm{Arg}(\mu A_e)$ is two to three orders weaker than $\mathrm{Arg}(\mu M_1)$.

### 3.2 CP-phase upper limits without flavor universality

Now we turn to the case of lepton flavor non-universality and calculate the phase limits from the electron $g-2$ result in Eq.(1.2) (obtained from the Berkeley measurement of $\alpha_{\mathrm{em}}$) and the electron EDM limit. We use Eq.(3.6) again to estimate the limit on the dominated phase

$$|\varphi| \lesssim \frac{4m_e}{|\delta a_e|}\frac{d_e^{\mathrm{lim}}}{\mathrm{e}} \sim 1\times10^{-6}(\mathrm{rad}), \tag{3.8}$$

where we take the central value in Eq.(1.2) for $\delta a_e$ and the upper bound in Eq.(1.3) for $d_e^{\mathrm{lim}}$.

In this case, the parameter space in the MSSM that can explain both electron $g-2$ and muon $g-2$ is proved to be very narrow [11, 12]. Based on the results in [11, 12], we only have two parameter scenarios to consider (we set the unimportant phases to 0). The

first scenario is [11]

$$
\begin{aligned}
&100\ \text{GeV} < (|M_2|, M_{L1}, M_{E1}, M_{L2}) < 500\ \text{GeV},\\
&-300\ \text{GeV} < M_1/\exp(i\text{Arg}(M_1)) < -80\ \text{GeV},\\
&500\ \text{GeV} < |\mu| < 5\ \text{TeV},\\
&1\ \text{TeV} < M_{E2} < 5\ \text{TeV}, \quad 2 < \tan\beta < 50,\\
&\text{Arg}(\mu M_2) = 0,\\
&-\frac{\pi}{2} < \text{Arg}(\mu M_1), \text{Arg}(\mu A_e) < \frac{\pi}{2},\\
&A_e/\exp(i\text{Arg}(A_e)) = \pm 100\ \text{GeV} \quad \text{or} \quad \pm 500\ \text{GeV},
\end{aligned}
$$

In this scenario the electron EDM mainly depends on $\text{Arg}(\mu M_1)$ and $\text{Arg}(\mu A_e)$. The second scenario is [12]

$$
\begin{aligned}
&100\ \text{GeV} < (|\mu|, M_{L1}, M_{E2}) < 500\ \text{GeV},\\
&-200\ \text{GeV} < M_1/\exp(i\text{Arg}(M_1)) < -80\ \text{GeV},\\
&-2\ \text{TeV} < M_2/\exp(i\text{Arg}(M_2)) < -100\ \text{GeV},\\
&M_{E1} = M_{L2} = 5\ \text{TeV}, \quad 2 < \tan\beta < 50,\\
&-\frac{\pi}{2} < \text{Arg}(\mu M_1), \text{Arg}(\mu M_2) < \frac{\pi}{2},\\
&A\ \text{parameters} = 0,
\end{aligned}
$$

In this scenario the electron EDM mainly depends on $\text{Arg}(\mu M_1)$ and $\text{Arg}(\mu M_2)$.





**Figure 2**. The exclusion curves obtained from the electron EDM limit combined with $\delta a_\mu$ and $\delta a_e$ (Berkeley). The region surrounded by the two branches of each curve is the corresponding allowed region. The curves labelled by $d_e$(EXP limit) is obtained by using the current electron EDM experimental limit in Eq.(1.3).

The results of the parameter scan are shown in Fig. 2, where the $2\sigma$ constraints of $\delta a_e$ (Berkeley) and $\delta a_\mu$ combined with the electron EDM limit are considered. The accidental cancellation occurs in both cases. Without such accidental cancellation, in the first scenario $\mathrm{Arg}(\mu M_1)$ is restricted to be smaller than $2.4 \times 10^{-6}$(rad) regardless of the value of $|A_e|$, while the upper limit of $\mathrm{Arg}(\mu A_e)$ is $4.1 \times 10^{-3}$(rad) for $A_e/\exp(i\mathrm{Arg}(A_e)) = \pm 100$GeV and $1.0 \times 10^{-3}$(rad) for $A_e/\exp(i\mathrm{Arg}(A_e)) = \pm 500$GeV; in the second scenario, the upper limit of $\mathrm{Arg}(\mu M_2)$ is $3.9 \times 10^{-6}$(rad) and the upper limit of $\mathrm{Arg}(\mu M_1)$ is $1.3 \times 10^{-4}$(rad). In the second scenario, $\delta a_e$ mainly comes from the wino-higgsino-sneutrino loops. Thus $\mathrm{Arg}(\mu M_2)$ dominates $d_e$, and its upper limit is close to the estimated value in Eq.(3.8).

Finally, we make some comments. As mentioned in the introduction, we concentrated on the CP-phase effects in the MSSM. We did not study the dark matter issue. In the allowed parameter space displayed in our results, if the dark matter is assumed to be the lightest neutralino, then the dark matter relic density and the direct detection limits may not be easily satisfied. However, the dark matter problem can be avoided if we assume a superWIMP to be the dark matter candidate, which is produced from the late decay of the thermal freeze-out of the lightest neutralino [50]. Since the superWIMP can be much lighter than the lightest neutralino, the relic density upper bound can be readily satisfied. Of course, the superWIMP interacts with nucleon superweakly and thus the direct detection limits can be easily satisfied. Such a superWIMP can be predicted in the framework of SUSY, e.g., a pseudo-goldstino in multi-sector SUSY breaking scenario [51, 52] with some peculiar phenomenology at the LHC [53, 54]. Note that these CP-phases in the MSSM, already stringently constrained to be very small in magnitude, may not have sizable effects at the colliders like the LHC. However, as shown in this study and in the literature [11, 12, 55–57], the interpretation of $(g-2)_\mu$ or both $(g-2)_e$ and $(g-2)_\mu$ in the MSSM can severely restrain the parameter space, which requires relatively light electroweakinos and sleptons. Such a restrained parameter space is found to be accessible at the LHC [11, 12, 55–57], which satisfies the current LHC constraints and can be further explored at the HL-LHC [56] or a 100 TeV hadron collider [58]. In addition, the required light electroweakinos may alter the Higgs couplings by a couple of percent which may be tested at a Higgs factory [56]. For similar studies in other non-SUSY models or extensions of the MSSM, see, e.g., [59–61]. Another point we want to stress is that we worked in the phenomenological MSSM and did not discuss the fancy GUT-constrained SUSY models like mSUGRA which are usually hard to explain the muon $g-2$ anomaly and some extensions are needed [62–67].

## 4 Conclusions

In this work, we studied the upper limits of the CP-phases from the constraints of muon $g-2$ and electron $g-2$ combined with the electron EDM experimental limit in the MSSM. We considered two cases: one is that assuming lepton flavor universality, we used the muon $g-2$ combined with the electron EDM experimental limit to set constraints on the CP-phases; the other is without assuming lepton flavor universality, we used the electron $g-2$ (Berkeley) and the muon $g-2$ combined with the electron EDM experimental limit to

set constraints on the CP-phases. We first derived an approximate analytical expression for the CP-phase upper limits. Then we performed a scan over the parameter space to obtain more accurate upper limits. We found that with the universality of lepton flavor the muon $g-2$ (FNAL+BNL $2\sigma$) combined with the electron EDM experimental limit can typically constrain the CP-phases under $1.9 \times 10^{-5}$(rad), while without the lepton flavor universality the electron $g-2$ (Berkeley $2\sigma$) and the muon $g-2$ (FNAL+BNL $2\sigma$) combined with the electron EDM experimental limit can typically constrain the CP-phases under $3.9 \times 10^{-6}$(rad), except that some accidental cancellation may relax the limits by a couple of orders. Such strong limits on the CP-phases in the MSSM may have some indications for the model building of SUSY.

## Acknowledgments

We thank Chengcheng Han and Peiwen Wu for helpful discussions. This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (NNSFC) under grant Nos. 11821505 and 12075300, by Peng-Huan-Wu Theoretical Physics Innovation Center (12047503), by the CAS Center for Excellence in Particle Physics (CCEPP), by the CAS Key Research Program of Frontier Sciences, and by a Key R&D Program of Ministry of Science and Technology of China under number 2017YFA0402204, and by the Key Research Program of the Chinese Academy of Sciences, grant No. XDPB15.

## References

[1] Muon $g-2$ Collaboration collaboration, B. Abi, T. Albahri, S. Al-Kilani, D. Allspach, L. P. Alonzi, A. Anastasi et al., *Measurement of the positive muon anomalous magnetic moment to 0.46 ppm*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **126** (Apr, 2021) 141801.

[2] T. Aoyama et al., *The anomalous magnetic moment of the muon in the Standard Model*, *Phys. Rept.* **887** (2020) 1–166, [2006.04822].

[3] Muon g-2 collaboration, G. W. Bennett et al., *Final Report of the Muon E821 Anomalous Magnetic Moment Measurement at BNL*, *Phys. Rev. D* **73** (2006) 072003, [hep-ex/0602035].

[4] R. H. Parker, C. Yu, W. Zhong, B. Estey and H. Müller, *Measurement of the fine-structure constant as a test of the Standard Model*, *Science* **360** (2018) 191, [1812.04130].

[5] D. Hanneke, S. Fogwell and G. Gabrielse, *New Measurement of the Electron Magnetic Moment and the Fine Structure Constant*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100** (2008) 120801, [0801.1134].

[6] T. Aoyama, T. Kinoshita and M. Nio, *Theory of the Anomalous Magnetic Moment of the Electron*, *Atoms* **7** (2019) 28.

[7] L. Morel, Z. Yao, P. Cladé and S. Guellati-Khélifa, *Determination of the fine-structure constant with an accuracy of 81 parts per trillion*, *Nature* **588** (2020) 61–65.

[8] T. Aoyama, M. Hayakawa, T. Kinoshita and M. Nio, *Tenth-Order QED Contribution to the Electron g-2 and an Improved Value of the Fine Structure Constant*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109** (2012) 111807, [1205.5368].

[9] M. Endo and W. Yin, *Explaining electron and muon $g-2$ anomaly in SUSY without lepton-flavor mixings*, *JHEP* **08** (2019) 122, [1906.08768].

[10] B. Dutta and Y. Mimura, *Electron $g-2$ with flavor violation in MSSM*, *Phys. Lett. B* **790** (2019) 563–567, [1811.10209].

[11] M. Badziak and K. Sakurai, *Explanation of electron and muon $g-2$ anomalies in the MSSM*, *JHEP* **10** (2019) 024, [1908.03607].

[12] S. Li, Y. Xiao and J. M. Yang, *Can electron and muon $g-2$ anomalies be jointly explained in SUSY?*, 2107.04962.

[13] A. Crivellin, M. Hoferichter and P. Schmidt-Wellenburg, *Combined explanations of $(g-2)_{\mu,e}$ and implications for a large muon EDM*, *Phys. Rev. D* **98** (2018) 113002, [1807.11484].

[14] J.-L. Yang, T.-F. Feng and H.-B. Zhang, *Electron and muon $(g-2)$ in the B-LSSM*, *J. Phys. G* **47** (2020) 055004, [2003.09781].

[15] J. Cao, Y. He, J. Lian, D. Zhang and P. Zhu, *Electron and Muon Anomalous Magnetic Moments in the Inverse Seesaw Extended NMSSM*, 2102.11355.

[16] L. Calibbi, M. L. López-Ibáñez, A. Melis and O. Vives, *Muon and electron $g-2$ and lepton masses in flavor models*, *JHEP* **06** (2020) 087, [2003.06633].

[17] V. Keus, N. Koivunen and K. Tuominen, *Singlet scalar and 2HDM extensions of the Standard Model: CP-violation and constraints from $(g-2)_\mu$ and eEDM*, *JHEP* **09** (2018) 059, [1712.09613].

[18] ACME collaboration, V. Andreev et al., *Improved limit on the electric dipole moment of the electron*, *Nature* **562** (2018) 355–360.

[19] C. Han, *Muon g-2 and CP violation in MSSM*, 2104.03292.

[20] S. P. Martin and J. D. Wells, *Muon Anomalous Magnetic Dipole Moment in Supersymmetric Theories*, *Phys. Rev. D* **64** (2001) 035003, [hep-ph/0103067].

[21] S. Kraml, *CP violation in SUSY*, in *15th International Conference on Supersymmetry and the Unification of Fundamental Interactions (SUSY07)*, 10, 2007, 0710.5117.

[22] P. Nath, *CP Violation via electroweak gauginos and the electric dipole moment of the electron*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **66** (1991) 2565–2568.

[23] Y. Kizukuri and N. Oshimo, *Implications of the neutron electric dipole moment for supersymmetric models*, *Phys. Rev. D* **45** (1992) 1806–1809.

[24] Y. Kizukuri and N. Oshimo, *The Neutron and electron electric dipole moments in supersymmetric theories*, *Phys. Rev. D* **46** (1992) 3025–3033.

[25] A. G. Cohen, D. B. Kaplan and A. E. Nelson, *The More minimal supersymmetric standard model*, *Phys. Lett. B* **388** (1996) 588–598, [hep-ph/9607394].

[26] T. Falk, K. A. Olive and M. Srednicki, *Phases in the MSSM, electric dipole moments and cosmological dark matter*, *Phys. Lett. B* **354** (1995) 99–106, [hep-ph/9502401].

[27] T. Falk and K. A. Olive, *Electric dipole moment constraints on phases in the constrained MSSM*, *Phys. Lett. B* **375** (1996) 196–202, [hep-ph/9602299].

[28] T. Falk and K. A. Olive, *More on electric dipole moment constraints on phases in the constrained MSSM*, *Phys. Lett. B* **439** (1998) 71–80, [hep-ph/9806236].

[29] T. Ibrahim and P. Nath, *The Neutron and the electron electric dipole moment in N=1 supergravity unification*, *Phys. Rev. D* **57** (1998) 478–488, [hep-ph/9708456].

[30] T. Ibrahim and P. Nath, *The Chromoelectric and purely gluonic operator contributions to the neutron electric dipole moment in N=1 supergravity*, *Phys. Lett. B* **418** (1998) 98–106, [hep-ph/9707409].

[31] T. Ibrahim and P. Nath, *The Neutron and the lepton EDMs in MSSM, large CP violating phases, and the cancellation mechanism*, *Phys. Rev. D* **58** (1998) 111301, [hep-ph/9807501].

[32] M. Brhlik, G. J. Good and G. L. Kane, *Electric dipole moments do not require the CP violating phases of supersymmetry to be small*, *Phys. Rev. D* **59** (1999) 115004, [hep-ph/9810457].

[33] M. Brhlik, L. L. Everett, G. L. Kane and J. D. Lykken, *A Resolution to the supersymmetric CP problem with large soft phases via D-branes*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83** (1999) 2124–2127, [hep-ph/9905215].

[34] A. Bartl, T. Gajdosik, W. Porod, P. Stockinger and H. Stremnitzer, *Electron and neutron electric dipole moments in the constrained MSSM*, *Phys. Rev. D* **60** (1999) 073003, [hep-ph/9903402].

[35] S. Pokorski, J. Rosiek and C. A. Savoy, *Constraints on phases of supersymmetric flavor conserving couplings*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **570** (2000) 81–116, [hep-ph/9906206].

[36] R. L. Arnowitt, B. Dutta and Y. Santoso, *SUSY phases, the electron electric dipole moment and the muon magnetic moment*, *Phys. Rev. D* **64** (2001) 113010, [hep-ph/0106089].

[37] M. Dhuria and A. Misra, *Sizable electron/neutron electric dipole moment in $D3/D7\mu$-split supersymmetry*, *Phys. Rev. D* **90** (2014) 085023, [1308.3233].

[38] S. Abel, S. Khalil and O. Lebedev, *EDM constraints in supersymmetric theories*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **606** (2001) 151–182, [hep-ph/0103320].

[39] A. Bartl, W. Majerotto, W. Porod and D. Wyler, *Effect of supersymmetric phases on lepton dipole moments and rare lepton decays*, *Phys. Rev. D* **68** (2003) 053005, [hep-ph/0306050].

[40] J. L. Diaz-Cruz and J. Ferrandis, *Solving the SUSY CP problem with flavor breaking F-terms*, *Phys. Rev. D* **72** (2005) 035003, [hep-ph/0504094].

[41] P. Paradisi and D. M. Straub, *The SUSY CP Problem and the MFV Principle*, *Phys. Lett. B* **684** (2010) 147–153, [0906.4551].

[42] T. Moroi and N. Yokozaki, *SUSY CP Problem in Gauge Mediation Model*, *Phys. Lett. B* **701** (2011) 568–575, [1105.3294].

[43] M. Ibe, S. Kobayashi, Y. Nakayama and S. Shirai, *Muon $g-2$ in Gauge Mediation without SUSY CP Problem*, 2104.03289.

[44] G. Degrassi and G. F. Giudice, *QED logarithms in the electroweak corrections to the muon anomalous magnetic moment*, *Phys. Rev. D* **58** (1998) 053007, [hep-ph/9803384].

[45] S. Marchetti, S. Mertens, U. Nierste and D. Stockinger, *Tan(beta)-enhanced supersymmetric corrections to the anomalous magnetic moment of the muon*, *Phys. Rev. D* **79** (2009) 013010, [0808.1530].

[46] M. Carena, D. Garcia, U. Nierste and C. E. M. Wagner, *Effective Lagrangian for the $\bar{t}bH^+$ interaction in the MSSM and charged Higgs phenomenology*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **577** (2000) 88–120, [hep-ph/9912516].

[47] T. Ibrahim and P. Nath, *CP Violation From Standard Model to Strings*, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **80** (2008) 577–631, [0705.2008].

[48] K. Cheung, O. C. W. Kong and J. S. Lee, *Electric and anomalous magnetic dipole moments of the muon in the MSSM*, *JHEP* **06** (2009) 020, [0904.4352].

[49] F. Jegerlehner, *The Anomalous Magnetic Moment of the Muon*. Springer Tracts in Modern Physics volume 274. Springer, second edition ed., 2017, 10.1007/978-3-319-63577-4.

[50] J. L. Feng, A. Rajaraman and F. Takayama, *Superweakly interacting massive particles*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91** (2003) 011302, [hep-ph/0302215].

[51] R. Argurio, Z. Komargodski and A. Mariotti, *Pseudo-Goldstini in Field Theory*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107** (2011) 061601, [1102.2386].

[52] J. Dai, T. Liu and J. M. Yang, *An explicit calculation of pseudo-goldstino mass at the leading three-loop level*, *JHEP* **06** (2021) 175, [2104.12656].

[53] T. Liu, L. Wang and J. M. Yang, *Pseudo-goldstino and electroweakinos via VBF processes at LHC*, *JHEP* **02** (2015) 177, [1411.6105].

[54] K.-i. Hikasa, T. Liu, L. Wang and J. M. Yang, *Pseudo-goldstino and electroweak gauginos at the LHC*, *JHEP* **07** (2014) 065, [1403.5731].

[55] P. Athron, C. Balázs, D. H. Jacob, W. Kotlarski, D. Stöckinger and H. Stöckinger-Kim, *New physics explanations of $a_\mu$ in light of the FNAL muon $g-2$ measurement*, 2104.03691.

[56] M. Abdughani, K.-I. Hikasa, L. Wu, J. M. Yang and J. Zhao, *Testing electroweak SUSY for muon $g-2$ and dark matter at the LHC and beyond*, *JHEP* **11** (2019) 095, [1909.07792].

[57] P. Cox, C. Han and T. T. Yanagida, *Muon $g-2$ and dark matter in the minimal supersymmetric standard model*, *Phys. Rev. D* **98** (2018) 055015, [1805.02802].

[58] A. Kobakhidze, M. Talia and L. Wu, *Probing the MSSM explanation of the muon g-2 anomaly in dark matter experiments and at a 100 TeV pp collider*, *Phys. Rev. D* **95** (2017) 055023, [1608.03641].

[59] D. Sabatta, A. S. Cornell, A. Goyal, M. Kumar, B. Mellado and X. Ruan, *Connecting muon anomalous magnetic moment and multi-lepton anomalies at LHC*, *Chin. Phys. C* **44** (2020) 063103, [1909.03969].

[60] B. Zhu and X. Liu, *Probing the flavor-specific scalar mediator for the muon $(g-2)$ deviation, the proton radius puzzle and the light dark matter production*, 2104.03238.

[61] M. Abdughani, Y.-Z. Fan, L. Feng, Y.-L. Sming Tsai, L. Wu and Q. Yuan, *A common origin of muon g-2 anomaly, Galaxy Center GeV excess and AMS-02 anti-proton excess in the NMSSM*, 2104.03274.

[62] F. Wang, L. Wu, Y. Xiao, J. M. Yang and Y. Zhang, *GUT-scale constrained SUSY in light of E989 muon g-2 measurement*, 2104.03262.

[63] Z. Li, G.-L. Liu, F. Wang, J. M. Yang and Y. Zhang, *Gluino-SUGRA scenarios in light of FNAL muon g-2 anomaly*, 2106.04466.

[64] S. Akula and P. Nath, *Gluino-driven radiative breaking, Higgs boson mass, muon g-2, and the Higgs diphoton decay in supergravity unification*, *Phys. Rev. D* **87** (2013) 115022, [1304.5526].

[65] F. Wang, W. Wang and J. M. Yang, *Reconcile muon g-2 anomaly with LHC data in SUGRA with generalized gravity mediation*, *JHEP* **06** (2015) 079, [1504.00505].

[66] F. Wang, K. Wang, J. M. Yang and J. Zhu, *Solving the muon g-2 anomaly in CMSSM extension with non-universal gaugino masses*, *JHEP* **12** (2018) 041, [1808.10851].

[67] C. Han, M. L. López-Ibáñez, A. Melis, O. Vives, L. Wu and J. M. Yang, *LFV and (g-2) in non-universal SUSY models with light higgsinos*, *JHEP* **05** (2020) 102, [2003.06187].