

Can the Higgs Still Account for the $g - 2$ Anomaly?

Fayez Abu-Ajamieh^{1,*} and Sudhir K. Vempati^{1,†}

¹*Centre for High Energy Physics, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore 560012, India*

(Dated: September 23, 2022)

We use an Effective Field Theory (EFT) approach to evaluate the viability of the Higgs to account for the $g - 2$ anomaly. Although the SM contribution of the Higgs to the muon's magnetic dipole moment is negligible, using a *bottom-up* EFT, we show that given the current level of experimental limits on the Higgs sector, the Higgs can still yield a viable solution to the $g - 2$ anomaly if its couplings to the rest of the SM particles are allowed to deviate from their SM predictions. Further, applying unitarity arguments, we show that such a solution would indicate a scale of New Physics (NP) of $\sim 10 - 18$ TeV, which could be lowered to ~ 5 TeV if the Higgs couplings to the W and Z are assumed to conform to their SM predictions. We show that such a scenario could yield significant enhancement to the di-Higgs production in muon colliders, thus providing further motivation for its consideration. A key takeaway of this study is to highlight the importance of measuring the $\bar{\mu}\mu hh$ coupling in current and future experiments.

arXiv:2209.10898v1 [hep-ph] 22 Sep 2022

* fayezaajamieh@iisc.ac.in

† vempati@iisc.ac.in

I. INTRODUCTION

The anomalous magnetic dipole moment of the muon, commonly known as the $g - 2$ anomaly, remains one of the best hints for physics Beyond the Standard Model (BSM). The E821 experiment at BNL [1] first showed a discrepancy compared with the theoretical predictions, at a significance of $\sim 3.7\sigma$. This was confirmed in 2021 by the E989 experiment at Fermilab [2–4], which yielded a measurement of $a_\mu^{\text{EXP}} = 116592061(41) \times 10^{-11}$. The Fermilab measurement, in comparison with the latest theoretical SM prediction of $a_\mu^{\text{SM}} = 116591810(43) \times 10^{-11}$ [5], further increases the discrepancy to 4.2σ

$$\Delta a_\mu = a_\mu^{\text{EXP}} - a_\mu^{\text{SM}} = 251(59) \times 10^{-11}. \quad (1)$$

On the other hand, some of the latest high-precision QCD lattice simulations [6, 7] appear to agree with the experimental measurements, thus eliminating the anomaly. Therefore, it seems that further confirmation is needed. The upcoming runs of the E989 experiment are expected to lower the experimental uncertainty by a factor of 4, whereas the E34 collaboration at J-PARC [8–10] is planning on measuring a_μ using a completely different method. As for the SM predictions, various theory and lattice groups are expected to present updated results from those in [6, 7]. For the purposes of this study, we will assume that the anomaly exists and is given by eq. (1).

We should also point out that another discrepancy between the predicted and measured magnetic dipole moments of the electron was reported, however, there is disagreement between the two experiments that reported the discrepancy on the sign and significance of the electron $g - 2$ anomaly. The first group [11] reported an electron anomaly $\Delta a_e = -88(36) \times 10^{-14}$ corresponding to a significance of 2.4σ , whereas the second group [12] reported $\Delta a_e = 48(30) \times 10^{-14}$, corresponding to a significance of only 1.6σ . Given this disagreement, it is not clear whether the electron anomaly indeed exists or not, and if it does which sign it has. As the sign of the discrepancy is crucial in determining the nature of the physics behind the anomaly, we will ignore the electron anomaly in this work, waiting for more accurate measurements to be made, and for an agreement to be reached.

In this paper, we seek to investigate whether or not the Higgs boson can still accommodate a solution to the $g - 2$ anomaly for the muon. In the SM, the contribution of the Higgs to the a_μ at one loop is $O(10^{-14})$ and is thus negligible, however, the current level of experimental bounds on the Higgs couplings to the rest of the SM particles still leaves ample room for significant deviation from the SM predictions. For instance, the coupling of the Higgs to $\bar{\mu}\mu$ is only constrained at $O(1)$, whereas higher-

dimensional Higgs operators remain essentially unconstrained. This suggests using an EFT approach in the Higgs interaction with the muon, in order to determine whether or not the muon anomaly can still be solved by the Higgs boson within the experimental constraints. The strategy is simple: We write down the most general Higgs interaction with the muon, and then calculate its contribution to a_μ given the experimental constraints, then determine whether this contribution can account for the measured discrepancy in eq. (1). Similar work using the Standard Model EFT (SMEFT) already exists in the literature [13–17], however, here we utilize a more phenomenologically-transparent, completely *model-independent* approach [18–22] in order to calculate the Higgs BSM contributions to the anomaly. We find that given the current level of experimental constraints, the Higgs sector can still provide a solution to the muon $g - 2$ anomaly. We show that the viable part of the parameter space can be significantly probed by future experiments, especially the proposed 10-TeV muon collider [23].

This paper is organized as follows: In Sec. II, we present a review of the model-independent EFT used in [18–22]. In Sec. III, we present the contributions to Δa_μ in this framework at one and two loops, and we present the current experimental bounds and future projections on the parameter space. In Sec. IV we discuss the phenomenology of the model, including unitarity violation and the scale of NP corresponding to the parameter space, and we discuss the experimental signatures in the LHC and proposed muon collider, then we conclude in Sec. V.

II. OVERVIEW OF THE MODEL-INDEPENDENT EFT

In this paper, we adopt the EFT framework employed in [18–22]. In this framework, we avoid any power expansion in writing down higher-dimensional operators, as is the case in the SMEFT. Instead, we parameterize NP as deviations from the SM predictions. Therefore, we write the effective Lagrangian of the Yukawa interaction of the Lepton sector as follows¹

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{SM}} - \frac{Y_l v}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\bar{L}_l \tilde{H} l_R + h.c. \right) \left[\delta_{l1} \frac{X}{v} + C_{l2} \frac{X^2}{2!v^2} + \dots \right] + \dots, \quad (2)$$

where δ_{l1} parameterizes the deviation of the lepton's Yukawa coupling compared to the SM predictions

$$\delta_{l1} = \frac{Y_l - Y_l^{\text{SM}}}{Y_l^{\text{SM}}}, \quad (3)$$

¹ This methodology of expanding the Higgs couplings is reminiscent of the chiral expansion of the Higgs Lagrangian (see for example, [24] and the references therein).

² Notice that in the κ framework, $\delta_x = \kappa_x - 1$.

whereas C_{ln} are Wilson coefficients that do not have SM counterparts. The field X is defined in terms of the Higgs doublet H as

$$X = \sqrt{2H^\dagger H} - v, \quad (4)$$

whereas we define the projector $\tilde{H} = \epsilon \hat{H}^*$, with

$$\epsilon = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \hat{H} = \frac{H}{\sqrt{H^\dagger H}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} + O(\vec{G}), \quad (5)$$

where \vec{G} are the Goldstone bosons. Notice that we are dividing X by the appropriate powers of v only to keep the Wilson coefficients dimensionless, i.e., v is NOT an expansion parameter. Notice that in the unitary gauge, $X \rightarrow h$. Therefore, expressing the Lagrangian in the unitary gauge and in terms of the physical masses $m_l = \frac{Y_l v}{\sqrt{2}}$, we have

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}} = -m_l \bar{l} l \left[(1 + \delta_{l1}) \frac{h}{v} + C_{l2} \frac{h^2}{2v^2} + \dots \right], \quad (6)$$

and for the case of the muon $l = \mu$. Before we proceed, a couple of remarks are in order. First, we are assuming that v is the minimum of the Higgs potential including all higher-order corrections, i.e., $v = 246$ GeV, and second, although eq. (6) appears similar to the Higgs EFT (HEFT) [25], we should keep in mind that secretly we are using the Higgs doublet in our expansion, and one can easily demonstrate that the effective Lagrangian in eqs. (2) and (6) can be mapped to any expansion in either the SMEFT or the HEFT. In other words, the deviations and Wilson coefficients in eqs. (2) and (6) can receive corrections from any number of higher-order operators in either the SMEFT or the HEFT frameworks. The benefit of this construction is twofold. First: there are fewer assumptions in this framework compared to either the SMEFT or the HEFT. Namely, we are only assuming that there are no light degrees of freedom below the energy scale where the EFT breaks down, and that the deviations and Wilson coefficients are compatible with experimental measurements. The second benefit lies in the fact that parameterizing NP this way is more phenomenologically-transparent, as these deviations and Wilson coefficients are what is measured experimentally as opposed to any expansion scale.

III. THE BSM CONTRIBUTIONS TO $(g-2)_\mu$

With eq. (6) in hand, we can readily calculate the BSM contributions to $(g-2)_\mu$ with $l \rightarrow \mu$, treating the effective couplings as contact terms. In our calculation, we limit ourselves to 2 loops. The Feynman diagrams that contribute to the anomaly at one and two loops are shown in Fig. 1.




FIG. 1: The diagrams contributing to the $g - 2$ of the muon at one and two loops.

Diagram I has already been calculated in the SM case [26] (see also [27, 28]). Thus, the BSM contribution can be readily calculated simply by substituting $Y_\mu \rightarrow \delta_{\mu 1} Y_\mu$. Given the latest bounds on $\delta_{\mu 1}$ [29]

$$|\delta_{\mu 1}| < 0.53, \quad @ \text{ 95\% C.L.}, \quad (7)$$

it is easy to show that this contribution is at most $O(10^{-14})$ and thus is negligible. Diagram II is loop-suppressed compared to diagram I and therefore is also negligible. Diagrams III and IV (of the Barr-Zee type) have also been calculated before in the SM [30–34]. Therefore, we can immediately extend the results to the BSM case with the above rescaling

$$\Delta a_\mu^{(\text{III})} = \delta_{\mu 1} \times a_{\mu, W}^{\text{SM}}, \quad (8)$$

$$\Delta a_\mu^{(\text{IV})} = \delta_{\mu 1} \times a_{\mu, f}^{\text{SM}}, \quad (9)$$

where $a_{\mu, W}^{\text{SM}} = (-19.97 \pm 0.03) \times 10^{-11}$ and $a_{\mu, f}^{\text{SM}} = (-1.5 \pm 0.01) \times 10^{-11}$. Notice here that in the fermion loop in diagram IV, only the contributions from $f = \{t, b, c, \tau\}$ are retained. Also notice in the same diagram that the BSM contribution could include the deviations in the Yukawa couplings of the above fermions, namely $\delta_{t1}, \delta_{b1}, \delta_{c1}$ and $\delta_{\tau 1}$, however, given the bounds on these deviations, we checked that their contribution to Δa_μ is insignificant, even if we saturate all experimental bounds and arrange for all the corresponding contributions to conspiratorially add up. Therefore, we set $\delta_{t1}, \delta_{b1}, \delta_{c1}, \delta_{\tau 1} \rightarrow 0$.

Diagram V only depends $\delta_{\mu 1}$, and explicit calculation of its contribution shows that it is $O(10^{-18})$ when the bound in eq. 7 is saturated. On the other hand, the contribution from diagram VI depends




FIG. 2: The parameter space that corresponds to the 2σ solution to $(g-2)_\mu$, together with the LHC constraints (solid red), the HL-LHC projections (dotted red), and the muon collider projections (dotted blue) on $\delta_{\mu 1}$, superimposed. $C_{\mu 2}$ is unconstrained.

on both $\delta_{\mu 1}$ and $C_{\mu 2}$ and therefore could be significant. Nonetheless, we checked that compared to the other diagrams, the contribution is suppressed and does not exceed $O(10^{-13})$ at best, and thus can safely be neglected.

This leaves us with diagrams VII and VIII. Both diagrams are somewhat complicated, however, if we use a UV-cutoff scheme such that $\Lambda \gg M_h$, then one can show that they can be approximated by

$$\Delta a_\mu^{(\text{VII})} \simeq \frac{m_\mu^4}{64\pi^4 v^4} C_{\mu 2}^2 \log^2 \left(\frac{\Lambda^2}{M_h^2} \right), \quad (10)$$

$$\Delta a_\mu^{(\text{VIII})} \simeq -\frac{3m_\mu^4}{32\pi^4 v^4} (1 + \delta_{\mu 1}) C_{\mu 2} \log \left(\frac{\Lambda^2}{M_h^2} \right) \log \left(\frac{M_h^2}{m_\mu^2} \right). \quad (11)$$

Putting all pieces together, the total BSM contribution to Δa_μ is thus given by

$$\Delta a_\mu^{\text{BSM}} \simeq \Delta a_\mu^{(\text{III})} + \Delta a_\mu^{(\text{IV})} + \Delta a_\mu^{(\text{VII})} + \Delta a_\mu^{(\text{VIII})}. \quad (12)$$

We have 3 parameters, namely $\delta_{\mu 1}$, $C_{\mu 2}$ and Λ . In the rest of this paper, we fix $\Lambda = 100$ TeV. Now, we can use eq. (12) in order to find the region in the parameter space that corresponds to solving the anomaly in eq. 1. Figure 2 shows the viable parameter space that corresponds to the 2σ solution to Δa_μ . The plot also shows the experimental constraints given in eq. 7 in solid red. The plot shows that the Higgs sector can still accommodate a solution to the $(g-2)_\mu$ anomaly. This is mainly because the BSM Wilson coefficient $C_{\mu 2}$ is essentially unconstrained experimentally, and we can see that a solution to the $g-2$ anomaly is still possible even if $\delta_{\mu 1} = 0$. On the other hand, $\delta_{\mu 1}$ cannot on its

	HL-LHC	HE-LHC		ILC			CLIC			CEPC	FCC-ee		FCC	Muon (10 TeV)	
		S2	S2'	250	500	1000	380	1500	3000		240	365	(ee/eh/hh)	+125 GeV	
$\delta_{\mu 1}$ [%]	9.2	5	3.4	30	18.8	12.4	640	26	11.6	17.8	20	17.8	0.82	3.6	0.19

TABLE I: Projected 2σ bounds on $\delta_{\mu 1}$ in the various future experiments taken from the Higgs@FutureColliders study [35] which is summarized in [36] (see also [37]). The most stringent constraints come from the combined analyses in the muon collider with COM energies of 10 TeV and 125 GeV. This experiment is essentially capable of exploring the entire $\delta_{\mu 1}$ dependence of the parameter space.

own solve the anomaly if $C_{\mu 2} \rightarrow 0$. In fact, we can see that $\delta_{\mu 1}$ only mildly affects Δa_{μ} , which is hardly surprising given the smallness of the muon Yukawa coupling and the bound in eq. 7.

The size of $|C_{\mu 2}|$ required to solve the anomaly is $\sim (1 - 2) \times 10^3$, which might seem large, however, we should keep in mind that this is merely an artifact of our parameterization when we divided $C_{\mu 2}$ by v to keep it dimensionless. We should note that with proper power counting (such as in the SMEFT), $C_{\mu 2}$ is divided by a larger UV scale that is typically $O(\text{TeV})$, which would yield lower values of $|C_{\mu 2}|$. We shall show later on that perturbativity is maintained for this range of $|C_{\mu 2}|$ up to safe levels.

The current LHC bound in eq. 7 is not very stringent, however, there are many proposed future experiments that are expected to probe the viable parameter space almost fully. These are summarized in Table I. We show the most relevant ones in Figure 2, which are the HL-LHC projections and the projections from the proposed muon collider with COM runs of 10 TeV + 125 GeV. We can see from the plot that the proposed muon collider can essentially probe the entire range of $\delta_{\mu 1}$. However, even in this scenario, the Higgs sector remains viable as a potential solution to the $g - 2$ anomaly, because $C_{\mu 2}$ remains unconstrained. To the best of our knowledge, there aren't any proposed measurements of $C_{\mu 2}$ either currently in the LHC or in the future. We think that current and future experiments should probe this effective coupling both because it can potentially provide a solution to the $g - 2$ anomaly, even when $\delta_{\mu 1} \rightarrow 0$; and because of its potential enhancement of the di-Higgs production as we will show below.

IV. PHENOMENOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

In this section, we will discuss the phenomenological implications of the viable parameter space, including implications of nonzero $\delta_{\mu 1}$ and $C_{\mu 2}$ on unitarity; and the enhancement to the di-Higgs production.

A. Unitarity-Violation and the Scale of New Physics

As explained in detail in [18–22], any non-vanishing deviations from the SM predictions will eventually lead to a breakdown in unitarity at some high energy scale. This is because the SM is the unique UV-complete theory with the observed particle content, and any deviation from the SM predictions will lead to UV-incompleteness that manifests itself as processes with energy-growing amplitudes that eventually lead to a breakdown in unitarity at some high energy scale, which signals the onset of NP.

This implies that each point in the parameter space that corresponds to Δa_μ will point to an energy scale where unitarity is violated, and thus to the scale at which NP should come into play. It is fairly easy to adapt the results of the top sector in [21] to the muon sector. There is only one model-independent process, namely

$$\mu\bar{\mu} \rightarrow hh : E_{\max} = \frac{8\sqrt{2}\pi v^2}{m_\mu C_{\mu 2}}. \quad (13)$$

This process is model-independent because it only depends on one parameter ($C_{\mu 2}$), and thus the scale of NP is independent of any other assumptions regarding the other potential deviations in the SM. We show the scale of NP that corresponds to the parameter space obtained from eq. 13 on the left side of Figure 3. We can see from the plot that the scale of NP is $\sim 10 - 18$ TeV, which is beyond what can be probed in the LHC, although it is well within the range of the future 100-TeV collider, and possibly the proposed muon collider.

Better bounds, however, can be obtained if the deviations in the couplings of the Higgs to the massive gauge bosons are assumed to vanish. As shown in [21], there are other processes that violate unitarity, however, the amplitudes of these processes also receive contamination from the deviation in hhV and $hhVV$ couplings, with V being the W or the Z . Therefore, the scale of NP will also depend on the sizes of these deviations. However, if these deviations are assumed to vanish, then these processes will become functions of $\delta_{\mu 1}$ and $C_{\mu 2}$ only, which enables us to obtain a lower scale of NP. Up to 6-body scattering, these processes include³

$$\mu\bar{\mu} \rightarrow W_L^+ W_L^- : E_{\max} \leq \frac{8\pi v^2}{m_\mu \delta_{\mu 1}}, \quad (14)$$

$$\mu\bar{\nu} \rightarrow W_L^- h : E_{\max} \leq \frac{8\pi v^2}{\sqrt{2} m_\mu \delta_{\mu 1}}, \quad (15)$$

³ We refer the interested reader to [21] for a complete discussion of how these bounds are obtained from unitarity.




FIG. 3: The model-independent unitarity-violating scale that corresponds to the parameter space that can solve the $g - 2$ anomaly when the Higgs couplings to the W and Z are allowed to deviate from the SM predictions (left) and when they conform to the SM predictions (right). In the former case, the scale of NP is $\sim 10 - 18$ TeV, whereas in the latter case, it could be as low as $\sim 4.4 - 5.3$ TeV.

$$\mu\bar{\nu} \rightarrow W_L^- W_L^+ W_L^- : E_{\max} \leq \left[\frac{32\pi^2 v^3}{\sqrt{2}m_\mu \delta_{\mu 1}} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (16)$$

$$\mu\bar{\mu} \rightarrow W_L^+ W_L^- h, \mu\bar{\nu} \rightarrow W_L^- h^2 : E_{\max} \leq \left[\frac{64\pi^2 v^3}{\sqrt{2}m_\mu |C_{\mu 2} - \delta_{\mu 1}|} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (17)$$

$$\mu\bar{\nu} W_L^+ \rightarrow W_L^+ W_L^- h : E_{\max} \leq \left[\frac{128\sqrt{3}\pi^3 v^4}{\sqrt{2}m_\mu |C_{\mu 2} - 3\delta_{\mu 1}|} \right]^{\frac{1}{3}}. \quad (18)$$

where W_L^\pm are the longitudinal modes of the W boson. We plot the lowest unitarity-violating scale from eqs. (14-18) on the right-hand side of Figure 3. We can see now that the scale of NP drops to $\sim 4.4 - 5.3$ TeV, which is indeed within the reach of the LHC. This suggests that the HL-LHC could shed more light on the potential BSM physics in the Higgs sector and its potential solution of the $g - 2$ anomaly.

B. Di-Higgs Production Enhancement

Nonzero $\delta_{\mu 1}$ and/or $C_{\mu 2}$ could have interesting phenomenological consequences, such as deviation in the branching fraction of the Higgs decay to $\mu^+ \mu^-$, and deviations in the Higgs signal strength from the SM predictions. However, perhaps the most interesting experimental signature for a nonzero $\delta_{\mu 1}$ and/or $C_{\mu 2}$ is their enhancement of the di-Higgs production. The di-Higgs production provides




FIG. 4: Di-Higgs production enhancement through gluon fusion.

The upper two diagrams are proportional to $\delta_{\mu 1}$, whereas the bottom diagram is proportional to $C_{\mu 2}$

an excellent probe for NP through both investigating the Higgs couplings compared to the SM, and searching for BSM particles through resonant enhancement, such as additional heavy Higgses, KK gravitons etc. Thus, we confine our discussion to the potential enhancement of the di-Higgs production.

We first begin by evaluating the possible enhancement of the di-Higgs production in the LHC (and other pp colliders). In pp colliders, the enhancement from $\delta_{\mu 1}$ and $C_{\mu 2}$ arises from gluon fusion (gF) with μ running in the loop as in Figure 4. The top two diagrams depend on $\delta_{\mu 1}$ alone and are expected to yield a negligible contribution due to the smallness of the muon Yukawa coupling. As in pp colliders gF dominates over Vector Boson Fusion (VBF), with the top quark yielding the dominant contribution thereof, we can estimate the enhancement of these two diagrams relative to the SM cross-section, simply by rescaling the σ_{SM} by $\left(\frac{(1+\delta_{\mu})m_{\mu}}{m_t}\right)^4 \sim O(10^{-13})$. This is obviously negligible. On the other hand, the last diagram is proportional to $C_{\mu 2}$, which given its larger size could be significant. We can estimate the contribution of the last diagram by adapting the results of the top quark in [38] to the muon case

$$A_3 \sim \frac{\alpha_s}{4\pi} C_{\mu 2} Y_{\mu}^2 \left(\log \frac{m_{\mu}^2}{\hat{s}} + i\pi \right)^2, \quad (19)$$

where \hat{s} is the partonic COM energy. Using eq. 19, we estimate the enhancement of the cross-section to be $\sim O(10^{-8})$ fb, which is also negligible.

Things are quite different if we consider a muon collider, since the di-Higgs production proceeds at tree-level and is therefore expected to be larger. Specifically, $\mu\bar{\mu} \rightarrow hh$ proceeds through the s, t and u channels, in addition to the contact term. The s, t and u channels are proportional to $\delta_{\mu 1}$ alone and are negligible. On the other hand the contact term depends on $C_{\mu 2}$ and can be sizeable. The




FIG. 5: The cross-section of the di-Higgs production in the proposed 10-TeV muon collider as a function of $C_{\mu 2}$. The red dashed lines bound the region of the parameter space that corresponds to solving the $g - 2$ anomaly.

cross-section of the contact term is given by

$$\sigma^{\text{BSM}}(\mu\bar{\mu} \rightarrow hh) \simeq \frac{C_{\mu 2}^2}{64\pi v^4} m_\mu^2 \sqrt{1 - \frac{4M_h^2}{s}}. \quad (20)$$

In Figure 5, we show the cross-section of the di-Higgs production in the proposed 10-TeV muon collider. The plot shows that for the region of the parameter space that corresponds to the solution to the $g - 2$ anomaly, the di-Higgs production cross-section is $\sim 7 - 23$ pb, which is quite sizable. This could be the smoking gun for the viability of the Higgs solution to the $g - 2$ anomaly, and it indeed represents another motivation for building the muon collider.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND OUTLOOK

In this paper, we analyzed the viability of a BSM Higgs solution to the $g - 2$ anomaly using a bottom-up EFT approach. In the SM, the Higgs contribution to the muon's magnetic dipole moment is negligible. However, given that the current level of experimental limits on the Higgs sector still leaves ample room for NP, it is possible for this contribution to be significantly enhanced compared to the SM.

We saw that while the deviation in the Higgs Yukawa coupling to the muon is not enough to account for the anomaly, the effective coupling $\bar{\mu}\mu hh$, which is unconstrained experimentally, can account for the entire discrepancy. We surveyed the proposed projections on the parameter space and found that the proposed muon collider could provide the best sensitivity for exploring the parameter space. We have also shown that unitarity can be used in order to estimate the scale of NP that corresponds to non-vanishing deviations from the SM, i.e. $\delta_{\mu 1}$ and $C_{\mu 2}$. We found that the model-independent scale of NP that corresponds to the region of the parameter space that can solve the anomaly to be $\sim 10 - 18$ TeV. This scale is lowered to $\sim 4 - 5$ TeV if the Higgs couplings to massive gauge bosons are assumed to be equal to their SM predictions.

We also discussed the possible enhancement of the di-Higgs production cross-section, and found that while the enhancement is negligible in the LHC (and other pp colliders), it could be sizable in the proposed 10 TeV muon collider as a result of the contact term interaction through $C_{\mu 2}$. A key takeaway of this study is that current and future experiments should try to measure and set limits on $C_{\mu 2}$ due to its potential significance in solving the $g - 2$ anomaly. Current searches focus of the $h\bar{h}t\bar{t}$ coupling $C_{t 2}$, which if non-vanishing, is expected to be the largest of the effective couplings of the type $hh\bar{f}f$. Nonetheless, we believe that $C_{\mu 2}$ should be given similar interest. We note in passing that we believe any UV completion would likely be a strongly coupled theory.

In this paper, we confined our analysis to flavor-conserving operators and avoided Flavor Violation (FV). FV Yukawa couplings $Y_{ij} \neq \delta_{ij}\sqrt{2}m_i/v$ have been discussed extensively in the literature, see for instance [39] and the references therein, however, to the best of our knowledge, FV effective operators such as C_{ij} have never been properly investigated before, although they were briefly discussed in [40–42]. We will study these types of FV coupling in a future work.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

FA would like to thank Stephen Martin for the valuable correspondence. The work of FA is supported by the C.V. Raman fellowship from CHEP at IISc. S.K.V. thanks SERB Grant CRG/2021/007170 "Tiny Effects from Heavy New Physics" from Department of Science and Technology, Government of India.

-
- [1] G. W. Bennett *et al.* [Muon $g-2$], “Final Report of the Muon E821 Anomalous Magnetic Moment Measurement at BNL,” *Phys. Rev. D* **73**, 072003 (2006) [hep-ex/hep-ex/0602035](#).
- [2] B. Abi *et al.* [Muon $g-2$], “Measurement of the Positive Muon Anomalous Magnetic Moment to 0.46 ppm,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **126**, no.14, 141801 (2021) [hep-ex/2104.03281](#).
- [3] T. Albahri *et al.* [Muon $g-2$], “Magnetic-field measurement and analysis for the Muon $g - 2$ Experiment at Fermilab,” *Phys. Rev. A* **103**, no.4, 042208 (2021) [hep-ex/2104.03201](#).
- [4] T. Albahri *et al.* [Muon $g-2$], “Measurement of the anomalous precession frequency of the muon in the Fermilab Muon $g - 2$ Experiment,” *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, no.7, 072002 (2021) [hep-ex/2104.03247](#).
- [5] T. Aoyama, N. Asmussen, M. Benayoun, J. Bijnens, T. Blum, M. Bruno, I. Caprini, C. M. Carloni Calame, M. Cè and G. Colangelo, *et al.* “The anomalous magnetic moment of the muon in the Standard Model,” *Phys. Rept.* **887**, 1-166 (2020) [hep-ph/2006.04822](#).
- [6] S. Borsanyi, Z. Fodor, J. N. Guenther, C. Hoelbling, S. D. Katz, L. Lellouch, T. Lippert, K. Miura, L. Parato and K. K. Szabo, *et al.* “Leading hadronic contribution to the muon magnetic moment from lattice QCD,” *Nature* **593**, no.7857, 51-55 (2021) [hep-lat/2002.12347](#).
- [7] M. Cè, A. Gérardin, G. von Hippel, R. J. Hudspith, S. Kuberski, H. B. Meyer, K. Miura, D. Mohler, K. Ottnad and P. Srijit, *et al.* “Window observable for the hadronic vacuum polarization contribution to the muon $g - 2$ from lattice QCD,” [hep-lat/2206.06582](#).
- [8] N. Saito [J-PARC $g-2$ /EDM], “A novel precision measurement of muon $g-2$ and EDM at J-PARC,” *AIP Conf. Proc.* **1467**, 45-56 (2012)
- [9] T. Mibe [J-PARC $g-2$], “Measurement of muon $g-2$ and EDM with an ultra-cold muon beam at J-PARC,” *Nucl. Phys. B Proc. Suppl.* **218**, 242-246 (2011)
- [10] M. Abe, S. Bae, G. Beer, G. Bunce, H. Choi, S. Choi, M. Chung, W. Da Silva, S. Eidelman and M. Finger, *et al.* “A New Approach for Measuring the Muon Anomalous Magnetic Moment and Electric Dipole Moment,” *PTEP* **2019**, no.5, 053C02 (2019) [physics.ins-det/1901.03047](#).
- [11] T. Aoyama, T. Kinoshita and M. Nio, “Theory of the Anomalous Magnetic Moment of the Electron,” *Atoms* **7**, no.1, 28 (2019)
- [12] 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**, no.7836, 61-65 (2020)
- [13] D. Buttazzo and P. Paradisi, “Probing the muon $g - 2$ anomaly with the Higgs boson at a muon collider,” *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, no.7, 075021 (2021) [hep-ph/2012.02769](#).
- [14] S. Fajfer, J. F. Kamenik and M. Tamaro, “Interplay of New Physics effects in $(g - 2)_l$ and $h \rightarrow \ell^+ \ell^-$ — lessons from SMEFT,” *JHEP* **06**, 099 (2021) [hep-ph/2103.10859](#).

- [15] J. Aebischer, W. Dekens, E. E. Jenkins, A. V. Manohar, D. Sengupta and P. Stoffer, “Effective field theory interpretation of lepton magnetic and electric dipole moments,” JHEP **07**, 107 (2021) [hep-ph/2102.08954](#).
- [16] L. Allwicher, L. Di Luzio, M. Fedele, F. Mescia and M. Nardecchia, “What is the scale of new physics behind the muon $g-2$?,” Phys. Rev. D **104**, no.5, 055035 (2021) [hep-ph/2105.13981](#).
- [17] K. Cheung and Z. S. Wang, “Physics potential of a muon-proton collider,” Phys. Rev. D **103**, 116009 (2021) [hep-ph/2101.10476](#).
- [18] S. Chang and M. A. Luty, “The Higgs Trilinear Coupling and the Scale of New Physics,” JHEP **03**, 140 (2020) [hep-ph/1902.05556](#).
- [19] F. Abu-Ajamieh, S. Chang, M. Chen and M. A. Luty, “Higgs coupling measurements and the scale of new physics,” JHEP **07**, 056 (2021) [hep-ph/2009.11293](#).
- [20] F. Abu-Ajamieh, “The scale of new physics from the Higgs couplings to $\gamma\gamma$ and γZ ,” JHEP **06**, 091 (2022) [hep-ph/2112.13529](#).
- [21] F. Abu-Ajamieh, “The scale of new physics from the Higgs couplings to gg ,” Phys. Lett. B **833**, 137389 (2022) [hep-ph/2203.07410](#).
- [22] F. Abu-Ajamieh, “Model-independent Veltman condition, naturalness and the little hierarchy problem *,” Chin. Phys. C **46**, no.1, 013101 (2022) [hep-ph/2101.06932](#).
- [23] D. Stratakis *et al.* [Muon Collider], “A Muon Collider Facility for Physics Discovery,” [physics.acc-ph/2203.08033](#).
- [24] G. Buchalla, O. Catà, A. Celis, M. Knecht and C. Krause, “Higgs-electroweak chiral Lagrangian: One-loop renormalization group equations,” Phys. Rev. D **104**, no.7, 076005 (2021) [hep-ph/2004.11348](#).
- [25] B. Grinstein and M. Trott, “A Higgs-Higgs bound state due to new physics at a TeV,” Phys. Rev. D **76**, 073002 (2007) [hep-ph/0704.1505](#).
- [26] R. Jackiw and S. Weinberg, “Weak interaction corrections to the muon magnetic moment and to muonic atom energy levels,” Phys. Rev. D **5**, 2396-2398 (1972)
- [27] D. Tucker-Smith and I. Yavin, “Muonic hydrogen and MeV forces,” Phys. Rev. D **83**, 101702 (2011) [hep-ph/1011.4922](#).
- [28] C. Y. Chen, H. Davoudiasl, W. J. Marciano and C. Zhang, “Implications of a light “dark Higgs” solution to the $g_{\mu-2}$ discrepancy,” Phys. Rev. D **93**, no.3, 035006 (2016) [hep-ph/1511.04715](#).
- [29] G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS], “Combined measurements of Higgs boson production and decay using up to 80 fb^{-1} of proton-proton collision data at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV collected with the ATLAS experiment,” Phys. Rev. D **101**, no.1, 012002 (2020) [hep-ex/1909.02845](#).
- [30] “Electroweak corrections to the muon anomalous magnetic moment,” Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 3267-3270 (1996) [./hep-ph/9512369](#)
- [31] J. Haestier, S. Heinemeyer, W. Hollik, D. Stockinger, A. M. Weber and G. Weiglein, “Precision Observables in the MSSM: W mass and the muon magnetic moment,” AIP Conf. Proc. **903**, no.1, 291-294 (2007) [./hep-ph/0610318](#)

- [32] T. Gribouk and A. Czarnecki, “Electroweak interactions and the muon $g-2$: Bosonic two-loop effects,” *Phys. Rev. D* **72**, 053016 (2005) [./hep-ph/0509205](#)
- [33] C. Gnendiger, D. Stöckinger and H. Stöckinger-Kim, “The electroweak contributions to $(g - 2)_\mu$ after the Higgs boson mass measurement,” *Phys. Rev. D* **88**, 053005 (2013) [hep-ph/1306.5546](#).
- [34] A. Czarnecki, B. Krause and W. J. Marciano, “Electroweak Fermion loop contributions to the muon anomalous magnetic moment,” *Phys. Rev. D* **52**, R2619-R2623 (1995) [./hep-ph/9506256](#)
- [35] J. de Blas, M. Cepeda, J. D’Hondt, R. K. Ellis, C. Grojean, B. Heinemann, F. Maltoni, A. Nisati, E. Petit and R. Rattazzi, *et al.* “Higgs Boson Studies at Future Particle Colliders,” *JHEP* **01**, 139 (2020) [hep-ph/1905.03764](#).
- [36] F. Abu-Ajamieh, S. Chang, M. Chen, D. Liu and M. A. Luty, “Snowmass 2021 White Paper: Higgs Coupling Sensitivities and Model-Independent Bounds on the Scale of New Physics,” [hep-ph/2203.09512](#).
- [37] S. Dawson, P. Meade, I. Ojalvo, C. Vernieri, S. Adhikari, F. Abu-Ajamieh, A. Alberta, H. Bahl, R. Barman and M. Basso, *et al.* “Report of the Topical Group on Higgs Physics for Snowmass 2021: The Case for Precision Higgs Physics,” [hep-ph/2209.07510](#).
- [38] A. Azatov, R. Contino, G. Panico and M. Son, “Effective field theory analysis of double Higgs boson production via gluon fusion,” *Phys. Rev. D* **92**, no.3, 035001 (2015) [hep-ph/1502.00539](#).
- [39] R. Harnik, J. Kopp and J. Zupan, “Flavor Violating Higgs Decays,” *JHEP* **03**, 026 (2013) [hep-ph/1209.1397](#).
- [40] K. S. Babu and S. Nandi, “Natural fermion mass hierarchy and new signals for the Higgs boson,” *Phys. Rev. D* **62**, 033002 (2000) [hep-ph/hep-ph/9907213](#).
- [41] G. F. Giudice and O. Lebedev, “Higgs-dependent Yukawa couplings,” *Phys. Lett. B* **665**, 79-85 (2008) [hep-ph/0804.1753](#).
- [42] A. Goudelis, O. Lebedev and J. h. Park, “Higgs-induced lepton flavor violation,” *Phys. Lett. B* **707**, 369-374 (2012) [hep-ph/1111.1715](#).